

HEBREW TEACHING AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Edited by
Moshe Nahir

UNIVERSITY
PRESS OF
AMERICA



Copyright © 1981 by
University Press of America, Inc.
P.O. Box 19101, Washington, D.C. 20036

All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

ISBN (Perfect): 0-8191-1709-9
ISBN (Cloth): 0-8191-1708-0

PJ 4545
44



Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 80-8142

REVIVAL OF HEBREW AND REVIVAL OF THE PEOPLE:
THE ATTITUDE OF THE FIRST *MASKILIM* TOWARD
THE HEBREW LANGUAGE

Moshe Pelli

Hebrew writers at the beginning of modern Hebrew literature in Germany were facing many insurmountable problems. There were the social and cultural obstacles which the Hebrew *Maskilim* had to overcome in their desire to bring the Jews closer to the modern times. There were also the religious and educational impediments blocking the way to the realization of the Enlightenment. However, most difficult was the language barrier, which seems to epitomize a concentration of almost all other problems together. Although never a completely dead language, Hebrew was far from satisfying the modern needs of the writers of Haskalah in their efforts to bring about the Enlightenment among the Jews. That ancient language had been, until the modern era, mostly a holy language used for the composition of the Scriptures, the Mishnah, the Talmud and their wide exegetical and homiletical literature, and the other religious, philosophical, theological and legal writings. Needless to say, even the belles-lettres composed in various periods of Hebrew creativity bear the mark of the sacral with its rich denotations and connotations. Thus, the Hebrew language as such, while offering a wide range of artistic possibilities, nevertheless posed difficult problems for the modern secular writer.

Facing the new realities in their existence and desiring to introduce new substance into the Jewish spheres, the *Maskilim* saw in the Hebrew language more than merely a sum-total of its words. It became a means to an end as well as an end in itself. For through a new style of Hebrew, the *Maskilim* desired to introduce a new style of life, a new world-view, as contrasted with the style of the rabbinic world, in language and philosophy of life, which the Enlighteners rejected and attempted to

replace. Language was to revive the Hebrew literature and open new horizons for a new culture and new values. This was the cause for their preoccupation, at times tiresome and pedantic, with the Hebrew grammar, with the definitions of various words and their modern exegeses of difficult passages in the Bible. Language was also to revive the Jewish people, according to the *Maskilim*, and thus, was a prime factor in the Hebrew Haskalah. An examination of their attitude toward the phenomenon of the Hebrew language against the background of the Enlightenment and against their enlightenment writings is of great significance. It surely would shed some light on the process of the secularization, at times profanation, of the Hebrew language, a process which has its roots in the literary efforts of the early Hebrew *Maskilim*. The secularization of Hebrew can be detected as early as in the writings of Saul Berlin (*Ktav Yosher*), in the German period. In the Galician period, it is found in Isaac Erter's "Gilgul Nefesh" [*Transmigration of a Soul*]. This phenomenon of the secularization of the language and its literature in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is a process that has had its impact also on contemporary Hebrew literature.

It is a generally-held view that the revival of the Hebrew language in modern times is a product of late nineteenth-century Hebrew literature. Similarly, it is generally accepted as an unchallenged fact that Eliezer Ben-Yehudah was the "father of modern Hebrew language" and "the reviver of the language" [*meḥayeh hasafah*]. While it is not the intention of this study to debunk these contentions for the sake of discrediting either nineteenth-century Hebrew authors or Ben-Yehudah, undoubtedly a re-evaluation of the above is long overdue. The more one studies and delves deeper into the Haskalah literature in its inception the more one comes to realize the important and vital role it played in the revival as well as the survival of the Jewish people, its culture and its ideas. Now, no one is immune from personal biases, or--to use a milder expression--personal predilections, as any student of Haskalah literature and Hebrew literature in

general may discover while reading pertinent works. Yet, in light of the negative attitude that some scholars have manifested toward Haskalah literature, a re-evaluation and re-examination are definitely very desirable if not absolutely necessary.¹ The writer's biases and predilections notwithstanding, this study in its defined boundaries is an attempt to present an overview of the attitude of the *Maskilim* toward the Hebrew language as enunciated by the Hebrew *Maskilim* themselves. It should give the student of Hebrew literature and language a significant insight into the nature of Hebrew Haskalah and the role it played in the recent history of Hebrew letters.

My discussion in this study will be limited to the writings of the major exponents of Hebrew Haskalah literature, namely, Naphtali Herz Wessely, Isaac Satanow, Mordechai Schnaber, and Judah Ben-Ze'ev. Due to Moses Mendelssohn's role in the Haskalah, some of his Hebraic writings will also be included. In addition, the first few volumes of *Hame'asef* and its forerunner, *Qohelet Musar*, have also been selected, although the latter is a product of the 1750's.² As it is our purpose to probe the beginning of Haskalah in Germany, we will concentrate on the last quarter of the eighteenth century.³

A great awareness of the deterioration of the Hebrew language in the *Galut* is dominant in the early Haskalah literature. As early as mid-century, a writer in *Qohelet Musar* lamented the low state of the Hebrew language. He expressed his astonishment as to the reasons the Jews had forsaken the "holy tongue": "I have seen that our brethren the children of Israel had forsaken our holy tongue, and I was angered very much. I did not know how this calamity came about."⁴ Typically, the Hebrew language, for the anonymous writer in *Qohelet Musar*,⁵ was still "the holy tongue," and was to remain so for a while. As we shall see, the term was questioned later on, and secular interpretations were proposed by the *Maskilim*. It will be noted that the question remained unanswered. The *Maskilim* of the last quarter of that century, however, were not

content merely to state the low ebb of the Hebrew language; they were already looking for reasons. It is quite clear that the writers of the Hebrew periodical considered solving the problems of the Hebrew language as one of their stated goals.⁶ Some thirty years later, the editors of *Hame'asef* would adopt a similar objective: to spread the knowledge of Hebrew among the Jews.⁷

That this awareness of the state of the Hebrew language was a result of European Enlightenment is obvious to anyone who studied carefully the various writings of the *Maskilim*. The feeling that new times had arrived in Europe, and that wisdom and knowledge had become dominant among the enlightened peoples of the continent, prevails in the Haskalah literature.⁸ These enunciations also served to stress the contrast between the state of culture of European Enlightenment and its counterpart among German Jews. The *Maskilim* utilized these pronouncements as a lever in order to help in introducing the Jews to the modern times through the revival of their language. As the editors of *Hame'asef* saw it, "the era of knowledge has arrived in all the nations; day and night they would not stop to teach their children both language and book. And we, why should we sit idle?"⁹ Already in 1771, a Hebrew *Maskil*, Mordechai Schnaber, at that time in London, resorted to the same argument: "The nations around us, far and near, would not cease and would not rest from making books without an end. Everyone speaks and creates (composes, writes) in the language of his people so as to broaden it; and why should we be deprived of the inheritance of our forefathers by forsaking our holy tongue? But indeed we are lazy [...]." ¹⁰ This well-educated *Maskil*, a physician by profession, and one of the first advocates of introducing the Jews to secular knowledge, lashed out at them with an original argument: even non-Jews know Hebrew better than the Jews themselves. Schnaber accentuated his argument with the well-known phrase *umah yomru hagoyim* [what would the nations, or non-Jews, say]: which plays on the national pride of his readers, and is indicative of the growing dependence of the modern Jews on the values and the opinions of the sur-

rounding culture.¹¹

Simultaneous with the external arguments, the *Maskilim* used an argument from within the Jewish spheres, dwelling for contrast on the glorious status of the Hebrew language in the distant past, as attested in the Bible, its poetry and prophecy.¹² Naturally, by so doing, the Hebraists displayed their pride in the Hebrew language, and their deep belief that its glory could be restored. Indeed, it is this unmistakable belief that underlies almost all of their literary as well as social activities, as I shall endeavor to point out.

Their attempts to explain the reasons for the deterioration of the Hebrew language reflect, to my mind, their collective thinking with regard to the actions that should be taken in order to revive both the Hebrew language and its culture as well as to revivify the Jewish people. It is safe to assume that while stating the reasons for the deterioration of Hebrew, the *Maskilim* also began planning their Enlightenment strategy. Their explanations can be divided into historical and contemporary explanations.

Historically, most of the *Maskilim* saw in the *Galut* the prime reason for the neglect by the Jews of the Hebrew language.¹³ In their exile the Jews began to speak other languages, thus forgetting their own language. Judah Ben-Ze'ev, a writer and a grammarian, was of the opinion that whatever happened to other ancient languages occurred also to the Hebrew tongue, the latter being the oldest of all languages. Hebrew deteriorated, according to him, because it ceased to be spoken, thus becoming a dead language. By contrast, western languages continued to be spoken, were alive, and as a result were developing and improving.¹⁴ Isaac Satanow went one step further, stating that although the main reason for the low ebb of Hebrew is the exile, Hebrew did continue to develop, but rather on a negative course. Responsible for the negative development of Hebrew, according to Satanow, were the *paytanim*--medieval liturgical writers--who disregarded all grammatical rules in coining new words

for their *piyuṭim*.¹⁵ Similarly, the medieval Jewish philosophers who introduced foreign words into Hebrew while ignoring the existence of appropriate Hebrew terms were the target of Schnaber. He also accused them of coining new words which have no linguistic foundations in Hebrew.¹⁶

Some of the *Maskilim* presented a few contemporary explanations regarding the status of Hebrew. The most popular of them was the argument that Yiddish, or Judaeo-German, dubbed by the Hebraists as *la'agei safah* [corrupted language].¹⁷ was a factor in the deterioration of the Hebrew language. Most European Jews had had a recourse to Yiddish, thus neglecting the study of Hebrew.¹⁸ The tendencies to shy away from the *pshat*, the plain and non-homiletical interpretation of the biblical text based on common sense and on grammatical rules, were also regarded as having led to the neglect of the Hebrew language.¹⁹ A notion that the Hebrew language has many shortcomings and deficiencies compared to other western languages was believed by another *Maskil* to be the cause for the low standing of Hebrew among the Jews.²⁰

After the turn of the century, and following two decades of attempts to correct and improve the situation, Ben-Ze'ev was able to pinpoint a number of causes for the decline of Hebrew despite the activities of the *Maskilim*. Basically, it is the old-fashioned, disorganized and chaotic Jewish education that led to the decline of the Hebrew language, he writes. The sudden change that took place in Jewish society resulted in changes of values and goals which emphasized the practical and utilitarian aspects of life. Due to the fact that Hebrew was of little practical value for a given student's business career--a matter of high importance among the middle- and upper-class German Jews--there was no necessity to study it. Thus the Hebrew language declined. Ben-Ze'ev also mentioned the rabbis as instrumental in the low state of the language. By their continuous attempts to separate Torah from wisdom, *i.e.*, Judaism from secular knowledge, the traditionalist rabbis actually drove many people away from the Hebrew language and its culture.²¹

It is, I think, of the utmost importance to consider the above-mentioned explanations against the literary and social activities of the *Maskilim*. Even a cursory examination would show that almost all of the stated reasons for the decline of the Hebrew language became the explicit target of the Hebrew Enlightenment in Germany. Whatever their attitude was toward Jewish nationalism,²² there is no doubt in my mind that they all stood against *Galut*. To the *Maskilim*, *Galut* represented, in part, the low condition of the Jews and their culture among the people of their dwelling, and the deprivation of the Jews of their basic human rights. An elaboration of this theme, necessary though it is, goes beyond the scope of the present study. The very activities of the *Maskilim* in Hebrew spell their desire that Hebrew should become a living language. Their attacks against the alleged corrupt *piyutim* are an integral part of the Hebrew Haskalah.²³ Purifying the language, too, was advocated by the *Maskilim*. Their negative attitude toward Yiddish is well known,²⁴ although some of them continued to create and to express their thoughts in that language.²⁵ The emphasis on the *pshat* in biblical exegesis is found in all their publications.²⁶ Their attempts to modernize Jewish education is the prime aspect of the Haskalah, while their endeavors to show the compatibility of Judaism and secular knowledge are abundant in their early writings. As the German Haskalah developed, one discerns a growing dissatisfaction with the rabbis who were blamed for keeping the old order of Judaism as was, and for rejecting any attempt to modernize it.²⁷ The only item listed above which the *Maskilim* did not fight was the emphasis on the utilitarian aspects of life, which was indeed one of the goals of Haskalah. However, they vehemently criticized those pseudo-*Maskilim*, who borrowed certain slogans of the Haskalah, such as utilitarianism, without their contents and meaning.²⁸

It is thus safe to conclude that the discussion of the decline of the Hebrew language by the *Maskilim* is closely connected with their ideals of reviving the language as part of the revival of the Jews.

The probe into the decline of Hebrew is often followed by an examination of the qualities of the language--a sort of soul-searching, in an attempt to find out whether there was anything inherent in the Hebrew language which might prevent its revival as a modern, viable language. It is important to note that the *Maskilim* concluded that there was nothing inherently wrong with the Hebrew language. What appeared to be deficiencies were explained by them as the people's own deficiencies, and not those of the language. The apparent impoverishment of the language in vocabulary was, in effect, the Jews' own impoverishment, since they did not know Hebrew well. This is the opinion of Judah Ben-Ze'ev and Shlomo Pappenheim, both writers and grammarians.²⁹ To the former, it is inconceivable that "a divine language" [*lashon 'elohit*] could be deficient.³⁰ The lack of some tenses--their apparent limitation to three in Hebrew--is seen by Schnaber to reflect the superiority of Hebrew and its pure state, rather than a sign of deficiency.³¹ Neither can Hebrew be criticized for having foreign words in it--thus being supposedly inferior to other languages; for whatever seems to the observer as foreign is actually of Hebrew origins, Hebrew being the mother of all languages.³² Most exponents of Hebrew Enlightenment regarded Hebrew as such, and as a result, many of them were of the opinion that Hebrew was even superior to other languages.³³ Those who believed that Hebrew is the mother of all languages relied, of course, on the biblical account and on the corresponding talmudic homiletics, which they did not question at all, to such a degree that some *Maskilim* did not even deem it necessary to state the source of their contention. It goes without saying that being considered the mother of all languages, Hebrew was regarded as superior to all its daughters even by those who did not expressly say so. While some of the *Maskilim* limited the superiority of Hebrew to the past only,³⁴ others maintained that it was currently superior as well.³⁵ However, even those who took the former view alluded to the potential superiority of Hebrew once it was revived. As a matter of fact, some stated clearly that their writings were intended to show that Hebrew is self-sufficient.³⁶

The attitude of the early Haskalah to Hebrew is manifested through a synonymous expression referring to the language. Almost all the *Maskilim* still used the term "the holy language" [*leshon haqodesh*] when speaking about Hebrew.³⁷ Although it was used as a conventional term, one may suppose that the first *Maskilim* actually did regard Hebrew as a *holy language*. However, one senses some hesitation regarding the holiness of the language in the attempts to explain the term. Mendelssohn, in his introduction to the commentary and translation into German of the Pentateuch, which has an overall traditional tone, gave the customary explanation of *leshon haqodesh*: It is a holy tongue because the Bible was written in it, God spoke in it to Adam, Cain, Noah and the holy fathers, to Moses and the prophets; he enunciated the ten commandments in Hebrew, which is also the language used on the two tables.³⁸ Naphtali Wessely explained it in a like manner. However, he tried to define the word "holy" in the sense of different, distinguished. Hebrew is thus distinguished, according to this *Maskil*, in that it is (or was) pure, without mistakes and confusion, as befitting a language created by God and not by any human beings.³⁹ According to Wessely, this holiness, or uniqueness, had ceased with the Babylonian exile very much like the cessation of the sacredness of other institutions in Judaism (i.e., precepts which can be practiced only on the land of Israel, or the cessation of prophecy).⁴⁰ Against the background of Wessely's other writings, it might be difficult to ascertain whether he is alluding to the secularization of the Hebrew language or not.⁴¹ I tend to think that Wessely did not have the secularization of Hebrew in mind when he wrote the foregoing, if by secularization we mean taking Hebrew completely out of the domain of the sacred.⁴² We know, however, that Wessely did advocate the use of the language for purposes which were not strictly religious in nature.⁴³

A few years later a writer in *Hame'asef* suggested that the Hebrew term *leshon haqodesh* is not to be understood as though Hebrew is a holy tongue, but rather, that Hebrew is the tongue of holiness, that is to say, the tongue which had been used for the writing of the holy Torah. The word *haqodesh* is not to be regarded as an epithet of

leshon.⁴⁴ Although the writer repeated what others had said before with regard to the explanation of the term *leshon haqodesh*, I think that the very dichotomy which he proposed signals the forthcoming change in attitude regarding the Hebrew language.⁴⁵

One notes some signs already in *Nahal Habsor*, the prospectus of *Hame'asef*, published in 1783. In their published letter to Wessely, the editors of the proposed journal spelled out one of their goals, namely, to spread the knowledge of the holy tongue among "the people of God."⁴⁶ Although this programmatic announcement was limited in scope and probably reached a few hundred readers only,⁴⁷ as a beginning it is quite impressive. In his well-known response, Wessely advised the young Hebraists, among other things, not to teach Hebrew as secular languages have been taught, which sounds like a quotation taken from the writings of Wessely's opponent, the traditionalist rabbi Yehezkel Landau of Prague.⁴⁸ His advice becomes clearer and more meaningful when he specifies that they should not spread knowledge of the language alone, but should teach the ancient sacred writings of the Jews as well. Thus the language was deemed by the conservative Wessely as a tool for the dissemination of the knowledge of Judaism.⁴⁹

Significantly, the arguments of the *Maskilim* for the obligation of knowing the Hebrew language lay mainly in the realm of the old order, or at least it so appears. They maintained that it is obligatory for the adherents of the Hebrew faith to know its language. Without it, the *Maskilim* claimed, one would not be able to know the Torah and its commandments.⁵⁰ This statement is especially true, maintained Ben-Ze'ev, with regard to the Jewish religion and the Hebrew language, due to the interdependence of the two.⁵¹ The only two non-religious arguments for the study of Hebrew came from Wessely and Ben-Ze'ev, and both are rather weak. Wessely says that the beauty of speech, the correctness of the language, and the purity of its idiom are intimately connected with wisdom and ethics.⁵² Ben-Ze'ev writes that a person who specializes in logic

must know at least one language very well.⁵³ Even though both had the Hebrew language in mind, their arguments are in no way unique to Hebrew, and could have been applied to German, or to any other language.

A word of explanation is in place here as to the nature of their argumentation. Although the religious arguments might be typical of the period and its *Maskilim* who, though being part of the new, had their spiritual roots in the old order of Judaism, nevertheless, their public should be considered too. Most probably the *Maskilim*, and especially the writers and editors of *Hame'asef*, were aware that their readers were mostly traditionalist Jews, and they therefore geared their writings in such a way as to appeal to their religious feelings. Against the background of their other writings, in which the *Maskilim* attacked the religious authority of the rabbis and demanded some religious reform, one may conclude that the religious argumentations in the context of the promotion of the Hebrew language ought not to be taken at their face value alone.

It is clear that the Hebrew *Maskilim* had as their goal, in addition to teaching the correct use of the language, also the broadening of it.⁵⁴ Although most of them advocated the use of biblical Hebrew only, there were indeed some who suggested very strongly that the mishnaic Hebrew is a legitimate part of the modern language, and may be used. They are: Shlomo Pappenheim, Ḥayim Keslin and Isaac Satanow.⁵⁵ The latter was quite liberal in regard to innovations in Hebrew; unlike his fellow *Maskilim*, he was willing to accept well-established, ungrammatical innovations, as well as erroneous forms which would be used in the future by the masses.⁵⁶ In a long article bearing his son's name,⁵⁷ Satanow presented a good argument for coining new words so as to meet the necessities of the modern era and its inventions and discoveries. New words and terms are to be coined, he wrote, in order that Hebrew should not be in the shameful position of having to borrow words from foreign languages.⁵⁸

No doubt these views by Satanow reflect the desire of the Hebrew Enlightener: to revive the Hebrew language. Indeed, the *Maskilim* expressed unequivocally their intention to rejuvenate their language.⁵⁹ Schnaber referred to modern Hebrew as *leshon haqodesh haḥadashah*,⁶⁰ that is, the new holy tongue, while Wessely, as always rather ambivalent regarding the sacral and the secular, asked: Why should the holy tongue be a thing by itself and German be something by itself?⁶¹ One wonders again whether Wessely means that Hebrew should be secularized, but even if he does not, a growing tendency toward secularization of the holy tongue is certainly discernable in the contemporary Hebrew writings.

Revival of the language was never held as merely a linguistic phenomenon by the Hebrew Enlighteners. Even at this early stage in the rebirth of the Hebrew language, the *Maskilim* expressed their belief that the revival of Hebrew must coincide with revival of the Jewish people. It must be stressed that they did employ religious terminology for the rejuvenation of the Jews which appears to be within the domain of the divine.⁶² Nevertheless, there is undoubtedly a strong nationalist feeling involved, even though we cannot expect a nineteenth-century type of nationalism in the eighteenth-century writers who were the product of their times. Yet there is every indication to believe that, regarding the rejuvenation of Hebrew, these *Maskilim* meant the same thing that their nineteenth-century followers did.

Even with regard to Hebrew as a vernacular, the careful reader of Haskalah literature may find some hints that a few *Maskilim* might indeed have thought of the forthcoming renaissance of Hebrew also in terms of a spoken language. "We shall speak in the presence of kings without shame," wrote Schnaber in 1784.⁶³ In Satanow's *Divrei Rivot*, the teacher advises the prince that knowing Hebrew is not enough, and that he should learn also to speak the language.⁶⁴

Another important aspect of the revival of the language is the literary creativity which the *Maskilim* hoped would bring about the flourishing of Hebrew literature. An early writer in *Qohélet Musar*, believed to have been Mendelssohn, endeavored to translate a literary piece from Edward Young's "Night Thoughts" in order to prove that, contrary to the common belief, Hebrew indeed could excel in translations from western languages. A pronounced objective of the editors of *Hame'asef* was the enhancement of Hebrew creativity. It is clearly stated by the poet laureate of Haskalah, Naptali Herz Wessely. The right instruction by qualified and inspiring teachers might stimulate students' creativity to write Hebrew poetry, according to Wessely.⁶⁵

One aspect of the German Haskalah is often misunderstood and misinterpreted by some students of Haskalah to show the negative attitude of the *Maskilim* toward the Hebrew language and toward Jewish nationalism. I refer to the attitude of the exponents of Hebrew Enlightenment toward the German language, and to their concerted effort to translate the prayers and the Scriptures into German. As I have pointed out elsewhere,⁶⁶ the *Maskilim* did not see any dichotomy in their attitude toward the two languages. To them, the two went hand in hand.⁶⁷ Furthermore, according to the *Maskilim*, the translation into German of Hebrew works would bring the readers, children and adults alike, closer to Hebrew.⁶⁸ Improper translations of the Bible, as well as the teachers' ignorance of the German language, were two of the causes given for the failure of Jewish education and the low state of the Jews.⁶⁹ One *Maskil* maintained that the mastery of at least another language is essential for the knowledge of Hebrew; so that German actually serves the cause of Hebrew.⁷⁰ Similarly, those *Maskilim* who advocated praying in the vernacular were trying to remedy the religious situation which became acute at the beginning of the nineteenth century.⁷¹ However, it should be stressed that the *Maskilim* were not unaware of the fact that the knowledge of German would bring the Jews closer to the German culture and the German people. Even an ardent Hebraist like

Wessely did not hesitate to articulate his belief that the lack of knowledge of German among the Jews created the gap between the Germans and the Jews.⁷²

In summary, the period of the beginning of modern Hebrew literature in Germany shows many indications that the early *Maskilim* had in mind the revival of the Hebrew language as part of their attempt to revive and rejuvenate the Jewish people, its culture and its religion. Some of the aspects of *thiyat hasafah* "renaissance of the language" (though not the spoken language) which took place a hundred years later already had their origins in the Hebrew Haskalah literature in Germany. However, we must bear in mind that the period under study was different from the one following it. The *Maskilim* were very much part of the old order in Judaism, as well as the new; there were a number of current social, cultural and religious forces which affected them. In their attempts to free themselves from the old way of life, they may have exaggerated in their demands for innovations. Yet many of them could not uproot themselves completely from the old order. Many of them attacked the rabbinic style of Hebrew; however, some of them still wrote in that very style itself.⁷³ The euphuism, *melizah*, for which Haskalah literature has been criticized, must be considered against the background of European literature of the time, and vis-à-vis the attempt of the *Maskilim* to form a style distinct and different from the accepted rabbinic style which they rejected.⁷⁴ To my mind, it is ironic that the origins of the *melizah* are to be found in the rabbinic style which the *Maskilim* were so eager to repudiate. True, some of their coined words and expressions were artificial, but so are some contemporary Hebrew neologisms; others, which have not been accepted into modern Hebrew, seem as good as ones in use, or even better.⁷⁵

The last quarter of the eighteenth century witnessed an attempt to revive the Hebrew language in Germany. After the turn of the century some of the *Maskilim* looked back to the two redeemers of Hebrew, Mendelssohn and Wessely, as well as to the other *Maskilim*, and to their literary and Enlighten-

ment efforts, and wondered what had happened to the great hope that had suddenly vanished.⁷⁶ The revival of the language did bring about some revival in Hebrew letters, but it was short-lived in Germany. Its impact, however, was felt in the writings of the Haskalah authors in Galicia and in Russia throughout the nineteenth century.

It is of importance to note that although the disappearance of Hebrew literary activity in Germany is generally accepted, the controversial temple reforms of 1813 introduced a new wave of writings in Hebrew. Several of these writings possess some literary merit. Ironically, Hebrew which had served both the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century *Maskilim* as a medium for changes and reform became, in the process, a target of its own writings. It began to disappear from some of the reform temples, thus reflecting not only the symptoms of the religious tendencies among the Jews in Germany, but their cultural state as well.

NOTES

¹A more balanced view of Haskalah literature can be found in the following writings: Moses Kleinman (1928), *Dmuyot Veqomot* [Portraits and Personalities] (Paris & London), pp. 15, 18; Geztel Kressel (1941), *'Ivrit Bama'arav* [Hebrew in the West] (Tel Aviv), p. 22; J. Zvi Zehavi (1943), *Tenu'at Hahitbolelut Beyisra'el* [The Assimilation Movement in Israel] (Tel Aviv), pp. 21, 32; Isaac E. Barzilay (1956), "The Ideology of the Berlin Haskalah," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, XXV, pp. 26-27, 33; *idem* (1959), "National and Anti-National Trends in the Berlin Haskalah," *Jewish Social Studies*, XXI, No. 3 (July), pp. 167-179; Joseph Klausner (1960), *Historiah Shel Hasifrut Ha'ivrit Ha'adashah* [History of Modern Hebrew Literature], I (Jerusalem); Daniel Ben-Nahum (1962), *Bema'aleh Dorot*, [Ascent of Generations] (Merhavyah, Israel), p. 15; Simon Federbusch (1967), *Halashon Ha'ivrit Beyisra'el Uva'amim* [The Hebrew Language in Israel and Among the Nations] (Jerusalem), pp. 193-197; Dov Sadan (1970), *Lashon 'Ivrit Hayah Ligvurot* [A Living Hebrew Language Reaching Maturity], *Hado'ar*, XL (January 9), pp. 150-152.

On the *Maskilim's* attitude toward the Hebrew language, see: Joseph Yiḏhaki, "The Views of Haskalah Authors on the Hebrew Language," *Leshonenu*, XXXIV (No.4, 1970), pp. 287-305; XXXV (No.1, 1970-71), pp. 39-59; (No.2, 1971), pp. 140-154 [Hebrew].

²Regarding the dating of *Qohelet Musar* see Klausner, *Historiah Shel Hasifrut Ha'ivrit*, I, p. 52; Yisaschar Edelstein (1928), "Haḥibur Qohelet Musar" [The Composition Qohelet Musar], *Sefer Hayovel Limlot Ḥamishim Shanah Levet Midrash Harabanim Bebudapest* (Budapest), p. 56; Jacob Toury (1968), "Mibe'ayot Qohelet Musar" [Of "Qohelet Musar" Problems], *Kirjath Sepher*, XLIII (No.2), pp. 279-284; Alexander Altmann (1973); *Moses Mendelssohn: A Biographical Study* (University, Alabama), pp. 83-91. It is important to note that similar trends regarding the Hebrew language are found in some rabbinic writings of that period which may signal the spirit of the forthcoming Hebrew Haskalah. See A. Shoḥet (1960), *'Im Ḥilufei Tqufot* [Beginnings of the Haskalah Among German Jewry] (Jerusalem), pp. 220-221, 235-237. See also M. Gilon's *Qohelet Musar Lemoshe Mendelssohn 'Al Reqa Teqfato* [Moses Mendelssohn's *Qohelet Musar* in Its Historical Context] (Jerusalem, 1979) and my review of it in *Ha'arets* (June 6, 1980).

³Ben-Ze'ev and Pappenheim continued to write, and publish, in the beginning of the nineteenth century. A methodological note should be emphasized: this study deals with the primary sources only and thus does not attempt to present a comprehensive summary of the secondary material on the social background (such as could be found in the works of Selma Stern-Täubler, see note 18, below) or the education of the German Jews (Mordechai Eliav's work), important as they are.

⁴*Qohelet Musar* (1750?), p. 2. The view that *Galut* is the cause of the deterioration of the Hebrew language is shared also by an English *Maskil*, Abraham Tang, in the second introduction to his Hebrew translation of William Congreve's *Mourning Bride* (1769); see "'El 'Ein Haqore" [For the Reader's Eye], p. 5b. I should like to thank Prof. S. Stein for drawing my attention to Tang's work and for providing me with a copy of the manuscript, which is in the library of the Jews' College.

⁵On the question as to whether Mendelssohn wrote the whole or part of *Qohelet Musar*, see the studies mentioned in note 2 above. Cf. Zvi Graetz (1904), *Divrei Yemei Hayehudim* [The History of the Jews], IX (Warsaw), p. 13. See also Altmann's biography of Mendelssohn, cited in notes 2 and 65.

⁶*Qohelet Musar*, p. 2.

⁷*Naḥal Habsor* [The Brook *Besor* or Good Tidings], (1783), p. 12.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 13, and p. 11. See also: *Hame'asef*, I (1784), p. 111; *ibid.*, III (1786), pp. 68, 131; VI (1790), p. 301; Isaac Satanow (1792), *Mishlei 'Asaf* [Proverbs of Asaf], II (Berlin), p. 10a.

⁹*Naḥal Habsor*, p. 13.

¹⁰Mordechai Schnaber (1771), *Ma'amar Hatorah Vehaḥochmah* [An Essay of the Torah and Wisdom] (London), p. 5.

¹¹*Ibid.* For further discussion of Schnaber, see my *The Age of Haskalah* (Leiden, 1979), ch. VII.

¹²*Naḥal Habsor*, p. 12.

¹³*Hame'asef* I (1784), p. 31 (Eliyahu Morpurgo); Isaac Stanow (1784), *Sefer Hamidot*, [Book of Ethics] (Berlin), p. 88b.

¹⁴Judah Ben-Ze'ev, *Ozar Hashorashim* [Treasure of Roots] (Vienna, 1807), introduction, p. 12. The idea that Hebrew is the oldest of all languages is by no means new. See *Kuzari*, VI, 13 (Satanow's edition: Berlin, 1795, p. 70b).

¹⁵Satanow, *Sefer Hamidot*, p. 88b: "'Az 'amdah miledet vatehi 'aqarah. 'Ach lo' 'aqarah mamash ki 'im astah pri kaqash boneha banim zarim yaladu. Ufayteneha he'emiqu ledaber sarah... Binyaneha harasu. Ve'avnei mishqeloteha shiqezu..." [Then she stopped bearing and she became barren. However, not really barren, but she has made [produced] fruit

of lies, her builders have borne foreign[strange] sons. And her liturgical writers have spoken deeply in rebellion... They have destroyed its constructions. They have abhorred its weighing stones (=meter)]: It should be noted that in their eagerness to display the causes for the deterioration of the Hebrew language, the *Maskilim* at times were not careful to distinguish between cause and effect.

¹⁶Mordechai Schnaber (1784), *Tochaḥat Megilah*, [A Rebuke of (on) the *Megilah* (Ecclesiastes)] (Hamburg, 1784), p. 3a.

¹⁷*Hame'asef*, IV (1788), p. 84. Isaac Satanow under the disguise of his son's name, Shlomo; see note 57 below.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, II (1785), p. 33 (David Friedrichsfeld). Mendelssohn's negative attitude toward Yiddish can be discerned in his *Gesammelte Schriften*, V (Leipzig, 1844), pp. 604-605, and also in '*Or Lintivah*. [Light for Path] (Berlin, 1783), pp. 49-50. Cf. my book *Moshe Mendelssohn: Bechavlei Masoret*. [Moses Mendelssohn: Bonds of Tradition] (Tel Aviv, 1972), pp. 65-74, and Selma Stern-Taeubler (1970), "The First Generation of Emancipated Jews," *Leo Baeck Year Book*, XV, p. 38.

¹⁹Naphtali Herz Wessely (1782), "*Rav Tuv Levet Yisra'el*." [Great Goodness for the House of Israel], *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet* [Words of Peace and Truth], II (Berlin), pp. 17b-18a; *Hame'asef*, IV (1788), p. 84 (Isaac Satanow); Mendelssohn, '*Or Lintivah*, p. 54.

²⁰Schnaber, *Tochaḥat Megilah*, p. 8a.

²¹Ben-Ze'ev, '*Ozar Hashorashim*, p. 18.

²²Cf. Barzilay, "National and Anti-National Trends in the Berlin Haskalah," pp. 165-192. See Euchel's criticism of *Galut* in *Hame'asef*, II (1784), p. 92; *ibid.*, II (1785), p. 106.

²³Saul Berlin (1793), *Besamin Rosh* [Incense of

Spices] (Berlin), siman 71, p. 28a; *Hame'asef*, III (1786), pp. 205ff.; *ibid.*, p. 48, J.B.L.'s [Joel Brill] critical review of Satanow's edition of *Seder Sliḥah* [Order of the Penitential Prayer] (Berlin, 1785); in his introduction, Satanow seems to be in disagreement with the rest of the *Maskilim* regarding the *piyutim*. He does, however, object to the corrupted *sliḥot*. For later criticism of the *piyutim* see: 'Amitai ben 'Avida' 'Aḥizedeq (David Caro) *Brit 'Emet* [A Covenant of Truth], II (Constantiople [Dessau] 1820), p. 112; Mendel Steinhart (1812), *Divrei 'Igeret*, [Words of an Epistle] (Rodelheim), pp. 11a-b.

²⁴See note 18.

²⁵For instance, the Yiddish plays by Isaac Euchel and Aaron Wolfsohn.

²⁶See for example the *Be'ur*, the exegesis, in *Netivot Hashalom* [Paths of Peace]; Isaac Satanow's edition of the book of *Job* (Berlin, 1799, on the title page: "Uve'uro...kefi hapshaṭ hanish'an ligvul hadiḳduq venishḡaf 'al pnei hemshech haktuvim" [and its exegesis...according to the *pshaṭ* based upon the boundaries of grammar and looking upon the continuation of the Scriptures]. Mendelssohn's edition of *Megilat Qohelet* [The Scroll of Ecclesiastes] (Berlin, 1770), on the title page: "'im be'ur qazar umaspiq lahavanat hakatuv 'al pi pshuṭo leto'elet hatalmidim" [with a short exegesis sufficient for the understanding of the text according to its *pshaṭ* for the benefit of the students], and p. 9 (my pagination); Judah Ben-Ze'ev (1810), *Mavo 'El Miqra'ei Qodesh* [Introduction to the Holy Scriptures] (Vienna), introduction, p. 6 (my pagination); and in numerous places in *Hame'asef*; in 1789-90 the editors start a new section - "Be'ur Sifrei Qodesh."

²⁷See my book *The Age of Haskalah*, chapters II and IV.

²⁸Cf. Aaron Wolfsohn's play published by Bernard D. Weinryb (1955), "An Unknown Hebrew Play of the German Haskalah," *Proceedings of the American*

Academy for Jewish Research, XXIV, pp. 165-170, 1-37, in Hebrew. A recent edition of the play was published by Dan Miron in 1977.

²⁹Judah Ben-Ze'ev (1827), *Talmud Lashon 'Ivri* [The Study of Hebrew Language] (Vienna), introduction, p. 3a; Shlomo Pappenheim (1783), *Yeri'ot Shlomo* [Sheets of Shlomo], I (Dyhernfurth), introduction, p. 4a.

³⁰Ben-Ze'ev, *Talmud Lashon 'Ivri*, p. 3a. His terminology is not original; "Halashon he'eloqi" is a term used in *Kuzari*, IV, 13 (Satanow's edition, p. 70b).

³¹Schnaber, *Tochaḥat Megilah*, p. 8a.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 3b. A similar view is expressed three years earlier by Tang in his introduction (see note 4), pp. 6a-b.

³³Isaac Satanow (1757), *Sefer Haḥizayon* [Book of Vision] (Berlin), in the introduction; *idem*, *'Igeret Bet Tfilah* [An Epistle of the House of Worship] (Berlin, 1773), p. 4b; *idem*, *Sefer Hamidot*, p. 88a; Moses Mendelssohn (1783), *Leshon Hazahav* [Language of Gold] (Berlin), on the title page.

³⁴Isaac Satanow (1789), *Mishlei 'Asaf* [Proverbs of 'Asaf], I (Berlin), p. 43b, basing his argument on the multiplicity of synonyms found in biblical Hebrew and on the vivid description of the tabernacle. See also *Qohelet Musar*, p. 2, and Ben-Ze'ev's *Oḥar Hashorashim*, p. 13.

³⁵*Naḥal Habsor*, p. 12; *Hame'asef*, III (1786), p. 132 (Eliyahu Morpurgo).

³⁶*Qohelet Musar*, p. 3: "Veha'ivrim yabitu lir-'ot ki nachon leshonenu lechol dvar miqreh ufega'. Leharim qol bevechi. Lashir beshirim 'al lev has-meḥim 'el gil 'o lehochi'ah basha'ar rish'ei 'arez. Veyiqhu musar veyin'amu ne'um leshon ha'ivrim" [and the Hebrews would look and observe that our language is prepared for any incident and accident; to raise voice in weeping, to sing songs upon the

heart of the happy ones or to reproach the wicked] (*ibid.*, p. 15). The writer (Mendelssohn?) believes that it is possible to write in Hebrew on every subject. Although he admits the difficulty of translating European languages into Hebrew, he encourages his readers to undertake this most laborious task. Isaac Euchel, in the letters to his student, published in *Hame'asef*, II (1785), p. 117, writes that he was encouraged to print the letters so as to show the possibility of speaking in Hebrew on any subject--"ledaber bah mikol hefez lemiqaṭan ve'ad gadol" [to speak in it of all things, small and big alike].

³⁷ See, for example, *Naḥal Habsor*, pp. 1, 5, 8; *Hame'asef*, II (1785), p. 159; *ibid.*, III (1786), p. 132; Mendelssohn, *'Or Lintivah*, p. 7 (my pagination). Tang refers to Hebrew as "leshonenu haqdoshah" [our holy language], p. 4b in his introduction (see note 4 above).

³⁸ *'Or Lintivah*, p. 7. Cf. an earlier explanation of Shlomo Zalman Hanau in his *Sefer Yesod Haniqud* [The Book of the Foundation of Punctuation], (Amsterdam, 1730), introduction, p. 3: "lashon shemal'achei hasharet mishtamshin bah" [a language used by the ministering angels].

³⁹ Naphtali Herz Wessely, *Levanon* [Lebanon] (Vienna, 1829), introduction, p. 21b; *idem*, "Mehalel Re'a" [Praise of a Friend], *Sefer Bereshit* (Offenbach, 1821), p. 19b.

⁴⁰ Wessely, "Mehalel Re'a," p. 19b.

⁴¹ See *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*, and my book *The Age of Haskalah*, chapter V.

⁴² "Mehalel Re'a" was published originally in 1778.

⁴³ *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*, I, p. 11a (my pagination), to teach students the obligations of an individual to his king as well as the teaching of ethics.

⁴⁴ *Hame'asef*, III (1786), p. 138.

⁴⁵ To Mendelssohn (see note 38), for example, there is no difference between *leshon haqodesh* and *lashon qdoshah*; both mean the holiness of the language. Once the dichotomy is made, as in the case at hand, its unquestionable purpose is to eliminate the halo of holiness from the language. It is typical of the methodology of the *Maskilim* that they employ the very same arguments used to fortify the traditional position in order to destroy it.

⁴⁶ *Naḥal HabSOR*, p. 5: "uviheyot kol megamatam veḥefzam leharḥiv da'at leshonenu haqdoshah toch 'am hašhem" [and being that their purpose and wish to disseminate the knowledge of our holy tongue amongst the people of God].

⁴⁷ *Hame'asef*, I (1784), p. 16. The editors report that they succeeded in securing about two hundred subscribers.

⁴⁸ Cf. Yeḥezkel Landau, *Ṣlah... 'Al Masechet Brachot* [...On Tractate Brachot] (Sdilikow, 1832), p. 27b: "mishum shelimud hamiqra' gam ha'epiqorsim lomdim bishvil halashon kemo shelomdim she'ar leshonot" [for the study of the Bible the heretics, too, study for language sake as they study other languages].

⁴⁹ *Naḥal HabSOR*, p. 8: "'al tasimu gvulchem belimud darchei halashon levad ledaber zaḥot, kederech shemelandim darchei leshonot shel ḥol, 'aval 'ad hayam haqadol yam ḥochmat hatorah yihyeh gvulchem, she'al yedei da'at halashon 'al mechono tavinu la'am 'amarot ṭehorot shebatorah, udvar qodsho shebefi nevi'av veqabalat 'emet shehaytah beyad ḥachmei hamishnah vehatalmud sheyesodatan behadrat qdushat halashon vehamelizah hane'edarot baqodesh" [do not limit yourselves to the study of the ways of language alone, to speak clearly and to write clearly as secular languages are taught, but your boundaries should reach the great sea, the sea of the wisdom of Torah. For by the fundamental know-

ledge of the language you should explain the pure sayings of the Torah to the people. And the holy word(s) in the mouth of his prophets and the true tradition that was in the hands of the sages of the Mishnah and the Talmud whose foundation is in the glory and holiness of the language and rhetorics that are glorious in holiness].

⁵⁰ Ben-Ze'ev, *Talmud Lashon 'Ivri*, pp. 2b-3a; Wessely, *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*, I, p. 8b; *idem*, *Hame'asef*, II (1785), p. 157; Schnaber (1797), *Solet Minhah Blulah* [An Offering of Mixed, Fine Flour] (Altona?), p. 35a: "one fulfills the obligation to study the Torah in the holy tongue only."

⁵¹ Ben-Ze'ev, *Yesodei Hadat* [Fundamentals of Religion] (Vienna, 1823), first introduction, pp. 13-14 (my pagination): "uveyoter bedat 'ivrit, 'asher hadat 'ahuzah balashon, umusageha niqsharim bemiloteha" [and especially in the Hebrew religion where religion is held by language, and its concepts are tied with its words].

⁵² *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*, I, p. 4b.

⁵³ *Talmud Lashon 'Ivri*, p. 2b.

⁵⁴ *Qohelet Musar*, p. 3.

⁵⁵ Pappenheim, *Yeri'ot Shlomo*, I, introduction, p. 4b; *Hame'asef*, III (1786), pp. 53, 60 (Keslin); *ibid.*, IV (1788), pp. 86-91 (Satanow).

⁵⁶ *Hame'asef*, IV (1788), pp. 88-89.

⁵⁷ Isaac Satanow is alleged to have published some controversial writings under his son's name. See *Minhat Biquirim* [An Offering of Criticism] (Berlin, 1797). The editor of *Hame'asef*, Wolfssohn, testified that he had known Solomon Satanow-Schönemann as a very learned man, and a doctor, yet the editor insisted that he, the son, did not know Hebrew (*Hame'asef*, VII, No. 4, 1797, p. 396). Cf. Graetz, *Divrei Yemei Hayehudim*, IX, p. 90; Israel Zinberg (1959), *Toldot Sifrut Yisra'el* [His-

tory of the Literature of Israel], V (Tel Aviv & Merhavayah), p. 119. For further discussion of Satanow see my above cited book, ch. VII.

⁵⁸ *Hame'asef*, IV (1788), pp. 85-86.

⁵⁹ *Nahal Habsor*, pp. 3-4; *Hame'asef*, I (1784), p. 32 (Morpurgo); *ibid.*, p. 70; Schnaber, *Tochahat Megilah*, p. 8b. Cf. the comments on punctuation in Hebrew in *Qohelet Musar*, p. 8, and the similar comments by Schnaber in *Ma'amar Hatora Veha'ochmah*, p. 1a.

⁶⁰ *Hame'asef*, I (1784), p. 183; "ve'od yadi netuyah lelamed 'et bnei yisra'el 'et derech leshon haqodesh ha'adashah" [and still my hand is stretched forth to teach the children of Israel the way of the new holy tongue].

⁶¹ *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*, I, pp. 13a-b: "madu'a nihyeh be'enehem keyonim hamezafzefim vehamehagim, uleshon haqodesh 'inyan bifnei 'azmo, uleshon 'ashkenazi 'inyan bifnei 'azmo, zeh ledivrei qodesh ha'emunah vehatorah, vezev ledivrei ha'olam be'isqei masa umatan uminhagei bnei ha'adam ule'ochmat hanimusiyot vехатив'iyot vehalimudiyot" [why should we be in their eyes like chirping and cooing pigeons, while the holy tongue is a thing by itself and the German tongue a thing by itself, this one for the holy matters of faith and the Torah, and that one for matters of the world, business, people's customs, and for the disciplines of the social, natural and mathematical sciences]. Cf. Barzilay's understanding of this passage in his article "National and Anti-National Trends in the Berlin Haskalah," p. 174.

⁶² Satanow, *Sefer Hamidot*, p. 88b: "'En lah lehisha'en ki 'im 'al 'aviha shebashamayim. Yishlah miqodesh 'ezratah 'et yiten miziyon yeshu'at yisra'el" [she can rely only on her father in heaven. He will send help from the sanctuary at the time that he will bring forth the redemption of Israel from Zion]. *idem*, *Mishlei 'Asef*, I. p. 43; Ben-Ze'ev, *Ozar Hashorashim*, introduction, p.

11: "veyada'ti gam yada'ti ki lo' tiyeh halashon 'od 'aharei noflah. 'Im lo' beshuv 'adonai 'et shvut 'amo" [and I surely know that the tongue will not live after its fall except when God will return the exile of his people].

⁶³*Hame'asef*, I (1784), p. 185: "unedaber bis-fatenu habrurah neged melachim velo' nevosh" [and we shall speak in our clear language in the presence of kings and we shall not be ashamed]. Admittedly, this might be just a figure of speech echoing Psalms 119:46; yet, even as such, he does discuss the speaking of Hebrew. See also *Tochaḥat Megilah*, p. 8b.

⁶⁴Isaac Satanow, *Divrei Rivot* [Matters of Controversy], II (Berlin?, 1793?), pp. 10b-11b: "ad sheyihye ragil 'al leshoncha ledaber zahot" [till you will be accustomed to speak clearly].

⁶⁵See *Qohelet Musar*, pp. 15-16, *Nahal Habsor*, and *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*, I, pp. 14b-15a. "Night Thoughts" was published in 1742. Altmann, in *Moses Mendelssohn*, pp. 90-91, believes that Mendelssohn was the translator.

⁶⁶*Moshe Mendelssohn: Bechavlei Masoret*, pp. 103-104.

⁶⁷*Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*, I, pp. 11b, 15b; *Hame'asef*, IV (1788), p. 141 (Euchel); Cf. L. Zunz (1947), *Hadrashot Beyisra'el* [The Sermons in Israel] (Jerusalem), pp. 206-207.

⁶⁸Shlomo Dubno (1778), *'Alim Litrufah* [Leaves for Healing] (Amsterdam, 1778), pp. 6-7 (my pagination); *Nahal Habsor*, p. 2; Wessely, "mehalel Re'a," pp. 20b-21a; *idem*, in *Hame'asef*, II (1785), p. 159.

⁶⁹See especially *'Or Lintivah* and *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*.

⁷⁰*Hame'asef*, III (1786), p. 92: "'ki mi zeh yeda' zaḥut leshon haqodesh veyavin bamiqra uvamishnah 'al buryo 'im 'en lo shlemut belashon 'aḥer zualato" ('Amitai Hashomroni) [for who will know the

clarity of the holy tongue and will understand thoroughly the Bible and the Mishnah if he should not possess a complete mastery of another tongue].

⁷¹See my *The Age of Haskalah*, chapter IV, and Jakob J. Petuchowski (1968), *Prayerbook Reform in Europe* (New York). An attempt to advocate praying in the vernacular, i.e., Judaeo-German, had been made before, in the threshold of the Haskalah period, by Aaron ben Samuel of Hergershausen who used similar arguments. See: S. Asaf (1925), *Meqorot Letoldot Haḥinuch Beyisra'el* [Sources for the History of Education in Israel], I (Tel Aviv), pp. 173-176; and most recently Siegfried Stein's "Liebliche Tefillah," *Leo Baeck Year Book*, XV (1970), pp. 41-72.

⁷²*Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*, I, pp. 13b-14a.

⁷³See, for example, Joel Brill's letter to Aaron Wolfsohn published in *Hame'asef*, IV (1788), p. 25: "Shemen tov shem 'aharon 'oleh venodef 'al pi midotav, la'ish 'asher 'eleh lo 'anochi noten 'et briti shalom" [a good oil the name of Aaron is spread in accordance with qualities, to the man who has got all of this I give my covenant of peace]. See also *Naḥal Habsor*.

⁷⁴Cf. Zunz, *Hadrashot Beyisra'el*, p. 207.

⁷⁵See, for example, Wessely's translation into Hebrew of 'gunpowder' (*Schiesspulver*, in German) as 'avaq milḥamah [war powder] instead of the accepted 'avaq srefah [fire powder] or 'avaq yeriyah [shooting, or firing powder], in *Divrei Shalom Ve'emet*, I, p. 7a.

⁷⁶Ben-Ze'ev, *Ozar Hashorashim*, introduction, pp. 17-18: "Vehamaskilim hizhiru kezohar haraḳi'a vayafuzu hamada'im vayarḥivu 'et halashon verabu dovrei zaḥot. Ve'imahem nitḡan darchei halimud veḥinuch ḥabanim. Rabah haytah hatiqvah hanishḳafah lador hahu... 'Ach mi he'emin ki yihyeh hamaḥazeh hazeh kemar'eh habazaq yuḡaz 'oro kemo rega' ve'aḥar ye'alem... Hame'asef ne'esaf veḥevrato nefoḡah ufanah hadar halashon. Zeh 'esrim shana me-

'az ne'esaf hazadiq [Moses Mendelssohn] ve'ad 'atah, vehineh yardah hasafah 'eser 'alot mima'alot 'asher 'altah bimei hayav" [and the *Maskilim* shone like the brightness of the sky. And the sciences became widespread, and they broadened the language, and the people who spoke the language clearly increased. And with them the ways of teaching and the education of the children were corrected. The prospective hope for that generation increased... However, who would believe that this phenomenon would be like the sight of lightning whose light flashes for a moment and then disappears... *Hame'asef* became extinct, and its people became scattered, and the glory of the tongue disappeared. It has been twenty years since the passing of the righteous man, and the language has fallen ten degrees from where it had arisen during his lifetime]. See also Isaac Euchel's summary of the situation around the turn of the century in Meir Letteris' "Toldot Hehacham R. Isaac Euchel Z.L.," *Hame'asef*, 1784 (second edition, Vienna, 1862), p. 46: "ḥalfu yemei ha'ahavah, 'avru yemei habrit 'asher hayu beni uven bnei yisra'el, 'et nir'u nizanei haḥochmah vatifrah leshon 'ever litehilah uletif'eret... 'ahah!... ma'asu bilshon 'avotehem, vayashlichuha 'aḥarei geivam; gam 'oti shacheḥu vaya'azvuni ke'ar'ar ba'aravah" [the days of love have passed, gone are the days of the covenant between me and the children of Israel, when the buds of wisdom were seen, and when the Hebrew language blossomed gloriously... Alas!... they have rejected the language of their forefathers, and they have thrown it behind their back; they have forgotten me, too, and have left me like the heath in the desert].