

The "Torah-Im-Derekh-Eretz"
of
Samson Raphael Hirsch

BY

MORDECHAI BREUER

THE SAMSON RAPHAEL HIRSCH PUBLICATIONS SOCIETY

FELDHEIM PUBLISHERS

JERUSALEM—NEW YORK • 5731—1970

Distributed by
PHILIPP FELDHEIM, Inc.
96 East Broadway
New York City 10002

©
1970, by
FELDHEIM PUBLISHERS LTD.
39 Tachkemoni St., Jerusalem

Printed in Israel

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

This paper was originally published in Hebrew in the Jerusalem quarterly *Hana'ayan*, Vol. IX (5729), Nos. 1 and 2. My thanks are due to Mr. Yaakov Feldheim for encouraging me to prepare an English edition and for making possible its publication. Rabbi Leonard Oschry rendered valuable assistance with the translation. This edition has been slightly amended.

While it has not been my purpose to discuss the present-day problems confronting the orthodox Jewish educator, both in Israel and in the diaspora, I have aimed at giving a full analysis of Rabbi S. R. Hirsch's educational philosophy, based on his own writings. I have also attempted to set the conceptual analysis within the historical context, thus enabling the interested reader to form a correct evaluation of a much mis-interpreted chapter of the history of modern Jewish thought and education and of its relevance to the present Jewish educational scene.

Jerusalem
On the Eve of Shavuot 5730

Dr. Mordechai Breuer

THE "TORAH-IM-DEREKH-ERETZ"
OF
SAMSON RAPHAEL HIRSCH

The totality of Samson Raphael Hirsch's thinking and teaching has always been regarded as comprehended in the single phrase, "*Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*." Yet in attempting to understand his particular conception of this idea, we have to contend with many difficulties, chiefly because he did not leave behind any systematic summing-up of this doctrine. What he did bequeath to posterity was a veritable treasure of ideas, definitions and fragmentary explanations scattered throughout his numerous writings. Furthermore, we have to realize that, from the very outset of his career as halakhic authority, philosopher, educator and popular instructor, S. R. Hirsch insisted upon stressing his conviction that there was nothing new in his conception of Judaism. "I have not set out to create a new Judaism," he wrote to one of his disciples, a short time after the publication of his first books, "instead I want to grasp and describe — as far as is possible — the ideas of Judaism as it is."¹ He was aware that the essence of his thoughts was contained in the ancient approach of the Torah, the Prophets and the Sages, and that it was his task merely to crystallize the ideas that had remained in the treasury of the ancient sources ever since. If he was conscious of himself as an innovator in any sense, this was only in respect of the methodology of a Jewish science which he used in interpreting the sources, and in the definitions and language patterns which he applied in formulating his conclusions. From the outset, his language and style constituted an instrument used deliberately and intentionally to teach the erring an understanding of Judaism, to draw those far-removed closer, and to educate the young as well as the adults. He never addressed the professionals — the "theologists" — and had he done so, he would have expressed himself differently.² He

scarcely ever dealt in systematic apologetics or in any kind of direct explication of Jewish, as contrasted with other, thought—Jewish or non-Jewish.³ Since this is the case, we have to link his ideas together, one by one, till we arrive at a clear-cut presentation of his system.

Hirsch's unshakeable conviction that his conception was derived from the immortal sources of our Sages, was frankly expressed in his interpretation of the saying of Rabban Gamliel, the son of R. Yehuda Hannasi: יפה תלמוד תורה עם דרך ארץ.⁴ This saying has been given a variety of interpretations, fully familiar to S. R. Hirsch. In the course of a violent controversy with one of the greatest rabbis among his colleagues concerning the question of the secession of orthodox Jews from communities supporting reform institutions, Hirsch pointed out that the explanation of the concept *Derekh Eretz* in that saying as a "principle of education"⁵ was open to question and even dispute.⁶ Thus, even in his own translations and interpretations, there is actually no clear-cut single exposition of the concept *Derekh Eretz*. In four passages in Pirkey Avot where the term is mentioned, S. R. Hirsch translates respectively: "Civic occupation in social and economic life," "Civic life," "Cooperation in civic life," "Civic affairs."⁷ The common denominator of all of these is, thus, seen in the *activities* of Man as a *citizen* among citizens. The *academic principle*, "knowledge and education," is not even mentioned. In his interpretation of Chapter Two, Mishnah Two, S. R. Hirsch explains:

"The term *Derekh Eretz* includes all the situations arising from and dependent upon the circumstance that the earth is the place where the individual must live, fulfil his destiny and dwell together with others and that he must utilize resources and conditions provided on earth in order to live and to accomplish his purpose. Accordingly, the term *Derekh Eretz* is used primarily to refer to ways of earning a living, to the social order that prevails on earth, as well as to the mores and considerations of courtesy and propriety arising from social living and also to things pertinent to good breeding and general education."

In this interpretation, S. R. Hirsch included nearly all accepted meanings of the concept *Derekh Eretz*, mentioning its

educational-cultural significance only in a subordinate clause. On the other hand, in his commentary to Genesis 3,24 (English edition, transl. I. Levy, London 1963) he explained "*Derekh Eretz*" as "the way of *culture* (emphasis in the German original), the way of social refinement... the first tutor and educator to morals, manners and order." Thus, in his articles, he explained the slogan *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* in fine as "the sum of Jewish and social knowledge."⁸

It is not only with regard to the concept *Derekh Eretz* that there is no uniform interpretation in the writings of S. R. Hirsch; in the description of the relationship between Torah and *Derekh Eretz*, he also used varying language patterns. In the first prospectus for his Frankfurt school, which was to be established in 1853, he wrote:

This school is based on the ancient and sacred principle of Judaism, saying that social wisdom and social life on the one hand, and religious wisdom and religious life on the other hand — not only are not mutually exclusive but, on the contrary, condition, complete and fulfil each other, and only by cohering, uniting, and merging most closely will they give birth to welfare and happiness, towards which we are bound to strive throughout our life in this world."⁹

In his earnest quest to arouse and draw his contemporaries closer to what he regarded as the realization of the truth of Judaism, S. R. Hirsch used flowery rhetoric rather than precise language. This — and not only this, as we shall see — was apt to lead to misunderstandings, within his own circle, of the basic and principal significance of his conception.

"There have been many errors with regard to the understanding of the slogan *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*. Some maintain that this slogan stands for an integration of Torah culture with European culture... There are others who say that this slogan has mainly educational implications, requiring secular studies as either a temporary expedient or a permanent provision... Others, again, insist upon explaining this slogan as calling for the professions — last but not least the academic professions, the doctor's degree — entailing the establishment of a relationship between the Torah and the sciences with a view to reaching a compromise."¹⁰

One of the reasons for these misunderstandings has also been the superficial identification of the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch with that of Moses Mendelssohn. This is not the place for a systematic analysis of the relationship between the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch and that of Mendelssohn.¹¹ The Jewish philosopher, S. L. Steinheim, a contemporary and compatriot of S. R. Hirsch, has clearly indicated the gulf separating the two, writing that S. R. Hirsch disregarded the "writ of divorce" by which Mendelssohn had sundered the beliefs and ideals of Judaism from the Divine Revelation of the Torah and the Precepts.¹² "Mendelssohn has watered down Judaism for the Jews to the observance of the precepts, seeing his own cultural fulfilment in the manifestation of his wisdom as a German Plato; while S. R. Hirsch would not accept contemporary culture unless and until it had passed the test of . . . Judaism."¹³ In Mendelssohn's Judaism, the symptoms of his split personality are clearly evident; *Torah* and *Derekh Eretz* are placed side by side, without attaining to any extent the fused or integrated state they reach in the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch.¹⁴ Mendelssohn distinguished between his life as a Jew and his life in non-Jewish society; he was one of those who paved the way towards the assimilation of the Jewish intellectuals within the society of gentile intellectuals; he wished to find, in the image of "Man," a sphere of equality between Jews and Christians.¹⁵ Hirsch's ideas on the relationship between "Man" and "Israel" were entirely different, as we shall see.

And yet, their separate doctrines do possess some points in common, especially the emphasis on the "essence of practical Judaism." Even if S. R. Hirsch criticized Mendelssohn for having stopped his quest to deduce Jewish concepts from the Precepts at its very beginning,¹⁶ still, the reader finds a number of passages in Hirsch's writings praising Mendelssohn and, whilst his praise is mixed with sharp criticism, his disciples rather frequently voiced unreserved admiration for Mendelssohn.¹⁷ Mendelssohn's disciples were able to claim that the main shortcomings S. R. Hirsch discovered in Mendelssohn were *prima facie* Hirsch's own. "Mendelssohn," wrote S. R. Hirsch, "showed the world and his brethren that it was possible

to be a strictly religious Jew and yet to shine forth as a German Plato." The words 'and yet' were decisive. As a matter of fact, S. R. Hirsch himself occasionally resorted to the same "and yet" in explaining his system of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*:

"And still, thank God, Israel is not widowed! There are among us men who have reached highly honored positions in economic and industrial life, owing to the high level of their European education, and yet they are Jews with all their heart and soul, Jews adhering faithfully to the Precepts of God and ancient Judaism."¹⁸

We shall see that the real significance of the concept *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* in the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch is on no account to be equated with the counter-pointing of the terms Torah and *Derekh Eretz* within an "and yet" relationship; he has merely adopted the stylistic usage of his contemporaries. At any rate, we can understand what, actually, made it possible for interested parties to equate the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch with that of Mendelssohn.

We have still not come to the end of the chain of obstacles lying in wait for us in our attempt to arrive at an understanding of Hirsch's concept of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*. He was by no means the first among German rabbis to appreciate the value of civic life and secular ("extraneous") education, identifying the concept *Derekh Eretz* with "the study of necessary worldly knowledge, such as arithmetic, geometry and the sciences, minor amounts of which are sufficient for the appreciation of the way of the world provided by God for man."¹⁹ For some generations preceding Hirsch's lifetime, the study of the arts and sciences as well as of foreign languages by strictly observant Jews had been nothing new, especially in his native town of Hamburg. *Derekh-Eretz*, in the sense of the knowledge necessary for the conduct of business with gentiles, was current coin used by the rabbis and sages of Hamburg. Naphtali Hertz Wessely, a figure much admired by Hirsch's family, interpreted the concept as follows: "*Derekh-Eretz* includes human relations, the behaviour of men towards one another, one's conduct with his wife and family, as well as good manners and political wisdom."²⁰ Rabbi Menahem Mendel Frankfurter, Hirsch's grandfather and the head of the Beth Din of Altona, played a prominent part

in the founding of the "Beth Midrash for Jewish Boys" in the year 1805. Among the eighteen "inspectors" of this institution, four were members of his family, including Raphael Aryeh, Hirsch's father. The aim of this institution was to teach the children "Torah, morals and wisdom, and good behaviour and *Derekh-Eretz*, to impart the knowledge requisite for earning a livelihood for themselves and to train them in the skills of reading, writing and arithmetic."²¹ The institution was developed and improved from 1822 onwards, by the "Hakham" Isaac Bernays, Rabbi of Hamburg and teacher of S. R. Hirsch. In a memorandum addressed to the heads of the Jewish community, Hakham Bernays expressed the opinion that "the teaching of religion . . . has to embrace . . . all the spheres of practical life the boy will have to deal with."²²

We shall thus not be mistaken in assuming that S. R. Hirsch had been familiar with the slogan *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* from his early childhood, having heard it used by teachers, rabbis and public figures. What novelty, then, did S. R. Hirsch introduce?

Moreover, for the Jewish community of Frankfurt-on-Main, the main centre of S. R. Hirsch's activities, there was, *a priori*, nothing new or daring in the system of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*. Already in the days of R. Joshua Falk, the author of *P'ney Yehoshua*, who acted as head of the Beth Din as well as of the Frankfurt Yeshiva, "there were respectable pupils who filled themselves body and soul with Talmud and the responsa literature" in the house of one of the learned men, and yet, at the same time, "did not neglect the other spheres of learning."²³ In the year 1818, one of the philanthropists of the community wanted to establish a boys' school, apparently on the model of the Hamburg Talmud-Torah, where, in addition to religious studies, other subjects would also be taught. The pious heads of the community energetically supported the implementation of this plan, but the institution was closed down by the city authorities at the instigation of a group of "progressives," sympathizers of the reform movement, within the community.²⁴ One of the leading figures advocating a traditional education which would also train students for practical life was the erudite Rabbi Aaron Fuld, dayan of the Beth Din, who corresponded on halakhic problems with the "Hatam Sofer."

He wrote to Rabbi Akiba Eger on the necessity of general studies for young people, asking his consent to the introduction of these subjects in accordance with the decree of the city authorities, for "the time has come to act."²⁵

Rabbi Akiba Eger's reply is not known, but from his letter to the orthodox preacher Solomon Plessner we learn that it was not entirely negative: "The study of Torah and *Derekh-Eretz* go well together, to teach pupils the skills of writing and arithmetic for an hour or two daily. In this way, with the help of the Almighty, we train our sons as His Majesty the King and his ministers have commanded us to do, having lent their attention to this matter."²⁶ What matters for our deliberations here is the fact that Rabbi Akiba Eger uses the concept *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* as referring to academic secular studies. Solomon Plessner himself was an older contemporary of S. R. Hirsch, and he was the first author in Germany to combine the strictest observance of the Precepts and assiduous Torah study with general education. He justified the law requiring rabbis to acquire general education by a colorful argument: "If you want to save a man from drowning, don't hesitate to jump into the water after him."²⁷ Rabbi Samuel Landau of Prague, the son of the *Noda Biy'huda*, was also among those who favoured imparting "the language and good manners of the country in which they live" to students. "Fathers should see to it that their sons succeed in *Torah im Derekh Eretz* and the youth should not divert their attention from both."²⁸ The concept *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* is not explicitly mentioned in either of the first two of Hirsch's published works. (The *Nineteen Letters* appeared in 1836, and *Horeb* was ready for the printer at the time.) In the same year, Rabbi Abraham Sutra, the rabbi of Muenster in North Germany, issued a polemical work against the Reform movement, where he explained the concept *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* as signifying the combination of Torah studies with general education: "Ask your fathers and your elders, and they will tell you that (before the reformers) there were ancient Sages who declared that the study of the Torah goes well with *Derekh-Eretz*, and there are many passages in the Mishnah proving that our Sages, blessed be their memory, did

Therefore, no particular significance attaches to the absence

not study the Torah alone but were also well versed in other disciplines and knowledge.”²⁹

We can thus confidently assert that, if the system of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* in Hirsch’s teachings was merely a curriculum for educational institutions to guide observant teachers in imparting general knowledge along with the study of the Torah, we would have to concede that, in principle, S. R. Hirsch did not create anything new. Yet before embarking on an analysis of what was novel in S. R. Hirsch’s system, we have to indicate an additional problem which might obstruct our attempt at understanding his contribution.

Undoubtedly, many points found in Hirsch’s ideology are to be regarded as his reaction to contemporaneous events and to opinions current in the Western Jewry of his day. His declarations regarding the acceptability to orthodox Jewry of the principles of European educational ideas were deliberately aimed at refuting the claims of the Reformers, that Torah and the Precepts on the one hand and European education on the other, were incompatible, so that the Jew was confronted by the dilemma: either/or. S. R. Hirsch’s demand for a practical life fully integrated in modern society within the compass of a life dedicated to Torah and Mitzvot came to contradict the opinion of Reform that the acceptance of emancipation and the integration of the Jews in the social and economic life of Europe was only possible once all connection with traditional Jewish life and its leaders had been severed. Economic hardship was, indeed, the lot of young Jews searching for respectable, gainful occupation and yet refusing to abandon the observance of the Mitzvot. The temptation was enormous: there was promise of a life of comfort and wealth, if only they would cast off a lesser or greater measure of the burden of the Mitzvot. The gates of economic and social advancement were open to them, if they would abandon the observance of the Sabbath and the ritual food laws. It was the support of the Torah which S. R. Hirsch set out to provide for these wanderers stumbling in the dark. Moreover, the Jews were under pressure from governments and authorities, who stipulated that Jews make their peace with European education, if not everywhere at least in most countries. Many laws were enacted obliging rabbis to

acquire general education and making it obligatory for parents to send their children to schools where the curriculum included instruction in general subjects.

S. R. Hirsch certainly wrote and spoke to his own generation, just as all great thinkers, each in his own time, addressed themselves to their own contemporaries. The problem, thus, is two-fold: the measure of subjective dependence of S. R. Hirsch's doctrine upon conditions of his own time and place; and secondly, its objective significance as a comprehensive conception of Judaism. Has his doctrine been more than a desperate attempt to save the erring souls lost to Torah and Judaism, a life-saving campaign, so to speak, for which the Torah itself makes far-reaching concessions? Is not the system of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* an ingenious plan to recover a generation whose knowledge of the Torah was at its lowest ebb, and for whom the problem of education and the place of the Jew in European society was a question of life or death? The formulations of S. R. Hirsch's ideas are, to a large extent, contained in postulates and expositions in which the factors of his time frequently played a major part. The question of the relation between "Religion" and "The Spirit of the Time" is one of his recurring subjects.³⁰ How is it possible to shorten the distance between the "time" and the Torah? "Has the Torah ever been adjusted to the spirit of the time? Can Judaism at all suit the spirit of the time, present and past?"³¹ "It must be the education and progress of time to the high plane of the Torah," was S. R. Hirsch's demand, and "only if the spirit of the time conforms with the spirit of God, will Judaism conform to the spirit of the time."³² Anyway, even if there is here a courageous expression of belief and conviction in the idea of the eternity of the Torah of God for all times to come and all changes of conditions,³³ we have still to ask ourselves: to what extent is the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch timeless in respect of its ideological and practical content? What is its significance for generations that do not any more regard the problem of the relation between Judaism and European education, between Judaism and European social and economic life, as a question of their very existence?

We shall have to direct some attention to these questions, too, in the course of our deliberations.

II

The unique and novel conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* in the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch is easily discernible at first glance by several signs bearing witness to the central position it occupies in his thought. This was not a side-street of his spiritual world, but the main-stream of his thinking, from which all his ideas are derived. This term, uttered half-willingly by S. R. Hirsch's fore-runners and mentioned by them as a passing phase in a period "calling for action" — rings through S. R. Hirsch's words as the immortal message of Judaism, a postulate upon which everything depends, one of the fundamental pillars of the faith. *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* is for him not only "the compass by which to set the wandering barge" of erring German Jewry back on its course.³⁴ The slogan was not only embroidered in golden letters upon the banner of S. R. Hirsch's school, but was also embedded in earth, in the foundation stone of his congregation's synagogue.³⁵ The scroll reads: "May it please God that we bring up our sons and daughters for *Torah* and *Derekh Eretz* together, as we have been instructed to do by the fathers of our nation, the true sages"; for, indeed, he was firmly convinced that the spirit of the Torah and of the sages was embodied in his system, so that he had only set out "to restore the crown to its proper place." He did not hew a path for individuals or a certain, closed social circle; he openly declared that this programme and outlook were for the masses, for the nation as a whole.³⁶

That Hirsch himself never felt impelled to explain or advance arguments for his principle, or even to present the theory underlying his basic outlook in his works written for generations to come³⁷ — this fact, too, is the consequence of the central position occupied by the concept *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* in his doctrine, and of his basic assumption that it is one of the fundamental pillars of the true and genuinely Jewish world outlook. He explained the application of the principle to practical and spiritual life in numerous definitions and articles, but the principle as such was considered by him the essence of the Torah of Israel and its faith, calling to every Jew in the words of each chapter of the Bible and every utterance of the Sages.

Therefore, no particular significance attaches to the absence of the concept *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* from S. R. Hirsch's first works.³⁸ Not the definition but the ideological foundation is important. Ideologically, S. R. Hirsch did not add anything in his later writings to what he had written in the *Nineteen Letters* and in *Horeb*. It is natural that he should have begun to write about *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* as a didactic postulate, once he had embarked on the application of his principles to practical education and instruction in the orthodox Jewish school. But it is an absolute error to draw the conclusion that, therefore, "the concept of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* is entirely a didactic postulate and not a philosophic one as well—that it applies only to teaching youth and not to enlightening the scholar striving to uncover the secret of the Torah."³⁹ The opposite is true: S. R. Hirsch set out to find the "secret of the Torah," and found it—in *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*. This concept he recognized as the common denominator for the beliefs and opinions, for the laws and precepts in the Torah and the teachings of the Sages.

"Behold, in nature and history God speaks to you!"

In this sentence, which he addressed as an officiating rabbi on Rosh Hashana to his first congregation,⁴⁰ he voiced the basic idea of his entire conception.

"The principles of Judaism, even the most elevated among them, address the spirit of Man striving at the acquisition of knowledge, and all the beliefs and teachings of Judaism . . . are based upon the existence of God and His omnipotent activity in the manifestations of nature and history."⁴¹

The Creator of the world is identical with the Giver of the Torah, and He has laid down the law of nature and has commanded the postulates of ethics to man. This is

"the truth which is of paramount importance in the Holy Scripture: God commanding man is the commander of nature, in other words: God is the *omniscient God of nature as well as the God of man*. The precepts of God rule nature, and the precepts of God were commanded to man to be observed by his choice. This fact is a basic principle of Jewish consciousness."⁴²

"The identity of the One and Only God in nature and history — this is the basis of our knowledge of God, as well as our knowledge of ourselves in our consciousness."⁴³

The greatest danger to which the Jewish faith is exposed is the mistaken notion that God has abandoned nature to its own laws, and man to his sensations and passions.⁴⁴ And yet nature and history are not the *source* of our belief in God. We have to *know* God by what has been passed on to us by our ancestors, who *have seen* His strong arm in heaven and on earth. Keeping this knowledge in our hearts, we have to look closely at nature and history, so as to be able to understand the phenomena of both in the light of this knowledge. Whosoever shuts his eyes to the phenomena of nature and the events of history prevents himself from seeing the One and Only God at work. "The Oneness of the creation" is no matter for theological speculation, but the obligation for us to set all our lives, body and soul, to the recognition of God and to serving Him, the blessed One.⁴⁵ Therefore: "The wayfarer walking along the road learning Torah, who interrupts his study, saying: How beautiful is this tree and how good this field to look at, is at fault even to the degree of committing a mortal sin" (Avot 3,9). For whosoever sees nature as a sphere of life outside Torah, so that he has to "desist" from learning in order to admire the wonders of nature, denies, as it were, the unity of the world of the Holy One, blessed be He; this unity which comprises the "learning" and the "tree" all in one, is the glory of God and His magnificence.⁴⁶

It is, however, not sufficient that man should recognize and admire; man has to act, to work and to fulfil, as long as he lives. It is for this purpose that man has been created, spirit and body; and the pure body — matter come from nature — that man dedicates to the ethics of the Divine law is no less susceptible of holiness than the spirit. All earthly and natural matter that man offers and sacrifices to divine worship, merges with the sphere of heaven, becoming part of it, as "an object of the pure heavens." Hence the central significance of altar and sacrifice in Judaism. The worshippers of God are not called upon to suppress and starve the matter and senses of their bodies, but to dedicate these, in free will, to the worship of God, to link and unite the earthly sphere of matter and senses with the Divine sphere of eternity, freedom and morality. This is the cornerstone of the edifice of Judaism: the sanctifying of body and senses. The

principal object of divine worship is the elevation of the earthly sphere into the sphere of the Divine; in other words, man's activity — in body, matter, nature and senses — subordinated to the will of the Creator and to His precepts: "*And thou shalt eat before the Lord, thy God.*" Man sins and misses his vocation, if he removes the reins of Divine moral postulates from his body and his physical powers, — "But Yeshurun waxed fat and kicked." This is the reason why only a man sound in body can perform the Temple service as the representative of the rest of mankind.⁴⁷

A full and perfect life in the spirit of the Torah and a life of happiness and material prosperity neither contradict nor exclude each other. The contrary is true: a healthy, secure and vigorous life — this is the ideal state for the establishment of the reign of God and His Torah. The greater and the stronger the matter that man subordinates to the will of God, the more will the magnificence and sanctity of God become manifest. Man has to strive for "proximity to the Lord" by utilizing his happiness in conformity with the will of God. This is a basic truth of Judaism: not only does the Torah allow man to enjoy the pleasures of sensual life in happiness but, moreover, the Torah sanctifies this life with the holiness of the Precepts, provided man remains — at all times — within the bounds of the Divine laws. "And ye shall eat before the Lord, your God, and ye shall rejoice in all the work of your hands" — it is this pleasure and this joy of the life *before the Lord* that impart to Judaism its specific, characteristic features, the likes of which are not to be found anywhere else. Whosoever refrains from enjoyment and pleasure, insofar as they are not forbidden by the Torah, prevents the glory of God from dwelling in areas which could have been sanctified through becoming permeated with Torah. When S. R. Hirsch returned in old age from his first trip to the Swiss mountains, he is reported to have said joyfully: "Now I will be ready to reply, when I am asked in Heaven: Hast thou also seen My own Switzerland?"⁴⁸

A perplexed generation, wavering between idealism and materialism, between an overestimation of the human spirit and an enslavement to material values, between Hegel, Marx and Darwin — this was the generation to which S. R. Hirsch issued the chal-

lenging call of Judaism, as he saw it: "The glory of God reigns in the world below!" Man has been created in the image of God, after His likeness; and in his natural and pure state, he has been "made a little lower than God." The purpose of man's life, the goal of human history, is to return to the state of proximity to God, which had been achieved by the great of our nation: "Our forefathers, they are the chariot (*merkavah*)"; "*They* are the Temple of the Lord!" — every person in Israel is under the obligation personally to become "the Temple of the Lord," and only if he is permeated by this desire, will his worship be favourably accepted on the altar of God. The principal point of the Torah is not to teach man the knowledge of God, but to teach him to recognize himself as God's likeness, as the servant of the Lord.⁴⁹ The challenge of Judaism to mankind is not primarily how to deserve the next world, but how to deserve the proximity of God in this world. A Jew who dedicates his practical life to the worship of God obtains a taste of the next world during his life on earth. The sanctity of the Jewish family home is the precondition for the sanctity of the Temple of the Lord, and it is the obligation of man to make his home a dwelling place for the glory of God, till "every cooking-pot in Jerusalem and Judah" will be holy to the Lord, and man, dwelling in his homestead, will see the fulfilment of his wish: "Let me dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life." Only those who are "planted in the house of the Lord," even while they stay at home and follow their daily business, "will blossom forth in the courtyards of our Lord." The fulfilment of Torah and Judaism is achieved only through the sanctification of the material life of the individual, the family and the nation, the life of society and state, by sacrificing them as a burnt offering on the altar of the will of God — and only this sanctification of the life of the individual and society is capable of causing the glory of God to dwell upon earth. There are many symbols of this basic perception in the Temple service, reminding individuals constantly that "*they* are the Temple of the Lord"; pomegranates hanging from the seam of the High Priest's cloak, proclaiming that the fruit of the seeds of sanctity sown in the Temple, do not grow in heaven but upon earth. The peace offering is the Jewish offering *par excellence* and, in contra-

distinction to the burnt offering, is not offered by gentiles, for, while the gentile world recognizes that a sphere of sanctity does exist, Judaism alone knows of the consecration of the body (the eating of the offering by laymen), of infusing sanctity into physical life. The essence of the worship of God is not in the starvation and avoidance of all that is human in man, but in the elevation of the human aspect to the sphere of sanctity.⁵⁰

The Jew is obliged to worship God with all his inclinations, talents and faculties. "With all thy heart — with all that is good and all that is evil in thee." All human acts are good, if they are moulded by the "patterns" set by God in His Torah, His laws and His precepts. Man may translate all his ambitions and even his physical desires into action, provided he does not trespass the boundaries set by the Torah and does not divorce himself from the sphere of sanctity and purity. Man will fulfil his vocation not by castigation and the hermit's life, but by the development of all the powers granted him by his Creator, so as to subordinate them to the will of the Father in Heaven. "Be perfect," be what thou art in thy spirit, thy soul and thy body, completely, if only "thou be with thy God." For so God had said to Abraham: "Conduct thou thyself before My presence" — serve Me and cleave to Me with all your being, but do not suppress any part of your personality — "and be thou perfect." Thus it was that Isaac hoped to draw his son Esau, with all his inclinations, closer to God, and to make the hunter of the field a worshipper of God. For there is no such man as can say: "For me, for the like of myself, the Torah has not been granted."

The light of God is reflected in all shades of mankind. The Torah is the master-plan for the construction of the nation, just as it is for the fashioning of man. Everyone is obliged to strive for the welfare and progress of the community, each man at his post, each man in accordance with his faculties. The Torah has not been given to the ministering angels, nor has it been granted to the sages and the righteous alone, but to the "community of nations," merchants and peasants, scientists and soldiers among them; and each tribe of Israel was assigned its vocation in life and in the building of the nation and the state.⁵¹

"The vocation of Israel does not postulate that the nation turn away from freedom and independence, from flourishing and prospering in the spiritual as well as in the material sense; on the contrary, Israel has to accept these benefits gladly whenever they are offered, in order to carry out the tasks of life which the Torah has imposed on the nation, doing it in as rich a variety of ways as only possible. There is only one reservation to be observed: that Israel always remain the master of the goods of material prosperity offered in abundance, that they be absorbed, as it were, into the particular character of Israel. They must be interwoven in the fabric of the spirit of the Torah, and Israel must only ascribe significance to them in so far as they become the threshold over which we step on our way to observe the Precepts. Israel, however, has to reject any offer that cannot be fused with the spirit of the Torah." 52

This transformation of everything earthly and material into a stage where the will of God is acted out is the true and ideal sanctification of God, which is greater and more important in Judaism than sanctification by sacrificing one's life. Our ancestors — Israel, the holy nation — have always been peasants and herdsmen, and the Jewish day-labourer who earns a scanty livelihood for his family, working hard by day, but spending part of his night in the house of learning, studying the law, — he is the most dignified representative of "Israel, the Holy People." 53
For —

"Judaism is no religion, the synagogue no church, and the rabbi no clergyman. Judaism is no appendage of one kind or another to life, nor is it part of man's vocation in life. Judaism embraces all the spheres of our life, being the sum of our life's vocation."

Judaism does not exist mainly in synagogues; prayers, fasts and holidays are not its essence. The Jewish religion is no substitute for life; the Jewish religion is Jewish life itself, and in the Jewish vocabulary there is no place left vacant for secular life." 54

All these ideas about the desirable relationship in Judaism between Torah and life, religion and society, between faith and action, between spirit and matter, between the Creator and the created — all these were summed up by S. R. Hirsch in the conception of Torah - I m - D e r e k h - E r e t z . Making this conception the central element of Jewish thought and Jewish action was not postulated by him as an ideological principle applying to a certain, particular or special historical, social or spiritual

situation experienced by the Jewish nation or the world. "Thou shalt know Him in all thy ways" — in all his ways the Jew walks as a Jew; in all circumstances that might affect Israel as a nation or community, there is always the obligation and the possibility for the Jew to live a full Torah life. The observance of the Torah is not conditioned by any particular historical, economic or social reality; any time and any reality are adequate for the establishment of the life of the Torah. To make such a declaration in Hirsch's days, the period of emancipation, was a manifestation of courage and daring: it meant the readiness, in principle, to leave the walls of the ghetto behind, and to accept the *Derekh-Eretz* of the new age as the environment for a full Torah life. Moreover, Hirsch was convinced that the conditions of modern life afford better prospects for the development of Torah-living, of a life that would be more accomplished and more satisfying than under the conditions of the ghetto; thus he regarded it as the special challenge of the new reality to exchange the "education of Jews" for "Jewish education."⁵⁵ The ghetto had divorced the spirit of Israel (*Torah*) from a healthy economic, social and political life (*Derekh-Eretz*), while the ideal of Judaism postulates their closest association and unity (*im*). For "*Derekh-Eretz* and Torah have come to Israel arm in arm" and the alienation of Israel from the achievements of general culture did not derive from the genuine character of Judaism.⁵⁶

An exhaustive definition of the relation between *Torah* and *Derekh-Eretz* in the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch has been presented by Rabbi Jacob Yehiel Weinberg of blessed memory, who was able, more than many others, to penetrate to the depths of the true significance of the idea: "Derekh-Eretz is none other than the matter which is moulded into form by the activity of the Torah."⁵⁷ Torah and *Derekh-Eretz* bear the relationship of form and matter to one another. One cannot exist independently of the other; each conditions the other and merges with it.⁵⁸ The rule of the Torah means giving life in this world the form that has been moulded by the Torah. This earthly life also includes the sphere of human culture, and in this sense *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* means the mastery of Torah culture over human culture. The raw material of man — his body, his spirit and his culture — are data

of his creation; the Torah comes to impose on it image and likeness. "*Derekh-Eretz* came before Torah," as the six days of creation preceded the Sabbath, as the seven days of the newly-born precede the eighth day, the day of circumcision."⁵⁹

Therefore there is no place left, in the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch, for secular or "extraneous" wisdom and studies. *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* gives expression to the belief that the Torah has the power to be a "dynamic formative principle," transforming any cultural content into the faithful service of truth and higher values.⁶⁰

The concept *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* in the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch has also been defined as a synthesis. However, this definition only holds good in its Hegelian significance: two contradictory forces contending with each other are reconciled and renewed on a higher level.⁶¹ Or to put it in the language of the natural sciences: *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* is not a physical mixture but a chemical compound. Torah and life, Judaism and culture, do not complement each other, but achieve complete identity.⁶² Against the compromising tendency to put Torah and *Derekh-Eretz* side by side, without any organic and dynamic fusion, S. R. Hirsch proclaimed: "Whoever puts together the name of Heaven with other matters — is erased from the world." He added: "We acknowledge before heaven and earth: had our religion ordered us to alienate ourselves from all that is called civilization and education, we would have done so unhesitatingly, for our religion is for us the word of God, and there is neither wisdom nor reason nor counsel against God."⁶³ Therefore there is no compromise of principle with the spirit of the time in S. R. Hirsch's conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*, nor is there any opportunistic consideration for the "vital" needs of the generation of emancipation.⁶⁴

The universal and timeless tendency of the conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* is most characteristically expressed in the special definition, given by S. R. Hirsch, of the image of the perfect Jew among the rest of mankind. Every human being has been created in the likeness of God, and it is in the very nature of his creation that he is able to reach out towards the heights of human moral perfection. Our forefather Abraham achieved the

summit of human capability, pure humanism, even before he became the father of the nation of Israel and the embodiment of its vision and vocation. Our father Jacob, while dwelling in the tents of learning, acquired all the supreme qualities of pure humanism without any limitation. The seed of Abraham that follow in his path have always been the most humane of men. Therefore, the Jew has to be "man" before he can aspire to be a "Jew." He has to adopt all the values of pure humanity, and only then will he be worthy to rise to the higher level of "Israel." Again: "*Derekh-Eretz* came before the Torah" — Judaism is the highest stage of humanism. This relationship between man and Jew, between humanism and Judaism, was expressed by S. R. Hirsch in the compound "Man-Israel."⁶⁵

"Man-Israel" is the accomplished Jew who is, at the same time, the perfect and ideal man. "Israel" includes "man" but "man" does not include "Israel," for the significance of "Israel" is much higher than that of "man." For the Jew it is sufficient to be "Israel," accomplished and perfect, for this stage includes the faculties of pure humanism. But it is not sufficient for a Jew to be an accomplished "man," and, on the other hand, Jewish existence is no substitute for humanism. "Man-Israel" means: be "Israel" with all your human capacities. "Man-Israel": not man and yet Israel, nor Israel and yet man; but Israel who is man at the highest level a mortal can reach by voluntarily subordinating himself to the will of God. Hence the ideal "Man-Israel" is as far removed from the slogan of the Jewish *Maskilim*: "Be a man outdoors and a Jew at home," as East is from West.⁶⁶

"Man-Israel" represents the ideal Jew putting the universal ideal of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* into practice in his material and spiritual life.

III

We have now to leave the sphere of *weltanschauung* and educational philosophy for the sphere of education. S. R. Hirsch based his ideas, in respect of fundamental elements of Jewish education as well as in respect of the methods of instruction, on one principle: *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*. However, we have to draw

a clear-cut line of demarcation between *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* as a philosophic principle and *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* as an educational principle.⁶⁷ Disregarding this distinction has caused, and is still causing, essential misunderstanding of S. R. Hirsch's doctrine as a whole.

The Jewish personality, embodying the ideal of "Man-Israel" as conceived by S. R. Hirsch, is not split with regard to "Torah" and "*Derekh-Eretz*." In its mind and heart there is no co-existence of the world of Torah on the one hand and the world outside Torah on the other hand. In its well-grounded and consistent *weltanschauung*, Torah and *Derekh-Eretz* have become integrated in a single whole. However, setting out to translate the vision into the language of educational and instructional reality, S. R. Hirsch did not intend to remove the barrier dividing pragmatically between the holy and the profane, between the words of the Living God and the philosophy of Greece and Rome. Vision and mind are able to embrace the world in one moment. The process of education and study, however, takes place within the dimensions of time; there is the early and the late, the first and the last, the essential and the secondary. It is inevitable for the single principle of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* to emerge in practical education, in the form of curricula, divided into books, subjects and class periods. A curriculum for imparting *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* seems, at first sight, to be compiled piecemeal: Bible, Talmud, language, the sciences, foreign languages, etc. Thus we have to ask ourselves anew: what is the relationship between the different and varying curricula in the system of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*?

We have already pointed out: the very inclusion of "secular studies" in the curricula for Jewish children was not the innovation of S. R. Hirsch. Divergent opinions with regard to "secular studies" have always existed among our sages: some of them remove the "beauties of Japhet" from the "tents of Shem," while others accord "a modest seat to the son of the maid at the honoured table of the mistress' son."⁶⁸ No one has ever forbidden vocational training intended to prepare the learner to earn a livelihood.⁶⁹ However, during the period preceding the generation of S. R. Hirsch, the question of "secular" studies had come to a head in consequence of four historical causes:

A. With the beginning of the emancipation, many Jewish parents had to face the alternative: either to let their sons follow the beaten track of the traditional Jewish ghetto occupations, such as peddling, which were, so to speak, "easy to learn but difficult and degrading to pursue," since they were notoriously "Jewish occupations" which evoked the contempt of the gentile for the Jew — or to prepare their sons for more respectable professions which required a prolonged period of training and an elementary knowledge of the arts and sciences. There were many parents, the pious and the God-fearing among them, who chose dignified professions, although these were difficult to enter.

B. The rise of capitalism and the industrial revolution in Western Europe made a many-sided academic training a prerequisite for many professions which, in former times, needed only a very limited schooling. *Derekh-Eretz* in the sense of a worldly occupation, providing a livelihood, and *Derekh-Eretz* in the sense of the study of the arts and sciences had, thus, almost become identical.

C. During the period of Enlightenment, science had become alienated from faith and religion, and the arts and sciences were imparted to young people at the price of their estrangement from the religion and life-patterns of their parents.

D. The "Berlin *Haskalah*" presented to the Jewish young man the image of a new, revolutionized, educated Jew who had not only abandoned the Jewish laws and customs, but had even discarded them contemptuously.

It is, therefore, not surprising that, in view of these circumstances, the leading rabbis kept voicing stern warnings against any occupation with "extraneous" studies as well as against any changes in the curriculum of instruction for Jewish children. Many of these leaders could not envisage anything else than the perpetuation of the socio-spiritual ghetto, even as the walls of the political ghetto were crumbling.

Rabbi Moshe Tuvia Sondheimer of Hanau, among the most distinguished rabbis of his time, told one of his students who had completed his course of studies at the university without any harm to his Jewishness: "You may not have come to harm, and yet it would have been better had you not studied at all."⁷⁰

When the "*Hatam Sofer*" first held office in Pressburg, the journal of the Jewish intellectuals in Germany published the following item: "The frustrated anger against modern education voiced by the Rabbi of Pressburg is absolutely ludicrous." "The Rabbi," the journal continued, "named Moses Sofer, born in Frankfurt, belongs to the old generation and is not only without influence and importance, but also quite unknown even in rabbinical circles. He has even delivered a public sermon against modern schools."⁷¹ Rabbi Abraham Bing of Wuerzburg presented an official petition, signed by the rabbis of Bavaria, asking the government to renounce its demand that no rabbi be confirmed in office unless he had acquired a general education.⁷² During the struggle against Abraham Geiger in Breslau, Rabbi Solomon Tiktin claimed that the very fact that a rabbi had studied at a university disqualified him from holding rabbinical office⁷³ — this, at a time when more than one rabbinical chair was occupied by pious and strictly observant Jews who had studied at universities, among them two of the teachers of S. R. Hirsch!

Viewed historically, the innovation introduced by S. R. Hirsch lay in his demand to take the new economic, political and social environment for granted;⁷⁴ i.e. to accept the *Derekh-Eretz* of the period of emancipation with all its economic and educational significance. Moreover, he did not accept the newly-created circumstances out of necessity, but recognized them as positive factors, normalising the material and spiritual life of the Jews. The high, dark walls of the ghetto had prevented the Jews from seeing the blue skies and the wonders of nature; Jew-baiting and persecution had stifled any desire to become acquainted with the process of universal history.⁷⁵ Happy the generation that had lived to see the exodus from the darkness of the ghetto into the light of liberty, that had been granted the opportunity to widen the borders of the kingdom of the Torah to include the world of thought and action from which the Torah had been barred by the harsh conditions of Galut.

In 1832, Hirsch wrote to an acquaintance who had been a fellow-student of his in the Yeshiva of Rabbi Jacob Ettlinger, and who had later, like himself, studied for a short time at a university. Hirsch stressed that the friend should not regard his

university studies as a burden forced upon him by the needs of the time. "These studies should be a source of spiritual enlightenment for you, through which your own wisdom will be united with the wisdom that has come down to you as the heritage of the congregation of Jacob."⁷⁶

The disciplines of natural sciences and history can and should be combined with the wisdom of the Torah. He who has granted the Torah to Israel has made the laws for all beings, animate and inanimate, and it is He, too, who directs the fates of nations and states. The study of the Torah has to be accompanied by the study of natural sciences and history, not in order to learn the ways of God from them — for this purpose the Torah in itself is sufficient — but in order to learn from God and His Torah the significance of nature and of history and to understand the vocation of Man-Israel within nature and history.⁷⁷ Thus there should be no separation whatsoever between instruction in the Torah and the teaching of general subjects. All should be taught in one and the same educational institution. God's Torah and the knowledge of the ways of the world shall be as two spheres revolving on the same axis. The Torah shall be the supreme test for the fruit of the human spirit, and the sum of human knowledge shall be illuminated with the light of Judaism. In a curriculum based on this conception, there are no "Divine" and "profane" studies, for it manifests the unity of all that is good, beautiful and true in the world of the Holy One, blessed be He. We can now also understand why S. R. Hirsch did not follow the practice of the Talmud-Torah school in Hamburg, instituted by his teacher Hakham Isaac Bernays, that non-Jewish teachers were to be preferred as instructors for the general subjects. Hirsch's method postulated the absolute opposite. He exerted much effort to find Jewish, God-fearing teachers for general subjects. He himself showed the way. He taught Torah and German to the same class in the same year.⁷⁸

Both spheres revolve on the same axis, but there is a higher and a lower sphere, the "son of the maid" belonging to a lower order than the "son of the mistress." The Torah is the standard by which all education is measured, and not vice-versa. The content of the Torah is permanent and absolute, while the content

of *Derekh-Eretz* has to be determined in accordance with the extent of its reference to the Torah.

S. R. Hirsch never became weary of stressing that, while speaking of the Torah, he meant the whole of the Torah, the written and the oral, the whole of Judaism without abridgements or elisions.⁷⁹ On the other hand, he was always very careful in qualifying his own words concerning the study of general culture and in subordinating it to the values of the Torah. *Not each and every Derekh-Eretz will stand the test of the Torah and be found worthy of being associated with the study of Torah.* So had he already warned his childhood friend in the above-mentioned letter: "Very much depends on the question of which spheres of science a man will choose, what his intentions are and to what goal he devotes his period of learning."⁸⁰ Only that *Derekh-Eretz* is worthy of being incorporated within the congregation of Jewish learners which is not contradictory to the truth of Judaism.

"The spirit of Israel is in sympathy with all culture, provided it leads towards the recognition of truth and well-doing. If, however, a culture is enslaved to sensuality, it will only lead to further corruption... Where there is no Torah, there is no *Derekh-Eretz*; if culture does not pave the way for Torah, but strives towards its replacement, it does not lead the way to the Tree of Life, but to corruption."

Again: "All the aims of culture are sacred and lead to happiness — as long as they are subordinate to God." Only "true culture" — i.e. a culture that is on the same level as the truth of the Torah — is able to enrich the spirit of a son of Israel and it is indeed our obligation to study and teach this culture.⁸¹

The principle of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* postulates, therefore, a classification of world cultures according to their proximity to the spirit of Israel and its Torah. S. R. Hirsch exemplified this himself by analysing the culture of Rome and Greece, drawing the conclusion that the Greek spirit of true and pure humanism contains all the ingredients that would enable it to serve Judaism, while the materialistic and utilitarian spirit prevailing in Roman culture is contrary to the spirit of Judaism to such an extent that no compromise is possible between the

two.⁸² Similarly, he distinguished between the two greatest German poets, Goethe and Schiller, his sympathy leaning more towards the latter than the former. To the memory of Schiller, in whose writing there is much of the ethical teachings of the philosopher, Kant, S. R. Hirsch dedicated an enthusiastic appreciation in a speech he delivered before the students of his own school; on the other hand, he rejected the turbulent, unorthodox spirit of Goethe.⁸³

And yet, in spite of all the worthiness of certain human cultures to be associated with Judaism, — “the son of the maid” will not inherit the portion of the “son of the mistress.” The Torah will forever remain essential, and all the rest is secondary. The sentence in *Torat-Kohanim* explaining the verse “My social laws shall ye practise and My laws shall ye guard to walk in them” — as meaning: “They are to form the essential, spiritual activity of your life, not the secondary, etc.” served S. R. Hirsch as the basis for a programmatic lecture on the relationship between *Torah* and *Derekh-Eretz* taken together as an educational principle.⁸⁴ The postulate of the sages, עֵשֶׂם עֵיקָר וְאֵל תַּעֲשֶׂם טַפֵּל involves the *a priori* supposition that the occupation with studies outside the Torah is permitted. However, for us the wisdom of the Torah is the essential, the permanent and the absolute, while all other wisdom is only to serve us as an ancillary of the Torah, and we are only to regard what fits the truth of the Torah as true.

“All that we accept intellectually, and all our actions as well, must always be considered from the point of view of the Torah and be within the lines of the doctrines it teaches, so that we only accept and adopt that which is in accordance with them, and do not adulterate the knowledge we draw out of the Torah with ideas which have developed from other and strange premises.”

For us, Torah wisdom must not be one among many sciences. We are not to classify the truth of the Torah in our mind and soul as co-existing with other truths on one and the same level. There can be only one single truth and one, single, true wisdom in our hearts, and in its light are we to examine all other wisdom. In this way we shall never yield the sacred soil of the Torah even while we are occupied with the study of other arts and sciences.

If this is the relationship between *Torah* and *Derekh-Eretz* in the Jewish school, then the many-sided content of the wisdom of the Torah is to be accorded an absolute, unchallengeable priority, a priority in quantity, in quality, and, first and foremost, in time. "First the Torah is to be blessed," and if circumstances require a choice between Torah and general education, our slogan has to be: "Judaism — first; general education — later."⁸⁵ We must not forget that one of the ways by which the Torah is acquired is "by moderation in civic affairs." It was owing to the blurring of the true distinction between Torah and *Derekh-Eretz* that the glorious Jewry of Spain fell into decline till it was finally extirpated.⁸⁶

Once the preferential position of the Torah has been assured, educators of the young generation are permitted and even obliged to introduce their disciples without fear or hesitation to the world of true human wisdom. They have to teach their students a love of true human wisdom which emanates from the *love of the Torah*. Whosoever loves the essential will love the secondary, the addition of flavouring to the essential. A knowledge of natural sciences, history and other disciplines provides the young with an entry to the knowledge of the world as a whole, assists them in their study of Torah and helps them achieve a *weltanschauung* in the spirit of the Torah.

This knowledge is "not only permitted, but desirable in its widest sense; for only a person equipped with this broad *weltanschauung* is able to understand the place and vocation of Judaism in the world, and to realize its unique position as compared with other world views."⁸⁷ Thus the subject-matter of *Derekh-Eretz* is to be studied as seriously and strictly as the Torah, and when general subjects have been included in the curriculum, their status should be equally as obligatory as the study of Torah.⁸⁸

Let the teacher approach the sacred assignment of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* with the necessary care, and yet confidently and unapprehensively:

"And do not fear for the Torah on account of other wisdom; for... true wisdom loves the Torah and is its ancillary. True

wisdom makes for modesty, and modesty makes for the fear of God, and the fear of God opens and guards the gates of the Torah."

That particular portion of European education that is regarded as "true wisdom," in that it is based on the values of faith and morals, the roots of which are ingrained in the sanctity of Judaism — that portion will merge well with Jewish studies, and there is no danger that it will harm the souls of our children.⁸⁹

There is no passage in the writings of S. R. Hirsch in which he has formulated the significance of "true wisdom" as clearly and in such detail as in his address in memory of Schiller, which we have mentioned before. It is, therefore, worthwhile to summarize it here.

Our Sages have taught us: If you meet one of the sages of the world, say: Be He blessed who has imparted of His wisdom to flesh and blood. Of *His wisdom* — this means: all that is truly beautiful and good, all that enlightens the spirit of man, all that paves the way for the voice of truth to enter the heart of man — in all this our Sages have seen the reflection of the wisdom of the Creator, an echo of the voice and spirit of God. Schiller was worthy of this blessing, for he has given glorious, poetic expression to the vision of pure humanity in the heart of man, and to the vision of the likeness of God that is ingrained in his humanity. Schiller's poems were dedicated to purity and ethics, to freedom within the law and to the observance of the law out of free will.⁹⁰ Schiller has no equal in giving expression to the elevated ideal of the nobility of mankind, the dignity of woman and the happiness of family life. He has portrayed history as the process of the education of mankind toward fulfilling its divine mission. He has proclaimed, in penetrating words, his belief in the final victory of law and justice and in the defeat of violence and physical might. Many of his words and formulations remind us of the words of our prophets and sages.⁹¹

S. R. Hirsch unhesitatingly declared: The greatest of the national poets of the German nation has instructed us in the practical wisdom of Judaism.⁹²

Parallel to "true wisdom" S. R. Hirsch set the term of "true science," and his approach to the natural sciences, as to literature, was of a selective kind. His opponents, adherents of the camp of "progress" and the "Science of Judaism," interpreted his eclectic attitude to the sciences as one of contempt, disrespect

and deliberate neglect. As a matter of fact, he sternly opposed any form of withdrawal on the part of Torah students from all branches of scientific research. His writings, and also his close friends, have borne witness to his never-ceasing interest in the achievements of the science of his day.⁹³ He declared on numerous occasions that the strongest reinforcement of faith is to be found in the exact sciences, for it is their basic assumption that the world exists in accordance with a stable and uniform system of laws — and who, if not the One and Only Creator, could have instituted law and order in the universe!? However, the rise of scientific materialism was observed by him with deep apprehension, for in it he saw a devastating attempt to depose the kingdom of Heaven from its place of honour and to enthrone science instead of Him who had commanded the world to be, and it was. He denounced the superficial and pretentious language of modern science proclaiming the discovery of laws and truths without being able, for the time being, to present anything but hypotheses, assumptions and interim conclusions.⁹⁴

In the “either-or” postulate, so characteristic of him, S. R. Hirsch declared: It is better to be a Jew without science than to be preoccupied with science that is alienated from and contradictory to Judaism. There is only one single truth and no other. There is no truth outside the beliefs and teachings of Judaism. There is no gulf between “faith” and “science,” for only a science that complies with the truth of the Torah is a true science. Thus S. R. Hirsch tried to *overcome* science by the means of the Torah, by way of interweaving the “true science” in the fabric of the Torah. This accounts for the paucity of references, in his writings, to general scientific subjects, although he was as well versed in them as any educated person of his time. For S. R. Hirsch proceeded as Rabbi Meir had done in his day: “Eat the fruit” — eat it all, turn the project of “true science” into a project of the Torah — “and throw away the peel” — what is not “true science” in his eyes is to be rejected and discarded as contradictory to the truth of the Torah.⁹⁵

The influence of the spirit of Israel in spheres outside the tents of the Torah becomes manifest in “true wisdom” and “true science,” but mainly in those developments and movements in

the history of mankind and of the world that promote the values of ethics, liberty, equality and peace. History is none other than a continual and complex process, guided by Providence, through which human society is elevated towards the values of the People of God. It is, therefore, in the explicit interest of those dwelling in the tents of the Torah to probe into this process and to follow it, confident in their belief that the kingdom of Heaven will finally prevail on earth.⁹⁶

S. R. Hirsch gave expression to this conception in a speech he delivered in the synagogue of his congregation on the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Leipzig, in which the allied armies had defeated Napoleon. It is, again, worthwhile for us to present a short summary of his speech.

In the victory of justice over tyranny, God is revealed operating in history, elevating the values of Sinai in the consciousness of mankind. Every gate and door that is opened to justice and liberty is the gate of God through which the righteous will pass. Napoleon was an instrument in the hand of God, for he was made to sow the seeds of liberty and justice among all the nations. God subjugates criminals and fools to the burden of His guidance in order to turn Jewish justice and Jewish truth into the common property of mankind. Christianity itself is nothing but temporary attire worn by Judaism among the nations in order to win their hearts for its values. The quality of the attitude that nations of the world adopt towards Israel has always been the touchstone by which to measure the quality of justice they harbor in their hearts and of the moral standards they have attained. At the time of their victory over Napoleon, the nations of Europe were not yet ripe in this respect, but the progress of Jewish emancipation henceforward bears witness to the ever-growing sense of divine justice in their consciousness.⁹⁷

This affinity of Judaism to the events of world history derives from the universal character of Judaism and the consciousness of its global mission. Is it conceivable, asks S. R. Hirsch, that believing Jews should not follow gladly and hopefully the manifestations of the first stages of the embodiment of the mission of Judaism in the nations of the world? On the other hand, Jewish universalism exists in social and religious solitude. Israel has indeed a "mission" — a task to perform for the nations of the world. Yet this mission can only be fulfilled by observing the precepts and by living an inner Jewish life. The universal

mission of Israel does not postulate an active engagement in moulding the spiritual images of other nations. The participation of Israel in the spiritual life of the nations of the world bears an essentially passive and receptive character, reflected in knowledge, understanding, observance and expectation.⁹⁸

IV

The ideological and educational innovations of S. R. Hirsch in the sphere of general studies overshadowed his demand for a reform of the study of the oral and written content of the Torah. There was nothing really new in this demand, for since the days of the Maharal of Prague, leading Ashkenazic rabbis had not ceased clamouring for far-reaching changes in the programme of Torah studies for children and adults. These changes were intended to achieve a comprehensive study of the Bible, the Mishnah, Halakhah and Aggadah—contrary to the abridged curriculum taught in the Batey Midrash and Yeshivot. In addition, methods of instruction were to be better adapted to the ages and life patterns of the students. Although Hirsch merely followed those who had earlier demanded these changes, we must not omit this aspect of his educational philosophy, for it too is one of the fundamental elements of his conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*. It was in the name of this conception that he postulated not only a change in the attitude to general studies, but also a reformation of the structure of Torah studies, their method and aims.

He sharply criticized the “spirit of abstruse speculation” which, in former generations, had turned Torah research studies into an end in itself, instead of directing it into the two essential channels: the achievement of a consistent Jewish *weltanschauung* and training towards the fulfilment of the vision and laws of the Torah in the active life of all generations to come. Hirsch went far in his demand for the ideal of “Torah for its own sake.” However “the flower of knowledge should be—life,” and “Torah for its own sake” is but the Torah studied for the achievement of a full life of accomplishment in the spirit of the Torah.⁹⁹ Therefore, all study of the Torah has always to be directed at

the knowledge of its practical precepts and the Jewish form of life; the grading of the subject-matter has to be carried out as closely as possible in accordance with the instruction of our Sages: At the age of five — learn the Bible, at the age of ten — Mishnah, and at the age of fifteen — Gemarah; the child is not to study Mishnah before he has acquired a broad elementary knowledge of the Bible and the Hebrew language; the child is to be instructed to speak the language of the Bible and to think in it, just as he does in the language of the state; Bible interpretation has to be associated with its language, and has to meet at the same time the vital and educational needs of the contemporary generation.¹⁰⁰

This is not the place for an exposition of S. R. Hirsch's method in the interpretation of the Mitzvot.¹⁰¹ However, we are obliged to probe into the impact of the concept of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* upon his thought in this sphere as well.

In S. R. Hirsch's lectures on the purpose of the Mitzvot, the conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* is revealed as an immanent Torah-system in the analysis of the laws of Israel and their roots. The Mitzvot hallow the material life of the son of Israel, they clothe the world of animals, plants and inanimate objects with Torah, i.e. they subordinate *Derekh-Eretz* to Torah, through some of the many details of the Mitzvot connected with and valid for it. An analysis of the Mitzvot has, therefore, to probe into the very depth of the minute details of the laws and the components which constitute the act of the Mitzvah in quantity and quality. Only the sum of this multi-coloured picture will elevate the scholar toward the true conception and true purpose of the Mitzvah.

This system excludes a distinction between the essential and the secondary in the details of the Mitzvot. Every material detail, every substance and quality, every measure and color — all of them are integral parts without which the true idea and correct purpose of the Mitzvah cannot be properly comprehended. Thus it may occur that one of the details of a Mitzvah, appearing, as it were, marginal and lacking in importance, emerges in the sum-total of all the details as the "finishing touch" of the explication of the purpose and idea of that Mitz-

vah. For example: the High Priest, when performing the service of the Day of Atonement, has to purify his hands and feet not only when changing his golden for his linen garments. Even before stripping his holy garments and changing into his private, profane clothes at the end of the entire service of the day, he must purify his hands and feet in a holy vessel. This comes to impart a significant idea: the value of the whole of the Yom Kippur service lies in carrying over its inherent spirit of purification to the profane life of every-day—the fulfilment of the “Torah” of the Holy of Holies in the *Derekh-Eretz* of every-day life.¹⁰²

The Torah is the “religion of life,” of the dynamic life and of economic, social and political activity. Hence the significance of the halakhic limitations, confining the observance of many Mitzvot to the hours of daylight. Judaism is no “religion of the night,” no religion for the hours of darkness, when one’s work is done. The year of the Jewish calendar is the lunar year, but from time to time the year “leaps,” so that the lunar year may reach the solar year, may reach the light of working day. Again, just as the Sabbath sanctifies the labour of six working days, and the year of Sh’mittah—the labour of six years, so does the prohibition of interest sanctify the life of commerce and industry. For the Torah has been given to sanctify the *Derekh-Eretz* of its faithful through their observance of its Mitzvot.¹⁰³

The Mitzvot of the Torah imbue Judaism with an aesthetic significance, since they establish in the life of Israel a supreme harmony, in which there is a complete congruence of the form and content of life. “Its ways are the ways of beauty” — there is a special beauty in the life of the Mitzvot, an aesthetic “taste” of a peculiar kind, satisfying the human sense of beauty by elevating “man” to the state of “Israel.” This is the central significance of the “*Hiddur Mitzvah*” in Judaism, which became one of the main pillars of S. R. Hirsch’s doctrine.¹⁰⁴

It was no mere chance that, in his old age, S. R. Hirsch devoted most of his teaching activity in his school to a subject which he called “The Spirit of the Jewish Theory of Laws.”¹⁰⁵ In those lessons he strove to implant in the hearts of his students

a love of Torah and Mitzvot and to inspire them with the consciousness of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* as the unifying principle of all the Mitzvot, moulding them into a uniform context of a harmonious *weltanschauung* and life-pattern.

V

Attempting to examine the question of how S. R. Hirsch and his students and disciples put the ideal of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* into practice in the actual life of their community, and especially in the curriculum of their school, we have first and foremost to point out their principal achievement and everlasting merit. Through the impelling, driving force and the enormous challenge of the conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*, the observant Jewry of Western Europe was able to withstand the forces of atheism, materialism and secularization operating most aggressively in their generation. A small group of "remnants," clinging to the tradition of their ancestors with their very nails, grew into a close-knit and organized camp, capable of proving to the Jewish public and the world at large that it lies within the power of the unabridged Torah to overcome the *Derekh-Eretz* of modern times. When S. R. Hirsch passed away in the year 1888, he was escorted to his rest by thousands of his congregation and by students and loyal followers from all over the country — believers and God-fearing men, strict observers of the Mitzvot, who set aside regular hours for the study of the Torah — all of them faithfully pursuing their occupations, many of them in possession of a broad European education, wealthy merchants and financiers, physicians, lawyers and members of the academic professions. At the graveside of their master, those delivering the eulogies could unhesitatingly proclaim: God has given His blessing to the life-work of the great rabbi, the ardent believer and heroic fighter of the battles of the Lord, and henceforward the glory of the Torah will never depart from the congregation of the faithful of Israel in Western Europe.

Still, we have to ask ourselves: was S. R. Hirsch's ideal of a "Jewish education," as he had postulated it in his writings

and sermons, fulfilled in respect of his average pupils? Was an adequate balance kept between the study of the Torah and general subjects, in accordance with the original curriculum of the founder? It seems that our answer to this question has to be in the negative. Actually, S. R. Hirsch himself, not to speak of his successors, had been obliged to compromise between the ideal curriculum of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* and the requirements of the State education authorities, whose recognition was essential to the material and legal existence of the school.¹⁰⁷

Even in the days when S. R. Hirsch was acting as a principal of the school, it was possible for one of its outstanding teachers to publish, in an official prospectus of the institution, an article on the teaching of the German language, in which there was practically no reference at all to Judaism and Hebrew,¹⁰⁸ although the permeation of *all* subjects with the Torah and the spirit of Judaism was one of the explicit, basic elements of the system! "One of the main tasks of the Jewish school," S. R. Hirsch had written, "is to make our young people capable of studying the literature of our sources independently."¹⁰⁹ Among the Hebrew language achievements required of the higher-grade students, mention was made in the original prospectus of the school of the capacity to write compositions freely in this language.¹¹⁰ Yet how wide was the gap between the ideal and reality, between the projected curriculum and its practical application! The average student indeed formed for himself a Jewish outlook and Jewish way of life, which enabled him to observe the Mitzvot and many of them with scrupulous strictness. His general education, however, far surpassed his Torah learning, and only a few exceptionally gifted students attained the ability to read and write Hebrew fluently. Contrary to his original bi-lingual approach, S. R. Hirsch had, for the time being, to put up with the realities of a situation which made it absolutely senseless to address his reading public, even partially, in Hebrew.¹¹¹

On principle, it would have been right, perhaps, had S. R. Hirsch followed the will of his grandfather and had devoted the first years of schooling of the Jewish child to the exclusive study of the Torah.¹¹² However, under the prevailing circum-

stances, this was absolutely impossible. In spite of his explicit announcement in the Introduction to the Statute of the Congregation, of his intention to establish a Yeshiva and a Bet-Midrash as an institute of further education affiliated with the school, he was unable to carry out this plan, and instead of "complete Torah" many of his students did not cover more than the Pentateuch with Rashi, some chapters of the other books of the Bible, *Mishnayot* and *Hayye-Adam*.¹¹³

S. R. Hirsch was himself fully aware of the imperfections of the Torah education offered by his school under the existing conditions, and none regretted the gap between his ideal program and the exigencies of contemporary realities more than he. The failure of his school to live up fully to the demands of his program, based as it was on the lines laid down by the Sages, evoked this eloquent sigh from the mouth of the aged master:

"Ah, when shall we see the day when our young people will once again tread the path to spiritual and mental development in accordance with the teaching left us by our wise 'fathers!'"¹¹⁴

The shortcomings in the practical application of the system of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* which were considered as a temporary measure (*Horaat Sha'ah*) by S. R. Hirsch, grew, in the consciousness of many of his disciples, into something of a permanent feature (*Horaah Le-Dorot*). It so happened that the essential became secondary, and the secondary became essential. The young generation, without giving the matter much thought, accepted the conditions of full emancipation and the integration into the German "fatherland," as circumstances not only to be taken for granted, but even to be considered as ideal. If even S. R. Hirsch saw himself compelled to confine instruction in Talmud to groups of outstanding students, offering even these some meager quantity, the conclusion was drawn that it was possible to be a "complete Jew," according to the concept of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*, without being capable of studying a page of Gemarah.¹¹⁵ The numerous inspiring passages they found in the writings of their teacher about *Derekh-Eretz* as the principal test for "Torah," produced a tragic misunderstanding. In the hearts of many of them the balance shifted from Torah to *Derekh-Eretz*. The curricula of European culture and

sciences were included within the framework of Jewish education, without having been subjected to a critical analysis or placed in proper perspective. The *Derekh-Eretz* of Western Europe was introduced into the Jewish home and the Jewish school, almost without limitation and without any attempt to watch it seriously against the odds of the spirit of the Torah and Judaism. The concept of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* was understood as a way of life of an outward, mechanical and loose co-existence of Torah with *Derekh-Eretz*, allowing for the full enjoyment of all the pleasures of European life "within the framework of what was permitted by the Torah." There developed an atmosphere of idealization of this kind of split Judaism, accompanied by a deprecation of, and even contempt for, the Judaism of Torah and Hassidism in Eastern Europe. Instead of the integrated ideal of "Man-Israel," there arose the image of a split and immature personality — half Jew and half European. Instead of subordinating the *Derekh-Eretz* to Torah, many chose an easy compromise between both, till finally "Torah" became subordinate to *Derekh-Eretz*. It had never been the intention of S. R. Hirsch to prepare observant Jews for the ways of life of the European "salon," but to establish a Torah "salon life." Yet there were many who used the concept of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* as a writ of divorce from the house of Jewish learning as well as an admission ticket to the European "salon."¹¹⁶

And yet we should not pass judgment on the concept of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* in the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch — on the ground of the impressions we have gathered from the spiritual image of persons who failed to grasp it in its entirety.¹¹⁷ Anyhow, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that, under the conditions prevailing at his time and in his social environment, the conception of S. R. Hirsch bore a somewhat utopian character: a wonderful and ideal master-plan, complete and perfect in itself, produced by an ingenious architect — but which could not be put into practice; a kind of "Celestial Jerusalem" whose counterpart — "the Earthly Jerusalem" — was missing. "The shortcomings of S. R. Hirsch's conception derive from the ingenuity of its creator."¹¹⁸

As long as the conditions of life and society prevailing among the Jewry of Western Europe remained the same as in the days of S. R. Hirsch, his disciples and their followers in turn walked in the wake of his doctrine as they understood it. But already, at the dawn of the twentieth century, we witness in the hearts of many orthodox young people in Germany a sense of frustration and dissatisfaction with the partial compromising practice of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*. With the breakdown of the old way of life and thought in Europe during the first world war, this feeling reached a critical juncture. Criticism was frankly voiced, inside the camp, of a vision become routine, devoid of imagination or religious fervour, of a religious life frozen in its stability and divorced from its sources and from the world of Torah ferment. Sons looking for a *complete* Torah associated with *Derekh-Eretz* were shocked to find their fathers handing down to them a Torah that had been damaged and truncated by too much attention to *Derekh-Eretz*. The style and language of S. R. Hirsch's writings no longer appealed to their tastes, and his scientific approach was regarded as outdated and old-fashioned. Certain definitions in his lectures on *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* seemed now to confirm, as it were, the misunderstandings of the epigones.¹¹⁹ They were particularly dissatisfied with S. R. Hirsch's exposition of the purpose of the Mitzvot, which did not allow for any doubt, transcendancy or mystery. The interpretation of the details of many Mitzvot as symbolism, which had delighted the simple fathers, did not fit the spirit of intellectual questioning prevailing among the sons, who were grappling anew with their faith and struggling over the eternal quality of the complete Torah. The generation of pupils raised by S. R. Hirsch had been educated towards commercial occupations; the new generation, to a far greater extent, looked to the academic professions, the training for which involved many years of university study.¹²⁰

The spiritual dilemma of the new generation and the practical failings of their Jewish education were clearly seen by S. R. Hirsch's successor and son-in-law, Rabbi Solomon Breuer. As soon as he came to Frankfort he established a Yeshiva for the high-school graduates, though he was forced to do so without

any material support by the institutions of the community. Rabbi Breuer never tired of pointing out that his Yeshiva was nothing but the crowning stage of S. R. Hirsch's educational system. The number of German-Jewish students attracted by the Yeshiva increased from year to year. Teachers and students from East-European countries contributed to the creation of an atmosphere in which a complete harmony between a full Torah-learning and an open-mindedness towards the "true" values of European culture and civilization was achieved. Here, at last, *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* as an educational principle was brought to its full realization and resuscitated from the misunderstandings and misinterpretations that had been attached to it. However, the bulk of orthodox German-Jewish youth remained outside the immediate sphere of influence of the Frankfurt Yeshiva.

The generation of the first World War, which experienced the decline of the European ideals of humanism and liberalism, suffered from the economic crisis that came in the aftermath. These experiences brought about an estrangement from the ideological elements of S. R. Hirsch's conception which were associated in their minds with the nineteenth-century world of idealism and humanism. Indeed, in the terms used by S. R. Hirsch to depict the ideal of "Man-Israel" there echoed the humanist and idealist conceptions voiced by the European intellectuals of his youthful days, but which had become outmoded even in his own lifetime.¹²¹ Those earlier conceptions could distinguish between passing and dated elements, associated with the spirit of optimism of a period of achievements and hopes, and perennial, absolute truths, such as the eternity of the Torah, that are valid even in times of frustration and changing values. However, many of the new generation did not follow this way; matters which S. R. Hirsch had bequeathed them as *Horaah Le-Doroth* were associated by them with definitions and social phenomena which they rightly could only regard as *Horaat Sha'ah*. Public discussions ensued on the topical significance of the conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*, an argument that continued till the destruction of German Jewry and has been renewed, in our days, in Israel and the diaspora.¹²²

The confusion of the new generation derived not only from

the contrast between the vision of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* and the gloomy reality of its practical application in orthodox Jewish society. The coin of the "Frankfurt system" had two sides: the educational system of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* on the one hand, and on the other — the principle of the independence of the orthodox community, i.e. the principle of "secession." How could both of them merely constitute two sides of the *same* coin? Had not *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* come, *a priori*, to permit, relieve, widen and include, while the principle of "secession" was held to prohibit, aggravate, confine, and separate? The answer to this question lies in a deeper understanding of S. R. Hirsch's doctrine. The Jewish community is the social sphere of *Derekh-Eretz* that has to be subordinated to the Torah. The field of activity of the righteous is "in town," not beyond. *Kelal Yisrael* and *Ahavat Yisrael* are central values of the conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*, but not as absolute and independent values. The Jewish public and activity on its behalf must not be removed from subordination to the Torah, exactly as the values of the human spirit and our preoccupation with them must also not be separated from Torah. Both sides of the coin bear *one and the same* inscription: "Totality of the Torah without compromise." One side — the educational system of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* — addresses the individual; the other side, the principle of "secession," addresses the public.¹²³

As a matter of fact, while the principle of "secession" was guarded as the apple of the eye of orthodox German Jewry, and at every attempt to mollify this principle a storm broke out within the Jewish public and its leadership, the tendency towards compromise in the field of education and with regard to daily conduct evoked a far more tolerant attitude. Orthodox youth were split between the pretentious postulate of "totality" and "iron consistence" in public life on the one hand, and the convenient surrender to contemporary civilization, including even its negative aspects, in the life of the individual, on the other hand. And yet, all the educational aims of S. R. Hirsch had been directed towards the healing of the split personality of the young contemporary generation by reuniting their souls which the spirit of the age had torn asunder.¹²⁴

The ever-growing inclination to reject the conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* was greatly assisted by the lack of understanding of this on the part of rabbinical and learned circles. S. R. Hirsch had been aware of the hesitations of many among his friends, and had known that some of them had feared that the concept would lead to a diminution of the study of Torah.¹²⁵ However, his generation and that of his students had every reason to hope that the concept would be widely recognized as correct, and would even be accepted in the Torah centres outside Western Europe. They had heard with satisfaction that the "*Ketav Sofer*," the Rabbi of Pressburg, had shown certain leanings towards the programme of S. R. Hirsch,¹²⁶ and they had been encouraged and fortified in their hopes by the attitude of the founders of the Mussar movement in the Lithuanian Yeshivot towards *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*. Rabbi Israel Salanter had not only expressed, in a conversation with S. R. Hirsch, his deep appreciation of the achievements of the system among German orthodox Jewry, but had even taken a positive attitude towards the attempt of one of his students, to establish in Lithuania a school with a curriculum that was very close in spirit to the conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*.¹²⁷ There were also other leading rabbis in Lithuania who recommended the writings of S. R. Hirsch and praised his system for Germany, although they were opposed to its introduction into Eastern Europe.¹²⁸

Nevertheless, despite their admiration for the stand taken by the Jewry of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*, the opposition to the conception as such grew among the heads of the Lithuanian Yeshivot of the last generation, and we may assume that this opposition did not derive primarily from a study of the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch, but from observing the educational reality and the life of orthodox Jewry in Western Europe.¹²⁹ Only the one Lithuanian Gaon, who alone knew the doctrine from its sources, and had been more closely associated with the life of the Jewish communities in Germany, uttered this retort:

"If the Almighty helps us and lends His grace to our endeavours, there will come a day when the great and the learned, who still insist on objecting to the educational conception of S. R. Hirsch,

will give us their blessings and proclaim: Our sons have defeated us." 130

However, the young generation of German orthodoxy between the two World Wars saw in the objection of the leading rabbis of Eastern Europe a well-founded, authoritative criticism of the conception in which they had been brought up. The mistaken notion prevailed among them, that S. R. Hirsch had intended to introduce his system in Germany only in view of its special conditions, that he had never thought of propagating it for other countries where the Torah centres still enjoyed their full strength and vigour.

This notion has no justification whatsoever. There is no doubt concerning Hirsch's sincere hope that his system would spread to wherever Jews were striving to raise their children to live a Torah life and as long as there was a conflict between Torah education and the spirit of the time. He had declared on many occasions that he saw in *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* the only salvation for the future of the nation. Upon his arrival in Moravia, where he held the office of Chief Rabbi, he never ceased his striving in the spirit of his conception, and his failure in this respect was one of the main reasons for his resigning that post. In a circular which he sent to the communities before his departure, he explicitly warned them:

"Neither should you lend your ears to those that alienate themselves from life and science, believing that Judaism must fear them as its worst enemies. They are mistaken in believing that Judaism and all that is holy to it can only be saved by shutting off the sanctuary of Israel within its four walls and by locking the door against any gust of the fresh wind of life, or any beam of the light of science. Listen only to the voice of our Sages (who said): If there is no Torah there is no *Derekh-Eretz*, and if there is no *Derekh-Eretz*, there is no Torah." 131

S. R. Hirsch took the same stand with regard to Hungary, where educational problems had blown up a storm.¹³²

The same holds good for Lithuania. In the early days of the spring of 1881, Rabbi Abraham Sheinker arrived in Frankfurt on a mission on behalf of the *Kolel Perushim* of Kovno, founded in 1879, upon the initiative of Rabbi I. Salanter and

Rabbi I. E. Spektor. This was the proto-type of the *Kolel* of married Torah students that exists in many places today. Sheinker was one of the leading personalities trying to win support for the *Kolel*, together with Rabbi Nathan Tsvi Finkel. He had come to solicit contributions from the wealthy members of the Frankfurt community, first and foremost from Baron Wilhelm Carl von Rothschild. Sheinker approached S. R. Hirsch, who was known to be carrying on a correspondence with the Rabbi of Kovno, and was given letters of recommendation to the heads of the community. In one of these letters S. R. Hirsch wrote:

"This institution trains brilliant young men to become great scholars, while at the same time imparting to them a knowledge of the language of the country as well as of other subjects important for their general education. This institution seems to be a true salvation for the religion which has been on the retreat in that great realm for many years. As a matter of fact, this is the first case, and the only one for the time being, of leading rabbis and Torah scholars of distinction proclaiming the study of the local language and the study of the general sciences a permitted and even desirable undertaking. This way the principle, on which our community, too, is based, is safeguarded against attack from different quarters and especially on the part of our brothers in Eastern Europe. And, indeed, this is the principle in which we see the only remedy against the regrettable religious aberrations of our time, and here we see it declared above all doubt as a model example worthy of imitation."

This is not the occasion to investigate how it came about that the Kovno *Kolel*, operating in accordance with the unmixed traditions of Yeshiva learning in Lithuania, was presented to S. R. Hirsch and those loyal to his system as an institution also imparting general education. Perhaps it was a misunderstanding, or, perhaps, S. R. Hirsch had, in his great joy, exaggerated and embellished some vague hints by Rabbi Sheinker. Whatever the cause, the letter reflects S. R. Hirsch's ardent desire to spread his ideas across the borders of Western Europe.¹³³

This letter was written a few weeks before the outbreak of the wave of pogroms in Russia. The distress of Russian Jewry constituted the permanent subject in the frequent correspondence between Rabbi I. E. Spektor and Rabbi Hirsch during the years 1881-1882, when the latter was exercising all his influence

and connections in order to save Russian Jewry, crushed under the burden of the Czarist regime. In one of Rabbi Hirsch's letters to Rabbi Spektor in the year 1882 the question of spreading the system of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* in Eastern Europe is mentioned once more, and the letter of 1881 throws light on the later communication, so that it assumes a significance transcending the context of the rescue action:

"I have come to inform you that on behalf of the publishers of the periodical 'Jeschurun' in Hanover, some pages will be sent to you in which there is an article on the problem of the Jews in your country. Special reference is made to the desire of the government to bring about a closer proximity between the Jews and the other citizens regarding the knowledge of their language and the wisdom of their writers. It is the purpose of the article to find a true solution of this matter, as follows: Although it is necessary and very useful to comply, in this respect, with the wishes of the government, whose intentions are undoubtedly good, at the same time an even greater duty will devolve upon every man in Israel not to leave the path of the Torah and the fear of God which have been our heritage forever; for the Torah and the true *Derekh-Eretz* and their sciences fit together and do not contradict each other at all, and only by disregarding the truth have the rulers of your country failed to achieve their aim so far, nor will they ever achieve it, as long as they regard the Jewish religion and true general culture as contrary to one another, imagining that the rabbis and learned men are full of hatred for the sciences, and as long as they try to turn the hearts of the Jews toward love of knowledge with the help of rabbis and teachers who are neither faithful nor God-fearing and are lacking in the knowledge of Torah etc." 134

This makes it clear that S. R. Hirsch did not recommend the conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* as a *Horaat Sha'ah*, restricted in time and place, but was rather anxious to propose it as a way to save the younger generation of Jews wherever, whenever the danger arose of some of them becoming divorced from the ways of the Torah through the influence of the changes of the times. There was indeed one case when he acted with special caution and self-denial; this was the objection of the Ashkenazic rabbis of Jerusalem to the establishment of an orphanage in the Holy City where the pupils would also acquire general knowledge and vocational training. Contrary to Rabbi

Esriel Hildesheimer, Rabbi Hirsch was not prepared to arouse the anger of the competent rabbis of Jerusalem and to rely upon the evidence of travellers whom he did not consider sufficiently trustworthy.¹³⁵

The question arises: What makes the difference between education in Jerusalem and the problem of education in Hungary? The difference is clear: In Jerusalem, a single opinion prevailed among the competent rabbis, and S. R. Hirsch shrank back before the rabbinic authorities of the Holy City, whereas in Hungary opinions were divided, so that S. R. Hirsch could throw in the weight of his opinion in favour of those sympathizing with his system.¹³⁶

VI

A discussion of present-day trends in Orthodox Jewish education does not fall within the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, in conclusion it should be noted that the impact of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* has been the single outstanding factor in remoulding Torah education throughout the Jewish world in the last three generations and gearing it to the needs and ever-more pressing problems arising out of the confrontation of Judaism with 20th century culture and civilization. To cite only two examples: the basic idea underlying the educational movement of "Beth Jacob" was directly inspired by S. R. Hirsch's writings,¹³⁷ and the growth of Yeshiva High Schools in America and Israel testifies to the soundness and vitality inherent in *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* as a program for a comprehensive Torah education in the modern world. There can be no doubt that, with Divine assistance and blessing, the coming decades will witness further progress of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* education in all Jewish centers towards the high ideals and goals outlined by S. R. Hirsch. This can be achieved by intensifying teacher training programs and presenting the teaching profession as a vital challenge to the best of our young men and women, imbued with a profound knowledge of Torah and a burning desire to make it the ruling principle of modern life.

If the love of Israel means the constant readiness to act for

the benefit of the nation wherever it is, to extend a helping hand for the solution of its problems, both spiritual and material, to accept responsibility and act for the future of the nation, to strive towards the rapprochement of estranged brethren by bringing out the light of the Torah — if so, there has never been a man who loved Israel as S. R. Hirsch did. Through his conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*, he intended, in essence, to restore the hearts of the fathers to their sons and the hearts of the sons to their fathers, and ensure the unity and continuity of Israel in a time of dispersion and division. He was fully convinced that only through this conception could the Jewish people preserve its pure nationhood as it struggled against powerful, spiritual and cultural forces which threatened to make the House of Israel like all the nations. In this sense, but not only in this, S. R. Hirsch regarded himself as a true “national Jew.”¹³⁸

The love of Israel and the love of the Torah united in his heart to make him postulate the participation of the nation in the solution of current problems in accordance with the Torah and the redemption of its sons from a state of “water-carriers and wood-cutters” to the nations of the world. In his vision, he saw Torah-observing and Torah-learning Jews, busy with ordering the affairs of the world, and elevating the honour of Israel and its Torah in the eyes of the peoples. Therefore he called for courage and strength not only in observing the Torah, in good deeds and prayers, but also in *Derekh-Eretz*.

דרך ארץ מנין ? שנאמר : חזק ונתחזק בעד עמנו ובעד ערי אלקינו.¹³⁹

Blank page in text.

NOTES

- 1 Letter addressed to Rabbi Loewenstein, Mosbach, dated January 1, 1839, printed in *Der Israelit*, 1906, No. 24, p. 4.
- 2 *Ibid.*
- 3 Cf. R. Joseph Wohlgemuth, *Jeschurun XIV* (1927), p. 9. This may partially explain why he failed to carry out his intention of writing a treatise on the teachings of Judaism as a sequel to his *Horeb* on Jewish laws. Cf. his foreword to *Horeb*, English translation by Dayan I. Grunfeld (London 1962), p. CLX.
- 4 Avot 2, 2.
- 5 *Bildungsprinzip*.
- 6 Die offene Antwort... Distrikts-Rabbiner S. B. Bamberger... auf seinen an denselben gerichteten offenen Brief, gewuerdigt von Samson Raphael Hirsch, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. IV, p. 38.
- 7 *The Hirsch Siddur* (Feldheim, New York, 1969) pp. 435, 456, 469, 518; *Chapters of the Fathers* (Feldheim, New York, 1967) pp. 23, 45, 57, 185. On the various connotations of *Derekh-Eretz* in rabbinical literature, cf. Higger, *Mavo le'Massekhtot Ze'ivot* (New York 1929).
- 8 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. V, p. 61, and in many other places.
- 9 *Festschrift zur Jubilaumsfeier der Unterrichtsanstalten der Israelitischen Religions-Gesellschaft zu Frankfurt a.M.* (1903), p. 34.
- 10 Isaac Breuer, *Moriah* (Jerusalem 1945), p. 151; cf. Rabbi E. Munk and Rabbi P. Kohn, *Nahalat-Zvi*, Vol. I, pp. 29, 189.
- 11 This subject has been dealt with, among others, by I. Heinemann, *Ta'amey Hamitzvot be-Sifrut Yisrael*, Vol. II (Jerusalem 1957), pp. 116 ff., and J. Wohlgemuth, *Moses Mendelssohn und das thoraetreue Judentum, Jeschurun XV*, (1929). An exhaustive study of the subject is needed.
- 12 S. L. Steinheim, *Die Offenbarung nach dem Lehrbegriffe der Synagoge*, II, (Leipzig 1863), p. 37.
- 13 Rabbi Y. Y. Weinberg, *Mishnato shel Harav S. R. Hirsch, Deot IX* (1959), p. 53 (and in almost identical terms: *Harav S. R. Hirsch Mishnato veShittato* [Jerusalem, 1962] p. 193). This basic study by Rav Weinberg was also printed, with minor changes, in *Talpiot* (Nissan 5721) pp. 180 ff., and in *Rabb. S. R. Hirsch*, ed. S. Ehrmann (Zurich 1960). A first draft of this paper was published in 1937 in *Nahalat-Zvi*. Cf. Heinemann, *loc. cit.*, p. 116.
- 14 Wohlgemuth, *op. cit.* pp. 332, 338; Z. E. Kurzweil, Harav S. R. Hirsch, *Sinai* (5719), p. 362, differs with Heinemann, *Ha-Ahdut ba-Pilosofia hadatit shel Moshe Mendelssohn* (Metsudda 5714), p. 205.

- 15 Cf. J. Katz, *Die Entstehung der Judenassimilation in Deutschland und deren Ideologie*, Diss. (Frankfurt 1935); *Tradition and Crisis* (New York 1961), Ch. XXIII; *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (Oxford 1961), Ch. XIV.
- 16 *Nineteen Letters*, (Feldheim, New York 1966), pp. 142-143, note 5; cf. Wohlgemuth, *op. cit.* p. 335; Heinemann, *Ta'amey Hamitsvot*, pp. 118-119; N. Rotenstreich, *Ha-Mahashavah hayehudit ba-Et Hahadashah* (1945), Part I, Index: S. R. Hirsch.
- 17 *Nineteen Letters*, (Feldheim, New York 1966), pp. 123 ff. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol II, p. 366; *Jeschurun*, Vol. XVIII (1885), p. 833.
- 18 *Nineteen Letters*, (Feldheim, New York 1966), loc. cit.; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. V, p. 61 (*Jeschurun* 1859), and cf. the polemics against Hess in 1853, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, pp. 475 ff. The comparison drawn by Heinemann, in his preface to the Hebrew translation of the *Nineteen Letters* (Jerusalem 1952, p. 9), between S. R. Hirsch's critique of Mendelssohn ("and yet") and his own motto ("*Torah im . . .*") is unfounded, both on linguistic and on logical grounds; cf. Weinberg, *loc. cit.*
- 19 Cf. Y. Emanuel, Be'ikvot Gedoley Yisrael be-Ashkenaz, *Harav S. R. Hirsch* etc., pp. 167 ff; E. Shohet, *Im Hillufey Tekufot* (Jerusalem 1961), Ch. 10. Rabbi Yishmael Hacoheh, one of the major rabbinical authorities of the time, who died at Modena in 1811, wrote: "However, we who live among the nations . . . should teach our children in early youth the language of their country, both to read and to write properly, so that they become accustomed to it from childhood . . . and this is in keeping with the saying of the Mishna — *Yafeh Talmud Torah im Derekh Eretz* (responsa *Zera Emet*, Vol II, Par. 107 [Leghorn 1796], f. 119a).
- 20 *Yein Halevanon*, a commentary on Tractate Avot (Berlin 1775), f. 23a. Wessely's well-known educational program, based upon the distinction between the "teachings of man" and the "teachings of God," bears a certain similarity to the doctrine of S. R. Hirsch, yet the two are far from being identical. This is a subject which still requires serious study and analysis. Cf. Katz, *Tradition and Crisis*, p. 266, and see my notes in *Kiryat Sefer* (Kislev 5722), p. 32.
- 21 *Darkhey No'am* (Altona 1808), f. 3a; J. Goldschmidt, Geschichte der Talmud-Torah-Realschule in Hamburg, *Festschrift zur 100-Jahresfeier der Anstalt*, 1905; M. Eliav, *Hahinnukh ha-Yehudi be-Germania* (Jerusalem 1961), pp. 159 ff.; see also the account in *Meassef* (1810), pp. 22 ff., where the aims of the institution are briefly defined: "to educate them in Torah, morals and *Derekh-Eretz*." The author of the article was S. R. Hirsch's uncle, Moses, who adopted the name of Mendelssohn.

- 22 M. M. Haarbleicher, *Zwei Epochen aus der Geschichte der Deutsch-Israelitischen Gemeinde in Hamburg* (Hamburg 1867), p. 249. Bernays had studied at the University of Wuerzburg. One of his fellow students was Rabbi Jacob Ettlinger, a graduate of a German gymnasium. Cf. *Jahrbuch der juedisch-literarischen Gesellschaft* (JjLG). Vol. V, p. 298. Ettlinger later became Hirsch's instructor at the Mannheim Yeshiva.
- 23 *Beyt Aharon* (Frankfurt 1890), preface by Rabbi M. Horovitz, p. V. R. Joshua Falk is said to have advised his sons, in his will, to learn high-German, cf. H. Schwab, *The History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany* (London 1950), p. 23. Rabbi Pinhas Horovitz, author of the *Haflaah* and Rabbi of Frankfurt, greatly admired Heidenheim's editions of the prayer-book with their German translations, and he gave them his approbation.
- 24 Cf. *Einige Beschluesse des Senats... betr. die Organisation des Schul... wesens der Israelitischen Gemeinde* (Frankfurt 1819); *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol III, pp. 511 ff.
- 25 M. Horovitz, *loc. cit.* p. VI. Rabbi Fuld himself was a member of the local stock-exchange.
- 26 S. Sofer, *Igrot Sofrim*, Vienna 1929, Part I, p. 25. I have amended the passage according to *Israelit* (1929), Nr. 18, p. 3. The date of the letter is Shevat 1, 5586 (1826).
- 27 Cf. M. J. Japhet, *Erinnerungen an R. M. Wetzlar*, JjLG, Vol. XXII, p. 249. Indeed, in defining the concept of *Torah im-Derekh-Eretz*, he still follows the trodden path: to combine Torah and religion with a "useful occupation"; cf. his German sermons, *Kevod Habayit* (Berlin 1841).
- 28 *Ahavat Zion*, Prague 1827, Ch. 12, f. 27a (the sermon was preached on the eve of Sh'vat 1, 5576 [1816]).
- 29 *Milhamot Hashem* (Hanover 1836), p. 11; and cf. the fourth edition (Halberstadt 1865), p. 18: "so that your children will study Torah and *Derekh-Eretz*." (See also p. 21 of this edition.) This formulation may already bear the impress of S. R. Hirsch's writings.
- 30 Cf. especially *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, pp. 501 ff.
- 31 *Op. cit.* Vol I, p. 150; cf. *Hama'yan*, Tishri 5715 (1955), p. 1.
- 32 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I. p. 158; cf. *Hama'yan*, *loc. cit.*, p. 3; *Nineteen Letters*, (Feldheim, New York 1966), p. 113.
- 33 Cf. *Moriah*, p. 143.
- 34 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 262; *Harav S. R. Hirsch* etc., p. 333.
- 35 H. Schawb, *Memories of Frankfurt* (London 1955), p. 9. A photostat of the foundation scroll is in my possession. Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, p. 501.
- 36 Cf. Pinhas Kohn, *loc. cit.*, p. 121.

- 37 Isaac Breuer, *Tsiyuney Derekh* (Tel Aviv 1955), p. 136.
- 38 I. Heinemann, Mehkarim al S. R. Hirsch, *Sinai XXIV* (5709), p. 255, greatly exaggerates the significance of this absence.
- 39 *Ibid.*, p. 258.
- 40 M. Lerner, S. R. Hirsch's erste Predigt, *Jeschurun I* (1914), p. 81.
- 41 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, p. 454.
- 42 *Commentary on Pentateuch*, Gen. 7, 9.
- 43 *Ibid.*, Deut. 16, 1.
- 44 Cf. *ibid.* 4, 9.
- 45 Cf. *ibid.* 6, 4.
- 46 Cf. *ibid.*, Gen. 28, 10; *Hirsch Siddur*, (Feldheim, New York 1966), pp. 458-459, (*Chapters of the Fathers*, Feldheim, New York 1967, pp. 46-47).
- 47 Cf. *Commentary*: Gen. 2, 25; Ex. 24, 10; Lev. 1, 5; 21, 17; Deut. 14, 22; 26, 15. See also the article on circumcision, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, pp. 268 ff., especially pp. 276, 281 ff., 287 ff.
- 48 Cf. *Commentary*: Ex. 23, 17; Lev. 1, 3; 1, 10-13; Num. 6, 26; 8, 2; Deut. 12, 7; 22, 9; 32, 15; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 436; Vol. VI, p. 471 ff. Cf. also Dayan Grunfeld's introduction to his English edition of *Horeb*, pp. XCIII ff.; Y. Emanuel, *loc. cit.* pp. 187 ff.
- 49 Cf. the references in my article in *Hama'ayan* (Tishri 5728), p. 15, note 51. To these the following should be added: *Commentary*, Ex. 20, 21; 20, 23; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, p. 434; see also Isaac Breuer, *Nahalat* (Tel Aviv 1951), pp. 39-40. A. J. Heschel refers to this idea, including the notion of "God's anthropology," without mentioning their source in S. R. Hirsch's writings; cf. *Man is not Alone* (New York 1951), p. 129; *God in Search of Man* (1956), p. 412; *Tradition*, Vol. IX, Nos. 1-2 (1967) p. 68, note 7; p. 118, note 29.
- 50 Cf. *Commentary*: Gen. 4, 3-6; 5, 2; 9, 27; 28, 10; 28, 13; 28, 22; 46, 1; Ex. 20, 22-23; 23, 18; 25, 8; 28, 43; Lev. 1, 5; 3, 1; 27, 12; Num. 5, 10; 6, 21; 29, 13; 29, 35; Psalms 15, 1; 27, 4; 72, 19; 92, 14; 100, 4; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, p. 445; Vol. VI, pp. 41, 81 ff.; *Siddur*, (Feldheim, N. Y. 1969), pp. 282, 304, cf. also *Nahalat-Zvi* Vol I, p. 157.
- 51 Cf. *Commentary*, Gen. 6, 5; 9, 15; 17, 1; 25, 27; 27, 3-4; 27, 37; 35, 11; 38, 3 ff. Num. 8, 2; 26, 53; 30, 2; Deut. 6, 5; 18, 13; *Siddur*, p. 116; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, p. 273; *Yesodot Hahinnukh* (Tel Aviv 1958), p. 70 ff. See also Grunfeld, *op. cit.* p. XCV; Emanuel, *op. cit.* pp. 170-71.
- 52 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. VI, p. 292.
- 53 Cf. *ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 32, 440; Vol. II, p. 366; *Siddur*, pp. 103 ff.
- 54 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, p. 502; Vol. VI, p. 142; *Nineteen Letters*, (Feldheim, New York 1966), p. 122; Rabbi Y. Y. Weinberg, *Nahalat Zvi*, Vol. VII, p. 137; *Deot*, *loc. cit.*, p. 51.

- 55 Cf. *Nineteen Letters*, (Feldheim, New York 1966), 16th letter; Vol. I, p. 32; See also *Tsiyuney Derekh*, p. 138; *Moriah*, p. 143; Rabbi Joseph Breuer, *Ateret Žvi*, Jubilee Volume (Feldheim, New York 1962), p. 52.
- 56 Cf. *Commentary*, Gen. 3, 24; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, p. 452; Vol. VI, p. 240.
- 57 *Harav S. R. Hirsch* etc., p. 192.
- 58 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 279.
- 59 Cf. *Commentary*, Gen. 3, 24; P. Kohn, *loc. cit.*, pp. 212, 226; *Tsiyunei Derekh*, p. 137. See also *Tosafot Yeshanim*, Yoma 85b, s. v. *Teshuvah*; *Haggahot Maimuniyot*, Laws of Talmud Torah, Ch. 3.
- 60 Cf. *Moriah*, p. 153; Rabbi Elie Munk *Nahalat Žvi*, Vol. I, p. 29; Weinberg, *ibid.*, p. 137.
- 61 Cf. P. Kohn, *loc. cit.*, p. 120; N. H. Rosenbloom, Religious and secular co-equality in S. R. Hirsch's educational theory, *Jewish Social Studies*, October 1962; Norman Lamm, Two Versions of "Synthesis," *Leo Jung Jubilee Volume*, New York 1962; Rabbi Lamm's contention, that the synthesis of Torah and *Derekh-Eretz* in S. R. Hirsch's doctrine is one of harmonization and static co-existence, seems to me to be entirely mistaken.
- 62 Cf. *Commentary*: Gen. 3, 24; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. VI, p. 283; *Jeschurun*, Vol. VIII, p. 377; Weinberg, *loc. cit.*, pp. 191 ff.
- 63 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, pp. 496, 499. Samuel Holdheim, one of the radical reformers, wrote of the "compromise" between religion on the one hand and science and education on the other: *Geschichte der Entstehung* etc., Berlin 1857, p. 20. The reform weekly, *Sabbathblatt*, carried the motto "*Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*!" The exposition by N. Rotenstreich, *op. cit.*, p. 104, of the relationship between Torah and *Derekh-Eretz* in Hirsch's teachings, has no foundation in S. R. Hirsch's writings.
- 64 Cf. *Jeschurun*, Vol. VII, p. 326.
- 65 Cf. *Commentary*, Gen. 3, 24; 5, 2; 17, 1; 18, 1.
- 66 Cf. *Horeb*, pp. 4, 271 ff.; *Commentary*, Gen. 14, 13; 17, 4; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. V, p. 312 (circumcision as the symbol of the "Man-Israel" ideal). See also *Moriah*, p. 146; N. H. Rosenbloom, "Religious and Secular Co-Equality in S. R. Hirsch's Educational Theory," *Jewish Social Studies* (October 1962), p. 227.
- 67 Cf. Rabbi A. Klein, *Festschrift Mekor Chajim*, (Frankfurt 1924) pp. 76 ff..
- 68 Cf. Rabbi H. Klein, *Hokhma im Nahalah*, Pt. III (Belgoray 1935, p. 99). See also *Nahalat-Žvi*, Vol. V, p. 243; *Hama'ayan* (Tammuz 5726), p. 4.
- 69 Cf. *Encyclopedea Talmudit*, Vol. VII, column 687 ff.; M. Munk, Torah im Derekh Eretz be-Yamenu, *Harav S. R. Hirsch* etc.,

- pp. 213 ff.
- 70 Cf. Japhet, *loc. cit.*, p. 212.
- 71 *Sulamith* (1811), p. 291.
- 72 S. Bamberger, *Geschichte der Rabbiner der Stadt und des Bezirkes Wuerzburg*, (Wandsbeck 1905), p. 88.
- 73 I. Heinemann, *Taamey Hamitsvot*, p. 101 note 61.
- 74 Isaac Breuer characterized this attitude as that of a "legitimate revolutionary," cf. *Tsiyuney Derekh*, pp. 134 ff.
- 75 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I, pp. 269 ff.
- 76 *S. R. Hirsch Jubilee Issue*, (Israelit), Frankfurt 1908, p. 35.
- 77 Cf. *Commentary*, Deut. 6, 4; G. Lange, S. R. Hirsch als Paedagoge, *Festschrift* (1903), p. 24; M. Munk, *loc. cit.*, pp. 204 ff.
- 78 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, p. 187; *Jeschurun*, Vol. I, pp. 108, 149; Vol. VI, p. 432; Vol. VIII, p. 374; F. Thieberger, S. R. Hirsch, *Der Jude* IV, p. 560; N. H. Rosenbloom, *op. cit.*, p. 237; *Einladungsschrift... der Unterrichtsanstalt der I. R. G.* (Frankfurt a.M. 1864), p. 62; M. M. Haarbleicher, *op. cit.*, p. 255.
- 79 Cf. *Commentary*, Deut. 6, 6-7; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 29; see also Grunfeld, *op. cit.*, p. LXXXV.
- 80 See note 76.
- 81 *Commentary*. Gen. 3, 24; 4, 23; 50, 2; Num. 25, 3; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, p. 456; Vol. III, p. 187; Vol. VI, pp. 392-393 (*Hama'ayan*, Tammuz 5726, p. 2). Cf. also J. Rosenheim, *Das Bildungsideal S. R. Hirschs und die Gegenwart* (Frankfurt 1935), p. 25; Grunfeld, *op. cit.*, p. LXXXV, XCIV; Y. Emanuel, *op. cit.*, pp. 165 ff.; M. Breuer, *Hama'ayan*, Av 5716, pp. 43-44.
- 82 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, pp. 24-48. See also *Commentary*, Gen. 16, 14, on Arab culture.
- 83 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. VI, pp. 308 ff.; Grunfeld, *op. cit.*, p. LXXXI; I. Heinemann, "Hayahas shebbeyn S. R. Hirsch le-Yitshak Bernays Rabbo," *Zion* 5711, p. 66 note 65. It should be noted that there are various indications that the conservative circles of the German Haskalah generation were strongly attracted to Schiller's works, while the "progressives" inclined instead towards Goethe; cf. Ph. Philippon, *Biographische Skizzen* (Leipzig 1863), p. 57; S. Bernfeld, *Juden und Judentum im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1898), p. 7.
- 84 *Commentary*, Lev. 18, 4; Deut. 6, 7; cf. *Moriah*, pp. 152-153; see also *Commentary*, Gen. 49, 15.
- 85 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, p. 186; Vol. I, p. 276. Compare this with the similar slogan: "First — Jew, then — merchant," Vol. I, p. 215; Vol. V, p. 71.
- 86 *Siddur*, (Feldheim, N. Y. 1969), p. 518 (*Chapters of the Fathers*, Feldheim, N.Y. 1967, pp. 105-106); *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. VI, pp. 293-294; cf. also *Erste und Zweite Mitteilungen* etc. (Frankfurt

- 1920), pp. 67 ff.; Y. Emanuel, *op. cit.*, p. 166.
- 87 *Commentary*, Deut. 4, 32; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, p. 187; *Horeb*, 551; *Erste und Zweite Mitteilungen*, p. 72. Cf. Rabb E. Posen, *Nahalat-Zvi*, Vol. I, p. 156; E. Munk, *loc. cit.*, pp. 282 ff.; W. Halberstadt, *Das Bildungsideal S. R. Hirschs*, *ibid.* Vol. I, p. 242.
- 88 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I, pp. 237, 278 ff.; Vol. II, p. 450.
- 89 Responsum on the Brunswick Assembly of Reform Rabbis, *Harav S. R. Hirsh etc.* p. 333; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 221. Likewise there is no danger involved in teaching occasional passages from non-Jewish literature written in the spirit of the Christian religion, cf. *Jeschurun*, Vol. IV, p. 397.
- 90 Compare with this the saying of our Sages: "אל תקריי הרות אלא "חירות".
- 91 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. VI, pp. 308 ff.; Vol. II, p. 454.
- 92 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 295.
- 93 See, for example, *Commentary*, Lev. 6, 4. He opened the columns of his *Jeschurun* to a lengthy appraisal of the findings of modern science in the light of the Torah, cf. Vol. V, pp. 535 ff.; Vol. VI, pp. 99 ff. A. Sulzbach, *Die Vier Muenzen* (Frankfurt 1889), p. 10.
- 94 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 460, 415 ff.; *Jeschurun*, Vol. II, pp. 271 ff.; Vol. IV, pp. 248 ff.; 485, 532 ff.; Vol. XIII, pp. 293 ff.; Vol. XIV, pp. 325 ff.
- 95 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 15; *Jeschurun*, Vol. VII, p. 357. Cf. Rabbi Raphael Breuer, S. R. Hirsch und Israel Hildesheimer, *Israelit* (7th January 1919), p. 4.
- 96 *Commentary*, Deut. 4, 6; 6, 7; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. VI, p. 15.
- 97 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. V, pp. 543 ff.; I. Heinemann, *Taamey Hamitsvot*, p. 95; R. Breuer, Was hat Rabb. Hirsch unserer Zeit zu sagen?, *Nahalat-Zvi*, Vol. I, p. 85 ff. Compare with the passage on Christianity the complete version of Maimonides, *Hilkhot Melakhim*, Ch. 11, in the Pardess edition of Rabbi Kalman Kahana (Jerusalem 5723), Appendix, line 53 ff.
- 98 *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. I, pp. 155-156 (*Hama'ayan* [Tishri 5715], p. 3), Vol. VI, p. 315; *Commentary*, Deut. 4, 32; cf. Weinberg, *loc. cit.*, p. 194; M. Wiener, The Conception of Mission in Traditional and Modern Judaism, *Yivo Annual of Jewish Social Science* II-III (1947/48), p. 23; Rotenstreich, *op. cit.*, p. 134. The contention of Rabbi M. Munk, *loc. cit.*, pp. 206 ff., 219, that S. R. Hirsch advocated the study of world literature and the like "in order to take part in the moulding of the image of mankind and to pour on it the spirit of Judaism" is utterly mistaken. His translation of the passage on p. 206 is faulty and partly misleading. The idea of mission is nowhere at the centre of S. R. Hirsch's argumentation for general studies, and he has never hinted at the need for training the young generation for active participation in the spiritual

- life of the nations. In passing, it should be noted that the sole article by S. R. Hirsch on which Munk bases his whole analysis is neither the most fundamental nor the most characteristic of the many papers dealing with *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*.
- 99 Cf. *Nineteen Letters*, (Feldheim, N.Y. 1966), p. 99; *Commentary*, Hebrew Edition (Jerusalem 5727), Editor's Introduction, p. 8; *Horeb*, Par. 1, 493; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, pp. 186 ff.; Vol. VI, p. 235; *Siddur*, (Feldheim, N.Y. 1969), p. 8.
- 100 *Horeb*, Par. 551; *Nineteen Letters*, (Feldheim, N.Y. 1966), pp. 126 ff.; Author's preface to *Commentary*; *Siddur*, (Feldheim, N.Y. 1969), p. 507 (*Chapters of the Fathers*, Feldheim, N.Y. 1967, p. 95). Cf. Y. Emanuel, *loc. cit.*, pp. 154 ff.; I Heinemann, *Zion* 5711, p. 68; *Commentary*, Hebrew Edition, Editor's Introduction, pp. 9 ff. At Hakham Bernay's Talmud Torah School in Hamburg, Talmud was not taught before the ninth year of study, but from then on, a significant number of hours per week were devoted to it, cf. J. Goldschmidt, *op. cit.* p. 54; I. Loewenstein, *Menorah Tehorah* (Schaffhausen 1835), pp. 70 ff.
- 101 Cf. Weinberg, *Deot IX*, pp. 55 ff.; Grunfeld, *Harav Hirsch* etc., pp. 117 ff.; Y. Emanuel, *ibid.*, pp. 175 ff.
- 102 *Commentary*, Lev. 16, 4. Compare also his exposition of the purpose of *Tosefet Shabbat ve-Yom-Tov*, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, pp. 16 ff. Cf. Y. Emanuel, *loc. cit.*, pp. 145-146, on the Mitzvah of *Hakhel*.
- 103 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, pp. 63 ff.; Vol. III, pp. 292 ff.; *Commentary*, Ex. 22, 24.
- 104 Cf. *Commentary*, Gen. 2, 9; 9, 27; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, pp. 28. ff.; P. Kohn, *loc. cit.*, p. 226; Weinberg, *Deot IX*, pp. 54-55.
- 105 *Der Geist der Juedischen Gesetzeslehre*.
- 107 Halberstadt, *loc. cit.*, p. 243.
- 108 I. M. Japhet, Ueber den deutschen Sprachunterricht, *Einladungsschrift* (1864), p. 3 ff.
- 109 S. R. Hirsch wrote this sentence in his recommendation of a Hebrew Grammar textbook by I. M. Japhet, *Metek Sefatayim*, (Frankfurt 1861). The identity of this author with the writer of the article referred to in the previous note is noteworthy!
- 110 A. Sulzbach, *Festschrift 1903*, pp. 44 ff.
- 111 Cf. Editor's note, *Jeschurun*, Vol. VIII, p. 356: "*Jeschurun* will only publish articles written in German."
- 112 Cf. E. Dukesz Zur Genealogie S. R. Hirschs, *JJLG XVII* (1925), p. 120. Compare also note 85 above.
- 113 Cf. Editor's note, *Nahalat-Zvi*, Vol. VII p. 134.
- 114 *Chapters of the Fathers*, p. 95.
- 115 Cf. *Jeschurun*, Vol. V, p. 572; Vol. VII, p. 31.
- 116 Cf. *Nahalat-Zvi*, Vol. I, pp. 29, 161-162, 189; Vol. VII, p. 132;

- Rabbi Y. Y. Weinberg, *Liferakim*, Jerusalem 5727, p. 233.
- 117 G. Scholem passed an extremely unfair judgment by stamping the conception of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* with the stigma of "a horrible theology of accomodation." Cf. "Politik der Mystik," *Juedische Rundschau* (1934), Nr. 57, p. 7. See also J. Rosenheim, *Bildungsideal*, pp. 41 ff.; *Tsiyuney Derekh*, p. 136; *Nahalat-Zevi*, Vol. IV, p. 282; Isaac Breuer, *Ein Kampf um Gott*, (Frankfurt 1920), p. 153.
- 118 Cf. R. Breuer, *loc. cit.*
- 119 For example: "The coupling of Torah with Derekh-Eretz" (*Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. III, p. 22); "Torah and *Derekh-Eretz* complement one another, and they are as two starry lights in the firmament," "*Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* — a dual principle" (*ibid.*, Vol. V, pp. 237 ff.).
- 120 Cf. Isaac Breuer, *Falk Nefts Heimkehr*, (Frankfurt a.M. 1923), pp. 46, 122, 173, 281 *et passim*; *Ein Kampf um Gott*, p. 163; M. M. Kaplan, *The Greater Judaism in the Making* (New York 1960), p. 340; R. Breuer, *loc. cit.*; E. Posen, *loc. cit.*, p. 60; *Jeschurun*, Vol. XVIII (1885), p. 224.
- 121 Cf. Weinberg *Nahalat Zvi*, Vol. I, p. 155; *Harav S. R. Hirsch etc.*, p. 192; J. Rosenheim, *op. cit.* pp. 12 ff.; I. Heinemann, *Taamey Hamitsvot*, p. 102; Grunfeld, *op. cit.*, pp. XC, XCIV, 271 ff.
- 122 In its literary form the discussion took place mainly in the weekly *Israelit*, and the monthly *Nahalat-Zvi*, and there is no need for documentation here. Cf. especially Rosenheim, *op. cit.*; Rabbi H. Klein, *Israelit*, 17th January 1935; Weinberg, *Nahalat-Zvi*, Vol. VII, pp. 186 ff.; *Harav S. R. Hirsch etc.*, p. 190 (*Deot IX*, p. 52); *Hama'ayan*, Tamuz 5726; Rabbi S. Schwab, *Heimkehr ins Judentum* (Frankfurt 1934), pp. 114 ff.; *These and Those . . .*, New York 1966.
- 123 Cf. *Commentary*, Gen., pp. 123, 325-326; P. Kohn, *Nahalat Zvi*, Vol. IV, p. 291; J. Rosenheim, The historical significance of the struggle for secession from the Frankfurt Jewish Community, *Historia Judaica* (October 1948), p. 137; E. Stern, Haadam ve-Yi'udo al-pi Hashkafat Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz, *Symposium on Personality Education and its Purpose* (Jerusalem 5727), p. 394; M. Breuer, *Hama'ayan* (Tishri 5725), p. 16. The remark may be in place that, in the halakhic responsum on his decision regarding secession, S. R. Hirsch mentioned also the principle of *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*, cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. IV, p. 354, compare also note 6 above.
- 124 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. VI, p. 283; *Ein Kampf um Gott*, p. 137 *et passim*.
- 125 Cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. II, p. 450; Vol. VI, p. 354. On Rabbi Seligmann Baer Bamberger's attitude towards *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* cf. *Responsa Yad Halevy* (Jerusalem 5725), preface; M.

- Eliav, *op. cit.*, p. 235, and compare my note, *Kiryat Sefer*, Kislev 5722, p. 32; *Hama'ayan*, Tamuz 5725, p. 47 note 3; *Jahresbericht der L. Ottensoser-Stiftung* (Hoechberg 1895), p. 13; S. Bamberger, *Geschichte etc.*, p. 70; M. Auerbach, *Jeschurun*, Vol. XV (1928), p. 523.
- 126 S. Buechler, *Die Lebensgeschichte des Rabbi Juda Aszod*, Dunajska Streda (1944), p. 50; *Jeschurun* VII (1920), p. 226; M. Eliav, *Mekomo shel R. E. Hildesheimer ba-Maavak etc.*, *Zion* XXVII, p. 81; *R. E. Hildesheimer: Briefe*, (Jerusalem 1965), p. 62.
- 127 On Rabbi I. Salanter's relation to S. R. Hirsch and his conversation with him, cf. H. Ehrmann, *Der Israelit* (1883), pp. 361 ff.; additional details were communicated to me by his son, Dr. Salomon Ehrmann. Cf. also M. Hildesheimer, "Kavim li-Demuto shel R. E. Hildesheimer", *Sinai*, Vol. LIV (5724), p. 87, note 116; D. Katz, *Tenuat Hamussar*, Vol. I (Tel Aviv 1958), Ch. 18 and especially pp. 225 ff.; L. Ginzberg, *Students, Scholars and Saints*, Philadelphia 1928, p. 156; M. G. Glenn, *I. Salanter*, New York 1953, p. 58; Rabbi Y. Y. Weinberg has compared the system of S. R. Hirsch to that of I. Salanter, cf. *Harav S. R. Hirsch etc.*, p. 196 ff.; *Deot* IX, pp. 57 ff. In this context it is remarkable that Rabbi I. Salanter's father quoted S. R. Hirsch's explication of some halakhic details regarding the Jewish calendar (*Horeb*, Par. 256 ff.) in his *Haggahot Ben-Aryeh on Tur Orah-Hayyim*, Par. 428. (Vilna Edition, 5660). My attention was drawn to this interesting fact by my revered teacher, the late Rabbi Hayyim Yosef Jakobovicz.
- 128 Cf. the approbation by Rabbis I. E. Spektor and H. O. Grodzenski, parts of which were reprinted in the Hebrew edition of *Commentary*, Gen. The approbation by Rabbi Spektor was reprinted in full in the English edition of the *Comenentary*, Gen., p. XXVI. See also *Or Rashaz*, (Kefar Habbad 5721), Gen., p. 51 (*Harav S. R. Hirsch etc.*, pp. 183-184); *ibid.*, Exod., p. 14; Weinberg, *Lifrakim*, p. 312.
- 129 Cf. Rabbi Barukh Dov Leibovitz, *Birkat Shemuel*, Kiddushin Par. 27; Rabbi Elhanan Bunim Wassermann, *Kovets He'arot* (New York 5712), Par. 11 (compare with this M. Munk, *Harav S. R. Hirsch etc.*, p. 214); Rabbi E. E. Dessler, *Mikhtav Me-eliyahu*, Vol. III, Bne-Braq 5724, pp. 356 ff.; *Hama'ayan*, Tamuz 5726, pp. 4 ff.
- 130 Weinberg, *Nahalat Zvi*, Vol. VII, p. 195.
- 131 The translation is based on an original copy of the circular in the Saenger collection of Hirschiana.
- 132 Cf. *Jeschurun*, Vol. III, p. 436; Vol. V, p. 318; Vol. X, p. 63; Vol. XI, pp. 51, 92; Vol. XV, pp. 18 ff. When S. R. Hirsch's son-in-law attempted to set up an orthodox secondary school at Papa (Hungary), his father-in-law supported him to the extent of addressing an urgent request in writing to the Hungarian authorities. The first

- draft of the letter is in the possession of my uncle, Prof. Samson Breuer.
- 133 The letter was addressed to Selig Goldschmidt on 13th March, 1881, and a copy of the German original has been kindly forwarded to me by his relative, Mr. H. Eisemann of London. On the *Kolel* and the mission of A. Sheinker cf. D. Katz, *Tenu'at Hamussar*, Vol. I, pp.192 ff; Vol. II, p. 306; E. Shimoff, *Rabbi I. E. Spektor* (New York 1959), pp. 73 ff.; *Der Israelit* 1881, p. 332.
- 134 Jacob Halevy Lifshitz, *Zikhron Ya'akov*, Part III (Kovno 1930), p. 42.
- 135 Cf. the correspondence published by Hildesheimer's grandson, *Hama'ayan* (Tishri 5714), pp. 41 ff.; *Rabb. E. Hildesheimer: Briefe*, pp. 97 ff.; *ibid.*, Hebrew section, pp. 47 ff.
- 136 Cf. Rabbi Joseph Breuer, *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* — Hora'at Sha'ah? *Hama'ayan* (Tammuz 5726), p. 1. This should also explain the note in *Igrot Soferim*, Part III, p. 41. I have it on the authority of Rav Joseph Breuer that S. R. Hirsch, when approached from some locality outside Germany regarding *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz*, replied that he felt responsible only for the state of Judaism in his own country; in other countries this was a matter within the realm of the responsibility of the local leading rabbis.
- 137 Cf. *Moriah*, p. 154.
- 138 Cf. Weinberg, *Nahalat Zvi*, Vol. VII, p. 138; *Harav S. R. Hirsch etc.* pp. 186, 196; I. Heinemann, *Sinai* XXIV, p. 260. It may be no mere coincidence that the example of the man jumping into the river to save another man from drowning (see *supra*, before note 27), which was popular in the circle of the first exponents of the *Torah-im-Derekh-Eretz* system, had also appeared in the thoughts of a great lover of Israel, one of the founders of Hassidism; cf. Rabbi Levy Yitshak of Berditshov, *Commentary on Cant.*, 1, 3-4.
- 139 Berakhot 32 b; and cf. *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. VI, p. 524.