HISTORIA JUDAICA

A JOURNAL OF STUDIES
IN JEWISH HISTORY, ESPECIALLY IN
THE LEGAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY OF THE JEWS

VOLUME XV

EDITOR
GUIDO KISCH

Digitized by Project Zikaron
Touro University-NY Libraries
www.zikaron.tourolib.org
2024

NEW YORK
HISTORIA JUDAICA
40 West 68th Street
1953

The Table of Contents will appear
at the end of the volume

VOL. XV APRIL, 1953 PART 1

Historia Judaica

GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND THE JEWISH PROBLEM PRIOR TO WORLD WAR I

By EDMUND SILBERNER
Hebrew University
Jerusalem

AFTER Lassalle, there was within the German Socialist movement considerable preoccupation with anti- Semitism, but only slight and occasional discussion of other aspects of the Jewish problem. Although on the whole consistently opposed to political anti-Semitism, German Socialism was not entirely devoid of manifestations of Jew-hatred. Relatively frequent in the eighteen-seventies and eighties, these manifestations became increasingly rare in the following two decades. Among the more important Socialists who showed a more or less pronounced anti-Jewish bias, the following may be named: Johann Baptist von Schweitzer, Lassalle's successor in the General German Workingmen's Association; Wilhelm Hasselmann, editor of the Lassallean papers, the *Social-Democrat* and *Neuer Sozial-Demokrat;* Rudolf Calwer, economics writer and editor of a provincial party newspaper, the *Braunschweiger Volksfreund*; and Franz Mehring, the historian. They will be briefly referred to or discussed in the first section of this article.

The second section gives a short survey of the Social Democratic party's ideological struggle against political anti-Semitism. As representative illustrations, two important leaders of the party have been chosen: August Bebel,

rapporteur on anti-Semitism at the Socialist Congress in Cologne in 1893, and Wilhelm Liebknecht, who also devoted some attention to the problem.

Parallel to its struggle against political anti-Semitism, German Social Democracy consistently opposed Jewish national aspirations. It was hostile, not only toward Zionism, but toward any political program based on the desirability of preserving Jewish culture. This hostility is well illustrated in the writings of the two outstanding theorists of German Social Democracy, Eduard Bernstein and Karl Kautsky. They are discussed in the last section of the present study.

The literature on the subject is very meager. Robert Michels drew attention to some manifestations of anti-Semitism in German Social Democracy in his article, "Die Deutsche Sozialdemokratie," published in 1906 in *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik,* (XXIII, 471-556). A few further pertinent details were given by Eduard Bernstein in his Yiddish article, "The Jews and German Social-Democracy," which, significantly enough, appeared in the New York *Tsukunft* (XXVI [1921], 145-152). Finally, Paul W. Massing devoted a section of his *Rehearsal for Destruction; A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany* (New York, 1949, pp. 151-206), to "Socialist Labor and Anti-Semitism (1863-1914)." It contains interesting material and a good survey of some aspects of the problem, but is unsatisfactory on the matter of the hostility of German Social Democracy to Jewish national aspirations. It is also strikingly disappointing—as far as source material is concerned—on such important representatives of German Socialism as Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Ferdinand Lassalle, and Moses Hess (who is not mentioned even once).

1. Anti-Jewish Manifestations

As early as 1862, Moses Hess bitterly complained about the anti-Jewish feeling within the ranks of German Social-

ists.[1] This in itself seems to show the intensity of German Socialist anti-Semitism in the early eighteen-sixties. That Lassalle himself was, in the latter part of his life, strongly anti-Jewish has already been indicated in a previous study.[2] It still remains to be added that anti-Jewish feeling was also cultivated by his successor, Johann Baptist von Schweitzer. In his literary works, Schweitzer caricatured the liberals by typifying them as Jews, and presented Jewish bankers or manufacturers as the embodiment of exploitation and deception of the common people.[3] The same may be said of Schweitzer's pupil, Wilhelm Hasselmann, who even outdid his master. It was under the influence of Hasselmann that the organ of the General German Workingmen's Association, the *Social-Democrat,* opposed Jewish literati to German workers.[4]

Generally speaking, "there was noticeable, for a long time, a tendency in the party's literature to show that the Jew and the capitalist exploiter are synonymous."[5] Hasselmann well represents this trend. At every possible opportunity, he identified, in the *Neuer Social-Demokrat,* the Jew and the exploiter. As a Lassalleanist, he was, of course, strongly opposed to Marx. But when a democratic paper once accused Hasselmann of Jew-hatred, he maintained that his language about the Jews was very moderate, and to "prove" it he reprinted extensively the most anti-Semitic passages from Marx's "Zur Judenfrage."[6] Under these circumstances the manner in which he treated comrades from the rival Socialist party led by Liebknecht (the so-called

[1] Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem* (Leipzig, 1862), p. 42. See also Edmund Silberner, "Moses Hess," *Historia Judaica,* XIII (1951), 3-28.

[2] Edmund Silberner, "Ferdinand Lassalle: From Maccabeeism to Jewish anti-Semitism," *Hebrew Union College Annual,* XXIV (1953), 151-186.

[3] Gustav Mayer, *Johann Baptist von Schweitzer* (Jena, 1909), p. 89; Eduard Bernstein, "Di Yidn un di daitshe sotsial-demokratie," *Tsukunft* (New York), XXVI (1921), 146.

[4] K. Schottenloher, *Flugblatt und Zeitung* (Berlin, 1922), p. 416.

[5] Bernstein, *Tsukunft,* XXVI (1921), 146.

[6] "Das Judentum," *Neuer Social-Demokrat,* Sept. 20, 1872, p. 3. Cf. Silberner, "Was Marx an Anti-Semite?" *Historia Judaica,* XI (1948), 3-52. On Marx's great friend, see Silberner, "Friedrich Engels and the Jews," *Jewish Social Studies,* XI (1949), 323-342.

"Eisenachers") is hardly surprising: he simply designated them as "Jews" and "Jew boys" (*Judenjungen*).[7] Liebknecht's organ, the *Volksstaat,* retorted that such a vocabulary was worthy of the Junkers.[8] This, however, did not prevent the Lassalleanists from calling the Eisenachers "Schacherjuden"[9] and from breaking up one of their meetings with shouts of "Jews!" and "Scoundrels!"[10]

Even after the unification of the German Socialist movement (1875), the party press used the words Judaism, Judaization, and Jew—*Judentum, Verjudung, Jude*—as synonymous with exploitation, cheating, and swindling.[11] It reprinted the well-known anti-Jewish passages of Marx's essay on the Jewish question.[12] This was done to explain "the social significance of Judaism."[13] On another occasion it ostensibly reprinted *in extenso* "Zur Judenfrage," simply "to render accessible to the German people" this "work of genius."[14] It singled out Jewish bankers, such as "the Jew Bleichröder."[15] It distinguished between "the big Jew" and "the trouser-selling children of Israel."[16] It asserted, furthermore, that "the Jews" rule over Germany. "The Jews are now, so to speak, getting their revenge. During five centuries of oppression they have been forcibly excluded from agriculture and 'productive' work, and systematically bred to be usurers. Now we suffer the consequences. By a cruel irony of world history, the oppressed race has become the ruling class."[17] Even a protest made by the *Sozialdemokrat* against the Russian pogroms is not straight-

[7] See Anonymous, *Volksstaat,* July 20, 1872, p. 1.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] A. Kapell, "Ehrliche Liebknechterei," *Neuer Social-Demokrat,* Oct. 30, 1872, p. 3.

[10] Anonymous, *Volksstaat,* Nov. 6, 1872, p. 3.

[11] Anonymous, "Die Verjudung des deutschen Reiches," *Sozialdemokrat,* Jan. 9, 1881, pp. 1-2. See also *ibid.,* June 30, 1881, p. 2, col. 3, line 1.

[12] *Ibid.,* June 30 and July 7, 1881.

[13] *Ibid.,* June 30, 1881, p. 2, col. 1. Needless to say, "Judaism" (*Judentum*) means here the Jewish collectivity and not only the Jewish religion.

[14] *Berliner Volksblatt* (later the *Vorwärts*), Oct. 10-19, 1890.

[15] *Sozialdemokrat,* Jan. 9, 1881, p. 2. Cf. also Oct. 27, 1881, p. 2, and Aug. 17, 1882, p. 3.

[16] *Sozialdemokrat,* Aug. 17, 1882, p. 3.

[17] Anonymous, "Auf falscher Fährte," *ibid.,* Oct. 26, 1882, p. 1.

forward; it is preceded by a statement that "no one is less inclined than we to represent the Jews as pure angels of virtue."[18]

These and similar statements could be multiplied, but there is no purpose in giving additional proofs that German Social Democracy—in spite of its theoretical stand on the Jewish question—was, in practice, far from being entirely free from racial prejudice. In his report to the party congress of 1893, Bebel admitted that anti-Semitic university students exercised "a certain influence even within the [Social Democratic] movement."[19] Eight years later, a party organ denied that anti-Semitism existed within the party, but frankly admitted that "there are individual party members who are still swayed by certain prejudices against Jewry. They have difficulty in reconciling themselves to this or that peculiarity of the Jewish national character [*Volkscharakter*]. Then, carried away by excitement and losing their tactfulness, they make generalized assertions which they themselves condemn upon calm reflection."[20]

As late as 1921, Eduard Bernstein admitted that, though the presence of "an outspoken anti-Semite" in German Social Demoracy is an impossibility, "one encounters here and there in the party or in the Socialist trade unions certain anti-Jewish prejudices or some small remnants of race feeling."[21] Anti-Semitic periodicals as well as Jewish publications were, of course, for opposite reasons, eager to record more or less accurately these anti-Semitic manifestations within the Socialist movement.[22] It must be added, however, that such manifestations were sporadic, and never took a rationalized or systematic form. In the last decade of the nineteenth century they were already rare, and became even less frequent and less significant in the first decade of the twentieth century. During these two decades

[18] Anonymous, *ibid.*, Feb. 16, 1882, p. 3.

[19] August Bebel, *Sozialdemokratie und Antisemitismus* (Berlin, 1894), p. 18.

[20] Anonymous, *Rheinische Zeitung*, Oct. 12, 1901, Erstes Blatt, p. 2.

[21] Bernstein, *Tsukunft*, XXVI (1921), 152.

[22] See the files of *Deutsch-Soziale Blätter;* Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus, *Mitteilungen;* and *Die Welt.*

there were, to our knowledge, only two prominent German Social Democrats who, in spite of their statements to the contrary, showed a bias against the Jews, Richard Calwer and Franz Mehring.

Calwer, a right-wing Social Democrat, published a pamphlet (1894) in which he maintained that the "independent" movement within the Social Democratic party was but a product of a "petty-bourgeois and 'radical' Socialism, fed and incited by a few Jews who make slander their business."[23] He complained that "specifically Jewish" characteristics, such as place hunting, oppositionism, and commercialism, were making themselves felt in the party, and more particularly in its press.[24] Among the Jewish publicists in the party there were also, of course, excellent comrades, but the overwhelming majority was worth nothing. It is obvious, Calwer noted, that in principle Social Democracy rejects anti-Semitism. Yet characteristically enough, he added: "The fight against anti-Semitism, however, goes so far in our press and literature as to create the impression that we are philo-Semites; indeed, some of our opponents claim already to have nosed it out that we are Judaized through and through."[25]

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Calwer, although he denies being an anti-Semite, is biased against the Jews. One must recall in this connection that in the Social Democratic party overt anti-Semitism could not be propagated, and anti-Jewish declarations had to be camouflaged. Thus, for example, at the party congress at Lübeck (1901), the Social Democratic deputy Wolfgang Heine, attacking Parvus (Alexander Helphand), clearly insinuated that the latter had committed an allegedly Jewish breach of tact. Heine did not, however, use the word "Jewish"; he simply asserted that Parvus' tactlessness would be exploited by the anti-Semites.[26]

[23] Richard Calwer, *Das Kommunistische Manifest und die heutige Sozialdemokratie* (Braunschweig, 1894), p. 18.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 39-41.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[26] Parteitag 1901, *Protokoll*, p. 195.

Even more prejudiced than Calwer was the renowned Social Democratic historian Franz Mehring (1846-1919). Long before 1890—the year of his conversion to the doctrine of Marx—Mehring had fought against the rowdy anti-Semitism preached in Berlin by the court chaplain Stöcker. Had the latter, Mehring noted, been satisfied with "occasionally" venting his anger on the Jews, it would not have been worthwhile to expend one drop of ink on it.[27] Stöcker was, however, a dangerous demagogue, inflaming popular feeling without really offering any solution to the Jewish question.[28] Mehring therefore felt bound to fight against him.

After joining the Social Democratic party, Mehring continued to fight political anti-Semitism. Yet his attacks on it were accompanied by even stronger attacks against "philo-Semitism," a movement which, in his eyes, was but a form of defense of capitalism.[29] He minimized as much as he could the dangers of anti-Semitism, and maximized, as it were, those of "philo-Semitism." The latter appeared to him "even more disgusting than the spontaneous Jew-hatred of the peasants and artisans."[30] "In considering the brutalities that anti-Semitism, more with words than with deeds, commits against the Jews, one should not overlook the brutalities that philo-Semitism, more with deeds than with words, commits against everyone, be he Jew or Turk, Christian or pagan, who opposes capitalism."[31]

All this, it may be rightly pointed out, is a matter of opinion, and not an indication of any animosity towards the Jews. There is, however, supplementary material showing that Mehring was not neutral with respect to them. In spite of his admiration for such Jews as Lassalle and Marx, and notwithstanding his friendship with Rosa Luxemburg,

[27] Franz Mehring, *Herr Hofprediger Stöcker der Socialpolitiker* (Bremen, 1882), p. 68.

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69, 75-76.

[29] Mehring, *Kapital und Presse* (Berlin, 1891), p. 89; *Die Lessing-Legende* (Stuttgart, 1893), p. 7; also in *Neue Zeit*, X^2 (1891-92), 547.

[30] Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*. 12th ed. (Berlin, 1922), IV, p. 98.

[31] Mehring, "Anti-und Philosemitisches," *Neue Zeit*, IX^2 (1890-91), 587.

a Polish Jewess, Mehring is nearly always hostile, derogatory, or ironical whenever, as a historian, he refers to the Jewish collectivity. In the eighteenth century, he said, the German Jews could not be called "angels of light."[32] In the middle of the nineteenth century, he noted, Russian and Polish Jews "could with the best will not be accounted as the flower of humanity."[33] Such passages more than reveal a good sense of humor. Mehring also used the term "Geldjudentum," or "Geldjuden."[34] This would have been perfectly normal if, occasionally at least, he had also used "Geldchristentum" or "Geldchristen." His defense of Heschel Marx's baptism would not merit mention if it did not imply that an honest Jew had no reason to remain faithful to Judaism.[35] He also asserted that Karl Marx was *completely* unprejudiced towards the Jews.[36] This statement is more than a distortion of facts by the official historian of German Social Democracy; it mirrors better than anything else his own "unprejudiced" attitude towards that people.

2. The Struggle Against Political Anti-Semitism

A. Bebel

It is hardly necessary to point out that German Social Democracy was strongly opposed to anti-Jewish excesses.[37] Also, it always objected to any political program based on anti-Semitism. In Germany anti-Semitic parties and groups not only attacked Jews, but regarded the whole Socialist movement to be of Jewish origin; assailing the Jews, they thus at the same time assailed Social Democracy, and particularly its leaders. This in itself was sufficient to create

[32] Mehring, *Die Lessing-Legende*, p. 253.

[33] Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemocratie*, II, 140. See also II, 113.

[34] *Ibid.*, IV, 96; Mehring (*ed.*), *Aus dem literarischen Nachlass von K. Marx, F. Engels und F. Lassalle* (4 vols., Stuttgart, 1902), III, 85-86.

[35] Mehring, *Karl Marx* (Leipzig, 1933), pp. 25-26.

[36] Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, I, 206.

[37] *Die Sozialdemokratie im deutschen Reichstag . . .* 1871-1893, pp. 209, 518.

within the Social Democratic movement a hostility towards anti-Semitism. Moreover, Social Democrats were opposed to anti-Semitic parties because of the latter's reactionary program in general. It is, therefore, quite clear why the Social Democratic movement in Germany was continuously battling anti-Semitism as a political weapon. Officially, the party's attitude toward the movement was defined in 1893, but long before that date various anti-Semitic movements had been condemned in principle by Social Democrats.[38] On January 11, 1881, a mass meeting in Berlin, called by Social Democrats, adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution urging German wage earners, in the light of their sense of justice and democratic spirit, to resist any curtailment of the civic equality constitutionally guaranteed to the Jews.[39]

Nonetheless the Social Democrats' condemnation of anti-Semitism was not always strong enough, for they believed that in the last analysis the anti-Jewish movement served the interests of Social Democracy. Thus, reporting on anti-Jewish agitation in Germany, the *Sozialdemokrat* wrote on January 9, 1881: "Though in principle we are opponents of all race hatred, we nevertheless view the matter [the *Judenhetze*] with some equanimity. For . . . after all it [the *Judenhetze*] evidences a high degree of social discontent, which at present is, of course, being steered along the wrong track, but which will outlast all the anti-Semitic humbug and will ultimately be beneficial to us." This would be so because the petty bourgeoisie would "soon" recognize that there was only one deliverance from present suffering, Socialism. A few months later, referring to Jew-baiting in Pomerania, which was said to be encouraged by Bismarck, the *Sozialdemokrat* (August 18, 1881) remarked: "In this respect, too, the Imperial Chancellor is proving to be a revolutionary despite himself. On the path that he incites the masses to follow, the Jews are being killed *today*,

[38] See, for example, *Sozialdemokrat*, 1881, Nos. 6 (Feb. 6), 14, 16, 20, 21, 28, 34, 39, 45 (Nov. 3).

[39] This resolution is reprinted in Bernstein, *Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung*, II (Berlin, 1907), 60.

and *tomorrow* it will logically be the turn of the court chaplains, imperial chancellors, kings, emperors, and all the rest of the 'unproductive' gang." Russian pogroms were interpreted in the same vein; on May 22, 1881, the *Sozialdemokrat* made the following comment on them: "There is a state of ferment everywhere among the Russian people, and their discontent demands an outlet; once it is unchained, it will not stop with the Jews—of this the Tzar's servants, who are already laughing in their sleeves, can be sure."

Though not alarmed by the progress of anti-Semitism, the party congresses devoted some attention to it. At the Congress at Halle (1890), the comrades from Marburg (Hesse)—where anti-Semitism was particularly strong—requested the party to do something in order to enable them to develop a vigorous counter-agitation. The request, their motion said, was made "in consideration of the gain the anti-Semitic movement is making in ever-widening circles and of the objectionable methods of fighting which the anti-Semites are using, especially against the Social Democrats."[40]

The Congress at Halle did not discuss the motion of the Marburg branch; it referred it to the party executive for consideration. Two years later, at the Congress in Berlin, Bebel was scheduled to speak on "Anti-Semitism and Social Democracy," but the topic was taken off the agenda, apparently for lack of time.[41] The Congress, however, passed by a large majority a resolution against anti-Semitism prepared by Bebel.[42] At the next Congress, in Cologne (1893), he finally presented his report on anti-Semitism. In it he pointed out that on the average the Jews were neither better nor worse than "the so-called Christians." Some of their characteristics have little to do with race, but rather result from the practice of commerce, an occupation into which they have been forced. Other characteris-

[40] Parteitag 1890, *Protokoll*, pp. 270-271.
[41] Parteitag 1892, *Protokoll*, pp. 248-249.
[42] Parteitag 1892, *Protokoll*, pp. 293-294.

tics of theirs which shock the Gentiles—pertness or loudness, mania for showing off and pushing oneself forward, boastfulness, and vanity—are partly race characteristics and partly the effect of having been disdainfully treated. These characteristics will disappear only after a long period of full equality and after an amalgamation of the Jews with the rest of the population. It is significant, however, that many Jews stand in the foreground of all progressive movements; they are self-sacrificing and generous, and in this last respect could serve as a model to their Christian oppressors.[43]

Among the causes of anti-Semitism—economic competition, religious hatred, and racial antipathy—Bebel stressed particularly the first. Peasants, artisans, small traders, white collar workers, officers, Junkers, feudal nobles, and students were, according to him, especially anti-Semitic. Paraphrasing Marx, he observed that what was imputed to the Jews was in fact not exclusively characteristic of them, but was rather an attribute of the whole bourgeois society. In other words, if one wishes to free the Jews of those characteristics for which they are criticized—huckstering and striving after money—one has to overthrow the present social order. "With the fall of bourgeois society, the peculiar nature of the Jew will disappear."[44] Anti Semitism does not offer any solution of the social problem, and is in fact used by the bourgeoisie as a means of diverting popular discontent. Nonetheless, in spite of the "dirty and base motives" of its leaders, and contrary to their will, anti-Semitism will "ultimately benefit Social Democracy alone."[45]

It may be recalled parenthetically that this was the opinion of virtually all Social Democratic leaders. Mehring, for example, was certain that anti-Semitism would pull hundreds of thousands into the social movement, which they would enter as anti-Semites, only to come out as Social Democrats. "This is the order," he said, "in the

[43] Bebel, *Sozialdemokratie und Antisemitismus*, pp. 31-32.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 11. Cf. also pp. 4-5, 12-19.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

ABC of our socio-historical development."[46] In the same vein, Wilhelm Liebknecht observed: "Yes, the anti-Semites plow and sow, and we Social Democrats will reap. Their successes are therefore not at all unwelcome to us."[47] A few days after the spectacular electoral victory of the anti-Semites in 1893, *Vorwärts,* the central organ of the Social Democratic party, wrote in a leading article: "Anti-Semitism . . . is the last phase of the dying capitalist society. . . . Barbarous as it [anti-Semitism] is, it is against its will a bearer of culture—cultural *manure,* in the truest sense of the word, for Social Democracy. Let us therefore rejoice over the successes of anti-Semitism, which are a heavy blow for all other capitalist parties, almost as much as we do over our own. These enemies are our best friends; the more fiercely they attack us, the greater service do they do us, and the more quickly do they dig their own grave."[48] Heinrich Braun, an Austrian Socialist of Jewish origin, who distinguished himself in German Social Democracy, wrote in the same sense: "It is very probable that anti-Semitism, according to the law of social gravitation, so to speak, will be merged with the larger and more powerful Social Democratic movement; this will be the result of an intellectual development which, depending on the circumstances, may require a longer or a shorter time."[49] As late as 1906, Philipp Scheidemann thought that, in the last analysis, anti-Semitism was working for Social Democracy.[50]

It is frequently said that Bebel coined the expression, "Anti-Semitism is the Socialism of the stupid man." In fact, he did not coin it. He himself and Mehring attributed the expression—without any proof, however—to the Austrian democratic parliamentarian Kronawetter.[51] Another

[46] Mehring, *Neue Zeit,* XI[1] (1892-93), 346.

[47] Wilhelm Liebknecht, *Rede über den Kölner Parteitag* (Bielefeld, 1893), p. 28.

[48] Anonymous, "Stichwahlen," *Vorwärts,* June 26, 1893, p. 1.

[49] Heinrich Braun, *Archiv für soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik,* VI (1893), 514.

[50] Philipp Scheidemann, *Neue Zeit,* XXIV[2] (1905-06), 632.

[51] Bebel, in H. Bahr, *Der Antisemitismus; ein internationales Interview* (Berlin, 1894), p. 21; Mehring, *Kapital und Presse,* p. 88.

writer credited it—with no evidence either—to the Austrian Socialist Engelbert Pernerstorfer.[52] But though he did not coin it, Bebel certainly believed in the substance of the expression. Anti-Semitic agitators, he pointed out, set in motion those groups of the population which are politically the most inert and mentally the most lazy. However, once they are shaken out of their dull indifference and driven into the struggle, they, too, will be forced to think, and they will recognize that not anti-Semitism but Socialism offers the only solution to their troubles.[53]

Bebel incorporated the main ideas of his report into a resolution which he had already submitted, in the preceding year, to the party Congress at Berlin. The same resolution was passed unanimously and without a debate by the Cologne Congress.[54] The resolution declared that anti-Semitism originates in the dissatisfaction of certain middle-class groups which, not realizing that they are doomed by the capitalist system as such, direct their struggle against only one of its aspects, Jewish exploitation. Anti-Semitism is, of course, retrogressive, and is therefore supported by the *Junkers* and the clergy. The struggle of the anti-Semites against Jewish exploitation must remain unsuccessful, because exploitation of man by man is a general bourgeois and not a specifically Jewish characteristic, and can be suppressed only by a socialist society. Consequently, in concluding, the resolution noted:

> Social Democracy opposes anti-Semitism as a *movement which is directed against the natural development of society,* but *despite* its reactionary character and *against* its will, it exerts an ultimately *revolutionary* effect, because the petty-bourgeois and small-farmer strata of society, who are aroused against the Jewish capitalists by the anti- Semitic movement, must finally realize *that their enemy is not merely the Jewish capitalist but the capitalist class as a whole, and that only the attainment of Socialism can free them from their misery.*[55]

[52] O. Heller, *Der Untergang des Judentums* (Vienna, 1933), p. 132. On Pernerstorfer, see Silberner, "Austrian Social Democracy and the Jewish Problem," *Historia Judaica,* XIII (1951), 129-133.

[53] Bebel, *Sozialdemokratie und Antisemitismus,* p. 32.

[54] Parteitag 1893, *Protokoll,* p. 238.

[55] Parteitag 1893, *Protokoll,* p. 224.

Why these groups *must* recognize that Socialism is preferable to anti-Semitism is not explained. To examine whether such a concept of anti-Semitism expressed anything but wishful thinking seemed utterly useless to the drafter of the resolution and to those who passed it—without debate. It is also worth noting that the resolution presents anti-Semitism as a purely bourgeois or petty-bourgeois movement directed exclusively against "Jewish exploitation." Not a word is said about the psychological or the racial aspects of anti-Semitism.

Convinced of the superiority of their scientific outlook and method, the Social Democrats were persuaded that anti-Semitism did not really endanger the Jews for the simple reason that it allegedly had no future. Bebel, to quote an example, asserted that anti-Semitism would never become a decisive factor in political life.[56] He was convinced that in the last analysis anti-Semitism served the interests of Social Democracy. After the Russian pogroms of 1904-05, which gave him some food for reflection, Bebel seems to have realized, for the first time, the *counter*-revolutionary potentialities of anti-Semitism. No longer did he look on the anti-Semitic movement as a factor beneficial only to Social Democracy. He also expressed his horror concerning "the moral depravity" of those groups of society which profess anti-Semitism.[57] But, as in the past, he continued to believe that anti-Semitism could not deeply affect his own country. "It is comforting," he noted, "that in Germany it will never have a chance to exert a decisive influence on the life of state or society."[58]

B. WILHELM LIEBKNECHT

A special section on Liebknecht would hardly be necessary had not his activity during the Dreyfus Affair given rise to a rumor that he was an anti-Semite. He him-

[56] Bebel, *Sozialdemokratie und Antisemitismus*, p. 13.
[57] *Ibid.*, 2d ed. (Berlin, 1906), p. 38.
[58] *Ibid.*

self publicly stated that he had received many insulting letters accusing him of having become an anti-Semite simply because he had dared to express his belief in the guilt of the unfortunate captain.[59] But was such an accusation well founded?

The answer is quite simple. Long before the Dreyfus affair, Liebknecht had casually made a few more or less ironical comments about the Jews. Apart from the Greeks and Romans, he said, the Jews have exercised the greatest influence upon the modern European *Weltanschauung*. For eighteen centuries many wrongs have been inflicted on them, but they have revenged themselves in advance and superabundantly by the gift of Christianity, which the Western World received from them.[60] It may be noted in passing that critical as he was of Christianity, Liebknecht ascribed to it at least one great merit, namely, that it had burst asunder "the narrow-minded nationalism of the Hebrews" and had substituted for it the idea of a universal humanity.[61] Be that as it may, Liebknecht emphasized that during the time of their national independence the Jews had curbed the institution of private property: they did not own land privately. Later, however, they became the most fanatical representatives of private ownership. "On the Jews a miracle has been performed exactly contrary to that performed on the cats. The latter, in the course of 'historical development,' have been transformed from short-boweled, carnivorous beasts of prey into long-boweled domestic animals, eating vegetable food as well as flesh; the Jews, however, have been transformed from agrarian Communists into most rapacious tyrants of private property."[62] Liebknecht added, however, that there are numerous exceptions among the Jews, and while Christian oppressors must be made responsible for the sins of modern Jews, it is the merit of the latter to have contributed more than a propor-

[59] See Liebknecht in *Echo de Paris*, Dec. 24, 1899, pp. 1-2.

[60] Liebknecht, *Grund- und Bodenfrage* (Leipzig, 1874), p. 9.

[61] Liebknecht before the Leipzig Imperial Jury (1872): *Der Hochverrats-Prozess wider Liebknecht, Bebel, Hepner* (2d ed., Berlin, 1911), p. 262.

[62] Liebknecht, *Grund- und Bodenfrage*, p. 9.

tionate contingent to the number of champions of human rights.[63]

Apart from Liebknecht's remarks mentioned above concerning Jewish rapaciousness, his other comments on the Jews are rather friendly, and sometimes even enthusiastic. In his memoirs he has only very kind recollections of Jews with whom he came in contact. They were amicable and helpful, and in gratitude for their kindness, he says, he fought with all his strength against Jew-hatred, the meanest and most savage of all contemporary phobias.[64] (On another occasion he called the anti-Semites "the representatives of anti-culture."[65]) His relations with the Jews were always pleasant. As a child, in Giessen, he was frequently a guest at the home of a neighboring Jewish family, and once was even present at, and deeply impressed by, the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles. At the University, Jews were among his best friends. Later he found in the Jew Johann Jacoby an honored model, and in Karl Marx, his immortal master.[66] During his stay in England, his sympathy for the Jews grew even stronger. There he arrived at the conclusion that not Anglo-Saxons and Jews, as Disraeli thought, but Teutons and Jews are the races most adept in governing. In his opinion, there is more vigor and truth in "Judeo-Germanism" than in the mendacious doctrine of "Christo-Germanism," or in the so-called "Christo-Germanic concept of the world."[67] And not only more vigor and truth, but also and above all more liberty. "It was the God of the *Jews*, Jehovah, and the *Jewish* heroes, with the Maccabees at their head, who impelled Cromwell to fight for liberty—whereas no war was ever waged in the name of Christianity for the liberation of peoples, but rather for their subjugation. The only country where the struggle for the liberation of the people has borne a religious

[63] *Ibid.*

[64] Liebknecht, *Souvenirs* (Paris, 1901), pp. 180, 187.

[65] In the Reichstag, Nov. 30, 1893. *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des deutschen Reichstags, 9. Legislaturperiode,* II. Session (1893-1894), I, p. 180.

[66] Liebknecht, *Souvenirs,* pp. 181-182.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

character is England—and in England it was not the *New* Testament, but the *Old,* which furnished the moral strength for the struggle."[68]

The history of the Jews since the destruction of their State was for Liebknecht "like an enigma and a miracle."[69] Already as a child he was horrified by the tales of their persecution. When he considered such pioneers of liberty as Boerne and Jacoby, his veneration of these men was involuntarily reflected upon their race. Proportionately to their numbers, the Jews contributed more than any other people to the welfare and liberty of mankind, as well as to literature and art. Liebknecht explained this phenomenon by the struggle for existence which, aggravated by centuries of persecution, developed extraordinarily the intellectual capacity of the Jews and prepared those among them who were not ready to surrender for a revolutionary struggle against oppression and injustice. He did not, of course, withhold his attention from the faults of the Jews. "But these faults are, like their virtues, the natural result of oppression."[70] The Jews were forbidden to practice "noble" professions; they were condemned to traffic in money, and thus became the forerunners of the modern bourgeoisie. They were, however, avenged by history or Nemesis in a very instructive and amusing way: The descendants of the robber knights who plundered the Jews are nearly all debtors of the descendants of the despoiled. Today the nobles, with virtuous indignation, see in the Jews monopolizers. Yet the nobles themselves became monopolizers of grain, that is, of the principal means of existence, and through their own business tricks they outdid the Jews to such an extent that whatever one may attribute to the Jews in this respect is by comparison mere child's play.[71]

Only Liebknecht's attitude towards the Dreyfus case could have created the unjustified opinion that he had become an anti-Semite. In 1899, indeed, he published a series

[68] *Ibid.,* p. 184.
[69] *Ibid.*
[70] *Ibid.,* p. 185. See also his *Rede über den Kölner Parteitag,* p. 33.
[71] Liebknecht, *Souvenirs,* pp. 186-187.

of three articles in *Die Fackel* (a Viennese review edited by Karl Kraus), where he asserted that he was not convinced of the innocence of Dreyfus. The Dreyfusards believed that the French General Staff had deliberately condemned an innocent man only because he was a Jew. This, said Liebknecht, is "a monstrous absurdity," an assumption that flies in the face of all psychology and of all common sense.[72] Only a madman could believe that a court martial of a civilized country would convict an officer merely because he happened to be of "Jewish nationality."[73] Liebknecht maintained, furthermore, that there existed an unwritten provision in international law that whoever is innocently accused of espionage is "immediately released" when the government concerned declares unofficially that the defendant is not its agent.[74] Consequently, the Dreyfusards deserved to be flogged for the damage that they did to their own cause and for the aid they gave to the anti-Semites and the reactionaries of all kinds.[75] Their tactic of accusing the General Staff of deliberate fraud Liebknecht called "hysterical madness," and he wondered how it was possible, outside an asylum, to find people who would approve of such "folly."[76]

There is nothing unusual about Liebknecht's articles except their date, 1899. At the *beginning* of the Dreyfus Affair nearly everybody, including Zola, Jaurès, and Clémenceau, was convinced of the captain's guilt.[77] But only at the beginning, and no longer in 1899. Written as they were in the fall of 1899, Liebknecht's articles show an extraordinary naïveté. Yet they do not contain a single word smacking of anti-Semitism. Nevertheless, for quite obvious reasons, the reactionary and anti-Semitic French press—

[72] Liebknecht, *Die Fackel*, No. 18, Sept. 1899, p. 3.
[73] *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
[74] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[75] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[76] *Ibid.*, No. 21, Oct. 1899, p. 6.
[77] Cf. Reinach, *Histoire de l'Affaire Dreyfus* (7 vols., Paris, 1901-1908), I, 476; II, 194; III, 125. "J'ai cru à la culpabilité de Dreyfus, et je l'ai dit en termes cruels. Il me paraissait impossible qu'une pareille sentence eût été prononcée légèrement par des officiers contre un de leurs pairs." Clémenceau, *L'Iniquité* (Paris, 1899), p. iv.

such as *L'Action Française* (December 1, 1899) and *La Libre Parole* (December 5, 1899)—utilized these articles for their own propaganda purposes. Some French Socialists, therefore, harbored resentment against Liebknecht for his pronouncements on the Dreyfus case. Gérault-Richard observed in the Socialist daily *La Petite République* (December 11, 1899), that though Liebknecht affirmed that he was neither an anti-Semite nor a militarist, at this juncture at least, "he speaks and writes as a militarist and an anti-Semite." But so great was Liebknecht's international prestige that when Emile Joindy, at the French Socialist Congress, in December, 1899, shouted "À bas Liebknecht!" he was immediately expelled from the meeting-hall.[78] Most Socialists believed, and rightly so, that though Liebknecht held a different view on the Dreyfus Affair, he was neither an anti-Semite nor a militarist. In fact, he was only incredibly naïve in his stand on the Affair and in his evaluation of the strength of anti-Semitism in general. When reproached with being an anti-Semite he replied that "this is an idiotic accusation. I am a rabid enemy of anti-Semitism. . . . "[79] And after having pointed out his own and his party's struggle against anti-Semitism in Germany, he added: "It is because of us that anti-Semitism has been run down, . . . and is at the present hour a dying party and increasingly negligible."[80]

3. Hostility Towards Jewish National Aspirations

Prior to 1914, all the important German Socialists, with the exception of Moses Hess, eagerly supported Jewish assimilation. In their opinion, the more rapid and complete such assimilation was, the better it would be for all concerned. And since autonomous Jewish labor organizations would necessarily tend to delay the process of as-

[78] *Congrès général des organisations socialistes francaises tenu à Paris du 3 au 8 décembre, 1899. Compte rendu sténographique officiel* (Paris, 1900), pp. 178, 213.

[79] See *Echo de Paris*, Dec. 24, 1899, p. 2.

[80] *Ibid.*

similation, German Socialists were opposed in principle to the establishment of such organizations. When Mikhail P. Dragomanov suggested, in 1881, that a separate Jewish Socialist movement be created in Russia, the central organ of German Social Democracy, after expressing doubts as to whether the creation of such a movement was expedient or practicable, noted characteristically: "Propaganda among the Jewish workers ought certainly to be recommended and advocated, but it must aim at uniting these workers directly with the Russian or Polish revolutionary party, and must pull them out of their separatist sphere, and by no means fix them more firmly in it, even temporarily."[81] Ten years later German Social Democrats learned with great satisfaction from Abraham Cahan's report to the International Socialist Congress at Brussels (1891) that the only reason that Jewish labor organizations were established in the United States was the fact that their members did not yet speak English. "We are glad," wrote the central organ of German Social Democracy, "that our Jewish comrades are joining the general labor movement without reservations, and are not pursuing separate goals. This is, moreover, the reason why the Jewish labor organizations are only a provisional arrangement, dependent, as the report emphasizes, on community of language. The more rapidly the fusion [of the Jews] with their American brethren progresses, the more rapidly will these groups, organized temporarily on a national [Jewish] basis, disappear by merging with the American labor organizations."[82]

Since Yiddish was considered only a barrier to assimilation, everything had to be done to induce the Jewish workers to forget it as rapidly as possible. The *Sozialdemokrat,* indeed, did not let slip the opportunity of reprinting from the *St. Louis Tagesblatt* an article by Adolf Hepner, in which this former student at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau called Yiddish "an insult to all languages which it distorts and twists, a hideous thing in its form

[81] Anonymous, *Sozialdemokrat,* May 22, 1881, p. 4.
[82] Anonymous, "Politische Uebersicht," *Vorwärts,* Aug. 28, 1891, p. 2.

and a horror in its sound," a "monster," a "Heimstätte der *Unkultur*," and in which he advised the New York Socialists and Anarchists to dissolve their Yiddish sections.[83] The *Sozialdemokrat* approved Hepner's views on Yiddish: Socialists, it said, must avoid everything that might tend to cause people to continue to use this dialect longer than they otherwise would. This danger, however, the *Sozialdemokrat* added, is bound up with the creation of a separate Jewish labor press. Such a press has the character of something permanent and thus encourages people to cling to their jargon and to jog on in the old groove, unless it makes propaganda against itself in every number. But since propaganda had to be made among Jewish workers, and since they understood only Yiddish, the *Sozialdemokrat* had to decide whether it should be in Yiddish, at the risk of delaying assimilation, or whether it should not be made at all. What policy did the central organ of German Social Democracy favor? It recommended, in all seriousness, a middle course. A special Jewish press, or special Jewish unions, must not be established. "In our opinion, however, there is no objection to starting educational organizations for Jewish workers, in which they are trained as recruits for the labor movement, nor to publishing pamphlets in their dialect, in which they are instructed in the basic principles of the labor movement and urged to participate in it. This is indispensable in order even to bring them to the point where they understand the necessity of giving up their jargon. Everything that goes beyond this [i.e., beyond educational organizations and pamphlets] is, to say the least, harmful trifling."[84]

Naturally, views on Yiddish are to a great extent a matter of personal taste; one may like it or dislike it as one does any other language. And it is usually of little

[83] Anonymous, *Sozialdemokrat*, Jan. 18, 1890, p. 4. Hepner was a former student at the Jewish Theological Seminary at Breslau, see *Der Hochverraths-Prozess wider Liebknecht, Bebel, Hepner vor dem Schwurgericht zu Leipzig vom* 11. *bis* 26. *März* 1872. *Mit einer Einleitung von W. Liebknecht und einem Anhang. Nach der* 2. *Auflage unveränderter Neudruck* (Berlin, 1911), p. 78.

[84] Anonymous, *Sozialdemokrat*, Jan. 18, 1890, p. 4.

importance, for those who use an idiom, what outsiders think about it. What is indeed significant in the Social Democrats' attitude is not so much their opposition to the survival of Yiddish as the fact that this opposition was caused by their desire to destroy any basis for the spiritual survival of a Jewish collectivity. They attacked Yiddish, but they aimed at the Jewish nationality. They were not hostile to Jews individually, but for the Jews as a living collectivity they had the greatest contempt. It is this contempt which seems to have prompted their insistence upon assimilation of the Jews, a euphemism for the complete disintegration of the Jewish collectivity. Among the German Social Democratic advocates of Jewish assimilation, there are two who deserve special analysis, Eduard Bernstein and Karl Kautsky.

A. Eduard Bernstein

Eduard Bernstein's ancestors were Polish Jews, many of them scholars and rabbis. His father, however, followed a different career. Born in Danzig and trained as a tinsmith, he moved to Berlin and worked there thirty years as a locomotive engineer.[85] A member of the reform synagogue, he was, in fact, indifferent to religion. Eduard Bernstein (1850-1932), born in Berlin, lived in an almost entirely Gentile society, and as a pupil at a boys' school also attended, voluntarily, classes in Christian religion.[86] As a youth he heard unpleasant things about Jews only from children, rarely or never from adults.[87] When he left school, he felt himself "completely a German" and was very patriotically-minded during the Danish and Franco-Prussian Wars.[88]

The behavior of Jewish capitalists and speculators in the eighteen-seventies made such a repulsive impression on

[85] Bernstein, *Von 1850 bis 1872* (Berlin, 1926), p. 4-5.

[86] Bernstein, "Wie ich als Jude in der Diaspora aufwuchs," *Jude, II* (1917), 191.

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[88] *Ibid.*, p. 194. See also Bernstein, *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung*, V (1915), 162.

him that he himself fell into an "anti-Jewish mood" at times.[89] The first signs of German anti-Semitism in the late eighteen-seventies appeared to him as an obvious reaction against excessive forwardness on the part of the Jews, and disturbed him but little. "I made the mistake of not seeing that the Jews who pushed themselves forward were only a minority alongside of the mass of Jews who calmly followed their vocations. Not until anti-Semitism developed from an accusing movement into a persecuting movement did I change my attitude towards it. But in combatting it I always took care to treat the question as one of democratic equality of rights. It never entered my mind to conceive the Jewish question as a question of a special national right or interest of the Jews."[90] In 1877, when the Berlin branch of the Social Democratic party carried on agitation among the workers for withdrawal from church membership, Bernstein, as a Jew, felt compelled to do the same as was asked of Christians; he officially withdrew from the Jewish religious community, with which in actual fact he had long since ceased to be connected.[91]

All of Bernstein's more intimate friends were non-Jews.[92] He spent nearly thirteen years in London (1888-1901), visited the Jewish quarters of East End, and lectured there from time to time before Jewish labor associations. However, he lacked a more intimate knowledge of the life of Jewish workers in London, and his command of "the dialect or the jargon [Yiddish]" was inadequate.[93] This is how he himself described his exteremely loose relations with Jewry:

I can only define them by saying that I am of course conscious of my descent from Jews and feel no need to keep it dark; that, on the contrary, I have a sense of solidarity with Jews wherever they are treated with disdain on account of their descent; but that I can not bring

89 Bernstein, "Wie ich als Jude . . . , " p. 194.

90 *Ibid.*

91 Bernstein, autobiographical sketch, in F. Meiner (ed.), *Die Volkswirtschaftslehre der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen* (Leipzig, 1924), I, 9.

92 Bernstein, "Wie ich als Jude . . .," p. 194.

93 Bernstein, "Einige Bemerkungen," *Jüdische Statistik* (Berlin, 1903), p. 336.

myself to join any specifically Jewish association, but would consider myself a stranger in relation to such groups, of whatever kind they may be, purely social or political, General Zionist or Socialist Zionist.[94]

Being himself detached from the Jewish community, he expected that in the long run all Jews would follow his example. If he never explicitly said that the Jewish *nationality* must disappear, the reason is that—like nearly all Social Democrats of the time—he refrained from applying the latter term to the Jews. True, in a speech at the Reichstag he once made a possibly inadvertent exception. Protesting against the persecution of the Jews in Rumania, where the Reich had a right to intervene on the basis of Article 44 of the Treaty of Berlin (1878), he referred to them in turn as "the Rumanian Jews," "the Jews of Rumania," a "tribe," and also—as if by a *lapsus linguae*—a "nationality."[95] But whether or not he employed the term "Jewish nationality," it is quite clear that he was opposed to the existence of an organized Jewish collectivity, whatever name might be attached to it. That is in effect what he meant by saying—in his circumlocutory terminology—that "with the formal emancipation of the Jews," "every excuse for isolation, for a special Jewish solidarity as against non-Jews, for a tribal or racial morality in the intercourse of Jews with non-Jews has been eliminated, and where anything of the kind still exists, it must be opposed as energetically as possible."[96] Naturally, one may be tempted to see in this statement a strong condemnation of Jewish *chauvinism* only. But it is more than that, since no nationality can exist without some kind of "special" solidarity. The fact that Bernstein explicitly condemned only that which may be rightly considered as excessive tribalism on the part of the Jews, should not obscure the other fact that he was also, and above all, severely condemning the *national* solidarity of the Jews, which had to be surrendered wherever they had been granted

[94] Bernstein, "Wie ich als Jude . . . " p. 187.

[95] Reichstag: *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstages*, 10. *Legislaturperiode*, II, *Session*, 1900-1903, X, p. 8756 (March 20).

[96] Bernstein, "Das Schlagwort des Antisemitismus," *Neue Zeit*, XI[2] (1892-93), 236-237.

"formal emancipation." It is in this sense of national annihilation that this concept of Jewish assimilation must be interpreted.

The desirability of the assimilation of the Jews is for Bernstein an axiom, so to speak, requiring no proof. "This assimilation," he says, "is a historical and cultural necessity. If a discussion about it is to reach any fruitful conclusion, the question must not be posed as to *whether* assimilation should or ought to take place, but as to *how* it will best take place."[97] Why this *must* be so, is not explained, but it is certain that by assimilation Bernstein did not mean a necessary adjustment of the Jews to their cultural environment in the Diaspora, but a complete eradication of the Jewish nationality. He took this for granted, and, in fact, discussed only the way this assimilation should proceed. As a Socialist and internationalist he wanted this assimilation to be a sincere one and not the result of a smart calculation.[98] The Jews must not forget that by their whole history and tradition they are internationalists. True patriotism is compatible with cosmopolitanism, and the assimilated Jew should not compete with the chauvinism of his new compatriots. Some Jews do not abide by this rule. Thus, for example, Franz Oppenheimer, in the summer of 1914—when Germany was drunk with victory—made fun of Norman Angell's assertion that war does not pay.[99] In the same jingoist spirit Ernst Lissauer, another superpatriotic Jew, wrote his "Hassgesang gegen England" (1914). And these two men were not ex-

[97] Bernstein, "Vom Patriotismus der Juden," *Friedens-Warte,* XVIII (1916), 247-248.

[98] See Bernstein, in Meiner, *op. cit.,* I, 49.

[99] Bernstein, "Ueberschätzte Friedensmächte," *Friedens-Warte,* XVII (1915), 127-128. Oppenheimer, whose ancestors included many rabbis in the Rhineland, considered himself a "liberal Socialist" and always stood outside the Social Democratic movement. In his writings he emphatically insisted on his being thoroughly German. As an economist and an agrarian reformer, he was keenly interested in Zionism. In 1913 he resigned from the German Zionist organization because it imposed on every member the duty of making migration to Palestine a part of the program of his own life. See his *Erlebtes, Erstrebtes, Erreichtes* (Berlin, 1931), pp. 133, 212-221; and his autobiographical sketch in Meiner, *op. cit.,* II, 69-116. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology,* VII (1947), 107-109, gives a bibliography of his writings on Jewish problems.

ceptions. "Herr Lissauer put into verse what the organs of the German-Jewish world round about him were disseminating in prose."[100]

By 1916 Bernstein discovered that the Jews, though doomed to complete disappearance as a collectivity, had nevertheless—as long as they still existed—a special task to perform in human history. He no longer denied to the Jews, as he did in 1893, the right to a "special" solidarity. On the contrary, this right was explicitly recognized. As the full disintegration of the Jewish collectivity through intermarriage might—particularly in view of the persistence of anti-Semitism—take a great many generations,[101] he foresaw for the interval a special mission for the Jews.

According to this new concept of Bernstein's, which, one may add, he did not elaborate in any detail, "three souls" inhabit "Jewry [taken] as a unity": (1) the soul of patriotism for the country in which the Jews live (*landespatriotische Seele*); (2) the soul of tribal patriotism (*stammespolitische Seele*); and (3) the cosmopolitan soul. In the breast of the individual Jew any one of these three souls may get the upper hand so completely that the other two drop into insignificance. For the Jews collectively, however, such one-sidedness is an impossibility. Indeed, in a large number of individual Jews, two or even all three of these souls may fight against each other, and by means of spiritual compromise a sort of synthesis may be achieved. This synthesis is an expedient, however, which, as long as it is left to individual choice, does not lead to a solution of the problem for the Jews as a whole, but only makes the problem still more complicated.[102]

Unfortunately, Bernstein did not explain how and by whom the problem could be simplified. He did, however, most emphatically indicate the direction in which the solution had to be sought. It is necessary, he maintained, that every Jew, be he a Zionist or simply a German, English, or

[100] Bernstein, "Ueberschätzte Friedensmächte," p. 129.

[101] Bernstein, *Die Aufgaben der Juden im Weltkriege* (Berlin, 1917), pp. 8-9.

[102] Bernstein, "Vom Patriotismus der Juden," p. 246.

French patriot, think and act in a cosmopolitan spirit. It is incumbent on the Jew to work with all his might against every kind of incitement of nations, against all abuses of nationalism. The history of the people from whom he springs and the position of Jewry in the world should make this the natural tendency of his thinking on world politics; and remembrance of the fact that Jewry as a whole consists of citizens of all nations should make this an elementary moral obligation for him.[103] This is "the great international mission" of the Jews.[104] It is "a special mission" assigned to them by past and present history.[105] Bernstein considered them "born pacifists."[106] Consequently, they had to act as mediators (*Mittler*) between nations.[107]

Before we leave Bernstein, a few words should be said about his attitude towards two movements in which he saw only a temporary barrier to the full assimilation of the Jews, anti-Semitism and Zionism.

1. Anti-Semitism was envisaged by Bernstein in the customary Social Democratic manner, that is, as a consequence of competition in the capitalist society, where it is chiefly supported by petty bourgeois and peasants.[108] It is vigorously stimulated by the overcrowding of the liberal professions.[109] In spite of its retrogressive character, it is a "preparatory school" for Socialism.[110]

Convinced that anti-Semitism was essentially a bourgeois movement, Bernstein devoted hardly more than three or four pages to its manifestations within Socialist ranks. In his history of the labor movement in Berlin, he rightly pointed out that whenever a German labor leader showed any inclination to coöperate politically with the anti-Semites, he was called to order by the workers themselves and had

103 Bernstein, *Die Aufgaben der Juden*, pp. 33-34.

104 *Ibid.*, p. 10: "grosse völkerpolitische Mission."

105 *Ibid.*, p. 31.

106 Bernstein, "Vom Patriotismus der Juden," p. 248.

107 Bernstein, *Die Aufgaben der Juden*, p. 24. The Jews are also called "die geborenen Mittler zwischen den Nationen." Bernstein, in Meiner, *op. cit.*, I, 49.

108 Bernstein, "Das Schlagwort des Antisemitismus," p. 234.

109 Bernstein, *Neue Zeit*, XII^2 (1893-94), 406.

110 Bernstein, "Das Schlagwort des Antisemitismus," p. 234.

no other recourse than to retract or to lose influence.[111] Of great interest also are Bernstein's comments on Marx's and Lassalle's influence on the attitude of the German Social Democratic party towards Jews. Both leaders, he noted, unintentionally influenced the attitude of this party in favor of the Jews. The mere fact that they were Jews must have strengthened Socialist opposition to anti-Semitism. The same fact contributed to the diffusion of Socialist ideas among Jews. The writings of Marx and Lassalle on Jews, however, probably had an opposite effect. Marx's treatment of the Jewish question was unsatisfactory because he generalized too rapidly. He took it for granted that the Jews were but traders (or money-minded persons). His statements to this effect were not even applicable to Western Jews, and still less to those of Eastern Europe. They were, however, useful to the anti-Semites and were also accepted by those Socialists who had an anti-Jewish prejudice. Lassalle, too, displayed a hostile attitude towards the Jews, and several of his followers shared the same bias.[112]

Only in one case was Bernstein wrong in accusing a Socialist of anti-Semitism. The British Social Democrat Ernest Belfort-Bax, in a polemical article against Bernstein's ideas on colonial policy, noted that too great an expansion of certain races—such as the Anglo-Saxons and, to a lesser extent, the Jews—was not in the interest of Socialism.[113] Bernstein saw in this reference to the Jews an expression of moderate anti-Semitism.[114] Bax found the reproach utterly unjustified: "I am not an anti-Semite," he asserted, "and I hate anti-Semites."[115] He added, furthermore, that had he known that Bernstein was so sensitive, he would, of course, have refrained from making the abovementioned statement, which appeared to him quite harmless.[116] Bernstein retorted that he made the accusation of

[111] Bernstein, *Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiter-Bewegung*, II, 165.
[112] Bernstein, *Tsukunft*, XXVI (1921), 145-146.
[113] Ernest Belfort-Bax, *Neue Zeit*, XVI[1] (1897-98), 426-427.
[114] Bernstein, *Neue Zeit*, XVI[1] (1897-98), 493.
[115] Belfort-Bax, *op. cit.*, p. 826.
[116] *Ibid.* On Bax, see also Silberner, "British Socialism and the Jews," *Historia Judaica*, XIV (1952), 48-49.

moderate anti-Semitism because, in an earlier argument with him, Bax, without any real reason, brought Jewry into the discussion in a manner that admitted of an anti-Semitic interpretation. "Thus," Bernstein added, "the second occurrence of the same thing necessarily appeared to me as an improper attempt to make capital of the fact that I am of Jewish origin. Anyone who knows me well knows that I am not at all sensitive on this point, but under present circumstances it is to me a categorical imperative to be a 'philo-Semite' in the face of all anti-Semitism."[117] With this rejoinder the incident was closed.

2. Zionism was differently envisaged by Bernstein before and after World War I. In the earlier period, he saw in Zionism a nuisance and was disturbed at its progress in Socialist and non-Socialist ranks. The main reason for his concern was, of course, the fact that Zionism hinders assimilation. Zionism apparently has the capacity to instill in its adherents a new consciousness of themselves.[118] Its aim is nonetheless "nebulous" and cannot stand serious examination.[119] Such an examination, incidentally, was never made by Bernstein, who satisfied himself with brief statements. The ratio of Arabs to Jews in Palestine, he said, was eight to one, and a substantial change in this ratio would be prevented by the climate, the soil, and the economic structure of the country.[120]

Zionism, Bernstein asserted, "is a kind of intoxication which acts like an epidemic. It may, and presumably will, also pass away like one. But not overnight. For in the last analysis it is only a part of the great wave of nationalistic reaction which has overflowed the bourgeois world and seeks to break into the Socialist world as well. Like that wave, it can have only a retarding effect. And this is sufficient reason why Social Democracy should take it seriously and subject it to a fundamental critique."[121]

[117] Bernstein, *Neue Zeit,* XVI[2] (1897-98), 232.

[118] Bernstein, "Der Schulstreit in Palästina," *Neue Zeit,* XXXII[1] (1913-14), 752.

[119] *Ibid.*

[120] *Ibid.*, pp. 750-751.

[121] *Ibid.*, p. 752.

Bernstein himself never attempted to furnish such a fundamental critique. On the contrary, after the war he even became to some extent reconciled with Zionism. As early as 1917 signs of his coming closer to this movement could be noted. True, he did not become a full-fledged Zionist: "I am no Zionist," he said, "I feel myself too much a German to be able to be one."[122] He also disapproved of Zionism as such, although he admired its capacity to give its adherents the disposition and the strength for great creative accomplishments.[123] Nevertheless there was visible already in 1917 a certain rapprochement between Bernstein and Zionism. He recognized then that "the idealistic element in Zionism can represent a valuable factor for cultural life," and that Zionism "is not necessarily incompatible with cosmopolitan thinking."[124] What is of even greater importance, he also realized that the Zionist aim, although it would turn backward the development of Western European Jews, might nonetheless have a "liberating effect" on the Jews of Russia.[125] The area of agreement between Bernstein and Zionism was thus, as one sees, not very large in 1917. There existed, however, at least a few points of contact between them. In time Bernstein found it even natural to coöperate with the Zionist movement. How did this about-face occur? He seems not to have published any statements on the subject. But whatever the circumstances may have been, he supported the Zionist cause in the last years of his life, and in 1928 he joined the International Socialist "Pro-Palestine Committee." In view of this later development on his part, it is quite obvious why he never wrote that fundamental critique of Zionism which he called for in February, 1914. It was written, however, a few months later, by another leading spirit of German Social Democracy, Karl Kautsky.

122 Bernstein, *Die Aufgaben der Juden im Weltkriege*, p. 32.
123 *Ibid.*, p. 8.
124 *Ibid.*, p. 32.
125 *Ibid.*, p. 8.

B. Karl Kautsky

What are the Jews? What is their future? These are the two main questions which Karl Kautsky (1854-1938) attempted to answer in his *Rasse und Judentum*, published in October, 1914.

The first question is examined extensively in its racial aspect. The greater part of the study is devoted to proving that the Jews, from the very beginning of their history, have been a mixed race.[126] However, the question of whether they are a nationality is dealt with in the most cursory and incidental way. This is all the more unsatisfactory as, in his previous writings, he expressed self-contradictory views on the matter, and here, too, without any detailed examination. In his very first article on the Jews, he called them a "nation."[127] Later on, however, he observed that with the disappearance of the Jewish state "the Jews ceased to be a nation," because a nation is inconceivable without territory.[128] Again, in 1904, in a congratulatory letter to a Yiddish Socialist periodical, he spoke of "the Jewish race" in a context that seems to indicate that the term "race" stands for "nation" or "nationality."[129] But a few years later he declared that the Jews are "a nation of which it is highly debatable whether it really is a nation at all," and that though Eastern European Jews consider themselves a nation, they are much better designated by the word "caste."[130] Thus, within some twenty years, Kautsky transformed the Jews from a "nation" into a non-nation, from a non-nation into a "race," from a "race" into a "caste."

[126] Karl Kautsky, *Rasse und Judentum* (*Neue Zeit, Ergänzungsheft* 20), pp. 47, 51.

[127] Kautsky, "Das Judenthum," *Neue Zeit,* VII (1890), 27, 29. On p. 25 they are also called a "people."

[128] Kautsky, "Das Massaker von Kischeneff und die Judenfrage," *Neue Zeit,* XXI[2] (1902-03), 305.

[129] Kautsky, in *Justice,* April 23, 1904, p. 4. See also *Welt,* Dec. 25, 1905, p. 4.

[130] Kautsky, "Nationalität und Internationalitat," *Neue Zeit* (Ergänzungsheft 1, 1908), p. 7. In explicit agreement with Kautsky, Lenin, too, called the Jews of Galicia and Russia "a caste." Nikolai Lenin, *Kriticheskie zametki po natsional'nomu voprosu* (1913), in his *Sochineniia,* XVII, p. 141.

Even in his monograph of 1914, the terminology leaves much to be desired. On some pages Jews are called a "caste";[131] on others they are designated—casually, as in the preceding writings—as "an international association (Bund)."[132] Once even, by a slip of the pen, perhaps, the term, "a people," is applied to them.[133]

Kautsky denied, in his *Rasse und Judentum,* that there was such a thing as the Jewish nationality. Even in Eastern Europe, he asserted, there existed only "the semblance of a Jewish nationality."[134] Why the Jews are only a "semblance" of a nationality is not explained, however. Neither did Kautsky take the trouble to explain how his idea of the Jews' being a "caste" could be reconciled with the economic materialism of Marx. How, indeed, could a "caste" —as Kautsky called the Jews—comprise a highly articulated system of classes (high finance, industrial and commercial bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie, proletariat, and *Lumpenproletariat*)? Unfortunately, he did not give the slightest hint on how to solve the mystery.

There is another obvious contradiction of which Kautsky did not seem to be aware. On the one hand, he denied that even Eastern Jews were a nationality; on the other hand, he spoke of their "national life." He was aware of the progress of Jewish culture in Russia, of the growth of a Yiddish literature, a Yiddish theatre, a Yiddish press, etc. Of these "productions and resources of an active national life on the part of the Russian Jews" he said that they would become progressively greater and stronger as long as the struggle for Jewish freedom went on.[135] One is inclined to conclude that where there is "an active national life," there must also be a real nationality that carries it on. It is therefore difficult to understand why Kautsky did not arrive at the same conclusion.

According to Kautsky, the cultural progress of the

[131] Kautsky, *Rasse und Judentum,* p. 51, 61.
[132] *Ibid.,* p. 49.
[133] *Ibid.,* p. 56.
[134] *Ibid.,* p. 93: "der Schein einer jüdischen Nationalität."
[135] *Ibid.,* p. 92.

Eastern Jews did not augur well for the future of the Jewish collectivity. This collectivity might, in the short run, develop culturally, but not so in the long run: "That which one calls the Jewish nation," says Kautsky, "can win the victory only to disappear."[136] This is a cardinal point in Kautsky's study. It is hardly necessary to say that in speaking of the disappearance of the Jews, Kautsky did not refer to some indefinite future in which all nations might perhaps disappear. What he meant was that as soon as full emancipation was obtained for or by the Jews, they had of necessity to disintegrate as a collectivity. "The more thoroughly the emancipation of Jewry is carried out, the more certainly does it mean the dissolution of Jewry."[137]

Why must this be so? Because the Jewish nation could preserve its own existence only through the fact that its members lived in close contact with one another. The occupations of the great mass of Jews in Eastern Europe were such, however, that they were not very compatible with such a congestion of the Jewish population. Persons engaged in those occupations could prosper only when they were living among great numbers of people following other professions, in which the Gentile population predominated. The compulsory congestion of population in a small area—which today still creates the semblance of a Jewish nationality—was precisely what had also created the misery of the Jews. With the disappearance of this misery the conditions for the existence of a Jewish nationality would also disappear. After the victory of the revolution, the Jews would have to make use of their freedom of movement in Russia by spreading out through the entire country. This would be of great economic and intellectual benefit to both Jews and non-Jews, but it would force the Jews to speak the language of their environment, whereby their assimilation would be begun. It would be furthered still more by the fact that in a free Russia, the elevation of the intellectual level of the whole population would be one of the

[136] *Ibid.*
[137] *Ibid.*

most important tasks of the commonwealth. Only from anti-Semitism, from persecution, did Jewry derive its existence as a special corporate body segregated from its environment. Without persecution it would long ago have been absorbed. It had to vanish together with the persecution.[138]

Kautsky's simplified sociology of the Jews dealt only with trends that led to their assimilation; it failed to consider contrary trends that did not fit into his schematic treatment of the subject. Thus he ignored the well-known inclination of the Jews, even when they migrated and dispersed themselves, to concentrate in considerable numbers in new population-centers. To take it for granted, as Kautsky did, that the spreading of the Jews over greater geographical areas necessarily implied the dissolution of their corporate life was a gratuitous assumption based more on wishful thinking than on real facts. And yet this was the basis of his prognosis. Kautsky's analysis also left out of account the possibility of professional readjustment of the Jews not incompatible with the existence of their national collectivity. He also took it for granted—gratuitously—that the learning of another language was, for the Jews, incompatible with the maintenance of their cultural identity. He did not foresee any serious economic or social obstacle to Jewish assimilation. Generally speaking, he did not evaluate adequately the vitality of the Jewish masses in Eastern Europe. In brief, he ignored the fact that in an age of nationalism, national trends among the Jews were more than an ephemeral phenomenon.

Convinced of the inevitability of complete disintegration of Jewry, Kautsky, in a kind of requiem, asked whether this process was to be deplored. He realized, of course, that this was a matter of personal opinion. "It seems to me, however," he added, "that for the Jew himself the ghetto,

[138] *Ibid.*, p. 93. Anti-Semitism, supported mainly by intellectuals and petty bourgeois (*ibid.*, p. 68), would not disappear "soon," but neither, of course, could it count on a victory (*ibid.*, p. 8). In Eastern Europe, it is explained by "the instinctive antipathy of the primitive man to a neighbor who is not of his own kind (*andersgeartet*)." Kautsky, "Das Massaker von Kischineff," p. 306.

which is the form of life of Jewry, is not a phenomenon evoking nostalgic memories. The friends of human progress have even less cause than the conservative Jew to shed a tear over the disappearance of Jewry (*Judentum*)."[139]

A few parenthetical remarks must be added here about the word *Judentum*, which is used equivocally throughout Kautsky's monograph. What is meant by this term? Kautsky emphasized that by Jewry (*Judentum*) he did not mean all Jews, "but those Jews who are gathered together in a special corporate body and cut off from the rest of mankind."[140] The definition is obviously lacking in precision, and, purposely or not, ambiguous. It may mean an ultra-orthodox, or a Socialist, or indeed, any other type of Jewish community, which, according to Kautsky's personal judgment, "isolates" the Jews from other peoples. The context of Kautsky's monograph suggests, however, that when he spoke of the disappearance of *Judentum* he had in mind the disappearance of any type of community that would identify itself as Jewish. Therefore, here as well as in the following paragraphs, the least inadequate English translation of the word *Judentum*, as Kautsky used it, is perhaps "Jewry."

Kautsky considered the disappearance of Jewry as a good thing, simply because he postulated that Jewry and the ghetto always had to remain interchangeable terms. Why this was so, he did not explain. Neither did he say a word about the non-conservative Jews who intended to preserve their national identity. Between Jews and Jewry in the modern age, he made an unexpected and undialectical distinction. "The Jews," he said, "have become an eminently revolutionary factor, while Jewry (*Judentum*) has become a reactionary factor. Jewry is even a weight of lead attached to the feet of the Jews who seek to progress; it is one of the last remnants of the feudal Middle Ages, a social ghetto which is still maintained in the consciousness after the real ghetto has disappeared. We have not completely

[139] Kautsky, *Rasse und Judentum*, p. 93.
[140] *Ibid.*, pp. 93-94.

emerged from the Middle Ages as long as Jewry (*Judentum*) still exists among us. The sooner it disappears, the better it will be for society as well as for the Jews themselves."[141]

Thus no one needed to worry about the disappearance of the Jewish collectivity. This disappearance, Kautsky asserted, would not involve a tragic process like the dying out of the American Indians or the Tasmanians. It did not mean descent into stupidity and degradation, but a rise to greater strength and prosperity. It did not involve a shift from one medieval ruin to another, a transition from orthodox Judaism to ecclesiastical Christianity, but the creation of a new and higher type of man. "Ahasverus will at last have found a haven of rest. He will live on in memory as the greatest sufferer of all mankind, as he who has been dealt with most severely by it, and has given it most."[142]

Holding such views, Kautsky was, of course, hostile to Zionism and to its alleged aim of creating a "world ghetto" in Palestine.[143]

"To be sure, the situation of Russian and Rumanian Jews is desperate, unendurable. But the question is not whether they could live better in Palestine than now in Russia, but whether the founding of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine would afford them better opportunities than the Russian revolution, or even emigration to England or the United States."[144] Furthermore, Palestine is not only too small to absorb all Jews from Eastern Europe, but has not the economic prerequisites for the establishment of a sound Jewish commonwealth. Such a commonwealth is unrealizable without an adequate agriculture. It is, however, impossible to transform city-dwellers into farmers, since, in the whole world, there is an exodus from the country to the city and not the reverse.[145] If this is true of all nations, it is even more so in the case of the Jews, the only people on earth that has constituted a purely urban population for approximately two thousand years.[146]

[141] *Ibid.*, p. 94.
[142] *Ibid.*
[143] *Ibid.*, p. 82.
[144] *Ibid.*, p. 79. And similarly (*mutatis mutandis*) in the revised English translation of 1926: "To be sure, the situation of the Polish, Hungarian and Rumanian Jews is desperate, unendurable. But the question is not whether they could live better in Palestine than now in Western (*sic*!) Europe, but whether the founding of a Jewish community in Palestine would afford them better opportunities than revolution in their own country" (pp. 184-185).
[145] Kautsky, *Rasse und Judentum*, p. 79.
[146] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

Nor is there the slightest chance of establishing an important industry in Palestine. "No industry can be founded on Biblical reminiscences. But nothing else is to be found there."[147] Zionism is thus only a "movement of literati."[148] "Zionism at one time wanted to become a movement of the Jewish proletarian masses, but it is becoming increasingly a mere sport of Jewish philanthropists and writers. . . . All that it will ever be able to produce is a lot of talk and no results."[149]

It is hardly necessary to point out that Kautsky's antagonism toward Zionism embraced both its bourgeois and Socialist versions.[150] It must be recalled, however, that he was also opposed to the national aspirations of the Jews as formulated in the program of the anti-Zionist and revolutionary organization of Jewish workers, the Bund. Kautsky found it superfluous to discuss this program at all and in his monograph on the Jewish problem passed over it in complete silence. This silence deserves to be stressed, for Kautsky held a very high opinion of the Bund and of the Jewish proletariat in general. He knew the sufferings of the Jewish workers.

"It is difficult to be a Jew, to belong to a persecuted and disgraced race; but to be simultaneously a Russian proletarian and a Jew—that means suffering beyond endurance, that means exposure to every insult, to every torture that can be inflicted by stupid omnipotence, by greedy baseness, by wicked idiotism."[151] The struggle of these workers was for him a great inspiration. "If such an oppressed class as the Jewish proletarians in Russia is able to rise and to overcome stupendous obstacles with a superhuman energy, then we may boldly, and sure of our victory, look at the future."[152]

Kautsky must have learned sooner or later that these proletarians fought not only for their class interests, but also for the preservation of their nationality. After the

147 *Ibid.*, p. 80.

148 *Ibid.*, p. 82 (left out in the revised English translation of 1926).

149 *Ibid.* In the revised English translation of 1926, Kautsky left out this passage and introduced a new argument against Zionism: Arab nationalism (pp. 208-213). Zionism, "a reactionary movement" (p. 207), is dangerous for the Jewish masses because it diverts their attention from the class struggle in their respective countries and aims at transplanting "Jews from regions in which anti-Jewish pogroms are subsiding [Eastern Europe], into a country [Palestine] where such pogroms are likely to ensue on a larger scale. . . ." (p. 213).

150 Kautsky, *Rasse und Judentum*, p. 77.

151 Kautsky, *Justice*, Feb. 22, 1902, p. 2.

152 *Ibid.*

Kishinev pogroms he suggested that next to the revolutionary thinking of the popular masses, "the dissolution of Jewry" is the best antidote for anti-Semitism.[153] He could not have been ignorant of the fact that as time went on, Jewish proletarians became more and more opposed to that "dissolution of Jewry." If the Jewish proletarians were indeed as class-conscious as he asserted,[154] he must have given some thought to the fact that precisely these proletarians would be indisposed to renounce their nationality. Why, then, in what was intended to be a basic inquiry into the Jewish question, did he not find it worth while to discuss their ideas and their program? And why was he unable to accept the fact that, after all, a class-conscious proletariat might know better than he whether their nationality (granted, of course, that they had one) was worthy to be preserved and developed? It is not easy to answer these questions, especially in view of the unavailability of his personal papers. It would seem, nevertheless, that the differences between Kautsky and the Bund were not only of a purely intellectual nature. It is hard to escape the conclusion —though it is only a hypothetical one—that Kautsky had a contempt for the Jewish collectivity or "Jewry," as he called it. It was not a contempt for the Jews taken individually, but for their collective or corporate life. It was a prejudice which he shared with many other distinguished Socialists, and even with Jewish contributors to his *Neue Zeit,* such as Jacob Stern, to mention one example.[155]

What is more, it was a prejudice that existed also in the writings of Kautsky's great master. True, in his *Rasse und Judentum* Kautsky did not find occasion to quote a single line from Marx's *Zur Judenfrage.* The spirit of both writings is, however, the same. Marx saw in the Jews a

[153] Kautsky, "Das Massaker von Kischineff," p. 307.

[154] See his eulogy to the class-consciousness of the Jewish workers, *Justice,* April 23, 1904, p. 4.

[155] That Stern was a friend of Karl Kautsky I learned in 1949 in a conversation with his son, Dr. Benedikt Kautsky, author of *Teufel und Verdammte* (Zürich, 1946), one of the best accounts of German concentration camps, where he spent nearly seven years, first as a "Jew"—Karl Kautsky's wife was Jewish—and then as a political prisoner. On Stern, see further below.

"chimerical nationality," while Kautsky regarded them as "a semblance of a nationality."[156] Marx thought that "the emancipation of the Jews in its last significance is the emancipation of mankind from Judaism," while Kautsky believed that the Middle Ages would not completely disappear "as long as Jewry still exists among us."[157] Marx had a contempt for Judaism because, some have said, he knew nothing of the Jewish proletariat, or because that proletariat did not yet exist. Kautsky knew that proletariat, and even praised it in the most glowing terms, without on that account losing his contempt for Jewry as a corporate body, a contempt so deeply rooted in Socialist tradition. His contempt was, of course, a refined one, and a most charitable one, but contempt it was none the less.

Kautsky's treatise on the Jews is full of oversimplifications and hasty conclusions. Reading it, one cannot help recalling what his intellectual masters had thought about their pupil in the early eighties, when he was still a very young man. Marx characterized him, in a letter to his daughter Jenny, as "a mediocrity, with a narrow outlook, a wiseacre (only 26 years old) and a know-it-all, industrious in a certain way, who busies himself a great deal with statistics but does not derive any sensible conclusions from them, [and] belongs by nature to the tribe of the Philistines."[158] Engels noted in a letter to Eduard Bernstein that "Kautsky has the misfortune that complicated questions do not resolve themselves into simple ones under his hand, but rather the simple ones become complicated. And then one can accomplish nothing if one writes so much."[159] These evaluations, harsh as they are, seem to characterize well at least some aspects of Kautsky's personality, and they are not much less true of the young Kautsky than of the old. Apart from his contempt for Jewry, the haste with which

[156] Kautsky, *Rasse und Judentum,* p. 93; Marx, *Zur Judenfrage,* in Marx-Engels, *Gesamtausgalse,* Erste Abteilung, I^1, 604.

[157] Marx, *Zur Judenfrage,* p. 601; Kautsky, *Rasse und Judentum,* p. 94.

[158] Letter of April 11, 1881, facsimile in *Bolshevik,* 1931, No. 5. p. 77.

[159] Letter of March 1, 1883, *Briefe von F. Engels an Ed. Bernstein* (Berlin, 1925), p. 118.

he wrote prevented him from seeing more adequately the Jewish problem.

Kautsky once noted that since he was of mixed origin —his ancestors included Czechs, Poles, Croats, Germans, and Italians—he always had a full appreciation of the national idea.

> "From the very beginning, my vein of national feeling was not directed toward one nation alone. Hence it cost me no effort to attain to international thinking; not a kind of thinking which has no interest in nationality nor appreciation of it, but one which seeks to offer to every nationality the same interest and appreciation, which wants to prepare for every nationality a thriving home on this earth, through the free and joyous coöperation of all."[160]

Such may have been, indeed, his feelings towards all the nations of the world except the Jews, who in his opinion had no right to aspire to "a thriving home on this earth," for the very simple reason that, according to him, they were not a nationality but "a caste."

C. "Neue Zeit"

Kautsky's hostile attitude towards the national aspirations of Jewry is also well reflected in *Die Neue Zeit*, the leading theoretical organ of German Social Democracy, which he edited from its foundation in 1883 up to 1917. The periodical fought constantly against Zionism, even before the emergence of Herzl. As early as 1892, it reported —with approval—on the opposition of the "class-conscious" Jewish workers against emigration to Palestine.[161] Three years later it published an article that characterized Zionism as a utopian movement.[162] The article was otherwise not especially hostile to Zionism, and its mildness provoked an immediate rejoinder from S. Häcker of Lwow (Lemberg), who pointed out that Jewish workers in Galicia were violently disrupting Zionist meetings, because Zionism was an "arch-reactionary" movement; it was characteristic, he

[160] Kautsky, autobiographical sketch, in Meiner, *op. cit.*, I, 118.
[161] I. Ignatjeff, *Neue Zeit*, XI[1] (1892-93), 178.
[162] B. Emanuel, *Neue Zeite*, XIII[2] (1895), 599-603.

said, that in Galicia the "rich oil-well owners of Drohobycz and Boryslaw, the most barbaric exploiters in Europe," were members of the Zionist party.[163]

Soon after the appearance of Herzl's book, *Der Judenstaat,* Jakob Stern reviewed it very briefly in the *Neue Zeit.* In not more than twenty-two lines (most of which are irrelevant), he described Herzl's "droll project" as "utopian" and conceived in the spirit of "negative courage."[164] He implicitly assumed that Jewish workers would not emigrate to Palestine, nor would the wealthy Jews: "The Jewish capitalists will be careful not to be taken in. They know only too well that anti-Semitism would follow them into the new Jewish State; to be sure, it then would drop the name and character of 'the Socialism of the stupid man,' and appear as the unmasked and unadulterated struggle of the exploited masses against the exploiters."[165] To this historical-materialist comment Stern added a more personal note. It was a pity, he said, that the Austrian poet Robert Hamerling did not live to learn of Herzl's project: "It surely would have given him some piquant material for a few additional touches in the eighth song of his satirical epos, *Homunculus* [1888], which deals with a similar Jewish State."[166] It is not easy to imagine what Herzl's book could have added to the highly anti-Semitic work of Hamerling, who, incidentally, in contradistinction to Stern, assumed that only speculators and other parasites would migrate to Palestine. In his own language, these were, indeed, the people who would go there, and for a while only: *Schacherjuden, Wucherjuden, Börsejuden, mauschelnde Finanzbarone, Zeitungsjuden, Kunstsemiten, herrenlose Juden-*

[163] Häcker, *ibid.,* 760. On the other hand, there is an unverifiable report that the most exploited Jewish workers of Boryslaw were not only ready, but even anxious, to migrate to Palestine. "Speak to them of emigrating to America or England, and they will regard you as one of their greatest enemies. Whoever doubts or disputes that the Jewish masses desire and need a Jewish State, let him go to Boryslaw." Anonymous, "Jewish Misery in Galicia," *Jewish World* (London), XLIX (1898), 330.

[164] Jakob Stern, *Neue Zeit,* XV[1] (1896-97), 186.

[165] *Ibid.*

[166] *Ibid.*

knaben, Judendirnchen, Judenhökerinnen, etc., etc.[167] It is significant that to deride Herzl the leading organ of the orthodox followers of Marx referred the reader to the anti-Semite Hamerling.

Political Zionism, another contributor to the *Neue Zeit* explained, did not result from an inevitable historical necessity; "it is in every way a child of Dr. Theodor Herzl's whim."[168] It was "an ephemeral phenomenon," "a beautiful pose, with which a nation that is no longer living steps onto the stage of history for the last time, before its complete disappearance."[169]

A more refined attitude towards Zionism was adopted by still another contributor to the *Neue Zeit,* Max Zetterbaum. Zionism, he declared, was the reaction of the Jewish bourgeoisie against modern anti-Semitism. The Jewish bourgeois were not satisfied with their political emancipation; they also wanted to rule. In this situation there emerged unconsciously the ideology of a state where they themselves would be the sole rulers. Social Democracy was not opposed, in principle, to the establishment of a Jewish State. If the establishment of such a state would involve a struggle for liberation, it was conceivable that Jewish Socialists would participate in it. But since Zionists intended to found their state by diplomatic negotiations and financial bargaining with Turkey, Jewish Socialists could have nothing to do with such an enterprise. Social Democracy fought against the Zionists, not because it was opposed to a Jewish State, but only because Zionists propagated class coöperation, cultivated Jewish particularism, and revered the Jewish religion. Their whole political creed was "ultra-reactionary." With all their tirades, *shekels,* banking and charter problems, they were diverting the attention of the Jewish bourgeoisie in Russia from its historical task, i.e., the struggle against absolutism. The Jews had no common language, and therefore were not a nationality, but a "tribal community." Only the future would show whether they

[167] Robert Hamerling, *Sämtliche Werke* (Leipzig, no date), XII, 145-172.
[168] Johann Pollak, *Neue Zeit,* XVI[1] (1897-98), 598.
[169] *Ibid.,* p. 600.

would once more become a nation or disappear completely. For the time being the Jewish proletariat had neither a material nor a moral interest in the national question. "Jewish Social Democracy must consequently pursue neither an assimilationist nor a 'national' policy."[170] Zetterbaum did not examine seriously the possibility of a synthesis of Zionism and Socialism. He was satisfied to state that while some noble but naive men dreamt of such a synthesis, the Zionist movement, including all its organs and leaders, was inimical to Socialism.[171]

When such a synthesis was aimed at by the Labor Zionist party, the *Neue Zeit* continued to support the anti-Zionist point of view of the General Jewish Labor League of Lithuania, Poland, and Russia, known as the Bund.[172] Shortly after the formation of the Labor Zionist party, an anonymous Bundist article[173] asserted once more that the old political Zionism had long ago fallen into decay, and that those who tried to revive it in a new pseudo-proletarian garb were not genuine Socialists. They were accused of suffering from a morbid national feeling; of arousing hostility among the Jewish masses against the Christian population; of infusing Jewish workers with distrust of their Gentile comrades; in short, of propagating Jewish chauvinism. Among the proofs of this chauvinism, reference was made to Labor Zionist leaflets stating that the *Narodnaia Volia* incited Russian masses against the Jews—which, of course, was an indisputable fact[174]—and that such was the situation of the Jewish workers in Russia that they must envy even the proletariat of other nationalities.[175] Zionism,

[170] Max Zetterbaum, *Neue Zeit*, XIX[1] (1900-01), 325. Cf. also pp. 329-330, 369.

[171] *Ibid.*, p. 326.

[172] It may be recalled that the Bund held that "it is hard to find a worse enemy of the Jewish people than Zionism!" Bund [Chaim Zhitlovsky], *Tsionizmus oder Sotsializmus* (reprinted from *Yidisher Arbeter*, No. 6, March, 1899) (London, 1899), p. 24.

[173] A. L., *Neue Zeit*, XXIV[1] (1905-06), 804-813.

[174] See Silberner, "Two Studies on Modern Anti-Semitism," *Historia Judaica*, XIV (1952), 93 ff.

[175] A. L., *loc. cit.*, p. 812. P. B. Axelrod, a leading (Jewish) member of the Russian Social Democratic party, declared by November, 1917: "I de-

the anonymous Bundist asserted, was an aim alien to the Jewish working masses. They knew that their class-struggle would bring Socialism to realization in their present homelands, and that the Diaspora would thus cease to be a Diaspora for them: "Why, then, should they worry about Zion?"[176]

More or less in the same vein is another article about "the Zionist-Socialist utopia." Its author explained why the Bund and the Russian Social Democratic party successfully opposed, at the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart (1907), the admission of Labor Zionists. This was done because Zionist Socialists, "true utopians and metaphysicians," did not understand that the economic and cultural development of Jewry did not lead to territorialism.[177] Zionism was moreover, more than a petty-bourgeois utopia and a fantastic fairy-tale; it was a movement that brought demoralization into the ranks of the Jewish proletariat. Consequently, the Russian Social Democrats as well as the Bund were fighting energetically against Socialist Zionism, in the firm belief that they were thus rendering an important service to the International.[178]

In contrast to the orthodox *Neue Zeit,* the revisionist *Sozialistische Monatshefte* published sympathetic articles about Zionism from the outset. The periodical was edited by an East Prussian of Jewish origin, Josef Bloch, who, according to Eduard Bernstein, was so Prussian-minded that he might have been at times mistaken for a German nationalist. As a Jew, however, he stood close to the Zionists.[179] As early as 1898 a contributor to the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* pointed out that there was no contradiction between Socialism and Zionism, and that the latter had great spiritual

sire the realisation of Zionism. . . . I often envy the lot of the most miserable people who live on their own land, and can consider a definite territory their undeniable property." Quoted from Lewis Rifkind, *Zionism and Socialism* (a collection of opinions) (London, 1918), pp. 16-17.

[176] A. L., *loc. cit.*, p. 810.

[177] B. Rosin, *Neue Zeit,* XXVII[1] (1908-09), 33.

[178] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[179] Bernstein, *Tsukunft,* XXVI (1921), 149. Bloch's ideas on Palestine are developed in a posthumous publication: Joseph Bloch, *Revolution der Weltpolitik, Anhang* II: *Palaestina in der Weltpolitik* (no place, no date [1938]).

influence, particularly on the poor classes of Jewry.[180] A. Schreiber declared that both Zionism and Socialism, in spite of all their differences, were liberation movements.[181] M. Ratner and M. Anin maintained that a territorial solution of the Jewish question was desirable.[182]

At the beginning of World War I, the periodical became even more pronouncedly pro-Zionist. Ludwig Quessel, a non-Jewish contributor, observed that the dissolution of the Jewish nationality would be a cultural loss for all mankind and spoke sympathetically of the Zionist movement.[183] Herman Kranold, another non-Jewish supporter of Zionism, noted that Palestine could absorb at least two million Jews. "It is, therefore, foolish to talk of a Zionist utopia. Zionism is rather a realistic political undertaking, farseeing, to be sure, but none the less sound for that."[184] Furthermore, the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* published articles recommending the creation, within the International, of a Jewish section that would comprise representatives of all the existing Jewish Socialist parties.[185]

Publications of pro-Zionist articles by the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* elicited ironical comments from the *Neue Zeit*.[186] The project of establishing an autonomous Jewish section within the International drew hostile remarks from the Bundist leader W. Medem.

[180] Anonymous, review of Karl Kraus, "Eine Krone für Zion," *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, II (1898), 535-536.

[181] A. Schreiber, *ibid.*, VII[1] (1903), 453.

[182] M. Ratner, *ibid.*, XII[3] (1908), 1540; M. Anin, *ibid.*, XIII[3] (1909), 1250.

[183] Ludwig Quessel, *ibid.*, XX[2] (1914), 673; XXIII[2] (1917), 843. Quessel (*ibid.*, XXI[1] [1915], 401) thought that Jewish colonization of Palestine would proceed more easily under Turkish rule than under British, and that such colonization would also be advantageous to Germany.

[184] Herman Kranold, *ibid.*, XXIII[2] (1917), 689. See also Kranold, *ibid.*, XXIV[1] (1918), 235, and *Jude*, III (1918-19), 251-260. Hugo Haase (1863-1919), the well-known German Socialist (of Jewish origin), is also reported to have favored the Zionist cause (see *Jewish Labour Correspondence* [London], II, No. 1, Jan. 1920, p. 1), but I am unaware of any writings of his on the subject.

[185] Anin, *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, XIV[2] (1910), 885-890, 1065-1068; XV[1] (1911), 396-401.

[186] See M. N., *Neue Zeit*, XXVIII[2] (1909-10), 646-647; and Medem *ibid.*, p. 748.

"Under the present circumstances the introduction of an autonomous Jewish section, which would attempt to bring together the Jewish workers of the Old and the New World, would mean nothing else than a demonstration in favor of Zionism. That is just what the proponents of this idea want. And inasmuch as they oppose the state principle and favor the nationality principle, they are really striving to get the idea of the *Jewish State* sanctioned by the International."[187]

Medem spoke, of course, in his own name. His opinion, however, reflected well the editorial policy of Karl Kautsky, who did everything in his power to discredit and ridicule the idea of the Jewish State. No other attitude towards Zionists could have been expected from the *Neue Zeit*, which saw in them merely "the party of the petty bourgeois and intellectuals."[188]

[187] Medem, *ibid.*, p. 751.
[188] Jakob Pistiner, *ibid.*, XXXIV[2] (1915-1916), 449.

BENJAMIN SZOLD AND THE RABBINICAL POST IN STOCKHOLM IN 1858

With An Unpublished Letter of Isaac M. Wise

By Kurt Wilhelm
Chief Rabbi of Sweden
Stockholm

IN his excellent Hebrew book on the Shaping of American Judaism Moshe Davis writes in a chapter on Benjamin Szold (1829-1902) that this rabbi officiated for a short period in Stockholm during the year 1858.[1] While still a student, Szold is said to have received a call to Stockholm, where the Jewish community intended to retain him as its rabbi, but Szold allegedly renounced this post in favor of Ludwig Lewysohn (1819-1901), the author of the work, *Zoologie des Talmud.* At the same time Lewysohn had been called to Oheb Shalom Congregation in Baltimore. However, he had a stronger desire for the Stockholm rabbinical post and is said to have suggested to Szold that they exchange appointments. Lewysohn preferred Stockholm because he did not like the idea of travelling with his large family to far away America, while Szold at this time still was a bachelor. Zacharias Frankel, director of the Breslau Jewish Theological Seminary, is said to have suggested to Szold that he accept Lewysohn's proposal, since the world would be open to him in America. And this is the story of how Szold came to America, where he introduced the good Breslau religious tradition.

Davis does not state where he found this version of Szold's ministry in Stockholm and his renunciation of it. The few lines Davis gave to it suggested to the writer that the events of that time might be traced in the minute books of the Stockholm Jewish Community, which would enable him to distinguish between truth and legend in the matter.[2] Be-

[1] M. Davis, *Yahadut Amerika be-Hitpathutah* (New York, 1951), p. 46 (Hebrew).

[2] "Mosaiska Församlingens i Stockholm protokollböcker 1858/59" (manuscript).

sides, the Stockholm archives offer some interesting information about the character of young Szold and his views on certain Reform trends.

Doctor Löb Seligmann, German-born and the first modern rabbi of Stockholm, who officiated in that community for twenty-five years, passed away in November, 1857. After his death, the community hoped that Seligmann's son Joseph, who in 1856 began his studies at the Jewish Theological Seminary of Breslau, would take over his father's pulpit in the course of time. But Joseph Seligmann left the Breslau Seminary after two years and became a book-dealer in Stockholm.[3] In the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* during the months of June and July, 1858, the vacancy in the Stockholm rabbinate was advertised several times: "... especially unmarried candidates are invited to submit their applications as soon as possible, by prepaid letters. . . ." Stockholm may have preferred an unmarried rabbi because of the notion that a new rabbi would acclimatize himself to the Swedish-Jewish environment by marriage with a daughter of the community.

A large number of German rabbis applied for the post, including scholars of reputation. Among the applicants were Dr. Ludwig Lewysohn of Worms and *candidatus theologiae* Benjamin Szold of Breslau. Lewysohn, though married and the father of four children had a good chance to receive the position. The community had sent the names of all the applicants to the rabbi of Mannheim, Dr. Prager, who was held in great esteem by the board of the community and who was asked to give his opinion on the qualifications of the candidates. Prager wrote to Stockholm on August 10, 1858, that he personally knew only one, namely, Lewysohn, whom he warmly recommended as a "qualified theologian, prolific author, good schoolman and friend of the Reform." Moreover, Lewysohn had in Stockholm an influential advocate, the publisher Albert Bonnier, who was a member of the board. Also, there were personal conncetions between Bonnier and the publisher Joseph Baer of Frankfurt, whose

[3] M. Brann, *Geschichte des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars in Breslau* (Breslau, 1904), p. 159.

sister was Lewysohn's second wife. In 1856, according to a letter from Baer to Bonnier, dated Leipzig, April 23, 1856, Baer hoped to meet Bonnier at the Leipzig Fair. Since Bonnier did not come to Leipzig, Baer wrote to his friend from there, thanking him for his interest in his brother-in-law Lewysohn, whom Bonnier had recommended for the rabbinical position in Gothenburg. Lewysohn, however, was not interested in Gothenburg. "It would be quite a different matter, should the position in Stockholm become vacant, as you predicted; in this case my brother-in-law would come there first, assuming you are able to give him reason to hope and promise your kind assistance." Baer praised Lewysohn highly as a preacher and a scholar. "Should you be able to help him to be called to the rabbinate in Stockholm, you certainly would have no reason to be ashamed of your intervention and you would obligate me to eternal thanks." The letter was written in 1856, when Seligmann was still alive, but apparently ill.[4]

Of the numerous applicants, only Lewysohn and Szold were asked to come to Stockholm to deliver trial sermons. Lewysohn arrived on August 28 and preached one Sabbath sermon. According to the minutes, he had asked the Board on the Friday before to give him the text for his sermon, but the Board politely declined. At a meeting of the Board with Lewysohn a few days later, Lewysohn was asked several questions regarding matters of principle, especially concerning his attitude toward reform of the services. Until then, the Stockholm religious services had been held in the traditional manner, without an organ. Lewysohn suggested, first of all, that a committee be appointed to deal with the question and explained in cautious words that he favored certain synagogue reforms. Should the community appoint him, he could enter upon his office about the first of April, 1859.

The other candidate who came to Stockholm for trial sermons, Benjamin Szold, had applied for the post on July 18 and had asked that, should he be invited to come to Stock-

[4] This letter and two others from the time when Lewysohn stood for the post and a number of letters by Lewysohn to Bonnier from the same time are kept in the "Judaica" Bonnier Archives, now in the possession of Mosaiska Församlingen, Stockholm.

holm, his trial sermons be postponed to the New Year. "At the same time I beg to declare, should you invite me to trial sermons upon the New Year, that I am ready not only to take upon myself all the sermons of both New Year's days, but those of the Day of Atonement and of the Feast of Tabernacles as well. I can entertain the cheerful hope that my sermons will find your approval." This welcome offer was gladly accepted by the community, which therefore invited Lewysohn to deliver his sermon shortly before the High Holidays so that both candidates might be heard within a brief interval. That the young and unknown Szold was considered at all was due to the fact that the teachers of the Breslau Seminary had recommended him highly in letters, copies of which are kept in the Stockholm Minute Book.[5]

Szold was 28 years old when he came to Stockholm. He had not yet passed his Ph. D. examination and did not call himself a rabbi, in spite of his Hungarian rabbinical diplomas. In his application as well as in a letter to the Stockholm community, dated August 18, announcing his arrival, he added to his signature "Doctorand der Philosophie." It may be that he received his Ph.D. only a few days before leaving Breslau, since the Minute Book mentions him as Dr. Szold. He, like Lewysohn, went to Stockholm by way of Gothenburg, in order to become acquainted with the reforms which only recently had been introduced in the Sabbath services. In Stockholm, he delivered two sermons on both New Year's days and a *derasha* on Shabbat Shuva at the Minha service. He was asked to meet the Board before the Day of Atonement. The minutes of this meeting are written in German, and the first draft of them is added to the Minute Book, every page signed by Szold. At the end of the protocol is written: "Read and acknowledged to be correct, Dr. Benjamin Szold." The essential item of the meeting concerns Szold's views on reforms. Paragraph 4 of the protocol reads in English translation as follows:

Called upon by the Board to give his views (1) on the admissibility of reforms of the services in general; (2) on the reforms of the services introduced in Gothenburg and their usefulness for the Stockholm community, Dr. Szold declared: (1) that, wherever the necessity for reforms generally

[5] See their original wording in the Appendix below.

would become known within a community, he as rabbi never would oppose such a desire and its realization; (2) that he approved of the introduction of an organ, of Swedish prayers and of choral song, such as had been done in Gothenburg; however, the new prayer book introduced there should once more be discussed in the local community before it be accepted in its totality. If, after such a discussion, services of the Gothenburg type should be approved, the only objection Dr. Szold had to it was that the prayers after the taking-out of the Torah Scroll, especially the *Shema Yisrael, Echad, Gadlu, Yehallelu, Uvnucho yomar,* would be read in Swedish translation, since said prayers, according to the views of Dr. Szold, should be kept absolutely in the Hebrew language, for these reasons: first, because a Jewish service must bear over all a genuine Jewish character, and second, because said prayers represent the fundamental ideas of Judaism.

The Reform movement in Sweden started in Gothenburg, in that community where in 1835 Abraham Geiger was refused a position as rabbi because he was too liberal.[6] Twenty years later, however, in 1855, when the new synagogue building was erected, an organ was installed and a new prayer-book introduced after the pattern of the Hamburg Temple prayer-book. This prayer-book acknowledged the rationalistic Zeitgeist by omitting the first benedictions at the lighting of the Hanukkah candles and before the reading of the Megillah. The Jewish Community of Stockholm introduced the Gothenburg prayer-book a few years later, but subsequent editions became more conservative again, and all the reforms opposed by Szold, have long since been abolished in Sweden.

The minutes of the meeting of the Board with Szold present young Szold in a most sympathetic light. Although he seems to have been eager to obtain the Stockholm position, he spontaneously declared that he was aware of the community desire to appoint as its future rabbi Mr. Joseph Seligmann, the late rabbi's son, who at present was a student at the Jewish Theological Seminary of Breslau, and that he always would seek to further this aim, and all the more so as he was a good friend of the said Joseph; and therefore Dr. Szold even would be ready — should this become necessary — to resign the position of a rabbi in his favor." Szold delivered

[6] See Geiger's application for the rabbinical position in Gothenburg in Ludwig Geiger, *Abraham Geigers Leben in Briefen* (Berlin, 1878), p. 84.

two more sermons on the Day of Atonement and again two sermons on the first day of Sukkot.

The day of the election of the rabbi was delayed until November. A general assembly of the community on November 18 seconded the motion of the Board to have Lewysohn and Szold as the only competitors, and three days later, on November 21, the community went to the polls. There were about a hundred Jewish families at that time in Stockholm. Eighty-three votes were cast, 64 for Lewysohn and 19 for Szold. Lewysohn had won. In a letter to Szold, dated December 2, informing him of his defeat, the community said: "Returning herewith to you your testimonials enclosed with your application and those later presented in the original, the Board — with whom your excellent performance as a trial preacher still lives in serene memory — cannot but add the sincere wish that you may soon receive a sphere of activity adequate to your distinguished abilities." This wish came true in the following year, when Szold was called to Oheb Shalom Congregation in Baltimore.

As pointed out by Davis, Lewysohn had been negotiating with Congregation Oheb Shalom in Baltimore before coming to Stockholm and had told this Congregation that he would be ready to accept its call. A letter from the Congregation to Lewysohn, of November 25, 1858, in the Bonnier Archives, signed by Julius Stiefel, President, Simon Cohen, Vice-President, and written by Secretary Joseph Sachs, transmits to Lewysohn the happy news that Congregation Oheb Shalom unanimously elected him as its rabbi on that day, that is, only four days after his election in Stockholm. The congregation would send him one thousand florins for his travelling expenses.

"You will notice," the letter reads, "that the Congregation, as far as it is concerned, gladly seeks to comply with all requests and all the more, because it hopes to have found in you the man who, through his resolution, diligence, knowledge and oratorical talent, will raise the young Congregation to the standard which it deserves because of its progress and its other institutions. The moral as well as the material strength of a congregation in America can be promoted or weakened by its spiritual leader. If he has won the confidence of his congregation, he need not fear that any power can prevent him from executing his ideas. Please make every effort to come as soon as possible to quench the thirst of

those who are yearning for instruction. Perhaps you will be able to celebrate the coming Passover, the festival of spring and redemption, with us in the land of freedom. Please write us soon when and with which Steamship Company you intend to travel to us, and if you want to oblige us greatly, please send us in the meantime your publications and other important essays and your sermons that have appeared in print. Dr. Wise does not have any of them. Regarding the guarantee you wish, I take the liberty to tell you provisionally that, according to the laws of this country, an agreement made with a congregation signed by its officers and confirmed with the seal of the congregation is the best possible security to be given. Enclosed please find a letter by Dr. Wise, sent here for you."

Rabbi Isaac M. Wise's letter to Lewysohn is an extremely interesting document regarding the conditions of American Jewry in those days. For this reason it follows here in English translation, the original German may be found in the Appendix.

Cincinnati, November 12, 1858.

Most esteemed Colleague,

I am very glad that you have made up your mind to come to the United States. In Baltimore you have an elegant and permanent position. The congregation is generous and amenable to teaching. It knows how to honor a man and to get along with him. The position in Baltimore is better than that of the Temple in New York, with respect to remuneration, because 1,500 [dollars] in Baltimore are more than 2,000 in New York and because in Baltimore the rabbi is honored as such, while in New York "the entire congregation is holy" and the rabbi himself of very little influence. The chances in Baltimore are much better than in New York, if you really know how to maintain the right balance, because Einhorn, aside from his congregation of 60 or 70 members, is dead, and there is nobody else outside of the congregation who could encroach upon your rabbinical functions or interfere with your bringing your influence to bear, a matter impossible in New York, where there is a Raphall, Isaacs, Fischel, Bondi, and others.

I have not the least doubt that the congregation will pay your travel expenses and perhaps you know already about that.

In my eyes, the congregation is honorable and generous, and you will have a good chance to live quite a satisfied life, especially since a sphere of activity is open before you, which cannot be found in Germany as far as extent and fruitfulness is concerned. Here the word is free like the air, and with electric speed it hurries through the vast and glorious country. Our Jews in America suffer, it is true, from lack of general education, but indifference finds no home here, and basically they are able to be educated.

I have given to my book-dealer for you (for the second time, the first shipment was lost) the following books: History, Vol. I; the Prayer-

book *Minhag America;* Sermon in Baltimore. For the compilation of the second volume for the New Year and the Day of Atonement I shall wait until you are here and able to cooperate, since I hope you will already be in Baltimore by next Passover. The sooner the better.

In case you need some information regarding travelling, etc., or any other service, I am at your disposal.

Louisville, my neighboring city, needs a preacher who is able to learn perfect English within a short time. A young and well-trained man can easily achieve this. Please suggest a candidate to me. He must be an educated rabbi and a good, popular speaker. The position is good.

Let me hear from you. Farewell and have an early and happy voyage.

Sincerely yours.

ISAAC M. WISE.

The disappointment of Oheb Shalom Congregation over Lewysohn's rejection of the post certainly was compensated by Szold's accepting the call in 1859 and his long and blessed activity in Baltimore. The defeat of Szold in Stockholm turned out to be a momentous event for American Jewry and Judaism. The margin of two dozen votes in favor of Lewysohn in Stockholm on November 21, 1858, inaugurated an important chapter, not only in American Jewish history, but through the American-born Henrietta Szold, in the history of the entire Jewish people and its Homeland.

APPENDIX

I

ISAAC M. WISE'S LETTER TO RABBI LUDWIG LEWYSOHN

Cincinnati, November 12, 1858

Bonnier Archives of the Jewish Community, Stockholm

"Cincinnati den 12. November 1858.

Geehrtester Herr College.

Es freut mich sehr, dass Sie nach den V[ereinigten] S[taaten] zu kommen sich entschlossen haben. Sie bekommen in Baltimore eine elegante und dauernde Stelle. Die Gemeinde ist generös und bildungsfähig. Sie weiss einen Mann zu achten und zu behandeln. Die Baltimorer Stelle ist besser als die im N. Y. Tempel, weil pecuniär 1500 in Balt. mehr als 2000 in N. Y. ist, und weil der Rabbiner in Balt. als solcher geehrt wird, in N. Y. כלם קדושים[7] sehr wenig Einfluss hat. Die Chancen in Balt., wenn Sie die rechte Ballance redlich halten, sind bedeutend besser als in N. Y.,

[7] "All the congregation are holy" (Numbers 16:3).

weil Einhorn[8] ausserhalb seiner 60 oder 70 Mitglieder starken Gemeinde todt ist, und sonst ist Niemand da, der Sie in den rabbinischen Funktionen ausserhalb der Gemeinde oder im Geltendmachen Ihres Einflusses beeinträchtigen kann, was in N. Y. nicht der Fall ist, da gibts einen Raphall,[9] Isaacs,[10] Fischel,[11] Bondi[12] und andere.

Ich zweifle nicht im Geringsten, dass die Gemeinde Ihre Reisenkosten gerne vergütet, doch sind Sie darüber vielleicht schon in Kenntniss gesetzt.

Mir erscheint die Gemeinde sehr ehrenwerth und generös, und Sie werden Ursache haben recht zufrieden zu leben; besonders da sich Ihnen hier ein Wirkungskreis eröffnet, der an Grösse und Fruchtbarkeit in Deutschland nicht zu finden ist. Frei wie die Luft ist hier das Wort und mit elektrischer Schnelligkeit durcheilt es das grosse, herrliche Land. Unsere Juden in Am. leiden zwar Mangel an allgemeiner Bildung, aber der Indifferentismus ist nicht zu Hause hier, und das Element ist bildungsfähig.

Habe meinem Buchhändler (zum zweiten Male, erste Sendung verloren) folgende Werke für Sie übergeben: History etc. Vol. I,[13] תפלה, מנהג אמריקא,[14] Sermon in Balt.[15] Mit der Bearbeitung des zweiten Theils für ר"ה ויו"כ warte ich bis Sie hier sind und mitarbeiten könen, da ich hoffe Sie schon nächsten פסח in Balt. zu wissen. Je eher desto besser.

Sollten Sie irgend eine Auskunft Bezug der Reise u.s.w. von mir wollen, oder sonst einen Dienst, so bin ich bereit.

Louisville, meine Nachbarstadt muss einen Prediger haben, der in kurzer Zeit die englische Sprache bis zur Vollkommenheit erlernen kann. Ein junger, tüchtig gebildeter Mann kann das leicht. Schlagen Sie mir

[8] David Einhorn, b. 1809 in Dispeck, Bavaria, d. 1879 in New York; became rabbi of Har Sinai Congregation of Baltimore in 1855.

[9] Morris Jacob Raphall, b. 1798 in Stockholm, d. 1868 in New York; from 1849 on rabbi of B'nai Jeshurun Congregation; see Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 29ff.

[10] Samuel Myer Isaacs, b. 1804 in Leeuwarden, Holland, d. 1878 in New York; became rabbi of B'nai Jeshurun in 1839 and of Shaarey Tefilla Congregation in 1847; see Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 24ff.

[11] Arnold Fischel, in New York in the middle of the nineteenth century, for some time assistant to Raphall.

[12] Jonas Bondi, b. 1804 in Dresden, d. 1874 in New York; rabbi of Anshe Chesed Congregation, according to Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 324, from 1859 on, which year, in view of Wise's letter, must be corrected at least to 1858.

[13] *History of the Israelitish Nation from Abraham to the Present Time* (Albany, 1854).

[14] *Minhag America* (Hebrew-English and Hebrew-German) (Cincinnati, 1857).

[15] [The editor was unable to locate a copy of this sermon in the United States or even to identify it bibliographically. It is not listed in Adolph S. Oko, *A Tentative Bibliography of Dr. Isaac M. Wise* [1819-1900], reprinted from the *Hebrew Union College Monthly*, III, No. 3 (Cincinnati, 1917). On Isaac M. Wise's visit to Baltimore and the sermon see "Editorial Correspondence", *The Israelite*, IV, No. 18 (1857), p. 141. — — Just before this article goes to press, Dr. Wilhelm sends information that a copy of the "Sermon in Baltimore" is listed in the catalogue of the Jewish Community Library of Stockholm. The title reads: *Walk in the Light of God. A Sermon* [No place given], 5618. — — EDITOR.]

gefälligst einen solchen vor. Derselbe muss ein gebildeter Rabbiner und guter Volksredner sein. Die Stelle ist gut.

Lassen Sie von sich hören. Leben Sie wohl, reisen Sie bald und glücklich. Ergebenster, ISAAC M. WISE.

II

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION FOR BENJAMIN SZOLD BY ZACHARIAS FRANKEL, HEINRICH GRAETZ, MANUEL JOEL

Breslau, July 13, 1858.

Mosaiska Församlingens i Stockholm Protokollböker 1858-59.
Archives of the Jewish Community Stockholm.

1

Herr Benjamin Szold aus Ungarn ist mir durch mehrjährigen Umgang mit demselben als junger strebsamer Theologe, der auf dem Gebiete des so weit ausgebreiteten Talmudstudiums und der mit ihm verwandten Fächer sich bedeutendes, ihn zum Rabbiner qualifizierendes Wissen erworben hat, bekannt. Nicht minder habe ich ihn von Seiten seines ehrenhaften Charakters und seiner ächten Religiosität kennen gelernt, und zweifle ich nicht, dass bei seinem regsamen wissenschaftlichen Streben und seiner Hingebung an seinen Beruf er dem Judenthum zur Ehre gereichen und dessen religiöse Interessen mit lebendigem Eifer fördern werde.

Breslau, den 13ten Juli 1858. ... Oberrabbiner Dr. Z. Frankel
Direktor des jüd. theolog. Seminars.

2

Herr Rabbinatskandidat Szold aus Ungarn ist mir seit einer Reihe von Jahren als ein Mann von fleckenloser Sittlichkeit, geläuterter Religiosität und gediegenen talmudischen, theologischen und philosophischen Kenntnissen bekannt. So oft derselbe Gelegenheit hatte, in Gemeinden zu predigen, sind seine Predigten mit sehr vielem Beifalle aufgenommen worden. Die Gemeinde, welcher Herr Szold als Rabbiner einst vorstehen wird, dürfte sich zu der glücklichen Acquisition Glück wünschen.

Breslau, den 13. Juli 1858. Dr. H. Graetz, Lehrer am jüdisch-theologischen Seminar "Fränkelscher Stiftung."

3

Herr Rabbinatskandidat Szold ist mir seit vielen Jahren persönlich bekannt und habe ich in ihm nicht bloss einen theologisch, wie allgemein humanistisch durchgebildeten Mann gefunden, sondern auch von seiner seltenen Anlage zur Kanzelberedsamkeit mich überzeugt, eine Anlage, die für seine ihn acquirirende Gemeinde eine reiche Quelle wahrhaft religiöser Belehrung und Erbauung werden muss. In Anbetracht dass zu dieser reichen Begabung sich wahre Liebe zur Wissenschaft überhaupt und zu seinem Berufe insbesondere gesellt, kann man im Interesse des Judenthums nur wünschen, dass Herr Szold bald einen seinem Verdienste entsprechenden Wirkungskreis finden möge.

Breslau, den 13. Juli 1858. Dr. M. Joel
ordentlicher Lehrer am Rabbinerseminar.

"MAARUFIA" IN RABBENU GERSHOM'S RESPONSA

By Shlomo Eidelberg

New York City

IN three of his responsa, Rabbenu Gershom of Mainz (960-1028) deals with the legal and economic institution known by the name of "Maarufia" and with the privileges deriving from it. "Maarufia" is the expression used in medieval Hebrew sources for a Christian layman or cleric, whose business affairs are managed by a Jew. The latter buys for his client all that he needs and provides him with monetary credit. In the Middle Ages, this type of business connection between a Jew and a feudal lord or other Christian client was considered by the Jewish community as a monopoly of the Jewish merchant involved. His rights, based on his original business association with his Christian patron, were protected by means of the ban, the most powerful legal measure applied by the medieval Jewish community for the maintenance and strengthening of its self-government.[1]

The institution of Maarufia played an important role in business life among the Jewish merchants in France and Germany as early as the end of the tenth century. The responsa of Rabbenu Gershom, presented hereafter in English translation, are not the primary source for it. Rabbi Gershom's older contemporary, Rabbi Meshulam ben Kalonymos (ca. 1000) had issued two responsa on the same problem.[2] From the responsa of Rabbenu Gershom it becomes clear that an ordinance restricting Maarufia to a monopoly existed in almost every community.[3] To this source may be traced the origin of monopoly which was so characteristic of the medieval period and which continued to exist well beyond the latter's end.

[1] Isaac F. Baer, "The Origins of the Organization of the Jewish Community of the Middle Ages," *Zion*, XV (1950), IV ff. (Hebrew).

[2] David Cassel, *Teshubot Geonim Kadmonim* (Berlin, 1851), Resp. 151; also Joel Müller, *Teshubot Geoney Mizrach u'Maarov* (Berlin, 1888), Resp. 174.

[3] See the text of the responsa below in the Appendix Nos. 87, 88A, 88B.

The medieval institution of Maarufia has hitherto received only scant attention from historians. Louis Rabinowitz made a comparative study of *Herem Hayyishub* and the ordinances issued in protection of Maarufia and found similarities between both legal institutions.[4] Solomon Zeitlin, however, maintains that the *Herem Hayyishub* was not instituted to protect business, but to keep "undesirables" from settling within a given community.[5] According to him, it was put into practice even when the new settler had no intention of establishing any business. Therefore, the relationship between *Herem Hayyishub* and the development of the guilds in medieval times, as suggested by Rabinowitz, is not proved.

A practice very similar to that of Maarufia attracted the attention of the famous medievalist Henri Pirenne. He discloses the fact that in the tenth and eleventh centuries in some medieval cities certain privileges of a similar nature had to be purchased from the mayor or the municipal council.[6] There is a similarity with the statement in Rabbenu Gershom's responsum: "You shall not pronounce the ban against us in this matter, but you can, if you desire, purchase this exclusive right from us." Pirenne also mentions objections of merchants to the monopoly as restrictive of free trade.[7] The same objections can be found in the responsa of Rabbenu Gershom.[8]

In the middle of the eleventh century a well-developed merchant organization existed in Saint-Omer, in northern France.[9] In Valenciennes, on the Belgian-French border, a cloak merchants organization was established at the same

4 Louis Rabinowitz, *The Herem Hayyishub* (London, 1945), pp. 122 ff.

5 Solomon Zeitlin, "The Herem Hayyishub," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XXXVII (1947), 430 ff.

6 Henri Pirenne, *Medieval Cities, Their Origin and the Revival of Trade* (Princeton, 1925), pp. 147 ff. According to Pirenne, similar restrictions in certain French cities during the eleventh century were the result of overcrowded conditions.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 196.

8 Resp. No. 88.

9 Pirenne, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

time.[10] Pirenne came to the conclusion that "Cologne, Mainz, and Worms are more closely related to Reims, Noyon, and Cambrai than to Magdeburg or to Lübeck." "Special circumstances such as trade or industry, their relations with their princes, stamped on their evolution the traits that distinguish the towns in different regions."[11]

It is possible that Jewish merchants of the Rhine region, en route to exchange products with English merchants on the French coast, may have influenced the French in regard to their commercial regulations; it also may have happened the other way around. In a later period references are found to Maarufia in the responsa of many scholars, but we lack specific information on the function and the development of this institution. In the opinion of Rabbenu Gershom's younger contemporary, Joseph Bonfils (middle of 11th century), not every community practiced the custom.[12] Rashi mentions the name, Maarufia, but there is no proof of the existence of such an institution in his time. [13] Rabbi Eliezer ben Nathan of Mainz (b. 2nd half of the 11th century) refers to Maarufia but there is also no proof of its legal existence during his generation. [14] Rabbi Isaac ben Moses of Vienna (ca. 1180-1250) mentions it, too, but finds its basis in talmudical law. [15] From Mordecai ben Hillel's well-known work one can draw the conclusion that, in his time, the rights deriving from Maarufia were not yet firmly established.[16] Later, in medieval times, this institution was found in parts of eastern Europe, where it continued to be practiced down to the modern era. It was not found, however, in any of the Jewish communities in Spain.[17] This may be explained by

10 Pirenne, *Belgian Democracy, Its Early History* (Manchester, 1950), p. 24.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 35.

12 Mordechai, Baba Batra, No. 516, (Vilna Talmud Edition).

13 Rashi, *Machzor Vitry* (Berlin, 1889), p. 31.

14 Eliezer ben Nathan, *Eben Haezer* (Jerusalem, 1913), No. 101.

15 Isaac ben Moses, *Or Zarua* (Jerusalem, 1890), No. 28.

16 *Mordechai*, Baba Batra, No. 501.

17 Baer, *op. cit.*, p. 35. Louis Ginzberg, *Genizah Studies*, II (New York, 1929), p. 203, maintains that the institution also existed in Spain, but does not indicate the source of his information.

the fact that in Germany the government was less centralized than in Spain where the strongly centralized government could protect the rights of the people to a greater extent, making institutions such as Maarufia less necessary.[18]

So much can be said about the concept and function of Maarufia, although the above discussion does not claim to be exhaustive in any respect. A few remarks may be added on the etymology of the term. Joel Müller suggested that its origin might be sought in the French language, because the term appears in the responsa of Rabbenu Gershom, a Franco-German scholar.[19] No reason, however, can be discovered to accept this conclusion. S. J. Rappaport considers Maarufia to derive from an Arabic root, a view that seems more plausible.[20] In his discussion of responsum 151, ascribed to R. Meshulam, he denies the authenticity of the responsum on the ground that it contains the word Maarufia which, according to him, is an Arabic word and could not have been used in the locale of R. Meshulam, who lived in western Europe. On such a ground, however, the authenticity of the responsum cannot be contested. It is possible to explain how a word of Arabic origin could appear in the writings of R. Meshulam. It may stem from a responsum of his father, R. Kalonymos of Lucca, who was connected with the yeshivot of Babylonia.[21] Thus it may be that Arabic words were transmitted to his son. However, even this theory cannot be accepted completely because no mention of this institution is found in writings of Babylonian scholars. It would hardly seem justified either to accept Baer's theory that Jewish merchants from Kairowan brought the name and the institution to Europe, as there are no references to Maarufia in the

18 Cf. Zeitlin, *op. cit.*, p. 430 ff.

19 Joel Müller, *Teshubot Chachmey Tzorfat ve-Lotair, Réponses faites par de célèbres Rabins francais et lorrains du XI. et XII. siècle* (Vienna, 1881), p. 37.

20 S. J. Rappaport, Introduction to *Teshubot Geonim*, p. 7.

21 Joel Müller, "Die Responsen des Rabbi Meshullam, Sohn des Rabbi Kalonymus," *Bericht über die Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin* (Berlin, 1893), pp. 1-16.

historical accounts of mercantile Kairowan.[22] For all these reasons, the most plausible etymological derivation of Maarufia may be that found in the Dictionary of Ben-Jehuda, according to which Maarufia means "an acquaintance, particularly not a Jewish one, with whom a Jew is doing business"; Maaryfa "is similar to partnership."[23] However, his distinction between Maarufia and Maaryfa cannot be upheld, for in the responsa of R. Gershom and R. Meshulam both forms are used interchangeably.[24]

Jacob Mann derives the word Maarufia from a Syriac root and gives it the meaning of "money changer." "A special kind of business developed among the Jews of France and Spain called 'Maarufia.' Jewish bankers would each have a number of Gentile clients to whom they advanced all the money they required.[25] Mann presents the Syriac derivation and proves that under Maarufia was understood a special privilege of Jewish money-lenders in their business with non-Jews. The passage from *Or Zarua*, quoted by Mann, reveals, however, that although the question deals specifically with money, the answer shows that Maarufia can mean all kinds of property rights.[26] Finally, S. Baron's opinion should be quoted: "Among commercial privileges, the protection of the scholarly moneylender and merchant against competition (according to an ordinance ascribed to Gershom, the principle of Maarufia, which sought to preserve a body of customers to some particular businessman or artisan, was to be applied particularly in favor of scholars) was extremely important in these periods of regimented economy."[27] R. Gershom's responsa, however, are not to be interpreted as general

[22] *Op. cit.*, p. 35; also S. Assaf, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History* (Jerusalem, 1946), p. 119, n. 2.

[23] Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew* (Berlin, 1925), p. 3196.

[24] See also Elia Bachur, *Sefer Hatishbi* (Grodno, 1805), p. 47. The derivation from a root which is translated as "partnership" seems also possible; cf. M. Brugsch, *Arabisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch* (Hannover, 1924-26), p. 625.

[25] Jacob Mann, "Responsa of the Babylonian Geonim," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, X, (1919), 329 ff. and note 252.

[26] *Or Zarua*, B. M., No. 28; cf. *Eben Haezer*, No. 104.

[27] Salo Baron, *The Jewish Community*, II (Philadelphia, 1942), 80.

ordinances, applying to all Jewish communities, but rather as specific edicts for a local community. R. Gershom says, that the Maarufia is to be observed where it is customary and need not be recognized where it is not customary. He only urges that special consideration be given to enable scholars to continue their studies without distractions.[28]

APPENDIX
RABBI GERSHOM'S RESPONSA ON MAARUFIA*

No. 87[1]

Question

A had many priests as his Maarufia. He asked the community to pronounce the ban against anyone who might do business with his Maarufia. To that the community replied: "You shall not pronounce the ban against us in this matter, but you can, if you desire, purchase this exclusive right from us." A consented and the community pronounced the required ban. Subsequently, B, his brother, claimed that the right to the exclusive clientele was exercised by their father, and consequently he was entitled to a share of their business.

Answer

The fact that A asked the community to restrict his Maarufia by the use of a ban should demonstrate that in your community the custom of restricted Maarufia is not accepted. How, then, can B demand a share in a right bought by A from the community? Moreover, A originally based his claim both on his own long-established Maarufia and on that of his father. Nevertheless, the community refused to recognize his exclusive right. B, who bases his claim only on the practice of his father, certainly can expect no more favorable decision by the community than that given to his brother. Even if B can prove through witnesses that A's Maarufia was originally derived from that of his father, it will be of no avail. Thus

[28] H. J. Zimmels, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland im 13. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1926), pp. 54, 111, note 354.

* The translation is based on Joel Müller's edition (*supra*, n. 19). The author is indebted to Dr. Irving A. Agus for his assistance in the preparation of this article.

[1] One of the responsa (No. 88A) is found in Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg's responsum No. 815 (Prague edition) and signed by R. Gershom. The signature of R. Gershom is not in the manuscript from which Joel Müller published the responsa. Because one of the responsa bears R. Gershom's signature and because of the similarity in style, it is safe to assume R. Gershon's authorship.

the community refused to allow A exclusive rights to his Maarufia, though it was well known that the priests were his Maarufia, until he had bought the exclusive right; no greater rights could have accrued to B. B, therefore, may not deal with A's Maarufia or he will trangress the ban.

No. 88A

Question

A had a Maarufia of clergymen. A is a talmudic scholar who without remuneration imparts his knowledge to the public. His students became aware of the profits he earned from his Maarufia and they attempted to lure away his customers from him. A complained to the community which by use of the ban prevented his students from interfering with his Maarufia. The question arose, however, whether such a ban could be extended to include all Jews, even those who were not A's pupils.

Answer

From your question we infer that the law of Maarufia is not accepted in your community; nor does talmudic law render it unlawful to do business with the Maarufia of another man. In A's case, however, talmudic law requires that an exception be made and a monopoly be established by the community for his benefit, since he is a talmudic scholar engaged in religious endeavor and in spreading the knowledge of the Torah.

No. 88B

Question

A, who enjoyed the custom of Maarufia asked the community to restrain anyone from slandering him to his Maarufia . . . and especially one particular customer, to gain whose good will and patronage A had spent money and effort, having occasionally lent him money without charging interest. B, however, protests against such an act by the community, claiming that A's favors to the particular Maarufia were of no concern to anyone, and that he, B, will do business with this Maarufia because he is his friend and his client.

Answer

We have already written that the law of Maarufia depends on local custom and that in those communities where men are not restrained from doing business with the Maarufia of another, no ban can be imposed to establish such restraint. However, if A has his money invested with Gentile clients and he demands that Jews be restrained by the ban from

slandering him, such a ban must be imposed to protect A from loss, and anyone who will cause A a loss through slander will have to compensate him, since talmudic law holds one responsible for losses caused by him through his direct acts. Moreover, should A claim that the doing of business with his Maarufia by others will cause his Maarufia to become independent of his goodwill and then they will find a way to free themselves from their money obligations to him, a ban should be pronounced in order to restrain anyone from doing business with his clients until he collects his money, in order to obviate any loss to A, since talmudic law requires that we protect a Jew's property from impending loss. After A shall have collected his money, however, the custom of free trade of your community will then apply also to A's client.

REVIEW SECTION

FALLEN ANGELS

A Book Review*

By Moses Hadas
Columbia University
New York City

THE theme of this book is a notion to which, through the ages, men have adhered with greater or less ardor, either as a literal belief or as poetic allegory. From the beginning of time men who have thought of a God who approached perfection, have had to find an explanation for the power of evil in the world, and their explanations have naturally tended to a diminution either of God's omnipotence or of his goodness. The simplest position, mathematically, is the thoroughgoing dualism of the Manichees, with the power of evil independent of the power of good. But to keep the power of God paramount, more orthodox thinkers have subordinated the power of evil and have made it an agency of the power of good, with various explanations of why such an agency is necessary and various estimates of the degree of independence granted to the power of evil. So fundamental is this problem that an adequate discussion of it must be tantamount to a basic treatise in theology, and in the hands of a moral teacher such a treatise would be, not merely a piece of antiquarian research, but a protreptic to a pure view of morality and religion.

Such is the character of Dr. Bamberger's book. In separate sections he traces the notion of fallen angels as responsible for evil from expressions of it in literature, Jewish and Christian, ancient and modern, draws its implications for theology, and with his conclusions as a text, preaches an eloquent sermon on pure religion. Without having given the subject special thought, we would surmise that the main current of Judaism has from its beginning been resolutely and consistently opposed to endowing evil with any independence whatever—though bypaths in the inter-testamentary period and under the Cabala did find fallen angels attractive—and that Christianity has consistently invested

* Bernard J. Bamberger, Fallen Angels. The Jewish Publication Society of America. Philadelphia, 1952. ix and 295 pp.

Satan with at least the kind of independence he enjoys in *Paradise Lost.* It is a useful thing to have these surmises illustrated and documented with erudition and grace. Dr. Bamberger has given us both scholarship and useful doctrine.

It is this combination of motives that gives Dr. Bamberger's book a special interest — and also makes it inevitable that he (and his reader) should occasionally find himself perched between two stools of different shape. The author has done as well as possible with his disparate goals and is to be commended for making scholarship accessible and meaningful to non-professional readers; but there is too much erudition here to make the book palatable to a large audience, despite Dr. Bamberger's valiant efforts to make it popular. Indeed, these efforts sometimes detract from the book's quality as a scholarly monograph. But criticism must perforce be captious, for every stricture may legitimately be parried by the argument that the author is concerned principally with the totality of his effect. The following remarks must therefore be taken as general observations on the theme and not necessarily as criticism of the work in hand.

For a complete history of the idea of fallen angels the whole field of primitive literature should be examined. H. M. and N. K. Chadwick in their three volumes on *The Growth of Primitive Literature* (Cambridge, 1932-1940), and more recently C. M. Bowra in his *Heroic Poetry* (New York, 1952), have demonstrated that certain types, heroic and other, persist through many variations and among various peoples. Their investigations yield tangible results much more convincing than the archetypes of the collective unconscious posited by the Jungians; nevertheless, a full study of the concept of fallen angels should also take cognizance of the Jungian approach. There is relevant and potentially illuminating matter in the Poetic Edda, in the ancient Near Eastern texts, which throw light on the vexed passages of Scripture that Dr. Bamberger cites, and in the ancient Greek material. Prometheus, as represented in Hesiod or Aeschylus, or more especially Typhon, as represented in Plutarch's *Isis and Osiris,* are particularly illuminating parallels. In the opinion of the present reviewer the efflorescence of the belief during the intertestamentary period (which rightly occupies an important place in Dr. Bamberger's book) was directly affected by Greek beliefs and speculations.

But Dr. Bamberger is not concerned with the general nature of man's beliefs, but with the history of a specific doctrine, and so he rightly limits himself to the more or less official texts, themselves enormous in scope, of Judaism and its daughter religions. The bulk of his book is a monograph on this theme, which, one suspects, may have grown out of a doctoral dissertation. The work is well organized, clear, and as complete as desirable for his purpose. Where he deals with the work of his predecessors, he walks judiciously. No man can

speak with first-hand authority on so wide a range of texts, but the basis of selection among divergent views should not rest on an imposing list of names of earlier scholars. Speaking of Zeitlin's late dating of the "Zadokite" work, Dr. Bamberger writes (p. 266): "But a pre-Christian date was maintained by Charles, E. Meyer, Kohler, Ginzberg, and other important authorities." In particular, the "separatist" theories of Charles are treated with too much respect. Occasionally one feels that the traditions of the monograph have constrained an exhaustiveness and prosiness against which Dr. Bamberger's own sense of the requirements of his true audience protests. Thus he can wryly say (p. 33): "Whoever wants scholarly exactness may turn to the notes, where full details are given; and, if he gets confused, it will only serve him right!"

Dr. Bamberger's own interest grows as his work proceeds, and his sometimes strained efforts at brightness become less frequent. In the final pages he is completely liberated from the pressures of the academic tradition. Here it is no longer the antiquarian but the ethical teacher who speaks. With cogency and eloquence the implications of the study are given meaning and relevance for the attitudes and conduct of thoughtful men. Disproportionate as the parts are, one senses that the scholarly preliminaries constitute in the author's mind merely a scaffolding for his own "message," and as scaffolding no one can say that they are inadequate. If the blend remains something of a mixture rather than a true amalgam, it is nevertheless an admirable example of a tendency to be encouraged. So many antiquarian studies could profit by being made relevant, so many sermons could be made more meaningful by a ballast of scholarship.

General History

EUROPA IM MITTELALTER. Alte Tatsachen und neue Gesichtspunkte. Eine Einführung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der nichtdeutschen Staaten. By *Justus Hashagen.* Verlag F. Bruckmann. München, [1951]. 519 pages.

THIS "Introduction" to medieval history "with special reference to non-German states," the work of a renowned medievalist with numerous standard historical books to his credit, offers a comprehensive, very stimulating, and generally reliable survey of the entire results of the more recent researches in the history of the Middle Ages. For external reasons the author had to forego an apparatus of footnotes.

Hashagen's accomplished mastery of the complete literature enabled him to make his selections in the manner most congenial to his scholarship. Within the text of his presentation he refers to all the important authorities consulted by him and enters approvingly or disapprovingly

into scholarly discussion with them. The form employed is that of verbatim quotations from the writings of all the modern historians dealing with the several problems treated. The presentation thus takes on the appearance of a *florilegium* of modern authorities. This does not mean, however, that the author takes no firm stand of his own on important historical questions, a stand that he has achieved by his own research and that he fortifies with his own arguments and reasoning.

This becomes clear from his very outspoken position with reference to the history of medieval Jewry:

> "From the early Middle Ages, even from the period of the barbarian invasions, the Jews played an important role in economic and intellectual history not yet by far elucidated and evaluated. This clarification can be effected and can serve the search for truth only if it does not indulge in anti-Semitic animosity or philo-Semitic exaggeration. In view of the fact that, at present, a new wave of anti-Semitism seems to be making its appearance, it is unfortunately by no means superfluous to forewarn historians not to disregard their scholarly duty with reference to the history of the Jews during the Middle Ages. Even today such a warning is still necessary."

Professor Hashagen buttresses this admonition to German historians with some drastic examples taken even from the pre-Nazi period. Drawing on his scholarly study of medieval political, ecclesiastic, and cultural history and its variegated sources, he arrives at this conclusion:

> "One must not approach the history of the Jews in the medieval period with hatred and prejudice. No one who has studied it carefully can remain ignorant of the fact that the Jews were by no means merely parasites or idlers who allegedly exploited their hosts and lived on their very marrow. Rather did the Jews hand down valuable treasures to these peoples, above all, of course, their religion and ethics, which in Christianized form dominated the Middle Ages. Intellectual life in the occident, too, is immensely indebted to the Jews. One cannot think about early scholasticism, dating back to the period before the summit of the Middle Ages, without at the same time thinking about the influence of Jewish theology and philosophy. Finally, in the economic life, the Jews still remained in many respects in a leading position during the Middle Ages" (pp. 196 f.).

According to the author, the Jews were under the protection of the law up to the time of the persecutions by the crusaders ("bis zu den verbrecherischen Pogromen des ersten Kreuzzugs"). He attributes anti-Jewish feelings and outbursts mainly to religious reasons; neither economic nor racial "anti-Semitism" can be detected in the early part of the Middle Ages that hardly knew any national sentiment. Nor can

general contempt, discrimination, or defamation against Jews be observed in that period. Nevertheless, anti-Jewish currents were not entirely absent. The early spokesman of such sentiments was Archbishop Agobard of Lyons. Compulsory ghetto, Jew-badges, persecutions, particularly during the period of the Black Death ("verbrecherische Judenpogrome," p. 367), followed, again motivated by religious reasons, which the author considers most weighty.

An almost identical historical-sociological evaluation of the medieval German source material concerning the Jews was propounded by the present reviewer and documented by him in several volumes in 1949. If Professor Hashagen arrived independently at his convincing conclusions, it would mean a very gratifying confirmation of my findings and deductions by an outstanding expert in medieval history, whose research has always been and remains an earnest and honest search for historical truth.

GUIDO KISCH

Hebrew Union College—
Jewish Institute of Religion

MIDDLE AGES

MOSES MAIMONIDES, EPISTLE TO YEMEN. The Arabic Original and the Three Hebrew Versions. Edited from Manuscripts with Introduction and Notes. By *Abraham S. Halkin.* An English Translation by *Boaz Cohen.* The Louis M. and Minnie Epstein Series, Volume One. American Academy for Jewish Research. New York, 1952. viii + xx + xxxvi + 111 pages in quarto.

THE famous letter (or rather, a literary version of it) which Maimonides wrote to the Yemen in 1172 for the purpose of confirming the persecuted Jewish community there in their ancestral faith, has long been known in some form or other. Now, a first edition of the Arabic original and the Hebrew translation of Abraham B. Hasdai, and a re-edition of the two other Hebrew translations by Ibn Tibbon and Nahum Ma'arabi are presented in this splendid publication. The four texts are printed in parallel columns, which makes it easy to study the techniques of the Hebrew translators.

For the establishment of the texts, a prodigious apparatus of manuscripts has been assembled. An exhaustive introduction in Hebrew and copious footnotes to the text deal competently with all the problems that the brief work offers to the understanding. An appendix (pp. 108-111) contains a letter, ascribed to Maimonides, concerning a pseudo-Messiah in Ispahan, first published by A. Neubauer in *REJ,* IV (1882), 174-7.

In comparison with the Hebrew body of the publication, the English part is rather thin, giving no idea of the wealth of material the book contains. The English translation, originally prepared a number of years ago, is out of step with the text edition. It does not indicate the slight variations between the different texts. In a few instances, the Hebrew interpretation of Ibn Tibbon is followed rather than the more correct Arabic. Not infrequently we find that the translation is unnecessarily free, teetering on the invisible border line between a free and a wrong translation.

Maimonides' *Letter* is of eminent historical interest. It gives us important material about Messianic movements in and close to his time, about which we would otherwise know hardly anything. The atmosphere prevailing among Jews of the period is well expressed by Maimonides' own hope for the coming of the Messianic age, though he wisely warns against the panicky attitude of his correspondents, who seek consolation in astrological predictions and are duped into accepting any likely candidate as the Messiah. Above all, Maimonides is quite well aware of the fact that purely theological or logical arguments can hardly convince the hard-pressed Jews of the Yemen of the superiority of their religion over the similar beliefs of Islam. He therefore rests his case almost entirely upon what, for him at least, was an incontrovertible historical argument, namely, the fact that God had spoken to Moses and Moses to God on Mount Sinai in the presence of the forebears of all true Jews. By this fact, the authenticity and originality of the Jewish religion was historically established once and for all time against the three enemies of Judaism throughout its history—tyrants, philosophers, and founders of rival religions. Thus, Maimonides is able to brush off the serious Muslim arguments in favor of their Prophet—the argument that the Bible was falsified by the Jews and that the coming of Muhammad was predicted in the Bible seems to him one that can impress only the gullible minds of uninformed people; consequently he devotes considerable space to its thorough refutation—: (1) There is no need for a "national" prophet, as the Muslims claimed; a prophet could be a true prophet regardless of his nationality, if only he recognized the historical mission of Moses; (2) the miracle or miracles that, according to Muslim dogma, every prophet must perform in order to establish his claim, is only a minor, albeit necessary, matter in the eyes of Maimonides. The true proof of a prophet's prophethood lies in his affirmation of the historical fact of the revelation on Mount Sinai.

Always conscious of the fact that his *Letter* is intended to bring comfort and strength to his coreligionists, Maimonides tries to present his ideas to them with great lucidity and much mellow understanding of their emotional upheaval. The *Letter* deals with subjects that were commonplace in the Middle Ages, but the sound observations made on

those subjects were by no means commonplace at the time. It is the type of simple work that only a great man can write. It is therefore all the more gratifying to be able now to read and study it in a solid, and possibly definitive, edition.

FRANZ ROSENTHAL

University of Pennsylvania

JEWS IN XVITH CENTURY TURKEY

JEWISH LIFE IN THE XVITH CENTURY: AS REFLECTED IN THE LEGAL WRITINGS OF SAMUEL DE MEDINA. By *Morris S. Goodblatt.* New York. The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1952. 240 pages.

FOR a people that prides itself on its historical consciousness, the Jews have thus far done surprisingly little to explore and analyze the source material on which their history is based. This applies especially to the halakhic and *responsa* literature of the Middle Ages. Admittedly, this material presents unusual difficulties and its analysis calls for a combination of types of knowledge and skills not frequently to be found in one person. It demands, along with much else, a thorough knowledge of rabbinic law, wide acquaintance with social and economic conditions in the country where and at the time when the author of the source material flourished, and a historical and social imagination keen enough to visualize the implications of the *quaestio* and the *responsum.* For lack of researchers thus richly qualified, there is as yet no adequate picture of the social and economic life within the Jewish communities during many centuries.

Dr. Morris S. Goodblatt has done much to improve this situation for the generation when Rabbi Samuel De Medina labored within the Jewish community of Salonica. Rabbi Samuel lived in an interesting age. Turkey was then at the height of its power, and a number of Jews stood close to the government. The Turkish Empire had become the goal of many Jewish refugees, exiles from Spain, Portugal, and various parts of Italy, Marranos seeking a place where they could enjoy freedom of worship, and German Jews tired of the oppressive atmosphere of Central Europe. The Jewish population of Salonica had risen spectacularly. During Rabbi Samuel's lifetime, the first half of the sixteenth century, it consisted of what we in the United States would call first- and second-generation Jews. Characteristically, they adjusted themselves to their new life in Turkey much more easily than they adjusted to one another. It took patience and wisdom and broadmindedness to guide such a community, to calm its quarrelsome tendencies and to persuade it to submit ot the traditional law and ethics of Judaism.

Dr. Goodblatt used whatever secondary sources he could find that were helpful in sketching the background of the Salonica community and its non-Jewish environment. For the rest, however, by far the major portion of his book, he relied on material culled from the *responsa* of Rabbi Samuel himself. Fortunately, Goodblatt saw behind the material the social and human relations out of which it arose. A gratifyingly clear picture emerges, not so much of Rabbi Samuel as of the community and the period in which he functioned. Especially interesting, in the opinion of this reviewer, are the chapters dealing with religious and community life.

In this connection it is well to call attention to Dr. Goodblatt's rather novel and highly useful approach to the treatment of *responsa* literature. He selected eighteen *responsa*, each dealing with a different phase of the Jewish life of that period, and presented them in full translation. They help, not only to illustrate Rabbi Samuel's method and viewpoint, but also to understand the nature and the very flavor of the period in which he lived. One can only hope that in the future workers in the area of *responsa* literature will adopt the same procedure. Indeed, it would be helpful if every student of *responsa* could be induced to provide a register of them indicating at least the problems with which each *responsum* concerns itself (cf. Irving Agus, *Rabbi Meir of Rothenberg*, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1947). Even if such registers could not be published, they could be deposited in one or another of the central Jewish libraries for use by future students of Jewish history.

Having done so well with this material, one may hope that Dr. Goodblatt will continue his work in this field, providing us with similar studies on the *responsa* of rabbis contemporary with the subject of this excellent work.

SOLOMON GRAYZEL

The Jewish Publication Society of America

THE SEPHARDIM OF ENGLAND

THE SEPHARDIM OF ENGLAND. By *Albert M. Hyamson*. Methuen and Company. London, 1951. xii+468 pp. Illustrations.

IN his recent volume Mr. Albert M. Hyamson, Anglo-Jewish historian and author, tells the story of the Spanish and Portuguese congregation that has centered around Bevis Marks Synagogue in London during the past two hundred and fifty or three hundred years. Earlier in the period this community — never numbering more than 4000 — achieved a remarkable pre-eminence in British Jewry, and the synagogue itself became a sort of mother synagogue to Sephardic congregations in other parts of England as well as in the West Indies, the United States, and Canada.

Mr. Hyamson's book is more than an elaboration of parallel chapters

of his earlier *History of the Jews in England;* it includes a considerable amount of new and not readily accessible material. It describes minutely the organization and internal affairs of the Sephardic synagogue, provides interesting details on the lives of scores of greater and lesser members of the community, and indicates the role they played on the larger stage of English political, economic, and social history. It also reviews the efforts of the community in the long struggle for Jewish emancipation and recounts the steps by which — in cooperation with the Ashkenazi community — it became the effective spokesman and guardian of Jewish interests at home and abroad.

In a sense the history of the Sephardic community is also the history of Anglo-Jewry. For the Sephardim were not only the first Jews to establish themselves in the British Isles; they were also the ones who set the tone and character of the whole Anglo-Jewish community. Though vastly outnumbered by later arrivals from German-speaking lands and the countries of eastern Europe, it was they who were largely responsible for some of the institutions and many of the patterns of life which still exist among the Jews of England and other parts of the English-speaking world.

The book begins with a chapter on the earliest Sephardim of the post-expulsion period, that small and intrepid band of Marranos who are known to have lived in Tudor and early Jacobean England. The shadowy existence of this group — of particular interest to students of English literature — has been made more real by the researches of Lucien Wolf and Cecil Roth. This community, consisting mostly of representatives of Spanish and Portuguese business houses, was not, however, the parent of the present Sephardic congregation. It came to an end in 1609, probably because of the unfavorable notice attracted to it by the trial and execution of Dr. Rodrigo Lopez; its members were dispersed, most of them returning to the continent.

Permanent settlement began with the re-admission of Jews under the Commonwealth. In the half-century that followed, the present congregation took shape: It acquired land for a synagogue and a cemetery — despite the uncertainty of its status — and established half a dozen communal institutions, among them a school and a yeshiva. The present synagogue building was erected in 1701; and it was, in fact, on the hundred and fiftieth aniversary of its opening that the present volume was published. Worthy of note is the remarkable organization that grew up in the synagogue, consisting of *yehidim, velhos, parnassim,* and *mahamad.* The language of the minutes of the congregation and of the *ascamot* was a Judeo-Portuguese patois, abounding in such terms as *medrasista* (student at the *beth medrash*), *minyanista* (man hired to complete the quorum required for religious service), and *parnas presidente;* and Portuguese remained the language of the congregation until the begining of the nineteenth century.

The intimate, family character of this early congregation is evidenced by the fact that the services of a communal physician were engaged and provision was made for *bikkur holim*. It was a tightly-knit oligarchy that ruled the community — solid, conservative, and inflexible. Its income — out of the funds of which were maintained schools, a hospital, almshouse, and other public institutions — was derived, not only from the usual offerings and legacies, but also from *impostas* (taxes levied on the business transactions of the members) and *fintas* (forced loans), both fruitful sources of misunderstanding and dissension.

A constant irritant was the regulation which imposed a fine — in one case as much as forty pounds — upon a person who refused to accept election to public office. The most serious source of friction was the fact that the governing council did not limit itself to purely congregational matters but frequently interfered in the private affairs of its members when no religious or communal matter was involved. For example, it required authorization by itself for the publication by a member of so harmless a work as an English-Portuguese dictionary, and freely imposed penalties and fines for infraction of its rules. It is rather an understatement to say, as does Mr. Hyamson, that the *mahamad* wielded its powers "somewhat dictatorially." Though the elders were doubtlessly convinced of the justice and wisdom of their conduct, and though the attraction of the outside world was, as always, powerful, the council cannot be held blameless for the many and serious defections that ocurred in the ranks of the congregation. The general conduct of the community recalls the state of affairs that had prevailed a generation or two earlier at Amsterdam, a community to which Bevis Marks sometimes looked for advice and guidance in lay as well as in ecclesiastical matters.

In an attempt to preserve the Sephardic character of the congregation, Ashkenazim were at first excluded from membership. But newcomers from Sephardic communities abroad, principally from Gibraltar, North Africa, and Italy — and later from countries in the Near East — were readily admitted. The newcomers, quickly absorbed into the community, tended to be more conservative in religious matters than the older members. Though formal relations with the Ashkenazic community were established as early as the eighteenth century, and joint action was occasionally undertaken in political matters — leading to the formation of the Board of Deputies in 1760 — the council continued to frown upon marriages of Sephardim with *tudescas* until well into the nineteenth century.

In the 1820's faint stirrings of Reform began to be heard, and in 1842 a group of Sephardim joined with a similarly-minded group of Ashkenazim to establish a Sephardi Reform synagogue, the West London Synagogue of British Jews. Among the changes proposed were the abolition of the practice of calling up members for the reading of the Torah

and the institution of a briefer ritual. At first the secessionists were threatened with *herem*, but a reconciliation with the parent synagogue was effected some years later.

An appreciable portion of the book is concerned with an account of the routine affairs of the community: the appointment of *shamashim* and *hazanim*, grants of money to needy scholars, contributions to Sephardic and Ashkenazic communities in distress, and all the minor details that make up so much of congregational history. A more rigorous pruning of material of this kind would, in the opinion of the present reviewer, have produced a more readable volume.

The chapters on Sephardic personalities are most interesting. With little known details and anecdotes Hyamson reviews a long procession of Sephardim who played a part in the business and political life of England as well as those who made important contributions to the arts and sciences and — to pugilistic history. He recounts the elder Disraeli's quarrel with the *mahamad*. He relates the strange story of Sampson Gideon, who, after formally renouncing the community, marrying out of the fold, and having his children baptized, remained a secret contributor to the synagogue and requested in his will that he be buried in the Sephardic cemetery and that his name be remembered on Yom Kippur. There is also an account of a proposal made in 1748 by a London financier and apparently supported by the *mahamad*, to acquire a grant of 200,000 acres in South Carolina for an exclusively Jewish settlement.

The book also contains a number of new details concerning the various attempts, from the eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth, to achieve emancipation. From the point of view of general Jewish history, the most illustrious Sephardi that England produced was Sir Moses Montefiore; but though one chapter bears the name of that famous philanthropist, the story of his life and activities is all too brief condensed into a few pages.

In the final paragraph of his book Hyamson invites the reader to draw his own moral from the history recorded. More than one moral might indeed be derived. To the reviewer the most amazing thing about the book is the cultural insularity — in a Jewish sense — of the Sephardic community which it reveals. The contributions of the members of the community and their descendants to the cultural life of the non-Jewish world are assuredly impressive, but their achievements in the field of Jewish learning are limited. One cannot recall a single important Hebrew book produced by a native Sephardi in the past two hundred and fifty years — and this at a time when the presses of eastern Europe were rolling off scores of outstanding works of permanent value. Though the community supported schools and yeshivas and possessed one or two fine private libraries, it cannot be said to have been profoundly affected by the various movements that have swept over European Jewry during the past two or three centuries. It was, indeed, disturbed by the Sabbatian

heresy of the seventeenth century, and one of the early *hahamim* left London under a suspicion of heretical taint; but it remained impervious to the pietist movement that overwhelmed parts of Poland and Russia a century or two later. Nor did it respond effectively to the renewed interest in Jewish studies which started in Germany and reached into Russia and Italy. The community produced no native scholars comparable to the galaxy that illumined the German-Jewish heavens in the nineteenth century. It was, as we have seen, touched by the Reform movement, but that reform, too, was of a peculiarly native kind. As for the revival of Hebrew and the cultural renascence of which that revival was both an aim and a vehicle, there is nothing to show that the community was seriously affected by it. From a Jewish spiritual and cultural point of view, therefore, its achievements were slight, but the position it attained as one of the earliest and most influential communities in western Europe make its history well worth investigating and recording. [1]

Brooklyn College JOSHUA H. NEUMANN

GENEALOGY

DIE SIEGBURGER FAMILIE LEVISON UND VERWANDTE FAMILIEN. By *Wilhelm Levison.* Ludwig Röhrscheidt Verlag. Bonn, 1952. viii and 187 pages in quarto with xix genealogical tables.

SINCE the decline of the German Jewish community, there has been no institution interested in the systematic collection and preservation for future historians of the raw material on German Jewry that has been dispersed all over the world. Nor does any scholarly or other society care to erect to that once great and historically still important segment of the Jewish people a monument in the form of a scholarly work describing its history, achievements and decline. Several attempts of this writer to arouse interest in such a task have been doomed to failure. Consequently, everything is left to the interest and enterprise of individual scholars, and to them is to be credited whatever research has been done in recent years in the fields of the political, religious, and legal history of German Jewry.

Genealogy, once developed and cultivated with much devotion among German Jews, received, even during the years of persecution, some attention from individuals. The historical results of these re-

[1] [On the significance of Hyamson's work for the economic history of British Jewry and for the connection between the London community and its offshoots in Jamaica and Barbados, see the critical review by Wilhelm Treue, *Historische Zeitschrift,* CLXXIV (1952), 643-46. — Editor.]

searches are all the more valuable and deserving of appreciation because, through them, material threatened with destruction has been preserved to cast light on a closed chapter of history.

The history of the Levison family of Siegburg and of related families, here under review, is written by none other than an internationally recognized scholar, the famous medievalist, Wilhelm Levison, formerly of the University of Bonn (see the necrologue by Adolf Kober in *Historia Judaica*, IX, 1947, p. 114; and *Chronik der Universität Bonn*, LXIV, 1939-1949, p. 57). The work, splendidly gotten up, was posthumously published by the University of Bonn, with which Levison was connected through most of his life up to his expulsion by the Nazi regime.

On almost two hundred quarto pages the numerous generations descended from the Siegburg Jew Loew (about 1680) and coming down in uninterrupted lines to the year 1939, are listed and treated both genealogically and biographically. The historical data are supported by nineteen elaborate genealogical tables worked up with great accuracy and expert technique. Only a few outstanding names from these lists can be mentioned here: a long line of rabbis Weil, from the seventeenth century to their last descendant, Professor Eugen Mittwoch, the famous Berlin orientalist; Professor Franz Boas, anthropologist of Columbia University in New York; the family of Jacob von Geldern with its most illustrious scion, Heinrich Heine. The material on the hundreds of individuals mentioned and the dozens of families described is made easily accessible through very elaborate indexes. It is, of course, impossible in a brief review to do more than direct the attention of interested researchers and individuals connected with these families to this very rich mine of information.

In an introductory chapter (pp. 1-36), Professor Levison offers a historical and sociological evaluation of the wealth of material he collected. It is the typical history of a Jewish family in Germany from the seventeenth to the twentieth century, beginning with a letter of protection for an individual which was extended later to others who formed a small community, burdened with all kinds of taxes and contributions for the local rulers or municipalities, and reflecting the occupations of the members, their economic activities and standing. The early development of the religious life and institutions of the community in accordance with the traditional pattern are described as well as the transformation that took place in the course of modern development, under the influence of Enlightenment, and as a result of the toll taken by physical, intellectual, and religious assimilation. Disappearance of Hebrew and religious instruction is characterized and motivated as follows: "The world of Goethe and Beethoven had much greater appeal and meaning to that generation" (p. 32). "Liberal Judaism, here and there with a more or less orthodox coloring, prevailed among the families during the last two generations, while some of their

members were prompted to renounce the forms of traditional Jewish law and did not participate in the activities of the Jewish community. The majority, however, followed a *'via media.'* " Some of the developments described are of general historical interest, such as the abolition of the *Schuleklopfen,* and the rejection by the local rabbi for religious reasons of the substitution of bells to call worshippers to daily services; the compulsory assumption of fixed family and first names, and the role of traditional Jewish names as compared with new Christian names in this process; intermarriage among the various Jewish families descended from Loew and later also intermarriage with non-Jewish and foreign Jewish and Christian families. Finally, mention should be made of the attachment of all members to their families and to the Rhineland on whose soil they lived and whose political fate they shared for centuries.

All in all, the book presents a colorful picture of Rhenish Jewry, drawn by a master of historical scholarship. Though his life work was devoted to the history of the Merovingian and early Frankish period, he erected to the Jewish community of his native Rhineland and to himself, to whom devotion to Judaism was a historical tradition, a *monumentum aere perennius.*

GUIDO KISCH

Hebrew Union College—
Jewish Institute of Religion

CORRECTION

By the printers' inadvertence a mistake crept into HISTORIA JUDAICA, XIV (1952), p. 108. Line 22 should read as follows:
pamphlet — — *Contribution à la révision du chris-*

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

American Jewish Committee (ed.), *American Jewish Year Book* 1953. Jewish Publication Society of America. Philadelphia, 1953. 627 pp.

Y. L. Cahan, *Studies in Yiddish Folklore*. Yiddish Scientific Institute. New York, 1952. 374 pp. (Yiddish).

Rudolf Glanz, *The Jews in American Alaska* (1867-1880). R. Glanz. New York (112 Haven Ave.), 1953. 46 pp.

Florence Guggenheim-Grünberg, *Aus einem alten Endinger Gemeindebuch. Der Schutz-und Schirmbrief für die Judenschaft zu Endingen und Lengnau vom Jahre* 1776. Verlag Jüdische Buchgemeinde. Zürich, 1952. 16 pp.

Walther Holtzmann and Gerhard Ritter, *Die deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft im zweiten Weltkrieg*. Bibliographie des historischen Schrifttums deutscher Autoren 1939-1945. 2 vols. Simons Verlag. Marburg, Lahn. Böhlau Verlag. Münster-Köln, 1951. XI + 149 and 512 pp.

Joseph Höffner, *Christentum und Menschenwürde: Das Anliegen der spanischen Kolonialethik im Goldenen Zeitalter*. Paulinus Verlag. Trier, 1947. 333 pp.

Bernard Lewis, *Notes and Documents from the Turkish Archives*. A Contribution to the History of the Jews in the Ottoman Empire. Israel Oriental Society. Jerusalem, 1952. 52 pp. and 9 plates.

Joseph Litvin (ed.), *The Zionist Year Book* 5713 (September 1952-September 1953). The Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland. London, 1952. 495 pp.

Michael Martin and Leonard Gelber, *The New Dictionary of American History*. Philosophical Library. New York, 1952. vi + 695 pp.

David de Sola Pool, *Portraits Etched in Stone: Early Jewish Settlers* 1682-1831. Columbia University Press. New York, 1952. xiv + 543 pp.

Simon Rawidowicz (ed.), *The Chicago Pinkas.* College of Jewish Studies. Chicago, Ill., 1952. 197 + 122 pp. (English and Hebrew).

Ellis Rivkin, *Leon da Modena and the Kol Sakhal.* Hebrew Union College Press. Cincinnati, 1952. xii + 144 pp.

Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Philosemitismus im Barock.* Religions- und geistesgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). Tübingen, 1952. 216 pp.

Siegfried Stein, *The Beginnings of Hebrew Studies at University College.* H. K. Lewis & Co. Ltd. London, 1952. 27 pp.

H. J. Zimmels, *Magicians, Theologians and Doctors: Studies in Folk-Medicine and Folk-Lore as Reflected in the Rabbinical Responsa (12th-19th Centuries).* Edward Goldston and Son, Ltd. London, 1952. viii and 293 pp.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS AND SUBSCRIBERS

All communications relating to the following should be addressed to the Editor.

HISTORIA JUDAICA, published semi-annually, is limited to research in mediaeval and modern history of the Jews, with special emphasis on their legal and social relations to the surrounding world. HISTORIA JUDAICA attempts to publish only articles which, as a result of unbiased scientific research, make actual contributions to scholarship.

Articles intended for publication should be written in English and sent to the Editor—not without prior inquiry. Unless this is done, the Editor does not accept responsibility for manuscripts. All manuscripts must be typewritten with double spacing. Detailed manuscript requirements may be obtained from the Editor. Accurate carbon copies should be retained by the contributors. Stamped, self-addressed envelopes should accompany all inquiries.

Articles will be accepted for publication with the understanding that they are offered to this journal exclusively and will not be reproduced elsewhere without permission in writing from the Editor.

Every contributor is fully responsible for his paper. He has to pay the cost of alterations in articles once set up in galley proof. Contributors of articles will receive one copy of the pertinent issue free of charge. Reprints may be purchased from the printers only by agreement with the Editor.

Copyright: — All rights are reserved by the Publisher. No part of the contents of this journal may be reproduced or translated in any language without permission in writing from the Publisher.

Reviews: — Books for review should be sent to the Editor. Books and articles received will be listed, reviewed, or abstracted in accordance with their importance. The Editor does not take any responsibility for the reviewing, listing, or returning of books not requested.

* * *

All communications relating to the following should be addressed to the Publishers.

HISTORIA JUDAICA is published in April and October. The annual subscription rate is $5.00; outside of the United States, $6.50. Single numbers will not be sold. Back volumes, as far as available, are at $12.50 per volume.

Editor:
PROFESSOR GUIDO KISCH
415 WEST 115TH STREET
New York 25, N. Y.

Published by:
HISTORIA JUDAICA
40 WEST 68TH STREET
New York 23, N. Y.

VOL. XV OCTOBER, 1953 PART 2

Historia Judaica

This issue of

Historia Judaica

COMPRISING ARTICLES ON THE CONTRIBUTION

OF JEWS TO THE RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL,

AND SOCIAL LIFE IN THE UNITED STATES,

COMMEMORATES

THE TERCENTENARY OF JEWISH SETTLEMENT

IN NORTH AMERICA.

KRAUS REPRINT CO.
New York
1971

Reprinted with the permission of the original publisher
KRAUS REPRINT CO.
A U.S. Division of Kraus-Thomson Organization Limited

Printed in U.S.A.

EARLY GERMAN PREACHING IN AMERICA

By Bernhard N. Cohn
Rabbi, Temple Emanu-El

Utica, New York

Preface

This study had its origin in a suggestion by Professor Guido Kisch to further develop part of an article by Adolf Kober, "Jewish Preaching and Preachers: A Contribution to the History of the Jewish Sermon in Germany and America," which appeared in the October, 1945 issue of *Historia Judaica*. It served as a rabbinic thesis at the New York School of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

The author makes no pretensions that his bibliography is exhaustive, although it very probably is the most extensive of its kind. He has used all available material at the libraries of both schools of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion and the New York Public Library, as well as the libraries at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Columbia University, New York University, and Temple Emanu-El in New York. The American Jewish Archives in Cincinnati contain only one sermon in manuscript form, which was put at the writer's disposal.

A word about the translation. Except for two or three instances which are mentioned in the notes, the translations from the German are my own. They are literal, except for occasional passages where, for the sake of clarity, I decided to preserve the meaning more than the text. I might note that I have chosen to translate the German *Lehre* as "teaching" as distinguished by the rabbis from *Gesetz* or "law." In this choice I am following the example of David Philipson and others. It is possible to translate *Lehre* as "doctrine" or "dogma." I believe, however, that "teaching" is closer to the spirit and meaning of the rabbis.

For helping me assemble some of my material, my thanks are due to Rabbi Edward Kiev and his staff at the New York school, as well as to Rabbi Theodore Wiener and Mrs. Selma Stern-Taeubler, both of Cincinnati.

The greatest share of gratitude belongs to Professor Guido Kisch for his generous help and guidance in the completion of this thesis.

I

Introduction and Background

THE object of this paper is to deal critically with German sermons of the "pioneer rabbis" who officiated in the United States between 1840 and 1879.[1] This epoch is important to us not only because of its associations with the origins of Reform Judaism in the United States, but also because it covers one of the most important periods in American history. It is a period which saw the development in this country of energies previously unimaginable. It is a period which, possibly more than any other, left its imprint upon the American scene.

On the one hand, the opening up of the West made vast new tracts of land available for development, and the men and women who answered the call of the frontiers were living testimony to the general temper of the middle decades of the nineteenth century. The virile pioneer spirit "encouraged individual initiative; . . . made for political and economic democracy; . . . roughened manners; . . . broke down conservatism, and bred a spirit of local self-determination coupled with respect for national authority."[2] On the other hand, the rapid progress of the Industrial Revolution also made itself felt as it attracted more and more people to the urban areas and into the factories.

Since both these developments put a premium on manpower, immigration began to play an increasingly important part in the American economy. This need for manpower was met by a corresponding desire of many Central Europeans to leave their homelands after severe economic failures

[1] The scope of this paper is limited on the one hand by the arrival of Leo Merzbacher (ca. 1842), and on the other by the death of the last of the consistently German preaching rabbis, David Einhorn (1879). — — The following abbreviations are used: *Deb.=Die Deborah.* — — *Einh.=Dr. David Einhorn's Ausgewählte Predigten und Reden, herausgegeben von Dr. K. Kohler,* (New York, 1880). — — *Jew. Ti.=The Jewish Times.* — — Lincoln=Abraham Lincoln—*The Tribute of the Synagogue,* ed. by J. H. Hertz, (New York, 1927). — — *Studies and Addresses=Studies and Addresses and Personal Papers* [of Kaufmann Kohler], (New York, 1931).

[2] Nevins and Commager, *America—The Story of a Free People,* (Boston, 1942), p. 191.

and the collapse of the Revolution of 1848. Among the new immigrants were a considerable number of Jews.

Up to that time the elite of the Jewish community in the United States belonged to the sefardic congregations. They had long established themselves in eastern and southern communities and adhered strictly to their own ritual. The title "rabbi" was unknown to them. Instead, the leader of the congregation was known as the *Chazan*, a teacher or prominent citizen whose duty it was not only to lead the congregation in prayer, but also to perform the various ritual functions that he might be called upon to fulfill. An additional duty placed upon his shoulders was that of delivering occasional sermons and lectures.

As a result of the new immigration, however, the complexion of the Jewish community in the United States changed completely. Between 1840 and 1860 the Jewish population in America nearly tripled.[3] Since the great majority of the immigrants gravitated toward the cities along the expanding trade routes, the number of active congregations doubled, being found in nineteen states and in the District of Columbia.[4]

The new congregations were generally formed along lines of national origin, thus serving as social as well as religious centers of activity. With very few exceptions—these being Har-Sinai of Baltimore and Emanuel of New York—they were ashkenazic and orthodox. For lack of rabbinic leadership, these congregations, too, were led by *Chazanim*, who performed the same functions as their sefardic counterparts.[5]

In addition to being centers of religious and social life, all the synagogues, sefardic and ashkenazic alike, assumed

[3] Bertram W. Korn, *American Jewry and the Civil War*, (Philadelphia, 1951), p. 1: "Exact statistics are unavailable, but we cannot be far away from the mark in estimating that at least two thirds of the approximately 150,000 American Jews were immigrants."

[4] Uriah Engelman, "Jewish Statistics in the U. S. Census of Religious Bodies (1850-1936)," *Jewish Social Studies*, IX, (1947), 131.

[5] A few discourses delivered by chazzanim of the day have been preserved. See James K. Gutheim, *Rede, gehalten bei der Grundsteinlegung der Synagoge der Gemeinde B'nai Yeshurun*, (Cincinnati, 1846); Guido Kisch, "Two American Jewish Pioneers of New Haven," *Historia Judaica*, IV, (1942), 16-37.

a service function. They dispensed charity, looked after the sick, and arranged for the burial of the dead. However, in the early 1850's the effectiveness of these functions was impaired by a sudden, inordinate increase in the Jewish population. Up to a point the numerous congregations had been able to care for the many poor immigrants. But soon their number became so great that it was necessary, especially in the larger cities, to found charitable institutions. They were generally organized along unifunctional lines, each institution taking care of one specific need.[6] These charitable institutions and benevolent societies, of which there were eventually thirty-five in New York and twenty-three in Philadelphia, must have done an excellent job in caring for the newcomers, for in 1854 they merited the editorial comment of two of the leading eastern newspapers to the effect that in New York and elsewhere "not a single Jew requires relief."[7] In smaller communities, however, charity, along with education, continued to be a function of the Synagogue.

The establishment of the many independent charitable institutions had an adverse effect upon the Synagogue. It was deprived of most of its service function and consequently lost a great deal of prestige. The Industrial Revolution had shown, among other things, the effectiveness of the policy of the division of labor and specialization, and the problem of how to deal adequately with the immediate needs of the many new immigrants made this specialization in the field of social welfare a practical necessity.

In the realm of education, too, the spirit of the age conspired against the Synagogue. This was the era of equalitarianism and democratization,[8] which had as one of its aims the expansion and secularization of the public school system. As might be expected, the early Jewish schools

[6] Korn, *op. cit.*, p. 3: "Generally they selceted one specific aspect of need and concentrated upon it: fuel, clothing, loans, assistance to widows and orphans, burial, visitation of the sick . . . Matzot for Passover for the poor."

[7] Morris U. Schappes, *Documentary History of the Jews in the United States* (1654-1875), (New York, 1950), p. 342 ff.

[8] Vernon L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought*, (New York, 1930), II, p. 145.

were generally of the Talmud Torah type. However, the depth to which this form of education had sunk can be judged by the fact that already in 1838 the otherwise strict and pious Isaac Leeser supported the Sunday school plan of Rebecca Gratz.[9] Under such conditions it was not surprising that the attempts at all-day Jewish parochial schools were generally short-lived.[10] Only briefly, as a result of the new immigration during the early eighteen-fifties, did the Jewish parochial school enjoy a more widespread popularity, and for a time nearly every synagogue in New York City had its own all-day school. However, when in 1856, in answer to the democratizing spirit of the time, the New York Board of Education secularized its public schools, the congregational schoolrooms once more became depleted, and the all-day Jewish school vanished as suddenly as it had come into being.[11]

It was to congregants living under conditions such as outlined above that the "pioneer rabbis" had to address themselves upon their arrival in America. What they said and what they preached reflects not only their concern over the state of American Jewry, but also the enthusiasm with which they took advantage of the newly found opportunity to speak their own minds. In a sense, this paper will deal with the influence exterted upon emancipated American Jewry, living in a climate of intellectual freedom, by religious leaders who, having been frustrated by social and religious reaction in Europe, were now free to test their ideals on virgin soil.

II

The Rabbis Arrive

The honor of being the first rabbi to practice his profession in America falls to Leo Merzbacher (1809 [1842]

[9] Leo L. Honor, "Jewish Education in the United States," *The Jewish People Past and Present*, (New York, 1946), II, p. 153.

[10] Hyman B. Grinstein, *The Rise of the Jewish Community of New York* (1654-1860), (Philadelphia, 1945), p. 232.

[11] Grinstein, *op. cit.* p. 238.

1856).[1] This largely forgotten pioneer was probably more influential than is generally thought. Though by no means an orator of any importance—probably owing to his ill health—Merzbacher made the most of the scant fourteen years that he was permitted to minister in New York. He was one of the founders of the B'nai B'rith Order and the Loyal Order of the True Sisters, as well as a guiding light of the Harmonie Club. Most important of all, for the last ten years of his life Merzbacher was the first rabbi at Temple Emanu-El. While occupying this pulpit he wrote his own prayer book, *Seder T'fillah*, through which he exerted a considerable influence on the development of the Reform liturgy in America.[2]

Merzbacher forms the vanguard of a steady stream of rabbis and reverends who, like him, found it increasingly difficult to pursue their calling in Europe. Among the earlier arrivals we find Elkan Cohn of Albany, rabbis Kalisch of Cleveland, Bernard Illowy and Henry Hochheimer, as well as the "constant Reverend" James K. Gutheim (1817 [1845] 1886) in whose honor it may be related that he never assumed the title "Rabbi" or "Reverend Doctor" for the simple reason that he was neither. Gutheim was the earliest advocate of the English sermon, preceding even Isaac Mayer Wise in that department, and was an orator of popularity and note.[3]

Into this same group of rabbis who left Europe before 1853 fall the names of Max Lilienthal (1814 [1845] 1882) and Isaac Mayer Wise (1819 [1846] 1900) whose life-long association is one of the legends of American Reform. Lilienthal, who at thirty-one was already well known as an educator and did much to further Jewish education in America, was, according to the testimony of his closest friend, a "puritanic, profoundly moralistic and edifying

[1] A Dr. Nordheimer preceded Merzbacher, but was never active in the rabbinate.

NOTE: The date in brackets indicates years of arrival in the United States.

[2] For information on Merzbacher see Hyman Enelow's file at the library of Temple Emanu-El, New York.

[3] Max Heller, "James K. Gutheim," *Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis*, XXVII, (1917), 365-367.

[preacher] in the very spirit of Dr. [Gotthold] Salomon of Hamburg."[4] Isaac Mayer Wise, the originator of the Friday evening lecture, also introduced the philosophical sermon and historical discourse, according to his own accounts.[5] Both found it necessary to immigrate to America when pressures abroad became too great. Lilienthal's failure in Russia, coupled with an attempt to convert him to Greek Catholicism, proved to him the futility of staying in Europe, while the moderate reformer Wise was in constant conflict not only with the Austrian government but also with his conforming rabbinical superiors. Europe's loss was American Judaism's gain.[6]

Early American-German homiletical literature received its most important contributors in 1854 and 1855 with the arrival of Bernhard Felsenthal (1822 [1854], 1908), Liebman Adler (1812 [1854] 1892), and David Einhorn (1809 [1855] 1879). Of the three only Einhorn was an ordained rabbi. Liebman Adler and Felsenthal were educated as teachers and started their careers in America as such. Felsenthal, who became the most active spirit in the early development of Reform in Chicago, was a speaker with a natural appeal who lacked all the oratorical trappings that were common in his day. Though at first a radical reformer of Einhorn's shading, he later parted company with his colleague on a number of issues. Like Einhorn, however, Felsenthal felt himself a spiritual German, though racially he considered himself a Jew, and politically an American.[7]

Undoubtedly the most gifted orator in the American Jewish pulpit of the nineteenth century was David Einhorn. Already a leading figure in the history of Reform in Ger-

[4] Isaac M. Wise's Introduction to *Sermons by American Rabbis*, (Chicago, 1896), p. xii.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] On Lilienthal see David Philipson, "Max Lilienthal," *Yearbook of the C.C.A.R.*, XXV, (1915) 191-220; *In Memoriam—A Tribute to the Memory of Rev. Dr. Max Lilienthal on the 10th Anniversary of his Death*, (Cincinnati, 1892). — — On Isaac Mayer Wise see the indexes of the volumes of the *Yearbook of the C.C.A.R.*, in addition to the standard works on Wise by Louis Grossman and David Philipson.

[7] Emma Felsenthal, *Bernhard Felsenthal: Teacher in Israel, Selections from his Writings with a Biographical Sketch and Bibliography by his Daughter*, (New York, 1924).

many, he continued to be the spokesman for radical Reform after his arrival in America. A brilliant speaker and a fiery personality motivated by the deepest convictions of social justice and religious progress, Einhorn virtually made his pulpit a spiritual totalitarian with his biting irony and his uncompromising ethical idealism. It is strange that the biography of this amazing personality still remains to be written.[8]

Compared with Felsenthal and Einhorn, Liebman Adler seems rather mild and meek. Coming to America in the hope of finding a better home and future for his children, he settled first in Detroit and then in Chicago, where he died thirty-one years later. He was essentially a Mendelssohnian, a more conservative influence, who opposed the preachment of higher biblical criticism as misleading for the public and bound himself to a more literal interpretation of the text. No one seems ever to have had trouble in trying to grasp the meaning of his words. His sermons were completely unsophisticated, being delivered in cordial and simple language and pervaded by a calm and tranquil spirit.[9]

Like Einhorn, Samuel Adler (1809 [1857] 1892), who was next to arrive, had been touched by the spirit of the German rabbinical synods of the eighteen-forties. In his seventeen years as rabbi of Temple Emanu-El in New York he proved himself a vigorous speaker and a staunch supporter of the eastern wing of American Reform. Samuel Adler is the first of a number of more serious academicians, some of whom, like Mielziner, Jastrow, Kohler, and the grammarian Salomon Deutsch, made noteworthy contributions to scholarship.[10]

[8] Samuel Hirsch, *Rev. Dr. David Einhorn—Gedächtnis-Rede gehalten vor seinem Sarge in der Synagoge der Beth-El Gemeinde, New York, am 6ten November*, 1879, (Philadelphia, 1879).

[9] Bernhard Felsenthal, *Liebman Adler—Eine Gedenkrede gehalten am* 14. *Februar* 1892 *im Tempel der K.A.M. in Chicago, (Sonderdruck aus The Reform Advocate* vom 5. März 1892); Emil G. Hirsch, *A Tribute to Liebman Adler*, (Chicago, 1892).

[10] L. Mayer, "Eulogy on the late Dr. Samuel Adler," *Yearbook of the CCAR.*, II, (1892), 27-32; Joseph Silverman, "Samuel Adler,—Tribute pronounced at the Celebration of the Centenary of his Birth," *Yearbook of the C.C.A.R.*, XIX, (1909), 415-423.

Moses Mielziner (1828 [1865] 1903) was a Talmudist of great stature. A student of Zunz and Holdheim, he was driven to Copenhagen by the German state reaction. There, before striking out across the ocean, he received his ordination from the Chief Rabbi of Denmark, Dr. A A. Wolff. As an advocate of a more moderate Reform he supported the position of I. M. Wise in his struggles with Einhorn.[11]

The moderate wing obtained additional support with the arrival of Adolph Huebsch (1830 [1866] 1884). While Mielziner was receiving his inspiration from the German scholars, Huebsch, a Hungarian, was in close contact with Rappaport and Wessely in Prague where he had gone to study in 1848. In 1866 Huebsch left Europe in response to a call from Congregation Ahawath Chesed in New York. He was known as a poised and measured speaker, and his melodious baritone voice must have added greatly to the effectiveness of his "prophetic" delivery.[12]

Samuel Hirsch (1815 [1866] 1889) was the philosopher of American Reform. A stiff-necked Hegelian, "whose passions were genuine but undisciplined,"[13] he argued for a rational exposition of Judaism. His cold reasoning brought him into frequent theological conflict even with some of his Reform colleagues, who still preferred the heart to the head. Hirsch was not unknown in American circles before his arrival, for he had written several books on Jewish philosophy through which he tried to further the cause of religious enlightenment.[14]

Kaufmann Kohler (1843 [1869] 1926) and Gustav Gottheil (1827 [1873] 1903) were the chief figures among the last rabbis whose sermons fall within the purview of this study. Both developed within the best scholarly tradition, though Kohler, a former admirer of Samson Raphael Hirsch, matured in an American environment, while the

[11] Ella Mc. F. Mielziner, *Moses Mielziner: A Biography with a Bibliography of his Writings*, (New York, 1931).

[12] *Rev. Dr. Adolph Huebsch—Late Rabbi of Ahawath Chesed Congregation, New York—A Memorial*, (New York, 1885).

[13] David Philipson and Louis Grossman, *Selected Writings of Isaac Mayer Wise with a Biography by the Editors*, (Cincinnati, 1900), p. 61.

[14] Maurice Lefkovitz, "Samuel Hirsch," *Yearkbook of the C.C.A.R.*, XXV, (1915), 174-190.

older Gottheil received his training at the best German universities. Gottheil came to America to assist Samuel Adler at Temple Emanu-El, after having served as reader and teacher with Holdheim in Berlin. At Emanu-El he became almost immediately involved in the Felix Adler affair, which resulted in the founding of the Ethical Culture Society of which Felix Adler became the head. Probably the most profound and best educated of the German rabbis, Gottheil added great weight to the prestige of the Reform rabbinate.[15]

Kohler, too, was a scholar and theologian whose works are still standard in present-day Reform. He was a popular lecturer more than a preacher and an advocate of the Sunday morning prayer service.[16]

These, then, are the important names who made early American Reform live. In general the rabbis stood head and shoulders above their congregants and were thus able to hold the reins of leadership within the Reform movement. Regardless of whether we agree or disagree with what the "pioneer rabbis" had to say, the period of their ministry undoubtedly represents one of the high points in the history of Reform Judaism.

III

The Rabbis React

A. The Rabbis and American Israel

We must now consider how the "pioneer rabbis" reacted to the new American environment in which they suddenly found themselves. Early American Jewry had, for lack of leadership and guidance, fallen into a general state of apathy despite the efforts of Isaac Leeser, who was just

[15] Richard Gottheil, *The Life of Gustav Gottheil—Memoir of a Priest in Israel,* (Williamsport, Pa., 1936).

[16] Kaufmann Kohler, *Personal Reminiscences of My Early Life,* (Cincinnati, 1918); see also the indexes of the *Yearbook of the C.C.A.R.;* David Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism,* (New York, 1907), contains some information on Kohler as well as on the important rabbis mentioned in this chapter.

beginning to make himself heard. Since Orthodoxy represented the prevalent mode of American Jewish life at the time, the new Reform rabbis lost no time in placing at its door much of the blame for the devitalization of Judaism in America. It must be remembered that the rabbis were the product of the European period of Emancipation and Enlightenment. They had, in the main, rejected the particularizing ghetto existence and were striving to infuse the highest Jewish ideals and spiritual values into the ideals and spiritual values of the nations of the world.[1] Consequently, they looked upon anything that tended toward exclusiveness and particularization with a great deal of horror and contempt. The very existence of orthodox Judaism in a free world seemed incongruous to them. How could any intelligent man, living in a modern, progressing, and enlightened world, cling to the past and its outmoded values? Though the lamentations about past oppressions had indeed been justified at one time, the rabbis felt that there was no reason "why the walls of many synagogues, where men pray in freedom, should still echo with their sound—sounds which had become discordant lies."[2] Furthermore, the whole lachrimose attitude toward the Jewish past was based on a confusion of the religious body and the religious soul. "Instead of striving for the elevation of the body through the soul, [Orthodoxy] compresses the soul into the body . . . so that even the moral law is measured by the standards of the ceremonial law."[3] While the mere observance of the ritual made for orthodox piety, the reformer preferred "to leave to the individual the outward expression of his religious thinking. For religious acts are moral acts, having spiritual value only when they are free. Performed under compulsion of religious law they are without effect and have no relationship to the inner life."[4]

[1] *Dr. David Einhorn's Ausgewählte Predigten und Reden, herausgegeben von Dr. K. Kohler,* (New York, 1880), pp. 202-203.

[2] Samuel Adler, "Predigt-Skizze, aus einem Vortrag gehalten am 2. Mai 1857," *Sinai,* II, (1857), 558.

[3] *Einh.,* p. 37.

[4] Emma Felsenthal, *Bernhard Felsenthal: Teacher in Israel; Selections from his Writings with a Biographical Sketch and a Bibliography by his Daughter,* (New York, 1924), p. 131.

This militant stand against Orthodoxy can be explained only in terms of the enlightened idealism of the German reformers. Having once breathed the free air outside the ghetto walls, they had become enamored of the very idea of freedom. In their enthusiasm for freedom of religious expression and in their rejection of all but moral authority, the reformers tended to swing to an extreme diametrically opposed to that of orthodox Judaism. Thus, many of the reformers saw in Orthodoxy a stumbling block in the way of all spiritual and moral progress, and in orthodox practice a chain binding the living Jew to the dead past.

The reformer's aim, then, was to free man from these "outmoded religious attitudes and practices" and to turn "his complete and undivided strength toward the essence of God's teachings, which stands sublimely above the changes of time and place, and which will continue to exist" to the end of time.[5]

But Orthodoxy was not the only force which the rabbis held responsible for the abject state in which they found the American Jewish community upon their arrival. Einhorn, for instance, observed that "instead of being teachers of the word of God," many Jews had become "ready students of materialism",[6] which was a part of the general temper of the time, answering to the practical needs of the rapidly expanding nation. Jews would do little or nothing for their Jewish spirit and, while they continued to contribute toward the building and maintenance of temples, most donors considered their obligations toward Judaism fulfilled once they had made their gifts.[7]

It was not surprising, then, to find many temples flourishing physically, while their pews remained empty week after week. Temple attendance appears to have been minimal.[8] On all but the most important occasions the majority

[5] *Einh.*, p. 39.

[6] *Einh.*, p. 108.

[7] David Einhorn, *Predigt zum Besten der Sanitary Fair, gehalten im Tempel der Gemeinde Knesseth Israel, am* 19. *März* 1864, (Philadelphia, 1864), p. 10.

[8] Samuel Hirsch, *Predigt gehalten am Sh'mini Atzeret,* (Philadelphia, 1867), p. 17; Milton Bien, *Predigt gehalten am ersten Neujahrstage in der Gemeinde Emanu-El, San Francisco,* (San Francisco, 1857), p. 3; Moses Mielziner,

of the congregants seem to have been women and girls, whose husbands, fathers, and brothers were attending to their respective professional and business duties.[9] The "servants of gold" greatly outnumbered the "servants of God."[10] But could anything else be expected of a generation whose orthodox parents were made to appear ridiculous and to whom everything concerning God, religion, and Judaism seemed ludicrous? In search of other values, "must not such a generation sooner or later fall into the arms of the most outspoken materialism?"[11]

The general education of children, too, seems to have been carried out with the same emphasis on material rather than spiritual values. Parents preferred to send their sons into apprenticeships rather than expose them to an academic education.[12] Naturally, then, not much time or desire remained for religious instruction.

Not only the parents, but the rabbis, too, neglected this aspect of community life almost completely. Although Einhorn had suggested the establishment of a Jewish parochial school in New York and had seconded I. M. Wise's suggestion for a theological seminary,[13] not until 1874 did Gottheil put his finger exactly on the sore, especially where the Reform of Judaism was concerned. "It cannot be denied," he said, "that we have started to build at the wrong end. We pay too much attention to the temple, and not enough to the school."[14]

Jewish youth had also been neglected in that it was not given the proper motivation and opportunity to become the

Zeugnisse und Hoffnungen—Predigt gehalten zur Wiedereröffnungs-Feier des renovierten Gotteshauses der Gemeinde Anshi Chesed, am 22 Mai 1868, (New York, 1872), p. 5.

9 Samuel Hirsch, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

10 Henry Hochheimer, *Rede am* 30. *April, als an dem von dem Präsidenten der Vereinigten Staaten angeordneten Buss-und Bettage, abgehalten im Gotteshause der Oheb-Israel-Gemeinde zu Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1863) p. 6.

11 Henry Hochheimer, "Aus einer Lech L'cho Predigt," *Jew. Ti.*, VII, (1875), 603.

12 Henry Hochheimer, *Israel der wandernde Prophet,* (Baltimore, 1865); *Einh.*, p. 223 ff.

13 *Einh.*, p. 67.

14 Richard Gottheil, *The Life of Gustav Gottheil—Memoir of a Priest in Israel.* (Williamsport, Pa., 1936), p. 376.

focal point of a new, indigenous, American Judaism. The immigrants were not yet willing to relinquish their inheritance to their sons and daughters.[15] Rabbis continued to be drawn from Europe, thus helping to prevent the crystallization of a new form of American Judaism.[16] "As long as we have to preach and pray in a foreign tongue, that long can we not speak of or hope for an American Judaism. Our hope is the youth, and it has a right to be American."[17] Not until 1875, when, under the leadership of Isaac Mayer Wise, Hebrew Union College opened its doors to the first class of future American rabbis, did the new generation of American Jews come into its own.

B. The Rabbis and America

The collapse of the Revolution of 1848, coupled with the failure of Reform Judaism in Germany, seems to have been the prime moving factor that brought the "pioneer rabbis" to America.[18] Some of them had come of their own free will, while others felt as though guided "by the hand of God."[19] All looked upon the United States as their new Canaan,[20] upon the Bill of Rights as the modern counterpart of Cyrus' declaration freeing the Jews of Bablyonia,[21] and upon their immigration to the United States as the return of the Exiles.[22] Taking their cue from their predecessors in France, the "pioneer rabbis" might have called America their Palestine, New York their Jerusalem, and the Hudson their Jordan.[22a]

15 Bernhard Felsenthal, *Schofarklänge: Voltrag, gehalten am Rosch Haschanah* (Chicago, 1860), p. 19.

16 On July 22, 1872, the *New York Herald* in an editorial entitled "Hebrew Rabbinical Education," deplored the lack of English preachers among the rabbis. At that time only S. M. Isaacs delivered addressses in English. See Morris U. Schappes, *Documentary History of the Jews in the United States (1654-1875)*, (New York, 1950), p. 554 ff.

17 Richard Gottheil, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

18 David Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, (New York, 1907). p. 339; see also above, Chapter 2.

19 Emma Felsenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

20 *Einh.*, p. 102.

21 *Rev. Dr. Adalph Huebsch—Late Rabbi of the Ahawath Chesed Congregation, New York: A Memorial*, (New York, 1885), p. 86.

22 *Ibid.*

22a See also Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, p. 467.

Though their enthusiasm for the United States was obviously great, it is surprising to find that most of the rabbis consistently shied away from political and other controversial issues, even on the many days proclaimed by the Presidents as national prayer days. "In general [the rabbis] were followers rather than leaders in political thought."[23] The slavery issue, for instance, was very rarely discussed from the pulpit until after it had already been decided. Even then some of the rabbis continued to feel the need to apoligize for the Bible which, as was obvious, permitted slavery. A distinction was made between the Mosaic law and the Mosaic teaching (*Lehre*). The law "permits an Israelite to be a slave for a period of six years—the teaching of Moses does not permit it one moment. It forbids the forced return of an escaped slave into the custody of his original owner—we, in America, know how far reaching such an ordinance is . . ." And yet, according to Mosaic law, a Jew is permitted to own non-Jewish slaves. This, however, only proves that while "the law may be an expression of the Mosaic teaching, the teaching is more profound and fundamental than the law."[24]

Actual references to American problems, like the above reference to the question of a slave owner's right to his escaped slave, are very rare. Implied references were more common. Samuel Adler, for instance, used the Joseph story as an example of rivalry between brothers. After all, brothers should not forget that they are all sons of one father, in whose image they have been created. But then, without further applying the Joseph story to the contemporary problem of internal strife, Adler turned to a completely different subject.[25]

This noncommittal attitude toward the war and toward national issues in general seems to have been an integral part of the total picture of the American Jewish scene. Not alone

[23] Bertram W. Korn, *American Jewry and the Civil War*, (Philadelphia, 1951). p. 30.

[24] Samuel Hirsch, *Predigt gehalten am Sh'mini Atzeret*, (Philadelphia, 1867), pp. 6-7.

[25] Samuel Adler, *Predigt über das erste Buch Moses* 44:20, *gehalten in der Synagoge der Gemeinde Ansche Chesed*, (New York, 1860).

the majority of the German-preaching rabbis were gripped by this political apathy. Most of the English-preaching rabbis, as well as nearly all German and English language Jewish periodicals, showed the same lack of concern for the important social issues of the day.[26]

The exceptions to the general attitude were David Einhorn and Bernhard Felsenthal. Of the two, Einhorn must be mentioned first, if for no other reason than the complete absence, in printed form, of Felsenthal's sermons on matters relating to social and national controversies.

Einhorn not only was a violent abolitionist, but he spoke vehemently against the worship of the modern golden calf—"the Almighty Dollar."[27] His many sermons which have been preserved in print show his acute awareness of contemporary events and their general implications. Einhorn's oratory spanned the whole gamut of American life. He had nothing but contempt for the corruptible government officials who remained at liberty to steal the public's money, while the poor, hungry, and destitute thief was sentenced to a long term in jail.[28] He attacked the Know-Nothing Party, which wanted to deprive the new immigrants of many of their rights;[29] he disagreed publicly with the Mormon interpretation of the Bible;[30] and confidently predicted that the Atlantic cable, which had been completed in 1866, would "undoubtedly [be] the greatest mediator of peace between the nations"[31] and the first step in the direction of a world brotherhood. Einhorn's attitude toward Jewish matters, as well as his militant stand on politics and social justice, was motivated by universal ideals which rejected all tendencies toward national or group exclusiveness, and had for their goal the speedy establishment of a spiritual, social, and political brotherhood of nations and peoples.

[26] Only the assassination of President Lincoln was met with a general, indignant response from the pulpit. See J. H. Hertz, *Abraham Lincoln—The Tribute of the Synagogue,* (New York, 1927).

[27] *Einh.*, p. 107.

[28] *Einh.*, p. 169 f.

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] David Einhorn,*Zwei Predigten*: *Abschiedspredigt, gehalten im Tempel Adath Yeshrun am* 28. *Februar* 1874, (New York, 1874), p. 12.

[31] *Einh.*, p. 181.

However, Einhorn's most vitriolic oratory was reserved for his chief foes, Slavery and Materialism. He considered both cardinal evils. He could not conceive, as did Morris J. Raphall early in 1861, that the Bible could "hallow the enslavement of any race."[32] Undoubtedly the literal text of the Bible treats slavery as a proper social institution. Yet none of the great men in Israel ever took this institution seriously. Though they had to tolerate it, the "great truth" of human equality always remained close to their hearts. "Naturally, such sublime truths may have to wait thousands of years until they attain their practical realization. Humanity advances only slowly but surely, and truth only grows gradually in man's mind . . . . And so the greatest of prophets had to tolerate slavery for the time being, even while he was implanting God's word in the hearts of men . . . . But the fundamental principle of the equality of all of God's children always existed."[33]

Yet, though the South was vigorously attacked, Einhorn did not consider it the only blameworthy party involved in the civil strife. Both the North and the South had committed the same moral crimes of respecting neither God nor man.[34]

This atmosphere of godlessness preceded the war and was, in the eyes of the rabbis, the direct cause of it. "The spirit of business, and the spirit of greed have replaced the sense for the higher and divine. They have driven the spirit of God from our midst", with the result that the war had to come.[35] At the same time, however, the war between the states also had its positive aspects, in that it was looked upon by some of the preachers as a purgative which was to rid the country of evil, once and for all.[36]

Besides Einhorn, only Felsenthal is known to have expressed himself on the slavery question before it was decided by war. Not even Gutheim, whose sentiments were

32 *Korn, op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

33 *Einh.*, p. 100; for a similar view see also Samuel Hirsch, *Predigt gehalten am Sh'mini Atzeret*, (Philadelphia, 1867), p. 7.

34 *Einh.*, p. 115.

35 Henry Hochheimer, *Rede am 30. April* (*supra*, note 10), p. 6.

36 Hochheimer, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

on the side of the Confederacy, mentioned the institution of slavery in his sermons.[37]

Other immediate and social issues of the day also seemed of little general importance to the rabbis, although we notice in a few sermons some concern about the implications of the anti-Semitic attitudes found among various segments of the American population.[38]

Nevertheless, all contrary indications notwithstanding, Judaism seemed to stand upon the same foundations as the United States, since the belief "that all men are created equal" and in the image of God, and that all are endowed with the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" was as much Jewish as American doctrine.[39] Thus the future of Israel in America seemed secure and full of promise.

C. The Rabbis and Their European Background

The same freedom which America offered to the immigrants who had been disappointed by the course of events in Europe, also attracted the rabbis, who found themselves thwarted by the state reaction following the Revolution of 1848.[40] "Impelled by force of circumstance, or the desire and thirst for freedom," the rabbis, along with the general immigration, turned their backs "upon the dear home of [their] childhood and embarked for a country where the rights of man were recognized, and where they could live unmolested, according to the dictates of their conscience."[41]

[37] Korn, *op. cit., p.* 47 ff; Emma Felsenthal, *op. cit.,* p. 33. None of Felsenthal's sermons on controversial questions have come to my attention.

[38] Jews seem to have been denied residence in some hotels, and the national press was not always certain of the good intentions of the Jewish community during the Civil War. See *Einh.*, pp. 103, 169; Lincoln's murder was likened in one newspaper to the "wicked Jews who killed Jesus Christ," a fact which caused Liebman Adler to praise God for not letting a Jew be the perpetrator of such an outrage. See J. H. Hertz, *Abraham Lincoln—The Tribute of the Synagogue,* p. 141.

[39] *Einh.*, pp. 98-99.

[40] Samuel Hirsch, Rev. *Dr. David Einhorn—Gedächtnis-Rede, gehalten vor seinem Sarge in der Synagoge der Beth-El Gemeinde, New York, den 6ten November* 1879, (Philadelphia. 1879, p. 4.

[41] James K. Gutheim, *Rede gehalten bei der Grundsteinlegung der Synagoge der Gemeinde Bn'ai Yeshurun,* (Cincinnati, 1846), pp. 2-3.

Nearly all the "pioneer rabbis" came to the United States as grown men with most of their formal education behind them. Some, like Bernhard Felsenthal, Liebman Adler, and James K. Gutheim, probably never seriously considered the rabbinate as a calling until after they had settled in America. Many of them, however, had occupied pulpits in various parts of Europe before they set out on their journey across the ocean.[42] Thus, in general, "their training and practical experience . . . predisposed [the rabbis] to the use of the German language" as their medium of expression.[43] And, of course, upon their arrival they had a large potential following in the German Jewish population of America.

It is a curious fact that, judging by the sermons under discussion, the rabbis made few direct references to Germany or Europe. Occasionally, they would refer to the restrictions placed upon German Jewry by the German governments in order to heighten, in a homiletical manner, the beauty of the new American freedom.[44] Or, in another vein, they might point to the weakness of a divided Germany as against the strength of a United States.[45] An interesting comment on the German-Jewish scene was made by Samuel Hirsch, who cautioned his listeners against infection by the "imitation-mania" of their German brethren, who were avoiding the synagogues because the Christian population was staying away from the churches.[46]

Only David Einhorn was in every way more deeply concerned with Germany and German culture. As a Reform

[42] Einhorn, for instance, had been rabbi in Mecklenburg-Schwerin; Samuel Hirsch in Dessau and Luxemburg; while Gustav Gottheil had been Holdheim's assistant in Berlin, and Mielziner was active in Waren and Mecklenburg.

[43] Adolf Kober, "Jewish Preaching and Preachers: A Contribution to the History of the Jewish Sermon in Germany and America," *Historia Judaica*, VII, (1945), 129.

[44] Gutheim, *op. cit.*, p. 2; Henry Hochheimer, *Zwei Reden von Henry Hochheimer, Rabbiner der Oheb-Israel Gemeinde zu Baltimore*, (Baltimore, 1861), p. 9.

[45] Bernhard Felsenthal, in J. H. Hertz, *Abraham Lincoln, The Tribute of the Synagogue*, p. 102.

[46] Samuel Hirsch, *Predigt gehalten am Sh'mini Atzeret*, (Philadelphia, 1867), p. 16.

Jew he could never forget his debt to Germany. "Is not the German spirit the bearer of Reform Judaism? And, because of this, has not our congregation [Adath Israel, New York] made use of the German language in ritual and school?"[47] "I cannot forget that the old homeland is the land of thinkers and, at the present time, the most cultured country in the world."[48] "Culture" is, in fact, Germany's heritage to the world and, "wherever her children may settle," there German culture spreads its beneficent influence.[49] Germany's culture "has been carried farther and farther to other countries and across the seas. Remove the German spirit or—what amounts to the same thing—the German language, and you will have removed the ground beneath human culture and the delicate flower must wither."[50] To deprive the synagogue of the German language is treason to Judaism. While Einhorn admits the importance of the English sermon for the sake of the new American generation of Jews, "the object of preaching in English can be nothing more than to make use of the treasures of the German spirit and of German literature for the enhancement and enrichment of religious life. In short: where the German language is banned, there Reform of Judaism is nothing more than a glittering veneer."[51]

At the same time, however, Einhorn was not unaware of conditions in Germany as far as the Jews were concerned. In Germany, however, we must expect improvement to be slow. After all, slow progress is an integral part of German thoroughness, since "it draws wisdom from deeper wellsprings" ("weil sie aus grösserer Tiefe schöpft").[52]

47 *Einh.*, p. 185.

48 *Einh.*, p. 90, as translated by Adolf Kober, *loc. cit.*, p. 130.

49 *Einh.*, p. 184 f.

50 *Einh.*, p. 90, as translated by Kober, loc. cit., p. 130.

51 Einhorn's "farewell sermon" in 1879, ends with the announcement that "henceforth you [of Temple Beth-El] will hear the word of God expounded alternately one week in English and one week in German." *op. cit.*, p. 92. *Einh.*, p. 90, as translated by Kober, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

52 *Einh.*, p. 185. Einhorn did not hesitate to preach a sermon in honor of the German victory over the French in 1871. At that time he took up a collection for the benefit of German war widows and orphans; *Einh.*, p. 184.

A more critical view, taking the conditions of American Jewry into account, was voiced by Gustav Gottheil, who warned of the dilemma that would face the American community once the supply of German rabbis would be cut off. "We can be saved only if we immediately and energetically undertake the founding of our own institute of learning."[53] Thus, as the English speaking children of the German immigrants began to move into their parents' temple pews, the work of Isaac Mayer Wise, aiming at the establishment of such an institution of higher Jewish learning and scholarship grew more and more important. It soon became detrimental to Reform to hire "a stranger [from Germany] . . . who would long for his homeland to the end of his days" and would never be able to preach a dignified sermon in the English language.[54]

It is undoubtedly true that many, if not most, of the German rabbis never mastered the English language adequately enough for use in the pulpit. But then, most of our early rabbis had come to the United States at an age when they were already fairly set in their ways. Leeser, Wise, Gutheim, and Kohler, who immigrated as relatively young men and immediately began to preach in English, are the exceptions. As a rule, after the thorough and often extensive education which they received at German seminaries and universities, America of the mid-eighteen hundreds did not have much to offer to the pioneer rabbis in terms of culture and intellectual stimulation. And since they had a ready-made German speaking audience waiting for them, we cannot blame them too much for having taken what appears to be the course of least resistance. This may explain in part the apparent chauvinism of a man like Einhorn, although his attitude never excluded a deep fondness for the United States. In fact, none of the rabbis harbored great longings for their former homeland and, certainly, they looked upon their new home as a refuge from oppression and a haven of freedom.[55]

[53] Richard Gottheil. *op. cit.*, p. 376.

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] Gutheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

IV

The Reform of Judaism

There were many reasons why the America of the mid-eighteen hundreds was fertile ground for religious innovation. An interfering government, a locally, and sometimes nationally organized hostile Jewish community, which prevented the spread of Reform in Germany, presented no obstacles in the United States. And so the Reformer saw in America a place of unlimited possibilities for the fulfillment of his aspirations. Although at times, as in the case of I. M. Wise, congregations would fight innovation,[1] more generally they offered little or no resistance once a Reform incursion had been made into their midst.

The temper of the American people, which, at the time, was open and receptive to change, also helped in the establishment of Reform Judaism in the United States. Conservatism in general was frowned upon. The pioneer spirit had little use for convention or religious niceties. The practical man, the one who could quickly adapt himself to new surroundings was the successful man. In fact, flexibility had become a necessary characteristic of the pioneer who went out to develop the unknown resources and potentialities of the land. And so religion, like thought in general, had to make way for the spirit of the time. The practical man, who had of necessity learned to become accustomed to changes, welcomed a form of Judaism which would fit into the pattern of his daily life. A Judaism that was flexible suited his needs and his temperament. He did not know Hebrew, and therefore approved the introduction of English into the liturgy. He was pleased that Reform did not consider working on the Sabbath a mortal sin, so that he could keep up in the hard competition with his non-Jewish neighbors.

It is against this background that we must understand the development of Reform Judaism in America, both in its practical and theological aspects. The sermons of our

[1] David Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, (New York, 1907), p. 336.

early rabbis afford us an excellent picture of how they dealt with these questions of Jewish living and thinking.

A. The Foundations of Judaism

As was the case in Germany, Reform Judaism in America was originally a lay movement, concerned not so much with aspects of theology as with the establishment and maintenance of a dignified, decorous divine service. We are not surprised, then, to find among the earliest known expressions of Reform in America proposals made by laymen aimed at the improvement of the synagogue service. The Charleston Reform Movement, falling outside of the purview of this essay, needs no further elaboration here.[2] Of interest to us is the sermon delivered in 1846 by James K. Gutheim at the cornerstone-laying ceremony of Temple B'nai Yeshurun in Cincinnati. Gutheim urged his listeners to see to it that the congregation "arrange and celebrate its divine service in a manner worthy of its outward form—the sanctuary."[3] Even more important for our purposes is the Chanukah sermon delivered at about the same time in New Haven, Connecticut, by Leopold Waterman, the uncle of the late Mrs. Stephen S. Wise. In appealing for greater decorum and attendance at services, Waterman suggested some minor reforms which, however, he understood only in the sense of transformation of the external forms of religious ceremonies. "The nature of religion, however, remains inviolable and eternal, and frail human reason trembles before its might."[4] Waterman here anticipated the problem of the dual nature of the foundation of Judaism, which nine years later found its most ardent American advocate in David Einhorn.

Once he set foot on American soil, Einhorn lost no time in making his views on this matter known. In fact, his first sermon delivered at the Har-Sinai Congregation in

[2] Philipson, *op. cit.*, p. 341 ff.

[3] James K. Gutheim, *Rede gehalten bei der Grundsteinlegung der Synagoge der Gemeinde B'nai Yeshurun*, (Cincinnati, 1846), p. 4.

[4] Guido Kisch, "Two American Jewish Pioneers of New Haven," *Historia Judaica*, IV (1942), 31.

Baltimore, on a memorable 22nd of September in 1855, contains the following declaration of belief:

"Like man himself, the child of God, the divine law has a perishable body and an imperishable spirit. The body is intended to be the servant of the spirit, and must disappear as soon as bereft of the latter. This spirit is the doctrinal and moral law of Scripture, whose fundamental principles the Ten Commandments set forth exclusively . . . . The Decalogue is the essence of the covenant between God and man, and is therefore binding for all times, places, and peoples, and was destined to become from the very beginning the common possession of mankind through Israel . . . . All other divine ordinances, on the other hand, are only signs of the covenant—guards and protections of the eternal universal law . . . . These from their very nature, cannot remain always and everywhere the same, nor acquire the force of eternal or general obligation. Not that man will ever be able to dispense altogether with visible signs, but the expression and form of these must necessarily change with different stages of culture, national customs, industrial, social, and civil conditions, in short with the general demands of the inner and outer life."[5]

Nothing could better illustrate the duality of the foundation of Judaism as conceived by the early Reform rabbis. Though Einhorn's views were the most extreme, they also show the general tendencies most clearly. The first of the two pillars on which Judaism rests is the immutable "rock of Sinai."[6] The other is made up of the needs and demands of the present generation. The man of today, being more highly developed than his forefather who stood at Sinai, mirrors the spirit of God more perfectly.[7] Certainly, then, nobody is in a better position to interpret the word of God correctly than the man of the present.

The division of authority in Judaism between the past and the present directly gives rise to its corollary, namely, that the moral law embodied in the Ten Commandments forms the universal essence or body of Judaism, while the ceremonial law constitutes its form or the clothes which cover and protect it. "Religion must change her dress according to the times and the climate . . . [and] according

[5] *Einh.*, pp. 35-36, as translated by Philipson, *op. cit.*, pp. 344-345.

[6] David Einhorn, *Zwei Predigten: Abschiedspredigt gehalten im Tempel Adath Yeshurun am 28. Februar* 1874, (New York, 1874), pp. 11-12.

[7] Kaufmann Kohler, "Die Eigenschaften des Gottberufenen Führers der Gemeinde Israel," *Jew. Ti.*, I, 28, (1869), 9.

to the dictates of advanced science, enlightened insight, more cultured taste, broadening conditions of life—in short according to the needs of the world today."[8] Changes in the ceremonial law thus became a necessary concomitant of Reform.

The differentiation between the form and essence of Judaism is most important to the understanding of Reform theology as seen by the early German preachers.[9] Orthodox Judaism had always considered every "jot and tittle" of essential Jewish value. At the bottom of Orthodoxy lies belief in the divine origin and immutability of the word of the Torah. This belief, of course, could not be maintained by the reformers. While they did hold that everything written down in the Bible was of divine origin,[10] they saw no difficulties in denying its immutability. At the time of Sinai God could do nothing but dress His eternal truths in the ceremonial forms He chose, since otherwise the primitive Israelites would not have understood their eternal mission. Since then, however, our conceptions of these truths have become "clearer and purer not because we have overshadowed the words of Moses, but because we have gained a much clearer insight into them."[11] Having gained this deeper understanding, man is also in a position to judge which parts of the Bible are essential and eternal, and which are merely a "deadening mass" of ceremony.[12]

What, then, becomes of Torah as originally conceived? Once more we are directed back to a variant of the dichotomy between the essence and form of Judaism. Torah is not a law. It is a teaching (*Lehre*). "The law is the application and assertion of the basic principles of the teachings under certain temporal conditions. But it is not

8 Samuel Adler, *Predigt über das erste Buch Moses* 44:20, *gehalten in der Synagoge der Gemeinde Ansche Chesed,* (New York, 1860), pp. 9-10.

9 Einhorn, *Zwei Predigten* (*supra,* note 6), pp. 8-9.

10 Einhorn, in *Sinai,* I, (1856), 55; Bernhard Felsenthal, *Schofarklänge-Vortrag gehalten am Rosch Haschanah,* (Chicago, 1860), p. 12.

11 *Einh.,* p. 221.

12 Emma Felsenthal, *Bernhard Felsenthal: Teacher in Israel, Selections from his Writings with a Biographical sketch and a Bibliography by his Daughter,* (New York, 1924), p. 126.

the teaching itself."[13] In other words, the character of the law depends upon the character of the eternal principles which underly it. "The reasons for the law, the aim of the giving of the law, is instruction [*Belehrung*]. The law as such demands and is satisfied with externals. It does not ask whether the commandments have a spiritual hold on us or not . . . nor whether the fulfillment of the law should be close to our own lips and hearts, or far removed from us in times long past."[14]

Furthermore, to obey the law is relatively easy. However, living up to the teachings implies much greater demands upon man. Law in itself is amoral. The demands of the teachings, on the other hand, are moral demands. They necessitate thought on the part of individual man. "Judaism as teaching makes us free of the law but binds us the more closely to the moral law; it does away with semblance and demands the truth; it despises thoughtless belief and action and demands consciousness, conviction, and inwardness. It demands that we dig to the rockbottom of our disposition and of our spirit."[15]

What is important in Torah is the spirit of the letter and not the letter itself. "Of what consequences is it for our religious thinking and doing whether Moses wrote the books named after him or not? . . . However great the number of contradictions, interpretations and omissions which may yet be pointed out by biblical critics, even if they brought to us the conclusion that Moses . . . [is a mythical personage] who never existed in reality, it would not trouble us."[16]

The truths which are contained in the Torah stand in no direct relationship to the written word. They are the "golden kernel" for which the Torah is a "silver bowl."[17] Nor are these truths limited to Israel alone. They are the

[13] Samuel Hirsch, *Predigt gehalten am Sh'mini Atzeret*, (Philadelphia, 1867), p. 5.

[14] Salomon Deutsch, *Zwei Predigten gehalten am Sühnfeste und Hüttenfeste, Sept.* 15 & 20, 1869, (Baltimore, 1869), p. 5.

[15] Deutsch, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[16] Emma Felsenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[17] Kaufmann Kolher, "Das neue Wissen und der alte Glaube," *Jew. Ti.*, V, (1874), 797.

common possession of mankind.[18] But just as God chose the Greek genius to be the messenger of the arts, so He chose Israel to be the promulgator of His eternal truths. But neither are the arts exclusively Greek, nor is the moral law of the Torah exclusively Jewish.[19] Only in this sense are we to understand the concept of chosenness. It is Israel's duty to make God's moral law known to all mankind. Having achieved this, Israel will have brought on the messianic age, "when walls and barriers separating man from man and brother from brother will again be overthrown."[20] Thus Israel is the divine instrument by means of which the world is to be redeemed.[21]

Israel's mission and the messianic age are inseparable. Einhorn celebrated the Ninth of Ab as the birthday of the Messiah, since on that day of dispersion Israel stood "at the beginning of its messianic world redeeming task."[22] In this task Israel is also said to be aided by Christianity and Mohammedanism which, as popular, worldwide outgrowths of Judaism, are preparing the world for the final acceptance of God's eternal moral truths.[23]

The gap between the "rock of Sinai" and the fulfillment of Israel's mission must be bridged by the continued efforts of succeeding generations. Since God reveals Himself to each generation in the cultural development of its day, and since each generation, therefore, experiences divine revelation in the context of its time, it follows that Judaism must be conceived of as being capable of unlimited development.[24] "It must constantly adapt itself in its outward form to time and circumstance."[25]

To bring about this adaption to the times, each generation must be endowed with the authority to change and re-evaluate the customs, ceremonies, and beliefs of Judaism.

18 Einhorn, *Zwei Predigten,* p. 9.
19 *Einh.,* p. 221.
20 Bernhard Felsenthal, *op. cit.,* pp. 15-16.
21 Einhorn had based his opposition to intermarriage solely on this principle of Israel's world redeeming mission. See *Einh.,* p. 91.
22 Einhorn, in *Sinai,* IV, (1859), 240.
23 Emma Felsenthal, *op. cit.,* p. 123.
24 Einhorn, *Zwei Predigten,* p. 11.
25 Emma Felsenthal, *op. cit.,* p. 127.

This issue is crucial to Reform. If the present generation has no say in the shaping of Judiasm, certainly the basis for all innovation has been removed. Most of the German rabbis agreed that, since revelation was a continuing process, not limited to any time or place,[26] the present generation of Jews, interpreting revelation in the context of its own experiences, was indeed, endowed with the authority to make changes in the form of Judaism.

Though the early Reform rabbis concurred with this idea in principle, in practice their agreement was by no means absolute. Many of them saw the great danger to which this view would, and, indeed, did lead. For, unless there is a recognized and properly constituted body to authorize changes, change itself becomes an arbitrary matter.[27] On the one hand, then, the rabbis preached and taught on the basis of an authority which they believed belonged to the present, while, on the other hand, they had to cope with congregations which took this authority too literally and found in it a way to make Judaism fit conveniently into the schedule of practical life.

And so it came about that practical Judaism tended to become the exclusive domain of the Temple. The synagogue service became the "center of gravity of religious life."[28] The Temple was considered the bridge between the past and the future.[29] On this basis, however, Judaism soon became externalized. "Devotion is as good as extinguished in our synagogues. They have become more beautiful and splendorous. Even the religious service has acquired a shining shell. Silence and decorum, singing and organ music have become the order of the day.[30] Everything has become

[26] *Einh.*, p. 177.

[27] The synod of I. M. Wise and Lilienthal seems to have been organized with this danger in mind. However, it disbanded after only one meeting. See H. B. Grinstein, *The Rise of the Jewish Community of New York* (1654-1860), (Philadelphia, 1945), p. 397.

[28] *Deutsch, op. cit.*, p. 13.

[29] Samuel Adler, "Predigt zur Tempelweihe der Gemeinde Knesseth Israel in Philadelphia, 24. September 1864," *Jew. Ti.*, II (1864), 780.

[30] Liebman Adler makes the following observation: "No matter how necessary the reform of the Synagogue service is, and how much praiseworthy work has been done in that direction . . . one has modeled the new service too much after the example of the Church." *Betrachtungen dem Texte der*

more cut to size, but the material has become thinner and lacks genuineness. The Jewish congregations do not know how to pray anymore."[31]

Against this tendency the rabbis spoke in no uncertain terms. "Under no circumstances," we hear them say, "is it the intention of Reform merely to tear down the old structure of Judaism and replace it with a new, beautiful but foundationless one. There is more to Reform than to put certain old usages behind you. The observance of the Sabbath [for instance] is one proof of the reformers' serious intentions. The other proof is that he must become a better Jew, in short, a better human being. Not he who prays out of the new prayerbook is a reformer, nor he who advocates a change in ritual; but he who reforms his life according to the spirit of the Temple cult."[32]

Yet their efforts seem to have been of little avail. As late as 1879, which is the last year of this study, we hear I. S. Moses of Milwaukee, while advocating religious progress, noting the absence of "the fruit and consequences of our efforts which we were justified to postulate. Along with superstitious fears, the true fear of God and the Holy has also diminished. With the overthrow of belief in authority we have also done away with all certainty and hold. We have thrown open the gates to arbitrariness and presumption, having set up our own infallibility as a guiding principle, if we can speak of such, and have lost all reverence for great memories, all respect for historical thoughts . . . One has become accustomed to consider religion as a superseded point of view . . . and a medicine for the feebleminded."[33]

Most of the early Reform rabbis, it seems, were committed to their cause to a point where they found it difficult, if not impossible, to do anything about the problems

Fünf Bücher Mosches folgend, in 182 *Vorträgen zur Belehrung und Erbauung,* published under the title *Z'enah Ure'nah,* (Chicago, 1890), p. 456.

[31] *Einh.,* p. 50.

[32] Moses Mielziner, *Zeugnisse und Hoffnungen—Predigt gehalten zur Wiedereröffnungs-Feier des renovierten Gotteshauses der Gemeinde Anshi Chesed, am* 22. *Mai* 1868, (New York, 1872, p. 7; *Einh.,* p. 57; Samuel Adler, *ibid.*

[33] Isaac Moses, *Zwei Reden, gehalten am Neujahrs- und Versöhnungstage im Tempel der Gemeinde Emanuel, Milwaukee,* (Milwaukee, Wis., 1879), p. 7.

which faced their congregations. And as long as many believed that Judaism was the only religious belief which did not contradict the doctrines of modern science, but was in line with "reason, knowledge, and understanding," we can appreciate the formidableness of the practical obstacles which stood in their way.[34] Gustav Gottheil was the first to object against this tendency of his contemporaries to court science at the expense of Judaism. "Either Judaism is something definite and unique, something true in itself, which we have to preserve, or it is not definable or recognizable . . . in which case let us in honesty to ourselves put down our prayerbooks and give up our religious schools."[35]

And it seems indeed true that in those early days of Reform, Judaism was nothing "definite." Opinions varied between the radical Einhorn and the conservative Szold,[36] while the bewildered congregants were caught not only between the grindstones of Orthodoxy and Reform, but also between the various Reform rabbis who were contesting with one another.

B. Ritual and Ceremony

It is probably true that due to the lack of properly trained *Chazanim* or teachers, the services in the early American synagogues were anything but dignified when measured against the standards of decorum which the German rabbis brought with them. Though the early American synagogue service was still conducted in Hebrew, that language had, for all intents and purposes, died out, and people objected to the fact that they had to "pray in a language which [they did] not understand, at a length which [was] tiring, and in a manner that [was] revolting."[37]

34 M. Landsberg, "Predigt gehalten in der Har Sinai Gemeinde zu Baltimore," *Jew. Ti.*, VI, 1874), 317.

35 Richard Gottheil, *The Life of Gustav Gottheil: Memoir of a Priest in Israel*, (Williamsport, Pa., 1936), p. 377 f.

36 Benjamin Szold, *Divre Schalom v'Emet: Gottesdienstlicher Vortrag gehalten in der Ohev Scholom Gemeinde zu Baltimore*, (Baltimore, 1859), pp. 11-12.

37 Herman Milton Bien, *Predigt gehalten am ersten Neujahrstage in der Gemeinde Emanuel, San Francisco*, (San Francisco, 1857), p. 8.

Thus, in the eyes of the rabbis, the form which Judaism had taken on belied the beauty and truth of those principles of which it was meant to be an expression. The whole structure of Judaism at this time, it would seem, came to be judged by its outward appearance. The general objections were that the old forms had become "too narrow" for the religious needs of the present,[38] and that the "eternal and essential in our religion [lay] buried beneath a dead weight of ceremonies which [had] lost all their meaning."[39]

And so it became the avowed purpose of the reformer to lift this ceremonial millstone from around the neck of Judaism and "to bring new life into religion and new religion into life."[40] The process by which this rejuvenation of Jewish religion was to be achieved was the point of greatest divergence amongst the early Reform rabbis. The radical Einhorn, for instance, admitted that the complete absence of ceremonial form would work to the detriment of the religious individual, whose sensuous nature needed the assurance of the symbol representing in tangible form intangible religious ideas.[41] According to this view ceremony was looked upon as somewhat of a necessary evil, for which man's nature, rather than the nature of religion, was to be blamed.[42] The conservative Benjamin Szold thought that the true approach to the problem lay somewhere between the views of Reform and Orthodoxy.[43] "All the means given us by time which will elevate and enhance the service must be utilized . . . as long as the old spirit is not pushed into the background."[44]

Between the views of Einhorn and Szold nearly every German preaching rabbi constituted a degree of his own. Samuel Adler considered *Kriath ha-Torah, Kedushah, Kiddush, Tefillah,* and *Kriath Sch'ma* the essential part of the service reaching back into the past, while the new English

38 *Einh.*, p. 172.
39 Emma Felsenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
40 *Ibid.*
41 *Einh.*, p. 68 f.
42 *Einh.*, p. 40.
43 Szold, *op. cit.*, p. 8 f.
44 Szold, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

prayers were the guides leading to the future.[45] Herman M. Bien, again, advocated that the whole service be shortened and recited in English, except for the *Shema* and the *Shemoneh Esreh.*[46] The actual degree of confusion with regard to ceremony and ritual can be gauged by the fact that during this time of the Reform movement's initial growth and consolidation, nearly every prominent rabbi published his own prayerbook.[47] In some congregations the Torah cycle was spread over three years, in others over the customary one year. Similar changes in the *Haftarot* seem to have been contemplated, too.[48] At least one rabbi expressed the hope that the decrease in the length of the weekly portions would be accompanied by an increase in congregational reverence.[49]

Yet with all the changes and innovations which they advocated, the German rabbis were not unaware of the justness of some of the criticism that was being leveled against the Reform. The modification which the rabbis introduced were certainly motivated by ideas and ideals the validity of which they felt they could justify. But to change for the sake of change, or out of opposition to the "old" and adoration of the "new"—which were the motivations of many congregants—was doing the right thing for the wrong reason. "We do not wish to create our own ceremonial cult, a Judaism that longs for good taste [and we do not] want to grind down Judaism's features . . . . [We want to create] a clearly defined Judaism that has its roots in

45 Samuel Adler, *op. cit.*, 780.

46 Bien, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

47 Among the best-known prayer books edited by some of the "pioneer rabbis" are I. M. Wise's *Minhag America* (1859), the *Avodath Israel* of Benjamin Szold and Marcus Jastrow (1863), Leo Merzbacher's *Seder Tefillah* (1855) which was subsequently revised and reedited several times by Samuel Adler, and Einhorn's *Olat Tamid* (1856); Adolph Huebsch, too, published his own prayer book: *Seder Tefillah* (for Sabbath, festivals, and weekdays, 1872, 1857, 1883). " . . . the favorite prayer books divided the country geographically more than doctrinally;" Philipson and Grossman, *Selected Writings of Isaac Mayer Wise with a Biography by the Editors* (Cincinnati, 1900), pp. 63-64.

48 Liebman Adler, "Schemini Azereth Predigt," *Jew. Ti.*, VII, (1875), 652.

49 *Ibid.*

Sinai and that desires to bear new fruit on the gigantic height of four thousand years of history."[50]

The whole problem was summed up by Moses Mielziner. "You have made 'the new' and 'the better' the basis of your struggle. You say, 'We want improvements warranted by time, enhancement and embellishment of the beauty of our service, so that we can gain the satisfaction which the old could not give us.' Oh love the truth! Do you really desire the 'new' because it is better and up to date? Or is it not a craving for the new which feeds on innovation and change, a craving for the new merely because it is new? Or maybe you are motivated by a desire to imitate others because they have something that you don't have? Do you really desire a Temple service for your own spiritual growth? Or will the new, too, leave you cold and indifferent as soon as the novelty of its newness has worn off?"[51]

It is possible that this state of affairs implied by Mielziner was at least partially due to the fact that the men who were leading the Reform lacked a program of innovation for their congregants to follow. Most of the German rabbis talked much about the tarnish, dust, and mud of ancient, meaningless ceremony which was obstructing the real beauty of Judaism. But not once in the available sermons do we find any of the more radical men telling his listeners how they were to go about removing this "useless dust," or even how they were not to go about it.

The closest we come to what may be termed a practical approach to Reform may be found in some of the sermons of the two moderates, Szold and Mielziner. They recognized that history and constant usage had imbued the traditional ritual with a touch of the holy, and that therefore one could not just change the service according to one's whim or fancy.[52] Yet, while on the one hand the Jew should obey the laws of the Torah, on the other he should not hesi-

[50] *Einh.*, p. 39.

[51] Moses Mielziner, *Gemeinde und Gottesdienst: Zwei Predigten*, (New York, 1866), p. 15.

[52] *Ibid.*

tate to follow those new ways which time had revealed to his spirit.[53] Thus, by keeping ourselves open to the old as well as to the new, our prayers and our services would contain only that which is consistent with truth and which "answers to the real wishes and needs of our hearts."[54] And the right way to achieve this end would be "through a gradual, thoughtful improvement of the service."[55]

Although several attempts were made to find a common basis for the reform of the ritual,[56] not until the founding of the Central Conference of American Rabbis in 1885 were the first concrete steps in that direction taken. Until that time the character of the Reform Temple service remained largely in the hands of the individual rabbi.

V

The Sermon

Since "as Judaism, Judaism [appeared] only within the Temple, within the Synagogue," [1] it was natural that the sermon, as an integral part of the synagogue service, should take on special importance. In fact, the sermon seemed to have become part of the essence of Judaism, and its role corresponded in many ways to the role of the Synagogue itself. The Temple was considered the bridge between the past and the future;[2] and, similarly, it became the "duty" of the sermon "to lift the pearls of thought out of the deep shaft of the past, thus permitting the congregation to behold the immeasurable biblical, talmudic, and midrashic

53 Szold, *op. cit.*, p. 8-9.

54 Moses Mielziner, *Zeugnisse und Hoffnungen: Predigt gehalten zur Wiedereröffnungs-Feier des renovierten Gotteshauses der Gemeinde Anshi Chesed, am* 22 *Mai* 1868, (New York, 1872), p. 10.

55 Moses Mielziner, *Gemeinde und Gottesdienst: Zwei Predigten,* (New York. 1866), p. 16.

56 Cleveland, 1855, Philadelphia 1869, Cincinnati 1871. See Philipson, *Reform Movement in Judaism,* p. 355 ff.

Notes on Chapter 5

1 Samuel Hirsch, *Predigt gehalten am Sh'mini Atzeret,* (Philadelphia, 1867), p. 16.

2 Samuel Adler, "Predigt zur Tempelweihe der Geneinde Knesseth Israel in Philadelphia, 24. September 1864," *Jew. Ti.,* II, (1864), 780.

treasure of ideas, and revealing the proud spiritual tower that Israel continued to build even with wounded limbs . . . toward the recognition of its world-embracing mission."[3] Inasmuch as the synagogue service was looked upon as the center of contemporary Jewish life,[4] it was the "preacher's duty . . . to throw light upon God's revelation in our time."[5]

As most of the Reform rabbis combined within themselves a knowledge of tradition and biblical and talmudic lore with an admiration for the spirit of modern enlightenment, they understood how to use an old homily or story to illustrate a point which appealed to their enlightened listeners. We find, therefore, that even the most radical arguments in favor of Reform or against Orthodoxy were couched in the language and symbolism of tradition. "This was a new feature in the homiletic literature, especially in the East, where there still were men who appreciated the sagacious interpretation of a Midrash or an ingenious application of a rabbinical maxim or story, framed in a rationalistic discourse of reformatory character, or applied philosophically."[6]

The majority of sermons followed the midrashic tradition of discussing and expounding a given biblical passage, generally taken from the week's Torah reading.[7] Just as

[3] Einh., p. 53.

[4] Salomon Deutsch, *Zwei Predigten gehalten am Sühnefeste und Hüttenfeste, September* 15 & 20, 1869, (Baltimore, 1869), p. 13.

[5] Kaufmann Kohler, "Der Communismus und seine Irrlehre," *Jew. Ti.*, III, (1871), 266.

[6] Isaac M. Wise in his introduction to *Sermons by American Rabbis*, (Chicago, 896), p. xiv. See Samuel Adler's use of the Joseph story to illustrate how, like the youngest and most beloved son Benjamin, Reform Judaism too, was the youngest and the most beloved child of the Old Father—God. Samuel Adler, Predigt *über das erste Buch Moses* 44:20, *gehalten in der Synagoge der Gemeinde Ansche Chesed*, (New York, 1860), p. 36. Cf. also Einhorn's use of the symbol of Amalek as reprsenting materialism which must always be opposed. David Einhorn, *Predigt zum Besten der Sanitary Fair, gehalten im Tempel der Gemeinde Knesseth Israel, am* 19. *März* 1864, (Philadelphia, 1864). A further example can be found in Kaufmann Kohler's use of Esau and Jacob to represent atheism and Orthodoxy respectively. Kaufmann Kohler, "Isaak und seine beiden Kinder," *Jew. Ti.*, VII, (1875), 603.

[7] Einhorn invariably used biblical quotations as his cues. This led to some very striking effects. Speaking on the completion of the trans-Atlantic cable, for instance, he used Exodous 3:2: "And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame (Einhorn uses "spark")." And, again, in a centennial sermon delivered in 1876, he compared the America of his day with that of

Torah was looked upon as teaching (*Lehre*),[8] so the sermon, based upon Torah, was regarded as an instrument of teaching (*Belehrung*) and revelation. "Essentially, the aim of the sermon was to bring the teachings [*Lehren*] up out of the dark depths of Jewish antiquity, and to immerse them in the profound spirit of Mosaic symbolism."[9] This "symbolism" and the "old biblical material" were made into an "attractive cloak" which was to give the sermon greater appeal. Underneath the "cloak," however, lay a valuable "core" which the preacher had to expose and reveal to his listeners.[10] Since the people were thirsting and longing for instruction, [11] it was the preacher's duty "to explain the wondrous writings of God" in terms applicable to and meaningful for the times.[12] The core of the sermon, then, was always to be timely, bearing upon one of the burning religious issues of the day.[13]

Of course, not every rabbi was able to live up to these homiletic standards. In general they were the aims toward which David Einhorn directed himself; and Einhorn was also the most constant critic of his colleagues. Too often, he complained, a sermon consisted "of a bouquet of flowers rather than thirst quenching waters." Too often they blinded the eyes with the "sparkling foam" of "artful oratory" instead of opening them to new truths,[14] awakening the heart and the spirit "for the glorious mission of Israel."[15]

Structurally speaking, the German sermon seems to have been under the influence of the popular dialectic. The strict three-part structure appears to have been particularly prevalent. A sermon constructed after this pattern began

1776 by calling upon Isaiah 1:21: "How is the faithful city become a harlot." *Einh.*, pp. 166, 176.

8 Samuel Hirsch, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

9 David Einhorn, "Was tut uns noth," *Sinai*, II, (1857), 670.

10 Liebman Adler, *Betrachtungen dem Texte der Fünf Bücher Mosches folgend, in* 182 *Vorträgen zur Belehrung und Erbauung*, (Cincinnati and Chicago, 1890), pp. 28-30.

11 *Einh.*, p. 53.

12 Kaufmann Kohler, "Der Communismus und seine Irrlehre," *Jew. Ti.*, III, (1871), 266.

13 *Einh.*, p. 53.

14 *Einh., ibid.*, and p. 65.

15 David Einhorn, "Was tut uns noth," *Sinai*, II, (1857), 670.

with a general exposition of the main theme. In the course of the exposition the three parts were usually stated together in the order in which they were to be taken up individually in the frequently lengthy body of the sermon itself. As a rule, the parts were related and were treated in the order of ascending importance. "The state, the family, and God,"[16] "truth, justice, and peace,"[17] "belief, trust, and truth,"[18] are examples of this pattern dealing with more abstract themes. A different and more analytical approach to the same structure is illustrated by the following: "We dedicate a house of God; we dedicate an Israelitish house of God; we dedicate an American, Israelitish house of God."[19] Or: "What may we call our spiritual and moral property? How much have we gained, either through our own efforts or through changing times? And what have we lost through our own fault?"[20]

Though the three-part pattern was frequently employed, we also find many deviations from it. Henry Hochheimer, for instance, was particularly fond of a simpler two-part construction,[21] while it was not uncommon for a preacher to seize upon a series of two or more biblical passages so as to relate and discuss them in order.[22] Sometimes the parts of a religious symbol or religious act were given special meaning. Thus Kaufmann Kohler recognized in the four cups of wine which are traditional on the Seder night four corresponding cups of redemption drunk by Abraham, Israel, Moses Mendelssohn, and all humanity.[23]

[16] J. S. Goldammer, "Die drei Gemeinden des Lebens," *Deb.*, XV, 37, (1870), 2.

[17] *Rev. Dr. Adolph Huebsch: Late Rabbi of Ahawath Chesed Congregation, New York: A Memorial*, (New York, 1885), p. 66.

[18] Isaac S. Moses, *Zwei Reden, gehalten am Neujahrs-und Versöhnungstage im Tempel der Gemeinde Emanuel, Milwaukee*, (Milwaukee, Wisc., 1879).

[19] *Rev. Dr. Adolph Huebsch, op. cit.*, p. 88.

[20] Isaac S. Moses, *op. cit.*

[21] Henry Hochheimer, *Zwölf Tischreden, an zwölf Festabenden der Israelitischen Wohltätigkeits-Gesellschaft*, (Baltimore, 1874).

[22] See, for instance, Samuel Hirsch, *op. cit.*: "The law which Moses comands us is an inheritance of the Congregation of Jacob; so that all the peoples of the world may know that the Lord is God, and there is none else; then let your heart be perfect with the Lord."

[23] Kaufmann Kohler, "Die vier Erlösungskelche," *Jew. Ti.*, III (1871), 90.

Similarly, Mielziner turned the myrtle and willow into young and old congregants, the *Lulav* into a Board of Trustees, and the Esrog into a rabbi.[24]

The one thing common to sermons constructed according to the various patterns outlined above is their internal orderliness. This had at least one considerable drawback. While it lent itself to high-toned and often philosophic treatment of a topic, it curtailed somewhat the imagination of the speaker, who found himself bound by strict limits of homiletic development. Among the early rabbis only David Einhorn was generally successful in avoiding the rigid patterns employed by most of his contemporaries, an achievement which, no doubt, contributed to his power as a preacher.

We have had occasion to note that most of our rabbis strove to avoid controversy in the pulpit. This seems to have been in line with the ideal of making the synagogue the heart and center of Judaism, and of having the sermon of a spiritually enlightening nature. These attitudes are clearly reflected in the sermons themselves. Outside of Einhorn, who introduced the polemic into the American Jewish pulpit, and Kohler, who preached more scholarly and problem sermons, most of the rabbis took a very moralistic approach to their work. They considered their words "mirrors" in which everyone could see a more or less accurate image of himself,[25] and they appealed to their audiences' "open and ready hearts" to accept the message which they brought.[26]

VI

Conclusion

There is no doubt that the Reform movement in America received its initial impetus through the efforts of the

[24] Moses Mielziner, *Gemeinde und Gottesdient, Zwei Predigten.* (New York, 1866).

[25] Salomon Deutsch, *Antritts-Predigt, gehalten im Har Sinai Tempel zu Baltimore am 27. Dec.* 1862, (Baltimore, 1863), p. 14.

[26] Moses Mielziner, *Wie und was soll gepredigt, und wie die Predigt gehört werden ? Zwei Predigten,* (New York, 1872), pp. 11-12.

"pioneer rabbis." Being products of German Enlightenment, they were also men of great religious enthusiasm and high ideals, who carried their message to the Jewish community in elevated and lofty tones. They advocated a pure, spiritual Judaism in place of the prevailing Orthodoxy which, to their minds, was all form without spirit, materialistic instead of universalistic. The Reform rabbis saw Judaism as "an outward means toward the realization of a universal religion"[1] and they therefore repudiated anything that might stand between Judaism and the world. They steered clear of all exclusiveness, couching their prayers and their sermons in an all embracing universalism. This meant specifically that Jewish customs and practices had to be de-emphasized. The good Jew did not have to observe the old and empty rituals and ceremonies of the orthodox, nor did he have to recite the traditional prayers. The good Jew was the good individual, the individual who could be considered righteous anywhere in the world. Thus it became the purpose of the early reformers to elevate the spirit of Judaism by emphasizing more and more the universal element in Judaism.

To this end the rabbis had to make a clear distinction between the form and spirit of Judaism. The one may be called Judaism under the influence of man's cultural development and therefore changeable in adjustment to prevailing social needs and conditions. The other was Judaism as the representative of all universal verities and therefore unchangeable and eternal. The spirit of Judaism being lofty and idealistic, its form had to be of such a nature as not to detract from the idealism and its spiritual content. Orthodoxy, the "pioneer rabbis" felt, had buried the Jewish spirit beneath an ugly crust of outmoded usages. Reform Judaism was going to scrape off those ancient usages, which had lost all their meaning to an enlightened age, and reveal the Jewish spirit to the whole world in a form befitting its loftiness. The body that housed this ideally conceived spirit of Judaism was not Israel, nor so much the individual Jew,

[1] Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, (New York, 1952) I, p. 26.

as it was the Temple with its divine worship, which alone was capable of giving adequate expression to the Jewish spirit.

This attitude effected a radical change in the scale of Jewish values. If Judaism was to be found in its purest form only within the framework of the Temple or Synagogue service, then the service itself had to live up to the loftiness of the Jewish spirit. And so, almost inevitably, we find parallel to the development of Reform in Europe, a new emphasis on decorum and demeanor in the synagogue. The outward appearance and form of Judaism rose to previously unheard of importance. The beauty of the service, as it appealed to the congregants' eyes and ears, was to help and enhance the appeal of ethical Judaism to the heart and the spirit of the Jewish worshipper.[2] In the view of the early Reform rabbis the appeal of Judaism seems to have been, to a marked degree, an aesthetic appeal.

As we might expect, the sermons of the German preaching rabbis clearly mirror these developments of Reform Judaism in the United States. The form of the sermons seems to have been very important, and their content was predominantly "spiritual"—that is, moralistic. Few and far between were the men who ventured to speak on controversial subjects. The authority of the rabbi, as the authority of Judaism itself, seems to have been purely moral. This emphasis on the moral authority of Judaism must have appealed to many congregants. The distinction between the amoral Jewish law (*Gesetz*) and the moral Jewish Teaching (*Lehre*)—paralleling the distinction that was drawn between the form and spirit of Judaism—the changeability of the one and the immutability of the other, and the superiority of the latter over the former, must have been welcomed by the many people who found the practical demands of orthodox Judaism not only unintelligible, but likewise too difficult to live up to in an age when compe-

[2] In the practical application of this ideal it would seem impossible to deny the influence of the worship service as conducted in the Protestant churches of the day upon the Reform service. See also, Liebman Adler, *Betrachtungen dem Texte der Fünf Bücher Moscbes folgend, in* 182 *Vorträgen zur Belehrung und Erbauung,* (Cincinnati and Chicago, 1890), p. 456.

tition in every field of endeavor demanded everyone's attention for at least six days a week. Reform Judaism offered the American Jew the opportunity to be Jewish, without having his Judaism interfere with the just demands of the times.

However, this did not mean that the Reform rabbis catered to the practical needs of the people. Reform had based its claims for change upon the authority of the present, upon the authority of God who reveals His truths to every generation in a context it can understand. And the context of the time demanded, in the eyes of the rabbis, certain changes that would bring Judaism back to life in the America of the mid-eighteen hundreds. America was in a state of social, economic, as well as political flux, and so Reform Judaism, too, had to show flexibility if it was to stay alive in a changing environment. That some modifications should work for the convenience of people, and that some people were attracted to Reform Judaism because of these conveniences, was inevitable. But it was never the conscious aim of the reformer to build a Judaism of convenience.

This development of early Reform Judaism at the time under discussion could not have taken place anywhere but in the United States. Germany, like Europe in general, as history has borne out, was both by temperament and political climate completely unsuited for such a free growth and development of religious thought. America, the home of the pioneers—with its strict separation of Church and State and its insistence on individual free choice—was the ideal soil for Reform. The conservative "orthodox opposition" in America could not induce an equally conservative government to restrict the activities of Reform Judaism. Conservatism in general was frowned upon in the United States, and new ideas and inventions were greatly in demand. Furthermore, the same religious reaction that brought the "pioneer rabbis" to America kept the moderate and orthodox Jewish leaders in Europe, with the result that the Reform rabbis had a free hand in building their own movement away from any organized religious or governmental interference.

An examination of the sermons, statements, and atti-

tudes of the German preaching rabbis who came to the United States between 1840 and 1879 has led me to the conclusion that the development of Reform Judaism as it is recorded in history is predominantly, if not wholly, an American development, forming a logical part of the growth and history of this country. Though the early Reform rabbis were German, and preached in German to Germanspeaking and Germaneducated congregatons, it was the fact that they were living at *that* time in America that made the growth and initial success of Reform Judaism possible.

Bibliography of Sermons and Biographies*

A. German Sermons

Adler, Liebman

"Zwei Reden, gehalten vor der Gemeinde K.A.M., Chicago, Ill., am 19. April 1865, und am 1. Juni 1865." *Lincoln,* pp. 141-144, 145-150.

"Abraham Geiger," *Jew. Ti.,* VI, (1874), 670.

"Schemini Azereth Predigt," *Jew. Ti.,* VII (1875), 652.

Fünf Reden, gehalten in der Israelitischen Gemeinde K.A.M., an wichtigen nationalen Gedenktagen der Ver. Staaten, Chicago, 1866.

Betrachtungen dem Text der Fünf Bücher Mosches folgend, in 182 *Vorträgen zur Belehrung und Erbauung,* published under the title *Z'enah ure-nah;* two vols., Chicago and Cincinnati 1890.

Siebenundfünfzig Vorträge über Texte den nachmosaischen biblischen Büchern entnommen. Dritter Band des unter dem Namen Z'enah urenah erschienenen Belehrungs- und Erbauungsbuches von Liebman Adler, Vienna, 1891.

Adler, Samuel

"Predigt-Skizze, aus einem Vortrag gehalten am 2. Mai 1857," *Sinai,* II, (1857), 555.

"Predigt-Skizze über das zweite Buch Moses 6:2-8," *Sinai,* III, (1858), 1096.

Predigt über das erste Buch Moses 44:20, *gehalten in der Synagoge der Gemeinde Ansche Chesed, am 5ten Tebeth* (31. December 1859), New York, 1860.

"Einweihung der neuen Synagoge der Gemeinde Bene Schalom in Chicago, am 23, Sept.," *Deb.,* X (1864), 57.

"Predigt zur Tempelweihe der Gemeinde Knesseth Israel in Philadelphia, 24. September 1864," *Jew. Ti.,* II, (1864), 762.

* For abbreviations used see *supra,* Chapter I, note 1.

Worte gesprochen beim Begräbnisse der Frau Betty Brühl (geb. Bass) am 6. April 1874, New York, 1874.

"Abraham Geiger," *Jew. Ti.*, VI, (1874), 668.

Bien, Herman Milton

"Jom teruah yiyeh lachem"—Predigt gehalten am ersten Neujahrstage 5617 in der Gemeinde Emanu-El, und derselben, wie den Freunden des Judenthums hochachtungsvoll gewidmet, San Francisco, 1857.

Bondi, Jonas

"Charakteristik Abraham Lincolns, dargestellt in einer Trauer-Predigt, gehalten am 19. April 1865 in der Synagoge der Gemeinde Poel Zedek, New York, 1865," *Lincoln*, pp. 79-91.

Cohn, Elkan

"Trauerpredigt-am Sabbathe nach Beerdigung des sel. Rev. Dr. Merzbacher," *Sinai*, I (1856), 420.

Deutsch, Salomon

"Predigt," *Sinai*, II, (1858), 779.

"Predigt gehalten im Tempel der har Sinai Gemeinde," *Sinai*, III, (1859), 872.

Gottesdienstlicher Vortrag, gehalten am ersten Tage des Neujahrsfestes 5620, und auf Verlangen veröffentlicht, Phildelphia, 1858.

Antritts-Predigt, gehalten im Har Sinai Tempel zu Baltimore am 27. Dezember 1862, Baltimore, 1863.

Zwei Predigten gehalten Sühnfeste und am Hüttenfeste, 5630 (September 15 & 20, 1869), im Tempel der Har Sinai Gemeinde zu Baltimore, Baltimore, 1869.

"Auszug aus Dr. Deutsch's Rede bei der Einweihung des jüd. Spitals zu Baltimore," *Deb.*, XVI, 15, (1870), 2.

Einhorn, David

Dr. David Einhorn's Ausgewählte Predigten und Reden, herausgegeben von Dr. K. Kohler, New York, 1880.

David Einhorn Memorial Volume, New York, 1911. [Content same as of the preceding volume.]

Predigt, am 19ten März 1864, *als am Sabbath P. Sachor, im Tempel der Knesseth Israel Gemeinde dahier, zum Besten der Sanitary Fair,* Philadelphia, 1864.

"Zur Abwehr—Predigt," *Jew. Ti.*, III, (1871), 154.

Zwei Predigten: Abschiedspredigt gehalten im Tempel Adath Yeshurun am 28. Februar 1874, New York, 1874.

[Einhorn's journal *Sinai* contains many of his sermons.]

Felsenthal, Bernhard

"Predigt gehalten im Tempel der Har Sinai Gemeinde zu Baltimore, am 2. Juni 1860," *Sinai*, V, (1860), 174.

Schofarklänge—Vortrag gehalten am Rosch Haschanah 5621 (17. Sept. 1860), *in Kehillath Ansche Maarab in Chicago,* Chicago, 1860.

"Die Ermordung des Präsidenten, Rede, gehalten im Tempel der

Zionsgemeinde, am 19. April 1865," *Lincoln,* pp. 100-105.

Zwei Reden gehalten am Vorabend und am Morgen des Neujahrsfests 5626, (30. Sept. und 1. Okt. 1864), im Tempel der Zionsgemeinde zu Chicago, Chicago, 1864.

"Unter welchen Bedingungen sind die Pforten unserer Gotteshäuser die Pforten der Gerechtigkeit ? Predigt zur Einweihung des Tempels der Sinai Gemeinde, Chicago, 1876," *Jew. Ti.,* VIII, (1876), 171.

Goldammer, J. S.

"Über das Formwesen im jüdischen Gottesdienst," *Deb.,* XV, 30, (1870), 3.

"Vergangenheit und Zukunft," *Deb.,* XV, 31, (1870), 2.

"Die drei Gemeinden des Lebens," *Deb.,* XV, 37, (1870), 2.

Gottheil, Gustav

Die Bedingungen eines erfolgreichen Kampfes. Predigt gehalten im Tempel Emanuel, New York am Sabbath 11. Tebet 5635 (19. Dezember 1874) von Gustav Gottheil, Dr. Ph., Rabbiner der Gemeinde, Berlin, 1875.

Gutheim, James K.

Rede gehalten bei der Grundsteinlegung der Synagoge der Gemeinde "B'nai Yeshurun," Cincinnati, Ohio, am 24. Tischry 5607 der Erschaffung der Welt, den 14. Oktober 1846, Cincinnati, 1846.

Sermon at the Cornerstone laying of the Baltimore Asylum for Israelites, Baltimore, 1866. [Printed in German and in English.]

Hahn, Aaron

Predigt gehalten im Gotteshause der Gemeinde Rodef Schalom am Schabbath Reeh, New York, 1869.

Predigt, New York, 1869. [Title page missing in copy used.]

"Gottes Ruf und der Menschen Antwort," *Deb.,* XVI, 11, (1870), 2.

"Die Propheten," *Jew. Ti.,* III, (1871), 505.

"Das Neue Haus," *Jew. Ti.,* VI, (1874), 428.

Hirsch, Samuel

Gedächtnis-Rede auf den verewigten Dr. Moritz Mayer, Philadelphia, 1867.

"Die Lehre, die uns Mosche anbefohlen, ist Erbbesitz der Gemeinde Jakobs," Predigt gehalten am Sh'mini Atzeret, 5628, Philadelphia, 1867.

Rev. Dr. David Einhorn—Gedächtnis-Rede, gehalten vor seinem Sarge in der Synagoge der Beth-El Gemeinde, New York, den 6ten November, 1879, Philadelphia, 1879.

Hochheimer, Henry

Zwölf Tischreden, an zwölf Festabenden der Israelitischen Wohltätigkeits-Gesellschaft zu Baltimore, Baltimore, 1874.

Zwei Reden von Henry Hochheimer, Rabbiner der Oheb-Israel Gemeinde zu Baltimore, Baltimore, 1861.

Rede am 30. April 1863 als an dem von dem Präsidenten der Vereinigten Staaten angeordneten Buss- und Bettage, abgehalten im Gotteshause der Oheb-Israel Gemeinde zu Baltimore, Baltimore, 1863.

Predigt, gehalten am 19. April 1865, als am Tage des Leichenbe-

gängnisses des Präsidenten der Ver. Staaten Abraham Lincoln, Baltimore, 1865.

Fest- und Fasttags-Predigt zum Gedächtnisse des ermordeten Präsidenten Abraham Lincoln, am 1,. *Juni* 1865, *Baltimore,* 1865.

Israel, der wandernde Prophet, Predigt gehalten am 4. *und* 18. *November* 1865, Baltimore, 1865.

"Aus einer Lech L'cho Predigt," *Jew. Ti.,* VII, (1875), 603.

"Worte, gesprochen am Grabe des Herrn Aaron Weglein, am 5. Januar 1866," *Deborah,* January 26, 1866.

Worte, gesprochen an der Bahre des Herrn Jacob Thannhauser, am 11. *November* 1869, Baltimore, 1869.

Rede am Grabe des Herrn L. Goldman in Baltimore, gehalten am 14. *August* 1876, Baltimore, 1876.

Worte am Grabe der Frau Adelheit Kaufmann, gesprochen am 30. *Sept.* 1879, zu Baltimore, Baltimore, 1879.

Worte am Grabe des Herrn Julius Haas von Baltimore, gesprochen am 23. *Oktober* 1879, Baltimore, 1879.

Rede, gehalten bei der 100 *jährigen Inaugurationsfeier Washingtons.* Baltimore, 1889.

Huebsch, Adolph

אורך ואמתך — *Dein Licht und deine Wahrheit: Sieben Predigten,* New York, 1868.

Rev. Dr. Adolph Huebsch, Late Rabbi of the Ahawath Chesed Congregation, New York: A Memorial, New York, 1885. [Contains some of Huebsch's early sermons, pp. 59-105]

Illowy, Bernard

"Schabbath T'shuba Predigt (Synopsis)," *Deb.,* XV, 15, (1869), 2.

Jastrow, Marcus

Predigt gehalten am Danksagungstage, (29. *November* 1866), *zu Philadelphia. Zu Gunsten einer schwerbedrängten achtbaren Familie veröffentlicht,* Philadelphia, 1866.

Kalisch, Isidor

"Predigt gehalten am Schabbath Mischpotim," *Deb.,* XI, (1866), 142.

Kohler, Kaufmann

"Die Eigenschaften des Gottberufenen Führers der Gemeinde Israel," *Jew. Ti.,* I, 28, (1869). 9.

"Die Religion Israels," *Jew. Ti.,* II, (1870), 251.

"Das Frauenherz im Lager Israels," *Jew. Ti.,* II, (1871), 811.

"Die vier Erlösungs-Kelche," *Jew. Ti.,* III, (1871), 90.

"Der Communismus und seine Irrlehre," *Jew. Ti.,* III, (1871), 266.

"Das eherne Schlangenbild," *Jew. Ti.,* III, (1871), 74.

"Antrittsrede—Sinai Gemeinde, Chicago," *Studies and Addresses,* pp. 497-508.

"Der Sabbath und die Schöpfungslehre," *Jew. Ti.,* IV, (1872), 237.

"Die Predigt des 9. Ab," *Jew Ti.,* IV, (1872), 537.

"Wesen und Wirkung des Gebets," *Jew. Ti.,* IV, (1872), 697.

"Glaube ist Licht," *Jew. Ti.*, V, (1873), 589.
"Die drei Worte Hillels," *Jew. Ti.*, V, (1873), 557.
"Das Wahre und das Schöne." *Jew. Ti.*, V. (1873), 605.
"Das neue Wissen und der alte Glaube," *Jew. Ti.*, V, (1874), 797.
"Ist unser Sonntags-Gottesdienst ein Riss im Judenthum ?" *Jew. Ti.*, VI, (1874), 141.
"Himmelsfeuer, *Jew. Ti.*, VI., (1874), 189.
"Der Dreiklang des Posaunenschalls," *Jew., Ti.*, VI, (1874), 492.
"Israel's Losungswort," *Jew. Ti.*, VI, (1874), 507.
"Heilig werdet, denn heilig bin ich, der Ewige euer Gott," *Jew. Ti.*, VI, (1874), 524.
"Dr. Abraham Geiger," *Jew. Ti.*, VI, (1874), 637.
'Das Christenthum," *Jew. Ti.*, VI, (1875), 812.
"Auf der Höhe, da wird Gott geschaut," *Jew. Ti.*, VII, (1875), 572.
"Isaak und seine beiden Kinder," *Jew. Ti.*, VII, (1875), 603.
"Ehrfurcht vor dem Heiligen," *Jew. Ti.*, VIII, (1876), 539.
"Die Prinzipien und Ziele des Reform-Judenthums, New York, 1879," *Studies and Addresses*, pp. 509-521.
Grab- und Gedenkrede für Rabbiner Dr. David Einhorn, gehalten im Tempel Beth-El, New York, von seinem Schwiegersohn und Nachfolger, am 6. und 9. November 1879, Milwaukee, 1879.

Landsberg, M.

"Predigt gehalten am Schemini Azerethfeste in der Synagoge zu Rochester, New York," *Jew. Ti.*, III, (1871), 523.
"Predigt gehalten in der Har Sinai Gemeinde zu Baltimore," *Jew. Ti.*, VI, (1874). 317.

Leucht, Rev. J. L.

"Haus und Schule—Predigt gehalten am Sabbath Chanukah in der Rampart Street Synagoge in New Orleans," *Jew. Ti.*, III, (1871), 773.
"Excerpts from a speech delivered at the dedication of a German-Protestant Church in New Orleans, 1879," *Jew. Ti.*, VIII, (1879), 108.

Mayer, Dr. A. L.

"Predigt gehalten im Tempel House of Israel, Richmond, Va.," *Deb.*, XVI, 48, (1870), 2.

Merzbacher, Leo

Confirmationsrede gehalten von Rev. Dr. L. Merzbacher am Shebuoth 1853 *im alten Tempel Chrystie Street, New York.* [Manuscript, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio].

Mielziner, Moses

Gemeinde und Gottesdienst. Zwei Predigten, New York, 1866.
"Jischmael," Predigt, gehalten am Sabbath Chaje Sara 5628, New York, 1867.
"Werde ein Segen," Gedächtnis-Rede auf Salomon Jehuda Rapoport, New York, 1867.
"Zweck und Ziel der gegenwärtigen Reformbestrebungen im Judenthum," *Jew. Ti.*, I, 39, (1869), 10.

Zeugnisse und Hoffnungen—Predigt gehalten zur Wiedereröffnungs-Feier des renovierten Gotteshauses der Gemeinde Anshi Chesed, am 22. *Mai* 1868, New York, 1872.

Wie und was soll gepredigt, and wie die Predigt gehört werden ? Zwei Predigten, New York, 1872.

"Rede, zur Grundsteinlegung des neuen Tempel Anshe Chesed, New York," *Jew. Ti.,* IV, (1872), 377.

"Der Priestersegen"—Abschiedspredigt gehalten Sabbath Naso, den 7. Juni 5633 bei seinem Scheiden aus dem Amte eines Rabbiners der Gemeinde Anshi Chesed in New York, New York, 1873.

Moses, Isaac S.

Zwei Reden, gehalten am Neujahrs—und Versöhnungstage im Tempel der Gemeinde Emanuel, Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisc., 1879.

Moses, Marx

"Vernunft und Glaube," *Jew. Ti.,* VIII, (1876), 59.

Reimann, Dr.

"Gotteserkenntniss, Predigt zu Voero," *Deb.,* XV, 28, (1869), 2.

Schwab, Isaac

Fünf Kanzelvorträge, gehalten in der Synagoge zu Portland, Oregon, Portland, Oregon, 1866.

"Einweihungsrede gehalten in der Gemeinde Beth Ehohim in Williamsburg," *Jew. Ti.,* VIII, (1876), 443.

Szold, Benjamin

דברי שלום ואמת — *Gottesdienstlicher Vortrag, gehalten beim Antritte seines Rabbiner-und Predigeramtes an der Oheb Scholem Gemeinde, Sonnabend den* 24. *Sept.* 1859, Baltimore, 1859.

"Vaterland und Freiheit—Predigt gehalten vor der Gemeinde Oheb Scholem, Baltimore, Md., am 1. Juni 1865," *Lincoln,* pp. 38-47.

"Auszug aus einer Rede bei der Einweihung des jüdischen Spitals zu Baltimore," *Deb.,* XVI, 15, (1870), 2.

Der judenfeindliche Artikel in der Baltimorer Katholischen Volkszeitung," *Jew. Ti.,* VII, (1876), 780.

Leichenrede zur Beerdigung des S. M. Landsberg, (geb. im Jahre 1810, *gest. zu Baltimore am* 29. *Aw* 5622, 26. *August* 1862), Baltimore, 1862. *Leichenrede zur Beerdigung des J. Behrends, (geboren* 27. *März des Jahres* 1793, *gestorben am* 15. *November,* 1865), Baltimore, 1866. *Leichenrede am Sarge des in der Blüthe seiner Jahre verstorbenen Abraham Winternitz, (geboren am* 7. *Mai des Jahres* 1847, *gestorben am* 14. *Dezember* 1865), Baltimore, 1866.

Waterman, Leopold

"A Chanukah Sermon delivered about 1846," *Historia Judaica,* IV, (1942), 35.

Wise, Isaac Mayer

"Aus meiner Predigt zum Schlusse des Versöhnungstages," *Deb.,* IX, (1863), 50.

"Das Judenthum ist unsterblich, Predigt zur Einweihung des neuen Gotteshauses der Gemeinde Ahawath Chesed, New York," *Deb.,* IX, (1863), 194.

Wolff, M. A. A.
Rede beim Buss-und Dank-Feste der Vereinigten Staaten, New York, 1865.

MISCELLANEOUS COLLECTIONS OF SERMONS

Miscellaneous Collection—Charleston, [New York Public Library].
Sermons, American, [Two volumes of sermons in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.]
Sermons by American Rabbis, Chicago, 1896.
Hertz, J. H.
Abraham Lincoln—The Tribute of the Synagogue, New York, 1927.
Kohler, Kaufmann
Studies, Addresses, and Personal Papers, New York, 1931.

JEWISH PERIODICALS CONTAINING SERMONS

Die Deborah, Vols. I-XXXIII (1855-1878).
The Jewish Times, Vols. I-XI (1869-1879).
Sinai, Vols. I—VII (1856-1862).

B. BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES

LIEBMAN ADLER

Felsenthal, Bernhard
"Liebman Adler—Eine Gedenkrede, gehalten am 14 Februar 1892 im Tempel der K.A.M. in Chicago," (Sonderdruck aus *The Reform-Advocate* vom 5. März 1892).
Hirsch, Emil G.
A Tribute to the Memory of Liebman Adler, Chicago, 1892.

SAMUEL ADLER

Mayer L.
"Eulogy on the late Dr. Samuel Adler," *Yearbook of the C.C.A.R.,* II, (1892), 27-32.
Silverman, Joseph
"Samuel Adler—Tribute Prounounced at the Celebration of *the Centenary of his Birth," Yearbook of the C.C.A.R.,* XIX, (1909), 415-423.

DAVID EINHORN

Hirsch, Samuel
Rev. Dr. David Einhorn—Gedächtnis-Rede, gehalten vor seinem Sarge in der Synagoge der Beth-El Gemeinde, New York, den 6ten November 1879, Philadelphia, 1879.

BERNHARD FELSENTHAL

Felsenthal, Emma
Bernhard Felsenthal: Teacher in Israel: Selections from his Writings with a Biographical Sketch and a Bibliography by his Daughter, New York, 1924.
Felsenthal, Bernhard
The Felsenthal Letters, a Collection of Letters Written by and

to Bernhard Felsenthal [Archives of the American Jewish Historical Society, New York].

GUSTAV GOTTHEIL

Gottheil, Richard

The Life of Gustav Gottheil—Memoir of a Priest in Israel, Williamsport, Pa., 1936.

JAMES K. GUTHEIM

Heller, Max

"James K. Gutheim," *Yearbook of the C.C.A.R.,* XXVII, (1917), 365-367.

SAMUEL HIRSCH

Lefkovitz, Maurice

"Samuel Hirsch," *Yearbook of the C.C.A.R., XXV,* (1915), 174-190.

ADOLPH HUEBSCH

Rev. Dr. Adolph Huebsch—Late Rabbi of the Ahawath Chesed Congregation, New York: A Memorial, New York, 1885.

BERNARD ILLOWY

Illowy, Henry

Sefer Milchamot Elohim—The Writings of Bernard Illowy with Biography and Historical Sketch by His Son, Berlin, 1914.

KAUFMANN KOHLER

Kohler, Kauffman

Personal Reminiscences of My Early Life, Cincinnati, 1918.

MAX LILIENTHAL

Philipson, David

"Max Lilienthal," *Yearbook of the C.C.A.R.,* XXV, (1915), 191-220; *In Memoriam—A Tribute to the Memory of Rev. Dr. Max Lilienthal on the 10th Anniversary of his Death,* Cincinnati, 1892.

MOSES MIELZINER

Mielziner, Ella McF.

Moses Mielziner—A Biography with a Bibliography of His Writings, New York, 1931.

BENJAMIN SZOLD

Rosenau, William

In Honor of the Seventieth Birthday of the Rev. Dr. Benjamin Szold: A Life, Baltimore, 1899.

Benjamin Szold: Originally Written by William Rosenau and Revised by Him for the 100th Anniversary of the Birth of Benjamin Szold, Baltimore, 1929.

ISAAC MAYER WISE

Wise, Isaac Mayer

Reminiscences, Cincinnati, 1901.

Philipson, David & Grossman, Louis

Selected Writings of Isaac Mayer Wise with a Biography by the Editors, Cincinnati, 1900.

JACOB NEWTON CARDOZO, AMERICAN ECONOMIST

By Alexander Brody
New York City

The Charleston Publicist

JACOB NEWTON CARDOZO, like his English contemporaries, David Ricardo and Nassau W. Senior, was a descendant of a Sephardic family of merchants.[1] His father, David Nunez Cardozo, born in New York, was the son of Aaron Cardozo, a merchant of London, who came to New York in 1752. While still a young man, David Nunez and his brother Isaac migrated to South Carolina where they enlisted with the American forces during the Revolutionary War.[2] As a volunteer, David Nunez led the "Forlorn Hope" in a futile attack against the British lines in Savannah. Taken prisoner when Charleston surrendered to the British in 1780, he was later released. Before the end of the war he settled in Savannah, Georgia, where his son Jacob Nunez (Jacob Newton as he later called himself) was born in the year 1786.[3] The family later moved to

[1] Standard biographies confuse the identity of Cardozo; see J. R. Turner, *The Ricardian Theory in Early American Economics* (New York, 1921), p. 75. The same character is frequently described under the name of Isaac N. Cardozo. J. F. Normano refers to Cardozo as "a mysterious figure in the history of American economics, even the first name of whom can not be ascertained." *Spirit of American Economics* (New York, 1943), p. 27. E. Teillhac confuses Cardozo with George Tucker of the University of Virginia, and the English translation creates two characters, Jacob Newton and J. N. Cardozo; *Pioneers of American Economic Thought* (New York, 1936), p. 55. J. M. Ferguson, in his *Landmarks in Economic Thought* (New York, 1950), p. 233, speaks of a Jacob Newton, N. N. Cardozo. J. F. Bell, in his *A History of Economic Thought* (New York, 1953), p. 40, misspells Cardoza for Cardozo.

[2] Benjamin Nathan Cardozo, eminent jurist and Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was the great-grandson of Isaac Nunez and Sarah (Hart) Cardozo.

[3] Charles Reznikoff and Uriah Z. Engelman, *The Jews of Charleston* (Philadelphia, 1950), pp. 42-43, 84-86.

Charleston, South Carolina, and young Cardozo grew up in one of the leading commercial cities in the South.

Cardozo, like Ricardo, was self-taught. His formal schooling ended at the age of twelve, after which he served a long apprenticeship in a mechanical trade and then became a lumber clerk. But he showed an early interest in the literary field, and he trained himself by reading extensively in problems of commerce and finance. As a youth he was admitted to the Philomathean Society, having been introduced by Isaac Harby, well-known Charleston journalist and novelist.[4] Membership in Charleston debating societies was composed of the leading figures of South Carolina. In 1811, when Cardozo was twenty-five, his "Oration on the Literary Character," delivered before the Methulogic Society, was published. His journalistic career began when, in 1816, at the age of thirty, he succeeded Isaac Harby[5] as editor of the *Southern Patriot*, a well-known Charleston daily newspaper. In 1823 Cardozo bought the paper and retained sole proprietorship until 1845.

There is little information available on Cardozo's Jewish affiliations. He was a member of Temple Beth-Elohim in Charleston and participated in some of its activities. He was a signatory to an unsuccessful petition by twenty-five members "contemplating an entrance to the [rebuilt] Synagogue from the South and some further ornament on that side." In the controversy between orthodox and Reform groups, Cardozo joined the former. On the basis of resolutions offered by him, a meeting of a majority of the Board was called without the authorization of the President, and at this meeting the applicants of the orthodox group were readmitted to membership in Beth-Elohim. This meeting and Cardozo's resolutions, however, were declared invalid by the Supreme Court of South Carolina in 1846.[6]

On two occasions, Cardozo's journal was used as the medium of public communication on matters affecting the

[4] J. N. Cardozo, *Reminiscences of Charleston* (Charleston, 1866), p. 13.
[5] He was also a leader, if not the leader, of reform Judaism in Charleston.
[6] Reznikoff and Engelman, *op. cit.*, pp. 295, 300.

Jewish community. On one, the Jews of Charleston sought to persuade Governor Hammond to issue a Thanksgiving Day Proclamation (1844) in non-sectarian form, so that Jews, too, could properly participate. The *Southern Patriot* brought the subject before the Executive by stating through its columns that the exclusion of the Israelites had given just cause for offense to many citizens of that persuasion. Governor Hammond acknowledged the protest in the *Southern Patriot* but did nothing to alter the terms of his Proclamation.[7] In the second case, a communication signed by "Eighty-Four Israelites" and appearing in the *Southern Patriot* for October 1, 1832, "disallowed and disclaimed" an impression which had been created that the Israelites of Charleston "are desirous of being represented as a religious sect" in the state legislature or that they have expressed a desire or intention to nominate any individual by virtue of his belonging to any particular sect.[8]

Under Cardozo's editorship, the *Southern Patriot* became a free-trade organ, his exposition of the principles of free trade following in the tradition of Smith, Ricardo, and Say. When Daniel Raymond published his protectionist treatise, sharp criticism came from Cardozo. He declared that Raymond's book was a defiance of the authority of Smith, Malthus, and Say, "men not only gifted for scientific inquiry but the results of those patient and profound meditations are embodied in works on which time has set the seal of immortality."[9] On the other hand, Cardoza gave much praise to McVickar who, in his *Outlines of Political Economy*,[10] devoted a long footnote to the defense of the free trade tradition.

In one instance, however, Cardozo used the *Southern*

[7] Morris U. Schappes, *Documentary History of the Jews in the United States*, 1654-1875 (New York, 1952), p. 248.

[8] On Cardozo's place of burial and his descendants see Reznikoff and Engelman, *op. cit.*, pp. 84, 101; and at the end of the following chapter of this essay.

[9] J. Dorfman, *Economic Mind in American Civilization*, II (New York, 1946), 572.

[10] (New York, 1825).

Patriot to bolster commercial restrictions.[11] He supported the retaliatory stand of Congress in 1818 and 1822 against the English ban on American trade with the British West Indies. But when Charleston merchants, affected by the stoppage of trade, decided to lead the southern ports in a memorial to Congress, Cardozo threw his editorial weight against such a move. He believed that commerce with the British West Indies would be more rapidly restored if the United States strongly indicated to Great Britain her displeasure with the particular Orders of Council. The merchants of Charleston, convinced of the merit of his point of view, did nothing to interfere with the nation's foreign policy. Later the government in Washington informed Cardozo and the leading citizens of Charleston that their support had helped the effectiveness of the American policy.[12]

Cardozo's journal was in difficulty for some time because of his position with respect to "nullification" on the tariff issue. Although he denounced the protectionists and called the tariff of 1828 iniquitous, he opposed the nullifiers and gave his support to Legare's "Unionist" branch of the Democratic Party. He was accused of deserting his principles by refusing to unite with such fiery exponents of nullification as McDuffie of South Carolina.[13] In retaliation, the ardent nullificationists, the State Rights and Free Trade Party, started an evening newspaper to compete with the *Southern Patriot.*

But the rival paper that sprang up did not last long. With the aid of Senator Robert Y. Hayne, one of the principals in the Webster-Hayne debate, Cardozo obtained relief legislation on a debt he owed to the Government. It seems that he had purchased the *Southern Patriot* in 1823 for $10,000, the sum for which the Government had a lien on the paper. He had paid this high price on the assumption

11 *Dictionary of American Biography,* III, 485-487.

12 *Ibid.*

13 See W. Z. King, *Newspaper Press of Charleston* (Charleston, S. C., 1872).

that the paper would continue to do the public printing from which it derived a portion of its income and popularity. When John Quincy Adams became President, however, Secretary of State Clay, unaware that the whole amount of the printing received by the *Patriot* was regularly paid back to the United States on account of the debt, transferred the business to another paper. As a result, Cardozo could not meet the terms of the contract. Congress came to Cardozo's assistance by passing a "Bill for Relief of J. N. Cardozo" authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make such reductions of the debt and extensions of payment "as may in his opinion be consistent with equality and justice," and President Jackson duly signed the bill in March, 1831.[14] Later, all the government printing was restored to the *Southern Patriot*.[15]

Of greater significance for Cardozo and his paper was the appointment of Joel Poinsett, the South Carolina Unionist leader, as Secretary of War in 1837. Poinsett was more than Van Buren's Secretary of War; he was also the President's economic advisor and negotiator of important financial measures. It was then that Cardozo's journal became Poinsett's mouthpiece. The two concurred on "the policy and propriety of the people of South Carolina giving an efficient and honest support of Van Buren's administration."[16] At a meeting with the Secretary of War, Cardozo remarked that "his [Van Buren's] claim to this suport . . . [was] so much strengthened by your appointment to high office, one not less complimentary to your personal deserts than kind toward the state, having shown so marked an opposition to his election."[17] It was Cardozo's hope that the President's conciliatory attitude "will be extended with good effects in disarming opposition in this quarter.[18]

Overtures to the new administration were also made by

14 Dorfman, *op. cit.*, p. 855.
15 Cardozo to Poinsett, May 8, 1838, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
16 Cardozo to Poinsett, March 7, 1837, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
17 *Loc. cit.*
18 *Loc. cit.*

Dr. Thomas Cooper, most influential citizen of South Carolina, and he chose the *Southern Patriot* as his medium. In an anonymous article he called on the South to give "fair play" to Van Buren. The Administration was interested enough to ask Cardozo for the author's name, and Cardozo gladly obliged, adding that he hoped to have Cooper write more for his paper.[19]

As the demand grew for a special session of Congress to deal with the depression of 1837, Poinsett paid a visit to his home state and informed Cardozo that the Administration had decided to separate the Government and the banks. He revealed, too, that the Administration was desirous of "breaking ground on this matter" by indicating the mode of carrying on the fiscal concerns of the Government without the aid of the banks. It preferred that this preliminary education be done by means of an "independent" newspaper, some distance from Washington. Cardozo undertook a "plan of inquiry" and set to work writing a lengthy series of editorials in support of such separation.

The precise form of the "divorce bill" which the Administration had in mind was not revealed to Cardozo. "I do not know," he anxiously wrote to Poinsett, "whether the plan of inquiry I have pursued meets with wishes of the administration."[20] He wanted more specific information. Did the Government wish to have "subtreasury or a permanent institution—this to be accomplished by the use of Treasury notes, drafts or any other description of treasury paper?" This information could not be furnished too soon or "there will occur an awkward gap in the series of numbers I am publishing." When Van Buren finally announced to the special session of Congress his scheme of subtreasury and treasury notes, Cardozo presented an ardent defense of the project.

Cardozo informed Poinsett that his undertaking on behalf of the Government cost him "much research and reflection." "I took the field," he reminded the President's

19 Dorfman, *op. cit.*, p. 847.

20 Cardozo to Poinsett, July 26, 1837, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

advisor, "at an early date on the currency question and indicated the course of the administration on that question with a degree of labor — which none but those accustomed to such researches can form an adequate conception."[21]

For these services and also as a matter of right, he was entitled to ask the favor of Poinsett "in keeping an eye" on the interests of the *Southern Patriot.* Cardozo's complaint was that although the *Patriot* had been selected as the organ for the publication of the Government advertising, extensive land sales were advertised in another paper. If the *Patriot* lost any part of the public printing, its income from other sources would be inadequate to meet the instalment on the debt he owed to the Government. "Surely," Cardozo reminded Poinsett, "if the paper which sustains the Government is to have no preference in this matter, how are friends to be attached to it?"[22] Poinsett's Secretary replied that there would be no transfer of the printing from any branch of the service under the War Department.[23]

In the early decades of the nineteenth century Charleston was not only a commercial center, but a cultural capitol. There existed a chamber of commerce as early as 1783 and the first municipal college was opened in 1790. In 1828, Cardozo was one of a group of South Carolina intellectuals who met in the home of General Hayne in Charleston for the purpose of launching the *Southern Review.* This periodical was to develop the doctrines of states rights and serve as an outlet for the literary interests of Charleston and South Carolina. The founders and original contributors comprised the most illustrious names of the South, among them Stephen Elliot, T. S. Grimke, Hugh S. Legarè, Robert Y. Hayne and Gov. James Hamilton.[24]

After 1820, however, there was a gradual decline in Charleston trade, and supremacy passed to New York and New Orleans. South Carolina found itself economically dependent on the North as it had been on Great Britain as

21 Cardozo to Poinsett, May 8, 1838, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
22 Cardozo to Poinsett, March 7, 1837, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
23 Cardozo to Poinsett, May 8, 1838, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
24 *Reminscences of Charleston,* p. 36.

a province. Cardozo was one of the first to advocate that the South diversify its production and not rely on cotton printing. He maintained that Charleston, "because of her geographic position," ought to stand in the same relationship to the South generally that "New York bears to the country collectively."[25] This could have been accomplished if greater attention had been given to the development of railroads to connect Charleston with the interior.

In 1823, Cardozo drew up a memorial on the need of reviving the old Charleston Chamber of Commerce, which had fallen in disuse after 1803. The purpose of this body was to encourage exports and imports and to vindicate the principles of free trade. In his *Reminiscences of Charleston* he wrote:

> It was not until 1823 that an attempt was made for its [the Charleston Chamber of Commerce] revival. . . . A meeting of the merchants was called. A large number attended. A numerous committee was appointed to memoralize the legislature on the subject, of which the writer of these *Reminiscences* was one, who drew the memorial. The legislature modified the tax. This was the occasion of the formation anew of the Chamber. The necessity of concentration of effort in resistance to class legislation was strongly urged. The number and complexity of the transactions of an extended and extending commerce induced the policy and propriety of such an institution [p. 23].

Later, through his newly established *Charleston Evening News*, Cardozo went even further and preached that Charleston should enter manufacturing. The surplus funds in Charleston banks, he thought, could be directed into industrial development. At the time (1846) Cardozo had no fear that Southern manufacturing would create a demand for a tariff.

When the Charleston Board of Trade was established in 1866, Cardozo hailed the event with enthusiasm. As he saw it, the work of the Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade was complementary and not conflicting. The former was more directly concerned with the import and export trade; the latter's field of operation was the interior

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

commerce of the city with its neighboring states. Already, he thought, the Board of Trade had accomplished material improvements in reducing freight rates. He was hopeful that the work of these bodies would result in the "infusion of fresh blood in the body mercantile."[26]

In 1827 or 1828 Cardozo was a member of a committee to frame a memorial to Congress against the "Bill of Abomination." This memorial was the first petition of the South in favor of free trade and was unanimously adopted by the Charleston Chamber of Commerce. Cardozo's victorious opposition to the tariff, his political contact with John C. Calhoun, gave him great prestige in the South.[27] The passage of the tariff act of 1828 was the occasion of the reversal of Calhoun's stand on nationalism. The "South Carolina Exposition" of state rights, which he authored, was adopted by the legislature of South Carolina in December, 1828 as part of a protest against the Tariff of Abominations. But Cardozo did not follow Calhoun's position of states rights on the tariff.

Cardozo conducted his newspaper, the *Southern Patriot*, until 1845, when he sold it; a few months later he bought the *Charleston Evening News*. It was in the *Charleston Evening News* that he first introduced a column called "Cotton Statements," i.e., cotton price quotations, which soon became a permanent feature in Southern newspapers.[28] He sold the *Evening News* in 1847 but remained its managing editor until the outbreak of the Civil War, when he left for Savannah, about which time the paper was discontinued.

Cardozo was also known as a literary critic. The *Southern Patriot* had a department that had been initiated by Isaac Harby, the paper's former editor, in which Cardozo commented on the drama and fine arts. A writer in the influential *North American Review* commended him for

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[27] Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

[28] Barnett A. Elzas, *The Jews of South Carolina* (Phildelphia, 1905), pp. 176-179.

"the solidity of his views in political economy and occasionally the felicity of his literary criticisms."[29]

The Political Economist

Cardozo's popular writings were conditioned by his time, his class, and his region. He was a leading Southern journalist, closely connected with the important Southern political and economic movements of the day. His editorials were extensively quoted in the North as well as in the South. On a still higher level were his theoretical writings. He was the ablest thinker of the South, approaching his subjects not only as a journalist but as a theorist.

Cardozo displayed mastery of the economic thought of his day, being familiar with the works of Berkeley, Harris, Hobbes, and Hume. He was critical of the Physiocrats and made occasional references to Say and Sismondi. A present-day economist speaks of Cardozo as "the only man in pre-Civil War America whose mind operated on a high level of abstraction which characterized Ricardo and his school."[30] Another student of early American economic thought calls him "a capable opponent of Ricardo, whose ideas were of such merit as to make his treatment worthy of a separate chapter."[31]

Although not an academician himself, Cardozo gained recognition in Southern academic circles. Dr. Thomas Cooper, College President and Professor of Political Economy, as well as George Tucker, first teacher of political economy at the University of Virginia, drew upon the Charleston journalist's ideas for their own formulation of a rent theory.[32] Cardozo knew of Daniel Raymond and both expressed in very similar language the likelihood of significant American contributions to political economics. John Rae, Northern nationalist, shared many ideas with Cardozo

29 Reznikoff and Engelman, *op. cit.*, p. 85.
30 Dorfman, *op. cit.*, p. 551.
31 Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 74.
32 Dorfman, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-80.

and is said to have resembled the latter in cast of mind, though Rae had the benefit of university training.

Cardozo's first effort in economic theory, entitled *Notes on Political Economy,* was published in 1826. This work was written to counteract Ricardian doctrines contained in McVickar's *Outlines of Political Economy.*[33] The Reverend John McVickar, first professor of Economics at Columbia College, wrote an annotated summary of an article by Ricardo's disciple, J. R. McCulloch. The *Outlines* was the basis of a course at Columbia and was the first European text edited by an American cleric. In general, McVickar accepted the basic teaching of Malthus and Ricardo but gave the main doctrines of the English School a religious frame of reference.

Cardozo's treatise was devoid of any religious tone. It contained practically no reference to the influence of the Deity on the social order. Although there was one pious reference to Providence, the appeal to sectarianism was wholly lacking, nor was there any attempt to identify political economy with the broad principles of political philosophy. Southern economists generally were secularists and little inclined to argue in terms of morals and abstract humanitarianism.

Cardozo justified the *Notes on Political Economy* as an indictment of McVickar's *Outlines* in particular and of American followers of Ricardo in general. If McVickar's text were adopted in American colleges and universities, not only would the progress of economic science be greatly retarded, but American statesmen would have an unsafe guide to follow. The doctrines of the classical economists were pessimistic, not from the nature of economic law, but because of a "vicious" social arrangement peculiar to the Old World. Cardozo's treatise, however, could not be used as a school text. The style was poor, and as critics have pointed out, the reasoning was involved and often obscure. No pedagogic devices were employed to make the *Notes* adaptable for school use. The arrangement of material was merely

[33] (New York, 1825).

an imitation of Ricardo's *Principles* with the emphasis wholly on distribution and taxation and little attention being given to the problem of production. There was no fundamental attempt to survey broadly the field of political economy. Southern writers generally organized their material in a very loose fashion, avoiding the idea of a carefully proportioned book. The Reverend Jared Sparks, editor of the then powerful *North American Review,* requested Daniel Webster to review Cardozo's book.[34] Webster was not sympathetic to economists generally, and he replied to Sparks in a letter on October 12, 1826:

> I have read Mr. Cardozo's book and I looked into McCulloch but the field spread out so wide before me that I gave up the idea of entering upon it, with any view of writing. A great part of Mr. Cardozo's *Notes* were taken up in commenting on Smith and Ricardo. The very statement of the questions in difference between him and them, so as to be intelligeable to general readers, would occupy the space of a short article. I must confess, moreover, that there is a great deal of solemn commonplace and a great deal also of a kind of metaphysics, in all or most of the writers on these subjects. There is no science that needs more to be cleared from mists than that relating to economy. If we turn our eyes from books to things, from speculation to fact, we often, I think, perceive that definition and rules of those writers fail in their applications.[35]

The review of Cardozo's book was assigned to Jonathan Porter, the New England lawyer and ardent Ricardian. In the 1827 issue of the *North American Review,*[36] Porter denounced Cardozo for supposedly casting aspersions on Ricardo and the landlord class. He argued that Cardozo failed to refute Ricardo and was unable to escape his conclusions. But Porter grudgingly admitted that the book was extremely interesting "and contains some very ingenious reasoning" and "that the book will be sought by true lovers of the science." Thomas Cooper of South Carolina was more sympathetic. He declared that "Mr. Cardozo of Charleston in his *Notes on Political Economy* has shown

[34] Herbert B. Adams, *Life and Letters of Jared Sparks* (New York, 1893), pp. 271-272.

[35] *Loc. cit.*

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 169-187.

himself profoundly acquainted with the nicer questions relating to the science, and has entitled himself to be read by those who wish to peruse Malthus and Ricardo with full advantage."[37]

Cardozo's theoretical writings include also contributions to leading Southern journals. In 1828, in the *Southern Review*[38] (which he helped to found) he undertook a comprehensive attack on the "new school" of Ricardo. This article may have been intended also as a rejoinder to Jonathan Porter, Cardozo's "Ricardian" critic. In the *Charleston Courier* of May 31, 1845, Cardozo made an elaborate statistical survey of cotton production and consumption from 1800 to 1847. In subsequent articles in *De Bow's Review*, he brought the history of the cotton trade down to 1858.[39] In 1850 he wrote a review article in the *Southern Quarterly Review*, in which he argued that credit and currency do not admit of government regulation.[40] The occasion was the appearance of a treatise on *Government and Currency* by Henry R. Middleton, an economist of South Carolina. A review article on "Building and Loan Associations" for the *Southern Quarterly Review* appeared in 1852.[41] Like many others at the time, Cardozo saw in such associations a praiseworthy form of cooperative effort and a social device to expand home ownership.

During the Civil War Cardozo worked on newspapers in Mobile, Atlanta, and Charleston. In 1861-62 he was joint editor of the influential *Southern Confederacy* in Atlanta, Georgia. In 1863 he wrote a pamphlet, originally published in the *Atlanta Southern Confederacy*, entitled "A Plan for Financial Relief Addressed to the Legislature of Georgia and the Confederate States Congress." The plan offered a solution to the disordered finances of the Confederacy, including the problem of deficit financing.

37 Quoted by J. F. Normano, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

38 I, 192-218.

39 XXI (August, 1856), 158; XXII (April, 1857), 342; XXIV (May 1858), 396.

40 Pp. 123-132.

41 XXII (October, 1852), 489-505.

Toward the end of the Civil War Cardozo returned to Charleston. In 1866 he published his *Reminiscences of Charleston,* a nostalgic chronicle of the city in ante-bellum days. For the next few years he was a contributing editor of the *Morning News of Savanah, Georgia.* Failing eyesight forced him to restrict an editorial career in which he was active up to a year before his death. Yet, despite this handicap, in 1870, at the age of 84, he wrote a prize winning essay in a contest sponsored by the Charleston Board of Trade. In April, 1873, he returned to Savannah where he died on August 30 of the same year at the age of 87. At the time of his death he was the oldest newspaper editor in the South.[42]

In a small Jewish cemetery in Savannah is the tombstone of Jacob Nunez Cardozo.

A Louis Cardozo, member of the "Reconstruction" government of South Carolina, claimed to be his son by a mixed marriage.

The Social and Economic Theorist

Politically, Cardozo was a product of his Charleston environment. The old federalist tradition still lingered in the narrow circle of Charleston aristocrats even after the Federalist party disappeared. Cardozo largely shared the Charleston distrust of democracy. In the *Oration* which he delivered as a young man, he attacked the "revolutionary fanaticism" in Europe and retained his conservatism especially in his attitudes toward "inferior orders" of society. Physiocratic agrarianism found few advocates in the Charleston elite, and Cardozo was more sympathetic to capitalism than to agrarianism. Characteristic of the Charleston type of federalism was an attachment to the Union, and when the nullifiers and unionists divided the state into two hostile camps, Cardozo joined the unionists.

42 Elzas, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-179.

With the death of Jefferson, a reaction in the Southern political economy became evident. The cotton planters' abandonment of Jeffersonian liberalism made it possible for Cardozo to become their spokesman against the extension of democracy as well as against protectionism.

Cardozo's views on suffrage, poor relief, education, and slavery reveal his conservative bent. Property qualifications for voting he thought were sound. In 1825 he warned Virginia that if the "democratic" principle of universal suffrage were introduced, the outcome would be a never ending struggle for spoils.[43] Cardozo viewed with skepticism even the struggle of the English middle class to widen suffrage. Concerning the great Reform Bill of 1832 he wrote:

> It seems to be a historical fact of curious character, that the close Boroughs sent into the house of Commons a far larger number of capable men than are brought into it now by the large constituencies of Liverpool and Manchester.[44]

But he turned to commerce as a greater "leveler of distinctions than the wildest spirit of democracy that ever vexed the quiet and order of society." Commerce was the great engine of advance in economics and politics; it was the ally of freedom, the enemy of monopoly and the force for prosperity. "Despotism and commercial restrictions are allied, but commerce has always been allied to liberty."[45]

On the matter of poor relief and workingmen's education, Cardozo was quite emphatic. Englishmen like Robert Owen were prolonging the misery of the poor by seeking legislation for the amelioration of their lot. In his opinion such men were actually ignorant of the operation of social laws. Instead of clamoring for relief legislation, they should seek to remove all existing barriers to the free and natural movement of society and population. With all artificial support removed, population would settle at a more natural level, in accordance with the needs of the economy.

The true way to social betterment was, according to Cardozo, through education. It was not Jefferson's concep-

[43] Dorfman, *op. cit.*, p. 553.
[44] *Charleston Evening News*, April 15, 1859.
[45] Quoted by Dorman, *op. cit.*, p. 553.

tion of popular education, however, that Cardozo envisaged, but the "qualified reforms" of Lord Brougham, the aristocratic English exponent of workingmen's education. The scheme emphasized the value of educating the children of the poor in those elements of political economy which served a quietistic purpose. The poor must learn the art of acquiescence. Hence, Cardozo favored promoting apprentice libraries and mechanics institutes, providing them with lectures and suitable tracts. The workers should "receive sound and salutary lessons on the subject of population, or those maxims of prudence and foresight necessary to their comfort and respectability." Thus the poor would understand the great truths of political economy and consequently be "brought to submit to temporary deprivation of employment as the law of our social condition."[46]

On the question of slavery Cardozo stood with the prevailing sentiment of the South and offered the familiar justification. Without slave labor the South would be barren, and the thousands in the North maintained by its production would be unemployed. "Slavery brought not only great wealth to the South, but to the slaves a greater share of its enjoyment than in many regions where the relation between employer and employee was based on wages."[47] How, in the face of such facts, could it be maintained that the wage system was superior to the master-slave relation in the production of wealth?

But slavery was not only an economic necessity in Cardozo's view; it was also morally justified. Slavery was moral because there existed a natural diversity of race:

> The reason the Almighty made the colored black is to prove their inferiority. We all know that when people become angry or embarrassed they change color, showing their moral indignation and superior intellect. Because the Negro cannot do this, it proves that he is morally and intellectually inferior to the white man, if not totally decadent. Providence also supports slavery as witness the subjugation of neighboring states, therefore those portions of the country that must have slavery

[46] Dorfman, *op. cit.*, p. 558; Cardozo, *Notes on Political Economy*, p. 124.

[47] "Political Economy—Rent," *Southern Review*, I (Febr., 1828), 200.

in order to exist, such as the South, have a right to the continuation of slavery although the North has not.[48]

On the matter of foreign slave trade, however, Cardozo stood with Calhoun. In his *Charleston Evening News* he vigorously attacked any attempt to reopen the slave trade and viewed with contempt those who trafficked in this human market.[49]

His social bias was also evidenced by his attitude toward the planter aristocracy.

> There was a species of patriarchal relations in the mode of life when surrounded by his household slaves, in that reciprocity of protection and obedience that exists between master and servant, when the child of the former becomes the playmate and companion of the latter, mingling their pastimes, and when sickness and old age required attention. In reality we know not in the whole circle of affections a more interesting spectacle than these family servants who have grown gray in the service of a large line of ancestry, who have been reared in the bosom of families and have descended to the graves with their master.[50]

The destruction in Charleston wrought by the federal bombardment moved Cardozo to exclaim:

> The Southerner who has been reared amidst the refinement of civilization, and has enjoyed the solace offered by liberal culture, has reason to deplore that his lot has been cast in a period so devoid of all moral restraint.[51]

He was mournful over the fate of the plantation owner.

> The reverse of fortune which was visited on the planters of the low country of South Carolina can scarcely find a parallel anywhere. Suddenly cast down into the abyss of poverty, the most painful contrasts are presented. The owner of two hundred to five hundred slaves with a princely income, has not only to submit to the most degraded employments, but he frequently cannot obtain them. In some instances he has to drive a cart, or attend a retail grocery, while he may have to obey the orders of an ignorant coarse menial. There is something unnatural in this reverse position. Something revolting to one's sense of propriety in this social degradation.[52]

48 *Charleston Evening News,* January 3, 1859.
49 September 15, 1854.
50 *Reminiscences of Charleston,* p. 8.
51 *Loc. cit.*
52 *Loc. cit.*

Cardozo's espousal of laissez-faire was in the dominant tradition of the South. Laissez-faire was not only a good maxim in economic life, it was also the governing rule in politics and social relations. He rejected "meddling by authority" and believed in self-interest as a sufficient check. Economic welfare and the balance between production and consumption would never be disturbed if left to the influence of the stimulants of self-interest. Social and institutional factors might, indeed, prevent competition from exercising its beneficial influence and thereby destroy the natural balance between saving and spending. War, protective tariffs, heavy taxation, laws limiting the alienation of land, and, above all, the "paper system" (irredeemable paper money) would weaken the natural influences of self-interest and thereby prevent the equilibrating effects of competition. But given "freedom" of commerce, individual self-interest would set the proper limits to spending and saving. Room for additional increases of capital would be found if individual enterprise were left unobstructed. "The old channels of commerce are constantly enlarged and others created with every increase of capital."[53] Cardozo was certain that "there can be no assignable limit to employment of additional capital,—for the experiment of a general and free commercial intercourse between countries has never been tried."[54]

But Cardozo's pleas for laissez-faire and free trade did not preclude his demanding that the state help in such matters as draining the swamps for the low-country planters, or build railroads and undertake similar projects. Nor was he above demanding relief for himself from a debt he owed to the Government. Navigation acts to build up naval strength or retaliatory measures against Britain he regarded as not inconsistent with the maxim that trade should be free. On the other hand, he vigorously opposed, in the name of free trade, a combination entered into by Southern bankers and planters to "maintain" the international price of cotton, for which he was roundly reprimanded by Mc-

[53] *Notes on Political Economy*, pp. 50-51.
[54] *Loc. cit.*

Duffie of South Carolina as an advocate for foreign manufacturers and indifferent to the plight of the planter.[55]

Another basic condition for the growth of commerce as well as free government was, in Cardozo's opinion, the unrestricted transferability of land. Where alienation or transfer was shackled by legal arrangements, such as entail and primogeniture, "illegitimate" monopolies would arise. It was due to such a monopoly that England's landed aristocracy, by virtue of maintaining the vicious Corn Laws, received "monopoly" rent. The consequent rise in food prices prevented the exportation of manufactures, for British capitalists were correct when they argued that free trade would benefit them only if they had cheap food stuffs, otherwise English manufacturers would be unable to compete in the foreign market. This, of course, was good Ricardian doctrine, and Cardozo effectively used it to criticize the Western "agrarians" who were employing political power to maintain tariffs for their own sectional interests.

On the question of tariffs, Cardozo represented the dominant interests of the South. The demand for higher tariffs, especially on woolens, was a demand for class legislation because it benefitted only the Western farmers. Western "agrarians" clamored for tariffs for the same reason that the English landed aristocracy insisted on Corn Laws. In both cases "monopoly" rent was the result. In a famous memorial in 1827, Cardozo warned that the Federal Government was abandoning its impartial benevolence. He also put the case for free trade on the broad grounds of national welfare.[56] He was convinced that tariffs oppressed the poor to the economic loss of the nation.[57]

Cardozo insisted, however, that the tariff system was a lesser evil than secession. He rejected the argument of extremists that the economic ills of South Carolina were due exclusively to the tariff. The primary cause, he now argued, was the more fertile lands of the West which were draining

[55] Dorfman, *op. cit.*, p. 939.

[56] *Southern Review*, II (Nov., 1828), 582-619.

[57] Loc. cit., cf. "The Tariff," *Southern Quarterly* Review, 1848, 114-149.

capital and labor from the state. A second factor was absenteeism; Southern incomes were used by absentee Southerners or by the beneficiaries of the "balance of debt" to fertilize the North. A final factor was the continuance of a style of living and scale of general expense beyond a proper standard of expenditure. When the clamor for nullification and secession grew, Cardozo wrote in his *Southern Patriot*:

> That a people living under despotic governments, insecure in person and property, and burdened by the weight of oppressive taxes, should be willing to try any change, is not surprising, but that any portion of a nation whose progress has been marked with the most unexampled prosperity; in which the means of subsistence are within the reach of every man who will labor; where there is no necessity for standing armies; and yet the country is exempt from all danger from foreign attack; where the press is perfectly unshackled; where religion is free and dependent upon voluntary contributions alone for its support; where suffrage is universal and offices accessible to all; where there is no public debt; and the difficulty is not how to raise revenue, but how to employ the surplus;—that a people thus happily situated should ever dream of a resort to force to change their institutions, is a thing so prodigious in its character, that it is difficult to believe that it is true.[58]

On the pressing questions of currency and banking, as in the case of tariffs on woolens, Cardozo spoke for the South in opposition to the Western farmers. The West was unreasonable in complaining about the scarcity of money. He deplored the demand in the Western areas for "relief" laws of all kinds. Federal subidies for internal improvements were sectionally motivated; hence he opposed as unsound the Clay-Webster measure to distribute the surplus revenue among the states.

On the question of bank credit Cardozo thought chiefly in terms of mercantile needs. Thus state-owned banks, like the Bank of the State of South Carolina, set a poor example by granting excessive loans to planters. The point of view of the management that their bank was not obliged to redeem its notes in specie was "repugnant to all sound principles" and "destructive of public credit." Cardozo noted

[58] *Southern Patriot,* Noevmber 12, 1832.

with satisfaction that as a result of his opposition "the inordinate extension of credit to planters was subjected to limitation and the institution became more of a commercial and less of an agricultural bank."[59]

Cardozo was of the "hard money" school, being consistently opposed to the "paper system." The issue of paper money by states or banking institutions was in reality concealed taxes and, like import duties, increased the price of commodities. He associated national decline with irredeemable paper. "We find that nations become more thriftless in proportion as they depart from the use of a medium of circulation possessed of intrinsic value."[60]

The quantity theory of money he regarded as erroneous and criticized the English school for the theory that "the state of prices is solely dependent on the quantity of circulating medium. Prices not being dependent on the amount of convertible currency, but being elevated and depressed by commercial cause, he thought that prices depend on the state of credit and not that of currency.

In the struggle over the United States Bank, Cardozo joined the pro-bank forces of South Carolina in opposition to Jackson. He supported the Bank of United States on the ground that it obviated the danger of the "paper system." He argued that convertible issues of a private commercial bank like the Bank of the United States merely represented the demands of the natural progress of commerce and agriculture. The Bank also exercised a salutary restraint by preventing excessive issues by local banks. But Cardozo soon turned away from the Whig opposition and became a supporter of the Administration's financial policies.

The election of Van Buren induced Cardozo to hope that the fiscal policies of the new Administration would be more favorable to the commercial interests of the South. No sooner was Poinsett of South Carolina appointed a member of the Cabinet than Cardozo wrote to him:

[59] *Reminiscences of Charleston*, p. 46.

[60] "Government and the Currency," *Southern Quarterly Review* (1850), pp. 123-132.

Too many have identified Mr. Van Buren's course of policy with that pursued by General Jackson particularly in relation to questions such as that of the currency affecting the commercial interest. But this is unjust. Let each administration be justified by its own measures.[61]

Cardozo's analysis of the business cycle followed that of Tooke and the Currency Schools. When the financial panic occurred in 1819, Cardozo wrote that the cause of the disaster was the over-expansion of bank credit and the consequent over-trading by individuals. As the clamor for Government control of bank issues increased, he changed to the thesis that banks were not an originating cause of speculation or distress because their issues followed rather than led the state of business. In other words, bank notes were the effect, not the cause, of high prices. Western states were to blame because their banks acted as an external demand which gave rise to the issues, and this paper money in turn became a stimulus to speculation.[62]

When Cardozo had to cope with the depression of 1826, he altered his explanation. The seat of the trouble, he maintained, was "overproduction" of cotton; he therefore proposed diversification as the remedy. With a variety of crops, the South would not collapse economically whenever there was a threatened loss of a foreign market. If, at the same time, home manufacturers were introduced, the South could become free of its complete dependence on English cotton mills.

Cardozo's ingenuity as a political journalist and financier was given full play in the crisis that ensued shortly after Van Buren's inauguration.[63] The new Administration was confronted with a complicated political and economic problem. The crisis became a party issue, debated on political rather than economic grounds. As the ablest mind of the South, Cardozo became a spokesman of the Administration and an advocate for its "relief" program.

On the first impact of this crisis, Cardozo offered his

61 Cardozo to Poinsett, March 7, 1837, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
62 Dorfman, *op. cit.*, pp. 554-555.
63 *Ibid.*, pp. 857-858.

usual explanation that it was the uncontrollable speculative spirit and not the banks that were to blame. Banks were merely passive agents of the credit system. An aggrevating, if not an originating, factor was the situation in the Western areas, and particularly in the Southwest. Western banks, with their unsound principle of lending on real estate, were vulnerable; their difficulties were due to great expectation in land speculation. The distribution of surplus among the states was unsound in principle, Cardozo asserted, because it drained specie from the Eastern commercial centers and locked it up in inactive capital in the form of the construction of canals and other schemes of internal improvements.

As the crisis grew worse and as the clamor against the banks increased, Cardozo shifted his position. The crisis was a world-wide phenomenon, which had its genesis in one of "those general and irresistible changes in human affairs which follow in a cycle, alternating at periods irregular in duration, but powerful in action." Depressions were inevitable and neither Government nor banking system could remedy the distress.

The Northern Loco-Focos were the first to come to the support of Van Buren's "divorce bill." Cardozo now wrote a series of editorials echoing their cry of "Freedom of Banking." But his remedy of "free banking" did not mean that any individual or group of individuals had the right to issue bank notes, only that there was to be free competition among banks of discount. Soon respectable national leaders of the Democrats, including Calhoun, were saying that they were proud to be considered Loco-Focos.

When Van Buren finally proposed the independent treasury bill, Cardozo presented an ardent defense. Calhoun already had accepted the sub-treasury scheme, praising it as an aid to the South.

The depression that was ushered in by the panic of 1857 caused Cardozo to revise his earlier, more optimistic estimate of the cotton trade. In one of the ablest discussions of the business crisis Cardozo wrote that the country was passing through one of these commercial cycles with

which we were "destined to be visited about every decade."[64] The immediate cause of the depression was excessive credit, but the underlying causes were free land, cheap money, inventive power, and increased imports. Nothing could be done about these factors, but their existence always threatened to increase cotton production beyond consumption.

Southern finance during the Civil War was hardly compatible with Cardozo's orthodox views on money and credit. The Confederacy was driven to rely chiefly on printing-press money. Depreciation inevitably set in as the amount of fiat money increased and the prospect of Confederate victory dimmed. To cope with the situation the Government attempted to fix prices for its purchases under a policy of "impressing" necessities. Cardozo, displaying the courage of his convictions, denounced price fixing and impressment of foods as relics of "barbarism." The cause of high prices was excessive currency; the only real remedy, therefore, was its reduction.

A reduction in the currency could be accomplished by a proper combination of taxing and funding. Since higher taxes would discourage capital reinvestment, Cardozo proposed funding. If, for example, $100,000,000 of Confederate currency were to be retired annually, the fall in prices would be greater in proportion than the reduction in currency. This would effect great savings for the Government and would also help its deficit financing.[65] Cardozo was aware that a scheme of funding would throw the burden on the future, but it was his opinion that the Confederacy would be vindicated if it shifted to the future its distributive share of the cost of the war. "Unredeemable paper money," he wrote, was the "great corrupter" and "the original source of all debasing instincts that follow in the train of avarice and assume so many of its forms."[66]

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 860.

Georgia and Confederate States Congress" (Atlanta, 1863), p. 32.

[65] Cardozo, "A Plan of Financial Relief Addressed to the Legislature of

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

The Nationalist Economist

A distinctively American literature on economics was emerging in the early decades of the nineteenth century. It represented a mature expression of dissent from the dominant political economy and an effort to adapt the English model to the exigencies of the American scene. Contributions to nationalistic types of political economy appeared in the South as well as in the North. In general, the early nationalists advocated protection and federal aid for internal improvements. They drew a distinction between national wealth and individual riches, denying that individual and national interests always coincided. They also rejected the labor theory of value and the explanation of distribution on a class basis. Finally, the early nationalist economists were antagonistic to the Ricardian rent doctrine and the Malthusian law of population.

Ricardian rent analysis and free trade went hand in hand. Hence, it would hardly be possible for a nationalist economist to accept the Ricardian theory of rent which served the individualist economy so well and which formed the basis of the then prevailing arguments for free trade.

The early nationalists disregarded the Malthusian terms as inapplicable to the United States and ascribed excess population to institutional arrangements rather than to the operation of a natural law.

The post-Jeffersonian South produced some nationalistic economics despite the implications of the cotton planters concern with free trade. One of these nationalists was Daniel Raymond of Baltimore, Maryland. Another was Cardozo, despite the fact that he yielded to the Southern interest in free trade. In view of the close relationship between free trade and the Ricardian rent theory, one would expect a staunch free trader to be in harmony with the orthodox teaching on rent. But in this respect Cardozo was an exception in that he was as strong an opponent of Ricardian rent analysis as he was of the tariff. His Southern patriotism did not permit him to look with favor upon the protective

tariff. Apparently he hoped for a type of nationalist political economy embodying the interests of the South.

In the preface to his *Notes on Political Economy*, Cardozo complained that the economic thought of David Ricardo and his "specious and captivating" teachings in *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* had "seduced" some of the most powerful intellects. At that very time the Reverend McVickars, Professor at Columbia College, he continued, had presented to the American public an abridged edition of Ricardo's work. It was the apprehension of the effect of this volume on the popular mind that had induced Cardozo to publish his own treatise. Novel conditions pointed to the need for a more realistic approach to economic inquiry. British political economy was related to its time and place and could not serve as a guide to statesmen of the New World.

Principles of universal validity were to be founded only on a comprehensive investigation of phenomena "as they are presented in a natural state of the social system," the New World;

> It is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that a country whose institutions and laws have done less to derange that natural order of things, than where a vicious social organization has resulted either from military violence or selfish policy, will present the fairest field for analysis and speculation into the causes of wealth (p. II).

Thus, American conditions called for a less absolute statement of diminishing returns. The assumption of the "niggardliness of nature" which served as the keystone in the Ricardian rent doctrine, was contradicted by American experience. The whole Ricardian analysis stemmed from an assumption of scarcity, i.e., the inability of natural resources to supply the needs of an increasing population. But the American scene revealed the unreality of such an assumption.

Cardozo held to the concept of static diminishing returns from land and of historcial increasing returns from industry. But he reasoned that improvements through inventions and new methods of cultivation, when used in

agriculture, became part of the soil. And because improvements blended with the soil, technological advance would be as effective in agriculture as in the field of manufacturing.

> There is no just ground for the conclusion that improvements in cultivation are necessarily partial and not progressive like manufactures. the quantity of productions in the progress of society is multiplied, the dependent on those arrangements which best stimulate in all departments of industry the invention and efforts of production and on these alone.[67]

Hence, is was not true that agriculture was an industry of diminishing returns in a historical sense. This was in line with the optimistic outlook of American economists, to whom the progress of society spelled increased abundance, not diminishing returns.

The absence of natural and historical restrictions in the New World prompted Cardozo to take an anti-Ricardian approach, particularly against the class analysis associated with Ricardo. Implicit in the Ricardian doctrines Cardozo saw effects "which confer advantages on some classes of society to the injury of others." The theory of Ricardo also supposed that profits and wages moved in opposite directions producing a class struggle between capitalist and worker for division of the product. This might have applied to Britain, where there existed a fixity of the classes—landlords, capitalists, and workers—and where "rent will be higher than it naturally would be and every addition to it must be at the expense of the other classes of society" (p. 34). But in the United States, land "being obtainable at the price of free competition, its rents can ever exceed its productive powers derived from nature" (p. 26). Nor did the other classes suffer, for "profits and wages advance inevitably in the progress of society."

The Ricardian rent theory was unacceptable to Cardozo and he sought to refute it logically and empirically. Apparently he sensed the danger to the Southern planter implicit in the political economy of English capitalism. Cardozo's theory of rent in large part had the effect of removing the stigma of exploitation and bolstering the economic position

[67] *Southern Review*, I, 215.

of the landlord in that it left intact the rent of the South as a mere return on investment, and an earned return at that.

Rent loomed large as a great surplus in the speculation of Old World economists because of the characteristic position of land in the European social structure. If, as in Europe, a monopoly of land was established, if land was purchased as an instrument of political influence or as a source of dignity and power, then there arose "monopoly" rent in the Ricardian sense. Cardozo admitted that there might be extra-natural rents or those beyond a competitive price, but such rents, he argued, were due to faulty distribution of land and other barriers to free commerce. In America the landlord was not dominant in the English sense and received much less than in Europe where monopoly rent prevailed. Thus, rent would be a "natural" return, not essentially different from interest on capital, and Sismondi was not correct in stating that rent under all circumstances had the character of a private monopoly.

It followed that rent was a component of price along with profits and wages, and not a surplus over ordinary profit as Ricardo argued. Ricardo's landlord took, not merely an absolutely larger rent, but a constantly growing proportion of the national wealth. In America, however, rent did not absorb the gains of the capitalist and the worker, and the landlord was not responsible for the stagnation implicit in the Ricardian system.

Cardozo's characteristic treatment of land bore the stamp of the American environment. The system of land tenure, social mobility, and the wide diffusion of ownership made land in his country a commercial property not requiring a special place in the scheme of distribution. Early American nationalist economists had a general distrust of the elaborated doctrine of rent and they regarded returns on land and interest on capital as similar in nature.

Cardozo's view on profit and wages reflected the economic optimism of the early nineteenth century America. Wages were not determined in accordance with natural law and subsistence needs. In keeping with his view on

increasing returns from agriculture, Cardozo argued that real wages rose because the price of necessities fell and the laborers' command of these was increased. Nor was there any empirical validity for Ricardo's "see-saw" relation of profits and wages. In the natural state of things which America represented, "wages do not encroach on profits nor profits on wages (p. 41). On the contrary, "profits and wages are increasing simultaneously in the progress of society."

Machinery was beneficial despite the contrary opinion of some of the Classicists. Ricardo and Say argued that a permanent displacement of labor could result through the introduction of scientific techniques. The trouble was that machinery was conceived as a means of abridging labor, but machinery was improved, not to save labor in the sense of quantity, but to save the wages of labor in order to create a fund for further employment of new labor in the natural growth of population and industry. In a note of piety Cardozo exclaimed that it would be a reflection of the wisdom of Providence to suppose that the powers of human invention could not operate for the benefit of mankind "without occasioning such disturbances as must follow the displacement of a part of the laboring population from its regular and accustomed employment," (p. 55).

Ricardo had maintained that eventually the rate of profit would decline, capital and population would no longer expand, and a stationary state would ensue. But Cardozo did not share this dismal view of the future of capitalism. Characteristic of Cardozo's dynamic view of economic progress was the denial of an historical decline in profits.

> Money profits do not fall in the progress of society for although the prices of all commodities decline, their quantity increases in equal proportion, and the capitalist receives as large a money amount as before the decline. Real profits rise, for they depend on the amount of the returns in produce compared with the amount of expenditure, and as the quantity of productions in the progress of society is multiplied, the real gains of the capitalist must increase (p. 40).

He was also critical of Malthus for attributing the decline of profits to the accumulation of capital. Cardozo

maintained that the fear of over-saving and the doctrine that unproductive consumption is necessary to balance production and consumption was unrealistic. Indeed, the whole controversy between Ricardo and Malthus over the proper limits of spending and saving was academic. "The self-interest of individuals fixes the limit here as in every other case where the arrangements of society do not interfere to disturb the regular action of this principle and weaken its natural influence." One of the causes which produced this disturbance, and perhaps the most "universal," was irredeemable paper money. The "paper system" gave too great a stimulus to "the wish or propensity to consume and by generating habits of extravagence destroy the natural balance between production in the gross and expenditure" (p. 14). But the remedy was not government action or unproductive consumption, but individual effort and economy.

Cardozo's view on population corresponded closely with those of other nationalist economic writers who interpreted the American scene. He showed awareness of the dynamic situation in America when he suggested that the Malthusian natural law might be only "the result of an imperfect social organization." A better "arrangement of the social elements" might well bring about an increase in the ratio of food to population.[68]

Cardozo conceded that under static conditions an increase in population would result in a diminution of returns per capita. To him, however, this was not worthy of consideration. He thought that the growth of science and invention comprised a positive force stronger than the negative force of resistance. Thus, through time there was an ever-growing increase of production.

The Malthusian relation of population and subsistence was a fallacy of inversion. Increase in population followed rather than preceded an increase in subsistence. Since the growth of productive power would continue in advance of the growth of population, there could never be the misery

[68] *Notes on Political Economy*, p. 124.

from excessive numbers which the theory of Malthus contemplated. Cardozo ended his discussion on a note of optimism.

> How much more consonent with what we may suppose the arrangements of Nature thus to infer that population and capital are permitted to increase together?[69]

In common with other nationalist economists, Cardozo was critical of the labor theory of value. He took Ricardo to task for refusing to give capital a coordinate status with labor. The notion that capital was nothing but stored labor was as erroneous as the notion that labor was the sole element in determining value. "There is no period in society," he argued, "in which capital does not constitute one of its ingredients" (p. 7). And he added a characteristic nationalist objection: The labor-value theory was discordant in that it set up a false cleavage between workers and capitalists.

> Mr. Ricardo invariably assumes that what is gained in value by one class of the community is lost to some others. This doctrine is an unavoidable inference again from the principle, that the value of commodities is determined, from the first to the last, by the quantity of labour which they have cost, and what as more or less is paid for wages and rent, more or less remains for profit, and vice versa [p. 105].

Cardozo's view was that the law of supply and demand was the regulator of value. Ricardo was in error in identifying value and price. Cardozo was convinced that "the identification of price and value under all cricumstances is at the foundation of some of the peculiar ideas entertained by the School of Ricardo" (p. 42). His reasoning on this point was inconclusive, but the import of his criticism was that price was governed by two factors, demand and supply, and not by supply (labor) alone, as Ricardo contended.

Cardozo and the nationalist economists would not limit wealth to physical products of purchase and sale. He distinguished between national wealth and individual wealth. To the Classicists national wealth was the sum total of individual wealth, but to Cardozo national and individual wealth did not necessarily coincide.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

The doctrines of Cardozo took on a special significance in their historical context. With the disappearance of the issues of which he was an exponent, Cardozo was forgotten and the influence of his work proved to be merely ephemeral. Yet his work represented a stronger reaction to his American environment than that of his contemporaries. America was not a replica of Europe, and the realities of American life were not to be subsumed under the Ricardian categories. Ricardian influence in the United States was his main concern, but in the effort to show the alien origin of classical economics, he anticipated much of the modern criticism of the Malto-Ricardian doctrines. To the extent that he called for a declaration of intellectual independence from the English classical school, he is to be regarded as a member of the American school of which Daniel Raymond was the founder and Henry C. Carey a later exponent.

JEWISH COMMUNITY TOKENS

A Neglected Field in Jewish Numismatics

By Bruno Kisch, M.D.
Yeshiva University
New York City

FROM the time of the Maccabees up to the Second Revolt of Israel, as the era of the Bar-Kochba movement is usally called in numismatic literature, the Jewish government issued, over a period of about 270 years, coins of brass as well as silver. No reliable author records the use of gold for coinage in ancient Jewish times nor have Jewish gold coins come down to us from this Jewish classical period.[1] Only Vespasian's gold coins (*aurei*) commemorating his victory over the Jews are still found in collections. After the time of Bar-Kochba, coinage of Jewish money did not exist until the time of the first revival of Jewish coinage by England as the mandatory power in Palestine, in 1927. Between the years 135 and 1927 only the coins mentioned above by Vespasian and his successors, Titus, Domician, Hadrian, and even by Lucius Severus (193-211) to commemorate the victory of the Roman armies of Titus and Vespasian over the Jews are reminders of the erstwhile Jewish state.

One interesting and noteworthy break in this gap in Jewish coinage is the gold coins, weighing one and five grams respectively, issued by a Jew, Julius Popper, in El Paramo (Tiera del Fuego) in South America in 1889.[2] These pieces, pictures of which have been previously published, are important, principally as the only gold coins (not medals) ever issued by a Jew, and because of the numismatically interesting fact that their weight and value was based on the decimal gram system.

[1] Bruno Kisch, "False Shekels and Shekelmedals," *Historia Judaica*, III (1941), 5-39.

[2] Bruno Kisch, "Judaica in Nummis," *Historia Judaica*, VII (1945), 135-158.

During the centuries when a Jewish government entitled to issue Jewish currency did not exist, there was still a certain need in the Jewish communities of the diaspora for tokens with or without monetary value. Such tokens are remarkable numismatic items, reflecting part of the cultural history of the Jewish communities of former times. From the numismatic viewpoint they have been entirely neglected up to now, and undeservedly so. They were mentioned as a group of numismatic items in a previous essay in this journal discussing the systematic subdivision of a collection of Jewish coins and medals.[3]

The use of tokens officially recognized by the authorities and issued independently of monetary items was already widely practiced by the Romans. They employed the so-called *tesserae* in distributing grain to the population of Rome. Those entitled to grain received certain tokens from the government which they exchanged for a fixed amount of food at the food distribution center. Certain *tesserae* served as admission tokens to the circuses in Rome, and *tesserae*-like monetary weights are also known from olden times to have been made under the name of *exagium* and to have been used by the Romans. Similar tokens made of glass appeared in the Arabic world in medieval times, and in European countries since the Middle Ages brass ones served as money weights.

In the Jewish communities of the diaspora tokens were also coined for various purposes and uses. Understandably, not many of them are preserved or at least known still to exist in collections. The amount of those issued was small, and, owing to the fate of Jewish communities in times of persecution, their tokens did not survive even if they did exist, except for a few specimens. To present the different types known to this writer is the endeavor of this paper. This survey will deal only with tokens issued and actually used for practical purposes by official boards in the Jewish communities. They all date from the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. A few may have originated in

[3] Bruno Kisch, "Judaica in Nummis," *loc. cit.*

the seventeenth century too. The tokens of this kind which have come to my attention up to now, are all of base metal.

Omitted here are all pieces issued to commemorate certain facts or meetings or as evidence of membership in a particular Jewish group or lodge. Nor are Jewish charms included. Found fairly frequently, the latter were used to protect children and adults from disease and harmful influences, such as the "evil eye." They are worn by superstitious persons even today. Nor is mention made of the falsifications known among numismatists as "Frankfurter Judenpfennige." These are falsified copper coins with fantastic designs from the time when so many princes in Germany minted small coins that nobody was able to know every pattern. In the nineteenth century, a group of counterfeiters took advantage of this state of affairs to issue their own money, and with good results. In spite of the name "Judenpfennige" it has never been proved that Jews really were involved in this crime. Even if they were, these coins have nothing to do with Jewish communities.

Community tokens that have been found up to the present fall into these groups: shehitah tokens, charity tokens (*pruta*), community and instiutional money (Palestine), balloting tokens, and *Chevra Kadisha* tokens.

Shehitah Tokens

These tokens were used to pay the slaughterer (*shohet*) for slaughtering animals. Two well-preserved specimens of such pieces with an explanatory inscription, coming from Italy, are in the Jewish Museum in New York, in the Samuel Friedenberg Collection. Pictures of them and also of paper tokens serving a similar purpose in the nineteenth century in the German province of Posen have been previously published.[4] A description of paper tokens will be omitted here.

Dr. Isaac Rivkind of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York kindly offered the information that an octogenarian friend of his remembers that in his youth tokens were used to pay the *shohet* in certain Russian-Jewish com-

[4] Jeremiah J. Berman, *Shehitah* (New York, 1941).

munities. There and in Poland they were called *koropka*, which was also the name for the community tax on slaughtering. The name derives from the Russian word for box, *koropka*, the *shohet* having a box in which his patrons deposited the fees.

Rabbi Jeremiah Berman, in his book, *Shehitah*, provides very interesting information on the use of community tokens to pay the fee for the ritual slaughtering of animals.[4a] As early as medieval times and all over the world Jewish communities levied fees for such services. The money collected paid the salaries of the *shohet*, the *bodek*, the man who examined the slaughtered animals, and the rabbi of the community, and also supported the educational and charitable institutions of the community. The first statement concerning a fee to be paid for the slaughtering of animals may be found in the literature of the tenth century from Babylonia.[5] The most important such statement comes from Spain, where a levy collected for slaughtering was expressly used to support teachers and students of Torah. A resolution adopted in 1142 at Valladolid provided that the money so gathered should be used for the support of Talmud Torah (teaching Jewish wisdom).[6] This tax was later transferred to other countries to which Jews emigrated from Spain, for instance, Algiers, Italy, Turkey, Syria, Palestine. It retained its original denomination, *gabela*, a Spanish expression for tax, all over the sephardic world.

It appears that as a rule this tax raised by the community had to be paid into the community treasury and not directly to the *shohet*. Whether this was a precaution against misuse of the money or whether there was another reason we do not know. We do know that in the various communities tokens printed on paper as depicted in Berman's book or in the form of coins were issued by the Jewish community, from which the Jews purchased them to pay the slaughterer who, on receiving them, had to turn them back to the community.

[4a] *Ibid.*, pp. 76 ff.

[5] Berman, *op. cit.*

[6] Louis Finkelstein, *Jewish Self-Government in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1924), p. 350.

Up to now only two such pieces seem to have survived, now in the Jewish Museum in New York. These tokens apparently are from the early nineteenth century. The obverse bears two Hebrew letters (תת), above them two dots marking the two letters as an abbreviation, probably for *Talmud Torah* (see plate I). This accords with the Valladolid resolution of 1142, which designates the slaughterer's tax for the support of the Talmud Torah.[7] On the reverse of the larger one is the Hebrew inscription, לשחיטת עוף גדול (*Le-Shehitath Ouf Gadol*). Beneath it is the Italian inscription *Pollo Grande*, which means "large chicken." In the center of a circle is B.3, apparently indicating the price of three baiocchi. The baiocco was a small papal coin, 100 of them being equal in value to one scudo, used in the Papal States between 1547 and 1849. The other piece in this collection is very similar to the first, but somewhat smaller in size, having a diameter of 33 millimeters. On one side again appears the abbreviation for *Talmud Torah.* On the other side is an inscription reading, לשחיטת עוף קטן (*Le-Schechitath Ouf Koton*), slaughtering of small fowl, and the Italian *Pollo Piccolo* (small chicken). In the center of the small token is written B.1½. It would seem that the price for slaughtering varied according to the size of the fowl. These tokens are made of brass.

Whether the tokens designated for big chickens were also used for geese and ducks cannot be said. In various countries of the world the tax on *shehita* was still collected even in the twentieth century.[8]

It is known that a *shehita* tax existed in Central Europe also, in Germany as well as in Austria, but up to now there is no known specimen of coined tokens used for *shehita* purposes in any of these countries.

Did Any Mikva Tokens Exist?

A community facility that had to be paid for when used was the *mikva* or ritual bath of which every Jewish

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Berman, *op. cit.*

community had to have one. The use of this bath, under Jewish law, obligatory for every married Jewish woman, could hardly be denied to anyone unable to pay even a small fee. However, the existence of community tokens specifically issued for this purpose cannot be established definitely since no such pieces have as yet been found.

Charity Tokens (Pruta)

Those Jewish community tokens about which we really find some enlightening explanation in literature are the tokens for charitable purposes. They are the closest relatives of the old Roman *tesserae* and of those tokens which, especially since the seventeenth century, were distributed all over Europe to the needy, who were then entitled to exchange them for bread, soup, peat (*torf*), wood, candles, and other daily necessities.

Jewish law asks for charity as a duty; even the poor members of the Jewish community are not to be deprived of the privilege of discharging this duty. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries money was extremely scarce in the eastern part of Europe. Pauline Wengeroff mentions in her autobiography that in the early eighteen-thirties the value of money was so high that a turkey sold in Russia (her parents then lived in Brest in Lithuania) for 15 kopeks, a goose for 30 kopeks.[9] A kopek was the smallest Russian coin, worth about 2 cents. This writer remembers having heard from old Russian farmers during the First World War that in their youth a pound of veal sold for 1 kopek, which corroborates Pauline Wengeroff's statement.

Since poor Jews were unable to afford even the smallest Russian coin as a charitable gift, an ingenious way was found out of this difficulty. The community or its rabbi, with the consent of the Russian Government, issued tokens in the value of a fraction of a kopek. They were bought and distributed to beggars, who brought them back to the community or the rabbi and received a kopek or its value

[9] Pauline Wengeroff, *Memoiren einer Grossmutter* (Berlin, 1913; 3rd ed.,

PLATE I



Two Italian Shehitah Tokens



TWELVE COMMUNITY TOKENS



VARIOUS COMMUNITY TOKENS



VARIOUS COMMUNITY TOKENS

in food for a certain number of tokens. These charity-tokens were called *pruta.* In the talmudic scriptures *pruta* is a coin of extremely low value.

What Pauline Wengeroff as an eyewitness remembers about the use of these charity-tokens of the Jewish community of Brest throws light on the subject. A translation of the pertinent passage from her book follows:

My mother used to distribute on Rosh-Chodesh [the beginning of each month of the Jewish calendar] a considerable amount of money. Aged men and women received a coin in the value of 3 Polish grosh, i.e., one and one half Russian kopeka. The younger the poor people were, the less they received, down to one grosh. Children received one *pruta* only. This was one-third of a Polish grosh, therefore 1/6 of a kopeka.[9a] These coins were made by the Jewish elders [*Gemeinderäte*] in Brest-Litovsk with permission of the government. I remember that this *pruta* was given to the poor people exclusively, but was not valid in business life. It was first cast in lead with the inscription *Pruta Achas,* which means one *pruta.* When they were misused, they were abolished and *prutas* were made from parchment with the same inscription. This parchment money was also soon abolished. Its place was filled by a *pruta* in the form of a medium-sized round button of wood with a little groove filled with red sealing wax on which the word *pruta* was impressed with the seal of the Community Council.[10]

In other Jewish communities conditions may have been very similar. An aged patient of mine remembered that parchment *prutas* were still used in the communities near Lemberg in Galicia late in the nineteenth century.

To the kindness of Dr. Isaac Rivkind of the Jewish Theological Seminary I owe the knowledge of some literature on *prutas* regarding their use in eastern Europe in the nineteenth century. According to this literature, in some places *prutas* were made from cardboard[11] and occasionally in different colors, according to their value; in some com-

[9a] Zwi Hirsh Lifschiz, *Midor Ledor* (Warsaw 1901), relates that a "Pruta-Zettel" (pruta-bill) represented 1/12, sometimes even 1/32 of a kopeka. Such was the poverty among the Jewish masses in Russia. According to *Yevrejskaya Encyclopedia,* IV, col. 635, the monetary value of a pruta was 1/5 to 1/10 of one kopeka. For public kitchens for the poor, special tokens in the value of ½, 1 and 2 kopeks were issued.

[10] Wengeroff, *op. cit.,* I, 119.

[11] Chajim Tshemerinski (R'mordchele), *Ajorosi Motele* (Tel Aviv, 1951), p. 34 f.

munities they were made from iron[12] and, when small coins were scarce, the Jewish *prutas* were accepted even by non-Jews as money.[13]

My late friend Rabbi Moses Jacobovits told me that in his youth (about 1900) the needy people in Pressburg received from the Jewish community round tokens with an elevated brim redeemable for bread in the value of three *Kreutzer*. Poor talmudic students, by way of distinction, were given flat square tokens engraved in Hebrew, ב"ח, (Society of the Students), redeemable for bread in the value of four *Kreutzer*.

Plates II and III show various charity tokens from my own collection. Some are round, some square. The material used for them is brass, white metal, and iron. Their appearance is poor; the inscription is in the form of a unilateral stroke.

Part of these Jewish charity tokens were not issued by the communities proper or their rabbis but by the *Chevra Kadisha*, of whose tokens I shall speak below. They are distinguished by the initials ח"ק (*Chevra Kadisha*).

The use of these community tokens for charitable purposes must have been very widespread in Europe. Plate II depicts one such token with the inscription, ק"ק סאראי 5 פ, which means "the holy community of Saray 5 P." This abbreviation probably refers to the Jewish community of Sarajevo (Yugoslavia) and 5 P probably stands for five *prutas*. Sarajevo previously belonged to Austria (province Bosnia). As early as the sixteenth century Jews were living there. Jews from Turkey settled in Sarajevo in the seventeenth century and founded a thriving community with famous rabbis such as Chacham Zevi of the seventeenth and David Pardo of the eighteenth century. In the early twentieth century two Jewish journals were published in

[12] Lifschiz, *Midor Ledor*. Cf. also "Jewish Charity Money," *News of the Yivo*, 1952, No. 45, p. 2; Saul Horowitz, "Ormeleit," *Jewish American*, June 19, 1953, p. 16.

[13] Meier Berlin, *Fun Volożin bis Yerusholayim*, I (New York, 1933), p. 64 f., describes how the yeshiva students were given for their support "*tzetlach*" (tickets) in lieu of cash. These "*tzetlach*" were accepted and circulated among Jews and Christians, not only in Volozin but also in its environments.

Sarajevo. There was also a Jewish community in the Russian village by the name of Saraj. The *pruta* under discussion, however, was bought from a collection together with another token with Turkish lettering. The two tokens from the twentieth century, issued by the Jewish community of Sopron (Ödenburg) in Hungary, (Pl. II), may have served purposes similar to those of the eastern *pruta* tokens. The Hungarian inscriptions read in translation: "For the Jewish religious community of Sopron." These tokens are of very thin white material (aluminum) and apparently from the twentieth century.

A copper token of 26 millimeters in diameter, the use and origin of which it has not yet been possible to ascertain, is shown on Plate IV, No. 2 and II, No. 1. From the nineteenth century, it reads on one side in Hebrew ק"מד, which means "Community MD." The abbreviation for MD may stand for Mattersdorf, Middelburg, or Minden. On the reverse appears IGM, probably *Israelitische Gemeinde M* (Jewish Community M). This token, too, may have been a charity token, and as the Latin letters indicate, from a German or rather Austrian community.

Community and Institutional Money in Palestine

In the writer's collection there is one token of brass, 28 millimeters in diameter, apparently from the nineteenth century. On one side is the arabic numeral 1 and around it in Latin lettering MIKVEH ISRAEL. The other side bears the three large letters A I U. This seemed to be the abbreviation for Alliance Israélite Universelle, a French institution that has founded a school in the agricultural colony of Mikveh Israel, southeast of Tel Aviv, now in the State of Israel. In 1870, when Israel, as Palestine, was still a part of the Turkish Empire, the colony Mikveh Israel was founded by Charles Netter. Inquiry from the principal of the Agricultural school at Mikveh Israel yielded the following information supplied by the secretary of the school.

In the nineteenth century the Mikveh Israel Agricultural School, as well as some Jewish colonies and institutions in Palestine, issued coins for internal use, as shortage of Turkish Government small change occurred often. The coin you mention was issued by our school. The

initials A I U are those of the Alliance Israélite Universelle of Paris, a society to which our school belongs. I am sorry that we have none of the said coins left.

It would thus appear that, as in Russia, so in the Turkish province of Palestine, the issuing of private money resulted from a lack of small government coins. It is noteworthy that in the case of Mikveh Israel, not the community, but the school of the Alliance, issued this kind of private money.

Further search for other such pieces besides the one in the author's collection elicited from John Walker, keeper of the Department of Coins and Medals of the British Museum in London, the information that the Museum's collection included the A I U money of Mikveh Israel in three different types (1, ½, ¼), in addition to similar tokens from modern times from Dora, Zichron Jacob, and Jaffa. The Zichron Jacob tokens (Pl. IV) show no connection between the settlement and the Alliance Israélite Universelle; they may have been issued by the community itself. Of the tokens of the Colony Zichron Jacob the British Museum has in its collection two types (1, ¼). Probably here, too, as in Mikveh Israel, there existed a value ½, but a piece of this kind has not yet been found.

All these tokens seem to be from the second part of the nineteenth century, and it would be very worthwhile to collect whatever can be found in Israel of this interesting private money as long as its relics exist.

Apparently from the end of the nineteenth century also is a token of different origin in this writer's collection. It is a thin token, 20 millimeters in diameter, of light brass. On the obverse is written JERUSALEM HOTEL and a capital A between two asterisks, in the center between two smaller asterisks the word JAFFA. On the reverse appears the figure 1, beneath it the word PIASTER, and beneath this an asterisk. Whether this piaster piece was used only in the hotel as small change or in the town of Jaffa as money of necessity (*Notgeld*) when Turkish coins were scarce cannot be ascertained, nor the meaning of the A on the obverse.

Balloting Tokens

A special group among the tokens used in Jewish communities are balloting tokens. They seem to have been rather popular from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries and were apparently used in the same way as the white and black balls for voting pro and con in other societies.

The New York Jewish Museum contains a few of these tokens. All of them were made in a similar way from the small governmental coins apparently of the country in which the community was located, one side being polished and "yes" or "no" engraved on it in Hebrew letters. For "yes" the letters חן (*hen*) were used, for "no" to letters לא (*lo*). On some were also added the letters פ'ד (P-D), meaning, "This is what I say." Probably for the same purpose or as personal legitimation small coins were used, polished on one side and engraved with the name of a person, probably one of those entitled to vote.

The exact date when these balloting tokens were used cannot be given, only the *terminus ab quo,* that is, the time before which the singular piece could not have been used. This is established by the date of issuance of the coin. Whether contemporary coins were employed for such purposes or those already taken out of circulation can, of course, not be determined. Some of these ballot tokens bear the name in abbreviation of the community where they were used; for instance, one 18 shilling piece of Denmark is engraved ק"ק ק"ה, apparently standing for *Killo Kedosho* Kopenhagen. Another piece in the Friedenberg Collection reads ק"ק ב"ב, which is translated by the curator of this collection as "Holy Community at Birnbaum" (Poland). Many of these balloting tokens are engraved on papal coins. All show that balloting with those tokens was very widespread in Jewish communities, surely at least in Poland, Denmark, and Italy.

Chevra Kadisha Tokens

Chevra Kadisha (the Holy Fraternity) is the name of an organization that exists in every Jewish community and

devotes its activities to charitable work exclusively—mainly to the care of the sick and poor, the care of the dying and dead, their burial in the traditional fashion, and the care of Jewish cemeteries.

The famous Rabbi Liva Ben Bezalel (called "der hohe Rabbi Löw") of Prague is supposed to have set up, in the sixteenth century, the constitution and by-laws of the Chevra Kadisha in Prague, which later became the model for all other similar fraternities in European Jewish communities.

Two types of tokens, distinguished by their inscription as issued by the Chevra Kadisha, can be found on Plate II. The first are charity tokens. The different material (brass, white metal), the different form (round or square), and the different level of craftmanship of these tokens indicate different places of origin and different manufacturers. All of them seem to date from the nineteenth century. Some, like No. 5, 6, 8 on Plate II and No. 10 on Plate IV show a high artistic level, some like No. 9 and 10 on Plate II a low one. On some the inscription is scarcely legible. The type of Hebrew characters on them is the only thing that justifies including them in this group.

The round tokens of this type in the writer's collection have a diameter between 18 and 20 millimeters. They are inscribed צ'ד, and underneath ח'ק. The two upper letters צ'ד, probably stand for *Zedoko Dalim* (charity for the poor), and the two lower letters ח'ק for Chevra Kadisha. Two of these tokens are made of white metal; a third is made of brass. Another token of this type is in the collection of the British Museum in London (Pl. IV, No. 10), One such round token of brass, 22 millimeters in diameter (Pl II, No. 9), has an inscription in Hebrew letters which is not well legible. This is also true of a square one (Pl. II, No. 10), 13 x 11 millimeters in size, made of a thin brass plate.

Besides these charity tokens of the holy fraternities, there are also some of a different type, apparently issued to a single member (male or female) of such organizations. They may have been used as a credential to identify the bearer. Two such pieces in this writer's collection are de-

picted on Pl. II, Nos. 2 and 3. Engraved on round brass plates both may be from the eighteenth or nineteenth century. The larger one (40 millimeters in diameter) shows the name Zelig Son of Leb Emden in an ornamental border of triangles. On the reverse is a pentagram in a border of ornamental leaves, and in the middle of it a five-cornered star and the abbreviations ח'ק/ל'ב/ו'כ. The first two letters, ח'ק stand for Chevra Kadisha. All the others are a matter of conjecture. ל'ב may signify the famous Jewish community of Lemberg (Lwow) in Galicia. The two last letters ו'כ, are topped by a crown with seven points and may stand for a name. The other very similar, but artistically much less elaborate, piece has on one side a simple ornamental border and its inscription reads רבקה/א' אברהם/כהן (Rivkah, wife of Avrohom Kohen). The other side is engraved ח'ק/נ'צ (*Chevra Kadisha Noshe Zadkonios,* meaning the holy fraternity, the pious women).

Tokens similar to the last two described can be found, made of the same material, light brass, and less elaborate in craftsmanship, in the Friedenberg Collection. One of them is supposed to have originated in the community of Frankfurt am Main.

This description of the various kinds of Jewish community tokens may induce other collectors, too, to devote time and interest to this field of Jewish cultural history. The author would appreciate receiving any information about other pieces of this kind in private hands and especially pictures of them.

845 *West End Avenue, New York City*

Explanation of Plates

Plate I

Italian Shehitah Tokens

Obverse and Reverse of Two Italian Shehitah Tokens
(Friedenberg Collection, Jewish Museum, New York)

Plate II

Twelve Community Tokens
(The Author's Collection)

No. 1. Copper token of the Jewish Community M'D.

No. 2. Brass token probably identification mark of the Holy Brotherhood for Zelig, the son of Leb Emden, probably Lemberg.

No. 3. Brass identification mark of Rebecca, wife of Abram Cohan.

No. 4. Money of the Alliance Israélite Universelle from the second half of the nineteenth century, used in Mikveh Israel in Palestine.

Nos. 5., 6., and 8. Charity tokens of the Holy Brotherhood, in brass and white metal, place of origin unknown.

Nos. 9. and 10. Similar tokens, less elaborately made.

No. 7. Charity token of the Jewish Community of Sarajevo, in the denomination of 5 prutas.

Nos. 11. and 12. Tokens of the Jewish Community of Sopron, Hungary.

Plate III

Various Community Tokens

(By courtesy of the Jewish Museum, New York City)

Nos. 1. and 3. Balloting tokens. No. 1 indicating "no," No. 3 "yes." No. 1, copper coin from the Papal States with picture of St. Peter on the reverse; No. 3, reverse not discernible.

No. 2. Front side abbreviation to be read: "The Holy Community of Kopenhagen." Reverse: the Danish coat of arms with crown.

No. 4. Balloting token, indicating "no," on a papal coin; on the reverse UN BAIOCCO GUBBIO 1750.

No. 5. Token, nineteenth century; Hebrew inscription indicating the name of "David Son of Chaim." Beneath, the letters G"Ch, possibly an abbreviation of *Gemilus Chassidim* (charity), and possibly an identification token for a member of the Board

of the Charitable Holy Fraternity. G"Ch could also stand for *Gabai* (Trustee) of the *Chevra* (brotherhood). The coin used for this purpose is, as the reverse shows, again from the Papal States and bears the quite legible inscription, PIUS/ SEPTIMUS/PONTIFEX/MAXIMUS/MDCCCI.

No. 6. Probably an identification token of a member of the Holy Fraternity of Frankfurt. On the obverse his name, Salman, son of Shabsei Cohen and in the middle the blessing hands as the symbol of Jewish priests. On the reverse the initials forming the abbreviation of the name of the Holy Brotherhood, and the letters F"M which indicate Frankfurt am Main.

Nos. 7., 8., and 9. Balloting tokens. Nos. 7 and 9 indicate "yes," No. 8 signifies "no." No. 7 bears on the obverse besides the Hebrew expression for "yes," the abbreviation for Holy Community, B"B which in the collection of the New York Jewish Museum is interpreted as Birnbaum (Poland). The reverse shows that the token was made from a Polish 3 grosh coin of 1790. The reverse of No. 8 cannot be identified. The reverse of No. 9 shows an L in the center of a wreath of oak leaves and above it the royal crown and three fleurs de lis, probably a French coin.

Plate IV

Community Tokens

No. 1. Identification mark of the Holy Brotherhood of an unknown place with the name Leb, son of Siskind, in light brass. On the reverse G"Ch.

No. 2. Copper token with Hebrew and Latin initials, indicating the Jewish Community of M-D. Identical with Pl. II, No. 1.

No. 3. Italian identification mark. Roman coin with picture of St. Peter on the reverse and the name of Rabbi Mose Minden. (Nos. 1-3 in the Jewish Museum, New York City.)

Nos. 4. and 5. Community tokens in denominations of 1 and ¼, second part of the nineteenth century, in Zichron Jacob.

Nos. 6., 7., and 8. Similar money issued by the School of the Alliance Israélite Universelle in Mikveh Israel.

No. 9. Token, inscription not well legible. According to information by the owener, it points to the Community Dora (Palestine).

No. 10. Charity token of the Holy Brotherhood, similar to those on Pl. II. (Tokens Nos. 4-10 in the British Museum, London. Permission to publish their pictures was given by the Jewish Museum, New York and the British Museum, London.)

REVIEW SECTION

JEWISH IDEALS AND THE GENTILE WORLD

A Book Review*

By Solomon B. Freehof
Rodef Shalom Congregation
Pittsburgh, Pa.

THIS extensive and learned book will be deprecated by some because it belongs to the field of apologetics. The word "apologetics" is in bad odor because of a semantic accident. It so happens that the secondary and derived meaning of the word "apology" has by chance become, nowadays, its primary and prevalent meaning. The word "apology" to us means a plea for the forgiveness of an admitted fault. But the original meaning of the word is far different. Far from admitting an alleged fault, it denies the charge. The original meaning of "apology" is simply "vindication" or "defense." It is, therefore, a misunderstanding which leads many to dislike apologetic literature. Part of their dislike, or a good deal of it, springs from their use of the secondary meaning of the word. They look upon it as cringing literature, as a plea for mercy; but the contrary is true. Apologetics is the literature of dignity, of the consciousness of one's worth. Jewish apologetic literature from the days of the Sybilline books and Philo and Josephus, through the days of Joseph Bloch's "Israel and the Nations," has been a literature of self-respect and courage and even defiance of maligners and slanderers.

This book is a worthy and valiant soldier in the ranks of Jewish apologetic works. It is apologetic in the classic manner and goes back, in a sense, to the very beginning of the literature. Whereas many of the later apologetic books, having been written in anti-Semitic lands, were compelled perforce to confine themselves almost entirely to specific defense against specific charges on the part of anti-Semites, this book, being written in free and comradely America, can go beyond mere direct defense and describe the entire mood of historic Judaism in a thoroughgoing and leisurely manner in order to demonstrate not only the falsity of certain specific charges but to portray the essential nobility of the Jewish faith,

* Jacob S. Raisin, *Gentile Reactions to Jewish Ideals*. Published Posthumously under the Editorship of *Herman Hailperin*. Philosophical Library. New York, 1953. xxiii and 876 pp.

its basic brotherliness in order thereby to show that all of the charges are in essence impossible. Thus the author goes back to the style of the first great apologetic work, Josephus' "Apion," which, in its first part, is primarily the history of Judaism, and only in the second part takes up specific accusations and disposes of them.

This work is devoted to a task which has been frequently envisaged but which has never before been systematically developed. When Dr. Jacob Z. Lauterbach wrote his well-known essay, "The Ethics of the Halacha," he wanted to indicate that *even* the Halacha, which many considered narrow and niggling, even that contained at least by implication a sense of respect for all peoples and a basic human brotherhood. Jacob Raisin meant to do for all of Jewish literature and history what Dr. Lauterbach did for this small section of Jewish thought and writing. He was well equipped for this broad task, having a deep knowledge of Jewish traditional literature, modern Hebraic literature and the optimistic mood of the western world at its best. Beginning with the Bible and from there all through Jewish writings, he demonstrates that Judaism was never planned to be narrow and exclusive but a vehicle for the bringing of pure, ethical monotheism to all men and that furthermore not only was Judaism not exclusive in its doctrine, but in actual experience there never was a time when Judaism did not have an influence and an attraction for those born out of its fold.

The book, therefore, is inadequately titled. It deals with much more than "Christian Reactions to Jewish Ideals." It describes Jewish ideals in relation to the Gentile world, Jewish and Christian reactions to these ideals and the unbroken contact between Jewry and the Gentile world all through the ages. Perhaps, therefore, a more correct although perhaps less specific title would be "Jewish Ideals and the Gentile World."

In order to carry out this broad plan, the late Dr. Raisin covers Jewish literature from the Bible to the Yiddish literature of our day and Jewish history from Bible times to today. In a work of such wide scope there will be inevitably certain chapters which deal with oft-quoted material. Some chapters will deal with material well-known to some readers, and others to others. But there is not likely to be a reader who will not find some chapters from which he can learn a great deal. And certainly all of the chapters together constitute a grand anthology of writings and a pageant of events illustrating the hoped-for comradeship between the Jewish and the Gentile world. In the chapters in which a particular reader happens to be more or less acquainted, he will perhaps suggest additional statements which might well have been cited in support of the main contention. For example, on page 496, where the author speaks of the relationships between Jews and Christians in northern France in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and the numbers who converted to Judaism, he says: "The Tosafists quote the opinion of an 'Abraham the *Ger*' of the twelfth century regarding the duties of a convert." It would have been of considerable help to the thesis if the

author had quoted and explained the entire statement to which he refers. The statement (found in the *Tosafoth* to *Kiddushin* 70b, *s.v. Kashim*) indicates the proud and loyal and scrupulous Judaism of these converts. This convert wants to explain away the anti-proselyte statement in the Talmud that "proselytes are worse for Israel than a scab," and he says in his explanation that the Talmud means that we proselytes are bad for Israel because we are so careful in our observance of the commandments that God rebukes those born Jews because they suffer by comparison.

The part of the book which will perhaps be most informative to the average reader is the twenty-fifth chapter, "Among the Slavonians," in which the author describes the widespread influence which Judaism has had both among the nobility and the plain people in the Slavic lands, the famous converts to Judaism and the many folk movements towards Sabbath observance, half-Judaism and even full-Judaism.

Dr. Raisin did not have the opportunity to complete his work at least as far as the scientific apparatus is concerned. The book needed a great deal of work before it could be prepared for the press. Especially the notes required checking and completing. This arduous and important editorial work has been done in a devoted and able fashion by Herman Hailperin whose own studies prepared him for this special field. Dr. Hailperin has devoted a great deal of research to the relationship of Christian biblical scholarship to Jewish Bible commentators in the Middle Ages. He is to be congratulated on having made this fine work available. Many readers for many years will be grateful to the memory of that devoted Jewish scholar, Jacob Raisin, for having gathered all these elements in Jewish life and literature which combine our discipline and our ideals, our experience and our hopes.

The Apocalyptic in Judaism

ON THE APOCALYPTIC IN JUDAISM. *By Joshua Bloch.* The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning. Philadelphia, Pa., 1952. Pp. vi, 154. (Jewish Quarterly Review, new series, Monograph Series, no. II).

THE thesis expounded by Dr. Joshua Bloch, chief of the Jewish division of the New York Public Library, in this study is that "in a way entirely their own the Jewish apocalyptic writers borrowed from the past in such a manner as to transmute traditionally received data into new conceptions," and that some, at least, of these new conceptions "have directly or indirectly, but profoundly, influenced religious beliefs and practices in Judaism." To put this in another way, Dr. Bloch wishes to suggest three main points: (1) that the apocalyptic literature produced during the several last centuries B.C.E. and the first century C.E. is more largely based upon traditional Jewish religious ideas than

has generally been held; (2) that this apocalyptic literature gave a unique interpretation to these traditional Jewish ideas and in so doing affected the later course of Jewish religious development more than has generally been admitted; and (3) that earlier scholarship, by failing to recognize the importance of apocalyptic, cut itself off from an important mine of source materials for the proper understanding of Judaism and its history. There is no doubt that Dr. Bloch, with his enormous erudition, makes out a strong case for these three points, although to this reviewer it seems that he has exaggerated the indifference of earlier scholars to the apocalyptic strain, and, perhaps as an overcompensation, that he now tends to exaggerate the importance of apocalyptic.

The loose organization of the monograph, which consists of twenty-five sections of varying length and varying importance, precludes any neat summary of Dr. Bloch's work. One group of sections deals with the relationship of apocalyptic to prophetic literature and notes how the internality of prophetic views of the transformations to come is externalized in apocalyptic accounts of the future. The version of history as "the unfolding of the divine purpose and a movement towards an end, namely, a universal and everlasting kingdom of righteousness" is one of the more interesting points. If the apocalyptic writers did not create, at least they advanced materially this characteristic Judeo-Christian theology of history. Another, more scattered group of sections presents evidence for the continued vitality of apocalyptic views and visions in the rabbinic literature. Still another group concerns the persistence of apocalyptic ideas in the Kabbalah. Another introduces the question of the relation between apocalyptic and the too-little known sectarian movements of the postbiblical period. In similar fashion, Dr. Bloch presents a conspectus of apocalyptic lore on angelology and demonology, eschatology, the kingdom of God, etc.

On the whole, if we regard this work not as a finished performance but as a prolegomenon to systematic studies of the apocalyptic element in Judaism, it has considerable value. Certainly we must be grateful to Dr. Bloch for the care with which he has searched the literature, while we express our regret at the almost haphazard way in which he has recorded his findings.

JOSEPH L. BLAU

Columbia University

LEON DA MODENA

LEON DA MODENA AND THE KOL SAKHAL. By *Ellis Rivkin*. Hebrew Union College Press. Cincinnati (Ohio), 1952. Pp. xii, 144.

PROFESSOR RIVKIN'S object in this interesting monograph is to rescue Leon da Modena (1571-1648) from the imputation of heresy attaching to his memory. Rivkin is particularly concerned to bring

forward all available evidence to disprove the nineteenth century contention (advanced especially by Isaac S. Reggio in 1852, and supported by Abraham Geiger in 1856) that Leon was the author of the *Kol Sakhal.* In his attempt to clear the name of Leon, Dr. Rivkin faces the large task of going against the weight of recent scholarship, which has at least tacitly accepted the Reggio-Geiger thesis. Among twentieth century scholars who have considered this question, Ludwig Blau, Isaiah Sonne, and Ephraim Shemueli are singled out for notice. Dr. Sonne, it should be remembered, has considered the relationship of Leon da Modena to the *Kol Sakhal* incidentally to a series of studies in the heresy of Uriel da Costa.

Now, the Reggio-Geiger thesis, supported by these later scholars, rests upon two arguments: that the "inimitable" style of Leon is clearly recognizable in the *Kol Sakhal,* and that the heretical views there openly espoused are covertly alluded to by Leon in other works ostensibly composed in defense of rabbinic Judaism. Even the fact that Leon himself wrote a refutation of the *Kol Sakhal* in his *Shaagat Aryeh* has been twisted by scholarship into a presumptive proof that he was the author of the *Kol Sakhal.* Thus it has been argued that the refutation in the *Shaagat Aryeh* is deliberately weak; Leon, it is asserted, used this ostensible refutation as a means of calling attention to the arguments of the *Kol Sakhal* and of suggesting their strength by contrast with his ineffective reply. Furthermore, as Rivkin argues, supporters of the Reggio-Geiger thesis have equated Leon's *description* of Rabbinic customs (e.g., in his *Historia de gli Riti Hebraici*) with *denunciations* of these same customs by the author of the *Kol Sakhal.*

Since the weight of scholarly authority falls so strongly on the side of the imputation of heretical views to Leon da Modena, whether by positive conviction, as in Reggio, or by failure to find a satisfactory alternative, as in Sonne, the task that Rivkin has set himself is a large one. It is a pleasure to be able to report that this large task has been carried out with distinction. Only by wilfully disregarding the wealth of evidence that Rivkin has amassed in his systematic refutation of the thesis that Leon da Modena was the author of the *Kol Sakhal* can this view ever again be deliberately espoused. I have insisted on the weight of authority that Rivkin had to counteract because, were it not for the strength of the supporters of the Reggio-Geiger thesis, he might otherwise be accused of having brought up his heavy artillery to destroy a house of cards. For, the context in which he sets his specific arguments is very broad. It is nothing less than a summary view of the cultural environment of seventeenth century Europe, with its seething cross-currents of intellectual life, with which Rivkin opens his study. In this century, he maintains, the full impact of the various factors entering into the breakdown of the medieval synthesis affected Jewish life and thought and led to the rise of anti-rabbinic heresy.

This reviewer found himself especially sympathetic with Rivkin's

insistence upon the broader framework. There have been far too many studies in the Jewish field that have disregarded the world in which Judaism and the Jews were living, making the tacit assumption that Jewish life was completely self-contained and isolated. An important methodological principle in all Jewish historiography should be the recognition that there is a constant interaction in all ages and all countries of the Diaspora between Jewish culture and the surrounding culture which serves as its medium. The point is, as Rivkin properly stresses, most important for the period of the breaking down of the medieval synthesis because (as Dr. Kisch has demonstrated) the medieval legal structure made a special place for Jewish law and thus incorporated the Jews, in a special role, into medieval society. As the newer monarchies and the new economic orientation of the postmedieval period emerged, the strain of culture change was inevitably reflected in the Jewish world.

Next, the focus of Rivkin's study narrows to the Jewish community of Venice. Here, he maintains, in the early years of the seventeenth century was to be found a center for the defense of traditional Judaism against the anti-rabbinical heresies that developed in this era. Leon da Modena, he finds, embodied "the dynamic, contradictory, and creative characteristics of the Venetian environment." Although Rivkin recognizes in Leon an early spokesman for conscious adaptation of Judaism to its cultural surroundings, nevertheless he makes clear that what Leon proposed was the adaptation of Judaism, not its abolition, and that Leon was, therefore, strongly opposed to the heretical views that were current. Rivkin's study next narrows still further to the single work, the *Kol Sakhal,* and his final chapters contain a summary of the heretical positions taken in this work, a survey of scholarly opinion on its authorship, and the systematic refutation of the Reggio-Geiger hypothesis that Leon da Modena was its author, which has been discussed above.

The success with which Professor Rivkin has carried out this difficult and crucial study leads one to look forward to the author's projected full-length biography of Leon da Modena, in the preparation of which the necessity for treating the problem dealt with in this monograph arose.

JOSEPH L. BLAU

Columbia University

MEDICAL FOLKLORE IN RESPONSA LITERATURE

MAGICIANS, THEOLOGIANS AND DOCTORS. Studies in Folk-Medicine and Folklore as Reflected in the Rabbinical Responsa (12th-19th Centuries). By *H. J. Zimmels.* Edward Goldston & Son, Ltd. London. 1952, viii and 293 pp.

IT has been recognized for some time that the vast responsa literature is a rich mine of information concerning virtually every aspect of

Jewish life, although its primary purpose was halachic. Jewish scholars have, in recent years, produced a number of excellent studies of various Jewish communities, basing themselves on the data revealed (often quite incidentally) in the responsa of a single eminent authority, and have thus greatly enriched our understanding of the dynamics and structure of these Jewries. Dr. H. J. Zimmels, who in 1926 published one of the outstanding examples of this type of monograph (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland im* 13. *Jahrhundert, Vienna,* 1926) derived from the writings of R. Meir of Rothenburg, has now turned his exhaustive knowledge of this branch of Jewish literature to a survey of the medical data disclosed in it.

The present volume contains a good deal of interesting information on a wide variety of related subjects: legal, ritual and theological issues posed by the practice of medicine in general and by specific medical procedures and innovations; theories of the causation of disease; the education and status of physicians; conceptions of anatomy and physiology; therapeutics; hospitalization, etc. But the nature of the material is such as to preclude a satisfactory treatment of these subjects.

Two things become quickly clear: (1) Such medical science as Europe acquired during the Middle Ages, initially largely through Jewish mediation, did not percolate through to the training and experience of the rabbis, whose responsa reflect accurately the prevailing popular attitude; their opinions and statements of "fact" are predominantly folkloristic, and even superstitious in nature. (2) The responsa, vast and varied though their contents are, do not provide sufficient data for a well-rounded treatment of such an extensive area; the medical-folkloristic tidbits to be gleaned from them are thin and scrappy. To enumerate the subjects covered is to arouse false expectations. At best these items are no more than jottings, random notations, and anecdotes. The author of this volume has sought valiantly to organize his material under general subject headings, but beyond a simple classificatory scheme his efforts have borne little fruit. Furthermore, the vast expanse of time (twelfth through nineteenth centuries) and space (virtually every state in Europe and North Africa) covered by Zimmels' sources renders his material even more fragmentary; he has often been obliged to telescope his earliest and his latest data, and to juxtapose such diverse milieus as those of Turkey and France, North Africa and Poland. It is well-nigh impossible to relate such scattered data cogently, or to disclose any consistent patterns of thought or development. Finally, the social background is neglected altogether; although the author often cites non-Jewish sources for comparison, the total effect remains haphazard.

This result is unavoidable, as we must conclude from Zimmels' frequent resort to such chapter headings as, "Notes on . . .," "Some Remarks on . . .," "Some Notes on . . ." Lacking correlative material from contemporary Jewish writings other than the responsa, or extensive comparative material from non-Jewish sources, or the examination of

cultural and social influences, this is what the whole amounts to: a series of notations on Jewish folk-medicine. The book does not stand comparison with the author's earlier work based on Meir of Rothenburg's responsa, dealing compactly with a single period, or with his work on the Marranos (*Die Marranen in der rabbinischen Literatur*, Berlin, 1932), treating of a single, limited phenomenon.

Of particular interest are the halachic and ritual problems created by new developments in medical practice. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the permissibility of autopsies and anatomical dissection had to be determined; queries concerning the ritual propriety of inoculation and vaccination were submitted during the nineteenth century; more recently rabbinic attention has been directed to hypnotism, artificial insemination, incubation, new surgical procedures, as well as to embalming, cremation, and changes in the traditional practice of circumcision. Dr. Zimmels might well have included a fuller presentation of the discussion in the responsa concerning such matters, though the sources are fully cited in the notes.

Given its inherent limitations, the book does not lack interest or value. As a notebook for an extended monograph on folk-medicine, the status and role of the physician, or the halachic-religious reaction to the practice of medicine, based on a comprehensive investigation of all the sources, it has its undoubted merits for the specialist.

JOSHUA TRACHTENBERG

Teaneck, N. J.

HISTORY OF HEBREW LITERATURE

STORIA DELLA LETTERATURA EBRAICA. By *Antonio Belli.* Academia, Milano, 1951. 466 pp.

THIS book is the first in a series of popular literary histories (*Storia della letteratura di tutte il mundo*) that was to appear under the editorship of the late Italian literateur, Vincenzo Errante. Mr. Belli is currently Professor of Hebrew Literature at the Università Cattolica in Milan. He has published a number of articles on modern Hebrew poetry in *Orfeo*, an Italian literary periodical.

Anyone acquainted with the vast scope of Hebrew literature and its multifarious aspects must of necessity sympathize with Mr. Belli's herculean effort to condense its history into a single volume. To do so successfully requires a staggering amount of erudition, an unflinching sense of discrimination, and a rare flair for good, even writing. That Mr. Belli has failed on all three counts, despite his honest endeavors and his warm sympathy for the Hebrew language is not completely to his discredit. None of his predecessors were any more successful.

Judging from the work before us, one must grant that Mr. Belli knows the Hebrew Bible. His approach is that of a Catholic scholar, and within the limits of his tradition he presents skillfully (although at times in a flamboyant style) plausible arguments for the retention of the more fundamentalist view of the redaction of the Bible. Thus, for example, he cautiously rejects the documentary theory on the composition of the Pentateuch, argues for a single authorship of Isaiah, and assigns most of the Psalms to David. In short, he does no violence to his Church's doctrine concerning the Hebrew canon, a doctrine which appears in its final form in Pius XII's encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* (1943). In so doing he draws very heavily upon the work of M. J. Legrange. Mr. Belli is to be commended for his open admission of his Catholic *Tendenz* and for his great care in keeping the Christological elements of his exegesis to a minimum (pp. 55, 98, 102, and a few other passages). His bibliography, however, is very inadequate, omitting most of the standard critical works.

Once he enters upon the post-biblical period, the author appears to be on very thin ice, and thenceforth his acquaintance with Hebrew literature comes mainly from secondary sources. In contrast to the vivid description and careful analysis in the biblical section, the post-biblical section contains hardly more than a catalogue of authors and titles. Quotations which abound in the biblical section are scarce in the remainder of the book despite Mr. Belli's promise in his preface "to give the greatest possible space to the anthological part." He makes frequent use of Umberto Cassuto's *Storia della letteratura ebraica post-biblica,* which in every respect is the more scholarly work. An indication of his unfamiliarity with the period and the sources involved are the numerous errors made in the transcription of Hebrew titles and phrases; they are far too numerous to be excused as printer's errors. To point to a few: *Rosh Goloth for Resh Galutha or Rosh Haggolah, kakah* for *kallah, Mislè shu'alim* (with an *'alef*) for *Mishlè shu'alim* (with an *'ayin*), *Massechoth* for *Massechtoth, Sifrà ha torah kohanim,* evidently an error in copying Cassuto's reference to *Sifrà* o (Italian for *or*) *torath kohanim,* and similarly *Melkhita* (cf. Cassuto, for *Mekhiltatha* p. 30). All these errors occur within a space of six pages (pp. 204-210). Mistakes in dating are much less frequent, and despite the unevenness in the allocation of space, the more important works are listed and commented upon.

The final section of the book deals with modern Hebrew literature. Here again Mr. Belli reveals a superficial knowledge of the period. He accepts Klausner's periodization but makes no use of such a standard work as Lachower's *History of Hebrew Literature.* Here, too, errors in transcription abound. When discussing the contempoary scene—some of the leading contemporary poets—Mr. Belli omits authors of the calibre of Uri Zvi Greenberg, Avraham Shlonsky, Sh. Shalom, and Leah

Goldberg, yet he includes lesser authors like Joseph Aronowitz, Moshe Smiliansky, and the more talented but still ripening Yizhar Smiliansky.

This book, we must conclude, has added very little to our knowledge or appreciation of Hebrew literature, nor has it superseded Cassuto's rather pedantic handbook. As a survey for the intelligent reader, unfamiliar with Hebrew, it may have some merit, after diligent correction and revision. The publication in a European language of a good, popular, one-volume study of Hebrew literature must still be awaited.

EZRA SPICEHANDLER

Hebrew Union College
Jewish Institute of Religion

A NEW PRESENTATION OF THE DREYFUS CASE

FUENF KAEMPFER FUER GERECHTIGKEIT. By *Gerhard Simson.* C. H. Becksche Verlagsbuchhandlung. München, 1951. 289 pp. and 5 portraits.

HISTORICAL FICTION, quite often—and rightly so—attacked by historians and scholars in general, is at its best in this volume. Written with skill and in an attractive style, it presents the biographies of five "fighters for justice": Christian Thomasius, Georges Picquart, Cesare Lombroso, Henri Dunant, and Fridtjof Nansen.

The arenas of their struggles are quite different. The last two are well known and appreciated throughout the civilized world for their work on behalf of the wounded, prisoners, and refugees of war. Jews render their share of gratitude for the achievements of these two benefactors of mankind. Cesare Lombroso is of special interest to them because this father of the doctrine of the "born criminal" belonged to the Jewish faith.

Most interesting for the Jewish historian, however, is the retelling and re-evaluation of the story of the "Dreyfus affair" in the biographical portrayal of one of the staunchest advocates of justice, Georges Picquart. The presentation is based on a profound study and knowledge of the available material (apparently only secondary sources were used for all five biographies). Picquarts' personality is correctly presented as far as historical truth is concerned and he is skillfully placed within the framework of the political events and intrigues of the period, in which the other equally well-depicted characters played their respective roles. It seems to this reviewer that in no other German publication has the Dreyfus story been brought so strongly home to the general reader as in this excellently produced small volume. And this holds true in spite of the fact that the stylistic mastery of the author, much praised by German critics, does justice mainly to the presentation of historical events and political developments and their implications for the story; his

reflections on their relation to the present are, for the most part, shallow. Moreover, his evaluation of certain persons in terms of social psychology is at times debatable, for instance, his apology for Schwarzkoppen, one of the few persons besides Wilhelm II who knew of Dreyfus' complete innocence yet did not speak up (his notes were published posthumously as late as 1930).

Only a few monographs are referred to in all five biographies. It is not understandable why the author of the most comprehensive monograph on Thomasius is not mentioned, although the work is cited on page 4. It would have been helpful, too, for the general reader if, at the end of each essay, he had been given a selected bibliography to guide him to further detailed information on specific problems of interest to him.

GUIDO KISCH

Hebrew Union College —
Jewish Institute of Religion

FESTSCHRIFT FOR LEO BAECK

FESTSCHRIFT ZUM 80. GEBURTSTAG VON LEO BAECK AM 23. MAI 1953. Council for the Protection of the Rights and Interests of Jews from Germany. London, [1953]. 111 pp.

THIS slim volume of a little more than one hundred pages is a very remarkabe new type of *Festschrift.* Dedicated to the celebration of Leo Baeck's eightieth birthday, it is a small bouquet of literary essays—biographical, historical, theological, sociological, and others—for the outstanding Jewish theologian and philosopher, the great representative and symbol of the glory and tragedy of German Jewry and Judaism, who was rightfully designated as "a living Saint." None of the various contributions by several outstanding survivers of the Nazi holocaust deals with Leo Baeck personally or with his work. Each of them, however, is transparent enough to offer—though by implication only—a clear picture of the significance of his life and work for an important period in Jewish history in a great Jewish center of the world that was destroyed by modern barbarism and vandalism.

Eugene Taeubler, who recently passed away, describes vividly the small town of Lissa in the Prussian province of Posen, a center of Western civilization, from which Baeck and he came. This partly biographical, partly autobiographical study, written in a particularly fine style with fine humor, is now also a memoir for its deceased author.

Adolf Kober offers a graphic picture of the former institutions of higher learning and rabbinic education in Germany. His piece is followed by essays on the small Jewish community as well as on the giant community in Berlin, on the rabbi and his office, on Jewish movements

in pre-Hitler Germany, on the "last act" of the tragedy, on the organizations outside Germany in which Baeck distinguished himself as leader, organizer, or scholar: The Hebrew Union College, The Society for Jewish Study, The Council of Jews from Germany.

The neatly produced volume comprises *in nuce* the history of the last century of German Jewry which, as Eva G. Reichmann says in her thoughtful "Dedication," should be written by surviving members of German Jewry so that future generations might have a genuine picture of Judaism as it originated, developed, and was lived on German soil.

GUIDO KISCH

Hebrew Union College —
Jewish Institute of Religion

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF JEWISH PRAGUE

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY OF JEWISH PRAGUE. By *Otto Muneles* [in cooperation with Miloslav Bohatec; cover and graphical lay-out by Zdeněk Sklenář]. Jewish Monuments in Bohemia and Moravia [edited by Hana Volavková]. Volume I, Part 1. The Jewish State Museum of Prague. [Prague, 1952.] 563 pp.

IN a brief Introduction the following reasons for the publication of this "Bibliographical Survey" are given: "Prague is one of the few large Jewish communities of which a comprehensive history has not yet been written, and this survey attempts to provide a list of the literature which would be useful for the compilation of such a history. In view of the lack of bibliographies of Jewish literature even this incomplete survey will perhaps be welcomed. And, finally, it will serve as a memorial to the generation of those interested in Prague Jewish history and who worked in this field of research until their tragic death. The Jewish literature of the last decades has been exposed to such ravages that the attempt to save at least a small part from oblivion is certainly justified."

On several occasions, this reviewer has deplored the non-existence of a comprehensive history of Prague Jewry which constituted throughout the ages, from the period of the world-traveler Ibrahim ibn Jacob up to the time of its extinction by Hitler, one of the outstanding centers of Jewish culture in Europe. His own intention to undertake the writing of such a history in the early nineteen-thirties was frustrated by the then prevailing adverse conditions. The generation of those scholars who, perhaps in a cooperative venture, were competent for such a task, for the most part either perished or died, and the few, if any, that are left are steadily diminishing in number. No younger generation has grown up to take its place. The knowledge of the glorious past,

the trials and tribulations of the "Mother and Mainstay in Israel—Prague" is waning.

Under these conditions, which can hardly change in the near future, the splendidly produced volume under review is very welcome and highly praiseworthy. It is arranged chronologically and, within the limits of its scope set by the compiler, extremely rich in material. Random checking indicates that the titles are bibliographically complete and correct. The illustrations—title pages of rare, interesting, or artistic books, portraits of representative personalities, book illustrations, and monuments—are expertly selected and excellently reproduced. A "List of Illustrations" at the end of the volume offers explanations, though not always the sources from which the subjects are drawn. And where references to these sources are given, they are sometimes inaccurate, as they are occasionally elsewhere in the book.

The guiding principles of the compilation, the bibilographical plan followed, and the arrangement applied are dealt with extensively in the Introduction. They are open to question and discussion, of course, and the numerous errors, inaccuracies, and other shortcomings enumerated there by the compiler show clearly that he and his associate were well aware of the shortcomings of their methodological approach.. Not only from a historical-scholarly but also from the bibliographical point of view their work reveals many more insufficiencies even than they envisaged. The necessary supplements and addenda would fill many pages. But in view of the tremendous difficulties with which they had to cope, the standards of regular criticism cannot be applied in this appraisal. The labors of the compiler and his associate were in fact almost Herculean, and the scholarly world must acknowledge them with sincere gratitude.

GUIDO KISCH

Hebrew Union College —
Jewish Institute of Religion

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Elias Auerbach, *Moses.* G. J. A. Ruys. Amsterdam, 1953. 243 pp.

Florence Guggenheim-Grünberg, *Pfarrer Ulrich als Missionar im Surbtal. Ein Beitrag zur Judenmission in der Schweiz.* Verlag Jüdische Buchgemeinde. Zürich, 1953. 21 pp. and 2 plates.

Herman L. Goldschmidt, [*Zweiter Jahresbericht*] *für ein jüdisches Lehrhaus, Zürich.* Hermann L. Goldschmidt. Zürich, 1953. 32 pp.

Hans Köhler, *Die Wirkung des Judentums auf das abendländische Geistesleben.* Duncker und Humblot. Berlin, [1953]. 137 pp.

Raphael Mahler, *History of the Jewish People in Modern Times.* Volume I: 1780-1815; Book 1:North America and Western Europe. Sifriat Poalim Ltd. Merhavya, Israel, 1952. 312 pp. and 15 plates. (Hebrew).

Jacob Rader Marcus, *Early American Jewry: The Jews of Pennsylvania and the South* 1655-1790. Volume Two. Jewish Publication Society of America. Philadelphia, 1953. xxi and 594 pp. with illustrations.

B. Netanyahu, *Don Isaac Abravanel: Statesman and Philosopher.* Jewish Publication Society of America. Philadelphia, 1953. xii and 346 pp.

Raphael Patai, *Israel Between East and West: A Study in Human Relations.* Jewish Publication Society of America. xiv and 348 pp. with illustrations.

Zvi Scharfstein, *Hayah Aviv Baaretz* [When Spring Was in the Land: Autobiography]. Massadah. Tel Aviv, 1953. 344 pages. (Hebrew).

Heinrich Schnee, *Die Hoffinanz und der moderne Staat.* Erster Band: Die Institution des Hoffaktorentums in Brandenburg—Preussen. Duncker und Humblot. Berlin, 1953. 267 pp.

The Joshua Starr Memorial Volume: Studies in History and Philology. (Jewish Social Studies, Publications No. 5). Conference on Jewish Relations. New York, 1953. vii and 262 pp. with one portrait.

Workmen's Circle, *Year Book of the Cemetery Deparment,* Workmen's Circle. [New York], 1953. 85 and 56 pp.

The Book of Jonah. Woodcuts by Jacob Steinhardt; Calligraphy by Franzisca Baruch. Jewish Publication Society of America. Philadelphia, 1953. (Hebrew with English translation and Introduction).

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

BRODY, ALEXANDER: Jacob Newton Cardozo, American Economist 135-166

COHN, BERNHARD N.: Early German Preaching in America 86-134

EIDELBERG, SHLOMO: "Maarufia" in Rabbenu Gershom's Responsa 59-66

KISCH, BRUNO: Jewish Community Tokens: A Neglected Field in Jewish Numismatics (with 4 plates) 167-182

SILBERNER, EDMUND: German Social Democracy and the Jewish Problem Prior to World War I 3-48

WILHELM, KURT: Benjamin Szold and the Rabbinical Post in Stockholm in 1858 (with an unpublished letter of Isaac M. Wise) 49-58

BOOK REVIEWS

Bamberger, Bernard J.: *Fallen Angels* (M. Hadas) 67-69

Belli, Antonio: *Storia della Letteratura Ebraica* (C. E. Spicehandler) 190-192

Bloch, Joshua: *On the Apocalyptic in Judaism.* (J. L. Blau) 185-186

Festschrift zum 80. *Geburtstag von Leo Baeck am* 23. *Mai* 1953 (G. Kisch) 193-194

Goodblatt, Morris S.: *Jewish Life in the Sixteenth Century: As Reflected in the Legal Writings of Samuel de Medina* (S. Grayzel) 73-74

Halkin, Abraham S.: *Moses Maimonides, Epistle to Yemen* (F. Rosenthal) 71-73

Hashagen, Justus: *Europa im Mittelalter* (G. Kisch) 69-71

Hyamson, Albert M.: *The Sephardim of England* (J. H. Neumann) 74-78

Levison, Wilhelm: *Die Siegburger Familie Levison und verwandte Familien* (G. Kisch) 78-80

Muneles, Otto: *Bibliographical Survey of Jewish Prague* (G. Kisch) 194-195

Raisin, Jacob S.: *Gentile Reactions to Jewish Ideals* (S. B. Freehof) 183-185

Rivkin, Ellis: *Leon da Modena and the Kol Sakhal* (J. L. Blau) 186-188

Simson, Gerhard: *Fünf Kämpfer für Gerechtigkeit* (G. Kisch) 192-193

Zimmels, H. J.: *Magicians, Theologians and Doctors: Studies in Folk-Medicine* (J. Trachtenberg) 188-190

List of Abbreviations, *see* Volume I 1-2

Notices of Recent Publications 81-82, 196

HISTORIA JUDAICA

A JOURNAL OF STUDIES
IN JEWISH HISTORY, ESPECIALLY IN
THE LEGAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY OF THE JEWS

VOLUME XVI

EDITOR
GUIDO KISCH

NEW YORK
HISTORIA JUDAICA
40 West 68th Street
1954

KRAUS REPRINT CO.
New York
1971

The Table of Contents will appear
at the end of the volume

Reprinted with the permission of the original publisher
KRAUS REPRINT CO.
A U.S. Division of Kraus-Thomson Organization Limited

Printed in U.S.A.

VOL. XVI APRIL, 1954 PART 1

Historia Judaica

FRENCH SOCIALISM AND THE JEWISH QUESTION 1865-1914

By EDMUND SILBERNER
Hebrew University
Jerusalem

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

THE Jewish question played an important role in French Socialism almost from the beginning of the nineteenth century. This writer has analyzed some of its aspects in a number of articles devoted to the early representatives of French Socialism: "Charles Fourier on the Jewish Question," "The Attitude of the Fourierist School towards the Jews," and "Pierre Leroux's Ideas on the Jewish People," appeared in *Jewish Social Studies* (VIII [1946], 245-266; IX [1947], 339-362; XII [1950], 367-384), while "Proudhon's Judeophobia" was published in *Historia Judaica* (X [1948], 61-80).

It is the purpose of the present inquiry to examine how, after Proudhon, various French Socialists treated the Jewish problem from about 1865 to 1914. In a few cases reference will also be made to later events. The word "Socialism" will be used in a rather broad sense, to include anarchism.

Most French Socialists who dealt with the Jewish problem concentrated their attention almost entirely on anti-Semitism. The first section of this article deals with those among them who expounded clearly anti-Semitic views. The second section is devoted to French Socialists who were opposed to anti-Semitism. Socialist attitudes towards Zionism are surveyed in the third section. The decline of Socialist anti-Semitism in France forms the subject of the fourth and last section.

The writer is not aware of any adequate and comprehensive study in the field. Z. Szajkowski published a lithoprinted volume in Yiddish

on *Anti-Semitism in the French Labor Movement; from the Fourierist Movement until the Closing of the Dreyfus Case,* 1845-1906 (New York, 1948). It is very good on Algiers, less so on the Dreyfus Affair, and glaringly deficient on the period prior to 1894 (e.g., one page on Proudhon, one sentence on Leroux). It lacks organization and a rigorous bibliographical apparatus. *Antisemitism in Modern France* (I, *The Prologue to the Dreyfus Affair* [New Brunswick, N. J., 1950]), by Robert F. Byrnes, is a highly inadequate account of French Judeophobia prior to 1894. The author shows no intimate acquaintance with the sources, and his volume contains several unwarranted statements (see the writer's review in *Jewish Social Studies,* XIII [1951], 259-261). The classical work on the Dreyfus case is Joseph Reinach's monumental *Histoire de l'Affaire Dreyfus* (Paris, 1901-1908, 7 vols.). The case is analyzed from the Socialist point of view by Alexandre Zévaès in his *Histoire du socialisme et du communisme en France de* 1871 *à* 1947 (Paris, 1947). Jean Maîtron, *Histoire du mouvement anarchiste en France* 1880-1914 (Paris, 1951) has a chapter on "Les Anarchistes et l'Affaire Dreyfus." Charles Péguy is the author of "Demi-réponse à M. Cyprien Lantier," an excellent satire on the attitude of Socialists of all shades towards the Dreyfus case, published in 1900 in *Cahiers de la Quinzaine* (Ist ser., No. 12). Yurii M. Steklov's Russian article on "The Latest Trends in French Anti-Semitism," in *Sovremennyi Mir* (November-December 1912), contains very useful material on French anti-Semitism in the years 1910-1911. There is little choice of works on Bernard Lazare: Apart from Charles Péguy's brilliant sketches in "Notre Jeunesse," appearing in *Cahiers de la Quinzaine* (11th ser., No. 12 [1910]), one may consult with profit the pamphlet of Baruch Hagani, *Bernard Lazare* (Paris, 1919), and the more searching study by Jean-Maurice Muslak (who died on the battlefield in France in 1940), "Bernard Lazare," in the *Revue des Études Juives* (VI [1941-45], 34-63).

This writer published an article on "Anti-Jewish Trends in French Revolutionary Syndicalism" in *Jewish Social Studies* (XV [1953]) and consequently does not deal with syndicalism here.

I. Anti-Semitic Currents

A. BLANQUISTS

THE Blanquist movement, representing, as is known, the French extreme Left, was not free from advocates of anti-Semitism. Auguste Blanqui himself, however, showed no interest in the Jewish problem. As a militant atheist he was, of course, hostile to Judaism no less than to Christianity. Yet if absence of relevant comments may be consid-

ered to manifest a lack of hatred, one may say that his hostility towards the Hebrew religion did not extend to modern Jews.

Eugène Gellin-Danglar appears to be the first writer to expound anti-Semitic ideas in the Blanquist press. The gist of his series of sixteen articles—published in 1867-68 in *La Libre Pensée* and *La Pensée nouvelle*—may be summed up in a few lines: The superior civilization of the Aryans, he asserts, is threatened by the Semites, who are an insatiably devastating element in all countries, except in the desert, the only place where they harmonize with the rest of mankind. "Semitism" must therefore be eliminated from Aryan society, though not by violence and persecution, but by peaceful means.[1]

A similar point of view was expressed more sharply and more vulgarly by a certain D. Benoît in the Blanquist paper *Ni Dieu ni Maître* (November 5, 1882). The Semites in general and the Jews in particular, are accused by him of being parasites. He also insults more specifically the Jewish workers who, as victims of Russian pogroms, had recently settled in Paris. This "horde of Israelites," these "unassimilable ones," he maintains, lower wages and cause unemployment among the natives.

The next writer under review, Gustave Tridon (1841-71), is one of the most important representatives of Blanquism. Closely associated with Blanqui, he was a member of the National Assembly and also of the Paris Commune and its Committee of Public Safety.

While serving a prison term of fifteen months (1866-68) for a violation of the press law, Tridon wrote the greater part of his anti-Semitic book, *Du Molochisme juif*. His ideas on the relationship between Jahve and Moloch, and his tendentious effort to present human sacrifice as a typically Semitic phenomenon are not within the scope of the present study. Only his ideas on the Semites in general are pertinent, and they can be summarized briefly: "The Semites are the shadow in the picture of civilization, the

[1] Eugène Gellion-Dangler, "Sémitisme," *Libre Pensée*, I (1867), 111; *Pensée nouvelle*, I (1868), 392.

evil genius of the earth. All their gifts are pestilences."[2] Tridon is also convinced of the unbridgeable chasm between Aryan and Semite. The Aryan is characterized by an open mind, creativeness in science and in the arts, and gentleness of manners. The characteristics of the Semite are just the opposite: fanatacism, contempt for science and the arts, and crudeness in social intercourse. The Aryan is generous, the Semite is egoistic. The Semite is the prototype of the exploiter. "To fight the Semitic spirit and ideas is the aim of the Indo-Aryan race."[3] It may be recalled here that "hatred of Semitism" was very popular among the revolutionary youth at the end of the Second Empire, and particularly in the so-called Hebertist or Blanquist group to which Tridon belonged.[4]

Ideas similar to those of Tridon were developed by his friend and admirer Albert Regnard (1836-1903), a physician and publicist in Paris. Active in the Blanquist movement up to 1871, he was secretary general of the Paris police under the Commune. After its defeat he took refuge in London, where he remained until the amnesty of 1880. After his return to France, he was no longer actively engaged in the political struggle, being more interested in social and political research.

Regnard was proud of being an Aryan[5] and complained that the Socialists neglected "the idea of race."[6] His main attack on the Jews was made in a series of articles, "*Aryens et Sémites,*" first published in the *Revue socialiste* (1887-89) and later reprinted in a separate book.

Regnard's study purports to prove scientifically the superiority of the Aryans, the only race that is able to prepare "social renovation."[7] It is the only race to possess the notions of justice, liberty, and beauty. All real science is of Aryan origin. Scientific Socialism is a "Franco-Ger-

2 Gustave Tridon, *Du Molochisme* juif (Paris, 1884), p. 5.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 5. See also pp. 6, 7, 13, 209.
4 Regnard, in *Revue socialiste,* V (1887), 499.
5 Regnard, *Les Principes de la Révolution* (London, 1875), p. 8.
6 Regnard, *La Révolution sociale* (London, 1876), p. 44.
7 Regnard, "Aryens et Sémites," *Revue socialiste,* V (1887), 501.

manic creation, i.e., Aryan is the strongest meaning of the term."[8]

In Regnard's view, the two main aptitudes of the Semitic race are a faculty for adaptation and a genius for commerce and "exploitation of the human race."[9] "The Jewish race" unquestionably constitutes "the most perfect type" of "eternal exploiters" of mankind.[10] The Jews are usurers by their racial nature, and not because historical circumstances have forced them to practice usury. To a large extent, capitalism is a Semitic creation.[11]

According to Regnard, Socialism has to be realistic and has to adopt the idea of a struggle of races. It must defend the superior Aryan race against the encroachments of the "deplorably inferior" Jewish race, which does everything in its power to monopolize all the wealth of the globe.[12]

These ideas, to some extent at least, were shared by Paul Argyriadès, a naturalized Greek and a leader of the Blanquist party, who several times represented it at the congresses of the Second International. At one of these congresses, in Brussels (1891), he and Regnard were successful in convincing the delegates that "philo-Semitic excitations" must be condemned.[13]

B. MALON AND REVUE SOCIALISTE

The group of Socialists discussed in this section belonged to the right wing of the movement, and centered around Benoît Malon and the *Revue socialiste* which he founded in 1885 and edited up to his death in 1893.

Benoît Malon (1841-93), son of poor and ignorant parents, learned to read only at the age of twenty. In the late eighteen-sixties he coöperated with the Blanquists; in 1871 he participated in the Paris Commune, and after its

8 *Ibid.*, p. 517.
9 Regnard, "Aryens et Sémites," *Revue socialiste*, VI (1887), 400.
10 Regnard, *Le Calendrier de l'ère révolutionnaire* (Paris, 1892), p. 32.
11 Regnard, Letter to Malon, in *Revue socialiste*, XI (1890), 348.
12 *Ibid.*
13 *Congrès Intern. Ouvrier Socialiste tenu à Bruxelles* (Brussels, 1893), p. 43. See also E. Silberner, "Anti-Semitism and Philo-Semitism in the Socialist International," *Judaism*, II, (1953), 117-122.

defeat escaped to Switzerland, where he was active among the Bakuninists. The amnesty of 1880 enabled him to return to France, where he became one of the leading spirits of the reformist (*possibilist*) wing of Socialism.[14]

The Jews, says Malon, are "an egoistic and hardhearted people"; their whole history is not worth so much as a single Greek Olympiad.[15] Mosaic institutions have had a disastrous influence on humanity,[16], and though the moral value of certain of the Prophets is not to be denied, the ethics of the Bible is a barbarous system made for a barbarous people.[17] Modern Jews are viewed by Malon in only a slightly different light. Eastern European Jews are "a particularly harmful caste of rapacious hucksters and unscrupulous usurers," a fact which renders pogroms explainable.[18] The emancipated Jew of France distinguishes himself from other citizens "only" by his special aptitude for invading "all the branches of politics and literature," and by a particular gift for commerce and finance.[19]

Malon renders homage to *Aryens et Sémites*, the "scholarly and superb study" of his "excellent friend" Regnard.[20] He does not accept all of its conclusions, but approves its "general spirit" of genuine "Aryanism.[21] He has no fault to find with the anti-Jewish weekly, *L'Anti-Sémitique*,[22] which, under the masthead of every issue, printed the slogan: "Le Juif, voilà l'ennemi!" and which, for the first time in history, tried to organize, though without success, an international anti-Semitic congress.[23]

Malon had cordial relations with Edouard Drumont,

14 F. Simon, . . . *Benoît Malon* (Courbevoie, 1926).

15 Benoît Malon, "La Question juive," *Revue socialiste*, III (1886), 509-510.

16 Malon, *Histoire du socialisme* (Paris, 1882), I, 79.

17 Malon, *Socialisme intégral* (Paris, 1890), I, 231.

18 Malon, "La Question juive," *Revue socialiste*, III (1886), 505.

19 *Ibid.* See also Marie Desprès, "Catéchisme socialiste," *ibid.*, VIII (1888), 272: "Quels sont les plus habiles dans l'art de la spéculation ? Ce sont les Juifs."

20 Malon, in *Revue socialiste*, XI (1890), 349. The admiration was mutual: see Regnard, *Le Calendrier* . . ., p. 127.

21 Malon, in *Revue socialiste*, XI (1890), 349.

22 Malon, "La Question juive," *Revue socialiste*, III (1886), 506.

23 See the repeated appeals for such a congress, which was to have taken place in Paris in 1884, in *L'Anti-Sémitique*, I, (1883), 209 ff.

whom he introduced into workingmen's circles in Paris, where everybody congratulated the famous anti-Semite on his *La France juive.*[24]

Malon[25] paid tribute also to the Socialist writer Auguste Chirac (1838-1903) who considered it a point of honor to assert publicly—nowhere else but in the *Revue socialiste* —that he, Chirac himself, and not Drumont (who had neglected to quote his works), was the first one after Toussenel "to brave the Jew."[26] Chirac devoted a good part of his career to fighting the Jew and, at the turn of the century, threw himself into the nationalist movement, wrote for Drumont's *Libre Parole,* and lectured before the anti-Semitic youth.[27] An admirer of Toussenel,[28] he used the term "Jewry" as an equivalent of parasitism "because Israel was its first and most complete incarnation."[29] "The Jewish *people*" is the prototype of financial speculation and manoeuvering.[30] The ancient history of that people is full of swindling, prostitution, and theft . The history of modern Israelites shows exactly the same trends.[31]

Anti-Semitic feeling has, according to Chirac, its true origin in the horror inspired by the parasitic vice, more odiously practiced by the Israelitic Semites than by anybody else.[32] The "Jewish Israelitic party" in France is already a nation within the nation and aims at becoming a State within the State.[33] In Russia, Jewish international finance is supporting attempts on the Tsar's life; nihilism, asserts Chirac, is in fact a movement of Jewish emancipation.[34]

24 Edouard Drumont, *La Fin du monde* (Paris, 1889), p. 125. See also his *Les Trétaux du succès. Figures de bronze ou Statues de neige* (Paris [1900]), p. 356-357.

25 Malon, *L'Agiotage, de 1715 à 1870* (Paris, 1885), p. ix; *Revue socialiste,* III, 506; VII (1888), 558.

26 Auguste Chirac, Open letter to Drumont, *ibid.,* V (1887), 84-85.

27 See editorial note in *Revue socialiste,* XLVIII (1908), 208; and Savine, "Auguste Chirac," *Revue d'art dramatique,* XVIII (1903), 349, 355.

28 Chirac, *Les Rois de la République* (Paris, 1888), I, 3.

29 Chirac, *Le Droit de vivre* (Paris, 1896), p. 225. See also his *La Prochaine révolution* (Paris, 1886), p. 84.

30 Chirac, *Les Rois de la République, I,* 35. Italics mine.

31 *Ibid.,* p. 40.

32 Chirac, *Les Brigandages historiques* (Paris, [1888]), II, 139.

33 Ibid., I, 129.

34 Chirac, in *Revue socialiste,* IV (1886), 975.

The Jews have "created" the Eastern Question and exploit it to their own advantage . Their very newest aim is "to reconstitute a Jewish nationality" in order to consolidate their monopoly.[35] In brief, "they want to be the masters of the world."[36]

Another contemporary and political friend of Malon, Gustave Rouanet, also expressed anti-Semitic views. In a review of Drumont's *La Fin d'un Monde*, Rouanet noted that there are among the Jews very honorable exceptions, but "the dominant trend of the people of Israel is the monopolization of the values of exchange."[37] Thus to the already existing natural racial antagonism between Aryans and Semites, the Jews add the economic antagonism prevailing between capitalists and proletarians. Rouanet disagrees with the Catholic arguments that Drumont invokes in his crusade against the Jews. Nonetheless, he expresses his full personal sympathy with the author of *La France juive*. He also implicitly shares Drumont's belief that the Jewish race wages an implacable war against the Aryan race, and that the Aryans are culturally superior to the Semites.[38]

The reader has undoubtedly noted that most of the anti-Semitic material quoted in this section was printed in the *Revue socialiste*. This organ of French Socialism theory brought out Regnard's series of articles, "Aryens et Sémites," without any editorial note. A later contributor divulged that he did "not like Jewry,"[39] and warned the readers of "the Judaic hostility against which it is our mission to take precautions.[40] Another one, after denouncing "the Jewish microbe,"[41] asserted that "the Jew is the king of fraud. To him belongs the sceptre of usury and agio. This is incontestable."[42] Still others, though not directly

35 Chirac, *Rois*, I, 40-41. On this point—the reconstitution of the Jewish nationality—Chirac is as brief as he is obscure.

36 *Ibid.*, p. 41.

37 Gustave Rouanet, in *Revue socialiste*, VIII (1888), 662.

38 *Ibid.*, pp. 661-663. In 1890, Rouanet reversed his position towards the Jews.

39 Robert Bernier, *Revue socialiste*, XVII (1893), 127.

40 Bernier, *ibid.*, XV (1892), 503.

41 V. Jaclard, *ibid.*, XVII (1893), 133.

42 *Ibid.*, p. 134.

attacking the Jewish people, used the words "Jews" or "Judaism" as synonymous with corruption or rapaciousness.[43] Anti-Semitic books were praised,[44] and "Israelites," because of their allegedly shameless spoliation, were made responsible for anti-Semitism.[45]

However, the editorial policy of the *Revue socialiste* was not consistently anti-Semitic. In 1886 the journal published an article against anti-Semitism by Tubiana, a Jewish socialist in Algeria.[46] In 1890 there appeared an article by Rouanet, in which he reversed his stand on the Jewish question. In the same year Regnard published in book form his *Aryens et Sémites,* and the *Revue socialiste* criticized the volume for its anti-Semitism.[47] At the turn of the century it even gave space to essays on the underprivileged and exploited Jews of Algeria, Russia, Rumania, and England.[48] In the twentieth century, anti-Semitic material disappeared altogether from its columns.

C. SOCIALIST FLIRTATION WITH ANTI-SEMITISM DURING THE DREYFUS AFFAIR

Many Socialists, though in principle opposed to anti-Semitism, supported or tolerated this movement in the firm belief that it was, for backward proletarians and petty bourgeois, a kind of preparatory school for integral Socialism. Thus, Louis Dubreuilh, commenting in *La Petite République* (September 27, 1895) on a recent anti-Semitic electoral victory in Vienna, says: "Anti-Semitism is but a preface to the movement which is taking shape; anti-cap-

[43] P. de Lalanne, *ibid.*, XXVI (1897), 303-306; J. Alavaill, *ibid.*, XXIII (1896), 289.

[44] P. Boz, *ibid.*, XXIV (1896), 378.

[45] R. Marié-Oswald, *ibid.*, XXVII (1898), 458-459.

[46] *Revue socialiste,* IV (1886), 634-636.

[47] Curiously enough the review was written by a rather unimportant and incompetent writer, Adrian Veber (*ibid.*, XII [1890], 628-640), because none of "the regular contributors" (*ibid.*, p. 628) wanted to review—i.e., to attack—Regnard, who continued to be called "our dear and learned collaborator" (Bernier, *ibid.*, XV [1892], 637).

[48] Cf. Durieu, Phalippou, Rouanet, and Garnier, *ibid.*, XXIX (1899), XXXI (1900), XXXVI (1902).

italism will be its necessary result." A somewhat similar point of view is taken by Alexandre Millerand in his article, "Equivoques" in *La Lanterne* of January 19, 1898. He does not seem to condemn all anti-Semitism without reserve. He criticized anti-Semitism for its half-measures and inadequacies, and not for its basic incompatibility with Socialism.

Anarchists, too, expressed similar views. One of them, Augustin Hamon, may serve as a good illustration. In 1889 he published with another writer a little-known book in the worst anti-Semitic tradition.[49] After the International Socialist Congress of 1896, which expelled the Anarchists, Hamon published a book in which he attributed the lack of courtesy at the Congress to the influence of race. "Messrs. Singer and Adler, Madame Aveling, etc.," he wrote, "are Jews, and lack of tact is one of the characteristics of the Jewish race."[50] A year or two later he arrived at the conclusion that anti-Semitism should rather be called "anti-Judaism," since a good number of Jews are in fact, Aryans. Of this rebaptized anti-Semitism he said: "With the petty bourgeois, anti-Judaism is the road which leads to Socialism. Anti-Judaism is the stage through which the petty bourgeois passes before becoming a Socialist."[51] Socialists and Anarchists fight against all capitalists, and not only against a fraction of them, and, therefore, are not anti-Jewish. If, nonetheless, Socialists (including Anarchists) take part in the anti-Jewish movement, they do it, not because of their anti-Judaism, but because they believe that in this way they are advancing the cause of Socialism.[52]

One may also recall here the Socialist weekly, *Chambard socialiste,* edited by Alfred Léon Gérault-Richard,

[49] A. Hamon and G. Bachot, *L'Agonie d'une société* (Paris, 1899), 247. The Jews are referred to as "youtres," "youddis," etc. (p. 238, 240, 244). A similar terminology ("youtres," "youpins") was used by the anarchist organ *Le Pére Peinard* (e.g., Sept. 1, 1889, p. 7, April 20, 1890, p. 10, Feb. 20, 1898, pp. 1-2).

[50] Hamon, *Le Socialisme et le Congrès de Londres* (Paris, 1897), pp. 193-194.

[51] Hamon, interview given in 1898 to Bournand, *Les Juifs et nos contemporains* (Paris [1898]), p. 215.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 216.

where one finds many vulgar anti-Semitic utterances. The following passage, printed in the issue of February 24, 1894, may serve as an example: "Cohn—cette dénomination à la fois youpine et pornographe." In another issue of the same periodical (March 24, 1894), E. Violard—also a contributor to the *Libre Parole*—describing a poor Jewish street-merchant in Algeria, noted that his physiognomy expresses "toute la rapacité du youtre, toute la crasse de la race maudite."

René Viviani spoke in parliament of the "legendary rapacity" of the Jews, and of "Jewish tyranny" in Algeria.[53] He is reported to have said that in Algeria, his native country, "anti-Semitism is the best form of social struggle."[54] The Algerian delegate to the Congress of the Union of Railroad Workers, held in Paris in 1898, was of the same opinion. He submitted a motion demanding the expulsion of all Jews from the Union, and motivated his proposal by saying that the "Algerian workers are anti-Semites because they are Socialists."[55] His motion was defeated, however.

The reader may ask whether the statements of Dubreuilh, Millerand, and Viviani, to say nothing of Hamond, really exemplify the Socialist (or Anarchist) attitude towards anti-Semitism. No one will deny that each of them injected a personal note into his comments. On the whole, however, their views are representative, and those who, for one reason or another, doubt it, may be referred to the well-known Manifesto of the Socialist Group in parliament, published on January 20, 1898 by the entire French Socialist press. It is signed by thirty-two deputies who were present at the meeting which voted it, among them Gabriel Deville, Gérault-Richard, Jules Guesde, Jean Jaures, Alexandre Millerand, Gustave Rouanet, Marcel Sembat, Edouard Vaillant, and René Viviani. There is thus hardly any document more representative of French Socialist thought than this Manifesto. And what does it say about anti-Semitism? It calls

[53] *Annales de la Chambre des Députés. Débats parlementaires.* 1895, pp. 592-593 (February 21).

[54] René Viviani, as quoted in Alexandre Juving, *Le Socialisme en Algérie* (Algiers, 1924), p. 89.

[55] *Temps*, May 1, 1898, p. 3. See also *Temps*, April 29, 1898, p. 3.

for non-participation in the Dreyfus Affair on the ground that while the reaction wishes to exploit the conviction of one Jew to disqualify all Jews, Jewish capitalists would use the rehabilitation of a single Jew to wash out "all the stains of Israel." True, the Manifesto warns the workers that anti-Semitism is "a means of diversion," but significantly enough it adds: "Assuredly many men of the people, and particularly of the petty bourgeoisie, having seen Jewish bankers and businessmen involved in all the scandals, imagine that in fighting the Jewish power, they are fighting capital above all. These are incipient Socialists (Ceux-là sont des socialistes qui commencent)."[56]

Many contemporaries, bourgeois and Socialist, non-Jew and Jew, recorded this Socialist flirtation with anti-Semitism. Clémenceau noted in *L'Aurore* (June 10, 1898) that Socialists "trembled" before anti-Semites, "flirted" with them, and accepted them as "'useful auxiliaries." Joseph Reinach, the Jewish historian of the Dreyfus case, observed that in order to retain their constituency, the Socialists treated Drumont with consideration; they smiled on anti-Semitism, in the belief that the latter, by undermining Jewish capitalism, would help them to overthrow capitalism as a whole. I. Levaillant, a Jewish bourgeois writer, makes a similar statement in his study on the origin of anti-Semitism under the Third Republic.[57]

Similar comments are found also in the Socialist and Anarchist camp. Sébastien Faure, a leading Anarchist, does not hesitate to confess that "we made the very great mistake of not rising either early enough or vigorously enough against the anti-Semitic movement." Even revolutionaries are contaminated by anti-Semitic ideas, admits Charles Malato, another Anarchist. Bernard Lazare, a Jewish Anarchist (and by this time a Zionist, too) recalled that "the advanced parties" of France applauded the formation of anti-Semitism; that they "dared to see" in anti-Semitism "a vanguard of the revolution; that they approved its primi-

[56] *Lanterne*, Jan. 20, 1898, p. 1.

[57] Reinach, *Histoire de l'Affaire Dreyfus* (Paris, 1907), I, 376; I. Levaillant, in *Revue des études juives*, LIII (1907), XCVIII.

tive manifestations; that they did not protest against its first excesses; [and] that they greeted as an ally the man who wrote *La France juive.*" Tabarant, a Socialist popularizer, pointed out in a pamphlet that Socialists temporized with anti-Semitism instead of beating down "the monster" from the beginning. Speaking of the rise of nationalism and anti-Semitism in France, Eugène Fournière, a Socialist writer, frankly admits that "Socialists have their share of mistakes and responsibilities."[58]

Last but not least, there is also the testimony of a group of Jewish Socialist workers of Paris. They addressed an open letter to the French Socialist party, published under the title, *Le Prolétariat juif* (Paris, 1898), in which they recalled the fact that the Jewish people is "alas, the most proletarian in the world" (p. 8). They further criticized the party for its stand on the anti-Semitic movement: "Your attitude toward anti-Semitism," they said, "is not sufficiently frank, indignant, and energetic, as it is in other similar cases, where a principle of progress and humanity is at stake" (p. 17). Socialists, though not all of them, are said to offer no resistance to anti-Semitism, because they consider that movement a profitable evil (p. 18).

D. MYRENS AND MERIC

During the years immediately preceding World War I, two French Socialists acquired some fame as anti-Semites: Pierre Myrens, Socialist deputy from Pas-de-Calais, and Victor Méric, an extremist left-wing publicist.

In 1911, to the great delight of bourgeois and Socialist anti-Semites, Myrens published a curious article on the Jews. Written in the form of a letter to the editor, it appeared on January 23, 1911, in *Le Petit Calaisien*, a provincial bourgeois newspaper of Calais, and received much publicity through several reprintings in the Parisian press.

[58] Sébastien Faure, *Les Anarchistes et l'Affaire Dreyfus* (Paris, 1898), p. 17; Charles Malato, *Philosophie de l'anarchie* (2nd ed.. Paris, 1897), p. 282; Bernard Lazare, in *Cahiers de la Quinzaine*, 3d ser., No. 21 (1902), p. 226; Tabarant, *Socialisme et Antisémitisme* (Paris, 1898), pp. 3-4; Eugène Fournière, *L'Artifice nationaliste* (Paris, 1903), p. 58.

Myrens makes a clear distinction between the poor and the wealthy Jews. The Jewish worker is described as an idealist, full of sacrifice and capable of the greatest heroism. On the other side there is, however, "the capitalist Kike," a ferocious materialist driven by his thirst for gold to commit the most outrageous acts. "The Kike [*le youtre*] is an Israelite by religion, a Jew by race, and, moreover, a capitalist." The Jewish capitalist is thus attacked, not as a capitalist only, but also as a Jew by race and religion.

Myrens must also have been known to his party comrades for other acts of an anti-Jewish nature, otherwise it would be hard to explain why, at the congress of the Socialist party held in April, 1911, one of the delegates, Varenne, implored him not to make a common front with Gustave Téry, Emile Janvion, and Emile Pataud, notorious anti-Semites of the day.[59] At the next congress held in February, 1912, another delegate, Uhry, reminded the audience that Myrens had told him personally that he was "anti-Kikish."[60] And it was an unusual incident to hear Uhry exclaim pathetically at a Socialist congress that older and more competent comrades might well "tell citizen Myrens what 'the Kike [*youpin*]' Karl Marx did for the Socialist party.[61] The congress took no disciplinary action against Myrens, who, without explicitly denying that he was an anti-Semite, made a statement to the effect that, since he was a Marxian, he favored a common organization of all exploited regardless of their philosophy, religion, or race.[62] This declaration was greeted with long cheers by the congress, which, without any discussion, voted a resolution against anti-Semitism.[63]

59 Parti Socialiste. 8^{e} *Congrès national* (1911), p. 188. On Janvion and Pataud, see E. Silberner, "Anti-Jewish Trends in French Revolutionary Syndicalism," *Jewish Social Studies*, XV (1953), 195-202.

60 Parti Socialiste. 9^{e} *Congrès national* (1912), p. 468.

61 *Ibid.*, p. 469.

62 *Ibid.*, p. 517.

63 "Le Parti socialiste dénonce la manoeuvre antisémitique, diversion grossière qui tend à pousser les travailleurs seulement contre le capital juif; déclare qu'il n'a pas à connaître les travailleurs en tant que juifs, catholiques ou autres, mais en tant qu'exploités victimes du capitalisme qui n'est ni juif ni chrétien; invite les travailleurs de toutes les races, juifs ou autres, à se débarasser des préjugés nationalistes et à réjoindre les organismes réguliers de lutte prolétarienne." *Ibid.*, p. 593.

Contemporaneously with Myrens, another Socialist anti-Semite appeared on the French horizon: Victor Méric. His attitude toward anti-Semitism seems to be somewhat ambivalent. He quite openly says that if, on the one hand, anti-Semites bring him closer to the persecuted race, the Jews, on the other hand, are marvelously able to make him appreciate anti-Semitism. What seems to trouble him, in particular, is the fact that there are "really, really too many" Jewish journalists and novelists, and that they vie with one another in concealing their origin by using a variety of pen names. For some time there has also been a great influx of Jews. In view of all this, "well, upon my word, no, one does not become an anti-Semite, because . . . hm! because . . . but one rushes headlong to anti-Semitic prose in order to cure one's irresistible longing to become one."[64]

Méric avers that he feels an "instinctive disgust for the Kikes," but most decidedly denies that he is an anti-Semite.[65] As a member of the Socialist party[66] as well as "an internationalist and Marxist"[67] he is against both philo-Semitism and anti-Semitism. Socialists should be "rather a-Semites."[68] ("A-Semitism," which seemed to Méric to be a new term, was in fact preached in Poland by the Jesuit Father Morawski as early as the eighteen nineties, as a doctrine more in harmony with Christianity than anti-Semitism.)[69] The Jews, to whatever class they belong, are, he says, unable to stand any criticism directed against any one among them; they all consider themselves to be *taboo.* As long as this intolerable state continues, "we will not turn to anti-Semitism, but we will, intentionally, invent [the term] 'anti-Kikism [*l'antiyoupinisme*]'"[70]

Méric used violent language, but his arguments were

[64] All quotations in this paragraph taken from Victor Méric, in *Guerre sociale,* Feb. 28, 1911, p. 2 (points of suspension are Méric's). See also Méric *ibid.,* April 5, 1911, p. 2.

[65] Méric, in *Hommes du Jour,* March 11, 1911, p. 8.

[66] *Ibid.,* April 1, 1911, p. 6.

[67] *Ibid.,* April 6, 1912, p. 4.

[68] *Ibid.,* March 4, 1911, p. 4.

[69] Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus, *Mitteilungen,* VI (1896), 150.

[70] Méric in *Hommes du Jours,* March 11, 1911, p. 8. See also April 1, 1911, p. 6.

rather old. In fact, by the time he wrote, it was not easy to add anything new to the theoretical arsenal of Socialist anti-Semitism. Yet, difficult as it was, it was accomplished by a certain Paul Aspord, a member of the French Socialist party and a contributor to one of its provincial organs. Aspord deplores the fact that there are certain comrades who are attempting to transform the Socialist party into a center of defense of the Jews. He seems to be troubled by the fact that a few Jewish delegates to the party congress at Saint-Quentin (1911) submitted a motion condemning anti-Semitism. Such a motion, he thinks, is but a prelude to future quarrels, with which the doctrine of the party has nothing to do. It is an attempt at an ideological "compromise" which can hardly be tolerated by genuine Socialists.[71]

Accused of anti-Semitism,[72] Aspord replied that there are three reasons why one should fight the Jewish capitalists: first, because they are capitalists; second, because they are Freemasons; and, finally, because they are Jews. Of course, there are Jewish proletarians, and one should not discriminate against workers of any race or creed. Yet there is a special reason for fighting against the Jewish religion. The Jews, "proletarians or not," are more faithful to their religion and race (the two are, in fact, identical) than the Catholics to theirs. There is thus a very strong solidarity among the Jews, "and who knows whether, in the near future, when capitalism will no longer be represented except by Jews, the proletarians of that race will not constitute the formidable bodyguard of the old bourgeois society?" It is not certain that such an event will occur, but one may nonetheless be "a little afraid" of such an occurrence. Therefore, one must distrust the motion—already referred to—against anti-Semitism.[73]

[71] Paul Aspord, in *Travailleur d'Eure-et-Loir*, May 6, 1911, p. 1. The party congress at Saint-Quentin repudiated any racial struggle, but because of lack of time, postponed until the next congress a vote on a motion on anti-Semitism. Cf. 8[e] *Congrès national, tenue à Saint-Quentin les* 16, 17, 18 *et* 19 *Avril* 1911. *Compte rendu sténographique* (Paris, no date), p. 349.

[72] By L. F. Bourgeois, in *Travailleur d'Eure-et-Loir*, May 13, 1911, p. 1.

[73] All quotations in this paragraph from: Aspord, *ibid.*, May 20, 1911. p. 1. French Socialist anti-Semitism is more extensively discussed in this author's

II. Opponents of Anti-Semitism

A. GUESDE AND LAFARGUE

In order to gain an adequate idea of the strength of the anti-Semites within the Socialist movement, it is necessary also to examine those Socialists who opposed anti-Semitism. One of the most important among them was Jules Guesde (1845-1922), the leader of the *Parti ouvrier français*, and the most orthodox follower of Marx in France. He warns the workers not to heed the battle-cry of bourgeois anti-Semites against Jewish finance. A financier or banker is, in his eyes, "a blood-sucker of the blood-sucking class, an exploiter of exploiters" and not of workers, and, therefore, the latter have no reason to nourish any anger against high finance in general or Rothschild in particular.[74] Furthermore, finance is, without knowing it, a revolutionary agent *par excellence*, because, by draining off the savings of peasants and other petty bourgeois, it hastens the centralization of capital in a few hands and thus renders nationalization easier.[75] Therefore, those who think that they pursue a Socialist aim in denouncing the financiers (under the improper name of "Jews") mistake the true enemy.[76] The bourgeoisie would be only too happy if the class war between labor and capital could be diverted into a struggle between the *sans prépuce* and those *avec prépuce*. The workers must realize that they are exploited by industry, and not by finance, and that industry is not a Jewish monopoly. The trade name of the firm which dispossesses them is "not Moses and Co., but Christ and Co."[77]

Guesde's refusal to take part in the Dreyfus Affair cannot be construed as acquiescence in anti-Semitism. In a declaration of the *Parti ouvrier français* (*Le Socialiste*, July

forthcoming volume, *Sh'elat ha-Yehudim basotsalizm shel maarav Europa* [The Jewish Problem in Western European Socialism] (Jerusalem, Bialik Institute).

[74] Jules Guesde, in *Cri du Peuple*, June 18, 1886, p. 1. See also *ibid.*, June 9, and 17, 1886.

[75] Guesde, "La Question Juive," *Le Socialiste*, June 26, 1892.

[76] Guesde, "*Réponse . . .*" (1892) in his *En Garde!* (Paris, 1911), p. 47.

[77] Guesde, "La Question Juive," *loc. cit.*

24, 1898) inspired by Guesde,[78] non-participation is urged on the ground that the proletariat cannot be actively interested in a quarrel between two bourgeois camps both equally hostile to workers. The same declaration, however, points out the necessity of unmasking the anti-democratic character of anti-Semitism. In September, 1898, at their congress at Montluçon, the "Guesdists" (the unofficial name of the *Parti ouvrier français*) passed a resolution on anti-Semitism submitted by Alexandre Zévaès and seconded by Paul Lafargue. It condemned anti-Semitism as "one of the forms of reaction," and drew attention to the existence of a numerous and much exploited Jewish proletariat.[79]

Lafargue (1842-1911), in contradistinction to his father-in-law, Karl Marx, actively fought against anti-Semitism. Casual references show that his phraseology was not always different from that of the anti-Semites. He sometimes identified the Jews, "those heroes of gold,"[80] with financiers. He also singled out Jewish bankers, so that he was publicly asked by a comrade why he did so without ever specifying the Catholic or Protestant origin of other bankers. In his reply he did not answer this question specifically, but expressed his deep admiration for the "Jewish people" that after centuries of persecution never surrendered, but now "is crushing European Christianity by the weight of its billions."[81] This, however, is not the only reason for his admiration of the Jews. They have also produced a great number of important Socialists, particularly in Germany. The Jews are able, intelligent, tireless, and devoted, and it must be regretted that there are so few of them in the ranks of French Socialism.[82] "Nous n'avons pas de Juifs dans notre mouvement; voilà notre malheur," Lafargue is reported to have complained once in a conversation with Max Beer.[83]

78 Cf. Compère-Morel, *Jules Guesde* (Paris, 1937), p. 441.

79 *Le Socialiste*, Sept. 18, 1898, p. 4.

80 Paul Lafargue, *Origine et évolution de la propriété* (Paris, 1895), p. 497. See also p. 498.

81 Lafargue, in *Cri du Peuple*, Oct. 2, 1886, p. 1.

82 *Ibid.*

83 Max Beer, *Fifty Years of International Socialism* (London, 1937), p. 103.

Holding such views, he was naturally opposed to the anti-Semitic movement. Anti-Semitism was for him a result of economic competition, "une question de boutique."[84] Drumont, "a dirty Jew," accuses the Socialists of being hirelings of Jewish capitalism.[85] Lafargue is rather happy over this accusation, because, as he says, in consequence of such slanders no one will be stupid enough "to confuse us with the anti-Semites."[86]

B. JAURES

Jean Jaurès (1859-1914), the great French Socialist tribune, ridiculed the reactionaries who wanted to reduce Socialism to a crusade against the Jews.[87] The contemporary social crisis, as viewed by Jaurès, was characterized by the increasing power of finance, by the destruction of small commerce, and by the corruption of the press. The Jews, with long experience in banking and trade, exploit the crisis to their advantage, but have not caused it. Therefore, the Socialists must eliminate all exploitation, and not only that practiced by the Jews.[88] Not the Jewish race, but Capitalism, which generates crises, must be smashed.[89] Anti-Semitism is but "a capitalist fake,"[90] a reactionary device to deceive the people.[91] Anti-Semites accuse Socialists of siding with the Jews, but the fact is that they themselves play into the hands of the Jews, or to be more precise, of the wealthy Jews, for Jews, too, are divided into classes. In this connection, Jaurès recalls that "the wealthy Jews are more capitalists than Jews," and are ready to betray their race in order to save their class.[92] He is convinced that the

84 Lafargue, in *Le Socialitse*, July 24, 1898, p. 1.

85 Lafargue, *ibid.*, Oct. 2, 1898, p. 3. Drumont (*Sur le chemin de la vie* [Paris, 1914], p. 112) denied categorically that he was of Jewish origin.

86 Lafargue, in *Petite République*, March 5, 1896, p. 1.

87 Jean Jaurès, in *Dépêche*, Feb. 5, 1890, p. 1.

88 Jaurès, *ibid.*, June 2, 1892, p. 1.

89 Jaurès, in *Petite République*, June 9, 1898, p. 1; *Lanterne*, Feb. 13, 1898, p. 1.

90 Jaurès, *Petite République*, June 7, 1896, p. 1.

91 The Church used this device as early as 1789; Jaurès, *La Constituante* (Paris, [1901]), p. 446-451.

92 Jaurès, in *Petite République*, June 9, 1898, p. 1.

anti-Semites will never carry out their program, because the expropriation of Jewish capital is a threat to all capitalists.[93]

Jaurès considers anti-Semitism a dangerous reactionary movement. This explains his participation in the Dreyfus Affair. For years he believed, as did most of his contemporaries, that Dreyfus was guilty and could be sentenced to death according to the law.[94] As late as the end of 1897 he refused his support to Bernard Lazare, who was then campaigning for a review of the Dreyfus case.[95] But when more facts became known, and when it became clear that the anti-Dreyfusards were threatening to overthrow the Republic, he changed his mind and threw himself wholeheartedly into the pro-Dreyfus camp. Yet it may not be out of place to recall that his opposition to anti-Semitism and his support of Dreyfus did not have much to do with any genuine sympathy for the Jews.

True, he declared himself to have no prejudice against the Jews. He pointed out that "the Jewish race is in some respects a very great one": it dreamt of the brotherhood of man, it produced a prophetic literature which in itself is the best condemnation of Jewish finance, and it gave mankind such men as Maimonides, Spinoza, Marx, and Lassalle.[96] Jaurès spoke with consideration of the Hebrew ideal of justice as one of the essential elements of French civilization.[97] He denounced the persecution of Jews at a meeting convened to protest against the pogroms at Kishinev and Tsarist oppression of the Finns.[98] He criticized Rothschild for discharging workers,[99] but his criticism is not adorned

93 Jaurès, in *Petite République*, Jan. 29, 1898, p. 1.

94 Jaurès, in *Annales de la Chambre des Députes* (1894), p. 839 (Dec. 24).

95 Reinach, *op. cit.*, II, 428. This campaign of Lazare was denounced by Alexandre Zévaès, as "a new maneuvre" of "finance and Jewry." (*Petite République*, Nov. 10, 1896, p. 1.)

96 Jaurès, in *Dépêche*, June 2, 1892, p. 1.

97 Jaurès, in *Journal Officiel*, 1910, p. 272 (Jan. 24).

98 See *Petite République*, June 28, 1903, p. 2. Bonnier's assertion (*Le Socialiste*, July 5, 1903, p. 1) that Jaurès kept silence on the Kishinev pogroms is not correct.

99 Jaurès, in *Journal Officiel*, 1910, p. 3526 (Dec. 20).

with the kind of anti-Semitic remarks which frequently accompany similar attacks on Jewish financiers.[100]

As against these statements,there are others which show that sometimes, at least, Jaurès thought of Jews in terms not unlike those of the anti-Semites. The capitalist system, he once said, permits "the tribe of Israel . . . to make incessant million-franc raids."[101] To show that he is *not* an anti-Semite, he notes that "the true Jews are those who know how to circumcise the savings of others, and in this sense there are thousands of Christians who are Jews or ready to become Jews."[102] In a parliamentary debate on Algeria he alludes to "Jewish rapacity,"[103] and on another occasion refers in the following terms to the Jews: "We know well that the Jewish race . . . handles with particular ability the capitalist mechanism, a mechanism of rapine, of lies, of corruption and of extortion.[104] Though opposed to anti-Semitism à la Drumont, he still is ready to blend—mildly, of course—Socialism with anti-Semitism. He says so himself, quite clearly, in a controversy with Drumont. The latter quoted the famous anti-Semitic passages of Marx in order to shed light on the Jewish question. Drumont, retorts Jaurès, has interpreted Marx incorrectly.[105] He could, however, have proceeded otherwise. This was, indeed, the advice given by Jaurès to Drumont in *La Petite Rèpublique* of December 13, 1898: "Like Marx, whom he [Drumont] quoted incorrectly the other day, he could have shown that

100 Persistent rumors were current that Jaurès' paper, *L'Humanité,* was established with the financial backing of Jewish capital. Charles Rappaport, a friend of Jaurès, created a violent incident at the party congress of 1911 when he voiced a similar opinion. See *L'Humanité,* April 20, 1911, p. 1, or a slightly different version in Parti Socialiste, 8^{e} *Congrès national,* p. 413-415. A. Zévaès (*Jean Jaurès* [Paris, 1951], p. 178) reports that *L'Humanité* needed "considerable resources," and that Jaurès easily found them in "Jewish circles" which were grateful to him for his ardent campaign in favor of Dreyfus. Zévaès (*ibid.*) also gives a list of the shareholders of *L'Humanité.*

101 Jaurès, in *Dépêche,* June 2, 1892, p. 1.

102 *Ibid.*

103 Jaurès, in *Journal Officiel,* 1898, p. 785 (Feb. 19).

104 Jaurès, in *Petite République,* June 9, 1898, p. 1.

105 On Marx, see E. Silberner, "Was Marx an anti-Semite?" *Historia Judaica,* XI (1949), 3-52. See also E. Silberner, "Ferdinand Lassalle: From Maccabeeism to Jewish anti-Semitism," *Hebrew Union College Annual,* XXIV, (1953), 151-186.

the social concept of the Jews, based on the idea of traffic, is in perfect harmony with the mechanism of capital. And he might have added, without exaggeration, that the Jews, accustomed by centuries of persecution to practice solidarity, and long habituated to the handling of liquid assets, have exercised an excessive and redoubtable influence in our society. Such Socialism, tinged with anti-Semitism, would scarcely have roused any objections among free intellects (*esprits libres*)."

C. OTHER SOCIALISTS AND ANARCHISTS

Aside from Guesde, Lafargue, and Jaurès, there were several other French Socialists who fought against the anti-Semitic movement. Gustave Rouanet was one of the more important among them. An anti-Semite as late as December, 1888, he completely reversed his stand on the Jewish question in an article published in the *Revue socialiste* in February, 1890, without indicating what personal experience had made him change so radically in such a short time. Whatever the cause may have been, he changed within a few years from an anti-Semite to a champion of Jewish equality. On May 25, and 27, 1895, December 23, 1898, and May 19 and 24, 1899, he delivered speeches in parliament against anti-Semitism. Incidentally, it may be noted that Herzl (*Tagebücher*, II, 579) was told by Leven that Rouanet received money for the speech he made in favor of the Jews in the French legislature in 1895. The reactionary character of anti-Semitism was also denounced by Rouanet in a number of articles in such Socialist publications as *La Lanterne* (January 1, 1898) and the *Revue socialiste* (1899, 1900, 1902).

A somewhat similar transformation also occurred in Gérault-Richard, who, as editor-in-chief of *Le Chambard socialiste*, printed anti-Semitic material as late as 1894, but soon found out that Socialism and anti-Semitism are not compatible.[106]

[106] Gérault-Richard, in *Petite République*, May 27, 1895, p. 1, Sept. 16, 1896, p. 1, May 28, 1899, p. 1. Gérault-Richard (1860-1912) is called by A. Zévaès (*Jean Jaurès*, p. 94) "l'un des meilleurs journalistes de son temps."

Two excerpts may also be quoted from the Socialist daily, *La Petite République.* Louis Dubreuilh called anti-Semitism a "lying counterfeit of Socialism" (November 11, 1896). "We are not anti-Semites," declared Marcel Sembat (March 24, 1898).

Léon Blum revealed his basic ideas on the Jews in his article, "Nouvelles conversations avec Eckermann," which he published anonymously in the *Revue blanche.* There he called the Jews "the great despoiled ones of history" and asserted that—because of their long sufferings, their destructive as well as constructive abilities, and their rational and this-worldly religion—they are more suitable for Socialism than the Gentiles.[107] He drew attention to the existence of a Jewish proletariat, whom too many people seem to forget.[108] "The antipathy toward the Jew," he said, "is not a natural, instinctive movement, but an acquired notion, factitious and arbitrary."[109]

Eugène Fournière condemned anti-Semitism and criticized the Socialist movement for not having fought against it energetically enough.[110]

Charles Péguy was not only opposed to Jew-hatred, he was in fact the only great writer among the Dreyfusards who really liked and sympathized with the Jews.[111] Anatole France was a different case; he was "an anti-Semite by instinct," according to an expert monographer.[112] Yet in spite of his aversion to the Jews, he wrote a preface to an anti-pogromist book published by a certain E. Séménoff under the title, *Une Page de la Contre-Révolution Russe: Les Pogromes* (Paris, 1906).

Gustave Hervé, prior to 1914 an extremist Socialist (or, as some prefer to call him, an Anarchist or half-Anarchist), has quite a consistent record of fighting against anti-Semitism. In his well-known book, *Leur Patrie,*[112a] he ex-

107 Blum, in *Revue blanche,* XXIV (1901), 360. See also pp. 362-63.
108 Blum, *Au Théâtre* (Paris, 1906), pp. 123-124.
109 *Ibid.* (2d ser., 2d ed., Paris, 1909), p. 207.
110 Eugène Fournière, *L'Artifice nationaliste* (Paris, 1903), pp. 58-60.
111 See Cécile Delhorbe, *Dreyfus et les écrivains français* (Neuchâtel, 1932), p. 291.
112 *Ibid.*
112a Gustave Hervé, *Leur Patrie* (Paris, 1905), p. 19.

pressed his sympathy for the persecuted Russian Jews. In another book of his, *Instruction civique*,[112b] he denounced the reactionary character of anti-Semitism. In his organ, *La Guerre sociale* (April 5 and 12, 1911), he insisted on calling himself a philo-Semite, precisely because there were, as he said, many racial anti-Semites in France and because he saw in anti-Semitism the meanest form of clericalism, nationalism, and social conservatism. He defended the Jews from leftist as well as from rightist attacks. In 1914, he turned from a militant Anarchist into a nationalist, but not into an anti-Semite, as is best seen in his article, "Pour faire honte aux antisémites," published in *La Guerre sociale* of June 20, 1915. In it he reproduced a patriotic letter of a certain Litvak, a Jewish volunteer, who wrote it on the eve of his death at the battlefront. Still later Hervé became an admirer of Hitlerism, but disapproved of "the error of its anti-Semitism."[113]

Besides the Socialists there were a good number of Anarchists who were opposed to anti-Semitism. Charles Malato rejected an invitation from the Marquis de Morès to join in founding a militant anti-Semitic newspaper.[114] Sébastien Faure condemned anti-Semitism in a series of articles which he published between December, 1897 and Februrary, 1898 in the Anarchist organ, *Le Libertaire*. He took an active part in the Dreyfus Affair, and with a few comrades even went to Algiers to fight against the adherents of Drumont.[115] According to unverifiable rumors, Rothschild financed the Anarchist campaign against anti-Semitism in Algeria.[116]

The famous French geographer and Anarchist Elisée Reclus denounced anti-Semitism, seeing in it a social phenomenon having little to do with race, since the Jews, through intermarriage with the Aryans, are only to a very small degree Semites. According to him, Jew-hatred is a

[112b] Hervé, *Instruction civique* (Paris, 1905), p. 254.
[113] Gustave Hervé, *Une Voix de France* (Zürich, 1934), p. 30.
[114] Malato, *De la Commune à l'anarchie* (2nd ed., Paris, 1894), p. 270).
[115] See Reinach, *op. cit.*, III, 257; IV, 330; V, 425.
[116] See Claude Martin, *Les Israélites algériens de* 1830 *à* 1902 (Paris, 1906), pp. 306, 359.

result of the present division of mankind into castes and fatherlands.[117] It will disappear in a society free from the exploitation of man by man.[118] Reclus spoke rather sympathetically about the Jews in his great work, *L'Homme et la Terre*.[119] The anti- Jewish utterances attributed to him by Denis, an anti-Semitic deputy in the French Chamber, and by Bournand, a hasty compiler of an anti-Jewish anthology, were in fact made not by him, but by his brother Onésime Reclus.[120]

Finally, anti-Semitism was also severely condemned by a group of Anarchist students in Paris, who prepared a report on this subject for the International Anarchist Congress, which was to be held in Paris in 1900. The Congress was forbidden by the French government, but the report appeared in the literary supplement of the Anarchist organ, *Les Temps Nouveaux* (November 10, 1900).

III. Attitudes toward Zionism

During the period under review, French socialists and anarchists paid hardly any attention to the national aspirations of the Jews. Aside from the few Fourierist comments discussed elsewhere,[121] relevant statements by Socialists seem to be very rare. One of them is an editorial footnote by Gustave Rouanet to a pro-Zionist article which the *Revue socialiste* printed shortly after the pogroms of Kishinev.[122] The article, says Rouanet, does not reflect the position of the editors. Zionism, he explains, must be rejected on the grounds that any nationalism—Jewish or other—is "a retrogressive and detestable conception," and that the Jews are

117 Elisée Reclus, in *Le Peuple* (Brussels), March 2 and 3, 1898.

118 Reclus, in Henri Dagan, *Enquête sur l'antisémitisme* (Paris, 1899), pp. 39-41.

119 (Paris, 1905-1908), II, 516-517; V, 466-468; VI, 372-382.

120 See Denis in *Annales de la Chambre des Députés*, 1895, p. 103 (May 25); François Bournand, *op. cit.;* Onésime Reclus, *France, Algérie et Colonies* (Paris, 1880).

121 See Silberner, "Charles Fourier on the Jewish Question," *Jewish Social Studies*, VIII (1946), 245-266; "The Attitude of the Fourierist School Towards the Jews," *ibid.*, IX (1947), 339-362.

122 Deka-Duo, "Autonomie juive et Philanthropie," *Revue socialiste*, XXXVIII (1903), 180-212.

not "a people in the true historical and political sense of the word." It is but a "myth" to believe that Palestine is the original and common fatherland of all contemporary Jews. Yet it is on this "legend" that Zionism bases the right of the Jews to Palestine. "It is hardly necessary to say that that is, in our eyes, a gross error, and that nothing justifies the 'patriotic' claims of Jewish Zionism. The Jews are coreligionaries having the right to security and to the exercise, in every country, of all the rights guaranteed to other citizens. Nothing more, [and] nothing less." In view of the atrocious persecutions of the Jews, concluded Rouanet, it is easy to understand Zionism. It is nonetheless an outgrowth of desperation, which pays no heed to obstacles nor even to impossibilities.[123]

This view was probably shared by most French Socialists of the time, in so far as they paid no attention at all to the problem. Except Verrier, the little-known Fourierist, Zionism seems to have found no sympathy among French Socialists of the period. After the outbreak of World War I, however, the situation changed. The French Socialist party, though silent on Palestine, recognized in 1917 the existence of a Jewish nationality, and individual party members, like Jean Longuet, Léon Blum, and Pierre Renaudel, gave support to the Zionist movement. In fact, the memorandum submitted on August 11, 1917 by the French Socialist party to the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee contains two recommendations concerning the Jews: first, that they be granted everywhere full civil equality; second, that "wherever they form imporant minorities, guaranties be secured for the free development of their national culture.[124]

One of the party leaders, Jean Longuet, said at a meeting of the Labor Zionists held in Paris in March, 1916, that he was not an enemy of Zionism, but since it offered only a partial solution of the Jewish question, one must fight first for the emancipation of the Jews wherever they live.[125]

[123] All quotations in this paragraph are from Rouanet, *ibid.*, pp. 180-181.

[124] Parti Socialiste, *Réponse au questionnaire formulé par la Délégation Hollando-Scandinave en vue de la Conférence de Stockholm* (Paris, n. d.) pp. 43-44.

[125] Cf. *Le Peuple Juif*, April 15, 1916, p. 12.

Two years later, at a similar meeting, he declared that the idea of a national Jewish center in Palestine deserved the support of the whole of Social Democracy.[126] Léon Blum, who before World War I showed only a superficial interest in matters Jewish, by 1918 became actively interested in Palestine. By 1927, he joined the pro-Zionist "France-Palestine" committee, and soon thereafter published in its organ an article suggesting the floating of an international loan for Palestine under the auspices of the League of Nations.[127] In 1928, together with Longuet and Renaudel, he joined the international Socialist "Pro-Palestine Committee." The next year he became a member of the Jewish Agency.[128]

It has already been shown that prior to 1914 very few French Socialists stated their views on Zionism. The same is also true of French Anarchists. Some of the latter condemned Zionism as an impracticable project, and, moreover, as one of "the cowardly and ambiguous solutions" of the Jewish question.[129] Emigration of Jewish workers, they thought, would decrease the active proletarian mass in Europe, and remove from the revolutionary cause "one of its most energetic, most intelligent, and most [class-] conscious elements."[130] A more sympathetic attitude was expressed by Elisée Reclus. He did not deny the existence of

126 See H. H. van Kol, *La Démocratie socialiste internationale et le Sionisme* (Lausanne, 1919), p. 11.

127 Blum, in *Palestine* (Paris), March, 1928, pp. 1-9.

128 Nothing describes Blum's attitude towards Zionism so well as the following message sent by him to a meeting held in Paris on February 1, 1950, in honor of Chaim Weizmann: "Juif français, né en France d'une longue suite d'aïeux français, ne parlant que la langue de mon pays, nourri principalement de sa culture, m'étant refusé à le quitter à l'heure où j'y courais le plus de dangers, je participe de toute mon âme à l'effort admirable miraculeusement transporté du plan du rêve au plan de la réalité historique qui assure désormais, une patrie digne, égale et libre à tous les juifs qui n'ont pas eu, comme moi, la bonne fortune de la trouver dans leur pays natal. J'ai suivi cet effort depuis que le président Weizmann me l'a fait comprendre. Je m'en suis toujours senti et je m'en sens plus que jamais solidaire." Quoted in André Blumel, *Léon Blum, juif et sioniste* (Paris, 1951), p. 13. See also Chaim Weizmann, *Trial and Error* (London, 1949), p. 450.

129 Le Groupe des Etudiants Socialistes Révolutionnaires Internationalistes, "Anti-Sémitisme," *Temps nouveaux, supplément littéraire,* Nov. 10, 1900, p. 273.

130 *Ibid.*, p. 278.

a Jewish nationality[131] and had no objections of principle against Zionism. He had, however, strong doubts about its future because Palestine was not rich enough and was too firmly held by the Sultan, under whose rule nothing great and solid could be created. Besides, the great powers would prevent the carrying out of the Zionist ideal.[132]

More space must be devoted to Bernard Lazare, the only Western European Anarchist who tried to combine his social doctrine—in a somewhat vague way, it is true—with Jewish nationalism. He is also, except for Moses Hess,[133] the only Western European Socialist (in the broad sense of the word) who saw in the national renaissance of the Jewish people the only possible and satisfactory solution of the Jewish problem.

Bernard Lazare (1865-1903), son of a Jewish tailor at Nîmes, used, in his early writings, a language in many respects reminiscent of the anti-Semites. He defined the Jew as anyone, of whatever race, "who is dominated by the single preoccupation of rapidly making a fortune, which he obtains by fraud, lying and trickery."[134] To these "Jews" he opposed the good, honest working "Israelites of France," but declined to speak about those of other countries, since they were foreigners and of no concern to him.[135] It would be desirable, he maintained, that "the anti-Semites" should change into "anti-Jews," and thus enable "many Israelites" to side with them.[136] Quite in line with this reasoning, he suggested that "the Israelites of France" withdraw from the Alliance Israélite Universelle and try to stop "the continual immigration of those predatory, rude, and dirty Tar-

131 "En effet, quoique ne possédant point de territoire en commun et ne parlant point le même langage, les Juifs constituent à certains égards une nation, puisqu'ils ont conscience d'un passé collectif de joies et de souffrances, le dépôt de traditions identiques ainsi que la croyance plus ou moins illusoire à une même parenté." Reclus, *L'Homme et la Terre,* VI, 373.

132 Reclus, in *Le Peuple,* March 2, 1898, p. 1. A letter from Bernard Lazare to Herzl, written most probably in the fall of 1897 and preserved in the Zionist Central Archives (H VIII 479/7), seems to indicate that Reclus was informed on Zionism by Lazare. See *infra,* note 160.

133 See E. Silberner, "Moses Hess," *Historia Judaica,* XIII (1951), 3-28.

134 Lazare, "Juifs et Israélites," *Entretiens politiques et littéraires,* I (1890), 177.

135 *Ibid.*, p. 178.

136 *Ibid.*, p. 179.

tars [i.e., Jews from Eastern Europe], who come to feed upon a land which is not theirs."[137]

Anti-Semitism, according to Lazare, is inevitably generated by the characteristics which the Jews have acquired in observing their political-religious cult or law: unsociableness, exclusiveness, belief that they are the chosen people, and attachment, in the dispersion, to Palestine. Their cult has transformed them into "a miserable and petty nation," rendered stupid and demoralized by poor education and unjustifiable pride.[138] These are some of the conclusions of Lazare's volume on anti-Semitism. Written by a Jew, the book was highly welcome in anti-Semitic circles. Drumont, in *La Libre Parole* (January 10, 1895), called it an impartial and "remarkable" book. The next year, however, he challenged Lazare to a duel, because in a controversy between Drumont and Zola, Lazare sided with the latter. "Two shots were exchanged with no result," reported a contemporary daily (*Le Voltaire*, June 20, 1896).

During the Dreyfus Affair—in which he played an outstanding rôle—Lazare completely changed his stand on the Jewish question. First, he reversed his attitude towards anti-Semitism, which he now called an "admirable safety-valve"[139] used by Gentile capitalists to divert the people's wrath towards all Jews, although a tremendous majority of the latter belong to the poorest of the poor. Second, he soon found out that a purely negative struggle against anti-Semitism is inadequate from the Jewish point of view, and particularly from that of the Jewish proletariat.

Nor can assimilation—"a bastard doctrine"[140] be envisaged as a practicable or desirable solution of the Jewish question. Lazare based this conviction on his own personal experience. Being himself an assimilated Jew (of Sephardic origin) who never received any special Jewish instruction, he believed until the middle eighteen-nineties that he was

[137] Lazare, "La Solidarité juive," *ibid.*, p. 232.

[138] Lazare, *L'Antisémitisme, son histoire et ses causes* (Paris, 1894), p. 14. Cf. also p. 3-13, 15-21.

[139] Lazare, "Le Prolétariat juif devant l'antisémitisme," *Flambeau*, Jan. 1899, p. 9.

[140] Lazare, "Le Nationalisme et l'Emancipation juive," *Echo sioniste*, II (1901), 134.

nothing but a Frenchman. Suddenly, during the Dreyfus Affair, he learned that, to use his own words, others considered him as being of another blood, soil, and brotherhood. One day, he says, "I awoke to find myself a Jew, without knowing what a Jew is."[141] The more he studied the Jewish people, the prouder he became that he was one of its members: "I belong to the race of those who, as Renan said, first introduced the idea of justice into the world. . . I am one of them and I want to be."[142]

More significant than this boasting is the fact that experience and study convinced Lazare that neither assimilation nor political emancipation offer an adequate solution of the Jewish problem.[143] What, then, in his view, is the answer to this thorny issue? At any rate, one must *not* attempt to find any solution for the problem of anti-Semitism. "One must exalt the Jews. Instead of christianizing Judaism, let us Judaize the Jew, let us teach him to live for himself, to be himself."[144] In other words, it is necessary to "impart the feeling of Jewish nationality to those Jews who do not have it any more, [and] strengthen it with those who [still] possess it."[145] But is there such a thing as a Jewish nationality or a Jewish nation? Undoubtedly, since any group of individuals having a common past as well as common traditions and ideas—as the Jews most obviously have—constitute a nationality. Consequently, "there is a Jewish nation."[146] Not only are the Jews a people; they also have the right to be one.[147] To be free, however, they need independence. They will secure full freedom only "when this landless Jewish nation has earth of its own of which it may dispose without constraint."[148] They must possess a "free land," by which Lazare means a land free

141 Lazare, *Le Fumier de Job* (Paris, 1928), p. 62 (posthumous).

142 Lazare, "Lettre ouverte à M. Trarieux," *Aurore*, June 7, 1899, p. 1.

143 It is difficult to say with certainty what writers, if any, contributed to his reorientation, because he scrupulously refrains from making relevant acknowledgements, references, or hints.

144 Lazare, "Nécessité d'être soi-même," *Zion*, April 30, 1897, p. 4.

145 Lazare, "Solidarité," *Zion*, May 31, 1897, p. 26.

146 Lazare, *Le Nationalisme juif* (Paris, 1898), p. 4.

147 Lazare, *Echo sioniste*, II, (1901) 169.

148 Lazare, *Le Nationalisme juif* (Paris, 1898), p. 16.

from "foreign oppression" as well as from class domination.[149]

This, of course, is Zionism, although Lazare never clearly elaborated whether "earth" means Palestine or any other territory. There are also some vague statements which make it possible to interpret Lazare's doctrine as one which admits of either a territorial or a cultural-autonomous solution[150] of the Jewish question, or perhaps of both at the same time. However this may be, he coöperated with the Zionist movement. He was present at the second Zionist World Congress at Basel (1898), which elected him a member of the Actions Committee; he also edited the French section of *Zion* and contribtued to *Flambeau,* an "organ of Zionist and social Judaism."

Dissatisfied with the bourgeois character of the Zionist leadership under Herzl, and with the creation of a Jewish Colonial Bank—in which he saw the most redoubtable instrument of oppression and demoralization—he resigned from the Actions Commitee, but did not withdraw from the Zionist movement.[151] In March, 1900 he still participated at the Conference of "the Lovers of Zion" at Frankfurt-on-the-Main,[152] and a few months later he expressed his regret at not being able, because of his wife's illness, to attend the World Zionist Congress in London (1900).[153] At this Congress Lazare planned to speak in favor of the education of Jewish youth in a national spirit, and to recommend the establishment of producers 'and consumers' as well as agricultural coöperatives for Jewish workers wherever they live in great masses.[154] He furthermore intended

149 Lazare to Nordau, Aug. 11, 1900, in *Welt,* IV (1900), No. 35, p. 12.

150 See Lazare, "Nationalisme et Emancipation," *Kadimah,* Aug. 15, 1898, p. 3; "Le Prolétariat juif . . .," *Flambeau,* Jan. 1899, pp. 11-12; *Fumier de Job,* pp. 161, 163, 165.

151 See his letter to Herzl, March 24, 1899, in *Flambeau* (1899), No. 4.

152 Consistent in being inconsistent, he there submitted the following resolution: "La Conférence des Chowewé Zion réunie à Francfort engage le Comité Central à reprendre le projet de la fondation d'une banque pour le développement de la colonisation et de l'industrie en Palestine." See *Echo sioniste,* I (1900), 250.

153 Lazare to Nordau, Aug. 11, 1900, in *Welt,* IV (1900), No. 35, p. 12.

154 See his little known letter (Aug. 1900) to Nahum Slustsh, in *Dr. Bloch's Oesterreichische Wochenschrift,* XII (1900), 639.

to make it clear that the Zionist party and the Actions Committee must "descend from the clouds" and cease to move only in a sphere of dreams about the future; they must pursue a realistic Jewish policy in the Diaspora and defend there the interests of the persecuted Jewish masses.[155] As time went on, however, Lazare's opposition to the Zionist leadership grew stronger, and finally he retired from all Zionist activity. In 1902 he accused Herzl and the Actions Committee of cringing before Wilhelm II and Abd-ul-Hamid, "the worst of assassins"; he mocked at their *Realpolitik,* which he characterized as "operetta diplomacy" and "a policy of the Ghetto," worthy of those who coöperate with the most fanatical rabbis of Eastern Europe.[156]

While the Zionist leadership had, in theory at least, a classless approach to the national program, Lazare centered his hopes in the Jewish proletariat. He distrusted the Jewish bourgeoisie, which, he maintained, poisons the Jewish nation with its rottenness.[157] This Jewish bourgeoisie, says Lazare, "is our garbage, our rubbish; we must rid ourselves of it."[158] In other words, the national program has to be carried out by the Jewish masses in opposition to their own bourgeoisie. The Jewish proletariat must revolt against its own Jewish bourgeoisie. By such a "revolution" within the Jewish community, Jewish workers can also contribute to the cause of the revolution in general.[159]

Is Jewish nationalism compatible with international Socialism? Lazare was certain that it is. Internationalism —an integral part of Socialism—obviously presupposes the existence of nations. Now, since Jewish nationalism (to be distinguished from chauvinism) aspires only to national freedom of the Jews, there is no incompatibility between Socialist ideology and Jewish nationalism. The Jews have thus the right to preserve their national identity, not only in a capitalist, but also in a Socialist or Anarchist world.

155 *Ibid.*

156 Lazare, "Le Congrès sioniste et le Sultan," *Pro Armenia* (Paris), II (1902), 29-30.

157 Lazare, *Le Nationalisme juif,* p. 7.

158 Lazare, in *Echo sioniste,* II (1901), 134.

159 Lazare, "Capitalisme juif et démocratie," *Aurore,* May 20, 1901, p. 1.

But will it be desirable to preserve that nationality in a non-capitalist world? Undoubtedly, because there is no guaranty that Socialism will automatically improve the situation of the Jews. Some day humanity will consist of a federation of free groups organized in a way altogether different from the capitalist system. Still, these groups must be given a chance to constitute themselves. "Why," asks Lazare, "should the Jews not constitute one among them? I see nothing which is opposed to it, and it is in the development of Jewish nationalism that I see the solution of the Jewish question."[160]

Lazare severely criticized bourgeois Zionism, but he never developed in any detail a program of action for Jewish socialism. His vagueness in this respect is probably due to the fact that he was essentially a literary and not a politically-minded man. Had he not died prematurely, at the age of thirty-eight, he probably would have elaborated his views with greater clarity and precision.

IV. Decline of Socialist Anti-Semitism

A survey of French Socialism from 1865 to 1914 shows that during that period several important Socialists shared anti-Semitic ideas. The most prominent of them are, among the Blanquists, Gustave Tridon, Albert Regnard, and Paul Argyriadès; among the possibilists and the group around the *Revue socialiste*, Benoît Malon, Auguste Chirac, and Gustave Rouanet (prior to 1890); among the so-called independents, René Viviani; and finally, among the less prominent Socialists, Pierre Myrens and Victor Méric.

The survey also discloses that during the eighteen eighties and the greater part of the eighteen nineties—up to 1898, to be precise—Socialists, generally speaking, flirted

160 Lazare, *Le Nationalisme juif*, p. 10. Cf. also pp. 12-13. A more detailed analysis of the Jewish problem in Lazare's work, is given by E. Silberner, "Lazare and Zionism," *Shivat Zion* [in Hebrew], II-III (1953), 328-363. The article includes several hitherto unknown letters from Lazare to Herzl, written in French. They were discovered by the writer in the Central Zionist Archives in Jerusalem and reproduced in the original language. A full bibliography of Lazare's writing on Jewish subjects is found on pp. 362 f.

with anti-Semitism because they considered it a useful, though aggressive, auxiliary. They believed that though anti-Semitism as such did not offer a solution of the social problem, it was nonetheless a preparatory school for, or the first step towards, Socialism.[161]

At the end of the eighteen nineties, under the impact of the Dreyfus Affair, the Socialist movement changed its attitude towards anti-Semitism. At their congress held in Paris in 1899, French Socialists branded anti-Semitism and forewarned workers against its reactionary character.[162] Anti-Semitism, it is true, did not disappear entirely from the Socialist ranks, but its exponents became considerably fewer. Moreover, after the turn of the century, none of the great French Socialists ever propounded anti-Semitic ideas. Some of the last preachers of pre-War Socialist anti-Semitism, like Myrens and Méric, were not unimportant, but they can hardly be compared in importance with such prior Socialist anti-Semites as Tridon and Malon.

Even during the period of flirtation with anti-Semitism, there were great Socialists who opposed that movement on the ground of its incompatibility with Socialism. The most significant among them are Guesde, Lafargue, and Jaurès.[163] It must be remembered, however, that some of them, like Jaurès, convinced of the peculiar fitness of the Jews for the capitalist mechanism, continued, in spite of their opposition to the anti-Semitic movement, to make utterances sometimes reminiscent of the language of the anti-Semites themselves.

[161] For a similar trend of thought among non-French Socialists, see E. Silberner, "Austrian Social Democracy and the Jewish Problem," *Historia Judaica,* XIII (1951), 121-140; "British Socialism and the Jews," *ibid.*, XIV (1952), 27-52; "Two Studies on Modern Anti-Semitism," (I. The Jew-Hatred of M. A. Bakunin; II. Edmond Picard's "Scientific and Humanitarian" Anti-Semitism), *ibid.*, 93-118; "German Social Democracy and the Jewish Problem Prior to World War I," *ibid.*, XV (1953), 3-48.

[162] "Le congrès flétrit les nationalistes et les antisémites et met les travailleurs en garde contre toutes les forces de la réaction." "*Congrès général des organisations socialistes françaises tenu à Paris du* 3 *au* 8 *décembre* 1899 (Paris, 1900), p. 410.

[163] Among the non-French Socialists *Engels* should be recalled. See E. Silberner, "Friedrich Engels and the Jews," *Jewish Social Studies,* XI (1949), 323-342.

The most important factor responsible for the change in the French Socialists' attitude towards the Jews was the fact that anti-Semitism, as the Dreyfus Affair clearly indicated, served reactionary forces, and not, as sophisticated Socialists anticipated, Socialism. More than that, anti-Semitism not only did not serve Socialism, but proved a strong weapon against the Socialists themselves. By strengthening chauvinism and anti-Republicanism, it threatened, together with other reactionary movements, the whole structure of democracy and Socialism. As soon as the Socialists realized this danger, they ceased, on the whole, to flirt with the anti-Semites.

Other factors responsible for this change are less important and more difficult to prove. However, it seems not unreasonable to assume that the appearance of a Jewish proletariat in France may have somehow modified the notions about the Jews of at least some Socialists in that country. The number of Jewish proletarians there, chiefly immigrants, was of course, not great; but neither was the total Jewish population of France, numbering 75,000 in 1899. In Paris (1899) out of a total Jewish population of 45,000, the number of proletarians was estimated at 20,000.[164] Even this absolutely though not relatively small number of Jewish proletarians in the capital of France did not entirely escape the attention of the Socialist press.[165] The growth of the Jewish proletariat in England and the United States, as well as the formation of a Jewish Socialist organization in Russia (1897), may also have provided some material for reflection to the more thoughtful French Socialists. Under such circumstances, the justification of anti-Semitism within the ranks of organized Socialism became more and more difficult in every country, France included. And such a justification became all the more useless in France, as Socialism there did not seem to gain much by using anti-Semitic or half-anti-Semitic slogans.

Concerning Jewish national aspirations, it appears

164 Paul Pottier, in *Revue des Revues,* XXVIII (1899), 482.

165 See Gaston Cogniard, "Le Prolétariat juif," *Petite République,* March 3, 1899.

from the survey that French Socialists and Anarchists showed a conspiciuous lack of interest in them. The few relevant statements that were made express either hostility (Rouanet and some Anarchists) or skepticism (Reclus). Lazare, the only Zionist in the Socialist and Anarchist camp, is in every respect an exception.

TWO OBSCURE SOURCES OF REUCHLIN'S "DE ACCENTIBUS LINGUAE HEBRAICAE"

By Eric Werner
Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio

For Leo Baeck, master and friend, to his eightieth birthday.

I

THE spiritual climate in which Reuchlin boldly ventured to publish his Hebrew studies was a mixture of theosophy-cabbala, genuine humanistic zeal, and, last but not least, belief in the divinely revealing nature of the Hebrew language. If, perchance, Hebrew served the younger Reuchlin as a mere tool to unriddle the secrets of the cabbala and thereby to demonstrate the truth of certain Christian dogmas,[1] the older Reuchlin approached the study of the Hebrew tongue more in the spirit of his fellow-humanists, in conformity with their watchword, "Ad fontes!"

The intellectual curiosity of the Renaissance was a feature much more characteristic of Italy than of Germany. When the Florentine nobleman Gianozzo Manetti began to study Hebrew systematically with a Jew (about 1450), he set a pattern that was followed by almost all Christian scholars for the next century.[2] It seems that the nucleus

[1] Cf. Ludwig Geiger, *Johann Reuchlin* (Leipzig, 1871), pp. 172-176, where the main sources are given. Also S. A. Hirsch, "Reuchlin, Father of the Study of Hebrew among the Christians." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, O. S., VIII (London, 1896), 451 ff.

[2] Cf. Jakob Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*, ed. Goetz (1925), pp. 198 ff. See also Vita Manetti in Ludovicus Ant. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, XX (Milan 1723 ff.), Col. 552 f.; Vogelstein-Rieger, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, II, (Berlin, 1895-96), p. 73, where Manetti is tentatively identified as the opponent of Moshe ben Yizchak de Rieti in a public religious disputation.

Historia Judaica, XVI (1954).

of the world-famous collection of Hebrew manuscripts in the Vatican was provided by Manetti, who also succeeded in interesting Popes Nicholas V and Sixtus IV in the pursuit of Hebrew studies.

Different was the situation in Germany and Central Europe. The paradoxical attitude of intelligentsia and nobility, who took up Hebrew studies abroad while expelling the Jews from their own homeland, is definitely *sui generis*, or rather *Germaniae generis*. Friend of the Jews, as Reuchlin certainly was, he stated simply that from his own homeland of Swabia the Jews were expelled and he, Reuchlin, had to go abroad to study the proper pronunciation and cantillation of Hebrew texts. But not a word of regret, no plea for the Jews![3]

It is well known, and Reuchlin himself asserted it more than once, that the ultimate goal of his Hebrew studies was to convince the world, and most of all the Jews, of the validity of the fundamental dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church.[4] It was for this purpose that he wanted to use his knowledge of Hebrew, and it is this purpose which accounts for his insatiable curiosity to learn everything concerning the cabbala and the Jewish customs connected therewith.[5] Yet it would be neither fair nor correct to ascribe the fine Hebrew background that Reuchlin painstakingly acquired over a period of almost thirty years, solely to his desire to proselytize the Jews. Reuchlin was a true child of his time, a man of manifold interests, that ran the gamut from music to classical studies, from cabbala and Hebrew philology to learned Latin comedies.[6]

[3] *Reuchlin, De accentibus*, fol. LXXI: "cui plane nulla Judaeorum relicta est conversatio quippe cum fuerint prope toto vitae meae tamque a mea patria exacti et extorres judaei, nec in ullo ducis Suevorum territorio habitare audeant." See also C. G. Wächter, *Württembergisches Privatrecht*, I (Stuttgart, 1839-42, p. 100 f.

[4] Cf. Reuchlin, *De verbo mirifico*, third book; also A. Geiger, in *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, VIII (1870), 255 f. Even the popes searched for christological material to be gleaned from the Talmud; see *Johannes Reuchlins Briefwechsel*, ed. Ludwig Geiger (Stuttgart, 1876), No. CCCI, p. 331 (Bamberg).

[5] See in this connection the highly interesting letter of Fra Ellenbog *ibid.*, No. CCLXXV, p. 310.

[6] Cf. L. Geiger, *Johannes Reuchlin*, pp. 8, 69, 165 ff. etc.

In this study we shall examine only a small section of Reuchlin's work, namely, the third book of his *De accentibus linguae hebraicae* (Hagenau, 1518). In this book, which he entitled *Negina* (chant, melody), we witness a syndrome of Reuchlin's grammatical, classical, and musical interests.

As every reader of Reuchlin's books knows, that famous humanist, in this respect different from most of his contemporaries, gave credit where credit was due. From Jews he had acquired his Hebrew knowledge, and these teachers, personally known to him, and the Hebrew authors, from whose works he had profited, he always remembered faithfully.[7] He did not hesitate to acknowledge that they remained his masters.[8]

Since he mentions them by name, there is no need here to discuss their merits; almost all of them are very well known. Yet there are two among them of whom we know relatively little. Indeed, one of them has remained a mysterious personality to this day. They were Flavius (Raymundus) Mithridates Romanus and Johannes Bossosthenius, *vulgo* Boeschenstein. The following pages are devoted to their respective contributions to Reuchlin's third book of *De accentibus linguae hebraicae.*

II

Reuchlin refers to Flavius Mithridates Romanus in the third book, fol. LXXXi a, b and on fol. LXXXiii b to Johannes Boeschenstein. The first mentioned passage reads in translation:

. . . we have set down everything according to the teachings of the Hebrews, in the same way in which they treated this matter in their grammatical and musical books. It was, however, hard work for us to invent examples, apt for general instruction; and every student will confirm the veracity of this remark.

It is true, we once heard Raimund Mithridates the Roman, when he was making the rounds of the French and German universities and

[7] Cf. Reuchlin, *De accentibus*, fol. LXXX b and LX a: "Ac simul id quidquid est quod in hebraicis sum consecutus (Hercle quod comparatione doctissimorum Judaeorum exile nimium iudico) amicos caelare non possum . . ."

[8] *Ibid.*

gymnasia, a man well versed in Hebrew, Greek, Arabic, and Latin. He attempted to systematize Hebrew prosody as a parallel of the Greek pattern, in this way:

As the *tonoi, chronoi, pneumata, pathemata* of the Greeks were used, so were they also employed in the mode of the Hebrews. For the Hebrews, too, classified the *tonoi,* i.e. the accents.

The *Acutus* corresponds with *Cadma* and *Maarich.*[8a]

The *Gravis* corresponds with *Tarha* and likewise with a preceding *Cadma, Segula, Zarka,* and *Azla.*

The *Circumflex* corresponds with *Shofar yasar* [*munach*] and *Yareach ben yomo.*

The *Tempora* likewise:

Longum corresponds in the beginning of a sentence to *Tharsa,* in the middle of a sentence to *Rebia,* in the end of a sentence to *super* A to *Karne para,* with preceding *Yareach ben yomo; super* E to *Pazer gadol; super* I it is passed, otherwise sometimes in the last letter *Zarka* [?]. In the praepenult letter (after a preceding *Darga*) merely to *Thebir,* and indifferently in all cases to *Zakeph gadol.*

Breve has nothing, except in the last syllable *Thalsa.*

Media Quantitas [middle length] is ambivalent [*anceps*]. At the beginning stands *Sophar Mahapach,* in the middle *Threnhuttrin,* at the end and sometimes in the middle *Salseleth.* In the last and penult trochaic syllable stands *Threpastin,* and also for the last (if in the following word there occurs *Thebir*), *Darga.*

Passiones: As for the *passiones* [affects] of prosody, he taught that the suspensions [breaks] of the sentences are represented at the beginning [of the sentence] by *zakeph katon;* in the middle by *Athnahtha,* in the end by *Soph pasuk.* Likewise there might be a hyphen *Samich* [*sic* for *S'micha*], and a hypodiastole *pasek.*

When Mithridates in this way ended his course of teaching and instruction, the students swore that they had not understood him at all. Therefore, after the fee agreed upon had been fully paid, the students left the teacher and his teachings as if it had been the dogma Scotinon [probably an allusion to the doctrine of will, as expressed by Duns Scotus, a principle not recognized by the Church] and he, Mithridates, returned with heavily swollen purse to Italy.[9]

[8a] Here I follow exactly Reuchlin's spelling and orthography.

[9] This completely misunderstood theory of Hebrew accentuation was blindly taken over by Sebastian Münster and others. Cf. Josef Perles, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der hebräischen und aramäischen Studien* (Munich, 1884), pp. 195 ff. This old interpretation was, to my great amazement, reprinted and seriously presented by A. Z. Idelsohn, *Jewish Music in Its Historical Development,* (New York, 1929), pp. 69-70, who paraphrased Reuchlin and Mithridates without mentioning either of them.

Who was this Mithridates? Most of the documentary vestiges lead us to the court of Pico della Mirandola, where Mithridates first appears. He was one of Pico's Hebrew teachers, together with a certain Datylo Hebraeus, "huius obtrectator [erat] Mithridates Romanus," as we read in a letter of Widmanstadt-Oesiander to Seripandus, the disciple of Cardinal Aegidius of Viterbo.[10] There was a time when Jules Dukas' identification of Mithridates with R. Jochanan Alemanno was accepted.[11] But after Steinschneider's penetrating refutation, the conjecture can no longer be maintained seriously.[12] The reason for Dukas' identification was the fact that both men in question had translated a number of cabbalistic treatises into Latin.[13] Steinschneider lists thirty-eight of the supposed translations of Mithridates, contained in the Cod.Vat., Nos. 189-191. Obviously, only a highly learned Jew could have had the ability to translate such intricate texts into Latin.

If Mithridates was a native Roman, as was assumed by his contemporaries Sebastian Münster and Widmanstadt on the sheer evidence of his sobriquet, "Romanus," he must have been the son of a Byzantine Jew. Reuchlin emphasizes his extensive Hebrew, *Greek*, and Arabic knowledge, a combination unheard of among occidental Jewry. Moreover, he gives himself the Greek-sounding name *Mithridates*, but takes care that this name occurs in the Bible.[14] Still, all this is mere conjecture. The crucial point, however, is his theory of the accents, the manuscript of which, entitled *De tropis hebraicis*, seems to be lost. Reuchlin and Münster still knew it, and especially the latter praised it highly.[15] An other-

10 Full text of Widmanstadt's letter in Perles, *op. cit.*, pp. 181 f.

11 Cf. Jules Dukas, *Recherches sur l'histoire litteraire du quinzieme siècle* (Paris, 1876); see also N. Brüll's *Jahrbücher für Geschichte und Literatur*, III, (1877), 196 f.

12 Cf. M. Steinschneider in *Hebräische Bibliographie*, XXI (1881-2), 109-115 etc. Perles, *loc. cit.*, identifies Datylo with Jochanan Alemanno.

13 Steinschneider, *loc. cit.*, and pp. 130-32; also Stephanus et Josephus Assemani, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codicum Manuscriptorum Catalogus* I, (Rome, 1756), Nos. 189-191, pp. 155-163.

14 Ezra 1:8; 4:7.

15 Seb. Münster, *Opus Grammaticum* (Basle, 1549), pp. 383-387.

wise unknown Imbonatus still recommends it in Wolff, *Bibliotheca Hebraea.*[16]

Mithridates' theory of the Hebrew tropes, as far as we know it from its brief description quoted above, is in every respect a product and a legacy of Byzantine music theorists. However, their works were not published or translated in the western world before the eighteenth century. Whether the Byzantines, in their turn, had borrowed elements of their theories from the Arabs is still a controversial question.[17] At any rate, the division of the musical functions of the accents of the Greek prosody stems directly from Byzantine writers. A small part of the Arabic theory concerning the classification of music had been translated by Dom Gundissalinus (twelfth cent.), who made Al-Farabi's *Ihsa 'al-'ulum* accessible under the title *De Scientiis.*[18]

However that may be, the fact that Reuchlin quotes (in Greek letters) the *Greek* terminology of Mithridates makes it obvious that Mithridates' source was Greek, not Arabic. The famous Byzantine theorists Pachymeres, Bryennious, and Koukouzeles had evolved a system which at each point shines through Mithridates' Hebrew application.[19]

The most interesting term of the Byzantine system, as presented by Mithridates, is the *pneuma;* there it signified the logical reading of a text with special reference to syntactically correct punctuation.[20] Reuchlin did not fully understand Mithridates' use of the Byzantine terms, for he lumped together the *pneumata* and *pathemata* in one single

16 Wolff, *Bibliotheca Hebraea* (Hamburg, 1733-45), II, 612.

17 Cf. H. G. Farmer, *Historical Facts for the Arabian Musical Influence* (London, 1929), pp. 48 ff, 54 ff.

18 Cf. Werner-Sonne, "The Theory and Philosophy of Music in Judaeo-Arabic Literature," *Hebrew Union College Annual,* XVI (1941), 266-72, where all sources are given.

19 It should be mentioned that Al-Mas'udi, quoting an older author, knew of the same divisions into modes (*tonoi*), beats (*chronoi*), caesurae (*pneumata*), and of the emotional affects (*pathemata*). Cf. Al-Mas'udi. *Prairies d'or* (*Mrurj al dhahab*) VIII, p. 90. See also H. G. Farmer, "The Old Persian Music Modes," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (January, 1926).

20 Cf. P. Wagner, *Gregorianische Melodien,* II, (Leipzig, 1912), 15, 52, and passim; also O. Fleischer, *Neumenstudien,* I, (Leipzig, 1895), 92.

rubric. Obviously, not only the ordinary students of Mithridates could have sworn "se non intellexisse." Nonetheless, that much remained in Reuchlin's memory for him to associate the "affective" (*pathemata*) qualities of the accents with their punctuating function.

Another misunderstanding of Mithridates' theory, perpetuated by Reuchlin, may be cleared up here. The former speaks of the *accentus acutus*, the Byzantine *neume oxeia*, of the *gravis*, the Byzantine *neume bareia*. It was but natural for the Latinist Reuchlin to add the prosodic-phonetic accent circumflex, although it does not exist as a Byzantine *neume*, neither under this nor under any other name.

After these comparisons it appears evident that Mithridates applied Byzantine systems and terms to the interpretation of the masoretic accents.

Let us now evaluate again the facts concerning Mithridates. He taught Hebrew at the court of Pico della Mirandola, where Greek Jews seem to have found a refuge. He was familiar with Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, Greek, and Latin. He applied the Byzantine theory of ecphonetic neumes to the masoretic accents, as we know from Reuchlin's and Münster's descriptions. Certainly he was a Jew, since he stipulated that nobody else but Pico should be present when he was teaching Aramaic, the language of the Cabbala.[21]

The notion that Mithridates came from Byzantine stock emerges as a distinct possibility to be considered. It is known that after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 many Jewish scholars fled to Italy and made their appearance in the circles of the humanists and at the courts of the humanistic-minded aristocracy. Among these princes Pico certainly held a prominent position.[22] Possibly Mithridates was still reared in Constantinople; at any rate, his knowledge

[21] Cf. Joann. Pici Mirandulae *Opera* II, (Bologna, 1496), 386; also Dukas, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

[22] Cf. Cecil Roth, *History of the Jews of Italy* (Philadelphia, 1946), pp. 204-5.

not only of the Greek language, but of the then current Byzantine theory of musical neumes, leads us to believe that he was not an occidental Jew, but a scholar who had lived in Byzantine as well as in Arabic environments. Unfortunately, his work *De tropis hebraicis* is lost. If it should be discovered, we probably shall be able to trace his identity. Although Reuchlin did not fully grasp the scope of Mithridates' application of the Byzantine system to Hebrew accentuation, he felt instinctively, and perhaps rightly, that Mithridates offered an artificially contrived construction, not an organically grown system.

III

Only a little more transparent than Mithridates is the character and personality of Johann Boeschenstein, who provided for Reuchlin the musical notation and arrangement of the Torah-cantillation at the end of the third book of *De accentibus linguae hebraicae.* There Reuchlin calls him *Bossosthenius sacerdos.*[23] This priesthood was doubted quite early, and even during his lifetime voices were heard claiming that he was a Jewish convert, calling him an opportunist, a swindler, a scoundrel, and the like. We shall later examine these statements. First, however, we shall investigate Boeschenstein's "priesthood."

Boeschenstein himself has, with one rather enigmatic exception, never used this title, not even in his apology, *Ain diemietige Versprechung* [An Humble Statement] (no place given, 1519 or 1523). Usually, he signed himself "Johannes Boeschenstein, Kaiserlich Majestaet Kapellan" (Chaplain to His Imperial Majesty).[24] The only exception

[23] The passage (fol. LXXXIII) is not without a quaint charm. Reuchlin writes: "Like Orpheus . . . in Thrace, sic nos a jugum Hercynium atque Bacenas in Suevia, Pythagoreo more cithara nostra docemus divina Hebraeorum carmina resonare, quorum symphoniam his subjungimus. Diatonicum autem modulamen nobis attulit Bossosthenius sacerdos. Harmoniam fecit Christophorus Sillingus Lucernensis . . ."

[24] Thus in Perles, *op. cit.*, p. 32, notes; also Steinschneider, *Katalog der*

(written in Judaeo-German) reads: "*Ani Yochanan Boeschenstein, Cohen Keysser kathavti.*"[25]

If *Cohen* is understood as priest in the Catholic sense, then a sharp discrepancy emerges, since Boeschenstein in his apology and elsewhere speaks of his "nachkumenden gepluet" (succeeding blood, i.e., children) and "meinen nachkommen zu gut" (for the sake of my descendants), which is, of course, impossible for a priest.[26] There are two ways to resolve this contradiction. He may have already left the Catholic Church and become a Protestant, which is not impossible, since in 1518 he was teaching Hebrew at the University of Wittenberg under the close supervision of Martin Luther. There, however, he signed himself in the *Album Academiae Vittebergensis* (ed. Förstemann) as "Johannes Boeschenstein de Esslingen Privilegiatus Cesaree Maiestatis Pbr. [pro bona re?] Hebraice ligue [sic] interpres Dioc. Constancien."[27] In other words, he still insisted on his official position with the diocese of Constanz. This seems incompatible with our first explanation, although it does not rule it out completely. Yet in 1518 Luther had by no means severed his relations with the Catholic Church. Another explanation might accept *capellanus*, *privilegiatus*, and *cohen* as free paraphrases of *subdiaconus*. Before the Council of Trent a subdeacon was not strictly under the vow of celibacy, and even the question whether a subdeacon belonged to the *ordo major* or *minor* was not unequivocally answered by the Church. If we accept this explanation, Reuchlin's calling him *sacerdos* might be traced to the title *capellanus*, which may mean anything and everything.

There is yet another interpretation of *capellanus*. Boeschenstein was a very able musician, and there are at least two substantial proofs of his musical prowess extent:

hebräischen Handschriften in der Kgl. Hofbibliothek München (2nd ed. Munich, 1895), No. 401, k, 1 (p. 222-3), No. 259, 3 (p. 124).

25 Cf. Perles, *op. cit.*, p. 32, note.

26 L. Geiger, *Das Studium der hebräischen Sprache in Deutschland* (Breslau, 1870), p. 49, notes.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 51, 2.

(1) the transcription of the oral Bible cantillation to musical notation; and (2) at least three musical manuscripts and compositions.[28] In his time the choristers of a royal chapel had the privilege of calling themselves *capellani;* the head of the choir was *magister* or *regens capellanorum.*[28a] This would justify the description, "Kaiserlich Maiestaet Capellan," but it would not fully cover the puzzling *Cohen Keysser.* However that may be, if Boeschenstein was ordained at all, it was no higher than a subdeacon.

Joseph Perles, in his excellent *Beiträge zur Geschichte der hebräischen und aramäischen Studien,* apodictically and without convincing proof calls Boeschenstein "a baptized Jew, although a very ignorant one." He echoes the often uttered accusation that Boeschenstein was an opportunistic convert, who "acted the Jew among Jews, and professed Christianity among Christians."[29] The only evidence offered by Perles are a few letters in Hebrew and Judaeo-German and a "sigh over his apostasy," to be found in Steinschneider's Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts in Munich. I was utterly unable to find this deploration of his apostasy. Instead—and perhaps Perles had this in mind—I came across praise of and prayer for the Jewish community of Regensburg, wherein he mentions a few names. I quote the passage in transcription and translation:

Das Tehillim hab ich Jochanan Boeschenstein kauft zu Tubingen bishnas [1518 in Hebrew letters] aus Rabie [?] Sohov Moshe Aurbach. Tovoth raboth osso li vekol hakehilo be-Regenspurg. Adonoi yagen [?] yiten alehem. R. Meir, Moshe Schulhof, Boruch Hacohen Wird, solt ein Meschumad in emuna heoli' [corrupt?], als wil leiden, als bei Jehudi' man werd kein Meschumad, im aulom das glab ich genzlich.[30]

[The book of Psalms I, Yochanan Boeschenstein, have purchased in Tübingen in the year 1518 from Rabbi Sohov Moshe Aurbach. He has done me much good, he and the whole community of Regensburg. God

[28] Cf. Reuchlin, *op. cit.,* after fol. LXXXIII (not paginated); Steinschneider, *op. cit.,* No. 401, 1; 401. c; 401, k 227.

[28a] Cf. M. Praetorius, *Syntagma musicum* (Wittenberg and Wolfenbüttel, 1615-20), II, ch. 2.

[29] Cf. Perles, *op. cit.,* p. 27.

[30] Cf. Steinschneider, *op. cit.,* No. 400, p. 220.

may protect and reward them, R. Meir, Moshe Schulhof, Boruch Hocohen Wird. If a convert to [Christian] faith came here, he would suffer, as among Jews one does not become a convert in ages, so I am absolutely convinced.]

I am unable to read into this hodge-podge of legal and personal notes a sigh over his "apostasy," even less since he signs the letter "Kapellan." This shows clearly that he was not acting the "Jew among Jews," but exactly the opposite: he was acting the Gentile among Jews. There is no doubt, however, that he liked the Regensburg community, which he could not have done had he been a convert. We have two more statements to evaluate his position. Melanchthon, who first had warmly received Boeschenstein in Wittenberg, tells, after Boeschenstein's death, and maliciously enough, the following anecdote:

We had a professor of Hebrew here [in Wittenberg], who used to say: "What shall I do? I can live elsewhere much better." I asked him, in which place. He answered: "I could live nicely among the Jews of Regensburg. Once, [when I was there] I took a stroll in the court of their temple. An old woman came, gave me a *Batzen* [silver-coin] and asked me to read a mass for her; then a second and a third came with the same request; thus I can make six *Batzen* during the week.[31]

Luther's epithets are not too complimentary, either. He called Boeschenstein "by name a Christian, actually an arch-Jew."[32] In the same vein wrote Seb. Münster.[33] An entirely different suspicion against him was levelled—more than two centuries after his death—by J. S. Baumgarten. He makes the following conjecture:

It would almost appear, concluding from this translation [of the Lord's Prayer and the *Ave Maria* into Hebrew] and in consideration of the place of publication [Cologne (1539), the bulwark of Pfefferkorn, Hogstraten, et. al.] that its author, Johann Boeschenstein, at last had turned to Cologne and solemnly rejoined the Roman Church.

[31] Cf. Geiger, *Das Studium der hebräischeu Sprache in Deutschland*, p. 51; the quotation from Melanchton's *Narrationes jucundae*, in J. G. Schelhorn's *Ergötzlichkeiten aus der Kirchenhistorie und Literatur* (Ulm and Leipzig, 1762-1764), II, 737.

[32] Cf. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

. . . Maybe he had uttered such intentions previously, and was hence called by Luther an apostate. This is more likely than that he should have been so accused because of an alleged conversion to Judaism, in which sense his [Luther's] expression has often been understood; thus the unfounded rumor was confirmed that Boeschenstein was born a Jew. . . .[34]

In view of this little anthology of bad names which Boeschenstein was called during and after his lifetime, it is necessary from the historical as well as from the moral point of view to study the actual evidence critically, *sine ira et studio.* In doing so the following data are available:

(1) Boeschenstein, also Boschenstein was, according to his own statement, born in Esslingen in 1472; he always signed himself as *Esslingensis,* and was so addressed by his contemporaries. He tells us in his apology[35] that his family came from Stein am Rhein, and it is easily conceivable that the name Boeschenstein had been formed as a compound name from "Bosch in Stein."

(2) He studied Hebrew with R. Moshe Möllin of Weyssenburg, whom he calls "praeceptorem meum" and to whom he set up a grateful memorial in these words: ". . . A similar fate [as Reuchlin's] afflicted me for many years, when I was attacked—of course by rabid adversaries—and put into jail. I was bitterly hated by the Jews, because I had learned their language, and by Christians, because I had conversations with Jews. One man I except here, my first teacher in the elements of the Hebrew language, Moshe Möllin of Weyssenburg, whom no forgetfulness will ever erase from my memory, since he alone, free of any perfidy, remained faithful to me."[36]

(3) He went in 1505 to Ingolstadt, in 1513 to Augsburg, in 1518 to Wittenberg, in 1521 to Heidelberg, then to Antwerp and Zürich, where he seems to have taught Zwingli. In 1525 we find him for a short time in Nürnberg, which he left abruptly, despite a fine recommendation by

[34] Cf. J. S. Baumgarten, *Nachrichten von merkwürdigen Büchern,* III (Halle, 1753), 118-9.

[35] See *supra,* note 24.

[36] Cf. *Reuchlin's Briefwechsel,* ed. L. Geiger, No. CLXXXVI, p. 216.

Melanchthon,[37] and he died in 1540 in Nördlingen, a pauper.[38] In between he must have lived in Tübingen, Regensburg, and Munich.

(4) Among his contemporaries he was known for his greediness; and we have at least two advertisements by Boeschenstein himself, in which he addresses himself to Jews, soliciting them to study Hebrew-German with him; there also are testimonies of his eagerness to teach Hebrew to Christians.[39] There cannot be any doubt but that he was keen to sell his Hebrew knowledge to the highest bidder.[40]

(5) A very rare pamphlet of Boeschenstein (*Ain getreuwe ermannung zu allem volk . . . der Christlichen Kirchen aufrur und zwytracht zu verhueten*) ("A Faithful Admonition to Everyone . . . to Save the Christian Church from Riot and Discord") (Augsburg, no date given) clearly takes the Protestant side; and the fact that he was called to Wittenberg and accepted the call confirms his Protestant sympathies. However, of his disciples, whom he lists in his letter to Reuchlin, one was Johannes Eck, the theological opponent of Luther; another was Sebastian Sperantius (Sprentz), bishop of Brixen in the Tyrol; some of the others were more inclined to the Protestant side. At the same time we must not forget that between 1500 and 1520 a legal, open schism or secession from the Catholic Church had not yet taken place. Matters were still fluctuant, persons still flexible.

(6) As has been mentioned above, Boeschenstein was an accomplished musician. To transcribe from oral tradition the Torah cantillation in exact musical notation for each accent, as he had done at least twice, was an achievement of the first order.[41] He composed psalms and four

[37] Cf. Geiger, *Das Studium der Hebräischen Sprache*, p. 52: "Joh. Boeschenstein, egregie doctum in hebraicis meo privatim, dein et publico Universitatis nomine, tibi recommendo. Bonus vir est."

[38] Cf. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, art.* "Boeschenstein."

[39] Cf. Perles, *op. cit.*, p. 32, where the Judaeo-German text is quoted.

[40] "Um ein ziemlich Gelt" (for a considerable fee). Cf.: Perles, *loc. cit.*

[41] Aside from the transcription printed in Reuchlin's *De accentibus*,

German sacred songs, probably for Protestant assemblies, of which "Da Jesus an dem Kreuze stund" (When Jesus Stood Before the Cross) is the best-known.[42]

(7) Boeschenstein was never able to hold a position for more than a few years. This learned vagabond was driven —not by external, but by inner forces—from one university to another, from one environment to another, and possibly from one Church to another, and back. His mercurial personality could not resist material inducements, wherever they came from, be it the Jewish side or the Christian— *non olet!* In one respect, however, he remained steadfast and faithful to his very highest ideal: to study, to teach, and to propagandize the Hebrew language to as many persons as possible.

The presentation of these facts should make it not too difficult to appraise this strange man with detached judgment. And yet it is not easy, for so many elements of his "human equation" are unknown to us, that we should be guided by great caution. He was a man disliked by many. Aside from certain personal qualities, such as restlessness and greed, the reason that he himself gives in his letter to Reuchlin for being generally disliked sounds plausible enough: He was suspect to the Jews because of his familiarity with their customs; and he was despised by the Christians for the very same reason. Did not the illustrious Reuchlin himself share somewhat the same fate with Boeschenstein? Some of Reuchlin's opponents betray exactly the same attitude.[43]

Boeschenstein *was not a baptized Jew;* this fact can be clearly established, since Jews were not permitted in the duchy of Swabia during his lifetime, except in "free [inde-

Boeschenstein had transcribed the cantillation in another manuscript, cf. Steinschneider, *op. cit.*, No. 401, k, p. 223.

[42] Cf. Zahn, *Melodien der deutschen evangelischen Kirchenlieder,* I, (Gütersloh. 1889-93), No. 1706, p. 455; also Julian, *Dictionary of Hymnology,* art. "Boeschenstein": "After taking Holy Orders as a priest" . . . (without documentation); the full history of his hymns in Philipp Wackernagel, *Das Deutsche Kirchenlied, von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Anfang des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1863-77), II, 109 f.

[43] Cf. the letter of the theological faculty of Cologne to Reuchlin in his conflict with Pfefferkorn, in *Reuchlins Briefwechsel,* No. CXXXIII (2 Jan-

pendent] cities." His birthplace, Esslingen, was not one of those privileged cities, at least not in his time. Reuchlin himself testifies to this fact.[44] On the other hand, there is no doubt that he tried to gain, repeatedly and stubbornly, material profit in his dealings with Jews. He was, as a scholar, almost generally respected, at least during his life. The only fellow-student who thought little of him was Seb. Münster.[45] But the latter's judgment seems to be considerably colored by envy and resentment. It is, moreover, undisputable that Boeschenstein had a number of important persons among his disciples.

He was, in all probability, originally a partisan of Luther, who, in a mild humor, termed him once "veteranus."[46] He took great pride in his status at the Imperial Court, which seems to have been that of a chorister at the emperor's chapel. His ability and interest in the musical field might have increased his personal prestige, although he lived in an intensely musical-minded era and milieu, when some of his most prominent contemporaries, such as Emperor Maximilian I, Martin Luther, and Pico had attained a musical skill far beyond that of an ordinary dilettant.

Boeschenstein must have had friends among the Jews of Regensburg; and it is quite conceivable that there he occasionally played the part of a faithful Jew. Had he been a convert, he certainly would not have written in Hebrew script, "A convert will suffer among Jews, since among Jews one does not become a convert."

Towards the end of his life Boeschenstein probably came to terms again with the Roman Church in some form of reconciliation, or he would not have translated the *Ave Maria* into Hebrew, to be published in Cologne.

In spite of all these rather strange and disturbing facts,

uary 1512); see also the *Defensio Joannis Reuchlin* (Tübingen, 1513), fol. H 4 a, b.

44 See *supra*, note 3.

45 In Münster's *Opus Grammaticum* (Basle, 1542), *Praefatio.*

46 Cf. L. Geiger, *Das Studium der hebräischen Sprache*, p. 94, note 1.

his love for the Hebrew language was genuine and sincere. Together with Reuchlin and Seb. Münster, we have to recognize Boeschenstein, adventurer and vagabond that he was, as one of the foremost pioneers in the Hebrew language, customs and music among the turbulent Gentile world of the Renaissance and the Reformation.

REVIEW SECTION

"THE FINAL SOLUTION"

A Book Review*

By Kurt R. Grossmann
New York City

AMONG the many books that have been written on the ghastly subject of Nazi persecution and terror, many of them authored by former victims, the book under review ranks as a first class comprehensive study of this enigmatic problem. This is true even though we have had such serious studies as Eugen Kogon's *The SS-State,* which surveys succinctly the concentration camp apparatus of Buchenwald,[1] and Zdenek Lederer's recent work on Terezin, conveying to the student a great deal of heretofore unknown facts.[2] Other great human documents also reveal inside knowledge of the happenings in the concentration camps, as Odd Nansen's diary *From Day to Day,* indeed a story written with awakened spirit and soul.[3]

All these books, however, are, understandably, narratives of events of which the respective author had been a part. Reitlinger's book is the detached work of a British scholar whom it took four years to write it; it is the most comprehensive study on the Nazi endeavor to liquidate the Jews, for which the term "Endlösung der Judenfrage" (Final Solution) was adopted as camouflage.

Reitlinger was in a position to check the stories of survivors with the tremendous material presented in the various war-criminal trials, which are by no means exhausted. This court evidence he used generously, obviously deriving from it the satisfaction that all safeguards of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence were observed as to veracity and admissibility. However, the war-crimes evidence is supplemented by narratives —

* Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution: The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe* 1939-1945. The Beachhurst Press. New York, 1953. xii and 622 pages.

[1] Original German title of Eugen Kogon's book: *Der SS-Staat, das System der deutschen Konzentrationslager* (Munich, 1946; 2nd ed., 1947; 3rd ed., 1949); English and American editions appeared under the title: *The Theory and Practice of Hell: The German Concentration Camps and the System Behind Them* (New York, no year given).

[2] Zdenek Lederer, *Ghetto Theresienstadt* (London, 1953).

[3] (New York, 1949).

of which I can give only a few examples —, by memoranda, and by the wealth of material put at the author's disposal by the Wiener Library in London and the Centre Juive de Documentation in Paris. The scholar may be interested in at least a sketchy survey of the material used by Reitlinger. It can be divided into the following groups: (1) Documentary material of the Nuremberg war crimes trials; exhibits as well as transcripts and the sentences imposed; (2) material of Jewish research institutes, such as the Institute of Jewish Affairs, Wiener Library, Centre des Documentations Juives, Paris; (3) books, such as the *Black Book of Polish Jewry,* Eugene Kulischer's *Displacement of Population in Europe,* monographs, biographies, and books on concentration camps; (4) law journals (the German *Reichsgesetzblatt*), newspaper clippings, speeches, new testimony submitted, articles in social science magazines, etc. Though it is evident that the Reitlinger volume is painstakingly comprehensive on the subject, it does not answer all questions and tries — unjustifiedly — to contradict the number of Jewish losses, to which aspect the author devotes a whole chapter of the Appendix.

Among the many questions that remain in our troubled minds are: Could more Jews have been rescued? What did the Big Powers do — or not do — to prevent the "final solution"? Further questions are raised by Dr. Reszö Kasztner, most active in the rescue work of Hungarian Jews, in his mimeographed *Report on Hungarian Jewry's Struggle for Survival*: Why did not other Jews fight back as did the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto? Why did millions of Jews go to their death in such an orderly fashion? And why did Jews themselves help the tormentors kill their own people?

Reitlinger starts with a chapter on forced emigration and pogroms before September, 1939. We could take issue with him on this point, for it could be said that any book dealing with the physical destruction of the Jews should include a chapter on the "rehearsal for destruction," the early anti-Semitic movements in Germany and Austria, and an effort should be made to compare these movements with the Nazi type of mob anti-Semitism. However, Reitlinger devotes to the pre-Hitler period only some passing observations. His story really begins in 1938, in the *Kristallnacht* of November 9, the "week of the broken glass," when all synagogues in Germany were set afire. Subsequently, indiscriminate mass arrests of Jews took place after the assassination of Von Rath, third German Legation counselor in Paris, by Grynszpan. Jewish property was seized. The term "Final Solution" is found for the first time in German Foreign Office papers of 1938, but at that time its tragic meaning was not general physical destruction, but forced mass emigration and expulsion of the Jews as paupers, with a view to creating economic tensions in the countries of reception.

Apparently the decision to exterminate the Jews physically was the result of the deliberations of Hitler, Himmler, and his Gestapo henchman

Heydrich, who became chief of the so-called *Reichssicherheitshauptamt* (Reich Security Office) in Berlin and served in this capacity until he was shot by Czechoslovak partisans near Lidice. To the inner circle of those preparing the plan to kill as many Jews as possible more than two hundred officials belonged, not all of them Nazis. Reitlinger's book gives the names of those directly implicated in the mass murder of the Jews. We are astonished that many of them have completely escaped punishment or served only short prison terms, living today in Germany, and holding responsible positions in trade, commerce and even in the political sphere of the new Germany. Karl Adolf Eichmann, a refugee said to have found asylum in Egypt, belongs at the top of the list. Among the persons who have since risen to new responsible positions in Germany is Otto Bräutigam, once liaison officer of the High Command to the Rosenberg Ministry, who was charged with complicity in the extermination of Russian Jews. He was never tried and at present holds a position in Dr. Adenauer's Chancellery. This list alone is most helpful when one tries to analyze Germany's downfall to a cultural abyss, from which she only slowly recovers.

Reitlinger's study offers first a general account of the "Final Solution," giving us the whole story from its beginning in 1938 until its sad end. This part of nearly 200 pages describes how Nazi Germany, after the Madagascar plan (the forced emigration scheme) introduced the "final solution" plan at the infamous Wannsee Conference, the protocol of which is not well known. This protocol is reproduced in large part. At the ill-famed Wannsee meeting on January 20, 1942, under the chairmanship of Reinhardt Heydrich, the term "final solution" was given its true meaning. "Under proper direction," the minutes say, "the Jews shall now in the course of the final solution be brought to the East in a suitable way as labor. In large labor gangs, in which the sexes are to be separated, the Jew capable of work to be brought to these areas and employed in road building, at which task undoubtedly a great part will fall out through natural diminution. . . . The remnant that is able to survive all this — since this is no doubt the segment with the strongest resistance — must be treated accordingly, since these people, representing a natural selection, are to be regarded as the germ cell of a new Jewish development, should they be allowed to go free. . . ."

The participants in this macabre conference, high officials of the SS and civilian officials representing the heads of the various ministries, proceeded to discuss the organization and coordination of the projected mass murder as if it were an every day, matter of fact affair. Reichsmarschall Hermann Goering was represented by his State Secretary Erich Neumann, the German Foreign Office by Under-Secretary Martin Luther (who mysteriously disappeared after the German collapse in 1945), the Ministry of Interior by the State Secretary Franz Stuckart. Other participants were Friedrich Wilhelm Kritzinger, representing the Reich

Chancellery, Ministerial-Director Georg Leibrandt, never prosecuted, representing the Minister of Eastern Territories Alfred Rosenberg and Martin Bormann, who many believe is still at large, was represented by his deputy, Gerhard Kloepfer who in the meantime has been denazified. The Race and Settlement Office sent SS General Otto Hoffman, and the Gestapo the notorious Adolf Eichmann. In addition to these representatives of the highest officials, there were the experts who participated in this conference.

Heydrich, in his role as chairman, started off with a long review of Jewish emigration from 1933 on, describing how the war with Russia had outdated the Madagascar project, and then came to the gist of the matter: the extermination of the Jews. The conference then proceeded to cataloguing all types of possible exemptions, which Heydrich tried to prevent: the decision, for instance, that half-Jews should be sterilized (though not deported), and Jewish war workers should stay on their jobs — an exemption which did not extend to the Jews of the General Government, who were the subject of a special address by Josef Bühler representing Governor Frank. Bühler denounced these Jews as carriers of disease, as unfit for work, and as black marketeers. He exclaimed: "Do you think that they will be settled in villages in the Ostland? That is what we are told in Berlin, but why all the ceremony? We can do nothing with them, either in the Ostland or in the Reichskommissariat Ukraine, so liquidate them yourselves."

The minutes of this conference record that the final solution had to take care of eleven million Jews. The grisly fact is that if the plan of January 20, 1942 had been executed, not only the Jewry of Eastern Europe would have disappeared, but also the Jews of Great Britain, Portugal, Switzerland, and Ireland. Only Jews in the Western Hemisphere and other overseas countries, such as Australia, New Zealand, etc., were not listed.

In the second part of Reitlinger's volume a country-by-country history of the final solution is given, including France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, Russia, Denmark, Norway, Greece, Slovakia, Bohemia-Moravia, Hungary. This survey relates the application of the accepted final solution to country after country and shows how the various schemes leading to the destruction of millions of Jews worked: concentration camps, the gas chambers, the purchase of Zyklon B from the I. G. concern Degesch, whose director, Dr. Gerhard Peters, had full knowledge of the facts but who, after protracted court action, was sentenced to only six years' imprisonment for complicity in the murder of half a million Jews.

The only real issue we have to take with Reitlinger is his Appendix, "Statistical Summary of the Final Solution," where he tries to prove — though there admittedly is no proof possible — that instead of the accepted figure of six million Jews, "only" 4.5 to 4.7 million Jews died.

Figures on Jewish losses have been disputed in Germany, especially by right-wing groups and various writers such as Peter Kleist in his

apologetic book, *Auch Du warst dabei* ("You Were Also There"),[4] in order to mitigate the Nazi crimes. Kleist says that the highest possible figure for Jews exterminated by the Nazis between 1933 and 1945 is 1,272,212 and adds that the figure of six million "has been invented in order to gain practical financial advantages," a reference to the then pending German-Israeli negotiations. If we follow Reitlinger's analysis of Jewish losses (he devotes a whole chapter to this problem), we have to accept the figure of 4,600,000. However, if we take the Nazi testimony — and there appears no reason for the Nazis to have exaggerated before the International Military Tribunal — we have to stick to the figure of six million Jews.

This figure was also arrived at in independent studies by the Institute of Jewish Affairs, New York, by the Jewish population expert Jacob Lestschinsky (putting the Jewish losses at 6,098,000), by the Centre Juive de Documentation, Paris. G. Kulischer, an authority on population trends who was connected with the old League of Nations, in his penetrating study on this subject arrives at the even higher figure of seven to eight million Jews liquidated. The German population expert, Professor Adolf Arntz, who recently analyzed the staggering figure of 55 million war-dead, confirms the six million figure.

We can readily agree with Reitlinger's conclusion that his book is a most necessary document at a time when the political climate has changed so much. The sociologist, unaffected by the ever changing expediencies of day-to-day politics, will concur with the German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer who said that to forget is to throw an experience out of the window. There are many reasons for keeping alive the painful events related in Reitlinger's book, because from them we can learn important lessons. I will try to list a few: (1) Improving international safeguards, for example, the new Geneva Convention to protect civilians in time of war; (2) getting the Geneva Convention ratified and recognized; (3) stimulating moral forces everywhere, especially in Germany; for this purpose a German-language edition of the book is urgently recommended; (4) educating youth everywhere, especially German youth, by pounding home the most dreadful chapter of recent history; (5) serving the leaders of powerful states as a sobering reminder of the consequences of an appeasement policy and lack of vision and courage to check the aggressor in time; (6) giving the sociologist and the historian the basic facts for further penetrating and fruitful studies to the end that human society shall never again have to deal with any kind of such a "Final Solution."

[4] (Heidelberg, 1952).

Biography

HAYAH AVIV B'ARETZ [WHEN SPRING WAS IN THE LAND: AUTOBIOGRAPHY]. By *Zvi Scharfstein.* Massadah. Tel Aviv, 1953. 344 pp. [Hebrew].

THIS is a delightful and informative volume. The author's Hebrew style, quite free from foreign words and phrases, reminds one of the Bible. The contents of the book take us back to a world that knew neither Hitler nor Stalin, neither Nazism nor Communism — a world comparatively stable, serene, and peaceful. Reading this fascinating autobiography, one secretly yearns for the "good old days" when the world was outraged at a mild Russian pogrom, when it was shocked at the antics of the Tsar, and found the Kaiser intolerable.

The author admires the Haskalah movement, and sets forth in detail its enduring aspects. Not all the Maskilim shared the illusions of the more aggressive Haskalah authors. Intelligent Jews accepted Haskalah attitudes without subscribing to the more extreme doctrines advocated by some. Remaining loyal to rabbinic Judaism, intelligent Jews enhanced it with Bible study, with love for Hebrew, with acquisition of Russian speech, and even modern dress. The Maskil was a leading personality in the community, and idealistically-minded. Many spent days on public missions to small, distant Jewish settlements, thereby raising the intellectual standards of the Jewish masses in Russia. By coming closer to the people and by identifying themselves with the lower strata among Jews, the Maskilim came to exercise a much larger influence on the Jewish community than did the rabbis.

That his children, for the most part, did not follow in his footsteps gave the Maskil reason for concern. They preferred secular life to living as Jews, the Russian language to Hebrew, and a career to service. Many drifted far from the Jewish pattern of life that was so dear to their fathers. What is lamentable is that this cycle perpetually repeats itself.

In the village of Donovits (Russian Podolia) where the author was born in 1884, the new ways encouraged by the Haskalah movement were gradually displacing the old ones. Russian speech was no longer taboo, neither was modern dress. Nevertheless, Jewish tradition was still firmly rooted. The author relates with justifiable pride that when the Bolsheviks came into power, the children fought fiercely for the inalienable right to study Hebrew, and when that privilege was denied them, underground study groups were established. In spite of the anti-Zionist campaign of the regime, the parents remained devoted to Zionism and to Hebrew culture.

The author writes of his parents in terms that most American-Jewish youths would find strange, indeed. His father and mother were

teachers and guides to him. The father was revered, not because he provided material luxuries, but because he inspired the young with ideals, vision and faith. His mother was a pious woman, deeply religious and reasonably happy. More educated than most of her friends, she was the "reader" in the womens' synagogue. Her recitation of Lamentations on the eve of the ninth of Ab at her home is still fresh in the author's memory. So are also the "sad" stories she would relate of Roman cruelty, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the like. The tragic tales helped forge even tighter the bond that linked the youth to its people. Somehow the story of Jewish persecution and injustice increased the devotion and love of the young. As an educational philosophy, this was more successful than the modern notion that acquainting the Jewish child with the facts of Jewish persecutions will lead him to reject his people and faith.

The author's Jewish education began at four and was saturated with religion. Just as important as the schooling was the atmosphere of the home and the general environment, both of which were intensely Jewish. Zionism had already had an impact on Jewish youth in Russia, and Scharfstein and his young friends became dedicated disciples of Theodor Herzl in spite of the fact that the more religious Jews were antagonistic, as was the government. Bribery paved the way for Zionist meetings in the author's home. From there he went to the "large" city of Kishineff, where he served for a short time as a bookkeeper in his uncle's business. Not his work, however, but the instruction in Bible and history that he gave to a group of tailors on Sabbath afternoons gave him the greatest pleasure and satisfaction. These simple people, he relates, renewed his faith and idealism and convinced him that he would succeed as a teacher. After a little more than half a year, he found his first position as teacher in Berditchev.

Scharfstein's experience as a soldier in the Russian army, in which he, like all Jewish recruits, was subject to constant abuse and ridicule, was brief. He escaped to Galicia, where he continued teaching, which gave him dignity and economic security. There Jewish education was deeply traditional. Despite the inadequate training of the teachers, the author emphasizes that the pupils did master portions of the Bible, Rashi, and other subjects. The educational process was a three-fold affair: "the teacher taught a little, the father yet more, and the environment more than both." Herein lies the explanation why the educational efforts of American Jewry, where the environment and the home ignore the Jewish school, are ultimately dismal failures.

The first instalment of Scharfstein's autobiography makes the reader impatient for the rest, which is to describe his educational career in America.

THEODORE N. LEWIS

Brooklyn, N. Y.

NECROLOGUE

ALEXANDER MARX

1878-1953

ON December 26, 1953, the Jewish Theological Seminary lost its distinguished librarian, Dr. Alexander Marx who, for more than half a century, was also its Professor of Jewish history and had been the founder of its Jewish Museum.

Born on January 28, 1878 in Elberfeld, Germany, Marx was educated at the universities of Koenigsberg, Prussia, and of Berlin. In Berlin he attended the Rabbiner Seminar, at that time under the direction of the renowned talmudist, David Hoffmann. Most impressive and decisive for the later life and work of the young scholar was the influence on him of the master of Hebrew bibliography, Moritz Steinschneider. In 1903, on the reorganization of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America under Solomon Schechter, Marx was appointed librarian and Professor of history.

His achievements are in the three major fields of Jewish bibliography, biography, and history. In the Seminary's Registers as well as in numerous essays and reviews Marx reported regularly on the growth of the library. Its 5,000 printed volumes in 1902, increased to 155,000 books plus 8,500 manuscripts in 1953. Marx's fund of scholarly information on rare books and his descriptions of manuscripts often containing valuable textual criticism greatly stimulated further research.

In the second field of his work, biography, Marx published forty essays, some of which were collected in his *Essays in Jewish Biography* (1947). They include Jewish scholars of the past, such as Saadia Gaon, Rabbenu Gershom, Rashi, Maimonides, as well as contemporary figures, among them D. Hoffmann, M. Steinschneider, and S. Schechter. In each Marx presented well-rounded biographical pictures and succeeded in doing justice to the individuality of each subject of his study.

The third field, Jewish history, must, in Marx's view, concern itself with the totality of Jewish life, but he gave special attention to the history of Jewish literature. Starting with an edition of the work on chronology, *Seder Olam* (chapter 1-10 [1903]), he continued with Geonic history and literature, wrote on the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, on French, Italian, and Bohemian Jewry, on Jews in Cochin, and so on. A number of these articles were republished in his *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore* (1944). Marx's *History of the Jewish People* (together with Max L. Margolis, 1927), a standard work, was translated into French and Spanish.

Marx served as editor of several memorial volumes and was the co-editor of the first volume of Steinschneider's *Gesammelte Schriften* (1925), and it goes without saying that he also contributed to many scholarly journals and other publications (see the bibliography in *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*, English section, 1951, pp. 35-60, 302 items).

Alexander Marx, great collector, bibliographer, scholar, and teacher, was a very modest and helpful man who did what he could "toward clarifying Israel's past, ordering its present, and preparing for its future."

ADOLF KOBER

New York City

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

H. G. van Dam, *Das Bundesentschädigungsgesetz — Systematische Darstellung und kritische Erläuterungen.* Verlag Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland. Düsseldorf, 1953. 247 and 71 pp.

Moshe Davis, *Jewish Religious Life and Institutions in America — A Historical Study.* Massadah. Tel-Aviv, 1953. 153 pp. and illustrations (Hebrew).

Morris A. Gutstein, *A Priceless Heritage: The Epic Growth of Nineteenth Century Chicago Jewry.* Bloch Publishing Co. New York, 1953. 488 pp.

Herman Hailperin (ed.) *Gentile Reactions to Jewish Ideals,* by Jacob S. Raisin. Philosophical Library. New York, 1953. xxiii and 876 pp.

Leo Jung (ed.), *Jewish Leaders* (1750-1940). Bloch Publishing Co., New York, 1953. xii and 564 pp.

Zdenek Lederer, *Ghetto Theresienstadt.* Edward Goldston and Son, Ltd. London, 1953. viii and 275 pp.

Judah Nadich, *Eisenhower and the Jews.* Twayne Publishers. New York, 1953. 271 pp.

Abraham A. Neuman, *Landmarks and Goals: Historical Studies and Addresses.* Dropsie College Press. Philadelphia, 1953. xv and 370 pp.

Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Jüdische Geisteswelt, Zeugnisse aus zwei Jahrtausenden.* Holle Verlag. Darmstadt, 1953. 357 pp.

Zosa Szajkowski, *Agricultural Credit and Napoleon's Anti-Jewish Decrees.* Editions Historiques Franco-Juives. New York, 1953. 112 pp. and tables.

Zosa Szajkowski, *Poverty and Social Welfare among French Jews* (1800-1880). Editions Historiques Franco-Juives. New York, 1954. 88 pp.

Zosa Szajkowski, *The Economic Status of the Jews in Alsace, Metz and Lorraine* (1648-1789). Editions Historiques Franco-Juives. New York, 1954. 152 pp.

Rhoda Truax, *The Doctors Jacobi.* Little, Brown and Co. Boston, 1952. 270 pp. and illustrations.

James A. Wax and Helen G. Wax, *Our First Century* 1854-1954, *Published on the Occasion of Temple Israel's 100th Anniversary, March* 2, 1954. Ernest Lee, Editor. Temple Israel. Memphis, Tennessee, 1954. 81 pp.

Arnold Wiznitzer, *The Records of the Earliest Jewish Community in the New World.* American Jewish Historical Society. New York, 1954. xiii and 108 pp. with illustrations.

VOL. XVI OCTOBER, 1954 PART 2

Historia Judaica

This issue of

Historia Judaica

COMPRISING ARTICLES ON THE CONTRIBUTION
OF JEWISH SCHOLARSHIP IN GERMANY TO
"WISSENSCHAFT DES JUDENTUMS",
ITS DISSEMINATION AND TEACHING,
COMMEMORATES
THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE FOUNDING OF THE
JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
IN BRESLAU

IN MEMORIAM

By Guido Kisch
Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
New York City

AUGUST 10, 1954 marked the end of one century since the Jewish Theological Seminary of Breslau, "Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar Fraenckelscher Stiftung," opened its doors. It was the first modern Jewish institution of higher learning and school for the education of rabbis and teachers in Central Europe whose guiding idea was "to reconcile positive Judaism with contemporary life on the basis of scholarship." It was this idea and this ideal that permeated the scholarly writings and rabbinic aims as well as the preaching and teaching activities of Zacharias Frankel, the Seminary's spiritual founder and its "Director" for the first two decades of its existence.

This is a melancholy anniversary, for it coincides with the fifteenth "Yahrzeit" of that once great institution of world-wide renown and influence. Together with German Jewry it fell victim to Nazi barbarism. Thus a fountainhead of Judaism suffered destruction. But the light that once shone forth from the great luminaries of Breslau could not be extinguished. It is still being spread in the Old and New World by other great institutions whose history and tradition reach back to the flowering of Breslau, both spiritually and personally. In the light of historical events, Frankel's words of 1854 become prophetic, indeed: "The

Seminary is of universal significance to Judaism. It does not belong to a definite place or country; it belongs to Judaism. It must have its point of departure and point of destination in itself."[1]

During its more than eighty years of existence the Breslau Seminary was fortunate enough to celebrate several happy anniversaries marking the milestones of its historical development, witnesses of its important achievements and growing reputation. On these festive occasions various *Festschriften* were either issued by or offered to the Seminary.[2]

The present commemorative number of HISTORIA JUDAICA is intended to add to, and possibly to conclude, that series of *Festschriften.* Its Editor, one time Visiting Pro-

[1] "Das Seminar hat für das Judentum eine universelle Bedeutung: es gehört nicht einem Orte, nicht einem Lande, sondern der Allgemeinheit an . . . Das Institut muss seinen Ausgangs- und Endpunkt in sich haben." Z. Frankel's letter to the Administrative Committee of the Fränckel Fundations, dated Dresden, February 27, 1854, published in *Das jüdisch-theologische Seminar Fränckelscher Stiftung zu Breslau am Tage seines fünfundzwanzigjährigen Bestehens, den* 10. *August* 1879 (Breslau, 1879; no author mentioned), p. 62.

[2] *Festschriften*: A. Issued by the Seminary: 1. The volume cited *supra,* note 1; 2. M. Brann, *Geschichte des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars (Fraenckel'sche Stiftung) in Breslau. Festschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Jubiläum der Anstalt* (Breslau, no year given [1904]; 3. *Festschrift zum 75jährigen Bestehen des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars Fraenckelscher Stiftung* (Breslau, 1929), comprising two bulky volumes, the first containing scholarly publications by the members of the Faculty, the second scholarly publications by graduates of the institution. B. Presented to the Seminary: Joseph Perles, *Kalonymos ben Kalonymos' Sendschreiben an Joseph Kaspi. Aus der Münchener Handschrift zum ersten Male herausgegeben und im Auftrage der ehemaligen Hörer des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars zu Breslau als Festgabe zum fünfundzwanzigjährigen Stiftungstage der Anstalt* (10. *August* 1879) *überreicht* (München, 1879). In addition, there were several *Festschriften* on the anniversaries of celebrated teachers of the Seminary, such as Frankel and Graetz, which cannot be listed here.

fessor of History at the Breslau Seminary and the only former member of its last faculty living now in the United States, considered it a *nobile officium* not to allow the memorable date to pass without directing scholarly attention to it in a literary form, however modest it might be. His feeling and determination that Historia Judaica should take upon itself the publication of a commemorative issue grew all the stronger as efforts in a similar direction by a specially constituted committee were doomed to failure.[3] The Editor, therefore, derives great satisfaction from the fact that publication of this issue is possible without any financial aid from the graduates of the Breslau Seminary, only very few of whom showed an active interest in the Committee's efforts. At the same time he is grateful to the literary contributors to this volume for their unselfish cooperation. He is particularly happy to see among them the oldest surviving member of the last Seminary faculty who, at the celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary in Breslau, delivered the principal address under more fortunate circumstances.[4]

[3] A "Breslau Centenary Committee" was formed by a number of graduates living in New York and its vicinity, in October 1951. Under the chairmanship of this writer, it had, over a period of two years, quite a number of meetings at his residence. In order to prepare an appropriate commemoration of the event, including a memorial volume, a list of all surviving graduates of the Breslau Seminary all over the world, amounting to almost 150, was compiled. "The complete lack of a response on the part of a large number" of the graduates contacted, as the final circular letter had to state, brought all efforts to naught. The cooperation of the untiring secretary of the Committee, Dr. Alfred Jospe of New York, and of Dr. Max Gruenewald of Millburn, N. J., is gratefully acknowledged.

[4] Isaac Heinemann, "Die Idee des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars vor 75 Jahren und heute," *Bericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars für das Jahr* 1929 (Breslau, 1930), pp. 34-48.

In the realm of "Wissenschaft des Judentums," the scholarly work of a great institution of learning and through it the memory of the Breslau Seminary from which it emanated, will last *in aeternum.*

THE IDEA OF THE JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN THOUGHT

By Isaac Heinemann
Formerly Professor, Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar, Breslau
Jerusalem-Kiryat Shemuel

ONE hundred years ago, on August 10, 1854, the Jewish Theological Seminary was opened in Breslau. Does this fact inspire us to do more than send "a pious message of greeting to the Breslau Seminary," as did Hermann Cohen fifty years ago upon remembering the institution where he had been trained?

Twenty-five years ago, when a festive gathering celebrated the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Seminary, the commemoration of that event was devoted to the idea upon which the Seminary had been founded—and to its permanent significance.[1] This idea was implicit in the organizational form chosen for the institution by its first head, Zacharias Frankel. He rejected, as a matter of principle, the Yeshiva, which at that time disapproved of any methodical discussion of world civilization; but he also rejected with equal determination a Jewish theological faculty as an integral part of a university, such as Geiger demanded—a faculty whose teachers would have been appointed by the State that then would not have had to fear the kind of opposition frequently offered to the wishes of the State by the more powerful and self-assured Churches. The speaker saw Frankel's ideal postulate expressed in his demand for this form of organization: a scientific self-representation of Judaism within the framework of universal civilization. To Frankel such self-representation appeared not merely as a postulate of scholarship; only

[1] *Bericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars für das Jahr* 1929, pp. 34 ff.

within the framework of scientific self-cognizance did he believe it possible to preserve Judaism from the grave threats menacing it. His demand, the speaker concluded, is ours, too; and he felt able to point, in our world also, to trends offering understanding and even encouragement to our striving for self-cognizance and self-preservation.

Twenty-five years have passed since then. Hate has swept away those trends toward understanding, and the Seminary itself has fallen a victim to barbarism. Yet that postulate of self-cognizance on a scientific basis is valid for us, too; today, basing ourselves on Frankel's "Plan of Organization of the Seminary,"[2] we wish to determine more closely how Frankel understood his postulate, and what new meaning the demand for self-cognizance has assumed for us in the light of our Jewish experience during the last generation and taking into account the progress made by scholarship during recent decades.

I

On Jewish Thought

"The shape which Judaism has assumed today, as well as the present state of scholarship, confronts [the preservation of Judaism] with obstacles that are almost discouraging," wrote Frankel in 1844.[3] The organization plan of the Seminary points the way to the removal of these obstacles. Frankel was by no means content with including secular subjects, especially the classical languages, in his curriculum, as was tried by Israel Hildesheimer in Eisenstadt, who encountered insuperable obstacles on raising even this minimal requirement. Frankel demanded, "as a first condition for the regeneration [of the Jewish academies], that a scholarly spirit be applied to the study of

[2] Reprinted in M. Brann, *Geschichte des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars* (Fraenckelsche Stiftung) Breslau [circa 1905], "Beilagen," p. i ff. This article refers chiefly to pp. iii-v: "Z. Frankels Organisationsplan für das zu gründende Rabbiner-und Lehrerseminar."

[3] *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judentums,* I, (1844), 23.

Jewish theology. While its peculiar spirit and the acumen and penetration so characteristic of it are not to be abandoned, this trend has to be penetrated with and directed by a systematic urge for research." According to Frankel, this change in method would considerably mitigate the doubts and conflicts prevailing among youth. "In making an early acquaintance with scholarship in general, the disciple of Jewish theology will, at an early stage, be familiarized with the idea of harmony between both disciplines and will thus be relieved of many constraints and doubts. It will be the task of the *teaching method* ["Lehrweise," italicised by Frankel] of the Seminary to iron out whatever contradictions may occasionally appear."

Frankel thus sees the tension between Jewish tradition and European culture principally in the field of method. His demand that "Judaism and scholarship ["Wissenschaft"] must be brought closer to each other" thus refers principally to the manner of thought and method of instruction. He believes himself justified before the spirit of Judaism to depart from Pilpul; for he rightly stresses that "already the Spanish and also the French school kept aloof from minute quibbles." By no means does he reject the old method of study as such—as does Abraham Geiger, who claims that, when the rabbis depart from those methods of exegesis with which we are familiar, they are basing themselves on a "greatly disturbed exegetic sense."[4] Rather does Frankel demand that they hold fast in principle to the specific character of the Jewish way of thinking, without regarding this as an infringement of the demands of modern scholarship.

If Frankel, therefore, did not regard Yeshiva and modern scholarship as irreconcilable contradictions, his view has proved justified in the subsequent period. True, the ancient extremes continue to exist in some minds; but many yeshivot have renounced their fundamental rejection of general education. We even possess a Yeshiva University,

[4] *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie,* V (1844), 81.

headed by a well-known expert on hellenistic Judaism. In many rabbinical seminaries, methods of the yeshivot are used to a greater extent than did Frankel;[5] the Yeshiva in Montreux for many years was attended by young rabbis from Western Europe, and not merely those who were conservative. The "rapprochement between Judaism and scholarship," recognizing the traditional methods of both, as demanded by Frankel, has thus been achieved in a larger sense than Frankel had dared to hope for.

It is of even greater importance that the justification of this synthesis has been recognized in principle. A prerequisite for this has been the systematic investigation of the rabbinical method; the last generation devoted a series of works to the research methods of the Halakha, of which Frankel was thinking in the first place, and also of the Aggada.[6] These studies, however, consciously or unconsciously, are connected with investigations in the field of "Geistesgeschichte." Works like Leisegang's "Denkformen" or Jaspers' "Psychologie der Weltanschauungen" demonstrate that philosophical systems differ, not only in their results but in their methods as well, and that the co-existence of different methods of thinking is not prejudicial to scholarship, but enriches it. Choosing the scientific method does not, therefore, absolutely preclude rabbinical methods of thought. The more we regard Judaism today as a cultural phenomenon and not, as did Geiger, as merely pertaining to a religious community, the more important appears Frankel's basic demand that the methods of Jewish thinking and Jewish exegesis be examined frankly and without prejudice as to their justification. Recent Jewish Bible exegetes have shown themselves alive to the justice of this demand.

[5] Already, Frankel's two successors, Lazarus and D. Joël, approached more closely the Yeshiva than he did; Brann, *Geschichte des Seminars*, pp. 105-109.

[6] The studies of Max Kadushin deserve mention here, especially his most recent work, *The Rabbinic Mind* (New York, 1952). Of the Hebrew work of this writer, *The Ways of the Aggada*, the second edition is on the press.

II

Concerning the Forms of "Jewish Philosophy of Religion"

It was not in the nineteenth century that specifically Jewish methods of thought were first combined with the philosophy of a world-wide civilization. It is not only the "Spanish-French school," which we mentioned, that is closer to general scholarship than the Eastern Jewish school; even in antiquity a synthesis between Jewish and Greek thought had been attempted. Frankel regards all these efforts as forerunners of ours, and therefore pays them due attention.

According to his plan of organization, the Seminary was to teach "religious philosophy (Midrash; the philosophy of Jehuda Halevi and others; as well as the Alexandrine School: Philo)." The mention of the Midrash shows that the word "philosophy" was not used here in strict accord with German usage, which denotes a strictly scholarly system of Weltanschauung, but in the larger sense, which was known to Frankel from the classical languages and which has been preserved in English. It is worthwhile to spend a little time on the various sources of this "Philosophy of Religion" as emphasized by Frankel.

We begin with the idea of the Midrash. How did Frankel understand it? In what did he find the value of the Midrash for the "Philosophy of Religion"?

In the beginning of his article on Palestinian and Alexandrine Scripture research, which was the first scholarly publication of the Seminary, Frankel states that the entire rabbinical interpretation of Scripture should not be called research in the Scripture ("Schriftforschung"), but exploration of Scripture ("Schrifterforschung"). He thus established contrasting methods, even though he gave no explanation; but the recent psychology of Weltanschauung makes it possible to explain his meaning. Almost sixty years later, H. St. Chamberlain reiterated this contrast between research and exploration by calling his Goethe an "explorer of Nature" ("Naturerforscher"), as contrasted with the "natural scientists" ("Naturforscher"), who care "only for

knowledge, without consideration of the possible repercussions on everything that might be called culture of the soul."[7] That two men of such diverse character should agree may be attributed to their opposition to the onesidedness and self-sufficiency of rationalism. Chamberlain refers to the manner of the artist who likes to see Nature as a person of feeling, as contrasted with the laboratory worker who believes he can compel Nature to disclose its secrets "with levers and screws." Frankel goes back to the sages of his people, whom he praises as teachers of morals in the course of his Plan of Organization. As in the Halakha, he recognizes their method also in the Aggada as justifiable and, in a certain sense, as exemplary, inasmuch as these great teachers read the Bible not as mere philologists, but in order to derive from their studies a "culture of the soul." Recent psychology of Weltanschauung has clearly recognized this harking back to people who are closer to Nature and who are impelled to seek a relationship between our "I" and the "Thou" of God, of Nature, of fellow man, whereas rationalism aims only at discerning an "It" or a "He."[8] We thus recognize in Frankel's independence from a purely rationalistic observation and in his following the methodological tradition of rabbinism a nucleus of truth whose significance modern research has clearly brought to light.

This approach does not, of course, mean blind devotion to tradition. This is evident from Frankel's attitude towards Jewish Hellenism. While this had been completely neglected in the traditional curriculum, Frankel demanded "taking into consideration the Alexandrine school: Philo." In order to explain these words, which were obviously chosen carefully, we can utilize several articles by Frankel on Alexandrine Judaism, as well as Manuel Joël's famous "Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte," since Frankel himself

[7] *Goethe* (1912), p. 243. The German terms are: Forscher—Erforscher (Forschung—Erforschung) in full consonance with the expressions chosen by Frankel.

[8] The contrast between the two views has been stressed with particular clarity by Henry Frankfort, *Before Philosophy* (1949), p. 12: "For modern scientific man the phenomenal world is primarly an It; for ancient man it is a Thou"; cf. also Buber, *Ich und Du* (1923).

valued his colleague at the Seminary as one holding the same opinion and as an expert on Jewish Hellenism.[9]

Both men recognize the value of the hellenistic school as the mouthpiece of Judaism in its discussion with world culture. What they believe especially meritorious is the refutation of defamations. "Josephus was the last Jew of his time who refuted hellenistic and Roman lies about the Jews. Afterwards, they could be charged with many things behind their backs without even being aware of them."[10] Here, both scholars side with the hellenists against the rabbis, even though Frankel cannot suppress an occasional doubt as to whether Josephus, the friend of the Romans, is really a proper defender of Judaism.

But more important than refuting ancient and outdated lies is the debate between Jewish Hellenism and the scientific critique of religion, as well as the presentation of Judaism in its relation to moral and religious ideals as enunciated by Plato and the Stoics. Philo and his followers attempt such a scientific presentation,[11] and it is chiefly for this reason that Frankel insists that they be given a place in the curriculum of the Seminary. Modern teachers of Judaism were to learn from their predecessors, who also were bound to contemporary civilization with its virtues and its faults.

Frankel finds three kinds of faults with the Alexandrines.

(a) Philo knows too little of the Bible. Philo never quotes biblical principles like, "Thou shalt love thy God—holy ye shall be, for I am holy." Frankel sees the reason for this in the fact that Philo did not know Hebrew.[12] He might have added that the Greek terms for love and holiness are only inadequate substitutes for the Hebrew words.[13]

[9] Cf. Frankel's remark in *MGWJ*, XVI (1867), 294, 7.

[10] M. Joël, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte zu Anfang des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts*, II (Breslau, 1883), p. 50.

[11] Frankel devoted an essay to the Aristeas letter in *MGWJ*, VII (1858), 237 ff.

[12] *MGWJ*, XVI (1867), 248, 3. When Philo gives explanations based on the masoretic text or on the knowledge of the Hebrew language, this proves nothing as to his personal knowledge.

[13] The question as to "what is lost in translation," I have briefly discussed

A consequence of this faulty knowledge of the Scriptures is, states Frankel, that Philo explains the Bible not from within itself, as do the rabbis, but in terms of a Greek idealism which recommends deadening sensuality as a way to God and sees the aim of life in a purely spiritual vision of God.

(b) Philo thinks he is honoring the Bible by giving allegorical explanations for its stories and laws.[14] Where the Bible speaks of agriculture, Philo explains this as the work which man performs on the soil of his soul. Circumcision stands for cutting off the excessive passions of our soul. True, Philo resists the final consequences of this method, as Frankel points out; but he does not attain insight into the true educational meaning of the Bible.

(c) Moreover, in the laws as represented by the Alexandrines, Frankel feels a lack of that "warmth" which we know from rabbinism. His remark refers in its context primarily to the laws protecting animals and nature, but applies with even greater force to ritual laws. Philo can see their meaning only in their allegorical content and perhaps in their moralizing influence, but he is unable to see in them the willing submission of the individual to the revealed will of God, which was the pride and satisfaction of the rabbis.[15]

True, the mediaevel philosophers of Judaism differ from Philo in their greater knowledge of the Bible and, for the most part, also in their rejection of allegory and their joyful devotion to a life of religious duty. However, in them, too, Frankel finds similar faults. The Cabbala "states in many places that the Law is the body and that

in *Jüdische Schulzeitung* of April 1, 1935. After concluding the Theological Dictionary for the New Testament, I intend to return to this question more extensively. Concerning Philo's knowledge of the Bible, cf. the German Philo translation, II, p. 8: "Rejection of mechanical sacrificial service he takes from Theophrastus, and not from the Prophets; he speaks of simplicity and purity of heart without quoting the Psalms, and arbitrarily injects the idea of loving mankind into the ritual laws without reminding us that the Pentateuch expressly commands us to love our neighbor. Thus, Philo often enough reminds us of an alchemist who tries to make gold out of diverse elements without suspecting that he stands beside a gold mine."

[14] *MGWJ*, XVI, 245 ff.

[15] *MGWJ*, XVI, 291.

which is allegorical is the spirit"; Maimonides was so closely bound up with the system of Aristotle that he could not look at Scripture otherwise than through it, even though Scripture "must find its explanation in the light of the spirit in which it speaks."[16] Frankel admits that a Jewish scholar like Maimonides is safe from the aberrations of Philo's allegorical interpretation; but with all due reverence for the great thinker and teacher, Frankel feels that his representation of Judaism is also "not to his liking" ("nicht zusagend").

In Frankel's Plan of Organization we therefore find as representative of mediaeval philosophy, not Maimonides, but Jehuda Halevi, who was also the subject of the first lectures on the philosophy of religion given at the Seminary by Jacob Bernays.[17] Frankel may agree in principle with Kusari's (IV, 16) famous distinction between the God of Aristotle, who can be reached only by speculation, and the God of Abraham; but in his relation to scholarship he differs greatly from Jehuda Halevi. The King of Kusar and his rabbi paid full attention to the general science of religion, but, according to their own words, only because both of them, to their regret, were denied the possibility of maintaining themselves on the highest plane, which is faith without examination.[18] If we compare this with Frankel's words, "Naïve faith gives happiness, but faith cannot always remain naïve,"[19] we see here a more conciliatory attitude towards a scientific concept of Judaism: firstly, because the Jew, at the time of emancipation and the debate on materialism could not remain without a serious answer to the serious religious questions of the world around him, and, secondly, because Frankel does not regard scientific exploration of Judaism as a mere apologetic device. On the contrary, to him such examination results in a picture

[16] *MGWJ*, XVI, 294-297.

[17] Perhaps Frankel wanted to prepare his students to bring Kusari closer to their congregations in the manner in which Isaac Bernays did it in his lectures at Hamburg, which evoked considerable attention.

[18] *Kusari*, II, 26, end; V, 1.

[19] *MGWJ*, XIII (1864), 18 f.

which, in its degree of historical truth and philosophical depth, is greatly preferable to childlike faith.

III

Frankel's Postulate and We

From Frankel's thoughts, as we have endeavored to restate them, there arises his specific and scientific self-cognizance of Judaism which he postulates as a basis for the preservation of Judaism. This self-cognizance is not attained by keeping aloof from scholarship in general, as regards both Weltanschauung and the treatment of documents; Frankel knows and stresses that even Maimonides' introduction to the Mishna is inadequate in view of today's methods of literary criticism.[20] But even less possible is the attainment of such self-cognizance, if the attempt is made to explain Judaism by comparing it with alien systems instead of explaining it through all the wealth of its own manifestations, including its own methodology. The Greek saying that "like can be recognized only through like"—that is, we understand earlier civilizations only to the extent that we feel related to them—this saying, which often recurs in mediaeval Jewish philosophy, is, in effect, the basis of Frankel's concept of the self-cognificance of Judaism. Today we shall understand the manifestations which we regard as a basis for this self-cognizance in a wider sense than did Frankel, even though it should not be overlooked that Frankel's proposed Plan of Organization also provided "modern Hebrew reading" (neuhebräische Lektüre") thus requiring of future religious leaders that they be conversant with secular literature, too. We may also think that a man like Luzzato has more clearly discerned the nature and the tragic results of the tension between Jewish and Greek thought as the basis of today's European civilization. But Frankel's basic postulate, demanding that the education of Jewish leaders and the preservation of Judaism be built upon the congenial cognition of its manifestations has received valid confirmation in recent developments in modern scholarship.

[20] *Hodegetica in Mishnam* (Leipzig, 1859), Introduction, p. 9.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF "WISSENSCHAFT DES JUDENTUMS" FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF JUDAISM

By ALBERT LEWKOWITZ
Formerly Professor, Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar, Breslau
Haifa

SINCE the destruction of the Jewish State by the Romans no single event endangered the existence of the Jewish people and of Judaism to such a degree as did the entrance of the Jews into the political, social, and cultural life of their non-Jewish environment following Jewish Emancipation. Despite all persecutions and expulsions and in spite of the denial of political rights and social equality, the Jewish people had preserved its national-religious unity during the two thousand years of Galut. True, its intellectual leaders had shared in the cultural life of the various countries of the Diaspora and, from Philo to Maimonides, had striven for a harmonization of Judaism with contemporary intellectual life. The basis of these efforts, however, was the unconditional recognition that the structure of the Jewish people rested on religious law, binding Eastern and Western Jewry into one national-religious unit. This structure, grounded on religious law, was the foundation of the life of the people as a whole as well as of each individual. It was basic to religion and cult, ethics and law, language and customs, in periods of exaltation as well as sorrow.

This national-religious unity was considerably loosened and finally dissolved through Jewish Emancipation and the political and cultural integration of the Jews into the body politic of the European State. For Emancipation openly aimed at atomizing the Jews and their assimilation to the non-Jewish environment, which ultimately meant the destruction of Judaism.

In these intentions the governments were met half-

way by many Jewish groups, which were ready to pave the way for Jewish Emancipation by adopting the culture of the surrounding world and adjusting Judaism to contemporary political and cultural conditions. Thus the representatives of radical Reform called for the renunciation of the authority of the Talmud, which had brought about the religious isolation of Judaism and Jewry, for the elimination of all references to national aspiration in the prayers. They demanded the substitution of the vernacular for Hebrew as the language of prayer, and postulated as the essence of Judaism its universalistic religious-ethical principles.

Two mutually antagonistic forces opposed this tendency towards the dissolution of the religious community of the Jews: Orthodoxy and "Wissenschaft des Judentums."

Orthodoxy, following the path of Moses Mendelssohn, strove to preserve traditional Judaism while accepting political and cultural emancipation. Their leader was Samson Raphael Hirsch. Like Mendelssohn, he proclaimed the absolute validity and authority of the revealed religious Law, proposing, however, the spiritual penetration of the religious contents of the Law through symbolism, just as the Midrash had at all times opened up the words of Scripture for dynamic religious instruction.

Those who could not accept Judaism as a religion of supernatural revelation were unable to follow the path of Orthodoxy which, to this day, is the way of truth for large segments of the Jewish people. Influenced as they were by contemporary philosophy of history, they regarded Judaism, not as an eternal revelation but as a result of the historical development of the Jewish people and its intellectual culture. This meant a loosening of the characteristic dogmas of Judaism. Judaism now appeared as a religious-spiritual creation of the Jewish people embedded in the stream of historical development.

In this way a foundation was laid for the attitude towards that historically developed creation. The ways of ideological approach were twofold. Based on the historicity

of the various phases in the evolution of Judaism, a critical attitude could claim the universalistic religious-ethical content of Judaism, characteristic of all its phases, as the only legitimate one and view the particularism of religious law merely as protective, preserving the Jewish people in times of persecution. Since the Jews had achieved political equality through Emancipation, particularistic law had become obsolete. This was the attitude taken by Liberal Judaism under the leadership of Abraham Geiger.

This attitude was opposed by the positive-historical school of thought led by Zacharias Frankel. In spite of the great variety of historical developments, of spiritual creations, and representative personalities, the positive-historical school strove to perceive and preserve the organic unity of historical Judaism. It was the idea of Krochmal, Zunz, Frankel, and Graetz to conceive of the individuality of the Jewish people in its historical development. With this ideal in mind they tried to find a way toward a Jewish future. In their pioneer works they "removed the cover of debris from the great past" and sought to arouse a new love for and devotion to the preservation of Judaism and Jewishness by means of scholarly research.

In "Wissenschaft des Judentums" Frankel saw a means to establish harmony between the theory and practice of Judaism through scholarly reasonableness. In this way, he thought emancipation could become acceptable as a political solution of the Jewish question without surrendering the characteristic historical-religious foundations of Judaism. Graetz, on the other hand, considered "Wissenschaft des Judentums" as a means to revive the national-religious consciousness of the Jewish people, which was to find its crowning achievement in the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine. To him, the original meaning of Judaism was a unity of people, doctrine, and country.

Thus, "Wissenschaft des Judentums" was profoundly influenced by contemporaneous philosophy of history, and especially by Herder, Hegel, and Ranke. The founding of the Jewish-Theological Seminary at Breslau provided a

central academic institution for the advancement of methodical research in the various disciplines of "Wissenschaft des Judentums."

The establishment of the Seminary was made possible by a generous bequest from Kommerzienrat Jonas Fraenckel. On Ab 16, 5614 (August 10, 1854) the Administrative Committee of the Kommerzienrat Fraenckel Foundations appointed Zacharias Frankel head of the new academic institution. Frankel opened it with these words: "This Seminary is to be the property of all Jewry. The ideas and ideals of Judaism are to be cultivated and taught here." The Seminary strove to fulfill this mission for eighty-four years, until it was closed on November 10, 1938. Its teachers promoted "Wissenschaft des Judentums" and educated generations of rabbis and teachers. Some of them became teachers at institutions modelled after the Breslau Seminary, such as Vienna, Budapest, London, and New York. Others taught at the Jewish institutions of higher learning in Berlin, Cincinnati, and Jerusalem.

Of course, we are deeply grieved by the destruction of this "seminarium" of Jewish religious spirit and thought as well as by the dissolution of Jewish life and work in Europe. Yet, we derive consolation and hope from the thought that the seed which was planted will bear fruit. Ever anew, Jewish research and teaching will be needed to preserve and unfold religious life in the Jewish community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Marcus Brann, *Geschichte des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars in Breslau. Festschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Jubiläum der Anstalt.* Breslau, 1904.

Isaac Heinemann, "Die Idee des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars vor 75 Jahren und heute," in *Bericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars für* 1929. Breslau, 1930.

Albert Lewkowitz, *Das Judentum und die geistigen Strömungen des* 19. *Jahrhunderts.* Breslau, 1935.

EDITOR'S NOTE

According to a news item contained in *Haaretz* of November 11, 1954, Prof. Albert Lewkowitz died in Haifa on Cheshvan 14, (Nov. 10).

ל " צ ו

THE JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF BRESLAU AND "WISSENSCHAFT DES JUDENTUMS"

By Adolf Kober
New York City

"Wissenschaft des Judentums" before the Founding of the Seminary*

WHEN on August 10, 1854 the "Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar Fraenckelscher Stiftung" opened its doors, rabbinical training and "Wissenschaft des Judentums" were joined together in a firm union destined to produce the finest cultural fruit.[1] It had taken time for the two to be brought together under one roof. The term "Wissenschaft des Judentums" was used for the first time by Leopold Zunz in the title, "Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," a journal which he edited in 1822-23 for the

* The author dedicates the present essay to the memory of his late teachers at the Breslau Seminary, Professors Marcus Brann, Saul Horovitz, and Israel Lewy, and to the memory of his late brother, attorney Hans Kober, member of the Administrative Board of the Fraenckel Foundations in Breslau.

[1] The historical statements and data concerning the Breslau Seminary are taken from the reports published annually by the Seminary as *Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars* [later *Bericht*] 1854-1938 [cited as *JB*] and from M. Brann, *Geschichte des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars (Fraenckelsche Stiftung) in Breslau. Festschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Jubiläum der Anstalt* (Breslau, 1904) [cited as Brann]. All personal dates, such as the years of birth, study in the Seminary, and death, as well as position, titles, and bibliographical information can be found in the above-mentioned publications. [The original German titles of the literary contributions to the *Jahresberichte,* hereafter translated by the Editor, can thus be easily identified from the *JB.* They are, moreover, for the years 1854-1929, listed in Aron Freimann's *Katalog der Judaica und Hebraica, Stadtbibliothek Frankfurt am Main,* I, Frankfurt 1932.—Editor's Note.] Abbreviations used hereafter:

ADB.=Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie
AZJ.=Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums
EJ.=Encyclopaedia Judaica
HJ.=Historia Judaica
MGWJ.=Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums

"Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft der Juden." In the first article of this periodical[2] Immanuel Wolf defined the word "Judaism" as an all-inclusive term for the totality of the conditions, characteristics, and achievements of Jewry in religion, philosophy, history, jurisprudence, literature in general, civic life and all human relations, "not in the limited sense of Jewish religion alone." Summarizing his findings, he stated: (1) "Wissenschaft des Judentums" embraces Judaism in its totality; (2) it interprets the nature of Judaism and represents it in systematic form by relating the particular in every case to underlying general principles; (3) it treats every subject for its own sake, not for the sake of some motive extraneous to it. It entertains no preconceived notions and is not concerned about the conclusion to which its investigation may lead. It has for its aim the historical and literary documentation of Judaism and statistical information about Jews in all countries of the world.

Leopold Zunz made the following comments on this article in the introduction to the first volume of the journal: "In the article inaugurating the present volume an attempt is made to clarify the meaning of such a 'Wissenschaft'; its development, however, must advance only step by step. . . . It is not a party which works here for partisan purposes. All men of good will who feel the calling should see fit to take a part in this periodical. . . . If moral worth and an intellectual force come to dwell in its pages, the right kind of contributors will not be lacking." Of this periodical only one volume appeared in 1822-23. In addition to the scholars mentioned, Lazarus Bendavid, David Friedländer, Ludwig Markus, and Eduard Gans were contributors to it.

The "Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft der Juden" which, according to Max Wiener, was to give expression to a new view of Jewish life, went soon out of existence.[3]

[2] Pp. 1-24: "Ueber den Begriff einer Wissenschaft des Judentums."

[3] Max Wiener, "The Ideology of the Founders of Jewish Scientific Research," *Yivo Annual of Jewish Social Science*, V (1950), 184-195; cf. L. Wallach, "The Science of Judaism," *HJ.* VIII (1946), 33-60; I. Elbogen, "Ein Jahrhundert Wissenschaft des Judentums," *Festschrift zum 50 jährigen Bestehen*

"Wissenschaft des Judentums," however, was not dead. Zunz had given it a start with his first publication, "Etwas zur rabbinischen Literatur" (1818). He continued his work with his pioneer study on Salomo ben Isaac in 1823.[4] In 1832 he published his classical work, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt.* Its publication was a historic event. In 1837 appeared his *Namen der Juden,* followed in 1845 by a collection of essays on the ethics and culture of Judaism, his *Zur Geschichte und Literatur.* With those works Zunz—together with Salomon Jehuda Loeb Rapoport of Prague and Samuel D. Luzzato of Padua—founded the "Wissenschaft des Judentums" and made it part of the *universitas litterarum.* Moreover, after the death of the philosopher and historian, Nachman Krochmal (1785-1840), Zunz was entrusted with publication of the manuscript of the former author's work, *More Nebuche Haz'man* ("Guide for the Perplexed of the Time"), which appeared in 1851.[5]

Jewish theology owes its creation to Abraham Geiger and his *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* (1835-1847). Geiger, who won a prize at the University of Bonn for his essay, *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judentum aufgenommen* (1832), wrote in his journal: "We need men able to demonstrate how Judaism developed gradually to its present state, men not afraid to show that contrary to accepted belief much of it does not spring from tradition or derivation from Scripture by correct exegesis, but originates in a historical period and can therefore also be rejected when times change. We need men who know how to oppose the views of ignorant reformers and the malicious mockery of non-Jews. . . ."[6]

Isak Markus Jost (1793-1860) published his *Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Makkabäer bis auf unsere Tage* (9 vols., 1820-1828) and continued it in his *Geschichte des*

der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (Berlin, 1922), pp. 107 ff.

[4] *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judentums,* I (1823), 217-384.

[5] *EJ.,* X, 452-457.

[6] I, 11-12.

Israelitischen Volkes (2 vols., 1831-1833). His *Neue Geschichte der Israeliten* (1845-1847) and *Geschichte des Judentums und seiner Sekten* (3 vols., 1857-1859) followed. In the eighteen-forties, Zacharias Frankel, then Chief Rabbi of Dresden and Leipzig, published *Die Eidesleistung der Juden in theologischer und historischer Beziehung* (1840), *Vorstudien zur Septuaginta* (1841), and *Der gerichtliche Beweis nach mosaisch-talmudischem Recht* (1846). The same decade witnessed also scholarly works by David Cassel, Julius Fürst, and Michael Sachs. Thus Zunz was on firm ground when he petitioned the University of Berlin on July 25, 1848, to grant to "Wissenschaft des Judentums" a place at the University. His petition was rejected. So also was an application submitted by representatives of the estate of Veitel Heine-Ephraim to establish a chair in rabbinic literature at the University in spite of the fact that sufficient funds for it had been made available.[7]

Efforts to Establish Modern Rabbinical Schools

Efforts to modernize the training of rabbis date back to the end of the eighteenth century. An example is the plan of 1824 by "Vize-Oberlandesrabbiner" S. Weyl of Berlin, who sought the consent of Minister Von Altenstein for the establishment of a Jewish theological and teachers' seminary. Only a teachers' seminary came into being; it existed until 1839. The endeavors of the governments of various German states to train rabbis were only partially successful; governmental good intentions provided no adequate substitute for the needed academy for Jewish theology. The single exception was the rabbinical seminary founded in 1829 in Padua on the initiative of the Austrian Government for its Italian provinces.[8]

[7] Cf. Ludwig Geiger, "Zunz im Verkehr mit Behörden und Hochgestellten," *MGWJ.*, LX (1916), 334-346; S. Maybaum, "Die Wissenschaft des Judentums," *MGWJ.*, LI (1907), 654-58; I. Elbogen, "Ein Jahrhundert Wissenschaft des Judentums," p. 120.

[8] Cf. A. Kober, "Die Hochschulen für die Rabbinerausbildung in Deutschland," *Festschrift zum* 80. *Geburtstag von Leo Baeck am* 23. *Mai* 1953 (London, 1953), pp. 19-20.

In Germany, the old talmudic schools went out of existence without anything new replacing them. In 1836, and again in 1845, Abraham Geiger called in vain for the establishment of a department of Jewish theology at some German university. In 1837 Ludwig Philippson started a fund-raising drive for a Jewish theological department and a seminary. It fared no better than other similar undertakings.[9] One of the protagonists in this fight for modern rabbinical education was Zacharias Frankel. His *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judentums* (3 vols., 1844-1846) was dedicated to the presentation of the religious aspects of Judaism. The periodical "aims at a harmonization of life and scholarship; it is hoped that it will become a forum where divergent views on Judaism can meet and where the peaceful exchange of ideas will lead to results that should become a secure and undisputed part of Jewish life. Research should lead to the discovery of the principle of evolution inherent in Judaism and contribute to the solution of important contemporary problems. Moreover, the journal should concern itself with the advancement of education, with defense against the defamation of Jews and Judaism, and with political problems, and should publish articles on theology and Judaism. Above all, its efforts must be directed towards a reconciliation of faith and life, progress in religion, and the preservation, advancement, and regeneration of Judaism."[10] "The editor sees the aims of his activities in a moderate reform." It is worth noting that in the journal's second volume Dr. Wolf Landau, Frankel's successor in the rabbinic post at Dresden, published an essay, "Challenge of Faith and Theology to the Rabbi."[11] In the last issue of the journal Zacharias Frankel promised his readers to transform it into a quarterly on a broader scholarly basis.[12] But he was unable to fulfill his promise

[9] *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie,*" II (1836), 1-21; *AZJ.*, I (1837), 348-55, 457; I. Elbogen, "Ein Jahrhundert Wissenschaft des Judentums," p. 125.

[10] I, 3-27.

[11] Pp. 139-142, 182-191, 214-218: "Anforderungen des Glaubens und der theologischen Wissenschaft an den Rabbiner."

[12] III, Epilogue.

before the stormy years of 1848-49 with their religious indifference had passed.

To divert tired minds and to direct attention once more to higher ideals, Frankel opened the first volume of the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* (October, 1851) as follows: "Jewry has always maintained that Judaism has its essence and fulfillment in research on religion and in intellectual activities connected with the religious sphere. 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' is its powerful lever, without it there is no Judaism, Judaism degenerates if it ceases to love its 'Wissenschaft'."[13] Therefore, the advancement of "Wissenschaft des Judentums" is the most important task of the *Monatsschrift*. In the same vein, Dr. Wolf Landau published also in this first volume an essay, "Wissenschaft, the Only Means for the Regeneration of Judaism."[14] In the second volume, Zacharias Frankel combined this theme with a call for the "establishment of a Seminary."[15] "This is required by the present desperate situation; the dead who devoted their lives to faith and teaching to be handed down to a thousand generations cry out for it."

This desire found fulfillment through the will of Jonas Fraenckel, which provided for a number of charitable foundations and particularly for the setting up of a rabbinical and teachers' seminary.[16] It envisioned realization of this plan by 1846 and to this end gave an initial fund of 100,000 thalers and the building at Wall-Strasse 1b in Breslau. The will was confirmed by the Prussian Government on August 31, 1847. Its executors issued a call to Zacharias Frankel. The seminary to be founded was intended as a Jewish theological institution which would serve for scholarly research and the education of rabbis in a modern, yet historically conservative spirit and so result in a reconcilation of the old and the new. This principle

[13] *MGWJ.*, I (1852), 1-6.

[14] Pp. 483-499: "Die Wissenschaft, das einzige Regenerationsmittel des Judentums."

[15] *MGWJ.*, II (1853), 4-6.

[16] Brann, pp. 7 ff.

was consistently maintained even later. At the inauguration of the Director, Dr. L. Lazarus, in 1875, it was officially pointed out that "providence had given to Dr. Frankel the task of realizing an idea which had animated the best of our co-religionists, the idea that 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' can prosper only if it is transmitted to the religious community, in connection with general education, philosophy, and classical antiquity, if it supersedes the narrow teaching methods of the old and enters into the halls of free, modern, scholarly research. This was the ideal of the Seminary's founders; it will ever in the future also guide its administrators and teachers toward successful work."[17] Similarly Israel Rabin, on succeeding to the chair of Marcus Brann in 1921, emphasized: "Since its founding, it has always been characteristic of the Breslau Seminary that it ha succeeded in combining a deeply felt religiosity with thorough, unprejudiced research in all fields of Jewish literature." That same year, upon his installation as head of the Seminary, Michael Guttman said: "As far as this institution is concerned, Jewish tradition and Jewish life are one."

Scope of the Present Study

On the occasion of the silver jubilee of the Breslau Seminary, a history of the institution was written by Jacob Freudenthal; on its golden anniversary Marcus Brann published a *Festschrift* containing its history during the first half-century of its existence. The seventy-fifth anniversary was the occasion for another *Festschrift* of two volumes with scholarly essays by the faculty and a number of graduates. The years 1904-1938 (in 1938 the Nazis ended its existence by force) have not been reviewed historically, and the present author does not intend to do so. Only one aspect of its activities since its founding in 1854 will be considered in this essay: the contributions of the Seminary's teachers and students to "Wissenschaft des Judentums." No

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

claim is made that this survey is all-inclusive or the bibliography exhaustive. The periods of time the students were at the Breslau Seminary and their activities at other theological institutions are outside the scope of this article.

The Seminary's Curriculum and Faculties

The Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau in its undergraduate department combined Jewish studies with classical and other studies customarily taught during the last two years at the German *Gymnasium*. The seven-year course of theological studies could be taken only by graduates of this department which, however, ceased to exist in 1887. A teachers' seminary for the training of teachers of Jewish religion existed from 1856 to 1867.

According to the curriculum laid down in the by-laws, the following subjects were to be taught in the rabbinical school: Bible in the original language, biblical exegesis, Hebrew and Aramaic, Talmud, religion and ethics, history of Jewish literature combined with Jewish history, pedagogy, the teaching of religion, philosophy of religion and ethics based on Jewish sources, homiletics, the spirit of mosaic-talmudical civil law with special emphasis on marriage laws. This curriculum underwent little change over the years. The study of Talmud retained a central position. Hermann Cohen called for the establishment of chairs in philosophy of religion and ethics at Jewish theological academies.[18] Not until 1914 was such a chair established at the Breslau Seminary. Modern Hebrew was introduced in the summer term of 1921. In 1926 a training program for academic teachers of religion was added. This measure gained in importance when the Prussian Ministry of Education recognized instruction in Jewish religion as a major and minor in the examinations for *Gymnasium* teachers in 1930 and appointed two teachers of the Seminary to the Breslau Board of Examiners.

Beginning on June 1, 1931, the Breslau Seminary was

[18] *MGWJ.*, XLVIII (1904), 2-21.

permitted to add to its name the title "Hochschule für Jüdische Theologie."

The form of the institution was molded by the strong personality of its first "Director," Zacharias Frankel, a man who had a sound knowledge of all fields of Jewish learning, uniting in himself traditional Jewish learning and modern critical schooling. He taught Talmud and biblical exegesis from 1854 to 1875. Jacob Bernays, son of the Hamburg Chacham Isaac Bernays and a pupil of Ritschl's, was active at his side as a full-time appointee; at first, he was in the undergraduate department, later he taught philosophy of religion in the rabbinical school from 1854-1866. Heinrich Graetz, also on a full-time basis, taught Jewish history and Bible exegesis. Part-time members of the teaching staff, mostly in the undergraduate department, included B. Zuckerman for science and mathematics; Manuel Joël for classical languages from 1860 to 1863 and from 1889 on also for philosophy of religion. Frankel was succeeded by L. Lazarus (1875-1878); David Joël (1880-1882); Israel Lewy (1883-1917); Saul Horovitz (1917-1920); Michael Guttman (1921-1933); Israel Rabin (1933-1935); Samuel Moses Ochs (1935-1938). Only Lazarus held the title of "Director" of the Seminary; all his successors were called "Seminarrabbiner."

David Rosin taught biblical exegesis, philosophy of religion, pedagogy, and homiletics from 1866-1894; Jacob Freudenthal, a graduate of the Seminary, classical languages in the undergraduate department and Hellenistic culture and philosophy of religion in the rabbinical school from 1864-1888. In 1888 he became full professor at the University of Breslau. Rosin was succeeded by Marcus Brann, also a graduate of the Seminary, who taught biblical exegesis, history, the Jewish calendar, and pedagogy from 1891-1920. From 1914 on, Albert Lewkowitz, another graduate, joined the faculty to teach modern philosophy of religion. Beginning in 1896, Saul Horovitz taught philosophy of religion, homiletics, and Talmud. In 1917 Isaac Heinemann joined the faculty to teach biblical exegesis, Hellenistic

culture, and homiletics. Israel Rabin was called to the Felix-Perle Chair and gave courses in biblical exegesis and history, 1920 to 1933. Other teachers included Heinrich Speyer for Bible and biblical history (1934-1935); Hirsch Zimmels (1929-1933) for history; Nachum Wahrmann (1933-1938); Ephraim Urbach (1935-1938); and Ernst Hoffman (1936-1938) for Talmud. S. H. Kirschner (1879 and 1882-83); Ferdinand Rosenthal (1918); Chanoch Albeck (1924-25); Max Simonsohn (1920-21; 1933-35); and Julius Guttman (1910) served as substitute teachers. From 1933 to 1935 Guido Kisch lectured on Jewish history. After 1934, courses on philosophy, psychology, history, and sociology had to be added to the curriculum because of the exclusion of Jewish students from the German universities. Such courses were given by Ernst Kantorowicz (1935) and Willy Cohn (1936-1938). Courses in social work had been introduced as early as 1920 by Gustav Glaser.

Although the teaching staff carried a heavy load of lectures and seminars, scholarly work in the various fields of "Wissenschaft des Judentums" was not neglected. The works published by the teachers testify to this, not the least of them being the scholarly essays which accompanied the Seminary's annual reports. Only few of these annual reports were without a scholarly contribution, notably those published 1922-1924. Sometimes these scholarly cotributions constituted a series, finally coming out in book form, for example, Marcus Brann's *Geschichte der Juden in Schlesien,* and S. Horovitz's *Die Psychologie bei den jüdischen Religionsphilosophen des Mittelalters von Saadia bis Maimuni.* A projected series of Publications did not materialize, however.

A stimulus to scholarly work among students was provided by a number of prizes funds for which were established at the Seminary. Prizes could be won only for work mature enough to be printed. In fact, authors accepted the obligation to have their prize essays published within two years.[19]

[19] Brann, p. 82.

The Seminary library assisted these scholarly activities in an outstanding manner. Its nucleus was the Saraval Collection bought in Italy and brought to Breslau in 1854. In 1904, the Seminary library numbered 400 manuscripts in 450 volumes and 1,800 printed works in 24,000 volumes. In 1937-38 the library consisted of 433 manuscripts, 54 incunabula, and 38,143 printed volumes. The yearly additions to the library were regularly listed in the annual reports.[20]

The Seminary's Contribution to "Wissenschaft des Judentums"

In this section the scholarly achievements of the teachers and graduates of the Seminary will be surveyed under the broad headings of the various fields of "Wissenschaft des Judentums." In this author's opinion such a procedure is in line with the general feeling among Jewish scholars that the author's name is secondary to his work. The compilation offered hereafter is not exhaustive. It rests on the assumption that even though the students of the Seminary were exposed to many intellectual currents, they were predominantly and lastingly influenced by the great masters of "Wissenschaft des Judentums" with whom they studied there.

Research in Bible

Although Graetz the historian ranks higher than the exegete of the Bible, his contributions to biblical scholarship should not be underestimated.[21] Shortly after he assumed the editorship of the *Monatsschrift,* he published therein an article on the Ebionites of the Old Testament (1869) that was followed in 1870 by a series of essays on biblical

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 78-82; Jahresberichte; *Minerva, Jahrbuch der Gelehrten Welt,* ed. by Gerhard Lüdtke, XXXIII (Berlin, 1938), p. 150.

[21] Cf. Philipp Bloch, "Heinrich Graetz, ein Lebensbild," *MGWJ.*, XLVIII (1904), 357-360, 491-94; Nathan Porges, "Graetz als Exeget," *MGWJ.*, LXI (1917), 367-384.

exegesis and Hebrew philology. After the completion of his *History* Graetz published works on the Bible, whose exegesis formed an important part of his scholarly work. In 1870 he published a translation and interpretation of the book, *Kohelet,* which he dated from the time of Herod. This was followed in 1871 by a long essay on the *Song of Songs* whose author he placed in the Hellenistic period. In the Commentary on Kohelet he made good use of the old versions and of the Hebrew vocabulary contained in the Talmud to elucidate obscure passages. However original and often amazing his interpretations of the two books may be, his commentaries met more opposition than acceptance. Graetz's main efforts as interpreter of the Bible were devoted to the Hagiographa. Outstanding above all is his critical commentary on the Book of Psalms, published in 1882-83, immediately after his translation of the Psalms. A year later his studies on Proverbs followed, consisting mostly of textual criticisms. In his approach to the Hagiographa Graetz did not shrink from radical Bible criticism; and equally, his analysis of the prophetic books was also far from dogmatic (although he did stress the unity of the book of Joel (*JB.*, 1873). But when it came to the Pentateuch as a code of law Graetz took his place among the conservative interpreters of the Bible and opposed especially the Wellhausen School. After his death, Wilhelm Bacher edited his *Emendationes in plerosque sanctae scripturae libros* (1892-95).

Israel Rabin published "Studies in the Pre-Mosaic Conception of God" in the Seminary *Festchrift* of 1929.[22]

Only few of the Seminary's pupils contributed to research in the Bible. Benno Jacob published a number of books attacking the Wellhausen School. His more important works in biblical exegesis are *Der Pentateuch, exegetisch-kritische Forschungen* (1905); *Quellenscheidung und Exegese im Pentateuch* (1916), and, above all, his commentary on Genesis, *Das erste Buch der Tora* (1934). Also active in

[22] "Studien zur vormosaischen Gottesvorstellung;" cf. Alfred Jospe, "Israel Avraham Rabin," *HJ.*, (1952), 170 f.

biblical scholarship was Felix Perles. Outstanding among his numerous publications are *Analekten zur Textritik des Alten Testaments* (1895, 2nd ed. 1922) and *Zur althebräischen Strophik* (1902).[23] Morris Jastrow wrote *The Gentle Cynic, Being the Book of "Ecclesiastes"* (1919), *The Book of Job* (1920), *The Song of Songs* (1921), and *Religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians* (1898). Ernst Jacob published "Die altassyrischen Gesetze in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Gesetzen des Pentateuch."[23a]

Ancient Bible Translations

In this field, Zacharias Frankel took the lead with his *Vorstudien zur Septuaginta* (1841). A monograph was dedicated to the Targum to the Prophets (*JB.*, 1872). Among the works published by students of the Seminary are H. Seligsohn, *De duabus Hierosolymitanis Pentateuchi paraphrasibus* (1858); S. Maybaum, *Die Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos und den späteren Targumim* (1870); Selig Groneman, *Die Jonathansche Pentateuchübersetzung in ihrem Verhältnis zur Halacha* (1879); and Julius Wolfsohn, *Untersuchungen des Targum Scheni zu Esther und seine Quellen* (1908). Samuel Kohn wrote on Samaritan translations of the Pentateuch, especially *Samaritanische Studien* (1868); the Samaritan Targum to the Pentateuch was also the subject of a number of studies by Adolf Brüll. The Syrian translation of the Bible (the *Peshitta*) was dealt with by Joseph Perles in his *Meletemata Peschitthoniana* (1859) and by Isaac Prager in *De veteris testamenti versione Syriaca quam Peschittho vocant quaestiones criticae* (1875).

Jewish-Hellenistic Literature

Jewish-Hellenistic literature was given special attention by the Seminary teachers. The trend was started by Zach-

[23] Hedwig Perles, "Verzeichnis der von Felix Perles veröffentlichten Schriften," *MGWJ.*, LXXXI (1937), 369-392.

[23a] *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, XLI; cf. *MGWJ.*, LXXXII (1938), 86.

arias Frankel's *Vorstudien zur Septuaginta* (1841). At the Seminary's opening he wrote on Palestinian and Alexandrinian Bible research (*JB.*, 1854). Frankel compared the two types of interpretative analysis and arrived at the conclusion that the Alexandrinian Bible interpretation tended to becloud the meaning of Scripture while Palestinian research was firmly grounded on the law. Special recognition for research in Jewish-Hellenistic literature belongs to Jacob Bernays, who attained to great scholarly accomplishments in his "Über das Phokylidische Gedicht" (*JB.*, 1856), "Über die Chronik des Sulpicious Severus" (*JB.*, 1861), and in his "Theophrasts Schrift über die Frömmigkeit" (*JB.*, 1866).[24] These works provided stimulus and example to classical philology, which at the time was almost without exception caught in a self-imposed isolation from other fields of knowledge. In the last-mentioned work Bernays not only restored a lost text by Theophrastus, but also offered many enlightening contributions to the understanding of the religious ideas of antiquity.

Equally excellent is the investigation of Jewish-Hellenistic antiquity by Jacob Freudenthal. Especially valuable among his works in this field are "Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift 'Über die Herrschaft der Vernunft' (IV. Makkabäerbuch.)" (*JB.*, 1869) and his "Hellenistische-Studien," 1-3 (*JB.*, 1874-75). In Parts 1 and 2 he applied in an outstanding manner the methods of textual criticism to Alexander Polyhistor and his fragments of Jewish and Samaritan historical works. Similiar honorable mention belongs to Leopold Cohen who, in cooperation with Wendland, published all the writings of Philo in seven volumes (1896-1930). He also started a German translation of Philo (2 vols., 1909-10). Another prominent scholar in Jewish-Hellenistic literature was Isaac Heinemann. Being both a classical philologist and an expert in Jewish literature, he contributed primarily to the understanding of Philo.[25]

[24] *ADB.*, XLVI, 93-402; H. Usener, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen von Jacob Bernays*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1889); Brann, pp. 124-26.

[25] Hanna Emmerich, "Isak Heinemanns Schriften," *MGWJ.*, LXXX (1936), 294-97.

Heinemann's essay, "Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung" (Part I in *Festschrift* 1929; Part II in *JB.*, 1929) is a milestone in Philo research. Heinemann was not interested merely in philology and history; he also gave his attention to the continued development of Hellenism in Jewish thought.

The investigation of Philo was cultivated also by some graduates of the Seminary. Examples are Leopold Treitel's *Philonische Studien* (1915) and B. Ritter's studies on Philo and the Halacha (1879). Adolf Büchler, an expert in the history of the Jews during the last centuries before and the first centuries of the Christian era, in his *Die Tobiaden und Oniaden im zweiten Makkabäerbuch* (1899), contributed greatly to the clarification of the Jewish-Hellenistic period.

Talmud and Midrash

Zacharias Frankel was interested in all fields of Jewish knowledge and pioneered in many; above all, however, he was the historian of the Halacha. Once the materials for a history of the development of the Halacha were collected in his "Preparatory Studies on the Septuagint," *Vorstudien zur Septuaginta* (1841), and in his "Influence of Palestinian Exegesis on the Alexandrine Hermeneutics," *Über den Einfluss der palästinensischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (1851), his whole scholarly activity centered around this field. In 1859 he published his classical *Darke ha-Mishna.* It contained an analysis of the origins and the development of Oral Law, offered a history of the teaching methods of the individual Tanaim, analyzed the relationship of the Mishna of Rabbi Jehuda ha-Nasi to earlier halachic collections, and presented the subsidiary sources important for the understanding of the Mishna and of its textual parallels. His *Additamenta* (1867) offered additions and corrections and included indexes of names and subjects compiled by Horowitz of Krefeld. It was Frankel's great merit to have thus laid firm foundations for research in our whole religion.

His special field of interest, however, became the Palestinian Talmud. The results of his studies were presented in his Introduction to the Jerusalem Talmud, *Mebo ha-Yerushalmi* (1870). This classical work opens with a discussion of the conditions under which the Palestinian Talmud came into existence. It proceeds to an analysis of the language characteristic of the Palestinian Amoraim and of the style of the Palestinian Talmud, its method and relationship to the Babylonian Talmud. The work includes an alphabetical index of all Amoraim mentioned in the Palestinian Talmud, to which biographical notes are added, as well as a list of the editions of and commentaries to the Talmud. Frankel also showed that both in the Babylonian and the Palestinian Talmuds other tannaitic collections are quoted. With extraordinary perception and a fine gift of combination he demonstrated the various tendencies in the Halacha. In addition to being a historian of halachic literature, he also commented on it. During the last years of his life his commentaries to *Berachot* and *Peah* (1874) and to *D'mai* (1875) of the Palestinian Talmud were published.[26]

Israel Lewy continued his master's work. He opened up new paths for scholarly research in talmudic literature by publishing a series of pioneering studies. His early essay on some fragments of Abba Saul's Mishna, "Einige Fragmente aus der Mischna des Abba Saul" (1867), is fundamental for the understanding of the development of the Mishna. Lewy demonstrated that, prior to their final redaction, the Mishna collections of the great teachers were in consonance with each other in the essential points of Halacha but often differed greatly in a number of details. Lewy showed how these individual Mishna collections were gradually forgotten, and how only the halachic-exegetical works, Mechilta, Sifra, Sifre, and Tosefta, retained limited validity along with the Mishna. Lewy's main interest is devoted to proving that Abba Saul compiled a Mishna containing variants to other Mishna collections, and that his Mishna

[26] Cf. Louis Ginzberg, *A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud, Introductory Essay: The Palestinian Talmud* (New York, 1941), p. lxii.

was used by Rabbi Jehuda ha-Nasi for the compilation of our Mishna. Only fragments of Abba Saul's Mishna were known in Babylonia.

This early essay demonstrated Israel Lewy's great mastery of critical analysis. He unraveled the firm fabric of the Mishna and discovered new combinations, up to then only dimly perceived. Moreover, Lewy rediscovered the Mechilta of Rabbi Simon, which he presented in his essay, "Ein Wort über die Mechilta des Rabbi Simon" (*JB.*, 1889). He opened up insights into the development of talmudic literature through his mastery of the method of thorough and penetrating textual criticism and through his incomparable talmudic knowledge.

His published works cover only part of Lewy's broad scholarly activities. This emerges especially clearly from the interpretation of sections 1-6 of *Nezikin* in the Palestinian Talmud (*JB.*, 1895, 1899, 1902, 1908, 1911, 1914). He starts with the assumption that the various schools of the Amoraim, which accepted the Mishna of Rabbi Jehuda ha-Nasi, commented on and added to it each in their own way (i.e., developed "Talmuds" of their own) in about the same manner that the schools of the Tannaim compiled their own collections of halachic and midrashic materials. The Talmuds of the earlier Amoraim were revised in many ways by the later Amoraim until they received their final form with the end of Amoraic teaching. The earlier Talmuds, which formed the basis for the later ones, could therefore not be preserved, especially because they never were written down. Only two versions, the Palestinian and the Babylonian, survived and even these are seemingly incomplete. Prior to and simultaneously with the final revision of the Palestinian Talmud, other revisions were made. Of these only the tractate *Nezikin* is still extant.[27] In his essay, "The Palestinian Talmud", (1941), Louis Ginzberg expressed the following opinion on Lewy's Commentary to *Nezikin* (1-6): "Though consisting of only 185 small pages, it contributed more to the understanding of the Palestinian Tal-

[27] Preface to the first chapter (Breslau, 1894).

mud, and indirectly to that of the Babylonian and the Mishnah, than many a bulky volume by an old style talmudist or lengthy monograph by a modern scholar."[28]

Saul Horovitz, Lewy's gifted pupil and successor, published talmudic source material. The *Corpus Tannaiticum* includes his *Midrash Sifre* to Numeri with a critical apparatus, notes and introduction; also *Sifre Zuta* to Numbers (1917). He died in 1920 before completing *Midrash Sifre* to Deuteronomy and the Mechilta. These works were edited posthumously by Israel Rabin (*Mechilta*, 1931) and Louis Finkelstein (*Sifre to Deuteronomy*, 1936).

Michael Guttmann, who followed Horovitz as head of the Breslau Seminary, published, among other numerous works, an "Introduction to the Halacha" (*Zur Einleitung in die Halacha*, 1909-1915). His *opus magnum* is an encyclopedic work on talmudic literature, *Realencyclopaedie der talmudischen Literatur, Mafteach ha-Talmud* (four vols., 1906, 1917, 1925, 1930). He was also one of the editors of the talmudic sections of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica.*

Of Frankel's students, Adolf Schwarz, Director of the Israelitisch-theologische Lehranstalt, Vienna, and Moses Samuel Zuckermandel acquired outstanding reputations as scholars in the field of Talmud. Schwarz edited various parts of the Tosefta and wrote on the interpretative methodology in talmudic literature. The *Festschrift* for Adolf Schwarz's seventieth birthday, edited by Samuel Krauss (1917), bears eloquent witness to his importance in various fields of Jewish studies, not the least in talmudic lore.[29] Zuckermandel published an edition of the Tosefta based on the Erfurt and Vienna manuscripts (1881-82) and wrote on the mutual relationship of Tosefta, Mishna, and Boraita and of the two Talmuds (2 vols., 1907-1909). Discussion of problems connected with the edition of the Mishna and

[28] Louis Ginzberg, *op. cit.*, p. lxiv; *Festschrift zu Israel Lewys siebzigstem Geburtstage*, ed. by M. Brann and I. Elbogen (Breslau, 1911), to which literary contributions were made by 35 scholars.

[29] A list of his writings is found on pp. 1-12.

its relationship to the Tosefta can be found in essays by J. Bassfreund and Alexander Guttmann.

Talmudic law was treated in several publications by Zacharias Frankel: *Der gerichtliche Beweis nach mosaisch-talmudischem Recht* (1846) and "Grundlagen des mosaisch-talmudischen Eherechts" (*JB.*, 1860). Nahum Wahrmann wrote on the condition in talmudic law in the Seminary's anniversary volume of 1929 and on the position of women in the period of the Tannaim (1933). To the ethics of the Talmud L. Lazarus devoted an essay, "Zur Charakteristik der talmudischen Ethik" (*JB.*, 1917); David Joël wrote on "Superstition and Judaism" (*JB.*, 1881).

Lasting importance in the field of Haggada was achieved by Wilhelm Bacher through his works which even now are not out of date: *Die Agada der Tannaiten* (I, 1884; II, 1890); *Die Agada der palästinensischen Amoräer* (I, 1892; II, 1896; III, 1898-99); *Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer* (I, 1878). His last great work, *Tradition und Tradenten: Studien und Materialien zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Talmud* (1914) concluded Bacher's research in the Haggada. In it, the authors of individual statements are dealt with as well as individual works of the Halacha and the Haggada.[30]

I. Theodor devoted his whole life to an edition with commentary of *Bereshit Rabba,* an important source in the field of haggadic Midrash. It appeared posthumously, edited by Ch. Albeck (1926-28).

A standard work in the field of lexicography is Alexander Kohut's *Aruch Completum* (1878-1892; new ed. 1910-1926). Jakob Winter published German translations of halachic Midrashim of the Mechilta and Sifra. The talmudic tractates, *Megillah, Rosh ha-shana, Sanhedrin* and *Ketubot* were translated into German by Victor M. Rawicz (1884-1900).

[30] Lajos Blau, *Bibliographie der Schriften Wilhelm Bachers* (Frankfurt a.M., 1910); Dénes Friedmann, *Nachtrag zu L. Blaus Bibliographie der Schriften Wilhelm Bachers* (Frankfurt, 1928).

Literature of the Geonic Period; Karaism; Rabbinic Literature

Contributions to the history and literature of the Geonic period were published by Simon Eppenstein, "Beiträge zur Geschichte und Literatur der Juden im Gaonäischen Zeitalter" (*MGWJ.*, LII, 1908). Pincus F. Frankl, to whom Solomon Schechter dedicated the first series of his *Studies in Judaism,* wrote "Karäische Studien" (1876, 1882) and *Beiträge zur Literatur und Geschichte der Karäer* (1877). Michael Guttman, Ludwig Blau, Wilhelm Bacher, Bernhard Ziemlich, and Adolf Schwarz wrote on Maimonides and the *Mishne Tora,* in the Maimonides Anniversary Volume (1908, 1914). David Rosin published a "Compendium der jüdischen Gesetzeskunde aus dem 14. Jahrhundert" (*JB.*, 1871). Ephraim E. Urbach wrote on the origin and organization of the Tossafoth (*JB.*, 1936); Zacharias Frankel, on the literary history according to talmudic responsa (*JB.*, 1865); Hirsch J. Zimmels, on the responsa of Rabbi David ibn Abi Simra, one of the outstanding Turkish rabbis of the sixteenth century (*JB.*, 1932). Zimmels' *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland im 13. Jahrhundert, insbesondere auf Grund der Responsen des Rabbi Meir Rothenburg* (1926) and *Die Marranen in der rabbinischen Literatur* (1932) are important contributions. The same is true of his recent book, *Magicians, Theologians and Doctors: Studies in Folk Medicine and Folklore as Reflected in the Rabbinical Responsa (12th-19th centuries)* (1952).

Medieval Hebrew Philology

In addition to a number of scattered articles, Wilhelm Bacher published *Die hebräische Sprachwissenschaft vom 10. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert* (1892).

History of Medieval Bible Exegis

David Rosin published an essay on the head of the exegetists, school of Northern France, "Rabbi Samuel ben

Meir als Schrifterklärer" (*JB.*, 1880) and edited the commentary, *Perush Rashbam* (1881). Nathan Porges wrote a treatise on Joseph Bechor Schor, a biblical exegete of the twelfth century in Northern France (1908); B. Einstein and S. Eppenstein discussed Josef b. Simeon Kara, a commentator on the Bible of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The Spanish Bible commentators were not neglected. The Seminary offered two prizes for a successful reconstruction of the commentaries to the Bible by Abraham ibn Ezra. One of these prizes was won by Ludwig Levy, who attempted a reconstruction of Ibn Ezra on the early Prophets (1903), the other by Moses Samuel Ochs on Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Mishle, Ezra, Nehemiah (1915). Joseph Perles wrote on the Commentary to the Pentateuch of Rabbi Moses ben Nachman (1858).

Medieval Jewish Poetry

David Rosin published German translations of Abraham ibn Ezra's liturgical and non-liturgical poetry accompanied by a commentary (*JB.*, 1885, 1887-88, 1891, 1894). An edition of the Divan of Abraham ibn Ezra including his *Hai ben Mekitz* came from Jacob Egers (1886).

Philosophy of Religion and Kabbala

The whole field of medieval Jewish philosophy of religion received such exemplary study by teachers and students of the Seminary that one is well justified in speaking of a "Breslau School." The start was made by Manuel Joël in his analysis of the neo-Platonist, Solomon ibn Gabirol, followed by studies on Maimonides, Levi ben Gerson, and Chasdai Crescas. Joël uncovered the relationship of the Christian theologian, Albertus Magnus, to Maimonides and proved the dependence of Spinoza on Crescas.[31]

Jacob Guttmann continued his work in numerous studies on Jewish philosophers of religion, such as Abraham ibn

[31] Cf. I. Heinemann, "Manuel Joël als Darsteller der mittelalterlichen Religionsphilosophie," *MGWJ.*, LXX (1926), 351-55.

Daud, Saadia, Isaac Israeli, Solomon ibn Gabirol, Simon ben Zemach Duran, Isaac ben Jehuda Abarbanel. He paid special attention to influences originating with the Arabs and Greeks and to the relationship between Christian scholasticism and Judaism. These researches resulted in the following works: *Das Verhältnis des Thomas von Aquino zum Judentum und zur jüdischen Literatur* (1891) and *Die Scholastik des* 13. *Jahrhunderts in ihren Beziehungen zum Judentum und zur jüdischen Literatur* (1902). Guttmann demonstrated in particular the great influence Maimonides had on Christian thinkers of the West. Together with Brann, Simonsen and Bacher, he edited the memorial volumes published in commemoration of the seven-hundredth anniversary of Maimonides' death, which have become a standard work on Maimonides' significance for the Jews in East and West.[32] In this connection the studies by David Rosin on the ethics of Maimonides (*JB.*, 1876) and on the philosophy of religion of Abraham ibn Ezra deserve mention.

The theology and philosophy of the non-rationalist thinkers were given masterly treatment by David Kaufmann ("Die Theologie des Bachja ibn Pakudah"; *Geschichte der Attributenlehre in der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie von Saadia bis Maimuni,* 1877). In his "Psychologie der jüdischen Religionsphilosophen von Saadia bis Maimuni" (*JB.*, 1898-1911) Saul Horovitz discussed important aspects of the Jewish philosophy of Saadia, the protagonist of the *Kalam,* of Gabirol and Joseph ibn Tsaddik, the representatives of of Neo-Platonism, and of Abraham ibn Daud, the representative of Aristotelianism.

The medieval Jewish philosophers of religion did not develop independent psychological systems but derived their ideas mainly from Greek antiquity. Nevertheless, their works should not be underestimated. The study of their psychological theories can contribute greatly to the elucidation of their philosophical systems. They are concerned with psychology mainly in connection with doctrines about

[32] *Festschrift zum siebzigsten Geburstage Jakob Guttmanns* (Leipzig, 1915), pp. VII-XV.

the immortality of the soul, ethics, and the problem of free will, all of which were central problems of medieval Jewish thought. Therefore, the general understanding of these Jewish philosophers is greatly aided by a clarification of their psychological theories. But Saul Horovitz did not confine himself to the analysis of the psychological thinking of the Jewish philosophers of religion. His essays on the influence of Greek skepticism on Arabic philosophy and of Greek philosophy on the development of the *Kalam* (*JB.*, 1911, 1909) throw light on the history of Arab philosophy.

Medieval as well as modern Jewish philosophy of religion and the relationship of philosophy to religion were the subjects of numerous special studies by Julius Guttmann, Professor at the Hebrew University until his death in 1950. He was the author of an excellent volume on the history of Jewish philosophy of religion (1933).

The philosophers of the modern period and their relationship to Judaism were also thoroughly discussed by teachers and graduates of the Breslau Seminary. Manuel Joël uncovered the Jewish sources of Spinoza's pantheism and drew special attention to Chasdai Crescas' influence on Spinoza. Jacob Freudenthal wrote a classic work on the life and teachings of Spinoza (2 vols., 1904-1927). Hermann Cohen, the founder of Neo-Kantianism and a determined opponent of the Spinozistic philosophy, directed his attention, during the first decade of the twentieth century, to Jewish problems.[33] He crowned his efforts by his work, *Die Religion der Vernunft aus den Quellen des Judentums* (1919). An attempt at a systematic presentation of Judaism, which it strove to reconcile with contemporary Weltanschauung, it can be compared with Maimonides' *More Nebuchim.*

Cohen is an illustration of the fact that of all the modern philosophers, Kant had the greatest influence on modern Jewish thought. Julius Guttmann published various essays on Kant's concept of God, and Moritz Steckelmacher an-

[33] *Cf. Hermann Cohens jüdische Schriften* (with Introduction by Franz Rosenzweig), 3 vols. (Berlin, 1924).

alyzed the reasons for the sympathetic reception accorded by Jews to Kant's philosophy (*Festschrift für Jakob Guttmann,* 1915). Kant's influence is strongly felt also in Steckelmacher's *Das Prinzip der Ethik vom philosophischen und jüdisch-theologischen Standpunkt* (1904). Albert Lewkowitz's scholarly attention was given to Judaism and modern ideological currents (*JB.,* 1928, 1929). He attempts to demonstrate harmonies and divergencies between Judaism and the leading philosophies of the modern period. The work is divided into three parts: the philosophies of the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, and the nineteenth century. From Giordano Bruno to Bergson, the systems of the main representatives of European philosophy and their views on religion, as well as the attempts made by Jewish thinkers to assimilate to themselves the spirit of European culture, pass in review. Also of importance for history and philosophy is the comprehensive work on Jewish religion in the period of Emancipation by Max Wiener (*Jüdische Religion im Zeitalter der Emanzipation,* 1933).

A contribution to research on Jewish mysticism is David Joël's *Die Religionsphilosophie des Sohar* (1879). Joël differed from Adolf Frank in his views on the origin of the Kabbala; he left the problem of the origin of the Zohar undecided. Philipp Bloch wrote various monographs and a comprehensive *Geschichte der Entwicklung der Kaballa und der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie* (1895).

Jewish History

Before the Seminary opened its doors, Heinrich Graetz had published an essay, "Die Konstruktion der jüdischen Geschichte" in Frankel's *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judentums;* volume three of his *Geschichte der Juden von der ältesten Zeit bis auf die Gegenwart* had also appeared (1853). While he was connected with the Seminary, however, ten volumes of his History were written. This History has been subjected to many criticisms. Graetz was blamed for being subjective, for wrongly interpreting sources, for postulating hypotheses. But it is to Graetz's

lasting credit that he taught his contemporaries to perceive an order in the heroic spiritual achievements of thousands of years in an apparently chaotic history, to understand the past as an organic whole, and to see it in continual interrelation with the contemporaneous events of world history. He applied the new methods of historic research to Jewish history. No one can deny Graetz the honor of being the historian of our people; his tombstone rightly testifies: "Love for his people guided his immortal pen." He laid the foundation on which those who came after him were to build. His friends, his students, and their disciples have honestly striven to do so.

M. Brann, S. Eppenstein, Jacob Guttman, Ferdinand Rosenthal, and others revised and re-edited some volumes of Graetz's History. Ismar Elbogen added a volume to it, *A Century of Jewish Life* (1944), bringing the work up to date.[34]

Gotthard Deutsch undertook to clarify the philosophical foundations of Jewish history. He wrote on the epochs of Jewish history and published numerous essays on Jewish history and literature (*Scrolls: Essays on Jewish History and Literature,* 2 vols., 1917). Hermann Cohen discussed Graetz's philosophy of Jewish history (*MGWJ.,* LXI, 1917).

Two of Graetz's most illustrious disciples, Moritz Güdemann and David Kaufmann, gained distinction by furthering the history of Jewish culture. Güdemann's special interest was Jewish education on which he published three well-known and still unsurpassed volumes (1880-89) accompanied by a selection of source material on that subject (1892).[35] David Kaufmann is the author of more than thirty books and 500 articles; he became one of the outstanding experts in Jewish cultural history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. His special fields of investigation were genealogy and the history of Jewish fam-

[34] M. Brann, "Verzeichnis von H. Graetz' Schriften und Abhandlungen," *MGWJ.,* LXI (1917), 444-491; Solomon Grayzel, Preface to Elbogen's *A Century of Jewish Life* (Philadelphia, 1945).

[35] D. Feuchtwang, "Güdemanns Anteil an der Wissenschaft des Judentums," *MGWJ.,* LXII (1918), 161-177.

ilies. His first work dealt with the well-known court purveyor, Samson Wertheimer and his children (1888). Monographs followed on Jair Chajim Bacharach and his ancestors (1894), Heinrich Heine's forebears (1896), and the Memoirs of Glueckel of Hameln (1896). The last volume of this genealogical series, on the Gomperz family, was completed and edited by Max Freudenthal (1907).

Graetz's disciples and other Seminary graduates studied the history of the Jews in various countries, regions, and cities. Thus, the standard work on the history of the Jews in medieval France was written by Heinrich Gross (*Gallia Judaica*). It contains an alphabetical list of all places of Jewish settlement in medieval France and presents in detail their political and literary history. Marcus Brann, faithfully preserving Graetz's heritage, showed in an exemplary manner in his "History of the Jews in Silesia ("Geschichte der Juden Schlesiens," 6 parts, *JB.*, 1895-1916) how regional Jewish history should be written and that it should be based on a careful perusal of Latin, German, and Hebrew sources.[36] On his suggestion, the "Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums" decided in 1903 on the publication of an alphabetically arranged work titled *Germania Judaica* containing all the settlements within the German Reich where Jews had lived from earliest times to the period of the Congress of Vienna, and their history, based on the sources. Of the *Germania Judaica* volume I, Part 1 was edited by M. Brann and A. Freimann (1917); volume I, Part 2 by I. Elbogen, A. Freimann and H. Tykocinski (1934). A further volume, edited by Elbogen, Freimann and Kober, was almost completed in 1939; the manuscript, brought to England, was subsequently lost and has not been recovered to date.

Reinhold Lewin wrote on Luther's attitude towards the Jews (1911), a very influential work on that subject; Max Freudenthal gained distinction in the history of Jews during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially the his-

[36] A. Freimann, "Verzeichnis der von Markus Brann verfassten Schriften und Abhandlungen," *MGWJ.*, LXIII (1919), 81-97.

tory of Jewish emancipation in Germany.[37] Elbogen published a one-volume "History of the Jews in Germany" (*Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland,* 1935).[38] Histories of the Jews in the following German provinces and cities were published by Seminary graduates:

Baden (Adolph Lewin)
Cologne (Adolf Kober)
Düsseldorf (Abraham Wedell)
Erfurt (Theodor Kroner; *Erfurter Judenbuch* 1357-1407 by Arthur Süssmann, *Mitteilungen des Gesamtarchivs der deutschen Juden,* V, 1914, pp. 1-126)
Frankfort on the Main (Isidor Kracauer)
Hessen-Kassel and Münsterland (Felix Lazarus)
Hannover (Selig Gronemann)
Hildesheim and Lower Saxony (Abraham Lewinsky)
Königsberg (Hermann Vogelstein)
Kremsier (Frankl-Grün)
Lvov (Jecheskel Caro)
Magdeburg (Moritz Güdemann)
Mayence (L. Levi)
Nuremberg (B. Ziemlich, M. Freudenthal)
Posnan (Joseph Perles)
Prague (Alexander Kisch)
Rhineland (Adolph Kober)
Rome (Paul Rieger and Hermann Vogelstein)
Silesia (M. Brann, I. Rabin)
Vienna (Max Grunwald)
Wiesbaden (Adolf Kober, Paul Lazarus)
Württemberg (Paul Rieger; *Jüdische Gotteshäuser und Friedhöfe in Württemberg,* published by Oberrat der Israeliten Württembergs, 1932)

Guido Kisch, a member of the last Seminary faculty, published *The Jews in Medieval Germany: A Study of Their Legal and Social Status* (1949), now recognized as a standard work. A companion volume, *Jewry-Law in Medieval*

[37] "Max Freudenthals Schriften und Veröffentlichungen," *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland,* VII (1937), 129-137.

[38] Regi Elbogen, "Ismar Elbogen (1874-1943): A Bibliography," *HJ.,* VIII (1946), 69-94.

Germany (1949), contains a collection of laws and court decisions concerning Jews from medieval German law sources.

A student of the Seminary, Herbert Fischer, investigated the political status of the Jews in the German cities during the thirteenth century (Gierke's *Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats-und Rechtsgeschichte,* XL, 1931). The legal status of Prussian Jewry in modern times was treated by Ismar Freund in his works, *Die Rechtsstellung der Juden im Preussischen Volksschulrecht* (1908), *Die Emanzipation der Juden in Preussen* (2 *vols.,* 1912), and *Die Rechtsstellung der Synagogengemeinden in Preussen und die Reichsverfassung* (1926).

Tombstone inscriptions in several Jewish cemeteries were deciphered and collected by Max Grunewald (Hamburg, Rothenburg, and Worms), Marcus Brann (Breslau, Glogau, Zülz), Sali Levi (Mayence), Kober (Cologne), and Rieger (Württemberg).

The diversity of David Kaufmann's genius is exemplified in his enthusiastic and energetic study of the history of Jewish art. He championed the collecting and preserving of art objects and historic monuments. He dealt with the history of illuminations in Jewish manuscripts ("Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Handschriften-Illustrationen"; *Haggada von Serajevo,* ed. by H. Müller and I. Schlosser, 1898). The beautiful Darmstadt Haggada was published by Bruno Italiener in cooperation with Aron Freimann, August L. Mayer, and Adolf Schmidt (1927).

B. Zuckermann and M. Brann contributed a number of articles on the Jewish calendar to the annual reports of the Seminary.

Jewish Folklore and Legends

This field owes much to Moses Gaster, who contributed to other fields of knowledge as well. In his *Maase-Book of Jewish Tales and Legends,* translated from the Judeo-German (2 vols., 1934), he presented a translation in conjunc-

tion with an analysis of the sources. This work was preceded by his *Exempla of the Rabbis* (1924) and *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Medieval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archaeology* (3 vols., 1925-1929; 1936).[38a]

Knowledge of Jewish folklore and research in legends was further advanced by two scholarly periodicals, *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für jüdische Volkskunde* and *Jahrbücher für jüdische Volkskunde*, founded and edited by Max Grunwald.

Homiletics

Manuel Joël, David Rosin, Saul Horovitz, and Isaac Heinemann, all of whom taught homiletics at the Breslau Seminary, did not publish any books on the subject. However, their ideas on teaching homiletics found clear expression in their sermons that appeared in print.[39] Manuel Joël, who preached in the Seminary synagogue from 1858, created a new style of preaching by appealing to an intellectual audience. In the introduction to a collection of his sermons (1867) he demanded that the preacher attempt to influence the will of his audience. The masterful perfection of the sermons he delivered in the synagogue of the Breslau Jewish Community for a number of decades manifests itself in the three volumes of his sermons (1893-1898). Joël searched for and found modern ideas in the creative genius of Israel. Although rarely appealing to emotion, he understood how to arouse enthusiasm for the eternal ideals of Judaism. His sermons were of a fine formal perfection.

In 1866-67, David Rosin published a selection of the holiday and Sabbath sermons delivered by Michael Sachs, whose notes and drafts he lovingly worked into complete sermons. These selections reflected Rosin's ideas on hom-

[38a] [Bruno Schindler, "List of Books and Papers of Dr. M. Gaster," *Gaster Anniversary Volume*, ed. by B. Schindler and A. Marmorstein (London, 1936), pp. 21 ff.—Editor.]

[39] A. Kober, "Jewish Preaching and Preachers," *HJ.*, VII (1945), 119 ff. According to information received from Dr. Max Gruenewald, the manuscripts of the lectures on homiletics of Saul Horovitz are in his possession.

iletics. He always insisted that his students prepare their sermons with great care.

The relatively few sermons published by Saul Horovitz, e.g., his sermon on the fiftieth anniversary of the Seminary and his eulogy for Israel Lewy (*Predigten,* 1894), show how unique a speaker he was and in what profound manner he made use of the Midrash, so that often apparently dead material gained new vitality through his presentation.

Isaac Heinemann's printed sermons reveal not only his rare mastery of Jewish literature, but also his ability to use its treasures to best advantage. Siegmund Maybaum taught homiletics at the Berlin Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. His *Jüdische Homiletik* (1890) lifted the field from the level of insecure experimentation to the height of an academic discipline. In this he followed in the steps of another Breslau graduate, Pincus F. Frankl, whose sermons appeared in 1888. Maybaum was succeeded in the chair of homiletics by Leo Baeck, to whom we owe much for valuable insight into the history of preaching (*Aus drei Jahrtausenden,* 1938). Benjamin Rippner, Adolf Schwarz, Abraham Frank, Moritz Steckelmacher, Cosman Werner, and many other Seminary graduates published model sermons. The *Israelitisches Predigtmagazin,* edited by M. Rahmer, contains many such sermons.

Pedagogy

In this field Siegmund Maybaum's *Methodik des jüdischen Religionsunterrichts* (1896) deserves to be mentioned first. Marcus Brann, who lectured on pedagogy at the Seminary, published works on the history and literature of the Jews for use in schools and homes; so also did Theodor Kroner. Many an essay from the pen of Lesser Knoller appeared in the annual reports of the Jewish religious schools of Breslau and Hannover. The same applies to Isaac Bamberger, Hermann Vogelstein, and Max Freudenthal for their respective schools. Albert Lewkowitz published an essay on the main currents of modern pedagogy and their significance for the reform of Jewish education (*JB.*, 1933).

Liturgy

Inspired by his teacher, Israel Lewy, Ismar Elbogen wrote on the history of *Semoneh Esreh* (1902), which finally led him to his "History of Jewish Worship," *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner historischen Entwicklung* (1912, 2nd ed. 1924, 3rd ed., 1931, also Hebrew translation), recognized as a standard work.

New Testament, Christianity and Judaism

In this field the following works are of importance: Josef Eschelbacher, "Zur Geschichte und Charakteristik der Paulinischen Briefe" (*MGWJ.*, LI, 1907) and "Die Vorlesungen Adolf Harnacks über das Wesen des Christentums" (*MGWJ.*, XLVI f., 1902 f.); Moritz Güdemann, *Das vorchristliche Judentum in christlicher Darstellung* (1913); Felix Perles, *Boussets Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, kritisch untersucht* (1903 f.); Max Dienemann, *Judentum und Christentum* (2nd ed., 1919), and, especially, Leo Baeck, *Aus drei Jahrtausenden* (1938).

Apologetics

Significant in this field were Zacharias Frankel's essay on anti-Semitism in the ancient world and his translation of and commentary on Josephus Flavius' *Contra Apionem*, published in the first volume of his *Monatsschrift*. Many of the Seminary graduates devoted publications to apologetics: a number of scholarly works may even be considered as merely apologetic. Examples of the close link between scholarship and apologetics can be found in Theodor Kroner's *Enstelltes, Unwahres und Erfundenes in "Der Talmudjude" von Dr. Rohling* (2 pts., 1871), and in Adolf Lewin's *Der Judenspiegel des Dr. Justus ins Licht der Wahrheit gerückt* (1884). David Kaufmann defended the "Wissenschaft des Judentums" by subjecting the attacks of Paul de Lagarde to scholarly scrutiny. He proved, for example, that Lagarde had no reliable knowledge of the Jewish field of scholarship (D. Kaufmann, *Gesammelte Schriften*, I,

205-257). Other outstanding contributions to apologetics were made by Moritz Güdemann (*Das vorchristliche Judentum in christlicher Darstellung,* 1903; *Apologetik des Judentums,* 1906). In the last-named work, he concentrated on the positive aspects of Jewish thought. Such positive apologetics is also stressed in Michael Guttmann's *Das Judentum und seine Umwelt* (1927).

Comprehensive Reviews

Excellent comprehensive reviews on the whole field of Jewish literature can be found in J. Winter's *Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur seit Abschluss des Kanons* (in collaboration with A. Wünsche, 3 vols., 1892-1896), and in Gustav Karpeles' *Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur* (1886, Engl. tr. by Gottheil, 1889).

Jewish religious thought, with no polemical note, is treated in Moritz Güdemann's *Das Judentum in seinen Grundzügen und nach seinen wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen* (1902). Volume II of Moritz Lazarus' *Ethik des Judentums* was edited by Jacob Winter, in collaboration with A. Wünsche (1911).

Leo Baeck's *Das Wesen des Judentums* (4th ed., 1926, tr. as *The Essence of Judaism,* 1948) has become a standard work in its field.[40]

Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums

The *Monatsschrift,* frequently mentioned before, was founded by Zacharias Frankel in 1851 and has been a steady companion to the Seminary teachers ever since its opening.[41] A quarterly, it was planned to arouse minds to a renewed interest in Judaism and its history after the let-down of

[40] Theodore Wiener, "The Writings of Leo Baeck," *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore,* I (1954), 108 ff.

[41] M. Brann, "Zur Geschichte der Monatsschrift," *MGWJ.,* LI (1907), 1-16; *Generalregister zu den Jahrgängen 1-75 der Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums,* 2 parts (Breslau, 1938).

the years following 1849. As Frankel put it in the first volume: "It has always been held among Jews that Judaism has its basis and essence in religious research and in intellectual activities connected with the religious sphere. 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' is its powerful lever, there is no Judaism without it; it degenarates if it ceases to love its Wissenschaft." The advancement of "Wissenschaft des Judentums" was, therefore, the other task. For seventeen years Frankel gave unstinting efforts to the editorship of the *Monatsschrift* (1851-1868); in fact, as Brann established, about one-fourth of its content stemmed from Frankel's pen. Close contact between the Seminary and the *Monatsschrift* was maintained by annual reports on the progress of the Seminary's work.

In 1869, Graetz took over the editorship. In an announcement the new editor stated that the *Monatsschrift,* continuing its past policy, would deal with subjects which previously had found little attention, especially exegesis of the Bible and the Apocrypha. Moreover, important current events were to be discussed impartially, though with firmness. Special attention was to be paid to attractive style and readability in order to arouse the interest of educated laymen also. Graetz began his editorship by publishing an article on the Ebionites. He, too, wrote more than one-fourth of the periodical while he was its editor (until 1887). From 1869 to 1881 he was the sole editor; then his disciple Pinkus F. Frankl joined him. Frankl's premature death forced Graetz, who had reached his seventieth year of age, to resign his post.

As a result, the *Monatsschrift* was discontinued until 1892, when it was revived (New Series) under the joint editorship of Marcus Brann and David Kaufmann and enjoyed the cooperation of numerous prominent scholars from all walks of Jewish life. This initiated a glorious epoch for the *Monatsschrift.* However, David Kaufmann's death in 1899 placed the entire heavy burden of the editorial work on the shoulders of Marcus Brann who, from 1900 until his death in 1920, gave of his incredible industry and un-

tiring devotion to the editing of twenty volumes of the *Monatsschrift*. Only financially was his task easier than that of his predecessors, for the *Monatsschrift* had become the official publication of the "Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums." Marcus Brann, following Frankel's example, succeeded in interesting young theologians in the journal.

Between three and four hundred scholars contributed scholarly articles to the *Monatsschrift*. It must be borne in mind that only a very few of those who dedicated themselves to "Wissenschaft des Judentums" did not carry on a constant fight against external obstacles. It is admirable, indeed, that rabbis of middle-sized and large congregations found time for scholarly work.

After Brann's death the editorship of the *Monatsschrift* passed to Isaac Heinemann (1920), whose dedication and success matched those of his predecessors. The journal, and with it an important factor in Jewish scholarship, came to an end when Heinemann had to emigrate to Israel in December 1938 and resigned as editor. By then it had reached its eighty-second year of publication. As late as 1939 an additional (83rd) volume was prepared and published by the "Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums" under the greatest difficulties due to the Nazi persecution. This last volume of the *Monatsschrift* included the following sections: 1. Bible; 2. Talmud: (a) Liturgy and Aggada, (b) Halacha, (c) Introduction, Texts and Realia; 3. The Middle Ages: (a) History, (b) Religious Law, (c) Philosophy of Religion, (d) Exegesis of the Bible, (e) Folklore and Realia; 4. The Modern Period; 5. Problems of Method. [Under Leo Baeck's editorship forty-five scholars contributed articles. A number of additional essays that had been solicited by and submitted to the editor had to be omitted because they did not pass Nazi censorship (e.g., Guido Kisch's contribution on the Jewish oath in medieval Germany). Although published, the volume could no longer be distributed in Germany because of the progress of Jewish

persecution. Only a few copies survived the Nazi holocaust and are therefore exceedingly rare.][42]

Jewish Journals Edited by Seminary Graduates

The following periodicals were edited by former students of the Seminary:

Populär-wissenschaftliche Monatsblätter, ed. by Adolf Brüll, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1880-1904.

Neue Israelitische Zeitung, ed. by Alexander Kisch, Zürich, 1878-1880.

Israelitische Wochenschrift für die religiösen und sozialen Interessen, ed. by M. Rahmer, co-editor 1872-1878, sole editor 1878-1895.

Das jüdische Literaturblatt, ed. by M. Rahmer, 1872-1895, 1897-1903.

Israelitisches Predigtmagazin: Homiletische Zeitschrift, ed. by M. Rahmer, 1874-1880.

Israelitische Schulzeitung, ed. by Rahmer and Kroner, 1882.

Das jüdische Literaturblatt, by Jecheskiel Caro, Cracow, 1896-97.

Ungarisch-jüdische Wochenschrift, Organ für Gemeinde, Schule und Haus, ed. by M. Kayserling and S. Kohn, Pest, 1871-72.

Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für jüdische Volkskunde, ed. by Max Grunwald, Hamburg, 1898-1903.

Hatsofe lechochmat Yisrael, ed. by Michael Guttmann, 1921-1925.

Tidskrift for Jodisk Historie og Literatur, ed. by Josef Fischer and Julius Salomon, co-ed. D. Simonsen, Copenhagen, 1917-1925.

Ungarische Zeitschrift für Jüdische Wissenschaft, Magyar Zido Szemle, ed. by W. Bacher and J. Banosci, Budapest, 1884-1890.

The Jewish Messenger, ed. by A. S. Isaacs, New York, 1878 ff.

Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland, ed. by Ismar Elbogen and Max Freudenthal, Berlin, 1929-1938.

[42] Editor's supplement.

Graduates of the Breslau Seminary at Other Jewish Theological Seminaries

The significance the Breslau Seminary had already acquired twenty-five years after its founding can be seen from the fact that two Breslau graduates, Wilhelm Bacher and David Kaufmann, were appointed to important chairs when the Rabbinical Seminary was founded in Budapest on the model of the Breslau school. When Michael Guttmann of Budapest was called to head the Breslau Seminary in 1921, he stated that strong ties bound him to that institution as he had been a disciple of Bacher and Kaufmann. He later returned to Budapest as Director of the Rabbinical Seminary, where his son, Heinrich Guttmann, who had studied at Breslau, also received a teaching position. Another former student of Breslau, Ludwig Venetianer, taught homiletics at the Budapest Seminary.

The "Israelitisch-Theologische Lehranstalt" in Vienna was connected with the Breslau Seminary by equally strong ties. Adolf Schwarz, Director of the Vienna school for many years, was a pupil of Zacharias Frankel. Adolf Büchler was a Professor at the Vienna institution prior to his appointment as principal of Jews' College in London. Two of Frankel's disciples, Pincus F. Frankl and Siegmund Maybaum, were active at the "Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums" in Berlin, where also Ismar Elbogen, Julius Guttmann, Ismar Freund, and Alexander Guttmann taught. When the Collegio Rabbinico Italiano was established in Florence, Italy, in 1899, S. H. Margulies became its first Director. Ismar Elbogen, and later Marcus Breger, also taught at the Collegio Rabbinico. Simon Eppenstein lectured on history at the "Rabbiner-Seminar" in Berlin.

Graduates of the Breslau Seminary also crossed the ocean to teach in Jewish institutions overseas. Bernhard Drachman taught Bible and Alexander Kohut lectured on Talmud at the Jewish-Theological Seminary in New York. Gotthard Deutsch, for some time acting president, taught history at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, while

Nathan Klotz was a teacher of Bible at Yeshiva College in New York.

Some graduates of the Breslau Seminary held offices as directors of teachers' seminaries: Holzmann at the Teachers' Seminary in Berlin; Knoller at the Teachers' Seminary in Hannover; Theodor Kroner at the Teachers' Seminary in Münster and later in Hannover.

Many scholars mentioned in the preceding pages participated in the activities of the "Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums" and of the "Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums." They also contributed numerous articles to the great Jewish encyclopedias. Jacob Guttmann, after having been vice-president of the Gesellschaft became its president in 1911 and served with great distinction. Graduates of the Seminary also helped to popularize "Wissenschaft des Judentums."

Among the hundreds of students who attended the Seminary and acquired a Jewish education there were some who did not complete their studies but preferred another career. In spite of this, Judaism gained from their contacts with Jewish theological instruction. Outstanding among these former students was Hermann Cohen whose achievements in philosophy and Judaism are generally recognized. Others were Solomon Kalischer, who became a professor at the Technical University in Berlin and deserved well of Judaism as President of the "Deutsch-Israelitischer Gemeindebund," and Adolf Pinner, professor of chemistry at the University of Berlin, who published textbooks on chemistry and was one of the founders of the "Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens"; Ezechiel Zivier, archivist of the Count of Pless, who initiated the founding of the Central Archives of German Jews in Berlin.

Teachers and students of the Breslau Seminary have thus made a truly significant contribution to "Wissenschaft des Judentums" to this day, especially in the fields of talmudic literature, Hellenistic studies, philosophy of religion, and Jewish history and literature. However, their accomplishments cannot adequately be presented by a mere enu-

meration of their scholarly works. According to our sages, "blessing is not to be found in anything that can be weighed or measured or counted, but only in a thing hidden from sight."[43] How numerous were the intellectual stimuli offered by teachers and students of the Seminary for eighty-five years and after. The Seminary has ceased to exist, but its spirit cannot be destroyed. Faith and scholarship, as advanced by the Breslau Seminary that has brought forth so many fruits for the "Wissenschaft des Judentums," will survive, an example for generations to come.

[43] *Talmud Babli,* Taanith f.8[b].

Appendix

Continuation of A. Freimann's List of the Literary Contributions to the Seminary's Annual Reports (*Jahresberichte*).[1]

1927. M. Guttmann, Eine Untersuchung der mosaischen Gebote.
1928. A. Lewkowitz, Das Judentum und die geistigen Strömungen der Neuzeit, I. Die Renaissance.
1929. A Lewkowitz, Bericht über die Feier des 75 jährigen Jubiläums. I. Heinemann, Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung, II.
1930. M. Guttmann, Eine Untersuchung über den Geltungsumfang der mosaischen Gebote.
1931. I. Rabin, Beiträge zur Rechts- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Juden in Schlesien im 18. Jahrhundert, Heft I: Der rechtliche Zustand (1713-1740).
1932. H. J. Zimmels, Rabbi David ibn abi Simra (RDS), Teil I: Leben und Lebenswerk.
1933. A. Lewkowitz, Die Hauptrichtungen der Pädagogik der Neuzeit in ihrer Bedeutung für die Neugestaltung des jüdischen Unterrichtswesens.
1934. H. Speyer, Der Festtag bei den Propheten.
1935. I. Heinemann, Altjüdische Allegoristik.
1936. E. Urbach, Die Entstehung und Redaktion unserer Tossafot.
1937. Wahrmann, Die Bedingung im jüdischen Recht.

[1] See *supra,* note 1.

REVIEW SECTION

Collections of Essays

ESSAYS PRESENTED TO LEO BAECK ON THE OCCASION OF HIS EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY. East and West Library. London, 1954. xii and 211 pp.

THIS splendidly produced volume, comprising contributions on religion, philosophy, history, literature, and bibliography, is the second *Festschrift* published on the same occasion (cf. *Historia Judaica,* XV, 1953, p. 193 f.). The two essays on Jewish history written in German are the only ones that fall within the scope of this journal.

In his "Wissenschaft des Judentums und Historismus bei Abraham Geiger," H. Liebeschütz interestingly discusses one of the numerous problems whose investigation is only part of the long overdue re-evaluation of the life and work of the father of the Reform movement in Germany. It is the question, to what extent the Jewish religious and intellectual attitude up to the middle of the nineteenth century was influenced by the surrounding world, and what character the limitation of this influence assumed.

The author shows how Geiger's problematics had their "conscious or unconscious" origin in the problematics developed in Protestant historical theology by Ferdinand Chr. Baur and David Friedrich Strauss, both of Tübingen. There was, however, the difficulty of integrating Judaism into Western history of civilization, dominated as the latter was by Christianity. "While the application of the historical methods of thinking to an important epoch of Jewish history did not offer any difficulty, the ways differed considerably when the task meant to consider the totality of Western history as the framework for the Jewish destiny and Jewish achievement" (p. 84). When Geiger was convinced that "the essence of Judaism and Europeanism is basically identical or, in any case, is to become identical, he did not become aware of the patent gaps in his construction." There is a great distance between historism and Jewish "Wissenschaft."

In her extremely interesting and well written article, "Die Vorstellung vom Juden und vom Judentum in der Ideologie der Reformationszeist," Selma Stern-Taeubler draws a picture of the Jew and of Judaism as conceived in the ideology of the period of the Reformation, which was, as our own time is, an epoch of revolutionary changes in every sphere of life. The conception of the Jew reflected the problematics and strife of that era in a most disturbing and exciting

manner. "One conceived of him, in accordance with the law of natural reason and the commandment of humanity, as a natural and human being; however, there was also a strong belief that the Jews were used by supernatural and devilish forces as their most dangerous and dismal tools." Thus, on the one hand, there were thinkers who considered the Jews (as they were thought of as early as the Middle Ages, though only sporadically) as God's children, just as were Christians, heathens, Scyths or Mohammedans. Chief among those thinkers were the humanists. They did not attempt, however, to conceive of Judaism as an individual religious phenomenon, nor did they understand it historically as a cultural development. On the basis of a profound knowledge of contemporary philosophical and theological literature, the author outlines the attitude toward Jews and Judaism of Pico della Mirandola, Erasmus, Boeschenstein, Cellarius, Sebastian Franck, Johannes Reuchlin, and Agrippa of Nettesheim, among whom Reuchlin receives special attention. The religious reformers, on the other hand, dealt with Judaism in a more thorough and revealing manner than the humanists and cabbalists. From their knowledge of Scripture they looked upon the Jewish people indeed as the chosen people. In spite of such cognition Luther wrote his wicked and inhuman books against "the Jews and their lies." The author analyzes carefully Luther's Jew-hatred, in her opinion motivated basically by the fact that his Weltanschauung was still grounded completely in medieval thinking. A Protestant-Christian unity, *res publica Christiana*, as propagated by Zwingli, Butzer, and Melanchthon, had to lead, of necessity, to the doctrine of excluding from state and society members of a nationally or religiously different group.

In contrast to the manifold and ambiguous conceptions of the Jew held by leading figures in the period of Reformation, the author plans to offer the actual historical picture of the German Jew in those agitated decades, in her forthcoming biography of Joselmann of Rosheim, that magnificent *exemplar vitae humanae*. The reviewer, as well as certainly many readers, is looking forward with anticipation to this work, for which no one is better equipped than the author with her intimate knowledge of all historical aspects of that period. Of no less scholarly importance would it be, however, if the author would also present in expanded and fully documented form her researches on the conception of Jews and Judaism in the period of Humanism and the Reformation, merely outlined in her essay. Similar problems are now being attacked from various angles. Her contribution would be invaluable for scholarship.

GUIDO KISCH

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

SCHWEIZERISCHER ISRAELITISCHER GEMEINDEBUND 1904-1954: FESTSCHRIFT ZUM 50 JÄHRIGEN BESTEHEN. Schweizerischer Israel. Gemeindebund. Zürich, 1954. 344 pp.

THIS imposing anniversary volume, published upon the semicentennial of the central organization of Swiss Jewry (today numbering less than 20,000 souls), could serve as a model for similar publications by American Jewish congregations and organizations. It consists of twenty contributions, all treating problems of Jewish life and history in Switzerland, all on a high literary level, some of them of general Jewish significance. Only the latter can be mentioned in the small space available for reviews in a scholarly journal of Jewish history.

Of historical importance, above all, are two contributions. One is "Memoirs" (in a very condensed form) by the Swiss statesman and member of the *Nationalrat,* David Farbstein, outstanding as a jurist, social and political leader, upright Jew, and early Zionist. In a fascinating composition of the highlights of his political career in Switzerland, written in his eighty-fifth year (he died in 1953), he illuminates the evolution of Jewish history and the status of the Jews in that country during the last half century. A similarly valuable contribution is from the pen of another Swiss-Jewish lawyer (also recently deceased), Marcus Cohn's "Reminiscences of a Citizen of Basel of the First Zionist Congress." The author, son of the then Rabbi of Basel, reports details of his father's contacts with Herzl and participation in the Congress and early Zionist activities.

Interesting "Discussions with Karl Joël," for many decades professor of philosophy at the University of Basel and nephew of the well-known rabbi and teacher at the Seminary in Breslau, are presented by Arthur Weil. Important for the historian as well as the sociologist is Hans Guth's statistical study, "The Jews of Switzerland Mirrored in Population Statistics." Finally, three outstanding contributions by renowned literary authors are to be mentioned: Jonas Fränkel's "Spitteler and the Spirit of the Hebrew Language"; Margarete Sussman's "The Peace Message of the Prophets"; and Fritz Strich's "Franz Kafka and Judaism."

The volume deserves the earnest attention of scholars as well as generally interested readers. The only flaw, it seems to the reviewer, is the ultra-modern typographical layout, leaving a space of one and a half inches empty on the inner margin of the pages and putting the page numbers in an unaccustomed and awkward place.

GUIDO KISCH

PERSONALITIES AND EVENTS IN JEWISH HISTORY. By *Cecil Roth.* Jewish Publication Society of America. Philadelphia, 1953. viii and 324 pp.

THIS volume contains a selection of the articles and essays on historical subjects published by the author in the course of the past twenty-five years. Some of them appeared in scholarly journals, others were popular surveys or revaluations. "A number of the essays have been selected without any ulterior motive, simply for the sake of picturesqueness." A good many deal with Italy, but Anglo-Judaica are not included, because the author intends to devote a similar volume to the latter topic.

Some of the articles were modified for republication; in those of a scholarly nature most of the footnotes and references have been omitted. For further information or research one must, therefore, still have recourse to the original publications. Only here and there references to more recent literature are added. For the most part, the structure and form in which the articles appeared for the first time remain the same.

In a lengthy Preface the author apologizes for this method of republication, offering quite a number of reasons to justify it. This was surely unnecessary, since scholars as well as lay readers will gladly welcome the opportunity to have an interesting selection of Roth's widely scattered essays quickly and easily available in this useful volume. Obviously, the scholars' task would have been considerably facilitated if the author had brought these writings up to date and provided an index.

GUIDO KISCH

HISTORY OF FRENCH JEWRY

POVERTY AND SOCIAL WELFARE AMONG FRENCH JEWS (1800-1880). By *Zosa Szajkowski.* Editions Historiques Franco-Juives. New York, 1954. 88 pages.

THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE JEWS IN ALSACE, METZ AND LORRAINE (1648-1789). By Zosa Szajkowski. Editions Historiques Franco-Juives. New York, 1954. 152 pages.

THE special place of the Jews in early modern capitalism is a theme on which much has been written. It is commonly assumed that the wealth of the Jews and the so-called *internationalisme économique* determined their specific role in capitalistic development. It seems that Mr. Szajkowski's research on the economic position of the Jews in France is directed against that familiar generalization. From his study of original documents he finds that Rothschild's wealth was by no

means representative of the position of the French Jews and that in fact French Jewry in the nineteenth century comprised to a great extent ordinary paupers.

The author's main contention is that the economic level was the same for Jews and non-Jews; the former were neither richer nor poorer than their non-Jewish neighbors. He does not formulate an objective gauge or relative measure. Indeed, he remarks: "Sometimes it is even difficult to compare economic conditions among Jews with those among non-Jews because the conception of riches and poverty was entirely different in these two environments, and one can not apply the same yardstick to measure poverty and riches among Jews and Gentiles" (p. 73). Nevertheless, Szajkowski's documents furnish positive proof of the poverty of the Jewish Community. He even gives some figures on the number of Jewish paupers (alms receivers) in comparison with the rest of the population. In the Lower Rhine during the 1850's, for example,there were proportionately more paupers among Jews than among Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists. Similarly, in Paris, throughout the nineteenth century, the proportion of Jewish paupers was greater.

The second volume under review is concerned mainly with the legal and administrative aspects of the deprivation of Jewish rights and only incidentally with their position in the economy. Here, too, the author's intention, presumably, is to throw new light on the familiar assertion of Jewish economic solidarity and preëminence in *La Haute Finance*.

The author shows that during the one and a half centuries of capitalistic development the Jews of Alsace-Lorraine were fragmented into some 200 communities with little interconnection. There was no economic contact between Alsatian and German Jews, and Alsatian Jews had but little trade relations with the interior of France. In fact, legal restrictions generally closed the avenues to a livelihood. As a result of historical development, Jews could not enter the guilds; if they wished to engage in industry or trade, they had to do so as "outsiders." Because of these circumstances, they were forced to become small-loan creditors, although money-lending was not confined to the Jews. That money-lending as a typical "Jewish" occupation was due wholly to legal and social circumstances is, of course, the conventional explanation. However, the author shows that far from being engaged in *Haute Finance* or in capitalistic enterprise, the economic destiny of the Jews of Alsace-Lorraine was in fact tied to a feudalized peasantry.

Szajkowski has limited his research to the gathering and description of "raw" facts. This type of economic historiography, although of particular interest to the professional historian, is of lesser value to the general student. The mechanical juxtaposition of statistical data is not sufficient; their import is not automatically revealing. It seems also that the author has stressed legal history at the expense of economic history. Law and administrative relations are important, but cannot

in themselves clarify issues in economic history unless interpreted in economic and social terms.

With a wider frame of reference and with greater attention to problems of unity and organization, Szajkowski's original research would gain greater significance for economic history. Yet, the author has thrown new light on an old problem, and his documentary evidence will be followed by scholars with great interest.

ALEXANDER BRODY

The College of the City of New York

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AND NAPOLEON'S ANTI-JEWISH DECREES. By *Zosa Szajkowski.* Editions Historiques Franco-Juives, New York, 1953. 112 pages.

ON May 30, 1806, Napoleon I promulgated a decree which granted in eight departments of Northeastern France a one-year reprieve to debtor-peasants for paying their debts to their Jewish creditors. He did this in order to combat so-called Jewish usury which allegedly had ruined the peasants of Northeastern France. After the labors of the Jewish Assembly and the Sanhedrin of 1806-1807, Napoleon signed (on March 17, 1808) three new decreees: two concerning the establishment of Jewish consistories and one decree which introduced an exceptional status for Jews for ten years under the pretext of fighting usury. The latter was a law that sought to ruin the Jews economically and to confine them to a low social status. In 1791 the Revolution had given citizenship to the Jews, but in 1808, by his "ignominious decree" (*décret infâme*) Napoleon practically deprived the majority of French Jewry of their rights of citizenship for ten years. Through this last decree and the manner in which it was applied by the courts, Jews were effectively deprived of the sums which the peasants had borrowed from them. In order to be able to engage in commerce Jews were obliged to obtain special licenses which the municipalities refused to grant in a good many cases. They were no longer permitted freely to settle or change residence in Alsace and other places. Subsequently the Jews (Sephardic) of Southern France, the Seine Department, and a number of occupied areas were relieved of the application of the decree to them, but their total number was somewhat less than one-sixth of all the Jews in the Empire. Against the greater number of Jews, located in Northeastern France, the decree remained in force during the entire decade.

Concerning Napoleon and the Jews a voluminous literature has been written, and on first impression there would seem to be no point in turning to this subject again. The present study, however, deals exclusively with matters that have been very scantily, or not at all, dealt with in previous works. By a searching examination of the ar-

chives of mortgages (*hypothèques*), notaries, tribunals, banks, and the like, Szajkowski proves that the percentage of total loans to peasants secured by mortgages on land in Northeastern France was much lower than has been commonly assumed. He is able to demonstrate that the problem of peasant indebtedness, of agricultural credit and usury was not merely a Jewish problem, and even not a problem of Northeastern France alone, as Napoleon I and others had viewed it.

Some historians have been inclined to treat Napoleon leniently, for to them he was principally the author of a proclamation in which (at the time of his war in Egypt) he promised the Jews that he would restore a Jewish State in Palestine. Others have proceeded from the standpoint that Napoleon, as was his habit, was brutal to the Jews, but after all, they add, the Jews did engage in usury and ruined the peasants of Northeastern France, and the anti-Jewish decrees were therefore a necessary measure. By examining the social-economic interrelations between Jews and their non-Jewish neighbors, Szajkowski undermines the theory that there was a justifiable basis for the anti-Jewish decrees as a solution. More non-Jews practiced usury than Jews; often Jews acted as agents for non-Jews in making loans. Those Jews who did practice usury were usually driven into it because of restrictions and exclusion from other occupations and professions. Usury was not purely an Alsatian, but an all-French problem, and the proper way to deal with it would have been for the Government to provide more adequate and more extensive agricultural credit facilities for the peasants, rather than to adopt discriminatory measures against Jews alone.

While it is only a beginning and in its particular line of approach—a detailed study of mortgages, loans, and economic conditions in the area concerned at the time—has only scratched the surface, this is a useful and worth-while study, and it is to be hoped that financial and moral support for a more detailed and extended analysis along these lines will be forthcoming.

JEROME B. COHEN

The College of The City of New York

AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORY

DARKEI HA-YAHADUT BE-AMERIKA ("JEWISH RELIGIOUS LIFE AND INSTITUTIONS IN AMERICA: AN HISTORICAL STUDY"). By *Moshe Davis*. Massadah Publishing House, Tel Aviv, 1953. 155 pages.

DR. Davis merits the gratitude of American Jewry for having so ably represented them to their fellow Jews in Israel. We know full well that most Israelis have little understanding of the problems and strivings of the Jews of the United States. Here at last an effort has

been made to point out that at no time has the American Jew neglected his spiritual heritage. Davis did well to take as the basis for his Hebrew book the excellent article which he prepared for the two-volume work, *The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion,* edited by Louis Finkelstein and published in 1949. The modifications made in the original article exclude such details as are of interest only to American Jews and expand such others as indicate the relations between American Jewry and the Palestinian *Yishuv.*

The book is primarily a survey of the internal history of the Jews in the United States. The emphasis is, of course, on religious life and institutions during the national period. The impression given—and it is a correct one—is that the career of Judaism in America has been a stormy one. Organization followed upon organization, disputes never ceased, division is a permanent feature. Within the limits of his space, Dr. Davis does full justice to every movement and aspect, though, as might be expected, he finds the so-called Conservative group most interesting and promising.

Altogether, this little volume breathes optimism. The author sidesteps the unpleasant aspects of American Jewish life. One would never suspect from this book that all was not well with the observance of, or even loyalty to, Judaism among vast numbers of Jews in the United States. The author cannot be seriously blamed for not having treated these phases of Jewish life in a book of such small size. But our Israeli brothers are entitled to full knowledge of the state of our Jewishness and, in a volume to be written soon, Davis ought to make equally clear, even if he has to be less complimentary all around, how desperately Judaism in America needs a renaissance.

SOLOMON GRAYZEL

Jewish Publication Society of America

EISENHOWER AND THE JEWS. By *Judah Nadich.* Twayne Publishers, Inc. New York, 1953. 271 pp.

DESPITE its inept and misleading title and its opening chapter, designed, apparently as an afterthought to excuse the title, this book must be regarded as an important contribution to most recent Jewish history. Its hero is only tangentially the Commanding Officer of the American Occupation Forces in Germany, and however patent his undoubted good-will, it is highly questionable whether his subsequent career will substantiate, as the writer seeks to maintain in his first chapter, the claim that "in the annals of Jewish history the name of General Eisenhower will always be venerated as one of the great saviors in the history of the Jewish people." All this aside from the dubious taste of such an approach, in modern times, to the writing of serious history.

Chaplain Nadich served for several months after the end of World War II as General Eisenhower's first special advisor on Jewish affairs, and he presents here a vivid eye-witness account of the displaced persons situation in occupied territories. His appointment was without precedent in American experience. The initiative was not that of General Eisenhower, who was, for understandable reasons, reluctant to take the step, but rather came from President Truman and General George C. Marshall, then Chief of Staff in Washington, supported by Stephen Wise, who were spurred by the famous report of Earl G. Harrison on the condition of stateless and non-repatriable persons in Germany.

Pre-victory army policy had not envisaged special treatment for the Jewish victims of Nazi ferocity; they were to be treated as "nationals" of their countries of origin. In pursuit of this program, Jewish displaced persons were to be herded into camps along with fellow "nationals," representatives if not actual perpetrators of the cruelties these Jews had barely survived; rations, clothing, shelter were to be doled out without regard to their unique ordeal of malnutrition, disease, and bestiality; they were to be "repatriated" as rapidly as possible to their "homelands." On the ideological level, this policy was best expressed in the British contention that "it is undesirable to accept the Nazi theory that the Jews are a separate race. Jews in common with all other religious sects should be treated according to their nationality . . . Any form of racial or religious segregation will only give rise to anti-Jewish feelings and may well have far-reaching repercussions . . ." (p. 51).

The problem was admittedly a difficult one—the eternal problem of defining the Jew. To the immense credit of the American authorities they hastily abandoned this "correct" theoretical position, to which the British adhered stubbornly, when the Harrison Report revealed the true state of affairs. "I know you will agree with me," Truman wrote to Eisenhower on August 31, 1945, "that we have a particular responsibility toward these victims of persecution and tyranny who are in our zone. We must make clear to the German people that we thoroughly abhor the Nazi policies of hatred and persecution. We have no better opportunity to demonstrate this than by the manner in which we ourselves actually treat the survivors remaining in Germany" (p. 114). The General agreed, and this sentiment became the basis of the historic decision which produced a complete volte-face in the treatment of Jewish D.P.'s, and the appointment of a Jewish advisor to report on its implementation.

That the Commander's new orders badly needed supervision and enforcement on the lower levels of command Rabbi Nadich makes abundantly clear as he recounts the details of his visits to the D.P. camps and his frequent clashes with obtuse or openly anti-Semitic officers who persisted in the old policy. General Patton, for one, emerges in a shockingly vicious role. Yet there were, of course, others who

displayed their decency and sympathy beyond the letter of the order: The officers, for example, who unofficially adopted the wholly irregular policy of not forcing repatriation of Russian and Baltic Jews, in contravention of the Russian-American agreement; and the unnamed General who helped outwit the Soviet border guards, intent on apprehending and returning Jews fleeing from Eastern Europe into Austria, by "casually pointing to the large map on the wall of his office and indicating several other safe crossings of the border where he knew no Russian guards were stationed."

The heroic activities of some of the D.P. leaders in organizing the people in the camps during this trying period were valiantly abetted by Jewish soldiers in the American army, and by Jewish chaplains, often without benefit of military protocol. Before the Jewish Agency could set up educational, vocational, and recreational programs, members of the Jewish Brigade had already, on their own initiative, brought hope and comfort to the distraught survivors through their efforts to establish such facilities, and their selfless devotion to the physical and psychic welfare of the D.P.'s. The effect on Germans and Jews of the slogan painted on their jeeps, a parody of the well-known Nazi boast, can well be imagined: "Kein Volk! Kein Reich! Kein Fuehrer! Achtung! Die Juden kommen!" Ben Gurion's unannounced visit to the camps had a truly electrifying effect. And throughout the book occur constant references to the work of the J.D.C. and U.N.R.R.A. in improving physical conditions as well as raising morale in the camps.

JOSHUA TRACHTENBERG

Teaneck, N. J.

EPIC OF THE WARSAW GHETTO

MARTYRS AND FIGHTERS: THE EPIC OF THE WARSAW GHETTO. Edited by *Philip Friedman*. Frederick A. Praeger. New York, 1954. 325 pp.

IT is very fortunate, indeed, that Dr. Philip Friedman, an expert on Polish-Jewish history, was able to escape Hitler's "Final Solution." Whoever occupies himself with research into the recent tragedy of European Jewry must be grateful for his untiring efforts to assemble a bibliography that is a prerequisite for writing the history of this most painful chapter of the recent Jewish past, a chapter that is slowly—because of political expediency, possibly too slowly—coming to light.

It is quite natural that Friedman, born in Poland, should, in one of his first comprehensive contributions, present the martyrdom of the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto, as he does in the volume under review. This book is more than a chronicle of events. As emphasized in the Preface by Maximilian Friede of the Club of Polish Jews in New York,

which initiated and sponsored the work, its main purpose is "to demonstrate that although sheer physical force and oppression may accomplish an act of total genocide, they can never destroy faith, ideas, and traditions." Friedman's knowledge of the source material enabled him to select from the wealth of literature the written word concerning the highlights of events. Friedman has not written a monograph, but has chosen from reports, books, and documents quotations describing the events that began with the German-Polish war in September, 1939 and ended with the Polish insurrection, launched by the Polish home army in the hope that the Russian army would support its efforts—a hope that did not materialize. In this last heroic undertaking the few remaining Jewish military units played their assigned role.

It is impossible here to list the material Friedman has used in his presentation, but he certainly searched exhaustingly the already voluminous literature on the tragedy of European Jewry. His book comprises significant reports presented in the following chapters: (1) The German Polish War, September 1939; (2) When Warsaw Surrendered; (3) The Ghetto; (4) Trap for Refugees and Expellees; (5) The Economic Life; (6) A Gigantic Laboratory of Death; (7) Social Life and Institutions; (8) The Morale of the Ghetto: (9) Cultural Life; (10) Genocide at Its Peak; (11) The Aftermath; (12) Life Begins Again; (13) The January Revolt and After; (14) The April Revolt; (15) The Last Chapter.

The Warsaw ghetto revolt is the most dramatic part of the book; it is based on the writings of eye witnesses and reliable authors representing a variety of political convictions. Friedman succeeds, though passionate writing alternates with sober reporting, to interpret the courage, the pain and the passions, the hopes and the desperation that emerged from the heroic but tragic epic of the Warsaw ghetto. He rigidly abstains from bridging the various excerpts with his own writing, yet a logical and continous story emerges.

In one of the reviews of the volume appearing in a communist newspaper Friedman is attacked for not having included in his story the contribution of the Communists and the Russians. I venture to say that such inclusion would have been an indictment against the totalitarian movement, which in the hour of decision deserted the fighters in Warsaw for selfish political purposes.

KURT R. GROSSMANN

New York City

Biography

JUEDISCHE KLASSIKER DER DEUTSCHEN RECHTSWISSENSCHAFT. By *Hugo Sinzheimer*. Frankfurter wissenschaftliche Beiträge, Rechts- und staatswissenschaftliche Reihe, Band 7). Vittorio Klostermann. Frankfurt am Main, 1953. xxvii and 254 pp.

THE Faculty of Law and Political Science of the University of Frankfurt considered re-publication of Professor Sinzheimer's work its duty, "not only to honor the memory of its unforgotten member, a noble person and a great scholar, and of the Jewish classics of German jurisprudence, but also to submit themselves to justice, . . . so that the picture of the Jews who, as German fellow-citizens have lived, are living, and are going to live among us, if destiny will so favor us, may appear in the light of truth. This refers particularly to the picture of the man to whom we owe this work."

The volume was originally published in Amsterdam in 1938. Since most of the copies were probably destroyed after the invasion of Holland, it was appropriate to make Sinzheimer's book once more available. The reprint is unrevised. Upon its publication, the work was reviewed at length in *Historia Judaica*, I, 1939, pp. 127-130. To the new edition an introduction has been added by the well-known protagonist of a just fulfilment of Jewish claims for reparation against Germany, Professor Franz Böhm, who offers therein his views on the catastrophe to scholarship and law wrought by Nazi barbarism, and who evaluates Professor Sinzheimer's personality as scholar, statesman, and man. Unfortnately, the date of his death (possibly unknown?) is not mentioned.

Guido Kisch

OESTERREICHISCHE RECHTS- UND STAATSWISSENSCHAFTEN DER GEGENWART IN SELBSTDARSTELLUNGEN. Edited by *Nikolaus Grass*. Verlag Wagner. Innsbruck, 1952. 272 pp.

OF the sixteen autobiographies of outstanding Austrian scholars in the fields of legal and political science collected in this interesting volume, only one is by a Jewish author, Heinrich Klang, President of a Senate of the Austrian Supreme Court and Professor of Law at the University of Vienna, recently deceased. The author held a highly respected position in the legal profession in Austria also for his widely used Commentary to the Civil Code (*Allgemeines Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch*) and because of his editorship of the influential weekly, *Juristische Blätter*. Unable to escape Nazi terror after the Austrian "Anschluss," he had to suffer indescribable humiliations at the hands of the German barbarians, who finally deported him to the concentration camp of Terezin. In his great modesty and humility, Klang omitted to describe

this sad chapter of his life story, much to the regret of the historian. With respect to it he wrote: "The difficulties and sufferings of life in the concentration camp are too well known to be described in detail." However, the role played by Klang in captivity jointly with Leo Baeck and the great Dutch jurist Eduard Maurice Meijers, also recently deceased, is well known from other "Churban" publications. The few facts mentioned by Klang may supplement these descriptions.[1]

GUIDO KISCH

[1] In contrast with Klang, another Austrian Nazi victim, Professor Ludwig Hirschfeld of Warsaw and later Breslau, described extensively his experiences in Terezin; cf. Wanda M. Bühring, "Die Geschichte eines Lebens," *Judaica*, X. Zürich 1954, pp. 164 ff.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Irving A. Agus, *Responsa of the Tosaphists: Unpublished Responsa from Various Manuscripts.* Yeshiva University. New York, 1954. 304 pp. (Hebrew).

Edward F. Barrett (editor), *University of Notre Dame Natural Law Institute Proceedings.* Vol. V. University of Notre Dame Press. Notre Dame, Ind., 1953. 180 pp. [Includes: Solomon Freehof, "The Natural Law in the Jewish Tradition.]

Allen Cabaniss, *Agobard of Lyons: Churchman and Critic.* Syracuse University Press. Syracuse, 1953. xii and 137 pp.

Philip Friedman, *Auschwitz.* Buenos Aires, 1952. 170 pp. (Spanish).

Louis Ginsberg, *History of the Jews of Petersburg* 1789-1950. Author. Petersburg, Virginia, 1954. viii and 118 pp.

Florence Guggenheim-Grünberg, *Die ältesten jüdischen Familien in Lengnau und Endingen.* Jüd. Buchgemeinde. Zürich, 1954. 23 pp.

Carlo Habersaat, "Repertorium der jiddischen Handschriften," reprinted from *Rivista degli Studi Orientali,* XXIX, Roma, 1954. pp. 53-70.

Sidney B. Hoenig, *The Great Sanhedrin.* Dropsie College. Philadelphia, 1953. xviii and 310 pp.

Bruno Kisch, *Forgotten Leaders in Modern Medicine: Valentin, Gruby, Remak, Auerbach* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, N.S., Vol. 44, Part 2). American Philosophical Society. Philadelphia, 1954. Pp. 137-317.

Ch. Lehrmann, *La Communauté juive du Luxembourg dans le passé et dans le présent. Histoire illustré.* Imprimerie Cooperative Luxembourgeoise. Esch-sur-Alzette, 1953. 155 pp.

Sol Liptzin (editor), *Jewish Book Annual,* Volume 12, 1953-1955. Jewish Book Council of America. New York, 1954. iv and 179 pp.

Raphael Mahler, *History of the Jewish People in Modern Times.* Volume I (1780-1815), Book 2: Central Europe; Poland in the Era of Partitions. Sifriat Poalim Ltd. Merhavya, Israel, 1954. 398 pp. with illustrations. (Hebrew).

Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel.* Cornell University Press. Ithaca, N. Y., 1954. 193 pp.

James Parkes, *End of An Exile: Israel, the Jews and the Gentile World.* Vallentine, Mitchell & Co. London, 1954. xii and 192 pp.

Stuart E. Rosenberg, *The Jewish Community in Rochester,* 1843-1925. Columbia University Press. New York, 1954. xi and 325 pp.

Jacob Shatzky, *The History of the Jews in Warsaw.* Vol. III: From 1863 to 1896. Yiddish Scientific Institute—Yivo. New York, 1953. 460 pp. (Yiddish).

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

HEINEMANN, ISAAC: The Idea of the Jewish Theological Seminary in the Light of Modern Thought 71-80

KISCH, GUIDO: In Memoriam 67-70

KOBER, ADOLF: The Jewish Theological Seminary of Breslau and "Wissenschaft des Judentums" 85-122

LEWKOWITZ, ALBERT: The Significance of "Wissenschaft des Judentums" for the Development of Judaism 81-84

SILBERNER, EDMUND: French Socialism and the Jewish Question 1865-1914 3-38

WERNER, ERIC: Two Obscure Sources of Reuchlin's "De Accentibus Linguae Hebraicae" 39-54

BOOK REVIEWS

Essays Presented to Leo Baeck on the Occasion of His Eightiest Birthday (G. Kisch) 123-124

Davis, Moshe: *Darkei Ha-Yahadut Be-America (Jewish Religious Life and Institutions in America)* (S. Grayzel) 129-130

Friedman, Philip: *Martyrs and Fighters: The Epic of the Warsaw Ghetto* (K. R. Grossmann) 132-133

Grass, Nicolaus (ed.): *Oesterreichische Rechts- und Staatswissenschaften der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen* (G. Kisch) 134

Nadich, Judah: *Eisenhower and the Jews (J. Trachtenberg)* 130-132

Reitlinger, Gerald: *The Final Solution: The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe* 1939-1945 (K. R. Grossmann) 55-59

Roth, Cecil: *Personalities and Events in Jewish History* (G. Kisch) 126

Scharfstein, Zvi: *Hayah Aviv B'Aretz* (When Spring was in the Land: Autobiography) (Th. N. Lewis) 60-61

Schweizerischer Israelitischer Gemeindebund 1904-1954: *Festschrift zum 50jährigen Bestehen* (G. Kisch) 125

Sinzheimer, Hugo: *Jüdische Klassiker der deutschen Rechtswissenchaft* (G. Kisch) 134

Szajkowski, Zosa: *Agricultural Credit and Napoleon's Anti-Jewish Decrees* (J. B. Cohen) 128-129

Szajkowski, Zosa: *Poverty and Social Welfare among French Jews* (1800-1880) (A. Brody) 126-128

Szajkowski, Zosa: *The Economic Status of the Jews in Alsace, Metz and Lorraine* (1648-1789) (A. Brody) 126-128

Necrologue:
Alexander Marx (A Kober) 62-63

List of Abbreviations, see Volume I 1-2

Notices of Recent Publications 64, 136

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS AND SUBSCRIBERS

All communications relating to the following should be addressed to the Editor.

HISTORIA JUDAICA, published semi-annually, is limited to research in mediaeval and modern history of the Jews, with special emphasis on their legal and social relations to the surrounding world. HISTORIA JUDAICA attempts to publish only articles which, as a result of unbiased scientific research, make actual contributions to scholarship.

Articles intended for publication should be written in English and sent to the Editor—not without prior inquiry. Unless this is done, the Editor does not accept responsibility for manuscripts. All manuscripts must be typewritten with double spacing. Detailed manuscript requirements may be obtained from the Editor. Accurate carbon copies should be retained by the contributors. Stamped, self-addressed envelopes should accompany all inquiries.

Articles will be accepted for publication with the understanding that they are offered to this journal exclusively and will not be reproduced elsewhere without permission in writing from the Editor.

Every contributor is fully responsible for his paper. He has to pay the cost of alterations in articles once set up in galley proof. Contributors of articles will receive one copy of the pertinent issue free of charge. Reprints may be purchased from the printers only by agreement with the Editor.

Copyright: — All rights are reserved by the Editor. No part of the contents of this journal may be reproduced, microfilmed, photostated, or translated in any language without permission in writing from the Editor.

Reviews: — Books for review should be sent to the Editor. Books and articles received will be listed, reviewed, or abstracted in accordance with their importance. The Editor does not take any responsibility for the reviewing, listing, or returning of books not requested.

* * *

All communications relating to the following should be addressed to the Publishers.

HISTORIA JUDAICA is published in April and October. The annual subscription rate is $5.00; outside of the United States, $6.50. Single numbers will not be sold. Back volumes, as far as available, are at $12.50 per volume.

Editor:
PROFESSOR GUIDO KISCH
415 WEST 115TH STREET
New York 25, N. Y.

Published by:
HISTORIA JUDAICA
40 WEST 68TH STREET
New York 23, N. Y.