About these translations and transcriptions

Every English translation and transcription on this site was produced by artificial intelligence: Anthropic's Claude did the transcribing, translating and formatting. These versions have not been proofread or checked against the originals, and they may contain errors in wording, numbering, citations or Hebrew.

They are offered so readers can explore and compare these catechisms. They are not a scholarly edition. Anyone quoting or citing these texts for research should work from the original printed books.

English translation by Claude of W. Mannheimer, emeritus acting rabbi and religion teacher in Darmstadt: Das Gebetbuch und der Religionsunterricht, zwei hochwichtige Fragen im jetzigen Judenthume historisch-kritisch beleuchtet (The Prayer Book and Religious Instruction: Two Highly Important Questions in Present-Day Judaism, Examined Historically and Critically) (Darmstadt: G. Otto, 1881; published by the author). It is a historical-critical study in 51 numbered paragraphs. The first part covers the origins of the oldest prayers: the Shema with its blessings, the Eighteen Benedictions and the belief in the Messiah. The second part covers religious instruction and education in ancient Judaism. Pages that open a section carry no printed number and are marked [p. —]. Where Mannheimer's printed references or dates are evidently wrong, they are kept and corrected in a note. Notes beginning "Translator:" are the translator's; the others are Mannheimer's.

[p. —] The Prayer Book and Religious Instruction

Two Highly Important Questions in Present-Day Judaism, Examined Historically and Critically

by

W. Mannheimer,
emeritus acting rabbi and religion teacher in Darmstadt.

Darmstadt.
Printed by G. Otto.
1881.
(Published by the author.)

[p. —] Printed by G. Otto in Darmstadt.

[p. —] Preface

Among the prayers handed down to us by our fathers, the oldest are unquestionably the most important in ritual terms and the most significant in content. How did they arise? Who was their author? From what religious views and circumstances did they emerge? To what historical events and conditions do they owe their introduction into worship? The answer to these questions is demanded not only by the historical interest, now more awakened than ever, in the course of development that biblical-Talmudic Judaism has taken in the past,[1] but also by the religious interest of the present. For decades there have existed differences, not yet reconciled, between the orthodox party, which would keep everything handed down in the prayer ritual unchanged, and the party of reform, which would not merely remove all later poetic (*payyetanic*) additions but would also make changes suited to the times in the oldest prayers and prayer formulas. But it is evident that neither party, particularly with regard to keeping or changing [p. —] the oldest prayers, can be credited with a fully valid judgment so long as it has not penetrated into their essence and grasped their historical genesis. To impart the knowledge and insight required for this is the purpose of the present book. — But in the field of religious instruction, too, there are differences of opinion,

[1] In a letter addressed to their Israelite co-religionists by the committee of the German-Israelite Union of Congregations, dated Leipzig, December 1880, the committee says in item 8, as beautifully as truly: "Let us cultivate the *science* and *history* of Judaism, and honor those who advance it, above all those whose endeavor is directed toward the further development of Judaism toward the goal of humanity that has been before it from the very beginning."

especially concerning the necessary subjects of instruction. I have therefore, relying on long years of experience and study, likewise subjected it to a thorough examination and assessment. To this are joined some retrospective glances at education in ancient Israel, which I have tried to present in its basic features, and at the founding and continued existence of schools in Judaism. On this occasion I considered it my duty to expose as groundless certain prejudices about Judaism that have found their way into pedagogical works, all the more since those who devote themselves to the teaching profession see themselves almost compelled to draw their pedagogical training from such works. —

For the laborious and strenuous work that I have devoted to the preparation of this book I would feel richly rewarded if, in keeping with my heart's desire, it were to help "spread the light of knowledge, and thereby bring about understanding and unity."

Darmstadt, January 1880.[2]
The Author.

[p. —] Table of Contents

First Section. Introductory.

§. 1. Prayer, Sacrifice.

§. 2. Prayer Formulas.

§. 3. The Oldest Prayer Formulas and Prayer Pieces.

§. 4. The Eighteen Benedictions (*Shemoneh Esreh*).

§. 5. The Prayer Book.

§. 6. The Struggles of the Maccabees.

§. 7. Influence of Hellenism on Jewish Views and Customs.

Second Section. The Shema with Its *Berakhot* (Blessings).

§. 8. Blessing to the Creator of Light.

§. 9. Added Insertions.

§. 10. Blessing for the Infinite Love.

§. 11. The Reading of the Shema.

§. 12. Blessing for the Redemption.

[2]Translator: So printed; since the Preface cites a letter of December 1880, January 1881 is presumably meant.

Third Section. The Eighteen Benedictions.

§. 13. The Fathers.

§. 14. The Manifestations of Power, or the Revival of the Dead.

§. 15. The Sanctification of the Divine Name.

§. 16. Blessing for Wisdom.

§. 17. Blessings for the Favor Shown to Repentance and for the Forgiveness of Sins.

§. 18. Blessing for the Redemption.

§. 19. Blessings for the Healing of the Sick and for the Year's Blessing.

§. 20. Ingathering of Those Driven into Exile.

§. 21. Blessing for Righteous Judgment.

§. 22. Blessing concerning the Sadducees or *Minim*.

§. 23. Blessing for the Exaltation of the Righteous.

§. 24. Blessings for the Exaltation of Jerusalem and of the Son of David.

§. 25. Blessing for the Hearing of Prayer.

§. 26. Divine Service.

§. 27. Confession, Thanksgiving.

§. 28. Priestly Blessing.

Fourth Section. The Belief in the Messiah.

§. 29. The Hope for the Messiah.

§. 30. The Nature of the Personal Messiah.

§. 31. Conceptions of the Messiah.

§. 32. The Fourth Book of Ezra.

§. 33. The Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel.

§. 34. The Probable Course of the Belief in the Messiah.

§. 35. The Appearance of the Messiahs Becomes Disastrous for Israel.

§. 36. The Messianic Idea — a Glorious Goal of Mankind.

[p. —] **Fifth Section. Religious Instruction.**

§. 37. Uniformity and Change in Jewish Education.

§. 38. Hebrew.

§. 39. Biblical History.

§. 40. Sympathetic Feelings.

§. 41. Moral Feeling and Judgment.

§. 42. Making Religious Truths Concrete.

§. 43. Knowledge of Self and of Mankind.

§. 44. Post-biblical Jewish History.

§. 45. Systematic Religious Doctrine and Moral Teaching.

Sixth Section. Education and Instruction in Ancient Judaism.

§. 46. Education in the Family.

§. 47. Pedagogical Theories Even before the Babylonian Exile.

§. 48. Schools in Ancient Judaism.

§. 49. Means of Discipline, and Paternal Authority.

§. 50. Continued Existence of the Schools.

§. 51. The Relation between Parents and Children.

[p. 1] First Section. Introductory

§. 1. Prayer, Sacrifice.

Prayer is a natural need of the human heart. As soon as man felt himself dependent on a higher, divine power, he prayed. Prayer formulas he did not know, nor did he need them; prayer welled up from his heart.[3] — But the mere word addressed to the deity did not suffice for earlier antiquity; only the surrender to it of a cherished possession of one's own, the sacrifice, did so. — Moses, enlightened by the divine spirit and surpassing his contemporaries in his religious views, had not, after the exodus from Egypt, announced any intention of introducing the sacrificial cult immediately. And had the Israelites shown a steadfast endeavor always to obey the voice of God, as Moses had commanded them (Exod. 19:2),[4] it would probably have been omitted altogether. But the worship of the golden calf proved that the moving impression the giving of the Law had

[3]Even now, when through advanced culture almost everyone possesses the ability to express his thoughts and wishes in words, there are moments in which a person's heart is wholly with God and yet is unable to clothe in words what moves him inwardly; these are prayers in sighs too deep for utterance.

[4]Translator: Exod. 19:5 ("if you will obey My voice") is presumably meant.

made on them lacked the light of knowledge and the motives for steadfastness, and that they were still in a state of immaturity; and therefore the introduction of a daily sacrificial rite appeared imperatively necessary. —

[p. 2] Moses, however, did not introduce fixed prayer formulas. For "Mosaism did indeed lay an imperishable foundation of true religion; yet this was to develop, be further formed and be perfected only in the course of many centuries. Had this foundation, firm but still unfinished, at once been given expression in a model fixed prayer for the congregation, this would have hindered its development and further formation, if not cut it off altogether. As it was, prayer was left to the heart of each individual, and the wonder-working power of such true prayer stirred ever more freely and mightily in the course of history, until in the Psalms it brought forth the most glorious blossoms and fruits. It was therefore beneficial to the development of Mosaism that no fixed prayer formulas had been introduced in ancient Israel, even though there was no lack of sacred sayings and echoes of prayer."[5]

§. 2. Prayer Formulas.

During the Babylonian exile (in the sixth century before the Christian era) a great change of mind had taken place among the Israelites through the influence of Jewish Scripture. As a result there were many among them who were "mourners for Zion," that is, those who mourned the downfall of Jerusalem and its former glory, and felt a deep longing [p. 3] for the holy city and its ruins lying in the dust. — By the Law they were not permitted to offer sacrifices on foreign soil; hence the house of prayer (בית תפלה [*bet tefillah*]) was to replace the Temple for them, and prayer the sacrifice. Three times a day they assembled for prayer, turning their faces toward Jerusalem.[6] From these prayer assemblies some beautiful psalms may well have emerged, but as yet no fixed prayer formulas. These were reserved for the Men of the Great Assembly, who, according to reliable reports, made the beginning of composing fixed prayers (BT Berakhot 33a; Mishnah Rosh Hashanah 4:5).

§. 3. The Oldest Prayer Formulas and Prayer Pieces.

After the Temple in Jerusalem had been rebuilt for the second time in the year 516 B.C.E., once great obstacles had been overcome, and worship in it gradually received a solemn order, a rite of prayer, according to a very ancient tradition, was practiced alongside the sacrificial rite, and in the

---

[5]These are my own words in the work I published, *Der Mosaismus und das Aegypterthum in religiöser und politisch-socialer Beziehung* (Mosaism and Egyptianism in Their Religious and Politico-Social Relations; Magdeburg 1877), p. 12. — After presenting there the various theories of sacrifice, I concluded on p. 17 with the following words: "The sacrificial system was suited to the cultural level of the ancient world; it was its natural manner of worshipping God. In Israel the concept of sacrifice went through all the phases of development, until it became more and more spiritualized and found its effect in prayer, repentance and good works."

[6]The view handed down in the Talmud (Ber. 20, and frequently) by R. Joshua ben Levi, "that the prayers were ordained to correspond to the daily sacrifices," is certainly very old and may have arisen already during the Babylonian exile. [Translator: The saying is found at BT Berakhot 26b.]

following manner. In the morning the service began in the Temple hall built of large hewn ashlar stones (*Lishkat ha-Gazit*, Chamber of Hewn Stone). The official (*Memune*, *Segan*) called on those present with the words: Pronounce a *Berakhah*[7] (praise)! And they pronounced a *Berakhah* to God, who created light and darkness (יוצר אור [*Yotzer Or*]), and joined to it another for His having bestowed on Israel the light of the Torah [p. 4] (אהבה רבה [*Ahavah Rabbah*]). Thereupon they read from the Torah the Ten Words (the Ten Commandments), the reading of which, however, was discontinued again early on account of the Sadducees; further they read the Shema with its three sections. All this was comprised under the name *Keriat Shema* (קריאת שמע) and formed the first part of the prayer ritual. After they had then also declared that the word of the Torah rests on truth (אמת ויציב [*Emet ve-Yatziv*]), they passed on to the second part, the *Tefillah* (prayer) proper. This consisted of six short pieces, namely the first 3 and the last 3 of our Eighteen Benedictions, which were given the following names in accordance with their content: 1) the Fathers, 2) the Omnipotence, 3) the Sanctification, 4) the Service, 5) the Thanksgiving, and 6) the Priestly Blessing, to which was added, for the people, the prayer for peace. — In the course of this treatise I shall return to each of these prayer pieces in order to set it in its proper light. Here they have been mentioned only because they are to be described as the oldest of our entire prayer ritual.[8] —

§. 4. The Eighteen Benedictions (*Shemoneh Esreh*).

According to Zunz (*G. V.*, p. 367),[9] we have in these Eighteen Benedictions the liturgical work of 5 successive epochs over a period of 300 years. Accordingly, a span of 300 years would have [p. 5] elapsed between the small beginning and the completion of our Eighteen Benedictions, and even afterward there would have been fluctuations and variations with respect to the wording. The first 3 and the last 3 prayer pieces are to be regarded as the oldest component; their language fits the time of the High Priest Simon[10] the Just. . . . Somewhat younger are numbers[11] 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 16;

---

[7]The word *Berakhah* (ברכה) means blessing, benediction, formula of blessing (benediction), but also praise (laudation), a saying of praise and thanks. — The service in the Temple hall or Chamber of Hewn Stone was the model for all other synagogues.

[8]We learn about the oldest prayer pieces and prayer formulas from the Mishnah Tamid IV and V in conjunction with Rosh Hashanah IV. According to the correct emendation of Professor Graetz (*Geschichte der Juden*, vol. II, part II, p. 187), the passage reads thus: אמר להן הממונה ברכו ברכה אחת והם ברכו וקראו עשרת הדברים שמע והיה אם שמוע ויאמר אמת ויציב אבות גבורות וקדושת השם עבודה והודאה וברכת כהנים וברכו את העם שלש ברכות [The appointed official said to them: Pronounce one blessing; and they blessed, and read the Ten Commandments, *Shema*, *Ve-hayah im shamoa* and *Va-yomer*; *Emet ve-yatziv*, *Avot*, *Gevurot* and *Kedushat ha-Shem*, *Avodah* and *Hoda'ah* and the Priestly Blessing; and they blessed the people with three blessings]. [Translator: The base passage is Mishnah Tamid 5:1.]

[9]Translator: Leopold Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (Berlin, 1832).

[10]Zunz places the activity of the High Priest Simon the Just in the period between 240 and 200 B.C.E., as does Jost, while Graetz moves it further back, to the period from 300 to 270 B.C.E. — Simon's standing among the people was great, as was the fame of his deeds that had been left to posterity. His personality, too, commanded reverence. Joshua ben Sirach, who lived later, glorified Simon's personality and activity in enthusiastic words. These in turn served a liturgical *payyetan* (poet) living more than a thousand years later as the basis for a poetic portrayal of the High Priest performing his office with majesty and dignity on the Day of Atonement. There it says, among other things: The priest's countenance shone, when he came out of the Holy of Holies, like the sun when it shines upon the earth, etc. —

[11]For better understanding let it be mentioned here that Zunz designated the individual pieces of the Eighteen Benedictions with numbers.

they beseech the spiritual goods of understanding, of return to God and of forgiveness of sins; further help and blessing, and finally the hearing of prayer . . . . Number 7 now appears partly superfluous, partly out of place. Probably it was introduced in a time of grave misfortune, perhaps under Epiphanes or Pompey, into the middle of the *Tefillah*, which then still consisted of 12 benedictions. . . .

A change also seems to have been made to number 17 on this occasion.[12] . . . . So far Zunz. —

[p. 6] Graetz (*Geschichte der Juden*, vol. IV, p. 71) expresses himself on the Eighteen Benedictions as follows: "From the Patriarch Rabban Gamaliel II there finally proceeded the introduction of fixed prayer formulas. Some prayer pieces were very ancient and already in use in the Temple alongside the sacrifice; tradition rightly traced them back to the Men of the Great Assembly. Such was the recitation of the confession of unity (*Shema*) from the Pentateuch, preceded by praise of God for the light bestowed daily and for His love for His people; further six benedictions on weekdays and seven on Sabbaths and festivals. These parts were firmly formulated; otherwise it was left to the heart what prayers it would direct to heaven and in what words it would express its feelings. R. Gamaliel first had the so-called 18 benedictions (*Berakhot*, eulogies) closed once and for all for daily prayer, which have been in use in the synagogues to this day; their wording was worked out by Simon of Pikole (Pikuli) on the commission of the Patriarch." —

E. Landshut, likewise a learned scholar, in his Hebrew commentary on the prayer book, called *Hegyon Lev*,[13] has assigned the entire Eighteen Benedictions to the time of the High Priest Simon and the shortly following time of the Maccabees, a view that I shall examine in what follows for each individual piece, and accept or reject according to the preponderant reasons. —

Jost (*Geschichte des Judenthums*, part II, p. 45) takes a more mediating path. According to him, the essential formulas of prayer, for weekdays 18 blessings (as he usually calls the sayings of praise and thanks), for Sabbaths and festivals 7, for the New Year 9, had indeed been fixed for centuries; but their filling-out, consisting of larger or smaller introductions to each blessing, remained more or less left to the worshipper himself, [p. 7] until in the school of Gamaliel the more exact form of the prayer was discussed and fixed.[14] —

---

[12]Zunz says there in a note: תפלה "the Prayer," also known by the name *Shemoneh Esreh* (Eighteen Benedictions), now consists of the following 19 pieces: 1) מגן אברהם 2) אתה גבור 3) קדושה 4) אתה חונן 5) השיבנו 6) סלח לנו 7) ראה בענינו 8) רפאנו 9) ברך עלינו 10) תקע 11) השיבה 12) ולמלשינים 13) על הצדיקים 14) ולירושלים 15) את צמח 16) שמע קולנו 17) רצה 18) מודים 19) שלום [1) Shield of Abraham, 2) You are mighty, 3) Holiness, 4) You graciously grant, 5) Bring us back, 6) Forgive us, 7) Look upon our affliction, 8) Heal us, 9) Bless for us, 10) Sound (the great shofar), 11) Restore, 12) And for the slanderers, 13) For the righteous, 14) And to Jerusalem, 15) The sprout (of David), 16) Hear our voice, 17) Be favorable, 18) We give thanks, 19) Peace]. The name Eighteen Benedictions has been retained, although it now consists of 19 pieces.

[13]Translator: Eliezer Landshuth, *Hegyon Lev* (Königsberg, 1845), a commentary on the prayer book.

[14]When the Second Temple was destroyed, the Synedrion (Sanhedrin) was moved from Jerusalem to Yavneh (Jamnia). R. Gamaliel II functioned there as Patriarch at the head of the Synedrion and of the Jewish community from the year 80 to 116 C.E.

In general I agree with this view. For not for nothing do the Eighteen Benedictions bear the name: 18 *Berakhot*, which indicates that originally they consisted only of 18 sayings of praise and not of the corresponding petitionary prayers added later. These short 18 *Berakhot* contain praises of God on account of His exalted attributes and works, which are ever revealing themselves. Linguistically they are expressed entirely in participles, which state the action in and of itself, without regard to the time in which it occurs. It is otherwise with the gradually added petitionary prayers. These bear the stamp of the time in which, and of the circumstances under which, they arose.[15] The matter may have taken the following [p. 8] course. In divine service only the reader (*Sheliach Tzibbur*) used to recite the prayer aloud, while the congregation listened silently and devoutly. The reader, versed in the Bible, endeavored to bring in for each blessing some Bible verses as well, which contained echoes of it and were to be regarded as its proof-texts.[16] But in time the religious need was not sufficiently satisfied even by this. It demanded that the concerns and requests filling the heart be directed to God in an appropriate petitionary form. These naturally conformed to the prevailing circumstances and conditions, especially to the fates that had befallen the nation. And so, gradually, according to the need and the demands of the time, introductory petitions were composed for each *Berakhah*, until finally Simon of Pikole, on the commission of R. Gamaliel, fixed the 18 formulas as a model and closed them for all time. — Not for nothing is this Simon mentioned by name. His merit was great. Our Eighteen Benedictions, to which he gave their completion, may truly be called classical in form and content. The language is pithy and yet vivid, easily understood and going to the heart. It loves compressed brevity and biblical parallelism and, in my [p. 9] opinion, forms the transition from the Old Hebrew of the Bible to the New Hebrew of the Mishnah. — —

Moreover, R. Gamaliel II's ordinance making a firm fixed prayer the norm, from whose form one was not to depart, did not go unopposed; and although as *Nasi* (prince, patriarch) he stood at the head of the Synedrion and knew how to procure high esteem for it, respected teachers of the Law nevertheless contradicted him. R. Joshua expressed the view that a shorter abstract of the 18 prayer

---

[15] By this assumption two passages of the Talmud that seem to contradict each other are also easily reconciled. In Ber. 33a it is transmitted in the name of R. Johanan: "The Men of the Great Assembly introduced blessings and prayers, etc., in Israel." Similarly the Talmud reports, Meg. 7, 6: "120 elders, among them many prophets, arranged the 18 *Berakhot* (blessings) in a certain order and introduced them." Contrary to this, a tradition in Ber. 28a reads: "Simon of Pakole arranged and fixed the 18 *Berakhot* before R. Gamaliel in Yavneh." — Is this not a contradiction? If the Eighteen Benedictions had already been composed more than 200 years B.C.E. by the Men of the Great Assembly, why was Simon needed, around 100 C.E., to do the same thing? Talmudic commentators assume that it had been forgotten in the meantime, and therefore its composition and introduction had to be repeated later. But, I ask, how could so important a liturgical institution have fallen into oblivion under such excellent patriarchs as Hillel, Gamaliel I, Johanan b. Zakkai and many others? That is not easy to imagine. Both passages, however, are in harmony if we assume that the 18 *Berakhot* were indeed composed by the Men of the Great Assembly, but that the composition of the introductory petitions to each *Berakhah* belongs to a later time. These were composed in different epochs, as circumstances required, until Simon brought them to completion. — [Translator: The passages are BT Megillah 17b and BT Berakhot 28b.]

[16] Around the year 1340 of our era David b. Joseph Abudarham published an excellent commentary on the prayer book. — Abudarham was a pupil of the famous Asher b. Jehiel, rabbi and head of the academy in Toledo. — He endeavored to trace every thought and expression of the Eighteen Benedictions back to a biblical verse and to show that it rests on biblical ground. — It may be remarked on this: in the Eighteen Benedictions the poetic form has been converted into a prose form. [Translator: Abudarham is usually described as a pupil of Asher's son, Jacob ben Asher.]

pieces sufficed; R. Akiba held that only one who did not know them by heart might content himself with such an abstract; R. Eliezer, on the other hand, would hear of no prayer practiced by legal prescription, but held that everyone was obliged to pray according to the need of his heart; for whoever prays according to a legally prescribed model, his prayer does not flow from the heart. But R. Gamaliel's view prevailed, and indeed to the welfare of Judaism. For these Eighteen Benedictions, which form the expression of biblical truth and which, despite all variations and alterations, always remained essentially the same, have contributed very much to guarding Judaism against fragmentation and preserving its unified character. —

§. 5. The Prayer Book.

Our prayer book, which has come down to us from hoary antiquity, and which in southern Germany is called *Tefillah* and in northern Germany, Poland and other lands more correctly *Siddur* (order of prayer), required for its complete composition a period of more than a millennium. As we have already mentioned, the Men of the Great Assembly made the beginning of composing and introducing prayer formulas, by which are also to be understood sayings of blessing, praise and remembrance. — By the name "Great Assembly" (*ecclesia magna*, כנסת הגדולה) is designated that [p. 10] body consisting of 120 men,[17] which formed under Ezra the Scribe around 450 B.C.E. and continued for over 200 years, though not with the same number of members, down to Simon the Just. The men of this body, who were called *Soferim*, *Hakhamim* or *Zekenim*, that is, scribes, sages or elders, had made it their task, after the example of Ezra, to explain Scripture, to interpret doctrine and law, to develop them further, to make them applicable to life and to acquaint the Israelites with them, and also to make ordinances that were to protect religion and promote the common good. — After the Great Assembly another authority came to the head of the nation, about which we know more precisely, namely the Great Synedrion (סנהדרין הגדולה [Great Sanhedrin]). Proceeding from the ancient Mosaic institution, it was established that the Great Synedrion was to consist of 70 men with a presiding officer. The Synedrion took into its hands in particular the administration of justice and was regarded as the supreme court. Its deliberations were attended by youth eager for knowledge, whose able minds had the hope of entering the authority itself or of being chosen as judges elsewhere. This authority, too, occupied itself with the order of prayer, as we have already seen in the case of R. Gamaliel II, the president of the Synedrion in Yavneh. But from the schools (academies) of Rav and Mar Samuel,[18] too, there came forth prayer formulas and prayer pieces that found general acceptance. Rav is the author of the *Musaf* prayer of New Year's Day named after him, which begins with the [p. 11] well-known "*Alenu*," further of the יהי רצון [*Yehi Ratzon*] now customary on the Sabbaths before the new moon,

[17] Why precisely 120? Some would see in the Great Assembly a representative body of 120 smaller assemblies (synagogues). In my opinion the 120 provinces or districts into which the Medo-Persian empire was formerly divided, in all of which Israelites lived, were represented in it. —

[18] Rav (Abba Arikha), born 175, died 247 C.E., was head of the academy at Sura; Mar Samuel, born 160, died 257 C.E., was head of the academy at Nehardea.

and others. — Mar Samuel is the author of the beautiful הביננו [*Havinenu*], which takes the place of the Eighteen Benedictions, and of other prayer pieces (JT Rosh Hashanah 1:5; Vayikra Rabbah 189d; Ber. 28, 6).[19] —

The Geonim put the final hand to our prayer book. From about 658 C.E. the head of the academy at Sura bore the title *Gaon* (dignitary). The Gaon Mar Kohen Tzedek was the first to lay out an order of prayer (*Siddur*, *Tefillah*). However, the Gaon Mar Amram (in office from 869 to 880 C.E.) is to be regarded as the real founder of the order of prayer for the European congregations. —

In response to an inquiry from a Spanish congregation he compiled everything that Talmudic statute and the custom of the academies had established concerning prayers and divine service (*Siddur Rav Amram*). This *Siddur* (*Tefillah*) was surely the first complete prayer book to reach the Spanish and later other European congregations, even though there may not previously have been a lack of prayers and prayer formulas that had come there from Palestine. The poetic additions (*piyyutim*) to the festival prayers Mar Amram left to free choice, since in his time they were not yet in general use. — Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, p. 59, says: At the beginning of the Middle Ages Israel's divine service was very simple: there were neither prayer books nor orders of prayer. — In the most ancient times the reader alone prayed at public worship; the eyes of the congregation were directed to him as their delegate; it listened attentively to him and joined in with its Amen or with other fixed refrains. —

§. 6. The Struggles of the Maccabees.

Before I proceed to examine the oldest fixed prayer pieces and prayer formulas, I find myself prompted, in order not to have to interrupt [p. 12] the course of the discussion too often, to single out and briefly present the following epoch of Jewish history. — Alexander the Great, the founder of the Greco-Macedonian world empire, died in June 323 B.C.E. without leaving a legitimate heir. His commanders (generals) fought one another until, after the battle of Ipsus in Asia Minor, they made and carried out a peaceful and lasting partition. The 4 commanders were: Ptolemy, Seleucus, Lysimachus and Cassander. They assumed the title of king. Only the first 2 named concern us here. Ptolemy received Egypt and the neighboring lands, and Seleucus[20] all the Asiatic lands with the exception of Phoenicia and Coele-Syria, to which Judaea also belonged. These were incorporated into the Ptolemaic kingdom, but the Seleucids always kept them in view, in order to seize them at a favorable opportunity and through them to gain a connection with the sea and Europe. The situation of the Israelites under the rule of the Ptolemies remained a very good one. The High Priest in Jerusalem, who was responsible for the payment of taxes — 20 talents a year — was regarded as the political head. But around the year 203 B.C.E. Judaea (Palestine) came

[19] Translator: "Ber. 28, 6" presumably means BT Berakhot 28b–29a, where *Havinenu* is attributed to Samuel (the text itself is at 29a).

[20] Seleucus also received the upper part of Syria, north of the Lebanon, and here he built the city of Antioch (around 300) and made it his residence. — In the historical part I mostly follow the account of Graetz in his *Geschichte der Juden*.

again under the rule of the Seleucid (Syrian) royal house. Antiochus the Great had, namely, exploited the weakness of the Ptolemaic house, wrested Judaea from it and incorporated it into Syria. His second son, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, brought much calamity upon Israel. He, who reigned from 175 to 167 B.C.E., was the first king to undertake a persecution and suppression of the Jewish religion, and he carried it out with cunning, tenacity and cruelty. The Jewish people was to Hellenize itself, and the [p. 13] recalcitrant were all to be consigned to death. At the same time he wanted to make manifest the impotence of the God to whom the Jewish people faithfully adhered and from whom it expected help. He therefore issued a decree that all Jews should henceforth no longer worship their God and follow His Law, but must sacrifice to the Greek gods. The practice of circumcision, the celebration of Sabbaths and festivals — signs of the covenant between God and Israel — the dietary laws, which separated the Israelites from the heathen, as well as gatherings in the synagogues, were punished with death.

On the other hand, everyone was compelled to take part in all the heathen processions and festivities. On the 17th of Tammuz = July 168 B.C.E. a prominent Antiochene, by order of Antiochus, had set up the image of Olympian Zeus on the altar in the Temple, to which sacrifice was henceforth to be offered, and had defiled and burned the Torah scroll found there. Many let themselves be led into apostasy by threats and promises, and these were the "violators of the covenant," as they are called in the Book of Daniel. — But when the bloody persecution had reached its height, an uprising and a reversal were brought about by the family of the Maccabees or Hasmoneans, consisting of an aged father and his five heroic sons, which strengthened the religious-national life of the people for half a century and established Judaism firmly for all time. — After the religious coercion and the desecration of the Temple had lasted three years, Judah Maccabee, through the decisive victory he won over the Syrian-Greek army at Emmaus and Beth-zur, was able to hasten to Jerusalem and carry out the dedication of the Temple (*Hanukkah*) (Kislev 165 B.C.E.). Nevertheless Judaea had to fight for over 20 years more, until it finally won its complete independence under the Maccabee Simon (142 B.C.E.).

[p. 14] §. 7. Influence of Hellenism on Jewish Views and Customs.

The relations between Judaea and the Greeks living in its vicinity became ever closer from the time of Alexander the Great. Just as Jewish colonies had arisen in Macedonian-Greek lands, so in the course of time Greek colonies arose on Judaean soil. The names of many Israelite cities were Hellenized, e.g., Akko was changed into Ptolemais, Dor into Dora, Beth-shean into Scythopolis. Many new cities were also founded by Greeks, such as Apollonia, Philoteria, Seleucia, etc., so that Judaea was surrounded on all sides by a Greek-speaking population. Now Greek culture did indeed awaken among the Israelites a sense for grace, beauty and harmony, for the cheerful creations of the mind; but with them there also entered all the infirmities, weaknesses and aberrations of the Greeks of that time: sensuality, licentiousness, lack of discipline, and they undermined Jewish discipline and Jewish morals. — This evil influence was further strengthened from Alexandria.

Alexandria in Egypt, founded by Alexander the Great and populated by Greeks and Jews, was and remained the residence of the Ptolemaic royal house. Under the first Ptolemies, who on the one hand protected and fostered art and learning and on the other preserved Alexander's tolerance toward the Israelites, the Jewish community of Alexandria attained its highest flowering. But here too, with Greek culture, there entered immorality and love of pleasure, in consequence of which people abandoned the inherited customs and usages of the fathers. Particularly under Ptolemy VI Philopator (222–206 B.C.E.)[21] immorality reached its highest degree. —

It may have been not a little promoted by the teaching of the Greek philosopher Epicurus, who denied the working of a deity on earth, a divine retribution, and [p. 15] placed the goal of man in enjoyment and comfort. — The spread of the immorality of the degenerate Greeks of Alexandria was substantially furthered by the tax-farmer Joseph, son of Tobias. Joseph came to the Egyptian court (around 230 B.C.E.) as Judea's envoy in the matter of tax payments. The king at that time, Ptolemy III Euergetes, took such pleasure in his refinement, adroitness and resolve that he appointed him tax-farmer for Phoenicia and Coele-Syria, to which Judea also belonged, and placed at his disposal two thousand mercenary troops who were to help him collect the taxes ruthlessly. Joseph, who remained in his post for 22 years and often stayed in Alexandria for long periods, had himself admitted there into the Dionysian guild, which was given over to drunkenness and the most shameless carnal lust. And so, with his subordinate officials and associates, he carried Epicureanism and moral rot to Jerusalem, where the Hellenizers had already made a beginning of brooding over the Jewish religion and abandoning themselves to sensuality. — For at that same time there was a large party among the Jewish people, to which the notables and the rich in particular belonged, which strove to win the favor and esteem of the Macedonian-Greek rulers and commanders by imitating Greek customs and ways of life. They were called Hellenizers or Hellenists. The high priest Jason[22] and other Aaronides belonged to it. In order to Hellenize the Jewish youth, they introduced athletic contests after the manner of the Greeks, in which boys and young men had to appear naked. Since Jewish law condemned such indecent conduct, the wrath of the Hellenizers turned against that law, and they [p. 16] schemed to abolish it altogether. Complete intermingling with the heathen Greeks was their goal. — Over against the doings of these Hellenizers there arose a "League of the Pious," or Hasideans (*Chassidim*), whose members clung firmly to the Law and to the ancestral customs and regarded every usage as an inviolable sanctuary; and since they enjoyed a reputation for great piety, they had great influence on the people, whom they spurred on to fight against Syrian rule and called upon to resist the intrusion of Greek ways. Nevertheless, the great mass of the people remained standing in the middle between these sharply opposed parties, far from both extremes. —

---

[21] Translator: So printed; Philopator was Ptolemy IV (reigned 221–204 B.C.E.).

[22] After Jason, Menelaus was installed as high priest by King Antiochus Epiphanes. He was a traitor and a tyrant. After him Alcimus attained the dignity of high priest, likewise a Hellenizer.

The introductory remarks I have given here should suffice even for the uninitiated to find their own way in the subject that now follows. And so I now pass on to the examination and elucidation of the oldest forms of prayer.

[p. —] Second Section. The Shema with Its *Berakhot* (Blessings of Praise and Thanksgiving)

§. 8. ברכת יצר אור Blessing of Praise to the Creator of Light

According to Zunz (G. V., p. 369),[23] the original form of this blessing of praise was as follows:

ברוך אתה יי אלהינו מלך העולם יצר אור ובורא חשך עשה שלום ובורא את הכל: המאיר לארץ ולדרים עליה ברחמים ובטובו מחדש בכל יום תמיד מעשה בראשית: תתברך יי אלהינו על שבח מעשה ידיך ועל מאורי אור שעשית יפארוך סלה: ברוך אתה יי יוצר המאורות:

> "Blessed art Thou, Eternal One, our God, who art the Former of light and Creator of darkness, Maker of peace and Author of all. It is He who in His mercy grants light to the earth and to those who dwell upon it, who in His goodness daily and continually renews the work of creation. Be Thou blessed, Eternal One, our God, for the glory of the work of Thy hands and for the shining lights which Thou hast created. May they glorify Thee, Selah! Blessed art Thou, Eternal One, Creator of the lights."

— As soon as the sun gleamed in the far east and day broke, [p. 18] divine service began in the Chamber of Hewn Stone of the Temple with this blessing of praise, whose sense and meaning, as well as its importance for monotheistic teaching, we can grasp only if we call to mind the circumstances and conditions under which it arose. — For many centuries the Israelites had lived in Persian-Babylonian lands; even their motherland Palestine stood under Persian suzerainty and was governed by Persian satraps. Now according to the Persian religious doctrine there was indeed a supreme god (Ormuzd), who was of the nature of light, who had created earth and heaven, spread life and sought to preserve it, and furthered purity, sincerity and the good in general. But he was not almighty; rather he had a hostile rival in the god of darkness (Ahriman), who constantly brooded over destruction and aimed at the death of creatures, especially of human beings. Because of this opposition the good could not prevail on earth. However much the god of light willed and furthered the good, he was constantly opposed and held down by the hatred and envy of his adversary, the god of darkness, and in this way evil was furthered.[24] —

---

[23]Translator: "G. V." is Leopold Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt* (Berlin, 1832).

[24]The antithetical dualism according to which, corresponding to the beneficial and harmful phenomena of nature, there are beneficent and maleficent gods, is found among all the peoples of antiquity, both the primitive and the civilized peoples. — Zoroaster, the reformer of the Persian religion, developed the opposition of light and darkness, of beneficent and destructive beings in nature, into a moral significance by placing man in the middle of the battlefield and making him the object of the struggle between the divine beings so conceived. — The Persian religion, Parsiism, is sometimes called Magism, because Zoroaster came from the priestly clan of the Magi; it is also called the Zend religion, because its teachings are set down in the Zend-Avesta. —

Prophecy, to be sure, had long since recognized the error of the Persian doctrine of a division within the Godhead and had declared that the God of Israel, the [p. 19] one and only and most perfect Being, had created light and darkness, good and evil (Isa. 45:6–7); that the world and mankind are not pulled to and fro by two mutually hostile powers but are called to unity and to peace. But since the Israelites lived for centuries in the midst of the Persians, Medes and their Magi, perceiving their religious views, customs and usages day after day; and since experience had already furnished ample proof that the Israelites were inclined to take foreign things into themselves and to imitate foreign worship, even that of their enemies and tormentors: their spiritual leaders saw themselves moved to compose a prayer formula in which God would be thanked daily at the morning service for having created light and darkness, a formula, therefore, in which the Jewish monotheistic conviction would set itself against Persian dualism and bar its entry. — By light is to be understood here first of all that ethereal, fine matter of light which we perceive at the rising of the sun and which is the source of life and joy; and by darkness the absence of light, which in antiquity was also regarded as something real.

Further, as the parallelism shows, both concepts also have a symbolic meaning here; namely, they signify good and evil, the goods and the ills of this world. For according to Jewish conceptions the ills or imperfections of this temporal world by no means conflict with the perfection of God and of His relation to it. As for physical ills, they have their ground in the finitude of the world as such and are consequences of the interaction in which the things of the world stand, things which are indeed relatively independent but which at the same time serve a common purpose. They are outward disharmonies which, however, bear all the louder witness to the power of the inner harmony. In their relation to the whole of the world they cease to be ills.[25] And as disturbances of human happiness and as human sufferings they appear, for the finite human [p. 20] spirit, as relatively necessary means of its self-realization, in that they awaken and challenge its spiritual powers[26] and thus become the educating school of its development. — As for moral ills, evil, they are a consequence of the misuse of human freedom. To create that freedom, however, was absolutely necessary. For if the world was to be a revelation fully corresponding to the free, self-conscious primal Spirit, then beings had to stand at the summit of creation who bear the idea of God within themselves as His image, that is, beings who grasp themselves in their existence and determine themselves in their action. Only thereby is the world a whole, perfect and harmonious in itself, that bears the image of its Creator within it. — This optimistic view of the world Judaism has held fast at all times, even under the harshest oppression. But although the ordinance of our

[25] Mendelssohn, in his commentary (*Biur*) on Gen. 1:31, "And behold, everything that He had made was very good," makes the remark: Only at the completion of the whole could it be said that everything was very good, but not at the completion of the individual parts. This thought of Mendelssohn's arose in my opinion from the Leibnizian philosophy, which assumed a pre-established harmony and held our world to be the best of all possible worlds.

[26] It is characteristic of our ancestor Abraham that, although God had from the very first appeared to him as a blessing, beneficent Being, when a famine broke out in the land of Canaan and threatened his life he did not ascribe it to another, maleficent deity, but regarded it as an ill that challenged his mind to devise means of overcoming it. This means he found in the journey to Egypt, whither he went at God's bidding. —

sages to thank God at the daily morning service for light and darkness has had the effect that on the soil of Jewish monotheism the Persian Ahriman, Satan, could never attain reality,[27] nevertheless

[p. 21] a number of ideas from Parsiism did penetrate into Judaism, as we shall see further on. Nor is this to be wondered at, when one considers that, after Alexander the Great had marched into Asia and subjugated the lands there, the great mingling of religions took place, and Asiatic cults found the greatest favor even in philosophically cultivated Athens. —

§. 9. Added Interpolations

As we have seen, the blessing of praise under discussion originally consisted of only 45 Hebrew words; but through interpolations made in it from time to time it has expanded into a prayer piece that now comprises 249 Hebrew words. These interpolations are: a) biblical. First the "Thrice Holy" (קדוש), taken from the Book of Isaiah, was interpolated. In the sixth chapter of his book the prophet Isaiah describes his installation as prophet in the following words: "In the year of the death of King Uzziah (755 B.C.E.), I saw the Lord sitting upon a high and lofty throne, and His train filled the palace. Seraphim stood above Him; each one had six wings: with two he covered his face, with two his feet, and with two he flew. And one called to another and said: Holy, holy, holy is the Eternal of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory. Then the foundations of the thresholds shook at the voice of him who called, and the house was filled with smoke. And I said: Woe is me! I am undone; for I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell among a people of unclean lips, and I have seen the King, the Eternal of hosts. Then one of the seraphim flew to me, and in his hand was a glowing coal which he had taken with tongs from the altar. And he made it touch my mouth and said: Behold, this has touched your lips; so your guilt departs, and your sin is atoned. And I heard the voice [p. 22] of the Lord, saying: Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? And I said: Here am I, send me!" The simple, natural explanation of this passage of Scripture, suited on the one hand to the situation and circumstances of that time and on the other to the psychological process in the soul of the prophet, may well be the following. At the time when Isaiah came forward, the Jewish state was deeply shaken. Idolatry and immorality had become rampant. Untheocratic kings entered into alliances with foreign nations which were ruinous. The rich oppressed the poor. — In so deeply agitated a time Isaiah feels the urge within himself to come forward as a herald of truth, teaching, admonishing and rebuking, in order to raise the people up out of its degradation. But misgivings of many kinds may have awakened in his breast: might he not himself, unawares, have been seized by the general sinfulness? And what success would his words have? Might not mockery, contempt and persecution await him? In this frame of mind he hastens into the Temple. Here in the palace of the Temple the palace of the world opens before him, heaven and earth, the universe. He gazes into it and sees how God is enthroned there in eternal majesty; how heaven and

[27] Compare on this my essay "Exorcism and Judaism" in the *Israelitische Wochenschrift*, Nos. 19 and 20, 1878. —

earth are but the splendid robe that surrounds Him; how His glory fills everything; how in the immeasurable creation everything follows His holy will in harmonious order — and man, he should resist the voice of God, he should not join in the harmony of the moral order? — Pervaded by such thoughts, he feels himself uplifted, purified, sanctified, and made fit and impelled for the prophetic calling. He casts his thoughts into a vision, clothes them in an easily understood symbol, hastens with it among the people, who had perhaps gathered on the Temple mount, and proclaims it as his inauguration. Through their simplicity and sublimity they must have produced the greatest impression. For this "Holy, holy, holy is the Eternal of hosts, [p. 23] the whole earth is full of His glory" is the greatest and most glorious hymn of praise to God; in it all the harmonies of the Psalms sound together; it is the eternal and inexhaustible keynote of the truth of sacred poetry. — As regards the angels (seraphim), we find them, as the Bible relates, appearing now and then from the time of the patriarchs onward, but only as manifestations of the Godhead, with which they were identical, and which, according to the biblical view, at times assumed a human-like apparent body in order to accomplish certain things. Once this had been done, the angels vanished again, returning as it were into the Godhead. Independent beings separate from God were not thought of. Only after the Exile, through the influence of Parsiism, were they no longer identified with God but conceived as independent beings separate from God. They were given a definite form and permanent attributes, and definite functions and relations of rank were established among them. There were now angel-princes or archangels,[28] who resembled the Amshaspands of the Persians, stood around God's throne, and there represented whole kingdoms (Dan. 10:13); yet they were also sent out for the protection of individuals (Tob. 3:15),[29] and they also brought prayer before God (Tob. 12:12). As among the Persians, they were called holy watchers (עירין קדישין) (Dan. 4:10). —

Once the doctrine of angels taken from Parsiism had taken root in Judaism and fused with it in a peculiar manner, it was assumed that Isaiah, who lived several centuries earlier, must already have held the views that had been unconsciously newly acquired and appropriated, and accordingly his vision was regarded

[p. 24] no longer as the product of a poetic-prophetic seeing and shaping but as a real actuality. — The same was done with the prophet Ezekiel (*Yeḥezkel*). Ezekiel, carried off into exile to Babylon with King Jeconiah (600 B.C.E.), lived among other exiles at Tel-Abib on the great canal that connected the Euphrates with the Tigris. Suddenly the spirit of God seized him, he had a prophetic vision; with his glowing, luxuriant, overflowing imagination he beholds the throne-chariot (מרכבה) of God, borne by wheels (*Ofanim*) and animal forms (*Ḥayyot*), and hears a mighty voice which

[28]The archangels received names of their own: *Michael*, the heavenly prince of the people of Israel; *Gabriel*, the Strong One; *Raphael*, the Healing One; *Uriel*, the Teaching One; *Sagsanel*, the Scribe; *Akadriel*, the Crowning One; *Matatoron*. The last is difficult to explain. According to Levy in his lexicon of the Targumim, Matatoron means the deputy of God, similar to the Demiurge in Plato. [Translator: Jacob Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim* (1867–68); the name is usually spelled Metatron.]

[29]Translator: Tob. 3:15 is not about angelic protection; the sending of Raphael to Tobit and Sarah is at Tob. 3:16–17 (Vulgate numbering 3:24–25).

cried out: "Blessed be the glory of God in every place." — The wheels and animal forms are symbols of the inanimate and the animate. By both the glory of God is borne. And the whole vision had the purpose of convincing Ezekiel that God's spirit reveals itself not only in the Holy Land, in the Temple at Jerusalem, but here in Babylon as well; it was meant to induct him into his prophetic office. — But the doctrine of angels that later penetrated transformed these *Ofanim* and *Ḥayyot* too into personal heavenly beings and has them utter this "Blessed be the glory of God, etc." daily. And so the following was inserted into the prayer piece and appended to the "Holy, holy, etc.": "And (והאופנים) the *Ofanim* and the holy *Ḥayyot* rise up with a mighty roar and praise, over against the seraphim: 'Blessed be the glory of God in every place.'" —

b) Poetic (paytanic) interpolations. Already during the Talmudic age (from about 100 to 500 C.E.) poetically minded spirits produced poetic works in order to expand the blessings of praise and benedictions, which consisted of simple sentences, and thereby to evoke a more devout mood. The characteristics of these liturgical pieces were: alphabetical word order, the words or sentences being arranged alphabetically, and here and there rhyme, which, however, usually consisted only in the repetition [p. 25] of identical inflectional endings. True, regular consonance of words and syllabic and verse measure, meter, belong only to a later epoch of the religious-poetic art. — Such a poetic product was called a *piyyut* (poem) and its author a *paytan* (poet). — Several such *piyyutim* have been interpolated into the present blessing. Here we find an alphabetically composed *piyyut*, אל ברוך [*El barukh*], which describes to us how the heavenly lights serve to the honor of God, and how the heads of His hosts, the holy ones, proclaim the glory of God and His holiness.

There follows another *piyyut*,[30] תתברך צורנו [*Titbarakh tzurenu*], which praises God because He created holy ones, servants (angels), who proclaim His words in the heights of heaven. And then it goes on to bestow laudatory epithets upon these angels, כלם אהובים כלם ברורים "All beloved, all chosen, all mighty, etc.," and indeed, as one sees, in alphabetical order; but this order is interrupted, 12 letters of the alphabet are skipped, and only with *Ayin* (כלם עושים) does it resume. Landshut says in his commentary, in the name of Rapoport, that the congregations made this abridgment of the *piyyut*. Finally the *piyyut* says: "All (the angels) take upon themselves, one from another, the yoke of the kingdom of heaven, and grant one another leave to praise their Creator, etc. . . . and all say with one accord and in reverence: Holy, holy, holy, etc." — To explain the content of these *piyyutim*, the following should also be

[p. 26] said. Once Persian views of the Zend religion had penetrated into Israel, they were also elaborated in the course of time; there arose a regular angelology. And once the existence of angels

[30]This *piyyut* derives, in my judgment, from the school of Rav (Abba Arikha, head of the academy at Sura, died 247 C.E.). As can be seen from the יהי רצון "May it be Thy will, etc." composed by him, a prayer customary on the Sabbath before the New Moon, Rav liked to repeat one and the same word often and to combine it with synonyms, as is also the case in this *piyyut*. Further: Rav liked to occupy himself with the secret doctrine (mysticism), and his saying about the angelic beings (BT Hullin 91b), "The angels sing praise to God daily in 3 divisions," is a confirmation of my view. —

was assured, one could easily multiply them to infinity, and people believed they were glorifying the Godhead if, after the example of the Persians,[31] they assigned to it myriads of compliant servants swiftly carrying out the will of their master. "A thousand thousands ministered to Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him" (Dan. 7:10). — — All the interpolations up to this point are to be regarded as an introduction to the *Kedushah*. After it is over there comes yet another *piyyut* (לאל ברוך [*La-El barukh*]), which begins with the account of the sweet songs dedicated to God by the angels, but then turns to the actual theme of the creation of light. Before the prayer piece closes, however, the sentence is also inserted: "Cause a new light to shine upon Zion, that we all may soon partake of its light." R. Saadiah Gaon (around 937 C.E.) warned against reciting this interpolated sentence; the sages, he said, had composed the benediction for the light that is now present, not for a future one. In the prayer books of the Sephardim this sentence is absent. —

§. 10. ברכת אהבה רבה Blessing of Praise for the Infinite Love (*Ahavah*)

The Israelites had by now come to love the Torah. From then on it was to serve them as a guiding rule in all the circumstances of life. The calling to be the bearer and living witness of eternal truth also came more and more into their consciousness. In order to give expression to their feelings in prayer, this *berakhah* was composed. In it they were [p. 27] to thank God daily that He had chosen them in love and bestowed the Torah upon them. According to Zunz (G. V., p. 370), interpolations from a later time also found their way into this *berakhah*. In any case the sentence "Bring us in peace from the four corners of the earth into our land" can only have arisen at a time when the Israelites had already been scattered to all regions of the world. — Some assume that this *berakhah* formerly made up *one* with the preceding one (*Yotzer Or*), and that they were later separated. —

§. 11. קריאת שמע The Reading of the Shema (*Keriat Shema*)

The Shema comprises three sections from the Pentateuch:

a) Deut. 6:4–9: שמע Hear, O Israel, the Eternal, our God, is one and only. And thou shalt love the Eternal, etc.

b) Deut. 11:13–21: והיה אם שמע And it shall come to pass, if you hearken to My commandments, etc.

c) Num. 15:37–41: ויאמר And the Eternal spoke to Moses, etc.

Landshut, in his Hebrew commentary on the prayer book, gives so fine an explanation of the Shema that, because of its excellence, I wish to render it into German and reproduce it here. He says, p. 47: That the 3 sections of the Shema were selected very early by our sages for daily recitation has its reason as much in their content as in temporary and local needs. For at the time

[31] The Persians assigned many thousands of Yazatas (Izeds) to Ormuzd. —

when the Greeks fell upon the Israelites, oppressed them, dealt cruelly with them and compelled them to fall away from their God, to break His covenant, to transgress His laws, and instead to serve their (the Greeks') idols: — then, through the martyrdom imposed upon them, faith and trust in the God of their fathers were truly strengthened in Israel; then the Israelites fought heroically for their [p. 28] faith and went to their death for it. Now in order to give fitting expression to their steadfast, pious disposition and to preserve and strengthen them in it, the ordinance was made that they should recite the Shema daily. In the first section they uttered the confession of the One and Only, as well as the acceptance of the kingdom of heaven. Therein they became aware of their superiority over the heathen, who bent their knee before dumb idols.

In the second they took upon themselves the duty of fulfilling God's commandments, so that their disposition might prove itself in deed; and in the third they remembered the Exodus from Egypt and drew from it the hope of now once again being redeemed from the power of their enemies. — Thus far Landshut. —

In my opinion one might also find the following thoughts in this arrangement. —

Epicureanism and the sensual craving for pleasure had already become rampant in Judea. The spiritual leaders wished to offer the core of the people that had remained faithful a bulwark against it in the daily reading of the Shema. The first section calls upon us to love God above all transitory goods; the second inculcates divine retribution, and even though this is presented in such a way that it could refer specifically only to a people engaged in agriculture and cattle-raising in Palestine, it is nevertheless biblical usage to put the species for the genus, and therefore all kinds of retribution are to be understood by it; and finally the third warns against the lusts of the heart and of the eyes, that is, against sensual pleasure. — The reading of the Shema has therefore at all times been regarded in Israel as something most holy. —

§. 12. ברכת הגאולה Blessing of Praise for the Redemption (*Ge'ulah*)

Zunz (G. V., p. 370) gives the formula as this *berakhah* originally ran. In Hebrew it comprised only 45 words; now, enriched by various [p. 29] additions, it contains 277 words. The first and oldest addition is indisputably the piece which begins with אמת ויציב "it is true and certain" and closes with חק ולא יעבר "it is an imperishable decree." In it is expressed the religious conviction that the word of the Torah, from which we have taken the Shema just spoken, with its concluding promise "I am the Eternal your God," is true and reliable, has proved itself in our fathers and will prove itself in us also. This piece is already cited by the Mishnah, Ber. 2 and Tamid 5. — On the other hand, according to the view of Zunz and Landshut, the second and largest piece, from עזרת "the help of our fathers wast Thou" to צור ישראל "the Rock of Israel," points to a much later time; for it contains fragments of *piyyutim* that have meter (verse and syllabic measure), and such an artistic form was first applied by the *paytanim* to their creations in the time of the Geonim. The prescription to describe in the *Ge'ulah* the wondrous power of God as it proved itself in Egypt and

at the Red Sea is indeed already found in the Tosefta (Ber. 2), composed in the third century C.E.; but these descriptions received their poetic garb only in the time of the Geonim. Rapoport, in *Kalir*, p. 146, also agrees with this. — Now that I have discussed the Shema with its three *berakhot*, *Yotzer*, *Ahavah* and *Ge'ulah*, I pass on to the *Tefillah* proper, the Eighteen Benedictions. Of each of its pieces I first give the literal German translation and then let the explanation follow. —

[p. —] Third Section. The Eighteen Benedictions. *Shemoneh Esreh*

§. 13. אבות The Fathers

I. מגן אברהם "Blessed art Thou, Eternal One, our God and God of our fathers, God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; great, mighty and awesome (exalted) God! Most High Being! who bestowest true benefits, who possessest the universe, who rememberest the piety of the forefathers and in love bringest redeemers to their children's children. King, Helper, Savior and Shield! Blessed art Thou, Eternal One, Shield of Abraham!" — The Eighteen Benedictions could not have begun more meaningfully than with the invocation: God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob! Through it the uplifting awareness was renewed daily in the hearts of the Israelites that the Lord of the universe had appeared to their fathers, blessing and protecting them, and had given them the gracious promise to stand by their descendants as well and to prove His redeeming power upon them. Such an awareness offered them, in the darkest times, under the hardest blows of fate, an imperishable consolation, a never-failing hope. — But therein lay at the same time the demand to emulate the patriarchs, these types of the Israelite people, in their virtues: Abraham — the hero of faith; Isaac — the one willing to be sacrificed; Jacob-Israel — the one who struggles, who indeed strives after the possession [p. 31] of earthly goods but does not thereby lose sight of his ideal goal, the Abrahamic calling, and also wins and holds fast spiritual goods. Earthly blessing was for him a foundation and condition of the higher spiritual blessing. — — "Great, mighty and awesome[32] (exalted) God!" This formula of invocation recalls the founder of the kingdom of God (theocracy), Moses, and the founder of Judaism, Ezra. The former uttered it in that heartfelt exhortation which he addressed to the people before his death (Deut. 10:17), and the latter in the popular assembly convened by him and Nehemiah on the 24th of Tishri (around 445 B.C.E.) (Neh. 9:32). The confession of sins which the Levites then uttered in the name of the people, and in which this formula occurs, was certainly Ezra's work. — This *berakhah* contains nothing that would entitle us not to place its composition and introduction in the time of Simon the Just, or in an even earlier

[32] That the word *furchtbar* ["fearful," "awesome"] is to be taken not in the sense of fear but of inspiring reverence is already proved by the context in which it stands (Deut. 10:17–19). There it goes on to say: "Who regards not persons, who takes up the cause of the orphan and the widow, who loves the stranger (non-Israelite). Love therefore the stranger, etc." — It is gratifying that even a Hengstenberg had departed from the old prejudice and remarked on Ps. 4:4: That is characteristic of the moral spirit of the Old Testament, which consists in love. — Compare Hupfeld on Ps. 5:8. [Translator: Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg (1802–1869) and Hermann Hupfeld (1796–1866), German Protestant Old Testament scholars and authors of commentaries on the Psalms. Mannheimer's dating of the Levites' confession to the 24th of Tishri follows Neh. 9:1, "the twenty-fourth day of this month," the month in question being Tishri.]

one. For as regards the sentence ומביא גואל לבני בניהם "who bringeth a redeemer to their children's children," which seems to point to a time in which Israel was in need of redemption from political oppression, Edelmann, the learned publisher of the *Hegyon Lev*, is quite right when he remarks on it: this *berakhah* contains only praises of God and no petitions, and the sentence in question means only to say that God is wont to send Israel a redeemer repeatedly and often. — I would [p. 32] add: the word גואל "redeemer" could be taken collectively and the sentence rendered: He brings redeemers (many). —

§. 14. גבורות Manifestations of Might (Ber. IV, 5) or תחית המתים Revival of the Dead

II. אתה גבור "Thou art mighty forever, O Lord! Thou revivest the dead, Thou art abundant in help. Thou causest the winds to blow and sendest down the rain. Thou sustainest all the living in grace, revivest the dead in Thy great mercy, supportest the falling, healest the sick, freest the fettered, and keepest Thy promise faithfully to those who sleep in the dust. Who is like Thee, Lord of all powers? and who resembles Thee, O King, who killest and makest alive and causest salvation to spring forth? Surely Thou wilt one day revive the dead again. Blessed art Thou, Eternal One, who revivest the dead."

In the work cited, p. 54, L[andshut] says: "According to the view of the wise Zunz, this *berakhah* too derives from the Men of the Great Assembly. In my judgment the original formula composed by them was very short and ran thus:

אתה גבור לעולם אדני מחיה מתים אתה רב להושיע: ברוך אתה יי מחיה המתים

> 'Thou art mighty forever, O Lord, Thou revivest the dead, Thou art abundant in help. Blessed art Thou, Eternal One, who revivest the dead.'

— — All the rest is a later addition, undertaken by the sages in Israel against the disciples of Antigonus of Sokho. For he had two pupils, Zadok and Boethus, who denied the continued existence of the soul after the death of the body, the revival of the dead and divine retribution (reward and punishment), as is handed down in *Avot de-Rabbi Natan*. And when they and their followers, who were called Sadducees or Boethusians, separated from the rest of the Jews [p. 33] and joined the Greeks, they became thorns and thistles (harmful) to their brethren during the Maccabean wars, since they gave the Greeks help and support against them. Strife and contention also arose between them and their fellow believers about the way in which the Jewish state was to be ordered and governed. Now in order to protect Israel from their views, which shook the foundation of the Jewish faith, the sages made various ordinances, among them this one, that the revival of the dead should be repeated often in prayer, in order to strengthen faith in it in the heart and to bar the entry of unbelief. Yet it was not this oppositional tendency against the Sadducees alone that guided our sages here, but also the intention, in that time of distress, of offering their brethren comfort and reassurance in various sad situations of life. — Many of their fathers, brothers, children, relatives, friends and fellow believers had met their death in the murderous war

against the Syrian Greeks without being able to rejoice in the victory they had helped to win. This must have grieved the survivors. To comfort them, it was to be brought to their consciousness in prayer that God would awaken the dead and let those who had risen feel joy in the work of victory. — Further: hostile armies laid the land waste, there was neither sowing nor harvest; some Israelites lay wounded on their sickbeds; others had fallen into captivity and been led away in fetters, etc. To all of them comfort was to be offered in this *berakhah*: God sustains the living, raises up the falling, heals the sick, frees the fettered, etc." Thus far Landshut. — The learned editor Edelmann adds further that in this *berakhah* mention is also made of God's wondrous power as shown in the granting of rain, because rain, which often comes contrary to human calculation, serves to give, preserve and further life. — — But however attractively [p. 34] this account of Landshut's may read and be received, it corresponds, in my opinion, just as little to the actual circumstances. First of all it must be established that L. confuses the Sadducees with the Hellenizers who preceded them. Only the latter were traitors, who sought to Hellenize the Jews and subject them to the rule of the Greeks; the former, on the other hand, though they differed from the Pharisees with regard to a number of doctrines of faith and statutes as well as legal practice, nonetheless clung to Judaism with body and soul. — Nor does Landshut's explanation account for that simple formula of the revival of the dead, which was introduced more than a hundred years before the appearance of the Sadducees. — Finally, one may ask: why were the bereaved not comforted over their departed by pointing to bliss in the life beyond? It is true that nowhere in Holy Scripture is the doctrine clearly expressed that the human soul, after its separation from the body, lives on with consciousness in a life beyond, even though there is no lack of sayings in which the pious, in their godliness and inward communion with God, found and expressed a sure pledge of their eternal continuance. It was not[33] in the plan and intention of Mosaism and prophecy to formulate and define the doctrine of immortality in a revealed article of faith, [p. 35] but rather to leave it to human thought, to the development of reason and to philosophical inquiry;[34] and here it was the philosopher Plato (born 429, died 348 B.C.E.) who, through his doctrine of Ideas, gave the belief in immortality its firmest support. According to him the universal concepts, which he called Ideas, are supersensible spiritual beings, true being, which come into appearance in individual things. They exist eternally beyond the heavens, which he imagined as a solid plate, in the realm of spirits. The human soul attains knowledge of these Ideas not by abstraction from experience but through its pre-existence;[35] that

---

[33]In non-Israelite circles the reproach has always been made against Mosaism that it speaks only of earthly retribution and not of heavenly. On the Jewish side this reproach was firmly rejected already in past centuries, often with great acumen. Recently I have found in the learned work *Geschichte des Materialismus* by F. A. Lange a new and noteworthy thought, which shall find a place here. Because of its ready tractability, he says approximately, it was not necessary, in order to guide the Jewish people to what is right, to threaten it with terrible punishments of hell. The threat of light, transitory punishments such as crop failure, sickness, etc. was sufficient. It was otherwise with the heathen, who were hard to guide.

[34]That is why it is often said in the writings of the Spanish-Jewish school: השארת הנפש נתאמת לחכמים בעיון וחקירה "The continued existence of the soul has been recognized by the sages through reflection and inquiry".

[35]The pre-existence of the soul also penetrated into Judaism. Compare Rashi on Avodah Zarah 81 [sic], on נשמות שבגוף [*neshamot she-ba-guf*, "the souls that are in the body"]. In the Book of Wisdom 8:19, too, there are echoes of the Platonic pre-

is, it remembers the Ideas because, before it entered the human body, it likewise existed in the beyond, in the realm of spirits. After its separation from the body it returns there again. This was now a powerful support for the belief in immortality. And if, as I have already mentioned in §. 8, Epicureanism had penetrated into Judea, then surely Platonism too, with its belief in immortality, which corresponded more closely to the religious earnestness of the Jewish teachers and leaders, was known and received there. Nevertheless they chose, instead of the latter, the form of the revival and resurrection of the dead and introduced it into prayer, and this happened for the following weighty reason, grounded in historical development. — The prophets had promised the Israelite people the complete restoration of its state, independence, prosperity and happiness. But had this promise been fulfilled? Was the [p. 36] Jewish national life that came into being in the post-Nehemian period in truth a realization of what a Deutero-Isaiah, an Ezekiel, a Zechariah had announced? Could a member of the restored community regard its dependence on Persian and later on Macedonian-Greek rule, its liability to tribute, its confinement to a small part of Palestine, its division into those who had returned home and those who remained in Babylonia, its constant irritation by the cult in Samaria, without the painful feeling that most of the promises of the prophets had remained unfulfilled? Where had the members of the people been carried on arms and shoulders from all four quarters of the world? Where did the nations behold Jerusalem's salvation, and kings its majesty; where had a new name been conferred on it by God? Where were its governors and overseers who were to be called Righteousness and Peace?[36] (Isa. 60:17 and 62:2). — For this reason the sages and spiritual leaders transferred the kingdom of God, to which Israel is called, to the end of days, to the end of this world-period, when the dead will awaken and rise, and when the pious, rising again, will have a share in the salvation of this kingdom of God. Then the promise of the prophets would have been fulfilled in its full meaning. But in order to establish this belief firmly in the heart of the people, it was formulated as a *Berakhah* (blessing) and taken into the prayer ritual. — In our days there are many Israelites who do not believe in a future resurrection of the dead. Nevertheless they can [p. 37] pray this *Berakhah*, because by the revival of the dead one can also understand what is commonly called the continued existence of the soul in the life beyond. — The second part of the *Berakhah* contains general human needs in whose satisfaction God's wondrous power is revealed at all times: He gives rain, sustains the living, heals the sick, etc. —

existence. [Translator: The printed folio "81" is evidently wrong, Avodah Zarah having only 76 folios; Rashi comments on the phrase at BT Avodah Zarah 5a and Yevamot 62a.]

[36]The rationalist conception of the prophets knows well how to distinguish between the divine thoughts which fill the spirit of the prophets and the linguistic, often pictorial, clothing. The latter takes images from experience and adapts itself to the prevailing thoughts in order to work upon the hearts of the hearers, without hoping for literal fulfilment. This distinction was no longer known at the time when prophecy died out; therefore the promises were understood literally. —

§. 15. קְדוּשַׁת הַשֵּׁם (*Kedushat ha-Shem*) The Sanctification of the Name. (Ber. IV, 5.)[37]

III. אַתָּה קָדוֹשׁ (*Attah kadosh*) "Thou art holy and Thy name is holy, and holy ones praise Thee daily, Selah! Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, the holy God." The holiness of God is a pregnant concept, difficult to define. It signifies sublimity, glory, purity and absolute perfection of life, the latter in the ethical sense; but it is not merely self-preservation, on the one hand from everything finite and limited and on the other from everything impure and unclean, but also self-disclosure and self-communication, in that it enters the finite to sanctify it and reveals itself in the world, so that human beings may attain a share in moral perfection. To this last meaning of the holiness of God corresponds here the parallel "and Thy name is holy". For according to biblical usage the name of God means His self-presentation in the world, the side of the human[38] being turned towards man. God's name is wherever God approaches man by way of revelation and lets Himself be known, named and called upon. — "And holy ones praise Thee daily." Erroneously, angels are understood by this. Rather, the Israelites are meant, as Abudarham already remarks. The divine election of Israel is expressed in the predicate "holy people", in which lies the having-been-brought-into and placed in communion with God.

[p. 38] Simple as this *Kedushah* is, there have nevertheless been fluctuations and variations in its wording, and indeed even after the *Shemoneh Esreh* (Eighteen Benedictions) had long since been concluded. Thus Zunz says (G. V. p. 369, note d)[39] that the Sifri, a work from the end of the second century C.E., had before it a *Kedushah* in which the sentence occurred also for weekdays: "Holy art Thou, and awesome is Thy name", a formula which among us is in use only on New Year's Day and the Day of Atonement. — Abudarham writes that in the prayer books of the Geonim the *Kedushah* contained the sentence "For Thou art a great God and King", but the people abolished it.

§. 16. בִּרְכַּת חָכְמָה (*Birkat Ḥokhmah*) Benediction for Wisdom.

IV. אַתָּה חוֹנֵן (*Attah ḥonen*) "Thou graciously grantest knowledge to the son of earth and teachest man understanding (insight). So let us, too, receive knowledge, understanding and discernment! Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, who graciously grantest knowledge." — According to the biblical concept, wisdom is directed not so much to theoretical questions as to the realization of God's holy will, to the sanctification of the heart and of the disposition, and to the fitness of action that proceeds from it. Among the attributes of a wise man belong: דַּעַת [*da'at*], knowledge of God, of His will and purpose, and of oneself; בִּינָה [*binah*], understanding, the gift of distinguishing

---

[37] Translator: So printed. The term *Kedushat ha-Shem* for this benediction occurs in Mishnah Rosh Hashanah 4:5, which is probably meant.

[38] Translator: So printed ("des menschlichen Wesens"); the sense requires "of the divine being".

[39] Translator: Leopold Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (Berlin, 1832). David Abudarham's commentary on the liturgy (*Sefer Abudarham*) was written in Seville in 1340.

between good and evil, wholesome and harmful; and הַשְׂכֵּל [*haskel*], discernment, skill in the choice of means to an end. —

In the Talmud (BT Megillah 17b) it is said that the petition for help towards repentance is placed after the one for knowledge in the order because a man who did not possess the latter could not arrive at repentance at all; for he would not be in a position to recognize his faults and sins [p. 39] and to produce in himself the need for repentance. Abudarham expresses himself similarly. —

§. 17. בִּרְכַּת תְּשׁוּבָה (*Birkat Teshuvah*) and בִּרְכַּת סְלִיחָה (*Birkat Seliḥah*) A Benediction for God's Delight in Repentance and One for the Forgiveness of Sins. (Ber. 17, b.)[40]

V. הֲשִׁיבֵנוּ (*Hashivenu*) "Bring us back, our Father, to Thy Torah (teaching and law), draw us near, our King, to Thy service, and bring us back to Thee in perfect repentance! Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, who delightest in repentance."

VI. סְלַח לָנוּ (*Selaḥ lanu*) "Pardon us, our Father, when we have sinned; forgive us when we have transgressed; for Thou forgivest and pardonest gladly. Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, who in Thy grace dost abundantly pardon."

The commentary *Hegyon Lev* by L.,[41] already cited many times, which from now on I shall designate only by ib. = ibidem, in the same place, says on p. 57 of these two prayer pieces: These two, too, were composed at the time of the Maccabean wars. Certain events that grieved the nation occasioned their composition. The Israelites were forced to draw the sword and defend themselves even on the holy Sabbath, and thereby to transgress the commandment of the Torah, the celebration of the Sabbath; hence the petition: "Bring us back to Thy Torah", let this state of affairs cease. — The divine service in the Temple had died out; on the altar the blood of swine was offered to Zeus; hence the petition: "Draw us near again to Thy service". — Because of the apostates who joined the enemies, those who remained faithful were to pray: "Bring us back to Thee in perfect repentance". — And because the enemies continually led them into temptation to sin, the petition for the forgiveness of sins was introduced. — Ingenious as this historical demonstration of the [p. 40] origin of the two prayer pieces in question seems to be, in my opinion it lacks truth and reality just as much. The interruption of the Jewish sacrificial cult that arose as a result of the intervention of Epiphanes lasted only 3 years, from Tammuz 168 to Marheshvan 165 B.C.E.; then it was restored by Judas Maccabaeus to its former order.

Consequently that petition, referring to the interruption, would have had to be dropped again. The word Torah, too, is taken in far too narrow a sense. Finally, by the word *Avodah* in this context is meant not the sacrificial cult but the actual practice of the Torah. — In my opinion these two prayer

---

[40] Translator: So printed; the reference elsewhere in these headings is "Meg. 17, b." (BT Megillah 17b), where the order of the benedictions is discussed, and that is evidently meant here.

[41] Translator: Eliezer Landshuth, *Hegyon Lev*, a commentary on the prayer book (Königsberg, 1845); Mannheimer names him as "Landshut" on p. 48.

pieces contain such profound thoughts, grounded in the teachings of the Bible, as are of great significance for the moral-religious life. — Once insight into the will of God and into his own self has awakened in the one who prays, the feeling of moral weakness and sinfulness stirs in him: he has not always complied with the will of God in thought, word and deed. He finds the sayings of the Bible confirmed in himself: "There is no man that sinneth not" 1 Kings 8:46. "Before Thee no man living is righteous" Ps. 143:2. "There is no man on earth who does only good and sins not" Prov. 20:9.[42]

None of us all has used the powers God has granted him, and the opportunities He has given him for their application and exercise, so zealously and faithfully that for his own person he became as wise and good, and for his fellow men as important and useful, as he might have become. And it does not stop at mere omission. Even the best among us cannot deny that now here, now there, they have done something contrary to duty, acted against the will of God, yielded to a shameful lust, obeyed an unjust passion, or at least done something that reason and Scripture declare [p. 41] evil. — But together with this depressing feeling of moral weakness and sinfulness there awakens at the same time the uplifting feeling of moral freedom of the will, of free self-determination and of the possibility of returning to God. Without freedom of the will there would be neither virtue nor vice, neither merit nor guilt. Even our noblest and best actions would have no worth if we did not possess the capacity to act otherwise as well, if, in willing the right, we could not also will the wrong, if our obedience to the voice of God did not spring from free choice. Just as little could any guilt attach to us if we were blind instruments, will-less machines, at the mercy of circumstances and conditions, or slaves who have fallen prey to the impetuous demands of the moment.

This, however, is not the case. Our accountability announces itself in our self-consciousness. And Moses, the man of God, before his death impressed upon the people of Israel in the most emphatic manner the doctrine of the freedom of the human will. "I have set before thee blessing and curse", "I have set before thee life and good, death and evil . . . . — choose life, by loving the Eternal thy God, obeying His voice, cleaving to Him, etc." Whether thou cleavest to God or turnest away from Him, it is thine own work, thine own[43] choice. — And this moral freedom of the human spirit, because it springs from the primal Spirit, is never wholly lost in man. And even if in him the inclination to evil has become ever so predominant through company, upbringing and habit, and even if [p. 42] he has sunk ever so deep into delusion, sin and vice — he still always possesses, in his God-descended moral freedom, the capacity and the strength to tear himself away from the errors of delusion, the frenzy of sin, the night of vice, and to return to duty, to virtue, to God, who receives the penitent and forgives his sins. — In the words of the immortal prophets we continually

---

[42] Translator: The words quoted are those of Eccl. 7:20; Prov. 20:9 expresses a similar thought ("Who can say, I have made my heart clean?").

[43] Judaism therefore decisively rejects the theory of absolute depravation, a total corruption of human nature, or deprivation of the powers for good, brought about by the sin of Adam; likewise philosophical determinism, according to which man in his moral resolutions is dependent on something lying outside him. —

hear the voice resounding aloud that calls to return, that wakes the sinners from their slumber and seeks to free the sunken strength of holy striving from the bonds of sin. But in them we also hear the sweet message of peace which promises God's grace to those who have returned in penitence, and brings them salvation and blessing.

"Return, O Israel, to the Eternal thy God . . . . I will be (so refreshing) as the dew unto Israel" Hos. 3:2, 6.[44] "Return unto Me, and I will return unto you" Mal. 3:7. — And when the voice of the prophets had died away, it was to find its echo in daily prayer. Daily temptation approaches man. "The sinful impulse renews itself in man every day", says the Talmud, BT Kiddushin 30b,[45] and daily the Israelite is to be summoned, or rather to summon himself, to return to God, to the purification and cleansing of his inner self. And if his striving is earnest, he finds help with God, as the Talmud likewise says, BT Shabbat 104a: "Whoever is in earnest about becoming pure and clean, to him God grants the strength and help for it; but whoever wishes to give himself over to sin, to him the doors are opened for it." — On No. VI it should be remarked: the biblical word אֱמוּנָה [*emunah*], faith, trust, which denotes the *state* of firmness and constancy of the heart in holding fast to God and His promise, also includes devotion to the merciful, sin-effacing God and His grace of promise. Isa. 44:22: "I blot out thy sins like a cloud; return unto Me, I redeem thee." —

[p. 43] As in No. V the word וְהַחֲזִירֵנוּ [*ve-haḥazirenu*], so here the word מְחַל [*meḥal*] is New Hebrew. It stands parallel to the biblical Hebrew סְלַח [*selaḥ*], but is nevertheless, strictly speaking, somewhat different from it. The sensory root meaning of סלח is: to separate, to sever, and the figurative meaning is: to detach sin, to annihilate it; whereas the sensory meaning of מחל is: to be weak, slack, and the figurative: to weaken sin, to enfeeble it. The same distinction can be found in the German translation. The prefix "ver" means "away". *Verzeihen* [to pardon] thus means *wegzeihen*, to accuse no longer, to regard the sin as not having happened; whereas *vergeben* [to forgive] merely means to give away, to push aside. —

§. 18. בִּרְכַּת הַגְּאוּלָּה (*Birkat ha-Ge'ullah*) Benediction for Redemption. (BT Megillah 17b.)

VII. רְאֵה בְעָנְיֵנוּ (*Re'eh ve-onyenu*) "Behold our affliction, plead our cause and redeem us speedily for Thy name's sake. Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, Redeemer of Israel." — ib. 57: When the war with the Syrian Greeks dragged on, and Israel, hard pressed on all sides, no longer had any confidence in its own strength, in sword and bow, it turned to God that He might plead its cause, etc. — But since at that time the brave Maccabees stood at the head of the hosts, fought against the enemies with courage and perseverance and finally defeated them, there was no reason for the Israelites to give themselves over to a lasting, total despondency. The introduction into daily prayer of the petition for redemption from political oppression certainly took place only at the time of the

[44] Translator: So printed; the verses are Hos. 14:2 and 14:6.

[45] Translator: The print reads "Kidd. 306", evidently for 30b.

dissolution of the Jewish state by the Romans. Judea, it is true, had fallen into dependence on Rome long before. In the disputes over the throne which had [p. 44] broken out around 62 B.C.E. between the two brothers Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, these degenerate descendants of the Maccabees, both turned to Pompey, the commander-in-chief of all the Roman troops in Asia. To the Romans it was always welcome to be able to meddle in foreign quarrels. Pompey accepted the office of arbiter, but immediately afterwards appeared as master and conqueror. Under some pretext city and Temple were conquered by him, on which occasion his troops wrought a terrible slaughter among the patriots, who did not want to hand Judea over to the Romans without a fight. Not long afterwards the Roman proconsul Gabinius, in order to break its unity and power, divided Judea into 5 districts independent of one another and set a separate Sanhedrin over each. Around 52 B.C.E. the patriots had considered the moment favourable to shake off the Roman yoke; but courage and bravery could not make up for the lack of discipline and unified leadership. They did gather an army and fought bravely; but they were nevertheless defeated, and those who did not perish in battle were sold as slaves. At that time many Jews are said to have emigrated to China, Asia Minor and the Ionian islands. — Now even if already at that time the small Jewish people could have had little hope of tearing itself from the embrace of mighty Rome by natural means, it is nevertheless quite improbable that the petition for redemption from political oppression had already been introduced into public worship then. For not long afterwards Herod came to the throne of Judea with the help of Rome. How could this cruel tyrant, against whom and against whose successors, Romanizers all, popular uprisings frequently broke out, have tolerated that every day in the Temple synagogue the complaint should be loudly uttered about the misery in which the people languished, and God be called upon for redemption? Even the high priests, mostly creatures of the Herodians, would not have permitted it. The prayer piece in question can therefore have been introduced only after the dissolution of the state.

[p. 45] §. 19. בִּרְכַּת הָרְפוּאָה וְהַשָּׁנִים (*Birkat ha-Refu'ah ve-ha-Shanim*) Benediction for the Healing of the Sick and for the Blessing of the Year. (BT Megillah 17b.)

VIII. רְפָאֵנוּ (*Refa'enu*) "Heal us, and we shall be healed; help us, and we shall be helped; for Thou art our glory. Bring perfect healing to all our wounds; for a God, a King, a faithful and merciful physician art Thou. Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, who healest the sick."

IX. בָּרֵךְ עָלֵינוּ (*Barekh aleinu*) "Bless us, O Eternal our God, this year and its fruits of every kind for good; grant dew and rain for a blessing upon the earth; satisfy us with Thy goodness and bless this year too like the good years. Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, who blessest the years." — Prayer piece No. VIII offers us a telling example that my assertion, put forward in §. 4, that the Eighteen Benedictions arose gradually through the transformation of Bible verses into the language of prayer, or rather into the form of petition, is a correct one. — "Heal us, and we shall be healed; help us, and we shall be helped, etc." is a verse in Jer. 17:14. — "Bring perfect healing for all our wounds" corresponds to a verse in Ps. 103:4, "Who healeth all thy diseases", and to one in Job

5:10, "He woundeth and bindeth up".[46] — "For a faithful and merciful physician art Thou" agrees with Exod. 15:26, "I am the Eternal, thy physician." —

In No. IX the Sephardim (Spanish and Portuguese Jews) differ in many ways from the Ashkenazim (German and Polish Jews). The following sentences stand in the Sephardic prayer books but not in ours: "Fill our storehouses with abundance, satisfy the whole world with Thy goodness, fill our hands with Thy blessing and the fullness of Thy gifts, guard and preserve this year from evil, from destruction and visitation, prepare for it a peace rich in hope, spare and have mercy on all its kinds of fruit and grain, and bless it with beneficent rain, etc." [p. 46] For the summer a shorter formula was in use; in it, too, "dew" stood instead of "rain". — Abudarham censures the people for saying: "Have mercy on us and on the fruits of the field, etc.", since the blessing is to be implored not only for us Israelites but for all human beings. —

§. 20. קִבּוּץ גָּלֻיּוֹת (*Kibbutz Galuyot*) The Ingathering of Those Banished into Exile. (BT Megillah 17b.)

X. תְּקַע (*Teka*) "Sound the great shofar for our freedom; lift up the banner to gather our exiles from the four ends of the earth. Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, who gatherest the outcasts of Thy people Israel." —

To the view expressed ib. 59, that by the exiles and outcasts are meant the Israelites carried away by Shalmaneser (715 B.C.E.)[47] and Nebuchadnezzar (586 B.C.E.) and dwelling dispersed in the extensive Persian-Babylonian lands, I must decidedly object. For, according to reliable reports, Cyrus, after taking possession of Babylonia, gave the deported Israelites their freedom again; he permitted them to return to Palestine, to rebuild Jerusalem and to restore the Temple (536 B.C.E.). Darius Hystaspes even gave orders that the building of the Temple be paid for out of the royal revenues and that, in addition, sacrificial animals, wheat, salt, wine and oil be supplied (516 B.C.E.); and Artaxerxes Longimanus, under whose reign Ezra returned to Palestine with a considerable band of Jews, donated votive gifts of gold and silver for the sanctuary in Jerusalem (458 B.C.E.). It is true that only the smallest part of the exiles made use of the permission to return; the greater part remained living in the Persian-Babylonian lands, because they had grown fond of their new home. But since it depended on each individual's pleasure [p. 47] whether he wished to return to Palestine or not, and this not merely under Persian but later also under Macedonian-Greek rule, the introduction of the petition "Sound the great shofar for our liberation[48] etc." would have been a veritable absurdity throughout that entire period. I therefore agree with Zunz that this prayer piece was introduced only at the time of the dissolution of the state by the Romans (around 70 C.E.). For when, after a terrible struggle in which over a million Jews are said to have perished,

---

[46] Translator: So printed; the verses quoted are Ps. 103:3 and Job 5:18.

[47] Translator: So printed; the deportation from Samaria is usually dated 722/721 B.C.E.

[48] The word חֵרוּת [*ḥerut*], liberation, is the opposite of the word עַבְדוּת [*avdut*], servitude, slavery, which, however, did not exist at that time.

and which ended with the complete destruction and razing of Jerusalem and the Temple, the last remnant of political independence had perished, the lot of the survivors was and remained a dreadful, horrifying one. Over 90,000 were taken prisoner. Some of these were condemned to death by a court-martial, many were taken to the mines of Egypt or sold into slavery at slave markets, and the most stately among them were torn to pieces in combats with wild beasts for the entertainment of the barbarians. — The whole land round about was covered with heaps of ruins; the dwelling places of the people presented a sight of misery. There remained only weaklings whom the war had spared, or widows and orphans who, without anyone to take them in, searched in vain for bread. The fields remained unsown, and the spontaneous produce of the soil became the prey of wild hordes who roamed about the abandoned territory. — And despite all this, the small remnant that was left did not remain without hope, this constant companion of the people of Israel. The Roman arms had conquered only the Jews, not Judaism, not the spirit that animated them, and this hope they expressed in our prayer piece: "Sound the great shofar for our freedom, etc.", that is, so direct [p. 48] destinies that the jubilant tones of freedom may again resound among us who languish in servitude.

§. 21. בִּרְכַּת הַדִּין (*Birkat ha-Din*) Benediction for Just Judgment. (BT Megillah 17b.)

XI. הָשִׁיבָה (*Hashivah*) "Restore our judges as at first and our counsellors as of old, remove from us sorrow and sighing, reign Thou alone over us in love and mercy, and let us be justified in judgment. Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, who lovest right and justice." —

Ib. 59 L. says: "The scholar mentioned (Zunz) counts this *Berakhah* among those which were composed latest, namely in the time of the Romans, before or after the destruction of the Temple. But in my opinion, he continues, this *Berakhah* too arose at the time of the Maccabean wars. At that time truth, right and justice had vanished from the land. The victorious enemies set up their own law as the standard for the defeated Jews, and whoever had a lawsuit was not permitted to turn to Jewish judges, who had moreover been driven out, but only to Hellenizers. In this distress they cried to God: Grant us judges as of old, etc. But when the Maccabees had won, the Jewish judges, too, were reinstated, who judged the people according to Jewish (divine) law and with justice, and the emergency ended. This event was so precious to the people that a special day of remembrance was instituted for it, namely the 24th of the month of Av, as reported to us in the Fast Chronicle, chap. 4 and 5 (*Megillat Ta'anit*). — Against the view of Landshut, however, I must declare myself for the following reasons. Nowhere do we find that the Syrian Greeks, in their invasion of Judea, displaced Jewish law (civil and criminal law) and put their own in its place. Even of Antiochus Epiphanes this is [p. 49] not reported. And as for the cited passages of the Fast Chronicle, they have no reference to the Syrian Greeks but to the Sadducees.

Between these and the Pharisees there were differences not only regarding many a doctrine of faith or ritual custom but also regarding the law of inheritance and criminal law. Already Hyrcanus I, towards the end of his life (he died 106 B.C.E.), breaking away entirely from the Pharisees and

joining the Sadducees, had driven the former out of all high offices and filled the Temple offices, the High Council (Sanhedrin) and the courts with men of Sadducean outlook; and although between Hyrcanus's second successor, Alexander Jannai, and the Pharisees a tolerable relationship was at first established through the influence of Simeon ben Shetah, so that even the High Council was again purged of its Sadducean members, a short time afterwards Alexander again appeared as a decided opponent of the Pharisaic teaching and made this known in an offensive manner. From then on he persecuted the Pharisees with bitter hatred and harsh cruelty. The bloody uprisings that broke out against him from time to time as a result he did indeed suppress each time with his Pisidian and Cilician mercenaries, but thereby the strength of Judea was weakened and its later decline prepared. This deplorable state of affairs lasted until the year 79 B.C.E. Then Hyrcanus[49] died. But before his death he had advised his wife Salome, whom he had appointed regent, to reconcile herself with the Pharisaic party, to which the people adhered. This she then did, and so the Sanhedrin was once again filled with Pharisees. — To these events refer the 2 days of remembrance cited by L. from the Fast Chronicle, events that occurred only when the Maccabean wars, into which L. places them, had been over for more than 60 years. — Let us look at the matter still more closely. Of the two passages cited from the Fast Chronicle, the one, a short heading, reads: "On the 24th of Av we returned to [p. 50] our law (the Pharisaic law of inheritance)" (one may therefore not fast on it), and the second, likewise a short heading: "On the 14th of Av the (Sadducean) penal code was abandoned" (on it, too, all public mourning must be suspended). These are thus anti-Sadducean days of remembrance, which were introduced as half-holidays at the time when, under Queen Salome (around 78 B.C.E.), Judah ben Tabbai and Simeon ben Shetah undertook to reorganize the Sanhedrin in the Pharisaic manner, to improve the administration of justice, and to make such arrangements as corresponded to the needs of the time. — But our prayer piece can just as little have been taken into the rite now as during the Maccabean wars. For had the Sanhedrin been filled with Sadducees, they would certainly not have permitted such distrust of them to be expressed in public worship as is contained in the petition: Grant us again judges and counsellors like the former ones. And had the Pharisees been at the helm, this petition, in the prevailing opinion, would have been pointless. — I therefore agree with Zunz's view that this prayer piece was composed and introduced either after the dissolution of the kingdom (70 C.E.) or shortly before. Around the year 6 C.E. Judea was made a Roman province and administered by a Roman procurator. As is well known, the Romans used to keep the feeling of subjection alive among conquered peoples by oppressing them with harsh taxes and introducing Roman law and Roman jurisdiction among them. That was now also the case with the Jews, and so the petition was entirely appropriate: Grant us again our just and wise judges and our own administration of justice. —

[49] Translator: So printed; the context (and the date) shows that Alexander Jannai, Salome's husband, is meant.

[p. 51] **§. 22. בִּרְכַּת הַצַּדּוּקִים (*Birkat ha-Tseddukim*) or בִּרְכַּת הַמִּינִים (*Birkat ha-Minim*) Benediction concerning the Sadducees or the *Minim*. (BT Megillah 17b; Ber. 19a.)**[50]

XII. וְלַמַּלְשִׁינִים (*Ve-la-malshinim*) "For the slanderers let there be no hope, and may all evildoers perish all at once and all be speedily cut off; and the arrogant do Thou cripple and humble forthwith. Blessed art Thou, O Eternal, who breakest the enemies and humblest the arrogant." —

ib. 60 L. says: There is a tradition in the Talmud that Samuel the Younger composed this *Berakhah* against the Sadducees. In BT Berakhot 29a and BT Megillah 17b it is handed down: "Simeon of Pakole composed 18 *Berakhot* before Rabbi Gamaliel in Yavneh. Then R. Gamaliel said to the sages: Is there anyone among you able to compose a *Berakhah* against the Sadducees? Then Samuel the Younger stood up and composed one. A year later, when Samuel again led the prayer, he had forgotten it. He pondered for a while (in order to remember it exactly), etc." So far the Talmud. — L. now continues: The Sadducees were at this time a stumbling block for Israel. Not only in their religious views but also in their conduct they deviated from the Pharisees. The sages often held disputations with them in order to lead them onto the right path, but without success. (See *Megillat Ta'anit* chap. 1 ff.) In Sanh. 13 it is handed down that the Sadducees denied the revival of the dead. Yet all this is not the reason why they were hated by the Israelites. This lies rather in the fact that some of them, in order to ingratiate themselves, became traitors and accusers of their brethren before the Romans and caused the latter much suffering.

When now the measure of their deeds was full, [p. 52] R. Gamaliel, *Nasi* and head, called upon the sages to compose a formula of imprecation against them and to pronounce it in public prayer, and Samuel complied with this call; yet he himself may not have shared the hatred against the opponents; for love of his fellow men had struck deep root in his heart, as the motto preserved from him in the Sayings of the Fathers (chap. 4) testifies, which reads: "When thine enemy falleth, rejoice not, and when he stumbleth, exult not, etc." This is indeed a verse borrowed from Proverbs (24:7);[51] but since it had become the motto of his disposition and conduct, this proves that true piety of heart dwelt in him. And from the circumstance that a year later Samuel had forgotten the formula of imprecation, it follows that he did not use it in prayer and therefore could not easily remember it. Only out of respect for the *Nasi* Gamaliel and to comply with his call had he earlier composed this formula of imprecation. — And R. Gamaliel himself is to be excused in view of other men of firm character who at all times were wont to hate those who fell away from their ancestral religion. Indeed, the heads and leaders of all confessions have from time immemorial hated those who broke through their religious creed and fell away from it more[52] than those who by their birth stood outside it and therefore denied it. —

---

[50] Translator: So printed; the text below correctly gives BT Berakhot 29a (the account begins on 28b).

[51] Translator: So printed; the verse is Prov. 24:17, quoted by Samuel the Younger in Mishnah Avot 4:19.

[52] Through the influence of education and enlightenment, tolerance has in our century made headway also with regard to converts, and will spread more and more.

But since for centuries this formula of imprecation offered the enemies of Israel, such as Eisenmenger[53] and his associates, a welcome occasion to kindle hatred and contempt against the Israelites, in more recent times a number of rabbis and scholars have done quite well to emend the word מַלְשִׁינִים [*malshinim*] "slanderers" into מַלְשִׁינוּת [*malshinut*] "slander", and [p. 53] to remove entirely the word עוֹשֵׂי [*osei*] "doers" before רִשְׁעָה [*rish'ah*] "evil, wickedness", and the like. — Note well: in the prayers for the New Year festival our compilers of prayers guarded against such harsh expressions. There it says: "injustice will fall silent, wickedness vanish like smoke, the dominion of iniquity Thou wilt drive away," etc. (Here, then, one prays not for the downfall of the wicked but of wickedness.) And in this they acted in the spirit of Beruriah,[54] who, according to BT Berakhot 10a, said to her husband Rabbi Meir: It does not say חוֹטְאִים [*hot'im*] "the sinners" but חֲטָאִים [*hata'im*] "the sins". And if some Talmudists held the view of R. Meir that the fall of the wicked gives God joy, these were merely individuals who disappeared among the great majority who maintained the opposite. To this majority belonged in particular R. Levi in *Yalkut Tehillim* no. 43; R. Joshua b. Levi in BT Megillah 10 [f. 10]; R. Aha and R. Tarfon in *Shoher Tov* on Ps. 7. — The Kabbalists, too, agree; for in the *Midrash ha-Ne'lam*, f. 105, it says: Rabbi taught: A person is obliged to pray for the wicked, that they may turn to the good and not come into Gehinnom; but it is not permitted to pray that the wicked should vanish from the earth; for had God removed the idolater Terah from the world, Abraham would not have come into the world; the tribes of Israel, King David, the Messiah would not have come into being; the Torah would not have been given; and all those righteous men, pious men, prophets would not have come into existence. Even R. Meir seems, through his wife's instruction, to have departed from [p. 54] his harsh judgment of the wicked, as is evident from BT Sanhedrin 46a. — To this ingenious explanation of the origin of the formula of imprecation against the Sadducees or *Minim* I have the following to add. In the last century before the destruction of the Temple, uprisings against the Romans had taken place from time to time, which were always bloodily suppressed, until finally a war of several years broke out between little Judea and great, mighty Rome, which ended with the destruction of the former. During this time a shift and transformation took place among the Jewish parties as a result of changed circumstances and conditions. The Sadducees ceased to be a popular party, and shortly after the dissolution of the kingdom one no longer had any correct notion of the former Sadduceeism; the Sadducee was identified with the freethinker, the *Minaean* (*Min*), who denied the teachings of religion. From the midst of such *Minim* came many Romanizers, who strove to Romanize the Jews, to introduce Roman customs, and to accuse and slander those who remained

[53] Translator: Johann Andreas Eisenmenger (1654–1704), author of the anti-Jewish polemic *Entdecktes Judenthum* (1700).

[54] In BT Berakhot 10a the following is related. Certain evildoers who lived in the neighbourhood of R. Meir troubled him greatly. R. Meir prayed to God that they might die. Then his wife Beruriah said to him: What do you think? Because it is written (Ps. 104:35): "Let the sinners vanish"? No, it does not say the sinners but the sins. R. Meir finally prayed for them, and they repented.

faithful before the Roman authorities; and against these accusers and slanderers the formula of imprecation was introduced.[55] —

§. 23. בִּרְכַּת רוֹמְמוּת הַצַּדִּיקִים (*Birkat Romemut ha-Tsaddikim*) Benediction for the Exaltation of the Righteous. (BT Megillah 17b.)

XIII. עַל הַצַּדִּיקִים (*Al ha-tsaddikim*) "Over the righteous, over the pious, over the elders of Thy people, the house of Israel, over the remnant of their scribes, over the righteous proselytes and over us all let Thy compassion be stirred, O Eternal our God! and grant good [p. 55] reward to all who trust in your name; grant us our portion with them forever,[56] and let us not be put to shame, for in you do we trust. Blessed are you, Eternal, support and trust of the righteous." — Ibid., p. 62, it says: "The expressions contained in this *Berakhah* (benediction) point to occurrences of the Maccabean (Hasmonean) period: the righteous (*Tsaddikim*), the pious (Hasideans), the elders of your people (*Zekenim*), the scribes (*Soferim*), the proselytes (*Gerim*); these designations arose at that time. And behold, the party of the evildoers (the Hellenizers), who forsook the covenant of their God and served foreign idols, was the subject (theme) of many visions in the Book of Daniel. Everything that befell Israel in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes was veiled in that book with the veil of apocalypse, the interpretation of which one finds in the First and Second Books of the Maccabees." (For the quotation from *Kerem Chemed*[57] see the note.) — Hereupon L. cites [p. 56] a passage from the First Book of Maccabees, chap. 7:8–19, where the following is reported: Many of the apostate Jews, at whose head stood the priest Alcimus, came to King Demetrius[58] and persuaded him to make war on the Jews, because they had fallen away from him. Demetrius gave them a hearing, raised Alcimus to the high priesthood, and sent him with the general Bacchides against Jerusalem to avenge the defection of the Jews. At first Bacchides feigned a friendly disposition, in order to bring the national party into his power by cunning. When, however, the

---

[55] In the Sifra מאינים [*me'inim*] is always written, which is derived from מאן [*me'en*], to refuse, to deny, so that *Minim* = deniers, negators.

[56] Heidenheim, in his translation of the prayer book, took the word לעולם in the sense of לעולם הבא [for the world to come], as did Präger (Mannheim 1855), who translates: "And give us our portion with them one day in eternity." In my judgment the word is to be taken adverbially: forever, continually, which I also found confirmed in Abudarham. —

[57] L. here cites the learned Rabbi N. Krochmal, who expresses himself thus in the 4th issue of *Kerem Chemed*: "We have already given in many places an explanation of the origin and value of the two chronicles of the Maccabees that have been preserved in the Greek language; the greater value belongs to the first, which was certainly composed originally in Judaea in the Hebrew language. We also remarked that the distinguishing name which is given in it to those who first went into battle for the Torah and risked their lives for the law is one and the same in Greek and Hebrew, namely Asidaeans, חסידים [*Hasidim*]. These are called in Daniel 'the wise among the people,' 'those who lead many to righteousness,' 'the holy ones of the Most High,' 'a people that knows its God'; while those who assisted the enemy and oppressed the Hasideans are likewise designated with a fitting name: 'the wicked,' 'those who forsake the holy covenant,' 'evildoers against the covenant.' — Thus the Book of Daniel stands in relation to the chronicles of the Maccabees." — Of this Krochmal, Jost says (*Geschichte des Judenthums*, vol. III, p. 343): "The most outstanding scholar was N. Krochmal (born in Brody 1785, died in Tarnopol 1840). He was the first among the Jews who, with courage and rare acuity, went through the biblical books for the purpose of establishing their historical origin and understanding their content, in respect both of language and of facts, destroyed much that was traditional, and brought new views to prevail." [Translator: Nachman Krochmal (1785–1840); the passage in *Kerem Chemed* belongs to the material later collected in his *Moreh Nevukhei ha-Zeman*. Isaac Marcus Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Sekten*, 3 vols., Leipzig 1857–59.]

[58] Demetrius was a nephew of Antiochus Epiphanes and came to the throne around 162 B.C.E. —

Jews saw the great army of the Syrians, they perceived the intention of laying a snare for Judah Maccabee and his followers, and thenceforth gave no hearing to their friendly words. Only some of the *Soferim* and Hasideans placed confidence in the peaceful assurances; for they thought that, after all, a priest of the descendants of Aaron stood at the general's side, and he would not allow any harm to be done to them. They therefore went fearlessly to Bacchides and Alcimus. But what happened? Sixty of them were seized and killed. In Krochmal's view, Yose ben Yoezer, the uncle of Alcimus, was also among the slain *Soferim* and Hasideans, and Psalm 79 was composed expressly on the death of these pious men. — In consequence of these events and conditions, L. continues, and as an expression of them, the prayer-piece "Over the righteous, על הצדיקים" was composed. The righteous denote [p. 57] the faithful (those faithful to the faith[59] and to the law), the pious are the Hasideans, the elders of your people are the supreme leaders (members of the Sanhedrin, senators, council of elders), [p. 58] the remnant of their *Soferim* are those learned in Scripture and the law, and by the righteous proselytes are to be understood those who, having the victories of the Maccabees before their eyes, joined Judaism voluntarily and gladly. The latter, he says, was nothing rare, as is sufficiently proven to us, according to the report of the Romanizer Josephus in the *Antiquities* he left behind, by the example of the kings Izates and Monobaz and of Queen Helena. — Thus far L. in the commentary *Hegyon Lev*.[60] — To this ingenious exposition of L.'s I have, apart from my theory on the origin of the Eighteen Benedictions in general, to raise the objection that in this thirteenth prayer-piece expressions occur which point to events and

---

[59]Until not long ago it was customary on the non-Israelite side to find fault with Judaism, insofar as it is founded on the Bible, because it allegedly demanded of its adherents only righteousness of the law but not righteousness of faith, and only legality but not morality. It is, however, gratifying that in the present day eminent Christian scholars, through deeper penetration into the spirit of the Bible, have arrived at better results, more in accordance with the truth, and have shown that those defects never existed. As evidence, some sentences from the excellent work of Professor Oehler, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen 1873), shall be cited here. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 162–164: "The Mosaic law already presupposes *faith*, that is, trusting devotion to God and his will. The demand for faith runs through the whole Old Testament; Israel's guidance is placed entirely upon faith from its redemption out of Egypt onward, Exod. 4:31; 14:31; Deut. 1:32; 9:23. Later it was asserted still more emphatically what faith is all about, how all righteousness is rooted in it, and how the attainment of salvation is conditioned by it. The prophetic thesis reads, Isa. 7:9: 'If you will not believe, surely you shall not be established'; cf. Chr. 7:9 [Translator: evidently a misprint; the parallel is 2 Chr. 20:20]. What is this faith? Negatively, a going out of all natural sense of one's own power, and positively, a leaning upon God's power, grace and faithfulness. Of the righteous it is said, Ps. 112:7: 'His heart is steadfast, trusting in the Eternal; his heart is upheld, he does not fear.' Isa. 28:16: 'He who believes need not be anxious.' Hab. 2:4: 'The righteous shall live by his faith.' — But the Old Testament also knows the faith which includes, negatively, the renunciation, arising from the knowledge of sin, of any claim of one's own right and one's own merit before God, and positively, devotion to the merciful God who blots out sin, and to his reconciling grace. Ps. 130:3–5." Ibid., vol. I, p. 278: "It is incorrect to say that the Mosaic law demands only *outward* conformity to the law, only the *opus operatum*, not the disposition; that it thus demands merely *legality*, not *morality*. On the contrary, the law penetrates into the *disposition* when it commands in Exod. 20:17, 'You shall not covet,' when it obliges to the love of God with all one's heart and all one's soul, to love and forgivingness toward one's fellow man and the like, Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:17f., when it demands the circumcision of the foreskin of the heart, that is, its very purification and devotion to God, Deut. 10:16. But it does indeed demand the outward alongside the inward in immediate coordination. Herein, however, lies an important pedagogical factor. — Since all relations of life, the outward ones too, are placed under a direct divine command, since man has to render obedience to God in all his doing and not-doing, he is thereby led to the recognition that he must seek the *measure* of what he ought to be not in arbitrarily abstracted and conventionally determined rules of life, but in an absolutely perfect will that conditions and determines everything." —

[60]Translator: "L." is Eliezer (Louis) Landshuth, whose *Hegyon Lev* (Königsberg 1845) is a prayer book with Hebrew commentary on the liturgy. The text prints "Commendar" for "Commentar."

persons of a much later time. These are a) the remnant of the *Soferim* and b) the righteous proselytes.

ad a. — When King Alexander Jannaeus had cruelly persecuted the Pharisaic scribes, because they would not recognize him in his dignity as high priest, and had had several hundred of them executed, and when Queen Salome, who succeeded him on the throne, had reinstated the surviving Pharisaic scribes in their former positions and appointed them to high offices of honor, [p. 59] only then did the concept arise: *Pletath safraja*, "the remnant of the scribes," and only then could it be introduced into the prayer. This, however, happened only around the year 78 B.C.E., that is, about 60 years after the Maccabean wars. —

ad b. — With regard to the proselytes, too, L. commits an anachronism. It is indeed true that Judaism had found entrance at the princely court of Adiabene, a principal territory of the former Assyria on the banks of the Tigris (around 18 C.E.). King Izates was converted to Judaism by a Jewish merchant, Ananias. Izates[61] wanted to take Judaism seriously and undergo circumcision; but Ananias, presumably a Hellenistic Jew, sought to convince him that circumcision was not necessary for him. Izates was at first content with this, until later a law-observant Jew from Galilee, Eleazar, came to his court and taught him another view. Thereupon Izates, and presumably also his brother Monobaz, had themselves secretly circumcised. — Their mother, Queen Helena, had traveled to Jerusalem to satisfy her longing for the Holy Land, and there, during a famine that broke out in Judaea, proved herself a benefactress of the Jewish people (around 48 C.E.). The queen had whole shiploads of grain bought from Alexandria and figs from Cyprus and distributed among the poor. She also endowed the Temple royally. The nation preserved a grateful memory of the proselyte for her beneficence and piety. She returned to Adiabene. — In the year 55 C.E. Izates died, and his brother Monobaz II came to the throne. When later his mother also died, he had the bones of both brought to Jerusalem and laid to rest in the mausoleum which Helena had had built in the [p. 60] vicinity of Jerusalem and whose ruins still exist under the name "the Tombs of the Kings." — But between these occurrences and the Maccabean wars lay a period of more than 150 years. For only in the last decades before the downfall of the Jewish state (around 70 C.E.) were there, as at no earlier time, many proselytes. Not merely for the sake of outward advantages, but also out of pure conviction, many professed Judaism. They found in it reassurance for their doubts and nourishment for mind and heart. Philo, the Alexandrian philosopher (around 40 C.E.), reports as something he had himself experienced that the heathens who had gone over to Judaism in his fatherland, Egypt, also changed their way of life and led a life adorned with the virtues of temperance, gentleness and love of humanity. — Philo's literary activity may have contributed much to this. — Women in particular, whose feelings were offended by the shamelessness of mythological tales, felt drawn by the childlike and sublime biblical narratives. In Damascus most of the heathen women had gone over to Judaism. — But the rabbis in Jerusalem

[61] In my historical accounts I mostly follow Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*.

did not take the admission of heathens so lightly. They paid attention to motives and rejected all such proselytes in whom earthly intentions, material purposes, could be presumed.

In contrast to such proselytes, those who had gone over to Judaism genuinely out of conviction are called גרי הצדק [*gerei ha-tsedek*], proselytes of righteousness, righteous proselytes; and only at the time when such a distinction was established could the notion of righteous proselytes come into use and be introduced into the prayer, from which it follows that our prayer-piece received its present form only quite late. —

[p. 61] §. 24. ברכות רוממות ירושלים ובן דויד (*Birkhot Romemut Yerushalayim u-Ven David*) Benedictions for the Exaltation of Jerusalem and of the Son of David.

XIV. ולירושלים (*Ve-li-Yerushalayim*) "To Jerusalem, your city, may you return with mercy and dwell therein, as you have promised. O, build it soon in our days as an everlasting edifice! And may you soon establish the throne of David therein. Blessed are you, Eternal, builder of Jerusalem."

XV. את צמח (*Et Tsemah*) "Cause the offspring of your servant David soon to flourish. May his horn of fortune be exalted through your help; for we hope for your salvation all the day. Blessed are you, Eternal, who causes the horn of salvation to sprout forth." —

To the view that even Judah Maccabee, his brothers and his like-minded comrades in arms could, even after the victory won over the Syrians, since complete independence had not yet been attained, have recited the prayers "Build, O God, Jerusalem, reside there and send the son of David!" I must object: had Jerusalem then not been rebuilt? Had not the Temple cult already shone in the greatest splendor under Simon the Righteous? Did God perhaps not reside there? And would the descendants of the Maccabees, who assumed the title of king, have tolerated the request for the sending of the son of David being uttered in public worship? No, these two prayer-pieces, with the exception of the actual short *Berakhot* (benedictions, eulogies), received their present form only after the destruction of the Second Temple, and definitively only from Simeon of Pakole.[62] —

On the son of David see the Fourth Section. — I should like here to correct an error which in recent times has frequently cropped up. The new prayer books composed by reform-minded rabbis have almost all eliminated the belief in a personal Messiah, but the petition [p. 62] that God may remember Jerusalem they have retained. People claim to have discovered an inconsistency in this. Now, I do not at all wish here to plead for one prayer book or the other, since I have endeavored to treat my subject only objectively. But there can be no question here of an inconsistency committed. For even if no son of David were in future to set up his residence in Jerusalem, it would nonetheless remain forever a holy city, to which great memories are attached as to no other. What

[62]Translator: Simeon ha-Pakuli, who according to BT Berakhot 28b arranged the Eighteen Benedictions in order before Rabban Gamaliel at Yavneh.

lively interest the two daughter religions that came forth from Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism, still take in Jerusalem even now! In the Middle Ages Christians and Mohammedans waged bloody wars for possession of this city. At present both possess churches and mosques there, build hospices for pilgrims and houses of study, and carefully guard their rights there. And we should be indifferent toward Jerusalem? We should not be mindful of a place where our fathers waged a fifteen-hundred-year struggle with heathenism, with the animal-worship of the Egyptians, with the star-worship of the Chaldeans (Sabaism), with the dualism of the Iranians, with the deification of men by the Greeks and Romans, until it, heathenism, was overcome and monotheism had attained victory for all mankind?

We should not pray for the continuance and preservation of Jerusalem, where our Psalter, this prayer book of all civilized nations, was sung by God-inspired men and the immortal speeches of our prophets were delivered? And has not the prophetic word proved true, and does it not prove true more each day: Out of Zion goes forth the teaching, and the word of God from Jerusalem? — O, certainly! Even if we strip off everything national, even if we expect no personal Messiah — Jerusalem remains ever holy and venerable to us. —[63]

[p. 63] §. 25. ברכת תפלה (*Birkat Tefillah*) Benediction for the Hearing of Prayer. (BT Megillah 17b.)

XVI. שמע קולנו (*Shema Kolenu*) "Hear our voices, Eternal our God, spare us and have mercy upon us, and accept our prayer with mercy and favor; for you are a God who hears prayer and supplication. Let us not, our King, go from you empty; for you hear with mercy the prayer of your people Israel. Blessed are you, Eternal, who hears prayer."

This prayer-piece, which forms the conclusion of the middle prayer-pieces, that is, of those which lie in the middle between the first 3 and the last 3 *Berakhot*, which stem from very ancient times, has as its content that God may grant the petitions presented, concerning both the individual and the community. — Into this prayer-piece the worshipper is accustomed to insert his particular needs as well (BT Berakhot 29a; 31a). — The Sephardim have a different reading in this prayer-piece too. Instead of the [p. 64] sentence "For you hear with mercy the prayer of your people Israel," they have the following shorter one: "For you hear the prayer of every mouth." —

---

[63]The formula of No. XIV is different and shorter in Sephardic prayer books than in ours. There it reads: "Dwell in your city Jerusalem, as you have promised, and build it soon and in our days as an everlasting edifice. Blessed, etc." The sentence "And may you soon establish the throne of David therein" is also missing in it. I explain this to myself as follows: originally the Jerusalem rite of prayer differed from the Babylonian with regard to these two *Berakhot*. From the Jerusalem Talmud (Rosh Hashanah 24 and Berakhot 84) it emerges that in Jerusalem the two *Berakhot* made up only *one*, which read: "Blessed are you, Eternal, God of David and builder of Jerusalem." In Babylonia, on the other hand, as is evident from the Babylonian Talmud (Berakhot 33 and Megillah 17), the *two* were separate. Now, it is true that *later* a separation of these two *Berakhot* was also made in Jerusalem, or rather Palestine, as appears from *Midrash Rabbah Bemidbar*, chap. 18; but in No. XIV the sentence "And the throne of David, etc." was left as a residue of the earlier arrangement. The Sephardim received and adopted the Babylonian rite through the Geonim. The Ashkenazim, however, had long since received prayers and prayer formulas from Palestine before the *Siddur* of R. Amram reached them in the ninth century C.E. —

§. 26. עבודה (*Avodah*) Divine Service. (Rosh Hashanah IV, 5.)

XVII. רצה (*Retseh*) "Be pleased, Eternal our God, with your people Israel and with its prayer, and restore the service to the inner sanctuary of your Temple, and accept the fire-offerings, its prayers, with love and favor. O, may the service of your people Israel ever be pleasing to you. Blessed are you, Eternal, who restores his glory to Zion."

As regards the form of this *Berakhah*, the very learned commentator Rashi says on BT Berakhot 11b concerning the word *Avodah*:

בשביל עבודה שעשו היו מברכין אחריה: רצה יי אלהינו עבודת עמך ישראל ואשי יי ותפלתם תקבל ברצון ברוך המקבל עבודת עמו ישראל ברצון. אי נמי שאותך לבדך ביראה נעבוד

"On account of the service which they (the priests) had performed, they pronounced the following benedictions: Graciously accept, Eternal our God, the service of your people Israel, and the fire-offerings of the Eternal and their prayer accept with favor. Blessed be he who accepts the service of his people Israel with favor. Or the conclusion read: Blessed be he whom alone we serve in reverence." —

The liturgical poet, too, who composed the *piyyut* אהללך (*Ahallelkha*) for the morning service of the Day of Atonement must have had before him the reading "whom alone we serve in reverence," but not the one customary with us. — Accordingly Zunz and Rapoport, these great authorities, are right when they maintain that in the old form of the רצה (*Retseh*) the following sentences were missing: "Restore the service to the inner sanctuary of your Temple," "May our eyes [p. 65] behold when you return to Zion," "who restores his glory to Zion." —

§. 27.) Confession, Thanksgiving. (Rosh Hashanah IV, 5.)*Hoda'ah*(הודאה[64]

XVIII. מודים (*Modim*) "Thankfully we acknowledge that you, Eternal, are our God and the God of our fathers forever and ever. You are the rock of our life, the shield of our salvation at all times. We thank you and proclaim your praise for our lives, which are given into your hand, for our souls, which are entrusted to you, for your wonders, which we have before us every day, and for the wonderful and good things that you show us at every time, evening, morning and noon. For, All-Good One, your mercy has no end; your grace, All-Merciful One, never ceases; we hope in you evermore. And for all this may your name, our King, be blessed and glorified unceasingly, forever and ever. Everything that lives shall thank you and praise your name in truth. Almighty One, who are our salvation and our help, Selah! Blessed are you, Eternal; All-Good is your name, and to you alone thanks are fitting." —

At the second rabbinical assembly held at Frankfurt am Main in the year 1845 (Minutes, p. 306), Rabbi Dr. Meier remarked: "The מודים (*Modim*) lying between the two pieces (רצה and שים שלום),

[64]This word is Aramaic and has been taken up into New Hebrew; it means confession as well as thanksgiving.

which offers no clue for determining the time and occasion of its origin, belongs by its language to the period in which those too arose. However pure and vigorous the language of these three benedictions is, they nevertheless do not seem to be older than the Maccabean period. [p. 66] They presuppose a completely ordered priesthood and Temple system, such as could only have arisen under the rule of these priestly kings." — Meier's view is entirely mistaken. Not only under the rule of the Maccabees, but more than 100 years before, an ordered priesthood and sacrificial system had arisen. Jesus Sirach has left us a description of the splendor of the Temple cult under Simon the Righteous. Nothing at all prevents us from assuming that the six benedictions were composed and introduced by the Men of the Great Assembly.

Abudarham says that the sentence "And for all this may your name, our King, be blessed and glorified unceasingly, forever and ever" uses the language of the *Hekhalot*.[65]

§. 28. ברכת כהנים (*Birkat Kohanim*) Priestly Blessing. (Rosh Hashanah IV, 5.)

XIV.[66] שים שלום (*Sim Shalom*) "Grant peace, welfare and blessing, favor, grace and mercy to us and to all your people Israel. Bless us, Father, in the light of your countenance; for in the light of your countenance you gave us, Eternal our God, the teaching of life, gracious love, righteousness and blessing, mercy, life and peace. May it please you to bless your people Israel at every time and at every hour with your peace. Blessed are you, Eternal, who blesses his people Israel with peace."

Maimonides explained the *Berakhah* ברכת כהנים (Priestly Blessing) that occurs in the Talmud by our שים שלום (Grant peace, etc.), that is, he substituted the latter for the former. The piece contains such sentences as correspond in content to the 3 parts of the Priestly Blessing, namely: the sentence "Give us peace, welfare and blessing" corresponds to the [p. 67] sentence "The Eternal bless you and keep you"; "Bless us, our Father, with the light of your countenance" corresponds to "The Eternal make his countenance shine upon you"; and the sentence "May it please you to bless your people Israel with peace" corresponds to "He grant you peace." —

Probably the Israelites present at prayer were accustomed, after the Priestly Blessing had been pronounced over them, to recite this שים שלום, perhaps together with the priests, in order to show that the wish of the priests was also the wish of their own hearts, which God might fulfil.

[p. —] Fourth Section. The Belief in the Messiah

§. 29. The Hope for the Messiah.

As long as Israel languished under harsh oppression and fierce persecution, the hope for the Messiah, who would come and gather the outcasts of Israel from all regions of the world and lead

---

[65] The Greater and Lesser *Hekhalot* belong to the Jewish secret doctrine (mysticism), whose influence on the later rite of prayer, especially on many *piyyutim*, is unmistakable.

[66] Translator: so printed; the sequence requires XIX.

them back to their former fatherland, Palestine, was a true need of the heart, a soothing balm in its burning wound. To be sure, the calculations devised from time to time by pious souls languishing for redemption, as to the moment at which the Messiah must appear, had proved deceptive. Thus the author of the Fourth Book of Ezra expected the coming of the Messiah in the year 97 of our era. — Around the year 132 C.E. redemption was expected from the revolutionary hero Bar Kokhba, and Rabbi Akiba, who was so active for the liberation of the Jewish people, said when he beheld him: "This is the messianic king." — A messianic apocalypse expected the dawn of the messianic age in the course of the year 751. — The Gaon Saadia had fixed the coming of the Messiah for the year 964. — In the Midrash devoted especially to the Messiah and Gog and Magog, which is contained among other things in the Hebrew *codex manuscriptus* located in the court library here, [p. 69] from which I took the account of the First Crusade, the Messiah was expected most definitely, on the basis of a saying of the *Tanna de-Vei Eliyahu*, at the beginning of the 13th century. — In the year 1641 Sabbatai Zevi was born in Smyrna. As a youth of about 20 years he declared outright that he was the Messiah, and the belief in the messiahship and the miracles of this fanatic threw the Jewish communities into the greatest excitement. — And although all these expectations always turned out to be mere illusions, the Israelites did not let their hope for the Messiah sink: for it was the only bright gleam that illuminated their long night of fate. — But does the belief in the Messiah still possess the power today to instil comfort in Israelites who feel unhappy under political and social disadvantage, by putting them off with the hope of the speedy appearance of the Messiah, who will redeem them and lead them to Jerusalem? I think not. Now it has become an empty, hollow dogma that has no life in it. And yet many find it blameworthy that it has been removed from the newer prayer books. All the more are we impelled to take the Messiah into view for once and to ask who, then, he really is.

§. 30. The Nature of the Personal Messiah.

Only two cases are possible: either the Messiah is a human or a superhuman being. Let us first assume the first case. A human being who did not overstep the sphere of the natural were to appear somewhere as the Messiah, the son of David — how could he legitimate himself as such, so that people would believe him? Every certain trace of the family of David has vanished for more than two thousand years. And even if the report (Bereshit Rabbah 5, 98) were well-founded that Hillel, president [p. 70] of the Sanhedrin at the time of Herod (around 30 B.C.E.), was descended on his mother's side from King David, yet with the death of the last Patriarch, Gamaliel VI, who died without heirs in 425 C.E., the last splinters of the Hillelite line were scattered. Moreover, in keeping with the spirit of the Israelite Bible, in the prophetic promise given to David (2 Sam. 7), "the kingdom shall remain with his descendants forever,"[67] certainly only male and not female

[67] Since, as Dr. Graetz says (*Gesch. d. J.*, vol. IV, p. 277), "it is more than doubtful whether the exilarchate also existed under the old Persian and Greek dynasties, since only in the time of Judah I, that is, of the last generation of Tannaim (about 200 C.E.), does a Mar Huna emerge as exilarch from an obscure background," the report of the *Seder Olam Zuta* that the exilarchs of Babylonia descended from the Davidic royal house also seems to me doubtful. —

descendants were meant. — Anyone who should still now, or in the future, give himself out to be the son of David, the Messiah, would have to be declared a madman or a gross impostor. — — We now come to the other case. The Messiah is a superhuman, supersensible being, who remains preserved in Paradise until the time when he comes from heaven, takes on human form, performs miracles and accomplishes the work of redemption. But where does the belief in such a Messiah have its foundation? In the canon of the Israelite Bible, not at all. The name *Meshiach* is never a proper name there, but a generic name, which is given to the high priest, to the prophets, to the theocratic king and to the Israelite people itself. People did not think of a single, definite person, be it human or superhuman. —

And the hope which the prophets expressed from time to time, that from the stock of Jesse a shoot would come forth, who like his ancestor David would conquer the heathen enemies of the people of God, establish rest and peace, [p. 71] and exercise justice and righteousness, was fulfilled by some kings such as Hezekiah and Josiah. But since the last Judaean kings, together with the great and the noble, had oppressed the people, bled them dry, treated them violently, and through their misgovernment brought about the ruin of the state, the glory of the Davidic royal house had faded; and when the prophet Ezekiel, living in the Babylonian exile, in describing the institutions which the future restored Jewish state would have, expresses the hope that dominion would continue to rest upon a Davidide, he nevertheless seeks to restrict it as much as possible. The bearer of this dominion was to protect and bless the people in David's spirit, but was to possess no unlimited power over all persons and all things. He was therefore to bear not the name of king but *Nasi*, prince. A piece of land would be assigned to him, but he must not take to himself the property of another. The tribute that the people bring him he was to use for the maintenance of the sacrificial cult, for the atonement of the people. He was to take part regularly in public worship and pray for the people, etc. — — As little as in Ezekiel is there to be found in the last prophets who followed any trace of a personal Messiah. As for Zech. 9:9, of that below. —

We come now to the apocalyptic Book of Daniel. The believers in the Messiah appeal to the passage 7:13–14, which reads: "I saw in the vision of the night, and behold, with the clouds of heaven he had come like a son of man, and he reached the Ancient of Days, and they brought him before him, and to him was given dominion and dignity and rule, etc." By בר אנוש [*bar enosh*], son of man, they understand the Messiah.[68]

[p. 72] I let the words of Hitzig in his commentary on Daniel 7:13–14 follow here: "More important is the fact that in the second, the explanatory part of the chapter, the Messiah nowhere makes his appearance, and the consistency with which what verse 14 attributes to the son of man is repeatedly attributed in verses 18, 22, 27 to the holy ones of the Most High makes it overwhelmingly probable

[68] Ibn Ezra says: "Rabbi Yeshua said: 'This son of man is the Messiah.' He is right, only that this is the holy people itself." Thus he identifies the Messiah with the people Israel. Likewise, according to Ibn Ezra on Isaiah chap. 52:13, the עבד ה׳ "servant of God" is the people Israel itself.

that the כבר אנוש [*ke-var enosh*], son of man, is meant to represent precisely these holy ones, the Jewish people, etc. By the assumption that the Book of Daniel was composed in the Maccabean period, the personal Messiah is excluded from the outset. Ever since the descendants of David had died out or the knowledge of their descent had been lost, every concern about it, every longing for it, had been completely lost among the people, who for centuries had been unaccustomed to a native king.[69] The hope of a personal Messiah, of a future king of an ideal theocracy, appears neither in the other Apocrypha, nor in the First Book of Maccabees, nor in the Maccabean psalms. Indeed, it is already foreign to Obadiah and Malachi; on the contrary, in Ps. 89:39; 84:10 it is rather the people itself that is the Messiah, the anointed of God.[70]

§. 31. Conceptions of the Messiah.

The question will now arise whether, in the period immediately preceding the rise of Christianity, the Israelites did not expect a Messiah who would redeem them from the power of the Romans, and whether definite conceptions of this Messiah were not then in circulation among the people. Before we answer this question, however, let us see what [p. 73] position the men of the critical school take toward it; we may fittingly disregard entirely the apologists, who find Jesus prefigured everywhere in the Israelite Bible.

David Strauss, in his *Leben Jesu* (4th ed., p. 192), proceeds from the presupposition that Christianity found the conception of the Messiah, as it saw it realized in Jesus, not merely in general but already more precisely defined, in the Jewish theology of the time in which Jesus appeared.

According to *Bruno Bauer* in his *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker* (vol. I, pp. 391–416), the concept of the Messiah as such would have arisen only around the time of John the Baptist, but in its individual features would not yet have been *developed* even at the time of the composition of the Gospels; rather it was developed only then, and indeed within Christianity.

According to *Volkmar* (*Die Religion Jesu*, p. 112; *Einleitung in die Apokryphen*, vol. II, p. 398), the Jewish people had indeed long before Christ expected its deliverance from the yoke of the heathen night from a God-sent personality whom it called Messiah, that is, the anointed and consecrated king of the kingdom of God;[71] only these pre-Christian beginnings must be

---

[69] In the year 140 B.C.E. the Maccabee Simon was confirmed by the people in the dignity of high priest and prince of the people, and it was declared hereditary in his family, without any regard being paid to any descendant of David who might still have been living.

[70] Translator: Ferdinand Hitzig, *Das Buch Daniel* (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Leipzig 1850). The opening quotation mark is not closed in the original, so it is unclear where Hitzig's words end and Mannheimer's resume.

[71] That is how Strauss understood him; but in the passage cited of the *Einleitung in die Apokryphen* I could not find that it was Volkmar's view that the Israelites had already expected their deliverance from a Messiah before Jesus' appearance and had formed definite conceptions of him.

distinguished from the later rabbinic extravagances, which developed only in opposition to Christianity and after it, partly into the fantastic. —

According to *Gfrörer* (*Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, vol. II, p. 219), four types of Messiah are said to have been in circulation side by side in the time of Jesus, according to whether one gathered his image from the older prophets or took it from [p. 74] Daniel, or shaped it after the model of Moses, or conceived of him mystically as a second Adam and the like. —

Strauss does not agree with Gfrörer unconditionally, but he takes this much as certain: that in the conception of the Messiah features from very different sources flowed together, with which a certain wavering, the possibility of different interpretations and combinations, were necessarily given, etc. Further, Strauss finds the program for the deeds of the Messiah drawn from the Old Testament chiefly in two rabbinic passages, and, he adds, however late these may be, they nevertheless correctly indicate the peculiarity of the Jewish way of thinking in this matter. — The two passages are:

1) *Midrash Kohelet*, fol. 73, 3 (on Eccl. 1:9: What has been is what will be, and what has been done is what will be done). Rabbi Berechiah says in the name of Rabbi Isaac: "As the first redeemer (Moses), so is the last (the Messiah). What does Scripture say of the first redeemer? Exod. 4:20: And Moses took his wife and his sons and set them riding on asses. So too the last redeemer, Zech. 9:9: Humble and riding on an ass. As the first redeemer brought down the manna, for it is said, Exod. 16:4: I will cause bread to rain from heaven for you, so too the last, for it is said, Ps. 72:16: There shall be abundance of grain in the land. As the first redeemer brought up a well, so too the last, for it is said, Joel 4:18: And a spring shall go forth from the house of the Lord and water the valley of Shittim."

2) *Midrash Tanhuma*, fol. 54, 4 (on Eccl. 3:15: What is to be has long since been). Rabbi Aha said in the name of R. Samuel, son of Nahman: "What God, the Holy One, highly praised, will do in the future (messianic) age, he has previously done in part in this (pre-messianic) age. God will raise the dead, [p. 75] as He has already done before through Elijah, Elisha, Ezekiel. He will dry up the sea, as He did through Moses. He will open the eyes of the blind, as He did through Elisha. He will visit the barren, as He did with Abraham and Sarah. Compare Zohar Exod. 4, 6.

As for the second passage, it is mistranslated. It is possible that Strauss did not make the translation himself but drew it from a secondary source. The Midrash says: What God will do לעולם הבא [*le-olam ha-ba*, in the world to come], in the future world, He has already partly done in this world, בעו' הזה [*ba-olam ha-zeh*, in this world][72]. For the Rabbis distinguish between the future world,

[72]The Rabbis early on combated the Gnostic notions that confused the messianic age with the resurrection of the dead, and kept the two apart. — It strikes me as remarkable that the learned Bacher says in his *Agada der babylonischen Amoräer*, p. 105, note 23: "Of the commandments, i.e. the ceremonial law, Joseph taught that they — in the messianic age — will be abolished. Nidda 61b." But here only the time of the resurrection, and not that of the Messiah, is spoken of. [Translator: Wilhelm Bacher, *Die*

where there will be a different order of the world, and the messianic age. But this was unknown to Strauss. —

Furthermore, he did not know that the Aggadah has no normative value whatsoever, and that the view of an aggadist is only an individual one and by no means the way of thinking of the Jewish people. But supposing the view of Midrash Kohelet did correctly reveal to us the peculiar way of thinking of the Jewish people concerning the Messiah that prevailed at the time this Midrash was composed — is that any proof that the same way of thinking was current among the Jewish people many centuries earlier? And were not the two Midrashim cited composed many centuries after Christ?[73]

[p. 76] Should not the conception of the Messiah have undergone a transformation in the course of many centuries? Was this not already the case in Christianity during the two centuries of its formation? And why, if certain notions about the expected Messiah were in circulation, if a definite programme of messianic deeds existed, and if a miracle-working, superhuman Messiah had actually been expected before the appearance of Jesus — why have no sayings about it been handed down to us from the times of the Soferim, or at least from the schools of Hillel and Shammai? Would the latter, as the founders of rabbinic Judaism, have passed over so important a subject in silence? No, I fully agree with Volkmar and Bauer: Judaism borrowed elements of the conception of the Messiah only from Christianity. —

§. 32. The Fourth Book of Ezra

There are two writings that are adduced by those who endorse Strauss's assumption that the conception of the Messiah, as Christianity sees it fulfilled in Jesus, was already present in Jewish theology before his appearance, namely: the Fourth Book of Ezra and the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel; but those scholars, Volkmar and Bauer, have demonstrated that the said writings were composed long after the death of Jesus[74] and, on the contrary, have taken up elements of the Christian conception of the Messiah, and thus form a reflection of the Christian view.

Volkmar devoted Part II of his Introduction to the Apocrypha to the Fourth Book of Ezra, and in it rendered great service toward the elucidation of this book;[75]

[p. 77] and if I here excerpt from it at some length, partly verbatim, partly according to the sense, it is done in order to convince the reader of the correctness of Volkmar's view.

Agada der babylonischen Amoräer (1878); the passage is BT Niddah 61b, Rav Joseph's dictum that "the commandments will be abolished in the time to come".]

[73]The Midrash Tanchuma was composed only in the 9th century C.E.

[74]The time of the composition of IV Ezra falls at the end of the first century, and that of the Targum Jonathan in the middle of the fourth century.

[75]Translator: Gustav Volkmar, *Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apokryphen*, Part II: *Das vierte Buch Esra* (Tübingen, 1863). "Bauer" is Bruno Bauer, cited below.

Ibid. p. 275. "As early as the second century the Christians appropriated this book because of its edifying, awakening and consoling power, and Christianised it. If one cleanses it, by means of the manuscript documents and Oriental traditions, of the emendations, interpolations, its introduction and its appendix, it appears to us in its genuinely Jewish form; only it is the first book that has taken up the supersensible Messiah. —"

Ibid. p. 331. "The main content. It is an admonitory writing unveiling the future (an apocalypse). It contains 7 principal visions and falls into 2 parts. — The first part, a free conception of earlier theodicies, has in its first 3 visions essentially the same question as its subject: How is it at all possible that God could so degrade precisely His chosen people, while the so much worse heathens fare so much better? ..... To be sure, it is not possible for a finite being to understand the Infinite completely; but in any case, for all His grace, there is an absolute justice, which grants to the faithful an imminent victory just as surely as destruction to the godless, however many these may be. This is the common content that the 3 visions develop in question and dialogic answer, from ever new points of view.

"The second part sets before our eyes the time and place of the restoration, as well as of the victory over a power hostile to God, as clearly as the apocalyptic veil permits. Out of the night of suffering, of pain and of doubt rises the light of hope: how soon the restoration of Zion approaches, how near is the victory of the Messiah over the eagle-empire, how near the completion of the victory over all the world. — In the 6th vision Ezra had a dream. [p. 78] He sees an eagle rising from the sea. It had 6 wings, 3 heads and 4 little counter-wings. The 6 wings are, according to Volkmar, the 6 Julians (from Julius Caesar to Nero). The head, however, is a three-headed monster; these are the 3 Flavians (Vespasian, Titus, Domitian), the second dynasty of the eagle-empire, which swallowed up Judaea and in which all infamy culminates. On closer inspection it turns out that there is something more in the monster: little counter-wings, usurpers who issued from the main wings, the Julians: first Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and later Nerva. — The eagle, the chief beast of Daniel (7, 2), is mighty in two ways: through its wings, with which it outstrips everything, and through its head, which devours everything. But Ezra sees a lion approaching which destroys the eagle, i.e. the Messiah, kept in store by God, comes down from heaven and destroys the infamous eagle-empire, Rome's dominion over the world."

Ibid. 338. "With the greatest precision the seer relates, in the form of the apocalyptic image and riddle, the history of the eagle-empire of the Caesars, from the founder of this world-ruling monarchy to the fall of Domitian. Under the powerless and turbulent reign of Nerva, who was raised up against this last Flavian head (Domitian), he expects the fall of the whole empire of the Caesars, whose infamy against the people of God had reached its peak in the three Flavians. He therefore wrote in the autumn of 97, when in particular the Praetorian guard rose against the powerless old man, even before the latter, by the adoption of Trajan (October 97), had given the empire a new firm support. . . He believed that Daniel's vision of the fourth world-empire was now

being fulfilled. . . . . He kept to the form of the riddle, which the apocalyptic form demanded just as much as his own protection from the power against which he wrote."

Ibid. 395. Here Volkmar gives a recapitulation of what has been said concerning the messianic expectations, from which we take [p. 79] the following propositions. — "Before the life of Jesus, the expectation of a superterrestrial Messiah nowhere appears in Jewish literature. When Daniel 7, 13 sees in a dream 'One like a son of man, brought from God's throne to receive dominion over all the heathen' —, he himself says in the interpretation, vv. 18, 22, 27, that what is depicted thereby is 'the holy people of the Most High, which is to receive the victory over all the heathen'; for the people of God alone is the human one, 'like a son of man', over against the idolatrous empires, the beasts. — The Apocalypse of Enoch (which Volkmar places in the time of the Bar Kokhba war [132 C.E.]) expressly has in view an earthly hero, who with the help of the Almighty is now to obtain full victory over the heathen and then become the prince of peace. — In Jesus Sirach (about 180 B.C.E.) every messianic hope is lacking; he is fully satisfied with the glorious cult at Jerusalem. The First Book of Maccabees (about 100 B.C.E.) expects the prophet of Deuteronomy (Deut. 18, 15), so that he may give information about what is unknown. Even the specific name 'the Anointed (המשיח)' is lacking before Christ. Only the Fourth Book of Ezra knows of one dwelling above the earth and designates him by the name 'the Anointed' simply. For Ezra, then, a scion of David's line, 'the Messiah', dwells in the superterrestrial paradise among other great figures caught up to God (Enoch, Moses, Elijah), for the present still somewhat unknown, until at the completion of the times he comes to overthrow all heathen power and to compensate the faithful blissfully in the Holy Land for as many years as the servitude lasted. After accomplishing this work of rescue the Messiah dies, as everything temporal dies away, and now eternity begins, the purely supersensible age of the world, which commences with the Last Judgment. This judgment, however, is exercised not by the Messiah but by God alone, the Creator of all. Nor does this son of David sit at the right hand of God, for the throne of God is attainable for no [p. 80] created being; rather, he dwells in paradise. — But just as the Ezra-hope of a superterrestrial Messiah has its origin in Jewish Christianity, so too the messianology of rabbinic Judaism, which later spread more and more with messianic miracles, is nothing but the reflection of the miracles of the Gospels[76], etc. .... But the reason why the Fourth Book of Ezra did not at once find acceptance in Jewish circles is that it was written in the Greek language and had taken up a superterrestrial Messiah and original sin." Thus far Volkmar. —

[76]However correct Volkmar's view is on this point, he is equally mistaken when he expresses the opinion that the Lord's Supper instituted by Jesus influenced the domestic devotion held among the Israelites on Passover eve, and that the rite of breaking bread and drinking wine is an imitation of it. Mr. Volkmar was not acquainted with the Mishnah II in *Arbe Pesachim*, which records that Shammai and Hillel disputed whether, on Passover eve, at the first cup of wine that one drinks, one must first pronounce the blessing over the festival day and then over the wine, or the reverse. One sees from this, therefore, that the said rite was already practised 30 years before Christ, and probably still earlier. [Translator: *Arvei Pesachim* is the tenth chapter of Mishnah Pesachim; the dispute is in m. Pesachim 10:2.]

Volkmar, however, is very much mistaken when he believes that the pious Jews had an aversion to a book written in the Greek language. This is already proved by the Greek translation of the Bible undertaken about 30 years later by the proselyte Aquila of Pontus. It was accorded the holiness of the Hebrew original text and was generally recommended for the purpose of public readings. (For it was then the general custom to interpret the sections of the Bible read in the synagogues into the intelligible vernacular.) — Just as little does it seem to me that original sin in the proper sense, according to which the sin of Adam would have resulted in a general, absolute depravation of the human race and even the dominion of Satan over it, is to be found in the Fourth [p. 81] Book of Ezra. Ezra speaks only of a weakening in resistance to evil, which arose through the sin of Adam, by which he seeks to excuse the moral imperfection of his people. — What, however, was bound to give offence to faithful Israelites was the belief, here emerging for the first time, in a superterrestrial Messiah. That was for them a foreign notion taken over from Jewish Christianity. And although Ezra declared that only he is the true son of David coming from heaven who appears, with the help of almighty God, to destroy the infamous eagle-empire, to lead the faithful of Israel to Palestine, to rebuild the Temple and to restore the sacrificial cult, they nevertheless could not reconcile themselves to it. — If we now take into consideration the second writing, the Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets, we shall see that this too furnishes no proof that definite notions about the Messiah were already widespread among the Jewish people before the life of Jesus.

§. 33. The Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel

We possess on the books of the Prophets a Targum composed in the Aramaic language, which is less a literal translation than a free, interpretive paraphrase, and which in many places passes over into Aggadah proper.

Let us first hear what Bruno Bauer says in his *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker*, vol. I, p. 411: "On the point that concerns us here, this paraphrase (the Targum Jonathan) rests on dogmatic reflection. The idea of the Messiah is complete, stands firm, and, by being more or less read into the sayings of the Prophets, connects the originally isolated views of the Old Testament." He then shows by some examples how skilfully, though often quite arbitrarily, [p. 82] the paraphrast brings ideas borrowed from Christianity into the Prophets and gives them another turn and direction, and arrives, ibid. p. 416, at the following conclusion: "In sum: the emergence and spread of the Christian principle, its struggle with the Synagogue, finally the downfall of the Temple service and the continued contact of the Jew with the Church, brought it about that for Jewish consciousness, too, the idea of the Messiah became important, significant, and the centre of an ideal world previously unknown to it[77]." — And as regards the author of this Targum, recent

[77] The prophetic view of the consummation of the kingdom of God was twofold. According to the *one*, it is brought about by the coming of God in His glory, when He appears amid the jubilation of all creation to judge and purify all nations, which then unanimously acknowledge His sovereignty. According to the *other*, the consummation of the kingdom of God will be mediated by a descendant of David. During the existence of the Second Temple, when the splendour of the house of David had been

scholars have sufficiently shown that a pseudonymity has taken place with it, and that it does not belong to Jonathan b. Uzziel, the famous disciple of Hillel. Jonathan may well have laid its foundation, but later men built further upon it and undertook its execution. It is certain that Joseph b. Hiyya, head of the academy at Pumbeditha (d. 333 C.E.), was the curator and editor of this Targum. In particular the messianic [p. 83] interpretations may derive from him, since he also showed himself elsewhere to be a believer in the Messiah. In Sanh. fol. 99 the following passage is found: "R. Hillel said: There is no Messiah for Israel, for the Israelites already consumed him in the time of King Hezekiah, i.e. the salvation proclaimed by the Prophets, to be brought about by a descendant of David, had already been granted to them at that time. But R. Joseph b. Hiyya said: May the Lord forgive Hillel (who had committed a sin by denying the Messiah); for Zechariah, who lived during the Second Temple, also proclaimed the Messiah in the words (Zech. 9, 9): 'Your king comes to you, righteous and victorious is he, humble and riding upon an ass.' This could not, however, refer to Hezekiah, who lived many centuries earlier." We see from this how much Joseph, in contrast to the learned Hillel, was devoted to the belief in the Messiah.[78]

Moreover, recent biblical criticism has sufficiently demonstrated that the Book of Zechariah from chapter 9 to the end belongs to another prophet Zechariah, who appeared at a time when the 2 kingdoms, Israel and Judah, still existed; and thus the verse cited by Joseph loses all probative force, since it could indeed refer to Hezekiah.

§. 34. The Presumable Course of the Belief in the Messiah

I imagine the course that the belief in the Messiah took to have been as follows: The scribe who introduces himself in the Fourth Book of Ezra had, however much he polemicised against Jewish Christianity, taken over the belief in a supersensible Messiah dwelling in heaven. At first such a foreign view was resisted in genuinely Jewish circles, and even in the uprising of the Jews under Trajan (118 C.E.) they expected all help from a [p. 84] revolutionary hero who had placed himself at the head of the fighters for freedom. But when the ruin of the state was complete, the Israelites scattered to all quarters of the world and forbidden on pain of severe punishment to enter Jerusalem, they turned their gaze from earth to heaven, and the belief in a supersensible Messiah dwelling in heaven gradually found entrance into Jewish circles. — As the Talmud, Sanh. 98a, informs us, R. Joshua b. Levi, who lived in the third century of our era, uttered the saying that the Messiah dwells in the world capital, Rome, among the beggars and the sick at the gate, awaiting at every moment the call to accomplish the redemption. This strange saying can be explained

---

extinguished, the first was the one that prevailed exclusively, as is evident especially in the prophets Malachi and Joel, whom Prof. Merx rightly places in the post-exilic period; and thus every hope of a personal Messiah had vanished. — Bauer's view was corroborated with evidence by Holtzmann (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 1867, pp. 389 ff.). — Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, p. 397, says: What the sages in Israel strove for was solely the greatest piety of conduct, unity in disposition and action, which was called the kingdom of heaven; and ibid., note, he says: The Rabbis in the time of the Herodians do not speak of the Messiah at all, but of the kingdom of heaven, מלכות שמים [*malkhut shamayim*]. — [Translator: Adalbert Merx, Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, Isaak Markus Jost.]

[78] Translator: BT Sanhedrin 99a. This page is misnumbered "38" in print for 83.

naturally. R. Joshua had been in Rome and there had the opportunity to become acquainted with the glaring disproportion between surfeited wealth and forsaken poverty.

This made a powerful impression on him. The thought must have suggested itself to him how easily such a contrast could provoke a mighty eruption, whereby the state would go to ruin and Israel would obtain its freedom. The saying could, however, also conceal a mystical meaning, since R. Joshua was a friend of mysticism and the hero of many legends[79]. — We find the supersensible Messiah clearly expressed for the first time in the Jerusalem Targum, which according to Zunz (G. V. p. 77) was composed in the seventh century of our era. There it says on Exod. 12, 46: ומלכא משיחא יפוק מן גו רומא "The King-Messiah will go forth from the height of heaven."[80] — The belief in the Messiah was, however, fully developed only in the eighth century of our era and set down in an apocalypse bearing the title "The Secrets of R. Simeon b. Yohai". —

Immediately after the fall of the Caliph Marwan II (750 C.E.), messianic enthusiasms stirred in Palestine.

[p. 85] At that time the writing mentioned appeared there, in an enigmatic apocalyptic form, in which it says among other things: God will cause the Messiah to appear in the clouds of heaven. He will slay the cruel king Armilos, gather all Israel and lead it to Jerusalem, which will be a splendid city attracting the nations. This happy messianic age will last two thousand years, and thereupon the Last Judgment will dawn. Our apocalyptist probably had in view Abu Isa, who was then appearing in the region of Isfahan and who felt himself called, as the forerunner of the Messiah, to free the Jewish people, weapons in hand, from the yoke of the nations. The time was favourable. Throughout the whole Mohammedan empire the flames of rebellion had broken out. Our apocalyptist wished to encourage Abu Isa in his undertaking. But the latter was defeated, and a heavy penalty was imposed on the Jews for their devotion to him.

But in spite of this renewed disappointment, elements of the picture described, in particular of the superterrestrial Messiah, became so ingrained in Judaism that they echo more or less in all later messianic portrayals. That they have no foundation in the Israelite Bible, however, has already been sufficiently shown above. But neither are they founded in the Talmud. Apart from the somewhat very obscurely worded saying of R. Joshua b. Levi quoted above about the Messiah's place of abode, there is almost nothing in the Talmud about his person, nature and essence. The discussions handed down revolve around the question when the Messiah will come and what is to be done to hasten his coming. And in answering these questions they proceeded from various practical points of view. One endeavoured, at a time of harsh oppression and persecution, to instil

---

[79]Rashi says on the passage Sanh. 98a: My teacher is of the opinion that what is meant here is not the gate of the actual city of Rome, but that of the heavenly paradise, which lies parallel to it.

[80]Translator: Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (1832). The passage is in the Jerusalem (Fragment) Targum to Exod. 12:42, not 12:46. The Aramaic מן גו רומא means literally "from the midst of Rome" or "from on high"; the author takes it in the second sense.

courage and comfort into the people through the prospect of the Messiah's speedy appearance. Another sought to dam up the messianic enthusiasm that was gaining the upper hand in [p. 86] his time, and which could easily bring danger upon the people, by painting what would precede the appearance of the Messiah in dark, terrifying colours. A third was filled with the intention of scourging, rebuking and suppressing the vices in vogue, such as arrogance, injustice, etc., and therefore put forward the assertion that the Messiah could not come until these vices had vanished from Israel. A fourth used the hope of the Messiah to urge his contemporaries to strict observance of the Sabbath, etc., to diligent study of the Torah, and so forth[81]. — These widely divergent opinions about the appearance of the Messiah could not and might not count as inviolable norms of faith.

§. 35. The Appearance of the Messiahs Becomes Disastrous for Israel

The hope of the Messiah stood firm in popular belief; yet as soon as the Israelites attempted to realise it, it became disastrous for them. The messianic uprising under Bar Kokhba (132 C.E.) came to a terrible end. At the taking of Betar, which he had defended bravely and stubbornly, besides those who perished through hunger and fire, over 500,000 Jewish warriors are said to have been slain by the Romans, so that the whole surrounding region far and wide resembled a field of corpses. And terrible was the lot of the survivors. —

About 1172 there appeared in the province of Yemen in Arabia, where many Jews lived, an enthusiast who announced himself as

[p. 87] the messianic forerunner and called upon the Jews to hold themselves ready for the messianic kingdom and to share their goods and possessions with the poor. Many joined this enthusiasm. Since the more discerning feared that the gravest fate might thereby be conjured up for the Jews of Yemen, they turned to Maimonides, who lived in Cairo, and asked him for counsel. He gave his answer in a letter known under the title "Iggeret Teman". In it he rebuked in sharp terms the messianic calculations and the false Messiahs, and warned the Jews of Yemen against the enthusiast who had appeared. He enumerated several Messiahs who had all brought the Jewish people to misfortune: thus one in Isfahan (about 750), another in Fez (about 1127), a third in Cordova (about 1117), a fourth in France (1087). — Notwithstanding this, Maimonides himself adhered to the belief in the Messiah and even stamped it as an article of faith. — Against this there arose in the 14th century a man who held independent views deviating from the prevailing routine and expressed them openly. This man was Hayyim b. Gallipapa, first rabbi of Huesca, then of Pamplona. —

---

[81] Samuel, head of the academy in Babylonia, a man of many-sided learning, put forward the assertion: There is no difference between the messianic age and the present time except that then all tyrannical oppression will cease (Ber. 34). [Translator: BT Berakhot 34b.]

He taught that the prophecies in Isaiah and Daniel of the wondrous future glory of Israel had already been fulfilled in the Maccabean period, and he boldly set aside the belief in the Messiah. — Joseph Albo, it is true, in his work of religious philosophy *Ikkarim*, which appeared in 1428 C.E., retained the belief in the Messiah, following the general intellectual tendency of his time, but assigned it a subordinate position among the articles of faith, and in this respect expressed a sharp censure of the Maimonidean view. —

The sufferings that befell the 300,000 who had fled from Spain and Portugal, from death by fire and the tortures of an inhuman Inquisition thirsting for blood and booty, were appalling; they defy all description. In the few [p. 88] who did not succumb to the accumulated sufferings and torments, courage was broken and every prospect of a better time was snatched away. The long-cherished messianic hope was given up entirely. This hopelessness pained Abravanel greatly,[82] and he composed 3 writings in order to furnish from the Bible and the aggadic writings what he believed to be "the very strictest" proof: that Israel might build on a glorious future, and that the messianic age must infallibly arrive. He also drew up a messianic calculation. According to it the messianic age should have dawned in the year 1503 and reached its completion with the year 1531. — But it proved just as deceptive as those of his predecessors. Nevertheless, in combination with Kabbalistic reveries, it seems to have stirred up many a messianic enthusiast. The unspeakable sufferings had produced among the Israelites an eccentric state of mind, which was further fostered by degenerate mysticism (Kabbalah). —

Asher Lämlein appeared (1502) near Venice as a messianic forerunner. He proclaimed that the Messiah must infallibly arrive after half a year if the Israelites practised strict repentance. His followers spread his proclamation in Italy and Germany and found belief. People did penance and awaited the arrival of the miracle. The Messiah did not come, and with Lämlein's death, which occurred soon after, the swindle ceased. — About the same time a Marrano woman in the region of Herrera in Portugal gave herself out to be a prophetess, claiming to have had all sorts of visions and to be called to lead her fellow sufferers to Jerusalem. She was burned with 38 followers. —

Some years later a Marrano in Barcelona proclaimed another fixed idea. He asserted that he was God in three

[p. 89] persons, and prophesied that he would suffer death and rise again in three days, and that all who believed in him would be saved. He was executed, instead of being handed over to an asylum. —

Solomon Molcho, born in Portugal as a New Christian (about 1501 C.E.), who as such bore the name Diego Pires, was initiated into the Kabbalah already in early youth. The exalted youth had many ecstasies and dream-apparitions, whose background was the messianic redemption.

[82] Don Isaac Abravanel, born in Lisbon 1437, died in Venice 1509.

Having emigrated to Turkey and returned again to Italy, he went to Rome, and, in order to make true the saying of R. Joshua b. Levi about the appearance and abode of the Messiah, for whom he took himself, he blackened his face, wrapped his feet in dirty rags and sat down among the beggars at the Tiber bridge. His end was terrible. By order of the Emperor Charles V he was burned at Ancona at the end of the year 1532.[83] In association with the adventurer David Reubeni, Solomon Molcho had caused great excitement among the unfortunate Marranos in Portugal, and this contributed to Pope Clement VII's finally consenting to issue the long-requested bull for the introduction of the Inquisition into Portugal. This Inquisition, established chiefly for the Marranos, surpassed even the Spanish one in cruelty, bloodthirstiness and the invention of tortures, and lasted over 2 centuries.

Sabbatai Zevi (born 1626, died 1676) of Smyrna in Asia Minor was the originator of a new messianic frenzy, which threw the whole of Jewry into such a delirium that for a long time it strayed from the true path. Initiated early into the labyrinths of the Kabbalistic book Zohar, he possessed an enthusiastic inclination toward the extraordinary and the miraculous. Many disciples sought him out in order to be initiated by him into [p. 90] the Kabbalah. In the year 1648 he revealed himself to his companions as the true Messiah, and found all the more following because at that time Jews and Christians believed in the nearness of the millennial kingdom of heaven. But he and his followers were driven out of Smyrna by the soberly thinking rabbis. Yet since the notions of a suffering Messiah had already penetrated into Jewish circles from Christianity, the persecution he suffered only strengthened him the more in his messianic calling and increased his following. In Constantinople a preacher, Yachini, played into his hands a mystical writing which allegedly attested Zevi's messiahship and later became the source of many messianic frauds. In Salonica the number of his disciples increased to 3000. There he, the Messiah, the son of heaven, celebrated a mystical marriage with the Torah, the daughter of heaven. In Cairo he married the beautiful Polish woman Sarah, through whom a romantic, dissolute strain entered into his fantastic doings. In Gaza he became acquainted with Nathan of Gaza, who entered into a closer relationship with him and even posed as the risen prophet Elijah, who was to prepare the way for the Messiah. — Having returned to his native city of Smyrna, he publicly declared himself in the synagogue in 1665 to be the expected Messiah, and the crowd hailed him jubilantly: Long live the King-Messiah! The news of the Messiah who had appeared was communicated to the Jews abroad. The alleged prophet Nathan addressed some fanaticising epistles to the great communities of Amsterdam and Hamburg and found unconditional belief. Festivities were organised. With the Torah scrolls in their arms people went in procession through the streets with dancing and music, to the astonishment of the Christian inhabitants. Finally, by order of the Grand Vizier Köprülü, he was arrested and taken to the Dardanelles castle of Abydos. On 14 September 1666 he was brought before the Sultan to answer for the movement and agitation he had provoked.

---

[83] Translator: Molcho was in fact burned at Mantua (1532); Ancona is the author's error.

[p. 91] Fearing harsh punishment, he and his followers went over to Islam. When the news of the alleged Messiah's apostasy reached the communities, confidence was followed by a feeling of disappointment and shame. Sabbatai Zevi died in 1676 in Dulcigno in Albania. With Zevi's apostasy from Judaism, and even with his death, Sabbatianism did not, however, cease. It split into 2 parties, of which the one drew near to Christianity and the other to Islam, and continued to exist. Adherents of this sect were the Frankists in Offenbach am Main toward the end of the last century.

§. 36. The Messianic Idea — a Glorious Goal of Humanity

The hope of a personal Messiah has accordingly always proved deceptive; naive faith, self-deception and the deceiving of others have worked hand in hand in it, and the Messiah awaited since the destruction of the Temple, that is, for 18 centuries, has not come and will not come. And yet there lies in the messianic idea a high truth, which has begun to be realised; and we can have confidence in the victorious power of truth that it will be realised in its whole fullness. What is true in the messianic idea lies in this, that a glorious future is to be expected for Israel and all humanity, namely a time of pure knowledge of God, of justice, of love and of peace. These are elements of the messianic ideal which, as experience teaches us, have already begun to be partly realised in ever wider circles, and which will probably still require many centuries for their complete unfolding, spread and general recognition. — While the heathen sages of antiquity bewailed the lost golden age, the Jewish prophets pointed to the future glorious [p. 92] future as the goal of struggling humanity.

Pure monotheism has suffered many a clouding and obscuring in the course of earlier centuries, from which in our century it is freeing and purifying itself more and more; and this pure knowledge of God is penetrating ever wider circles of the people and becoming their lasting possession. — To Israel has fallen the task, as the servant of God, of carrying the pure knowledge of God through all the world and all time, as Deutero-Isaiah has expressed so clearly and so often. —

With the pure knowledge of God is bound up a purified worship of God, which manifests itself as much in noble and dignified forms of cult as in the morality of human beings; and the view that true piety consists essentially in a moral disposition and manner of action is likewise spreading more and more among human beings.

That forms the first stage toward attaining the messianic age. — A second stage is formed by the independent development of the idea of law. Throughout the whole Middle Ages even common or private law was dependent on Church and theology. There was then no objective law for all rational beings, no equal law for all, but only rights: — rights and privileges for some, restriction, exclusion and lawlessness for others. Only at the beginning of the seventeenth century did the Dutch scholar and statesman Hugo Grotius begin to set jurisprudence on its own feet and to free it from the tutelage of Church and theology. Positive law, he taught, must rest on natural law; the latter has its ground in reason, and the concepts of law are to be developed in accordance with the laws of

reason. And all later significant teachers of law advanced further in his footsteps. From these principles there was bound gradually to emerge an equal law for all without distinction of faith and station. [p. 93] With this the dawn of redemption from injustice had already risen for Israel and all oppressed classes of humanity[84]. To this was added the recognition of innate human rights, raised to law in August 1789 by the French National Assembly, following the precedent of the North American Union states, according to which every human being, irrespective of station and religion, possesses innate rights of which no state may deprive him, unless he should have forfeited them through a crime.

This recognition of universal human rights has found entrance, if not always in its full rigour and absolute universality, into all the constitutions of Europe. — And since the human being, born for society, can fulfil his task and promote his own welfare, as well as that of the whole community, only within a political order, it follows from the recognition of human rights that one must grant him the right to take part in some way in the legislation that mediates the political order. — But is that not a preliminary stage toward attaining the messianic age? — Yet the protection of law and the administration of justice are not sufficient to make human beings happy unless love is added, to which the welfare of the human being and of humanity is dear. And in this respect, too, our time has made progress. Love of the neighbour, i.e. of the one who stands near us, with whom we have entered into some relationship, has widened into love of the great whole, of entire strata of the people, of the community at large, to which we turn our active love.

Charitable associations are multiplying everywhere, both those that promote art and science, industry and agriculture, and those that relieve want and

[p. 94] misery and that strive most zealously to take the poor of their locality, of their town, under their protective care, and to diminish poverty itself as far as possible or to eliminate it entirely.

State authorities, associations and individual persons are striving to raise the working class materially and intellectually and gradually to lessen the great gap between the propertied and the propertyless; efforts are made to procure cheap and healthy dwellings for the workers, etc. To be sure, the duty of self-preservation already obliges us to this. For the continually depressed condition of the working class would at last have to lead to violent eruptions, which would threaten the existence of states and of human society. And when an epidemic breaks out in the stuffy, unhealthy dwellings of the poor, it very easily reaches the great and the noble as well.

But the fact that we have come to the insight that human society forms an organism, whose full health is conditioned by the health of all its members, allows us to hope for an ever happier future for it. And as regards peace, human beings have surely never been so thoroughly convinced of the reprehensibility of war as now. For apart from the unspeakable misery that war causes, the countless livelihoods it destroys, and the fact that it strikes all humanity and culture in the face,

[84] That basic ideas of a law of reason and of natural law lie in Mosaism is only in our days being properly recognised.

people have also come to the conviction that it is just as ruinous to the victor as to the vanquished; indeed, that the victorious state sometimes goes to meet an even far greater ruin than the defeated one. —

It may therefore be expected that in the near future a court of arbitration will be established which will decide disputes between nations according to law and justice, just as the ordinary courts are accustomed to do between individuals.

The Peace League has, after all, made it its task [p. 95] to prepare and bring about the establishment of such a court of arbitration, which states and peoples must obey. Then will be fulfilled the saying of the prophet (Mic. 4:3) concerning the kingdom of God on earth: "And it (the word of God, the word of truth) shall judge among many peoples and rebuke mighty nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." —

It is therefore not a Messiah coming down from heaven who will redeem Israel and humanity, but the power of truth proceeding from the Absolute, from the infinite World-Spirit, from the Godhead; it is ideas, spiritual powers, gradually realizing themselves in the human world, that will bring about a glorious messianic age.

And every right-minded person, of whatever faith and station, is called to contribute to this for his part, in his circumstances, under his conditions.

[p. —] Fifth Section. Religious Instruction

§. 37. Uniformity and Transformation of Jewish Education

It may rightly be asserted that instruction in the Jewish schools preserved, in its essentials, a uniformity of more than a thousand years. The Hebrew prayer book, the Pentateuch, other biblical books, and in addition, in the higher schools, Mishnah, Gemara, Rashi, *Shulchan Arukh*, etc. — these were the books that, right into our century, were taught more or less in all schools. Arithmetic, Judeo-German writing, etc., were added as more subsidiary matters. Instruction consisted essentially in the teacher's rendering the books mentioned, or parts of them, into the mother tongue or vernacular that the children understood, and bringing them to understand them. To be sure, the German that the Israelites spoke in past centuries was usually a faulty jargon; but this is no reproach to them, if one considers that the Christian rural population, even in Protestant regions where Luther's translation of the Bible was widely circulated, likewise used to speak a corrupt German. It remains to the credit of the Israelites, however, that among them the linguistically correct Mendel- [p. 97] ssohnian translation of the Pentateuch, despite the opposition of hyper-orthodoxy, found general and willing acceptance, that many even seized upon it with avidity, and that within a relatively short period they acquired a pure German even in their everyday speech. This testifies to a strong innate drive for education. — It was also reserved for

our century to bring a thoroughgoing transformation to Jewish education. The dividing wall between Jews and Christians disappeared more and more. The former entered civic life, became members of the organism of the state, and were therefore required by the state to send their children to the public elementary (common) schools.

But where were the children now to find the time and strength to master all the books named above, composed in Hebrew and partly in Chaldaic?[85] Of necessity, therefore, some had to be removed from religious instruction. On the other hand, the need was felt to admit into it new educational elements that did not demand so much time and strength: biblical and Jewish history, as well as religious doctrine and moral teaching. In most recent times, however, when the two parties, the orthodox and the reformist, have become especially pronounced, religious instruction too has taken on a party character. Strong differences exist about which subjects are necessary to it. Indeed, even within one and the same party opinions differ. I therefore believe I am acting in the interest of Judaism if I subject each subject that is to be considered necessary to a thorough discussion. In doing so, one must not lose sight of what the distinguished psychologist and educator Waitz[86] calls the statics of instruction, i.e., the subjects must be weighed against one another, both in their relation to the purpose of education and instruction and to the time and strength the children are able to devote to them.

[p. 98] §. 38. Hebrew

The Hebrew language, in which the Jewish religious outlook found its adequate expression, has for thousands of years been the language of prayer of the Israelites in public worship, and it still forms today the bond that encloses all Israelites as a single religious community and protects them from splintering into many sects. And although in our time the German element too has gained entry, and rightly so, because a person can express the feelings and concerns of his heart only in his mother tongue, the essential prayers must nevertheless be retained in the Hebrew language, as must the reading of the Torah. But since it is demanded by reason, and declared by biblical-talmudic Judaism, that a person should pray nothing he does not understand, it is an undeniable need for Israelite youth to be instructed in Hebrew; and since these young people, especially in the cities, where they attend institutions of higher learning for the sake of their intellectual education, can devote only little time and strength to Hebrew, the latter is to be restricted to a minimum: the reading and translating of the essential prayers, of the Pentateuch with the exception of such passages as are unsuitable for the young, and some knowledge of Hebrew grammar. This minimum, which must necessarily be learned in order to be able to understand the Hebrew divine service, is to be impressed so deeply on the children's memory that it does not easily disappear from it again. With children this goal can be reached only by way of continual repetition and

[85] Translator: "Chaldaic" (*chaldäisch*) is the period's name for Aramaic, the language of the Gemara and the Targumim.

[86] Translator: Theodor Waitz (1821–1864), philosopher, psychologist and anthropologist at Marburg, author of *Allgemeine Pädagogik* (1852).

practice, which must be begun early. As soon as the child has acquired the skill of reading Hebrew fluently and correctly, translating and explaining the Pentateuch and the prayers is to begin. The objection that this procedure, since children of tender age are not yet mature enough to grasp the meaning of the various word forms [p. 99] and the rules of syntax, leads to a dead mechanism is unfounded. For the natural course of education is from the external and mechanical to the inward and spiritual. The child gradually learns, through imitation and practice, to acquire and use the mother tongue or everyday language to a certain degree before it becomes in any way aware of the rules of language. And in learning Hebrew the reverse relationship should obtain — first insight and then practice! That would be unnatural. And translating Hebrew into German, learned through imitation and practice, is not only no hindrance to the children's intellectual education but even very beneficial to it. All operations of the understanding occur in it: analysis and synthesis. The verse is broken down into its parts and these are again united into a verse. — The word order of the Hebrew language is different from that of German. The pupil acquires the sense that one can also connect ideas in another sequence and take them up into the unity of consciousness. The mind is released from its slavish habit. These operations, combined with the explanations of words and subject matter to be given, which must be adapted to the age of the children, must necessarily have the effect of exercising and strengthening the understanding. And if the assertion often heard of late, that the Israelites possess a special resourcefulness and alertness of mind, is true, then the acquisition of this characteristic has surely been aided by the circumstance that for thousands of years their youth have been required to translate the holy books into Aramaic, Greek, Latin, German, etc., that is, into the most diverse languages. — If our old teachers, without having made any particular psychological and didactic studies, achieved astonishing things in Hebrew instruction, this came from the fact that they felt a holy enthusiasm for the Judaism [p. 100] they wished to teach the children, which communicated itself to the children as well. They possessed the true spirit of teaching, that deepest side of method, which amply made up for whatever other shortcomings there might be.

§. 39. Biblical History

Who will doubt that biblical history constitutes an essential subject in religious instruction? A religion that rests on a historical basis cannot be imparted otherwise than together with its historical material. One would, however, be very mistaken to believe that the teacher's instruction had already reached its purpose once the children had been brought to the point of having taken the historical facts into their knowledge and impressed them on their memory. Instruction in biblical history must also pursue educational aims. The historical material must be so prepared by the teacher that it penetrates the children's hearts stimulatingly and formatively and produces a moral-religious disposition. Under the teacher's guidance, lessons are to be drawn from the historical material that will serve the children as a guiding rule in later life and raise them to a level of moral cultivation such as is found among the better and nobler sort of people. To this end, a few points of view may be indicated here from which biblical history is to be regarded and treated. Instruction

in it should awaken sympathetic feelings, enliven and sharpen the moral feeling and moral judgment, illustrate religious truths, and further knowledge of oneself and of human nature. The more clearly and distinctly the teacher is conscious of these educational aims, the more orderly, better and more valuable his instruction will be. —

§. 40. Sympathetic Feelings

Human nature is so organized that the feelings of others are mirrored in oneself and [p. 101] awaken fellow-feeling. Very early, in the unspoiled heart of the child, there appears a sympathy with everything human. The expression of joy in a feeling being arouses *shared joy*, and its opposite *compassion*. From the perception of another's benevolence, loving affection and unselfish goodness there arises that tender emotion which makes one ready for similar expressions. The degree of these feelings is visibly connected with the whole organization of the person; hence easily moved, hence less sensitive hearts. The disposition to sympathy promises for the future a sympathetic, benevolent character and points to goodness of heart. It therefore deserves to be attended to and cultivated by education. Biblical history offers touching examples of fellow-feeling, sympathy and unselfish goodness toward one's fellow creatures, which, when properly made vivid to the children and set before their mind's eye, would call forth the same feelings and strivings in them. — How touching is the affection that Abraham shows his faithful servant Eliezer! Kindly treatment of servants was at home among our fathers. Rebekah's nurse is buried below Bethel under an oak, and the oak is given the name "Oak of Weeping," in honorable memory of the faithful servant.[87] — Friendship too belongs to the sympathetic feelings. How touching is the friendship that bound the hearts of David and Jonathan! A purer, tenderer and more heartfelt one hardly exists in history. The intelligent teacher who strives to ennoble people should use this example to awaken and enliven the feeling for friendship in his children. Let him show them how friendship beautifies the joys of life, protects the friend, comforts in misfortune, etc. — It is remarkable that even many a commandment of the Pentateuch takes its motive from the sympathetic feelings.[88]

[p. 102] §. 41. Moral Feeling and Judgment

The moral feeling too develops very early in the child's soul, in its pleasure in what is right and good, and in this the rule of reason over raw impulse and selfish desire begins to stir early on. Even at the tenderest age, self-respect and self-satisfaction show themselves in the consciousness of having acted rightly; in the opposite case, remorse, shame, unease. Important as the cultivation of the moral feeling is for education, however, it is by no means sufficient for the formation of a moral character, this ultimate aim of all education. This can be attained only through the

---

[87] Translator: Gen. 35:8 (Deborah, Rebekah's nurse; *Allon-bachuth*).

[88] Note. Adam Smith founded his moral system on sympathy. [Translator: the marker in the text is "1", the note itself is marked "*". *The reference is to Smith's* Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759).]

development of reason and the subjection of the will to its commands. The clearer the insight the pupil gains into what is right and good, the more readily his will submits to the law. But instruction on this point is all the more effective with children when it is gained through examples, and for this the biblical narratives and the actions occurring in them are especially suitable; in judging them the pupil's understanding must be set to work, so that he notices in them the greater or lesser moral content. In treating biblical history the teacher must not fail to ask questions such as the following: Was that right? Why was it right? What do you think of David when he spared Saul, who was pursuing him, at the moment he could have killed him? What do you think of him when he awards the property of Mephibosheth to the slanderer Ziba without having heard Mephibosheth?[89] — What do you think of Solomon when he prefers wisdom for the conduct of his royal office to all other goods? — Do you feel the power of conscience when Jacob's sons cry out in their hour of anguish: "We have deserved this because of our brother Joseph"?[90] — Here, as everywhere, the outward side of actions must be judged according to the general principle of morality, the inward side according to the motives. — Now as for the consequences [p. 103] of an action, the worth of the action does not indeed depend on them; nevertheless it should be pointed out that as a rule good consequences arise from good actions and evil consequences from evil actions.[91] [92]

§. 42. Illustration of Religious Truths

The first traces of a religious feeling are noticed earlier in one child, later in another. This is mostly connected with the awakening of conscience. It has further been observed that when children respect and love their visible benefactors, their parents, they readily transfer these feelings to the invisible benefactor, God. Children surrounded by goodness and love will readily sense the highest, infinite goodness, though it naturally depends on whether a religious spirit prevails in their surroundings. But religious feeling does not yet give lasting piety or firm virtue. Knowledge must be added to it. The understanding must be educated so that [p. 104] it gains insight into religious truths. These appear in the biblical narratives presented in a form perceptible to the senses. A single example will illustrate this. The story of Joseph gives sensible form to the thought: there is a providence that steers and guides the destinies of human beings. — Joseph, taught by joyful and

---

[89] Translator: 2 Sam. 16:1–4.

[90] Translator: Gen. 42:21.

[91] Note. There are cases that can be regarded from different points of view, according to which moral judgment is directed. When Joseph accuses his brothers before their father, does he act rightly? The outward form of this action is indeed blameless; for I can wish that every reasonable father should learn of the errors of his children. But the inner worth of the action remains undecided, since the story maintains deep silence about the motives from which it flowed. If Joseph thought: "Evil must be prevented, and my father must know what my brothers are doing in order to be able to prevent it," then his action stands before the judgment seat of morality. But if he did it out of love of domination, or to ingratiate himself with his father — who could approve of it? —

[92] Note. — The king and kingdom of Sodom perished through the vices that prevailed in the land. Today, to be sure, the vices of a people do not bring down a rain of fire and brimstone, but they make peoples no less unhappy. For the spirit of vice a) destroys the strength of the people through intemperance, luxury, idleness and extravagance, and b) tears apart the bond of peace among the members of a state. Where each wants only to grab for himself and no one wants to care for the whole, how is the state to survive? Cunning, fraud, avarice, mercilessness — they ruin the whole.

sorrowful experiences, recognized and acknowledged this (Gen. 45:5). — In guiding our destinies God has the intention of purifying us of faults and raising us to virtue. Jacob was on the way to spoiling his favorite Joseph and thereby sinning. The loss of Joseph prevented the evil. Ten of Joseph's brothers were frivolous, passionate men. But their father's grief, the famine, their predicament in Egypt — in short, the course of fate — taught and improved them. — Through the guidance of our destiny God often furthers even our earthly welfare. For Jacob and Joseph painful sufferings were the way to higher joys. The attentive person often has similar experiences in his own life.

§. 43. Knowledge of Oneself and of Human Nature

History is a mirror of the human heart, and there are few books, even those written expressly to further knowledge of human nature, that are so rich in characters of every kind as the Bible. It leaves no level of human goodness and human wickedness, of human perfection and human weakness, unoccupied. — Here are some examples: The Fall. Here, in a vivid, warning picture, is presented the victory of sensuality over virtue, which it often wins through inner and outer enticements, through specious reasons, through cunning seduction; and the observer of himself and of others finds here, stroke for stroke, the history of most human transgressions from their origin to their sad consequences. — The character of Abraham. There is one point of view [p. 105] from which it can best be judged, namely his conduct toward truth and toward the Father of truth, God. — Idolatry spreads; even Abraham's father does not remain free of it. But he — he feels the unworthiness of idol worship. He rises above the errors and vices of his time. He moves away from the land infested with error. — Abraham hoped: truth will triumph, perhaps late but surely. I will make its victory easier by having my descendants remain faithful to it. Surely one day, through my descendants, all peoples will be enlightened and blessed with the ray of truth. — With Abraham it was no barren knowledge and belief, but childlike trust and firm obedience. God commands what is easy and what is hard. He obeys. He also honors outward worship as a means of awakening to the good. — And how did this noble man behave toward people? His brother dies; he takes in the orphan, Lot. Lot grows rich under his care, and — ungrateful. Abraham sacrifices everything to peace, but does not cease to be beneficent toward him. Lot falls into distress, and Abraham rescues him at the risk of his life. — Toward Melchizedek most generous, toward the king of Sodom a man of noble pride. Unselfish in other respects too. They want to give him the field for the burial of his wife as a gift. He does not take it without payment. And what a father he was to his son Isaac, and what a master to Eliezer! — All-loving, respected by all, loved by all, constant to himself until death! — Such pictures, presented with liveliness, fill the children with respect for the good and noble, and leave behind the wish: may we one day become like that too![93] —

[93]Note. As regards the form in which the pupil is to arrive at the lessons and practical applications that follow from the historical narratives impressed on his memory, it must be remembered that he, as a free personality, is destined to appropriate the truth through his own activity. It is therefore the catechizing form of teaching that is to be applied here, in which the teacher requires of the pupil answers he has thought out himself, by whose combination more complex thoughts gradually come to be understood

[p. 106] §. 44. Post-Biblical Jewish History

For children who have already matured, instruction in post-biblical Jewish history also becomes a need. It begins a few centuries before the Christian era and extends to the present. It should acquaint the young with the most important events that befell the Jewish people during this long period, and with the political position it occupied among various peoples and at various times, and should also characterize the most significant products of Jewish literature, especially those that exercised an essential influence on the moral-religious outlook and education or on the forms of worship. Through knowledge of Jewish history and through insight into the tasks that Judaism has to fulfil in the family of nations, the young gain love and attachment for the community of faith into which they were born and to which they belong. Without knowledge of the past, the events of the present, especially those relating to emancipation, cannot be understood either. — In the first part of this book I have attempted to derive the oldest prayers from historical events and circumstances. This is a pointer for many a teacher. If he takes the same path when translating the prayers, the children's interest in Jewish history will increase and grow.

[p. 107] §. 45. Systematic Religious Doctrine and Moral Teaching

Once the children have heard and read much about God, his revelation in nature and history, his guidance, and what he demands of us as human beings and as Israelites, and have taken it into their consciousness, it is time for the teachings and truths of religion to be brought into an inwardly coherent whole for them, illuminated and grounded by the light of reason and of Scripture, both of which flow from one source, worked through with them catechetically, and made fruitful for their lives. — This subject of instruction too has found many an opponent, who maintains that the historical and didactic passages of the Bible offer material enough from which to derive all the teachings and truths of religion that are needed for a moral-religious life. But I ask: does this derivation actually take place in the schools, and does it take place in a methodical, fruitful way? And if it did, where would the children find the means to repeat the teachings already received, to preserve them from oblivion, and to bring them ever closer to their understanding, if not in a textbook of religion? And if with every other subject of instruction it is the task of a good method to give pupils insight into its members and parts and their systematic connection, this is surely the case with religion as well: its members and parts must come to the pupils' knowledge in a well-ordered system in which all the teachings stand in inner and living connection and form a unified whole. Only thus can a clear and fruitful knowledge of religion be furthered. — A textbook containing the sum of religion in systematic order can be presented either in acroamatic (lecturing) or in catechetical (questioning) form. The latter is the most suitable for children. A textbook [p. 108] in question form is called a catechism. This, however, should not supply ready-made

by him. On a historical foundation, by skilfully framed questions, the teacher should so stimulate the children to think that they seek out and find the resulting lessons by themselves. Such a procedure keeps the children in suspense, sharpens their judgment, and makes the lessons they have found appear as their own property, which they can and should one day prove in disposition and deed.

catechizations, but should occasion them. The teacher, as the *explainer* and *interpreter* of a catechism, must know how to handle the questions before him with dexterity, recast them, prepare them for fruitful working-through, and therefore lay out a formal plan for most of them, which must proceed now from the question set down, now from the catechism text, now from Bible passages, but now also, in Socratic fashion, from nature and history, from inner and outer experience. The content of a given catechism text must be developed on all sides in such a way that it is recognized by the pupil in its whole significance, according to the measure of his ability.[94] —

[p. —] # Sixth Section. Education and Instruction in Ancient Judaism

§. 46. Education in the Family

All civilization takes its first natural beginning in the family, this first and closest community of life. And so in ancient Israel too, as among many ancient peoples, the education of children was solely a family education; of institutions in which the children of many families were taught by a third party, a teacher, nothing was known. Education was undivided, i.e., it shared its work with no third party; all educational activities were concentrated in the hand of the father as head of the family, and hence a concentration, a unity, could take place in those activities themselves, and their effect was bound to be all the more intensive and lasting. Let us consider the three powers of education: care, instruction and guidance.

Care. — The Mosaic legislation had no need of a law imposing on the parents, and particularly on the father, the duty of nourishing his children. For apart from the natural instinct, which we find even among animals, in the Orient children were regarded as wealth, and numerous descendants as great good fortune and a blessing of God, while childlessness was lamented as a great [p. 110] misfortune and a hard fate. It goes without saying that in every good household the necessary care was devoted to the nourishment and care of the children, so that this blessing might be preserved for the house. — The idea found in many other religions, that the body is a work of sin and the seat of the devil, which must be mortified, remained entirely foreign to ancient as to modern Judaism. Judaism held the body too in high esteem[95] as the bearer of the spirit that makes the human being the image of God. Therefore Mosaism also contains many precepts aimed at the nourishment, health, cleanliness and strengthening of the body — must this not have had an effect on the physical education of the children?

---

[94] Note. In the *Lehrbuch der israelitischen Religion* (Textbook of the Israelite Religion) that I composed (Frankfurt, Jäger), I have included in many a doctrinal statement allusions to its grounding in nature and history, in order to give it more depth and fullness and to make its whole content easier for the pupil to retain by means of the association of ideas.

[95] Note. Hence it comes that in Judaism even the lifeless body of a person is still regarded and treated with high respect, on which more is contained in the address I delivered on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the burial society here (published by the author).

And that even in the patriarchal age the necessary care was devoted to the care and nourishment of children is shown by many a fact in the narratives handed down. Gen. 21:8 says: "When the boy had grown, he was weaned; and Abraham made a feast on the day his son was weaned." The nourishment and care of children seems at that time to have proceeded in the following way. According to an ancient, natural custom, newborn children received their nourishment from the mother's breast for a time, about a year; after that they were fed for 2 years with a mixture of goat's milk and honey (cf. Isa. 7:15), until they had grown strong enough to tolerate adult food, and this transitional stage was celebrated as a joyful event with a feast. — And if progressive dietetics demands of education that, as the child advances in age, attention also be paid to the development of the body through gymnastic exercise,

[p. 111] such exercise may well not have been lacking in Israelite family education either. This is indicated by the runners (רצים), the slingers (קלעים), the archers (רומי קשת), among whom gymnastic exercises had surely preceded, until they had attained a notable degree of skill and dexterity. Dancing, to which people often gave themselves, especially on festive occasions, was probably used early on for physical training.[96]

Instruction. — In Judaism, however, the care of the children's bodily organism never absorbed the other educational activities. It is remarkable that the Pentateuch puts the high ethical value of education into the mouth of God himself, when it tells us (Gen. 18:17 and 19): "And the Eternal said: 'Shall I hide from Abraham what I am about to do? . . . For I have chosen him, that he may instruct his children and his household after him, that they keep the way of the Eternal and do what is right and good.'" Thus through teaching and habituation they were to gain insight into the way of God, into what is right and good, as well as the strength of will to walk in it. But if already with Abraham the elements of instruction and moral guidance lay in his educational activity, how much more must this have been the case with the later Israelites, after Mosaism had imposed on the father the duty of instructing his children in teaching and law and of impressing on them the love of God and the observance of his commandments (Deut. 6:6–7 and 11:19). — How great the scope of the father's instruction was, we do not know. But since it emerges from many hints and statutes of the Pentateuch that

[p. 112] already in the time of Moses writing and reading were generally widespread among the people, since otherwise those statutes could neither have been ordained nor carried out, the father will presumably first have instructed his children in this foundation of all further education, that is, in reading and writing; and since Hebrew was the vernacular and mother tongue, it was easy for him to introduce them to the understanding of the holy scriptures. The logically ordered language of these scriptures, being at the same time the mother tongue, must, quite apart from its

[96] Note. The runners were employed as express messengers, as attendants accompanying the chariots of state, as royal messengers; the slingers and archers rendered excellent military service (2 Kings 3:25; Ps. 78:9). — חגג [*hagag*] means "to dance in a circle" and also "to celebrate a festival."

moral-religious content, have exercised in and of itself a formative power on the minds and hearts of the children.

It was made quite especially the father's duty to acquaint his children with facts of the nation's history on religious occasions. — Instruction in history fulfils its purpose only when it not merely enriches the children's insight (intelligence) but also awakens the heart to sympathy for those in whose destinies history unfolds. This was particularly the case here. The children were instructed in such facts as were connected with the welfare of the nation, and since these were presented as guided by God, they were well suited to awaken sympathy with the destinies of the nation as well as a moral-religious interest. — Besides the holy scriptures, the Israelites early on also possessed other books that contained narratives about pious men (ספר הישר [*Sefer ha-Yashar*, the Book of the Upright]) and about national wars (ספר מלחמות ה' [*Sefer Milhamot Adonai*, the Book of the Wars of the Lord]),[97] which surely offered the young much that was instructive. And what the young needed to know of practical occupations was, in the simple circumstances of a people engaged only in agriculture and cattle-raising, so slight that they could acquire it partly by watching and imitating, partly through a little instruction. Instruction in the facts of the nation's history was often, as for example at the Passover meal, linked with religious customs into which [p. 113] the children were initiated early, which were interpreted as symbols of those historical facts, and which moreover offered at the same time a joyful enjoyment of life, so that all the factors of education were represented here and worked together: care, instruction and guidance. The school has to struggle until it awakens interest. In such a family education everything sprouts and buds, as it were, of itself. Certain verses and passages of Holy Scripture, such as Deut. 6:4–9; 11:13–21, had to be learned by heart by the child under the father's direction and impressed on his memory. The word שנן [*shinnen*, to impress, inculcate][98] points to this. That was important. Through learning by heart and impressing on the memory, it could easily be recognized in the family how, by means of practice, repetition and habituation, an educational influence of the mature on the immature is possible for the shaping of his spiritual life in general. Furthermore, through this learning by heart the family had the opportunity to notice whether the child at times turns away from external sense perceptions, by which children are as a rule entirely captivated, turns its attention inward, observes itself and, what is still more important, controls itself. But this leads us to the third power of education, *guidance*.

It is of great importance for education that children be made receptive to and inclined toward sympathy and benevolence for others early on. This provides the foundation for the formation of a good character. In the family the child's sympathy is limited to a few persons, to parents and siblings; but precisely for this reason it can on the one hand be more easily noticed and surveyed,

---

[97] Translator: The two books are cited in the Bible itself: the Book of Jashar in Josh. 10:13 and 2 Sam. 1:18, the Book of the Wars of the Lord in Num. 21:14.

[98] Translator: Alluding to ושננתם [*ve-shinnantam*, "you shall teach them diligently"] in Deut. 6:7.

and on the other hand it is the natural preparation, the preparatory school as it were, for sympathy and benevolence toward people in general. When siblings in the parental home help and support one another and continually show one another sympathy and benevolence, this, because it already rests on free choice, that is, on morality, is a good [p. 114] omen that later they will also enter other circles with sympathy and benevolence. Likewise, the family is also the right place where national and moral-religious interest can be founded and deepened. Only in its warm atmosphere can such a formation of heart and character flourish as we admire in our great prophets, in those men who had an open heart for everything great and divine and possessed a character that shrank from nothing when it was a matter of helping the true and the good to victory. — The right relationship between husband and wife also contributed a great deal to good family education in Israel. Pedagogy makes the demand of education in the family that the father, as head of the family, conduct and maintain the government of the house, since the family offers favorable ground for unity and concentration of all educational activities only when it is constantly ruled by the strong, unified will of its head, the father. To be sure, a great task in education is also assigned to the mother. Nourishment, care and early habituation fall to her by nature. And if she rightly grasps her life's task, which falls so entirely within the family, her relationship to her child acquires that power of forming the heart which nothing whatever can replace. For in the mother, who first comes to meet it and stands at its side everywhere caring and helping, the child must at once and without interruption experience the full devotion of one human being to another, if a firm foundation for sympathy and benevolence is to be laid in its heart. Likewise, with regard to religion, it is the mother who is able to work powerfully on the child's heart earliest. For if religion is to grow into a power of the heart, it must be planted in earliest childhood, and that can happen not so much through instruction as through example. The most sincere expression of [p. 115] believing heart, of religious humility and exaltation, which the child sees before it in adults, that is chiefly the source from which the foundation of its faith must come. Religion is best imparted when the child often sees its mother pray, and when she teaches her child to pray and accustoms it to prayer.[99] — Nevertheless, the main task of education is the business of the father. He labors in his calling to satisfy the needs of his family; every day the family perceives how the maintenance of the whole depends on him, and he alone stands independent. The spirit of the family comes from him; his judgment concerning the worth of external things is decisive and sets the standard by which one orders one's life: he determines the family's standing toward the outside world and marks out what is expedient and what inexpedient, what useful and what harmful. If, then, in ancient Judaism the business of teaching and instruction was in addition entrusted to him — how great his authority

[99]The pious Hannah, who in the view of the Talmud teaches us how our prayer ought to be — namely, that we should pray often and repeatedly, quietly and devoutly, humbly and from the heart — surely also often offered fervent prayer in her own house, and this may have laid the foundation in her son Samuel for his moral greatness, his inwardness with God, his nobility of mind and his selflessness, in which he surpassed all his contemporaries. And when we remember our pious mothers, who not only themselves daily lifted their eyes to heaven in devout prayer but also held us to it, we must exclaim: "Alas for those who are gone and are no more to be found!" [Translator: the closing exclamation echoes the Talmudic saying "Woe for those who are lost and are not found," BT Sanhedrin 111a.]

must have been! And yet the relation of his wife to him, though she had to submit to his rule of the house, was not to be one of service and slavish obedience. Already in Mosaism, in keeping with the respect for personality and human dignity that it proclaims, the woman holds a freer, worthier position than in the other Oriental religions. Here the woman already appears as the natural helpmeet, by [p. 116] whom "the arrangement of household affairs is, as it were, bent to meet the master of the house" (Herbart, *Allgemeine Pädagogik*, Werke X p. 25).[100]

The Proverbs, in chapter 31, give us a picture of a worthy Jewish wife: how by her supervision, her activity and her thrift she maintains the order and prosperity of her house; how she seeks to bring her husband joy, honor and esteem; how she provides for the nourishment of her household and for the continuation of their work; and "how she opens her mouth with wisdom, and gracious teaching is on her tongue." This last seems to indicate that she also took part in the actual instruction of her children. Indeed, it is said repeatedly in the Proverbs: "Hear, my son, the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the teaching of thy mother."

Pestalozzi says of the child: "The image of its mother, which accompanies it everywhere, itself becomes its conscience";[101] for it gives the child the general rules for its willing and acting, and by these the verdict of its conscience is guided. Nevertheless, as already mentioned, its father remains its principal educator, especially in later childhood. It goes without saying that the father's authority must not degenerate into harshness and tyranny; rather, he must join strictness with gentleness. — In the *Menorath Hamaor*, composed in the 13th century by Isaac Aboab,[102] the following rules among others are given (ch. 86): "Let a man take great care not to speak an unworthy word in the presence of his son, still less to commit an unworthy deed, and so give him a bad example; rather let him seek to keep him far from everything ugly and abominable and lead him to piety. In particular let him seek to keep him far from hostile dispositions, from hatred and envy."

Ibid., ch. 85: "The father shall lead his son to the study of the Torah: first by granting what gives the child sensual pleasure, later [p. 117] by awakening and using his sense of honor, later still by showing him how the study of the Torah is connected with his now awakened moral and religious interest." — It is evident from this that our ancient moralists were well acquainted with the negative side of the cultivation of the heart and set great value on it; but that they did not fall into the one-sidedness of a Rousseau, who put forward the view that, since the child is by nature good, guarding it against evil influences is by itself sufficient for it to reach its moral destiny of its own accord —

---

[100]Translator: Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776–1841), German philosopher and educationist; his *Allgemeine Pädagogik* appeared in 1806.

[101]Translator: Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746–1827), Swiss educational reformer.

[102]Translator: Isaac Aboab (the elder), author of the ethical-homiletical compendium *Menorat ha-Maor*; he is now generally dated to the late 14th century.

a view long since refuted by experience; rather, they joined to the negative cultivation of the heart the positive one as well, which must come more and more to the fore the older the child grows.

§. 47. Pedagogical Theories Even before the Babylonian Exile.

Although in ancient Judaism, as was discussed in the preceding §., the education of children was solely the business of the family and the paternal home, where one was accustomed to educate according to inherited custom and tradition, there was nevertheless no lack of pedagogical theories even in pre-exilic times; and when Professor von Stoy, in his *Encyklopädie der Pädagogik*, p. 125, asserts: "Among nations which, like the Jews before the Exile, had no philosophy, one is not to expect any pedagogical theory either,"[103] we cannot agree with him as regards the Jews. For, quite apart from the question whether they really were wholly without philosophy, the proverbial wisdom set down in the Sayings of Solomon (Proverbs) teaches us that they certainly did possess pedagogical theories. Proverbial wisdom, which does indeed regard offspring as the honor of the house (Prov. 17:6): "The crown of the aged are children's children," but only if the children become wise and walk in the ways of the fear of God (Prov. 10:1; 17:21): "A [p. 118] wise son gladdens his father; a foolish one is the grief of his mother," "He who begets a fool does so to his own sorrow, and the father of a base son has no joy" — proverbial wisdom had in consequence to demand a careful education of children and to prescribe for it the right course. And this it did. For it, education falls into two parts, discipline and instruction. Above all, the evil propensity of the child, the folly that is in the heart of the boy, must be tamed (Prov. 22:15; 29:15): "If folly is bound up in the heart of the boy, the rod of discipline must drive it from there," "The rod and reproof give wisdom; but a boy left to himself brings shame on his mother." To spare the rod with a child is to hate it, whereas true love shows itself precisely in strict discipline, because the child is saved from ruin (Prov. 13:24; 23:14): "He who spares the rod hates his son; he who loves him chastens him betimes," "Thou beatest him with the rod and savest his soul from destruction." Here, however, a distinction is made as to where corporal punishment and where reproof is in place (Prov. 17:20; 19:25):[104] "A rebuke goes deeper into a man of understanding than a hundred blows into a fool," "Smite the scorner, and the simple will become wary; admonish the man of understanding, and he will learn insight." — Now the knowledge for which discipline is to open the understanding is moral and religious knowledge; the instruction with which the Proverbs of Solomon deal has as its task guidance to the knowledge of God and the fear of God, from which further proceeds insight into right and justice and into every path of the good (Prov. 2:1–9). Youth is to be directed to the divine word, which is to come to it from the mouth of the parents. The admonition goes out to parents to begin early with the instruction of the boy and so to win him for his whole life (Prov. 22:6): "Train up the boy according to the requirement of his way (i.e., according to what his course

---

[103]Translator: Karl Volkmar Stoy (1815–1885), Herbartian educationist at Jena and Heidelberg; his *Encyklopädie, Methodologie und Literatur der Pädagogik* appeared in Leipzig in 1861.

[104]Translator: the saying quoted is Prov. 17:10; "17, 20" is evidently a misprint.

of life demands); even when he [p. 119] is old, he will not depart from it." Close attention is to be paid to the boy's doings, since by them one can recognize "whether his nature is pure, whether it is upright" (20:11). In the *particular* pedagogical rules set down in the Proverbs, industriousness is urged with emphasis (6:6–11 and parallel passages), moderation is demanded (13:25), and warning is given against seduction to unchastity (7:5[105]). — These are surely sound pedagogical theories. Professor Franz Delitzsch says in Herzog's biblical encyclopaedia, vol. XIV, p. 715: "The tendency of proverbial wisdom is directed toward the humane in the Israelite, toward the universally religious in Jehovism, toward the universally moral in the Law."[106] Since, then, proverbial wisdom seeks to give this tendency effect especially among the young, its pedagogical aims are of such a kind that they are not surpassed even today.

§. 48. Schools in Ancient Judaism.

Family education was sufficient only so long as the Israelite people lived in the simple circumstances of shepherds and farmers. But when it had returned from the Babylonian exile to Palestine and established itself there as a colony, its conditions of life gradually changed and multiplied, and family education could no longer suffice in the long run. For despite the isolationist tendencies of an Ezra and a Nehemiah, the people was obliged to enter into intercourse with other peoples, and its contact with the most cultivated people of the ancient world, the Greeks, by which its horizon was widened, could not remain without influence on its need for education. Besides, the new circumstances may well no longer have allowed very many fathers of families to devote the necessary time and leisure to the instruction [p. 120] of their children. Moreover, the Hebrew language had long ceased to be the language of the people and of daily intercourse. If, therefore, a father wished to introduce his children to the Holy Scriptures, this could be done only by translating the Hebrew into Aramaic (Syriac and Chaldee) and later into Greek. But the business of translating and rendering is not everyone's affair; not everyone possesses the skill and talent for it. Further, from Ezra's time oral explanations were added to the written Law, which in the course of time accumulated into a considerable body of traditional material, and which, since they fixed the law and determined custom and usage, also had to be taught. These circumstances alone made the lack of schools felt. Then, about the year 70 B.C.E., a very important one was added. — The history of pedagogy teaches that when in a people a deep-reaching division has taken place in some sphere, separating it into several parties, one party or another turns its attention to the young, in order to lay in the growing generation a firm foundation for its views and to give it a direction corresponding to them. Thus, for example, did Luther. When the Reformation was an accomplished fact and the German people was divided into two parties, a Protestant and a Catholic, Luther issued admonition upon admonition to the German people, to fathers, to magistrates, to

---

[105]Note. That most of the proverbs do not derive from Solomon is now almost universally accepted. They are a mirror of the customs and views found among the better part of the people, especially in the time of King Hezekiah.

[106]Translator: Franz Delitzsch (1813–1890), Christian Hebraist; the reference is to J. J. Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*.

princes, etc., that they should establish schools in which children would be instructed in the Protestant-Evangelical faith. In the Israelite people, too, toward the end of the 2nd century B.C.E., a division had taken place that split it into three politico-religious parties: a Pharisaic, a Sadducean and an Essene party, which, however, took on their full character only under John Hyrcanus (d. 106 B.C.E.).[107] From then on Pharisees and Sadducees struggled for possession of power. Then the grave question had to come before the fathers of the nation, the members of the Sanhedrin, which party system was [p. 121] most conducive to the preservation of nation and religion, and to which, therefore, victory and preponderance should be secured. The answer to this question must have led to the following considerations: Should the Essene spirit, which fled worldly life and was averse to the common interest, spread widely and prevail among the people, the Jewish state would have to succumb to the attack of every hostile army and fall into ruins; should Sadduceeism, wholly devoted to worldliness and regarding religion as something quite subordinate, attain omnipotence, this would present the greatest danger for the ancestral religion and for the customs and usages of the fathers. Only Pharisaism seemed suited to preserve nation and religion and to regenerate them. For though religion was to it the highest thing, that which was to remain the fundamental feature of all human relations, it nevertheless did not close its eyes to the real world, but rather remained in the midst of worldly life and spent its strength for national independence. And with respect to the religious law, the Pharisees were the reformers of their time. They broke through the letter of the written Law, drew out its living spirit, and sought to adapt it to prevailing circumstances.[108]

How, then, to help Pharisaism to victory? The ruling party of the Maccabees and their aristocratic following was inclined toward Sadduceeism. Then [p. 122] about the year 70 B.C.E. Simeon ben Shetah, president of the Sanhedrin, turned his gaze to the young and established in every district of the land a school that served the surrounding area as a central point, in which youths received instruction from their 16th year onward.[109] This arrangement was regarded as sufficient for over a hundred years. Later, however, a division again took place within the people. On the one side stood Zealotism, a religious-republican party whose watchword was that it would violate the divine Law to render obedience to Roman rule; to God alone belonged dominion, and he alone could demand obedience. One must, with the exertion of all one's powers, with the sacrifice of property, family and one's own life, fight the presumptuous ones who demanded the duty of subjects from the Jews in God's stead. — On the other side stood the politically moderate, peace-loving Pharisaic party. Though not insensible to the heavy oppression of the Romans, it preserved a peaceable disposition

---

[107]Translator: John Hyrcanus I is now usually held to have died in 104 B.C.E.

[108]Note. Only recent times, through thorough research into the sources, have done justice to Pharisaism. The outward piety of the Pharisees by no means excluded inward piety. The better among them — several classes were distinguished — were regarded as strictly moral, moderate in enjoyment, gentle and benevolent toward everyone. Even in the administration of criminal law they let gentleness prevail; therefore the people clung to them with deep veneration. Here is one example. The Sadducees took the Pentateuchal penal provision "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth" literally. The Pharisees, on the other hand, recognized in it only the idea of compensating justice, and held it more fitting for a people of advanced culture that justice be satisfied by a compensatory payment of money for the injured limbs than by useless harshness.

[109]Translator: the tradition of Simeon ben Shetah's schools is found in JT Ketubot 8:11 (32c).

toward them, and its only concern was to preserve and propagate the ancestral religion of the fathers in accordance with tradition. Then pedagogical reflection awoke in it once more, and it again turned its gaze to the young, changing the practice in the field of education. This time it was Joshua ben Gamala who, appointed high priest about the year 60 C.E. by the procurator Albinus, called into being in every town of Palestine schools for children of 6 years, and who on account of this improvement of the instruction of youth was remembered for blessing by later generations.[110] Joshua certainly belonged to the peaceably minded in Jerusalem; otherwise the Roman procurator would not have appointed him high priest. At that time the institution founded by Simeon ben Shetah for grown youths appeared insufficient. The teachings of Judaism were from now on to be planted in the *tender* souls of children. — v. Stoy is in error when, in the encyclopaedia cited above, p. 187, he dates the Jewish [p. 123] school system only from Joshua ben Gamala; likewise when he gives there as its motive the hope "that the disintegrating national edifice could be held together by the spiritual bond of a common school," a hope which, however, was not fulfilled; for, he says further on p. 188, in spite of all human efforts the Jewish nation, because its destinies had been fulfilled, had to vanish from the great family of nations. The Romans, he says, dealt Judaism its death blow. — We have seen, however, that schools had been established more than 100 years before Joshua ben Gamala, that is, at a time when the Jewish state was still flourishing. And as for the latter, Joshua, he was certainly not so short-sighted as to think he could halt the ruin of the state, already before his eyes, by establishing schools for little children. No, it was traditional Judaism he wished to save, and it has been saved. The Romans were indeed able to deal the national edifice its death blow, but not Judaism, which on the contrary has outlasted them, still continues to exist and must continue to exist, because its mission is not yet wholly fulfilled.

§. 49. Means of Discipline and Paternal Authority.

The spirit in which children are guided and led, whether wise or foolish, shows itself above all in the use of the means of discipline, in particular of punishments. Now if it is true, as v. Stoy says in the work cited, p. 172, that the kind of these means of discipline depends on the level of culture of those who educate, then the Israelites must already in the first centuries of our era have attained a high degree of culture, from which they never again descended, but on which, rather, they advanced further. Rab, the famous head of the school at Sura (d. 247 C.E.), once said to Samuel, a teacher of children: "When thou strikest a child, strike it only with a shoe-strap [p. 124] (i.e., a strap with which the sandal was fastened); if it learns, well and good; if not, put it beside a child eager to learn" (BT Bava Batra 21a).[111] — The hasty man, inclined to quick anger, may not be a teacher. Avot II, 7.[112] — The direction that Isaac Aboab (lived in the 13th century) gave to Israelite fathers, so that they would bring up their children with kindness and love, I have already cited in

---

[110] Translator: BT Bava Batra 21a: "Truly that man is remembered for good, and Joshua ben Gamla is his name …"

[111] Translator: in the Talmud Rav addresses Samuel bar Shilat, a teacher of children; the Talmud's "put him beside" reads literally "let him be a companion to his fellow."

[112] Translator: "The quick-tempered cannot teach" is Mishnah Avot 2:5 (2:6 in some editions).

§. 46.[113] — This spirit of gentle guidance, which showed itself on the part of parents and teachers in the use of the means of discipline, remained at home in Judaism down to our own day. — Let us now hear what v. Stoy, relying on trustworthy sources, says of the means of discipline that were in use in Christian schools of the 17th century. P. 174: "There it is reported from Hesse that the schoolmaster thrashed the pupils all in a heap, that he took a large iron pot that had been full of porridge off the fire and hung it round the neck of a small, slight boy; there the well-known Latin verses of Clajus Herzbergensis[114] speak of the pillory, the clamping of the arms, etc., as by no means unpopular disciplinary measures; ordinances of that time, as for instance that chastisement should be done with moderation and not with coarse cudgels, sticks, keys or fists, or that teachers should not lay into the boys as though upon donkeys, seize them by the hair, trample them with their feet or thrash them with clubs, involuntarily call to mind pictures from Roman antiquity, such as the classic flogging scenes in Herculaneum." — How fundamentally different is this harsh chastisement from the gentle Jewish one! But if, by v. Stoy's own words, mild punishments in education are the sign of a certain degree of culture in those who educate — how could he pass so harsh a judgment on the level of culture of the Israelites, or rather assent to such [p. 125] a judgment, as he has done on p. 28? There he expresses himself on the question of the effectiveness of education in the following way: "And indeed, one need not set a Samoyed beside a cultivated German as proof of a difference produced, after all, chiefly by education; one has weighty examples in the Quakers and Jews already mentioned in this sense by Jean Paul."[115] That can surely mean nothing other than: the Quakers have enjoyed an education and are therefore cultivated people, but the Jews are not. In the eccentric imagination of the poet of Wunsiedel[116] this harsh judgment is pardonable. He lived, after all, at a time when in non-Jewish circles Jews and Judaism were not known at all, when people produced notions of them subjectively and took them for objective. But that a thinker like v. Stoy should repeat such a prejudice in a work published in 1858 and dedicated chiefly to the teaching profession is very saddening for every friend of truth who knows Jews and Judaism closely. If there had not been among the Jews, in every epoch of their historical existence, a level of culture produced by education, how could their literature have been continually enriched and grown in extent and many-sidedness? — I must here draw attention to yet another error and correct it. In the place cited, p. 173, it says: "As a natural, to be sure, but most significant expression of such a fundamentally different view of education, we meet in history the fact that the *patria potestas* (paternal authority), immeasurably great among the heathen and even among the Israelites, was from the beginning confined within narrow limits in Christian legislation, and above all lost the right over [p. 126] the life and death of the child, which even in the Solonian

---

[113]Note. The father was forbidden to punish his already grown son with blows, because he could wound his sense of honor or provoke his resistance. BT Mo'ed Katan 17a.

[114]Translator: Johannes Clajus (Clai) of Herzberg (1535–1592), Lutheran schoolmaster and grammarian.

[115]Note. Remarkably, this juxtaposition of Jews and Quakers by Jean Paul has also passed into the *Pädagogik* of Gustav Bauer.

[116]Translator: Jean Paul (Johann Paul Friedrich Richter, 1763–1825), born in Wunsiedel; the reference is to his treatise on education, *Levana*.

legislation, though greatly restricted, had still been left in place for one grave case.[117] How could it be otherwise! As little as the God of the Christians wills the death of the sinner, but rather that he turn and live, so little can and may the father will the death of his sinful child."

First, the second sentence. It was not, as v. Stoy supposes, the God of the Christians — if he did want to use a special designation of God — who uttered the saying cited, but the God of the Jews, and that through the mouth of the prophet Ezekiel, who lived 600 years B.C.E. (Ezek. 33:11): "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but in this, that he turn back from his evil way and live." In my opinion it is simply the God of mankind who has spoken here, since all human beings who return to him obtain restoration, reconciliation and grace. — In the first sentence, in asserting that among the Jews too paternal authority was immeasurably great, v. Stoy seems to have had in mind the stubborn and rebellious son who, according to Deut. 21:18 f., was to be stoned. But let us look closely at the passage in question; it reads: "If a man has a stubborn and rebellious son, who will not obey the voice of his father and of his mother, and they chasten him, but he still does not obey them; then shall his father and his mother lay hold of him and bring him out to the gate of his place, to the elders, and say to them: This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice, he is a glutton and a drunkard, etc." — One sees from this: Mosaism does not leave the right over life and death to paternal authority, but only the right to bring a charge against the stubborn and degenerate son before the elders, that is, the judges, and to these the decision fell. And wisely the participation of the mother is required; for of the tender, compassionate heart [p. 127] of the mother it could be expected that it would consent to so harsh a procedure only in the most extreme necessity. But where, even in this single grave case, is the immeasurably great paternal authority? Obedience to parents was regarded as one of the foundations of the edifice of religion and state. If, then, a son's disobedience degenerated further into debauchery, people saw in it a threat to the public welfare. In this sense tradition too understood the law. It says: when the degenerate, stubborn son no longer has the means for his debauchery, he will become a highwayman, attack travelers, rob and kill them.[118] But here too the Pharisees, just as they brought a gentle practice into criminal law in general, displayed their reforming wisdom. They surrounded the law with so many clauses and attached it to so many conditions that its application became an impossibility. Of the right that fathers among the Romans had over the person and life of their children, even those already independent and holding office,

---

[117] Translator: Mannheimer prints "Salomonischen" (Solomonic), evidently for "Solonischen," the legislation of Solon, which is what Stoy's argument requires.

[118] Michaelis, in his work *Das mosaische Recht*, arrives at a similar thought when he understands by this rebellious son a dangerous drunkard who, in intoxication — which in the South raises the passions to a terrible pitch — is capable of committing any crime. [Translator: Johann David Michaelis (1717–1791), *Mosaisches Recht* (1770–75).]

there is no trace in the Mosaic provisions. (Compare Saalschütz, *Das mosaische Recht*, pp. 588 and 816.)[119]

§. 50. Continued Existence of the Schools.

Both institutions, that of Simeon ben Shetah for grown youths as well as that of Joshua ben Gamala for little children, have maintained themselves down to our time, that is, for almost two thousand years.[120] The Israelites were scattered over the [p. 128] whole globe; yet wherever they settled and made their homes, even if only in small numbers, it was one of their most important concerns to set up a prayer room for common divine worship, a school for their children, and to found societies[121] (חברות [*ḥavurot*]) for the poor and the sick. From the Talmudic age many fine sayings about the instruction of the young have been handed down, some of which shall find a place here.

BT Kiddushin 30 lays upon the father the duty to procure a teacher for his son and to pay him the wage due. Against a recalcitrant father the communal authority could proceed by compulsion. —[122]

Ibid.: Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba once met R. Joshua ben Levi just as the latter, with his nightcap on his head, was taking his children to school, and asked him why he was doing so. R. Joshua answered: "Is it not said in Scripture: Thou shalt make them (the events) known to thy children and thy children's children? And is it not specially added: the day that thou stoodest before Horeb? Is this a small matter?" R. Joshua, that is, interpreted the two passages to mean that it is reckoned to the father who brings his children to the house of study as though he had stood at Horeb and received the Torah.[123]

Ibid. it is related of Rabba bar Huna that he never [p. 129] breakfasted before he had taken his children to the house of study.

BT Shabbat 19: Resh Lakish transmits in the name of R. Judah Nesiah: Every town that does not appoint a teacher for the instruction of its children must be destroyed. Ravina transmits the saying

---

[119]Translator: the tradition cited is BT Sanhedrin 72a (cf. Mishnah Sanhedrin 8:5); the many restricting conditions are in Mishnah Sanhedrin 8:1–4 and BT Sanhedrin 71a ("there never was and never will be a stubborn and rebellious son"). Joseph Levin Saalschütz (1801–1863), *Das mosaische Recht* (1846–48).

[120]The institutions for grown youths used to be called *Yeshivot*; if one wished to give them a modern name, one could call them continuation schools. Some of them were famous in our century: Fürth, Prague, Pressburg, Würzburg, etc. If the youths were strangers to the place and poor, they were supported with great munificence by the Israelite inhabitants. Notable scholars have come forth from these nurseries. [Translator: the note's marker is printed "1" in the text, evidently for "2".]

[121]These associations or fellowships, in which sympathy for one's fellow man made itself known, have accomplished great things: they have preserved Judaism from a degraded class, from a so-called proletariat. Already on the soil of Mosaism are found the first organizational attempts at institutions against the rise of a propertyless class of the people (proletariat). See *Der Mosaismus im Gegensatz zum Aegyptenthum* (Magdeburg 1878, p. 26).

[122]Translator: the father's duty to teach his son Torah is in BT Kiddushin 29a–30a; the compulsion of the community is a later halakhic formulation (cf. Maimonides, *Hilkhot Talmud Torah* 1–2).

[123]Translator: BT Kiddushin 30a, citing Deut. 4:9–10.

in another form: The town must be placed under the ban, for the world endures only through the breath of the children of the house of study.[124]

BT Berakhot 17: Rab said: Women attain eternal salvation by bringing their children to the house of study. —[125]

The high importance of schools was so valued that it was laid down that school instruction may not be interrupted even for the purpose of rebuilding the Temple. BT Shabbat 119. —

The Talmud also contains rules concerning school discipline, the number of pupils in a class, and the course of study; and with regard to the erotematic (catechetical) form of teaching, methodology could take from it much that is valuable. (On this, read my essay in the *Israelitische Wochenschrift*, No. 36, 1879, on "Mendelssohn's Influence on Pedagogy.") —

The high esteem for the instruction of the young was taken up with great thoroughness by Maimonides and the later moralists and casuists into their codes and became the outlook on life of the Jewish people. Most communities were poor until well into our century, and yet they provided for the upkeep of their schools and teachers. And even the poorest father of a family, who supported himself and his own with toil and hardship, gladly contributed his mite to it. For he thereby fulfilled the holy duty of instructing his children in the Torah or having them instructed, and he lived in the firm conviction that through a moral and religious education of his children he best furthered their temporal and eternal welfare. — But besides this self-sacrificing religious sense there was yet another factor that contributed essentially to the lasting existence of the schools, and that is the governance, [p. 130] administration and direction of the schools and teachers, or the school regime. Whoever attentively goes through the history of practical pedagogy gains the conviction that if in any land or state the whole school regime depends on the power of the supreme school authority, if it is conducted and exercised by it alone and in every respect, if all school affairs are concentrated in its hand, then precisely this complete concentration will be not merely not conducive but even a hindrance both to the founding, spread and maintenance of schools and to the flourishing and prospering of school instruction. For even with the best will it possesses and the greatest energy it displays, it will be impossible for it to take account of local circumstances at all times and everywhere. And if this state of affairs lasts for decades or even centuries, families become disaccustomed to providing for the instruction of their children; rather, they shift their cares in this regard onto the supreme school authority. Hence the expectations of the latter have always had to fall far short of reality. This has been recognized in recent times in Germany, and therefore, in the founding and endowing of schools, the appointment of teachers, the supervision of their performance, etc., families and communities, or rather their representatives, are more and more drawn in to cooperate. — The school is a tender plant that must

[124]Translator: the passage is BT Shabbat 119b; "f. 19" is evidently a misprint for "f. 119".

[125]Translator: BT Berakhot 17a.

never be torn from its natural root, from which it draws its nourishment, that is, the family, if it is to thrive properly. In Judaism the school regime always remained in the hands of the families and communities, or rather their boards; it thus remained on the soil that alone is suited to protect and preserve the tender plant of the school and to further its thriving. The schools were founded, endowed, supervised and directed by the communities. As a matter of course, all school affairs were arranged according to local conditions and circumstances. And because the schools were the creations of the communities and of the [p. 131] families, these always took the greatest interest in them. Here willingness to sacrifice and its work stood in constant interaction. And so the schools were assured an existence of almost two thousand years, to the imperishable glory of Judaism.

Appendix.

§. 51. The Relation of Parents and Children.

In Mosaism and in the Judaism that proceeded from it, the relation of parents and children, this basic form of human community, appears as a holy, divine one; the parents are God's representatives. The Mosaic Law holds murder committed against parents to be impossible; therefore it set no penalty for it. On the other hand, it threatened the striking or cursing of parents with the death penalty, and designated every violation of filial reverence as a grave sin that would bring heavy punishment in its train. — Of the two tablets of the Ten Commandments, one is customarily called the tablet of God and the other the tablet of man. The commandment "Honor thy father and thy mother" stood on the first, so that a higher radiance might fall on it and parents might be regarded as God's representatives. — Wisely the divine word does not say: Thou shalt love thy parents, but: Thou shalt honor them. For though love is the element in which the unspoiled child lives, it has been covered by nature itself with the veil of unconsciousness. In such a child it is a natural feeling that resists the drawing of love into the light of day. But once the [p. 132] child has been taken into discipline by the divine commandment to honor, then love founded on respect becomes a moral power that will and should express itself vigorously in tokens of love toward the parents. — Mosaism is altogether filled through and through with holy awe before old age and with the duty toward its infirmity. "Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head and honor old age," it says in Lev. 19:31.[126] Among many peoples of antiquity we find contempt and disdain for the old members of the family who had become useless as something quite ordinary. Among the ancient Germans it was indeed considered a crime to kill an old man who had become feeble, yet it occurred in isolated cases (Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, vol. I, p. 41).[127] In Israel, by contrast, tender parental love and filial reverence prevailed from its very beginnings, as the narratives of the Pentateuch hand down to us. Isaac's conduct toward his father Abraham, his selfless surrender to his will, shows us an ancient model of the high duty of the child toward its

[126]Translator: the verse is Lev. 19:32; "19, 31" is evidently a misprint.

[127]Translator: Georg Waitz (1813–1886), *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*.

parents. Conversely, in those narratives pictures of unfilial, undisciplined conduct are designated not as Israelite but as Canaanite; and the disrespectful behavior of children toward their parents is even traced back to the ancestor of the Canaanite people, to Ham the son of Noah, who made sport of his father as he lay drunk and uncovered. Likewise the displeasure that Esau's Canaanite wives aroused in his parents may have had its ground in their disrespectful behavior toward them. — Concerning the duty of children to support their parents, Mosaism does indeed contain no regulation, but this is already implied in the duty to honor. Joseph gives us a model of a son concerned for the care of his father, and Sirach (3:3–12) teaches: "Child, care for thy father in his old age, and grieve him not as long as he lives." — In the Talmudic age the manner in which one must honor one's parents became a subject of discussion in the [p. 133] houses of study, and it was laid down as *halakhah* (rule): The son must feed his parents, clothe them, etc., lead them in and out when they need a guide, and do all this with gladness; he may not, however, contradict them except with tender consideration, and must avoid everything in which they might see a slight.[128] — And so the intimate and holy family life has remained the distinctive basic character of the Israelite religious community down to our time.

Corrections.

Page 8, line 7 from below, read *Ascher*
Page 9, line 3 from below, read *Danksprüche*
Page 10, line 6 from above, read *Chachamim*
Page 12, line 14 from below, read *Palästina*
Page 20, line 1 from above, read *und als Quelle*
Page 32, line 10 from above, read *hältst*
Page 39, line 11 from above, read *vergib*
Page 69, line 3 from above, read *Ausspruches*
Page 70, line 3 from above, read *denn*
Page 77, line 9 from below, read *von*
Page 79, line 17 from above, read *Kultus*
Page 81, line 2 from above, read *Schwächung*
Page 81, line 2 from above, read *durch*
Page 82, line 2 from below, read *Trajan*
Page 88, line 12 from below, read *verbreiteten*
Page 93, line 2 from below, read *Industrie*
Page 94, line 19 from below, read *dessen*
Page 94, line 16 from below, read *anbelangt*
Page 94, line 23 from above, read *gewesen*[129]

[128]Translator: cf. BT Kiddushin 31b–32a.

[129]Translator: the corrections refer to the German words of the original printing and are given untranslated; page numbers are those of the printed book.