

The following is my own extrapolation and understanding of the information from R. Carmy's MJIH. (fancy way of presenting a disclaimer)

Opening Historical Background

The outgrowth of the Spanish Portuguese Jewry is integral to understanding the 16th century. Jews in Spain were under pressure from the Inquisition and thus may have converted. Scholars debate the circumstances of the conversion from ideological views. There are two basic schools of thought:

- 1) Older Zionistic (H.U.) Camp views the so called “Conversos” (or Moranos in the more derogatory name) as real Jews who just “went along” with the game faking their conversion although they themselves felt they still were Jews. When the Inquisition came after them (there was a separation between church and state and that means that the Inquisition did it on behalf of the state but not the inquisition as a body itself) they were viewed as Christians who were sliding. From testimonies the Inquisition was privy to knowledge about and ways of conduct. (ignorant-sector-factor) Basically no matter how far they strayed in the public light they were still good Jews.
- 2) Ben Zion Netanyahu represents the other camp. The “Conversos” were really those who wanted to assimilate into the society, become Christians as they could. And why then were they still bothered? Because the anti-Semites did not care, all they wanted was to drive them out. The anti-Judaism in the Iberian Peninsula is coming close to modern racial anti-Semitism. (St. Augustine said Jews were needed to stick around for the second coming.) [See: “The Friars and the Jews.”] Spanish Expulsion was where this first was seen. If a few Jews converted, perhaps they had seen the light. If all the Jews converted all they would do is clog up the medical schools and take over society. The issue here is the rabid hatred and anti-Semitism.

There are also those Jews who don't convert but rather just leave (ending up in Italy, Turkey, Egypt, or even Israel). Here we have a quasi-type as there was emigration from the places of settlement.

1348 Began a Crisis for Ashkenazi Jewry, the outbreak of the Bubonic Plague (Black Death) which wiped out 1/2 of the population – for intellectual history this is a big deal since this wipes out many who sat and learned.

15th Century Jews from all over Europe (Jews only permitted to settle in England in mass numbers in the 17th century) namely Germany, Poland, Prague, and Provance. There begins intellectual life. , , , , just to name a few. Something which is frequently ignored, we tend to think Ashkenaz is separate from the Mediterranean world. Poland was basically not so, although we assume it was separated intellectually.

In terms of transportation, there are known and established trade routes throughout Poland and Italy. The roads were opened socially and economically. Books were printed and sent, even.

Do people read the _____ in Poland during the 16th century? If people are reading it why don't we hear about? _____ wrote a letter to the _____ criticizing him for reading the philosophy (he also criticized his _____) Some may see the _____ as a maverick who wrote this "_____ " on the _____. This may not be a seminal work on Jewish thought but it certainly is a start. (Or maybe it is so, other _____ wrote too, ex. _____. The _____ gets reprinted.)

A Talmud scholar should know something about Medieval Jewish Philosophy? Why were they not so well known? This may be an indication of the lack of importance.

The best known works which came out of Ashkenaz in the 16th century would be the _____ and the various commentaries on the _____, the _____ and others.

The 17th century brought about other things: _____, _____, _____, the _____; all the seminal works which flanked the _____. These are books that are the major _____ on the _____ aruch. Works on the Talmud are lacking in a sense, _____ (18th century) there is the _____ (18th) and _____. Basically we don't find much on the tractates in the 17th century. The _____ is predominantly the only 17th century books used for Talmudic study-his style is more that of the _____, whose purpose is _____ and going through the various issues attempts a _____ like conclusion. To sum up, we have a body of work most of which is a commentary of the _____. Overall we can generalize the focus is on _____ rather than exegesis. (This is all the literary production, however, it is assumed that the learning of Talmud was continual and was the main focal point of the Talmud Torah experiences. The writing was though on the _____.

_____ as a style of learning was not so published and displayed – it was not translated into what was written. The classical _____ is a type of virtuosos performance of bringing proves from far away on the scene. _____ had a very showy and baroque quality, but as a means to an end its purpose was not so founded.

The _____ is a book of pure _____ which is based on _____ and not _____. _____ is an exception, who as a 16th century author did write on the _____.

Part of the power that the _____ exerted was his exhaustive knowledge of _____ which he read and quoted in his _____.

[The famous Phillip Aries theory (French) he held until the modern period there was nothing called children. Until then children were simply little adults. Their knowledge of sex was that of adults; child deaths made parents less attached to their parents. In Jewish history, this notion is not advocated at all. For medieval Jews there were obligation of _____

Talmud Torah and other heritage base obligations. – digression from a discussion on individualism as a contemporary movement, though this is untrue.]

There is an interesting issue debated by Jewish Historians from the past century, regarding the shift in the way was decided in cases of saving lives. The 17th century (the tat v'at decree) brings about who are more lenient, mainly in Ashkenaz. Jakob Katz takes the view that they are more aesthetic; while Chaim ben Sasson argued. This wasn't based on philosophies of the body or any other phenomenon, rather the began to carry more weight and thus by the the was. It may not have anything to do with sociological concerns, but rather internally how the was views. This would begin to affect the , but not to say that their concern was less on , rather their understanding of the through the led to more leniently rulings.

Before this period was , now there is a transition to the . In Ashkenaz it's fairly clear, **BLACK DEATH**. In the world the break wasn't so clear. In Ashkenaz after those who died they lacked those scholars to uphold the Torah world. In the world the break was less blunt – there are writers who are called even predating authors who were called . The is an easy way of drawing the line in between the two worlds. Historically there may have not been an awareness of this break in time.

- previously we emphasized that Polish Jewry did not really oppose a broad outlook as many assume. There were writings on philosophy, not popular today probably because of their lack of excitement. The 's on the is not particularly interesting (and maybe its philosophic weight is weak). Imagine what the felt of this purpose of writing a book on Jewish Philosophy, acknowledging that there is such a field. However, when your intent is about keeping the tradition warm and not answering the key issues at hand, the work becomes weak. This is basically a theory pushed forward by Dr. Hayyim Soloveitchik. [All the wrote poetry, wrote, the wrote. But it wasn't particularly good as poetry. Everybody did it, it was accustomed to be done.] The fact that the wrote a philosophy which he was not clear of his own goals, even if they are nice ideas, his book lacked a goal. It was more of something which people were accustomed to do, similar to the writing of poetry by . The did not indulge in it for feeling it was not useful.

So then what did bother them? Nothing is usually not an answer, so we'll leave that out. Generally people need something in addition to . It is usually Torah V' something. And it seems that philosophy wasn't it. Tanach is a possibility – but the peshat has been exhausted by now. The writing on as a super commentary; , , and on the other hand began to produce more Commentaries. was popularized as an explanation to along with the commentaries on the . There was a greater attention to the homoleitics. This movement has a tendency to focus on something oriented. The philosophy has to a certain extent been exhausted, and Tanach is not quite fulfilling as a substitute. And so we have .

- so what does he exactly do? He quotes what said and explains it. Why then do we read today and not other contemporary works – probably because within he found anything that he wanted to talk about.

First thing he published in his 60's was his commentary on , known as the (In a certain way this is a commentary on being that used so much of as a basis) One of his smaller works, Be'er HaGolah , was the defense of . Look at the other major works- Derech haChayim, Nezach Yisrael, Tifferet Yisrael, Netivot HaOlam etc.

Netivot HaOlam is mostly about various middoth. In the intro the actually says that the book is a collection of , an anthology of a sort. Chidushei Agadah are clearly about , published when he was very old. Other works, in style always work from . is about , is about the giving of the , is about . Compare this to medieval Jewish philosophy, we see the working from as opposed to and who knew but worked from Tanach. There are shifts in the matter, but basically from . works from and very clearly. In his introduction to , the says his book will be on the holidays. Structure was for the holidays (gevurah, tifferet, nezach, hahod) but the content wasn't theology rather about the nature of our concepts, , redemption, commandments. These are not outside problems but rather an enumeration on the agenda of Jews, and internally produced agenda. Basically the is shifting Jewish thought from peripheral issues of outside thought to internal Jewish issues. There is no question of this, he is definitely aware of the difference between his approach and or . You may say it is not all that original since they can be inferred from the on .

, is the other category of that which is inherently internal. There is a debate to the extent of the 's usage of though it seems clear that he did know it. There are two extremes to this view:

- 1) Try to translate what the said into terms
- 2) chose not to use the words of . This may have been:
 - a) keep it away from philosophy or
 - b) make it available for the general public

And thus the is baffling to an extent for his usage and ideas because he may not be here nor there.

is shifting from the medieval Jewish framework which dealt with philosophical topics, to working with important historical instances that have importance with . He is dealing with problems that bothered him as opposed to problems which bothered people before.

THE TEXT:

The problem is many times the difficulty in what the is trying to say. Ordinarily you'd think that a piece would have questions and answers. Or you would expect something more historical – although how much history does one expect from a 16th century work. Look at the and we don't get either of those.

- 1) has his own terminology – that of medieval philosophers, however, without the meaning the medieval philosophers gave to it. Ex. We have a principle of matter and form, a terminology going back to Aristotle. A table is made out of metal and it is in the shape of a rectangle. A dog has matter, a bunch of chemical, the form is the number of legs, teeth, unique features of a dog that makes it a dog. Grind him up – now we have the same matter but different form. (versus) The form changes, the matter remains. The form is seemingly more spiritual, it makes the matter into something. So there is value judgment to where form is better than matter. [In lomdus we kind of do the same – instead of explaining the text we rather explain the concept beneath the text using more abstract terminology] The does the same; he uses the terminology to approach the under-lying concept within the text. One of the difficulties here is the limited number of under-lying concepts. The nature of simplification means we constantly use the same terms, even though they don't function the same in every concept. And this can be very confusing.
- 2) Even though the language is philosophical, he is dealing with a midrash. To what extent could a person with literary intentions come to the same conclusion?

The third perek begins with a discussion of yitziat mitzrayim.

The first image, the gold in the crucible, is the Egyptians getting stronger; Yisrael are like the fetus in the mothers stomach, in itself it is nothing. Israel could not be united with God for they were already united with Egypt. The constant repetition in the works, becomes bothersome to readers. 1) A frum answer would be that each mentioning has a different dimension. 2) difficult concepts need to be reiterated and he knew it. 3) There were different manuscripts written [Elbaum, Yaakov. Pitichut V'Histadrut – on Intellectual Jewish Life at the time] later in life and incorporated, something of this matter, not really sure.

Why is any number important?
Why is this specific number important?

The number 600,000 is an important number – because it keeps turning up again and again. “Something important is not accidental”- , and thus we must say that the above number is important to the because of its repetition. Quantity may sometimes determine the quality. At a social level one can argue that numbers do make a difference. In order to become an entity, a certain substantial number is required. Ants need a certain number to be called a colony. This approach can be viewed in two ways:

- 1) Try to extend into secular terms that are understandable into our terms. Rather that, the number in itself has value for metaphysical value which one cannot make a comparison to in a modern context. (more of a gizrat hakatuv)

Historical-Technical term

- 2) Morph the idea of the into a more lucrative and applicable theory, ignoring the historical applications and making the gap thus that much larger.

Modern proposition of the terminology

Essentially the difference is whether we have to limit the text itself to the background the resources of the author's historical framework, or can we take the ideas and apply them into modern contexts, for instance that the number 600000 represents the politicalist theory that a nation has X amount of people – not saying that the 600000 has a metaphysical value.

Either we deal with the way we deal with any other text, or we treat it as a literary poem like text. How does the operate?

- 1) Some places he interprets allegorically
- 2) Othe places he shuns from the latter, more literary approaches.

Even when it seems that has ignored a certain period in terms of counting the years, perhaps did not think they were so important. The point would be what note is important and what they did not, is not. This would be an approach of the in defense of .

Where does the actual number 600000, come from?

6- is a complete number, the total number of directions. The hundred thousand comes from the decimal system, hundreds, and then thousands. What about ten or ten thousands? Mathematically that would be a problem, but the says that tens and ten thousands don't count in Hebrew. Symantics, each multiple of ten has its own name. This is a mystical reality in the Hebrew language. The logic of Hebrew is up to a thousand there is its own name, and after that prefixed by a number such as ten thousand. **This, points to the nature of Hebrew being important to the 's philosophy.**

“ηυχρ” (thousand) is multiplicity but not perfection. Philosophers discuss types of infinity as, bad infinity- no limit; and Good infinity- nature of the object is infinite, has more closure to the ideal. is working with some type of intuition of the sort. Something infinite is good, but unlimited is bad. Unlimited things lack order, they have no closure or perfection. It is possible to add on more and more without obtaining any order or form. This is ,Ινηκᾱ. There is a difference between and . There can be form to those which are not even dignified.

This point goes back to Plato, to where the question of whether there can be hair and nails, if there can be a Platonic idea of goodness? On the other hand it may be beneath the dignity of the forms to have hair and nails within the category for form. The question of

form may be above that. (Question of the form is for only things which we want to discuss and is worthy of a proper discourse.)

2 aspects in Yisrael, one as a _____-before the 600,000; the _____-the distinctive aspect of Yisrael. The Egyptians came at the Jews from both these sources. _____ is enslaved because someone has power of you, _____ is enslaved for the abuse. These are two forms of enslavement, the actual slavery and the undermining of the basic self image. (Avdut versus Inui)

There is a problem with providing a _____ to something not worthy of having a _____ ?
Different kinds of _____ ?

Ch. 4 starts off with a midrash which tells of the corruptness of the Mitzri and the Cannani. The advantage of light from darkness – a sense of contrast. And in a sense Mitzrayim and Canan are contrasts with Yisrael. Spiritually, the Egyptians were involved in adultery and this was also a contrast to Yisrael.

Then what is the difference between Egypt and Canan? From _____'s view it is important to make distinctions. Mitzrayim was involved in Zenut and this is _____. Minchat Sotah comes from barley and oats is animal food. Thus _____ derives that zenut is _____ for it is animalistic. Even so the word '_____' can be connected to chamor – donkey.

_____ by definition lacks _____, so it is potential and fill it with whatever content. If we have Egypt being _____ and Yisrael being _____, without proper _____ - Yisrael is less than _____. That is the logic that when Yisrael is without _____, they are the most subjugated and thus the lowest.

Cananites have a _____ of _____ stamped onto them – which is worse. Proof for this is that Canan was cursed. To be cursed is not identical with _____, no one talks about you you're simply _____. To be cursed is to have a form of _____ imposed on you, and that is having _____ too but as a _____ of _____. [see the Grand Rabbi of Satmar V'Yoel Moshe, explanation on Lech Lecha, that Eretz Yisrael has more kedusha and thus the satan works stronger there. That is why the non-Jews are always so much more horrific than the ones outside of Eretz Yisrael]

The entire approach of this perek has a certain deterministic element. We start to say that historical phenomenon, all represent some type of greater significance which leads us to determinism and we downplay the element of human freedom. In Judaism in general there certainly is a tension between the two elements. – _____ . In this

these issues certainly come out. The more the shift to mysticism the more we turn to determinism. But there is a sense of it, and most certainly Judaism grapples with the determinism versus the free will. ("passive figure of ossified tzidkut" – Rav Lichtenstein in referring to larger than life portraits of the Avot)

How shall we view the _____ in this light? There is a legitimate approach that he is speaking the abstract, at a certain point he may distinguish between the real person;

however, there is no proof that he would operate in such a way. (the individual Egyptian may not shed any relevance to the general push of Egyptian culture and attitude)

In normal logic negation is simply negation. Hegelian logic will state that there are different ways of negation, and here the distinguishes between the negations. Black contradicts white, but black can also contradict sweetness. An object can be black and sweet, but there is a sense that the two do not go together as we are talking about two different things. This is more of a vertical contradiction where things on different levels are contradicted. is the opposite of because it is the separate of , but they do have a relationship categorically. Yisrael and Egypt have a certain relationship being that they are opposites. In a sense you can only negate that which has a relationship with another.

(this gives a general overview of the problems of language and metaphysics latent within the writings of the)

 held the view that contemporary education wasn't the way it should be. The order found in he felt was certainly advisable. One of his greatest talmidim, the Tosefot Yom Tov and his perush on mishna points to this issue. He was open to science and awareness of Copernicum Astronomy. Although he was not so open to astronomy, and was critical of RaSaG and .

Lurianic

The major work of in the medieval century was the Zohar ascribed the Rebi Shimon bar Yochai. While the work contains old traditions it was written in the 13th century. The Zohar is not a unified work and eventually all the parts are quoted over time but it didn't start off that way. From the beginning there are questions of the total authenticity. Rav Moshe deLeon claimed to have discovered the Zohar – his wife claimed that he did write the Zohar. By the time of the modern period, it is established as an important mystical work, but not the only one that discusses the sefirot.

Prior to the Zohar and an underlying principle in Jewish mysticism is the ten sefirot. It in essence is putting a complexity within the Deity, speaking of different levels in God. Even the non mystical do speak of God in certain notations, the concepts of middath haRachmim, or middat haDin. In the , however, we get the notion that they exist in different entities, not as compartments of God. There is a second element which is important to the way of thinking like is, mainly how the world was created. We start with God, who is perfect and unified. God creates the world but it is not unified or perfect. How does one get from a God of perfection to a multiplicity like world? How does evil come out of good?

The notion of Emanation, a neo-platonic conception, that the light which was powerful up high as it drops down to earth breaks into multiplicity, not containing the full gamete of light. It does not solve philosophical problems but allows for a certain understanding of the world for many people.

The kind of language we get is as follows: (the picture is usually the same- out of a human being)



The right is the male, the left the female. The male side starts with what we know, the female side doesn't have the actual insight but the ability to infer and analyze.

-wisdom ; Binah-insight

There is an alternative version of the first three sefirot having , binah, and daat as the tripod of the top level with keter high above.

The lower sefirot correspond to the moral issues:

Chessed, gevurah, and tefferet (Emet) as a synthesis between the two.

We then have the same type of dialectic:

Nezach, Hod, and . With we have made it fairly far with the image of the body, the penis – so that this sefirah will have strong male implications.

, below that (known as shechinah as well) is more feminine, but also indicates the interface with the world. is engendered by . Some will set up more distinctly an end with and a parallel with . Some call as well as .

There is a whole apparatus of metals corresponding to these various sefirot, as well as historical figures.

Yosef being – his main achievement, sexual self control, bringing us back to the .

- Dovid.

Avraham- Chessed,

Yitzchak- Gevurah,

Yakov - Tefferet

The top three have a more intellectual relationship on their own and don't have correspondence.

The sefirot as an identity was already known to Saadia Gaon. There certainly is *mesorah* in these matters, but how much is the historical Zohar taken into the account and how it has changed the approaches is not our focus.

The sefirot can be interpreted functionally with two approaches:

1. Aspects of and the interface with the world
2. A blueprint for the creation of the world

Rivash is concerned that some of the imagery in is reminiscent of Christian ways of thinking. When talking about sefirot you risk the possibility of denying the unity of God. This is a dangerous ground to walk on.

The Ari lived in the 16th century in Eretz Yisrael, his thought written down by Chaim Vital a duplicate name (both meaning life). You start out from God, the Ein Sof. The governing imagery is of light, pouring out of the divine into the world, in a way one would pour liquid from the source into a receptacle, ke'lim. As the light is poured, because they are inadequate to hold the light, the ke'lim break and spill the light (

) and as a result this light becomes alienated from its source. These sparks called are trapped within these Klipot. The act of redemption is elevating the sparks getting rid of the Klipot. Service of God is bringing the world up again, reversing the process of creation sending the light back to its source. That is what redemption is all about, reversing the . *"For the sake of reuniting Malkhut/Shechinah with the Creator."*

- where the occurs will be the difference to in the understanding of the role of evil in the world.
- Tzimtzum -> the idea that God is willing to contract himself and push the light down.
- Why would he want to do that to begin with? For the rational person who attempts to dismiss the personal dimension and interaction with God, there certainly is a difficulty. For the mystical individual the concept

In addition there are four different levels:

,Υκημτ

ωτηρδ

ωρημη

ηΥθγ

Our world being more tied to the lowest ηΥθγ.

There is also another side where we would have ten levels of Tumah.

Understanding the sefirot can either: make the avodath HaShem more personal or more mechanical (In tefilah instead of talking to God you are attempting to push the correct button to get what you want from God).

How important the move to Lurianic for history is debated?

Gershom Scholem felt that Sabbatianism could not be understood without it. Moshe Idel and more modern scholars do not think this to be true, by fact that certain places where Sabbatianism spread there was no influence of . The theory which was prevalent dictated that the spread of helped breed Sabbatianism

Sabbatianism

born in Smerna, Turkey; studied and from 1648 on he believed that he was the . He went to see a psychiatrist named and told him the reason he thought he was was because he indeed was the . Over the next few years that belief spread as well.

There were debates on the authenticity but there were great Torah scholars that did. Part of the controversy was that if we start with the notion of “lifting up the sparks” the more controversial the spark the greater the zechut. Sexual transgressions are more interesting than returning your friend’s donkey that was lost. This is true especially with the symbolism of the – the spilling of the light. What is more appealing is one who conquers the Klipot in their own home territory. Add to this the notion that, “commandments will be lifted in the future.” There are expressions of which do discuss the case (Vayikra Rabba – the chazer is called so, that God will return it to us and permit it) The idea that this is a burden and one day we will be freed to have as much as we would like, that is something to look forward towards. For people who are thinking viscerally, the orgiastic tendency is part of human nature.

They voided many of the public fast days and granted many sexual liberties, highlighting that the days of allow for such freedom. Eventually, was in Constantinople for the purpose of meeting with the Sultan, although he did not approach him. The Sultan heard of and decided to approach . Then let the Sultan know that the Jews were to be liberated. The Sultan said no, of course, and gave the choice of converting to Islam or dying. He chose Islam. For many of his followers this

indicated the end. For others, including Natan who was the intellectual brains of the operation, this was part of the Ha'leot . What better than to convert to the religion itself in order to flip out of Kilpot and let the free? This is engaging the Klipa more than simply bashing it or fighting against it.

(The Rav viewed these ideas even if found in traditional sources as marginal – scholarships' analyzing of in this light)

Scholem even felt that the Spanish Expulsion fueled Kabbalat HaAri, the idea being that the sentence into exile and God being in exile to two resonating. The idea then followed that the presence of , allowed Sabbatianism to flourish. Scholem takes this all the way to the 18th century, connecting Sabbatianism with later movements, including Haskalah and Reform. In chassidut there are certain ideas that smell of Sabbatianism, and Scholem would point to ideas of “averah lishma” and that would show they were Sabbatians.

Mendel Piokaz, knocks out this thesis by reading books and manuscripts from pre-16th showing ideas of “averah lishmah” beforehand. This means that Chassidim did not take it from Sabbatianism rather the idea existed as well beforehand. He would rather say, because Sabbatianism ended up so bad these ideas went underground. Years later the Chassidic sources went back to original points. (Scholem would counter that the Chassidim simply were going back to Sabbatianism) The gedolie Torah who would recognize the presence of such ideas didn't know what to do with the movement.

After the apostasy of , those who embraced him tried to forget about it and suppressed the ideas. Some did following him into Islam, they call themselves the Donmeh – Jews for Mohhamud. At the same time, there were those in the middle who weren't ready to convert to Islam but still believed in him and take him seriously – seeing him function in some messianic ways.

Causes and Themes of Sabbatianism

- foremost is Scholem's view that Lurianic had a role (disputed) especially the “holiness of sin” themes; even to say that the conversion to Islam.
- In Sabbatianism, instead of overcoming the temptation (*Ai priori* the highest level is attained by coming close to temptation but not indulging) indulgence in the sin was external and didn't affect the inside. Though what it would do is release the .
- Sabbateans wanted to redeem the world and redeeming the world was thus more efficient by going out to the world – and engaging in the sin.
- The higher world is a world of “Sabbatean ” permits these acts.
- Usage of “lishmah” here is very controversial – makes us question practice of the later *Chassidim* or even contemporary groups [

Other Historical Connections

The relationship with the Expulsion from Spain, not as connected to Lurianic , but rather more in the form of the Moranos and their connection . By the 17th century there

are a significant amount of people from the “Morano” class who want out and wish to diffuse back into mainstream Judaism. These people bring with them a lot of problems? For 100 years their spiritual religious life has been more of a twilight, holding on to certain , having limited knowledge of basic things in yahadut, for instance not eating bread during the Spring (the Inquisition looked for this as indication of a Jew). When a guy like Spinoza hits, they have no idea of what real torah shebal peh. They were in a sense apostates, but even more their chance to escape they didn’t use to get out. Many of these Moranos moved to Holland.*

For many of them, until they actually came back to Judaism, they were living a blank slate. Going back to Judaism would not only be a matter of keeping the general *mizvot*, but many of them needed a circumcision, something which many were willing to put off. It has been argued that Sabbateans were strong among these groups:

1. because they were confused, and
2. the messianic visions are more Christian than Jewish.

There is a certain amount of political messianism in Spain, where their king Sabastian. Unlike his brother Issac, Abraham Cordozo was a Sabbatian and called his brother an *apikores* for not believing in and thus not taking belief in the messiah.

[1648] It has been argued that the bad state of the world (408-409; gezerat Tach V’tach) as well as the 30 years war, which messed up the economic situation. Even in the Muslim world there was troubling times, and even in the Christian world, 1648, was considered a Messianic year for the world.

Spinoza

In Amsterdam* until Spinoza’s time, it was illegal for Jews to be there. The main body of Jews consisted of expatriate Spanish Morano like Jews. People thus get there because it was a port city, enabling movement to there.

A great deal of discrimination exists against the non- m, as the community was ruled by these Spanish-Portuguese Jews. They even questioned if the *Ashkenazi Rav* could still be buried with the rest of the people being *Ashkenaz* and not . (similar to black ministers from the south being respected like clergy but hated for their race) This type of racism was prevalent in Amsterdam, and interesting is that people of this weak background strengthen themselves by backing their own group history and not letting those who differ in origin to infiltrate. They develop a superiority over other Jews from the inferiority they felt from the Christians.

Before Spinoza there is a character called Uriel da Costa, who was an *apikores*, writing a book denying torah shebal peh. (although they didn’t know much about it themselves, the clergy certainly did) Eventually this fellow was put into Cherem. He repented, they took him back, and he went back again to the kefirah. He eventually committed suicide. Some like to place him as a type of father figure for Spinoza.

During the time of , Spinoza is brought to Amsterdam from Portugal orphaned at a young age. There is a time during his earlier life that he leaded the Amsterdam Jewish

community. It is disputed if he wished to remain part of the community after they ousted him, but he didn't make an effort to get back in by showing any amount of respect. The community was more concerned with the gentiles and their impressions about the issue. Spinoza did not make an effort to bend his views.

The kind of Romantic image of a man who was ostracized for being intellectually honest is not so true; he had contact with his family, the outside world, gentiles included. There was a legend that he died since he was a lens grinder as a profession and it got into his eyes. It's not really true, his involvement was out of science, as philosophers were interested in other fields and development of science was without assistants. That was part of what the scientist did.

He had strong connections to the government and he had been involved in political matters. A life, as it seems relatively normal.

Until then one may have thought that to live in Europe you need some identity. In certain places you may get away of being of heretic if there was a following, but you more or less need to be a part of a community. Spinoza was the first modern Jew in this light, because he never converted to religion but was completely detached from the Jewish community. The Jewish community in Amsterdam incubated people, Holland thought of as a tolerant place for religion among Jews, Catholics, and Protestants. This may be due to the commerce community which developed because of the business. From a purely historical point of you, this may be the most interesting thing about Spinoza – his removal from the Jewish community without converting. [Jakob Katz's "neutral community" comes to mind here]

Spinoza and 17th Century Philosophy

Although the intent here is not to view Spinoza in this context, he is certainly viewed this way. Wolfson wrote that all later philosophers following Spinoza were essentially repeating what others had said earlier. And thus in Wolfson's language Philosophy went from Philo to Spinoza. The Philosophers attempted to conquer two realms of knowledge, **reason** and **revelation**. One wouldn't necessarily lead to the other. The latter can tell us that God created the world out of nothing, while the former not fathoming. The freedom of God and human beings, whereas in reason necessity is king. Over the 2 thousand years of these revelations agreeing with each other; they all hold that reason and revelation respectively have claims, giving justice to both sides. Reality does not let us take certain things to their extreme disposition.

for example, who Spinoza did take, seems to be coming out in the middle on some of these issues. Creation – the is aware that the demands a creation out of nothing, but Aristotle rejects creation. concludes proving it is impossible anyway, but comes out with arguments for the version. Revelation would be man encountering God, for the Philosopher it would be reason. However, the element of divine will introduces a compromise. Ethics- revelation would hold behavior depends on God's hand, but reason on man's own contentions. and would give to a combination towards both, giving attempts to satisfy both sides.

At a certain level we can see Spinoza as someone who makes this whole edifice, this whole dialogue between the reason and revelation, collapse. Coming to an extreme is essentially the approach of Spinoza and the traditional “totting” of both lines is not seen within his writings.

Spinoza writes the way a Geometer writes Geometry – definitions, axioms, etc. This literary form depicts his understanding of Philosophy, that the correct definitions creates the correct principles and theories. The ideal is that here you are operating under pure logic.

This means, Spinoza’s conception of God will be one sided. The notion of God being everywhere and all power – free will for human beings, and the separation between God goes out the window. Spinoza is a patheist, God is everywhere and there is no distinction to everything. Logically working with those assumptions makes sense and doesn’t allow room for anything else. If all is rational, then the only way to know truth is kind of mathematical and therefore the Tanach is an inferior book since it lacks philosophical arguments. The prophets speak in poetry and imagery, the anathema for the rational person. Thus, prophecy is inferior since it is not philosophy.

God doesn’t have free will, because if you are rational things need to be that way. $2 + 2$ will always equal 4 and not dependent on how anyone feels about it. There is no room for divine freedom, because that would imply there is a certain degree of arbitration in the world. The same would be true for Ethics.

The theory of God creating the world is irrational because God cannot change his mind from one day to the next. Rational means the world would be created perfect – but then to make commandments are also irrational sands for the Ethics which are rational. God and nature are the same thing.

What is the need for the word God in Spinoza’s thought?

1. on a social level is has usefulness – talk religious without actually being
2. the man is a real mystic – despite how mechanistic the philosophy

Spinoza certainly believes in God within his own definition of God. The question posed above is what is his need for God as a term; as evident that the term itself does not need to be present. The cosmological argument is an argument for the existence of God that starts with the creation of the world. There is an underlying concept that the world is not self-sustaining and there is something holding it up. God could be this, but if he is synonymous with the world, I am not being told anything new. Is this the case with Spinoza?

The price paid for this, is getting rid of the things that religious as well as normal people believed in. The desire of Spinoza, may be psychologically, the ability to stabilize the change and get rid of it. If there is no change, we live in a world without surprises, reasonable, without contingencies; then God cannot be free (freedom = unpredictability) and Ethics being a system if moralistic notions of reason and not commandments.

Personal relationships with God is thus out of the question. A human being may love God, but God does not love the people – as his unity declines relationship with people. Psychologically, Spinoza was starting out of the notion of “the block universe.” Since the starting point could have been different this may suggest his own temperament.

One would think that Spinoza would be very skeptical of life after death – but he does think of it, and it would fall in within his conception of standards and “no change,” making the world a continuum.

Spinoza as reacting to History: the and Political credence

In theory, the Theological Political Tractate is to deal with the relationship between the theology and the political aspects. It was published anonymously for he would have gotten in a lot of trouble otherwise. The topic is very important in the 17th century this discusses the relationship between the religion and the state.

Within the Tractate there are two elements that are important:

1. *Undermines the credibility of the Tanach.* Part of what goes on there would be what we consider Biblical criticism; however, his scholarship is more concentrated around famous statements of regarding authorship of the bible. Essentially this was to get rid of the aura of in . Part of the issues deal with transmission of the texts and preservation. In addition, his whole preoccupation with the faults in for not being rational, obviously add to debasement of . Poetry is inferior to reason. *Primarily to undermine the as being poetry or politics, exploiting an ambiguity in the (could have sympathized with Spinoza); and calculating a form of Biblical criticism and contempt for .*
 - i. is unimaginative to communicate the truths
 - ii. it should be calculated in mathematically terms – an ambiguity in the which was not fully fleshed out in the
2. *Advice to ruler to make religion obligatory* – not any religion but the religion that he espouses to. The background to this, is what he discussed in earlier chapters that the is about politics, and Moshe spoke politically. Spinoza wanted a modified version of his own philosophy taught – unity of God etc.

Spinoza does believe that virtuous people ought to be happy. For Spinoza, what is even more important is living a philosophical life. If you believe in free will it may bother you that things don't work out; however, if you believe in the determinism, so it shouldn't bother you because it will happen that way. If people know that God rewards and punishes so their approach to life will be one of more happiness and less worries.

The issues that divide Spinoza from others is not just a debate regarding the validity of from Sinai, but maybe even an exposition on emotions, the type of personal lifestyle someone should live.

Spinoza advocates a religion – a political, but civil religion which does not demand the king to tell absolute truths to the people, rather only what is important to them. This does create a society which is more civilized, safer for the philosopher.

[most copies of Spinoza's works today, leave out the chapters where he advocates the king to lie to the people. The editors apparently did not feel that such selections were so integral to the people]

How Spinoza treats Judaism in the *Theological Political Tractate*

Within Holland could be found a melting-pot of religious people; Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, etc. Clearly, Spinoza was aiming towards a religious tolerance of all. Spinoza goes back to the Biblical period and claimed that the originally envisioned a type of democratic order. Originally the service was done by the firstborns – meaning every family had someone involved in the clergy. The idea that every firstborn is a priest, means that power and charisma is somewhat diffused. This is a human arrangement where the priest does control what happens and is not simply a channel for God's will. The opposite of this – the Kohanim as a tribal family producing a political order that represents the interest of that family alone. Thus, the original intent was that the firstborn were in control, but the control was spread. After the Golden Calf which demonstrated an immaturity in preparedness to take the power, it was shifted to the kohanim.

Spinoza was not a fan of and the prophets themselves because they reflect a rigid morality which is not necessarily what the people need. Spinoza's Ethics is an ethics of selfishness, and that which is good for the people. A society run by prophets breeds only a certain direction for the people to advance.

[this does not mean that he agreed with Korach, for Korach also could have bred anarchy. He admits to the golden calf as a folly of man. The framework of firstborn was ideal.]

Is Spinoza in favor of separation between church and state or against?

He favors church by state. Separation, Spinoza identifies with the Catholic church – two sources of authority, the emperor and the pope. In principle the pope saves the soul while the emperor takes care of the politics. For Spinoza the church is a system where there is power without responsibility; in his terms the emperor should be the pope. **The leadership should be politically oriented with religion as a tool.** This is what would have been if the firstborn model still existed. The king then inputs civil religion – and the government will have control over the historical religion and keep it in line.

[Cuddihy argues that in America every religion needed to give up something in order to “get in” and be accepted. The Catholic church accepted church and state, Judaism gave up the idea of “bechirat Yisrael.”]

Spinoza is pro-Calvinist rather than Pro-Catholic in his ideology. The view Spinoza espouses puts Judaism at a very favorable plain.

Spinoza and Judaism

If Moses was more of a political figure for Spinoza, than Jesus was a philosopher. The notion that the Jews are carnal, and Christianity being more spiritual – this is not necessarily so true. Why does Spinoza make statement in their favor?

1. Spinoza was self-hating Jew
2. Spinoza had to talk this way to get his point across
3. One could argue that Spinoza thought Christianity had an edge over Judaism in what he perceived to be a proper religious dogma. In the end, given that Christianity requires less it is much easier to turn Christianity into Spinoza's religion rather than Judaism.

Spinoza raises the question regarding the persistence of Am Yisrael. The continuation of Am Yisrael is certainly something to think about, the survival despite the constant years of terror and abuse. Spinoza feels he needs to address the subject and says the reason they survive separate is because they are very stubborn. God is not the one doing it, rather the people have kept themselves separate and thus they will remain separate. Survival, according to Spinoza, is due to circumcision and commandments. Getting rid of the two will allow religion to take its natural course. (the two may be separate, b/c one is pre-commandments and the other post).

Spinoza does envision a possibility that the Jews will return to Israel along with the . Spinoza saw the as pertinent only in the land of Israel and saw potentially a retaking to the in the return to the land.

Excommunication

There has been a revisionist trend to make those who excommunicated Spinoza as unenlightened men and treat the situation with apologetics. There seems to be a quasi embarrassment with the way the Amsterdam community dealt with Spinoza. [His last meal was chicken soup – maybe this indicates he was a loyal Jew. jk] In the earlier period there were those who were emotional about undoing the excommunication; Rav Herzog had been requested to deal with it.

Appendix –

In the Responsa there is a question from the English/Portuguese community regarding a sermon given by David Nieto – claiming there is no difference between nature and God. Even the word is a medieval word there is no biblical word as such. Thus, if one wanted to look for the biblical equivalent for would be synonymous with God. [most people who have heard about David Nieto will identify him with a defender of and a fighter against the Karaites. What presents itself as interesting in this case is that although this is not Spinoza, it certainly smells a little like it.

Emden and Eibshitz

Yakov Emden

Emden was the son of the above mentioned . He incidentally was not involved in the Rabbinate; he was a Rav for only 3 years in Emden, and hence the name. Thus, he did not have a large involvement in , ruling of . Jakob Katz, in his book *Shabbas Goy*, mentions how strict Emden was in ruling against the usage of a shabbas goy and selling your business to him. Why was he more stringent than others? One possible answer is that he ruled really only for those who approached him, and not the community at large. Thus he was able to be more stringent without taking the community into account, and this was true for leniency as well. For example, pre-marital sex according to is not a strict violation, Emden thus thought to permit the concubine for whatever reasons needed – perhaps there was a limit on “Jewish” marriages etc. It may be that his lack of involvement in the community and the laymen did not cause him to think about the permissibility of allowing men to have sex outside of marriage. (think about modern attitude to such an idea and how, maybe in a joking way, people would champion it.) As opposed to his son, , was a prominent communal Rabbi in Ahuvah, Hamburg, and U??

In any event Emden interests many people because he gives the impression as being open to secular studies. This is true that he has a greater interest and appetite for it, although not as much as some claim – annotations on Talmud and mishna, show he has interest in science and history. He write about his interests in secular studies in some way, feeling conflicted from not studying all the time and yet also not mastering any other disciple fully. The fact that he wrote an autobiography makes him an unusual figure; the book itself gives us much insight into his character and interest in secular world. There he talks about sexual tension and his bad marriages – of which he had a number of them.

It is possible to suggest the reasoning for writing his autobiography was to teach his children about his life, although there is still much speculation for its purpose being that it wasn't so prevalent in the world in general, especially for scholars.

Printing Press

Emden owned his own printing press, a very important fact to know. He edited his own prayer book. There were problems in the prayer book – things he had to say about business ethics where he was being critical of certain practices. Other comments made it into the siddur, “shelo asani aved” with an aleph as a commentary – so he has not made me av beit din. There is another comment about cantors, including one cantor who viewed himself as knowledgeable in the Hebrew language, so that he pronounced the words “ushmoer tozatenu.”

Sabbateanism

He is most famous for his attacks on Sabbateanism. As we know, there were underground movement of Sabbateans, and there were also those who hunted those followers of

. Emden believed the movement was still quite strong. The most notable was the accusations made against Eibshitz, who was more famous and more popular than Emden. (Urim V'tumin, Drush, Yad U'dvash, Flatzee U'Platzee) He was the Rav in Prague when he was young. In 1750 Eibshitz became the Rav in Ahu, while Emden was living in Altuna.

As far as we know, Emden wanted nothing to do with the rabbinate in Ahu, but one can psychoanalyze Emden being that he was the son of the Rav in Altuna near Ahu and he did not follow in his father's shoes. In any event Emden made accusations which shook the Rabbinic world for the next 10 years. It was a terrible scandal, but it may have done something to extradite the weaker rabbanim in Europe. The fact that there were charamot and charamot, gave a certain disgust to the charim. The politics of Ahu meant that governmental agencies got involved into the scandals, where Eibshitz was removed and his followers went to the king of Denmark for assistance. Generally the Danish government had something to do with the weakening of charmot. With the arrival of the modern states, it may be that the government did not want a "state within a state" (originally a French Uganot term, used also against Jews and their own control).

Eibshitz after being kicked around, back and forth, died. The issue left a certain folklore being it. Emden could print anything he wished; he had a printing press and thus allowed for strong language in his publications.

The major thing with the accusations revolved around were amulets prepared by Eibshitz to which when Emden looked at them realized they were Sabbatean. A part from that there were family issues, and other rumors. Most rabbis at the time shared those suspicions. Even the Nodah Beyehuda, who attempted to solve the situation, seemed to have a certain concern on the matter.

The scholarly world and the "frum" world argue whether Eibshitz was a Sabbatean or not; the scholars seem to think that he was involved, while the frum world cannot fathom such a possibility. Look in the 19th century, people look at the controversy from their viewpoint and issues of that century. They were less interested in whether Eibshitz was a Sabbatean, but rather that Emden was a prototypical "maskil." He wrote an autobiography, was interested in secular subjects, and attacked Eibshitz for his .

Post-history brings a tendency for "maskilishim" writers like Grouetz, who liked Emden for being against the like literature. This is namely incorrect for he did use . Scholem said that Emden was more Sabbatean – meaning very often we persecute someone because we are attracted to it ourselves. This is a more psychological approach, although not entirely accurate or falsifiable. Leibess argued that even more, Emden shared a tendency with the Sabbateans – when Emden uses the word "shabttai" he talks about it – basically there is a certain spiritual function serves, a sort of anti-

messianic function. “There is always another (shadow) side,” is a theme in ; there is a dark side to things, and similarly here there is challenge to the Sabbatean. This idea is a framework similar to “anti-Christ” which appears to be essential in discussing messianic times. His direction of argument does establish and confirms that Emden was not a rationalist who was looking at a “false” messiah. He is not someone who hates amulets and makes accusations against those who partake. He is part of that culture. (this is certainly true to a good degree)

Modernity and Emden

How much can we perceive Emden as a modern person? The background for this question is when did Modern Judaism begin? Ezri Shochet believes that the period of modernism for Jews really started in the 17th century, don't blame Mendelson, the period started beforehand. His evidence stems from “sifri drush” as a source for complaints by the clergymen of the time period. Once complaint is that mussar books in general always log complaints and problems, and thus any findings of the sort do not support such a claim. Thus many argue against such a methodology. In his defense, Shochet said that by looking at earlier sefiri drush we see the complaints are different, and thus an inference can be made about early 18th century material; the complaints are new and related to the way people are living and not just how they behave badly to each other.

Emden writes of the point, “people eating meat for breakfast” a prototypical “goyish” thing to do; going to the theater, dogs instead of children, etc. Shochet will also many less negative aspects of modernity are coming to light; the secular knowledge of the scholars, not to mention Emden as well as Eibshitz.

Emden even published doubts about the authenticity of the Zohar. He was probably the first person who was known for his works and wrote questions. He himself says he only wrote about this because of Sabbateanism and wanted to “shake up” people's usage of . In other writings it seems as he treats the Zohar as authentic and with great respect.

Emden liked “goyim” – in his commentary of the Siddur, in the part of the Haggadah, “ ,” he mentions that there is a redundancy because the announcement is meant to include the “goy” who may eat at the table but not eat of the Pascal lamb. In his commentary on the we also see “a position held for the sake of heaven will abide” being questioned in light of the Church. Tosefot Yom Tov answered the question by saying this refers to Jewish groups. Emden held that the Church and Christianity had introduced high moral standards and brought people to high levels of faith and are considered as holding “a position for sake of heave.”

[when we discuss above the term MODERN we refer to positions on secular studies, approach to goyim, claims against Sabbateanism]

However, he did not like philosophy and thus had a beef with 's – to the extent that he made a comment that didn't write it. Although liking philosophy does not make a person Modern. The issues that modern people should think about were

the philosophical problems; thus being against does not make him anti-modern but rather anti-medieval. It is not clear if he didn't like it because it wasn't modern or for more internal issues of the .

Jakob Katz thought that what is important is the way people viewed themselves – more relaxed with religion – a not modern. Emden would not gloat on how much different he was from his father, and thus it seems that MODERNITY is where people become aware of what they are doing is different from what they did before.

Responsa regarding followers of Jakob Frank*

It says it is better that these people are now in the open and we know who they are; we can prevent marriages and interactions between us. The complain of persecution by the Jews for being Christian, so they went to the government. The real Christians, claim Emden, would be anit-Sabbatean for a “new religion” has no right to exist. Even the most liberal of “goyim” would not allow a new religion – because although not everyone is the same, but if there is no “chazakah” we don't accept it. Think of religion in terms of its practical consequences – the issue is how to live in this world without killing each other. A religion that survives the test of time is a “tame” religion. A new religion we have no idea of what it is. [this argument will come up with regard to reform] Even the sexual anarchy will not go well with the other religions. He also states that Jesus and Paul insisted that the commandments be kept. If they were real Christians they would believe in Paul and Jesus, instead of .

The fact that he writes about it exhibits his contempt for Sabatianism. [In the end it is difficult to treat Jesus and Paul as Jews with a certain discrepancy.] Some want to point to Emden's modernity through his literacy of the New Testament. (mentioned above)

Moses Mendelssohn

Life, History, and Accomplishments

His name has collected a lot of impressions around it. He was born mid 1720s; into his younger teens he studied with R. David Frankel (author of Korban haEidah). The 18th century is a period where study turns into a different direction; the previous centuries were mostly concentrated on the Orach. One of the things that happen now are people beginning to write explanations on the Jerusalem Talmud. This has to do with economics; some Rabbis begin to look at manuscripts as well as have the ability to buy more books.

Mendelssohn followed Frankel into Berlin, and during the next few years he brought himself to the point of becoming one of the leading intellectuals of his time, a leader of 18th century thought, extolled for the quality of his prose. Professionally because he was a Jew an academic career was out of the question. He worked in a silk factory, to which his education gave him an advantage with his fine intellectual qualities and mastery of languages.

During the 1750s he was involved very much in Hebrew writing, creating even a magazine. In later years this would be considered “enlightenment” activities, publishing about ethics and moral outside of Judaism. He was active in German to some degree translating. He was trying to show the beauty of Hebrew and Jewish culture. This was separate from whatever positive ideas he committed.

There was discussion on admitting him to the Prussian academy, the king said no, but he did invite Mendelssohn to his home – Mendelssohn did go, it was on Yom Tov sheni, a goy brought him.

He associates with several intellectuals of the time, especially with **Lessing**. Within the group he was accepted, a well respected person. His reputation in Germany was great, they referred to him as the “German Socrates” and his work the *Phaedo*, a modern revision of Plato’s *Philo*. It has been shown that working in this form he avoided saying anything about Christianity. Lessing wrote a play called “Nathan the Wise” within it a religious strife is dealt with and the highlight is when Nathan the Jew (modeled after Mendelssohn) tells the story of the three rings [father of three sons who bequeaths 3 rings to his sons instead of one, because he didn’t want to choose to which would get the ring] – the implications of the parable being that Christians, Jews, and Islam all do not have the truth, so they should be nice and presumably none are genuine. Lessing believed in Progress, that of the historical religions, none are genuine, and the purpose of the religions, were to inch up to a higher form of moral good.

Mendelssohn himself did not hold that way. Generally speaking he did not believe in Progress. This is an important factor. Within his public career there were two moments of crisis within these issues. Around 1770 was called the Lavater crisis, a Swiss Christian not really friendly with Mendelssohn who wrote a book called “Old Genesis” in which he argued for an enlightenment form of Christianity. He dedicated the book to Mendelssohn hoping that he would do as Socrates would have done, either arguing against it or accept it. Mendelssohn was deeply insulted by this. Within a framework here, he couldn’t say anything personal about this person. Mendelssohn was regarded as a peaceful man. He was an Irenic Personality.

He got out of this whole dispute by way of a parable, of a house that has two stories to it. Anyone willing to live in the upper story is assuming the bottom floor is solidly built. Implicit that we sit here, we assume the floor is solid. If Christianity is built on Judaism, the idea to live on the second story when the first floor is not sturdy simply doesn’t make sense.

Later on, ten years later, occurred another challenge. Mendelssohn wrote *Jerusalem* as his justification of Judaism – it was written under pressure to justify Judaism to the non-Jews. At this point Mendelssohn loses passion for philosophy, claiming the pressure got to him. His next work was the translation of the Bible into German – he did *Shemot* and supervised the rest. It had to do with the fact that he couldn’t think about philosophy.

In any event, Mendelssohn died relatively young. The event that precipitated his death was the death of Lessing. There was a man Jacobi, who claimed that Lessing had said many positive things about Spinoza, which upset Mendelssohn because it meant Lessing was a larger apikores than he had thought (also it means as a friend he didn't know everything).

Kant wrote his *Critique of Pure Reason*, Mendelssohn received a copy from Kant to review. There is a famous description of a meeting between Kant and Mendelssohn, in Keningsberg. [In Keningsberg you had to pay the goy to get to shul on shabbas. The goy was to make sure the Jew did not say anything about Christianity]

Mendelssohn had a problem with his kids – how for them to stay frum and also the kind of people that hung around him. He remained frum his whole life. Once he died, all his kids left yiddishkeit. (he had a dilemma of marrying his daughters to business men who had money, but were unenlightened; or enlightened men who were not frum) Mendelssohn as religious intellectual was severely limited in his financial mobility.

[Early Burial

Beliefs in vampires grew out of early burials, people who were buried alive and tried to scratch their way out, having blood on their finger nails, looking very pale. Emden wrote to Mendelssohn to do something about the early burials.]

Jerusalem

In his work, Jerusalem, Mendelssohn deals with the question of why he remains Jewish if he sympathizes with the European Enlightenment. In addition to cultural and religious discussions, the question is also raised as to the political equality of Jews. In the medieval world and geographical terms there is no centralization of the source in establishment of nation. There were a variety of political entities but none of which were an established nations. Germany as an example, even when united, had different provinces that saw their own identity part and parcel of the established nationality. States were ruled by Kings; king of Bavaria, Prussia, Dukes and other nobilities. Even France which seemed the most unified of the period, many people living in France don't even speak French [Eugene Weber, "Peasants in Frenchman"].

A Jew a person could be. As the modern state moves in, the contradiction of being a Jew and being a German or Frenchman comes to light; this idea more eloquently expressed is, "a state within a state." The Jews have their own laws, their own judiciary – batei din – the idea that people can conduct their own legal affairs within their own confines celebrates the differences between the two populations. The fact that the Jews speak a different language makes it easier for them to cheat the non-Jew and change the business records; this would make a non-Jew more suspicious. Some of the more liberal Christians thought that breaking down barriers would tempt Jews to convert to Christianity and thus they endorsed it for their own gain.

The opening question has to do with the nature of relationship between the human conscience and the state. The discussion is developed through allusions to Hobbs, a

notion of social contract – we treat the state as if there is a contract with the people made up of the state, and without the state no one will survive. Thus they hand their own power over to a centralized authority, a king, who is only responsible to God and people have given everything into their hands. The social contract makes society work better, even if they assume they could work well without it, it will enhance the welfare. How much power should a king have over religion? Mendelssohn would say the king should not have power over what people think. Locke who is more of a liberal theorist, Mendelssohn assumes that if people would come to the conclusion that they will also succeed regarding spiritual realms they will in act such a system.

Mendelssohn believes the state cannot regulate people's ability and way of thinking. With regard to what people out to believe there is no right to the state. What this does in the realm of action is unclear. Mendelssohn defines religion as ones beliefs. The ethical realm of what people out to do, religion included. Then religion in addition to ethics involves certain beliefs. Finally, politically, there is a coercion by the state to do X, and is distinct from the ethical and religion.

In terms of implementation of the religious education it is up to the family, school, and other voluntary institutions to inculcate the morals and religious creeds. If they cannot how can we assume the king will not be able to it? A state has no business in religion or in ethics – where ethics is defined as the inner conscience.

This leads Mendelssohn to the belief that religion and ethics are rational. He believes anything that one believes it can be comprehended rationally. Mendelssohn did not say Judaism has no dogmas. He held the issues that are important for belief can be demonstrated rationally, and thus they cannot be dogmatic. He held God could be proven, immortality of the soul can be proven, and that the basic orientation of ethics, are rational. With from Sinai, he takes the Kuzari's argument since it was given in public any rational person would accept it. But there is no reason for a non-Jew not to accept it, because he does not have a mesorah like the Jew does for the occurrence. The problem that Mendelssohn faced was who says in Laws of Kings (ch. 10) that a non-Jew keeps the Noachide laws not because of Sinai but because of reason is considered ". This presents a problem for Mendelssohn, and asks Emden about this phrase. Emden (who did have tendencies to pro-Christians) wrote back that he found a in the for the . This was not the answer that Mendelssohn wanted. Today we know that this is not the correct in the , the word should be interjected instead of . As far as the was concerned the non-Jew needs to have the belief in the from Sinai, not just from reason; the new text change only distinguishes between and the latter being a higher spiritual person.

Mendelssohn basically had a view associated with *apotaktasis* a Greek word engaging that in the end, all attain (some form of) salvation.

The second part of Jerusalem, Mendelssohn speaks about the origin of religion and .

Whenever you start with signs and symbols the original meaning will be distorted. Language gets twisted. The wrote about this in his introduction to Hilkhot Avoda Zara. For Mendelssohn the focus is not on causality but the meaning.

[We saw in part one elucidated the principle of religious freedom, that the state has no right to intervene in the people's religion, and moral choices, and the extension of politics. Mendelssohn felt that reason could provide basic moral and philosophical beliefs. Judaism would be entailed by historical evidence (Kuzari argument). Mendelssohn doesn't require a gentile to know of and it makes sense that any reasonable person would admit that a gentile would not be privy to such knowledge. The commits Mendelssohn to a certain position regarding gentiles and his view of being a singular opinion (is probably in the middle, see the above reference to the version problems). According to Mendelssohn immortality is rational, and the nature of the soul provides for immortality. Thus it would have to be operant for gentiles as well. Mendelssohn thus insists in some places with a critique on Christianity, because Christians demand a belief in Jesus from all, unlike Judaism. Part 2 of Jerusalem, Mendelssohn discusses his theory of the rise of idolatry – based on language, that it misleads people to relate to the signified and not what is real. Thus all human attempts at religion will lead to some form of idolatry. Mendelssohn claims that to avoid this one should not focus on words, but on actions which are not deceitful like words are. The actions which involve commandments would absolve any misleading factors of the language. In this process he has justified the separation of the Jewish people from the nations. The observance of kashrut and other laws enforce this – although he didn't write this in Jerusalem because his audience was the gentile community – but he did believe it. Politically and religiously the approach of words and not actions – Christianity – is problematic.]

Mendelssohn enforces that there are beliefs in Judaism but they are all supported by reason and thus not difficult to believe. In order to acclimate within society the Christians did require some form of indication of a belief in Jesus – this goes back more in the 18th century – but it was a fight which prevailing during the current discussed period. Professors at prominent institutions in order to teach there had to conform to the religious standard – be it Protestant in England – or the pronouncement of belief in Jesus and the trinity. Mendelssohn's question is whether Jews can be citizens, despite they do not believe in Jesus, but based on the fact that they are competent citizens. Locke, who we perceive as being an upholder of emancipation, removes Catholics from this category. Many enlightened people would exclude Jews. Can one trust a person who doesn't believe in Jesus? These people, who we would think of as liberals, did create limitations. Furthermore, for Jews especially, the notion that they created a **state within a state** for themselves presents certain mistrust between Jews and gentiles.

So, then what is Judaism really all about? His answer is that Judaism is law, . If we are talking about philosophical beliefs, so everyone shares basic moral and ethical values. Judaism differs with its laws. What does that mean? Not morality, because everyone share the same morals; it's not beliefs because they are rational themselves. We are not left with much after that, and essentially Mendelssohn makes Judaism into political laws

that conform to reason, but are not identical with laws of reason. You don't become a moral person by obeying the traffic laws – the moral law exists within itself as a rational establishment.

In the Diaspora since the is independent from the state, coercion does not make sense. That is why it is wrong for any ecclesiastical body to put someone in . Long before Mendelssohn wrote this, Gentile authorities were cracking down on Rabbis who did such; they did not want a state within a state. In affect, Mendelssohn was not giving away so much. What would he have said if Jewish self rule was vigorous? The answer is debatable. At this time autonomy is ebbing and as a matter of principle the community would throw it out. In fact, who needs religion more than a person who is back-sliding. That's like telling someone who is sick that they cannot have a hospital. Even within their own state of Jews, Mendelssohn could have argued that a state has certain responsibilities.

In terms of Mendelssohn is not so far off from other traditional approaches. Hirsch found Mendelssohn's approach better than the 's because the former relates to the world of the 19th century, whereas seems to alienate that fact especially when we connect the commandment with paganism and idolatry.

Mendelssohn wants to give a general position on the commandments. Do we want to develop a general theory or do we want to argue out each particular detail and aspect, the danger being, it is harder to convince of details than a larger picture. The general approach solves problems fundamentally and often times intellectually more honest. The particular development is likened to a "band-aid" method, where we patch up problems here and there. Example: people are often embarrassed by the concept of *shadim*, demons and other forms of supernatural beings in Judaism. So we can say the problem of going out alone at night – because of actual mystical beasts or because of hooligans? Can such an answer be given for each time there a mentioning of *shadim*? In transferring such a discussion to Mendelssohn takes the general approach and does not address particulars. One may say, though, that such an brings a danger that the is not fulfilled when one does not appreciate the internal aspects of the issue. [The Kotzker Rebbe once said that when the gave the ruling that there were no *shaddim* they left. This, the Kotzker explained, as the power of the .]

(Heinrich...)

The problem for Mendelssohn is that treating philosophically as Jewish law ("stuck" with it) develops a drab religiosity which doesn't excite people and makes law. Mendelssohn may have fallen into a trap created by Spinoza – the only difference is Mendelssohn says that the law is to be kept outside of Israel, and that God is a real God and the law is divine. He can't say much else because then he would lose his position within the rational camp. Judaism ends up being something, however legitimate it may be, which people do not share with each other because it does not have a motivation or a dimension of reality. This was one of the problems with Mendelssohn's philosophy.

When we speak of the historical background of *Jerusalem* two notions come to mind. 1) The issue of Jewish emancipation and the equality of the Jews socio-economically and politically. 2) Not using the . Jakob Katz has noted that the was on its “last leg” anyway. However, for Mendelssohn the fact that the encouraged some form of coercion, it had to be removed from the practices of the Jewish community. Not to mention that usage of Jewish judicial methods would make rifts between the Jews and gentiles. Why should they use their own courts when the (gentile) society has a justice system? These two issues, how the Jews should interact with gentiles and how the Jewish community should manage itself are at the heart of *Jerusalem*’s background.

The gentiles did question the Jews’ own tolerance in light of the accusation that they the gentiles were not tolerant of the Jews. But Mendelssohn’s point was that unlike the Christians, the Jews do not require belief in their own ideas by the gentiles. The fact that Jews put each other in Mendelssohn had to go a long way, to admit that within a Jewish political framework it does make sense, but certainly not in Europe where there is a governing authority. (At the time he was defending this situation Rabbis were putting others in and making full usage of its potential) The book did not make such a huge tumult in the religious community, as Mendelssohn contended that the book was for gentiles and not predominately for Jews.

Some ideas which were proposed in order to allow Jews easier access into society were to get new jobs, make a wide scale change and do something completely different. In this light, the Jews usage of showed that they were intolerant of each other.

As far as a *Jerusalem* as a title for the book, Carmy, thinks it’s just catchy. Georg Hermann wrote to Mendelssohn (author of *Golgotha*) saying that there is more to religion than just the rational fathoming of ideas. Further because man is not as rational as Mendelssohn believed, the state needs to provide forms of spirituality for the people. For Hamann you cannot divorce the political realm from the private realm and the various elements. There is an argument between Mendelssohn and Hamann about a verse in the New Testament. In it a person asks Jesus if he should pay taxes. Jesus asks him to bring him a coin and asks whose face is on the coin. When the man answers Ceasar, Jesus says what is Ceasar’s render it to Ceasar, and what is God’s give to God. It’s a balanced answer, but a trap. Mendelssohn understood this to be, as a citizen you do what the state requires and in private you do your own religious lifestyle. Hamann thought the verse intended to mean that you give a little to Ceasar but most of it you give to God. The dispute how to interpret this represents the contrast of Mendelssohn’s position – liberal approach that religion autonomous but state does not interfere and visa versa – and Hamann’s position – more conservative, that we cannot have these artificial divisions.

In his early years Mendelssohn tried to create a Jewish literacy, translating books, writing poetry, but stops for lack of an audience. Years later he enters the literary scene to publish and create a community that will represent what he was after. Within this context was the translation of the into German with a so called . Initially Mendelssohn translated the bible for his family at home, but others asked why he would not share with others. Mendelssohn only translated and while others did the rest such

as Naphtali Wessely () - referred to in - who translated . This was a major project. Originally the project was intended for children who didn't speak Hebrew. This was meant to compete with the non-Jewish translations and explanations; in the Christian works they found references to Jesus in the Old Testament and the found in some of their explanations.

specifically came out against Mendelssohn's translation of the bible. Many of the Rabbis in Europe were bothered by the explanation more the translation.

thought the German was too good, but also protested more to the explanation than the translation itself. What were Mendelssohn's real intentions? Sorke and Edward Breuer ("Limits of Enlightenment") in their overall view was that Mendelssohn was *from* and certainly when it came to our hashkafa. When Mendelssohn says we want equality and we are willing to be citizens for the cause, he means there is no contradiction between a life of and the Prussian Army. Breuer sees this as a "we'll see." Like in America Jews are equal and if there was a draft Jews would certainly not claim that they are exempted, but in general Jews do not go to the army. The way the world looks, we answer "yes" but it didn't mean that he had really committed so far.

Mendelssohn made it clear that you don't mess with as passed down through and even moved away from lower criticism, insisting on the authenticity of the Masoretic texts.

Wessely was important for publishes his pamphlet – but most likely never led to Shalom (Carmy joke). In this article, which was written in early 1780s advocates secular studies – something at that time was controversial. Children who attend a cheder style education come out not knowing how to function in society, be it on a sociological level or even politically. admitted that speaking Yiddish does not suffice for not speaking the language of the country. Even on a Judaic educational level people were coming out into the world not even knowing so much. Children were coming out not knowing how to be *menchen*. Wessely used the term advocating the importance of being a human being, above all. He differentiated between and additional forms of laws. The usage of such terminology wasn't meant in the context of strict secular education, but moralistic and humanistic notions of what it means to be a good person. An education in this light would bring out *menchen* from young Jewish children.

This pamphlet created a great deal of negative feeling in the Jewish world. In terms of *charamot* they still existed amongst a great deal of unhappiness in the Rabbinic world.

Mendelssohn unlike the rest of the people who have been spoken of, does not believe in progress. This comes clear from his discussion about in Jerusalem. On one hand he is very liberal for believing that every soul will eventually get redeemed. In terms of the world he was very skeptical of progress. This is Mendelssohn – if one believes in progress, he is more likely to accept changing the – various revelations and interchanges within the framework of . [Although the belief in is present in Judaism, it is not a major point, even more for the Lithuanians.] This skepticism is

important for Mendelssohn in developing his *frumkeit*. His friend, Lessing, certainly did hold of progressive Christianity and even Mendelssohn did not hold of such for Christianity. A lot of things may change but nothing fundamentally would change.

Mendelssohn dies in January 1786. Jerusalem was written in 1782 and was an important year for two reasons.

1. Emperor of Austria publicizes Jewish progression and emancipation. There are even responses written by the _____ who wishes a _____ to the Jewish soldiers on their way out to fight for the Austrian army. (the characteristic behavior of _____ is strange here because in private many time he would denounce any forms of progress and enlightenment, such as taxing Jewish books in that regard)
2. Wessley and the publication of _____ which was meet with incredible opposition in the rabbinic world. (not verified- spaced out #2)

MASKILIM

A lot of the tension that we have between Mendelssohn and others in the rabbinical world may be looked upon as some form of *turf war*. Ultimately there is a political question of who sets the tone; rabbinic leaders or intellectual leaders? This polemic is relatively new. Intellectual Jews who do not claim to be _____ the question of who is in charge is seriously debated. The idea that Mendelssohn, a man who is not a professional rabbi, or even Wessley who wrote a book on Hebrew grammar and got a _____ for his explanation of _____ from the _____, would be ludicrous for the rabbinical councils to step down from their positions. _____ gave this approval and next thing he knows, Wessley is criticizing the Jewish educational system and how Jewish children are not taught anything.

During this time the works of Rav Shaul Berlin (forgery known as _____) were published. His father was a more moderate of a figure at this tim. Berlin was a big scholar and a *maskil*. He published a book trying to undermine all the arguments of a certain Rav HaZolei from Elbogen, who used the _____ in order to undermine his value as a Rav. It could be seen even as being sarcastic and satirical. This polemic of debate between the rabbis and their overall ignorance of the workings of the outer society plagued this time period.

Jakob Katz would point out that the time period can be considered a semi-neutral society, where things are not labeled as Jewish or Christian, and thus people can move into the world. These types of people would feel much more comfortable integrating into the world than the rabbis, and command more respect for their knowledge unlike the rabbis.

The time gets more interesting, as these *maskilim* are ready to discuss Jewish enlightenment but the general _____ are virtually aloof. This goes for saying on both accounts; on the account of the *haskalah* and on the account of push for Judaic investigation, study, and performance.

G
E
R
M
A
N
Y

The Edict of Tolerance of Austria in 1782 moved towards Jewish rights in Germany. In France where the community was not as big, the Jews were given emancipation in 1789. The early stages of the FR revolution were very antireligious, as “Frenchman everything, as Jews nothing.” This was a movement as antireligious (mainly Christian) as anything until the Russian revolution. As with most ethical and liberal people they ended up killing each other and causing more problems that they had started with.

Once they had Napoleon, there still was equality for Jews but not much better. He still was killing off people, through sending them off to wars. He conquered half of Europe, which was relevant for the Germans, meaning that in the next period, the French are running Germany. There are places where Napoleon simply takes over and installs his family members as protectors and kings. Prussia remained independent but French troops occupied it.

Within France proper, Napoleon decided to do something about the Jews. Part of the issue was a feeling that Jews were involved in smuggling activities in the frontier and were a sort of annoyance. If you focus people’s complaint on the Jews it makes them forget the rest of their problems. In the height of his power, 1806, he decided to convene and to make changes in Judaism. “Some day a will allow people to drive to shul on Shabbas.” It had layman but some rabbis, most notably, the author of - Rav Dovid Zinsheim. Napoleon posed a few questions to them (Shwarzfuchs):

1. Are French Jews loyal to France....? Of course
2. Mixed Marriages? Since the ceremony says cannot have a non-Jew. This left uncovered, otherwise, whether anything would be wrong with it. gave a to Zinsheim, for working with Napoleon in this way. When it came to mixed marriages they needed to be much more creative with solving the issue in a proper and politically correct manner.

France and England don’t have reform Judaism, because the rabbi was acceptable to a large part of the community, and the chief rabbi was selected by the monarchy(?). Napoleon had an episode where he was in Israel – before he became Emperor – he had just conquered Egypt and Israel.

In Germany the Jews are pro-French since they think the French are the ones bringing these forms of equality. Being occupied by the French integrated a nationalistic spirit of the German people, especially against the French. In any event, the Jews in the short run were very happy. This allowed them to intermarry with Prussian officers; the war brought a lot of young men to Berlin with not much to do. It was good for the salon life, and the many Jewish woman who converted were able to get German officers. These years brought a great deal of to the German Jewish community, by pressuring Jews to convert. The is presently going no where, it is stuck between emancipation and

Reform Movement

The Reform movement begins approximately now. Napoleons brother, successfully brought together a like body to make decisions on the changing and Jewish ideas. There are two important aspects to keep in mind.

1. laymen
2.
 - a. Eating on - same issue as in WWI when there were food shortages. The idea was not that radical, if soldiers were in the army that may be all that they could eat.
 - b. Sanctuary – shorter prayer, quieter prayer, this leads to what about prayer in other languages. [Orthodox response needed to work on that] said that German was not a pure enough language. The Talmud in which is quoted in favor of language change is referring to purer language such as Greek. This may not be only apologetics, but rather the language lacks precisions, for example slang. The language needs to be able to command poetry.

“Orthodoxy and the Outsider”.
by Bleich.
Ed. Schachte

institutional Reform will primarily focus on public religious issues. The 20th century, saw JTS getting rid of the stringencies of the Three Weeks, and since it was psychologically unhealthy they got rid of a number of the issues. Why would they do this? Summer Camp (not to say it doesn't play an important role in the orthodox world). Kids grow up that is part of the Jewish calendar because there is a difference in behavior during those times.

Even more, what happens when a non German speaking Jew attends the synagogue? What about the possibility of killing potential of learning Hebrew and ? The question of musical instruments in the sanctuary is now posed. Since it's rabbinic it should not be so problematic and there should be ways to circumvent the problem. Moreover there were precedents found in Eastern Europe for doing so. There were situations where they permitted a non-Jew to play music after Friday weddings. The notion here was at least to do it within . At this stage they are trying to work with some semblance of the system.

All these people could have converted to Christianity. Some scholars think that Reform were all people who could have disappeared within the . Myers proves that they wanted to remain Jewish; after Reform the went away. By 1815 the is not as feasible as it was 15 years earlier.

Organ playing, the language, the content of the prayer, and the abridging on the prayer, removal of nationalistic components are all on the reform agenda. [think of the dreary music being played in a church and the thoughts it conjures up. sin, death, repression, etc. Carmy wanted to compare it with a torture chamber and say it plays a role in horror movies.

Most of the material found on the Reform is found in a six volume work of the published posthumously. He may have thought it wasn't important for all generations and thus perhaps did not include it when he published his book, .

1818 marks an important stage in this polemic in which the Hamburg (Reform) Temple was inaugurated. At this point there were sharp reactions from the Orthodox world on the founding of this temple. Issues like the organ and the . In Jakob Katz's on the divide between the Orthodox and Reform, he mentions that told the orthodox Jews to complain to the King about the Reform. On one hand the assimilation and desire to be included in society may please the king. On the other hand it may lead to greater anti-Semitism with Jews taking away jobs etc. However, there would be another factor to take into account, Reform would only be a way of them assimilating with keeping a Jewish factor. Without the Reform these Jews would simply assimilate; now they have an option of a quasi assimilation but they still retain their Jewishness. (This could be compared to a leftist opposition to torah u'madda 50 years ago. Any kind of orthodoxy which is a challenged to them could not be a valid orthodoxy.)

The argument here is not Orthodox per se but rather that Reform Judaism was an attempt to avoid the general . On the other hand, the split between the Orthodox and Reform may be problematic for the monarchy or ruler because now when one deals with the "Jews" they need to deal with all the denominations. The interest of Reform and Orthodox are obviously not congruent and thus the king would have his own autonomy split because the two sides will be seeking his approval. The king may favor the Orthodox because they have "no surprises." The Reform may have a more liberal side and may impact and limit the king's power. The Orthodox are not likely to agitate or take an active role in the government. This tension does play itself out to a large extent to the difference between the Orthodox and Reform in the eyes of the governments and how they deal with the issues.

In 1818 the is aware that the Reform could be seen as a political threat. A similar idea was viewed by Emden in his wish that the Frankists and their activities being curtailed. If could convince the government that this is a "new religion" who changes the rules and tries to create a new place for them, the king would fear his own power and restrict their movement. Katz pointed out an irony here, Hamburg did not have a king. Germany is not uniform, Prussia and Bavaria have kings, but Frankfurt and Hamburg are run by Senates. Thus letter to the Jews in Hamburg bares this irony. In a Senatorian/Republican society, such a fear would not create concern among the leaders.

1830s -1840s brought a gradual development of another stage of Reform: the Rabbinate. Generally speaking in most places the government would recognize the Rabbinate and also have only one Jewish community. Either you are in or you lack identity of a Jew. A member of the religion pays taxes to that community for its services. People are not walking around claiming to be Reform rabbis or looking for Reform congregations. Some Rabbis would have more or less intellectual qualifications but no one wanted to give them a job.

The control of a community meant that the minority was disenfranchised. In Berlin the *frum* community had the upper hand, in Frankfurt the opposite. Some places there were able to get along, like Vienna. The Rabbis were not that *frum* and were not that Reform either. Many things were kept pareve. Without militants in either camp it was easy to get along.

Theology

Theologically there are a number of particular issues that came up. In Breslau people wanted to get rid of . Zechariah Frankel solved the problem by outfitting the with fancy shawls and turned the whole thing into an aesthetic pageant. And then people actually liked it.

1844 was a point where there was liberal or Reform grouping got together to discuss things. Lines were not drawn so sharply, Hirsch was invited to participate (he declined). He spoke German and gave sermons in German, so naturally it would seem that he should be invited. These conferences began to define what Reform was; on the extreme left some Rabbis were willing to exchange shabbas with Sunday and even absolve people of circumcision. (It did not make sense in their rational standards, but they did not want to become Christians) However, this was very extreme; rarely did anyone advocate such an extreme opinion. [Michael Meyer would argue here that this points that these people were not interested in moving over to Christianity. They wanted to stay within a normal trend of religious practices, but wanted to change the details] The breaking issue for the right was the Hebrew language. In terms of it may not matter that much, but in terms of education and functioning knowledge of Judaism, giving up Hebrew was an immediate loss. This would destroy the cohesion of the Jews, and Frankel happened to have walked out on this very issue. Study of was also important to this factor. The factors that were important were monotheism and ethics.

As stated last time there were moderates and extremists within the Reform camp all attempting to place their agenda on the map.

[Disclaimer: this is watered down philosophy]

Kant and Hegel

Kant & Hegel: Influence in time period

Kant (1724-1804) in his critical stage (Pure Reason, Practical Reason, Judgement) produced a revolution in general philosophy: metaphysics and ethics.

Metaphysics – the assumption people made for Kant, was that when studying it we try to make statements about the way the world really is. There were philosophers such as David Hume who were skeptical of such manifestations. The question of objective knowledge was addressed. Ex. think of causality from a common sense view, there is a connection between cause and effect (hitting the table produces a sound). Hume questioned the reality of that causal relationship – the effect is there, but what is the cause? When we say cause, we may say that refers to the inherent connection between the movement and the hitting of the table. Hume will say that he does not see that connection. It doesn't show the actual causal nexus. Two approaches to this:

- a. Causality cannot be proven

b. Causality does not exist.

The second example is about the nature of the self. There is a notion of “I” (I am looking at the table) and while doing so, I still exist. Hume would counter, if the “I” is removed from the self, there is nothing left at all when the experience is removed. Thus “I” is shorthand for bringing all the experiences together; there is no substance of the self without it. Kant was shaken by these conceptions.

The Critique of Pure Reason (math and physics – reason that underlines science) was written by Kant countering Hume’s attacks on reason. How can we be certain? The element of certainty and rationality that goes into science does not derive itself from the outside world or causality from the outside, rather causality is a factor of reasoning itself. The way the world is organized, in order to establish a notion of before and after, there needs to be categories to establish it as such. It is an attribute of how we organize the world and not the world itself. When Kant talks about the mind organizing the world, he is not talking about psychology or sociology. He is talking about the structure of reason, not the structure of a particular animal (it happens to be that humans are rational animals). In reality what Kant is after is the way that reason operates.

Part of what Kant is up to, is claiming that the categories of metaphysics do not relate to the outside world, but the way that reason operates. This introduces a limitation of human knowledge, we only know that which we organize the world. We do not really know ourselves. Kant would argue that there is a self that organizes the perceptions, but we do not know the self, we only know aspects which are organized in a certain way. We do not organize in the same way, entities which are not organized that way. Infinity is unknowable from the standpoint of pure reason. Kant claims that a scientist could not determine if there are uncaused events (free will) because it encapsulates experience beyond self perception. Is the world infinite in time or space? No way for pure reason to decide.

Kant believes that people cannot really prove the existence of God using the tools of pure reason. After Kant did what he did, many people lost their appetite for engaging these proofs. (There are no places the Rav would say the proofs do not work; he would say they are irrelevant) From a cultural perspective, Kant convinced the people that these proofs were irrelevant. At a cultural level it took away the appetite for getting involved in traditional discussions on religion. [Königsberg which was Prussia in Kant’s is actually in Russia today - Kaliningrad] Kant was well to the east of Berlin, and yet he mentions that because of limitations of reason proposed by Kant you need to rely more on faith. Being a philosopher is realizing human limitation.

Ethics: Kant in Critique of Practical Reason (morality) asks similar questions of what we have to assume in order to attain moral knowledge. What underlines morality in a way that would validate it? Kant’s argument basically is that the universality or content of ethics is derived from human reason attempting to legislate moral law. If you legislate without universality, you create different forms of morality. Morality is universal, people are to be treated as ends and not merely as means. Kantian ethics are universalizable – something which is not cannot have ethical value. For something to be a moral value it

**Kantian
Ethics**

needs to be universalizable. [developing ones talents could be such a value] No matter how admirable or dignified that which is not cannot be morality. A act is moral only if it motivated by moral actions. Without moral intent it has no moral value.

This would now mean two things from a Jewish point of view:

1. The idea that one should engages in moral activity for the sake of moral law alone and not because being moral makes me happy, that is very similar to the notion of acting – doing something for the right reason and not for myself. In this respect Kantianism is very much like Judaism – viewing the motivations against the actions. (This would be the opposite of Utilitarianism – where the ideal is to become an admirable character)
2. The content may be problematic in terms of ; we would need to come up with ingenious reasons for the commandments. Since morality is built on an autonomous legislative process, acting because God commanded it so, is heteronymous. If God commands us to do certain things, it is because God has a good will and is moral, but not because God commands it. God must be moral.

Hegel

After Kant either from a religious or metaphysical point of you, a lot of people wanted to reverse the thinking and return it back to God. To a certain extent he did this in his moral philosophy – regarding immortality the idea world is one which virtue and happiness go together. Because this is lacking in the world, we need to posit it with God. Here we could view “smuggling” back to God. As Kant said, “I got rid of God to make room for faith.”

[Schleiermacher said that we know God through specific experience (he pioneered the psychology of religion)]

Hegel

Hegel in a word historicized the absolute. Until Hegel, most philosophers did not incorporate the history of philosophy into what they said. Hegel took the view that the history of philosophy is a history of the usage of reason and its operation. It is not a contingent history, each stage is necessary for the next stage. An analogy for the operation of an individual human being; teach a child to use the word “love.” You then look at an adult, his conception is different than that child. It would be impossible for the adult to adapt to the child’s conception of love. Rather the child needs to go through the experiences and attain that understanding of love as the adult does. The child cannot immediately jump to adulthood, and the adult cannot have amnesia of how he got to this stage. Hegel thought he was close to the end point. It is not clear how he came to such a theory.

This Hegelian conception points out, that unlike Kant, Hegel is more oriented to the society rather than the individual. Working out a notion of what one ought to do, the fact that people do not behave that way it does not affect me – this would be a Kantian theme. Kant is not a stoic, but he does hold in terms of moral value that is all that matters. Hegel sees freedom as a social matter. There may be periods where the individual is separated from the group, but this is not an ideal and rather tragic. Hegel’s sense of the human

being is much more embedded in a concrete social setting and not a reasoning phenomenon conjured alone in the corner.

Hegel used philosophy historically. Where does Judaism fit in? For Kant, where Judaism fits his moral reasoning it is good, where it does not bad. (The tribal and non-universalistic nature of Judaism did not especially espouse Kant; although after *Jerusalem* he saw the potential to reform Judaism and make it to his likening) There is no inherent reason for Judaism and Kantianism to be in conflict, even Christianity does not match up with Kant's theology.

For Hegel everything revolves around history. In his earliest writings which we not published, Hegel has a low opinion of Judaism and Christianity. The latter writings, it gets better. Every religion will have a place, though, within the historical sequence. So if you take Hegel in the middle/late period, he would say that Judaism is important because it created duties. Judaism ended 2000 years prior, for Hegel, and the Jews who are around have no impact on the future of history.

From a Kantian point of a view, the one element which would be important for Judaism is the impossibility of proving good – making the religion more experiential (Schliemecher), moral (Kant), or historical (Hegel). Kant derives that the function of in Judaism is purely political and thus more malleable than Christianity which has the trinity and more problematic issues. At the most favorable level, Kant knew about *Jerusalem*.

With regard to Hegel we say the spirit becoming more historicized. For Judaism this would be that a historical basis would be needed. Within the Hegelian critic it would be about fulfillment more than transcendence and the ability to say no to inclinations (Kant).

Jewish Thinkers

Among the Jewish thinkers there were many who were Jewish Hegelian philosophers, namely reform rabbinic figures. Why didn't they work from Kant? There were none at this point. The whole focus of the 19th century was to get past Kant and say more than what he wanted to say. This brought out the Neo-Kantians, most famous of them Hermann Cohen. [People wanted a system more positive than Kant's – a heroic endeavor for German Philosophers] After Hegel's death in 1830, right wing Hegelians attempted so synthesize Christianity and political theory, while left wing Hegelians like Carl Marx went on far off and did some stuff who I never heard of. Ludwig Feuerbach derived from Hegel that what we mean by God is the human being written out in big letters – God is a projection of what we mean by human being.

How did they become Jewish Hegelians? They need to show that Hegel's notions of freedom fit Judaism better than Christianity, because Christianity has a lot of paganism. Two notable reform rabbis, Freundmecher and Samuel Hirsch, were these Jewish Hegelians.

- Samuel Hirsch – argues that if the goal of Judaism is freedom, then you need to be able to overcome natural obstacles. The ideal would be to re-

shape nature. If you ask which religion reshapes nature and advocates free will, it is Judaism and not Christianity who do rely on original sin.

- In being a Jewish Hegelian it is imperative to notice whether the philosopher recognized that Judaism still exists (and not whether he liked Jews or not).
- Freundschmecher – established that Christianity did not go far enough away from paganism.
- The idea of overpowering nature is more Hegelian or Kantian?

Conservative Judaism

Zechariah Frankel who began the Breslau seminary, was associated with Historical Judaism, who oriented themselves with _____, who today would be the right wing branch of the conservative movement. Frankel deviated from Orthodoxy when he eliminated to a large extent the authority of _____.

Once you get outside _____ the rabbinic rules revolve around what the community will accept. Frankel also wanted to eliminate _____ – within the Orthodox camp the sharpest against this came from Hirsch. (In theory the fact that rabbinic law shows an evolution in the _____ means that it is simply an extremely large stringency)

Solomon Shechter would talk about Catholic Israel or _____ – the people are the ones who govern. Who is more likely to be an atheist? Strangely enough it would be the conservative rabbi. For Reforms the abstract issue of monotheism is unchangeable. However if one works straight from history, the people govern and direct things and not God. (This statement does not refer to modern conservatives, try 1950s)

_____ wrote much scholarship and on the _____ as well. Interesting to see how he deals with bible criticism. (Felt that Ecclesiastes was written late second temple, but could not fathom Job at a later date than the Talmud's expressed opinion)

When it comes to claiming that _____ made changes in Biblical reasons it is difficult because one can defend that they were made for socio-economic systems. That ignores the fact that many cases where there were drashot of _____ and the _____ of the verse, has very little to do with socio-economic factors. Some people will claim that when _____ say the issue has to do with sacrifice laws it really has to do with socio-economic governing. Everything has to do with the _____.

This does not really make sense if you are having deep discussions on the particulars of the sacrificial laws only for a socio-economic agenda. _____ in his explanation of the laws of _____ creates new questions of why a _____ would say something so crazy that _____ would need to come and fix it up, but on the other hand it fixes up a lot of the problems.

R. Samson Rafeal Hirsch

Hirsch was born in Hamburg in 1808, to a maskilish but from family. The Rav of his town was known as a _____ which says a lot about the time period and functioning of the rabbinate in Hamburg. _____ was the _____ of Hamburg and forged a close relationship

with Hirsch so much that Hirsch went to learn by the [redacted] who was a close friend of the [redacted]. Hirsch learned there for about a year and a half – and then went to University for about a year, having a chavruta with Abraham Geiger. The common denominator of both actions point to Hirsch being an individualist and took whatever he wanted from each of the institutions. Beyond that he trusted himself – a psychological factor that runs a stream throughout his career.

1828 or so he goes to Oldenberg where he becomes a Rav of the city. Here he published 19 Letters published under a pseudoname. The historian Gretz read the letters and was so impressed that he went to Oldenberg to find Hirsch.

1840s Hirsch becomes the Rav in Moravia, more to the East (Czech Republic) where there was a more substantial job. There he wasn't so happy – Carmy suspects that it may have been more of a question of method than him not being erudite enough (as Rosenblum argues). In Eastern Europe lomdus was more of a contact sport, very argumentative. It's not that he didn't know what he was talking about, rather the people there were more argumentative. One individual he had trouble with *Rav Shlomo Kvetch*.

Early 1850s Hirsch is invited to lead a massive congregation in Frankfurt, a city which was prominently non-Orthodox. Hirsch claimed there were 12 people who were still holding out and refused to go over to the Reform community (recall from the discussion on the state system of Frankfurt – one couldn't practice Orthodoxy there in Frankfurt) one of the man was named Rothchild. Hirsch takes on the responsibility, establishes a school, a structure in the synagogue, and over the next few years he advocates for succession, a stepping out of the community. He claimed the collective Jewish community was illegitimate. Basically the notion was not to kick people out, but rather not to tolerate a structure where there is a Jewish community not based on [redacted] and totally illegitimate. The Orthodox Jew belongs in a different community than the Reform Jew – just as Catholic and Protestants are different.

Eventually, Hirsch is successful, when Bismark gets in a fight with the Catholic Church. Otto Van Bismark, a nationalist, wanted the Church broken for interfering with his program – the *kulturkampf*. Hirsch was politically liberal and he used this argument as a right to succeed from the body. Now the Reform were interested in making compromises, giving over the cemeteries, the kashrut at hotels, etc. Many Rabbis in Germany were glad to have the upper hand and wanted to enter the compromise. Hirsch felt fundamentally you could not have a divided community and insisted that his separate themselves from the Reform.

19 Letters – an exchange between Binyamin, the youngster, and Naftali (Hirsch means [redacted] in German). In the first letter, Binyamin, asks about his own place in Judaism, not being able to conform with Orthodox and recognizing that Reform does not offer anything substantial [redacted]. He asks what should I do with my children?

1. Where do I send my children? or 2. Being that during this period there was a questioning about circumcision; this is what he asks [suggested by Jakob Katz]? He basically asks for a reason to stay involved in Judaism, especially for an enlightened man.

Then Naftali responds with an argument of “don’t knock it until you have tried it.” Basically you have to know about Judaism from experience or the text itself and not secondary sources. With this, Naftali creates a plan to expose his friend to Judaism using texts. Throughout the rest of the letters, Naftali presents the texts [the dialogue dies out and instead monologues are presented – it’s not a real debate like a platonic dialogue].

What is the big deal? The statements presented are fairly uncontroversial and about 50% of the chapter are quotations from . Why is this a classical work if so much is so bland?

The best formulation of an answer is that the novelty of the book is in the fact that Hirsch is responding to real people. Until this point, you’ll have on the Orthodox side certain criticisms and sometimes jokes, but there is no attempt by any Orthodox writer to give a voice to the people who are affected. The very fact that there was someone who was willing to allow the affected people to speak this is the great of the book.

“It and not about it.” [JTS Slogan, but apropos for what people were reading about Judaism the “about it” and not the “it”] The books written at the time were catechisms, spitting out the fundamental principles. Hirsch implies that books of this nature will not attract those to approach Judaism, rather we need to learn it and not about it. This is done in two ways: [If Judaism did have catechism it would be the calendar]

1. Discussion of the
2. Texts – centrality of – as Hirsch is concerned it is primarily in order to orient the disenfranchised person. This was partly because (1) this is what Jews new about (2) there is a limit to how much you can “stuff down someone’s throat and (3) Hirsch wanted to used the beauty of the , and the did not have that appeal. The was not felt as relevant to the modern people. was only given in a lecture format but its purpose as intellectually central was non-existent. In terms of style, Hirsch did not have the tools for making Talmud study central.(1) does not attract people and even going back to Mendelssohn the problem of jargon, (2) using Yiddish as a language, did not attract them. Talmud scholars did not speak German well; they were better endowed to speak in Yiddish.

Hirsch did not publish his but recited them. R. Dovid Zvi Hoffman was only known as a because people published them afterwards. German Jewry did not get into Talmud in a serious way until WWI, where there was a certain crisis in the Hirschian world as Orthocrax – of people who act within but who do not believe in it – was very prevalent at that time. WWI had an affect in this as well, bringing an intercourse with eastern Europe and Bnei coming to Germany to study at Universities.

Hirsch’s emphasis on and study, were two parts of his program to implement *frumkeit*. These works on are limited in value because they do not have the kind of precision that one looks for in the and other commentaries. It does not deal with conceptual issues, and so you get a lot of paraphrase with good rhetoric. It is inspiring but a lot of verbalization, and there seems to be something lacking. (Carmy)

Additionally, the poetic and literary whims of _____ could be compared to Ovid, Virgil, etc. and thus the people took interest in it.

Hirsch rejected any use of “academic Jewish studies.” The notion of looking to the outside to clarify that which was going on was not part of the agenda.

1. Position is salient. Just as you don’t want to discuss “about it,” you do not want to discuss Judaism in categories outside of Judaism. Part of the critique on _____ is his implementation of commandments as practical issues. For Hirsch these reasons that are not religious cannot be used, because they are alien categories which do not grow out of Judaism. This applies as well to understanding facts not found in _____ or _____ to interpret a passage or text. The experience of _____ is within itself. [partly theological point, part of it from a desire not to get distracted in learning]

19 letters includes a division of commandments in a fairly rudimentary way. After writing 19 Letters, Hirsch wrote _____ and worked out what he stated in 19 Letters into a developed and deeper exegesis. His explanation of the _____ is much more involved in the classical formula for exegesis.

2. The approach here is different from the Seminary in Berlin.

_____ fill in the place where _____ would fill in Brisker or other forms of learning. There cannot just be biblical stories and lessons learned from the _____, and since _____ is not an option, it occurred to Hirsch that a really detailed approach to _____ would not only give people a motivation to observe the commandments but also serve to give people intellectual meat. Part of his critique on the _____, was that the explanations were often general and removed from the _____. Hirsch’s explanation on _____ proves his erudition and knowledge of _____ and not that he was an unlearned Rabbi. The _____ also bolster the study of the _____ as they are imbedded in the text. Often Hirsch’s _____

_____ do sound similar to the structure of commandments as outlined by the Rav in his philosophies. A certain abstraction, however, seems to find itself within the _____ of Hirsch. The details are always important but more so symbolic. In order to make the _____ work, he argues that many commandments act in a symbolic manner. _____ can either relate to the higher or animal nature of man. It may be possible that the commandments sound a lot like Jewish Kantianism, discussing the higher and lower and transcendence of beings. Many feel that reading Hirsch is like entering the 19th century and that Hirsch is bound to his period like _____ was to his own.

Gershom Scholem says that what we have here is an extraordinary system of symbols which has no basis in Judaism. If you want symbols rooted in Judaism, they should be taken from _____. The literature of _____ is more certain than Romanticism and its notions. And thus he is dismissive of the whole project. One answer given is _____ Hirsch is really rooted in _____ and if you look at his notebooks they document the usage of _____. Not only does he object to the _____’s approach but he also works from Judaism itself using the _____, but just does not quote it publicly. This (revisionist) approach has been pushed by some of his students who have published his _____.

Frankfort – when Hirsch gets to Frankfort there is a certain aura/legend about his standing up to the adversity. [was the name given because it connotes the being alone, the lone resistance.] What he does in Frankfort is a number of things:

- Presents the module of the **Modern Rabbi** (not in terms of not following the – there was a tradition that Hirsch did not say while in Olenburg)
 - He **spoke German**, the language of the common folk.
 - He had a **choir**. (The complaint against much of the synagogue was that it was not beautiful) Hirsch went over the *nigunim* with his choir conductor and made sure the tunes should follow the words. The attendance was also maintained with the choir singing after the evening service on Friday night, by having people to stick around and not run out of the synagogue.
 - He started his own school with - - the intention of the teachers who taught also teach secular subjects. Hirsch himself taught German Literature. A problem in the school was that the government partly funded the school and thus placed limitations on the amount of time permitted for learning. Therefore, studies were limited and not given as much time as Hirsch would have liked. Additionally, the community of Frankfort was not exactly so forward with their love of study, they were businessmen and accountants.
 - Parents of the students at the school were not so from, but numerically it didn't look that way, because there were Jews moving into Frankfort and so the numbers rose.

Austrieich – given Hirsch's principles within an orthodox community it is impossible to reject and thus you cannot communicate with someone who does not have that sense of authority. The approach that Hirsch took demanded a legal separation between the communities. Other orthodox leaders in Germany did not care to go that way. There are a number of centers of intellectual influence at the time.

- **Berlin – R. Azriel Hildscheimer** [In Hungary there were strands of the *shtark* community and also the “neologue” or the more Reform in ideology. Hildscheimer was in the middle of the two, and as politics changed in the Austria-Hungarian Empire, Hildscheimer was left in the middle and went from Hungary to Berlin.] It may be important to note the connection between Hungarian and Berlin Orthodoxy. Jakob Katz emphasizes that events in Germany and Hungary were connected, and Hirsch for one, was very well respected in Hungary for the way he dealt with the situations properly. Hildscheimer went to the Rabbinical Seminary which had a sense of and secular studies, requiring each *semicha* student to have a University degree, but it did not have a college as part of the Seminary. Although the Seminary did study academically Judaic texts and methods in addition to the traditional learning. **R. Zelig Wurtzberger** was viewed as being the major among German Jews and he had a teachers college.
- What divides Hirsch from the other thinkers is that he demanded the dedication of the Jewish community but was not saying that you would be kicked out for not going along with everything. Everything was done down to

earth and traditional. He was often apologetic of his discern of the Reform, saying it was for pragmatic reasons, and still viewed them as Jews.

As Hirsch was educating people to be _____ it made sense _____ for his focus on pragmatic reasoning and understanding the purpose for the commandments, as opposed to investigations of Jewish academic studies. Whatever, the value of Hirsch's writings, if it becomes your only diet, it is narrow. But that was what Hirsch was setting up for his community. His writing style does not provoke thinking – one coming to him with an education may gain, but Hirsch's intention was to create laymen of a certain type.

Hirsch is very much an individualist, if you look at the language he uses, the way he operates, at a certain level scholarship is a communal project.

The period beginning here is early 1700s in Eastern Europe. The person identified with the arrival of **Israel Baal Shem Tov** with dates somewhere in the mid 17th century. With the Besht there are no such legends of being a prodigy. Contrary, he was a teacher's helper, wandering in the forests a lot. The only legend there is that at age 30 he came out and was what he was. Since we have virtually no record of his writings, he did not end his life like a world class *lamdan* either. He clearly was not a major intellectual figure and we virtually know nothing about him. What we do know, is that he was one of several charismatic figures and by the time he died he had followers who we do no more directly about. In terms of historiography, three generations later the _____ is put out.

What was his charisma? One view is an itinerant preacher, people who went from town to town giving *mussar*. The most famous of these the Maggid of Dubno. Was he a magician? Was he a _____? Obviously the tradition will say so. Then what is the nature of his _____ – we can look for evidence among his students, or from what we know about 18th century history.¹

Fresh evidence has opened up new gates of understanding. In Mezibich, the Besht was exempt from taxes indicating his high stature. One paradigm always presented is that of the Besht being persecuted, but the image presented from current evidence is that he a man of "flesh and blood," and not the persecuted alienated figure.

¹ 2 stories found in the _____ : One that a man asked him why he was walking around with a copy of the Zohar until he realized who the Besht was. Another story states that the someone asked the Besht what to do when forgetting _____ and the Besht answered that he never forgets and who cares because [the one who asked the question] forgot the second time as well. He obviously knew you had to repeat but it highlights his mystical power and implies _____ knowledge

Relationship with Sabbatianism

Scholem not surprisingly thinks there was a very strong connection with Sabbateanism. In the _____ there is a story about a certain man, and that refers to SZ. Whatever antinomian elements in _____ are Sabbatian modified. This is not so surprising knowing Scholem's philosophy.

Mendel Piekartz has disputed Scholem's premise. If you take earlier, pre-Sabbatian literature such as the _____ – there are variably antinomian ideas, and it was most likely that _____ and Sabbatianism were rooted in the same antinomian ideas, but not that _____ embarks from Sabbatianism.

Scholem in his essay on the Besht will look for certain references that do not mention anyone by name and attacks on various _____. It could be that reference refers to the Besht. Disallowing those references very well may be that no body made any references to the Besht in his own lifetime.

Either he was very uncontroversial or he was not very famous. "In his own lifetime other than those who dealt with him, he did not make TIME magazine" – R. Carmy.

Who does he attract? The legend that comes from various schmoozes, the 18th century had elite people who knew the whole Talmud who looked down on everyone else. These persons were rigorous and knew all of Talmud, but then the Besht comes and gave spirituality to the masses and made them feel like human beings. Much is made of the crises of Jewish life. The formulation is that people post-Sabbatianism had little hope and the Besht was able to provide it. It was the democratic revolution from below against the high level intellectuals above.²

The truth is a little more complicated:

1. The image of the _____ is simply not true. The levels of learning were not as high and the amount of money being shelled out to support the scholars. The notion that there was the Vilna Gaon against the Vilna Shoemaker is untrue. Whatever the objections were, the sociological picture presented is not true. (there could be strong correlations between the less and less elite and the high level of snobbery)
2. The typical Hasid was not a little boy with a whistle either. The typical Hasid is someone who is part of the communal elite, but not the highest levels of the elite. The _____ who were elites of their own small towns. People who do play a role in the community, but are not the really top level – their intellectual

² The story of little boy and whistle, who knew nothing of _____ and came to the Beit _____ on Yom Kippur while the Besht was praying away to stop some gezirah that only he could stop. This little kid comes in the Beis blows his whistle as it's the only thing he can do, and the Besht know says, "he got it." This kid's sincerity blew everything open. Most people who tell the story do not bother to add, that this happened a couple centuries before. In this case the ignorant shepherd boy juggled, and he did not juggle in the BM, but he was entertaining the blessed Virgin in the church.

interests would be more in the , a softer discipline, but maybe more satisfying. They are not at all total ignoramuses.

The Besht probably died 1750. The debates among Frankism broke out 1759 or so, and there are attempts to connect him to the debates, but no evidence at all. It should be stressed that perhaps during his life he was not as important.

gets on the map with the following of his two disciples:

1. **R. Jakob Joseph of Panoya** ()³ – In it he writes *shtikle* from the *Besht*, published in 1771 and burned not long after. It was a controversial book making insulting statements to scholars being described as “demons in the shape of Jews.”
2. **Maggid from Mezeritch, R. Dov Ber** – he did have a resume of a Talmud scholar learning with R. Pinhas haLevi Horowitz – – a Rav in Frankfort. The also studied with Horowitz. The Maggid did not really know the Besht so well, and it would seem that Jakob Joseph spent more time with the Besht. When the movement went to the Maggid, it seems as if the follower of the Besht should be someone entrenched in the world. He seems to be a more sensitive fellow.⁴ The Besht went out and traveled, the Maggid did not circulate but people came to him. The idea of the Hasidic master’s court began from the Maggid. The Maggid’s concept of was more aesthetic and had a stronger emphasis on self-denial.

Is for everyone, or another form of elitism? Some may answer especially when the doctrine of the is espoused, but it was an evolution and did not start off that way. The Besht had genuine intentions of displacing the elitism.

The doctrine of the comes from R. Elimelech of Luzansk. On one hand the image presented is of a Tzadik coming down to the people to assist on their level or . Those like Scholem would make the connection with Sabbatianism and . The Tzadik needs to learn how to share their joy and sorrow, and internalize their worries and problems.⁵

³ The Story in says that R. Jakob went to find a minyan in his town Sharago, but couldn’t find one so he went to the marketplace where he saw the Besht telling stories. He was very upset but in the end he was converted to the Besht’s way of thinking. The story is that he was kicked out of the Rabbinate in Sharago for making a more spiritual minyan. **The theme of form of prayer is already outlined in these stories making for a later argument**

⁴ Story goes that the Maggid once went to see how the Besht daven, and he began to tremble from the intense nature of the Besht’s prayer. The movie version has the Besht played by Andy Griffith and the Maggid by Don Knotts.

⁵ A parable is told off a prince who was camouflaged and received a letter from his father the king bearing happy news. Of course he could not divulge that he was royalty, so he went to the tavern and bought everyone drinks to celebrate. This over joy of the physical being though a manifestation of his spiritual elevation gives a creed to

In the generation of Dov Ber, there are a number of important students:

- R. Elimelech: important for doctrine of the *tsimmes*, but also brought *tsimmes* to Galitzia
- R. Yitzchak of Berdichiv –
- R. Shneyer Zalman of Liady – Lithuania, north eastern Poland, northwest White Russia.
- R. Efraim of Meglidor – *tzadik*, grandson of Besht
- R. Nachman of Bratzlav – grandson of Besht
- R. Menachem Mendel of Metst – went to *Chabad* and set up a colony of *Chabad*

In terms of literary productions, the basic Hasidic literature [excluding the Tanya for now] is not necessarily a “bookish” literature, but rather people sitting down and writing *shet*. The style of a book does have a lot to do with the content of a book. Early Hasidic books were books of sermons, *shtetl* on the weekly portion, nothing systematic about them. Others are more a collection of sayings. It is almost as if you are saying, from a literary point of view, the best thing is to be with the Rebbe and if you can’t the written form is the best. These books are not even particularly well written.

Generally they are written by the students – “the writings of the Maggid of Mezeritch were primarily written by R. Yitzchak of Berdechiv, and he did such a bad job, his own *talmidim* punished him by writing a bad version.” – R. N. Lamm

Tanaya was different. The Baal haTanya, was big into *Chabad*; in fact while the Maggid was alive he wanted him to write the book to show that Hasidim could learn *Chabad*. He wrote Lekutei Mamarim on the *Chabad* portion, or the *Chabad*, which he didn’t write but his students did.

The most unique of all the books was the Tanya which is a real book about the dogma and workings of *Chabad* and other fanfares. In Lubavitch, there were strict rules about coming to see the Rebbe and times on how long you could spend. This clashed with the older Chassidim, who were encouraged to come less frequently and had to wait longer. This pushes Habad to originally begin as a **missionary movement**. How does one Rebbe have a large number of Hasidim? They regulated face-time and frequency of the older Chassidim so that the newer Chassidim could come and meet the Rebbe.

This forced Hasidim to be more individualistic and perhaps this was why there was a more reliance on Talmud *Chabad* among the Hasidim, who were not dependent on the Rebbe as much as in other circles. These characteristics made Habad a much different movement even today; the missionary movement and the approach that everyone really belongs with them. We call this the *Chabad* sentiment.

A theological issue [in *Chabad* in general] is the role of the Messiah. Gershom Schoelm held that the novelty of *Chabad* neutralized the messianic idea. A Sabbatian believes in the messiah which caused eventual problems, so you have a messianic movement without a political messianic notion. The messianism becomes internalized. Other writes such as

Yeshiya Tishbi, has denied this, and feel that Hasidim were more worldly and wanted to move to Israel and longed for it. The idea of translating a political practical movement was alien to them. [the events of the past 25 years in Habad is an upheaval of the original theology] The missionary aspect though has a deep history.

Officially Tanya is called because the first chapter talks about one of the tanaaim who was a . are perfect but still have to struggle with the evil inclination. The does not have a .⁶

There is a notion of – strange thoughts – that in themselves though undesirable, can be used to serve God; this idea does have some similarity to the notions of . The Tanya is different in this regard; the Tanya would see an ideal person as one not having at all.

may not be as Sabbatian as some scholars entertain. It may only be used in instances where the sin was committed as an accident. We would not say a person could murder as an extension of but nonetheless it may seem like Sabbatianism; more likely though that it was finding graces in all of man's actions.

is also an important concept, the contemplation of an evil in a positive sense may bring you closer to God.

Many scholars think that the early years of the Hasidic movement were the real years and the years afterwards the forerunners of Hasidic movement were not genuine .

: The view that you will get in the more narrative writers (Buber) is that Hasidim were trying to anticipate the philosophy of art. There is very little sense that Hasidim spend time observing like other Jews, but rather that it is a social entity, as opposed to the Mithnagid view. The is involved in the social lifestyle of the community; the image of sitting around the table with the Rebbe, passing around the bottle taking a swig. Their sense of – the color of their clothing, the meaning that living with God with all your life and not abandoning him. Some concepts of do not always fit into this picture. When dreaming of a woman during prayers, the way to remove the thought would be to think of her as dead, and that would redeem a person. The ideas presented here are more aesthetic, opposed to the Buberian model, which indulges in the aspect. For people like Scholem, it was more about the books written by the Hasidic leaders and not the stories written years later. This basically is the difference between the aesthetic view and the . Then again the literary elements may only be presenting a less provocative agenda, whereas the real world was much wilder.

⁶ Habad Hasidim who came to R. Carmy's high school and exclaimed "I do not want cholent, I want God" to which the kids in the school said, "why can't you have both"

Halkahic aspects: In the late 1700s, the complaints from the halakhic world were born; thus began the Hasidic Polemic. The arguments against that began right away focused on practical objections:

- Lack of emphasis on vigorous learning
- Prayer
- Other areas of major religious conduct

: the Hasidic curriculum emphasized more than the standards form of learning (despite HaBaD's own emphasis). There was a stronger emphasis on the emotional aspects of learning, including portions of the Talmud. In the there is a comment which responds to Mithnagdic grievances, that says if you saw the intensity of a Rebbe learning, the passion and emotion, you would not make fun of their learning of . The Mithnagdim would criticize that the problem even with such a statement is that it emphasizes the emotional and non-intellectual importance of learning and the image of the Rebbe himself.

In the ⁷ appears a discussion about what is which has nothing to do with the emotional high that one receives from studying. The mastery of the text and the learning of the content, knowledge of the , is what is learning. He proves this from the fact that if the other approach was true, a person could learn the same thing over and over again. If his approach is true, then you had to attempt to learn - in Volozein they had people learning around the clock, for in itself it kept the world standing. The idea of learning all of as important in of itself, was the goal of R. Hayyim's view of .

In 19th century there was an attempt to bridge the two approaches. To some degree this is connected to Kotzk. In Congress Poland⁸ there was a certain ferment and a tendency to move away from the centrality of the Rebbe. R Simcha, the Kotzker Rebbe, and some other, there is a rebellion against the development of the . It is difficult to know what the Kotzker really did hold, because he did not really write anything.⁹

Themes of Kotzk:

- Individualism (God can be found where people will allow him to be found and even can become)
 - People very often are critical of the emphasis on the – there is though a genuine problem because as generations change over there is more people wanting to get involved with the Rebbe. HaBaD institutionalized the and emphasized that the Rebbe could not always be there.
- (son in law was the , another student was Gerer Rebbe)

⁷ First edition does not have chapters that are critical of the Hasidim – the legend says that the Hasidim captured a copy of the book on route to publication and took out portions. R. Lamm has suggested that more likely R. Hayyim did not want to release those portions for he feared they were true strong, and only later after his death were the comments against the Hasidim published.

⁸ Post Napoleonic period, areas of Warsaw

⁹ "The Kotzker became the "Yogi Berra" of because anything which he did say then people quoted."
– R. Carmy.

- The wrote an interesting line about and doesn't mention who is arguing against. He takes a middle position – treating as an intellectual activity, but on the other hand, proper learning should involve an emotional response. There should be happiness from learning and that should not be viewed as a selfish activity.
- The and also echo similar thematic thoughts.
- The said that in order to be with you have to understand what you are learning.
- has a complete polar approach claiming that as long as you read it you will understand it in the world to come. On one level it is anti-experiential, on the other a very emotional and powerful value.

Kotzker Rebbe is rumored to have suffered an emotional breakdown (kind of the way everyone wants Rebbe's do suffer breakdowns) around 1840. What exactly went on is not clear. Aryeh Morgenstern claimed that messianism in the early 19th century was prevalent among Hasidim and Mithngadim. The year 1840 was set to be the coming of the Messiah. He speculates that when it did not come in that year, many Jews living in Israel converted to Christianity. One of Agnon's novels even have converted Christians wandering around Jerusalem. Morgenstern, suggests that maybe the two events have something to do with each other. There is another version told over, that one Friday night, the Kotzker blew out a candle and said "there is no judgment" and he was locked up for going crazy. This is purely fictitious; instead it was a story about the son of a prominent Rebbe and really the Zionists attached the story to downplay the influence of the Agudah bolstered by the Ger community. In any case, the Kotzker definitely withdrew from the formal social scene. The Kotzker once made up a story about a unicorn, who had a large horn that reached the sky. One day a man came along cut off part of the horn to make a snuff box, and others did etc. In the end there was nothing left of the horn. This was a parable for the relationship between the Rebbe and Hasidim.

The Itzbitzer, removed himself from Kotzk. In Itzbitz (teacher of Rav Tzadok) you get one of the strongest deterministic views you can find in Judaism. There is an attitude that everything is determined, which ends up being very anti-individualistic. It's position also opens up into certain antinomian approaches. , the book written by the Itzbitz, writes on the verses of – that when one has a great desire for a woman out at war, if that is what God wants you to do it, go ahead and do it. This is not the conventional way to look at the ; however, in this framework it is seen as this is what God wants. The Itzbitzer does clarify this and does not support a liberalize sex ethic. This can only be done by great tzadikim who are on the highest levels. The basic philosophy does though support a system of antinomianism.

: In this area as well there were theoretic and practical differences in approach. Hasidim were making separate minyanim and the motivation may be a dangerous thing. There are people in the 18th century who are suspicious of Sabbatean groups. As early as the 1770s one of the complaints were that the Hasidim say " " - mumbling and ranting nonsensical sounds (Chaim Dovids yamma my). In the implication were

, reference to Shabbatai Zvi. Apart from any issue of _____ was the suspicion of what they were actually doing in these minyanim.

Those who were serious would arrive at the synagogue and before the services began, would prepare for prayers, contemplating and focusing on the process of praying. This was not so abnormal, the Talmud in _____, emphasizing this. Hasidim paid a lot of attention to the bathroom in the morning, and smoking a pipe was also a gentle laxative. (Others have suggested that there were “other” things in the pipes) If this is the way one starts there day and meanwhile the _____ passes away what can you do? This would be a type of defense given for the late prayer. One perspective of viewing these actions is that they indeed did start there “religious” day early, they just started the actual prayer. Sociologically this meant that the Hasidim had to make their own minyan.

The Hasidim adopted the _____ and did it for the special _____ attached to the _____. In order to have those things they were tied to the _____. They did not want to be _____ per se, and this is based on the fact that there are similarities in the prayers but they are not identical.

Ex. _____ in the Hasidic prayer books, after the evening prayer they say _____ and they say _____ afterwards, but only half because the last line of the _____ doesn't have _____ attached. Thus the adoption was for a Kabbalistic service. Among the Jews at the time, there were those who did prayer according to _____ but only privately. The _____ of the _____ was known to pray this way. This also developed the separation between the Hasidim and Mithnagdim in prayer services. The davening practices were not just separated at a ritual level but also ended up changing the entire rest of the day. Jakob Katz points out from an economic-efficiency view Hasidism was potentially a failure, because the day was totally messed up after being that it took a large portion of the day.

In contrast the _____ would advise one to stick with their traditions as much as possible. Regarding _____ – one attitude is to think about what you are saying. This is not the way that mystics thought about prayer; you go to God with whatever qualms you have and you ask for your own personal needs. For Kabbalists this is not spiritually dignified enough, and so you need to take your needs and put them on a higher level to separate them from the other problems. This is one reason why the _____ becomes so important. As far as the attitude the Mithnagdim and Hasidim were the same, they both strove to elevate the communication between man and God and make it less trivial. However, if the issue is Kabbalistic, saying the wrong word can cause severe issues when mistaken. It's not just a matter of not following your father's custom, but also not speaking to God properly.

In the Hasidic world there is a parallel issue. A person wants to have _____ so they go ahead and do it. The concern for each _____ representing a strand of Judaism would not bother them (this would be the complaint against switching the _____) because they would claim that _____ is a universal one. And as far as needing to be a zadik to indulge in this _____, you ride piggy-back on the Rebbe who is a zadik.

One part of Hasidic prayer (aside from) is an emotionalism or mysticism captured in the idea of – a Kabbalistic formula – .
 raised the question whether anyone should do it all. He goes through a discussion in the Talmud in the beginning of (7a) where the prefers that you should not have for sacrificing, because you will then always worry that you didn't have enough. If you do something for the sake of the appropriate reason, you will do it well. However, once you think about what you are doing, it is more likely that something will go wrong. This is a deep point of human psychology, creating perhaps a backlash of attitude.

One other issue involved in Hasidism, has to do with the idea of transcendence and the imminence of God. Overall, the tendency in Hasidism is to emphasize the imminence of God – being in creation. Within the Mithnagid tradition the emphasis was on God not being equally present and a greater sense of separation between God and man.
 writes that if everything is indeed equal, then one could learn in the bathroom, but that is not the case. In HaBaD Hasidism there is a distinction between the imminence of God and man. The Tanya in emphasizing the God can only be experienced through and uses the image of a person who wants to literally embrace a king. But you need to ask to him beforehand to take off his clothes (and take off your own clothes). Otherwise you are not embracing a king, you are touching his clothing. Nevertheless, if someone embraces the king, we understand that he is doing so without asking the king to remove his garments. Since the clothing is a of a king, we know you are embracing him. Likewise, since the is the clothes of God, then embracing is like embracing the king. has a similar prototype, that the is the real elements of God and divine imminence is imitation. For the Tanya the imminence is the real thing but because you cannot touch it you interact with the .

The issue of as an argument is important as well. From a social point of view, this hampered the ability to eat with other people and important because many Hasidim were . Control of a town was very much connected with control of the knife. The disagreement was about the nature of the knife. The Hasidim utilized what was a polished knife. The idea was that the more polished, the sharper the knife. Mithnagdim invalidated this, that the knife was not a better knife but a worse one. This was because if the knife was very sharp, and the blade was thin, it would be able to curve more easily. A thicker blade, maybe not as sharp, would at least cut straight. This had practical implications towards the dispute between these two groups.

Left handed side of the sefirot are called .
The piece in the anthropologizes and brings it closer to the human experience.

The political history for the movement is highly important. The first half of the 19th century in Russia was not so great for the Jews. At the time there are many Jews in Russia, since Poland was included. Jews were restricted from living in certain places, called the “Pale of Settlements.” Those who lived in areas that they were officially prohibited were always cautious of being kicked out. Czar Nicholas was far from being good for the Jews; on the other hand more enlightened kings simply wanted a conversion from the Jews. At times the Russian government supported Haskalah movements. A book called by Yuval, dictated the reasons for Jewish Haskalah and at one point the Yuval received money. He claimed from this that the government supported Haskalah. Not so true though.

At the same time, Jews are being drafted into the Russian Army. Legally children under 12 were not legally drafted, but in actuality they often were. The onus to draft was placed upon the Jews themselves, a dehumanized system. Usually the wealthy were not drafted, money talks. Often people would sell their children to people who don't have children “kidnappers” and that way under the law only children were not conscripted. This business, as a collective consciousness, formed a large basis of Yiddish literature; what happened to these kids? The dehumanizing factors of this system were beyond repair. Many of the children even were sold to non-Jews. The applications of that are even more disturbing. Non-Jews were drafted at later ages and for much less time. Jews, they reasoned, needed more time to integrate into the army and so were drafted for longer periods.

Meanwhile, R. Yisrael Salanter (real name, Libkin) who was from Salant, a very learned man, founded the movement. His life can be divided into several episodes.

1. 1840's – Giving shiur in Vilna. During this period his lectures were very much like. Some think he did this as a trick, because he would not be respected if he did not possess the talent of the “major league” and was his real want. In any event he was good at it.
2. 1849 – Disappears from Vilna. (1848- There is a famous legend about him eating on Yom Kippur, which is simply not true. 1848 was a Cholera year, and so the legend goes is that he gathered 2 other Rabbis and they ate on Yom Kippur. What probably happened is that he allowed people to eat on Yom Kippur if they were afraid of the Cholera.) Why?
 - a. One story is that he left because of competition.
 - b. He thought he could better the movement elsewhere
 - c. The government decided to open a Torah U'Madda type of seminary, and that would mean that anyone who wanted to be a Rabbi would have to have this background. In fact in Russia a few years later a

position opened up for a Rabbi opened by the government. The community usually did not accept this fellow as being Rabbinic. Often these fellows were ignoramuses and they often did not recognize themselves as rabbinic leaders. It is suspected that they considered Rav Yisrael to be an appropriate Rosh Yeshiva being that he was very open and often spoke up for morality.

Kovna – important for the formulation of the movement.

What was about?

1. not a dethroning of study, but also maintaining a higher standard of ethics learning during the day
2. It was too important to leave its application to chance [for Nefesh ha-Hayyim to the contrary the storehouse is merely a means for the granary, for R. Yisrael the storehouse has a more dynamic quality]
3. The people who devoted most of their days to were not part of R. Yisrael plans. The amount of time needed to dedicate to was minimal but more substantial than R. Hayyim's approach.
4. R. Yisrael has a certain view of human psychology. The problem is action does not live up to that which we nominally believe in. This gap or shadow is for R. Yisrael unlike Freud (many people see them as the same both talking about unconscious fulfillment) it comes about because people are deluded as to how the world functions (Freud that it was about desires and attainment). The reason for R. Yisrael was because of the gap between imagination and reason. He was impressed in the way people discounted the future. We tend to think of the future as being far away and less important. Simply knowing intellectually what the right thing is simply is not enough to control the evil inclination.
5. R. Yisrael does not rely on an insight that provides discovery of one's self. It is not so much about dispelling the darkness as it is taking a stick and beating up the darkness. Whether you see it or not, you can knock it out.
6. More of a behaviorist
7. Motivations are not through psychoanalysis but rather training. In the framework as developed in Kovna, people had a room for studying – a special place without associations to other things – alone.
8. No aversion to books about hell. The man is attuned to these ideas, he may pick up different mantras. The tone is mournful and is supposed to penetrate into one's system. A more behavioral technique than purely analytic.
9. Some versions have the - a stock exchange – where people rank each other out. R. Yisrael was influenced indirectly by Benjamin Franklin who wanted to divide the year in 13 weeks, each week for a particular and then you would have 4 cycles. Through various Hebrew sources this eventually got to R. Yisrael.

Last stage R. Yisrael went to Germany to better his health. The last 20 years he was not part of his family (he had a son who went to University and became a famous chemist).

R. Yisrael once he left had little contact with his family. They stayed in eastern Europe; in fact in one of his letters he advises one of his talmidim to become Chief Rabbi of Helsinki instead of working for the family bakery business. He had a sense that a scholar is there to learn, not to make money, and he identified with the elitism of the world.

In Germany he learned German and studied chemistry, hoping that if he needed to work he would have a real job. He read Hirsch and Kant and recommended that Hirsch be translated into Hebrew. He thought Talmud should be translated into German so people would learn it at university and not think it was not intellectually challenging.

Overall, the movement began to devote more time during the day to the study of and a willingness to deal with the evil inclination through drastic measures. In the following generation, became controversial. The modern people viewed him as hope presenting his modes of ethics and morals. Other modern people saw him as a overly zealous observer. In the Yeshivish circles, they were suspicious of the movement and introducing it into the curriculum. Rav Hayyim of Brisk thought that it was not needed and that has a stronger affect which is unnecessary and maybe even unhealthy (analogy of the laxative). Don't want to go away from is good enough.

The morose attitude is also one that does not fit into the Ish haHalakha. at Telz was instituted with great opposition, with a riot smashing all the light bulbs. From the point of the bochurim, was something which made things more onerous. These two struggles, from both camps plagued the movement.