

Preface

The articles in the present volume were originally presented as papers at two separate congresses organized on behalf of the Department of Jewish Philosophy at Tel-Aviv University: The first one, dealing with "Myth, History and Utopia in Jewish Thought" was organized by Dr. Yoram Jacobson in 2000; the second one on "Wissenschaft des Judentums: the provocation of its cultural agenda" took place in 2001 and was conducted by Dr. Michael F. Mach in collaboration with Dr. Almut Bruckstein and Dr. Rachel Livne-Freudenthal. The common goal of both academic enterprises was an attempt to clarify processes and basic models within Jewish history and the self-conception of Judaism as expressed in different historiographies. The respective contributions were assembled and are being published together.

The lectures from the second congress concentrate on the historiographic concepts of scholars who represent the so-called "Wissenschaft des Judentums" in the 19th and 20th centuries as well as on the relationship between this science of Judaism and its underlying ideologies. The chronological framework of the first congress was expanded so as to encompass a wider spectrum of Jewish thinkers, among others Maimonides and Nahmanides, the Maharal of Prague, Rabbi Kook, Immanuel Levinas and others. These collected articles represent the variegated and thorough interest which generations of Jewish thinkers — from early times up to the present — have taken in the meaning of history, originating and nourished from the roots of ancient myth and striving towards a new, utopian world order that is envisioned as solid and lasting. This order will find its expression in the realm of the individual who wants to transcend historical reality as well as in the

Preface

life of the community permeated by cosmic and metaphysical lawfulness. Notwithstanding the fact that history is based upon these laws, upon their revelation, the historical framework will collapse, its laws will be annulled, and a totally new reality will spring forth and dominate the world. Accordingly, history will develop into the opposite of itself, and become a utopian and meta-historical reality.

The authors are scholars from many different academic institutions in Israel and abroad; their studies reflect how deeply Judaism and modern scholarship are concerned with the meaning of history and its processes. This is not surprising: by the end of the second millennium, under the impression of events and developments unprecedented in Jewish history, the problematic character of a meaningful understanding of Jewish history in the past and in the future has grown immensely, and has led to repeated efforts by thinkers and scholars to decipher it. The impact of the catastrophic events just hinted at have undermined the foundations of historical research, arousing the need for new methodological questioning of its scientific premises.

The editors would like to express their appreciation and gratitude not only to the scholars who contributed to the present volume, but also to all those who made its final publication possible: Prof. Ziva Shamir, head of the Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, and her predecessor Prof. Yair Hoffmann (up to 2002); the former secretary of the school, Mr. Gideon Spiegel, who was very helpful in organizing the congresses and encouraging the publication of their proceedings, as well as Ms. Sarah Vered who has taken over from him recently; Mr. Aaron Berger, the language editor, Dr. Yossef Schwartz and Mr. Haim Mahlev who translated some of the articles into Hebrew.

Tel Aviv, March 2005

Michel F. Mach

Yoram Jacobson

ABSTRACTS

Dieter Adelman

Why Philology Matters to Religion: On Textuality and Humanism

1. In the opinion of Leopold Zunz (1794–1886), ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ is the systematic examination and criticism of all stages of the development and manifestation of Judaism as well as the integration of this research into the ‘Totality of Sciences’ in accordance with the style and concept of ‘science’ as it was understood in the classical period of the early 19th century. Zunz saw this as a means of integrating Judaism — liberated from the ghetto — into modern culture and sustaining it. He developed the method he employed to attain this goal from the specialized concept of philology that August Boeckh (1785–1867) had introduced and taught at the Friedrich Wilhelm Universität in Berlin from 1811 to 1865. Boeckh considered philology to be the special science of retrieving knowledge that had once existed but was now lost. Philology is the ‘Rediscovery of the Discovered’. The connection between this interpretation of philology and the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ continued to influence students at the Berlin Institute for ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ right up to the last graduate, Herbert A. Strauss. The institute was closed on July 1, 1942. It was this experience that later caused Strauss to feel obliged to systematically extend the renewed ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ by conducting research into anti-Semitism.

2. On November 19, 1936, the newly founded Reichsinstitut for the History of New Germany in Munich inaugurated the Research Institute for the ‘Judenfrage’ [Jewish question]. The purpose of this institute was

to investigate and eliminate the interface that existed between German and Jewish spheres of life with regard to the 'Judenfrage'. The institute provided a scientific, institutionalized basis for the holocaust that ensued. In order to eliminate the interface, it was especially necessary to eliminate the 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' itself, which had, during the course of the 19th and early 20th centuries, led to a host of scientific research papers and to the establishment of a broad international system of research institutes supported by funds provided by diverse Jewish communities. The real extent and effect of the institutes founded by the Nazis for the purpose of scientific research into the *Judenfrage* has only come to light in the most recent research papers on anti-Semitism and on the historio-scientific investigation of historical research.

3. The theoretical purpose behind the Nazi research efforts into Judaism was to tear down the walls that the thinking of the recent past had erected between the realm of the mind and the realm of nature. In contrast, the ethos of Jewish thinking lay precisely in building up and culturally extending the polarity between mind and matter. Within the systematics of philosophy, the concept of God is a prerequisite that serves the purpose of sustaining this difference. It is precisely this difference that must be integrated into the Totality of Sciences.

4. The history of the 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' in the 19th century is not based solely on the definitive work of L. Zunz, but even more so on the existence and organization of the Berlin Institute for 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' and on its most prominent teacher, H. Steinthal (1823–1899). The latter is connected less with Zunz than with Wilhelm von Humboldt's concept of science, which Steinthal linked to August Boeckh's concept of philology.

5. In his essay, 'Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture' (1944), E. Cassirer describes the creation of 'symbols' as the self-definition of the function of knowledge within the natural world and as the constitutional process whereby human culture evolves. Looking back scientifically, this world of symbols is only accessible philologically if once known but now lost knowledge is restored. August Boeckh's

Encyclopedia and Methodology of the Philological Sciences becomes the original paradigm that affords, as a human basis, the conditions necessary for generating a new humanity. With the aid of this concept of 'Wissenschaft des Judentums', Hermann Cohen (1842–1918) tried to extend this method into a general constitutional condition for the concept of culture as a 'hodegetic encyclopedia of the unity of consciousness of culture'. Here *hodegetic* means *suitable for teaching purposes*.

Yoseph Ben Shlomo

History and Utopics in Maharal and Rav Kook

The Maharal of Prague and Rav Kook are the last two Jewish thinkers who included a philosophy of history within their philosophies. Their respective eschatologies are systematically developed as part of the philosophy of history. In both cases, the eschatological theories fluctuate between apocalyptic-utopic and historic-restorative messianism. The Maharal stresses the former, whereas Rav Kook favors the latter. According to the Maharal, the turnabout that is expected at the end of days will change things from one extreme to the other and lead to a *total loss* of the natural world. The transition from exile to salvation is entirely different from natural proceedings. As a result, there is no beginning of salvation to be detected in history, no step-by-step revelation of the messianic era. As opposed to this view, Rav Kook does detect the beginning of salvation in a natural way within historic reality.

This contrast is based upon different ontological hypotheses and is expressed by means of diverse understandings of negation. According to Rav Kook, negation is part of a reality that originally served a positive purpose; the difference between Being and Non-Being, Sanctity and Nature, good and evil belongs to the inner dialectic of being itself. It must not be perceived as two opposites confronting each other, and the way from one to the other is direct and unmediated. This dialectic is at work, according to Rav Kook, not only in history, but in the entire cosmos. It

is *the little key to the palace kept on a huge chain* and therefore even determines biological evolution.

These ideas correspond astonishingly well with those of the Catholic theologian, Teilhard de Chardin, who, like Rav Kook, perceives reality as a whole, including the material as well as the non-material parts, which form a teleological stream. The latter can only be understood on the basis of God's existence as origin and goal together. Yet, according to both thinkers, the final aim of evolution is to be located beyond the limits of the human spirit. In the words of Rav Kook, "The organization of the perfection of the spirit and its fulfillment cannot remain incomplete and will strive to reach the final goal." The path of human development is endless, since man longs "to return to his unlimited origin, to unite with the Deity, and thus the creator creates himself, and he will attain the full level of creator and will transcend the limits of being created." Teilhard calls this goal of universal development 'the omega point'.

Alfred Bodenheimer

The History of a Missing Land: Yitzhak Fritz Baer's Book Galut

This article discusses Yitzhak Fritz Baer's small book (German original 1936) as a historiographic program based on his education, his absolute Zionism and his discussions with colleagues, particularly G. G. Scholem. During the preparation of his monumental edition of sources regarding the history of the Jews in Spain, the former exponent of the 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' had become critical toward and even estranged from that 'Wissenschaft', and his book, *Galut*, reflects that change.

After 1933, the hope of the founders of the 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' to integrate Judaism into the modern Western culture could no longer be sustained. Thus, while the emphasis on the Jews' contribution to world history (Graetz and Dubnow, for instance) was not denied, it was by now secondary at best. The history of the Spanish Jews offers a different

view of the famous “symbiosis” celebrated by Buber and criticized by Scholem. As a whole, Jewish existence in the Diaspora betrayed the Jewish spirit, since Judaism had established the ideas of nation and history for the Western cultures — values that were denied the Jewish people by their host nations. The real turning-point in Jewish history, then, was the crusaders’ destruction not only of Jewish communities along the Rhine, but more so in Palestine. From that time on, there was no possibility of a dual existence — a real historical one in the Diaspora and an ideal one in the Jewish homeland (Yehuda Halevi). The idea of that homeland was to be redefined by Torah; however, this redefinition was tantamount to the loss of any real historical and political connection of the Jews within this world. Baer thus describes Isaac Abravanel’s eschatology as disconnected from the political realm versus the Marranos’ attempt to reestablish a Jewish form of historical and national self-definition. Consequently, ‘Marranos’ becomes a basic term for the discussion of modern Jewry (including Spinoza, for this purpose).

Baer addresses the European nations that denied the Jews the right to live among them any longer, and demands their help in reconstructing a Jewish national homeland. (Here, at least, Baer’s own discussion contains some eschatological overtones.)

Jewish history perceived in this manner becomes counter-history as compared to the modern Western notions of history and nation as well as in its relation to the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’. Baer’s book is not merely the replacement of a religious homily with a national one (as Scholem told some of his colleagues), but rather a serious quest for the meaning of Jewish history and for the legitimization of the Jewish historian.

Hagai Dagan

Theology and Secularization in Scholem’s Thought

According to Scholem, secularization can and should play a positive role

in the construction of a modern Jewish theology. This constructive role is possible precisely because of the destructive nature of secularism, namely, its ability to shake Jewish theology and discard its superfluous contents. This, therefore, enables it to be rebuilt within the modern framework. Secularism allegedly imposes this process both on liberal and orthodox theology. The new theology will then be based on a Cabalistic rationale and reflected by the discipline of Jewish studies.

Secularism can only serve as a passing stage on the way to a new kind of religious ex-perience, since alone it is nothing but destructiveness and existential despair.

The article presents Scholem's thesis in light of the present situation, sets out the premises upon which it stands, and discusses its meaning and weaknesses.

Amira Eran

On the Concept of Spiritual Pleasures

This article explores the notion of spiritual pleasure. Spiritual pleasures are described by religious philosophers as the only real pleasures that await man in the other world. It is not the tragic fact that we do not have living testimony to their real essence that most mostly stresses the other-worldliness of these pleasures, nor is it the remoteness of everyday sensual experience that makes them so substantially vague. It is the desire of religious philosophers to leave the question of reward and punishment in the next world hidden under a cloak of fantasy and promise, beyond human comprehension and imagination, that creates the mystery of these pleasures and makes any discussion of them so elusive and puzzling.

In the attempt to furnish the classical background of the religious attitude toward spiritual pleasures, it is shown that Avicenna, Al-Ghazali, Averroes and Maimonides used the Aristotelian link between supreme divine delight and supreme intellectual delight to create a concept of intellectual other-worldliness, which marks the pinnacle of human

achievement. However, in order to make these pleasures appealing to ordinary people at the beginning of their journey toward intellectual fulfillment, the religious philosophers presented them in the image of physical pleasures. At the same time, they also made extensive use of images of physical defects, hoping to make their non-philosophical audience aware of the fatal effects of a mere physical existence totally devoid of spiritual pleasures.

Rahel Livne-Freudenthal

Jewish Studies: The Paradigm and Initial Patrons

Prior to the inception of the 'Science of Judaism', there were only stories about Jews. Since then, the science has undergone the same process as the 'dry bones' that the prophet Ezekiel witnessed awakening, rising and becoming covered with skin and sinews.

The analogy of Leopold Zunz, one of the founders of Jewish Studies, indicates the role assumed by this science, namely, to represent Judaism as a self-conscious "collective self" acting within history according to plan and purpose, and affirming its own existence by writing its history. The construction of Jewish Studies entailed defining the structure of the research object and its *raison d'être* and methodology, thereby creating the paradigm and its resulting principles. Jews were characterized as a distinguished people, and the role of Jewish Studies was to reconstruct the national existence of Judaism by writing about its past as a coherent national narrative.

In the conflict between universal existence according to the Enlightenment and national existence according to historicism and national romanticism, Judaism was characterized as a national culture. This definition served two purposes: (1) the integration of the Jews as a 'Kulturvolk' (people of culture) into the German 'Kulturnation' (nation of culture); and (2) the formulation of a public sphere of Jewish existence as an integral part of the surrounding culture.

This concept dictated the following principles:

- The notion of returning to history: the reconstruction of Judaism as a 'historical subject' within the discussion of the concept of freedom;
- The historicization of Judaism: the belief that the essence of Judaism, like all other national cultures, is revealed in history;
- A fundamental concept of monotheism, which distinguished Judaism as a national culture;
- Athens and Jerusalem as a pattern of dichotomy;
- 'Bildung': the representation of Judaism as an aspect of 'European culture'; for example, the periodization of Jewish history should reflect the notion of Progress;
- Categories of knowledge: a body and an organization of knowledge derived from contemporary science.

The paradigm and the principles introduced by the founders of Jewish Studies became the foundations of the modern 'Science of Judaism'. They reflect both acceptance and rejection, since they frame the discourse of Judaism.

Goerge K. Hasselhoff

The 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' of 19th-Century Germany and Its Rediscovery of the Maimonidean Influence on Christianity

This article presents the attitudes of four 19th-century scholars toward the influence of the Rambam — Moses Maimonides — on Christian thinkers.

The two older scholars, Moritz Steinschneider and Manuel Joel, had different historical approaches. Steinschneider was a bibliographer whose main objective was to provide a broad basis for further historical works. His principal interest was Arabic Judaism. For him, Judaism was "an occurrence and a development" that had to be compared with the neighboring cultures. Joel's primary interest, on the other hand, was apologetic. For him, Judaism was superior — particularly to Christianity

— for historical, religious, and, most important, for philosophical reasons. Therefore, he attempted to prove that the essentials of the great Christian philosophers relied on Maimonides. The historical research of both authors laid the foundations for further studies on this subject.

Subsequently, this research was continued by Joseph Perles, who, in his well-known article, combined some of his teachers' scholarly conclusions and his own great philological abilities into a brilliant and enduring contribution to Maimonidean scholarship. His study, which was published in 1875, is still unequalled. Like the second scholar of the second generation of the 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' presented here, Jacob Guttman, Perles' attitude toward Christianity might have been similar to Joel's, but neither he nor Guttman gave any outward indication of it. Furthermore, Guttman displayed systematic rather than explicit historical interest. That might explain why he made no reference to Steinschneider's works. In his writings, Guttman demonstrated his broad horizons with regard to the history of philosophy and his profound knowledge of Christian literature. In addition, his rather systematic approach along with his own particular attitude toward Maimonides revealed major differences between his and Joel's writings. Again, they are not expressed explicitly.

Regarding all four authors, the lasting value of their works lies in the fact that, by emphasizing different aspects of one phenomenon, each one demonstrated that the history of medieval thought cannot be written without a close comparative analysis of works by Muslim, Jewish and Christian authors who themselves wrote in Arabic, Latin, and sometimes Hebrew.

Israel Koren

Mythical Cognition in Historical Perspective

Friedrich Weinreb's (1910–1988) Neo-Hasidic world conception combines the immanent approach to the divine as manifested in Hasidic sources with the symbolism of depth psychology. According to him,

Abstracts

myth is not first and foremost a way in which our ancestors experienced the world and expressed themselves, but rather a present reality — another dimension of it — to which man can relate. That reality exists alongside man's 'ordinary' experiences of reality. The creatures of the world, be they inanimate, plant, animal or human, as well as the world's occurrences, constitute physical expressions of divine thoughts that manifest themselves in space and time. The Hebrew language in general and Cabalistic hermeneutics are the means whereby one can read the purposeful 'text' of the world. The world as a divine symbol also appears in our dreams, but man's task is to experience his life as a whole as a symbolic dream. The appearance of a snake during the day or in a dream at night bears the same significance. In both cases, it is a divine revelation, a pictorial speech, addressed to man in order to be decoded with the help of tradition.

After taking a cognitional step in the rational modern era, man has to take a step with his other mythological 'foot'. History contains the two above-mentioned versions of reality. The Biblical era was an era of myth in which angels revealed themselves, animals spoke, the raging sea was an expression of the divine will, and a prophet rose up to Heaven in a chariot of fire. At the time of the destruction of the Second Temple, the myth reality withdrew to man's innermost soul and to the hidden dimension of reality. In our time, however, man can and should awaken that reality once more — both within himself and by looking at his surrounding world in a different way.

Dalia Levy

Rabbi Moshe Avigdor Amiel and European Culture

This article examines the confrontation of Rav Amiel (1883-1945) with Western cultural values. Rav Amiel's aim is to guide the young Jewish generation — "the perplexed of our time" — who, in their ignorance, tend to adapt Western values. The issues of this polemic are as follows:

1. Rav Amiel protests against the monotheistic nature of Christianity, claiming that it suffers from multiplicity in both deities and the Creation. This is in contrast to the pure monotheistic nature of Judaism. He further claims that Christianity glorifies power, thus profoundly opposing the Jewish ideal of justice and mercy. Rav Amiel also argues that Jewish love is superior to Christian love. (Nevertheless, he prefers Christianity to secularity, which bears potentially dangerous seeds such as Nazism.).

2. Rav Amiel's polemic with Kantian ethics is consistent in all his writings. He claims that this ethic is rigid and egotistical, and its weakness stems from its own secular and formalistic definition. It is a secular ethics based on utilitarian principles, unlike Jewish ethics, which originates from an absolute divine source.

3. Nationalism has become an idol in our times. It originates from the belief in a national deity that overpowers other nations and their gods. Modern nationalism is a struggle for survival, which evokes the darkest human lusts to conquer, dominate and spill innocent blood in its name. Its extreme manifestation is Nazism. In contrast, the ideal of the Jewish people is to change reality into what it should be. Jewish nationalism differs from modern nationalism in its moral concept and in its goal, namely, to influence other nations and to redeem the sins of humanity. It is noteworthy to mention that Rav Amiel fiercely criticized secular Zionism.

4. Rav Amiel disagrees with political and social systems because of their materialistic outlook and the suppression of the individual. He particularly argues against Socialism, the so-called banner of justice of our times, which has become a cause for idealistic youth.

In tackling these issues from a Jewish point of view, Rav Amiel shows the moral superiority of Judaism. Thus, Judaism is not merely a set of do's and don'ts; it is true monotheism and pure morality, a complete world-view presenting absolute and eternal values.

Ephraim Meir

The Utopia of Peace and the Topic of Politics in E. Levinas' Oeuvre

The thesis of this article states that Levinas' work allows for the development of a social and political philosophy in which human rights and the equality of all citizens are central. While politics and social organization receive attention in his ?uvre, the focal point of his thinking is ethics.

Some people accuse Levinas of his relative neglect of politics the attention, whereas others hold that politics is dealt with sufficiently in his ethical metaphysics. This contradiction in the evaluation of Levinas' philosophy given in the present article deals with the political dimension of Levinas' thought and with the interaction between ethics and politics, seeking to present textual evidence for his treatment of politics.

It is maintained that for Levinas, the heteronomy, diachrony and asymmetry of the ethical relation do not contradict the autonomy, synchrony and symmetry of the political relation. Levinas is not a merely utopian and naive thinker who prefers humanism to the exigencies of justice. On the contrary, his philosophy is born in a century of multiple conflicts, wars and violent events and remains an important model of thinking about humanized politics.

In the course of the article, Levinas is situated within the line of thinkers who discuss the complex relationship between politics and ethics. Levinas does not separate the two domains, as Augustin, for instance, did. On the contrary, like Arendt, he anchored politics in ethics. Politics is not necessarily the continuation of the totalizing Self; it can be rooted in ethics. Levinas agrees with Heraclitus that Being discloses itself as war, as "polemos", in which the individual's singularity is obliterated. Nevertheless, there is the good beyond Being that lends Being its very meaning.

In *Totality and Infinity*, politics and polemics are opposed to the

eschatology of messianic peace. Like Rosenzweig, Levinas strives for a way out of totality. He finds it in the exteriority of Infinity, in the transcendence of the face of the Other.

Totality and Infinity highlights the problematic character of a state that may adopt a Machiavellian character, becomes involved in war, and uses 'reasons of State'. There is the temptation to absorb the individual in a (Hegelian) totality that reduces the Other to the Same.

Levinas gradually became more interested in politics, as well as in economic, juridical and social institutions. He showed the way from a dual relationship to the plurality of the 'we'. Man has political and economic value. Levinas does not promote a liberal politics that affirms man in his spontaneity. Already in *Totality and Infinity*, the Third appears in the dual relationship. The Utopia searches for its topic realization. It is the whole of humanity that looks at me in the face of the Other. Fraternity or solidarity is the result of proximity and is linked to non-indifference and paternity.

In *Otherwise than Being*, there is an increased emphasis on the political element — the 'Said' — which is craved by ethics — the 'Saying'. There is the I, the Other and the Third who is also an Other. One perceives the traces of the Third in the face of the Other. Therefore, one needs synopsis and symmetry, a State with its laws and institutions. 'Thank God', I am also the Other for the Others. In his testimony to 'Illeity', the I passes to the Other. Thank God, he is also the Other for the Others.

In *Outside the Subject*, Levinas writes about human rights for everybody, including the I. He stresses that ethics demands politics and that ethics as human rights of the Other remains the source for all human rights.

Finally, I search Levinas' 'confessional' writings for important utterances on politics. In these writings, the State of Israel is conceived as a result of justice, and yet the State itself does not have the last word. Levinas talks about 'monotheistic politics': there are ethical limits to the political existence.

In short, Levinas' philosophy is a reflection on the fundament and aim

Abstracts

of politics. His thinking represents an alternative to a philosophy like that of Hobbes, for whom the State is the result of the limitation of violence between people. In Levinas' philosophy, politics is not autonomous, but anchored in ethical heteronomy. Politics is the limitation of high moral exigency. The State with its laws has its limits regarding respect for the human being.

Levinas manifested an increased interest in politics. In his later philosophical work, man is political from the outset; there is more emphasis on the State, equality and rights. In contrast to Martin Buber, Levinas stressed the necessity of political institutions. He writes about the relation between Judaism and the State of Israel. More generally, Levinas shows a link and a tension between ethics and politics. He avoids a 'Realpolitik' without ethics as well as ethics without politics. Peace as proximity is beyond the political and craves politics. The ethics of Jerusalem craves the politics of Athens. Ethics takes the interests of people into account in order to make them less violent. Human respect cannot exist without the laws of the State or an economic strategy. In our present situation, self-assertion and self-affirmation may be important, but the humanity of human beings ultimately lies in the humble service of the Other. This elevated attitude of one-for-the-Other craves political institutions that have to remain really human. Students of Levinas could develop this line of thinking further and make it a more central point in their own thinking — more central even than in the writings of Levinas himself.

Guy Miron

History, Science and Social Consciousness in the German-Jewish Public Discourse in the First Years of the Nazi Regime

In the last years of the Weimar Republic, German-Jewish historians and publicists treated popular history as a part of the Jewish struggle against the rise of Nazism. Naturally, this changed after January 1933,

but the new political situation did not stop the Jewish public from dealing with history. Until late 1938, Jewish historians, educators, rabbis and other public figures continued to discuss historical topics extensively in the pages of German-Jewish periodicals as well as in new popular publications. This article deals with the way in which they related to the tension between the scientific characters of the historical discipline and its public role during times of crisis.

One of the clearest representatives of the liberal German-Jewish mainstream in these discussions was the young Berlin historian, Fritz Friedländer. In a critical review of a book by the young Nazi historian, Wilhelm Grau, Friedländer bravely criticized the tendency to judge or misjudge the liberal heritage of German history from the point of view of current political values. On the basis of Ranke's thesis that all periods of history are equally close to God, Friedländer claimed in late 1935 that the historical significance of Jewish emancipation should not be misjudged, its present political defeat notwithstanding. In the circumstances in which political struggle against Nazism was no longer possible, the value of free and objective attitudes toward history, as opposed to the Nazi historical discourse, could still be presented by Jewish liberals such as Friedländer.

An interesting example of the attitude toward history in the inner Jewish discourse of the time can be found in Stefan Fraenkel's article, 'History Teaches the Present' (1934). Stressing the importance of the objective dimension in history, Fraenkel still related to its role in imbuing current events with the correct perspective and in helping to calm the Jewish public. In addition, various attitudes toward this problem are discussed in view of the reviews of Ismar Elbogen's popular book on German-Jewish history (1935). In 1936, the 50-year anniversary of Leopold Zunz's death provided German-Jewish spokesmen with another opportunity to reevaluate the 19th-century heritage of 'Wissenschaft des Judentums' and to relate to the problems of the public role of Jewish science in times of crisis.

Yossef Salmon

**The Orthodox Reaction to Secularity in Eastern Europe:
The Beginning of East European Orthodoxy**

Normally, Jewish orthodoxy is defined by modern historians as the reaction to modernity that came into being during the 19th century. For Western Europe, this process is generally linked to the Hamburg 'temple' established in the second decade of that century. However, for Eastern Europe, the picture is far less clear with regard to time and circumstances. This article seeks to pinpoint the 1860s as the beginning of East European orthodoxy and to discuss the different levels of polemics as they developed in reaction to liberal trends.

The main danger was been perceived in literature and journals that reflected distinguishable levels of enlightenment. Accordingly, the main battle was fought in the journals of the traditionalists.

Besides the inner Jewish struggle for social change in Russia, the knowledge of reform congresses in the West as well as inner Russian movements reinforced the anxiety of the traditionalists.

Special attention is paid to Lilienblum's attacks on the rabbinic Judaism of the time. However, the reactions make it clear that not only the connection of Jews to the more modern arts and sciences was on trial, but more so the danger of secularization and assimilation. It was claimed that both elements were liable to render Judaism untrustworthy in the eyes of the non-Jewish environment and its government. The subsequent apologetics partially denied the value of modern sciences. However, this issue became part of a larger argumentation, as is well attested to in Lapidot's writings. The latter denied any important differentiation between customs of different ranks and commandments, and declared rabbinic literature to be a fount of knowledge, including magical practices. Ultimately, orthodoxy was perceived as useful for the authorities.

Other strands of the discussion may be seen in Israel Lifshitz' polemics against languages of prayer other than Hebrew or in Gordon's negative

reaction to the diminution of the messianic elements by some of the liberalists.

The outcome may be defined as a twofold attitude to science in general: whereas the one group declared traditional Judaism to be the basis of all further knowledge, the other allowed for an interest in the sciences once Israel was again in its own country, free from any fear of assimilation and secularization.

Yossef Schwartz

Jakob Guttman: Medieval Philosophy as a Multicultural Project

This article examines the place of Jakob Guttman in the early phase of German-Jewish scholarship and develops two main perspectives: (1) the description of Guttman as a Jewish religious leader, and (2) the understanding of the development of his scholarly interest in medieval Jewish and Christian thought. Guttman's main motivation as a scholar was directed at intercultural aspects of medieval thought, stressing the major role played by Jewish thinkers, particularly Maimonides, in shaping medieval Christian thought. By means of such a description, Guttman strives to depict a new image of medieval culture — one that might contribute to the shaping of a new intellectual atmosphere within modern German culture. It is no coincidence that this effort is parallel to Catholic Neo-Thomism, while the figure of Maimonides functions as a parallel image to that of Thomas Aquinas in Catholic discourse.

Yossi Turner

History, Redemption and the Messianic Future According to Franz Rosenzweig

This article analyzes Franz Rosenzweig's conception of history in the

Abstracts

context of the tension obtaining between 'faith and humanism' in his thought. It begins by tracing the evolution of Rosenzweig's anti-Hegelian stance from his early letters and diary entries to the detailed historiographical position set forth in the second section of his major work, *The Star of Redemption*. It is shown that while previous Rosenzweig scholars were certainly correct in stating that Rosenzweig's anti-Hegelian historical stance followed from his notion of revelation, his understanding of history in the *Star* nonetheless developed by way of the Hegelian dialectic. That is to say, not only for Hegel, but for Rosenzweig as well, history is a process of human self-awareness rooted in the ultimate unity between spirit and nature. However, whereas for Hegel, the dialectical development of history stems from the all-encompassing power of reason as the source of that unity, for Rosenzweig it is rooted in the dialogical relationship maintained between the primary fact of individual human existence and a transcendent God. In this manner, the history of religion and philosophy in the West no longer reflects the development of reason's self-understanding as the basis of all things, but rather the extent to which humanity is willing to push beyond the borders of its own immanence in order to create a future based upon a full-fledged partnership between the immanently human and divine transcendence. Based on this, it is found that Rosenzweig requires that going beyond the parameters of the Hegelian universe be the only possible basis for a reasonable fulfillment of the hopes and aspirations of the modern humanism that is characteristic of Hegelian philosophy.