

47
JEW AND
GENTILE

*Essays on Jewish
Apologetics and
Kindred Historical
Subjects*

GOTTHARD
DEUTSCH

fornia
nal
y

85



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

JEW and GENTILE

*Essays on Jewish Apologetics and
Kindred Historical Subjects*

BY

GOTTHARD DEUTSCH

Professor of Jewish History and Literature, Hebrew Union College

SCROLLS, VOL. III



1920

THE STRATFORD COMPANY, Publishers

BOSTON

Copyright 1920
The STRATFORD CO., Publishers
Boston, Mass.

The Alpine Press, Boston, Mass., U. S. A.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. The Deficiency of the Sources of Jewish History	1
II. Origin of Christianity	10
III. The Protestant Reformation and Judaism	38
IV. Why, When and How Shall We Write Memoirs?	67
V. The Humor and Tragedy of "Jew Taxes"	82
VI. The Maimonides Prayer Myth	93
VII. Journalese	96
VIII. Library Chat	103
IX. Plowden in Theology	109
X. Higher and Lower Anti-Semitism	119
XI. It Takes Two to Make a "Shidduk"	127
XII. The Real Cause of Anti-Semitic Persecution	140
XIII. The Curse of the Crucifixion	164

PREFACE

AN author needs no apology for his desire to see essays, scattered in periodicals, published in a more accessible and permanent form. He does not wish to "sow among the thorns." The public, however, requires an explanation, why the author should presuppose on their part a similar interest. The reason for this expectation shall be briefly given.

The position of the Jewish people is absolutely unique. The Jews are not only found in all lands of civilization and semi-civilization but their position enters conspicuously into all prominent questions of public life.

The relation between Church and State, one of the most vital problems of humanity, which dominated the politics of caliphs and czars, which impeded the unification of Italy and cemented the North American colonies into a nation of unparalleled strength, has to a greater or lesser extent always been linked with the Jewish question.

The regeneration of Russia was preceded by an era of pogroms. The French republic achieved the separation of State and Church through the Dreyfus affair. The seething caldrons of eastern Europe, and especially the Balkans, furnish another impressive illustration of the same law of history. Poland and Rumania particularly bring it home to us. They have

PREFACE

to provide a resting place for Ahasuerus before they can expect to bring order into their chaotic household.

Above all, the Balfour Declaration of Nov. 2, 1917, and its indorsement by the Supreme Council of the Allied Nations at San Remo, April 24, 1920, are an epoch-making event in the history of the question whether the Orient shall conquer the Occident, or whether the latter shall in a peaceful way return to the former the interest on the capital of civiliation which in the infancy of mankind, Cadmus, the king of the East, invested in Europe, the land of the west.

It may be that the mandates over the lands of Abraham and Nimrod will be the closing chapter in the struggle for western dominion of which the victory of Charles Martel over the Arabs at Tours (732) and the defeat of the Turks by John Sobieski at the gates of Vienna (1683) are the most important epochs.

But even if these mandates should prove another crusaders' romance, their connection with the Jewish question will remain a fact, and the Jews will continue to stand forth as a people who in the words of their prophet are either a "burdensome stone for all the peoples" or a "blessing among the nations."

It therefore does not seem altogether an author's vanity when he expects that the Jewish side of the many questions connected with the relation between "Jew and Gentile" will meet with interest on the part of the large public, an interest which, he hopes, may prove sympathetic. Leopold Zunz (1794-1886), the pioneer of systematic and critical study of Jewish

PREFACE

History and Literature, misnamed "Science of Judaism," called a collection of essays, bearing on this topic, "Zur Geschichte und Literatur." It was his desire to emphasize the principle that the history and literature of the Jews are part of the cultural activities of universal mankind. I believe, as he did, although I selected a title which cannot be suspected as camouflage or as over-estimation of my work.

The first two volumes have appeared under the title "Scrolls" (New York and Cincinnati, 1917), explained from a Talmudic motto which implies the idea that the interest of the large public is more easily enlisted by essays on individual topics, loosely connected, than by ponderous coherent works, intended for the information of specialists. Upon the advice of friends who claim that the original title was not easily understood, I relegated it in this third volume to the position of sub-title. I hope that their advice will gain for the book greater popularity, and that I shall have contributed a modest share to the noblest ideal of mankind, preached by Isaiah and Micah, by Rousseau and Lessing, and not less impressively by the Jewish apostle to the heathen world, when he said: "let each man, wherein he was called, therein abide with God."

I

THE DEFICIENCY OF THE SOURCES OF JEWISH HISTORY*

The difficulties in writing Jewish history are manifold. The severest one is that our history extends over so many countries, and lacks, at least up to the eighteenth century, all chronological continuity. Even today, this most important basis of history is missing in such countries as Persia, Morocco, and Turkey, where the annals are filled with an occasional massacre, the sacking of a Jewish quarter, a blood accusation, and the like.

Another very important defect is the lack of the personal element. The Jews were evidently no hero-worshippers. Still, this does not suffice to explain the entire absence of biographies and autobiographies, down to the seventeenth century, and their dearth, even now. This defect is not accidental. When we see how medieval rabbis, such as Mordecai ben Hillel, of the thirteenth century, and Solomon St. Goar, of the fifteenth, minutely noted down all that they had seen from their teachers, or heard from them, about the religious practices of former rabbis, we must admit that there is bound to be a strong

*The American Hebrew, Nov. 9, 1906.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

reason, other than a lack of hero-worship, for the absence of biographical literature. This is the general tendency of rabbinic thought, which has created dialecticism.

Dialecticism, or *Pilpul*, as it is called in rabbinic terminology, is the method of harmonizing two admittedly contradictory statements. The same method prevails in the theology of all denominations. It is the method of the opponents of biblical criticism, of the Catholic apologists in their defense of Catholicism, and of Protestant apologists in their arguments against the liberal school. Rabbinic theology, however, seems to have developed this art to such an extent, that it has become a habit, and has been applied even in cases where, from a religious point of view, it was not necessary at all. It is easily understood that a believer in the Mosaic origin of the whole Pentateuch, would not find a contradiction between the Pentateuchal law, which allows the election of a King, and the book of Samuel, supposed to have been written about 400 years after Moses, which treats the desire to elect a King as a rebellion against the will of God. Rabbi Abraham Biberfeld tried his hand on this difficulty, and solved it by saying that Moses intended to defer the election of a King, after the completed conquest of Palestine, because he was afraid, that in a country not divided up into farms of modest size, the election of a King would lead to the formation of large landed estates. The orthodox

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Society for the Promotion of the Science of Judaism, in Frankfort, o. M., judged this essay worthy of the honor of publication in its yearbook. To one who is not compelled by dogmatic views to harmonize these two contradictory statements, this attempt at a solution must appear exceedingly weak, nevertheless as some kind of a harmonization was necessary from the orthodox point of view, this might do, for lack of a better one.

Less cogent, according to our opinion, is the harmonization of two different views of the rabbinical law. If, for instance, one rabbi limits the time for the recital of the Shema to midnight, and the other extends it to daybreak, there would seem to be no apparent reason for harmonization. We might very well say, that the two men had different opinions on a law. The important factor for the understanding of this anxiety for harmonization is the belief that the whole rabbinical law dates back to the time of Moses, and consequently, must not be contradictory in any detail. Therefore, two different authorities, unless one is absolutely wrong, which can not be admitted, must have expressed the same views in words which are only apparently contradictory. This theory of the Mosaic origin of the rabbinical law also pushes the personality of its interpreter into the background. He became a mere messenger. Samson R. Hirsch has most emphatically expressed this theory in his criticism of Graetz's work. When Rabbi Johanan thinks

that it was not necessary to sacrifice one's life, in order to escape violation of the law ordered by a tyrant, he was not, as Graetz thinks, influenced by existing conditions. Hirsch insists that Johanan merely gave information on a law, which had been so interpreted from the time of Moses.

It is manifest that such a view tends to make the personal element disappear from history, and, therefore, as this unrestricted belief in authority grew, scholars would perhaps note carefully how Rabbi So-and-So acted in religious practice, but would pay, otherwise, no attention to his private life. Only in this way can we understand how such a powerful personality as Rashi, worshipped by his contemporaries and idolized by posterity, was not made the subject of a biography, although, at the time of his death, one of his grandsons was quite old enough to appreciate his grandfather's importance. The same reason explains to us the indifference to strictly personal material in historic records. We have very few private letters, diaries, household ledgers and other documents, which might tend to cast a light on a man's individuality. Only occasionally, in the prefaces of their works, the authors make a few personal remarks touching their life, mostly in the sense of presenting an excuse for their boldness in publishing their works. Jair Hayim Bacharach (1634-1762), points, with pardonable pride, to his father and grandfather, his predecessors in the rabbinate of

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Worms, and to his grandmother's grandfather, the famous "High Rabbi Loew," of Prague (1530-1609). He does it in order to prepare the readers for the publication of his own works, in which he wishes to show himself not unworthy of his great ancestors. Zebi Ashkenazi (1658-1718) tells of his terrible experiences when the city of Ofen was besieged in 1686, and his wife and child were killed by a bombshell. It is a public expression of gratitude to Providence, which saved his life, and which he thus acknowledges. Jacob Joshua, of Frankfort, o. M., (1680-1756) speaks, in the preface of his work, "Pene Jehoshua," of the miracle which saved his life, when, in the explosion of a powder magazine at Lemberg, in 1703, he was buried under the debris of his house. In order to express his thanks to Providence, he resolved to defend the honor of Rashi against the criticism by the Tosafists. The first real memoirs that I know of, if we do not include the autobiography of Josephus, who lived in the pre-Talmudic age, is the short history of his troubles written by Lipman Heller (1578-1654), when some of his enemies informed against him to the effect that he had blasphemed Jesus and Mary. This was a very dangerous charge at a time when religious fanaticism reigned supreme in Bohemia, and the Jesuits strained every effort to show the necessity of protecting the holy Catholic religion from all attacks. He was brought in chains to Vienna, and saved from prison only with great difficulty. Even

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

then he felt insecure in the lands of the Emperor, and therefore emigrated to Poland. In writing down his story, he wishes to preserve the memory of his salvation for his posterity, who should forever celebrate the day of his liberation from prison. The details were of little consequence to him, and, in his great kindness he even suppressed the names of his enemies. This delicacy, however, greatly reduced the historical value of his memoir.

A very valuable specimen of a real autobiography is preserved to us in the memoirs of Glueckel, of Hameln (1646-1724). She was a woman of uncommon intellect, and of more than ordinary education, but her life presented nothing extraordinary. She was born in Hamburg, married at the age of 14, Hayim of Hameln, and, after a short stay in the latter city, went back to her native place, where she remained until she went to Metz, where she married again after a long widowhood, and where she spent the years of her old age. Her interests are, naturally, centered on her petty business affairs, and on the events in her large family. Of the non-Jewish world, she knows nothing worth telling. Even great events in Jewish life, such as the excitement created by the Messianic pretender, Sabbathai Zebi, she touches but slightly. Still, her naive way of describing match-making, and journeys to the fairs of Leipsic, instruction of children, and the like, possess a great value to us, because we learn something of the daily life of the

great masses, which is entirely neglected in literature.

A great master of history, considering his age and education, was Jacob Emden (1696-1776), born at Altona, as the son of a prominent rabbinical family, following, later on, his father, to Amsterdam. He married at the age of 18, and lived for a time in the house of his father-in-law, Mordecai Kohen, of Ungarisch-Brod, in Moravia, and afterwards returned to Germany, when he became rabbi of Emden, and, finally settled down again in his birthplace. He saw a great deal of the world, aside from his occasional journeys to such distant places as Lemberg and London. Besides, he was a great Talmudic scholar; in my estimation, the greatest scholar of his age. His horizon was wide, and owing to the prominent part which he took in the religious controversies of his days, his experiences are a valuable source of information as to the moving forces of the Judaism of his day. Towards the end of his life, he wrote his memoirs, which present a wealth of information about communal and private life. He tells us how his father failed to be elected Rabbi of Altona, because he was too independent for the congregational boss, whom he had once rebuked because of the high-handed manner in which he conducted congregational affairs. He tells us how matrimonial schemes occasionally decided, in his days, rabbinical elections. Issachar Kohen, of Altona, had a very homely daughter, whom he wanted to marry off, and for whom he found

some Schlemihl of a Bachur. In order to obtain for his son-in-law the rabbinical position of Keidani, in Lithuania, he promised to the rabbi of that place, Ezekiel Katzenelbogen, the rabbinate of Altona, and, in order to create a sentiment favorable to this election, Schnorrers and Melamedim were instructed to tell wonderful tales of Rabbi Ezekiel's learning and piety. With the same naive frankness, he tells the story how he sold his vote, at the election of the successor to his enemy, Jonathan Eybeschuetz, and how he was cheated, afterwards, of the bribe promised to him. He tells us further that he had trouble in Emden, because he would not allow the son of a congregational boss to blow the Shofar on Rosh Hoshana, and because he exposed some frauds, for which a prominent member of the congregation had engaged himself, and who now was ashamed of his credulity, and, therefore, accused the rabbi of intriguing against him. He tells us of the Palestinian Haham, Moses Hagus, who was liberally supported by the German congregation of Altona, but reciprocated merely by expressions of contempt for the "Tudescos." He tells us of his travels in Austria, and how a Catholic priest who was in the same stage-coach, forced him to give up his better seat for another one, which was less convenient. Such incidents make his book full of highly interesting information.

In modern times this literature has become more numerous, and, strange to say, a great deal is due to

the Hasidim. While these people in their fanatical mysticism, might be expected to be hostile to all civilizing influences, they have developed a biographical literature, because the important point in their doctrine is that certain chosen individuals are mediators between God and man. Their "Zaddik," or "Rebbe," occupies the central position in their religious life, and, therefore, they have preserved all recollections concerning him, even the most insignificant private letters. There is a great deal of legend, very often of the silliest kind, in their works, but these are, nevertheless, a laudable presentation of the value of the personal in history. With the entrance of the Jews into modern civilization, biographical literature, naturally, increased. Moses Mendelssohn was already, shortly after his death, the subject of a careful biographical research. Isaac M. Jost, with his fine historical tact, unfortunately marred by his dry, schoolmasterly tone, showed his historic insight by writing his autobiography, which is very important because it presents the history of the transition from the uncouth methods of the Heder to modern education. Still the material is, even now, not as large as it might have been for a clear presentation in all its details of the marvellous transition from Ghetto life into modern civilization.

II

THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY*

This essay originally was a lecture delivered in 1895, eleven years before William Benjamin Smith published his "Der Vorchristliche Jesus" and fifteen years before Arthur Drews startled the public, accustomed to take Harnack's idealized Jesus as the final verdict of historic science by his "Die Christus-mythe."

The author states this fact not with a desire of boasting of originality. Alfred Loisy has proven that Harnack's views are an arbitrary compromise between historic criticism and the longing of a churchman for some definite expression of Christian belief. The fundamental work of David Friedrich Strauss had to be continued. Strauss was largely negative. He showed that the mythological method, applied to the gospel story, led to the conclusion that what we possess of early Christian history is a crystallization of ideals, not an exaggerated account of actual facts, as the rationalistic school had taught. The only point which is entirely new in my presentation of the subject is the explanation of Judas Iscariot as "the

*A lecture delivered in the B. Y. Temple of Cincinnati, Friday evening, Jan. 5, 1896. American Israelite, Jan. 30, Feb. 6, 1896.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

man of falsehood," an emblem of Israel, pertinaciously clinging to an error.

An apology is due to Christian readers who—and I can not blame them for this—will believe that "my eyes are blinded and my heart is hardened" by Jewish prejudice. To them I owe the following explanation. As a Jew I did approach the question of the historic origin of Christianity without dogmatic prejudice. I started from the conviction that the Christ of the dogma, the son of God, "the lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world" by vicarious atonement through his death, who rose from the tomb on the third day after his death to give evidence of the truth of bodily resurrection and to fulfill what, by the way, is a misrepresentation of Psalm 110, a prophecy that he would sit on the right hand of the father in heaven, is an impossibility.

Yet he might have been a Jerome Savonarola, a John Huss, a Michael Servet, one of the many victims of ecclesiastical tyranny and religious fanaticism, of whom there were undoubtedly some in ancient Israel also. My study of the problem, however, led me to the belief, that he is a creation of mythical idealization, symbolizing the ideal Judaism of the second century in the same way in which Ahasuerus is the symbol of Judaism, condemned to live, or William Tell the symbol of the Swiss struggle for freedom. Twenty-three years of study have only confirmed this conviction, and I therefore give this essay to the

public in the form in which it originally was delivered without any except slight, verbal changes. "And be indeed that I have erred, mine error remaineth with myself."

The Talmud, (Abodah zarah, 55, a) gives a dialogue between Zeno the founder of the Stoic school and R. Akiba, in which the philosopher is reported to say: Although both of us know that there is nothing essential in Christianity, how is it that so many sick are healed in the Christian churches? Between Zeno and R. Akiba there is an interval of four centuries and although for this reason the dialogue can never have taken place, nevertheless there may be some truth underlying this statement, viz, that the leaders of the two spiritual movements of whose flesh and bone Christianity's flesh and bone were formed, were astonished at the marvellous rapid growth of Christianity. The stoic philosophy on one hand taught not to resist evil, and Judaism taught an ideal state of the future. So the puzzle over the remarkable progress of Christianity may well have been the topic of the conversation between some rabbi and some representative of the Stoic philosophy. The reason for the remarkable progress of Christianity is still a problem to this day. In order to understand it, it will be necessary for us to go back to its beginnings, and to study the religion of its founder. But here we meet an insuperable obstacle. The German emperor recently addressing the recruits of his navy

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

said: A soldier must be a good Christian. If we revert the statement, he is not wrong, for Jesus said: Give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and therefore a good Christian ought to be a soldier. But His Majesty on another occasion shortly before that time, was present when a recruit refused to take the oath, for he was a Christian and Jesus had taught: Swear not at all and resist not evil. Which Christianity is the real religion of Jesus?

We therefore arrive at the conclusion that Christianity is not a unit, but rather a complex of forces and ideas. When I speak of Christianity in this connection, I do not speak of the Christianity of Pope Pius the Ninth, or of Mr. Pobedonoszew compared with that of Roger Williams and General Booth, the diversity of which no one of the parties concerned would deny. I speak of Christianity as it appears in the oldest documents; even then it comprised views of a diametrically opposed character.

Christianity was as little the work of one man as was any movement in history. No matter how large a portion you assign to George Washington in the foundation of this republic, there were many prominent men who aided him, and whatever they have accomplished, it would not have been possible without the Puritan spirit that induced men to leave their homes in order to establish the kingdom of righteousness, that taught Barrow and Greenwood to die on

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

the scaffold praying for the Queen who had condemned them to the gallows.

Nor was the reformed church for which the Puritans suffered the work of one man, not the work of Knox, nor the work of Luther and Calvin, however great their merits are. John Huss had with a smile on his lips testified to it on the pyre of Constance, he had based his views on the doctrines which Bohemian scholars had brought over from across the Channel and there Wycliffe had preached these doctrines with impunity because the English people resented the humiliation by the Pope of their king, and were determined not to allow their king to be a vassal of the Pope.

If history therefore has any right at all to investigate the origin of Christianity, which it certainly has, if we do not accept the dogma of its supernatural origin, then we know that not one person conceived the idea of a new religion without any impetus from outside, but a number of men in successive ages, affected by conditions of political nature and by philosophical views then prevalent and potent, contributed to build up what about the middle of the second century presents itself to us as early Christianity. How much of it belongs to one man as a leading spirit, we can not know, for dogmatic tendencies have been at work to obscure just this point. And this is not an isolated fact in history; it is quite common. There are up to date two forces at work in the narration of

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

events of the past, the historical and the mythological; the former tries to present the facts as they really are, the latter, as they might have been, if they would have been shaped with a knowledge of the events that grew out of them in later times, and therefore later ideas are transferred back to former ages and subjective opinions are made the generally accepted views of olden times. In the sixteenth century Cabbala had taken hold of religious practice, and, while formerly it was speculative only, it now permeated the daily life of Judaism. The expounders of this doctrine would never own their shares in this new departure from Jewish traditions; they referred it back to one Isaac Luria, of whose teachings, we only know that his disciples mutually accused each other of having put their own opinions into the mouth of the dead teacher. The modern expounders of theosophy who claim to have received their teachings from the Buddhists in Tibet and India, while men, who are in a position to know it, state that there never existed an esoteric doctrine of Buddhism, are another instance of the same character. Thus the views of Christians in the second century, one of whom preached abolition of the Law, while the other warned against such tendencies as destructive, one of whom preached a universal religion, while the other insisted on an internal reform in Judaism,—they all claimed that their views were the real teachings of Jesus. Nor are such historical delusions limited to antiquity.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

The anecdotes about Washington, Napoleon, Bismarck are other instances of the principle which makes the hero of the past act in a way in which we would think he ought to have acted. Nearer related to our topic is the anecdote which makes John Huss say on the stake: "This time you roast a goose (Hus is in Slavic, goose), but after a hundred years there will appear a swan whom you will have to let alone."

While there are instances, in which real historic characters are the tree on which the ivy of mythology climbs with its grasping fibres, there are others, which show us a mere idea personified. This is the case with Ahasuerus the Wandering Jew who is the personification of Judaism which did not die in spite of centuries of persecution. William Tell is another instance of the brave struggle of the Swiss for their independence, personified in one man. Faust is another instance of the same character, a personification of the ever repeated attempt of humanity to solve the problem of happiness.

Thus, the biography of Jesus may be a fiction of the second century, combining everything which to men of that age made the ideal man. In fact there were many widely different views all claiming to represent the real Christianity, just as it was the case during the age of Reformation.

There was a conservative party, of men, like Erasmus of Rotterdam, advanced liberals in theory, but strictly conservative in practice. Their views are

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

expounded by the author of the epistle of James 2, 17 who says that faith without works is barren and by the author of Matthew 5, 19, who says he who breaketh the least of the commands shall be the least in the kingdom of heaven. There were radicals like Carlstadt and Thomas Muenzer who denounced the conservatives as false brethren just as Hutten denounced Erasmus, and who preached "If ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing" (1) and "whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace." (2) There were also mediators between the two extremes who like Luther and Calvin would denounce equally the coolness of an Erasmus and the hot-headed radicalism of the Anabaptists and above all things preached unity entreating their hearers to set aside all differences. Circumcision is nothing and noncircumcision is nothing. Brethren let every man wherein he is called, therein abide with God. (3)

That Jesus took a part in the foundation of Christianity is by these remarks neither affirmed nor denied. However it must be borne in mind that outside of the gospels we possess no sources on the history of Jesus. A passage in Suetonius' history of Vespasian is misinterpreted, another in Josephus' Antiquities is evidently interpolated, the epistle of Pliny and the reply of Trajan are forged, the Talmudic reports, far from being historical, are altogether influenced by the narratives of the gospels, and the latter were written nearly a century after the events which they report

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

had elapsed. The Talmudic authorities that appear as opponents of Christianity, (and in two instances as adherents of the new doctrine) as, R. Gamaliel, R. Tarphon, R. Akiba, R. Ishmael, R. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos and Elisha ben Abujah belong to the second century.

To this negative evidence we must add the positive self-contradiction of New Testament history, omitting all that is miraculous as not coming within the range of this historian.

In the biography of Jesus we first are struck by the discrepancies of the two pedigrees, the one found in Matthew (1), the other in Luke (2). Both writers inform us that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, but Joseph's father in Matthew is named Jacob, while Luke calls him Eli. Eli's father is Mathat, while Jacob's father is called Mathan. If in this case we would overlook the slight difference, we would gain nothing, for Mathat's father is Levi, while Mathan's father is Eleazar and so the whole lineage differs, only David and Shaltiel and his son Zerubabel being common to both, but with the son of David the difference begins; Matthew tracing Jesus' descent from Solomon and Luke from Nathan, another son of David; Matthew counting twenty-six generations from David to Jesus, Luke forty-one, and to remove the possibility of supposing that Matthew omitted some names, the latter states expressly that there were fourteen gen-

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

erations from David until the Babylonian exile, and fourteen from the exile unto Christ.

The only way out of this difficulty is to admit frankly, that both pedigrees are fictitious and based on no other records except on the conviction that Jesus was the Messiah, and therefore had to be of Davidic origin. Must we not ask ourselves, after the authors had invented so many names, would their conscience have warned them against the invention of one more name, and could they not have derived the name of Jesus, too, from the inexhaustible archives of their imagination?

We have now to consider the report concerning the place of Jesus' birth. In both gospels that contain the history of Jesus' youth we are told that he was born at Bethlehem, while otherwise his home is Nazareth, he is always called Jesus of Nazareth (3) and his followers the sect of the Nazarenes (4). Luke seems to have felt this difficulty and he apparently tells us the story of the taxation (5) to make it plausible that Jesus' parents left their home temporarily for Bethlehem.

But there is another difficulty: first of all we do not know from reliable sources that such a census of the whole Roman empire as Luke expressly states, ever took place under the reign of Augustus, but even if such a remarkable event should have taken place without being recorded, it could not have taken place while Herod was king, for the Romans, although they

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

could levy tribute from a country that had its own king, could not assess the individual citizens. It would have been the same thing as if the United States were to assess the people of Venezuela.

It is so much the less likely as the first census after the expulsion of Archelaus, i. e. about ten years after this supposed event, caused a revolution amongst the Jews, who not only resented this manifestation of Roman sovereignty but objected to it on religious grounds. (1) And so strongly they objected to it, that the word "Kenas" census meant to them fine or punishment. Is it likely that they would have tolerated the first census and objected to the second? But even this is not all. The census is said to have taken place when Cyrenius was governor of Syria, but Jesus was born, while Herod was king and Cyrenius was appointed governor about ten years after Herod's death. If we should overlook all these difficulties, there would still remain some more. A citizen had to appear before the assessor of his city, for only there was he known. What should the Romans care about the supposed Davidic descent of Joseph? It were just as if my grandchildren should be cited before the assessor, not of my native town, but before the assessor at Brunswick, whence two hundred years ago my eighth ancestor emigrated. And granted even that, what necessity was there for Mary in her delicate condition to journey to Bethlehem? Yes, there was one reason. The reason that she

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

should give birth to the Messiah who according to a misinterpreted passage in the prophet Micah (2) was to be born in that city and according to another misinterpreted passage in Genesis (3) before Judea would lose its independence that is, while Herod was yet king and before the first taxation had made it manifest that Judea had ceased to be an independent kingdom. The whole story is therefore a fabrication of which dogmatic tendencies are the only reliable basis.

Time does not permit that I should go through the whole history of Jesus. Let it suffice to state that the account given by Matthew (4) according to which Jesus with his parents went from Bethlehem to Egypt is irreconcilable with the account given by Luke (5) according to which they repaired from Bethlehem to Jerusalem. The story of Jesus' disputation in the temple, when he was twelve years (6) old, is highly improbable. According to one account given by both Matthew (7) and Luke, (8) John the Baptist heard only in prison of Jesus and sent disciples asking Jesus whether (9) or not he was the expected Messiah, but, according to another account John refused to grant Jesus' request to be baptised by him, saying: "I have need to be baptised by thee" and after he had yielded to Jesus' request, the heavens were opened and the spirit of God descended like a dove and a voice was heard saying: "This is my beloved son." I should think this would have satisfied the most skeptically inclined agnostic.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

In another account John, when he first saw Jesus exclaimed: "Behold the lamb of God" (10) and finally according to Luke, (11) John when still in the womb greeted Jesus, who was his cousin, as the Lord. Here we have decidedly a growing tendency to mark the relation of John to Jesus as that of a forerunner of the Messiah.

The first report made John testify to Jesus shortly before his death, the second at the baptism, the third when he first saw him, the fourth when he was an unborn baby in the womb. Similarly the accounts of Jesus' greatest miracle, the resurrection of the dead, show a gradation. According to Mark and Luke (1) the daughter of Jair was dying when Jesus was called to heal her; according to Matthew (2) she had just died when the father called him but in all three reports she was dead when Jesus entered the house. Luke (3) records the resurrection of the son of the widow of Nain, who was carried out to the cemetery when Jesus stopped the funeral procession and revived him. John evidently finds this account not a sufficient evidence of Jesus' Messianic powers and records the resurrection of Lazarus (4) who was already four days in the tomb and to remove all doubt concerning his death, Martha, his sister says: "Lord, by this time he stinketh." (5) The only conclusion remains that these stories were invented to prove Jesus' Messianic powers.

Another difficulty is the record of Judas' treachery.

I forego the question why Jesus, knowing beforehand that Judas would betray him, made him his disciple. I only ask why was it necessary for the Sanhedrin to hire a traitor? Surely not for a testimony to Jesus' doctrine. He had preached it to multitudes (6) and had driven the money changers out of the temple. (7) It was not necessary to know his hiding place, for he did not hide himself; besides Judas did not content himself to show Jesus' hiding place but he gave to the soldiers a sign by kissing Jesus, (8) which would only have a sense, if it was the person, not the place which had to be betrayed. Now, we ask, was it worth 30 pieces of silver, about five dollars, to point out a man whom the whole city had hailed with Hosannas, whom the children had proclaimed the son of David (10) who had discussed his ideas with the priests as well as with the heads of the Pharisees and Sadducees? This is a problem which can only be solved, if we deny all historical basis of it, and understand Judas only as a type of the Jewish unbelief and, may be, that the name Iskarioth is to be derived from "skakrutha" man of falsehood. One of the greatest difficulties is the celebration of the Passover, which gave origin to the ecclesiastic rite of the Lord's supper. The three synoptic gospels make Jesus celebrate the Passover on the night of the festival in Jerusalem, (11) while the fourth gospel (12) states expressly that it was celebrated at Bethany six days before the Passover.

Prof. Daniel Chwolson a few years ago with the

zeal of the convert attempted to solve this difficulty by retranslating, as he thought, the text into Aramaic. The attempt is a failure. The only solution possible is this: The Judeo-Christians had retained the solemn rite of the Seder-evening just as many in our days who are entirely estranged from the Jewish community will go to the Synagog when they have Yahrzeit.

The custom had such a powerful influence that even the proselytes from paganism celebrated it. By and by the original meaning was lost or rather was found inconvenient, just as our people would not trace back our lamp on the Yahrzeit to usages of the Catholic mass or to ancestor-worship of the pagan world, and so Jesus had to establish the Passover anew. The more conservative element made Him celebrate the Passover in the traditional Jewish way and give another meaning to it. It is not any more the Exodus that shall be remembered, but the death of Jesus who took his last meal on earth promising to his followers, as he was sure to receive it, the new wine from the hands of the father, (Mat. 26, 29). The radical Christians would not admit this origin of the Lord's supper. Therefore Jesus had to celebrate his meal not in Jerusalem, and on the 14th of the Nisan, but in Bethany and six days earlier. So the dogma is the source of the history, and not the history the source of the dogma.

The difficult and intricate problem of Jesus' teach-

ings I can only treat in two instances: His position to the law and, what is closely connected with this, the mission of Israel to the heathen-world. The generally accepted theory is that Christianity taught the law merely as a symbol of certain ideas and that Judaism must cease to be clannish and take the heathen world into its fold, or, while Pharisean Rabbinical Judaism regarded these things as a distant ideal, Christianity wished them to be put into immediate effect.

The question now remains: Did Jesus himself already teach these doctrines? Let us consult the sources: According to Matthew he says: "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or Prophets but to fulfill; for verily I say unto you, till earth or heaven pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." "Whosoever shall break one of the least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: for I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and the Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven," (ib, 5, 17-20). If we translate this into our modern way of speaking, Jesus said: One who would not observe all the minutiae of the law, "the dot on the i" (Menahot 29, a), does not deserve the name of a Christian. The sentiment is quite Jewish and a parallel passage is found in the Midrash, (Exod. Rabba C. 6) where it reads: "King

Solomon and thousands like him shall perish but not a dot on the "i" shall perish from the law." Christianity according to this doctrine is only something accessory to the teachings of Rabbinical Judaism. The Greek word "plerosai" may have the meaning "to add to" or "to complete" by bringing to the light the real meaning. We can accept it only in the former sense for the quotation of this passage in the Talmud (Sabbath 116, b) has in its place "le-osofo al" which unmistakably means to add to. While here the law is regarded as essential to Christianity, Jesus according to Luke (16, 26) says: the law and the prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God is preached, which evidently means that since Christianity arose, the law lost all obligatory character. While according to Matthew (Mat. 5, 18) Jesus taught that heaven and earth would sooner pass than a word of the law, according to Luke (16, 17) Jesus complains that it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the law to fall.

Furthermore, the three synoptic gospels (Mat. 9, 16, Mc. 2, 21, Luc. 5, 36) contain the parable: No man putteth a piece of a new garment on an old and no man putteth new wine into old wine skins. This means clearly a radical view of the law. No patchwork, no conservative reform, no regard for tradition! Luke who more than the other evangelists preaches this radicalism adds: No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new for he saith, the old is

better. (Luc. 4, 39.) That is exactly the point: If you tolerate tradition, you put yourself in the wrong, just as the Catholic would say to the Episcopalian: If the church is a divine institution, why not accept the pope?

The toleration of the law is the view which according to Matthew (19, 16-22) is Jesus' principle. When a young man asks him: "What good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" Jesus answers straightway: "Keep the commandments," and when the young man says: "All these things I have kept from my youth, what lack I yet?" Jesus says: "Sell all that thou hast and give it to the poor." There we see the principle of the fulfillment in the sense of adding righteousness to the observance of the law.

The same story is found in the other gospels, but both Mark and Luke (Mc. 10, 19; Luc. 18, 20) say instead of "Keep the commandments" "thou knowest the commandments." Evidently they avoided to make Jesus say that one should keep the commandments. Stronger still is the declaration against the law, found in an incident, told with slight variations by both Matthew and Luke. (Mt. 8, 19-22; Luc. 9, 57-62.) A disciple wishes to join Jesus, but he first would bury his father. Jesus says: "Let the dead bury their dead." We can understand this only, when we present to ourselves the rabbinical view, that to bury the dead is the foremost duty (Moed Katan 27, b) and is one that brings man to eternal life. (Mishnah,

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Peah I, 1.) To bury his father is even permitted to the priest (Lev. 21, 2) who otherwise is not allowed to defile himself by coming into contact with a dead body. Therefore Jesus emphasizes that to preach the kingdom of heaven stands higher than to observe even the highest commandments.

Another telling story which only Luke (10, 38-42) has, presents this view in stronger words. Jesus entered the house of Martha; Martha was cumbered about much service, while her sister Mary was sitting at Jesus' feet and heard his words. When Martha complained, Jesus said to her: "Thou art careful about many things but one thing is needful: and Mary has chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her." Martha represents Judaism which is troubled about many laws, while Mary who is the type of Christianity which instead of observing the many laws only listens to Jesus' preaching of the kingdom, the one thing needful, and so she has chosen the good part which shall never be taken away from her.

The strongest condemnation of the law as worthless, when compared with the belief in Jesus, is the story of Jesus' anointment, which with some variations appears in all the four gospels (Mat. 26, 6-13; Mc. 14, 3-9; Luc. 7, 36-50; John 12, 1-9) but most manifest in its meaning it appears in John.

Jesus enters the house of Martha and Mary in Bethany. Mary, the representative of Christianity,

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

poured out a pint of ointment, which was worth 300 Denars, on his feet, and Judas Iscariot said that this ointment should rather have been sold and given to the poor. This he said, not because he cared for the poor, but because, as the evangelist suggests, Judas was the treasurer of the small society, and could have made some money by this transaction, but Jesus said: "Let her alone, for the poor you have always with you, but me you have not always with you." In this parable—so to speak—even charity is deprecated in comparison with the belief in the kingdom of God. And it is most noteworthy that John makes Judas instead of all the disciples, as the other gospels have it, the interpreter of this dissatisfaction and discredits his motives. This is therefore the strongest contradiction of the Jewish doctrines that charity secures man the kingdom of heaven.

The same tendencies, viz: a commendation of works as laudable and indispensable, an indifference towards them, and finally a decided condemnation of all observances as obnoxious appears in the epistles. James, no doubt the apostle of Judæo-Christians, known in the Talmud (Aboda Zara, 17, a) as Jacob of Sakanja, says: "What doth it profit though a man say he hath faith, and have no works?" (James 2, 14). Exactly the opposite view is held by the author of the epistle to the Galatians, who calls the law a curse from which Christ hath redeemed us (Gal. 3, 13), and finally a mediating position is taken by the author of the epistle

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

to the Corinthians, who says: "Circumcision and uncircumcision is nothing but the keeping of the commandments of God," (I. Cor. 7, 19) and similarly the author of Romans, for "circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law." (Rom. 2, 25). In the same way, as this important question, whether the law should be observed, tolerated or rejected, was the platform on which the first Christians were divided, so was the attitude towards the pagan world, and just as each faction made Jesus the expounder of its particular views in the former case, so they did in the latter.

Matthew makes Jesus denounce strictly all missions to the heathen. "Go not," he says to the twelve disciples, "into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Mat. 10, 67.)

In another instance he is approached by a Canaanitish woman (Mat. 15, 21-28; Mc. 7, 24-30) who begs him to heal her daughter who is grievously vexed with a devil, and he, at first not taking any notice of her, on the entreating by his disciple says: "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," but the woman would not desist, and so he answers her: "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to the dogs." And when the woman cleverly applies the adage of no rule without exception to her case, saying: "Yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table," he

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

reluctantly complied with her request. It is of great importance that Luke omitted this story entirely, because he would not admit that Jesus called the heathens dogs, and that Mark mitigates it somewhat omitting the words "Let the children first be filled," so indicating that the heathen world should not be excluded from salvation entirely.

Just the opposite tendency is manifest in the story of the centurion of Capernaum (Mat. 8, 5-13; Luc. 7, 1-10) who came to beg Jesus that he might heal his servant, and Jesus, being struck by his faith said: "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel, and I say unto you many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, with Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." In our modern language this means the heathen shall be in heaven and the Jews shall be in hell.

The parable of the vineyard (Mat. 21, 33-46; Mc. 12, 1-12; Luc. 20, 9-19) in which the owner whose son was killed by the tenants, destroyeth the tenants and gives the vineyard to others, clearly means that the Gentiles shall take the place of Israel. And so repeatedly Jesus is made to say, the gospel must first be preached to the gentiles. (Mc. 13, 10). The story of the Samaritan (Luc. 10, 29-37) who took care of the wounded man while a priest and a Levite passed by without rendering assistance, is told by Luke ex-

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

clusively to show that the Jews are not any more the bearers of the divine spirit, and therefore according to Luke, Jesus refuses to accede to the wishes of his disciples that he might curse the Samaritans, while the order given to the disciples in Matthew not to enter the cities of the Samaritans shows the opposite tendency.

Thus we see that even in this case, tendencies which agitated the minds of the early Christians, not later than in the second century, are referred back to Jesus; for in the first century Rabban Gamaliel defends a friendly attitude to the Samaritans (Weiss. Gesch. Jued. Trad. II. 74) and consequently they were not held in so low an esteem by the Jews, as the gospel describes it.

How are we to solve the question of Jesus' genuine teachings, and the real doctrines of early Christianity? The only possible answer is: Dogmas were made into historical facts and thoughts were referred back to earlier times, just as the Catholics of today would prove the supremacy of the Pope from Jesus' words or as Rabbi Ezekiel Landau (Z'lach p. 39. d.) would prove from the Talmud that the study of Hebrew grammar as advocated by the Mendelssohn school was dangerous, while Leon Modena (Haboneh, Kiddushin 2. b) would prove that the Talmud commends the study of grammar.

We must try to understand the great crisis of the destruction of the temple, the death blow which cruel

reality dealt the Messianic hopes. The Messiah had not preserved the temple, he had not established the kingdom of God, which should include the heathen world, as Daniel (12, 1-3) had prophesied. The dead had not been resurrected. What wonder that the progressive party concluded, that God did not care to preserve the temple and Israel's worldly kingdom, but that his kingdom would soon be established as one that is not of this world, that the dead then should rise, the people should then make themselves worthy of this kingdom by turning away from worldly pleasures, that Jews should do missionary work amongst the heathens, that what the Rabbis had taught as an ideal, the view that to love one's neighbor is the whole law, that the gentiles who lived a righteous moral life and abstained from idolatry, are God-fearing people, should be practically acknowledged. What is this theory for, they exclaimed, let us put it into practice at once, and in this way they constructed the picture of Jesus, the ideal man, a utopia referred back into the past, as Thomas Moore, Bebel and Bellamy referred theirs to the future.

The question that agitates us is: How do we understand the claims of Christianity? To answer this, we must ask first: What is Christianity? The belief that mankind, overburdened with sins had to perish, for God in his righteousness could not pardon them, therefore he accepted the sacrifice of His son, who, though sinless, died the death of a criminal, and this

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

meritorious self sacrifice outbalanced the sins of the whole world, present and future. This doctrine we cannot accept. We believe in the great truth, everyone shall die for his own sin. Liberal Christians have long ago given up this theory, and the philosopher Schleiermacher has reconstructed the doctrine by declaring Jesus to be the divine man, the man who in himself combined all the ideals of mankind. Against this theory there was objected, that not one man but only mankind represents the human ideal, and even mankind for a certain period of time. Aristotle was no poet, Michelangelo no philosopher, Goethe no sculptor, and the classic age of the Greeks as a whole is inferior to ours in mechanic arts, in natural science, in statescraft and in many other things.

Then the belief in Jesus as the ideal man was restricted to his ethical teachings, but even to this we cannot subscribe. The Jesus of the gospel despised family life. He says to his mother: "Woman, what have I to do with thee" (John 2, 4). He would not permit his disciple to attend the funeral of his father. (Mat. 8, 22.) Jesus finds no merit in any practical pursuit. He says: "He who putteth his hand to the plow and looketh backward is not fit for the kingdom of heaven," (Luc. 9, 62.) Jesus regards wealth, no matter how honestly acquired, as sinful. He says to the young man: "Take all that thou hast and give it to the poor." (Mat. 19, 21). The rich man is in hell suffering agonizing pain, poor Lazarus is in

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Abraham's bosom, and yet is it not said that the rich man was a sinner and Lazarus was righteous, but the one suffers in the hereafter because he had received his share of happiness already, the other is happy, because he was miserable on earth. (Luc. 16, 19-31). Jesus despises science and praises those that are poor in spirit (Mat. 5, 3) and although this by some apologists is understood to mean the meek and lowly, (Prov. 16, 19) it is not so, for the meek are mentioned afterwards and R. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos who stood nearest the Christians, teaches: Keep your children away from speculation and through this you shall inherit eternal life. (Berakoth 28, b.) At all events Jesus is indifferent to science. Jesus commands a passive attitude to the state, to the highest interests of his country and his people. He says when questioned about the important issue of the tribute money: "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's" (Mat. 22, 21). No word of encouragement for the struggle of his people for independence; no word about Cæsar's tyranny who revelled in luxury on the earnings of hard-working people, no word of condemnation for the outrageous practices of the Roman officials. He preaches unconditioned submission. Still even Maimonides (Moreh II., 37) admitted that Jesus was a divine instrument, or as we put it: Christianity fulfilled a mission in the world. Judaism at that time missed the opportunity to become a universal

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

religion by intrenching itself behind the breastwork of its national hopes and traditional customs. It suffered for it terribly. The flames of the fagots on which innocent men and women sang "in thy hand I commend my soul," made the heavens lurid. From the dungeons and racks resounded the cries of the tortured. The descendants of those whom Christians acknowledged as the beloved of God were mercilessly expelled from one country and debarred from another. Have they suffered in vain? No, they have not. They taught the world the lesson of the highest liberty, the liberty of conscience. They worked in narrower confines, it is true, but their work was so much the more thorough and complete. They assisted the poor in unselfish manner, they cultivated exemplary family relations, they created the concept of fear of God as self restraint as "Dabar hamasur laleb," they made charity a duty of justice, "Zedakah" which is higher than love. Yea, even their ceremonialism had its great merits. It produced a Yom Kippurim, a day that taught the lesson of contrition and self-humiliation and fostered the sense of responsibility for one's deeds. Let me abide by this reminiscence. Before my eyes there arises the synagog of my native city on Kippur eve. It is late. Most of the worshippers have left the house, few only are present, reciting the Psalms, and I see my good old father in his white gown, covered with a Tallith, standing before the ark, and I hear him recite the touching mystical prayer, in a voice

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

trembling with emotion: "As we recite these Psalms this day, so may it be our lot to sing thy praises in the world to come, and may the rose of Sharon be awakened to sing with a voice jubilant and rejoicing, the glory of the Lebanon may be given to her; magnificence, majesty in the house of our God. Amen. Selah."

III

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION AND JUDAISM.*

Heinrich Graetz, the centenary of whose birth was celebrated all over the Jewish world a few months ago, speaking of the Hussite movement, makes the brilliant remark that every attempt to deepen the religious sentiment within the church, started from a return to the Old Testament. (Graetz: *Geschichte*, VIII, 130-131. 3d. ed.) Indeed the Hussites named their principal fortress Tabor, and the Puritans of New England are in every modern American novel characterized by the most unusual Old Testament names.

Again speaking of Luther's movement the master historian of Judaism makes the somewhat flippant remark that the only beneficial effect which the great upheaval of the Christian church had on the Jews was the negative boon that the contending parties within the Church were so busy fighting their own battles that there was no time left to them to harass the Jews. (*ib.* IX, 196, 3d. ed.) Graetz in his case yielded to a prompting of temper which is claimed as typically Jewish. An antisemitic essayist once said

*Address, delivered at the Second Annual Spring Conference of the Chicago Rabbinical Association, April 8, 1918.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

that a Jew would kill his own father, if it would be needed for a clever pun. This is no doubt one of the exaggerations in which the enemies of Judaism often indulge in order to make their arguments more impressive, but in this individual case it does seem that Graetz preferred being clever to being guided by historic temper.

With the exception of the Unitarian movement which, remarkably enough, arose in the Latin countries, Spain and Italy, where the revised Christianity of Luther, Calvin and Zwingli found the least fertile soil, none of the various Protestant churches that were established in the sixteenth century, could see in Judaism more than an anachronism, and in rarest cases even a sincere and sympathetic anachronism, such as High Church Episcopolics might see in the Quaker church. Yet the mere fact that all Protestant churches started as minorities and for centuries afterwards had to protect followers who were hopeless minorities in lands of intolerance, necessitated their insistence on the principle of freedom of conscience, usually not as a theory, but as an accommodation to existing conditions. A clear case is found in a letter, written by Landgrave William IV of Hesse to his brother Ludwig in 1570. A pastor, named Nigrinus, who was under the jurisdiction of Landgrave Ludwig had published a book whose title: "Jew-hater" (Juedenfeind, oder von den edelen Fruechten der talmudischen Jueden, so itziger Zeit in

Deutschland wohnen. Giessen, 1570) sufficiently characterizes the author's tendency. Landgrave William reproaches his brother for tolerating such an agitation, for, so he argues, if arguments like those of Pastor Nigrinus were accepted and a monarch would have the right of persecuting all those who profess a religion different from his own, the "papists" would use this argument for the persecution of the Protestants in countries where they have the majority.

While the effect of the Reformation on the condition of the Jews, appears only later, we have to look for their beginnings at a time, coeval with the beginnings of the movement, just as renewed measures of oppression in Catholic countries, and especially under ecclesiastic rule, indicate the effect of the principle of strict ecclesiastic authority. The first important event which proves the favorable turn in the situation of the Jews is the opening of Holland to their settlement. William the Silent, one of the noblest rulers of all times, opened right after the proclamation of the independence of the Netherlands in 1581 the country to the Jews on the principle of unrestricted toleration of all religions. There was no stage display in this measure, such as a later Jewish author, Daniel de Barrios, tells us, whom Graetz, somewhat fond of romance, follows. The story of an Argonaut expedition of Maranos protected by a young woman mascot of captivating beauty, which, driven by ill winds into the harbor of Emden, and wandering aim-

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

lessly about in the city, until they were attracted by a Hebrew sign over the door of a house, where they found a Jew who advised them to go on to Amsterdam, offering his services as their minister, is pure fiction. The Netherlands were a Spanish dependency, and it was natural that they should have in their midst some Spanish Jews, who, as they were accustomed at home, continued to practice their religion in secret, until the proclamation of religious liberty, inspired them by and by with the courage to worship the God of their fathers publicly. The same was done in Hamburg and Bordeaux, where the fugitives from the horrors of the Inquisition first settled as Portuguese merchants, the municipal authorities winking at the fact that the newcomers were Jews, until the population became used to it, and recognized them as Jews.

Hamburg was another refuge opened to Jews through the growing spirit of toleration which was the unintended result of the Reformation. This is of no mean import, for Hamburg was strictly Lutheran and tolerated in the beginning neither Calvinists nor Roman Catholics. The German emperor, theoretically the overlord of the free city, was wroth at this partiality which allowed, as he expresses himself, the worship of the synagog, where the name of Jesus is reviled, while the holy mass was prohibited. We find such a complaint a century later in another Protestant country. The elector of Brandenburg, himself a

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Lutheran, but desirous to maintain peace between the two leading Protestant denominations, severely reprimanded the Berlin pastor Paul Gerhardt for his vehement attacks on the Calvinists. Gerhardt, a deeply devout soul and author of inspiring religious poetry, was a narrowminded Lutheran and would not yield, so the elector dismissed him from his charge. The congregation that loved its pastor protested. They proclaimed it an injustice that in a city, where the "blasphemy" of the Jews was tolerated, the "pure doctrine" of Luther should not be permitted to express itself in the abuse of its opponents.

The readmission of the Jews to Berlin in 1670 has a more than local import. It marks an epoch in the modern history of Judaism and is a milestone in the progress of religious toleration. Trade jealousy and religious fanaticism had combined to make the existence of the Jews in Vienna impossible. The complete triumph of Catholicism in the lands of the Austrian crown had in the course of the seventeenth century shown its consequences in growing hostility to the Jews. The Jesuits had succeeded in introducing the practice of the papal states, inaugurated by Sixtus IV in 1584 which compelled the Jews to listen to the sermon of a conversionist every Sunday. A ghetto was established on an island of the Danube River, making their isolation complete, and finally their banishment from Vienna and from the province of Lower Austria seemed to complete the realization of

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

the Spanish ideal to which the wife of Emperor Leopold I was sworn as a Spanish princess. The exiles looked for a new home. In their distress they appealed to the Elector Frederick William who had opened his land to the Huguenots, who had shortly before been exiled from France. This is the new feature of the event. The Jews do not ask for the right to crouch in another corner, where thanks to personal benevolence or, which was more frequently the case, owing to financial stress there was an opportunity of finding a shelter. They ask for a home in a land whose prince had recognized religious liberty by opening his country to the victims of religious tyranny, and they obtained this privilege.

Still more important, both for the motives and for the effects is the opening of England to the Jews. Desirous to avoid a romantic coloring of history, we shall begin with the most prosaic point. The Stuarts plotted in Holland for their reinstatement on the throne of their fathers. The community of Amsterdam, little older than half a century, had already won a considerable financial standing. Charles II bargained frankly for the financial assistance of the Portuguese bankers who had settled in Amsterdam, promising them in turn for the support that they were to give him, the right of settlement in England. Cromwell could not overlook the safety of his own government, and introduced a bill into Parliament which abolished the edict of expulsion, issued by

Edward I in 1290. The bill failed to pass, but the Jews silently found toleration, afterwards legalized by the opinion rendered by the highest court which declared the edict of expulsion as invalid on the ground that it never had been passed by Parliament. This fact in itself shows that it was not mere utilitarianism which brought about the change in a condition, maintained for nearly four centuries. The civil wars which ravaged the British Isles, and the war of thirty years which had devastated the European continent, led the highest intellects, to the appreciation of freedom of conscience. Sir John Locke, born in 1630, was in the most impressionable period of his life, when the peoples of Europe began to draw the balance of the terrible cost in lives and property, which the war for the sake of religion had imposed upon them.

He embodied the results of his thinking in his various epoch-making works of which from the Jewish point of view his "Letters concerning Toleration" is the most important. In it he mentions the Jews expressly as entitled to legal equality, and he went even farther. In the constitution of the colony of Carolina which he drafted, the Jews are mentioned again as being on one level with the professors of other religions. The Magna Charta, passed in the same year when Pope Innocent III decreed the yellow badge as symbol of the position of the Jews as pariahs, was a protest against ecclesiastic tyranny. Puritanism was its logical consequence, and it laid a breach into

the ghetto walls, although it did not remove the ghetto gates. Puritanism had, however, also another emotional feature which guided its policy with regard to the Jews. It worshipped the Old Testament whose halo still surrounded the people to whom it had been revealed. The church which would not allow any hymns except the versified Psalms in its service, felt a deep sense of gratitude to the descendants of the inspired poet who had sung the triumph arising from suffering which in their church hymnal reads:

“He that sowing precious seed, in going forth does mourn.

He doubtless, bringing home his sheaves, rejoicing shall return.”

The establishment of Jewish communities in Amsterdam, Hamburg, London and Berlin is a living testimony to the growth of the spirit of toleration that sprang from the Protestant insistence, though by no means carried to its logical consequences, on the freedom of human conscience. Luther's bold word, spoken in the memorable session of the Reichstag of Worms: “Councils may err and have erred,” was a condemnation of all the misery which these councils had heaped upon the Jews, the ghetto, the restrictions on earning an honest livelihood, the yellow badge, the suppression of rabbinic literature, the enforced baptism of infants, the taxation of Jews for the benefit of rich cathedrals and monasteries, and all that unequalled catalog of fiendish sufferings which wily

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

priestcraft had evolved in order to make its own ambition appear as the will of God. In 1529 a compromise was decreed by the Reichstag of Speyer, which, leaving the religious controversy in statu quo, practically recognized the breach of the church as past healing. In 1540 a Spanish noble, whose character was a peculiar mixture of the visionary and the tyrant, founded the Jesuit order, which, determined to establish absolute ecclesiastic authority, had to treat the Jews as rebels against the kingdom of God, and in addition, justifying the means by the ends, though this much quoted word is not literally found in the works of the Jesuit theologians, utilized the age-long hatred of the Jews, created and nurtured by the church, for its own needs. In 1555 Pope Paul IV issued a bull which made the ghetto a law for all Christendom, and yet even at that time a plain Alsatian village Jew, Josel of Rosheim, had the courage to say to the Reichstag over which the bigoted Emperor Charles V presided: "The Almighty has created us to live by your side, although we do not profess the same religion, and it is the duty of the governments to provide for our livelihood." (Feilchenfeld: Rabbi Josel von Rosheim, Strasburg, 1898, p. 86 et seq).

Of still greater importance is the work of the French statesman and philosopher, Jean Bodin (*Heptaplo-meres De Rerum Sublimium Arcanis Abditis*, ed. L. Nowack, Schwerin, 1857. M. Philippson: Jean

Bodin. Eine Lebensskizze, Allg. Zeitung des Judentums. 1866, pp. 437-440. J. Guttmann: Jean Bodin in seinen Beziehungen zum Judentum, Breslau, 1906) who presented in the form of a dialogue the claims of the various religions in which Judaism is given the best of the arguments. Some authors therefore claimed that Bodin was a Maranno, although there is no proof to be found for it, except the provocation of certain historians at Bodin's sympathetic attitude to Judaism. To the same category belongs the famous statesman John Reuchlin, like Bodin, a Catholic and even strongly opposed to Luther's work, which was most enthusiastically supported by Melanchthon, Reuchlin's grandnephew. Reuchlin, the first Christian to write a Hebrew grammar, was a Humanist. As representative of the Renaissance movement, he advocated the study of the Hebrew Bible, and even of rabbinical literature on the ground of the same principle which induced the Humanists to encourage the study of the ancient classics, and to abandon the fanaticism of the Dominican friars who used the apostate Pfefferkorn, an ignorant butcher, to denounce the whole rabbinic literature as blasphemous. While Reuchlin deplored the breach in the church caused by Luther, he may be classed as a reformer from the point of view of his opposition to the narrow fanaticism of the two mendicant orders, the Franciscans and the Dominicans, who for three centuries

had vied with each other in making the life of the Jews miserable in every Christian country of Europe.

Another pre-Reformation reformer was the Dominican friar, Girolamo Savonarola, one of the heralds of the new era which began with the discovery of the New World. Savonarola was not only a Catholic like Reuchlin, but a devout monk who believed not only in the sacrament, in the worship of saints, the intercession of the Madonna and the remission of sins by confession, but even in the infallibility of the pope, while at the same time, he denounced Pope Alexander VI as the Antichrist. Savonarola called the pope a Jew, while the pope's advocate and Savonarola's life-long enemy, Mariano da Gennazzano, returned the compliment, calling his rival a Jew. Savonarola was a most remarkable character, and, like all great men, full of contradictions. Possessing a clear grasp of politics which astonished trained diplomats who visited the famous monk in his cell at San Marco in Florence, he was at the same time a mystic, who earnestly believed that his political foresight was a supernatural gift. So, as already indicated, was his religious view contradictory. He saw in the pope the legitimate successor of St. Peter to whom Jesus had entrusted the keys that open the heavens, and at the same time, he denounced the pope who then was the trustee of the keys, as the embodiment of evil whom nobody was held to obey. Equally contradictory was his attitude to the Jews. In his chief work,

“The Mystery of the Cross,” he denounces them as rebels against the kingdom of God in the style of mediæval scholasticism. In one individual instance he uses milder forms of expression. The Republic of Lucca had asked the famous monk for an opinion on the question whether it was permitted to allow Jews to settle in the city and engage in the business of usury. Such invitations were usually extended to Jews in the various cities of Italy by princes or municipal boards. The Jews, often associated in business, obtained the privileges of a bank whose business was an aid to commerce and industry. The mendicant friars, always ready to utilize every opportunity of gaining influence in public life, aroused the population to rebellion against the authorities who favored the enemies of Christ. The Franciscan friar, Bernardino da Feltre, preached all over northern Italy against the Jewish exploiters and agitated for the establishment of cheap loan banks, known since that time as “Monte di Pieta.” The princes, like the Medici in Florence, did not cherish either the form or the object of the agitation, and the Dominican friars, as rivals of the Franciscans, denounced the loan banks as sinful, inasmuch as talking of interest was sin in itself. Savonarola’s view is a compromise. The Jews, so he says in his reply to the aldermen of Lucca, are to be preserved as a living testimony to the truth of Christianity. “Slay them not, lest my people forget,” he quotes from Psalms (Psalm 59, 11). They

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

may be admitted not in order to practice usury, but if they do it after they are admitted, it may be tolerated, just as prostitutes are tolerated to avoid a greater evil. Savonarola's view is that of scholastic theology and in accordance with the principles laid down by Pope Innocent III in the thirteenth century, which was even maintained by the New York Presbytery in its synod, held in 1849 (*Occident*, VII, 491) and by the "Churchman," the organ of the Episcopal Church in 1856. (*ib.* XIV, 31.) At the same time he urged the establishment of a Monte di Pieta in Florence under the auspices of the state.

Savonarola is claimed by the Protestant Church. Pope Pius IV condemned his doctrines as Lutheran, Luther declared him as his forerunner, and his statue is seen at the foot of the Luther monument in Worms. While historic analogies are never complete, we may justly say that the Dominican friar who died at the stake in Florence on May 23, 1498, as a martyr for the liberty of conscience, and cruel, as his view on the Jews is, measured by our own standard of religious liberty, he foreshadows, nevertheless, the awakening of justice toward the victims of ecclesiastic tyranny.

Martin Luther whose bold challenge of the right of ecclesiastic authority to control the individual conscience, makes him the prophet of a new era, is like Savonarola, full of contradictions, when viewed in the light of the modern conception of freedom of conscience.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

His inconsistency, manifest in approving of the execution of Michael Servet, while he demanded toleration for his own departure from the standard of ecclesiastic othodoxy, insisting on the sacramental character of the communion service, while he rejected five of the sacraments of the Catholic Church, is equally manifest in his attitude to the Jews. In his earlier works, especially in his pamphlet, entitled: "Jesus, born a Jew" he condemns the persecutions of the Jews by the mediæval church, advocates kindness toward them as means of their conversion to Christianity and toleration of those who refuse to convert. He goes even so far as to say that had he been born a Jew and seen the idolatry, practiced by the "Papists" in the name of Christianity, he would sooner have become a hog than a Christian. This pamphlet was published in 1523. Twenty years later Luther changed his attitude. In two pamphlets of which the more important bears the title "About the Jews and their Lies" he joins with his Catholic opponent, John Eck, in reviling the Jews. Even the hope in their conversion is abandoned, for the Jewish heart is so "stocksteineisenteufelshart" that one might sooner expect to convert the devil himself than a Jew. The only solution of the Jewish question is to kill all Jewish adults, and educate their children as Christians. Various causes have contributed to this remarkable change. Various converts from Judaism had filled Luther with bitter hatred of their former

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

co-religionists, by their stories of the ridicule of his work on the part of the Jews, another proof of the great reformer's inconsistency who allowed himself to be influenced by apostates from Judaism, while at the same time he declared in his writings that there was no such thing as a sincere convert to Christianity from Judaism. Besides, the experiences of his later life, the continued strife in the church, the disagreement in the camp of the reformers, political and economic radicalism which threw Germany into a state of anarchy, and for which his work was held responsible, and finally physical ailment had embittered the soul of the man who like all great men was of an impetuous temperament. So he went back on the humane ideals which he had expressed in 1523, and in 1537 refused to receive the Jewish advocate Josel of Rosheim who brought a letter of introduction from Luther's trusted friend, Pastor Capito of Strasburg, with the request that Luther assist Josel in his attempt to make the Elector of Saxony, Luther's protector, repeal the edict of expulsion of the Jews from his states.

The fundamental principle of the Reformation was the examination of church doctrines by the words of the Bible. For this purpose the study of the Hebrew language was necessary. Luther advocated this study and introduced it in the university of Wittenberg, in which he held a chair as professor. His own knowledge of Hebrew was limited. It does not seem to have gone beyond the ability to read an occasional

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Hebrew word, quoted in the older Latin commentaries of the Old Testament. As the knowledge of Hebrew among Christians was exceedingly rare in those days, Luther had to employ converted Jews as professors in Wittenberg, but he changed them constantly, as inefficient for one reason or other. Bernhard Gepier (the name seems to point to Goeppingen, Wuerttemberg) the same man whose stories seem to be responsible for Luther's animosity, expressed in his anti-Jewish pamphlets, was an ignorant man who even after his conversion was unable to sign his name in other than Hebrew characters. He naturally could not command the respect of his students, and soon afterwards changed his position for that of a night-watchman. Mathaeus Adrianus, a Spanish Jew who was a physician, and seems to have been originally converted to Catholicism, teaching at the University of Louvain, then as now a center of Catholic scholarship, became a Protestant, and taught Hebrew at Wittenberg. For unknown reasons he fell out with Luther and was discharged. A successor of his, Johann Boeschenstein, was born a Christian, and one of the few who were qualified to teach Hebrew. He was even less able to agree with Luther, because he wished to teach Hebrew as an academic study, while Luther angrily declared, he did not mean to train his students to become preachers in the synagog, and Boeschenstein speaks of Luther as a fanatic friar (ab atrato quodam circulatore) (Bauch: Die Ein-

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

fuehrung des Hebraeischen in Wittenberg. Monatschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, Vol. 48, p. 22 et seq. 1904).

The desire for the knowledge of Hebrew among Christians increased constantly, partly, as was done in the case of Ruechlin from strictly academic, humanistic motives, and partly inspired by religious sentiments. Rabbis began to discuss the question, whether it was permissible to instruct Christians in Hebrew, and Christian scholars recommended this study as part of the prescribed curriculum for secondary institutions. (Elijah Manahem Halfan's opinion, written in 1544, *Revue des Etudes Juifs*, XXVIII, *Allg. Zeitg. d. Judentums*, 1897, pp. 463-464. Solomon Luria, *Baba Kamma*, IV, 9, who strongly condemns the teaching of Hebrew to Christians. He is approvingly quoted by Isaiah Horowitz in fol. 185a and by Hayyim Hezekiah Medini X, 133, Warsaw, 1901. Michael Neander (a disciple of Luther and Melancthon); *Bendencken an einen guten Herrn and Freund, wie ein Knabe zu Leiten und zu Unterweisen*, etc. *Eisleben*, 1582. (see *Steinschneider, Hebr. Bibliographie VII*, pp. 69-71.)

Solomon Luria who wrote about 1545, gives as one reason for his disapproval of the teaching of Hebrew to Christians, his experience of cases of apostasy of such teachers, and it is quite probable that some of the numerous cases of conversion to Christianity by learned Jews that occurred about this time, represent

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

instances in which the Jewish teacher was influenced by his Christian pupil to embrace the religion of the New Testament. One of the most remarkable instances is that of Immanuel Tremellius, 1510-1580, an Italian, at first a monk, who afterwards converted to the Reformed church, became a close friend of Calvin, whose Catechism he translated into Hebrew as a text book for the conversion of the Jews. He also translated the Old Testament from the Hebrew into Latin because the Reformers would not use the Vulgate, the official Latin church Bible, as biased in the Catholic sense, and needed a Latin Bible text for quotations in their scholarly works which were written in Latin.

Another co-worker of the early Reformers was a Polish Jew who as Christian called himself Luke Helic. We hear of him first in 1570, when he joined the Moravian Brethren, whom he assisted in the translation of the Bible into the Slavic language, the so-called Bible of Kralitz. In Eibenschitz, Moravia, he was ordained as minister of the Brethren community and served as such in the Moravian town of Fulnek in 1581. He returned in 1592 to Posen, and caused the community constant trouble. (Ottuv Slovník naučný, díl XI. Prague, 1897.) One Paul Helic of Cracow published already in 1540 Luther's translation of the New Testament in Hebrew characters in Cracow. (Jahrbuch, Jued. Liter. Gesellschaft, X. 301. Frankfort o. M. 1913.) It was evi-

dently done for the sake of missionary work among the Jews. It is not known whether he was a relative of Luke Helic.

Marco Perez was a Marano who had left Spain to escape from the Inquisition. Like many others of his class he turned first to the Netherlands, where, although the country was a Spanish possession, the Inquisition was less powerful in the first half of the sixteenth century. There he became an ardent follower of Calvin's teachings, had the "Institution," Calvin's main work, published at his own expense in 30,000 copies for distribution in Spain. When the Inquisition spread its horrors to the Netherlands, Perez emigrated to Basel (1567) where he became a benefactor of the numerous Huguenot refugees, for whose benefit he established a silk mill. There he also had the Spanish translation of the Bible printed at his own expense. (*Allg. Zeitg. d. Judentums*, 1898, 477). While Perez must have been a sincere enthusiast, it is safe to assume that the majority of the converts from Judaism, won by both parties in Christendom, were guided by mercenary motives and tried to make themselves useful by heaping abuse on, and often maliciously slandering, their former religion, and its followers. Paul Staffelstein of Nuremberg published in 1536 "Ein kurze Unterrichtung, das man einfeltig dem Herrn Jesu Christo nachwandern . . . sol, und die juedischen . . . Heuchler und Gleisner nicht sol abwenden lassen." Paul, reminis-

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

cent of the fanatic Pharisee Paul, who had turned into an enthusiastic believer in Christ's resurrection, was a name favored by apostates from Judaism. One Paul Pfedersheimer became a Franciscan friar about the same time when Staffelsteiner became a Protestant. He instructed another brother of the same order, Konrad Pellican, in Hebrew, and the latter was the first Christian to write a textbook of Hebrew grammar in German. This instruction may have contributed to a change in Pellican's religious views. He left the order and the church, and became a follower of the Swiss hero reformer, Ulrich Zwingli. (Bacher: *Zur Biographie Elijah Levitas. Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, vol. 37, pp. 398-404. 1893.)

We see that Catholicism, as well as Protestantism, had its accessions from the ranks of the Jews. It seems that there was more to gain in the Catholic Church. One of these converts for revenue was Antonius Margaritha, the son of Rabbi Jacob Margalit of Ratisbon, who slandered his former co-religionists in a mean pamphlet, entitled "Der Gantze Juedische Glaube." The book is so idiotic that it would bore the reader, were it not for its vile tone which gives evidence of the mercenary motives of its author. Margaritha did not find satisfaction in the pay roll of the Catholic church and tried to sell his convictions to Luther, but with no better success. It is a great pity that Jewish authors of that time were so bitter

against apostates that, as we saw in the case of Solomon Luria, they would not mention their names, thus depriving us of the information so interesting from an historical point of view, what the Jews had to say about the motives of men like Margaritha, the son of a rabbi, or Johannes Levita Isaac, 1515-1577, who was rabbi in Wetzlar and became a Protestant in mature manhood. Teaching Hebrew in Louvain, he turned to Catholicism, and educated his son Stephen who was born as a Jew in 1547, as Catholic. The latter took orders, was professor in Cologne, and there became a convert to Protestantism, writing a number of polemical works against Catholicism. (Wetzer und Welte, Kirchenlexikon, article: Isaac, VII, 938. 2. ed.)

Individual instances of such apostasies we find all the time, for there are always rogues willing to sell their conscience, and dupes willing to buy it. Yet it can hardly be denied that the religious excitement produced by the upheaval within the Church, made itself felt in the ghetto too. There were at all events largely increased opportunities for people acquiring and changing religious convictions. Protestantism had made great headway through the printing press, and we saw in the case of Marco Perez that its advocates made great sacrifices in order to spread the new gospel. The Roman Catholic Church felt that it had to watch its fold against the attacks by literary wolves, and established strict censorship of all books.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Naturally Jewish converts for revenue saw their opportunity. Following the example of equally ignoble predecessors, dating back to the thirteenth century, before the printing press existed, they called the attention of the commission appointed for the compilation of the Index of Prohibited Books, as it was now called, to the fact that Jewish literature contained many books which denied the divinity of Jesus, his virgin birth, his resurrection and his ascent into heaven. A special index commission was appointed, and one of its members, who signs as Domenico Gerosolymitano, though he was a native of Egypt, had so suddenly become convinced of the truth of Christianity, that he had no time to acquire even the Latin alphabet, signing the imprimatur of the books which he revised, in Hebrew characters. (Steinschneider: *Hebr. Bibliographie*, V, 76, 97, 125. *Berliner. Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 19.)

While Judaism, persecuted in a manner which has no parallel in the world's history, was bound to lose those weak characters who from a material point of view had everything to gain by their apostasy, it required no small amount of firmness for non-Jews who were in sympathy with the plain ideas of monotheism, to profess their views openly. The first one who, drawing the consequences of the principle of Reformation, followed his own convictions regardless of ecclesiastic authority, was the Spaniard Michael Servet. He came to the conclusion that the New Testament

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

did not teach Trinity and expressed this view openly. Feeling his life threatened in Catholic countries, he turned to Geneva, believing that Calvin who had found there a refuge from persecution would be willing to act consistently on the same principle towards those who differed with him, but he was sadly disappointed. Calvin, who decoyed him to Geneva by ambiguous promises, had him burned at the stake in 1553. Luther approved of this act with equal inconsistency. The blood of martyrs has always proven the seed of a new religion. Servet's sympathizers, persecuted in free Switzerland, turned to the wilds of Poland, and found there a foothold simultaneously with the Jesuits who were called there a year after Servet's martyrdom. While their pioneers, like Lelio Socino and his nephew Fausto, were professed Christians who merely denied the divinity of Jesus, some of them went farther, declaring that the transfer of the Sabbath to the first day of the week was a violation of the Divine will, and others going still farther rejected the fundamental principle of Paulinian Christianity, which declared the Law abrogated, and professed Judaism without any limitation.

These sectaries found accession among a class of Christians in the Slavic east of Europe, who since 1470 under the influence of a missionary named Zechariah, and supposed to have been a Karaite, had more or less accepted the doctrines of Judaism. They had found followers among the high dignitaries of

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

the Russian church, like Zosima, the metropolitan of Kiew. Their number grew in spite of wholesale executions and banishments, and their descendants, named variously Sobotniki (Sabbatharians), Molokani (milk people, a term not satisfactorily explained), and Yudeyushtshvi (Judaizers) survive in large numbers in Transcaucasia, where the czars Alexander I and Nicholas I exiled them, unable to coerce them back into the Greek Orthodox Church. (Johannes Gehring: *Die Sekten der Russischen Kirche, 1003-1897. Nach ihrem Ursprunge und inneren Zusammenhange dargestellt.* Leipsic, 1898.) Jacob Emden, who is very reliable, reports that in 1763 a large number of peasants from the Ukraine emigrated to Turkey in order to escape persecution and to live as Jews, (Hitabbekut, p. 19a, 46a, 59b. Lember, 1877.) With the growing power of the Jesuit order in Poland the Unitarians were compelled to leave and found a new home in Transylvania which, being contested territory between Christians of various denominations and Mohammedans, offered them a refuge. Yet even there they were not free from persecution during the ascendancy of Christian dominion. Catherine Wejgiel or Zalaszewska, the widow of a member of the Cracow city council was burned at the stake in 1539 for refusing to believe in Trinity. (Graetz Geschichte, IX, 454, 3. ed. Ha-Eshkol, VI, 227, 1909. Allg. Zeitg. d. Judt. 1909, p. 576. Jahrbuch der Jued. Liter. Gesellschaft, VII, 375. 1910. IX, 499. 1912. Oesterr.

Worhenschrift, 1914, p. 133.) In Transylvania various princes and diets had since the end of the sixteenth century legislated against these heretics. One of their number, John Toroczkai, was stoned to death in 1638, thus being given to understand that even the Christian Law was occasionally a hard taskmaster; but with all these persecutions the seed of Unitarianism continued to bear fruit, and in 1869 the remnants of their descendants in Transylvania, at last freed from legal restrictions, openly professed Judaism, while in Transcaucasia according to the estimate of German Protestant missionaries who can hardly be suspected to exaggerate, 15,000 peasants of Russian nationality are devout and steadfast Jews. A number of them emigrated to Palestine and a small colony lives in Los Angeles, California. It is also fairly certain that the author of a polemical work against Christianity, Isaac of Troki, who lived in the sixteenth century, was a convert to Judaism. Graetz, (*Geschichte*, IX, pp. 456-457, 3 ed.) believes him to have been a Karaite, which is possible, but would not militate against the conjecture that he was originally a Unitarian. For his Christian origin speaks his knowledge of the New Testament and of Christian polemical literature and also the name Isaac ben Abraham, the latter often assumed by proselytes on the ground of the rabbinic theology which makes Abraham the prototype of all missionaries. (*Gen Rabb*, 44.)

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Considering the great advantages offered to Jews who turned Christians and the dangers which confronted converts to Judaism, we have a right to be proud of the facts, but it does not seem that the struggle between religions has ever been settled by a melodramatic surrender, such as may have been the dream of Pope Benedict XIII when he arranged the disputation of Tortosa in 1413. The Jews won another more decisive victory. They persisted to live in spite of discrimination, persecution and humiliation, and the most enlightened rulers learned that the prophet Zechariah was right, when he warned tyrants that Jerusalem would be a burdensome stone and those who would try to move it, would hurt themselves, while those who would injure Israel would touch the apple of their own eye. The exiles from Spain found new homes, not only in Mohammedan Turkey and in the Protestant states of Holland, Hamburg and England, but even in the territories of some enlightened Catholic princes right under the eyes of the pope, who, however, as was the case with Alexander VI, in times of financial stress overlooked previous conditions and allowed refugees from the Inquisition, although baptized, to live as Jews in their own states. A Talmudic statement that it was a providential act of God to divide the world into so many realms that in case of tyranny in one, the Jews could find refuge in another, (Pesahim 87b) proved true, especially in Germany and Italy. Emanuel Phil-

bert, Duke of Savoy, had admitted such fugitives in 1551. A papal nuncio who was anxious to win his spurs in the service of the Church, reported the fact. The duke denied that his Jewish subjects had ever been Christians, but he was bound to expel them, although after a while the Church winked at this order, and they were tolerated again. The senate of the duchy of Milan, then (1597) under the rule of the fiendish and bigoted Philip II of Spain, asked for an opinion on the Jewish question, had the courage to declare that by the law of nature the Jews are to be considered fellow human beings to whom humane treatment was due. (*Impero che partecipando essi con li cristiani della ragione della natura e chiamandosi prossimi non si devar negar loro la ragione della comunione humana. Vessillo, Israelitico, 1915, pp. 337-339.*)

Tuscany, whose rulers of the house of Medici had risen from the counting room, was still more appreciative of the economic importance of the Jews. They opened their land to them as to Greeks and Mohammedans, regardless of ecclesiastic laws. The consequence was that the Jews, whom the bitter enemy of the Medicis, Savonarola, had denounced as dangerous on account of their usurious practices, now under the rule of these benevolent autocrats, who opened to them other avenues of livelihood, became merchants on a large scale, raising the port of Leghorn to first-class importance in the Levant trade,

and developing the silk and coral industries which to this day are giving to the city its importance. The removal of the restrictions on the practice of Jewish physicians, which, while decreed by popes and council, were disregarded by prelates and popes alike in their own cases, gave to Jewish talent opportunities in professional life. Ecclesiastic tyranny and professional, usually mercenary jealousy, tried to blacken the character of Jewish physicians (George Marius (originally Meier); *In Judaeorum Medicastroorum Calumnia et Homicidia pro Christianis Pia Exhortatio*. Marburg, 1570. See also article: Lopez in *Jewish Encyclopædia*), but the public rendered here as in business relations, the final verdict which was favorable to the Jews. The Jesuits staged ritual murder trials and host desecration dramas in Poland, and claiming that a number of Jews had sneaked into the order, and occupied a high rank in it, passed under the fifth general Claudius Aquaviva (1581-1615) a rule that men of Jewish ancestry to the fifth generation can not enter the order. (*Institutum Societatis Jesu. Decreta Congr. V. 52, Congr. VI. 28*. Florence, 1893, II, pp 278-279, 302. Count Hoensbroech: *Vierzehn Jahre Jesuit*. Leipsic, 1910, II. 10.)

We have lived to see the time when right under the eyes of the Black Pope, as the Jesuit general is called, a Jew, Ernest Nathan, was mayor of Rome and another Jew, Luigi Luzzatti, was directing the government of the United Italy which was the dream of the

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

infidel Machiavelli and of the mystic monk Savonarola alike. As in Leghorn, when the law of intolerance was broken, so in Amsterdam, Berlin, London, New York and in all important centers of commerce and industry, the Jews have shown that their supposed harmful influence was due not to their innate character but to the restrictions imposed upon them, and that it would have paid Philip II of Spain to accept the advice of the senate of Milan and treat the Jews as "Prossimi" to whom "communione humana" ought not to be denied.

IV

WHY, WHEN AND HOW WE SHALL WRITE MEMOIRS*

When I speak of "we" as authors of memoirs, I mean "we" the small people who have never commanded in a naval battle, nor attempted to reach the North pole, who have not invented an apparatus for wireless telegraphy, nor written Faust or Hamlet, who have not distinguished themselves as premiers of a great country, nor as assassins of a noted monarch.

The average people think there is nothing interesting in such memoirs. I believe, with Leibniz, the great to be an evolution of the small (*les perceptions petites*). *Cognitio est adaequata, quum id omne, quod notitiam distinctam ingreditur, rursus distincte cognitum est.* The arguments for my statement are evident. Even our interest in the biography of great men is a proof of it. We are interested in the life of Washington as a civil engineer or as a landholder, because we wish to understand the great man not only as a strategist or as a statesman, but as one who is human like ourselves. A clear insight into the condition of the average Virginia farmer of the eighteenth century is absolutely necessary for us, if we wish to

*H. U. C. Journal, Vol. V, pages 4-10, September, 1900.

understand the heroic figure of the leader towering above his contemporaries.

Unfortunately Jewish history, owing to the deficiency of our sources, lacks this personal element. We possess the literary productions of past ages, but in many cases we do not know their authors, and in no case previous to the eighteenth century do we possess that *notitiam distinctam* which is necessary for a *cognitio adequata*.

We possess a codification of Jewish laws, called Halakot Gedolot, supposed to be the work of Simeon Kayara, written in 741. The first question is, whether this gentleman's name is Kayara, the Thora-reader, or Kahira, which would make him a Cairene (see: Neubauer, Letterbode, IV, 65). Another question is, whether we shall trust those authorities who call Simeon Kayara the author of this book and whom we can follow back to the tenth century (Respp. Geonim, ed. Harkavy, Berlin 1885, p. 191) or whether we shall accept the testimony of others, going back to Rashi (Berakot 42, a) who make Jehuday Gaon the author of this compendium. A decision on this question would not make Mr. Jacob Biegeleisen, of Taylor, Wash., hats, gents' furnishing goods, etc., feel any more comfortable. I don't blame him. We would have collars, cuffs, neckties and nightrobes, if Simon Kayara had never lived and if Halakot Gedolot had never existed. To me it would be of some interest to have light on the question. I suspect that this

work was written much against the wish of the Geonim. It was somewhat handier and more systematically arranged than the Talmud. It might in some instances render an appeal to the Geonim unnecessary, and we do not wish to be dispensable. The Geonim said, the authors of "Halakot" are incendiaries, destroying the law. (Temurah 14b.) This is quite natural. Since a handy volume, with appropriate headings makes the law more accessible to the less learned, the admiration for the Gaon would decrease. Our high-school professors do not approve of "ponies;" in my time they did not even permit "Specialwoerterbuecher." The rabbis of the beginning of the nineteenth century were very much opposed to the works of Abraham Danziger, because they contained the material of the laws on ritual in a much handier form than any of the older works. So Simeon Kayara's biography would be of some interest, even if — what is not very likely — the Halakot Gedolot had been written verbatim as we possess them.

But I have a far stronger proof for the benefit derived from the *Perceptions petites*. A younger contemporary of Simeon Kayara and of Jehuday Gaon was a sort of a peddler or travelling merchant whom I do not even know by name, but whose biography would be intensely interesting to me and perhaps even to our friend Mr. Jacob Biegeleisen. This unknown gentleman is spoken of in a biography of Charlemagne

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

written by an anonymous monk of St. Gallen, in Switzerland. The author tells us that Charlemagne wished to play a trick on a parsimonious bishop and for this the Jew had to serve him. The Jew went to the bishop, showed him his goods, amongst which was a mounted mouse. This attracted the bishop's attention and he asked what it was for. The Jew replied that he had bought it in the East for a great deal of money; it was a charm of great value. The bishop offered three pounds, but the Jew said: "I would sooner throw it into the sea." The bishop offered eight pounds, but the Jew said: "The God of Abraham would not have me lose time and money." Thereupon the bishop offered twenty pounds, but the Jew instead of giving a reply, wrapped his mouse in costly silk and turned to the door. Then the bishop offered a peck of silver. The Jew hesitated, and with profuse protestations of his disinterestedness finally yielded. He brought the money to the emperor who publicly rebuked the bishop for his worldliness. (Freytag: *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, vol. I, p. 322).

This story is highly interesting. It shows that the Jew in the eighth century was a trader in the highest sense of the word, an importer, an advance agent of civilization. This business brought him in contact with the greatest on earth. He enjoyed their confidence and—what is of greater moment—he deserved it. He was shrewd in business, he swore by the God

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

of Abraham, but he was honest. Of what great interest would it be to us, had this peddler written his biography, telling us where his home was, how he had been taught, how he came to Germany, where he bought his goods, how he was introduced to Charlemagne's court, where he ate and where he slept while on his journey and so many other things! How I would love to read his letters addressed to his wife and to his children! In his days, however, and this is my point, this interesting man was a very commonplace personality, and his letters were devoid of all interest to anyone except the nearest of kin and even to them they were of merely passing interest.

Why should we small people write memoirs? Because there may come a time when no one will be able to supply the information which they contain. Goethe, the author of *Faust*, we know through his works, but it is Goethe, the student, who was no more than a bright young man in whom we are interested. The Coliseum, the arch of Titus, the needle of Cleopatra are certainly very valuable relics of art, but we need for a full comprehension of ancient life such relics as a shoemaker's shop, the notebook of a schoolboy, the interior of a tavern, a middle class people's kitchen, a plow, a stable and briefly just those things which in those times no one would have described or preserved, because everybody knew them.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Our rabbis were wise when they said: "Do not say: 'When I shall be at leisure, I shall study, for perhaps thou shalt never be at leisure.'" It was Goethe, if I am not mistaken, who said that a man should begin to write his memoirs at the age of fifty. It is a fact that he who began at the age of sixty committed many serious errors which can be proven as such from documents. Even fifty is late. I recollect, e. g. very dimly that I was acquainted with Theodore Herzl when we both were students in Vienna, 1879-1881. I also recollect that Herzl spoke to me of Judaism as a matter of no consequence, but in those days no one knew that there would ever be such a thing as a Zionist movement and that Herzl would be its leader. There were then about 5,000 or 6,000 students in the university of Vienna and most likely more than 1,000 members in the "Akademische Lesehalle" and I did not keep a diary, but today I am very sorry that I did not take down verbatim what Herzl said to me.

Just we Jews have in this respect a meagre literature. There is nothing of memoirs known to me previous to the sixteenth century, when the great "Shtadlan" Josel Rosheim wrote his book. Occasional incidents like the arrest of Yomtob Lipman Heller for blasphemy have prompted people to write down their experiences, but the oldest memoirs in our sense, are the naive descriptions of Jewish life in the seven-

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

teenth and eighteenth centuries by Glueckel of Hameln and Jacob Emden.

I have drifted into the "why," while I was to speak on the "when." It is never too early as we saw in the case of Goethe and as I can prove from numerous instances. Imagination is always encroaching upon our intellect. If I were to read to a class the story of Charlemagne and the Jew, and then ask them to write it down, you can depend upon it that everyone will add something of his own. Besides the unconscious working of the imaginative faculty, there is the frequent wilful misrepresentation of facts. Here is an excellent illustration. In the diary of empress Augusta, grandmother of the present emperor, the story is told that the empress regretted the growth of anti-Semitism so much, because it impeded the progress of the Christianization of the Jews. In this connection, the empress says that Zunz, at her teas had expressed his regret at having remained a Jew or, as he put it, at the great whim of his life. Zunz died March 18, 1886; Empress Augusta, Jan. 7, 1890; her diary was published by one of her ladies-in-waiting in 1892; consequently all evidence would seem to prove the reliableness of the narrative, but it is all false. Zunz never was at the court. Zunz was strongly opposed to apostasy and this cynical remark about a whim comes from Heine and has been adulterated by Karpeles. (*Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, 1893, p. 110.)

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

The author of this story mixed up Berthold Auerbach, to whom the empress spoke with regret of the growth of anti-Semitism, with Zunz and put into Zunz's mouth a witticism which Heine had used in regard to Zunz and which she had read in a changed form in Karpeles' book on Heine.

In 1886 a Spanish author, Menendez Pelayo, wrote an essay on Acosta published in the Madrid paper, *El Dia*, in which he includes a supposed letter of Daniel de Barrios dated May 25, 1641, in which de Barrios gives an account of Uriel Acosta's death and adds that R. Isaac Jesurun prophesied that Spinoza would end similarly. This letter was reprinted in the "*Vossische Zeitung*" of Berlin, July 18, 1886, and in a number of other papers. The facts are, that in 1641, Spinoza was only eight years old and that de Barrios was not in Amsterdam before 1660. In 1641 no one considered Spinoza's age a matter of any consequence and in 1660 no one believed that it ever would be of any interest to fix the date of the arrival in Amsterdam of de Barrios, who was one of the many fugitives from the Inquisition.

Moses Mendelssohn died Jan. 4, 1786, and King Frederick the Great, Aug. 17, of the same year. Two years later, Mendelssohn's friend, the publisher Nicolai, wrote a book "*Anekdoten ueber Friedrich II,*" Berlin, 1788. It would appear that time and persons should guarantee the genuineness of the reported facts. Yet amongst them is the following

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

popular anecdote. Marquis d'Argens handed to the king Mendelssohn's petition for a charter "*Schutzbrief*" in April, 1763, but the petition was pigeonholed. Mendelssohn felt very much humiliated and yielded only to d'Argens' urgent demands when he wrote another petition, July 12, 1763. D'Argens endorsed this petition with the words: "A philosopher who is a bad Catholic petitions a bad Protestant to grant the desired charter to a philosopher who is a bad Jew. There is too much philosophy in this petition that common sense should not grant it." This story found its way into Mendelssohn's works, edited by his grandson, I, 49, and from there into Kayserling's biography of Moses Mendelssohn, 1st ed. p. 126 and God knows into how many almanacs, but it is not true. First of all Mendelssohn's charter dates from March 25, 1762, and then we possess a letter from Mendelssohn's own hand dated July 7, 1761, in which he writes to his fiancée that he has to wait with his petition until the king shall have joined the army and that he hoped to obtain the charter without cringing before R. Veitel—Veitel Heine Ephraim, the influential mint-contractor—(L. Geiger, Berlin, 1688-1840, Berlin, 1893, vol. I, p. 393).

In the cases quoted, there is some wilful invention underlying the reports, but in most instances we find inaccuracies due to the workings of imagination and especially to the shifting of persons and facts,

due to the association of ideas. According to the story told by Graetz (*Geschichte*, vol. V, 3d ed. p. 183) Charlemagne called R. Kalonymus from Lucca to Mayence in 787 to establish there a congregation. The fact that the story is first told in the sixteenth century; that there are no documents proving the existence of Jewish congregations in Germany previous to the eleventh century; that the appointment of rabbis by the king is something unknown previous to the fifteenth century; goes to prove that it is not true. But it originated in the following way: A man by the name of Kalonymus had saved Emperor Otto II's life in Italy, 982. He was perhaps rewarded with some grant in Germany, and a later legend combined this Kalonymus with the more popular emperor Charlemagne. (*Zeitschrift fuer Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* vol. II, p. 82, et seq.)

This series could be endlessly prolonged. I shall give only two more instances because they are particularly striking. In 1785 a Roman Catholic, Joseph Steblicky, a respectable citizen in the town of Nicolai in Upper Silesia, converted to Judaism. He was a man of fifty years, of sober habits, and no outward inducement could have tempted him to take such an unusual step. One should imagine that such an exceptional occurrence should have induced people to write it down faithfully. But these are the facts. Steblicky died in 1807 and in 1816 a

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

man by the name of David Samostz published in German a report of Steblicky's conversion which the rabbi of Nicolai, Samuel Zuelz, had written in Hebrew, and which must have been written not more than thirty years after the event. It is full of fictitious features. Steblicky is made burgomaster, he goes to Amsterdam to be converted, the Christians of the town threaten to take his life, all of which, as the court-records prove, is not true. (L. Neustadt: Josef Steblicky, Breslau 1891.)

In Dr. Wise's biography, the following fact is reported as having taken place in 1846. "A movement was then on foot to erect a statue in Vienna to Joseph II. the liberal minded emperor. Turning to Auerbach, Fuerst asked: "Dr. Auerbach, what biblical verse would you suggest for this statue?" Quick as a flash Auerbach answered: "Joseph recognized his brethren, but they did not know him." (Gen. 43, 8.) (Selected writings of Isaac M. Wise, Cincinnati, 1900, p. 15.) This story cannot be true, the way it is told here. The statue of Joseph II. was erected in 1807, and this remark of Auerbach is found in a story called "Josef und Benjamin" in the first volume of his collection "Zur guten Stunde," Berlin, 1872, vol. I. when he says: of Joseph—not in regard to any monument—it may be said: "Joseph knew his brethren and they knew him not." I do not doubt that Dr. Wise told the story, but then, his recollections were not exact, and in order to show

how such things originate, I shall, contrary to my original intention, add three incidents of my own experience.

While in Buffalo attending the rabbinical convention I formed the acquaintance of a very interesting old gentleman, Mr. Kaiser. As he is like myself a Moravian, our conversation turned on topics connected with the Jewish history of our native province. In the course of this conversation, Mr. Kaiser said that he recollected how the congregations of Prague and of Nikolsburg quarreled over the privilege of burying the chief rabbi, Marcus Benedict, who had died in Karlsbad. Said I: "Mr. Kaiser, you are mistaken." Said he: "How can I be mistaken? I recollect it distinctly. I was then a boy fifteen or sixteen years of age." I looked at Mr. Kaiser, who is a very well preserved old man, with some astonishment and said: "How old are you, Mr. Kaiser?" "I am seventy-four," he replied. "Well," said I, "here you have it that you are mistaken. Marcus Benedict died Aug. 12, 1829, and you were then only three years of age. Therefore, you cannot remember the fact distinctly. Further, Benedict died in Karlsbad, where Jews were then not allowed to reside and, therefore, he was buried in Lichtenstadt. The question which arose was, whether he should be left in Lichtenstadt or transferred to Nikolsburg. The latter congregation wished its beloved pastor to rest among his flock, and the former

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

did not wish to give him up, presumably because his grave would have been a place of pilgrimage for the many pious Jews visiting Karlsbad. But I tell you, Mr. Kaiser, what you do recollect. You recollect the death of Benedict's successor, Nehemias (Nahum) Trebitsch, which occurred July 6, 1842, in Prague, his native city, strangely enough, while, like his predecessor, he was on his way to Karlsbad. In this case, the congregation of Nikolsburg was not so eager to obtain the body of the Zaddik and he found his resting place in Prague." Here it is, where Mr. Kaiser got mixed up and it is quite pardonable. If he had kept a diary he would not have been mistaken.

The next incident happened while I was in Cleveland, conversing with another "Landsman," Dr. Wolfenstein, who told me some interesting stories from his student-life in Vienna. Amongst them was the story—I shall not give the particulars, for they would surely be wrong—of a critic, who in 1861 or so about, had written a review of a new play, from what he had seen at the rehearsal. Next morning the review appeared in the *Neue Freie Presse*, but unfortunately, owing to the sudden sickness of an actor, the play had not been given. The story was the talk of the town and the talented critic lost his position. Said I: "Doctor, you are mistaken, for the *Neue Freie Presse* was not published until 1864 and therefore it either happened later or it was a differ-

ent paper." Dr. Wolfenstein was positive. In 1864 he was not in Vienna and it was surely the *Neue Freie Presse*. Fortunately he possessed a *Konversations Lexicon* and as this showed that the *Neue Freie Press* was actually not started before 1864, he had to admit that it was some other paper.

And now the last! In Cleveland I found in the Home for the Aged a man named Bernhard Weidenthal, a Bohemian, 85 years old. He had attended the Yeshibah of Nikolsburg and was very glad to see me, especially as for some time he had tried to recall the name of Reb Shmul Reb Phol' Koien's boy—who had died meantime as an old man—and no one could assist him. Now when I told him that I had known this boy as Reb Moishe Loeb, he was the happiest man on the western hemisphere. But now he had serious grievances. "Mr. Deutsch," he said, "I was longing to see you. You have once written in the *Deborah* that my teacher, Reb Nochem Trebitsch of blessed memory, was opposed to secular education. I tell you, you are wrong. He even advised me to get a secular education." "Well," said I, "Mr. Weidenthal, I have written a number of things in my life, and not only in the *Deborah*, which would better not have been written; but in this case, I plead not guilty. I took it from Leopold Loew's works, (II, 99 f.) where this statement is made. I naturally inferred that Loew who lived in Prossnitz, where Nehemias Trebitsch had been rabbi, knew the

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

facts." "No," said Mr. Weidenthal, "it is not true," and he gave me a whole story which was well connected and proved that the man's memory is excellent. "Mr. Deutsch," he said, "you have to change that." "Well," said I, "Nehemiah Trebisch, as a Zaddik, will come to life again in the resurrection, but as to the resurrection of the Deborah I am not so sure." Returning home, I found that the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, as early as 1838, (p. 196 and 365), contains two contradictory statements. According to one, Trebitsch was opposed to modern education, according to the other he was orthodox, but not an opponent of secular education.

The question, yet to be answered, is: "How to write memoirs." I would state it in general. Write them with consciousness of responsibility to posterity, write the full truth and if you cannot, or are afraid of it, say nothing.

V

THE HUMOR AND TRAGEDY OF "JEW TAXES"*

In an editorial comment on the death of Emperor Francis Joseph, the *Jewish World* refers to the ancient custom according to which the congregation of Pressburg presents the Austrian Emperor, or to speak more correctly, the King of Hungary, with Michaelmas geese on November 11. The London paper gives as a reason for this custom that the predecessor of the late Emperor once strolled through the ghetto of Pressburg, and scenting the odor of roast geese, entered a Jewish restaurant, where he tasted some of this famous product of the Jewish kitchen, and being highly pleased with it, ordered that the congregation present him every year with this delicacy. The story is, of course, without basis in fact, although the legend has been repeated with numerous variations. Some even go back as far as the reign of King Mathias, in the fifteenth century, while others, more modest, ascribe it to Joseph II, who was indeed wont to appear unexpectedly, in any part of his empire, and is said to have entered, incognito, a Jewish restaurant in the Press-

*The American Israelite, January 11, 1917.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

burg ghetto. Again others, with a touch of romanticism, ascribe it to Francis II, the grandfather of the late Emperor, who is said to have fled after the battle of Austerlitz, in 1805, and to have arrived very hungry at Pressburg, where he entered a kosher restaurant to obtain a meal. Needless to say, all these romantic stories are fiction without any historic basis.

No better is Guedemann's (*Geschichte des Erziehungswesens* III, 183) rationalistic attempt to explain this custom as having originated from an incident reported of Emperor Maximilian (1493-1519), to whom the German Jews made a coronation present of golden eggs. The Emperor, upon his ascent to the throne, had been approached by the enemies of the Jews, with the request to expel all Jews from Germany. When he received this present he was so highly pleased, that he said, it would be folly to kill the goose that laid the golden eggs. The report of such a generous present is highly suspicious. The truth is, that Maximilian's father, Frederick III (1440-1493), was a friend of the Jews, and repeatedly refused to act upon the hostile demands made by the Austrian "states," and that the latter expected from his successor a different policy, but were disappointed. These golden eggs have a counterpart in the story reported from Worms at the occupation of the city by the French in 1689, that the Jews presented the French general with

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

two geese that were filled with louis d'ors. A contemporary, Alderman Seidenbender, who is authority for this story, tries to prove from it that the Jews were the cause of the fall of the city (Loewenstein: *Blaetter fuer Juedische Geschichte und Literatur* III, 66). Needless to say there is not a particle of truth in the whole business.

Jews were the favorite object for taxation all through medieval times and down to the end of the eighteenth century, when the special Jew taxes were eventually abolished. They were first of all subject to excessive taxation, for which they had to be responsible as a body. Thus in the thirteenth century in Germany, the Jews paid one-twelfth of the total taxes of the empire, while they could hardly have formed one per cent of the total population. In addition to these "legal taxes" they were bled on every possible occasion when the royal treasury faced a deficit. Thus Emperor Rudolph, in the thirteenth century, imprisoned Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg, in order to compel the Jews to pay additional taxes, which they declared themselves unable to raise. Somewhat earlier King John of England imprisoned a Jew and ordered that every day one of his teeth be drawn—it is not reported that gas was used in the operation—until he would pay the sum demanded of him.

Finally, the Jews had to pay for anything in an emergency, and to furnish any article that was diffi-

cult to obtain. Thus a Jew in Brandenburg, an der Havel, was obliged to keep a stallion for the city and to furnish seven "Wispel" of oats per annum, 1416. (Ackermann: Geschichte der Juden in Brandenburg p. 23.) The Jews living under the protection of the commandery of the Teutonic Knights in Franconia had to furnish to every commander upon his election a "schoenen und kostbaren Leitpferd sammt Equipage," which in 1658 was compromised by a tax of, 400 florins. (Israelitische Wochenschrift, Strassburg 1910, No. 32.) The wife of the Landgrave of Hesse, on a tour through her country, on October 22, 1687, ordered that the Jews of every district have a fine saddle horse ready for her on that day (Jahrb. der Jued. Lit. Gesellschaft VI, p. 112, F. a. M., 1909). In order to keep the stable of their sovereign in good condition, the Jews of Hesse were required to buy all old saddle horses of the Landgrave, and to have good ones ready for their places. In 1745 they compromised this duty by a payment of 500 florins per annum (ib. VI, 112; Monatschr. f. G. u. W. d. J. 41, 514). From the same source we learn that the Jews of Hesse had to furnish hounds for the Landgrave, in lieu of which they paid in 1715 the sum of 3,000 florins. Hounds were also a favorite article of taxes in kind. The Jews of Prague had to provide them for the princely house of Piccolomini known to us from Schiller's "Wallenstein" (All. Z. d. J. 1869, p. 244). The Jews of Mergentheim had to maintain

eleven hounds for their lord, and in addition furnish relays for his coach (Jued. Pr., 1909, No. 19). The Jews of Hesse Cassel had to furnish a sort of feather duster used in chasing game. This tax was later changed into an annual payment of one florin in gold per capita (M. f. G. u. W. d. J. 41, 514). An order, issued in Prague (1652) directed the Jews of Prague to pay for the maintenance of the king's English hounds. The Jews of Peine, Hannover, a very small community, had to furnish six "Malter" of rye for the maintenance of two greyhounds, 1621 (ib. 1899, p. 572). The Baron of Osterberg, Bavaria, evidently was in straightened circumstances when he received Jews under his protection in 1802, for he stipulated that every Jew or Jewess pay on their marriage 11 florins as "glove money" for the "gnaedige Frau" or "Fraeulein" and furnish upon receiving his "Schutzbrief" a shirt and two florins in money (Meidel: Die Juden in Memmingen, p. 82). The papal court was especially liberal in devising taxes to be levied on the Jews. The Jews of Avignon, which, until the French Revolution was papal territory, had to furnish torches on St. John's Day (Revue des Études Juives, 53, pp. 272-276). Emperor Rudolph II, a queer character, who left the duties of the government in the hands of Philip Lang, a converted Jew, once received a pair of lions as a present from some African ruler. As the treasurer reported that there were no funds for their maintenance, the

Emperor ordered that the Jews of Prague furnish twenty-two pounds of fresh meat every day, 1593 (Bondy: *Zur Geschichte der Juden in Boehmen*, II, p. 668).

Any individual who conceived of a pet scheme, for which he had no money, would petition the sovereign to furnish it to him from a special tax imposed upon the Jews. P. B. Boetticher, Mayor of Pyritz, had designed a map of Palestine with a diagram of all battles that were fought there. Not having the means to publish it, he petitioned in 1765, Frederick the Great to compel every Jew of his kingdom to buy this map for two thalers, which would yield to the royal treasury approximately 300,000 thalers and of which the inventor of the scheme demanded only 20,000. The king declined the offer (*Isr. Fambl.* 1915, No. 25). This great ruler, who was very hostile to the Jews imposed upon them the duty to buy on any occasion, when they needed a privilege, as for instance a license to marry, 300 thalers' worth of china from the royal manufactory, and to export it (1769.) Similarly the Jews were taxed elsewhere for the benefit of a struggling industry. Thus Markgrave Karl Friedrich of Baden gives to a firm in Pforzheim, the privilege that every Jew, received into his protection, buy of them 200 florins' worth of goods and export them, 1778 (*M. f. G. u. W. d. J.* 1908, p. 79). Emperor Charles IV, who was always in bad financial straits and used to help himself by pledging the

Jews of various cities, which means their taxes, reserved for himself the right that the congregation of Frankfort should furnish him parchment, bedding and kitchen utensils, when he should reside in the city (Kracauer: *Polit. Gesch. d. Juden in F. a. M.*, p. 37). Similarly the Jews of Nuremberg had to furnish the Emperor with bedding and firewood, when he was in the city (Fraenk. Kurrier, March 29, 1908). King Charles of Naples (1266-1284) ordered the Jews of Bari and Trani to furnish him with the necessary furniture on his visit to these cities (Guedemann: *Erziehungswesen*, II, p. 153). When Marguerite Aldobrandini, grandniece of Pope Clement VIII, married, the Jews had to furnish a brocade canopy, 1600. (Vessillo, 1914, p. 387.) When Duke Alfred of Modena married (1579), the Jews had to pay a special tax to defray the cost of the festivities (ib. p. 386). The Jews of Rome had to maintain 2500 beds for the soldiers of the papal guards (Rev, d. E. J. LI, p. 340.) At least somewhat in harmony with Jewish ideals, was a tax imposed upon his Jewish subjects by King John II of France (1350-1365). They had to pay for the expense of writing a French Bible with commentaries (R. d. E. J. LV, p. 97).

In many places the Jews had to pay special taxes for fire protection. To avoid misunderstanding, it must be stated that this was not done because the Jews were suspected of starting fires in order to de-

fraud insurance companies, which did not exist, but it had a semblance of justice in the fact that the fire companies were composed of volunteers, and the Jews were not admitted to them. In Ober Hesse every Jew had to furnish a bucket for the fire brigade, 1750. (Jahrb. d. J. L. G. VI, p. 112). In Berlin the Jews paid in the eighteenth century fifteen thalers at every fire that occurred in the city (Geiger: *Gesch. d. Juden in Berlin*, II, p. 61, Freund: *Emancipation d. Juden in Preussen* I, p. 23). In Mayence, the Jews had to keep fifteen fire buckets in readiness, 1661. (Salfeld: *Vorboten d. Emancipation*, p. 349). Frederick William I of Prussia was especially fond of tall soldiers. As militarism had not yet developed, he had to depend on the enlistment of volunteers, and for this purpose the Jews since 1728, had to pay 4,800 thalers per annum for the enlistment of "Lange Kerls" (Freund: *Emancipation* I, p. 23). In Negroponte, Greece, which in medieval times was under the rule of Venice, the Jews had to pay for the maintenance of the fortification (1304). They also had to pay for the additional expense, incurred by the city, when the salary of the aldermen was increased in order to compensate them for the prohibition to engage in trade (Miller: *The Latins in the Levant*, p. 209). Frankfort o. M. was favored with a list of taxes which almost fills a book. As a curious instance, which has some bearing on our main topic, it may be mentioned that they had to furnish the

officials of the building department, up to 1703, with lemons, which in those days did not have the significance that they have now in America (Festschrift, Philanthropin II, p. 399).

St. Michael's Day was a favorite time for collecting taxes. As early as 1227, Viscount Aimeri IV, of Narbonne, imposed upon a Jew the duty to furnish a certain amount of grain on that day (R. d. E. J. LVIII, p. 82). In Koenigsbach, Baden, the Jews had to furnish six pounds of hemp every year to their lord (Lewin: *Gesch. d. Badischen Juden*, p. 172). Probably hemp was a scarce commodity in those days. In Hesse, just as is the case now, fats had become scarce in 1718, and a special tax of 1,200 florins per annum was imposed on the Jews to pay for the increased price of candles and soap. A somewhat comical tax is reported from the same country as late as 1807. The Jews of Wannfried had to furnish to the pastor, to the judge, and to the governor, each a silver spoon every year (*All. Ztg. d. Judenthums*, 1865, p. 383). In Poland, a specialty of Jewish taxation was the duty to furnish wax for church candles, and spices to the officials, evidently because in those days spices were hard to obtain. Thus the Jews of Inowratzlaw, now Hohensalza, Posen, had to furnish to the "Starosta" six "stein" of wax, one pound of pepper, four pounds of crocus, and similar quantities to the provost of the cathedral (*Zeitschr. d. Hist. Ges. f. d. Prov. Posen* XV, 1, pp. 43, 49). The

constitution of Cracow, 1595, provides for a special overseer of this spice tax (Jahrb. d. J. L. G. X. p. 327). In Carpentras, France, which was also under papal rule, the Jews were accused of having crucified a dummy made of straw. To make atonement for this supposed mockery of the Christian religion they had to pay for an iron crucifix, and were annually taxed for its maintenance until 1793 (Vessillio 1915, p. 367). Such a crucifix, erected at the expense of the Jews for supposed blasphemy, is seen on the historic bridge of Prague, and also in some other place. For the fun of the carnival the Jews of Pisa had to furnish the university students with confetti, until 1783 (Vessillo 1907, p. 76). The sufferings of the Jews in Rome during the carnival season, where they were made the sport of the mob, and from which they had to redeem themselves by excessive taxes, are well known to American readers, through Zangwill's "Dreamers of the Ghetto."

The law requiring Jews to furnish geese to their rulers, therefore, presents but one of the many taxes imposed upon the Jews. It is reported from Salzburg, under the rule of Bishop Pilgrim (1364-1396), (Der. Isr. 1912, No. 30), from Altenstadt an der Iller, Bavaria, in 1719 (ib. 1898, p. 101), from Horburg, Alsace 1723 (Ginsburger, Les Juifs des Horburg, Paris 1904), from various places in the Grand-duchy of Baden, as late as 1814 (Lewin: Gesch. d. Badi-schen Juden, p. 172), from Osterberg, Bavaria in 1802

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

(Meidel: *Juden in Memmingen*, p. 82), from Schnaittach, Bavaria in 1645 (*Der. Isr.* 1878, p. 1229), from Illereichen, Bavaria, in 1789 (Meidel, p. 77), from Mayence, in 1724, where in addition, they had to help maintain the students of the Jesuit College, to furnish fish during the Lent season to the Franciscans, the Capuchins and the Jesuits, in addition to furnishing bedding for the bishop's hunting lodge at Aschaffenburg, during the hunting season. This sufficiently explains the fact that the origin of the custom in Pressburg is but a relic of such a tax, which the Jewish community in later times considered as a privilege, and therefore maintains it to this day.

VI

THE MAIMONIDES PRAYER MYTH.*

Editor Israelite:

Sir—Rev. Madison C. Peters in one of the editions of his book, "Justice to the Jew," quotes a prayer for physicians by Maimonides. Can you tell me where the original can be found, or, at least in what authoritative work on history, literature or medicine can it be found, and oblige?

Yours very truly,

Wm. W. Golden,

Supt. Davis Memorial Hospital,
Elkins, W. Va., June, 1914.

REPLY.

This so-called prayer of Maimonides is an old hoax. It was actually written by Marcus Herz, a prominent physician of Berlin (1747-1803), who attended Moses Mendelssohn in his last illness and, while in his day quite prominent as practitioner and lecturer on philosophy, has won lasting fame through his wife, Henriette, a society leader who survived him more than forty years. This prayer was translated into

*The American Israelite, June 25, 1914.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Hebrew by Isaac Euchel, one of Mendelssohn's collaborators in the Bible translation (1756-1804). It appeared for the first time in the Hebrew periodical "Meassef" (VI, pp. 242-244) in 1790, as the work of Herz. For reasons quite inconceivable to me, Ludwig Philippson published it in his "Weltbewegende Fragen" (II, pp. 159-160) Leipsic, 1869, as the prayer of a Jewish physician of the twelfth century. As the translation is so accurate that it could not have been made from memory, my only explanation is that somebody else must have published it before, making a false statement as to its origin. I have not been able to discover the source of Philippson's authority. From Philippson's popular book it was incorporated into the popular "Magazin fuer die Literatur des Auslands," published by a Jew, Joseph Lehmann, and so Haeser embodied it in his "Geschichte der Medizin," I, p. 837, Jena, 1875. Having thus been recognized by a standard publication it was accepted by Julius Pagel, professor of the history of medicine at the Berlin University (1851-1912) also a Jew, in his essay on Maimonides as physician, which forms part of the memorial volume, "Moses Ben Maimon," edited by the Gesellschaft zur Foerderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums, I, p. 244, Leipsic, 1908. Following all this its authenticity could no more be doubted than the authenticity of the gospel of St. John. The *Israelite* (March 12, 1908) gave it its seal of approval, although I con-

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

tested it in the subsequent issue, but repeatedly since it has been proclaimed as being written in distinctly Maimonidean spirit. Recently I wrote a letter to the editor of "Ost und West," who had published it as Maimonidean. He thanked me, but preferred not to publish it. As the very popular "Medizinische Wochenschrift" of Berlin published it in 1902, and any number of medical journals reprinted it, no amount of argument will rob Maimonides of the credit for having written this typically sweet-lemonade prayer, characteristic of the rationalistic tendencies of the era of "Aufklaerung," and I still have hopes that one hundred years hence, somebody will credit Herodotus or at least Rabbi Jose Ben Halafta, the genuine author of Seder Olam, with my "Foreign Notes."

VII

JOURNALESE*

Men of genius are best recognized by the readiness with which the public takes up their winged words. Whatever we may think of Roosevelt, whose picture, to quote the German poet, is swaying in history, owing to partisanship, his hat in the ring, his muckraker, his armageddon, and various other expressions show, like the popularity of the teddybear, the hold which the man has on the nation. Bismarck's greatness may be gauged by similar experiences. One of his famous sayings is: "Newspapers are printer's ink to me," and another is that "journalists are people who have missed their calling in life." Israel Zangwill, another brilliant man, is wonderfully happy in coining popular phrases. To him international vocabulary is indebted for the invention of the term "Yiddish." It is the best name for a dialect which in its previous form of Judeo-German is awkward, and, under the name of jargon, unjust. Zangwill once said with regard to certain American Jewish literature, that it was "journalese" to him. In this way he expresses tersely a widespread view of many people who look upon journalism as sloven-

*The American Israelite, September 2, 1914.

ly from the point of view of its literary form, and as superficial from the point of view of the information contained.

With all due respect to Bismarek, it is much easier to fill the position of presiding judge of a court of appeal, or even to be the head of a department in the foreign office than to be an efficient editor. These people have time to consult works of reference, and always have the advice and assistance of specialists at hand. Finally, they have time before passing on any question. It is different with the publicist. He must be ready within a few hours, and rarely has any other help at hand than that which a general encyclopedia can furnish. Jewish journalism, being, as a rule, confined to weekly publications has, perhaps, in the majority of instances, more time than the daily paper permits, but it is equally hampered by the difficulty of obtaining ready information, and, further, labors under the grave responsibility of the mischief which incorrect information or tactlessness may produce. The work of painstaking scholars like Zunz and Steinschneider certainly deserves admiration, but they had time to do their work, they could submit the proof sheets of their books to friends, and, if they made mistakes—and they surely did make some—they had the forgiveness of every fairminded reader who knows how deeply he is indebted to them for the mass of correct information. The journalist has a very critical

public, one with a short memory and inclined to be ungrateful.

Jewish journalism is very young. The small sheets that were published in Yiddish in Amsterdam at the end of the seventeenth century are hardly to be classed as newspapers in any but the historic sense. The haphazard information and the combination of magazine and newspaper found in our earliest publications of the nineteenth century, such as "Sulamith" or "Voice of Jacob," would in our days be ridiculous. It is only since the appearance of "Die Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums" in 1837 that real journalism began to develop. Even then the development was slow, as was still more the case in the earliest years of the "Jewish Chronicle." The real news was almost exclusively taken from the secular papers, and what correspondents furnished was mostly small talk. The contributors were people who worked either for the love of the cause or for self-advertisement. It is, for instance, remarkable that the "Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums" did not take notice of the death of Herz Homberg. Here was a man eighty-two years old, probably the last survivor of the intimate circle of Moses Mendelssohn, a man who had been tutor in Mendelssohn's family and a witness to the policy of Emperor Joseph II, and who earnestly strove to improve the condition of the Jews by education. In our day every Jewish paper would devote columns

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

to his obituary and thus preserve the testimony of contemporaries which would have been of invaluable help to the historian, but is now definitely lost.

The reading public of a newspaper is not supposed to be interested in posterity. It may even be said that history is a by-product of journalism, but without contemporaries gathering the events posterity will be the loser, too. Take as an instance the Frank case. What inestimable value is found in the collection of newspaper comments, such as the "New York Times" devoted to the tragedy! How easy will it be with a complete list of the chronologically arranged series of events to study the case in detail!

Again, let us make a concession to the Philistine who says, "Why shall I care for posterity since posterity never cared for me?" We, therefore, may illustrate the value of newspapers to current activities by two recent instances. Some anti-semitic had noticed that eleven Jews were employed in clerical work in military offices in the city of Constance. He wrote an anonymous letter to the department of war complaining that the Jews, with their money, are able to dodge the dangerous field service, preferring to perform their military duty in comfortable and safe offices. An investigation was ordered, and it was found that these eleven men were physically unfit for duty in the field, that the Jewish community of Constance, numbering 580 souls, had 110 men in the field, of whom fourteen had been killed in

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

action and nine decorated with the iron cross. Figuring that more than twenty per cent of the Jewish community serve their country in one capacity or other, that more than ten per cent of those in the field sacrificed their lives, that eight per cent were decorated for bravery, and that it is certainly to be presumed that the conditions at Constance are not different from the average, it is well established that the Jew is doing his patriotic duty at least as well as any other class of the population. The newspaper furnished this information.

Another very frequent charge against the Jew is that he shuns physical labor, or, as one of our Christian contemporaries not so long ago put it, that he prefers getting money to making it. Our newspapers last year, in discussing conditions in the overcrowded districts of the Russian pale, gave us the fact that 2,224 Jews were employed in the various manufactories in the district of Lodz, a figure which does not include 3,000 girls working at various minor occupations in the factories. The weekly wages ranged from five roubles for a girl's work to eighteen roubles earned by a foreman. One must take into consideration that Jewish labor meets with two difficulties. The Christian manufacturer will not employ Jewish help, and the Sabbath observance is a serious obstacle even in the way of the laborer seeking employment with a Jewish firm. There is still another difficulty in the fact that a Jewish em-

ployer who cannot employ Jewish labor exclusively is compelled for political reasons to discriminate against Jews if he wishes to avoid labor troubles. Another lesser but equally important item the New York papers of June 28 reported. Two Jewish painters fell from a scaffold in Rivington street, one being killed and the other seriously injured. The anti-semite, making charges against the Jews as parasites, never cares to quote facts. He takes his task very easy and speaks in terms to imply that all Jews are millionaires who accumulated their fortunes by stock-broking, exploitation of labor, of crime and vice, by fraudulent bankruptcy and arson. The publicist presenting the Jewish side in the argument has the harder task of meeting these general accusations with actual facts. His task becomes still more difficult because, while the anti-semitic appeals to a public that is already convinced even before reading the argument, the Jewish apologist is compelled to combat this prejudice in addition.

Does our Jewish public appreciate the work which the journalist is doing? We prefer not to give the answer directly but leave it to every reader to ascertain how many of his friends and neighbors will answer his question whether they read a Jewish paper with a sneer, one saying with a supercilious smile, "I don't read a Jewish paper," and another insinuating that he pays his subscription as a matter of charity, saying, "It comes to the house but I hardly have the

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

time to look into it." Very often these very same people have time to read the trashiest novel in a magazine that has no literary merit, either in its form of expression or in its ideas, and surely they have time for other pleasures. Very few realize that the support of a Jewish paper is a service to the cause nowise inferior to the support given to the synagogue and to educational and charitable institutions. At no time, perhaps, has this duty been of greater importance than at this critical moment in our history. Let us not forget that the outside world cares very little for us. The British House of Lords will stage an indignation debate on cruelties perpetrated against the Armenians, but ignores the atrocities committed by Russia against her Jews. The secular press is no longer interested. We must follow Hillel's maxim, "If I do not work for myself who else will?"

VIII

LIBRARY CHAT.*

One of the most charming things which Isaac M Wise has written is a series of essays called "Aus Meiner Buecherei," and published about ten years ago in *Die Deborah*. There is a peculiar charm in the still converse held by a student with his books. They are whispering to him of the intimate events of the past, they are suggesting to him plans for the future, they are soothing him in days of trouble and quickening his energy when his will power relaxes.

Such a feeling has to be lived through in order to be understood. Even intelligent people fail to grasp it. It is nearly thirty years since one of my older classmates in Breslau, Dr. Emanuel Fuchs, died. His parents and brothers had come to the funeral, and before they left, wanted to see the *Seminar*. As a special attraction they were shown in the library the alcoves containing the donation of Dr. Bernhard Beer, the life-long friend of Zacharias Frankel. Their surprise at seeing this large collection grew into amazement when they were told that these books constituted only one-half of the man's library, the other half containing his collection of secular

*The American Israelite, Feb. 8, 1906.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

works, having gone to the University of Leipsic. "Nu, is das nicht a Shetuss?" one of the party exclaimed; "can the man have read all these books?"

They were plain country folks, and they thought books, being an expensive luxury, ought to be read from cover to cover before being placed on the shelves, just as they would not buy a new garment before the old one had served its time limit. Even intelligent people are of the opinion that as long as you have enough books to keep you busy, there is no need of collecting others, and therefore it might not be altogether superfluous to talk of the needs of a Jewish library.

We are all to some extent historically educated. Because of the rapid changes produced in our modern life by inventions, and because of the growth of large cities, buildings, house furnishings and our whole environment are undergoing a constant change. This produces in us a longing for retaining symbols of the past. There is not a Jewish home of a well-to-do family in our days which has not in the parlor a brass Sabbath lamp, a Shofar, an illuminated Megillah and the like. Of course, with many it is merely a fashion. Silversteins have to have it because Goldsteins have it. Still, this instinct of mimicry would not suffice to explain that fact, if we do not appreciate the sentiment underlying it.

Collections in private houses can not do away

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

with the needs of museums, systematically arranged by experts as a factor in public education. I have just recently received through Rabbi Rubinstein in Baltimore a Mohel's record, begun in 1697 and carried on by his successors until the beginning of the nineteenth century. The prayers are written on parchment and an awkward pen and ink drawing of a Milah is a highly interesting piece of naive art, besides being instructive in showing the costumes of Dutch Jews in the seventeenth century. A scrap of paper, containing a receipt of fifteen *Silbergroschen*, which the Herr Vorsteher, Dr. Beer, paid for the privilege of opening the ark, is another historical curio in our days, although not more than fifty years old. A donation by Mrs. Louis S. Levi of an autograph of Berthold Auerbach brings home to the observer the fine painter of country life whose good fortune it was to be beaten by a much inferior man, in his competition for a Hamburg pulpit and so to be forced into literature.

From the collection of Temple Emanuel we possess a Mahzor, printed on vellum at Bologna in 1541. Think of the many reminiscences connected with such a book that has served worshippers for over three centuries. When it was printed the censorship was not established. About twenty years later a monk went over it, carefully erasing everything that seemed objectionable to Christians, and affixing

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

his signature at the end "Revista da me Fra Giovanni, O. Pr." To possess a Hebrew book without such a mark was a crime punishable with fine and imprisonment. What a vivid object lesson this is in studying the recently again so much lauded kindness of the Pope towards us, and in understanding the charge that Reform means apostasy! The Dominican friar who revised the Mahzor was a Meshummad and there were hundreds like him. An important erasure was made in the "Alenu," where the original text reads: "*We thank the Lord of the Universe who has not made our lot like that of the Gentiles, for they prostrate themselves before what is naught and vanity, and pray to a God who cannot help, while we bow before the king of Kings, etc.*" The words in italics have been erased by the censor and later editions were not allowed to print them. Two hundred years ago upon the denunciation of a Meshummad that the Jews still recited these words and spat out when they mentioned the God "Lo Yoshia" (who can not save), the King of Prussia ordered policemen to the synagog to watch that this should not be done, and in every letter of protection granted to a Jew it was expressly enjoined that "he shall refrain from blaspheming our most gracious Lord and Savior under penalty of incurring our disgrace and forfeiting this letter." The sight of such

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

a book is a vivid object lesson in Jewish—yea, in the world's—history.

There are about thirty, perhaps fifty thousand books of Jewish interest. Of every one of these books something might be said which is of general interest. Say, *e. g.*, a year ago, I bought at an auction in Amsterdam a little pamphlet of about twelve pages for one dollar. A fancy price, indeed! But it is worth it to me. It contains the story of how a devil was driven out of a young man in Nikolsburg, the congregation fasting, chanting Psalms during the exorcism, the devil finally leaving his abode from the tips of the young man's little finger—you could observe the notch—and flying through the window. This happened in 1785. One of the Beth Din present was Mordecai Benet, the famous opponent of Reform. He also indorsed the book as sound religious literature. Some liberal-minded men must have objected to it, for a little later an imperial edict prohibited the printing of such ghost stories—of course, only Jewish—while Catholic devils could be exorcised without any hindrance upon the part of his imperial and royal majesty's government. I came to Nikolsburg eighty-three years later. You could not have obtained a Minyan for such a devil affair, you could not have gotten my Talmud teacher to tackle such a ghost, although he was a graduate (Morenu) of

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Mordecai Benet's Yeshiba. Mordecai Benet's great-grandson, who was a classmate of mine, would not have been able to recite the Psalms necessary for expelling the devil without a flaw. All this philosophy of history is taught by this small pamphlet.

IX

PLOWDEN IN THEOLOGY*

Probably all nations have proverbs ridiculing that selfishness which applies a different standard to the same act when done by ourselves and when done by others. The Romans said, "Quod licet Jovi, non licet bovi." The English say, "The case is altered, quoth Plowden," and the Germans, "Ja Bauer das ist etwas anderes." In no branch of human intellect is this selfish discrimination more evident than in liberal theology.

The orthodox Protestant and the Roman Catholic need no defense. Pope Pius IX, in 1864 issued his *Syllabus Errorum*, containing some seventy statements, which are declared damnable errors, and anyone who holds one of them, *anathema sit*. Luther, or any good Puritan holding to the Westminster Confession, is equally positive. Luther does not like scholastic philosophy. Belief cannot be demonstrated, but "Wer glaubt, wird selig." Calvinists declare that Catholicism is paganism, and that its devotees believe in a "baked god." Every one is as sure of his ground as the drummer who sells a well known brand of champagne. All he has to prove is

*The American Israelite, Oct. 19, 1916.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

that his goods are entitled to their label, for if they are genuine, their superior quality needs no demonstration. It is only the fellow with a new article to sell who wants to prove to his customer that his goods are home made, and union made, and that the other fellow sells goods that are manufactured by child labor sold at ruinous prices. Our liberal Christian theologians also are past masters in such drummers' tricks, especially when presenting Judaism. The procedure is an easy one. Christianity is so presented, that features which the apologist does not like, healing the dumb and the paralytic by driving out the evil spirit, the contempt for industrial activity, for thrift and the virtues of family life, are ignored or declared to be passing phases for the sake of accommodation to the local ideas. Other statements like the fatherhood of God are exalted away above their actual meaning, or even interpreted in a meaning absolutely foreign to the original author.

With Judaism the procedure is just the opposite. When Jacob deceives his father to obtain his blessing, this folklore story is promoted to the rank of a fundamental creed, to be contrasted with Jesus' saying, "Forgive them, for they know not what they do," but never with his saying to the Canaanitish woman who implores his miraculous healing power in a loathsome chronic infirmity: "It is not meet to take the bread from the children and give it to the

dogs." When the Torah says, "God visiteth the sin of the fathers upon children and the children's children, to the third and fourth generation," a fact which hospitals, insane asylums and penitentiaries prove every day, then Jehovah is the god of vengeance, a sort of giant Bedouin who likes nothing better as an ornament to his house than a pyramid of the skulls of his enemies: but when the gospel records the cry of the Jews, "His blood come upon us and our children," as justification for the unparalleled sufferings which Christianity, praised as the religion of love, has meted out to the supposed believers in a religion of hatred, then the case is altered.

When the Hebrew Bible gives a law, "Eye for eye," which is a crude form of justice no worse than that still practiced in the days of Cromwell, this one section of a criminal code is promoted to the rank of the fundamental principle of Jewish ethics. When, however, Jesus predicts that people who will not believe certain irrational doctrines (which our liberal theologians do not believe any more than did Jesus' Jewish contemporaries), then the case is altered. But did he not say: "By their fruits ye shall know them?" Let us quote one fact out of hundreds of thousands. In many dioceses of Christendom the believers in the improved ethics of "Ye have heard * * but I say unto you," required a Jew to stand at the door of the cathedral so that the bishop after mass could slap his face. In Toulouse,

in the eleventh century, on such an occasion the bishop hit so hard that the eyes of the unfortunate Jew popped out and in falling to the ground his brains were dashed out. After that time the Jews compromised with the bishop, paying an annual sum of money to be freed from the humiliating ceremony. This also helped them to obtain an order that the people, who upon the signal given by the bishop used to storm the Jewish quarter, butchering and pillaging the inhabitants, were warned not to use any weapons except stones. They evidently had used axes, scythes and swords before. I admit that I am not convinced of the muscular strength of the archbishop who with one slap of his hand made a man's eyes pop out and the man fall bodily to the ground, but is it not just as bad that the monk who wrote the chronicles in which this fact (?) is reported invented it out of Christian zeal? Is not the fact—undisputed and indisputable, continuing in some parts of Europe to this day—that Christians with the inspiration of the Easter service, exchanging the greeting, "Christ has arisen," celebrating the crowning act of him who said, "Father, forgive them," who taught, "I say unto you, do good to them that persecute you," rush from church to the street, torturing helpless old women to death and dashing infants out of the windows to the pavement? This ought to settle the question. Suppose (which we are not ready to grant) that the gospel contains the

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

highest expression of morality, what good did it do, if the organization, based on these teachings, taught on its part that it was a meritorious deed in the sight of the God, who so loved the world that he sent his only beloved son, to slap the face of an absolutely innocent man in public, and to kill, maim and rob helpless individuals who were no more responsible for Jesus' crucifixion (provided it ever took place) than Dr. Lyman Abbott is responsible for the brutal killing of that Jew in Toulouse?

For he is the venerable exponent of liberal Christianity with whom we have to deal. In a discussion of what prayer means to the liberal Christian, Dr. Abbott, in *The Outlook* of September 13, contrasts "two kinds of prayer," that of Jacob who prays for bread to eat and raiment to put on, and that of Paul, who encourages the brethren in Ephesus with the announcement of his prayer, "that ye may be strengthened with power through his spirit in the inward man." This is sheer pulpit cant, although one does not like to apply such harsh word to such a sympathetic and venerable figure as Dr. Abbott. Its real meaning is: The Jew knew only a material prayer; his God was a boss who would give him a well-paying job if he kept himself remembered until a vacancy occurred. Even the "Preacher King" had only the one life prayer: Give me, give me houses, orchards, silver and gold.

The Christian prays for "fulness of God;" he

does not care for pleasure, like wicked old Solomon in his well-stocked harem. On the reverse, he takes pleasure in "infirmities, in reproaches, in persecutions, in distresses," and other things that count only in heaven. Of course he also prays "Give us our daily bread," as did the "preacher king," in a distinct way, when he desired neither poverty nor riches, but enough bread to sustain him, but this is an entirely different case. The Christian, when he prays for things material, does not mean it; he means fullness, spirit inwardness, and other "Schmoos" that you don't have to understand, as long as it sounds like something, while the Jew, when he prays, "Search me, O God, and know my heart," to which we could add many others, like "Whom have I in heaven beside thee, and with thee I desire nothing on earth," the case is altered.

The grave injustice, perhaps done unintentionally, but more likely with the feeling that something must be done to prop the tottering structure of liberal Christianity, leads simply to this: to pass by all in Judaism which presents in clear, often more impressive language, that which is supposed to be real Christianity; to underscore in Christianity that which we like, though we have read it into the text, and to underscore a misinterpreted conception of Judaism, to paint as black as we need it to show to the dullest eye the difference between Lucifer's complexion and that of the union Hallelujah Chorus.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

First of all, ought we not know them by their fruits? Most of the magnates who have created the economic condition which places our country all the time before a crisis portending civil war, are orthodox Christians. You find them like Rockefeller in the Baptist, like Gould, Morgan and Belmont in the Episcopal church, which seems to hold the largest part of Paul's disciples, believing that not the treasures that rust and moth will destroy, but only distresses bring real happiness. But we find them also in the Methodist church, where they find happiness in manufacturing cardui, a schnapps purporting to be a patent medicine; we find them in the Presbyterian church, where a man like Russell Sage, until his ninetieth year, went every day to his seat in the stock exchange, though he never actually had to care for the morrow. You find among them, quite exceptionally, a Unitarian like H. H. Rogers, though as a rule it is rather plebeian to be a member of a liberal church. The only question is, if Christianity is and can be a real force in shaping man's spiritual life, and if it taught people "the power in the inward man with all the fullness of God," why did the miners in Colorado have to be shot down to protect the outward man in John D. Rockefeller and the fullness of the safe in the offices of the Standard Oil Company?

We might go on indefinitely enumerating people with admiration for Paul and contempt for Jacob,

who, to use the terminology of Dr. Abbott, pray "give me" in stead of "make me." "Give me" is the prayer of the wily Jewish Jacob; "make me" is the prayer of the prodigal son who prays, "Make me one of thy servants." We shall have to say something about that Midrash which Abbott substitutes for the altogether different meaning of the New Testament text. We shall see, first, how the rabbis in the Midrash interpret Jacob's trick in obtaining the birthright. They say Jacob knew through his prophetic gift that the first born were destined to be called into the service of God, and therefore he craved for it, obtaining it easily from Esau, who frankly confesses he does not care for it. You see how you can read idealism into anything. Much better is another Midrash on Jacob's attitude. Scripture tells us that he was left alone on the other side of the Yabbok, when he fought with the angel. The rabbis asked the correct question "How could Jacob remain alone when he successively forded the river with the members of his family?" The answer is: he returned to fetch some household goods, acting like the righteous who will risk their lives for the sake of their property because they are afraid of temptation to become dishonest through need. Is not this Midrash a more natural interpretation of Jacob's prayer? He prays for bread to eat and raiment to put on, not for wealth and power, but, like Solomon, for the bread he needs. He adds the prayer that

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

God bring him back in peace to his father's house. He does not go out with the spirit of the Spanish conquistadores, who while driven by the thirst of gold, claimed they wanted to subject the whole world to the Holy Virgin. Jacob longs for the home of his fathers, though one of the charges against his descendants is that they are nomads, lacking the home sentiment, "Bodenstaendigkeit." Then he promises, of the modest fortune which he expects from God to whom he prays, one-tenth to good purposes. Ten per cent of the gross income of all the believers in the inspiration of the Epistle to the Ephesians would go a long way to settle our labor troubles. And with all that, we have read nothing into the prayer of Jacob which is not actually found in it.

Let us read the New Testament story of the son who squandered his father's heritage, and in order to save himself from starvation would work on his father's farm as a hired man. The outward meaning is clear. Conditions at home were too narrow for the ambitious young man; he was seized with something like the wild west fever, lost all he had, and when he was completely broke he thought of his father again; feeling that the servants in his father's house were better off than he.

True, it is a parable. The younger son is the heathen world that will come to the father they had forsaken. But surely the insignificant phrase,

“make me as one of thy hired servants,” is not the pivotal point, contrasting the moral lesson with Jacob’s “give me.” Nor had the Preacher King prayed, as Abbott put it, for knowledge, pleasures, houses, servants. Praying is not his habit at all. He merely tried the various roads to happiness—learning, wealth, power—and being disgusted with all, cried “All is vanity.” Only for the sake of propping up liberal Christianity, Jacob’s and Solomon’s, cases are altered, quoth Plowden.

X

HIGHER AND LOWER ANTI-SEMITISM.*

The late Dr. Schechter coined the very clever phrase "higher anti-semitism." It is patterned after the commonly accepted term "higher criticism." The latter meant the attempt to determine the origin of a certain book of the Bible or of a certain doctrine by internal evidence, and is distinguished from lower criticism which concerns itself with textual questions alone. Higher anti-semitism is the more or less conscious anti-semitism of scholars, who, while they would shrink in horror from the atrocities of a pogrom, are guided in their scientific studies by an unreasoning antipathy to everything Jewish.

Julius Wellhausen, whose name is typical for advanced criticism, or Friedrich Delitzsch, to whom the whole of the Old Testament is an Assyrian religion, are good specimens of this type. Their method is simple. Everything Jewish is interpreted in the narrowest sense the text will bear, and everything Christian is presented in the broadest interpretation which an apologetic conception of the text will permit. One of the most popular terms that

*The American Israelite, January 26, 1916.

owe their origin to this sentiment is "henotheism" as contradistinguished from monotheism. For centuries the Jews were considered the pioneers of the latter doctrine, which declares the belief in one God as the basis of all ethical and religious conception. This world is a unit, created and governed by one spiritual force, and therefore all humanity is one. Any Sabbath School child knows that the "Sh'ma Yisrael" has been inserted in the ritual for all occasions as the expression of this fundamental truth, and as the guiding force of truly Jewish concept. Probably the majority of Jews who have received a fair religious training are familiar with the Talmudic statement that God created only one man in the beginning, so that no one should have the right to say: "I am of a higher descent than you!" Liberal Christian theologians of our day claim that Judaism did not teach this idea, but spoke only of one God as the God of Israel, who loves his people, but hates all other nations in the manner of a whimsical despot. This doctrine is called "henotheism." It is true there are passages in the Bible and in Rabbinic literature which corroborate or seem to corroborate such an idea, and by emphasizing such passages and by ignoring all others, it is easy to make such defamatory statements with a semblance and pretense of scientific correctness. The exactly opposite is done in the case of Christianity. Everything unfavorable is interpreted away, or entirely

ignored, or declared a later interpolation. Everything favorable, though it may have its exact parallels in the Old Testament or in Rabbinic literature, is typically Christian.

When Jephtha, who is represented in the Bible as a chief of brigands, says, "That which Chemosh, Thy God, giveth thee to possess, thou shalt possess, and whomsoever the Lord our God, has dispossessed from before us them we will possess" (Judges 11, 24), he lays down a fundamental doctrine of Israel for all time. When, however, Moses, the teacher of Israel, than whom there never was any greater nor ever will be according to Jewish dogma, said, "Know therefore this day and lay it to thine heart that the Lord he is God in Heaven above and upon the Earth beneath. There is none else" (Deut. 4, 39), and when this passage is found in the daily prayers of the Jews, our higher critics for all of their liberalism ignore this fact altogether.

When Jesus is quoted as saying, "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called 'Sons of God'" (Mat. 5, 9), this is the undisputed and original teaching of Christianity. When, however, the same author quotes Jesus as saying, "Think not that I came to make peace on the Earth. I came not to send peace but a sword," (ib. 10, 34), this is entirely ignored or declared to be a later invention put into the mouth of Jesus by some fanatic. When in the Talmud Rabbi Simeon ben Yohai, who lived at the

time of the Bar Kochba rebellion said, "The best of the Goyim kill and the best snake crush its head" (Mekiltha Par. IV.), this is irrefutable proof that the Jews are vindictive and that they know of no ethical law which binds them to other nations by the principles of humanity. Nobody remembers then that an American general once said that the only good Indian is a dead Indian; that the Inquisition put to death in Spain alone, according to Llorente's computation 300,000 people and that even if Llorente exaggerated, we know it to be a fact that in the little town of Guadeloupe, which numbered about 3,000 people, 53 persons were burned at the stake in a single year, (1485). We know also that in the city of Seville during forty years 40,000 people were burned at the stake. We know also that Pope Sixtus IV, congratulated Thomas Torquemada, the butcher who is responsible for the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, on his "great achievements for the glory of the church." We further know that on June 29, 1867, Peter Arbues, "the bitter persecutor of heresies" as his admirers called him, was declared a saint. For all these occurrences Christianity is supposed not to be responsible, but we Jews of today and Judaism of all generations, are charged with responsibility for a word spoken by Simeon ben Yohai, a man who lived at a time when his people fought against that system of tyrannical oppression and exploitation, which characterized the Roman

provincial administration. Is it really so bad that a man in his bitter feeling, provoked at the sham of Roman Kultur, said that the best of the Goyim—speaking of the Romans of his time—are no more to be trusted than a snake?

We have no quarrel with the narrow-minded fanatic. To him Christianity is the only means of salvation, and by Christianity he understands the dogmatic system in which he believes and therefore, “if any man loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema” (I Cor. 16, 22) and the Jews “shall be cast forth into the outer darkness. There shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth.” (Mat. 8, 13). It is grievous, however, to find that a man of broad views like the venerable Washington Gladden, in an article entitled, “What ails the Church?” published in *The Congregationalist* and *Christian World* of January 13 should say, “By the precepts of henotheism, the massacre of the Caananites was lauded. Under the precepts of Christ it is horrible.” We find that “under the precepts of henotheism, the prophet said, “Have we not all one father, has not one God created us? Why shall we deal treacherously, every man against his brother? (Malachai, 2, 10). We find that under the same precepts of henotheism, a man said: “I will gather all nations and tongues, and they shall come and see my glory, and they shall bring all your brethren from all the nations for an offering unto the Lord; and all flesh shall come to

worship before the Lord." (Isa. 66, 18-24). We see on the other hand, that, under the precepts of Christ as late as 1799, a mob, shouting, "Viva Maria," burned 19 Jews alive in the public square of Siena and as late as November, 1905, in the city of Odessa alone, 301 Jews were horribly butchered within four days by a mob that was led by priests carrying the images of Him under whose precepts the massacres of the Caananites are said to be impossible. It is true Dr. Gladden frankly admits that the churches have often generally misrepresented Christ. We are quite willing to admit this statement but then it must also be admitted that the precepts of Christ were not strong enough to prevent such misrepresentation and Torquemada and Arbues could not possibly have been worse monsters than they actually were under "The precepts of henotheism."

It affords some little satisfaction to read a different view of the cause of Christianity's degeneration. Ellwood Hendrick, in an article entitled "Saul of Tarsus," published in the January issue of the *North American Review*, makes the apostle Paul responsible for all the ills of the present Christian society, and the reason for this pernicious influence of Paul was that he preached "Instead of the simple gospel of love which Jesus taught, a new Jewish code." Mr. Hendrick is not an anti-semite. He wishes that Paul had never contaminated Christianity. "Then we should all have been Jews, and

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

the Jews would have been different." Mr. Hendrick also regrets the persecutions of the Jews which are "one of the most unkind and unchristian features of Christian society." Paul is also responsible for Calvin and the Presbyterian Church, which, following his principles, established a political machine that took all the heart out of religion.

It cannot be our purpose to meddle with these internal quarrels of Christendom. We don't rejoice in them and we do not believe that in themselves they prove the superiority of Judaism. It may, however, be said that we fail to understand the big ado made by a Church society which recently held its convention in the Madison Square Presbyterian Church, of New York. This convention declares it to be the great need of the present Church to convert the Jews to Christianity. Fortunately the Jews are in position to reply that the fear of the success of these missions is the least trouble which confronts the present day Jewry. It is quite a long time since the apostle Paul—though according to modern critics the authenticity of his writings is in doubt—prophesied that "All Israel shall be saved" (Rom. 11, 26). It is now a hundred years since a German cobbler named J. C. Frey patched up—he doesn't seem to have made good in patching shoes—a missionary society in America which proposed to settle Jews on the land and incidentally make Christians of them. The scheme did no good to anyone except

to the reverend cobbler. The New York convention spoke gloriously of the wonderful success of a mission in Chicago. From personal observation the writer knows that this mission is officered by two young Polish Jews, who make a livelihood by repeating the cant in which they have been drilled by one who is of the same type as themselves. We can understand that a Christian, though he has outgrown the dogmatic conceptions in which he was reared, constructs for himself a Christianity which, while entirely of his own making, he claims and even believes to be the real Christianity of Jesus. We can understand that the Christianity which he sees about him, the Christianity preached by Billy Sunday, who prays to the Trinitarian God to kill the Unitarians, else He should be considered a liar, that such Christianity is abhorrent to men of such refined mind as is the famous Columbus preacher. We can understand that one sees the cause of Christianity's troubles in the misrepresentation by such preachers while another dates the degeneracy back to St. Paul. We cannot understand, however, how people admitting the need of re-interpreting Christianity, can logically insist that Judaism is incapable of any development and requires the services of ignorant scamps, or at best "Schlemiels" to bring it up to the level of the only true type of humanity.

XI

IT TAKES TWO TO MAKE A "SHIDDUK"*

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE QUESTION OF INTERMARRIAGE IN JUDAISM.

Every world crisis has in some way or other a connection with Jewish affairs. Of modern instances the case of Dreyfus furnishes the best example. It was the prelude to the final passing of the bill which legalized the separation of state and church in France. The present world crisis no doubt has had and will have a still greater bearing on Jewish affairs and, vice-versa, its complication with Jewish affairs will in all likelihood contribute considerably to the settlement of the present war. From this point of view it is but natural that the discussion of Jewish affairs at this very moment has assumed such great proportions, even in neutral countries like the United States. There are two pre-eminent questions connected with the war which in some way or other are bound to be solved when peace shall have been declared. One is the unbearable situation of the Jews in Russia, and the other the scheme of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine. The condition of the Russian Jews has come prominently before

*The American Israelite, Feb. 10, 1916.

the public through a resolution passed by the United States Senate, which requested the president to appoint a special day for a collection on behalf of the Jewish war victims in the eastern theater of the European war. The question of a Jewish State in Palestine, which has been agitated for the last twenty years quite considerably, has in the United States assumed a more popular aspect by the rather unexpected participation in the movement on the part of Louis D. Brandeis, the great advocate of efficient trust legislation.

The various views on the future of the Jews, or to use a more popular term, on the solution of the Jewish question, can easily be summed up in two of these views; the ultimate end is either the renationalization of the Jews, or their absorption by the people in whose midst they are living. The latter view is presented by Mr. Schreiber, in an article published in *Harper's Weekly* of January 8. It is by no means new. In October, 1912, there appeared in the *Open Court of Chicago* an anonymous article which, like Mr. Schreiber, quotes Ahasuerus who yearns for death. Nor is this very new. More than a hundred years ago a Jewish merchant living in Koenigsberg published a pamphlet in which he appealed to the state's authorities to utilize the then still existing restrictions on marriage in the interest of a similar scheme. No Jew should obtain a license to marry unless a brother or a sister of his had married out of

the faith. We are too enlightened to propose such police measures as might have been considered feasible in Prussia under the system of strictest paternalism, but our views, at least those of a considerable portion amongst the Jews, are still the same. They seem to overlook two important points. The one is that there might after all be a third alternative. The Jews might be tolerated as Jews by their environment, and then feel perfectly happy and in place. Logically or theoretically, everybody will admit that such a solution is within the range of possibility. Another point, which is overlooked by Mr. Schreiber, as it has been overlooked by many before, is, that intermarriage, whether decreed by a police power, or by some benevolent philanthropist, or by a Jew afflicted with what Heine aptly terms, "Judenschmerz," conflicts with the Ghetto proverb, "It takes two to make a Shidduk." "Shidduk" and "Shadchen" are two words not merely peculiar to the Jewish vocabulary, though slowly being adopted by the English language, but also to Jewish social life. The word "Shidduk" taken from Talmudic Aramaic means originally, "compromise," because it was the duty of the "Shadchen," the matchmaker, to bring about a compromise between the conflicting views of the two families whose children he proposed to unite in wedlock. In modern times, under the influence of the environment, this institution is no longer legalized. It is, however, not ex-

inct, as the advertisements of the "Shadchen" in the Jewish press prove. In former times the "Shadchen" practiced a recognized profession, often as a secondary occupation of the rabbi, teacher, or any other person connected with Jewish congregational life. It was then calmly deliberated, whether the standing of the family, and especially the amount of dower promised, justified to enter into further negotiations. Modern times have changed the social habits, or at least the professed social ideals of the Jews, and the "Shadchen" practices his profession, more under cover, so that the engagement, when announced, is supposed to be the choice of the two young people. Yet we find in Jewish plutocracy, and in bourgeois circles this old system still prevailing, and as a rule, only abandoned when the young man or the young woman marry out of the faith.

It remains inconceivable, how one can appeal to the Jews in favor of intermarriage, when this fact cannot be arranged by the police as in good old Prussia; but has to be left to the choice of the individual. Or should indeed somebody decree that a Jewish young man or a Jewish young woman must under no condition marry anyone who is of Jewish parentage? For let this be understood: Intermarriage from the racial point of view, was at no time prohibited by Jewish law. Up to very recent times, all political laws prohibited intermarriage between

Jews and Christians. Conversion to Judaism from Christianity was also prohibited. Intermarriage, therefore, could only occur under great difficulties. But it did occur. It was not infrequent in the case of slaves. The Jews in mediæval times were largely engaged in slave trade, and very often kept some slaves in their homes treating them as members of the family and raising their offspring as Jews. Further, numerous cases, comparatively speaking of course, of proselytes are recorded, and at no time do we find any objection to intermarriage with these newly made Jews. In modern times, beginning with the nineteenth century, when progressive states permitted conversion from Christianity to Judaism, which, it must be remembered, is even today not legally permitted in Russia, cases of such intermarriage are quite frequent. So are cases of intermarriage without conversion of the Jewish part, in which children are brought up as Jews.

The whole idea of racial purity and of a theoretical objection to intermarrying with persons of non-Jewish descent, is an invention, unless in so far as habit and social prejudice are concerned. The percentage of such intermarriage may be small. In the United States, we have absolutely no means of forming any idea as to their statistics. In Germany they average ten per cent. In large cities, like Berlin, they rise to sixteen per cent among women, and eighteen per cent among men. These figures

naturally do not include those who, before marrying, accept the faith of the other party. Therefore, the total must show even a larger figure. At any rate the tendency to intermarry is on the increase. In Hungary where up to 1895 intermarriage between Jews and Christians, as well as conversion from Christianity to Judaism were prohibited, the latest figures at my disposal show for 1911, 7950 Jewish marriages amongst whom 391 were intermarriages. This is slightly less than five per cent, and again, there must be added to these figures the marriage of those who embrace Judaism before marrying. Leaving them out, though they may not be an inconsiderable quantity, we would of course find five per cent very little. It still would mean that out of a hundred Jews, ninety-five marry within the Jewish fold, and only five outside of it, so that the absorption of Jews by their environment, if not progressing more rapidly, would be indeed a very slow process. Suppose such an aim were desirable, the question still remains as to what can be done to increase this ratio, unless the Prussian method of 1804 were adopted. The most important question, however, is, why should it be the Jews, taking them to be a racial unit, who are to be compelled to marry outside of their racial boundary line? The only answer to be given to it would be that Judaism as an institution, be it expressed in synagog or in social life, is something undesirable. It is undesirable to their

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

neighbors; for to the Jews themselves it could only be undesirable, when their neighbors treat them as inferiors. That the Jews are racially inferior beings, no sound person will assert. Even the most pronounced anti-semites of the type which took its cue from Renan, claim no more than that the Jews have habits that are objectionable to their neighbors, or at worst have habits which are morally undesirable. Sound reasoning will hardly be willing to admit this claim. No one will deny that there are "white" and "black" non-Jews. The fact that seven Jews have received Nobel prizes during the short time that these prizes are in existence, is in itself sufficient evidence. The names of David Ricardo, Benjamin Disraeli, Heinrich Heine, Giacomo Meyerbeer, and Paul Ehrlich, certainly prove that the Jews as a class are not inferior. It will even seem to me that proportionately the Jews have done more for the world's civilization, than their small number would require of them, applying to them a per cent limit, which only narrow-minded, and barbarous governments like Russia would exact. A proof for such an assertion is just as hard to bring, as it is hard to refute. We may say, however, this. If Italian Jews who number only one permille of the total population, have given to their country a statesman like Luigi Luzzatti, and a scientist like Lombroso, the case would be proven for Italy. We may even say that names like those of Israel Zang-

will, of Arthur Schnitzler, of Ludwig Fulda, and David Belasco, will be in a century hence, as prominent as the average found in any history of literature, or in any biographical encyclopedia. Be it, however, as it may, no sane person will deny, that the Jews as a class have done their share towards establishing their claim on recognition as equals, and human society as such has absolutely no reason for demanding that the Jews as a class shall disappear.

The question, however, may be placed before the Jews themselves. Why should they persist to exist when their existence as a separate body has become meaningless? The answer has to be given from three points of view. There is still a very large class of Jews who contest the claim that their existence is an anachronism. To millions of Jews their religion is something God-given, that can be neither abolished, nor improved upon. They see absolutely no reason why they should loosen the tie which binds them to their ancient historic tribe—to use the anti-semitic slang. That in this twentieth century any public authority should compel Jews to abandon this claim, no sensible person will demand. Let us take an individual instance. The first Jews arrived on the soil of the United States in 1654. Suppose we could trace an American Jew who could establish his ancestry from these Jewish pilgrims. Suppose this Jew were an enthusiastic Jew, who believes

that the Jewish law is divine, and has to be observed in all details, until by some act of a new revelation it shall be abrogated, or until the prophecy that all Israel shall be brought together from the four corners of the earth and renationalized in ancient Palestine, shall have been realized. I will admit that the probability to find such a person is not very strong, but it might be the case. The question then would be in order: Can any state or any social law, or even prejudice rightfully demand of such a man that he submit to ostracism, to legal disabilities or persecution, unless he would give up this idea? We have no statistics on the early Jewish population of the United States, but as there were in 1840 about twenty organized Jewish congregations, it is safe to assume that there were 10,000 Jewish people living in the country. There are, therefore, numerous Jews still affiliated with Jewish life, and some of them sincere, and devout Jews, who have four American ancestors to look back upon. Could it occur to anybody as possible to compel these people to abandon their affiliation with Judaism? There can be but one answer to this question.

There is a second class of Jews—and they may form the largest proportion—to whom Judaism is not absolute truth and absolute revelation, but who consider Judaism either better, or at least as good as Christianity. These Jews will, as a rule, let us say nine out of ten, marry within the Jewish fold. They

will do so, perhaps from choice, but more likely from social habit, because, "It takes two to make a Shidduk." Such people, facing the question how to bring up their children, will feel that these children ought to be taught the religion of their fathers, at least in that way, that this constitutes not merely an inheritance of historic value, and an inspiration in the forming of character, but in some respects the best system of religious thought. This may, and does even occur in a considerable number of cases of intermarriage. But the consistent attitude of those who advocate intermarriage with a view that Judaism as a class shall disappear, would be that only such intermarriages should be tolerated, whose offspring will be brought up as Christians. I ask, is this reasonable?

A third class consists of those who labor under their "Judenschmerz." The type of this class is Michael Beer, the brother of the composer Meyerbeer, who writes to Heinrich Heine from a French seashore resort that unfortunately even all the waters of the Atlantic Ocean cannot wash his Judaism off. Many of these have tried their best to meet the advice of getting rid of their Judaism. Some have changed their names, have changed their religion, have studiously avoided contact with Jews, and have even affected the habits of their environment to an extent which made them ridiculous. Did

they succeed? The case of Heinrich Heine, to whom his native city refuses a monument, and that of Benjamin Disraeli, whom his political opponent, the truly liberal Gladstone, calls a fanatic Jew, proves the contrary.

Any injustice done to the first two classes, which means, any withholding of social or civic rights on the ground of their affiliation with Judaism, is plainly illogical, and as to the third class, the proper policy would be for those who feel that the Jews of today are "the burdensome stone" of which Zechariah speaks, to encourage the assimilative tendencies by proper social attitude. On the part of the Jews nothing can be done in this respect, for "It takes two to make a Shidduk."

All this is beside the question. What is demanded now under the present critical condition of the world, is first of all the removal of the burning shame under which the Jews of Russia suffer. These Jews who were, at least for the most part, inhabitants of the territory which they now occupy, long before Russia annexed it, are entitled to full civic and political equality, as are all human beings. Russia for the present, withholds from them the most natural rights of decent people, the right of selecting their residence, their occupation, and of availing themselves of the educational facilities furnished by the state, to the maintenance of which they

contribute liberally by their taxes. In addition, they are entitled to a full participation in the public life of their country, while at present they are not permitted to take part in municipal elections, even in places where they form from seventy to eighty per cent of the population. This is rank injustice and has to be removed. The same rule is true of Roumania, although she is at present no party to the world conflict. The next problem is that of the countries, where the Jews do enjoy full civic and political equality by law, but where the practice of the administrative authorities denies them this full enjoyment. Questions like this are difficult to settle. The Dreyfus case is the clearest proof of it. The state may give to the Jew the right to occupy positions in the army, and the administrative authorities may carry out this law, but the prejudice of the privileged classes, existing for centuries, will negate such a law or such practices or at least work against its realization. Still more difficult, however, is the question of social prejudice. No legislation, no administrative act, can solve this difficulty. Life alone must act here as the only remedy. In each case it is not the Jew who has to speak the first word. A clever cartoon in a German anti-semitic paper, on just this point of the proposed self-effacement of the Jews, presented a negro, who is refused service at an American bar. The bartender points

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

to a legend above the bar, which says that colored persons will not be served. The negro, however, says: "I have resigned from the negro race." In spite of the malice of the story, this is a very good illustration of actual conditions. As far as the Jews are concerned, it takes two parties to make a "Shidduk."

XII

THE REAL CAUSE OF ANTI-SEMITIC PERSECUTION.*

To the Editor.

Sir: On June 14 a pogrom broke out in Bialystok. The daily papers contained the first reports, June 15, and it seems that Professor Goldwin Smith, who lives in Toronto, must have at once sat down to write an article which amounts to as much as saying "Serves them right," for this article appeared already, June 21, in the New York Independent.

I first learned of the appearance of this article while I was attending the rabbinical convention held at Indianapolis in the first week of July, and as it requires more time to refute a falsehood than to utter it, for the one who makes the false statement does not go to the trouble of proving it, while the argument for the defense has to be—that is, at least, my habit—supported by facts, an earlier reply was impossible.

I wrote the argument from the Jewish point of view, as the reader may judge, without any animosity or personal abuse and expected that the Independent would be glad to publish it in order to prove that the paper is not identified with the ideas expressed by Goldwin Smith, but my expectation was too optimistic. One who reviles the Jews will always find a readier publisher than one who attempts to defend them against calumny, as will be seen from the letter of the Independent. I therefore have to publish my reply to Goldwin Smith in the Jewish press and hope that

*Published in various American Jewish weeklies in August, 1906. An abstract of it appeared in the "Literary Digest," Sept. 22, 1906.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

at least the readers will do their best to make this modest attempt of mine circulate in the non-Jewish world.

Respectfully yours,
G. DEUTSCH.

LETTER OF INDEPENDENT

New York, August 10, 1906.

My Dear Sir:

I am sorry to have to return to you this article in reply to one published some time ago by Goldwin Smith. I would like to print this article. It is an admirable one, but in the first place that was a good while ago, and in the second place it is not our habit to publish articles attacking other contributors, and again it is very long and finally the record of the Independent, editorially, does not make it really needy, for we criticised his article when it appeared, and we have always in every way attacked the anti-Semites. It is not likely that one who like myself has read the Hebrew Bible through before I was nine years old, would be likely to have much anti-Semitic feeling. It is a very valuable article, and if it would have been shorter and had not been in the form of a reply to Professor Smith, I should have been glad to use it.

Yours very truly,
WILLIAM HAYES WARD,
Editor.

Professor Goldwin Smith, in his article (Independent, June 21), entitled, "Is It Religious Persecution?" takes, in the light of recent events in Russia, his old stand, taken a quarter of a century ago, that the Jew has only himself to blame, if he is persecuted.

The committee appointed by the Duma to investi-

gate the events in Bialystok, found that during the two days of June 14 and 15, 82 Jews and 6 Christians had been killed and 70 Jews and 12 Christians wounded. The government appointed another committee, which arrived at somewhat different results, finding that, instead of 6 Christians, 7 had been killed, while the Jews, killed, numbered not 82, but 75. It may be stated right here that the Duma report deserves preference, because the official record of the Jewish Cemetery shows that on June 18, 78 bodies were buried in Bialystok.

This event is not isolated. Similar outrages have occurred now and then for the last three years. To quote the best known instance: In Odessa, during four days, commencing October 31, 1905, 301 people were killed, and thousands wounded, and property to the amount of millions was destroyed.

In the midst of peace, under the eyes of the officers of the law, both civil and military, some seventy people, amongst them old men, women and infants, are killed, and a writer sits in his study, some four or five thousand miles away, and calmly tells an intelligent public that the thing was not so bad, after all.

It is true that Professor Smith says that the outrage is not palliated by inquiring into its cause, but as he goes on, trying to prove that the provocation was all on the Jewish side, that this evil has existed for centuries, and that the qualities of the Jews do

not change, even when they leave the Jewish fold, the only inference is that there is no remedy for the evil, unless all the Jews are disposed of, in the way in which the hooligans of Odessa and Bialystok understood the philosophy of history.

Of course, Professor Smith may say that in finding fault with the Jews he spoke expressly and exclusively of those who are unassimilated, but, at the same time, he includes Benjamin Disraeli, who was never educated as a Jew and who was baptised at the age of thirteen, amongst those who prove his theory of the absolute Jewish depravity, and when he says that the transportation of the negro to America and the dispersion of the Jew are the greatest evils that have befallen mankind, the so-called assimilation of the Jew is at once declared an impossibility.

Compared with this view, it is a small matter when Professor Smith speaks of exaggeration of the persecutions which the Jews of Russia have suffered. Suppose that in a city of half a million inhabitants slaughtering was going on for four days. Frightened people flee from cellar to garret, from the roof to the house of a neighbor, down again into a cellar, out into an alley, and everywhere they meet the ghastly faces of cruelly murdered people, they see others fleeing with the blood streaming down their faces, they hear the bell of the ambulance which is carrying victims to the hospital, and the agonizing cries of those who are being kicked, clubbed or stabbed. Should any

one wonder that in the excitement of these moments they believe the hundreds to be thousands? Or can any exaggeration add to the impression produced by the fact that among the victims are infants, two years of age, or that a Cossack, just for the fun of the matter, grasped a five-months-old child by the throat and held it out in the air until it choked to death, just as naughty boys might do with a bird fallen from the nest? These are facts which one can only deny if he would declare the burning of Bruno and Huss, the hanging of Mary Fisher in Massachusetts, the executions of the Puritans in England, and the record of the Spanish Inquisition, a myth.

Goldwin Smith, however, claims that all these facts are not religious persecution, although, strangely enough, in one instance, which I shall illustrate later, he admits it, evidently without being aware that he has overthrown his theory. For the sake of systematically arranging the plea on the Jewish side, I shall divide Mr. Smith's statements according to three principles: The objection to the Jews from the economical, from the ethnological and from the religious point of view, and as we are living in a materialistic age the economical side of the question shall be taken up first.

The Jews, according to Goldwin Smith, are a parasitic race, a tribe wandering all over the world for the purpose of gain. The metaphor is not very complimentary, as it suggests the vines which, killing the

tree, live on by their embrace. We will, however, not quarrel with Professor Smith on this account, as the expression is not his own, for it has been used by the late Edward von Hartmann (*Das Judentum in Gegenwart und Zukunft*, Leipsic, 1885), and is, very likely, older still. If, however, we examine it critically, it will be impossible to give a definition of it. Why are the Jews parasites? They are traders, stock-jobbers and, in general intermediaries in the economic life of the world. Granted for a moment that this be so, are they the only ones in this line? Are there no Christian merchants, shopkeepers, stock-jobbers, insurance and book agents, real estate and ship brokers, and engaged in any number of other pursuits where they make a livelihood by bringing the buyer and seller together? The only answer that I can think of in this case is that the Jew practices his vocation unscrupulously and dishonestly, while the non-Jew is always filled with higher ideals. To such a statement no objection could be raised, because fairness and unfairness are terms which can not be proven by statistical records. But if we consult the statistics of criminality, it will become evident that the Jew shows, on an average, a higher morality than his Christian neighbors. Not wishing to burden this essay with cumbersome statistics, I merely refer to the article, "Criminality of the Jews," in the *Jewish Encyclopædia*. Taking the matter up from the standpoint of personal experience, I might add that I at-

tended recently a discussion on the subject of trusts, and one of the debaters, quoting his own business practices in favor of the trusts, answered the objections raised from a moral point of view, with the plain words, "I am not in business for my health." I merely ask the reader whether he is convinced that such a statement could only have been made by a Jew, or whether the great magnates of finance, like Jay Gould, Russell Sage, J. D. Rockefeller, J. Pierpont Morgan, and all the great speculators, whose practices have been revealed by Thomas W. Lawson, have not been acting on this principle.

Merely to defend myself against misinterpretation I wish to add that I do not consider the work of a middleman parasitic. Jewish second-hand shopkeepers help to turn cast-off articles, valueless and burdensome to their present owner, into articles of value and usefulness. The junk dealer is not a criminal, and his business practices, even if they are somewhat sharp, do not justify anybody in choking that shopkeeper's baby to death, nor in performing the same act of kindness on his neighbor's child, who happens to recite his prayers in Hebrew. Further, I do not believe that the publisher — in this line of business the Jews are almost totally unrepresented — is anything different from a middleman. I further do not believe that a Jewish storekeeper in New York could do business on any different methods than those employed by John Wanamaker or Marshall Field.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Neither of these gentlemen are in the business for their health, nor is the self-avowed object of Englishmen wandering all over the globe different from those which Goldwin Smith charges to the Jews. The *Spectator* of July 14, 1906, says: "We (the British people) have in most of the dark regions commenced our work with the intention of securing gain."

The most important point, however, is that it is absolutely false to say that the Jew is exclusively a middleman. This statement is so grossly false that it cannot have been made out of ignorance. The New York papers of July 27 contain the report that Meyer Goldstein, a painter, fell from the scaffold and was killed. The name, Meyer Goldstein, does not suggest Irish descent; still, this same Mr. Goldstein, who may have come from Bialystok, and might have been killed there by hooligans, if he had not previously gone to New York, is made responsible for the deeds, which the good-natured Mujik has been goaded into doing. Or should Meyer Goldstein be the only one, amongst the 750,000 Jews of New York, who followed a manual trade, while the remaining 749,999 are sucking the blood of their Christian neighbors? Is it not a matter of public record that the workers in the sweatshops of London and the large cities of America are, to a great extent, Jews? Do we not know hundreds of thousands of Jews to be working in the tailor shops, in the shirt, cap and cloak-making trades, in the shoe factories

and the like? This fact is patent with anti-Semitic agitators. They often use it against Jewish immigration, as tending to the pauperization of the masses. Now what is the Jew to do? If he makes money in business, he is ruining his neighbors by taking too much of their money. If he works in shops at low wages, he is ruining them by not taking enough of their money. So it is the old story of Lessing's Patriarch, "Thut nichts, der Jude wird verbrannt." Prof. Smith brings another argument from history. The Jew has always been a blood-sucker. He was a money-lender, serving the king for the purpose of looting his dearly beloved subjects. I shall lay stress on the latter fact, proving from altogether unsuspected sources how little the Jew was to blame for such a condition. The Talmud prohibits the taking of interest—mind you, the taking of any interest, not merely usury—as unlawful, even when the debtor is a non-Jew. This is clearly stated in the usual Talmud editions. (Tractate Baba Meziah, page 70b), and pious Jews, in the twelfth century had, naturally, very serious scruples. One of their rabbis, Jacob ben Meir, who lived in the Champagne, says; "What can we do? Since we have to pay burdensome taxes to kings and nobles, no matter at what interest we lend the money, it barely suffices to make a livelihood. Furthermore, we have no other trade left, and, therefore, it is just as legitimate to lend money as to follow any other

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

trade." Prof. Smith may look this reference up in any edition of the Talmud, from any library, or consult any manuscript, all in the possession of non-Jews.

We have, however, other testimony. Under the Carolingian kings, collections of specimens of public documents were made. In such a *Liber Formularum*, passports, issued to Jews, are preserved, and the most careful study of these documents shows not the slightest evidence of money-lending as an occupation amongst the Jews. (Ed. Rozières: *Recueil général des documents usités dans l'empire de France*. Paris, 1859-71, Vol. I, pp. 41-3). They were traders, and no less reprehensible than the English or German merchants, who are praised as pioneers of civilization for establishing their business houses in some South Sea Island, or on the coast of Africa. Under Charlemagne, we hear of a Jew who came to court as an importer of foreign goods. The king had great confidence in his honesty, and used him to play a trick on a greedy bishop. (Freytag: *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, Leipzig, 1888, Vol 1, p. 321.) The story is reported by the biographer of Charlemagne, the Monk of St. Gall. A toll law, referring to a place called *Raffelstetten*, on the Danube River, speaks of "Jews and other merchants" passing by this place on their business travels. (*Monumenta Germaniae, Leges*, iii, p. 480.) The two famous charters, granted by

King Henry IV (1090) to the Jews of Speyer and Worms give them the freedom to travel all over the empire for the purpose of buying and selling, but make no mention of money-lending as a Jewish occupation. (*Zeitschrift fuer die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, Vol. i, p. 151 et seq.) This negative evidence is stronger than it would appear on the surface, for, in the legislation on the Jews, from the thirteenth century on, money-lending and pawn-broking regulations occupied most of the space. This is the case with the charter issued by Duke Frederick II of Austria (1244), (Scherer: *Rechtsverhaeltnisse der Juden in deutoesterreichischen Laendern*, Leipsic, 1901, p. 179), a document, which became typical of the legislation on the Jews in mediæval times. If, therefore, money-lending is not mentioned as an occupation of the Jews, in 1090, but is given a prominent place in 1244, it is certainly proven that the Jews were not money-lenders up to that time. This inference is corroborated by the fact that St. Bernard was the first to speak of the Jews as money-lenders, adding that Christians are, in this respect, no better, while Agobard, the Bishop of Lyons, who wrote a venomous libel against the Jews, does not mention this vice, amongst the others of which they are guilty. (Simon: *Jahrbuecher des fraenkischen Reichs unter Ludwig dem Frommen*, Leipsic, 1874, Vol. i. pp. 393-6.) It may therefore be said to be absolutely proven that the Jews were not money-

lenders until after the first Crusade (1096), when the bitter animosity of the mob, fomented by the clergy, relegated the Jews to this trade. How they were driven to high rates of interest can best be established from the fact that from time to time, the kings would declare the debts owed to the Jews void, then settled with their debtors on the basis of one-third of the amount, or, in other instances, let the mob pillage the Jewish houses, burn the bonds and take the pledges found in their possession, as long as they received a share of the plunder. (Jewish Encyclopedia, article: Toetbrief.) This is an answer to Prof. Smith's statement that the Jews were always safe, under royal protection.

Under such conditions the Jew was, by law, excluded from following a manual trade, because this trade was monopolized by the guilds, which would never admit a Jew to membership; he was further excluded from regular commerce, because this occupation also was controlled by the guilds. Finally, he was absolutely prohibited to hold land in some countries down to the latter half of the nineteenth century, in almost all countries down to the beginning of the nineteenth century, while in Russia and Roumania this prohibition is still in force. In Saxony, as late as 1833, it required a royal order for a Jewish boy to be apprenticed to a trade. In Austria, as late as 1852, a Jew had to fight, in the courts, for the possession of a house in a rural district. In Russia the Jewish

agricultural school of Minsk a few years ago was not allowed to buy a farm beyond the city corporation line. The demand, therefore, that under these conditions the Jews should be farmers is equal to the demand that a man with hands and feet tied should jump into the water and swim.

One of the most malicious calumnies against the Jews in Russia is that, by their wealth, they provoke the peasants, who naturally think that this wealth is stolen from them. I do not know whether Prof. Smith has ever visited Russia. I have. I can state that in Bialystok alone there are twelve to fifteen thousand Jews working in the woolen mills, in the tanneries and in the tobacco shops. All over the so-called "Pale of Settlement" in Russia the great majority of the mechanics, cab drivers and other people living by hard labor are Jews. This fact can be tested in this country, where, in every large city, a great number of Jewish mechanics will be found, so that, of all charges made by Prof. Smith, only one remains: That the Jews are not found, to any large extent, amongst the farming population. Considering the fact that the laborer in the factory, the mechanic and the shopkeeper are not drones of society, it would be no condemnation of the Jews that they are not farmers, and still even this is not true. All over the world the Jews are found amongst the farming population. But even if they were not among the farmers at all, they would merely follow

the general tendency of the ordinary population. The general tendency is from rural districts into the city, not the reverse. "The cry 'Back to the land,' " says the *Spectator*, July 14, 1906, p. 47, "has not as yet led to any appreciable result."

The most serious charge placed against the Jews by Prof. Smith is that they are a different race, and that their "tribal spirit" prevents them from assimilating with other nationalities. First of all, the intermingling of the two terms, tribe and race, is directly illogical. The Jew is certainly not a race, in the sense in which we speak of the negro, or of the mongol race. What keeps him separate is his religion. The best proof of it is that a Jew who changes his religion is immediately absorbed by the people which he joins at the moment when he professes his new faith. It is further a fact that the Jew does not present a different tribe, race, nationality or whatever you may call it. While the majority of the Jews are descended from Jews, they have, from time immemorial, received into their covenant people of other nationalities. Dio Cassius (xxxvii, 17) already, in defining the word Jew, says that by this name all those are comprised who, coming from other countries, have accepted the Jewish customs. During the mediæval times, while both in Christian and in Mohammedan countries proselyting was prohibited under penalty of death, individual cases of converts to Judaism are recorded.

They were especially numerous in the cases of slaves emancipated by their Jewish masters, and perhaps still more frequent in the cases of bondswomen, whose children, begotten of Jewish masters, were educated as Jews (Lehem Rab, rabbinical decisions by Abraham di Botom, Smyrna, 1660, No. 44). Of the individual cases I shall mention but one. In 1874, Joseph Steblitzky, a Roman Catholic of Nicolai, in Silesia, converted to Judaism. He was charged with apostasy, a crime, according to the laws then in existence, punishable with death. He escaped execution merely because in the days of the free-thinker, Frederick the Great, it was not quite practicable, and the authorities got out of the entanglement by declaring him insane (Jewish Encyclopedia, article: Steblitzky). It is natural that only a few instances of this kind have been preserved in historic records. The only objection to this argument would be that such cases were not very frequent, and while this is true, it would be a puzzle to define how little Jewish blood one must have in his veins in order to become estranged from his former nationality, or how much he must have, in order to become assimilated with it. Let us take a well-known instance. The Belmont Brothers, of New York, are the sons of a Jewish father, and of a non-Jewish mother, but they are not considered Jews any more. On other hand, there are numerous instances, known to me, as to everybody else, in which sons of a Jewish father and of

a non-Jewish mother have been raised as Jews. Why should the latter be less of American nationality than the former?

The absolute impossibility of making such a definition of Jews as a tribal group is increased by the question of nationality. Why should the child of a German Jew, born in America, be less American than the child of a German Catholic? Or why should the great-grandchild of an immigrant Jew be less American than William McKinley, the son of an Irish immigrant? Is there anything like inherited nationality in these days even in countries, which, for years, have had a stable population? England had amongst her statemen, Mundella, an Italian; Labouchere, evidently of French descent, while France has had her Wilson, Waddington and Thompson. Germany has now three members of the Cabinet, with decidedly Slavic names: Posadowsky, Podbielski and Tschirsky, and she has had, in former times, a chancellor by the name of Caprivi. Russia has any number of prominent public men with German names. I mention off hand Lamsdorff, Voelkersan, von Plehve. The same is true of all other nations. In the ruling families this is still more pronounced. The English king is the son of a German father, and there is very little, if any English blood in his family, if we go back to George I, who was unable to speak English correctly. This clearly proves that nationality is a matter of choice, and

still Prof. Smith claims that Disraeli, English born, and the son of English-born parents, was not British, but merely a Jew. Even Disraeli's interference in the peace of San Stephano, and his successful effort to keep Russia from seizing Constantinople, is counted against him, as a proof of the unassimilative character of the Jews. Perhaps Prof. Smith's antipathy to Disraeli may be the cause of his anti-Jewish feelings, for twenty-five years ago he claimed that Disraeli created jingoism for the purpose of Jewish propaganda (*The Nineteenth Century*, 1881, pp. 494-515). This statement is equal to the other, that the Jews of Johannesburg, although cosmopolitan, dragged Great Britain into the Boer war. Leaving the question unsettled, as to whether it was such a crime, that people, holding considerable property, wanted to protect themselves against the arbitrary rule of medieval theocracy, I do not know of any Jew who could be held responsible for the Boer war unless it were Alfred Beit, who, born of Jewish parents, was raised as a Christian. Surely Cecil Rhodes and Dr. Jameson were no Jews. It is a strange thing that Alexander Dumas, the son of a mulatto father, and of a Jewish mother, could become a Frenchman!

The tribal spirit of the Jews is responsible for the fact that the Russian Jews are charged with eating into the core of the Muscovite nationality. It would seem to palpable a truth to retort that there is no

Muscovite nationality, but that Russia has several dozens of nationalities, the Russian forming only one-half of the population of the empire, and Jews living mostly amongst the Poles, or in that part of the Russian Empire which was formerly Polish. Their existence in that country is proven by laws regulating their condition, dating as early as 1264. Consequently, their claim to the territory is older than that of Russia. History, however, seems to have little weight with Prof. Smith, or else he could not say that Tacitus called the Jews the enemies of all races. As no quotation is given, I must believe that Prof. Smith's reference, often quoted by anti-Semites, is found in Tacitus' *Annales* (xv, 4), where he speaks of *odium generis humani*. A careful reading of this passage would convince Prof. Smith that this refers to the Christians. Tacitus speaks in this passage of the conflagration of Rome. He says that Nero accused the Christians of having set Rome on fire in order to avert suspicion from himself. Tacitus clears the Christians of this accusation, but says that they deserved their fate for their hatred of mankind, and in connection with this statement charges them with a number of vile habits. This passage, as I stated before, has often been referred to the Jews, and occurs again and again in anti-Semitic literature, although, even in the German Reichstag, February 13, 1893, this interpretation was proven to be wrong, and if this is not of sufficient authority, I refer to the

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Protestant theologian Karl Mueller, who, in his *Kirchengeschichte*, Freiburg, i. B., 1892, Vol. I., page 53, takes the same view. I lay stress on this fact merely to prove the inaccuracy of Goldwin Smith's statements in historical matters, not because it would condemn the Jews, if Tacitus had charged them with such an attitude toward the non-Jewish world. In fact, Tacitus (*Historiæ*, V, 2, et seq.) does not speak very well of the Jews, either, but he at least gives them credit for resisting religious tyranny. This inaccuracy in quoting history is also evident in the reference to the murder of Greeks in Cyrene and Cyprus, reported by Dio Cassius (lxviii. 32) who says that in Cyrene 220,000, and in Cyprus 240,000 Greeks were killed by the Jews. It will be permitted to allow a considerable discount on these figures, when we compare them with the number of those killed in the bloodiest wars in modern history (as e. g., that Germany in the war of 1870-71, lost only 40,080 men), and it will be sufficient to say that, as in Palestine and in Egypt, there were frictions between the two nationalities which resulted in bloody fights, in which the Jews were not always merely the victims.

The only remedy which Prof. Smith seems to hold out to the Jews, if they wish to escape the fate of their co-religionists in Russia, seems to be contained in the words: "The Jew may presently learn to give up the tribal rites, which conflict with a full sense of nationality, to intermarry, to associate freely, and to keep

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

the same day of rest." This statement leads us at once into the religious side of the question, which Prof. Smith, by the very title of his essay, makes an absolutely indifferent matter. While not minimizing the fact that there is an objection amongst the Jews to intermarriage, I first of all wish to point out that it is not found amongst the Jews exclusively. The *Neue Freie Presse*, of July 1, 1906, contains a report of a case which came before the court of Graz, and in which Bishop Kahn, of Klagenfurt — by the way, not a Jewish, but a Roman Catholic Bishop — had declared a marriage between a Catholic and a Protestant invalid because a Protestant minister had solemnized the marriage, and on this ground the Bishop gave to the Catholic husband the right to marry again. The Supreme Court of Austria, on October 3, 1905, declared the marriage of a Christian and a Jewess, contracted in Switzerland, invalid in accordance with the view of canonical law. Another court decision in Austria, May 21, 1900, declared the marriage of a Jew and a Catholic woman contracted in New York as invalid. Strong invectives against the marriage of Protestants and Catholics are found in one of the leading Catholic newspapers of Germany (*Die Koelnische Volkszeitung*, February 14, 1906). In the German Reichstag, on January 24, 1906, a complaint was made that in a book, by a Catholic priest, Father Fischer, it is stated that a mixed marriage, i. e., a marriage between a Catholic and Prot-

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

estant, was "not a Christian marriage, but merely a beastly, political intermingling of sexes." Better known is the fact that the Imperial Protestant Federation of England appealed to the king to veto the marriage of his niece, Princess Ena, of Battenberg, to the King of Spain. In a divorce case which came before the court of New York, March 30, 1906, the woman who was the defendant stated that she could not inform her parents of the fact that she had married a Jew (*New Yorker Staatszeitung*, March 31, 1906). Anti-Semitic politicians have repeatedly spoken in European Parliaments of the necessity of issuing a law, prohibiting the marriage of "Jews and human beings." Still, the number of intermarriages is not inconsiderable. In countries in which we have statistics, this can be proven. So, in Prussia, one out of seven Jews, and in Bavaria, one out of ten, married out of the faith, and in this number, naturally, those are not included who were converted to the religion of the other party before their marriage. Prof. Smith speaks, in a vague way, of the tribal rite. I can only imagine that he refers to circumcision. Leaving aside the hygienic question, it would seem to me evident that no law has any right to interfere with religious convictions. Granted that circumcision is a barbarous rite—from the point of view of logic there is no reason why it should be prohibited by law, while the belief in transubstantiation, or, for that matter, in the vicarious atonement,

and in the practices built on these dogmas, such as the Lord's Supper, Supreme Unction, etc., should be more reasonable. This being a delicate matter, I wish to be clearly understood. I do not attack any of these dogmas or practices, but I merely see no reason for declaring that circumcision ought to be prohibited as contrary to the spirit of modern civilization. Will there not be a possibility that some day an Ingersoll might make a demand that baptism, being a gross superstition, ought to be prohibited by law? This argument refers to the Day of Rest just as well. We have now quite a number of Seventh Day Baptists and Adventists. There was Alexander Webb, a convert to Islam, who made propaganda for conversion to Mohammedanism. Supposing he would have been successful? It is not the noblest idea which the Prophet of Israel has proclaimed "that all the peoples will walk everyone in the name of his god?"

A word must be said on the Talmudic Jew, whom Goldwin Smith attacks so bitterly. Let me first of all say that the Talmudic Jew does not exist any more than the "tribal" Jew. If Prof. Smith were capable of the slightest degree of fairness he would notice that in America, as well as in Western Europe, the observance of the Sabbath in business is a very rare exception. He would see, not only in passing along Broadway, New York, that there is perhaps not one Jewish business house closed on the seventh day. He could even notice in the heart of the "Ghetto," on

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Canal Street, that the push-cart trade is flourishing on Saturday more than on any week-day, although buyers and sellers are both Jews. The expression, Talmudic Jew, is a meaningless, anti-Semitic phrase. The Talmud is partly a code, regulating the ritual and the civil laws of the Jews, and partly a scholastic and strictly theoretical discussion of the Biblical laws which have not been practiced for 2000 years. Talmudic literature also contains historical and archaeological statements, folk-lore and ethical teachings, many of which are no more law than the ethnical theories of Goldwin Smith are part of the American Constitution, because they appeared in a New York periodical. This does not mean that the Talmud is an altogether condemnable book. The Talmud teaches patriotism as a duty, enjoins moral principles in commercial life, praises menial labor and is very emphatic on the duty of gratitude to one's teachers, and on the importance of cultivating the intellect. Of course, there are a number of antiquated statements in the Talmud. Rabbis of 1600 years ago believed that the sun revolved around the earth, and, provoked by oppression, made here and there bitter statements against the Romans and the Parthians. Suppose that these statements are somewhat more objectionable than the compliments paid by Tacitus and other Roman authors to the Christians. Could any Roman in our days be held responsible for what Tacitus said in the days of Rabbi Akiba? Still, Gold-

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

win Smith claims that the Jew is not "tolerant" now. His diatribe will certainly not foster the spirit of toleration, which alone can bring about the progress of the world.

How do we account for the hostility to the Jews? It has three causes: Snobbery, bigotry and that mental inertia which is responsible for the survival of many other antiquated ideas.

XIII

THE CURSE OF THE CRUCIFIXION*

In the "Journal and Messenger" of April 24 I read the following:

Our attention has been called to an address, or sermon, delivered on Easter Sunday by a Jewish rabbi in Poughkeepsie, N. Y., in which he took occasion to air his objections to Christianity. He held that Easter is to be observed, not because it commemorates the resurrection of the Son of God, but because it signalizes "the resurrection of earth's energies." The rabbi declared his disbelief of the record of the resurrection of Christ, and was particular to declare the Jews non-responsible for his death. All was to be charged upon the Romans; and he undertook to reason that if the death of Christ brought about redemption, the Jew ought not to be blamed for it, since good came of it. All this is very shallow reasoning, and yet it is nothing new. It has been a sort of stock argument with Jews in all ages. It must not be forgotten that the Jews said to Pilate: "If thou let this man go thou art not Cæsar's friend." "His blood be upon us and upon our children." "Crucify him!" "Crucify him!" Today we are not disposed to load

*American Israelite, May 15, 1902.

upon the Jews anything more than they take upon themselves. But when the Jews undertake to shift the responsibility by such arguments, and when they persist in justifying their ancestors of the days of Pilate and Caiaphas, we are compelled to withdraw some of our sympathy and to admit that the blood called down upon them has not been all washed off.

It is remarkable how people will oppose inconvenient truths. Many years ago Ludwig Philippson wrote a pamphlet under the title, "Did the Jews Crucify Jesus?" in which he said everything that could be said on the subject. The summary of his arguments, which I give from memory, is the following:

According to the account of the crucifixion found in the first three, so-called synoptic, gospels, Jesus was crucified on the Passover. This was plainly an impossibility, for Jews, fanatical enough to have demanded his crucifixion, would certainly under no condition have desecrated their holy day. According to the Gospel of John, the crucifixion took place on the day preceding Passover. Mistake is excluded in both cases, because according to the synoptics Jesus celebrated the Passover meal with his disciples; consequently the crucifixion could not have taken place before the day following that meal, while in the fourth gospel stress is laid on the fact that Jesus represented the Passover lamb which was to be sacrificed on the day preceding Passover, and consequently the state-

ment that the crucifixion took place on that day can not rest on a mistake of a scribe or on the inexactness of the memory of the author. These contradictory statements would in themselves suffice to make any judge hesitate before he would pronounce sentence on such conflicting testimony.

Further, crucifixion was never a Jewish mode of executing criminals. The Pharisees, who were so particular in their legal minutiae, would, if they had had to pronounce sentence, certainly have proceeded according to their law. Again, unmistakable historical testimony proves that the Jews under Pontius Pilate and long before his time possessed no jurisdiction in criminal matters, and consequently a sentence of death rendered by the Sanhedrin, had to be submitted to the Roman government for confirmation. The authors of the various gospel accounts were familiar with this fact, and this is the reason why they assigned to Pilate the role of pleader for clemency. Pilate washes his hands in innocence and attempts to dissuade the members of the court from insisting on the sentence. From what we learn from reliable historians about Pilate's character, he was a tyrant, who certainly could have had no reason for objecting to an execution—but the authors of the gospels found it desirable to reconcile the supposed guilt of the Jews with the fact that before a sentence of death could be executed the governor had first to confirm it.

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

Further, if we accept the crucifixion story, we must also accept the reports of the resurrection and the ascent to heaven, and there are serious obstacles in the way of an honest man's accepting these. If such reports were given out today from Dowie's Zion City, I have no doubt but that the editorial staff of the "Journal and Messenger" would greet them with laughter, and would consider as dupes those who believed them.

But suppose that all this be true. Suppose that the Jews really did crucify some one who promised to come on the clouds of heaven, and who said that he and the Father were one. What would it prove? It would prove that there were fanatics in those days just as there are now, who, instead of committing a man, mentally afflicted, to an insane asylum, prosecute him as a blasphemer. Many worse things have been committed in the course of history. Shall we again point out the fact that on free American soil the Puritans hanged Mary Fisher, a Quakeress, because she preached against the rigidity of the Puritan creed, and that a number of others were scourged and put to death for the same offense? Shall we point out the fact that Michael Servetus was burned at the stake by Calvin because he rejected the belief in the Trinity, and that Luther heartily congratulated the Swiss reformer for the act? Shall we point out the fact that about 1620, in the very same Geneva, where Calvin taught, a reformed preacher, Nicholas An-

thoine, was burned at the stake because he professed belief in Judaism? Shall we point out the numerous victims of the Inquisition and of the Crusades? The Jews can not be accused of any persecutions such as these. It is true, it may be said they had not the power to enforce their religion with the threat of the fagot. Very well. But if they really did crucify Jesus, they did certainly nothing worse than every church of Christendom has done since the beginning of its history, or what some churches would do today if they had the power.

As late as 1852, Pope Pius IX, condemned a man and his wife to the galleys for life because they had become converted to Protestantism, and about 1867 he made Peter Arbues a saint, whose only claim to this elevated position was that he relentlessly burned heretics, mostly Jewish backsliders, at the stake.

Allowing that the Jews crucified Jesus and that their case was worse than all the cases thus far quoted, which can hardly be proven, it remains a fact that the present generation of Jews is entirely free from responsibility in this matter. At the supposed time of the crucifixion there were thousands of Jews living in Alexandria and a great number in Rome, in all the important commercial centers of the Mediterranean and in Mesopotamia. Even a great number of those who lived in Palestine were beyond the scene of the tragedy. How can it be proven to the present generation of Jews that they are those upon whom the

blood of Jesus came in accordance with the curse which they are supposed to have brought upon themselves?

Pilate held office as governor of Palestine from 26 A. D. to 36 A. D. Suppose the crucifixion took place in 30 A. D. Since that time 1870 years have elapsed. Giving only three generations to a century, which is a liberal estimate, this would make 56 generations. Now, how can any reasonable being suppose that the almighty, Allwise and Beneficent Being who rules the universe will punish anybody for a crime, no matter how atrocious it may be, which his 56th ancestor had committed? What outcry of horror would fill the civilized world, were any court to pass a sentence that the innocent child of a murderer should be hanged for the crime of his father. If this is not logic, I would like to know what is. And another thing: How can it be proven to any Jew living that he is not a descendant of one of the multitude of Jews who at the time of the crucifixion lived hundreds of miles away from this scene, and never heard of it until Christian Sunday-school children surprised them with the important news? How can it be proven to any Jew living at present that he is not the descendant of one of the numerous proselytes who were converted to Judaism from nations who had not the slightest hand in that crime of crucifixion!

All the preceding remarks are based on the supposition that the crucifixion really took place, which for

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

argument's sake I am willing to allow. Still I consider it my duty to state again and again that a sound historical critic can arrive at but one conclusion, namely, that the crucifixion, like the resurrection and ascent into heaven, like the whole history of Jesus, is a myth. Here are my arguments. Any one who will not accept the miracles finds himself placed before the following alternatives: The history of Jesus, as given in the gospels, is either a legendary ornamentation of an event the truth of which cannot be ascertained at this distant date, or it is an outgrowth of folklore, a myth become faith, an idea materialized into belief. There is no other way of getting out of the difficulty which faces us when we consider the various conflicting stories of the accounts of Jesus' birth and all the miracles connected with his life until his ascent into heaven. If we do not accept them, we have to choose between interpreting them as legends or regarding them as myths. To me personally the latter course seems to be the better, not from the Jewish point of view, from which, as I said before, it would be altogether immaterial if all these events had actually taken place, but from the point of view of the scientific historian. That ideas are really condensed into myth the experience of every day will prove. I might cite the story of the Wandering Jew, of William Tell or of Faust. In all these instances a mere idea is through the evolution of folklore condensed into fact. If, however, we regard the story of Christ as legend-

SCROLLS, VOLUME III

ary, we would have to state that we are confronted with such a perplexing theory that our only escape from the difficulty lies in the conclusion that all that is definitely known about the crucifixion is that something like a heresy trial was held in Palestine about 1870 years ago. It is because of that one meager bit of knowledge on the subject that today in Rumania the poor Jewish mechanic is not permitted to follow his trade; that the Jewish boy in Russia is not admitted to a public school, and that an inoffensive old Jewish peddler in America is insulted on the streets by those who are "baptized" and "believe" and shall be "saved."

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

REG'D LIBRARY

AUG 11 1996



A 000 429 565 5

Univ
Sc
L