

Saul Berlin's Ktav Yosher
The Beginning of Satire in Modern Hebrew Literature
of the Haskalah in Germany

BY MOSHE PELLI

PREFATORY NOTE

In 1782, under the influence of Joseph II's Tolerance Edict, the Hebrew writer Naphtali Herz Wessely published a pamphlet *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet* (*Words of Peace and Truth*) in which he advocated the introduction of certain Enlightenment ideas into Jewish society. He proposed that Jewish children, whose education at that time was mainly religious, should receive secular education. Wessely's main innovation was the placing of secular education before religious education and the reduction of the study of Talmud for most students. The underlying innovation appears to be the substitution of traditional Jewish values by European values. The leading rabbis did not like these ideas and especially resented certain phrases which Wessely quoted – verbatim – from the traditional sources of Hebrew literature, and which, in this context, sounded to them derogatory. They banned his book and fought the author. The controversy lasted for some few years as Wessely issued three additional pamphlets on the subject. In them he solicited the approval of some lenient Italian rabbis. He also attempted to prove that his first pamphlet was in no way anti-religious.

Saul Berlin wrote his *Ktav Yosher* in Wessely's defence. It circulated among the enlighteners in manuscript form and was only published after his death, in 1794.

Saul Berlin (1740–1794) was a rabbi in Frankfurt on the Oder from 1768 to 1782. He then moved to Berlin, and became associated with the Hebrew *Haskalah* (Enlightenment).^{*} In 1789 Berlin was involved in a dispute – which some scholars believe to have been a personal one, others say it was ideological – with rabbi Rephael Hacoheh of Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck. He published a book under an assumed name, in which he waged a pungent critical attack against his opponent's earlier writings; there were overt signs to the effect that not just an individual religious leader, but the rabbinate *in toto* was Berlin's target. Once his identity was revealed, he was excommunicated by the religious court of his opponent.

In 1793 Berlin published a volume of religious responsa, the manuscript of which he said he had found in a library in Italy. He attributed this religious code to the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Rabbi Asher ben Yehiel and some of his contemporaries, and claimed to have only annotated it. The book is a masterpiece of religious reform in a clever guise. The authoritative Rabbi Asher ben Yehiel *et al.* appear as eighteenth-century enlighteners. Although at the time most of Berlin's opponents accused him of forgery, the question remains unsolved. Some scholars nowadays believe that several parts of the book had indeed been composed by the medieval rabbi and some of his contemporaries.

As a result of the controversy, Saul Berlin had to leave Germany. He went to London, supposedly to obtain a rabbinic position, but died there soon after his arrival, on 16th November 1794.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ever since Saul Berlin's *Ktav Yosher* (An Epistle of Righteousness) † was published in 1794 (Tav Qof Nun Hei – the Hebrew year 5555)¹ it has received very little serious treatment as a work of literature by the literary critics and historians.

^{*}See also the preceding essay by James H. Lehmann in this volume of the Year Book – Ed.

†This article is the first part of a study of the satiric art of Saul Berlin.

¹See Appendix I for a discussion of the date of publication.

In most cases, this work is merely cited in the context of Wessely's *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet* controversy.² It is also mentioned in passing in connection with Saul Berlin's other controversial writings, such as *Mizpeh Yoqte'el* (Watchtower of Yoqte'el) and *Besamim Rosh* (Incense of Spices).³

The few writers who did consider Berlin's work meriting special attention generally classified it as a satire, but did not analyse it as such. Instead, the tendency was to cite some of the phrases used in the work as speaking for themselves and thus representing the nature of *Ktav Yosher* and the ideology of its author. This phenomenon is indicative either of a lack of interest in Saul Berlin as a creative writer, or else of an inability on the part of Hebrew critics and historians of Hebrew literature to cope with the subject matter. To a student of Hebrew satire such as Joseph Chotzner, Saul Berlin and/or *Ktav Yosher* are non-existent.⁴ To others, the image of Saul Berlin as a forger and a coward dominates their treatment of the man and his work. So much so that it prevented any new insight into the extraordinary phenomenon of Berlin in the annals of modern Hebrew letters.

It is only in recent years that we notice some encouraging new trends in this regard. Firstly, one notes some attempts to evaluate Saul Berlin, to re-examine his personality and his general work.⁵ In addition, there is an indication that the subject of satire in the early period of modern Hebrew literature has received the spotlight of a number of learned studies.⁶ Against this background, a detailed scrutiny of *Ktav Yosher* is proposed in this study.

II. STRUCTURE

Ktav Yosher is divided into eight chapters and it is perhaps intentionally so structured in order to be equated with the eight chapters in Wessely's *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*. Chapter one serves as an exposition – an introduction to and background of the controversy. In it, the narrator sets the tone for the complete book, and cunningly builds up a set of criteria – through the various satiric techniques – which help determine his covert stand and intentions. He moves from the general to the particular; from a description of the public reaction to Wessely's book to an individual religious teacher and his reaction; from

²See my study 'Naphtali Herz Wessely's Attitude toward the Jewish Religion as a Mirror of a Generation in Transition (During the Early Period of Hebrew Haskalah in Germany)', in *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*, XXVI (1974), No. 3, pp. 222–238.

³See Appendix II for a Bibliography on *Ktav Yosher*.

⁴Joseph Chotzner, *Hebrew Satire*, London 1911.

⁵See App. II, No. 37, 39, 41 and Samet's recent article '“Besamim Rosh” Shel R. Saul Berlin', in *Kirjath Sepher*, XLVIII (1973), pp. 509–523 [Hebrew].

⁶Shmuel Weres, of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, has published a few studies of Joseph Perl; Yehudah Friedlander, of Bar Ilan University, and the present author, have submitted papers on satire in the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem 1973. Friedlander published a series of articles in the Israeli press in 1973/4, and I submitted a few studies on the satiric art of Isaac Euchel and Isaac Erter, to be published shortly. One should also note B. Kurzweil's insight into Perl's satire, and Avraham Sha'anan's recent contribution (in addition to his past works) on Isaac Euchel's satire.

generalised statements about Wessely's alleged heresy to specific accusations (developed and elaborated upon in subsequent chapters). In between, the narrator expresses his amazement at this extreme reaction; accordingly, he has not seen nor read the book in question, yet he knew Wessely as a righteous person.

Chapters two and three consist of a dialogue between the narrator and the *melamed*, the religious teacher. The dialogue is mostly a long monologue of the teacher interrupted intermittently by the narrator. Eleven pages are devoted to this part – more than one third of the thirty-two-page booklet. The general subject in chapter two appears to be the superstitious beliefs and deeds prevalent among the Jews, and the abundance of religious ordinances. Chapter three concentrates mainly on Jewish education and on the educators.

In chapters four and five the scene shifts from the religious teacher to the religious leader – the rabbi – “one of the great [personalities]”. In this upper stratum the discussion centres on the process of *Halachah* and on the ever-increasing body of legal matter. In the first of these two chapters the narrator appears equal to the rabbi, and as such he suggests that an enquiry in depth be conducted into the problem. There is a definite development in treatment, in style, as well as in plot. Towards the end of the chapter the rabbi hints what his decree might be: a death sentence for Wessely. In chapter five, the narrator finally is successful in obtaining Wessely's book – a theme recurring in Hebrew satire.⁷ Significantly, he gets the book from the rabbi. He reads it and discovers that the book is influenced by the writings of an unnamed, great Kabbalist teacher. He finds in *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet* deep Kabbalistic ideas. Once having revealed the “secrets” behind *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet* to the rabbi, and having persuaded him as to its infallible truth, the rabbi commissions the narrator to write this book and to spread the truth in order to stop the persecution of Wessely. The rabbi's about-face, Wessely's death sentence averted, is only one goal of the narrator.

For in the next two chapters the narrator addresses the Jewish people and its leaders. He first establishes the concept that heretical pronouncements do indeed have an opposite, religious meaning in Kabbalah. He then proceeds, in chapter seven, to discuss quotes from *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet* in a Kabbalistic fashion. The narrator ends his discussion in a call for action: “Go peacefully to this man.”⁸

The last chapter is addressed to Wessely himself, stating his limitation; only a man like him [the great Kabbalist teacher] is destined to clear the road, says the narrator.*

One notices that despite the organised disorder in this work, there is a definite outlined plan: One introductory chapter, two chapters devoted to the teacher, two to the rabbi, two addressed to the people and the final chapter – to Wessely. Throughout these divisions there is a definite shift from the general to

⁷In Joseph Perl's *Megaleh Ṭmirin* [Revealer of Secrets], Wien 1818, an antihasidic book is being sought.

⁸*Ktav Yosher* [Berlin? 1794–5?], p. 16a.

*The use of Kabbalah for satiric purpose and the identity of the Kabbalist teacher are discussed in a second part of this study which is not included in this article.

the particular; from the mob scene, through the low rank of the teacher to the higher rank of the rabbi, and eventually to Wessely. Similarly, the narrator shifts his role from that of an observer (ch. 1) and a listener (ch. 2–4), to one of an activist (ch. 5–7), and finally as a carrier of his own message which, although related to the *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet* controversy, goes beyond its limits. In the same vein is his attitude towards Wessely. For purposes of effectiveness, the narrator is first an objective bystander, who very quickly turns out to be a strong supporter of Wessely in order to sum up some negative views of him in the last chapter. It is important to note that while the narrator did not attempt to persuade the teacher as to Wessely's righteousness, he did indeed attempt to influence the rabbi and succeeded in changing his opinion of him. In this fictional fact one may perhaps discern Berlin's conviction as to where the enlighteners should aim in their endeavour to spread Haskalah.

III. SATIRIC TECHNIQUES

Although a number of critics and literary historians have recognised *Ktav Yosher* as being the first satire in modern Hebrew literature,⁹ there was no serious attempt to discuss and analyse the satiric art of Saul Berlin and his techniques. Among the writers touching on the subject, Sandler incidentally contributed an important note regarding this literary phenomenon. He refers to *Ktav Yosher* as a "very special literary form which serves perhaps as a prototype for the Hebrew satire in the *Haskalah* period".¹⁰ Some literary critics employ such terms as mockery, cunning, ridicule, buffoonery, irony, etc. Others regard Berlin's satire as wonderful, sharp, pungent, witty and some think of it as an artistic achievement. Nevertheless, a literary analysis of this Hebrew satire and its art, its common ground with other European satires and its unique Hebraic characteristics is unfortunately wanting.

In his use of satire, Berlin comes close to the genre of satire as found in other European literatures. One can discern in *Ktav Yosher* the three basic shapes of satire as classified by Hightet:¹¹ the monologue, parody and narrative, although dialogue, too, has its share in this satire. All these forms are employed here in a chaotic order typical of the satire. The lack of a unity in form is striking. The author intentionally employs disorder so as to achieve his goal, namely, to project, through the medium of form, a reality of utter confusion.

Similarly, "the scene of satire" – to use Kernan's phrase¹² – portrays an utterly disordered chaotic setting, saturated with human stupidity and ignorance. In effect, Berlin purposely starts his book with a mob scene. The opening line echoes the noise of the crowd: "Qol 'anot 'ani shome'a" – "I hear an echoing

⁹Katz (see App. II, No. 17), Zinberg (No. 32), Kressel (No. 36), Pelli (No. 41). Isaac Euchel's satire 'The Letters of Meshulam ben 'Uriyah Ha'eshtemo'i' was published before, in 1790, but not as a separate publication; it was published in *Hame'asef*.

¹⁰See App. II, No. 25.

¹¹Gilbert Hightet, *The Anatomy of Satire*, Princeton 1962, pp. 13–14.

¹²Alvin Kernan, *The Cankered Muse*, New Haven 1959, pp. 7–8; published also in his *Modern Satire*, New York 1962, p. 167.

noise".¹³ This phrase alludes to the disorder and disobedience of the Israelite crowd at the erection of the golden calf.¹⁴ Aside from the noise effect, the satirist alludes vividly to the low spiritual and religious state of the people engaged in the Wessely controversy, equating it with the notorious sin of the golden calf.

Berlin, like all satirists, sets a goal for his satire: to present the truth – his truth – to the reader. Through the essential distortion of reality, as he sees it, the Hebrew satirist aims to kill two birds with one stone. He wishes to defend Wessely in his controversy with the traditionalists, and simultaneously he would like to satirise that world of which the traditionalists are a part.

Satirical techniques, by their very nature, are quite complicated. "Satire, to take a metaphor from music," writes Clark, "is not a simple melody on the G string, but a symphony in discord."¹⁵ In order to achieve whatever goal the satirist sets for himself, he must employ enough satirical devices on a variety of levels to be grasped by as wide an audience as possible. Berlin employs an abundance of techniques and devices for that purpose.¹⁶

Many of Berlin's satirical techniques are found to be common to most works of satire. Others appear to be unique to Berlin in this period of modern Hebrew literature.

The basic ingredient of satire, ridicule, is the common denominator, and the end result, of other techniques. However, it is not to be found here in a direct form. The explanation for this phenomenon is that many of the "ridicule" utterances are disguised under sophisticated veils. It results from the narrator's image and role as portrayed in *Ktav Yosher*, and in his ostensible relationship with the religious teacher, the rabbi – and perhaps the reader.

One of the most important devices employed by Saul Berlin is that of irony. The narrator sums up his impressions of the *melamed* – the religious teacher, speaking of the "diligence of his mind" and of his ability "to draw very strong proofs, well founded on logical analogy and strong evidence which cannot be contradicted".¹⁷ The rabbi, too, reportedly presented the narrator with "additional strong proofs".¹⁸ The latter refers to the teacher as "a clever and wise" person, and to superstitious customs as "good and correct".¹⁹ The narrator praises these qualities which are known to be lacking. The key to decipher the irony inferred in the narrator's pronouncement is given beforehand by him in a cunning but systematic way through some other techniques, and by interjecting his covert point-of-view. These verbal ironies are coupled with something resembling situational ironies where the teacher himself is made to express superlatives about the "holy and wonderful *piyutim*" [liturgical poems], and to

¹³*Ktav Yosher*, p. 2a; translation is mine.

¹⁴Exodus 32: 18: "but the noise of them that sing do I hear". Note that the verb "sing" does not appear in the original text, but is generally believed to have been alluded to in the text. "Anot" denotes answer, reply; thus, my translation – echo.

¹⁵Arthur M. Clark, 'The Art of Satire and the Satiric Spectrum', in *Studies in Literary Modes*, London 1946, p. 33.

¹⁶I differ from Matthew Hodgart, *Satire*, New York 1969, p. 108, who believes that the satirist is bound to use a limited range of techniques.

¹⁷*Ktav Yosher*, p. 5b–6a.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 8b.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 6a, 3b.

compliment his fellow Jews for “the holiness of their deeds, the purity of their views and for their wonderful customs”.²⁰

A step further towards extremity is his use of sarcasm. The teacher appears to be yearning to become a martyr; for there is no greater satisfaction for God than Jewish martyrdom, he says. It is as a result of the increase of “our sins”, says the *melamed*, that the kings have abolished “the decrees of persecution and slaughtering”.²¹ This technique borders at times on the sardonic: the teacher describes in details the slaughtering of men, women and children below on earth only to be repeated by the archangel Michael up in heaven as a sacrifice on the heavenly altar.²²

Berlin employs also the technique of invective. However, as a result of the special role of the ostensibly objective narrator, the invective assumes a different direction. It is mostly put in the mouth of the teacher and the rabbi in their attitude towards Wessely. The people refer to the Hebrew writer as “Hazefoni hazif’oni” – the northern viper.²³ The teacher speaks of “that trouble-maker”, “that wicked person”, while the rabbi utilises the phrase “ish zar ve’oyev”, originally said of Haman.²⁴ Wessely’s book is said to be “full of wickedness and treachery”, intending for heresy and sin.²⁵ The intention of the satirist here is to achieve an inverted invective through the continuous use of irony.

Obscenity, another of the satirist’s tools, is employed in *Ktav Yosher* only in a very mild and indirect way. It is in the context of superstitious beliefs and practices that the narrator mentions such bodily activities as urinating (on Rosh Hashanah that occurs on a Sabbath) and spitting (from high above).²⁶ Berlin’s aim is to reduce religious practices to the bare bodily necessities. Scatology is seen by the satirist as a preoccupation of religion. Besides the comic effect achieved by putting together the most holy with the most profane, the satirist wishes to lampoon his coreligionists who deem such matters as religiously important.

One of the most important devices of a satirist is hyperbole. Exaggeration highlights a given subject matter out of any accepted proportions, thus creating a notion of humour and of ridicule. Berlin uses this device quite often in depicting certain aspects of Jewish reality, Jewish mentality, and his satiric protagonists as well. “Birkat Haminim” – a minor prayer on the heretics – is said by the people – as quoted by the narrator – to have sustained the Jewish people ever since the exile till now. Similarly, Wessely’s book, allegedly full of wickedness

²⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 7a, 4a.

²¹*Ibid.*, p. 4b.

²²*Ibid.*

²³*Ibid.*, p. 2a. It is based on *Sukah*, p. 52a. Similar expressions are found in the writings of Berlin’s father, Rabbi Zvi Hirsch Levin, in his letter to Benet (Simon Büchler, *Shai Lamoreh* [A Gift to the Teacher], Budapest 1895, p. 19), and in his approbation to Berlin’s *Besamim Rosh* [Incense of Spices], Berlin 1793, p. 4 [my pagination]. Undoubtedly, Berlin is alluding here to the invectives used by Rabbi David Tevel in his anti-Wessely sermon in which he referred to him as a snake (see L. Lewin, ‘Aus dem jüdischen Kulturkampfe’, in *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft*, XII (1918), pp. 184, 187.

²⁴*Ktav Yosher*, pp. 7a–b, 10b.

²⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 2a, 7b.

²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 3b.

and treachery, has had no equivalent since the secession of Ephraim from Judea, and none such book would ever be seen till the re-establishing of the temple-worship.²⁷ In these examples the author relates minor historical phenomena with major historical events and phenomena. Thus the inexplicable endurance of the Jewish people is related to a minor prayer on the heretics (the allusion that Wessely is among them is obvious). Wessely's book is regarded as the cause for the most terrible national division within the Jewish people; no such book can possibly be published till the coming of the Messiah. The narrator, in like manner, regards the trivial customs and superstitious acts as "tluyim berumo shel 'olam" – issues hung at the top of the world, that is, items of paramount concern.²⁸ The items listed not only are not of any significance in Judaism, but indeed are trivial and nonsensical. Berlin does not restrict the use of the hyperbole to the narrator, but as in the case of his other devices, unhesitatingly he puts exaggerations in the teacher's mouth as well. The latter feels that a decree to study grammar – as preached and practised by the *Maskilim* – is much worse than the decrees of persecution or forced apostasy.²⁹ All secular knowledge is like a drop in the bucket compared to one discussion of the Talmudic sages 'Abaye and Rava.³⁰ Such proclamations were indeed made by traditionalists in their disputes with the Hebrew enlighteners; the claims of self-sufficiency of Judaism must be viewed against the enlighteners' claim to the contrary. Another way in which the author employs hyperbole is in his use of language: in verbosity and redundancy.

Exaggeration in general aims at incongruity; the sense of harmony disappears to be replaced by the lopsided, awkward, disproportionate, i.e., the humorous.

Several uses of incongruity employed by Saul Berlin take the form of an analogy. "As the sect of Zadok and Shabtai have been uprooted from the world, and their views are not remembered, so would this man [Wessely] and his book be uprooted from this generation," the people say to the narrator.³¹ The Wessely controversy, quite trivial historically, is being equated with significant and consequential controversies in the history of the Jewish people. There is an added ridiculous allusion to the extremely heretical nature of Wessely's writings. The satirist assumes – and rightly so – that his contemporary readers are fully cognisant of Wessely's traditionalist reputation stemming from all his books prior to this controversy. Thus this extreme analogy is utterly ridiculous.

At times, Berlin would use the technique of *reductio ad absurdum*. Referring to certain casuistry practices, Berlin's figure of the rabbi maintains that Halachic disputes among latter-day authoritative rabbis had been referred to already "in the story of Haman and Ahashverosh"; accordingly, Haman follows the opinion

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 2a. Berlin employs a phrase from the Passover Hagadah ["Vehi She'amdah"] to allude to its contextual contents.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 3b.

²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 7a.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 5b. Also: "Our Talmud contains all the *Hochmot*" – all learnings, sciences and knowledge; there is more knowledge and understanding in what a Talmudic student innovates than in the totality of the Gentile wisdoms (*ibid.*).

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 2a.

of the RIF (Rabbi Isaac Alphasi of the eleventh century) while Ahashverosh follows the school of Maimonides (of the twelfth century).³² Significantly, Berlin does not refer to the biblical book as customary, namely, “the scroll of Esther”, or the book of Esther, but in a colloquial way, so as to lower and debase this source from the authoritative stand of a biblical book to a purim story – a purim “spiel”, so to speak.³³ In order to make his point clearer, he continues: “At times, Ahashverosh put forth a question of MaHaRSHA (rabbi Samuel Eliezer Eidels (Edels), 1555–1631) to which Haman replied Maharam Schiff’s solution (MaHaRaM – rabbi Meir ben Jacob Hacoheh Schiff, 1605–1641).³⁴ This use of anachronism in reverse is not foreign to Jewish thinking. The midrash is saturated with such examples. They are intended, however, not to be understood literally, but to teach a moral, and to convey the idea of continuity and eternity in Judaism. By using this technique, Berlin is making fun of this traditional device, or at least its literal interpretation. Since it has been commonly used in Jewish literature, it is very effective as a satirical tool.

The caricature is another of Saul Berlin’s satiric devices. He singles out one aspect of Jewish education of that time, and not necessarily the most important aspect; he then concentrates on that aspect alone, twists it and exaggerates its features out of all proportion. Thus he lets the religious teacher describe the professional treatment of the pupils by his learned colleagues: “If you could only see how the teachers beat the boys in our country, beating and injuring, they would not fear hitting an eye or a tooth, or plucking out their hair, and these hard beatings would bear fruit in the pupils, for the subjugation, the oppression, the beating and the injuries soften the boy’s heart so much so that even if it were a stone it would be softened.”³⁵ Beating is here regarded by the satirist as the most typical, nay, significant aspect of Jewish education.

The satirist employs wit to lash at his adversaries. “The more a teacher beats, the more praiseworthy he is,” the religious teacher says in his monologue on Jewish education.³⁶ The Jewish child is brought to school even before he is able to say the two basic words “father” and “mother”, according to the teacher.³⁷ On the abundance of religious volumes that the children have to cope with, the teacher says: “The days will end before they [the books] will.”³⁸ Wit may take the form of an aphorism, generally patterned after a known adage which in most instances is based on the classical Hebrew sources. Thus the teacher announces: “The study of grammar is the beginning of heresy,”³⁹ following such biblical verses as “Reshit hochmah yir’at ’adonai.” The study of grammar, as has been pointed out, became the focus of a controversy between the traditionalists and the *Maskilim*. The use of the aphorism form registers easily in the reader’s mind.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 9a–b.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 9a: “Besipur ma’aseh Haman va’ahashverosh.”

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 9b.

³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 6a.

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 6b: “Kol melamed hamarbeh lehakot harei zeh meshubah”; it is patterned after the Passover Hagadah phrase: “And the more a man tells about the departure from Egypt, the more praiseworthy he is.”

³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 4a.

³⁸*Ibid.*

³⁹*Ibid.*, p. 7a.

The employment of wit here is doubly effective because of the irony involved; many of the witty sentences are uttered by the teacher who is not aware, as it were, of the full meaning of his words.

Humour is the mildest of a satirist's tools. Berlin uses humour at times as a relief after a long series of other satiric techniques. Humour helps in reducing tension and creates at times an anti-climax, yet is very effective in preparing for the next series of satiric attacks. Thus the teacher ends one of his long, tiring monologues by telling all about the low state of the teaching profession which Wessely is endeavouring to debase even more. Accordingly, when Joshua offered the Givonites an alternative either to become hewers of wood or teachers, they indeed preferred to be hewers of wood.⁴⁰ As in other cases, the humour is intensified by the irony, for the teacher is not aware of the meaning of the anecdote. The beating of school children is justified for it educates them to charity (bribing the teachers in order to escape corporal punishments). In like manner, beating enables teachers to receive remuneration since the teaching itself may not be used as a means (remuneration), but rather as an end by itself (study for study's sake).⁴¹

IV. FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE AS SATIRE

The techniques of satire are intensified by Saul Berlin's use of figurative language. Despite certain limitations imposed on the satirist in the use of the Hebrew language, Berlin's manipulation of rhetorical devices to enhance his satirical goals is quite impressive. Undoubtedly, one is led to the conclusion that Saul Berlin was a master of the Hebrew language, and one of the most sophisticated creative writers of the time. It is unfortunate that his fictional writing is limited to *Ktav Yosher*.

In the following discussion I shall refer to some of his rhetorical devices and cite examples from the text.

He uses simile and metaphor as vehicles for his ironical devices in order to achieve his satirical aim. To cite an example from his use of metaphor: the teacher speaks of himself, telling of his educational activities: "I always sat next to the meat pot and [near] the wine of the Talmud like any other religious teacher."⁴² The metaphors are intended to portray a caricature of the teacher – ironically, by himself. The expression "Yam Hatalmud" – The Sea of Talmud – which is a traditional metaphor for the vastness, perhaps spirituality, of the Talmud, is here changed to the "wine of Talmud". Although the latter expression may be accepted as a positive metaphor, its parallel counterpart, "the meat pot", gears it, too, to its debased, hedonistic connotation. Thus the *melamed's* Talmud is compared to a pot, reminiscent, perhaps, of the seething pot of Jeremiah 1:13, "Sir Nafu'ah", that is, a blown-up pot, and/or to something which is materialistic ("meat"). His spirituality is gastronomic.

He very cleverly uses the synecdoche: "Behold, we have our language ('Sfatenu'), a tongue ('Lashon') which we are accustomed to from our mother's

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, p. 6b.

⁴¹*Ibid.*

⁴²*Ibid.*, p. 3a.

breasts.”⁴³ He means mother tongue, yet the association of “Sfatenu”, literally, our lips, “tongue” and “breasts” concentrates on the physical sucking and not on the metaphor. Berlin’s intention is to mock even at the *melamedim*’s mother tongue, let alone their knowledge of the German language.

We find here the use of metonymy. The teacher refers to the university as “their church”.⁴⁴ This metonymy harbours within it the traditionalist’s concept of secular education as being related to Christianity, and perhaps tantamount to conversion. Thus the satirist reflects the traditionalist state of mind in an authentic way, yet criticises its message as part of his satire.

Berlin uses the aposiopesis in a dramatic way, building up tension and expectations, and leaving the narrator’s view rather beclouded.⁴⁵ Apostrophe is employed in the last two chapters where the narrator is calling directly on the leaders of the people as if they were present. Thus he is creating a sense of proximity of himself to the leadership as well as the urgency of the problem.⁴⁶ His satiric message is given the framework and disguise of a public pronouncement which helps it to come across to the reader.

While citing the list of what he calls “the good and righteous customs”, Berlin employs the anti-climax, or bathos approach. That is, starting with the unimportant, yet accepted, custom of “Kaparot” on Yom Kipur’s eve, he goes all the way down to those superstitious practices or restrictions such as urinating on Rosh Hashanah when it falls on the Sabbath, spitting from a high place (as mentioned in another context).⁴⁷ This use helps illustrate how low and irrational these “good and righteous customs” could get. Since the satirist’s main concern is the reduction of his opponent, or target, this device is employed quite often by him.

Berlin is very conscious of the use of literalism. The people of Israel are referred to by the narrator as “the poor and impoverished of the flock”.⁴⁸ The biblical metaphor “the poor of the flock” is reduced to its literal meaning. Thus the narrator portrays the people around him as a herd, as sheep.

His puns are sophisticated. The most outstanding example could be found in the discussion of the beating of the school children, where the *melamed* refers to God as “Rochev Ba’aravot”.⁴⁹ Based on Psalm, 68:5, it is play on the word ‘Aravah. While his total discussion, which is a page long, alludes to the custom of “Hibuṭ Ha’aravah” (beating of the willow twigs on Hosh’a’ana Rabba in the synagogue), God is titled as the God of those willows . . . Not only is God portrayed as condoning this corporeal attribute of religious education, but he is moreover depicted as the master of this education.

The oxymoron helps establish the sense of conflicting and contradicting values within the reality which *Ktav Yosher* is trying to picture. The result is

⁴³*Ibid.*, p. 7a.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, p. 8a.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p. 3b: “If he [Wessely] did wicked things, indeed one should not have pity on him [. . .] for he who denies these things is like —.”

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, p. 13a.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, p. 3b.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 2b. “Dalei va’aniyei haẓon” – based on Zechariah 11:7. A detailed discussion to follow.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, p. 6a.

confusion on the part of the reader. The rabbi speaks of the Jewish people's poverty: "The poorer and the more impoverished we get, indeed these are our riches."⁵⁰ Similar is the use of paradox in this satire: The more the early sages wanted to write in a concise and brief way, the more the ones who followed them commented lengthily and elaborated on the original brief and concise form, so much so that the original intention of the early sages was forfeited. The paradox serves the satirist in that it evokes the notion of senselessness and confusion in the reader.

V. DEBASEMENT OF SACRED IDIOM

These techniques of satire and of figurative language intending to satirise are common to most works of satire, although Berlin's tools seem to be very sophisticated. There is nothing here, however, which is unique to Saul Berlin, or else typically Hebrew in its essence, although the Jewish milieu of the time is of utmost importance to the understanding of the satire.

Berlin's satiric writing does, however, present us with a feature which is uniquely Hebraic in nature. It has to do with the basic linguistic problem which confronted modern Hebrew literature in general, namely, the employment of a sacred language for the description of the modern world and the modern man. This problem became acute in modern Hebrew belles-lettres, for there was a discrepancy between the lofty, sublime and euphuistic language and the mundane, down-to-earth subject. A lack of authenticity resulted, as well as inaccuracies of expression.

Ironically, the very nature of the problem offered the Hebrew satirist a solution, putting in his hands a most important and potent satiric tool. It is the very lowering of the sacred idiom in its application to everyday use, which the Hebrew satirist adopted as his device. Saul Berlin began it in modern Hebrew satire, and the nineteenth-century Hebrew satirists Joseph Perl, Isaac Erter and Mendele Mocher Sfarim followed in his footsteps. In Saul Berlin's writings it may take the form of a biblical quotation which is twisted, or taken out of context, or the form of a Talmudic concept, phrase or Halachic device, which is given a similar treatment. In Erter's writings we may find an attempt at profanation of the language, whereas in Mendele's writings it leads to the secularisation of the sacred idiom.

One should note, though, that this use of the biblical sources is not entirely new in Hebrew letters. For indeed medieval Hebraists – poets and writers – used biblical verses in their writings for purposes other than the literal meaning of the text. However, in most instances their goal was mainly humorous, intending both to amuse their readers and to exhibit their wit. There are a few exceptions, though, as in the case of Yehudah Elharizi and Immanuel Haromi.

By contrast, the modern Hebrew satirist would employ the scriptural quotes for the purpose of critical and invective satire.

Furthermore, this method is quite different from the mock-heroic parodies in

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, p. 9b.

modern European literature (as distinguished from medieval and renaissance works). In the mock-heroic parodies, the artificial aspect of the parody style is not only immediately noted, but it is indeed made to appear deliberately awkward by the satirist. As a matter of fact, he wants the reader to know that he is imitating a given style. The modern Hebrew satirist, by contrast, is employing language and style which prevailed in Hebrew writings at that time. Thus the parodic artificiality is not immediately apparent. The Hebrew satirist is therefore more subtle in his approach, and the impact of the satire is much stronger. Once the reader gets the clues to the satire, the message is intensified.

In a subtle way, the Hebrew satirist is employing the authority of the scriptures to enhance his message. This unique aspect of the use of the quotations from the sacred writings cannot be found in the parody, for it stresses the imitative nature of the quote, thus highlighting the artistic play which is involved. For parody, by its very nature, annuls the authoritative aspect of the use of the scriptural texts. The Hebrew way in modern Hebrew literature, however, is patterned after the rabbinic tradition of the responsa literature as well as after some theological and philosophical writings. It is not immediately apparent that it is written tongue-in-cheek, and the satiric message is swallowed by the reader before he realises what the mechanics are. Should the reader be as sophisticated as the writer – and perhaps of a similar opinion – he would grasp the satiric elements at once, and would go on appreciating and enjoying the subtleties of the satire.

Thus Saul Berlin refers to the people who were complaining about the heresies of Wessely's book as "the poor of the flock". Berlin is using the phraseology of Zechariah 11:7 "And I fed the flock of slaughter, O poor of the flock."⁵¹ However, the similarity remains on the surface only. For Berlin does change the original meaning and intention of the biblical verse, while wanting the resemblance to stay in order to serve as contrast. In Zechariah, the flock is a metaphor for the people of Israel; the prophet is instructed to act symbolically as the shepherd of his people. Berlin takes this unique biblical metaphor (which appears only in Zechariah), and reduces it to its literal meaning. Namely, that the people with whom he spoke – the adversaries of Wessely – were indeed sheep. He does it by adding three weights to the metaphorical phrase, thus lowering and debasing the metaphor to its actual literal meaning.⁵²

He does it by describing this proverbial flock as being wrapped and bound in order to protect its wool ("hakvulot vehakvunot"); he further chooses the period of heat ("et yeḥamnah") in depicting the sheep. These actual descriptions of the flock are topped with an additional synonym of "poor" (sort of "poor and impoverished" – "dalei va'aniyei haẓon") in order to relate the metaphoric flock back to the people. The upshot is a reversal in attitude on the part of the satirist towards the people of Israel. The prophet Zechariah describes the flock as being likened to Israel; Saul Berlin depicts the people of Israel as being

⁵¹"Va'er'eh 'et zōn haharegah lachen 'aniyei haẓon."

⁵²*Kitav Yosher*, p. 2b: "[. . .] midivrei dalei va'aniyei haẓon hakvulot vehakvunot 'et yeḥamnah" – "the words of the poor and impoverished flock, being wrapped and bound in their time of heat."

likened to the sheep – in their attempt to preserve tradition without reservation (wrapped and bound in order to protect the wool), and in heat – of the controversy, that is – unable to overcome their passion. Berlin's manipulation of the holy tongue and its accepted traditional metaphors is indeed very powerful in his satire. His technique is intensified through the employment of "zon" as a motif later on in this satire.

Referring to the treatment of grammar in his own education, the *melamed* relates that "when we arrived at a grammatical place we skipped and passed over it as God passed over the houses of the children of Israel when he plagued Egypt".⁵³ The employment of the biblical quotation is intended by the author to reflect his own attitude towards grammar and the correct use of the Hebrew language through the *melamed's* rejection of the study of grammar. The *melamed* relies on the association of the word "Pasaḥ": they passed over the study of grammar very much as God passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt. When the sentence is studied carefully, grammar is discerned as being equated with the houses of the Israelites; thus grammar is regarded – through the analogy – as something that ought to be protected. The irony of it is that the *melamed* is not "aware" that he is being used to reflect the author's positive stand regarding the study of grammar. This method of quoting the bible is further an indication of the superficial approach of the teacher to the sacred text, and his inability to comprehend it in depth.

In the same vein, the *melamed* praises the Jews for not relenting on the issue of the study of grammar and the acquisition of modern languages, quoting the bible: "ki 'am qsheh 'oref hu", – for [the people] is stiff-necked, i.e., stubborn.⁵⁴ While it is the logical intention of the teacher to praise the Jews for their insistence, the author puts in his mouth a quotation which supports the notion that stubbornness is a negative trait. For the biblical phrase always denotes a negative attitude. Thus the satirist relies on the biblical connotation to convey his covert point of view.

Close to this method of quotations from the Bible either out of context or for an ironical purpose is the use of various techniques which are taken from the vast literature of the Talmud. The author strikes a familiar chord on using such a technique, and the tendency on the part of the reader is to accept it as a bona fide Halachic, or theological discussion. The contrast between the seriousness of the form and the utter nonsense of the content is Berlin's way of making fun of his adversaries. A given quotation may reflect the traditionalist's state of mind. However, when studied closely against the narrator's covert Enlightenment point-of-view, the quotation seems to serve the latter in his satiric goals more than it does the former.

To illustrate his knowledge in the Talmudic literature, the teacher – when speaking about the abundance of *mizvot* and customs which he favours – cites the rabbinic phrase "schar mizvah – mizvah" – the reward of a *mizvah* is the *mizvah* itself.⁵⁵ However, behind this Talmudic quote lies the satiric message of the author, saying sarcastically that the reward for a *mizvah* is another *mizvah*. Thus the perpetual abundance of the *mizvot* is part of an endless vicious circle.

⁵³*Ibid.*, p. 7b.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, p. 8a.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, p. 5a.

The rabbi, too, exhibits his erudition in the Talmud, citing the Talmudic veneration for the generations of antiquity: If the first ones are likened to human beings we are likened to donkeys. This phrase was said in Talmudic times, but it is even truer in our days, says the rabbi.⁵⁶ What appears to be a run-of-the-mill quotation from the Talmud, as commonly practised by rabbis and preachers in writing and orally, is a cleverly selected phrase which the *Maskilim* used on a number of occasions, as recorded in the *Haskalah* literature, to express their disrespect for the contemporary generation which is likened to donkeys.⁵⁷ Again the irony is intensified, for the mocking phrase is said by the rabbi.

Likewise is the employment of the Talmudic *Qal Vaḥomer*, inference from minor to major, in a nonsensical fashion. The format is the Talmudic one, but the logical inference is omitted, thus leading to a clash between the expectations and the outcome. The *melamed* declares that he would not drink the milk which was prepared by a non-Jew even if the king himself would give him half of his kingdom; *Qal Voḥomer* that he would not transgress by learning a foreign language and grammar. To implement the false, satiric notion that the study of languages and grammar is a major transgression, the *melamed* is made to say the biblical phrase “veḥaṭati leloqim kol hayamim” – and I would be sinning against God all the days [of my life].⁵⁸ Against the background of the enlighteners’ preaching for the study of these disciplines, and the rabbis’ opposition, the satiric intention is crystallised.⁵⁹

Following the Talmudic pattern assumes the technique of parody when the rabbi exhibits his talents of casuistry connecting the Mishnah discussing the case of the firstborn who fell into a ditch with the Mishnah on the dog and the kid that jumped from the roof.⁶⁰ The nonsensical scholarship of the rabbi is dead-serious, thus adding to the pungency of the satire.

The use of the sacred or semi-sacred text as material for satire at times takes the shape of the anecdote. Rashi’s exegesis to a verse in Exodus, where he cites an example in French, is said by the *melamed* to be the names of four tomb places in Egypt.⁶¹ This absurd explanation is said to have been given to his teacher by tradition. From the short exegesis to the prophets [Magidim Qṭanim] the *melamed* tells the anecdote of the Givonites, cited above.

The use of the biblical, Talmudic and medieval sources appears to be a very common allusion to the phraseology which has been employed regularly in the traditional writing, or in the Hebrew belles-lettres of the period. Yet the subtle

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, p. 9b. It is based on *Shabat*, p. 112b; see my study (App. II, No. 4), p. 9.

⁵⁷Among the *Maskilim* who utilised this expression: Isaac Satanow in his *Mishlei ’Asaf* [Proverbs of ’Asaf], II, Berlin 1792, p. 10a; Aaron Wolfsohn, *Hame’asef*, VII (1796?), No. 2, p. 127; Joseph Perl, *Megaleh Tmirin*, p. 13b; Isaac Erter, ‘Toldot Hehaluz’, *Haṣofeh Levet Yisra’el* [‘The History of Hehaluz’, Watchman for the House of Israel], Wien 1848, p. 10.

⁵⁸*Ktav Yosher*, p. 8a, based on Genesis 39:9. For other uses of *Qal Vaḥomer*, see also p. 9a.

⁵⁹Some rabbis would use the quote “Min’u ’et bnechem min hahigayon” – prevent your children from the [study of] logic, or grammar.

⁶⁰*Ktav Yosher*, p. 9b, the author employs an inner rhyme [“Bechor shenafal labor’”] and a remote play on words [gdi-gidin] to highlight the funny – not logical – resemblance. For another such technique see p. 10a, a casuistry on a biblical verse.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, p. 7b. Rashi writes the following French phrase in Hebrew characters (in four words): Si pour faillance de non fosses.

satiric techniques practised here by Saul Berlin out of the necessity of appearing as though he were objective in the dispute are powerful indeed. His predicament – being a practising rabbi, and being related to a well-known rabbinic family – necessitates the subtle approach whose artistic value – as satire – is more sophisticated, thus more impressive.

To sum up, *Ktav Yosher* is one of the most sophisticated pieces of literature of those that were composed in the early period of *Haskalah* literature. In its structure, language and techniques, this satire is much superior not only to other satiric writings of the time, but also to other forms of Hebrew literature. It is ironic that satire, generally being regarded as a “lower” form of literature, can be credited with literary accomplishments not to be found in the “legitimate”, traditional forms of literature. It was as a result of the accepted attitude towards satire in general, and the attitude towards Saul Berlin in particular, that *Ktav Yosher* has been ignored for too long a time. Apparently, from its very beginning *Ktav Yosher* was destined to suffer from this attitude. Saul Berlin chose not to publish it during the heat of the Wessely controversy for reasons which could be reconstructed.⁶² It was published posthumously, ten years after the controversy. However, it is as vivid and enjoyable nowadays as it was when it was written. One can imagine Saul Berlin, master of the Hebrew language and satire, exclaiming – in the manner of Juvenal’s dictum on satire: “It is difficult *not* to write satire!”⁶³

⁶²It could be that the main reason for Berlin’s not publishing his satire was because of Wessely’s public utterances against the use of satire for the enhancement of *Haskalah*. See Wessely’s letter to the editors of *Hame’asef* which was published in the prospectus of the journal, *Nahal Habsor* [The Brook of ‘Besor’, or, Good Tidings], bound with *Hame’asef*, I (1783/4), and his article published five years later, in which he reprimanded the *Maskilim* for the use of satire (‘Ma’amar Ḥiqur Hadin’ [An Essay (on) Search of Justice], in *Hame’asef*, IV (1788), pp. 97, 98, 165).

In the author’s article on Berlin (cited in App. II, No. 41), p. 5, it is suggested that it was because of his father’s opposition to Wessely’s *Divrei Shalom Ve’emet*, that Saul Berlin did not publish the satire. He did not want to come out in public against his father, rabbi Zvi Hirsch Levin of Berlin. Even according to Samet, rabbi Levin was somewhat involved in the dispute (see his article ‘Mendelssohn, Weisel, and the Rabbis of Their Time’, in *Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel*, Haifa 1970, pp. 249–253 [Hebrew]).

It is also possible that Berlin was apprehensive lest the figure of the traditionalist rabbi in *Ktav Yosher* might be identified with his father; thus he would not want it to be published.

⁶³‘The Satires of Juvenal’, I, 30, in M. Madan, *A New and Literal Translation of Juvenal and Persius*, I, London 1829.

APPENDIX I

Ktav Yosher's Date of Publication

The publication date is cited by the *Praṭ* (chronogram) as equivalent to Tav Qof Mem Dalet – 5544 (1784/5); however, the first reviewer of *Ktav Yosher* in *Hame'asef*, VII (1796), No. 3, p. 271, corrects the *Praṭ* counting as Tav Qof Nun Dalet (5554), yet writes that “he [Saul Berlin] composed the book at the time of the controversies, but did not allow to go to the press during his lifetime” (*ibid.*, pp. 270–271). Since Berlin died 16th November 1794, the printing date must be Tav Qof Nun Hei (5555). The reviewer changed the *Praṭ* needlessly, and erroneously. The text of the title page including the original *Praṭ* has apparently been retained intact by the publishers as had been written in the manuscript by the author in 1784. For otherwise it would seem rather odd that the publishers did not refer to the author as being deceased (“Hamano’ah” or “Z.L.”). Yet it is indeed obvious that Berlin wrote about himself as the author in third person, utilising a unique terminology which is applicable only in third person. He writes: “Ulerov ’anvetanuto lo’ hodi’a ’et shmo” (and as a result of his great modesty he did not announce his name). This expression is not uncommon, as it is used by the editors of *Hame'asef* a number of times; see *Hame'asef*, III (1786), pp. 78, 191, 211 (*cf.* also *Nogah Hazedeq* [Glow of Justice], Dessau 1818, p. 7). Saul Berlin does it intentionally in order to establish the author (that is, himself) as “one of the great persons of the generation” (“Migdolei hador” – on the title page). Thus he sets the author (i.e., himself) on a par with the fictional rabbi in *Ktav Yosher* with whom he discusses the topic of Wessely and who is also being referred to as “gadol” and “gedol hador” (*Ktav Yosher* [Berlin? 1794/5?], pp. 8b, 10b, 11b). The narrator even says it directly: “that he [the rabbi] speaks to a man like himself” (*ibid.*, p. 8b). He stresses the point that it is a discussion between equals. In addition, he utilises the title page in like manner to announce his expertise in Kabbalah (Jewish mysticism); as it turns out, Kabbalah later on becomes the vehicle of satire. Thus the title page text clearly manifests the same techniques used in the text of the book. It would be highly improbable to assume that the publishers successfully adopted Berlin’s style for the title page. It should be also noted that the reference to the author’s expertise in Kabbalah is cited in the present tense. Moreover, the title must be read with the two paragraphs that follow below it, thus it must be assumed to have been written by one person – the author himself. The rhymed text on the title page is in the narrator’s style. The inescapable conclusion, then, is that the title page must be considered as part of the original manuscript as written by Saul Berlin inclusive of the *Praṭ*.

The corrections of the reviewer led Landshuth to write that “D.A. said explicitly that this book was printed ten years afterwards [after 1784] in the year 1794 after the death of the author” (Landshuth, *Toldot*, p. 105; cited in App. II, no. 11). Well, D. A. did not say that. In addition, Landshuth cites from a copy of *Ktav Yosher* which Friedländer possessed, on which he – Friedländer – wrote that rabbi Saul Z.L. was the author of this satiric work. It is indeed a proof that it was not published in 1784; however, there is no conclusive evidence that it was published in 1794. It may as well be that it was early in 1795.

The difficulties of dating the year of publication led to various bibliographical data. Most bibliographers regard 1794 as the year of publication and Berlin as the place: Steinschneider, *Catalogus*, II, p. 2506; Zedner, *Catalogue*, p. 682; Roest, *catalog*, p. 1035; Cowley, *Catalogue*, p. 618; Friedberg, *Bet ’Eged Sfarim*, II, 478; *Harvard Catalogue*, p. 249.

Fürst, *Bibliotheca*, I, 111, has “(1774)” as the date. Since it predates the Wessely controversy, it is surely an error. Isaac E. Benjacob, *Oẓar Hasfarim*, p. 248, knows of another edition published, according to him, in Levov in 1784. No other bibliographer (aside from Menahem M. Slatkine, *Oẓar Hasfarim*, II, Jerusalem 1965, p. 128, who supplements Benjacob, and follows him) mentions any second edition of *Ktav Yosher*. As a matter of fact, the only complete republication of this work appeared in my text *Mavo’ Lasifrut Ha’ivrit Haḥadashah Bame’ot Ha-18 vaha-19* [Introduction to Modern Hebrew Literature in the 18th and 19th Centuries], Jerusalem 1971/2, pp. 111–118, and in my mimeographed text *Iyunim Basafirah Ha’ivrit* [Studies in the Hebrew Satire], Beer Sheva 1971/2.

Benjacob is also the source for another speculation which states that the place of publication was Frankfurt on the Oder in 1784. Slatkine follows him, as well as Meisl (see App. II, No. 21), Zvi

Hurwitz (App. II, No. 24), who resorts also to Benjacob's phraseology, and the *Hebrew Encyclopedia* (App. II, No. 30). Einhorn has it Tav Qof Nun Vav – 5556 (No. 26). Only Klausner, (No. 33) Pritzker (No. 29) and myself (No. 41) state the year as Tav Qof Nun Hei (5555).

Interestingly enough, *Ktav Yosher* does not appear on the list of available books published from 1784–1796 by the *Maskilim's* "Defus Hevrat H'inuch Ne'arim" [The Press of the Society for the Education of Youth] in Berlin. See Nahman ben Simhah 'Ein Mishpat [The Fountainhead of Justice], Berlin 1796, in the end. The reason for that is that apparently the book was sold out ("books that have been sold out are not mentioned here").

APPENDIX II

Bibliography on Ktav Yosher

Below are some of the sources discussing *Ktav Yosher* in chronological order (articles and books cited in this note are in Hebrew unless otherwise stated or understood from the title. An asterisk indicates a longer discussion of *Ktav Yosher*, as compared to a brief discussion (up to five lines):

1.* D – A [Dov Ottensosser, according to Steinschneider], in a review of the pamphlet in *Hame'asef*, VII (1796), No. 3, pp. 266–271, treats Berlin very favourably, and quotes abundantly from the text in order to show the author's satire and irony.

2.* David Friedrichsfeld, *Zecher Zadiq* [Memory of a Righteous Man], Amsterdam 1809, p. 7 (my pagination), cites the book as a work of art intended to mock at the author's ignorant opponents and defend Wessely, as part of a biography of Wessely.

3. Shneur (Senior) Sachs, *Hameliz*, I (1861), No. 27, pp. 481–482, while thinking highly of Berlin's great personality, and understanding his predicament, he criticises Berlin's other writings.

4. M. Straschun, in Samuel Joseph Fünin, *Qiryah Ne'emanah* [Trustful City], Wilna 1860, p. 296, cites the book briefly among Berlin's other works.

5.* Elyaqim Carmoly, *Ha'orvim Uvnei Yonah* [Ravens and Pigeons], Rödelheim 1861, pp. 41–42, quotes verbatim from the first review in *Hame'asef* (No. 1, above).

6. Heinrich Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, XI, Leipzig 1900^a [1st edn.: 1870], p. 151, speaks negatively of Saul Berlin, yet "forgives" him for his light laughing-matter.

7. Zvi Graetz, *Diurei Yemei Hayehudim* [History of the Jews], IX, Warsaw [1904], p. 111, the same in Hebrew translation.

8. L. Rosenthal, *Tode'a Sepher* [He Who Knows (the) Book] in M. Roest, *Catalog der Hebraica und Judaica aus der L. Rosenthal'schen Bibliothek*, II, Amsterdam 1875 [facsimile edition: Amsterdam, 1966], p. 154, No. 818.

9. David Cassel, *Lehrbuch der jüdischen Geschichte und Literatur*, Leipzig 1879, p. 507.

10. The same was translated by David Radner, *Qorot 'Am Yeshurun* [The History of the Nation of Israel], I, Wilna 1886, p. 563, who added to the original text his own erroneous identification of the pamphlet and its subject matter (apparently reading the wrong lines in *Ozar Hasfarim*, p. 248), and confusing two books bearing similar titles.

11.* Eliezer Landshuth, *Toldot 'Anshei Hashem Ufe'ulatam Ba'adat Berlin* [The History of Prominent Persons and Their Activities in the Community of Berlin], I, Berlin 1884, p. 105, testifies that his copy is the one on which David Friedländer identified the author of *Ktav Yosher* as Saul Berlin.

12. Shlomo (Solomon) Mandelkern, "Toldot R. Naphtali Herz Weisel" [The Life Story of N.H.W.], in *Ha'asif*, III (1886), p. 412, regards it as "a wonderful satire".

13. Marcus Brann, "Geschichte des Landrabbinats in Schlesien", in *Jubelschrift zum 70. Geburtstag des Professors Dr. Heinrich Graetz*, Hildesheim and New York 1973 [reprint from the Breslau edn., 1887], p. 256–257.

14. J. L. Kantor, 'Dor Hame'asim' [The Generation of *Hame'asef* Writers], in *Ha'asif* (1887), p. 27, follows Graetz in his negative attitude towards Saul Berlin (see above).

15. Moritz Steinschneider, 'Hebräische Drucke in Deutschland', in *ZGJD*, V (1892), p. 179.

16.* L.G. [Louis Ginzberg], *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, III, London and New York 1902, p. 83, in an article on Saul Berlin, states that "Wessely warmly defended" *Ktav Yosher*; this contention cannot be substantiated. Regards Berlin's humour as "wonderful" and his style as "florid though racy".

17.* Ben-Zion Katz, 'Toldot Haskalat Hayehudim Berusia' [The History of the Enlightenment of the Jews in Russia], in *Hazman*, I (1903), pp. 93-96, dwells on some expressions of Berlin's satire, citing dialogues from the text. However, Katz apparently is not sensitive enough to grasp Berlin's satire. He considers the pamphlet as the first modern satire in Hebrew language. His attitude is generally negative.

18.* Similar views are expressed in Katz's book published half a century after that article, *Rabanut, Hasidut, Haskalah* [Rabbinute, Hasidism, Enlightenment], I, Tel Aviv 1955, pp. 201, 240-242. Although Katz refers to *Ktav Yosher* as a satire, he concurrently states that the description in the booklet is very, very exaggerated; thus he argues, matter-of-factly, that at that time there were no such rabbis and teachers in Germany . . . As in the previous article, there is no understanding of the fundamentals of the satiric art.

19. Naḥum Slouschz, *Qorot Hasifrut Ha'ivrit Haḥadashah* [History of Modern Hebrew Literature], I, Warsaw 1906, p. 31.

20. Simon Bernfeld, *Dor Tahapuchot* [A Froward Generation], II, Warsaw 1914, pp. 75-76, approaches Berlin and his work negatively.

21. Josef Meisl, *Haskalah*, Berlin 1919, p. 21.

22.* C. Duschinsky, *The Rabbinate of the Great Synagogue, London*, London 1921, p. 41, distinguishes between the narrator and the author, but mistakenly considers the former to be "a modern youth".

23.* Simḥah Asaf, *Megorot Letoldot Haḥinuch Beyisra'el* [Sources for the History of Education in Israel], I, Tel Aviv 1925, p. 242, cites long passages from *Ktav Yosher* in reference to Jewish education.

24. Zvi Halevi Ish Hurwitz, 'Kitvei Yeshenim' [Writings of the Sleeping Ones (= the Dead)], in *Hazofeh Leḥochmat Yisra'el*, XIV, Budapest 1930, p. 10, writes favourably of Berlin.

25.* Peretz Sandler, *Habe'ur Latorah* [The Exegesis to the Torah], Jerusalem 1941, pp. 3, 9, 97, refers incidentally and briefly to his satiric technique which he regards as a "very special literary form that served perhaps as a prototype of the Hebrew satire in the Haskalah period".

26.* Isaac Einhorn, 'Beḥinat Hakabalah' [A Probe of Kabalah], in *Tarbiz*, XIII (1942), No. 1, pp. 60-65, believes that Saul Berlin is the author of *Qol Sachal* [The Voice of a Fool] and *Sha'agat 'Aryeh* [Lion's Roar], generally attributed to Yehudah Aryeh Modena. Einhorn bases his contention on the following points: a. Berlin never published anything which he had not forged. b. He used pseudonym in *Mizpeh Yoqte'el* and *Ktav Yosher* as did the author of the other works. c. *Ktav Yosher* is full of covert ridicule of tradition behind the pretention to defend tradition, very much like *Sha'agat 'Aryeh*. d. The objects of ridicule in both books are "almost the same": "in both he ridicules Kaparot on Yom Kipur's eve, eating a lamb's head on Rosh Hashanah"; here Berlin ridicules the prohibition to spit against the wind, and there the prohibition to urinate on Sabbath in public or to spit from a high place. e. The spirit of ridicule and mockery that is in *Ktav Yosher* can be discerned also in *Sha'agat 'Aryeh*.

Items a. and b. do not constitute any proof; in items c. and d. Einhorn confuses criticism, as could be found in Modena's books, with satire. The tone of Modena's books is not satiric at all, but is a direct criticism. Likewise, there is no similarity whatsoever in the terminology which might indicate a single authorship, and there is no relationship between the two. It is my conclusion that Einhorn has no proof at all for his contention.

Indeed, Benjamin Klar, in his book *Mehqarim Ve'iyunim* [Research and Studies], Tel Aviv 1954, pp. 357-378, has proved that Einhorn was wrong. However, Klar did not use any argument from *Ktav Yosher* to disprove Einhorn.

27.* Raphael Mahler, *Divrei Yemei Yisra'el Dorot 'Aḥaronim* [The History of Israel, Latter Generations], II, Merḥavyah, Israel 1954², pp. 77-79, 337, regards the satire as "one of the excellent works in that generation's Hebrew literature", and speaks of his "art of satire". Mahler utilises the satire to expound on Berlin's Enlightenment ideology and his attitude towards the Jewish religion.

28. Isaac Eisenstein-Barzilay, 'The Treatment of the Jewish Religion in the Literature of the Berlin Haskalah', in *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, XXIV (1955), pp. 42-43.

29. Asher Pritzker, *Sefer Hame'ilah* [Book of Treachery], Tel Aviv 1957, p. 32, an orthodox approach.

30. *The Hebrew Encyclopedia*, IX, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv 1958, p. 784.

31. Meir Hershkowitz, 'Hezizu Velo' Nifge'u' [They Peeped and Did Not Get Hurt = Did Not Become Heretics], in *Hadarom*, VIII-IX (Nisan 1959), p. 165.

32.* Israel Zinberg, *Toldot Sifrut Yisra'el* [The History of the Literature of Israel], V, Merhavayah, Israel 1959, pp. 122-124, although Zinberg criticises Berlin's personality and character, he does consider the author of *Ktav Yosher* as possessing a very definite literary talent, having written the first satire in Hebrew literature; Zinberg cites some of Berlin's satiric methods.

33.* Joseph Klausner, *Historiah Shel Hasifrut Ha'ivrit Hahadashah* [History of Modern Hebrew Literature], I, Jerusalem 1960, pp. 132-133, has a high regard for this work - as the work of an artist.

34.* A. Avigad, 'Parashat Hasefer "Besamim Rosh" Umehabro' [The Case of the Book 'Besamim Rosh' and Its Author], in *Hazofeh* (11th November 1961) p. 5.

35. Mordechai Eli'av, *Ha'inuch Hayehudi Begermayah Bimei Hahaskalah Veba'emancipazyah* [Jewish Education in Germany in the Period of Enlightenment and Emancipation], Jerusalem 1960, p. 32.

36. G. Kressel, *Lexicon Hasifrut Ha'ivrit Badorot Ha'aharonim* [Cyclopedia of Modern Hebrew Literature], I, Merhavayah, Israel 1965, p. 358, considers it, too, as the first satire in modern Hebrew literature.

37.* Moshe Samet, 'R. Saul Berlin Uchtavav' [Rabbi Saul Berlin and His Writings], in *Kirjath Sepher*, XLIII (1968) pp. 429, 434. A detailed bibliography of Berlin's writings. Samet regards *Ktav Yosher* as a "jewel in the literature of 'Hame'asfim', and its author as possessing an 'exceptional satirical talent'."

38. Moshe Pelli, 'Intimations of Religious Reform in the German Hebrew Haskalah Literature', in *Jewish Social Studies*, XXXII (January, 1970), No. 1, pp. 7, 10.

39.* Moshe Pelli, 'Some Notes on the Nature of Saul Berlin's Writings', in *The Journal of Hebraic Studies*, I (1970), No. 2, pp. 47-61.

40. A.D., *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, IV, Jerusalem 1971, p. 663-664.

41.* Moshe Pelli, 'Hareformah Hadatit Shel Harav "Haharedi" Saul Berlin' [The Religious Reform of 'Traditionalist' Rabbi Saul Berlin], in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XLII (1971), pp. 1-23 [Hebrew Section].

42. Pelli, article cited in note 2 above, p. 233.