

SHULAMIT VOLKOV

## INVENTING TRADITION

### On the Formation of Modern Jewish Culture

#### I

Tradition is such a self-evident element in our culture that it seems to require no special explanation. Nevertheless, it has recently become a subject for a prolonged debate in a number of scholarly disciplines<sup>1</sup>. Repeated efforts to redefine and analyse its meaning led especially to some fundamental rethinking especially in the field of *Volkskunde*, in Folklore-studies, in what Americans usually call Anthropology.<sup>2</sup> Interestingly enough, the matter has now invaded other domains, too. The problematising of the concept of tradition, together with some of its most common antipodes, such as innovation and modernity, brought about a fundamental rethinking in *Kunst- and Literaturwissenschaft*<sup>3</sup> and, as could only be expected, its reevaluation is now slowly becoming an issue for historians too. In an ever expanding and changing world, with continuously shifting perspectives, explaining what has always seemed only obvious is no mere luxury. The clearing-up of terminological mess becomes an absolute necessity if one wishes to avoid dogmatism and, worse still, the ever-present danger of provincialism. Terms like tradition must be repeatedly rethought and reconsidered and their meaning reconstructed again and again; they must, in fact, be deconstructed.

1 A shorter version of this study has been the basis of a lecture given in the framework of the Jewish Studies Public Lecture Series of the Central European University on 4 December 2001.

2 See the interesting discussion in D. Ben-Amos, 'The Seven Strands of Tradition: Varieties in Its Meaning in American Folklore Studies', *Journal of Folklore Research* 21 (1984), pp. 97-131. Ben-Amos refers to the combination of words "new tradition" often repeated in Ethnography and cites the British Folklorist Edwin Hartland who said as early as 1885 "tradition is always being created anew ..." (p. 99). I should like to thank Gadi Elgazi for having made this essay known to me. A critical view of an unreflective concept of history may be found in H. Bausinger, *Volkskunde. Von der Altertumsforschung zur Kultureanalyse* (Darmstadt o.J.), and in H. Bausinger and W. Brückner, *Kontinuität? Geschichtlichkeit unter Dauer als Volkswissenschaftliches Problem* (Berlin, 1969).

3 A short overview of the development in this field may be found in the introduction of W. Barner, *Tradition, Norm, Innovation. Soziales und literarisches Traditionsverhalten in der Frühzeit der deutschen Aufklärung* (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien, 15.) (Munich, 1989), IX-XXIV. Cf. W. Barner, 'Wirkungsgeschichte und Tradition. Ein Beitrag zur Methodologie der Rezeptionsforschung', in *Literatur und Leser. Theorien und Modelle zur Rezeption literarischer Werke*, ed. G. Grimm (Stuttgart, 1975), pp. 85-100, and W. Barner, 'Über das Negieren von Tradition - Zur Typologie literaturprogrammatischer Epochenwenden in Deutschland', in *Epochenschwelle und Epochenbewusstsein*, ed. Reinhart Herzog and Reinhart Koselleck (Munich, 1987), pp. 3-51.

I would then like to begin by trying to define tradition. And in order to remain as close as possible to the common-sensical meaning of the word, avoiding flight into some intricate theory, let me begin on a rather cautious, conservative tone. Tradition, thus, is a “*Sammelbegriff*,” denoting the overall symbolic, textual and institutional apparatus, by which a group preserves or claims to preserve the memory of its common past, its values, its old ethos, its unique inherited genius. It functions, no doubt, much like an individual’s memory. But while it is easily evident that memory begins to play its role only when real experience is removed from a present to past tense, this simple truth is only rarely applied in the case of tradition. Memory serves, not always faithfully to be sure, to uphold a bygone world. Tradition too acquires its meaning only when the ‘real thing’ is gone. It presupposes a certain level of historical consciousness and some sort of an overall conception regarding the mechanism of temporal change. But, like memory again and, one might add, unlike history, it is singularly unconcerned with recalling the past “*wie es eigentlich gewesen war.*” Instead, tradition endeavours to reconstruct the past for particular purposes, all clearly relevant to the present. Despite its claim for authenticity, it normally provides us a rather slanted view of former realities. It serves, more often than not, as a distorted mirror.

One of the most amusing but unexpectedly instructive examples of the emergence of such a slanted modern tradition in recent historiography is a study of customs and rituals connected with present-day British monarchy.<sup>4</sup> Throughout the first part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and as long as the king or queen possessed real political power, the ceremonies attached to the monarchy were normally quite shabby, lacking any elevating spirit; indeed, often rather pathetic. It was between 1870 and 1914, as the monarchs gradually retired from active politics, that the way was open for the construction of grand ceremonial traditions in connection with each of their public or private moves. Precedents from earlier periods were not lacking and it was easy enough to improve upon them, in an effort to achieve the politically useful aggrandisement of a decaying institution. Religious traditions, too, though they include much more than a series of formal ceremonies, often gain their significance when religion itself loses its real power. Such traditions then tend to develop in response to the dissolution of faith and the deterioration of the life-style associated with it. They grow as substitutes for transcendental experiences and authentic convictions.

There certainly was no Jewish ‘tradition’ of an authority until well into the 18th century. Surely, sacred texts and a multitude of religious practices were transmitted from one generation to another among Jews too. But Jewish life has been dictated by the commands of a presumably timeless religious law, not by tradition. This law alone had the power to regulate

<sup>4</sup> See David Cannadine, “The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the ‘Invention of Tradition’ c. 1820–1977”, in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 101–64.

various aspects of Jewish life, dictating the routine of work and rest, the rhythm of common and holy days, the human life-cycle on all its components. It was by fulfilling the commands of this Law, that such private events, like birth, marriage or death were given a collective meaning, and it was this law which regulated sexual practices, family relations and all aspects of inner-Jewish social life. Ancient habits may have played some role in handling conflict situations or in settling unanticipated problems. But it was the legitimate decisions of the local Rabbi, drawing authority from his mastery of the texts, never from any sort of a vaguely shared tradition, which finally dictated solutions. Pre-18<sup>th</sup> century Jewry seemed to have had no need for tradition.

In fact, the invention of tradition was the most comprehensive, perhaps even the most formidable Jewish “project of modernity.”<sup>5</sup> Unlike other aspects of modernisation, this was not an unintended outcome of the individual’s decisions and action but a conscious collective effort, designed to reshape and modernise that ever-present but often so evasive, even mysterious entity, Judaism.<sup>6</sup> Not surprisingly, indeed, the entire project has only rarely been identified as such, let alone studied or analysed. After all, negating its own existence was its *raison d’être*. An immanent task of the entire project was to gloss over its novelty and dish out a new Judaism as a merely restatement of the age-old one. Thus, while some aspects of the new tradition were singled out for investigation, the phenomenon as a whole has not yet been examined. Historians of German Jewry, moreover, have normally been so entirely absorbed by quite another aspect of their subject matter, namely by the spectacular entry of Jews into the non-Jewish culture around them, that internal developments within Judaism seemed rather provincial and unattractive to most of them. Taking over and continuing the debates among contemporary Jews, first between reformers and orthodox and then between the so-called assimilationists and their Zionist critics, historians have only rarely been in a position to seek new perspectives. Worse still, they have too often been, and sometimes still are dominated by the terminology of the past, haunted by the discourse which had once divided the protagonists.

One could perhaps break away from all that if one would manage to replace the old paradigms, centred above all around the two most common and prominent terms in this historiography, emancipation and assimilation, and try to observe anew the familiar landscape from a different perspective. The application of new concepts is a familiar technique for gaining

5 Jürgen Habermas used this expression in 1980 in his lecture “Die Moderne – ein unvollendetes Projekt?”. See J. Habermas, *Kleine politische Schriften I–IV* (Frankfurt am Main, 1981), pp. 444–64.

6 Concerning the modernisation of Jews as members of a certain social-ethnic group, see S. Volokov, *Jüdisches Leben und Antisemitismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Zehn Essays* (Munich, 1990), pp. 131–45. See also S. Volkov, ‘Erfolgreiche Assimilation oder Erfolg und Assimilation: Die deutsch-jüdische Familie im Kaiserreich’, *Jahrbuch des Wissenschaftskollegs zu Berlin*, 1982/83, pp. 373–87.

such a changed outlook and it is in this way, indeed, that I would like to proceed here. In order to clear up some persistent misunderstandings, I would like to begin by treating Judaism neither as a confession, nor as an ethnic group, certainly not as a straightforward modern nation – but as a multi-faceted “cultural system.” I would then like to argue, that though this system had been undergoing deep transformations since the last decades of the 18th century, these, contrary to established wisdom, were not inevitably leading to its disintegration or decay but included a massive collective effort at a cultural rejuvenation, resulting in what might readily be subsumed under the title of an “invented tradition.” True enough, this project was not always a story of success, but its significance at the time, and its implications for later generations, must not be underestimated. The new tradition represented a joint modernisation enterprise, even though its products often carried an ambivalent message, looking backward and forward at the same time. It suffered from a number of immanent, structural weaknesses but, I would finally argue, both its failures and its achievements belonged to German Jewry as a whole. Neo-orthodoxy and reform, even orthodoxy itself, were all engaged in the same kind of enterprise. Both Assimilationists and Zionists were playing a part within one and the same history.

## II

The treatment of Catholicism or Protestantism as something more than ‘mere’ confessions normally arouses comparatively little opposition. More than 30 years have passed since Rainer-Maria Lepsius, for instance, characterised the Wilhelmine Society as a conglomerate of “milieus,” one of which, he most naturally assumed, was the Catholic.<sup>7</sup> Beyond the familiar church hierarchy, Lepsius could easily demonstrate, Catholics have created a whole network of social associations, mostly concerned with entirely secular matters. For a variety of historical reasons, moreover, Catholics also came to occupy a very specific social position in 19<sup>th</sup> century Germany. They were clearly over-represented in rural areas and in the lower orders of society and under-represented among the well-off and especially among the highly educated. At the time, as Thomas Nipperdey has later reminded us, one often spoke of the danger of “*Zwei-Kulturen-Gesellschaft*,” even though the actual depth of the gap between Catholics and Protestants, especially in a variety of unobservable and intimate spheres of life, could hardly be appreciated by contemporaries. Protestantism, too, was demonstrably more than a matter of pure religion. One may thus speak of ‘*Kulturprotestantismus*’

7 M. R. Lepsius, ‘Parteiensystem und Sozialstruktur. Zum Problem der Demokratisierung der deutschen Gesellschaft’, in *Wirtschaft, Geschichte und Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Friedrich Lütge*, ed. Wilhelm Abel (Stuttgart, 1966), pp. 371–93.

and of 'säkulare Religiosität,' determining much of the basic values and the specific life-style of all members of this denomination, true believers as well as the common agnostics, the pious and the heretic alike.<sup>8</sup>

Things seem rather more complex when one turns to Judaism, and not without reason. Since the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, in fact, Jews were expected to be able to shed their peculiar "Jewishness" at will. Jews themselves repeatedly wondered at their inability to do so. Ludwig Börne's much-cited complaining about the insistence of both friends and foes to see only the Jew in him, immediately come to mind: "*Es ist wie ein Wunder*" he lamented, "*Sie sind wie gebannt an diesem magischen Judenkreis, es kann keiner hinaus.*"<sup>9</sup> And almost a century later, Sigmund Freud still mused about that "*Geheimnisvolle Etwas ... das den Juden ausmacht.*"<sup>10</sup> The Kafkas and the Mauthners too were endlessly wondering at their invisible ties to Judaism. But if their Judaism was, indeed, more than a confession; if it was, as I suggest, a full fledged culture, "a historically transmitted pattern of meanings" to quote the American anthropologist Clifford Geertz, acting "to establish powerful, pervasive and long-lasting moods and motivations,"<sup>11</sup> then perhaps it was not all that surprising that such men were unable to shed its traces, as they were moving from one milieu to another. Perhaps this ever-present 'circle' was, after all, not so "*magisch.*"

In any event, it was no doubt among the central goals of liberal reform Jews to turn Judaism into nothing but a confession, precisely in order to escape the embrace of an overall Jewish culture, associated for them with rabbinic authority, intellectual sterility and social inflexibility. Some of them wished to go so far as to reduce it to a formal combination of rituals and liturgy alone.<sup>12</sup> But while these efforts can be accounted for, even sympathised with, considering the background of the time, they were all based on a stark misunderstanding – not of the nature of Judaism alone, but, as we have seen, of religion as such. Fortunately, perhaps, men are not really doing what they proclaim, neither can they fully foresee the consequences of their action. Thus, all ideological statements notwithstanding, 19<sup>th</sup> century

8 See T. Nipperdey, *Religion und Gesellschaft: Deutschland um 1900* (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Dokumentationen, 5) (Munich, 1988), pp. 5–29 and in particular pp. 24–7. For more details, see T. Nipperdey, *Deutsche Geschichte 1866–1918. Bd. 1: Arbeitswelt und Bürgergeist* (Munich, 1990), chapter 12.

9 L. Börne, *Samtliche Werke. Bd. 3* (Düsseldorf, 1965), p. 510. For this and other relevant examples, see also M. Reich-Ranicki, *Über Ruhestörer. Juden in der deutschen Literatur* (Munich, 1973), pp. 36–56.

10 S. Freud, *Briefe 1873–1939* (Frankfurt am Main, 1960), p. 421. Cf. his letter to the members of the Viennese association of B'nei Brith.

11 C. Geertz, 'Religion as a Cultural System', in *The Interpretation of Cultures. Selected Essays* (New York, 1973), pp. 87–152.

12 For information on radical interpretations of Jewish identity, see M. A. Meyer, *The Origins of the Modern Jew, Jewish Identity and European Culture in Germany, 1749–1824* (Detroit, 1975). See in particular the chapter on David Friedländer, pp. 57–84. For further examples, see also M. A. Meyer, *Response to Modernity. A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 28–61 and 119–31.

German Jews were normally working not to limit the relevance of their Judaism but to extend it. Whatever their arguments might have been, they were engaged in renovating their overall culture, transforming an old into a new one, no less Jewish and no less unique.

Reformers were by no means alone in their efforts. At the end of that same century, German Zionists, too, turned out to be cultural renovators par excellence. While defining Judaism as a modern political nation, they were irresistibly infected by plans of cultural rejuvenation. Despite Herzl's purely diplomatic approach, his followers, in Germany no less than elsewhere, were never exclusively concerned with politics. Within the international Zionist movement, it was perhaps the new Jewish cultural complex created in Russia and not in Germany which in the end proved more lasting and influential. But the project as a whole had begun within the German speaking world, indeed, long before the launching of Zionism, and had taken its course elsewhere only much later. German Zionists, despite their far-reaching claims, were not only revolutionaries. In many ways they too continued the project of their predecessors, participated with their adversaries in the modernisation of Jewish culture and, undoubtedly too, in the invention of a new Jewish tradition.

Let us then be undisturbed by the pros and cons of the debates over the meaning of Judaism at the time and proceed to go beyond them. There is no reason why Judaism, like other religions, should not be seen as an overall cultural system. On the contrary, there are ample reasons for applying to it the same categories which have proven fruitful in parallel cases. Indeed, a great number of unresolved issues are made intelligible by the use of such terms. It allows us a new overview of our subject matter as well as a new kind of approach to the details. What else can we ask for?

On the eve of World War I, we may thus argue, most Jews in Germany were certainly no longer part of the old Jewish world; nor were they so completely absorbed within their new environment, as they so often wished to believe. Most of them were, in fact, living within a compound third sphere, gradually evolving during the century. They populated a dynamic organisational structure, primarily secular in character, and possessed a network of educational institutions, primarily religious. They sustained a vivid *Öffentlichkeit*, giving voice to a variety of conflicting ideological positions and to a joint, newly-shaped tradition.<sup>13</sup> Most of them lived, not exclusively but to a great degree, within this particular milieu. More than any one single element within it, this overall culture constituted their Judaism.

<sup>13</sup> This is based on B. Harshav, 'The Revival of Eretz-Israel and the Modern Jewish Revolution: Reflections on the Present Situation (Hebrew)', in *Culture and Society in Eretz-Israel*, ed. N. Graetz (Tel-Aviv, 1988), pp. 7-31.

## III

The new tradition, actually like most, was a two-tiers project. It included what anthropologists sometimes call “great” and “little” traditions, analogous to the more commonly discussed “higher” and “lower” culture, “high” and “popular” art.<sup>14</sup> The links between the two are always complex but in our case they were particularly persistent and meaningful. The newly created “great” Jewish tradition never lost sight of its pedagogic and apologetic goals and these could be achieved only by constantly invading the popular sphere. The “little” Jewish tradition, in turn, was constantly attuned to messages coming from above, for ever trying to reflect and reproduce them. The two developed in close and constant contact, so much so that the dividing line was often rather blurred.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, for analytical purposes, it may be useful to treat the two separately and say a few words about each. I begin with the “greater tradition,” the more pretentious one, professing to be an heir to the old Jewish intellectual world.

Max Weber has characterised cultural modernity as “the separation of the substantive reason expressed in religion and metaphysics into three autonomous spheres: science, morality and art.”<sup>16</sup> No doubt the essential unity of a truly religious life was lost to most modern Jews. An alternative was now to be reconstructed from a variety of elements, supporting each other or at least coexisting in a relative, though sometimes artificial harmony. Indeed, the efforts to ‘replace’ religion by science characterised this entire cultural effort from the very beginning. The philosophical, theological discussion soon commanded central-stage, too, and attempts to produce a new kind of art, especially a new literature, permeated 19<sup>th</sup> century Jewish intellectual life.

The first comprehensive, conscious effort in this direction was made by the members of the Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft des Judentums.<sup>17</sup> These men, joining together in the late summer of 1819 at the aftermath of the “Hep-Hep riots” against Jews throughout Germany, sought ways of positively responding to their sense of loss and rejection. By then, full acceptance into bourgeois society was proven far more difficult than the early

<sup>14</sup> See in particular R. Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture* (Chicago, 1956). For use of these terms in anthropology and ethnography see also D. Ben-Amos, *The Seven Strands*, pp. 107–116.

<sup>15</sup> The close relationship between the “great” and “little” traditions has been underlined by R. Redfield in *Peasant Society and Culture*, but see also H. Bausinger, ‘Folklore und gesunkenes Kulturgut’, *Deutsche Jahrbücher für Volkskunde* 1 (1966), pp. 15–25.

<sup>16</sup> For this abbreviated formula, see J. Habermas, “Die Moderne— ein unvollendetes Projekt?”. Cf. M. Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*. Vol. 1. (Tübingen, 1922/23), pp. 436–73.

<sup>17</sup> For information about the Verein, see S. Ucko, ‘Geistesgeschichtliche Grundlagen der Wissenschaft des Judentums (Motive des Kulturrevereins vom Jahre 1819)’, *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* 5 (1935), pp. 1–34. See also H. M. Graupe, *Die Entstehung des modernen Judentums. Geistesgeschichte der deutschen Juden 1650–1942* (Hamburg, 1977), chapter 13.

decades of emancipation had at first seemed to promise. In response, this young scholars began to deal systematically with Jewish history, to outline a new theological discipline, to recover old Jewish poetry and prose-texts and to produce new ones. But while they were launching their project on a wide and diversified intellectual front, Eduard Gans, Leopold Zunz, Isaak Marcus Jost and other members of the Kulturverein made their most revolutionary departures in the field of History.<sup>18</sup>

From the perspective of modern historiography, the pre-modern Jewish spiritual world, despite its dependence on historical symbolism and on a rich historical narrative, was principally ahistorical. The concentration on the exegesis of a strictly defined body of holy texts and on the cultivation of a number of national myths, excluded any real interest in history.<sup>19</sup> A Jewish historiography only grew during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, primarily in Germany and under the influence of romantic historicism and the new scientific methods of modern German historiography. But the impetus did not only come from the outside. A historical approach to Judaism, relativising the authority of religious law by reference to the concrete historical context of its emergence, was to become an indispensable tool in the work of reform.<sup>20</sup> In it, in fact, a critical historical method strove to replace the old-style interpretation of texts. But the fascination with history was not limited to reformers. Since mid-century, this became a preoccupation of educated Jews of all religious trends. Investigating the story of Jewish life in the past became a widely-shared passion.<sup>21</sup>

The most important intellectual event in the context of 19<sup>th</sup> century Jewish culture in Germany was, no doubt, the publication of Heinrich Grätz's 11-volume *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. Its popularity was unrivalled. It was reviewed and commented upon by numerous Jewish scholars and treated by all with a great deal of undisguised animation. But while Grätz's work was truly a heroic venture, it represented only the tip of the iceberg. History was by then a major

18 On Gans, see H. G. Reissner, *Eduard Gans. Ein Leben im Vormärz* (Tübingen, 1965). On Zunz, see N. N. Glatzer, *Leopold Zunz, Jude – Deutscher – Europäer* (Tübingen, 1964), and L. Wallach, *Liberty and Letters. The Thought of Leopold Zunz* (London, 1959). On Jost, see R. Michael, 'I. M. Jost und sein Werk', *Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts* 3 (1960), pp. 239–58.

19 See in particular Y. H. Yerushalmi, *Zachor, Erinnere Dich. Jüdische Geschichte und jüdisches Gedächtnis* (Berlin, 1988). This book was first published in English, Seattle/London, 1982. (I used the Hebrew edition, Tel-Aviv, 1988.) Cf. the criticism in A. Funkenstein, 'Collective Memory and Historical Consciousness', *History and Memory* I (1989), pp. 5–26. See also I. Schorsch, 'The Emergence of Historical Consciousness in Modern Judaism', *LBIY* 28 (1983), pp. 413–37.

20 See M. A. Meyer, *Response to Modernity*, pp. 84–99. Cf. the summary introduction, in *Ideas of Jewish History*, ed. M. A. Meyer (New York, 1974), pp. 1–42.

21 In his book "Zachor", mentioned in note 18, Yerushalmi describes, however, the relative weakness of the historical consciousness of modern Jews. See his comments, pp. 160–65, as well as A. Funkenstein, 'Reform und Geschichte: Die Modernisierung des deutschen Judentums', in *Deutsche Juden und die Moderne (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs)*, ed. S. Volkov (Munich, 1991).



sphere of Jewish interest. The work of selection – critical for the process of inventing tradition – was by then taking place on a very wide front.

The selection proceeded on two levels: the substantive and the methodological. Substantively, selection meant the preference for specific periods and aspects of Jewish life in the past and the neglect of others. Methodically it was a matter of choosing a mode of presentation, a type of interpretation, an appropriate narrative style. It was especially the first kind of selection, which has been so vehemently criticised by Gerschom Scholem in one of his most biting essays.<sup>22</sup> Scholem saw in the particular selection practised by the various representatives of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, a form of “*Selbstzensur*.” He objected to what seemed to him their turning of Judaism into a “*rein geistige, ideale Erscheinung*,” expunging from it all mythical or irrational elements and all signs of “disintegration, revolution and discord.” But his criticism does not exhaust the matter. After all, selecting is essential to the writing of history and it was surely inevitable for pioneers like Jost, Zunz or Grätz. Moreover, Zionist historians too had to make their own selections and these, in fact, were often enough not unlike the ones taken by their liberal antagonists.

Thus, it is true, indeed, that Abraham Geiger, for example, singled out for a particularly vicious attack by Scholem, found much of Jewish medieval history uncongenial and placed instead an unusually great emphasis on biblical history. But most Zionists, too, saw with disdain the “Galuth” experience and chose to dwell upon earlier, ancient times. They certainly differed with reformers concerning the national-historical sections of the Old Testament, but they too tended to gloss over the legal chapters of the Pentateuch and, like liberal-reformers, particularly valued the biblical prophets, exponents of an ancient Jewish social morality.

This affinity went even further. German Zionists, like almost all Jewish scholars in 19<sup>th</sup> century Germany, had a special affection for the history of Spanish Jewry. In an important article, Ismar Schorsch has beautifully elaborated upon this theme.<sup>23</sup> From the early Haskalah, he argued, the radical critique of existing Jewish culture “drew much of its validation, if not inspiration, directly from Spain.”<sup>24</sup> The advocacy of secular education, the curbing of Talmudic exclusivity, the need to revive Jewish philosophy and poetry, all seemed to receive powerful support from the history of Spanish Jews and appealed to reformers as well as to orthodox Jews, to liberals and Zionists alike. The ‘supremacy’ of Sephardi over Ashkenazi Jewry, the latter

22 The most outspoken version of this essay was published only in Hebrew, firstly as ‘Thoughts on the Science of Jewry’, in *Luach Ha’Aretz*, 1945, pp. 94–112, reprinted in G. Scholem, *Dvarim Bego*, Vol. 2 (Tel-Aviv, 1976), pp. 385–403. Its publication in German, based on a lecture at the Leo Baeck Institute in London in 1957, was entitled ‘Wissenschaft vom Judentum einst und jetzt’, *Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts* 9 (1960), pp. 10–20. See also G. Scholem, *Judaica*, Vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main, 1963), pp. 147–64.

23 I. Schorsch, ‘The Myth of Sephardic Supremacy’, *LBIY* 26 (1989), pp. 47–66.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 49.

steeped in Talmudic reasoning and in Yiddish ‘dialects’, seemed to all of them quite self-evident. German Jewry built its synagogues in Moorish style, idealised the “Marrano pose” in its literature and celebrated Spanish Jewry in its historical writings.<sup>25</sup> It was “nurtured on a Spanish diet,” Schorsch claimed.<sup>26</sup> Zionism, he might have added, has symbolically crowned this process by choosing the Spanish Hebrew pronunciation as paradigmatic for the revival of a modern Hebrew tongue.

Methodologically, too, the emerging new historical consciousness of German Jewry had its special preferences. Above all, the so-called “exemplary type” came to dominate the field.<sup>27</sup> Its didactic usefulness was irresistible. Here, indeed, links between the “great” and the “little” Jewish tradition are already quite apparent. Jewish history in this guise was turned into a truly “Magistra Vitae.” It had an essential educational task to fulfil. Thus, a gallery of selected Jewish personalities was dished out to a growing Jewish readership: open-minded Rabbis, highly-cultured Marannoës, Spanish literati, philosophers and influential political men. An assortment of “excellent Jewish women” never failed to be included, too. The more sophisticated historical works did occasionally venture into other modes of historical writing. But in all works, a clear continuous narrative was indispensable. It was essential for establishing the parameters of the new tradition, central for bequeathing meaning to modern Judaism as a whole.

A presumably new kind of Jewish morality, too, being then worked out no less intensively, was equally important from this perspective. Much has been written about the missionary idealism of 19<sup>th</sup> century liberal Jews.<sup>28</sup> It certainly bears repeating that this abstract, philosophical, purely ethical interpretation of Judaism was a complete novelty. It resulted from the efforts of men like Moritz Lazarus, Hermann Cohen or Leo Baeck to make Judaism acceptable to modern men. It was a reformulation which sought to turn it intellectually, even socially, palatable in the context of 19<sup>th</sup>-century German bourgeois society. Here too selection and the choice of new accents were essential. The didactic purposes here, were often even more

25 For the most famous case, see P. F. Veit, ‘Heine: The Marrano Pose’, *Monatshefte* 66 (1947), pp. 145–56. An additional discussion with emphasis on the parallel case of Spain may be found in Y. H. Yerushalmi, *Assimilation and Racial Anti-Semitism: The Iberian and the German Models* (Leo Baeck Memorial Lecture, 26) (New York, 1982).

26 I. Schorsch, *The Myth of Sepharadic Supremacy*, p. 59.

27 I have borrowed this terminology from Jörn Rüsen. See his ‘Typologie der Gesichtsschreibung’ in *Lebendige Geschichte. Grundzüge einer Historik, III: Formen und Funktionen des historischen Wissens*, ed. J. Rüsen (Göttingen, 1989), pp. 45–9. See also J. Rüsen, ‘The Development of Narrative Competence in Historical Learning – An Ontogenetic Hypothesis Concerning Moral Consciousness’, in *History and Memory* 1 (1989), pp. 35–59.

28 See in particular U. Tal, ‘German-Jewish Social Thought in the Mid-Nineteenth Century’, in *Revolution and Evolution, 1848 in German-Jewish History*, ed. W. E. Mosse (Tübingen, 1981), pp. 299–328, and U. Tal, ‘Theologische Debatte um das “Wesen” des Judentums’, in *Juden im Wilhelminischen Deutschland 1890–1914*, ed. W. E. Mosse (Tübingen, 1976), pp. 599–632. See also in the same publication, P. E. Rosenblüth, ‘Die geistigen und religiösen Strömungen in der deutschen Judenheit’, pp. 549–98. For a useful summary, see H. Graupe, *Die Entstehung des modernen Judentums*. Chapters 18 and 19.

apparent and the link to the “little” tradition even more crucial than in the sphere of history. It may therefore be instructive to move away now from the great to the little tradition; to neglect the first Garniture for the second or third, perhaps even for the third and the fourth. Behind the work of major Jewish historians, but even more so behind the towering philosophers and the major literary figures, one discovers a whole domain of Jewish popular culture, practically forgotten. A whole army of tradition-makers were then busy popularising the more sophisticated thinkers and spreading out their message. A whole new *Öffentlichkeit* was drafted to fulfil this task, attempting to fill the vacuum created by secularisation, apathy and the attraction of non-Jewish culture.

#### IV

In Kurt Koszyk's authoritative text-book on 19<sup>th</sup> century German press, there is nothing to suggest the extent of Jewish newspapers or magazine production at the time.<sup>29</sup> In fact, more than 200 Jewish periodical publications made their appearance during the century and while many were short-lived and insignificant, a few managed to appear continuously for decades and gain a considerable influence.<sup>30</sup> At the end of the century, one has estimated the number of copies of the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, surely the most important German Jewish weekly and the longest-lasting among them, at about 3,000.<sup>31</sup> On the eve of World War I, the orthodox *Jüdische Presse*, a so-called *Organ für die Gesamtinteresse des Judentums*, reached similar figures. But doubtlessly many more people had a chance to read something of these newspapers. The *Hamburger Israelitische Familienblatt*, a non-party “*Unterhaltungsorgan*,” reached the publication number of 12,300, while innumerable local papers and news-sheets were put out for an exclusively Jewish readership. “*Im deutschen Reich*”, the publication of the *Zentralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens*, which began to appear in 1895, probably reached most of

29 K. Koszyk, *Geschichte der deutschen Presse. Vol. 2. Deutsche Presse im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1966). Cf. B. Suchy, ‘Die jüdische Presse im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik’, in *Juden als Träger bürgerlicher Kultur in Deutschland*, ed. J. H. Schoeps (Stuttgart, 1989), pp. 167–92.

30 There is no comprehensive research on the Jewish press in Germany. Still of use is M. T. Edelheim-Mühsam, ‘The Jewish Press in Germany’, *LBIY* 1 (1956), pp. 163–76, as well as her article ‘Presse, jüdische’ in *Jüdisches Lexikon*, Vol. 4/1. Berlin, 1930, pp. 1102–10. A complete description of the Jewish press in Austria is available, however, in J. Toury, *Die Jüdische Presse im österreichischen Kaiserreich 1802–1918* (Tübingen, 1983). He also wrote several essays on the Jewish press in Germany. See J. Toury, ‘Die Anfänge des jüdischen Zeitungswesens in Deutschland’, *Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts* 38–39 (1967), pp. 93–123, and J. Toury, ‘Das Phänomen der jüdischen Presse in Deutschland’, in Quesher, *Journalism Studies*, Tel-Aviv University, *Jüdische Zeitungen und Journalisten in Deutschland*, May 1989, pp. 4–13.

31 See ‘Adressbuch der deutschen Zeitschriften und der hervorragenden politischen Tagesblätter’, *Hand- und Jahrbuch der deutschen Presse* 36 (1895). Published by H. O. Sperling, Stuttgart, 1895, p. 163.

the Verein-members, about 40,000 by 1914. The Zionist press, too, known for its journalistic and literary quality, was surely read by more than its direct subscribers. For a population of just over half a million, the press-fever of German Jews must be considered remarkable, indeed.

Quite striking, moreover, is the almost exclusive interest of this press in Jewish matters. There clearly was an avid reading public for such themes. Indeed, a considerable literary production was concerned with supplying that demand. The Judaica Catalogue of the Stadtbibliothek, Frankfurt a.M., for instance, lists thousands of German titles, mostly published before 1914, all concerned with a variety of Jewish issues.<sup>32</sup> It includes publications dealing with Biblical criticism and the explanation of other Jewish sacred texts; works on history and education, on medicine and Theologie, on science and literature. Most imposing is its register of over 120 *Predigtsammlungen* and the hundreds of titles under the heading of *Erbauungsliteratur*. Such a listing merely gives an idea of the dimension of the cultural efforts made by German Jews at the time. Having been practically hypnotised by the Jewish “*Beitrag*” to German culture and by the apologetic value of concentrating on outstanding Jewish names, one has almost entirely neglected this side of their activity. A century long effort to invent their own tradition seems to have left only a marginal note in modern historiography.

It is therefore salutary to remember that, though German Jewry did not include a peasantry population, nor did it contain a sizeable proletarian element, it was – even by the late 19<sup>th</sup> century – essentially a lower middle class population. Searching the entire 19<sup>th</sup> century up to the years of the Weimar Republic, Werner Mosse has identified a Jewish economic elite of only a few dozen families.<sup>33</sup> And Avraham Barkai’s analysis showed that by the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, even most urban Jews belonged to the lower brackets of city tax-payers.<sup>34</sup> Well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century Jews were primarily occupied in trade and, preferring independent employment, the great majority of them ran small, usually “*Einmann- oder Familienbetriebe*.”<sup>35</sup> The massive entry of Jews into academic occupations occurred only since the last decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and even then their share of the Jewish working population never reached the 10% level; not even in Berlin.<sup>36</sup> While Jewish

32 Stadtbibliothek Frankfurt am Main, Katalog der Judaica und Hebraica, Vol. 1. Judaica. Frankfurt am Main, 1932.

33 W. E. Mosse, *Jews in the German Economy. The German-Jewish Economic Elite 1820–1935* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 87–95.

34 A. Barkai, *Jüdische Minderheit und Industrialisierung. Demographie, Berufe und Einkommen der Juden in Westdeutschland 1850–1914* (Tübingen, 1988), pp. 62–70 and 136–65.

35 See in particular A. Prinz, *Juden im deutschen Wirtschaftsleben. Soziales und wirtschaftliche Struktur im Wandel 1850–1914*, ed. A. Barkai (Tübingen, 1984), pp. 166–68 and 172–76, and A. Barkai, *Jüdische Minderheit und Industrialisierung*, pp. 36–44. Cf. J. Segall, *Die beruflichen und sozialen Verhältnisse der Juden in Deutschland* (Berlin, 1912).

36 Cf. J. Segall, *Die beruflichen und sozialen Verhältnisse der Juden in Deutschland*, 45 ff. J. Lestschinsky, *Das wirtschaftliche Schicksal des deutschen Judentums* (Berlin, 1932), p. 101. U. Schmelz, ‘Die demographische Entwicklung der Juden in Deutschland von der Mitte des 19.

children were strikingly over-represented at the humanistic Gymnasien, over half of them received no more than a minimum of elementary education even at that time.<sup>37</sup> And while Jews were on average clearly better-off than their non-Jewish compatriots and almost always better educated, a sizeable group among them could still be easily counted among the middle- and lower-middle-class consumers of mass cultural products. These were the readers of the various *Familienblätter*, the subscribers to the *Unterhaltungspresse*, the gift-bringing relatives who exchanged various Jewish *Kalender* and Almanachs, among them – an assortment of ‘instant-culture’ publications.

In Rudolf Schenda’s pioneering work, *Volk ohne Buch*, we were for the first time made aware of the extent and significance of reading material for the lower social elements of German society between 1770 and 1910.<sup>38</sup> In a similar fashion, then, German Jewry too developed its own “little tradition” and the organs of transmitting and propagating it. In addition to the periodical press, one easily discovers the Jewish “*hinkende Bote*”, to use Schenda’s terminology.<sup>39</sup> These modest yearbooks included information on Jewish (and non-Jewish) holidays, a list of special market-days and other useful facts. They then provided a seasoned mixture of the new “Jewry”. One would invariably find there a few historical essays on ancient times, portraits of important Jewish personalities or obituaries of recently departed celebrities, a short history of one or another Jewish community in Germany, a couple of poems, occasionally even in Hebrew but always with appended German translation, a short or serialised historical novel, usually based on a Spanish-Jewish theme or upon a Ghetto-environment vignette, etc. The pattern is always the same.<sup>40</sup> In comparison to the general German popular literary-production, the Jewish counterpart was perhaps somewhat more pretentious. It was less exclusively preoccupied with the various genres of the so-called “*Trivial-Literatur*” and more concerned with non-fiction – history, ethics and the like. Nevertheless, this was no doubt a parallel phenomenon – a Jewish version of the German lower-class culture. It paid tribute to some of the most renowned German authors; it certainly wished to include such figures as Lessing and Schiller. But on the whole it

(cont. from previous page) Jahrhunderts bis 1933’, *Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft* 8 (1982), p. 64. See also A. Barkai, *Jüdische Minderheit und Industrialisierung*, pp. 48–51, and A. Prinz, *Juden im deutschen Wirtschaftsleben. Soziales und wirtschaftliche Struktur im Wandel 1850–1914*, pp. 138–40 and 184–86.

37 See J. Thon, *Der Anteil der Juden am Unterrichtswesen in Preußen* (Berlin, 1905), pp. 23–5. According to his data, in 1886, 46.5 per cent of Jewish boys had more than primary school education, and this figure rose to 56.3 per cent by 1901. The corresponding percentages for non-Jewish boys were 6.3 and 7.3 per cent.

38 R. Schenda, *Volk ohne Buch. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der populären Lesestoffe 1770–1910*. Second edition (Munich, 1977).

39 R. Schenda, *Volk ohne Buch*, pp. 279–87.

40 See, for instance, *Kalender u. Jahrbuch für Israeliten* (Vienna, 1843/44–1847/48). Published since 1854/55 by J. Wertheimer. Also J. W. Pacheles, *Illustrierter Israelit. Volkskalender* (Prague, 1865); or J. K. Buchner, *Jahrbuch für Israeliten*, Vol. 21 (Leipzig, 1863).

was a Jewish enterprise – responding to the demand for a modern, popular tradition.<sup>41</sup>

The most prolific single producer of this tradition was, no doubt, the founder and half-a-century editor of the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*,<sup>42</sup> Ludwig Philippson. With innumerable articles on historical themes, philosophical and ethical ruminations, sketches of Jewish luminaries, poems and historical novels, political manifests and public appeals, Philippson unquestionably dominated the popular Jewish literary scene. Between the late 1830s and his death in 1889, he produced an amazing stream of publications and was capable of tireless activity in all conceivable Jewish causes.<sup>43</sup> More than anyone else, Philippson determined the cultural diet produced for the common German Jew at the time. Philippson's book "*an den israelitischen Konfirmanden (Barmitzva) und die israelitische Konfirmandin*," (this latter creature in itself an invention of modern German Jewry), published under the title *Der Rat des Heils*,<sup>44</sup> beautifully exemplifies his overall effort. It is a written Credo of the new Jewish tradition. "*Fühlst Du dich glücklich, ein Israelit zu sein?*" runs the title of the first chapter of this elegantly produced book. Two long historical chapters then follow, divided into the history of religion and that of the "*Stamm*," appended by a prolonged exposition of the spiritual and ethical meaning of religious ceremonies, practical "*Gebote*," Jewish holidays, the Sabbath, etc. Finally, a number of chapters present the practical implications of Judaism for orderly professional and social life within German bourgeois society.

Philippson was a declared supporter of reform Judaism, but Samuel Raphael Hirsch, the leader of Jewish Neo-Orthodoxy could have not put matters more convincingly. In some ways, Hirsch's *Torah im Derech-Eretz* may have presented stricter demands of observance upon the Jews, but the message of liberal Judaism *à la Philippson* and of Neo-Orthodoxy *à la Hirsch*

<sup>41</sup> The best examples are to be found in the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*. See H. O. Horch, *Auf der Suche nach der jüdischen Erzählliteratur. Die Literaturkritik der „Allgemeinen Zeitung des Judentums“* (1837–1922) (Frankfurt am Main, 1985). For details on the classical German writers, see in particular chapter 3.

<sup>42</sup> There is no modern biography of S. Philippson, but M. Kayserling, *Ludwig Philippson. Eine Biographie* (Leipzig, 1898); and J. Philippson, 'The Philippsons, a German-Jewish Family 1775–1933', *LBIY* 7 (1962), pp. 95–118; also M. Kayserling, 'Ludwig Philippson und die Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums', in *Das Judentum in der deutschen Umwelt 1800–1850*, ed. H. Liebeschütz and A. Paucker (Tübingen, 1977), pp. 243–91.

<sup>43</sup> The following is a selection of the works of Philippson, separately or newly printed: L. Philippson, *Saron. Gessamelte Dichtungen in metrischer und prosaischer Form*. 5 volumes. Second edition (Leipzig, 1855–1870); L. Philippson, *An den Strömen, durch drei Jahrtausende. Erzählungen* (Leipzig, 1872); L. Philippson, *Weltbewegende Fragen in Politik und Religion. Aus den letzten dreissig Jahren* (Leipzig, 1868); L. Philippson, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 2 volumes (Leipzig, 1911).

<sup>44</sup> L. Philippson, *Eine Mitgabe für das ganze Leben and den israelitischen Konfirmanden (Barmitzva) und die israelitische Konfirmandin oder beim Austritt aus der Schule*, 3rd edition (Leipzig, 1870).

were surprisingly similar.<sup>45</sup> Both represented what might be called a domesticated version of modern Judaism, placing a strong emphasis on family life and community responsibility; expressing a wide-ranging but rather rudimentary historical interest, a moralistic approach – in short, a middle-class cultural mix for law-abiding citizens, all patriotic Germans and loyal Jews at the same time.

In his study of Neo-Orthodoxy, Mordechai Breuer has delineated the strength and the weaknesses of this movement. Above all, he argued, Neo-Orthodoxy fitted a particular social group at a particular historical moment. It could therefore never grow beyond its original, limited constituency, nor survive the changes which has been rapidly occurring in its surroundings.<sup>46</sup> Liberal German Jewry was faced with the same dilemma. Both shared in the invention of a new tradition, responding to the needs of the time. Both could not overcome some of the immanent weaknesses of this project. Despite a network of organisations, the existence of special schools, rabbinical seminars, active Vereine für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur, Bnei Brith lodges and the like, the new Jewish tradition in its popular version has remained a basically unsatisfactory cultural project.

## V

Being produced for German-Jews in German, however, this project was bound to lose its best talents to the surrounding culture. A comparison with its Russian counter-part serves to underline this point. Thus the Bialiks and the Sholem Aleichems who were no doubt deeply influenced by their overall cultural milieu, had to remain within their own, particular Jewish sphere. After all, they were writing in Yiddish or in Hebrew, sometimes perhaps in both, but their living space was thus clearly defined. The Heines and the Wassermanns, on the other hand, always sought their way out. The Jewish cultural system in Germany can thus be termed headless. Despite its novelty, moreover, it could not become truly modern and could not catch up with cultural developments outside its own boundaries. Indeed, it perennially suffered from a fundamental *Ungleichzeitigkeit*. It was propagating the ideals of the Enlightenment, when these were already under

<sup>45</sup> For more on Hirsch and neo-Orthodoxy, see in particular M. Breuer, *Jüdische Orthodoxie im Deutschen Reich 1871–1918. Die Sozialgeschichte einer religiösen Minderheit* (Frankfurt am Main, 1986). For his early life and work, see D. Sorking, *The Transformation of German Jewry, 1780–1840* (New York, 1987), in particular chapter 8; and R. Liberles, *Religious Conflict ins Social Context. The Resurgence of Orthodox Judaism in Frankfurt am Main, 1838–1877* (Westport, 1985), in particular chapter 4. For his philosophy, see N. Rosenbloom, *Tradition in an Age of Reform. The Religious Philosophy of Samson Raphael Hirsch* (Philadelphia, 1976). For the works of Hirsch, see his *Gesammelte Schriften*, 6 volumes (Frankfurt am Main, 1902).

<sup>46</sup> M. Breuer, *Jüdische Orthodoxie im Deutschen Reich 1871–1918. Die Sozialgeschichte einer religiösen Minderheit*, pp. 351–58.

massive attack. It was idolising Lessing and Schiller, when German literati were struggling to comprehend the expressionist theatre. It finally played with an early 19<sup>th</sup> century version of nationalism, when this was taking on a rather threatening right-wing guise, speculating with racism and the early versions of national-socialism. But worse of all, perhaps, this popular culture too often failed to be sufficiently attractive. True enough, the popular German culture of the time was often no better. It was perhaps more clearly oriented towards entertainment and less openly didactic in its tone, but its general level of performance was, if at all, perhaps even more deplorable. Nevertheless, the possibility of a gradual transition from a lower to a higher culture, the move from the little to the greater tradition, was, for an average upward-striving German, never as traumatic and as loaded with social and psychological consequences as it was for a Jew. For him such a move involved a total modification of themes and context, a drastic transformation of self-perception, a reshaping of one's personal identity.

This was, indeed, apparent from the very beginning. The efforts to create a new Judaism in the Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft des Judentums, as early as the 1820s, did not even convince its own members. Throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the better minds tended to seek nourishment elsewhere. Zionists in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century were well aware of this problem. Scholem's autobiographical writings give a touching expression to this longing to break through the intellectual limitations of an existing Jewish milieu. Such a breakthrough, however, was only rarely achieved at the time. Martin Buber's effort to interest German Jewry in East-European Hassidism, a modern version of an emotionally-laden mystical, warm-hearted Judaism, has often been hailed within this context. But a close look at the actual products clearly demonstrates its limitations, too. In his Hebrew edition of the *Tales of the Baal Shem*, a collection of Hassidic stories, the Israeli editor, a well-known author and poet, Pinhas Sadeh, objects to Buber's older presentation of these same stories on very similar grounds to those which had been brought forth by Scholem against the liberal-reform scholars of the older Wissenschaft des Judentums a generation earlier.<sup>47</sup> Buber, he claims, emptied the Hassidic tales of their inner life, and did it quite consciously. He intended, to quote Sadeh, "to improve the original texts and the Baal-Shem's image, to exchange his muddy boots with elegant slippers and turn this natural, vital, ecstatic, sometimes even brutal character into kind of respectable intellectual..."<sup>48</sup> It is above all the systematic exclusion of stories concerned with demons and spirits, with witches and madmen, with the powers of the night, nature and earth which enrages Sadeh. For Sadeh, and

<sup>47</sup> P. Sadeh, *Tales of the Baal Shem* (to which are appended some of his propositions concerning the Divinity, the purpose and substance of life, its sorrows and its joys) [Hebrew] (Jerusalem, 1987), pp. 177–81. Cf. P. Sadeh, *König Salomos Honigurteil. Märchen und Legenden der Juden* (Munich, 1989).

<sup>48</sup> P. Sadeh, *Tales of the Baal Shem*.



may I add for me too, Buber represents the reconstructed German Jewish tradition no less than Zunz or Hermann Cohen. I am afraid it is only a matter of time till someone diagnoses Scholem's view of Jewish mysticism and the Kabbalah in the same terms.

Thus, the problematic nature of the new tradition were quite apparent long before the onslaught of National Socialism. But everywhere in Europe, the Jewish project of modernity had no time to test its own vitality and develop its potential. Moreover, it is rather questionable today whether in its two present transformations, in Israel and within the life of Reform or Conservative Judaism in America, this project has truly found its viable and reliable heirs. Despite an impressive development of a Hebrew-language literature and a dynamic cultural life in Israel, The fragility of secular Zionism in the face of a new religious nationalism can no longer be denied. Certainly, the consciously and radically secular Jewish culture, which seemed to have been growing first in Palestine and then in Israel, as late as the mid-1960s, has shrunk to insignificance today. In America, too, desertion of Judaism may have proceeded more slowly than most pessimists had expected, but has certainly not been entirely checked, not even considerably slowed down. Under entirely new circumstances, the need to invent a modern Judaism is still apparent. The work is far from being accomplished.