

ISAAC SATANOW, THE MAN AND HIS WORK;
A STUDY IN THE BERLIN HASKALAH

By
Nehama Rezler Bersohn

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Philosophy

Columbia University

1975

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am very grateful to Professor I. Barzilay for his friendly advice and encouragement throughout the course of my studies and research.

Thanks are also due to the Jewish Memorial Foundation for a grant.

ABSTRACT

ISAAC SATANOW, THE MAN AND HIS WORK; A STUDY IN THE BERLIN HASKALAH

Nehama Rezler Bersohn

Isaac Satanow, one of the most prolific writers of the Berlin Haskalah (Jewish enlightenment), typifies the maskil (an enlightened Jew) of his time. He was born and reared in Podolia, Poland at a time when Frankism and Cabbalah were reaching their peak influence. He subsequently moved to Berlin where the Jewish enlightenment movement was gaining momentum influenced by the general enlightenment and Prussia's changing economy. Satanow's way of life expressed the confluence of these two worlds, Podolia and Berlin.

Satanow adopted the goal of the moderate Haskalah to educate the Jewish masses, and by teaching them modern science, modern languages and contemporary ideas, to help them in improving their economic, social and political situation. To achieve this goal, he wrote numerous books and articles, sometimes imitating styles of and attributing the authorship to medieval and earlier writers so that his teaching would be respected and accepted. Satanow's writings dealt with the dominant subjects of his time; secular knowledge, science, the relationship between man and state, the

Jew and society, military service, tolerance, the function of religion, conversion, blood libel, social, political and economic reforms, language, literature and education as a remedy to most evils.

Satanow's Hebrew sources are easily traceable to classical and medieval writings. Even though his work is saturated with contemporary ideas, his non-Jewish sources are not clearly identified. The general impression is that while he was familiar with his contemporaries' thoughts and ideas, he did not read their works in the original but learned their ideas through secondary sources such as popular journals, discussions and Hebrew translations.

Satanow, who was an authority on Hebrew grammar, maintained a special interest in the development of the Hebrew language. He believed there was a correlation between the underdeveloped condition of the Hebrew language and the degraded situation of the Jews. He advocated the modernization of the language and the expansion of its vocabulary, believing it would contribute to the revival of the Jewish people as a nation. This made Satanow one of the more nationalistic writers of his time. He was among the first to suggest the use of Mishnaic vocabulary as a means of expanding the language and consequently, the horizon of Hebrew literature. As literature was an important means of promulgating contemporary ideology, Satanow also wrote on function and style of literature, his ideas were rooted in medieval Hebrew sources and contemporary ideology.

Satanow's attitude toward Cabbalah is an enigma to scholars of Hebrew literature. Spending more than half of his life in Podolia, a center of Cabbalah and the cradle of Frankism, and the other half in Berlin, the center of Haskalah, left an impact on Satanow's personality. He was not a mystic; still, he never freed himself from the impact of Cabbalah. A substantial portion of his "library" consisted of Cabbalistic works. He tried to reconcile Cabbalah with secular knowledge and often used Cabbalistic terminology in an effort to attract and convince his pious readers.

It has not been possible to point to a direct link between Satanow and Frank. Yet, Satanow spent his formative years in an area and a time when Frank had tremendous influence. Some of his writings seem to be in reaction to Frankism and in some works he attacks Sabbatians. All of this suggests the possibility of some direct or indirect Frankistic influence on Satanow.

A study of Isaac Satanow "half a heretic and half a believer," a controversial figure, a combination of the worlds of tradition and enlightenment, an embodiment of his time, enables us to examine his unusual personality as described by himself and others. We learn about his ideology as reflected in his works which are rooted in his time, a time of transition in Jewish history and thought, a time that marks the beginning of modern Hebrew literature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
ABSTRACT	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
I. BIOGRAPHY	3
Podolia	
Berlin	
II. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL STUDY	21
III. SATANOW: RATIONALIST AND REFORMER 	59
Knowledge and Science	
Man and Society -- Jews and Society	
Religion and Tolerance	
Views on Education	
Reforms in the Socio-Economic and	
Political Sphere	
IV. LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE AS AN EXPRESSION OF NATIONALISM	113
V. SATANOW'S THOUGHTS ABOUT LITERATURE 	132
VI. CABBALAH AND FRANKISM; THEIR INFLUENCE ON SATANOW	151
EPILOGUE	172
APPENDIX	184
BIBLIOGRAPHY	194

INTRODUCTION

A central figure in the first generation of the Jewish Enlightenment movement in Germany in the late eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth was the Polish born writer Isaac Satanow. Like many other maskilim of his generation he received a traditional Jewish education which he supplemented by extensive readings in Jewish philosophy. At the age of forty, he moved to Berlin, then a major center of German intellectual life. There he was exposed to the learning and the spirit typical of the Age of Reason. His life style and literary activities considered controversial by some of his contemporaries, are the result of both his background and the spirit of the time.

Satanow participated in various literary activities. He contributed to the first modern Hebrew periodical, ha-Meassef (The Compiler); he republished Hebrew classics from medieval Jewish philosophy, poetry, and liturgy, often adding his own commentaries to the texts. In addition to poetry, he wrote many books in diverse fields such as Hebrew language, Cabbalah and philosophy, as well as books dealing with secular and Jewish issues of his time.

Satanow was one of the most prolific writers of his generation and a colorful and controversial personality. Though most of his writings are available, no comprehensive study of him has yet been done. The present study is being undertaken to fill this gap.

CHAPTER I

BIOGRAPHY

Podolia

Isaac Satanow was born on September 5th, 1732,¹ in the city of Satanow (from which he acquired his name), in Podolia, an eastern province of Poland. He lived there until he was forty. It was a border area, which for twenty-eight years (1672-1699) was cut off from the Polish Kingdom and governed by Turkey. Even after its return to Poland, this area continued to be influenced by Sabbatianic sectarianism from the south.

Due to the distance of Podolia and Bratzlav from the Lwow center, various spiritual movements from abroad exerted an influence upon the Podolian Jews. Many of these movements emanated from the Ottoman Empire.²

Since 1672, "the road of commerce and culture was from Salonica to Kamieniec, Satanow and Mezibuzh, while the old road Lwow, Tarnopol and Satanow was closed. New people came to Podolia and brought with them new ideas."³

¹J. Klausner, Historia shel ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha, I (Jerusalem, 1960), p. 165.

²M. Balaban, L'Toldot ha-Tenu'a ha-Frankit, I, Tel-Aviv, 1934), p. 21.

³Ibid., p. 22.

As a trading center, the city of Satanow had always been open to new trends and ideas brought there by travelling merchants. After the treaty of Karlowitz (1699) which gave Podolia back to Poland, many Jews from other Polish districts, especially from Galicia, moved to Podolia. "Podolian Jewry became a strange mixture of people, with different cultural backgrounds and a variety of sectarian religious tendencies."⁴

This was also true of the town of Satanow. It was a private city, built on the property of a nobleman,⁵ where the Gentile citizens could not object to the settlement of Jews, as often happened in the royal cities. As a private city and an important trade center, Satanow attracted many Jewish settlers. Thus, when Podolia became an independent district in the Council of the Four Lands, Satanow was chosen for its capital, and the rabbi of Satanow was henceforth considered the chief rabbi of the district.⁶ In 1765, one year after the Council ceased to exist, there were already 1,625 Jews in that city,⁷ a comparatively large community for that time. Because of its proximity to Turkey, the influence of

⁴Ibid., p. 23.

⁵Ibid., p. 21.

⁶Ibid., pp. 82, 116.

⁷Ibid., p. 68.

Sabbatianism was sharply felt in Podolia. Remnants of the sect were active there and later became the nucleus for the Frankist movement.⁸

Jacob Frank (1726-1791), the founder of the sect, was a contemporary of our Isaac Satanow, and for a while lived in the neighboring town of Landskron which subsequently became notorious in the history of the sect.⁹ The town of Satanow appears on the list of Jacob Emden as one of the centers of Frankism.¹⁰ In 1756 Frankists were brought before the rabbinic court in Satanow. It was the responsibility of the rabbi of Satanow, as the rabbi of the main city of the district to uproot the Frankist sect. But, he failed in his task.¹¹

In 1757, when Isaac Satanow was twenty-five years old, the first disputation between Frankists and rabbinic Jews took place in Kamieniec Podolsk and two years later, in 1759, the second disputation took place in Lwow. Though Satanow never mentions these disputations, we have reason to

⁸S. Ettinger, Toldot Am Yisrael ba-Zeman he-Hadash (Tel-Aviv, 1969), p. 55.

⁹J. Emden, Sefer Shimush (Altona, 1758), pp. 5, 6; A. Kraushaar, Frank i Frankisci Polscy (Cracow, 1895), #1312; G. Scholem, in I. Halperin's Beit Yisrael be-Polin (Jerusalem, 1954), vol. 2, p. 58.

¹⁰J. Emden, Sefer Shimush, p. 6; G. Scholem, in Beit Yisrael be-Polin, p. 73.

¹¹M. Balaban, L'Toldot, I, 111, 116; G. Scholem, in Beit Yisrael, p. 68.

believe that they must have exerted an influence on him. Satanow discusses in his writings characteristics and behavior typical of the Frankists, such as forcing Jews to dispute with them before a Christian public, accusing them of blood libel or converting to Christianity in order to avoid punishment by court.

In 1760 Frank and his followers converted to Christianity. However, remnants of his sect continued to exist in the towns and hamlets of Podolia, including Satanow. There, the son of the head of the Jewish community, and seven other men converted to Christianity under Frank's influence.¹²

The Frankist movement brought into focus the religious and moral decay of the Jewish community which had started much earlier.

Indeed, we are startled by the fact of large numbers of converts that multiplied in Poland during the eighteenth century. There was neither a city nor a year in which one could not find a convert.¹³

"The growing religious indifference; the tendency to conversion that followed it, went hand in hand with the willingness of the Catholic Church to embrace renegades from Judaism."¹⁴

¹²A. Kraushaar, Frank i Frankisci Polscy, appendix; G. Scholem in Beit Yisrael, p. 73.

¹³M. Balaban, L'Toldot, p. 80.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 81.

Besides Frankism, two other spiritual trends were at work in Podolia at that time, Cabbalah and Hasidism. Satanow was apparently not influenced by Hasidism as there are no allusions to it in any of his writings. However, he admits that he was influenced by Cabbalah.

Satanow described his youth in Podolia as typical of the life of a Jewish boy in Poland during the first half of the eighteenth century. Writing about himself in the third person under the pen name of his son, Dr. S. Sheinman, he said:

During his early youth, until the age of fifteen, he lived in the house of learning where he studied Torah from great scholars. At the age of fifteen he began to write, and when he was eighteen he married my mother. . . . When he was about twenty years old, he became a merchant. He earned his living far from home, travelling one thousand parasangs each year. Three times a year he would travel to Frankfurt on the Oder which was a hundred and fifty parasangs away, and three times a year he would travel to the Ukraine, selling his merchandise. Even in those days he never stopped writing. He used to carry an inkhorn with him and whenever he took a rest he used to put into writing the ideas that came into his mind during the daytime.¹⁵

We know nothing about Satanow's parents except that his father's name was Moses Ha-Levi.¹⁶ As for his own family, we know that he had at least two sons and several daughters.

¹⁵ Isaac Satanow, Minhat Biqqurim (Berlin, 1797), p. 11.

¹⁶ S. J. Finn, Knesset Yisrael (Warsaw, 1876), p. 643.

Except for one son, who became a physician, his wife and children stayed in Satanow and did not follow him to Berlin.¹⁷ The one son, Dr. Sheinman, studied medicine in Berlin and then practiced in Dresden.¹⁸ Satanow frequently used his son's name as a pen name, especially when he participated in polemics and, for some reasons, preferred not to use his own name.

Satanow's commercial travels carried him from Frankfurt on the Oder, famous for its fairs, to the Ukraine,¹⁹ only sparsely settled at the time. In the second half of the eighteenth century the Ukraine experienced the bloody uprising of the Haydamaks under the leadership of Gonta and Zelezniak (1768). This rebellion left the area in ruins. Its trade was decimated and the population impoverished. This situation apparently brought an end to Satanow's commercial travels there. From then on Satanow had to concentrate his efforts on the west alone.

Berlin

Scholars disagree as to the exact year of Satanow's arrival in Berlin. Moses Mendelson of Hamburg (1782-1861)

¹⁷ Minhat Biqqurim, p. 11.

¹⁸ A. Wolfsohn, in ha-Meassef, VII (Berlin, 1797), 396.

¹⁹ Minhat Biqqurim (Berlin, 1797), p. 11.

a young contemporary of Satanow writes: "In those days there lived R. Isaac Satanow. . . . He was forty years old when he came to Berlin."²⁰ Accordingly, the year of Satanow's arrival in Berlin would be 1772. This date is also accepted by the well known scholar David Kassel, in his history book. "The head of the printing and publishing house of the Berlin Freischule was R. Isaac Satanow, a native of Poland who came to Berlin in the year 1772."²¹ But, in his own Megillat Hasidim (1802), Satanow states that he came to Berlin forty years ago,²² which would place his arrival in 1762. Klausner, however, believed that this date should not be taken too seriously. Satanow merely mentioned the number forty as a symbolic number,²³ frequently used in Biblical narratives. Support for 1772 as the date of his settlement in Berlin may also be derived from the fact that in that year Poland was partitioned for the first time and the Ukraine was annexed by Russia. Perhaps as a result, the area of Satanow's commercial activities was greatly reduced.* This may have

²⁰M. Mendelson (Frankfurter), Pnei Tevel (Amsterdam, 1872), p. 251.

²¹David Kassel, Qorot Am Yeshurun, trans. by D. Radner (Vilno, 1887), p. 562.

²²I. Satanow, Megillat Hasidim (Berlin, 1802), introduction.

²³J. Klausner, Historia, I, 165, Note 2.

* See S. Dubnow, History of the Jews in Russia and Poland, trans. I. Friedlander, vol. I (Philadelphia, 1916), 310-311, 313-320.

been the decisive factor in his move to Berlin. However, even after he moved to Berlin, he still visited Podolia frequently. On one such visit, he stayed for more than two years.²⁴ But Podolia could no longer serve as a center for his activities. From then to the end of his life he spent most of his time in Berlin, the center of the rising Jewish enlightenment known as the Haskalah.

Satanow's move to Berlin was not an isolated phenomenon, but reflected a general trend in Jewish life of the time, the movement of increasing numbers of Jews from Eastern Europe to the West.²⁵ Commercial ties between Poland and Prussia increased during the rule of Frederick II, resulting in closer ties between the two Jewish communities.²⁶ Numerous Jews began to find their way into Germany. There were traditional scholars looking for a new livelihood,²⁷ Jewish intellectuals who were dissatisfied with traditional education,²⁸ Jewish merchants hoping for better prospects in the

²⁴H. D. Friedberg, Toldot ha-Defus ha-Ivri be-Polania (Tel-Aviv, 1950), p. 74, Note 2.

²⁵M. H. Sachar, The Course of Modern Jewish History (Dell Pub., 1963), p. 35; A. Schohat, Im Hilufei Tequfot (Jerusalem, 1960), Introduction, p. 10.

²⁶I. Barzilay, "The Background of the Berlin Haskalah" in Essays on Jewish Life and Thoughts (Columbia Univ. Press, 1959), p. 193.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸S. Maimon, An Autobiography, ed. M. Hadas (New York, 1967).

west,²⁹ and Frankists fleeing from persecution, trying to establish a new center. These Jews created a disturbing and agitating effect on the old German Jewry. The fermentation and unrest they caused may have hastened the process of change in the Jewish community of Germany, and ultimately, in the new arrivals themselves. Satanow the merchant, the Polish Jew, a contemporary of Frank and a traditional scholar no longer satisfied with what Jewish education alone had to offer, typifies the new element that went to Germany.

Satanow describes his life in Berlin in a book written in the third person and attributed to his son.

When he was forty years old, he came to the city of Berlin. There he invested his money in business [lent it on interest], which left him free to devote himself to spiritual matters. He devoted his days and nights to the holy undertaking of editing his own works, and slept no more than three or four hours a night. He lived in such a manner for a number of years, until he lost his wealth in a bad business deal with two dishonest merchants from the city of Satanow, and as a result of other misfortunes that befell him.³¹

It appears that he never got over the blow of his financial loss, and time and again complained about it in his various writings.³² After that financial debacle, he had to depend

²⁹I. Barzilay, "The Background," p. 193; A. Schohat, Im Hilufei Tequfot, pp. 25, 26.

³⁰A. Schohat, Im Hilufei Tequfot, p. 234.

³¹Minhat Biggurim, p. 11.

³²I. Satanow, Mishlei Asaf (Berlin, 1789), p. 64; M. Maimonides, Moreh Nevukhim (Berlin, 1796), III, I. Satanow's commentary, p. 47.

on the benevolence of the Jewish rich, a fate he shared with many others. Unlike Shlomo Maimon³³ or even Moses Mendelssohn³⁴ Satanow had no financial problems when he first came to Berlin.

During his life in Berlin, Satanow was in close contact with the wealthy members of the Jewish community. Their aid and protection made his existence there possible. This relationship between maskilim and rich Jewish benefactors was not unusual at the time.

The Haskalah first appeared among Jews in Prussia because it was there that a class of Jewish industrialists and Jewish bankers grew early into modern bourgeoisie. This element . . . influenced the fast spread of the Berlin Haskalah.³⁵

The Jewish magnates, bankers, industrialists, army purveyors, etc., who rose at that time, looked for a change. They strove for emancipation, but as long as the government treated Jews collectively, one could dream of emancipation only within the framework of the community. Though some individual rich Jews were granted certain privileges, they could achieve full emancipation only together with the rest of the Jews.³⁶ Despite

³³S. Maimon, An Autobiography, M. Hadas ed., pp. 79, 96.

³⁴I. Euchel, Toldot ha-Rambaman (Vienna, 1814), p. 139.

³⁵M. Erik, Etuden Zu Der Geschichte Fun Der Haskoleh (Minsk, 1934), p. 23.

³⁶D. Friedlander, Akten Stücke die Reform der Jüdischen Kolonien betreffend (Berlin, 1793), erste Betrachtung, "über die solidarische Verbindung der Juden," pp. 84, 95, 96, 98.

the enlightened ideas of the time, the non-Jewish society did not consider the Jews fit for emancipation in their current backward and distinct life style.³⁷ Therefore the Jewish magnates set out to change the Jews and make them fit to become equal citizens.³⁸ It was in their own interest to try to bring the Jews closer to the culture of the Gentile population.

Education was the means for such a rapprochement.³⁹ At this time a stream of autodidacts began appearing in Germany.

Those philosophers later became teachers, book-keepers, employees and merchants. The rising Jewish bourgeoisie needed such a stratum of partially and fully educated or enlightened people who knew languages but also were not strangers to Jewish tradition. . . . They needed them for their commercial and financial undertakings, as tutors for their children and as spokesmen for their ideologies.⁴⁰

That is why maskilim like Wessely, Euchel and Satanow could always get support from these magnates.⁴¹

Satanow's exact trade while in Podolia is unknown but once he settled in Berlin, his main occupation became books.

³⁷C. Dohm, Concerning the Amelioration of the Civil Status of the Jews, trans. H. Lederer (Cincinnati, 1957), pp. 65, 66; A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn (Univ. of Alabama, 1973), p. 467.

³⁸D. Friedlander, Akten Stücke, pp. 122, 150.

³⁹A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn, pp. 474-478.

⁴⁰M. Erik, Etuden, p. 54.

⁴¹A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn, p. 483.

After he lost his money, he worked for a while as the director of the publishing house of the Berlin Freischule,⁴² sponsored by the Jewish banker Daniel Itzig and his son-in-law David Friedlander. He held this position until 1788 when Isaac Euchel came from Koenigsberg to Berlin and took over.⁴³ Satanow continued to work there as a printer, and there he published most of his books.⁴⁴

At the same time Satanow continued to travel. In 1780 he returned to Podolia where he stayed for at least two years. There he reprinted two Cabbalistic books. According to Friedberg, Satanow was the publisher of the Etz Hayim and Torat Etz Hayim.⁴⁵

He used to live in Berlin, but when he heard that they started to publish Hasidic books in his native country, and that there was a big demand for them, he hurried there in the year 1780. He brought those two books of Haim Vital to a printer. The rabbis who gave their approval, fixed the price of each book at one golden coin per copy. In fact he was successful and sold them in a very short time . . . he returned to Berlin in 1783 and with the money he earned and saved he published his other books.⁴⁶

⁴²D. Kassel, Qorot, p. 562.

⁴³J. Klausner, Historia, I, 165.

⁴⁴D. Kassel, Qorot, p. 562.

⁴⁵H. Vital, Etz Hayim (Koretz, 1782), ed. I. Satanow; Torat Etz Hayim (Koretz, 1782), ed. I. Satanow.

⁴⁶H. D. Friedberg, Toldot ha-Defus, p. 47, Note 2.

Satanow himself tells about his travels, putting his words under his son's name:

Even today when he is old, he is still in the habit of travelling three times a year to Frankfurt. There he sells his books, and maintains himself, my mother and the children who depend upon him in the town of Satanow.⁴⁷

It is possible that Satanow did not bring his whole family to Berlin because of the restrictive laws against Jewish settlement there.⁴⁸ Thus, even after he himself had settled in Berlin, his family remained in Satanow. However, there may have been other reasons. Such an existence is, indeed, almost symbolic of Satanow. He simultaneously lived in two cultural environments, each deeply affecting him.

In Berlin Satanow devoted himself to secular studies. He studied philosophy and was especially fascinated with science. He also studied Hebrew grammar, a subject in which he acquired great proficiency and to which he devoted many publications. These interests are strongly reflected in his writings.

In Berlin Satanow came to know most of the maskilim of his time. The poet laureate of the period, N. H. Wessely, even dedicated a poem to him.⁴⁹ According to Isaac Euchel,

⁴⁷I. Satanow, Minhat Biqquirim, p. 11.

⁴⁸R. Mahler, Divrei Yemei Yisrael, Dorot Aharonim (Merhavia: Sifriyat Po'alim, 1954), II, 16.

⁴⁹N. H. Wessely, Introduction to Satanow's Sefer ha-Hizzayon (Berlin, 1775).

it was Satanow who convinced Moses Mendelssohn, in whose house Satanow was a frequent visitor, to intervene in a case of a blood libel in Poland.⁵⁰ He was also acquainted with the Meassfim. As mentioned, several magnates in the Jewish community were his benefactors, among them Daniel Itzig, for whose seventy-sixth birthday Satanow composed a poem and prayer.⁵¹ Among his influential supporters were also Itzig's son-in-law, David Friedlander, one of the founders of the Berlin Freischule, and the famous physician and philosopher Marcus Hertz. They belonged to a group called The Philantropen Society who assigned Satanow to reissue old Hebrew classics.⁵² It appears, however, that before Satanow succeeded in entering the social and intellectual life of Jewish Berlin, he suffered loneliness and economic hardship. He describes it as follows:

Then I became tired of wandering and came to the . . . city of Berlin. In the beginning of my dwelling there I was the most despised and rejected of men, and I did not know who was going to protect me, because there the rich ruled the poor. . . .⁵³

⁵⁰I. Euchel, Toledot, p. 132; I. Satanow, Mishlei Asaf, chap. 42 commentary to sen 17; A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn, p. 354.

⁵¹I. Satanow, Shir Yedidut (Berlin, 1799).

⁵²D. Kassel, Qorot, p. 562.

⁵³I. Satanow, Iggeret Eder ha-Yeqar (Berlin, 1772), p. 2.

Satanow contributed numerous articles to the periodical ha-Meassef.⁵⁴ They dealt with education, the Hebrew language, Biblical exegesis and current events. However, in the course of time, his good relations with the Meassfim became strained. Meir Letteris, a nineteenth century Hebrew poet writes in his introduction to the second edition of the Meassef, "In later days, the wise R. Isaac Satanow wrote slanderous articles about the Meassfim, but those articles were lost."⁵⁵ The reason for the breakdown of relations is not entirely clear. Satanow himself explained it as the result of false accusations brought against him. Hiding again behind his son's name, he writes:

My father, may he live long, was put in a high position in the printing house of Hinukh Ne'arim. Nahman Barash of Berlin came with a manuscript and asked my father to print it. When my father read two or three chapters, he realized that the author's purpose was to degrade the Meassfim. He therefore refused to print the book. When this became known to the wise benefactor Itzig Jaffe, he ordered him to print it as mentioned in the first page of the book. Those people thought that my father himself was either the author of the whole book or of parts of it and that Nahman was not the true author. They therefore became angry at him and criticized the book of Asaf.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ ha-Meassef (Tevet, 1784), p. 53, (Tevet, 1788), pp. 82-95. (Nisan, 1784), pp. 238-239.

⁵⁵ M. Letteris, ha-Meassef, 2nd ed. (Vienna, 1862), p. 43.

⁵⁶ I. Satanow, Minhat Biqqurim, p. 5. See ha-Meassef, VII (1797), 251-271.

According to Israel Zinberg, a person named Barash did, indeed, write a book entitled Ein Mishpat, in 1796. In it he sharply criticized the Meassfim, especially Aaron Wolfsohn who was at that time the editor of the Meassef.⁵⁷ Wolfsohn suspected Satanow, who more than once attributed his own writings to other people, of being the author of this book. In the 1797 issue of the Meassef Wolfsohn launched a bitter attack against Satanow and his book Mishlei Asaf. Satanow refers to this controversy in Minhat Biqqurim where he mentions the fact that the Meassfim prevented him from publishing the book of Psalms with a German translation. Nevertheless he maintains that his quarrel is not with the early Meassfim who were all his friends, but with the newcomers who had failed to live up to their standards.

. . . . The present members of the group are not the same as before . . . many who belonged to the group before, have left, and the ones who remained are like fossils, negligent in the correct use of pure language and not strong enough to accept criticism. The result is false judgment.⁵⁸

Satanow sharply criticized the newer maskilim for their lack of morality which they in turn blamed him for. He wrote:

⁵⁷ I. Zinberg, Toledot Sifrut Yisrael (Tel-Aviv, 1959), vol. 5, p. 71; A. Wolfsohn, in ha-Meassef (Berlin, 1797), p. 301.

⁵⁸ Minhat Biqqurim, p. 4.

This is the behavior of the Meassfim of today, they flatter the great and the rich, thanking and praising them again and again. Every few months they shower upon them laudatory compositions, until one realizes that all of it is nothing but flattery. On the other hand, those they hate and despise, they trample under their feet.⁵⁹

Satanow's preoccupation with books continued until the last day of his life. As mentioned before, he was a member of the society by the name of Marpeh la-Nefesh [Cure of the Soul] which was established by the Berlin "enlightened," for the purpose of reprinting Hebrew classics. Each member of the society obligated himself to donate five to twelve thalers a year for the publication of the books.⁶⁰ The list of books Satanow selected for the new publication is interesting because it indicates the wide range of his interests, among which were philosophy, ethics, Cabbalah and language. We will see that every book Satanow published had its impact on his writings.

Toward the end of his life Satanow became blind and complained of loneliness.

I left my house, forsook my heritage, abandoned both mother and sons and now besides my body I have nothing. I am like a wandering bird and like a guest for a night . . . my strength has all dried up like a potsherd, and I do not have my eyesight anymore. As a result of overworking in writing my eyes became dim.⁶¹

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 5.

⁶⁰D. Kassel, Qorot, p. 562.

⁶¹I. Satanow, va-Ye'etar Yitzhak (Vienna, 1815), p. 86.

He also suffered from fever and various other disabilities,⁶² and was afraid he would not be able to finish his work: "I am writing in the evening, and in the morning it goes to press, as I am afraid that death will take me before I complete what I have started."⁶³ Toward the end of his life he suffered a stroke which left one side of his body paralyzed. He tells about it in the opening page of Megillat Hasidim:

It has been about two years since the hand of God was upon him; his eyesight was taken away from him and the feeling in the left side of his body. He became like a dead corpse whose half side was rotten. But even today he gets up in the middle of the night to dictate to copyists who write down what he says.⁶⁴

Satanow died on December 24, 1804, and was buried without honor. Some years later Leopold Zunz erected a tombstone on his grave.⁶⁵ The flowery epitaph on his tombstone may be translated as follows:

A writer who never ceased studying and who continued to write until the day of his death.⁶⁶

⁶²Moreh Nevukhim, III, Satanow's commentary p. 27.

⁶³ha-Kuzari (Berlin, 1795), Satanow's commentary p. 40.

⁶⁴I. Satanow, Megillat Hasidim, front page.

⁶⁵S. Bernfeld, Dor Tahapukhot (Warsaw, 1897), p. 10.

⁶⁶S. J. Finn, Knesset Yisrael, p. 645.

CHAPTER II

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL STUDY

Satanow was in all likelihood the most prolific writer in the group of Hebraists which gathered around the Meassef. He wrote numerous books, articles, and commentaries, and also reprinted and edited some of the Hebrew classics. Yet, so far we do not have a complete bibliographical list of his works. He is, of course, mentioned by most bibliographers or historians of Hebrew literature, but their lists of his writings are incomplete. There is little doubt that he himself is in part to blame, because he was in the habit of attributing his own works to others, thus making it difficult to identify them. As a result of this habit, he was even suspected of authoring books, or portions of books, expressing ideas close to his own (mainly of controversial content) which were actually written by others.

It is therefore essential that a study of Satanow should include a bibliographical list of his works. We shall attempt to make that list as complete as possible by checking the lists of previous bibliographers and historians, and by sifting through all references and allusions to his works in his own writings. We have also used the comments of his contemporaries and of later scholars to determine Satanow's

authorship. This chapter also discusses some bibliographical aspects of Satanow's work which are of special interest. Finally, in the appendix we compiled a catalogue of Satanow's "library," that is, the names of books and writers which frequently appear in his works, indicating their possible impact on his own writings.

The following list is based mainly on data given by Satanow himself, and supplemented by the incomplete list of William Zeitlin,¹ and the remarks regarding Satanow in the works of Frantz Delitsch,² Moses Mendelson of Hamburg,³ David Kassel,⁴ Shmuel Joseph Finn,⁵ The Jewish Encyclopedia,⁶ Hayim Y. Friedberg,⁷ Joseph Klausner,⁸ Israel Zinberg,⁹ and Samuel Verses.¹⁰

¹W. Zeitlin, Bibliotheca Hebraica Post Mendelssohniana, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1891), pp. 333-357.

²F. Delitsch, Zur Geschichte der Jüdischen Poesie (Leipzig, 1836), pp. 115-118.

³Pnei Tevel, pp. 251-252.

⁴Qorot Am Yeshurun, pp. 562-563.

⁵Knesset Yisrael, vol. I, 643-645.

⁶Vol. XI, 71.

⁷Toldot ha-Defus ha-Ivri be-Polania, pp. 61-62.

⁸Historia shel ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha, I (Jerusalem, 1960), 169-173.

⁹I. Zinberg, Toldot Sifrut Yisrael, IV (Tel-Aviv, 1959), 118-122.

¹⁰S. Verses, "Al Yitzhak Satanow ve-Hiburo Mishlei Asaf," Tarbitz LII (Jerusalem, 1962-63), pp. 370-391.

Some of the books mentioned by Satanow and included in this list have probably remained in manuscript and were consequently lost. We were not able to find any trace of them in any source other than in Satanow himself. For this reason it was difficult to order them chronologically or even by their subject matter. Their classification is therefore speculative and according to the date of the publication of the work in which they are mentioned and based on Satanow's own remarks there.

Books and Articles

<u>Iggeret Eder ha-Yeqar</u> ¹¹	(An epistle on the Splendid Mantle)	1772
<u>Iggeret Beit Tefillah</u> ¹²	(Epistle on the House of Prayers)	1773
<u>Siftei Renanot</u> ¹³	(Singing Lips)	1773

¹¹Contains poems, discussions of poetics, a description of the temple according to Ezechiel 40-47, and an explanation of the properties of parallel lines. (30 l.) 8°.

¹²A discussion of the prayer-book, and corrections of grammatical errors of the text. (40 l.) 8°.

¹³A grammar, includes syntax, verbs and nouns. The first part of Sefer ha-Gedarim by Satanow which follows the pattern of D. Kimki's ha-Mikhlol. The other parts are Safa Ahat, Sefat Emet and Devarim Ahadim. Satanow tells us that he originally composed the book for his own benefit, to help him in rhyming, but later thought that it might also be helpful for other poets. (40 l.) 8°. See infra, p. 49.

<u>Sefer ha-Hizzayon</u> ¹⁴	(Book of Vision or Presentation)	1775
<u>Zohar Tinyana</u> ¹⁵	(A Second Zohar)	1783
<u>Safa Ahat</u> ¹⁶	(One Language)	1783
<u>Ha-Galui ve-he-Hatum</u> ¹⁷	(The Revealed and the Hidden)	1784
<u>Si'ah Yitzhaq</u> ¹⁸	(The Narration of Isaac)	1784
<u>Sefer ha-Middot</u> ¹⁹	(Book of Ethics)	1784

¹⁴ A conglomerate of poetics, poems, science and grammar. There is no date on the book but according to Steinschneider in Zeitschrift fur die Geschichte der Juden, V (1892), 170-171 and Klausner in Historia, I, 109, the book appeared in 1775. (10 + 68 + 2 l.) 8^o.

¹⁵ An imitation of the Zohar to the first chapters of Genesis. In it Satanow tries to compromise between Cabbalah and philosophy. See infra, p. 33.

¹⁶ Hebrew dictionary; includes all different meanings of each word. It is the second part of Sefer ha-Gedanim (Sefer ha-Shorashim). See note 13. (1 + 29 l.) 4^o.

¹⁷ A prospectus of books. See infra, p. 38. 8^o.

¹⁸ A commentary on the Passover Haggadah with a discussion of grammatical aspects of the text. A copy of this book bound together with ha-Galui ve-he-Hatam is in the British Museum. (A microfilm of this copy is in the National Library in Jerusalem.) 8^o.

¹⁹ A book of ethics bound together with Sefer ha-Nefesh. The latter is a translation by Satanow of a part of Phaedon by Mendelssohn. (David Friedlander's translation was not published until 1787. See A. Altman's Mendelssohn, p. 181.) In Sefer ha-Hizzayon, p. 70, Satanow promised to publish a second part to be called Sefer ha-Middot. Many other books of ethics were written at this time, e.g., N. H. Wessely, Sefer Middot (Berlin, 1788); J. L. Ben Zev, Yesodei ha-Dat (Vienna, 1811); M. Lapin Satanover, Heshbon ha-Nefesh (Lemb 1809) and many others. Satanow's book is influenced both by Aristotle's Ethics and Ibn Pakoda's Hovot ha-Levavot (144 l.) 12^o.

<u>va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq</u> ²⁰	(And Isaac Prayed)	1784
<u>Imrei Binah</u> ²¹	(Words of Understanding)	1784
<u>Sefer ha-Shorashim</u> ²²	(The Book of Roots of Verbs)	1787
'mi-Darkhei ha-Lashon ve-ha-Melitzah" ²³	(Ways of Language and Rhetoric)	1788
<u>Mishlei Asaf</u> ²⁴	(Proverbs of Asaf)	1789
<u>Gam Elleh Mishlei Asaf</u> ²⁵	(These are also Proverbs of Asaf)	1792

²⁰ Grammatical comments on the prayer book, also polemics against previous grammarians. (48 l.) 8°.

²¹ This is the name of the main part of de-Rossi's Me'or Einayim which Satanow published in 1799. Rossi's "Imrei Binah" discusses Philo, Jewish sects during the period of the 2nd temple, and events in Jewish history. Satanow's Imrei Binah tries to reconcile secular knowledge with Cabbalah. (2 + 35 l.) 4°.

²² The name is taken from David Qimki's book with the same title. (J. L. Ben Zev [1764-1811] wrote a book with a similar title, Otzar ha-Shorashim.) This edition includes Sefat Emet and Devarim Ahadim. See also note 16. (2 + 65; 11 + 14 l.).

²³ This article which appeared in ha-Meassef (1788), pp. 82-95 deals with the development of the Hebrew language, its present degraded condition and ways to improve it. See infra, pp. 121-122, 124-125.

²⁴ An imitation of the Biblical book of Proverbs and The Proverbs of Ben-Sirah. It includes proverbs dealing with every day life and contemporary philosophy. According to Zeitlin in BHPM, p. 335, the book was published in 1791. The book is considered to be Satanow's best literary achievement. See infra, pp. 178, 182. (6 + 96 l.) 8°.

²⁵ The Second part of Mishlei Asaf. It uses the same style and deals with the same topics as the first. (1 + 88 l.) 8°.

<u>Zemirot Asaf</u> ²⁶	(Psalms of Asaf)	1793
<u>Perush Rashbam</u> <u>le-Tehillim</u> ²⁷	(Rashbam's Commentary on Psalms)	1794
<u>Holekh Tamim</u> ²⁸	(A Righteous Man)	1795
<u>Si'ah Yitzhaq</u> ²⁹	(The Prayer of Isaac)	1797
<u>Minhat Biqqurim</u> ³⁰	(An Offering of Criticism)	1797
<u>Shir Yedidut</u> ³¹	(A Poem of Friendship)	1799
<u>Divrei Rivot</u> ³²	(Polemics)	1800(?)
<u>Megillat Hasidim</u> ³³	(Scroll of the Pious)	1802

²⁶The third book of Asaf. It is an imitation of the book of Psalms. (8 + 55 l.) 8°.

²⁷The book was already mentioned in Gam Elleh Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 69, commentary 22, where Satanow tries to prove a grammatical point. See infra, p. 32. (1 + 139 l.) 8°.

²⁸On ethics, also praising secular knowledge. (6 + 2 l.) 8°.

²⁹This book is mentioned only by Zeitlin. According to him it was a response to criticism of Satanow's edition of the prayer book. See Zeitlin's BHPM, p. 336.

³⁰A polemic against the Meassfim who criticized Mishlei Asaf. See infra, p. 56.

³¹A poem of praise in honor of the 76th birthday of Daniel Itzig.

³²Two vols. Deals with the principles of Judaism and with religious reforms. L. Blau in Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliographie, VII (Frankfurt am-Main, 1904), pp. 19-20 thinks that the essence of Divrei Rivot was already written in 1793 as a memorandum to Itzig. For a fuller description of the views of Satanow see ch. 3. (48 + 68 l.) 8°.

³³The fourth and last book of Asaf, similar in style and topics to the first two. (4 + 60 l.) 8°.

Lost Works

<u>Sefer Toldot Yitzhaq</u> ³⁴	(The Book of the History of Isaac)
<u>Iggeret Emeq Yehoshafat</u> ³⁵	(Epistle on the Valley of Jehosaphat)
"Ma'amar Hayei Hitbonenut" ³⁶	(An Essay on the Life of Contemplation)
<u>Yerushalayim</u> ³⁷	(Jerusalem)
<u>Har Tsiyon</u> ³⁸	(The mountain of Zion)
<u>Sefer-Chimia</u> ³⁹	(Book of Chemistry)
<u>Be'ur Al ha-Torah</u> ⁴⁰	(Commentary on the Torah)
<u>Sefer ha-Meturgeman</u> ⁴¹	(The translation of the Torah into Aramaic)

³⁴Mentioned in a list of books that Satanow was about to publish cf. see ha-Galui ve-he-Hatum, p. 3.

³⁵Sefer ha-Middot, p. 90. Also, infra, p. 45.

³⁶Mentioned in Middot, p. 186.

³⁷According to I. Zinberg in Toldot, V, 113, note 18, Yerushalayim was mentioned by Satanow at the end of Ein Mishpat by N. Barash, as a book to be published soon. (Ein Mishpat is not available in any major library in the U.S.A. or Israel.)

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹See Job (Berlin, 1799). I. Satanow Commentator. 1st introduction.

⁴⁰See Sefer ha-Middot, p. 26.

⁴¹See Megillat Hasidim, introduction, p. 1. The translation of the title The Meturgeman is The Translator.

Publications of Works by Other Authors

with Commentaries or Corrections

<u>Selihot</u> ⁴²	(Prayers of Penitence)	1785
<u>Nevuat ha-Yeled</u> ⁴³	(The Prophecy of the Child)	1789
<u>Sefer ha-Middot shel Aristo</u> ⁴⁴	(Aristotle's Ethics)	1790
<u>Qol Shahal</u> ⁴⁵	(Voice of the Lion)	1790
<u>Moreh Nevukhim</u> (3 vols.) ⁴⁶	(The Guide of the Per- plexed)	1791-96
<u>Me'or Einayim</u> ⁴⁷	(The Light of the Eyes)	1794
<u>Be'ur Millot ha-Higgayon</u> ⁴⁸	(Definitions of terms of Logic)	1794

⁴²Grammatical corrections of the Selihot by Satanow.

⁴³Five mystical prophecies in Aramaic. In Kiryat Sefer II (1925-26), 101-144, Gershon Scholem writes that Nevuat ha-Yeled was written in the Near East sometime during the thirteenth century. Abraham b. Eliezer ha-Levi wrote a commentary to it in 1517. Satanow published Nevuat ha-Yeled together with his own commentaries.

⁴⁴See infra, p. 53.

⁴⁵The name Qol Shahal is taken from Job 4:10. The book is Satanow's edition of Ephrayim Luzzatto's Elleh Bnei ha-Neurim. See also p. 48.

⁴⁶Satanow's commentaries on the Moreh deserve a detailed analysis of them. However, it is an entire research topic by itself. See also p. 52.

⁴⁷Me'or Einayim has three parts; "Qol Elahim" describes the earthquake in Ferrara, "Hadrat Qeqlim" is the translation of Aristias epistle, and "Imrei Binah" discusses mainly aspects of Jewish history of the Second Commonwealth era. See p. 25, note 21.

⁴⁸Fourth edition of Millot ha-Higgayon by Maimonides, with Mendelssohn's commentaries. See p. 46.

<u>Mahberot Immanuel</u> ⁴⁹	(The Maqamas of Immanuel)	1796
<u>ha-Kuzari</u> ⁵⁰	(The Kuzari)	1796
<u>Sefer ha-Gedarim</u> ⁵¹	(Book of Definitions)	1798
<u>Perush le-Iyov</u> ⁵²	(Commentary on the Book of Job)	1799

Books that Satanow was Suspected of Authoring

<u>Ein Mishpat</u> ⁵³	(Source of Judgment)
<u>Besamim Rosh</u> ⁵⁴	(Poisonous Perfumes)

The most common method of classifying Satanow's works was the chronological one. Klausner seems to be the only scholar who attempted a topical classification. He divided Satanow's works into the following categories: a) Poetry and "related subjects." b) Ethics, philosophy and science. c) Polemics and current events. d) New editions of the classics and commentaries on them.⁵⁵ Klausner's classifications

⁴⁹Considered a faulty edition of Immanuel's Maqamas because Satanow added and also omitted some rhymes according to his own judgment. See p. 48.

⁵⁰See pp. 46, 47.

⁵¹Called also Mikhlal Yofee, a grammar book by Menahem of Perpignan (1st ed., Salonica, 1967). Contains definitions of philosophical, medical and ethical terms. Satanow added some more definitions to the original edition. (105 l.) ⁴⁰.

⁵²See p. 47.

⁵³See p. 35.

⁵⁴See p. 36. The name is taken from Exodus 30:23. There it means The Best of Perfumes.

⁵⁵J. Klausner, Historia, pp. 169-172.

as well as the chronological classifications are, no doubt, valid. However, an additional categorization is necessary in view of the problem of clearly identifying Satanow's authorship. In the following pages we shall therefore discuss Satanow's works under the following headings:

- a) Books and articles attributed by Satanow to other authors.
- b) Books and articles acknowledged by Satanow to be his own.
- c) Commentaries and republications of classics.
- d) Lost books and articles.
- e) Books of other authors attributed to him but without sufficient proof.

Satanow was often attacked by his critics because of his so-called forgeries.⁵⁶ He was well aware of the criticism but he maintained it was a necessary practice. Believing that literature should be used for promulgating desirable ideas, he thought such ideas would be more readily accepted by the public if the source appeared to be an ancient authority. Indeed he expressed this view rather clearly in the books of Asaf and Minhat Biqqurim.⁵⁷ Because Satanow's purpose in most of his writings was didactic, namely, to educate the public, he thought that once the books were read, there was no more

⁵⁶See Epilogue.

⁵⁷Mishlei Asaf (Berlin, 1789), Ch. 33, sen. 5 (also commentary), Ch. 23, commentary to sen. 24. Introduction to Ha-Levi's ha-Kuzari, p. 1. Minhat Biqqurim (Berlin, 1797), p. 6.

reason for him to hide his true identity. As a matter of fact, admitting to a desire for fame,⁵⁸ he mentioned those pseudo-epigraphic writings in subsequent books and boasted about his authorship.⁵⁹

Let us see with what kind of pseudo-epigraphic works Satanow was involved. His "forgeries" belong to three categories: a) Books attributed to famous men of the past. The list of those books includes the four books of Asaf (Mishlei Asaf, Gam Elleh Mishlei Asaf, Zemirot Asaf, Megillat Hasidim), Rashbam's commentary on the book of Tehillim, and Zohar Tinyana. b) Books attributed to unknown writers of the past. This category includes Imrei Binah and Divrei Rivot. c) Books written under the name of Satanow's son. They included Minhat Biqqurim, Yerushalayim, Har Tziyon, a book on chemistry and an article, "mi-Darkhei ha-Lashon ve-ha-Melitza."

Satanow chose each category to serve as a front for his own writings for several reasons. He imitated famous writers who lived many centuries earlier. Since his imitation of their style was usually very good, it is difficult to prove that they did not really in fact write the books he attributed to them. Such was the case of the books of Asaf. Besides, this was a time of a renewed interest in the Apocryphic books and their rediscovery by the Jewish maskilim. It was common to deal with the Sefarim Hitzonim (Apocrypha). Wessely was busy with The Wisdom of Solomon,⁶⁰ Ben Ze'ev with Ben Sira

⁶⁰Hokhmat Shlomo, ed. by N. H. Wessely (Berlin, 1780). According to A. Meisl, Leben und Werken N. H. Wessely (Breslau, 1871) appeared in 1778.

and Yehudit, etc.⁶¹ That is why Satanow could easily believe that the authenticity of books similar in style and form to the Sefarim Hitzonim, as the books of Asaf were, would be accepted.

It would seem that Satanow chose to imitate Rashbam for the same reasons that a noted scholar and legalistic mind like Saul Berlin chose to imitate a legalist like Rabbi Asher, as a means to disseminate his own ideas. Satanow, naturally, would be more tempted by a commentator like Rashbam, whose method, based on the understanding of the scriptures according to their simple grammatical meaning, was appealing to the eighteenth century rationalistic grammarian. It was common knowledge that Rashbam wrote a commentary on the Torah, so Satanow could assume that people would believe Rashbam had also written a commentary on Psalms. His assumption proved correct and it took years before scholars decided that Rashbam's commentary on Psalms was really written by Satanow himself.⁶² However, as noted, Satanow was not really interested in hiding his identity completely. As in Imrei Binah, here also Satanow claims to have found an old partially destroyed manuscript, which he had to reconstruct for publishing. He wrote:

The manuscript from which I have copied was rotten; half pages and sometimes whole pages were missing. Therefore the reader should know that a lot of this

⁶¹Y. L. Ben Ze'ev, Hokhmat Yehoshua Ben Sirah (Breslau, 1798); Megilat Yehudit (Vienna, 1779).

⁶²D. Rosin, Perush Rashbam Al ha-Torah (Breslau, 1882), Introduction, p. xix.

commentary is mine. . . . In general, if the reader perceives a good thing he should attribute it to Rashbam, and if there is a mistake, it is mine.⁶³

Since the Zohar has numerous parts, Satanow may have assumed that people would accept the existence of one more part, namely, his Zohar Tinyana. People were still deeply immersed in the Cabbalah at that time, and it was possible to influence them by expressing modern ideas in Cabbalistic form. That may also have been the reason for commenting on The Child's Prophecy. He probably could not resist the temptation to prove that this kind of style was also within his reach, even though he was opposed to writing in Aramaic, on principle.⁶⁴

In the second category, Satanow attributed works to unknown writers only when he dealt openly with contemporary problems and ideas, and could not attribute their content or style to any known writer of the past. Imrei Binah which tried to harmonize Cabbalah and "Wisdom," and Divrei Rivot which in style reminds us of the Kuzari but deals basically with current issues, are important for understanding Satanow's ideology and together with Asaf will be treated in more detail in later chapters.

⁶³Ibid., p. 341 (A colophon giving a statement by the editor, namely, Satanow).

⁶⁴I. Satanow, Iggeret Beit ha-Tefillah (Berlin, 1773), p. 31(a).

The third group of books were those written under the name of his son, Dr. Scheinman. These are either polemics in which Satanow did not want to use his own name to defend his ideas as was the case with Minhat Biqqurim, or when his opinions sharply contradicted those of his contemporaries as was the case in 'mi-Darkhei ha-Lashon ve-ha-Melitza."⁶⁵ Perhaps his ideas, in the latter, of expanding the Hebrew language with Mishnaic vocabulary or foreign words were unacceptable to a generation which advocated the purification of the Hebrew language and the return to its classic origins. However, in the Meassef (Tevet, 1786) Hayim Keselin expressed similar views without any fear. Nevertheless Satanow preferred to preach his "radical" opinions under his son's name.

The books Yerushalayim and Har Tzion are lost.⁶⁶ We may only guess that they also might have included some controversial material which Satanow preferred not to publish under his own name. As far as the book on chemistry, which is also lost, is concerned, it is very possible that Scheinman who was a physician was really the main source of Satanow's knowledge of the subject.

⁶⁵I. Satanow, 'mi-Darkhei ha-Lashon ve-ha-Melitza," ha-Meassef (Berlin, 1788), pp. 85-87.

⁶⁶See p. 44.

Because of Satanow's habit of attributing his own writings to other people, it happened that he was suspected of writing books that he had no part in. In some cases there is no way of proving that he wrote or even participated in their composition. Such a book which, according to Satanow's own testimony, he was suspected of having written was Ein Mishpat. Satanow, however, completely denies that he had anything to do with that book. He maintains that he not only did not write it, but even refused to publish it, and did so only after Daniel Itzig put pressure on him.⁶⁷

It is easy to understand why Satanow was suspected of authoring Ein Mishpat. The book sharply criticizes the Meassfim for having abandoned the ideas of the founders. By this time his relations with the Meassfim had already deteriorated to an open quarrel.⁶⁸ Since he published the book and used it as a platform to advertise some of his other publications, his colleagues had every reason to suspect him of being its author.

Nevertheless, it seems that Satanow did not write Ein Mishpat. It is unlikely that he would have chosen to attribute it to a contemporary writer, a person who lived in Berlin and was well known.⁶⁹ It is clear that even though Satanow

⁶⁷Minhat Biggurim (Berlin, 1797), pp. 4(b), 27(a).

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹In Minhat Biggurim, pp. 4, 5, we read that Barash lived in Berlin and when he became disappointed with the policies of the Meassef he criticized the movement. Satanow speaks about him as though he is known to the public.

did not write the book, he basically sympathized with its criticism and quoted it quite extensively in his own Minhat Biqqurim.

Another book Satanow was suspected of contributing to was Besamim Rosh, which is now considered to be solely the product of Shaul Berlin (1740-1794).⁷⁰ Zunz suspected Satanow of having at least participated in its composition.⁷¹ Zinberg agrees with Zunz and adds some weak arguments of his own. Zinberg identified Satanow with Yitzhak di Molena, who allegedly copied Besamim Rosh, because the gimatria of Satanow and of di Molena are the same.⁷² But Satanow himself argues against attempts to prove authorship by gimatria, because it is not scientific.⁷³ Satanow was very careful to avoid any conflict with the orthodoxy of his time. He never went to extremes, even in books he attributed to others. We also know that even with his forgeries it was always he, the real author, who brought the book to the press. In the case of Besamim Rosh, Berlin was the one who brought the book to press and not Satanow.⁷⁴ Satanow printed the book

⁷⁰M. Pelli, 'ha-Reforma ha-Datit shel . . . Sha'ul Berlin," HUCA, XLII (1971), 17. About S. Berlin see Zinberg's Toldot, V, 69, 72, 122, 125.

⁷¹L. Zunz, Die Synagogale Poesie, p. 226.

⁷²I. Zinberg, Toldot, p. 122.

⁷³Minhat Biqqurim, p. 6.

⁷⁴S. Berlin, Besamim Rosh (Berlin, 1793), front page.

and ardently supported its author or he would not have defended the authenticity of the book in his own Sefer ha-Galui,⁷⁵ but he did not write Besamim Rosh.

In addition, when one carefully examines Satanow's "library" it is clear that the literature of the early Poskim (Jurists) was not his field of interest. He was interested in the Poskim only in as far as they dealt with grammatical problems but not in their halakhic dealings. Only a man whose main concern and daily occupation was law and customs would choose a book of Poskim as a means of diffusing his opinions. Berlin was such a man and as noted, scholars generally now agree that Besamim Rosh was written by Berlin.

Satanow did not deny the authorship of his early works. These works are not as interesting to the modern reader as Satanow's "forgeries." The counterfeits reveal much more of his personality, his thought processes, his true concerns and interests and the extent of his talents. While he was frequently attacked for his fabrications, he was also praised by his contemporaries for the scholarly achievements in his acknowledged books.

The earliest work of Satanow that we have is Iggeret Eder ha-Yegar. It was intended as an introduction to a larger book but was published separately out of fear that in the

⁷⁵ According to a copy that was in Zeitlin's hands. See BHPM, p. 334.

meantime it might be lost.⁷⁶ Like many of Satanow's early writings, the book contains a variety of topics ranging from "wisdom," ethics, poetry, theory of literature, astronomy and geometry to a description of the temple structure as presented in Ezekiel.

Sefer ha-Hizzayon is also an eclectic work. In it Satanow tried for the first time in modern Hebrew to discuss a theory of literature.⁷⁷ The rest of the book deals with sciences, grammar, ethics, poems, knowledge and ignorance, etc. Satanow promised to publish a second volume of Sefer ha-Hizzayon, but it never appeared. Sefer ha-Middot was apparently intended to be a sequel of Sefer ha-Hizzayon.⁷⁸ In the beginning of Sefer ha-Middot he introduces the same characters as in Sefer ha-Hizzayon, however, its style and content show that the two books have nothing to do with each other.

Sefer ha-Galui ve-he-Hatum is a prospectus of several books which provides bibliographical information about Satanow himself. Some of this information appears nowhere

⁷⁶ Iggeret Eder ha-Yeqar, p. 27(b).

⁷⁷ Earlier works in the theory of Hebrew literature were M. Ibn Ezra, Shirat Yisrael (Jerusalem, 1967); Y. Messer-Leon, Nofet Zufim (Jerusalem, 1971); M. H. Luzzato, Leshon Limmudim (Mantua, 1727).

⁷⁸ Sefer ha-Middot, p. 99.

else. It also contains some of Satanow's views on the history of the Hebrew language, a view which he took from the Kuzari. Following Yehudah Ha-Levi,⁷⁹ Satanow says:

. . . after the destruction of the tower of Babel, we received the chosen language . . . but since we ceased to speak it, the language was forgotten and nobody knows anymore how to speak it in a pure manner.⁸⁰

In spite of this statement, Satanow considers himself as the reviver of pure Hebrew.⁸¹ Noteworthy is the fact that in Sefer ha-Galui Satanow strongly defends the authenticity of Besamim Rosh, claiming that it was really written by Rabbi Asher.⁸² No wonder then that he was suspected of being involved himself.

Satanow's later books were no longer conglomerates and their structure was more consistent. Of those, Sefer ha-Middot and Holekh Tamim belong to the category of ethics and learning. While the emphasis of Holekh Tamim is on the importance of learning, mentioning only briefly ethics and morals, the emphasis of Sefer ha-Middot, as its name implies, is more on ethics than on learning.

⁷⁹J. Ha-Levi, ha-Kuzari (Tel-Aviv: Mahbarot Le-Sifrut), II, 68.

⁸⁰I. Satanow, Sefer ha-Galui ve-he-Hatum (Berlin, 1784), Introduction.

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²According to W. Zietlin, BHPM, p. 334. I did not find it in the copy at the National Library in Jerusalem.

There is common agreement among students of Satanow that his best scholarly achievements are in the field of Hebrew grammar. He wrote books of formal grammar like Sefer ha-Shorashim with its four parts; Siftei Renanot, Safah Ahat, Sfat Emet, Devarim Ahadim, as well as books which include a substantial amount of grammatical material, but are not formal texts. For example, Iggeret Beit Tefillah is basically a criticism of the impure language of the prayer book. In it Satanow objects to the usage of foreign meters and Aramaic vocabulary. According to Zeitlin, Satanow also argued in it against the view of his contemporary, the grammarian Salman Hannau.⁸³ In the course of his polemics Satanow deals with many linguistical and grammatical problems. In the book Beit Tefillah Satanow compares language to sex, an idea he claims he found in Sefer Yetzira.⁸⁴ Both, he points out, are aimed at the perpetuation of the human race; the one does it spiritually and the other physically. Expanding on this idea, Satanow compares the maskil's desire to promulgate ideas to the sexual drive which causes the propagation of mankind.⁸⁵

⁸³ Ibid., p. 333. Satanow does not mention Hannau by name.

⁸⁴ Iggeret Beit Tefillah, pp. 6, 7.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

Si'ah Yitzhak and va-Ye'etar Yitzhak are also books which are primarily concerned with grammatical problems even though the first one deals with the Haggadah of Passover and the second with the prayer book.

We could also mention another acknowledged work of Satanow and that is a short poem Shir Yedidut, dedicated to his benefactor Daniel Itzig. It is a typical poem of flattery and praise which follows the literary tradition of the time.

A number of Satanow's books and articles have not been found. Whatever we know about them comes from remarks scattered in Satanow's own writings. These references will be quoted as each work is discussed. In the introduction to Megillat Hasidim there is an advertisement calling on subscribers to contribute money for publication of Sefer ha-Meturgeman. The two parts book is described as follows:

The first part is the Meturgeman itself,⁸⁶ with the addition of many roots that the rishonim (first commentators) overlooked. The second part is a commentary both on the first part and on Targum Yerushalmi.⁸⁷ The book will contribute to a better understanding of the translations and those who study the Zohar will also be enlightened by it and will be able to understand everything in the Zohar which is written in Aramaic.⁸⁸

⁸⁶The translation of the Bible into Aramaic. (Meturgeman-Translator).

⁸⁷About Aramaic translations to the Bible see M. Z. Segal, Mavo ha-Miqra (Jerusalem, 1967), IV, 947-973.

⁸⁸Megillat Hasidim, Introduction.

As Megillat Hasidim (1802) is Satanow's last known published work, and he already was sick and blind when it was printed, thus it appears that Sefer ha-Meturgeman was never published and the manuscript was probably lost.

Other books which dealt with commentaries and language were a Commentary on the Torah and a Commentary on the Book of Jonah. In Sefer ha-Middot (1784) Satanow mentioned "my commentary on the Torah."⁸⁹ On the other hand, in Sefer ha-Galui he mentioned a "Commentary on the twenty four holy books."⁹⁰ Satanow speaks about these commentaries as though he had already finished them, but we were unable to find any trace of them. Nor is it completely clear whether the commentary on the twenty-four books is his or someone else's. If, as is implied, this commentary is his, then why does he have to single out the other two by name (Torah and Jonah). Perhaps he planned to write a commentary on all the twenty-four books of the Bible but had completed commentaries only on the Torah, Job and Jonah as well as the pseudo-epigraphic commentary on the Psalms. The commentary on the Torah and the one on Jonah,⁹¹ mentioned in the first introduction to the book of Job, must have remained in manuscript and were

⁸⁹ Sefer ha-Middot, p. 26.

⁹⁰ Sefer ha-Galui, last page.

⁹¹ Job (Berlin, 1799), introduction.

lost. Another lost commentary is Sefer Toledot Yitzhaq which is mentioned in Sefer ha-Galui and is described as follows: ". . . a beautiful enlightening commentary on the tractate of Avot."⁹² It seems that he also composed an ethical work which was lost. In Sefer ha-Middot when he speaks about spiritual joy he adds ". . . as was mentioned in Ma'amar Hayei ha-Hitbonenut."⁹³

Among his scientific works there is a book of chemistry attributed to Scheinman. It is mentioned in the first introduction to the book of Job and is described as "explaining potash."⁹⁴ There is no other trace of this book.

Satanow twice mentions that he published the book of Euclid in Hebrew translation. He mentions it first in Sefer ha-Hizzayon: ". . . Euclid was translated from a foreign language, to teach the sons of Judah geometry in an easy language."⁹⁵ He refers to the book again in Sefer ha-Galui: "Euclid was translated from foreign languages and is a very important book."⁹⁶ When Sefer ha-Hizzayon was published (1775) Barukh of Shklov's translation of Euclid was not yet

⁹²Sefer ha-Galui, p. 3.

⁹³Sefer ha-Middot, p. 186.

⁹⁴Job (Berlin, 1799), 1st introduction.

⁹⁵Sefer ha-Hizzayon, p. 70(a).

⁹⁶Sefer ha-Galui, p. 3.

in print.⁹⁷ There were, however, other Hebrew translations of Euclid.⁹⁸ Yet, Satanow does not make clear which translation he used.

In the introduction to the book of Job, Satanow counts among his publications la-Yesharim Tehilah "poems by Luzzato." As mentioned, the only Berlin edition we were able to find was one by Shlomo Dubno.⁹⁹ Unless Satanow considered this one to be his we must conclude that his own was lost.

Two other books may also be classified "forgeries," which were lost. On the last page of Ein Mishpat by Barash there is a list of books about to be published. Two are attributed to Scheinman. The first which is Yerushalayim, deals with the soul and its faculties and consists of twelve sections, one for each of the tribes of Israel.¹⁰⁰ The second, Har Tziyon, is a conglomerate of "questions and answers in matters of research containing also articles and poems."¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ Euclid, Uclidos, trans. by Barukh of Shklov (The Hague, 1780).

⁹⁸ Cf. M. Steinschneider, Die Hebrä'ische Übersetzungen Des Middlealters und Die Juden Als Dolmetscher (Gratz, 1956), pp. 504-506.

⁹⁹ M. H. Luzzato, la-Yesharim Tehilah, Introduction by S. Dubno (Berlin, 1780).

¹⁰⁰ I. Zinberg, Toldot, vol. 5, p. 313, note 18.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

From an historical point of view, the missing Iggeret Emeq Yehoshafat would probably have been the most interesting to the modern reader. This work apparently dealt with innovative commentaries on the Bible giving new interpretations to the "mitzvot." It must also have dealt with Sabbatianism or its offspring Frankism since the reference appears in the midst of anti-Sabbatianic writings and assaults on this sect. The reference to the book is as follows:

He who comments on the Scripture without also referring to the full passage is capable of turning good into evil in his commentary, according to his own ideas. We have already spoken at length about this matter in Iggeret Emeq Yehoshafat.¹⁰²

Satanow's lost books seem to have dealt with most of the same ideas as his other books, namely, grammar and language, philosophy, science and ethics. Satanow himself may have considered these books less important than his other works and may therefore not have been too eager to publish them. Most of them apparently remained in manuscript and eventually were lost.

We have put commentaries and new editions in one category because it is difficult to differentiate between them. Satanow hardly ever reprinted a work without adding something of his own to it, either in the form of a commentary or by what he called a correction in the original

¹⁰² Sefer ha-Middot, p. 90.

text. Like his own writings, Satanow's reprints are, to a certain extent, indicative of his main fields of interest: philosophy, science and ethics, Cabbalah, grammar, poetry and language. Thus, he reprinted Maimonides' Moreh Nevukhim¹⁰³ with the commentary of Shlomo Maimon on the first part and his own on the other two; the Be'ur Millot ha-Higgayon with Mendelssohn's commentaries and his own corrections. He also brought out a new edition of Ha-Levi's ha-Kuzari with a commentary of his own and Aristotle's Ethics.

Books of a philosophical nature were quoted by Satanow extensively in his writings and some of them also served as models for his own works. For example, he wrote a book of Ethics modeled after that of Aristotle; his book Divrei Rivot was influenced by the Kuzari and some of its arguments are taken from Azaria de Rossi's Me'or Einavim which he also reissued.¹⁰⁴ Others were taken from Shevet Yehudah by Ibn Verga.¹⁰⁵ Even though the book does not appear in his library, he seemed to be familiar with it.

¹⁰³ See about Satanow and Moreh Nevukhim, p. 52.

¹⁰⁴ In Divrei Rivot there is a discussion between a king and a Jew, following the pattern of the Kuzari and historical discussions like in Me'or Einavim.

¹⁰⁵ S. Ibn Verga, Shevet Yehudah (Jerusalem, 1947) about conversion, p. 21; about antisemitism, p. 30; about luxury, p. 48.

Satanow incorporated some eighteenth century ideas in all of his commentaries,¹⁰⁶ not only in his commentaries on medieval philosophical works, but also in his commentaries on Biblical books.¹⁰⁷ Those included a commentary on the Torah which he merely refers to¹⁰⁸ and which he may never really have written, and a commentary on the book of Jonah which is lost. However, we do have two of his commentaries on Biblical books one under his own name and the other attributed to Rashbam. The first is the commentary on the book of Job. Satanow tells us that he chose to comment on the book of Job because this particular book is of interest to maskilim. It raises questions that every maskil should ask, and its answers are also the answers in the spirit of the enlightenment, namely, that knowledge is the answer to almost anything and if one has no answer to a problem it only means that he has not yet reached the right level of knowledge.¹⁰⁹ His reason for writing a commentary on the Psalms is different. It seems that Satanow, after printing Brill's commentary on the psalms,¹¹⁰ was not satisfied with

¹⁰⁶ Thus in the midst of commentary on the belief of the philosopher we find a long physical explanation of the function of the sun, p. 2. In the midst of conversation about Hebrew poetry there are long discussions about pleasure, p. 32, mechanic, p. 40, etc.

¹⁰⁷ I. Satanow, Perush Rashbam, Introduction, chap. 7, sen. 23; chap. 150, sen. 6.

¹⁰⁸ See note 91.

¹⁰⁹ I. Satanow, Introduction to the book of Job.

¹¹⁰ Minhat Bikkurim, p. 41.

it and decided to publish one of his own without revealing his identity.

Being himself a poet with a tendency to hedonism,¹¹¹ Satanow chose to reprint works of two Italian poets known for the same tendencies. One was the Mahbarot of Immanuel of Rome, who lived at the end of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth, and the other was the Elleh Bnei ha-Ne'urim by Ephrayim Luzzato (1729-1792). Satanow was criticized for both publications because of his departures from the original text, including not only corrections, but also additions and omissions.¹¹² Satanow also claimed to have published la-Yesharim Tehilla by M. H. Luzzato¹¹³ but in the book Dubno is credited with publishing it.¹¹⁴ Satanow was probably merely the printer.

Many of the books which appears in Satanow's "library"¹¹⁵ were Cabbalistic books. In a later chapter we will discuss Satanow's attitude toward Cabbalah. At the moment it should be mentioned that he chose to reprint two Cabbalistic books by Vital. Friedberg believes that the

¹¹¹See last chapter.

¹¹²E. Luzzato, Elleh Bnei ha-Ne'urim (Vienna, 1829), Letteris' introduction; Immanuel, Mahbarot Immanuel (Berlin, 1926), ed. H. Brody, pp. 9, 10, 146.

¹¹³Sefer ha-Galui.

¹¹⁴See note 100.

¹¹⁵See p. 52.

reason for this choice was purely practical, that is, his wish to make money.¹¹⁶ However, an examination of the Cabbalistic books in his "library," his own books on Cabbalah and the Cabbalistic books he chose to print, suggests other reasons as well.

Satanow's third field of interest, grammar and language, was also expressed in his publications. As a matter of fact, his own book Siftei Renanot, the first part of Sefer ha-Gedarim was an abbreviation of Kimhi's book ha-Mikhlol. He also reprinted the Sefer ha-Gedarim of Menahem of Perpignan (Salonica, 1567) with his own corrections and grammatical commentaries on the book of prayers, the Passover Haggadah and the Selihot.

In sum each and every book which Satanow chose to reprint, republish or to comment upon, had a special place in his intellectual world. He used each as a model for his own writings or he borrowed ideas that he used in his own books. Sometimes the books served both purposes.

As an appendix to the works of Satanow the publisher, we should also mention some of his works as a printer which he himself publicized, namely, his printing of some specific works of his colleagues. Satanow mentioned the Four Letters by Wessely (1725-1805) of which the first one, Divrei Shalom

¹¹⁶H. Friedberg, Toledot ha-Defus, p. 61.

ve-Emet (1782) is considered to be the manifesto of the Haskalah, and whose ideas about education Satanow followed more than once.¹¹⁷ Another book that he mentioned was Reshit Linmudim (1788) by Barukh Lindau (1759-1849), a text-book written in the spirit of the ideology of the Haskalah. Also mentioned are Toledot ha-Rambaman by Euchel, Sefer ha-Nefesh by Mendelssohn (edited by Friedlander),¹¹⁸ a prayer by Friedlander and Masa be-Arav by Romanelli.¹¹⁹ As the printer of the Freischule, Satanow must have printed many more books than he chose to mention. Nevertheless, it appears that the above list and the book Ein Mishpat were the only books the content of which was close to his heart. We have already discussed the reason for his mentioning Ein Mishpat. As for the rest of the list it is interesting to note that each one of those books is an important part of the literature of the Haskalah. It also shows how acute was Satanow's sense and understanding of what was really important in the Hebrew literature of the time.

In Satanow's numerous books, articles, commentaries and introductions to new editions he mentions names of many writers and books whom he either quotes or disputes. A

¹¹⁷See p. 90.

¹¹⁸A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn (Univ. of Alabama Press, 1973), p. 181.

¹¹⁹Sefer ha-Galui.

study of those names may give us some insights into Satanow's intellectual life, what languages he knew and which, if any, of the contemporary writers (Jewish and Gentile) made an impact on him. The task of compiling a list of those books and writers is complicated by the fact that Satanow quite often used abbreviations of names, initials of books and writers, names of books without names of authors, etc., as was the practice in Hebrew writing of the time. Nevertheless, it is possible to reconstruct a catalogue of Satanow's so-called library, that is, a list of books and authors with whom he was so familiar that he mentioned them in his own writings. It seems that most of the books can be arranged in three categories:

- a) Philosophical, ethical and scientific works
- b) Grammatical, linguistic and legalistic works
- c) Cabbalistic works.

Legalistic works as well as commentaries were included in the second category because, in spite of their legalistic or commentative nature, Satanow used them only for their linguistic and grammatical contributions. Except for two or three books in each category which will be discussed later, most of the names in the catalogue appeared only once or twice. A complete list of the books appears in the appendix.

The books most frequently mentioned by Satanow deal with language and grammar. He was interested in language

and grammar in general, and in the language and the grammar of the prayer book in particular. A substantial number of books in his "library" are books that deal with the language of the prayers. Even those books whose primary concern is with legalistic problems are used by Satanow as vehicles to prove his views about the correct grammatical forms of words in the prayer book. Books that belong to the category of philosophy, ethics and science appear most frequently and in almost all of his writings. Consequently, one may say that while books of language and grammar were used by Satanow to enrich his knowledge of the field, books of philosophy and ethics enlarged his intellectual horizons. In this category are Aristotle and Maimonides, the two most quoted writers.

The study of Maimonides' Moreh Nevukhim has always represented the tendency toward rationalism in the Jewish world.¹²⁰ In modern times it was one of the first books the maskilim turned to for spiritual guidance,¹²¹ and it became the intellectual guide for Satanow in particular. He quoted it extensively and reprinted it with the commentary of S. Maimon, another great admirer of Maimonides. Since Maimon had written a commentary to only the first part

¹²⁰I. Barzilay, "The Ideology of the Berlin Haskalah," PAAJR, XXV (New York, 1956), 5.

¹²¹S. Maimon, Autobiography, pp. 60-61; S. Braz, "Toldot Rabenu Moshe ben Maimon," ha-Meassef (1786), III, 19-27, 38-47.

of the Moreh¹²² Satanow undertook the task of writing a commentary to the other two parts.¹²³ Satanow also mentioned Maimonides' Yad Hazakah¹²⁴ and Shemona Perakim¹²⁵ as well as Be'ur Millot ha-Higgayon¹²⁶ which he republished together with Mendelssohn's commentaries.¹²⁷ However, none of these books were as important to him or to his generation as Moreh Nevukhim.

The other most quoted writer in Satanow's works is Aristotle. However, only one book of Aristotle is quoted constantly and that is the book of Ethics. We know that Satanow read Aristotle's book of Ethics in the medieval Hebrew translation of Rabbi Meir Alguadez,¹²⁸ because he published it in his capacity as the director of the Berlin Freischule

¹²² Maimonides, Moreh Nevukhim, ed. by I. Euchel (Berlin, 1791), part one.

¹²³ Ibid., part 2, 3.

¹²⁴ va-Ye'etar, Introduction, p. 3.

¹²⁵ Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 40, commentary 24.

¹²⁶ Holekh Tamim (Berlin, 1795), p. 9(a).

¹²⁷ Maimonides, Be'ur Millot ha-Higgayon, Satanow's ed. (Berlin, 1794).

¹²⁸ Aristotle, Sefer ha-Middot, trans. by Meir Alguadez (Lemberg, 1867; Berlin, 1790). Satanow published this book with his own commentaries in Berlin, 1790.

printing house.¹²⁹ That, together with the fact that he also wanted to reprint the book of Elements of Euclid in a Hebrew translation, leads us to believe that whatever he knew about the Greek classics in general and Aristotle in particular was learned through Hebrew translations.

Satanow obviously was aware of the ideas of non-Jewish writers of his time since he frequently alluded to contemporary ideas and scientific discoveries.¹³⁰ But, the scarcity of references in Satanow's catalogue to contemporary Gentile writers, suggests that he did not read the works just as he did not read the classics in the original or he would have hinted at it. It should be mentioned that in his disputes with the Meassfim, Satanow claimed that they prevented him from publishing the book of Psalms with a German translation, implying that it was his own translation.¹³¹ He also hinted that he translated the book of Job to German.¹³² In his calls for reforms in Jewish education he advocated the study of foreign languages.¹³³ He also published a

¹²⁹See chapter I.

¹³⁰See his commentary on ha-Kuzari, p. 32.

¹³¹Minhat Biggurim, p. 4(b).

¹³²I. Satanow, Commentary on the book of Job, front page. According to Zeitlin in Biblioteca, p. 336, the German translation is not Satanow's.

¹³³See p. 93.

lexicon of German and Hebrew words, but in spite of all this evidence, a mere glance at the catalogue of his library, convinces us that he did not read foreign languages. It seems that the only language (besides his mother tongue which was Yiddish) that this Podolian Jew mastered was Hebrew. He probably knew some Polish since he needed it in his trade in Poland. He could also probably converse in German, as he lived in Berlin for forty years, was a frequent visitor at Mendelssohn's house where German was the spoken language among the enlightened visitors, and also translated part of Mendelssohn's Phaedon into Hebrew calling it Sefer ha-Nefesh.¹³⁴ Nevertheless, it seems that he never acquired in German the proficiency Mendelssohn had or the proficiency he himself had in Hebrew.

As noted, Satanow's "catalogue" included almost exclusively works in Hebrew. Except for Aristotle and Euclid, the only other known Gentile writers that he mentioned were Newton and Leibnitz in reference to science,¹³⁵ Toussaint is mentioned in regard to ethics,¹³⁶ and "the wise man" Krigor is quoted as asserting that at the time of the Bible there

¹³⁴I. Satanow, Sefer ha-Nefesh (Berlin, 1784). The original Sefer ha-Nefesh by Mendelssohn, ed. by D. Friedlander, was published by the latter in 1787. See A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn, p. 181.

¹³⁵Gam Elleh, second introduction.

¹³⁶Minhat Bikkurim, p. 11. About Toussaint see P. Hazard, European Thought, pp. 96, 115.

was more than one flood,¹³⁷ again a scientific matter. None of the authors' books were mentioned and it is apparent that Satanow heard about their theories but did not read any of their works. This leads us to believe that Satanow did not know foreign languages well enough.

Looking at the "catalogue" we also realize that there are very few contemporary Hebrew writers that Satanow mentions by name. Moses Mendelssohn, for example, the "lighthouse," of the Hebrew Haskalah, is mentioned only four times. Wessely, the "great Melitz" is mentioned only twice. One can explain that by saying that Mendelssohn was basically a German writer while Satanow read mainly in Hebrew, but that is certainly not the case with Wessely who wrote in Hebrew and even composed a poem in honor of Satanow. Some Meassfim with whom Satanow had grievances he mentions by name,¹³⁸ as well as Jacob Emden with whom he argues about the authenticity of the Zohar.¹³⁹ But even those people are not mentioned more than once or twice and then only to dispute them, never to admit to their influence.

¹³⁷Minhat Biqqurim, p. 11. I was not able to identify Krigor through other sources.

¹³⁸In Minhat Biqqurim, pp. 7, 28, he mentions the Comedies and Mahberet Avtalion by Wolfsohn, and on p. 41, the Commentaries by Brill.

¹³⁹I. Satanow, Zohar Tinyana, last page.

Satanow's reason for ignoring his contemporaries might be found in his own explanations of his forgeries. Among other things he claimed that the Jewish people do not have enough respect for contemporary writers even if what they write is wise and correct.¹⁴⁰ So Satanow preferred to quote by name writers of the past to enhance his credibility. Thus, even though there is no doubt that Satanow, being the publisher and printer of the Berlin Freischule, must have read everything that was published there, yet, he did not consider these writings authoritative enough to quote them by name, and that is why we do not find them in his library.

Most of the Hebrew writers that are mentioned by Satanow are from the medieval and early modern periods. They are mainly Polish and Italian writers. The only contemporary writer who is frequently mentioned and with whom Satanow almost always agrees is Jacob Emden and his book Lu'ah Eres.¹⁴¹ He quotes this book quite often when he discusses the language of the prayer book.

Satanow was familiar with almost all of the classical literature of the Cabbalah. In a following chapter we will

¹⁴⁰ See his commentary on ha-Kuzari, p. 1(a).

¹⁴¹ I. Satanow, va-Ye'etar Yitzhak, pp. 38, 44, 70. Lu'ah Eres (Atona, 1769) deals with the grammar of the Prayer Book, and polemics against S. Z. Hannau.

discuss his attitude toward Cabbalah, but in the meantime we can already say that there is no doubt that Cabbalah was a very important part of his spiritual world. Whether he believed in it or not, the fact remains that he was well read in its literature and as a result acquired its special vocabulary and terminology. He quotes Cabbalistic works for two purposes: To support his opinion about grammatical matters,¹⁴² and to achieve a compromise between Cabbalah and knowledge.¹⁴³ What Maimonides tried to do with Aristotelian philosophy, he undertook with regard to Cabbalah.

This chapter dealt with Satanow's works only from a bibliographical aspect. Therefore, the contents of some of his books were described very briefly. The substance of his writings will be dealt with in the following chapters in which Satanow's ideology and his way of thought as revealed in his writings will be analyzed and discussed.

¹⁴² Ibid., pp. 10, 49, 50.

¹⁴³ I. Satanow, Lurei Binah, front page.

CHAPTER III

SATANOW: RATIONALIST AND REFORMER

Satanow's writings reflect the eighteenth century era of rationalism, and they reflect his admiration for "wisdom" literature in general and science in particular. His approach to life as revealed in his writings is a rationalistic one. Like his Gentile contemporaries, he tries to analyze the relationships between man and mankind and the relationship between Jews and non-Jews and the state. He mildly criticizes religion and concludes that the remedy for all evil is to be found in a proper education. Like his contemporaries, both Jewish and non-Jewish, Satanow devoted much of his thought and writings to the need for reform in education and in the socio-economic and political situation of the Jews.

Knowledge and Science

"Wisdom" in general and science in particular were greatly admired in the eighteenth century. Indeed, to a great extent, modern science has its roots in that period. At that time many scholars followed the tradition of the Renaissance, and the ideal of the universality of human knowledge. For example, Leibnitz, who probably was the

outstanding philosopher of the time, is also known as the discoverer of calculus. Isaac Newton, the mathematician, also wrote philosophical treatises. Authors and poets like Dryden and Pope also mention and describe scientific phenomena. The same is true of Montesquieu, Diderot, Rousseau, Voltaire and many others.¹

The Jewish maskil Isaac Satanow was no exception. His works are permeated with admiration for secular knowledge, and scientific details are scattered throughout most of his books. In Holekh Tamim (Berlin, 1795) he stated that man's superiority over animals is based on man's ability to acquire wisdom and science.² The eighth chapter of Mishlei Asaf imitates the eighth chapter of the book of Proverbs which is a hymn to wisdom.³ Satanow's definition of wisdom is as follows:

. . . Anyone who explains phenomena in terms of causes and consequences is wise. Understanding is the intellectual deduction of one thing from another without having precise and complete knowledge. Wisdom is the combination of thorough understanding with previous knowledge.⁴

¹P. Smith, A History of Modern Culture, II, 141.

²Holekh Tamim, p. 4.

³Mishlei Asaf, ch. 8. Bible; Proverbs, ch. 8.

⁴Imrei Binah, p. 7.

Satanow's arguments on behalf of wisdom and science were primarily directed toward the Hebrew-reading orthodox Jews who were suspicious of ideas and ideologies acquired from the non-Jewish world. Satanow divided this audience into two groups. The one he called Mordei Or, rejectors of light, and he considered them beyond redemption. He felt there was no use trying to convince them, because to do so was a waste of time and possibly dangerous.⁵ The other group was the more liberal orthodox Jews. Other Jewish writers drew similar distinctions.⁶

It was the liberal orthodox Jews that Satanow hopes to convince that enlightenment and wisdom were not contradictory to religion. He argued that "The source of the Torah is wisdom and the Torah is also based on research."⁷ Not only are wisdom and religion mutually not exclusive, but they are actually very much interrelated. He tries to prove this theory throughout most of the second part of Divrei Rivot (Berlin, 1800?). In Gam Elleh Mishlei Asaf, he wrote:

⁵Satanow, Gam Elleh Mishlei Asaf (Berlin, 1792), Ch. 69, sen. 9-10; Ch. 73, commentary to sen. 22.

⁶Lazarus Bendavid, Etwas zur Charakteristik der Juden (Leipzig, 1793), p. 47ff; Aaron Wolfsohn, Jeschurun (Breslau, 1804), pp. 111-116; David Friedlander, Sendschriften . . . an Teller (Berlin, 1799); Isaac Euchel, in ha-Meassef (Berlin, 1788), Introduction, p. 1.

⁷I. Satanow, Divrei Rivot, II (Berlin, 1800?), 14.

"Religion and knowledge are desirable because they both reflect truth and justice."⁸ Therefore, each person should inquire and search for wisdom.⁹ Every generation has the right to its own interpretation of the Torah according to its understanding based on the newly acquired wisdom.¹⁰ Also the sages of the past understood the importance and necessity of research for a true understanding of the law and said that "It is desirable to examine and probe with wisdom everything done in the name of religion."¹¹ In his book Holekh Tamim, Satanow upholds the value of "wisdom" by quotations from the Bible and subsequent authorities.¹² Religious law, he argues, should be adhered to in the way prescribed by tradition, while secular knowledge must be the subject of the human intellect and research.¹³

⁸ Gam Elleh, Ch. 64, sen. 15-16.

⁹ Divrei Rivot, II, 19.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 54.

¹² I. Satanow, Holekh Tamim, p. 7. Years later this approach was used with greater thoroughness and success by Isaac Baer Levinson of Russia in T'uda be-Yisrael (Vilna, 1828).

¹³ Holekh Tamim, p. 9. Satanow's approach to the problem of the relationship between religion and secular knowledge is reminiscent of the approach of the medieval and Renaissance protagonists of the "double truth" doctrine. See E. Cassirer, The Renaissance Philosophy of Man (Chicago, (continued on next page)

Aware of orthodoxy's fear that secular wisdom would undermine and harm religion,¹⁴ Satanow tried to lessen and assuage that fear. He admits there are people who while pretending to be enlightened forsake the Torah; however, these people, he declares, are really ignoramuses who are neither familiar with secular knowledge nor do they even know Hebrew. They pretend to be wise and like to be called philosophers, but they are neither. One should not avoid "wisdom" because of these deviators.¹⁵ Satanow argues that religious people who abandoned religion after acquiring wisdom were not fit for this wisdom in the first place. Their deviation was their fault and not the fault of wisdom as some mistakenly think.¹⁶ Satanow disagreed with those who maintain that religion and wisdom cannot coexist, implying thereby as if religion was only meant for fools. Such a view

13 (continued)

1948), p. 12. Also E. Gilson, Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages (New York, 1938), pp. 67-99. Like Isaac Albalog of the thirteenth century, Eliyahu Delmedigo of the fifteenth and Yashar of Candia of the seventeenth century, Satanow thought that faith and philosophy must be separated. See I. Zinberg, Toldot, pp. 90-100; J. Guttman, Philosophy of Judaism (Hebrew), trans. by Y. H. Barukh (Jerusalem, 1951), pp. 184, 234, 236.

¹⁴I. Satanow, Holekh Tamim, p. 1.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 2.

¹⁶Ibid.

he thought leads to heresy.¹⁷ God created wisdom and one cannot suspect God of creating anything in vain.¹⁸ He expected people to make use of wisdom,¹⁹ and that is why the greatest of our rabbis and prophets acquired wisdom. One should follow their example,²⁰ because anybody who hates wisdom hates also the creator of wisdom, God.²¹

Following the trends of the time,²² Satanow blamed the clergy for impeding the advance of secular learning. According to him, the clergy opposed rationalism for two reasons: because it leads people to heresy, and secondly, because rationalism negates the belief in miracles.²³ It is interesting to note that throughout his writing Satanow refuted the first charge, that of heresy, but failed to argue against the second complaint. It is possible that he himself rejected miracles but found it too dangerous to admit it.

¹⁷I. Satanow, Sefer ha-Hizzayon (Berlin, 1775), p. 6.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁹I. Satanow, Mishlei Asaf (Berlin, 1789), Ch. 25, sen. 12.

²⁰Hizzayon, pp. 8-9.

²¹Ibid.

²²I. Barzilay, "The Ideology of the Berlin Haskalah," PAAJR (New York, 1956), p. 12.

²³I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 41.

The problem of miracles was frequently discussed in earlier Hebrew sources²⁴ as well as in contemporary literature.²⁵

The clergy only allowed practical wisdom for the daily benefits of man, such as learning a trade in order to earn a living and to enable a person to choose the proper religion.²⁶

Satanow compared the clerical viewpoint on wisdom to that of an enlightened person and found, of course, that the view of the enlightened person had a much broader outlook than that of the naive believer. An enlightened person sees the benefits of wisdom both in its practical as well as its intellectual contributions to man.²⁷ The practical use of wisdom is in its ability to help man conduct himself in a proper way, as well as help him to acquire a livelihood. Wisdom contributes to man intellectually by enabling him to study natural phenomena.²⁸ Consistent with his time, Satanow believed that the intellect is the highest expression of man²⁹ and wisdom enables him to develop that intellect.

²⁴J. Guttman, Philosophy of Judaism, pp. 58, 65, 75-77, 125, 158, 172; I. Barzilay, Between Reason and Faith (Mouton, 1967), pp. 38-39, 48, 70, 82, 94-99, 100, 203.

²⁵B. Spinoza, Theologie-Political Treatise, trans. by R. H. M. Elwes (New York, 1951), Ch. 6; M. Mendelssohn, Jerusalem and Other Jewish Writings, pp. 130-132.

²⁶I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 12.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 12-13.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Ibid., p. 13.

Following ancient and medieval concepts, Satanow compares wisdom to God.³⁰ Just as all believers recognize the existence of God, even though there may be differences among them in their understanding of His essence and Will, equally everyone admits the existence of wisdom though people may differ in their view of its essence. Some believe that the essence of wisdom is piety, others consider cleverness as its essence while the ignorant call their ignorance wisdom.³¹

Since wisdom is the goal, its sources are irrelevant. Like Rabbi Meir who justified his studying with the heretic, Elisha b. Avuya,³² Satanow says:

Buy pearls from whoever sells them and knowledge from whoever is knowledgeable. Respect wisdom and ask for it from anybody, whether he is important or not.³³ The light of the candle of intellect which lightens the darkness through wisdom does not increase if it is lightened by a pious man, and does not decrease if it is held by a criminal . . . as Maimonides said . . . when it comes to truth I do not care if it was said by a prophet or by a Samaritan. The sages also said that the truth should be accepted from whoever tells it . . . the rabbis also said 'who is a wise man? One who learns from everybody.'³⁴

³⁰I. Satanow, Imrei Binah (Berlin, 1784), p. 6. See also Joseph Kaspi's commentary to Maimonides, Moreh Nevukhim (Solomon Werbluner publication, 1848), p. 98.

³¹Imrei Binah, p. 6.

³²It was said about R. Meir that he found a pomegranate, ate its inside and threw away its outside. See Hagigah 15:10.

³³I. Satanow, Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 1, commentary on sen. 10.

³⁴I. Satanow, Sefer ha-Middot (Berlin, 1784), p. 105. See Avot 4:1.

Wisdom is the dividing line between man and animal and the tie which connects all human beings. What unites members of different religions are their parallel attempts to learn and understand the acts of God in the world. This is the heart of wisdom.³⁵

Satanow also sought to explain the relationship between wisdom and knowledge on the one hand and piety on the other. He admitted that piety must come before wisdom, but, nevertheless, wisdom is the ultimate goal of piety.³⁶ Piety is the teaching of man while wisdom is the teaching of God.³⁷ Satanow revealed his true self when he leveled criticism against piety, claiming that the pious shy away from research out of fear that it may harm their belief in God³⁸ and forgetting that the sages also advocated secular wisdom. According to Satanow, the Talmudic opinion forbidding people to study "Greek Wisdom"³⁹ referred to Greek mythology only but not the study of logic.⁴⁰ The sages themselves were

³⁵I. Satanow, Holekh Tamim, p. 3.

³⁶I. Satanow, Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 1, commentary to sen. 10.

³⁷I. Satanow, Megillat Hasidim (Berlin, 1802), Ch. 4, commentary on sen. 1.

³⁸I. Satanow, Rivot, II, 58.

³⁹Sota; 49, Baba Kama; 82.

⁴⁰I. Satanow, Hizzayon, p. 7.

familiar with the science of their time. Their use of scientific names for animals, as well as the Levites' knowledge of music proves this point.⁴¹ Thus, it was not secular knowledge that was forbidden by the sages but its misuse. Wisdom and particularly inquiry were even advocated by the rabbis and many of them used scientific methods in their efforts to explain matters of tradition.⁴²

Satanow is fascinated by science. In Divrei Rivot he enumerates some of the areas of study that he advises people to pursue. He includes in his list politics, geometry, hydrology, optics, astronomy, dioptrics, logic and medicine.⁴³ In whole chapters of his Megillat Hasidim he preaches the importance of acquiring wisdom and the learning of science. The sciences recommended most frequently were optics, hydrostatics and chemistry.⁴⁴ He devotes portions of Asaf to a description of the various branches of science as well as to the praise of science in general.⁴⁵ The book Eder ha-Yegar explains among other things the

⁴¹Ibid., p. 34.

⁴²Imrei Binah, p. 10.

⁴³Rivot, I, 49.

⁴⁴Megillat Hasidim, Ch. 44, commentary 8-13.

⁴⁵Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 5, commentary 19; Ch. 6, commentary 2; Ch. 7, commentary 7; Ch. 8, commentary 19-21; Ch. 38, commentary 28; Ch. 49, sen. 8.

qualities of parallel lines and discusses the movement of the moon and the moon's spots.⁴⁶ In Megillat Hasidim Satanow explains the function of a prism, the physical qualities of light and the way a magnet works.⁴⁷ Sefer ha-Middot which is basically a book of ethics also deals with hydraulics, optics, the telescope, the Milky Way, the reflection of light and the earth's gravitation.⁴⁸ Satanow was very much interested in medicine. He describes blood circulation, the causes of fainting, and compares mental and physical illnesses.⁴⁹ He believes that the cause of mental illness is physical, namely, the lack or surplus of certain elements in the body.⁵⁰ Satanow also discusses the structure of the eye, and compares the process of digestion to the work of the alchemist.⁵¹

Scientific details appear in all his major works. In Imrei Binah (1784) he discusses light, the prism, and the the phenomenon of the camera obscura. He explains that

⁴⁶Iggeret Eder ha-Yeqar (Berlin, 1772), pp. 14-16.

⁴⁷Megillat Hasidim, Ch. 29, commentary 1; Ch. 37, commentary 5.

⁴⁸Middot, pp. 92-93.

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 116, 122, 125.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 205. His opinion is in harmony with the theory of the humors.

⁵¹Middot, p. 165.

phenomenon in both scientific and cabbalistic terms.⁵² In Zemirot Asaf he describes light and sound waves⁵³ as well as some of the popular scientific experiments of his time.⁵⁴ He also explains how the limbs of animals fit their natural function in nature;⁵⁵ he writes about geology, the equator, the poles, units of time, the seasons of the year,⁵⁶ the rotation of the globe, its orbit,⁵⁷ the sun as the center of the universe, the existence of other suns and other universes, the gravitation of the earth and of other planets.⁵⁸ In Gam Elleh he speaks again about time, measurements, directions, movements, diameter, volume, the movements of the planets, distances between planets, the telescope, etc.⁵⁹ Satanow repeatedly tries to convince his readers that there is no harm in studying science. He asserts that the rabbis were also familiar with the sciences of their time. He claims the

⁵²Imrei Binah, pp. 16-17.

⁵³I. Satanow, Zemirot Asaf (Berlin, 1793), Ch. 31, commentary 27.

⁵⁴Ibid., Ch. 9, commentary 9.

⁵⁵Ibid., Ch. 9, commentary 15.

⁵⁶Ibid., Ch. 14, commentary 20.

⁵⁷Ibid., Ch. 31, commentary 14.

⁵⁸Ibid., Ch. 7, commentary 9.

⁵⁹I. Satanow, Gam Elleh, Ch. 54, commentary 9; Ch. 34, commentary 2.

rabbis knew about light reflection, colors, camera obscura, and perhaps even a little bit about gravitation.⁶⁰ He also explains that the reason the Temple was never hit by lightning was because the rabbis knew about the lightning rod and had one made of gold to protect it.⁶¹

Satanow's sources for all the scientific details scattered in his books probably came from the wealth of material available in this time of unprecedented interest in science.

If one probes a little further to find out the deeper causes of all the excitement, one soon realizes how serious was the nature of the work which the fashionable people merely took up to pass the time. The journals give so much space to reviews of books about science that it resembles a positive inundation. Books on physics, botany, medicine come along in ever growing numbers. But, owing to the rapid progress in their departments of knowledge, they are soon out of date and need to be replaced by new ones. And replaced they are. To this huge multitude of books, this mass of printed matter, all announcing some new discovery, the Academies fling wide their gates. . . .⁶²

Satanow probably did not read most scientific material in the original, since many of the scientific works of the period were written in English, French and in Latin. Satanow apparently knew none of these languages, or he would have

⁶⁰I. Satanow, Middot, p. 95.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 96.

⁶²P. Hazard, "Natural Science," European Thought, p. 133.

mentioned it in his writings. Yet, it may be assumed that the gist of these scientific discoveries was well known among maskilim, since many scientific articles appeared in the Meassef.⁶³ Another source of knowledge about new discoveries might have been his son Dr. Scheinman who, as a physician, probably knew other languages besides German, or possibly someone like Dr. Marcus Hertz who attended secular universities and was friendly with many people who were familiar with new discoveries.⁶⁴ Satanow also probably read popular journals and talked to people close to science, to familiarize himself with much of the new science of his time.

Hebrew was the only language in which Satanow was a true expert and from his "library" we see that he was very familiar with Hebrew writings. Thus, another important source of Satanow's knowledge of science were the Hebrew discussions of scientific subjects that existed at this time such as Zamosc's works in mathematics.⁶⁵ By the eighteenth century there were quite a few books dealing

⁶³ ha-Meassef (Nisan, 1784), pp. 120-124 (Tishrei, 1785), pp. 5-15 (Tishrei, 1789), pp. 3-9 and many more.

⁶⁴ Marcus Hertz lectured in Berlin about science. See Klausner, Historia, I, 35; Graetz, Divrei, IX, 95.

⁶⁵ M. Kayserling, Moses Mendelssohn (Leipzig, 1862), pp. 13-15. Also Tovia ha-Rofeh, Ma'ase Tovia (1681); cf. A. Schohat, Im Hilufei Tequfot, p. 241.

with science which were written in Hebrew⁶⁶ including Zemah David⁶⁷ by David Gans who in the introduction to the book wrote about geometry quoting Euclid, also the Elim⁶⁸ by Yashar of Candia which dealt with scientific discoveries of his time and there were also other contemporary scientific books in Hebrew.⁶⁹

In sum, though Satanow reflected the admiration for science and secular knowledge that characterized his time, his scientific knowledge was apparently limited. He wrote about various scientific discoveries in their popularized form. So one has to conclude that the sources were books on science in Hebrew, the scientific articles published in

⁶⁶J. Eschelbacher, "Die Anfänge allgemeiner Bildung unter den deutschen Juden vor Mendelssohn," Festschrift M. Philippson (no place given, 1916), p. 170.

⁶⁷D. Gans, Zemah David (1592; Warsaw, 1878).

⁶⁸J. S. Delmedigo, Elim (Amsterdam, 1628-29).

⁶⁹Other available scientific books in Hebrew were: A. Anshel b. Wolf Worms, Maft'e'ah ha-Algebra ha-Hadasha (Frankfurt am-Main, 1721); Refael Levi, Tekhnot Shamayim (Astronomy) (Altona, 1755); Gumpel Schnaber published in London an article under the name "Ma'amar ha-Torah ve-ha-Hokhma" in which he explains basic physics, mathematics and astronomy (ha-Meassef [1784], pp. 183-186); also Sefer Shvilei Rakia by Alihahu Hechis (Prague, 1784), Introduction to Sefer Merkevet ha-Mishneh by Shlomo of Chelm, Mlekhet Mahshevet by Eliyahu of Pinchev (Berlin, 1765); Sefer Kelil Heshbon by David Friesenhausen (Berlin, 1796); Or Olam and Beit Middot by J. L. Margolioth (1777); Amudei Shameyim by Barukh of Shklov (Berlin, 1766-67); Ma'ase Tovia by Tovia ha-Rofeh (Venice, 1707) and others. See also I. Barzilay, "The Background of the Berlin Haskalah," Essays on Jewish Life and Thoughts (New York, 1959), pp. 183-186.

ha-Meassef, or even discussions with learned people who were familiar with new discoveries.

Man and Society -- Jews and Society

In Divrei Rivot Satanow summarized his basic beliefs and views which reflect the thinking and attitude of the enlightenment: a) Man is free by nature; b) Every man ought to treat his fellow human beings fairly, regardless of religious views; c) A man should be allowed to dispose of his property however he wishes; d) A man cannot harm his body which is a part of the state, and is needed for the state's benefit, but his soul is free; e) A man should not force others to convert from one religion to another.⁷⁰

It is unlikely that Satanow ever read the works of John Locke or Henri Gregoire or other eighteenth century thinkers. Yet, their ideas penetrated his mind. These ideas belonged to "the spirit of the time."⁷¹ Ideas

⁷⁰I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 37. Some of these ideas are found in M. Mendelssohn's Jerusalem (Berlin, 1783) where he also quotes J. Locke's "Letter on Tolerance." See M. Mendelssohn, Jerusalem and Other Jewish Writings, trans. by A. Jospe (New York, 1969), pp. 15-18.

⁷¹More frequently than in any previous period, also the Jew was included in the thought of the time. See I. Barzilay, "The Jew in the Literature of the Enlightenment," JSS (New York, 1956); John Locke, in "A Letter Concerning Toleration" in The Works of John Locke, Vol. VI (London, 1823), 9, expressed the general idea that "the care of every man's soul belongs unto himself." Thus, in p. 59 he says "Neither a Pagan nor Mohammedan nor Jews ought to be excluded from
(continued on next page)

travelled and were discussed in enlightened circles, literary salons and cafes. Satanow was quick to transform the general subject of "man and society" into a more specific one, namely "Jews and society." Satanow was no doubt acquainted with the controversy around Dohm's book⁷² and indeed many of his arguments about Jews and society echo this book or Mendelssohn's. For example, in Divrei Rivot he practically quotes Dohm and Mendelssohn.

There should be no difference between Jews and natives of the country . . . let them (the Jews) be in all the king's domains. . . . I have said it once and I shall not change my words, each nation should be loyal to its God and that should be the only difference among nations. . . . The king should hand over honors to those who deserve them. He should not make any distinction among members of different peoples, because these privileges should not be given to a man just because of his religion . . . all the people in our country are of one kind and belong to one natural religion. Therefore, the only thing that will distinguish one person from the other should be wisdom and alertness. The more skillful one is the better. Whoever is great in wisdom and contributes of his talent and power to the political success (of the state) should earn respect.⁷³

71 (continued)

the civil rights of the commonwealth because of his religion." Henri Gregoire, in Essai sur la Regeneration Physique, Morale, et Politique des Juifs (Metz, 1789), pp. 111-112, said openly that the Jews, once emancipated, "will become attached to the state by ties of pleasure, liberty and life of ease."

⁷²About the controversy see Klausner, Historia, I, 76. Altman, Mendelssohn, pp. 459-461.

⁷³I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 40. These words are almost quotations from Christian Dohm, Concerning the Amelioration of the Civil Status of the Jews, trans. by H. Lederer (Cincinnati, 1957), pp. 10-14.

Satanow was aware of Gentile criticism of Jews and their arguments against granting civil rights to Jews because of their deficiencies⁷⁴ and even though sometimes he agrees with some aspects of this criticism, nevertheless he maintains: "I do not see any substantial difference between Jews and other nations; they are all human beings. . . ."⁷⁵ Satanow maintains the living conditions of the Jews are unhealthy. Like the physician who must find the cause of the illness then administer the medicine, with the Jews, the unhealthy situation which causes them to be sick should be eliminated.⁷⁶

Religion and Tolerance

Following his contemporaries,⁷⁷ Satanow tried to define the general function of religion. "Religion was created for the purpose of disseminating brotherhood among people and leading man the right path. Its aim is to increase love among people and not to teach them to hate a stranger."⁷⁸ "True religion helps nature to benefit mankind in cases where nature

⁷⁴C. Dohm, Concerning the Amelioration, pp. 9, 17, 19.

⁷⁵I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 41.

⁷⁶Ibid.

⁷⁷C. Dohm, Concerning the Amelioration, pp. 11, 12, 15. See also Mendelssohn's Jerusalem, pp. 66-68, 99-100; P. Hazard, European Thought, pp. 114, 115; P. Smith, A History of Modern Culture, II, 450-453.

⁷⁸I. Satanow, Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 31, sen. 10, 11.

by itself is incapable of doing so."⁷⁹ Satanow believed that religion has a very positive function. "Nothing is better and more sublime than religion. It makes life in our world more pleasant, and leads us to an eternal life in the next one."⁸⁰ Therefore one should not try to destroy religion or undermine it, not even by rationalism: One should not "use his understanding as a vehicle to destroy religion. The one who does it is a fool and an ignoramus. . . ."⁸¹ These words reflect the essential positive attitude of deism to religion as such.⁸²

However, Satanow found fault with the undesirable results of religious fanaticism which breeds hatred.⁸³ He pleads that all religious disputations over the so-called true religion, be abandoned and proofs left for the next world.⁸⁴ He argued further that since no religion can be proven to be the true one, religion should not be used as a criterion for bestowing privileges.⁸⁵

⁷⁹Ibid., Ch. 31, sen. 12.

⁸⁰Middot, p. 28.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 88.

⁸²Contemporary deists also defended religion against atheists. See P. Hazard, "Natural Religion," European Thought, pp. 71, 128, 129.

⁸³Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 21, sen. 6-9.

⁸⁴Rivot, I, 38.

⁸⁵Ibid.

Despite his call for an end to religious polemics Satanow, like Mendelssohn, emphasizes the supremacy of the Jewish religion. He points out that Judaism in contrast to Christianity does not contradict reason and in fact is based on it.⁸⁶ "The argument that reason rejects faith is a Christian argument, because their faith is contrary to reason. However, Judaism is based on rationalism."⁸⁷ He is even more specific in Divrei Rivot arguing that

The Mosaic religion is preferable to Christianity because it has "substance," "form," "goal," and "acts." The laws and the commands constitute the substance. Christianity lacks laws and commands . . . which means it lacks substance. . . . Besides, it is not true that Judaism was given only to Jews, it was also given to anyone who would join them. . . . The laws of Moses are eternal while the laws of Christianity change from one Pope to another.⁸⁸

Satanow, like Maimonides, is concerned with the hidden meanings and purposes behind the commandments and he interprets them in a rationalistic way. He also tried to show their contribution to the supremacy of the Jewish religion.⁸⁹

⁸⁶Moses Mendelssohn, Jerusalem, p. 72, "On Judaism and Christianity" from a letter to Karl-Wilhelm, Hereditary Prince of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. Jerusalem, pp. 123-129.

⁸⁷Holekh Tamim, p. 9.

⁸⁸Rivot, I, 24; Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 47, commentary 2.

⁸⁹Rivot, II, 15, 17, 25.

Following the trends of the time, Satanow preached tolerance⁹⁰ and was against religious persecution. He turned to history and tried to show the destructiveness of religious persecution. He pointed out that religious persecution was cyclical. The persecutors of today were themselves persecuted in the past. "Many people have been massacred in the past in the name of faith and religion. How many Christians were massacred by Pagans, and how many more Jews were massacred by Christians."⁹¹ Religious fanaticism was not the only form of intolerance:

Many people who wish to have plenty of money murder their friends in order to inherit their money. Many countries would like to expand their boundaries by conquest, thus causing bloodshed and death. Many try to reach God by murdering "untrustworthy" people, and many, because of their love for their own religion and hatred for other religions murder their friends.⁹²

⁹⁰The idea of tolerance is basic in J. Locke's "A Letter Concerning Toleration," The Works of John Locke, VI (1st ed. 1689; London, 1823); M. Tindal, An Essay Concerning the Power of the Magistrate and the Rights of Mankind in Matters of Religions (1st ed. 1697; London, 1879); F. Voltaire, "Tolerance," Oeuvres Completes de Voltaire . . . par Condorcet (Paris, 1882-88), pp. 525-526; D. Diderot, Dictionnaire encyclopedique, "Intolerance" (Paris, 1751-65); M. Mendelssohn, "On Tolerance," Jerusalem and Other Jewish Writings, pp. 145-148; C. L. Montesquieu, The Spirit of the Laws, trans. by Thomas Nugent (1st ed. Geneve, 1748; New York, 1949), p. 54.

⁹¹I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 39.

⁹²Gam Elleh, Ch. 20, sen. 6-9. See also Zemirot Asaf, Ch. 34, sen. 20.

Satanow describes the origins of religious intolerance.

Since man recognized the existence of God, different religions have multiplied and caused hatred to flourish among mankind. Hatred separated people one from another and resulted in the murder of innocent people.⁹³

These words imply that religion by its nature carries within it the seeds of intolerance. Since this was a dangerous thought for a member of the Jewish community, at that time, Satanow tried to assuage possible adversaries in his commentary to these sentences where he says:

. . . when the holy name was desecrated by being called God by foreign people, religions multiplied, hatred spread, because it is natural for members of different religions to hate each other, and no hatred is as strong as religious hatred. Therefore, most religious adherents think that killing a member of another religion is a good deed and a fulfillment of the wish of God. Even the heretic believes that it is a good deed to kill the believer . . . whoever knows just a little bit of history knows that I am right.⁹⁴

Satanow also wrote about intolerance among various sects in one religion "different sects in one religion (in every religion) hate each other with the same kind of hatred, namely each one thinks that it reached the true path of religion while the other believes the opposite."⁹⁵ Though

⁹³ Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 31, sen. 6-9.

⁹⁴ Ibid., Ch. 31, commentary to sen. 6.

⁹⁵ Middot, p. 274.

the Jews, more than any other people, suffered the ills of intolerance, they themselves, Satanow admits, were not free from the evil. "Also among the Jews there is a lot of hatred between people of different opinions, so that each one believes that it is a good deed to annihilate anyone who opposes his own opinion."⁹⁶ Satanow, no doubt, thinks of the Jews of his day and the injustices perpetrated against them by Christians when he writes of intolerance in Zemirot Asaf:

Religious hatred is the primary hatred among human beings and . . . any member of one religion believes it is a good deed to murder a member of another religion, take away his money, enslave his sons, cheat him, and prevent him from deriving any benefit from agriculture, art and certain trades.⁹⁷

Like Voltaire, Diderot, and the more extreme Holbach and others, Satanow saw in the clergy the main source of religious fanaticism:

In truth the priests of every nation are to be blamed . . . because they derive their livelihood from their own people and not from people of a different religion. Therefore they hate anybody who does not do them any good and they like those who are good to them. That is why they arouse hatred between their followers and others.⁹⁸

⁹⁶I. Satanow, Zemirot Asaf, Ch. 45, commentary to sen. 13. This may be an allusion to the struggle between Hasidim and their opponents.

⁹⁷Ibid.

⁹⁸Ibid.

Satanow also adduces evidence from contemporary events to uphold this view that the clergy is the source of religious hatred.

The advice of the priests was that killing a member of a different religion is according to the wish of God. Sometime ago several Greek priests were arrested for encouraging and arming their parishioners to murder the Jews and the noblemen of the town. However, the good Lord cancelled their scheme and revealed their plan and they were punished. . . .⁹⁹

The notion of the "evil priests" was common to the eighteenth century.¹⁰⁰ Satanow follows the popular arguments by saying that "because [the priests] were interested in money, they were not sensitive to the truth but enacted laws which would enable them to acquire fortunes."¹⁰¹ Again and again Satanow warned that

Many good people became evil as a result of their belief, because they were misled by evil people. Therefore do not pay attention to everything people say, and do not become pious according to their concept lest unknowingly you will deny God in Heaven.¹⁰²

Popular at the time was the notion of natural religion as opposed to revealed religion. Satanow used this concept in his arguments against intolerance. "The

⁹⁹Rivot, I, 24; Gam Elleh, Ch. 18, commentary 17. The specific event to which Satanow refers is not clear.

¹⁰⁰P. Hazard, "The God of the Christians Impeached," European Thought, pp. 53, 54.

¹⁰¹Rivot, I, 17.

¹⁰²Gam Elleh, Ch. 47, sen. 8-11.

acquired religion (in contrast to the natural one) changes according to time and the nature of the land."¹⁰³ Therefore "One should convince members of different religions not to hate each other because a variety of religions is as natural among human beings as a variety of seeds in plants. The variation is the will of God."¹⁰⁴ These are deistic views.¹⁰⁵ And if it is the will of God, religious tolerance is logical:

. . . love members of your own religion and do not hate those of different ones, because one God created them all and they all address the same God though by different names. They worship him in different ways which they have learned from their ancestors but though they offer different gifts it is to the same king.¹⁰⁶

People should be tolerant of each other because, "why should we be mean to each other, we are all the children of one man and one God created us all."¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³
Rivot, I, 24.

¹⁰⁴
Gam Elleh, Ch. 39, commentary 76.

¹⁰⁵
P. Hazard, "Revealed Religion," European Thought, pp. 71, 430.

¹⁰⁶
I. Satanow, Gam Elleh, Ch. 42, sen. 6-9. See also M. Mendelssohn, "A Letter to Karl-Wilhelm," in Jerusalem, p. 127; also Jerusalem, II, 68-69.

¹⁰⁷
Rivot, I, 3.

He realized that rationalism cannot abolish religious fanaticism as long as "Every member of a creed says that his faith is on a higher plane than the human intellect and the human mind is incapable of judging its truth."¹⁰⁸ However, if a man can admit that all nations are equal except for their religion, then he should also realize that there is no reason for mutual hatred because of differences in religion. "We are all descendants of one man and were all created by one God. We all live in this world, so why should we try to overpower each other?"¹⁰⁹ For Satanow as well as for other Jews of his time a crusade for religious tolerance was both urgent and practical. They saw it as a way to improve their social and economic standing as well as a way to lessen the pressure on the Jews to convert to Christianity. Religious toleration also meant the final repudiation of the infamous blood libel that still haunted life in Poland.

Following the collapse of the Sabbatianic movement, large numbers of Jews converted to Christianity.¹¹⁰ The numbers increased with the conversion of the Frankists and reached their peak with the mass conversion of the extreme

¹⁰⁸ Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 31, commentary 5.

¹⁰⁹ Rivot, I, 38.

¹¹⁰ M. Balaban, Le-Toldot ha-Tenua ha-Frankit (Tel-Aviv, 1934), pp. 80-81.

branch of the Jewish Enlightenment movement in Germany.¹¹¹ The early second half of the eighteenth century also witnessed the emergence of the blood libel in Poland as a result of the accusations by the Frankists against Talmudic Judaism. By that time Satanow was already living in Berlin, however he never severed his ties with Poland, and remained deeply affected by the difficulties of his fellow Jews there. According to Satanow's testimony,¹¹² as well as the testimony of others, he asked Mendelssohn to write to Polish noblemen to save Jews accused of the blood libel. He also wrote extensively on the subject, refuting accusations made by converts as untrustworthy. Converts, he asserted, are dishonest, their conversion is not genuine, and they actually remain in the fold of their original religion. Moreover, they use their new religion as a means to attain influence in society. Those who are converted by force are even worse. You cannot impose ideas by force, and the forced convert will use flattery to save himself, but he is far from becoming a true believer.¹¹⁴ Often when he has the opportunity he will return to his original religion.¹¹⁵ Forced conversion

¹¹¹A. Schohat, Im Hilufei Tekufot, pp. 192-195.

¹¹²Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 42, commentary 17.

¹¹³I. Euchel, Toldot ha-Rambaman (Vienna, 1814), p. 139.

¹¹⁴Rivot, I, 5, 6.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 7.

is the result of religious fanaticism, and Satanow as a rationalist and a Jew rejected it vehemently.¹¹⁶

A substantial portion of the book Gam Elleh Mishlei Asaf deals with the issue of conversion. Satanow repeats the contemporary view that

. . . because it is empirically impossible to prove the truth of one religion over the other, one should not be encouraged to convert but rather should stay in his father's faith because this faith is the most suited for him.¹¹⁷

Accordingly, Satanow preaches, "Love your religion but do not hate those whose religion differs from yours."¹¹⁸ "Your religion and the religion of your fathers, thou shall not forsake."¹¹⁹ Following his view that different religions result from different geographical and historical circumstances, Satanow says that any conversion is undesirable because laws of every religion are made to fit the nature of the people and the land where they were given and therefore

¹¹⁶ Gam Elleh, Ch. 39, commentary 9.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., commentary 9. See also M. Mendelssohn, Jerusalem, II, 104, and Lessing's story about the three rings which were so identical that no one was able to tell the original from the imitations in E. Lessing, Laokoon, Nathan The Wise and Minna von Barnhelm, ed. V. A. Steel (London, 1949), pp. 166-169.

¹¹⁸ Gam Elleh, Ch. 42, sen. 6.

¹¹⁹ Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 14, sen. 17, 18; see also M. Mendelssohn, Jerusalem, II, 104.

it is also impossible that there will ever be a universal religion.¹²⁰ That is why anybody who converts, be it to Judaism or Christianity, is a very undesirable addition to his new religion.¹²¹

Satanow's arguments against conversion can be traced to the writings of both Mendelssohn and Dohm. He may have found support for his allegations that converts are untrustworthy in Dohm's book.

. . . the proof of his (Eisenmenger) accusations are to be found only in the statements of apostate Jews who by such accusations against their former coreligionists seek to curry favor with their new coreligionists. They are, in most cases, so ignorant that they know the faith they left just as little as the new one which they have embraced, and usually they are a dishonor to both.¹²²

Views on Education

Satanow looked on education as a major area in Jewish life that required reform, in accordance with the rationalistic ideas of the time.¹²³ The issue of education was a

¹²⁰I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 17.

¹²¹Gam Elleh, Ch. 39, commentary 8. These arguments also appear in M. Mendelssohn, Jerusalem, pp. 107-109, 134.

¹²²C. Dohm, Concerning the Amelioration, p. 16. About the attitude to converts, see also J. H. Callenberg, Bericht an einige Christliche Freunde von einem Versuch das arme jüdische Volk zur Erkenntnis und Annehmung der Christlichen Wahrheit anzuleiten. Forsetzung 9, Anderer Theil. d. dritten Forts., s. 36, Forts 7, s. 144. Mendelssohn also opposed conversion for similar reasons. See M. Mendelssohn, Jerusalem and Other Jewish Writings, pp. 104-110, 133-134, 145-147.

¹²³See M. Eliav, ha-Hinukh ha-Yehudi be-Germania Bimei ha-Haskalah ve-ha-Emanzipazia (Jerusalem, 1961).

major topic for many of the great thinkers of the time.¹²⁴ Men like John Locke, Rousseau, Diderot, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Leibnitz, Helvetius and Condillac devoted much attention to it. "The great abundance of writing on the theory of education during the enlightenment witnesses the importance attributed by that age to training."¹²⁵ Even monarchs dedicated time and ideas to educational reform. One of the projects of Frederic the Great was to improve the education of the schools in Prussia.¹²⁶ The Russian Czar was interested in the improvement of education and Leibnitz wrote a memorandum for Peter the Great specifying rules and principles that were to be followed.¹²⁷

Education is of paramount importance in the Haskalah literature. Wessely devoted to this subject in his Divrei Shalom ve-Emet,¹²⁸ which is considered the manifesto of the Jewish enlightenment on the problem of education. Wessely considered the educational process as consisting of two parts, the teaching of God, and the teaching of man.¹²⁹ In his view,

¹²⁴P. Hazard, "Education," European Thought, pp. 189-192.

¹²⁵P. Smith, A History of Modern Culture, II (New York, 1933), 438.

¹²⁶Ibid.

¹²⁷Ibid., p. 437.

¹²⁸N. H. Wessely, Divrei Shalom ve-Emet (Berlin, 1781-84; Vilno, 1826).

¹²⁹Ibid., pp. 3-4.

the teaching of man ought to precede the teaching of God.¹³⁰
 The teaching of man includes manners, ethics, pure language, history, geography, political science, mathematics, astronomy, natural sciences, etc.¹³¹ In ha-Meassef, the mouthpiece of the Hebrew maskilim, an anonymous writer complained bitterly about the condition of Jewish education.

I look at my people and their lack of knowledge in such an important field as education, I see Jewish children aged fifteen and sixteen who do not know the difference between right and wrong because they did not learn ethics and did not read the book of God. But even if they would have read it, they would not have understood because before a boy knows any of the principles of his religion or the roots of his faith he is brought into a strange man's house, . . . a man who speaks to him in an incomprehensible language, and that man is the one to teach him the words of our sages, may they rest in peace, before the boy even knows who was that man Moses, what Moses had done for his people, what he taught, who were our righteous and truthful prophets, what happened to our predecessors, etc.¹³²

In the same issue of the Meassef another article on the same subject appeared:

The deficiencies and sicknesses of the soul stem from bad education and improper behavior. The heart and soul of a child are like a smooth stone on which anything can be inscribed. Yet from morning to night you confine the boys in school,

¹³⁰ Ibid., p. 4.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² ha-Meassef (Berlin, 1789), p. 32.

a place where they learn neither Torah nor ethics. You desire that all of them should be wise, but as a result of this schooling, their heads are filled with things that their souls are not yet capable of reaching.¹³³

The Meassef is filled with suggestions for reforms, demanding new curricula and methods. The maskilim composed new textbooks according to many of the new suggestions.¹³⁴ Thus, Wolfsohn wrote Avtalion (Berlin, 1790), most likely the first modern textbook for the study of Hebrew reflecting a new approach to education. Following him, Ben Ze'ev wrote Talmud Lashon Ivri (Berlin, 1796), a practical grammar book, and Beit ha-Sefer (Berlin, 1802), one of the first textbooks in Hebrew. Barukh Lindau wrote Reshit Limmudim (Berlin, 1788), another textbook with emphasis on natural sciences. Satanow was also part of this trend. Though he did not write textbooks, he participated actively in the criticism of contemporary Jewish education and put forward some suggestions of his own. In consonance with Wessely's view, he also maintains that

The purpose of "man's teaching" [secular studies] is to legislate good laws that will enable people to live comfortably . . . and help each other. These laws are not concerned with after life. The purpose of God's teachings is both to make good laws for the benefit of man in the community . . . and to prepare him to affirm the knowledge of God through his deeds. . . .¹³⁵

¹³³Ibid.

¹³⁴I. Barzilay, "The Ideology of the Berlin Haskalah," PAAJR (1956), Vol. XXV, 33.

¹³⁵I. Satanow, Rivot, II, 29.

On the other hand, he objects to Wessely's view that secular studies should precede religious studies,¹³⁶ and suggests instead an opposite course, namely, that natural sciences be taught only after the completion of Jewish education and only as a supplement to the latter. Nevertheless, he also accepts the view of Wessely, but at a more advanced age. After studying nature, the young ought to return again to Scriptures since by then they will be better equipped to understand the Bible.¹³⁷

Satanow is among the first maskilim who tried to define the word Hinukh, education. According to him: "Education is the acquisition of habits, which the student might acquire with or without knowing the reason or the goal. . . ." ¹³⁸ Education is a combination of training and teaching. Both must be done gradually. "Do not give the boy too many orders lest he get tired and do not over teach him or he will get bored." ¹³⁹

Proverbs became a popular genre in the literature of the time, because it was believed that through them it was

¹³⁶ N. H. Wessely, Divrei Shalom, p. 4.

¹³⁷ I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 11-12.

¹³⁸ Gam Elleh, Ch. 65, commentary 15.

¹³⁹ Megillat Hasidim, Ch. 18, sen. 1; Ch. 37, sen. 6-8.

easy to teach and influence the young and the masses alike.¹⁴⁰ Satanow, the father of the modern Hebrew Proverb¹⁴¹ considered the fable one of the best educational methods. "When a maskil wants to teach the public or educate people with profound thoughts, he does it through fables, epigrams and riddles which enable them to grasp the deeper moral of the story. . . ."¹⁴² Fables were created by God to enable man to understand a desired teaching the same way that a sailor builds a small model of a boat to teach his son how to navigate a big one.¹⁴³

Satanow was aware of the new pedagogical approaches of the time and expresses his views on them. In Megillat Hasidim he advises teachers not to teach by orders and commands, but by being a model and setting an example for emulation by the children.¹⁴⁴ Above all, he insists that teachers be fully qualified. They should prove their knowledge in German and Latin, and their familiarity with some

¹⁴⁰H. N. Shapiro, Toldot ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha (Kaunas, 1928), p. 309.

¹⁴¹F. Lachover, Toldot ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha (Tel-Aviv, 1963), p. 81.

¹⁴²Rivot, II, 38.

¹⁴³Ibid. Satanow must have read Eliezer Ashkenazi's book Ma'ase Adonai (1540; Lwow, 1958) where Ashkenazi speaks about the fable as an educational tool (Introduction, p. 4) and uses the same example of the sailor and his son (p. 17).

¹⁴⁴Megillat Hasidim, Ch. 12, sen. 8-12.

astronomy and natural science.¹⁴⁵ He puts forth this demand in an article of the Meassef of that time, in which he reported that in the city of Mainz the Jewish teachers were required to pass a municipal exam to prove their qualifications.¹⁴⁶

Even though Satanow preached new methods of teaching, he warned educators not to be too permissive with children because this might result in spoiling and weakening their character.¹⁴⁷ But, as noted, Satanow dealt less with details and methods than with the need for general reform in Jewish education.

In his book Divrei Rivot he suggested the following curriculum of study:

In every city there ought to be three teachers. The day must be divided into three parts. During the first portion a teacher with sufficient helpers will teach the children Bible, language, calligraphy, ethics and religious commandments. During the next portion of the day they must study foreign languages with the second teacher, while the third part of the day will be spent with the third teacher in studying arithmetic, geometry, geography, astronomy and some natural and empirical sciences, so that wisdom will be implanted in the children's soul and the love of God in their heart. Every day they will be allowed one hour for walking and recreation, and thus it will continue for ten years. In the tenth year the boys will be examined by the wise men of the city to determine the quality of each boy. Any boy with a strong and skillful mind should continue his studies.

¹⁴⁵ Rivot, I, 47.

¹⁴⁶ ha-Meassef (Berlin, 1785), p. 27.

¹⁴⁷ Gam Elleh, Ch. 37, sen. 7-10.

He may choose his own subjects and study them under qualified professors. The salaries of the teachers and professors will be paid by the state, and the livelihood of the students provided for by the Jewish community of each city. Boys incapable of study and understanding will learn arts and crafts in wood, metal and stone, or choose any other occupation according to their preference. Some will learn trade and some will become tillers of the land to plough and sow, while others will become gardeners. However, a person must not practice his craft unless he had studied it for a number of years and received a certificate from the guild testifying to his craftsmanship. Whoever volunteers to teach a Jew any kind of trade should get a tax exemption and receive a medal from the king.¹⁴⁸

Along with this general plan, Satanow also suggests a specific program of Hebrew studies. Insisting that Hebrew studies cannot be done in translation,¹⁴⁹ he divides the educational process into stages. In the first stage the child should simultaneously learn reading, writing, vocalization, and correct pronunciation. In the second stage he should learn the different meanings of roots and their

¹⁴⁸ Rivot, I, 11. It might be interesting to compare Satanow's curriculum with Leibnitz' memorandum to Peter the Great as is quoted by Smith in his book History, II, 437. The memorandum proposed a course of studies which Leibnitz considered the best for molding a man of the world. He writes: "The first six years of the child's life would be well spent in acquiring the mother tongue and Latin, both by the natural method of use. During the next six years, at school, the boy would form his character and master the art of correct speech and composition and learn history, mathematics, optics, mechanics, astronomy and natural history. The next period, from his thirteenth to his eighteenth year the boy should spend at an academy, pursuing scientific studies, economics, medicine, jurisprudence and theology, together with Greek, Hebrew, French, Italian and public speaking. After this he should spend two years in travels."

¹⁴⁹ Rivot, I, 11.

synonyms. In the third stage grammar, correct accent and tropes. In the fourth stage the child should learn logic in its Jewish form, namely, the thirteen Middot (rules of deducing laws) of Rabbi Ishmael and the thirty-two of Rabbi Jose the Gallilean. Only after those four stages have been completed, should the child be introduced to the study of the Bible, according to the simple meaning of the text, based on a correct understanding of grammar. After the child has acquainted himself with the Bible, the study of the Talmud and "Pilpul" may begin. However, "Pilpul" should not be used for the sake of mental exercise but for a better understanding of Jewish law.¹⁵⁰ Satanow also believed that learning a trade should be one of the goals of education because it benefits the state. "Man was born to work so that he may participate in the betterment of the world. It is not honorable for a man to be idle because in his idleness he robs other people, being helped by them but not contributing to them."¹⁵¹ Satanow understood the effectiveness of reward and punishment and advised educators to use this principle in education. "Attract children with sweets, boys with nice clothes, young men with sweet words. . . ."¹⁵² Satanow did not believe in delayed punishment.

¹⁵⁰Ibid.

¹⁵¹Middot, p. 174. See also Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 3, sen. 12-13; Ch. 19, commentary 17.

¹⁵²Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 40, sen. 23.

"Punish him when he sins, and don't let him go without punishment. Do not pity him because if you do not punish him at an early stage, he will end up being a criminal and will have to be judged by others. . . ." ¹⁵³ A person should teach his children ethics and morals without frightening them. ¹⁵⁴ Teachers and nurses who frighten little children make cowards out of them, and those who teach children by scaring them with untruthful stories teach them to be liars. ¹⁵⁵

But most important is the education of tolerance.

"One should teach young boys to do favors to everybody, to the unimportant as well as to the honorable, to the alien as well as to the citizen . . . because we are all brothers, sons of one father and the worshipers of one God." ¹⁵⁶

Intolerance is the result of superstition which is taught by unqualified teachers. One should avoid entrusting one's child to an ignorant nurse who teaches him evil instead of honesty and hate instead of love. This woman makes the child fearful of anyone in foreign clothes so that eventually the child fears and hates anyone unlike himself. She also teaches him to call after them as if they were dogs. She tells fairy tales and he is led to believe all kinds of nonsense. ¹⁵⁷

¹⁵³ Ibid., Ch. 40, sen. 6-10.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., Ch. 40, sen. 1-5.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., Ch. 40, commentaries 3, 4.

¹⁵⁶ Megillat Hasidim, Ch. 6, sen. 10.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., Ch. 15, sen. 17-18.

As seen, Satanow was not alone in his interest in Jewish education nor was he the first to draw attention to the subject. In 1772, Joseph Levin, a private tutor in Potsdam,¹⁵⁸ issued a call for reforms in Jewish education, addressing a detailed proposal to Frederick II.¹⁵⁹ Eliyahu Morpurgo, obviously influenced by Wessely, suggested a curriculum similar to the one offered by Wessely.¹⁶⁰ Josel Rachenow had other ideas about reforming Jewish education.¹⁶¹ Both Friedlander and Bendavid made radical proposals on the same subject.¹⁶² Satanow was thus a part of a wider trend of the time, but his interest in education was an integral part of his general ideology.

Reforms in the Socio-Economic and Political Sphere

The eighteenth century was a time of deep transformation in the life of the Jews in Germany not only intellectually but also socially and economically. Satanow saw two kinds of political, social and economic problems; those

¹⁵⁸M. Eliav, ha-Hinukh ha-Yehudi be-Germania, p. 24.

¹⁵⁹M. Stern, "Der jugendunterricht in der Berliner jüdischer Gemeinde während des 18 Jhdts," JJLG, 1928/29 (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Gemeinde, Berlin, Heft 5) (Berlin, 1934), p. 14.

¹⁶⁰ha-Meassef (Berlin, 1786), pp. 66-78.

¹⁶¹ha-Meassef (Berlin, 1789), pp. 171-187.

¹⁶²M. Elizv, op. cit., p. 64.

imposed on the Jews by the Christian world, and those which appeared within the Jewish community itself. A subject which frequently occupied Satanow and his contemporaries was the relationship between the communal Jewish leadership and the Jewish masses. In moving from Poland to Germany Satanow discovered to his great disappointment that Jewish communal life hardly differed from East to West. As Sachar in his book Modern Jewish History notes;

In truth the Polish Jewish Qahal was in every respect as autocratic as the Jewish government of the West. Property qualifications determined franchise [in both places]. The principal officers of the Qahal, with their immense power to influence the courts and the excise Commissions, were very often wealthy tyrants who shifted the burden of taxation onto their disenfranchised impoverished brethren.¹⁶³

Some of the families who controlled the Jewish community in Berlin, such as Friedlander and his father-in-law Itzig, were among Satanow's benefactors. However, being patrons of culture did not prevent them from mistreating the socially lower classes of the Jewish community. Such a situation was common not only in Berlin but throughout the Jewish communities in Germany. Rabbi Jonathan Eybeschuetz complained

¹⁶³ M. H. Sachar, The Course of Modern Jewish History (Dell publ., 1963), p. 32. On the relationship between the community and its leadership in Germany see also A. Schohat, Im Hilufei Tequfot (Jerusalem, 1960), pp. 72-74, 92-100, 113-117. However, David Friedlander believed that the life of the Polish Jew was worse than that of the German Jew. D. Friedlander, Akten Stücke, p. 13.

"Because of our numerous sins, most of the leaders and the respectable men of the community failed in their duties [toward the community], especially when it came to taxation."¹⁶⁴ Jacob Emden used even darker language to describe the situation.

In those days the Parnasim and the leaders of the community controlled the old chief of the rabbinical court, who had the power and permission from his Majesty to judge and to teach, to fine and to punish. He ruled with an iron hand over the poor and the wretched and there was no one to protest. Although . . . he should also have control over the Parnasim and the other leaders of the community, he subjugated himself to them and [freely] chose to obey them and fulfill their orders and decrees. Therefore he was liked by them and they praised him for being modest. Alas for such an improper modesty, it is nothing but flattery, to support the rich and powerful, to surrender to the few and do as they wish, acting for the sake of his own advantage and benefit. He supported them in their misdeeds and in return they protected him. . . . People complained but found no help.¹⁶⁵

Friedlander who was a parnas himself, naturally saw the source of evil not in the Parnasim but in the rabbis.¹⁶⁶

Satanow was no doubt aware of this situation as it existed in Poland as well as in Germany. As a maskil he must have considered it his duty to press for reforms. However, since he was a beneficiary of the same system, he

¹⁶⁴J. Eybeschuetz, Ya'arot Devash (Karlsruhe, 1779), Vol. II, 17.

¹⁶⁵J. Emden, Megillat Sefer (Warsaw, 1897), p. 133.

¹⁶⁶D. Friedlander, Akten Stücke, pp. 19-20; A. Schohat, Im Hilufei Tequfot, pp. 72, 90-92, 102-103.

could not afford to press the point too hard. Nevertheless, he raised the problem in several of his books.

When a man becomes a Parnas he does not consider his goal to benefit the community [as it should be] but to enhance his wealth, to benefit his friends and take revenge on his enemies. Therefore justice becomes meaningless, and the masses, instead of getting help from the Parnasim are wronged by them.¹⁶⁷

An even sharper criticism of the communal leadership appeared in two other books by Satanow. In Beit ha-Tefillah he said:

Because of our sins this plague of taxation has spread in some communities. The country is full of evil, the important people of the community do not pay taxes as they should and they "trample on the faces of the poor and pull the skin off their bones." They close their ears and do not listen to the cry of the down-trodden.¹⁶⁸

In Divrei Rivot Satanow repeats the same accusations.

Some Parnasim cause harm to the people, pulling the skin off their bones by the heavy taxes they put upon them. They also lend them food and money but extract so much interest that the poor cannot bear it.¹⁶⁹

The powerful Parnasim were part of the old ghetto establishment, but modern times have worsened the situation and made it more unbearable.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷Minhat Biqqurim (Berlin, 1797), p. 41.

¹⁶⁸Iggeret Beit Tefillah (Berlin, 1973), p. 28. Some of Satanow's idioms are taken from Amos 2:7.

¹⁶⁹Rivot, I, 49.

¹⁷⁰R. Mahler, Divrei Ye'mei Yisrael (Berkavia, 1954), Vol. II, 35, 37-38; I. Satanow, Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 25, commentary 9; A. Schohat, Im Hilufei Tequfot, pp. 117, 118.

The problem of a corrupt leadership was essentially an internal Jewish problem although this leadership had state support. More decisive for the state of German Jewry was the negative attitude of the government. This attitude found its expression in an elaborate system of legal enactments aimed at restricting the number of Jews in Germany and their economic activities. These restrictions affected the occupations, habitation and social contacts of Jews outside of the Jewish community. Satanow believed that these restrictions were partly responsible for Jewish misery.

The Jews are treated as foreigners in your country. . . . You do not help them as you should. You prohibit them from participating in arts and trades, and you teach your children to call them names as if they were thieves.¹⁷¹

I went through many cities in the kingdom and there were no Jews there. I asked for the reason and was told that no Jew had permission to dwell there, and in some of the cities where Jews do live, there are limitations on their trade. . . .¹⁷²

One of the most exhaustive studies of the situation was made by Christian W. Dohm, a liberal Christian of the time. He writes:

The Jew is severely restricted in earning a living; he is excluded from the honor of serving the state in peace as well as in war.¹⁷³ . . . every trade

¹⁷¹Rivot, I, 49.

¹⁷²Ibid.

¹⁷³C. Dohm, Concerning the Amelioration, p. 2.

guild would consider itself dishonored if it accepted a circumcised man as a member, so the Hebrew is in almost all countries excluded from artisan and mechanical arts.¹⁷⁴

"They are not allowed to reside in some principalities at all and enjoy the protection of the ruler only for a price and then only for a short time. . . ." ¹⁷⁵

Satanow mentioned other reasons for Jewish economic misery, some reminiscent of those that appeared in Shevet Yehudah¹⁷⁶ by Shlomo Ibn Verga (sixteenth century). Ibn Verga cites the Jewish love of luxury and a Jewish tendency to exhibitionism as reasons for animosity felt by some Jews.¹⁷⁷ Satanow reiterates that view when he says

Luxury and laziness have combined in them . . . the Jews respect and honor their wives more than they can afford. One who can barely provide his family with basic needs will still dress his wife in silk and decorate her with golden chains and pearls.¹⁷⁸

Satanow cites high interest rates as another cause of poverty among Jews, both of individuals as well as communities.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 1.

¹⁷⁶ S. Ibn Verga, Shevet Yehudah (Jerusalem, 1946-47).

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 30.

¹⁷⁸ I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 44. See also A. Schohat, Im Hilufei Tequfot, pp. 35-37.

¹⁷⁹ Satanow is probably speaking mainly about Poland. See S. Dubnow, History of the Jews in Russia and Poland, pp. 169-70; Friedlander, Akten Stücke, p. 13.

I think that it is because of the corrosive effect of interest. Most of the Jews who are in the king's domain have creditors and the interest is destroying them. . . . the communities of every city have borrowed money from the priests and other high officials. They repay a very high interest every year but the capital always remains. . . . Every Jew borrows money from a money lender and the interest he has to pay is more than he makes. That is why the communities in general and the individual Jew in particular become poorer and poorer.¹⁸⁰

Friedlander cites heavy taxation as a reason for the poverty of the Jewish communities in Germany.¹⁸¹ Both Friedlander and Satanow say communities are forced to borrow to redeem Jews from death or captivity, and to pay the heavy taxes for the poor members of the community who cannot pay themselves.¹⁸²

One of the most common notions in the political and economic thought of the eighteenth century was that the size of the population was an essential element in the strength and wealth of a state. Satanow, like both Mendelssohn and Dohm, was well acquainted with that view, and wondered why the number of Jews in a state was not also considered an asset. He concluded that the reason was anti-semitism. He analyzed the arguments of Gentiles against granting civil

¹⁸⁰I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 44.

¹⁸¹D. Friedlander, Akten Stücke, pp. 81-84.

¹⁸²Ibid., pp. 54, 57, 81; I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 44.

rights to the Jews: a) Jews are not capable of accepting the responsibilities that come with civil rights; b) Jews are so sly that if they will be allowed to own real estate they will eventually take over the entire land; c) Jews hide their criminals and do not bring them to justice, therefore if Jews were appointed to the court the number of murders in the state will increase.¹⁸³ Satanow refuted those claims. Though he admitted that the Jews may be "sick," he blamed their sickness on the Gentile world. "The main reason for the general sickness of the Jews is the hatred toward them which exists in the heart of the multitude."¹⁸⁴ "I do not see any essential difference between Jews and other people; they are all human beings. . . ."¹⁸⁵ He admits that the present generation may not be ready for civil rights, but argues on behalf of future generations:

This generation is already corrupted; they are not fit for commerce, agriculture or military service. . . . but their children if trained properly like other nations will be as successful as other people.¹⁸⁶

Satanow believed that every human being had three concerns: himself, his household and family, and his country.

¹⁸³Rivot, I, 48. See also Friedlander, Akten Stücke, pp. 91, 92.

¹⁸⁴Rivot, I, 38.

¹⁸⁵Ibid., p. 41.

¹⁸⁶Ibid., p. 141.

In other words, it is the responsibility of every person to take care of his own conduct, the conduct of his household, and the affairs of the state.¹⁸⁷ This view is as old as Aristotle. As a social being, it is natural for man to live within the framework of a state, because that is the best way for him to receive help from his fellow man. "A wild animal stays in the wilderness and a human being in a state so that he can find support when needed."¹⁸⁸ Satanow considers the state's main function is to regulate human society in such a way that its members will contribute their utmost to the well being of the state and through it, to the well being of the individual. For this purpose, society is also divided into classes: "Divide your people into different classes, some of them should till the soil, some should be artisans, and others merchants, soldiers and scientists, so that they can help each other and be able to do everything that is worthwhile doing."¹⁸⁹

According to Satanow, the structure of the state should be based on three social classes and each should be evaluated in accordance with its contribution to the good of the state. The upper class ought to be exempted from all

¹⁸⁷Hizzayon, p. 3.

¹⁸⁸Gam Elleh, Ch. 4, sen. 13.

¹⁸⁹Ibid., Ch. 8, sen. 9-11.

taxes. The middle class, consisting of artisans and tradesmen, should bear the main burden of taxation. The third, consisting of farmers and peasants, should not pay regular taxes, but should only pay for land tenancy. This class should also provide soldiers for the state.¹⁹⁰

The Jews also should be a part of this structure, and should have the same obligations as their Christian counterparts. This means that only the Jewish middle class should pay taxes, and not more than the Christians.¹⁹¹ A Jewish third class, of farmers and peasants which did not exist at the time, should be created. The state should give this group special consideration exempting the first two generations from the army. Only the third generation should serve in the army, but they must be allowed to maintain their religion.¹⁹²

The state is the ultimate goal of society because it is the social structure in which a human being can be happiest. Satanow even claims that the purpose of the Torah is to keep and preserve the state, and the only way to do it is by not hurting a fellow man, be he either Jew or Gentile.¹⁹³

¹⁹⁰Rivot, I, 48.

¹⁹¹Ibid.

¹⁹²Ibid.; D. Friedlander, Akten Stücke, pp. 91, 92.

¹⁹³Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 19, commentary 21.

In Divrei Rivot he expressed the same idea: "Men need the state, in cities and in villages, so that they will be able to help each other and so live comfortably."¹⁹⁴ That means that man's function in life is to be of help to his fellow man. "My son, even before you were born, you were already included by your parents in the covenant to help your generation."¹⁹⁵

Satanow envisions yet another stratification of society. In Megillat Hasidim (1802) he depicts a society made up of four classes based on the intellectual abilities of its members. In this society the lower class are farmers and peasants. Above them are the "God fearing people"; a still higher level is made up of wise men, and on the highest level are the prophets.¹⁹⁶ Obviously this is an intellectual rather than a social stratification. The low position he assigns to the farmers in his model societies is worth noting. This is quite different from the view of the later maskilim in Galicia and Russia who idealized the agriculturists.

¹⁹⁴
Rivot, I, 28.

¹⁹⁵
Minhat Biqqurim, p. 47.

¹⁹⁶
Megillat Hasidim, Ch. 24, commentary 15-23; J. Ha-Levi also puts the prophet at the upper social level, see Kuzari, 1:43.

Also worth noting, and reflecting the spirit of the time, is Satanow's attitude toward money lending and interest. The rise of capitalism increased dependency on credits and loans, resulting in a more positive attitude toward interest. Dohm tells us that ". . . lending out money was [formerly] regarded almost as a dishonest business deal. . . . nowadays this prejudice is no longer prevalent."¹⁹⁷ Satanow echoes this opinion:

There is no evil in collecting interest as long as it is done properly, that is to say, when the borrower gets out of the money as much as the lender does, because. . . . money lending is really like business.¹⁹⁸

Though he is of the opinion that money lending is an acceptable, and even desirable practice, Satanow is still sensitive to the Gentile condemnation of the Jews as usurers. He does not justify this practice, but tries to explain its roots. Like Friedlander, he believes that it is the economic restrictions on the Jews which limit their sources of livelihood that forced the Jews to turn to dishonest practices like usury.¹⁹⁹ A human being, he asserts, will turn to dishonest

¹⁹⁷C. Dohm, Concerning the Amelioration, p. 4.

¹⁹⁸Rivot, I, 34.

¹⁹⁹These arguments were mentioned already by John Toland in Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews in Great Britain and Ireland, on the Same Foot with all Other Nations. Containing also a Defense of the Jews Against all Vulgar Prejudices in all Countries (London, 1714), p. 56. See also Simhah Luzzato, Ma'amar al Yehudei Venezia, trans. from Italian Don Lates (Jerusalem, 1941), pp. 109-110. See also L. Modena, Riti (Venice, 1658), p. ii, 5, 3.

practices when forced to by hunger.²⁰⁰ Again he utilizes

Dohm's arguments:

As there are almost no honest means of earning a living left to him [i.e. the Jew N.R.] it is natural that he falls into criminal practices and frauds, especially since commerce more than other trades tempts people to such practices.²⁰¹

Satanow differed from Dohm's focus. Dohm's primary interest was the state and he advocated political, social and economic improvement of the Jews only in so far as it was for the benefit of the state. Satanow's primary interest was the improvement of the situation of the Jews, and he utilized contemporary theories of economics as an instrument to achieve that goal.

Satanow was not blind to the Jewish role in creating and maintaining the deplorable conditions. He criticized Jews for their lack of secular knowledge and for their pacifism. "I don't know a single one of them who ever heard about this important knowledge, but they all are busy with the Talmud."²⁰² Like the author of Shevet Yehuda he says in Rivot that "The rulers wanted to teach the Jews war so that they would be able to defend themselves but they opposed it

²⁰⁰ Rivot, I, 34; David Friedlander, Akten Stücke, p. 35.

²⁰¹ C. Dohm, Concerning the Amelioration, p. 5.

²⁰² Rivot, I, 42; D. Friedlander, Akten Stücke, pp. 21, 22.

saying that it prevents them from studying the Torah; as a result they were killed in pogroms."²⁰³ He argues that the Torah does not oppose self-defense, and all those laws which restrict the learning of self-defense are late laws, which express mere cowardice."²⁰⁴ In more than one place he repeats the common accusation that Jews are cowards.

It is not by choice and by intellectual approach that they abstain from bloodshed, but because of their nature. Because a Jew by his nature is soft hearted, he cannot see his fellow man in trouble and fears for his blood. That is why kings abstain from recruiting soldiers from among them, their soft heart prevents them from participating in a war, and they might even have a bad influence on other soldiers.²⁰⁵

Of course there is also an advantage in this situation, because other nations decrease in numbers because of wars, while Jews increase.²⁰⁶

Satanow also blames antiquated laws for the condition of the Jews. "The kings in the past distinguished you from other nations by putting upon you heavy taxes, . . . and they made a law that passing travelers must pay ransom to

²⁰³Rivot, I, 47.

²⁰⁴Ibid.

²⁰⁵Ibid., p. 5.

²⁰⁶Ibid. There is a great deal about service in the army in the Meassef, e.g., ha-Meassef (1790), pp. 62-64; ha-Meassef, vii, 99-103; and more. Patriotism and military service were very much in fashion because of the Seven Year War, and Altman tells us that Mendelssohn's friendship with Thomas Abbt started as a result of Mendelssohn's open admiration of Abbt's book Vom Tode für's Vaterland (Berlin, 1761), see A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn, p. 101; I. Barzilay, "The Ideology," pp. 21-24.

to the lord of the land as if they were cattle."²⁰⁷ This is reminiscent of Mendelssohn's famous story where he describes his own experience of having to pay ransom, as if he were an ox brought from Poland.²⁰⁸ Satanow compares the treatment of the Jews to the treatment of negroes. Stupid people believe that because the negroes are black they are not human and should be bought and sold and mated like animals. Some nations also treat Jews like animals charging them head tolls and even calling them animals and all because of the difference in their religion and way of dress.²⁰⁹ As a result of mistreatment the Jews are not able to behave correctly and therefore are not allowed to participate in crafts and some trades. However ironically, when a Jew converts, he is suddenly capable of doing everything. As if being a Jew means that he is the worst possible human being and should not even be considered to be a human being at all.²¹⁰ "The Gentiles torture the Jews among them with taxes, and find pleasure in these tortures."²¹¹ Satanow's remedy

²⁰⁷ I. Satanow, Rivot, I, 40.

²⁰⁸ R. Mahler, Divrei Yemei Yisrael, II, 22.

²⁰⁹ I. Satanow, Zemirot Asaf, Ch. 34, commentary 14.

²¹⁰ Ibid., Ch. 45, sen. 3.

²¹¹ Rivot, I, 40.

for the situation is tolerance "There should not be any difference between Jews and other people, they should be allowed to live everywhere and participate in any trade. . . . the only thing that should separate people should be wisdom and eloquence."²¹² He offers ways to prevent anti-semitism and suspicions about the Jews. 1) Jews should invite Christians to their houses; 2) Christian mothers should not teach their children to hate Jews; 3) Proper education will take care of all kinds of poverty, poverty of the mind as well as material poverty.²¹³

Satanow, the rationalist and reformer, touched all the subjects that were popular in his time, the age of reason. He was preoccupied with knowledge and science, with man in relation to society, with religion and mankind, with social political and economic problems and solutions for those problems.

²¹²Rivot, I, 40.

²¹³Ibid., p. 47; D. Friedlander, Akten Stücke, pp. 172-174.

CHAPTER IV

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE AS AN EXPRESSION OF NATIONALISM

Like most of the Hebrew maskilim, Satanow showed a keen interest in the Hebrew language partially for scholarly reasons, but also as an expression of his own nationalistic feelings.¹ Kleinman² believes that the Haskalah aimed at three goals. 1) the secularization of the national culture, particularly the expansion and modernization of the Hebrew language and literature, 2) social reforms to improve relations in the Jewish community itself and 3) the economic rehabilitation of the Jewish people.³ Since the second and the third goals have already been discussed, we turn now to the first goal: the modernization of the Hebrew language and literature, as a means of enhancing and updating Jewish culture and the status of the Jewish people.

There is disagreement among scholars in their evaluation of the character of the Hebrew Haskalah: was it nationalist or anti-nationalist? Halkin, for example,

¹See I. Barzilay, "National and Anti-National Trends in the Berlin Haskalah," JSS (1959), p. 176.

²M. Kleinman, Demuyot ve-Qomot (Paris, 1928).

³Ibid., p. 18.

maintains that the Hebrew Haskalah, although it was influenced by the cosmopolitan spirit of the European enlightenment, was nevertheless nationalistic since it was dedicated to the nation and committed to its historical existence. The maskilim dreamt the impossible dream of making life of the Jewish people more humane without hurting their historical continuation.⁴ In contrast, Shapiro⁵ reflects a more ambivalent viewpoint. He believes that the Hebrew Haskalah literature was essentially a product of forces and developments within Jewry and was only slightly influenced by the external world; he nevertheless claims that it was anti-national in character. "The enlightenment movement was in its real essence a war against the national existence of the people in exile."⁶ He argues against the view that the mere use of Hebrew was indicative of nationalist tendencies,⁷ saying that for the maskilim the Hebrew language was never a goal in itself but only a means of reaching the people.⁸ Nevertheless, even

⁴S. Halkin, Mavo la-Siporet ha-Ivrit (Jerusalem, 1959), p. 55.

⁵N. H. Shapiro, Toldot ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadashah (Kaunas, 1938).

⁶Ibid., pp. 8, 26.

⁷M. Kleinman, Demuyot ve-Qomot, p. 15.

⁸H. Shapiro, Toldot, p. 9.

Shapiro, who distinguishes between a spiritual and terrestrial nationalism, believes that the Haskalah opposed only the former but not the latter.⁹ Inasmuch, however, as Jewish nationalism at the time was of a spiritual character, it may be said of the Haskalah that it was anti-national.

The problem of defining the Haskalah in either nationalist or anti-nationalist terms is obviously a difficult one. Bearing in mind the all-out assault of the maskilim on all aspects of Jewish life and culture, one may justly wonder to what extent was the continued existence of Judaism foremost in their mind, or were they simply carried away by the Zeitgeist and their naive optimism. Moshe Kleinman who champions the view of the nationalistic character of the Haskalah maintains that it was not the Haskalah which initiated or even intensified the general tendency toward moving out of the ghetto. This tendency was the result of external forces, above all the Prussian industrial revolution. By the time the Haskalah began, Jews had long been pouring out from the ghetto.

The literature of the Haskalah . . . was a reaction against the breaking away movement. It tried to save whatever was still possible to save, by the help of the powerful national factor that existed in the national language.¹⁰

⁹Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁰M. Kleinman, Demuyot ve-Qomot, p. 15.

One may argue, of course, against this notion that the Haskalah was reacting to the escape from the ghetto. Even Kleinman admits that the movement did not oppose it openly and sometimes seemed even to support the move, but even then it tried to curb the flow and lead it into a stream leading back to historical Judaism.¹¹ Kleinman concludes that "The literature of the Haskalah was the embodiment of the national wish of the Jewish people . . . to keep and to develop their cultural inheritance and to stand out in history as a separate national entity with values and a development of its own."¹²

Unlike Shapiro, Kleinman considers the devotion of the maskilim to the Hebrew language as proof of their national feelings. To use his words

. . . that cult of the Hebrew language by itself is sufficient testimony to the strong national feelings that were alive and awake in the hearts of the maskilim. Why was the Hebrew language so dear to them? Because on the one hand it was the only remnant of the national "treasure" meaning national independence. . . . The existence of such a cult, does it not testify like a hundred witnesses that there was not even the slightest wish [in their hearts] for a national extinction?¹³

Kleinman's view that language is an expression of nationalism is also accepted in essence by other scholars dealing with the literature of the Haskalah. Dinur, for

¹¹Ibid., p. 17.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid., p. 18.

example, thinks that "The Hebrew language was an expression of the struggle of 'the last burning ember' for its existence, an expression of its fight for the creation of some kind of a Jewish atmosphere in the life of the Jews in foreign lands, at the time when the majority of them walked over 'the bridge of enlightenment' into alien and foreign worlds."¹⁴

What both Dinur and Kleinman say is certainly true with regard to Isaac Satanow. He dealt intensively with the Hebrew language and occupied himself with the theory of literature, hoping thereby to improve the quality of the Hebrew literature of his time. Occasionally he even expressed himself openly and directly on the question of Jewish nationalism and its relation to the problems of the Hebrew language.

The preoccupation with language was not only typical of the Hebrew Haskalah but of the general enlightenment movement as well.

Latin, the language of the educated, was losing ground. The vernacular not only became respectable but replaced Latin. With the new discoveries and new developments a new vocabulary was needed. Since the rise of the vernacular the European race had hitherto like M. Jourdin in Moliere's comedy, spoken prose without knowing it. Now they became acutely conscious of it, and of the inadequacy of their former speech to express their meaning. . . . What it lacked (the written language)

¹⁴ B. Z. Dinur, Sefer ha-Ziyonut, p. 88.

and what was urgently demanded of it was clarity, lucidity, and the exactness of science coupled with the comprehensibility of well-bred conversation. Style must be made correct, that is consonant with reason, and witty, that is, interesting to the common man.¹⁵

Already in the seventeenth century the French Academy was established with the task of purifying the French language and making it free of ambiguities and of all obscurity. For this purpose a grammar, a rhetoric, a treatise and a dictionary were planned.¹⁶ Under the combined influence of science, the growth of a larger reading public, and the example of France, an increased interest and enthusiasm for the vernacular became more and more evident also in England, in Italy, and what is more important for our case, in Germany. Language became an expression of nationalism even before the era of nationalism arrived and Moses Mendelssohn found it appropriate to reproach Frederick II for using French instead of German.¹⁷

Thus we see that Satanow's own preoccupation with language as well as that of the other maskilim was not unique. Yet the problems they faced were unique. Thus Gumpel Schnaber

¹⁵ P. Smith, A History of Modern Culture, Vol. II (New York, 1933), 273-274. See also Paul Hazard, "The World of Letters and Ideas," European Thought in the Eighteenth Century, trans. L. May (London, 1954), pp. 229-230.

¹⁶ P. Smith, A History, p. 297.

¹⁷ A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn (Univ. of Alabama, 1973), p. 30; also I. Euchel, Toldot ha-Rambaman (Berlin, 1774), p. 6.

complained in the Meassef:

. . . I have seen another great evil, and that is the abandoning of our holy language . . . at the time when nations all over the world are producing large numbers of books and thereby enriching their national languages, why should we lose our fathers' heritage and forsake our holy language.¹⁸

Satanow's attitude to language is interesting. He draws an analogy between language and sex. In Gam Elleh he writes: "The one who wrote Sefer Yetzirah¹⁹ (Book of Creation), compared sex with language, meaning that when the time is not right for sex, [literature] can satisfy desires through poems of passion."²⁰

In the same book he quotes again Sefer Yetzirah, drawing the same analogy but with a slightly different interpretation.

The desire for wisdom is comparable to the desire for sexual intercourse, as is written in Sefer Yetzirah: "and He made the covenant of the tongue between man's ten fingers and the covenant of the sex organ between man's ten toes." Both of them give eternal existence to man, each in its own way and each in its own form. Therefore God created in man the desire for both so that he should reach

¹⁸M. Gumpel Schnaber, ha-Meassef (Berlin, 1788), p. 227.

¹⁹One of the most ancient Cabbalistic books attributed to Abraham the patriarch. It discusses the creation of the world in mystical terms. According to it the world was created through the mystical combination of the twenty-two Hebrew letters and the ten Sefiroth. Many Jewish mystics and philosophers wrote commentaries on the book.

²⁰Gam Elleh Mishlei Asaf, p. 86.

the ultimate goal; either the perpetuation and multiplication of mankind, or the spreading of wisdom which is the most elevated accomplishment of man.²¹

In other words, both sexual desire and intellectual creativity contribute to the betterment of mankind, one by helping it to multiply and the other by educating it. The third interpretation of that analogy appears in Beit ha-Tefillah:

. . . Sefer Yetzirah compares the covenant of the sex organ with the covenant of the tongue; As God planted in human nature the desire to mate through the sex organ in order to give birth to another human being in his own image, so he also put in the heart of the enlightened man the desire to spread his thoughts by using his tongue. An enlightened man speaks in order to inform mankind of his thoughts and ideas. . . . The common aspect of both covenants is that both wish to perpetuate mankind; one materially and the other spiritually.²²

In other words, Satanow considered language to be as important to the spiritual continuity of man as the sex drive is to his physical continuity. Therefore, when Satanow deals with the Hebrew language, he is expressing his concern for the spiritual continuity of the Jewish people.

²¹Ibid., Ch. 31, commentary 19.
 ודמה תשוקת החכמה לתשוקת המשגל על דרך הכתוב בספר יצירה ז"ל
 וכרת לו ברית הלשון בין עשר אצבעות ידיו וברית המעור בין
 עשר אצבעות רגליו כי שני אלה יתנו קיום נצחי לאדם האי כי
 אורחיה והאי כי אורחיה, זה בחמרו וזה בצורתו. ועל כן ברא
 ה' באדם התשוקה על שתיהן להביא הדברים אל תכליתם אם להזריע
 זרע אדם בחמרו או להזריע זרע החכמה שהיא צורת האדם. . .

See Sefer Yetzira (Horodna, 1806), p. 35.

²²I. Satanow, Beit ha-Tefillah, p. 51.

As is typical of Satanow, one of his most comprehensive discussions of the Hebrew language, an article under the name of 'mi-Darkhei ha-Lashon ve-ha-Melitza"²³ was not published under his own name but under the name of his son, Dr. Scheinman. In this article Satanow summarizes his views on the history and development of the Hebrew language. He compares his own age with that of Ezra and Nehemiah, when Hebrew was almost forgotten because it was not fashionable to speak it. Satanow feels that the condition of Hebrew in his day is even worse, because not only is the language degraded but its grammar is practically unknown.

Like Schnaber and other Meassfim, Satanow realizes that Hebrew's greatest deficiency is its lack of new and adequate vocabulary. He understands that in a changing world where new discoveries are made every day, a language must adapt to invent new vocabulary and to renew itself constantly in order to survive. Satanow said:

Our language stopped giving birth and became barren, because from the time that our forefathers went into exile, nothing has been added to the language, and it has become poorer than any other language . . . no one has been allowed to innovate and now we suffer from starvation, not a hunger for food or a thirst for water, but a hunger for new vocabulary which we have to get from other languages, which have constantly renewed themselves according to their need.²⁴

²³I. Satanow, "mi-Darkhei ha-Lashon ve-ha-Melitza," ha-Meassef (Berlin, 1788).

²⁴Ibid., p. 85.

Time and again he complains that "At a time when every language is expanding with the new scientific developments in the world, our language remains barren."²⁵ Part of the reason for that situation, Satanow points out, is that the Jews, through lack of knowledge and because of official discrimination, were not in contact with the new sciences and professions.²⁶

Satanow draws a correlation between the development of knowledge and science in a nation and the development of that nation's language. He enumerates several reasons for the lack of secular learning among the Jewish people. a) The sages forbade the writing down of scientific theories in order to prevent arguments about their meaning; b) The fear of paganism: gentile wise men used scientific knowledge to create artificial miracles to glorify their Gods; c) Because God hid wisdom from men, our sages wanting to act like Him also hid it from the masses.²⁷

But this lack of knowledge impaired the Hebrew language. There is a direct connection between the expansion of knowledge, arts and crafts on one hand and language

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Gam Elleh, Ch. 8, commentary 11; Ch. 53, commentary 2; Middot (Berlin, 1784), p. 224; see also D. Friedlander, Akten Stücke, pp. 10, 21.

²⁷Middot, p. 101; see also Maimonides, Moreh, I, 71.

on the other. The value, greatness, and richness of a language is in direct relation to the knowledge of a nation. It increases with the increase of knowledge and decreases with its decline.²⁸

To solve the problem of a deficient vocabulary Satanow suggested the use not only of Biblical sources, but also post-Biblical sources. He was among the first to recommend the use of Mishnaic Hebrew. In spite of his own belief that Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew were two separate languages, he considered such usage both legitimate and beneficial because the creators and users of Mishnaic Hebrew were Hebrew speakers. He hoped that this might partially solve the problem of a vocabulary shortage. He realized that Biblical Hebrew was purer, but he also noted that it was poorer in terms of realia because a large portion of its vocabulary was lost when only the twenty-four books of the Bible survived.²⁹ Satanow considered Talmudic language also lacking because it does not include many roots or idioms in use at the time.

Satanow argued against those who objected to the use of Mishnaic Hebrew on the ground that it has a large number of foreign words. Neither Biblical nor Mishnaic words were

²⁸ Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 25, commentary 1; Gam Elleh, Ch. 18, commentary 17.

²⁹ Iggeret Beit ha-Tefillah, p. 5.

totally sufficient for the needs of modern times, thus use of foreign words was acceptable, even essential. Following Leon of Modena³⁰ he argues that modern words in the Mishna were originally Hebrew but were forgotten by the Jews once they were adopted by other nations and then reappeared in their foreign derivation in Mishnaic Hebrew.³¹ Therefore, there was no reason to reject them now. The Hebrews

. . . received as their inheritance the lady of all languages, the first one both in time and importance,³² the language which the first man had used and with which God spoke and named heaven and earth and all their creatures. The patriarchs passed on this language to their sons and their sons gave it to later generations until there came the father of all prophets who wrote down the words of God, purified in the holy language. In that language he wrote the book which contained God's teachings to Israel. After that time the spirit of God passed to the prophets and they wrote for the Jews the twenty-four holy books in an exact language and spelling which became the source of pure language. . . .³³

Satanow bolsters this not very convincing argument by adding that the origin of a word does not really matter ". . . after it (a new word) has entered the language, one should not mind

³⁰Leon of Modena argues that it is not true that Hebrew contains foreign vocabulary but to the contrary those words were originally Hebrew and were acquired by foreign nations. L. of Modena, Beit Yehudah, commentary on "Rosh ha-Shanah" 3:26 (Venice, 1635).

³¹L. Satanow, "mi-Darkhei ha-Lashon," p. 87.

³²Beit Yehudah, Commentary "Rosh ha-Shanah," 3:26.

³³Mishlei Asaf, Introduction.

whether the word is new or of foreign origin because what really counts is that it has been accepted."³⁴

Satanow's arguments were apparently influenced by Judah Ha-Levi's Kuzari³⁵ which he had republished. He says:

Since the time that we went into exile and stopped using our language, we became mute. We do not have our language anymore. We can't express ourselves and there is nobody knowledgeable in the Hebrew language. As a result, the holy language is hidden from our people and there is no one among us who knows how to speak it.³⁶

Exile brought decline not only to Hebrew, but to other aspects of Jewish culture as well. He claims that the Jews invented the alphabet (before there were only hieroglyphics), knew astronomy and were in general even more knowledgeable than Plato and other wise men.³⁷ Ben Kamzar knew the process of printing before John Guttenberg.³⁸ These theories were quite popular in medieval Jewish writings³⁹ and Satanow, the

³⁴I. Satanow, "mi-Darkhei ha-Lashon," p. 87.

³⁵J. Ha-Levi, ha-Kuzari (Mahbarot Le-Sifrut Publication: Tel-Aviv).

³⁶I. Satanow, Mishlei Asaf, Introduction. This thought is an elaboration of Ha-Levi's words: "What happened to its bearers also happened to it. It became poor because of their poverty and limited because of their limitation, but by itself it is the most important of all languages both by the criterion of logic as well as by tradition." See ha-Kuzari, II, 68. Similar words are repeated in many of Satanow's writings. See Hizzayon, p. 3; Beit ha-Tefillah, p. 5.

³⁷I. Satanow, Middot, p. 99. See also Moses Isserles, Torat ha-Olah (Prague, 1530), I, ch. 11, 39-40.

³⁸Middot, p. 102. Ben Kamzar was a skilled scribe at the time of the second temple. See Yoma 38:10.

³⁹M. Maimonides, Moreh Nevukhim, I, ch. 71; J. Ha-Levi, ha-Kuzari, II, 68.

maskil, reiterates them. He does this not because he necessarily believes in it but because the masses do and he wants to increase their national pride and even more their interest in wisdom and discoveries. In the past Hebrew was rich, as can be seen from all the technical details in the description of the tabernacle, and the existence of so many synonyms in Hebrew. However, with the exile, when Jews were prevented from participating in arts and crafts, their knowledge withered and so did their language.⁴⁰

Again and again he emphasizes the correlation between the national condition and that of the Hebrew language.

When we were on our own soil and the cloud of God was hovering above the enlightened people of our nation, they preserved the pure language, and increased and strengthened it. However, since we went into exile, our language lost its dignity because we were in the midst of other nations, we learned their languages and forsook our own.⁴¹

Satanow, the reformer, offered some suggestions for improving what he considered an unsatisfactory situation.

In Minhat Biqqurim he summarized his suggestions:

It is in the nature of a language to expand with time, because of the invention of arts, actions and tools which did not exist before. The more new tools and actions there are, the more names and verbs the language needs . . . therefore we should expand our language and speak it . . .

⁴⁰Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 25, commentary 1; Gam Elleh, Ch. 53, commentary 2.

⁴¹Middot, p. 225.

and one should not object to words borrowed from other sources beside the Bible, as long as these words are consistent with grammatical rules and the meanings of existing Hebrew words which can be used in matters of secular knowledge.⁴²

Satanow put his views on the Hebrew language into practice. He composed grammar books.⁴³ He corrected prayer books because he felt that they were plagued with too many grammatical mistakes.⁴⁴ He made rules for the study and usage of language, and like Maimonides⁴⁵ and Abraham Ibn Ezra⁴⁶ he sharply criticized the paitanim whose grammar was faulty and whose style too flowery and hyperbolic.⁴⁷ Satanow complains that even those who write books and consider themselves to be knowledgeable, speak gibberish.

. . . and if it were not for the few who still carry the covenant of the pure language, then the holy language would have been lost for our people and would have been as forgotten as the dead. Even

⁴²Minhat Biqqurim, p. 17; Middot, p. 222.

⁴³Sifte'i Renanot (Berlin, 1773); Safah Ahat (Berlin, 1783); Sfat Emet (Berlin, 1787).

⁴⁴Va-Ye'etar Yitzhak (Berlin, 1784); Iggeret Beit ha-Tefillah (Berlin, 1773); Seder Selihot (Berlin, 1785).

⁴⁵Maimonides, Moreh Nevukhim, I, 59.

⁴⁶A. Ibn Ezra, Perush Al-Oohelet, Ch. 5, commentary 1.

⁴⁷I. Satanow, va-Ye'etar Yitzhak, p. 3; Holekh Tamim (Berlin, 1795), p. 9; Divrei Rivot, II (Berlin, 1800), 11. Modena had similar criticism although Satanow does not mention him in relation to the paitanim. See L. of Modena, Beit Yehudah (Venice, 1695), p. 5.

nowadays, for all the nations and for many Jews as well, the holy language is just a name and they call it a dead language.⁴⁸

Satanow was quite pessimistic about the prospects for the Hebrew language as long as Jews lived in exile. He emphasizes the correlation between Hebrew language and the fate of the nation (as did Kleinman) and sees the best chances for a revival of the language with the revival of the nation, or, to use his own words, "Hebrew has no one to lean on but God, who will come to its aid when He will bring from Zion the redemption of Israel."⁴⁹ Satanow believed that at that time the language will be purified and will become fruitful again.⁵⁰

Satanow expressed his national Jewish feelings and his hope for redemption:

When we and our fathers sinned, God left us in the hands of our enemies and delivered . . . his holy and splendid temple into captivity. But even then, He did not forsake us . . . forever. He told us through the prophets, . . . that in due time the temple will be rebuilt . . . may our eyes see its reconstruction soon, in our own time.⁵¹

⁴⁸Mishlei Asaf, Introduction.

⁴⁹I. Satanow, Middot, p. 225.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Iggeret Eder ha-Yeqar (Berlin, 1772), p. 6.

These words echo similar words and hopes expressed in traditional Hebrew prayers and cannot alone serve as an indication of his fervent national belief. However, there are many other passages in his works which are more original and convincing in their fervor and leave no doubt as to Satanow's national feelings.⁵² In Mishlei Asaf he speaks about the shortcomings of living in exile.⁵³ In Megillat Hasidim he advises the pious: "If you want to observe pious ways of life, leave the country where you now dwell and go to the land of our fathers, live there and observe God's laws and teachings as He commanded us to do. . . ."54

In Zemirot Asaf Satanow inserted a prayer for the renewal of prophecy, wisdom and spiritual leadership among the Jews.⁵⁵ The renewal of prophecy⁵⁶ was always considered in Messianic Judaism as one of the first signs of redemption. Satanow even describes his ideal Messiah as leading nations in the right path, judging among kingdoms and ending wars among them.⁵⁷ The wish for redemption is a repeated motif in Zemirot Asaf:

⁵²Zemirot Asaf (Berlin, 1793), Ch. 38, sen. 2-28.

⁵³Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 26, commentary 22.

⁵⁴Megillat Hasidim, Ch. 17, sen. 15.

⁵⁵Zemirot Asaf, Ch. 46.

⁵⁶Ibid., Ch. 50, commentary 24.

⁵⁷Ibid., Ch. 34, commentary 24, Ch. 34, sen. 38.

You expelled them and scattered them; they wandered like lost sheep and dwell in foreign lands. But Your hand still guides them, even in captivity, You guide them, and make their captors pity them. In the course of time You will gather them again to live in the Holy Land and they will thank You for Your goodness.⁵⁸

There are even more fervent passages in Satanow's work. In one psalm Satanow quotes from Isaiah referring to the servant of the Lord.⁵⁹

God, how long will You make us shamed among peoples, and despised among nations. How long will we appear as a powerless man, how long will we be among nations as a man of sorrows, acquainted with grief. Yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted by an incurable leprosy, who is separated from mankind, dwells by himself and is called loathsome. He has nothing to do with mankind and human society and is not considered among the worthy nations. How long must we suffer for their sins. . . .⁶⁰

Genuine pain and despair are expressed in the following lines:

God, how long will the enemy abuse the glory of Your powerful host. . . .⁶¹ How long will our land be like a woman bereaved of her offspring who painfully feeds wolves' cubs the milk of her breasts which was intended for her dead son. Many nations were as sick as we but in time they recovered while my sickness is incurable and my pain is eternal. Every nation which is captured by an enemy changes its religion and exchanges its God with the God of its enemies. This way they avoid trouble, receive amnesty and become free, but Your people

⁵⁸Ibid., Ch. 48, sen. 21-23.

⁵⁹Ibid., Isaiah, Ch. 53.

⁶⁰Ibid., Ch. 46, sen. 2-8.

⁶¹Ibid., Ch. 32, sen. 2.

will not deny Your faith and will not change Your teaching. Therefore they are not given amnesty and are despised. It is for You, O God, that we suffered shame and it is for Your teaching that we were killed.⁶² God, how can You see the evil that visits Your people. How long will You give Your land to desolation, Your people to contempt and Your teaching to faultiness.⁶³

Zemirot Asaf is the most nationalistic book that Satanow wrote. It proves beyond doubt that his Haskalah did not aim at assimilating the Jews, on the contrary, it aimed at a Jewish revitalization. His frequent expression of nationalist feelings and his devotion to the Hebrew language make him one of the more nationalistic maskilim of his time.

⁶² Ibid., Ch. 38, sen. 8-17.

⁶³ Ibid., Ch. 38, sen. 20, 21.

CHAPTER V

SATANOW'S THOUGHTS ABOUT LITERATURE

Satanow's writings obviously reflect his many-sided personality: half Polish Jew, half German Jew, a believer and a heretic. According to Klausner,¹ Satanow's works exhibit trends that came to dominate modern Hebrew literature. Yet Max Eric² considers him a humanist of the Renaissance period. He was clearly a rationalist but at the same time he was greatly preoccupied with mysticism, and his writings constitute a mixture of medievalism and modernity. Although he uses medieval sources mainly to reinforce his modern ideas, nevertheless, his frequent references suggest a strong attachment to those sources. This combination of medievalism and modernity is also apparent in his thoughts about literature.

The thousand years between the ninth and the nineteenth centuries witnessed the rise of three centers of secular Hebrew literature. The first one arose in Spain

¹J. Klausner, Historia shel ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha (Jerusalem, 1960), p. 177.

²M. Eric, Etuden, pp. 95-96.

during the so-called Golden Age, the second, in Italy during the Renaissance, and the third, in Germany in Satanow's time. Secular Hebrew literature never functioned in a vacuum, but was always integrally connected and influenced by the dominant literature of the milieu in which it arose. Thus, it was Arabic that influenced Hebrew literature in Spain, Latin in Italy during the Renaissance period³ and French and English as well as German in Germany⁴ during the enlightenment.

During each of those periods a theory of literature arose, which bore the imprint of the general literary views of the time. Thus, when Moses Ibn Ezra, the eleventh century Hebrew poet of Spain, wrote a book on the theory of literature,⁵ even though his examples were taken from classical and contemporary Hebrew literature, his models and even his language were Arabic. His younger contemporary, Judah Ha-Levi also analyzed poetry in his philosophical book The Kuzari,⁶ again, using Arabic as his means of expression.

³J. Messer-Leon quotes Latin sources extensively in his book on esthetic Nofet Zufim (Jerusalem, Makor publication, 1971).

⁴Paul Hazard, European Thought in the Eighteenth Century, trans. L. May (London, 1954), p. 65; N. Shapiro, Toldot ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha, pp. 37-42; J. Klausner, Historia shel ha-sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha, I, 26.

⁵Moses Ibn Ezra, Shirat Yisrael, trans. by B. Z. Halper (Leipzig, 1924).

⁶ha-Kuzari, II, 69-78.

On the other hand, in the Italian center the language used was Hebrew, though the ideas were all drawn from the general environment. Thus, Judah Messer-Leon, the fifteenth century Italian rabbi, scholar and physician, wrote his Nofet Zufim (1480) in Hebrew but his models and quotations were from Greek and Latin. Also the eighteenth century M. H. Luzzato uses classical forms and ideas in his book on esthetics, Leshon Limmudim,⁷ but like Messer-Leon he writes in Hebrew.

Satanow was among the first Hebrew writers in Germany who shows interest not only in literature itself but also in its theory. The sources which may have influenced him range from Aristotle, whose Poetics he might have read in the Hebrew translation of Todros Todrosi,⁸ Judah Ha-Levi's Kuzari, through Messer-Leon's Nofet Zufim which he mentions,⁹ up to his contemporaries in the general literature, especially Lessing whom he might have known personally, since both were frequent visitors at Mendelssohn's¹⁰ home.

⁷M. H. Luzzato, Leshon Limmudim (Mantua, 1727).

⁸According to Moritz Steinschneider there were numerous manuscripts of the translation of Poetics by Todros Todrosi. The manuscript was also published twice in the nineteenth century (Lips, 1842; Pisa, 1872) under the Be'ur Ibn Rashed Al Sefer ha-Shir. See M. Steinschneider, Die Hebräischen Übersetzungen Des Mittelalters Und Die Juden Als Dolmetscher (Graz, 1956), §21, pp. 62, 63.

⁹Gam Elleh, Ch. 5, commentary 17.

¹⁰I. Euchel, Toldot ha-Rambaman (Berlin, 1814), p. 139; A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn, pp. 352-354.

Although the eighteenth century was proud of its new ideas and discoveries in all realms of knowledge, as far as art and literature are concerned, it acknowledged its indebtedness to the seventeenth century and readily accepted its literary values and standards.¹¹ The outstanding literary theoretician of that period was Boileau.¹² His literary theory can best be described as rationalist, universal, ethical and utilitarian. According to him, literature must above all adhere to the principle of reason as the superior judge of Truth, which is in his view identical with Beauty. Anything contradictory to reason or truth or anything not natural, useful or good is out of the boundaries of belles lettres.

¹¹About literary views of the eighteenth century see F. Ernst, Der Klassizismus in Italien, Frankreich und Deutschland (Zurich-Leipzig-Vienn, 1934); V. Klemperer, Idealistische Literaturgeschichte (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1929); P. Hazard, "The World of Letters and Ideas," European Thought, p. 215.

¹²N. Boileau, L'art poétique (Paris, 1674; Strasbourg, 1909). A poem requires clear ideas and concepts. See Ibid., verse I, line 143-154. It should be simple and truthful. See Ibid., I, 101-102. Anything irrational is also unnatural and therefore should not be included in the poem. See Ibid., III, 48-51. In line with these clear and defined concepts and ideas a poem should be structured according to clear and defined rules of rhythm and rhyme. See Ibid., II, III. Language should also be rational, clear, exact and well disciplined. See Ibid., I, 163. A poem should be both pleasurable and useful, in other words, enjoyable but also ethical. See Vereker, "Reason and Happiness" in Eighteenth Century Optimism (Liverpool, 1967), p. 39, and Boileau, verse 4, line 85. Following Boileau there was an impressive list of works on the art of Poetry which repeat, with some not unimportant variations, pretty much what Boileau had said already. To name a few, for example, the English poet Alexander Pope and his work "The Essay on Criticism" and the

(continued)

The eighteenth century was also the age of great critics. In fact these critics were also the theoreticians of literature.

. . . a higher dignity was claimed for the critic, investing him with powers not a whit inferior to those of the creative artist. By virtue of his office, if duly performed, the critic might aspire to an eminence equal to that of the orator, the poet, or the playwright. And it happened that there came on the scene just then some of the greatest critics that ever were, Pope, Voltaire, Lessing.¹³

Satanow's criticism of the Hebrew literature of his time is more in line with medieval and ancient theories of literature. His main criticism concerned the use of foreign meters in Hebrew poetry.¹⁴ Judah Ha-Levi maintained in the Kuzari that the Arabic meter was foreign to the spirit of the Hebrew language,¹⁵ but he, himself, used this meter in his poems, and so did Satanow. In Sefer ha-Hizzayon Satanow says: ". . . because gentile poets used quantitative meter in their poetry, many of our people did the same out of jealousy, trying to prove that the Hebrew language does not lack anything. However, to do it is

12 (continued)

German J. C. Gottsched's "Versuch einer Kritischer Dichtkunst." They and every literary theoretician of the time, tried to establish a set of rules and discipline for poetry. See P. Hazard, European Thought, pp. 218, 220.

¹³P. Hazard, European Thought, p. 220.

¹⁴See supra, Chapter about Language and Nationalism.

¹⁵ha-Kuzari, II, 73-74.

against the spirit of pure Hebrew.¹⁶ In spite of this objection, Satanow goes on to explain in detail a variety of Spanish poems and meters.¹⁷ He is also critical of the use of foreign words in Hebrew, notably Aramaic.¹⁸ Nevertheless, he himself wrote poetry in Aramaic, and used foreign meters of which he was so critical.¹⁹ With Satanow, theory and practice did not always coincide.

There were several reasons for Satanow's criticism. The first was his nationalist feelings. The mere fact that a meter was foreign was enough to turn him against it.²⁰ However, there were also literary reasons for his criticism. True to his utilitarian approach to literature he maintained that meter is secondary to the main purpose of poetry:

A poet who imitates gentile poets, who writes sweet poetry using equal rhymes and quantitative meter to such a degree that a musician is able to play it on an instrument or to sing it, is a poet who abandons the main goal for the sake of a secondary one. While his poetry is pleasant to listen to, it does not express the wishes of the heart which is the main purpose of poetry.²¹

¹⁶Sefer ha-Hizzayon, p. 9; Beit Tefillah, p. 8.

¹⁷Hizzayon, p. 9.

¹⁸Beit Tefillah, p. 31.

¹⁹Megillat ha-Yeled.

²⁰Hizzayon, p. 16.

²¹Gam Elleh, Third Introduction.

Another reason for his criticism of Arabic meter is Satanow's awareness of the limitation it imposes on free expression:

. . . the pressure put on a poet by the necessity to write in rhymes and in quantitative meter interferes with the need to add or omit syllables to enable the poem to express the meaning of the heart, which is the main purpose of poetry. By adding syllables in this way, the poet destroys the beauty and grandeur of the poem.²²

It seems that Satanow had ambivalent feelings about Arabic prosody. On the one hand he felt that it was alien to Biblical poetry and should be rejected, but, on the other hand, he felt it enhanced the beauty of poetry. In Sefer ha-Hizzayon he offered a compromise between the two approaches:

A poet should combine in his poetry Biblical phrases, quoting them exactly as they are, or turned around; he should do it because as the rabbis said, Biblical language is the most perfect one. . . . He should also use quantitative meter because all these devices make poetry so pleasant that it sounds like bell ringing.²³

However, a few pages later, in the same book Satanow advocates again the sole usage of Biblical style.²⁴

Beside the Arabic meters Satanow also criticized the piyyutim. Following Abraham Ibn Ezra,²⁵ Satanow complains

²²Ibid.

²³Hizzayon, p. 4.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 5-7.

²⁵Perush Al-Qohelet, Ch. 5, commentary 1.

that the paitanim (writers of piyyutim) do not follow correct grammar. ". . . a poet should speak clearly both from the point of view of language, as well as ideas. Poets should not be like some paitanim who did not write in a pure language as Ibn Ezra remarked."²⁶ Time and again Satanow complains that the Paitanim used sacrilegious language in their piyyutim,²⁷ and their unclear language created a barrier between the praying man and God.²⁸ However, even in the case of the paitanim Satanow is not completely consistent in his opposition. He found some justification for their language. ". . . One should not mind if some paitanim did not observe the rules of grammar because anything that causes spiritual awakening is more important than grammar. Spiritual awakening is the ultimate goal."²⁹ However, for the most part Satanow is not so benevolent to the Paitanim. Besides Ibn Ezra he often quotes Maimonides in support of his criticism of them.³⁰ Nevertheless, one has to remember

²⁶ Megillat Hasidim, commentary to 35:20.

²⁷ Ibid., Ch. 35, commentary 22.

²⁸ Holekh Tamim, p. 10; about Paitanim see also L. Modena, Beit Yehudah, p. 5(b).

²⁹ Hizzayon, p. 8.

³⁰ Gam Elleh, Ch. 32, commentary 17; Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 53, commentary 9; Ch. 32, commentary 23.

that Satanow's criticism of Arabic prosody or the piyyut is directed not so much against ancient poets as against his own contemporaries who still adhered to the old style and form.³¹ As a maskil, Satanow is a pragmatist. It is not the past but the present that interests him. Criticism of the past is important only as a means to improve the present. Therefore Satanow's analysis of literature includes suggestions for improvement as well as criticism.

A careful examination of Satanow's writings on the theory of literature suggests that Aristotle had the most outstanding influence on him. Satanow accepts Aristotle's basic view that literature is a form of art. Like Aristotle³² he classifies it somewhere between the oral and the visual arts. Every knowledgeable man understands that a poet and a painter both recount a story poetically, but each in a different way. (The poet will create a poetic story while the painter will create a poetic drawing.) Knowing the fact that if a painter misses a small detail in his drawing of a picture, be it even a little dot, the painting will no longer resemble the thing that was painted. The poet too has to be faithful to reality. Satanow's words about proportions in

³¹ Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 32, commentary 23.

³² Aristotle, Poetics. Translated by Hamilton Fyfe (London, 1927), p. 31.

art which were mentioned earlier remind us also of Laokoon (1766): "Physical beauty arises from the harmonious effect of manifold parts that can be taken in one view."³³ Or of Lessing's declaration that "A single defective part can destroy the harmonious working of many parts toward beauty."³⁴ It is likely that he knew of this work since he was friendly with Mendelssohn who was very interested in it.³⁵

Satanow applies the same thesis to poetry. "With the smallest deviation of the poet, the poem will change and become obscure."³⁶ Satanow compares poetry to painting also in Sefer ha-Hizzayon.³⁷ Following Aristotle³⁸ Satanow also compares poetry and music.

Poetic lines are very short, because it is the short distance between the subject and the object that creates the beauty and the splendor of a poem. The short intervals between musical notes make it more pleasant to listen to music, just as the short distance between the different parts of the baby's face makes it more beautiful. . . .³⁹

Satanow missed Lessing's basic principle however. Lessing believed in the evaluation of literature purely on

³³E. G. Lessing, Laokoon, trans. A. B. Still (London, 1949), p. 74.

³⁴Ibid., preface, p. 3.

³⁵A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn, p. 73.

³⁶Minhat Biqqurim (Berlin, 1797), p. 12.

³⁷Hizzayon, p. 4.

³⁸Aristotle, Poetics, p. 31.

³⁹Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 49, sen. 19-21.

the basis of its esthetic merits, without any consideration of its practical value.⁴⁰ By the same token, Satanow missed also Mendelssohn's ideas of literature which were similar to Lessing's. Mendelssohn differed from Lessing granting to a genius the right to break accepted literary rules.⁴¹ Nevertheless he subscribed to Lessing's principle of *l'art pour l'art*.⁴²

Satanow had other criteria for evaluation of literature. Despite his acceptance of poetry as an art form, he did not accept the concept of "*l'art pour l'art*." As part of a new ideological movement, he considered literature's main function to support that ideology. Like Wessely in the introduction to Shirey Tif'eret,⁴³ Satanow explained the purpose of poetry by saying "When one of the Maskilim wants to teach the public or simple people things that originated in the depth of the mind, he will do it with a story or a poem, so that with the help of the wisdom of the fable, they will understand the deep moral of those things."⁴⁴

⁴⁰E. G. Lessing, Laokoon, preface, p. 3.

⁴¹A. Altman, Mendelssohn, p. 73.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 70-72.

⁴³N. H. Wessely, Shirey Tif'eret (Prague, 1829), Introduction, p. 5; see also Y. ha-Efrati, Mlukhat Shaul (Vienna, 1892), Introduction.

⁴⁴Divrei Rivot (Berlin, 1800), II, 38.

Also in Sefer ha-Hizzayon he said:

When a poet wants to put his words into the hearts of his listeners so that they will stay forever, he will make his poem heard by using a true story or a fable which will astonish the listeners so that it will be remembered. As a human being is impressed by music which is an arrangement of melodious sounds, and consequently his mood changes from sorrow to joy or vice versa, so the soul will also be impressed . . . by listening to the moral of the story and change its attitude from better to best.⁴⁵

These words put literature in the category of a tool rather than a goal in itself. Its importance lies in its usefulness as an educational means rather than in the pure esthetic pleasure it brings.

Satanow's view as to the purpose of literature is expressed even more precisely in connection with the Meassef. He views the Meassef's goal "to instruct the sons of Judah in morals through fables and stories written in a pure language, and to teach them new and previously unknown things."⁴⁶ That makes literature a means of education and learning. Every literary work has an ultimate goal. "The goal of a poem is the broadening of the scope of man by supplying him either with good qualities or with correct ideas."⁴⁷ Or, as Satanow expressed it in another place, ". . . the usefulness of expression is, by definition, in transmitting ideas and

⁴⁵Hizzayon, p. 3.

⁴⁶Minhat Biqqurim, p. 41.

⁴⁷Hizzayon, p. 4.

revealing sources of thoughts, that is to say, its function is to transfer words from the heart of the speaker to the soul of the listener."⁴⁸

Even though the eighteenth century witnessed the rise of prose as a literary style of belles lettres,⁴⁹ Satanow, following Aristotle as well as his predecessors in the theory of Hebrew literature, hardly deals with prose as a literary style. For him belles lettres are only poetry in its different forms. He is aware of the existence of the prose style in literature and even mentions the definition of a story, but for him a story is just an oral account of a sequence of events and thoughts. "The written matter which expresses a man's ideas and intentions to his friends is called a speech or a story. . . . The revelation of the intention is called a story or a recital."⁵⁰ Evidently Satanow considers this form as a lower form of literature. Aristotle had already said that poetry is more philosophical than history because poetry deals with general truths while history deals in particular facts.⁵¹ Satanow accepts this

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 2. About goals of literature see also N. Boileau, L'art poétique, verse 4, line 85; G. Lanson, Histoire de la littérature française (Paris, 1916), pp. 502, 506.

⁴⁹P. Hazard, "The World of Letters and Ideas," European Thought, pp. 229-233; Preserved Smith, A History of Modern Culture, II (New York, 1933), 301.

⁵⁰Hizzayon, p. 6.

⁵¹Aristotle, Poetics, p. 35.

idea and that is why at a time when prose was rising in importance,⁵² Satanow deals almost exclusively with poetry in its various forms to which he devotes a detailed analysis.

Satanow defines a poem as "a poetic writing made by a poet through means of imitation and imagination, of either a fictitious story which could pass as real or of a true story about the sentient soul."⁵³ He perceives four components in every literary piece: "The act, the form, the material and the purpose."⁵⁴ It was the last component that the literature of the Haskalah emphasized, but Satanow deals with the others as well, asserting that it is the duty of every poet to see to it that his work should include each component in a perfect form. In the introduction to Gam Elleh Mishlei Asaf, Satanow interprets "material" as the use of pure language and the organization of the verses in short and long lines in order to make the poem more beautiful. The "purpose" according to Satanow is to influence the reader and impress him, or indeed to press him to think or act in a certain way.⁵⁵

⁵²P. Hazard, "The World of Letters and Ideas," European Thought, p. 230.

⁵³I. Satanow, Hizzayon, p. 3.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 4.

⁵⁵Gam Elleh, Third Introduction.

In Sefer ha-Hizzayon Satanow further elaborates the four components of literature. Again, while not discussing the "act," [פעל] as he probably thought it was understood, his interpretation of "material" [חמר] or pure language is slightly different from the one just mentioned. Here, pure language means correct grammar, pure Biblical Hebrew without any admixture of Talmudic language, and also the emphasis on rhymes and meter.⁵⁶ Satanow seems here under the influence of Hebrew poets of the Gold Age of Spain whose work he either published or imitated. His demand for a quantitative meter⁵⁷ appears anachronistic in the eighteenth century; furthermore he himself opposed it in other works.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Hizzayon, p. 4. By act Satanow probably means plot.

והנה בהיות סבות כל פעולה ארבעה. והם הפעל והצורה והחמר והתכלית, לכך כל סופר מהיר ירצה לפאר מליצתו מצד הסבות הג' אשר בפעל מליצתו, והם מצד החמר והצורה והתכלית. מצד החמר הוא שישמר דרך הצחות ר"ל שחיינה התיבות שהם כמיץ חמר המליצה מדוקדקות כפי דקדוק הלשון ולא תהיינה מעורכי הלשונות. כאשר ראיתי קצת המליצות לא ידעו מחבריהם מדקדוק הלשון כלל...

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ See Chapter about Language and Nationalism; also Satanow, Gam Elleh, Third Introduction; Hizzayon, p. 9.

Satanow interprets form by saying that ". . . the poem should have a clear idea."⁵⁹ Furthermore, even though the poet is allowed to use unusual examples from nature, those examples should not be illogical, and the poet should also arrange his words in an esthetic form.⁶⁰ The last but not the least literary component according to Satanow is the Tachlit or goal. Satanow believed that poetry should strive to better man, both morally and intellectually.⁶¹ In this respect Satanow joined Wessely and other maskilim who believed this goal was the main purpose of the Haskalah movement.

Satanow is aware that art first influences the senses and only afterwards the mind. He therefore suggests devices to make that effect on the senses stronger, illustrating his recommendations with examples from the Bible.⁶² He reminds poets that some senses are more effective than others; thus a human being is more impressed by what he sees than by what he hears. The poet should therefore describe actions rather than preach.⁶³

To make the action vivid, the writer is allowed to include in his work descriptions that are not an integral

⁵⁹Hizzayon, p. 9.

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 4.

⁶²Ibid., p. 5.

⁶³Ibid.

part of the ultimate conclusion, but which contribute to the completeness of the picture.⁶⁴ Satanow concludes his technical advice to poets by suggesting some literary devices mentioned either by Aristotle or Messer-Leon who quoted Aristotle extensively. He also offered some literary ornaments that were used by the Spanish medieval poets. To name a few of his suggestions: 1) opposition, 2) exaggeration, 3) similies, 4) refined language, 5) reversing chronological order, 6) use of association, 7) use of allegory, and 8) repetition.⁶⁵

Since according to Satanow and the rest of the maskilim the main purpose of literature is didactic, the author's choice of proper themes and literary techniques are very important for the achievement of this goal.

As we see, love poems arouse man to activities of passion and sex. On the other hand, ethical poems and fables will arouse good qualities in man and inspire him to proper deeds. They will also move his soul to reach fulfillment.⁶⁶

One cannot conclude a chapter dealing with Satanow's ideas about literature without including his words about the influence of poetry on the listener. In Sefer ha-Hizzayon he says that poetry should act on the human soul as a spark

⁶⁴Ibid.

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 7; Gam Elleh, Third Introduction.

⁶⁶Hizzayon, p. 3.

which kindles the whole soul, or like rain which saturates the earth. However, the actual influence of poetry depends very much on the preparation of the reader and his readiness to be influenced, or, to use Satanow's own words, "There are pure souls who will easily be impressed by the poet's words because they understand them and obey him. On the other hand, there are rough souls . . . whose ears are deaf and will not listen. . . ." ⁶⁷ The rough souls, according to Satanow, are his contemporaries who are not capable of understanding the depth of poetry. ⁶⁸

Satanow's hymn-like praise of poetry summarizes the goals and effects of literature. In the introduction to Gam Elleh Mishlei Asaf he wrote the following:

How precious is the word of poetry in the mouth of the poet. In a moment it changes the heart of the listener from one state into another, making him cry and lament, or laugh and rejoice. The honest man will be aroused to do what is good and right in the eyes of God, the pious one will be aroused to do the great deeds that are commanded by the Torah, the hero will do heroic things . . . and the enlightened one will be aroused to be enlightened with the truth of God. ⁶⁹

Satanow's theory of literature appears to be eclectic. It echoes contemporary theories but contains elements of medieval literary criticism. Though his views

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 7.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Gam Elleh, Third Introduction.

unmistakenly bear the imprint of his time, they cannot convincingly be traced back to a specific source, not even Lessing or Mendelssohn whom Satanow visited frequently. Despite his contact it is questionable whether Satanow was aware of Mendelssohn's literary views. It was also impossible to ascertain beyond any doubt that Satanow actually read the Hebrew translation of Todros Todrosi (because a copy of this translation is not available in any of the major libraries of New York, Washington or Boston). However, it is reasonable to assume that he did read the translation⁷⁰ and was influenced by it. He certainly read Messer-Leon's Nofet Zufim.⁷¹ However, as his didactic inclinations were stronger than his esthetic ones, the influence of Nofet Zufim was limited. In other words, while there were probably both direct and indirect influences of every writer mentioned in this chapter, nevertheless no one writer was the sole or main source of Satanow's eclectic theory of literature. It is also possible that his literary views came not from reading essays on literary criticisms but from discussions.

⁷⁰ See note 9.

⁷¹ See note 10.

CHAPTER VI

CABBALAH AND FRANKISM; THEIR INFLUENCE ON SATANOW

Devotion to reason, a commitment to science and reform, are merely part of the personality and activities of Satanow and do not reflect the whole man. He also displayed a strong and sustained interest in Cabbalah. Moreover, his rationalism is tempered not only by mysticism but by a strong sensualism as well.

This apparent preoccupation with Cabbalah is a puzzling aspect of Satanow's thought. Many scholars tend to dismiss it as not genuine, even a pretense aimed at convincing Cabbalists, through Cabbalah, to accept the principles of the Enlightenment. Those scholars believed that it is impossible for a person to believe both in Cabbalah and rationalism at the same time.¹ However, such a viewpoint may be too simplistic. After all, until the age of forty Satanow lived in one of the Polish centers of Cabbalah at a time when Cabbalah still had immense influence on the populace. Though we know that he was familiar with the Cabbalah writings of Yashar of Candia and Jacob Emden,²

¹M. Mendelson (of Hamburg), Pnei Tevel (Amsterdam, 1872), p. 252.

²See Appendix.

which may be interpreted as anti-Cabbalistic, yet no negative attitude toward Cabbalah can be found in his own works. To the contrary, he was the publisher of the books of Hayim Vital. It is hard to believe that an opponent of Cabbalah would help to spread it, even for the sake of money, especially if he was also a maskil who believed that Cabbalah contributed to ignorance.

Taken at face value, Satanow's writings seem to indicate that he held the Cabbalah in great esteem and considered it the highest stage of philosophy:

Man is a microcosm, therefore whoever wants to know the secrets of wisdom in the world has the choice of four roads that may lead him to witness the grace of God and to visit His palace with all its mysteries. . . . The one who can elevate himself intellectually to understand the mysteries of the upper world is able to descend to understand their similarity in the lower world; such people are the divine Cabbalists who received the knowledge about the mysteries of wisdom from the elders and sages of Israel, one generation after the other, starting with Moses or even with Adam as is told in the Book of Creation.³

Satanow assumes a parallelism exists between the so-called upper and lower worlds. Thus a mastery of the "upper" world's

³ I. Satanow, Imrei Binah (Berlin, 1784), p. 5; see also M. Isserles, Torat ha-Olah, I, Ch. 2, where he compromises between Cabbalah and philosophy giving the upper hand to Cabbalah saying at the same time that Cabbalah is the true philosophy (Torat ha-Olah, III, Ch. 4); also J. S. Del Medigo, Matzref la-Hokhma (Odessa, 1864), pp. 21-23, discusses a compromise between Cabbalah and philosophy and mentions the idea of upper and lower worlds. Everything in the lower world has its roots in the upper world.

knowledge may elucidate the knowledge of our own world. Satanow reiterates this view of the superiority of the Cabbalah in another passage: "I have already mentioned and justly so, the superiority of Cabbalah over research. . . . The Cabbalah explains the wonders of creation in the upper heights, while research only explains the phenomenon of our world."⁴ Satanow further indicates the difference between Cabbalah and science by pointing out that the Cabbalists did not receive their knowledge through research but from the prophets.⁵ They use literary devices to help them lead people to true knowledge. "Cabbalists use pure language and speak in a poetic way, describing intellectual matters by means of riddles and fables."⁶ Satanow also defends Cabbalah against those who complain that it separates man from God.⁷ On the contrary, he argues it is a channel between the Cabbalist and God.⁸ Whether facetious or serious, Satanow asserts that in view of the parallelism between the upper and the lower domains of beings and the expertness of the Cabbalists in the mysteries of the former, they discovered

⁴Imrei Binah, pp. 14, 17.

⁵Ibid., p. 13. See also J. S. Del Medigo, Novlot Hokhma (Amsterdam, 1631), p. 13.

⁶Imrei Binah, p. 4.

⁷Ibid., p. 20.

⁸Ibid.

the secrets of the supernal worlds long before scientists discovered the secrets on earth.⁹ Moreover, the Cabbalists may therefore be able to foretell things about our world which have not yet been discovered by modern science. Satanow devoted a whole book, Imrei Binah to reconciling Cabbalah and modern knowledge. Nevertheless, he cautions about the use of Cabbalah. "Faith without knowledge is like a city without walls, and as someone else said: Cabbalah in the hands of fools is like a seeing man helping the blind. When he disappears they fall into pits."¹⁰

Satanow attributed great importance to the main text of Cabbalah, the Zohar,¹¹ and showered high praise on it:

Here is the Book of Splendor, in which there are uncountable hints of divine knowledge which ears cannot bear to hear. It is the well of fresh water from which the Cabbalists draw divine knowledge, based on true intellect.¹²

He was deeply impressed by the Zohar, as indicated by the fact that he composed a Zohar Tinyana, in which he tried to prove the authenticity of the Zohar.¹³ He even accuses

⁹ Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 12.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ I. Satanow, Zohar Tinyana (Berlin, 1783), p. 25.

Wolfsohn of insulting the Zohar and in reply to Wolfsohn's criticism of the Zohar Tinyana: 'What can one do to such an arrogant man, who insults even the Zohar. He despises anything which his intellectual ability does not reach. [His disdain for the Zohar] is because of his lack of intellect."¹⁴ Moreover, Satanow implies here that not to believe in the Zohar represents a flaw in one's character and intellectual ability. 'When he wanted to criticize the holy Zohar and find defects in it, he took as an example the booklet of Zohar republished by my father . . . and through it he came to the old Zohar and said untruthful things about it."¹⁵

Modern scholars tend to find his defense of the authenticity of the Zohar controversial.¹⁶ Satanow attacks Emden who in his book Mitpahat Sefarim criticizes the Zohar.¹⁷ In contrast to Emden, Satanow claims that the whole Zohar was written by Ben Yohai and Moses De Leon had nothing to do with its writing.¹⁸ He also rejects Emden's claim that in the Zohar there are words against the Talmud.¹⁹ He says

¹⁴Minhat Biqqurim (Berlin, 1797), p. 11.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁶M. Pelli, I. Satanow ha-Min ha-Ma'amin be-Sifrut ha-Haskalah (Be'er Sheva, 1973), pp. 10-11.

¹⁷Zohar Tinyana, p. 25; J. Emden, Mitpahat Sefarim (Lwow, 1831), pp. 2, 3, 7.

¹⁸Zohar Tinyana, p. 25.

¹⁹Ibid.

"But I'll consult the Zohar and prove that all its words are right and truthful, none of them is crooked."²⁰ Most baffling is Satanow's explanation of events and names mentioned in the Zohar which belong to a period much later than that of Ben Yohai, its alleged author. He says: "It is possible that the spirit of God spoke from the mouth of the people of the Zohar and God's word was on their tongue. Through the spirit of God they discovered then all that scholars will teach later on."²¹ Pious though this explanation appears it is difficult to treat it seriously in the case of a rationalist like Satanow.²² Satanow may have revealed his true opinion about the authenticity of the Zohar in the following lines:

Every wise man understands that because the words of the Zohar are right and truthful by themselves and awaken piety and love in the heart of those who study it, there is no room for confusion and perplexities. Every clever preacher uses different devices to bring his words into the heart of his listeners. . . .²³

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid.

²²There is little doubt that Satanow was familiar with other books besides Emden's which were critical of the Zohar; see J. S. Del Medigo, Matzref la-Hokhma, and following him J. L. Modena, Ari Nohem (Jerusalem, 1929). About criticism of the Zohar, see also I. Tishby, Mishnat ha-Zohar (Jerusalem, 1949-1961), Introduction.

²³Zohar Tinyana, p. 26.

He was mpt really interested in the question of authenticity. It is the teaching and not the teacher that was important to him and he considered the Zohar of great value. Thus, while he seems merely to pay lip service to the authenticity of the Zohar, his esteem for the deep meaning of the Zohar seems genuine.²⁴

The following passage is indicative of Satanow's view of the Cabbalah:

We have inherited the wisdom of Caballah from our holy ancestors. There are four schools of thought concerning this wisdom: a) One school maintains that the entire Cabbalah is merely lies and its assumptions are imaginary and false. Its ideas are not based in intellect or in truth . . . b) Others who say that the entire Cabbalah is the simple truth. Such Cab-balistic terms as: contraction, copulation, sucking . . . etc. have their heavenly parallels and should be understood according to their simple meanings even when used in connection with spiritual matters. c) Those who say the opposite, namely that none of the Cabbalistic terminology should be understood according to its simple meaning because all of this terminology also has internal meaning. Some believe that this internal meaning can be understood only by angels. Others maintain that after a human being who studied Cabbalah dies, only then, as an angel, would he understand its internal meaning. d) Another school claims that all of the Cabbalistic teachings are true. However, they are purely intellectual activities which take place in the world of the intellect, yet are similar to what takes place in the world of sensation. . . . The ideas of the first group of people are null and void, because an intelligent person understands that God's Torah, and the teaching of our sages, as well as all of our prayers and commandments are based on the wisdom of Cabbalah. The theories of the second group of people are also untrustworthy because they anthropomorphize both God, the Holy One, blessed be

²⁴Even J. Emden, the harsh critic of the Zohar admits the importance of its teachings. See Mitpahat Sefarim, p. 2.

He, as well as the entity of the three upper Sefiroth. People who believe this are pagans. Thus Maimonides²⁵ and also the disciples of the Ari wrote "Whoever believes in contraction according to its simple meaning is considered a heretic. . . ." There is also no room for the third group because the wisdom of Cabbalah was not given to angels and to the dead, but to living men. What is the sense of studying it if one does not understand its meaning during one's lifetime? . . . The view of the fourth group alone is acceptable, namely, that all the assumptions of the Cabbalists are intellectual matters in the world of the intellect which have parallel examples in the world of the senses. That is why they use the parallel sensual terminology. This is the opinion of the most accomplished, faithful and enlightened members of our people.²⁶ Some of our enlightened people sought similar examples both in the intellectual and the sensual world such as the author of Shomer Emunim²⁷ and Herrera in the book Sha'ar ha-Shamayim²⁸ and Beit Elohim.²⁹ There are also other authors whom I followed and supplemented their words in my

²⁵Isaac Abravanel in his commentary to Aboth alleges that in his old age Maimonides recognized the truth of Cabbalah. See I. Abravanel, Pirkei Aboth Im Perush . . . R. Moshe b. Maimon . . . v'im Perush Don Yisshaq Abravanel . . . v'qura ha-Ma'amar ha-Zeh Nahlat Aboth (Venetia, 1545; New York, 1935), Abot 3:22, p. 106(b). See G. Scholem, "Mi-Philosoph Li-Mequbal," Tarbitz, VI (1934-35), pp. 90-98.

²⁶The Hebrew text dealing with the fourth group is as follows:

דברי הכח הרביעית בלבד הם יאמנו שכל ההנחות שהניחו המקובלים
המה ענינים שכלים בעולם המושכל ויש להם דוגמאות בעולם
המורגש על כך קראו בשמותם. וזה דעת שלומי אמוני משכילי בני
עמנו וכבר עמסו עליהם קצת משכילינו למצא אלה הדוגמאות בזה
העולם המורגש והמושכל גם יחד.

²⁷J. Ergas b. Immanuel, Shomer Emunim [shomer v'Kolel Ikarei Emuna . . . Moreh . . . Amitut Hokhmat ha-Cabbala Hekhino Joseph Ergas] (Amsterdam, 1736).

²⁸A. C. Herrera, Sha'ar ha-Shamayim [Sh'ar ha-Shamayim Lavo ad Tekhunot Cabbalath haR. I, 1 . . . Hekhino v'Gam Yesado Bilshon La'az Avraham Kohen Herrera He'etiqa Lilshon Qodesh v'Hevio laDfus Ishaq Abuhav (Amsterdam, 1655).

²⁹A. C. Herrera, Beit Elohim [. . . Zoth Torath ha-Bayit u'tkhunato . . . Al Derekh ha-Merkava . . . ha-Derkh ha-Ahat kfi ha-Emeth ha-Mequbeleth v'ha-Shevi Hokhmat Platonit . . .] (Amsterdam, 1655).

book Imrei Binah.³⁰ One may conclude that anyone who wants to study Cabbalah cannot succeed unless he understands something of the wisdom which God used in his creation of the sensual world. This sensual wisdom should serve as an example of the wisdom in the intellectual world which is the origin of our world, the sensual one. . . .³¹

The final part of the passage, explaining the view of the fourth group, is undoubtedly the most important, and, indeed, strengthens the view of those who believe that Satanow used the Cabbalah for the same reason he used his Biblical and other forgeries, namely to diffuse science and rationalism. In the final analysis he preaches the study of the sensual world, although allegedly, for the purpose of perceiving the intellectual world. It should further be added that his interpretation of the relationship between the two worlds is more Platonic than Cabbalistic.

Satanow was well aware of Christian attempts to link the Trinity with the three Cabbalistic upper Sefiroth.³² He refutes it by maintaining that the similarity is only on the surface. He says any attempts to prove that there are

³⁰ Imrei Binah (Berlin, 1784).

³¹ Zemiroth Asaf (Berlin, 1793), Ch. 5, commentary 6.

³² About Christianity and Cabbalah see Mishnat ha-Zohar, Introduction, Ch. 3, p. 47; also J. L. Blau, The Christian Interpretation of the Cabbalah in the Renaissance (New York, 1944).

allusions to Christianity in Cabbalah are rooted in misunderstanding of the Cabbalah.³³ To further disprove this claim Satanow quotes the Zohar extensively to show the Zohar's disbelief in the Trinity.³⁴

Satanow's keen interest in Cabbalah as an intellectual phenomenon, his extensive use of Cabbalistic vocabulary and terminology, and the large number of Cabbalistic books in his "library," indicate that even if he did not believe in Cabbalah in its popular mystical form, it nevertheless formed a substantial part of his spiritual and intellectual world.

Cabbalistic vocabulary was used extensively by Jacob Frank, Satanow's compatriot and contemporary. Gershon Scholem believes that both Hasidism and Haskalah, the two outstanding movements in Jewish life of the eighteenth century, are the outgrowth of Sabbatianism³⁵ and its direct offspring Frankism. Frank and the maskilim do express many similar ideas. Although many of these ideas were prevalent at the time, it is still worth examining some of the similarities expressed in the writings of Frank and Satanow. Kraushaar in his book Frank and His Followers³⁶

³³Divrei Rivot, I (Berlin, 1800?), 17-18; Minhat Biggurim, p. 20.

³⁴Rivot, I, 20.

³⁵Gershon Scholem, "Mitzvah ha-Ba'a b'Avera," Kneset, Vol. II (1937), 365.

³⁶A. Kraushaar, Frank ve-Adato, Vol. I (Warsaw, 1895), trans. by N. Sokolow.

writes: "[Frank] had one goal which he never forsook, and that was to put an end to the poor condition of the Jews in the lands of their exile."³⁷ Above all, Frank wished to weaken the hold of religion on his people and bring them closer to the culture of the time.³⁸ Much of Satanow's works aimed at a similar goal; to bring the spirit and ideas of the general enlightenment to the Jewish people and awaken them from their religious stagnation: Frank, like Satanow, did not believe in the superiority of one religion over another. "When people change their religion it is like pouring oil from one receptacle into another."³⁹ However, their conclusions were different. Frank believed that it was not only not harmful to change religion (as in fact he had done) but it is even necessary from time to time.⁴⁰ Satanow, on the other hand, though agreeing that all religions are essentially the same,⁴¹ came to a very different

³⁷Ibid., p. 20.

³⁸Ibid., p. 32.

³⁹A. Kraushaar, Frank, p. 225.

⁴⁰H. Sachar, The Course of Modern Jewish History (Dell publishers, 1963), p. 75.

⁴¹The idea that it is impossible to identify the true religion was common at the age of reason and even before. See E. Lessing, Laokoon: Nathan the Wise and Minna von Barnhelm, ed. W. A. Steel (Everyman's Library, London: 1949), pp. 166-169. Also see Ibn Verga, Shevet Yehudah, Introduction by Baer (Jerusalem, 1947), pp. 14-15.

conclusion. He believed that a man should remain in his fathers' faith because it is the most suitable for him. In Mishlei Asaf he warns: "Do not forsake your religion and the religion of your fathers."⁴²

The two share other similar ideas typical of their time. Many thinkers of the time expressed preference for modern rather than ancient ideas,⁴³ as the new inventions and discoveries gave rise to a sense of pride and confidence in the human mind on the one hand, and to contempt for the sages of the past on the other hand.⁴⁴ Frank said that "anyone who emulates manners and attitudes or reads books that were written in the past is like one who turns his eyes backward and looks at dead things . . . but the eyes of the wise man are always . . . in front of him."⁴⁵ Satanow believed that the present and the future are more important than the past. In Sefer ha-Middot he asserts that ". . . Later generations are wiser than earlier ones because every day the understanding of God's wisdom increases; therefore

⁴²Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 14, sen. 19.

⁴³C. Vereker, Eighteenth Century Optimism (Liverpool Univ. Press, 1967), pp. 284, 285; see also Marquis de Condorcet, "Outline of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind" (London, 1796).

⁴⁴R. R. Palmer, A History of the Modern World (New York, 1950), pp. 260ff.

⁴⁵A. Kraushaar, Frank, p. 119.

the future generations will be even wiser than the present ones.⁴⁶ The preference for the present over the past is a common theme in Satanow's writings.⁴⁷ "Even if Aristotle and the old sages of antiquity came back to life, they would feel like ants comparing their knowledge to the knowledge people have today, because many scientific facts, unknown to the ancient, are known today."⁴⁸ Satanow expressed the same view in Gam Elleh Mishlei Asaf: "Not all the ancients inherited wisdom and not all the moderns inherited stupidity; fathers were not clear of folly and sons did not lack advice."⁴⁹

Satanow and Frank share similar views on the rewards of knowledge. According to Frank's new teaching, writes Kraushaar, "man's ultimate goal is what Frank refers to as

⁴⁶Sefer ha-Middot (Berlin, 1784), p. 92; about the advantage of later generations in regard to knowledge see also A. De Rossi, Me'or Einayim (Berlin, 1784), Ch. 11, p. 56.

⁴⁷Mishlei Asaf (Berlin, 1789), Ch. 38, sen. 8, commentary to sen. 8; Ch. 33, sen. 11, 14, 15.

⁴⁸Sefer ha-Middot (Berlin, 1784), p. 92.

⁴⁹Gam Elleh, Ch. 25, sen. 14-15. On the other hand there can be little doubt that as far as this problem of modern versus ancient is concerned, his main sources of influence were not his own contemporaries but Azaria De Rossi. He merely repeats the view of Azaria when he declares that only with regard to the laws of the Torah were the former generations on a higher level than the subsequent ones, because they were closer to the source, but not with regard to secular knowledge. As far as this knowledge is concerned, later generations are in the possession of greater knowledge than earlier ones. This kind of knowledge is accumulative and increases from generation to generation.

the entrance into knowledge. Only the one who reaches this sublime goal will gain riches and honor."⁵⁰ In Mishlei Asaf Satanow wrote: "Wisdom will make your life pleasant, understanding will reward you with pleasure, and knowledge will give you riches and respect."⁵¹

A subject frequently discussed in the Haskalah literature of that time was Jewish military service.⁵² Most maskilim saw Jewish military service as a prerequisite to attaining full civil rights. Frank preached Jewish militarism, which to him meant changing the image of the Jew from a coward into a warrior. He said: "What has happened happened, but now new things are coming. We will not deal anymore with what we dealt with in the past, from now on we will only learn war strategy."⁵³ Satanow also writes extensively on the idea and strongly advocates Jewish participation in the army, not only for the sake of civil rights but also as a means to insure their own safety. In

⁵⁰A. Kraushaar, Frank, p. 262 (Sefer Hapitgamim 110).

⁵¹Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 13, sen. 40.

⁵²See Ch. Dohm, Concerning the Amelioration of the Civil Status of the Jews, trans. H. Lederer (Cincinnati, 1957), pp. 76-79; M. Mendelssohn, Jerusalem; D. Friedlander, Akten Stücke, pp. 91, 92, 125, 159, 160; "Toldot ha-Zman," ha-Meassef, IV, "Toldot ha-Zman," Ibid., V (Tamuz, 1788), "Toldot ha-Zman," Ibid. (Elul).

⁵³A. Kraushaar, Frank, p. 285.

Divrei Rivot he complains: "The Jews oppose the study of military strategy arguing that it is against their religion and as a result others are successful in slaughtering them."⁵⁴ Apparently referring to the recent Haydamack massacres in Poland, he questions why the Jews did not resist. His answer ". . . maybe it was their cowardliness and their lack of military knowledge that caused it,"⁵⁵ is reminiscent of Ibn Verga's explanation for the defeat the Jews suffered in the great rebellion against the Romans. He said that

. . . at the beginning, when the Jews found favor in the eyes of God they had no need to learn war, because He fought their battles . . . but when they sinned God turned away from them and they became double losers. They did not know how to make weapons, and they did not have the protection of God. They remained without anything and fell like sheep without a shepherd."⁵⁶

The emergence of the heroic motif in Hebrew literature coincides with the positive attitude of some maskilim toward Jewish military service.⁵⁷ Satanow gave expression to this motif: "Heroism will preserve you, wealth will make you happy and wisdom will make you respected."⁵⁸

⁵⁴Divrei Rivot, p. 47.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 46.

⁵⁶S. Ibn Verga, Shevet Yehudah (Jerusalem, 1947), p. 44; D. Friedlander, in Akten Stücke, pp. 91, 159, was only lukewarm to Jewish military service.

⁵⁷I. Barzilay, "The Ideology of the Berlin Haskalah," AAJR, XXV (1956), 21-24.

⁵⁸Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 39, sen. 5.

Like Frank, Satanow also preaches the full enjoyment of life. A wise man should be joyous because there is no pleasure in the grave and no enjoyment after death: one should enjoy himself while he is alive.⁵⁹ One should not worry too much because

Whatever has happened has already passed and what will happen does not yet exist and what exists at the moment, vanishes in the next moment.⁶⁰ In the meantime, man should enjoy worldly pleasures because God did not create pleasure in vain. He created it for enjoyment.⁶¹ A man should enjoy the pleasures of the flesh⁶² as well as good food.⁶³ Moreover, one should always find new pleasures because the newer the pleasure, the more enjoyable it is.⁶⁴ One should also indulge in sex because it was not created in vain.⁶⁵

⁵⁹I. Satanow, Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 7, sen. 14; Ch. 17, sen. 24-31; Ch. 21, sen. 7-8; Ch. 34, sen. 15-17; Ch. 51, sen. 18-19; Megillat Hasidim, Ch. 12, sen. 8; Ch. 17, sen. 14. I. Satanow, Gam Elleh, Ch. 37, sen. 2-5. Such ideas were typical of the time see P. Hazard, European Thought, p. 162; A. Schohat, Im Hilufei Tequfot, pp. 35-38. Other maskilim expressed similar tendencies, see S. Maimon, An Autobiography, p. 79; J. Klausner, History, p. 179 (about Ben Z'ev); S. Bernfeld, Dor Tahapukhot, p. 79.

⁶⁰Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 31, sen. 17.

⁶¹Gam Elleh, Ch. 37, sen. 7-8; see also S. Maimon, An Autobiography, p. 79.

⁶²Ibid., Ch. 54, sen. 5; Ch. 76, sen. 13-15.

⁶³Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 49, sen. 3.

⁶⁴Ibid., Ch. 36, sen. 11-12.

⁶⁵Ibid., Ch. 36, sen. 11-12.

Satanow's call for a life of pleasure and enjoyment was indicative of the life style of Frank and his followers. In this passage Satanow emerges as a man of this world, a lover of life and its pleasures and a seeker of enjoyment and gaiety. Moreover, his own life style was referred to by some as libertine.⁶⁶

While Satanow's critics considered him libertine, and, some of his works seem reminiscent of Frankist ideology, he was no Frankist. In several passages, Satanow refutes Frankist ideology and life style. He condemns Frankists whom he identifies with Sabbatians for loose morals; in a commentary in Asaf he writes: ". . . the stupid people like the sect of Shabbatai Zvi, may the name of the wicked rot, with their mouth they make sensual love poems and with their sex organs they engage in indecent coitus claiming that all their deeds are secrets and mysteries of wisdom."⁶⁷ He blames them for distorting the scripture ". . . many support their false ideas with the Torah, like the sects of Shabbatai Zvi, may the name of the wicked rot."⁶⁸ "Many are preoccupied with unimportant concepts and ideas and some, like the sect of Shabbatai Zvi (may the name of the

⁶⁶S. Bernfeld, Dor Tahapukhot (Warsaw, 1897), p. 10.

⁶⁷Mishlei Asaf, Ch. 13, commentary 27.

⁶⁸Gam Elleh, Ch. 65, commentary 14.

wicked rot), are occupied with false ideas deluding themselves that they come closer to God through these false ideas."⁶⁹

One of the principles of Frankism, as formulated in the platform they submitted for the disputation at Lwow was a negative attitude to the Talmud and the national belief of restoration of Zion. Frank himself was quoted as saying "Jerusalem and the temple will not be rebuilt and the Jews are waiting for the Messiah in vain, and their Talmud is full of mistakes."⁷⁰ Indeed, even before the Frankists turned their back on Judaism they already called themselves Opponents of the Talmud. They reached an extreme position when they included in their credo the sixth principle which reads: "The Talmud teaches its followers to use Christian blood. Whoever believes in the Talmud is blood thirsty."⁷¹ Many of the maskilim of the time were rather cool to the Talmud. They considered it as a major barrier between Jews and Gentiles. Satanow was among those few⁷² who had a positive attitude toward the Talmud.

⁶⁹I. Satanow, Zemirot Asaf, Ch. 5, commentary 5; Ch. 43, commentary 9.

⁷⁰A. Kraushaar, Frank, p. 83, also in p. 265, Frank is quoted as saying that the Talmud distorted the truth of the Torah.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 137.

⁷²N. H. Wessely, for example, in Divrei Shalom ve-Emet (Warsaw, 1886), pp. 23, 34, included the Talmud in the curriculum of study for the young.

Satanow compares the Sabbatians and Frankists to Karaites because of their rejection of the Talmud. ". . . if these [Frankists] sinners believe in Karaite doctrine, one should try to show them the greatness of the wisdom of our sages . . . proving to them that there is no other way than the way of the Talmud, because the oral law was received at Sinai the same way as the written law was."⁷³

While Satanow supports the Talmud in the face of Frankist criticism, he also complains about the great devotion of the Jews to the Talmud,⁷⁴ and their parochial belief that only its study assures one a share in the world to come as well as the best of this world.⁷⁵ He is critical of the predominant place of the Talmud in Jewish education to the almost total exclusion of other studies.⁷⁶ He recognizes

⁷³Middot, pp. 90 and see also 89.

⁷⁴I. Satanow, in Rivot, I, 42 says: "All of them are occupied with the Talmud, saying that it leads them to the right actions by which they will get the fruits of this world. They are blind to any other wisdom except the Talmud. They hate knowledge and reject understanding."

⁷⁵Rivot, I, 43.

⁷⁶In Rivot, I, 42 Satanow writes: "Those blind Hebrews think secular knowledge is evil and avoid it as if it were a plague. They do not even know its goodness and usefulness because they were plagued by God with blindness of the mind and they walk in the darkness of stupidity."

the importance of the Talmud for Jewish law,⁷⁷ and admires its methods of reasoning and inference. In Imrei Binah Satanow says: "All the commandments of the Torah cannot be fully understood without the commentaries of the great Talmud. . . . As there can be no true faith without investigation, equally there cannot be fulfillment of a commandment without the Talmudic commentary."⁷⁸ Also in Divrei Rivot Satanow writes: "After you have trained yourselves in the Bible for some time, be prepared to learn the Talmud . . . because without it there is no proper worship of God."⁷⁹ By these words Satanow implied that the Talmud is a necessity for understanding of Biblical law. This is of course the traditional approach to the Talmud, an approach that was often abandoned by the maskilim, but preferred by Satanow. It is possible that this Podolian Jew who was a witness to the harm caused by the Frankist accusations against the Talmud had more reasons than others to come to its defense.

Satanow's time and place of birth, together with his direct references to the sectarian Jews, strengthen the possibility that he was familiar with Frankist ideology, and

⁷⁷Hizzayon, p. 6.

⁷⁸Imrei Binah, p. 12.

⁷⁹Rivot, II, 12.

to some extent was even influenced by it. His life style and some of his writings suggest such an influence. It is expressed both directly, in the form of similar ideas and opinions, and indirectly, by his choice of specific topics of discussion and subjects of polemic against Frankist ideology. Moreover, as noted, Satanow's personality and interests may be understood not only from the books he wrote but also from the books he published. He wrote books of Cabbalah, published books of Cabbalah, and also published hedonistic books like those of Immanuel⁸⁰ and Luzzato;⁸¹ his writings and publications confirm the mystical and also hedonistic side of his personality which in part may be attributed to the influence of Cabbalah and Frankism during the early part of his life in Podolia.

⁸⁰Immanuel of Rome, Mahbarot Immanuel, ed. I. Satanow (Berlin, 1796).

⁸¹E. Luzzato, Qol Shahal, ed. I. Satanow (Berlin, 1790).

EPILOGUE

Hardly any historian of modern Hebrew literature has avoided mentioning the name of Satanow. Interestingly, the more contemporary they were to him the more they criticized him; very few nineteenth-century writers overlooked his faults. However, most twentieth-century critics are more tolerant and tend to exclusively view the positive side of the man Satanow. One of Satanow's most severe critics was Wolfsohn¹ (1754-1835), a major contributor to the ha-Meassef and editor of its final volumes. In one of the issues of ha-Meassef, in 1789, he disparaged Satanow's practice of attributing his own works to other authors, both ancient and contemporary. Referring to the Mishlei Asaf² which (as its name indicates), Satanow attributed to a Biblical author, Wolfsohn claimed that he himself witnessed Satanow's composition of that work. Further, Wolfsohn asserted, Satanow had recited excerpts of it to him to demonstrate his facility with the Biblical style. Such a practice was in Wolfsohn's view fraudulent. He felt it

¹A. Wolfsohn, ha-Meassef, VII (Berlin, 1787), pp. 252-253, 396.

²Isaac Satanow, Mishlei Asaf (Berlin, 1789).

might encourage other people to act likewise to the detriment of truth. Referring to Satanow's habit of using his son's name in some of his writings, Wolfsohn noted that this son did not know any Hebrew at all.³

Wolfsohn acknowledged Satanow's accomplishments in the field of Hebrew language, but advised him to stop writing about ethics, so that people would not say "you preach nicely but you do not act according to your own preachings."⁴

Moses Mendelson of Hamburg, a younger contemporary of Satanow, described Satanow as "a man capable of both good and evil, and though he had some knowledge in astronomy, was otherwise ignorant of the sciences, the knowledge of which he boasted about."⁵ Mendelson, too, spoke about what he considered Satanow's folly of attributing books of his own, such as the Mishlei Asaf, and his imitation of the Zohar, to famous people of antiquity, apparently ignoring the possibility that any man of learning could easily recognize the differences in style.⁶ According to him, Satanow himself was unaware of his weaknesses. He was haughty and considered himself a great poet, though he lacked a poetic

³A. Wolfsohn, ha-Meassef, VII, 396.

⁴Ibid., p. 399.

⁵M. Mendelson (Hamburg), Pnei Tevel, p. 251.

⁶Ibid.

soul.⁷ Mendelson described him as "half a heretic and half a believer"⁸ who pretended to believe in Cabbalah and wrote Cabbalistic books for the sole purpose of making a name for himself. He was also very critical of Satanow's editions of the Hebrew classics, for he found them to be full of errors, additions and omissions. Mendelson conceded that Satanow's books on Hebrew grammar were valuable; he thought, however, that on the whole Satanow's faults exceeded his virtues.

Another young contemporary of Satanow, Tuvia Feder (1760-1817),⁹ was much more severe in his criticism. He praised Satanow for his keen interest in grammar; but he criticized him, for publishing his books just for the sake of money or fame, and accused him of being an irresponsible scholar. He reiterated the criticism of Mendelson that Satanow's editions of the Hebrew classics were faulty, and accused Satanow of forgeries of his own.¹⁰ Feder added the somewhat puzzling information that Satanow's books had been burnt in public.¹¹ This has not been corroborated by other

⁷Ibid., p. 252.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Tuvia Feder, Lahat ha-Herev ha-Mithapekhet (Vilna, 1866).

¹⁰Ibid., p. 15(a).

¹¹Ibid.

sources. We know that Saul Berlin's¹² books had been burnt in public.¹³ Satanow was Berlin's publisher and was even suspected of helping him in his forgeries,¹⁴ so it is possible that Feder may have confused Satanow with Berlin.

Yashar of Gorizia (1784-1855),¹⁵ a nineteenth-century scholar, mentioned Satanow as an example of a forger. Discussing the custom of beginning a book with a laudatory preface by somebody else, he writes that "the source of this renewed custom exists only in Ashkenaz and not Spain and the rest of the countries. I say that this is dishonest because it caused many misusages . . . some have used it as an instrument to deceive the reader as did R. Isaac Satanow who himself wrote approbations for his own books."¹⁶ Pinehas E. Hurevitz, author of the famous Sefer ha-Berith (1797) and one of the

¹²Saul Berlin, rabbi of Frankfurt, one of the most extreme maskilim. For further information see Zinberg, Toledot Sifrut Yisrael, vol. 5, p. 122.

¹³I. Zinberg, Toledot, vol. 5, p. 122.

¹⁴M. Pelli, "ha-Reforma ha-Datit Shel ha-Rav 'ha-Haredi' Shaul Berlin," HUCA, XLII (1971), 17; Z. Braetz, Divrei Yemei ha-Yehudim (Warsaw, 1864), vol. IX, 112; R. Mahler, Divrei Yemei Yisrael Dorot Ahronim (Merhavia, 1953), vol. I, book II, 337; I. Zinberg, Toledot, vol. 5, p. 127.

¹⁵J. S. Reggio, Iggeret Yashar El Ahad mi-Meyuda'av, I (Vienna, 1834), 6.

¹⁶Ibid.

early conservative maskilim, cites Satanow as an example of those 'who attribute their own words to a great name and write whatever they wish in the name of early sages, though these later ideas could have never occurred to them. Such is the case with the book of Asaf that Satanow composed."¹⁷ He concludes by warning people to stay away from such books as Asaf which Satanow wrote in order to mislead people.¹⁸

David Kassel (1818-1893), another nineteenth-century scholar, found some justification for Satanow's attribution of his own works to other people.

Perhaps this man's methods were better than what may be inferred from his notoriety. He must have known from experience that Jews preferred ancient books to new ones; he therefore composed many books and attributed them to writers of antiquity. He also changed the name of their place of publication so that he would be able to sell them. Most of the Jews knew about his deceitful tricks and he was able to mislead only a few of them.¹⁹

A somewhat milder criticism was expressed by Shmuel Joseph Finn (1818-1890). To him "Isaac, son of Moses HaLevi, (was) a learned rabbi, a grammarian and a poet, who had both learning and understanding in all the disciplines." However, ". . . because he did his work in a hurry, it seems at times

¹⁷ P. E. Hurevitz, Sefer ha-Berith ha-Shalem (Warsaw, 1876), p. 112.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 213.

¹⁹ D. Kassel, Qorot, p. 562.

that in his early works he neglected the high quality expected from a scholarly author devoted to the pursuit of learning for its own sake."²⁰

An indirect criticism of Satanow was expressed by Zunz. In discussing the controversial book Besamim Rosh he alluded to a suspicion that Satanow might have been involved.²¹ However, his feelings about Satanow could not have been so bad, or else how can one explain the fact that he erected a tombstone on Satanow's grave, which remained neglected and unmarked for eleven years after his death.²²

Graetz²³ and his follower, Kantor,²⁴ also recognized Satanow's multiple talents. They felt that had he lived in the time of Moses de Leon (thirteenth century) or in similar times, when the accepted style was for people to write books in Hebrew or Aramaic and to attribute them to ancient authors, he would have been considered one of the great masters of that art. However, they considered such

²⁰S. J. Finn, Kneset, p. 643.

²¹L. Zunz, Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters (Hildesheim, 1967), p. 226.

²²S. Bernfeld, Dor Tahapukhot (Warsaw, 1897), p. 10.

²³Z. Graetz, Divrei, IX, 89-90.

²⁴Y. L. Kantor, "Dor ha-Meassfim," ha-Meassef le-Mefitzei Haskalah be-Russia (addition to Ha-Asif, 1887), p. 4.

a practice during Satanow's time as forging and labeled Satanow a dishonest man "whose inside and outside were not the same, for he tried to ingratiate himself with both the maskilim and the Orthodox people at the same time."²⁵

A benevolent evaluation of Satanow and his works is found in Frantz Delitsch, one of the important scholars of Hebrew literature in the nineteenth century. He considered Satanow an outstanding representative of what he called the "Slavic school of Hebrew literature," which, according to him, combined a knowledge of classical Hebrew literature and a nationalistic approach.²⁶ Providing us with specific details about Satanow's manner of dress (such as fine German clothes under a Polish kaftan), Delitsch seemed intrigued by his appearance. In his view, it was an outward expression of Satanow ambivalent inner self, "a free thinking philosopher and a physicist on the one hand, and a poet, an expert in ancient sources and a founder of a new school of Hebrew literature on the other."²⁷ Delitsch was deeply impressed by the range of Satanow's talents, which found expression in a masterpiece such as the book of Asaf on the

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ F. Delitsch, Zur Geschichte, p. 115.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 116.

one hand, in writings on such diverse subjects as how to blend brandies, and how to pierce three hundred pearls in one day on the other hand. The nature of Delitsch's criticism of Satanow's works is significant.²⁸ Nowhere does he even touch on the forgery issue, which no one else failed to bring up and attack. In this respect his approach is closer to that of some twentieth-century scholars rather than to that of the nineteenth. It is possible that he ignored the forgery issue because he considered it a trivial matter in such a colorful personality as Satanow. Or, perhaps he may have felt that writing under the name of famous people of antiquity was either an old literary tradition, or an accepted literary device in Satanow's circle.

Israel Zinberg (1873-1939), a noted historian of Jewish literature, considered Satanow a very talented man whose "inclination to disguise, to pretence, to deceit by way of forgeries, marked all of his writings."²⁹ After criticizing and evaluating his style, Zinberg concludes that "Isaac Satanow is the master of imitation"³⁰ and that "having so many styles only meant that he had no style or personality

²⁸Delitsch thinks that Zemirot Asaf is inferior to Mishlei Asaf.

²⁹I. Zinberg, Toledot, p. 118.

³⁰Ibid., p. 120.

of his own. Lacking in character, his forgeries were nothing but a mockery and mischievous tricks. He enjoyed very much the fact that he deceived the innocent reader."³¹

Hayim N. Shapiro (1895-1943), an expert in the early history of modern Hebrew literature, thought that playfulness was a typical characteristic of Satanow's personality, and attributed this to the Rococo influence rather than to the inner makeup of the man.

Throughout his life he preferred to play, he based his whole style on playfulness and his creativity was also founded on it. . . . He was a man of the Rococo from head to toe. For him a man was nothing but a playboy, and life had just one purpose -- joy and rejoicing; pleasure was the goal of everything.³²

Joseph Klausner (1874-1958) also considered Satanow a major figure in the Berlin Haskalah, and his inconsistencies a product of his times.

He was the product of a period of transition, and that is the reason for his deficiencies. In his time the old truth was no longer valid and the new one was not yet established; that is why he was always caught between two worlds and not because of his bad character.³³

Concurring with earlier critics, Klausner too thought that Satanow's main deficiency was his scholarly irresponsibility,

³¹Ibid., p. 122.

³²H. N. Shapiro, Toledot ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha (Tel-Aviv), p. 315.

³³J. Klausner, Historia, vol. I, 167.

as evidenced by the faulty editions of Hebrew classics he brought forth, and, in general, his dabbling in too many fields. However, Klausner did not include Satanow's "forgeries" among his deficiencies. He did not view those "forgeries" as frauds but as the continuation of an old literary tradition whose origins he traced back to the time of the pseudo-epigrapha.³⁴

On the whole Klausner believed that in spite of Satanow's inconsistencies and scholarly irresponsibility, his work already contained all the components of modern Hebrew literature, for "in all of his many sided and numerous works there already were the threads from which Hebrew literature was to be woven: general humanistic science, scholarship, reissuing of old classics, linguistic studies. . . . Therefore, in spite of his mistakes, he has a place of honor in our literature."³⁵

To Fishel Lachover (1883-1947), an eminent historian of modern Hebrew literature, Satanow was "a man with an outstanding linguistic talent and very bright; a man who lived in two worlds, the world of the Berlin Haskalah and the world of ancient Hebrew culture."³⁶ As the author

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 177.

³⁶ F. Lachover, Toledot ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha (Tel-Aviv, 1963), p. 81.

of Mishlei Asaf he considered him one of the fathers of the fable genre in modern Hebrew literature.³⁷

A recent work on Satanow is a monograph by S. Verses entitled "Isaac Satanow and his book Mishlei Asaf." In it Verses disputes the contention of many that Satanow was inconsistent in his life and especially in his works. According to him, an examination of Satanow's writings which span forty years reveals a constant devotion to the same ideas and principles.³⁸ As for hiding his true identity in his books, Verses notices that it was an accepted literary device commonly used in the polemical literature of the time. He pointed out, for example, that people such as Isaac Euchel in his "Igrot Meshulam ha-Eshtamoe" in ha-Meassef of 1790, Vol. I, or even Satanow's ardent adversary, A. Wolfsohn, employed the same device.³⁹

Alexander Altman in his biography of Moses Mendelssohn (1973) also mentions Satanow " . . . an immensely gifted and incredibly prolific writer who by his own works alone could keep a small press quite busy."⁴⁰ ". . . [Mendelssohn] must have recognized the genius of a man who was equally at home

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ S. Verses, "Al Yitzhak Satanow," p. 371.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 378.

⁴⁰ A. Altman, Moses Mendelssohn, pp. 352-353.

in all strata of Hebrew literature and could imitate all styles with perfect ease.⁴¹ ". . . he intrinsically belonged to the age of transition, just as the rest of Mendelssohn's followers did. . . . At all events, Satanow's presence in Berlin undoubtedly gave considerably strength to the forces of the Haskalah.⁴²

It is evident that Satanow's personality has for two centuries continued to capture the imagination and interest of scholars. Even though he was by no means an original writer, yet one could choose no better person to represent his period, a time of transition in Jewish life and consequently in Hebrew literature. I. Satanow, the Jew who wandered from Poland to Germany, the heretic and the believer, the man who was captivated by the spirit of the enlightenment yet could not shake off his training in Cabbalah; a contemporary of Frank on the one hand and Moses Mendelssohn on the other, is the embodiment of his time.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 353.

⁴²Ibid., p. 354.

APPENDIX

THE "CATALOGUE OF SATANOW'S LIBRARY" --

A PARTIAL LIST OF

BOOKS AND WRITERS THAT HE MENTIONS

I. Science, Philosophy and Ethics

Abraham, Ibn David. Hasagot¹ (criticism). Perush le-Sefer Yetzirah² (a commentary on the Book of Creation).

Abraham, Ben Hisdai. Ben ha-Melekh ve-ha-Nazir³ (The Prince and the Nazarite).

Albo, Joseph. Sefer ha-Iqqarim⁴ (Book of Principles).

Aristotle. Ethics.⁵

¹Criticism of Maimonides' Mishneh Torah (1st ed. Shwenzino: 1490). See Megillat Hasidim, ch. 13, commentary 1.

²See p. 119, note 19. According to Ben Ya'aqov in Ozar ha-Sefarim this book is not by the author of the Hasagot but by an Ashkenazi writer with the same name. See Imrei Binah, p. 34.

³Book of fables in the form of a Maqama. A discussion between a king and a Nazarite. Was translated from Arabic to Hebrew by Abraham b. Hisdai. Had many editions. (1st ed. Istanbul: 1578). See Sefer ha-Hizzayon, p. 19.

⁴Explanation and discussion of the Jewish principles of faith and religion. (1st ed. Schwenzino: 1496). See Imrei Binah, p. 19; Middot, p. 240; Gam Elleh, ch. 66, commentary 4.

⁵One of the books most frequently mentioned by Satanow in his writings.

- Bahya, Ibn Pekoda. Hovot ha-Levavot⁶ (The Duty of the Hearts).
- Ben Sirah.⁷ (The Proverbs of Ben Sirah).
- Berekhyah ha-Naqdan. Mishlei Shu'alim⁸ (Foxes' Fables).
- Crescas, Hisdai. Or Adonai⁹ (The Light of the Lord).
- Euclid.¹⁰ (Probably the Book of Elements).
- Figo, Azaria. Binah la-Itim.¹¹
- Ha-Levi, Jehudah. ha-Kuzari.¹²

⁶One of the most popular books of ethics. Was written in Arabic in the eleventh century and translated to Hebrew by Yehudah Ibn Tibon. (1st ed. Naples: 1490). See Middot, pp. 106, 228, 240, 280; Gam Elleh, ch. 32, commentary 13; ch. 33, commentary 8; Beit ha-Tefillah, p. 3; Megillat Hasidim, ch. 13, commentary 10; Mishlei Asaf, ch. 30, commentary 19; Holekh Tamim, p. 5; Rivot, II, 50.

⁷Was written in the fourth century B.C. by Shimon Ben Sira in Jerusalem. Later was translated into Greek by the author's grandson Yehoshua. Most of the original Hebrew text by M. Segal. Ben Zev was the first to translate Ben Sirah from Aramaic to Hebrew. See Middot, pp. 89, 335; Hizzayon, p. 33. During the eighteenth century there were a number of translations of Ben Sirah into Hebrew. The most well known is J. Y. Ben Ze'ev's (Breslau: 1758).

⁸A hundred and eight rhymed ethical fables about animals. Written in thirteenth century. (1st ed. Mantua: 1557). See Hizzayon, p. 19.

⁹Discussions of the principles of the Jewish religion. Contains first part only of Crescas' Ner Elohim. (1st ed. Ferrara: 1556). See Imrei Binah, p. 19.

¹⁰Mentioned in Middot, p. 87; Gam Elleh, ch. 14, commentary 7; Zemirot Asaf, ch. 37, commentary 23; Mishlei Asaf, ch. 41, commentary 24. See also p. 43.

¹¹I. Satanow, Holekh Tamim, p. 9; Gam Elleh, ch. 7, commentary 11; ch. 8, commentary 8; ch. 69, commentary 1 (1st ed. Venice: 1649).

¹²One of the books most frequently mentioned by Satanow. Satanow reprinted Yehudah Moscato's edition adding to it his own commentary.

Gersonides. Milhamot Adonai¹³ (Wars of the Lord).

Krigo^r.

Leibnitz.¹⁵

Maimonides. Moreh Nevukhim¹⁶ (Guide to the Perplexed); Het Perakin¹⁷ (Eight Chapters); Sefer ha-Madda¹⁸ (Book of Science); Millot ha-Higgayon¹⁹ (Terms of Logic); Hilkhot Yesodei ha-Torah²⁰ (Laws of the Basics of the Torah); Ma'amar Tehiyat ha-Metim²¹ (Epistle about the Resurrection of the Dead).

Mendelssohn, Moses. Sefer ha-Nefesh²² (Book of the Soul); ha-Be'ur²³ (The Translation).

¹³Philosophical work about the principles of the Jewish faith. Includes six articles. (1st ed. 1560). See Megillat Hasidim, ch. 37, commentary 1; Imrei Binah, pp. 6, 10; Gam Elleh, ch. 63, commentary 13, 14.

¹⁴I could not identify this person. In the introduction to the second part Satanow quotes Krigo as claiming that there was more than one flood.

¹⁵I. Satanow, Gam Elleh, 2nd Introduction. See also p. 55.

¹⁶Moreh Nevukhim is one of the books also mentioned frequently by Satanow. See p. 52.

¹⁷Gam Elleh, ch. 55, commentary 17.

¹⁸Ibid., ch. 54, commentary 23.

¹⁹Holekh Tamim, p. 11; Minhat Bikkurim, pp. 1, 43.

²⁰Gam Elleh, ch. 13, commentary 2.

²¹Ibid., ch. 80, commentary 1.

²²Megillat Hasidim, ch. 37, commentary 1; Mishlei Asaf, ch. 29, commentary 2; Middot, p. 339. About Sefer ha-Nefesh, ed. by Friedlander (Berlin: 1797), see supra, p. 55.

²³The Be'ur is a collection of translations of the Bible into German. Mendelssohn himself translated only the Torah, Tehillim, and Shir ha-Shirim and commented on "Parashat Bereshit." See Klausner, Historia, I, 72-75.

- Messer-Leon, Jehudah. Nofet Zufim²⁴ (Honeycomb).
 Newton.²⁵
 Philo of Alexandria.²⁶
 Plato.²⁷
 Saadia. ha-Emunot ve-ha-De'ot (Book of Beliefs and
 Opinions).²⁸
 Toussaint.²⁹
 Wessely, N. H.³⁰ Shirei Tif'eret (Songs of Splendor).
 Yashar of Candia. Novlot Hokhma.³¹

²⁴One of the first Hebrew writings about esthetics. (1st ed. Mantua: 1480). See Middot, p. 106; Gam Elleh, ch. 5, commentary 17. Messer-Leon is mentioned in reference to theories of esthetics.

²⁵See Mishlei Asaf, ch. 52, commentary 5. Satanow mentions "Newton of England" in reference to the laws of gravitation.

²⁶See va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 30. Satanow may have known about Philo from Azaria de Rossi's "Hadrat Zeqenim," Me'or Einayim, part II, which is the Translation of Aristias' Epistle from Latin into Hebrew. It describes the translation of the Bible into Greek.

²⁷See Middot, p. 99.

²⁸See Imrei Binah, p. 10; Middot, p. 106; Megillat Hasidim, ch. 37, commentary 11.

²⁹See supra, p. 55. Mentioned in Minhat Biqqurim, p. 11.

³⁰Eighteen songs on the period of the Exodus beginning with the going down to Egypt and ending with the Revelation at Sinai. Until the sixties of the nineteenth century, the work was considered the greatest poetical achievement of the Berlin enlightenment. See Minhat Biqqurim, p. 12.

³¹See Hizzayon, p. 68 (deals with codes). Also Imrei Binah, p. 10; Novlot Hokhma appeared in Ta'alumot Hokhma (Bazel: 1631) and deals with aspects of Lurianic Cabbalah.

II. Grammar, Language, Law and Commentaries

Abraham, Ibn Ezra. Perush le Qohelet³² (Commentary to Ecclesiastes).

Abudrham, David. Perush ha-Berakhot ve-ha-Tefillot mi-Kol ha-Shanah³³ (Commentary on the Prayer Book).

Arama, Yitzhaq. Aqedat Yitzhaq³⁴ (The Binding of Isaac).

Brill, Joel. Be'ur le Tehillim³⁵ (Commentary on the Psalms).

David, Ben Shemuel. Turei Zahav³⁶ (Golden Lines).

Dusseldorf, Mordekhai. Sefer ha-Tefilla³⁷ (Order of Prayers).

Eliyahu of Vilna.³⁸

Emden, Jacob. Lu'ah Eres.³⁹

³²See Middot, pp. 139, 115; Imrei Binah, p. 10; Beit Tefillah, pp. 9, 20.

³³Beit Tefillah, pp. 7, 10, 11, 22; va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, Introduction, pp. 27, 30. The "Abudrham" has many editions (1st ed. Lisbon: 1490; Istanbul: 1584).

³⁴A popular homiletical work on the Sayings of the sages, the "mitzvot," and the holidays. (1st ed. Salonica: 1522). See Imrei Binah, p. 10; Megillat Hasidim, Introduction; Gam Elleh, ch. 8, commentary 17.

³⁵Minhat Biqqurim, p. 41. Also see p. 54.

³⁶Turei Zahav is a commentary on the Shulhan Arukh (1st ed. 1680, no place is mentioned). See va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 82.

³⁷Prayer book with grammatical explanations and polemics against (S. Hannau, Prague: 1774). See va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, Introduction.

³⁸Mentioned in regard to the grammar of the prayer book in va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, pp. 20, 55, 73.

³⁹Beit ha-Tefillah, Introduction. References to Lu'ah Eres are scattered throughout Beit ha-Tefillah. See p. 57.

- Gironi, Jonah. Sha'arei Teshuvah⁴⁰ (Gates of Repentance).
 Hai Ga'on.⁴¹
- Hannau, Zalman. Tzohar ha-Tevah⁴² (A Window for the Arch).
 _____ . Sha'arei Tefillah⁴³ (Gates of Prayer).
- Hurevitz, Yeshaya. Shnei Luhot ha-Berith⁴⁴ (The Two
 Tablets of the Covenant).
- Immanuel of Rome. Mahbarot Immanuel⁴⁵ (Immanuel's
 Maqamas).
- Ideles, Shmuel.⁴⁶ (Maharsho).
- Isserles, Moses.⁴⁷ (Ramo).
- Jaffe, Mordechai. Lavush⁴⁸ (Dress).

⁴⁰ Ethics. (1st ed. Istanbul: 1718). See va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 49.

⁴¹ va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 36.

⁴² A grammar book (Berlin: 1733). See va-Ye'etar, p. 50.

⁴³ Grammatical corrections of the prayer book (Amsterdam: 1766). See va-Ye'etar, Introduction; Beit ha-Tefilla, p. 7.

⁴⁴ Contains Cabbalistic writings, ethical and legal discussions (Amsterdam: 1648). See va-Ye'etar, Introduction.

⁴⁵ See p. 48. See also Beit ha-Tefillah, p. 15; va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 25.

⁴⁶ See Mishlei Asaf, ch. 24, commentary 24.

⁴⁷ See Gam Elleh, ch. 38, commentary 20.

⁴⁸ See Megillat Hasidim, ch. 35, commentary 5; va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 38. Lavush includes ten books of commentaries on the Shulhan Arukh.

Kimhi, David. ha-Mikhlol⁴⁹ (Thesaurus); Sefer ha-Shorashim⁵⁰ (Book of Roots).

Kimhi, Joseph.⁵¹

Menahem of Perpignan. Sefer ha-Gedarim⁵² (Book of Definitions).

Pollak, Yehoshu'a. Pnei Yehoshu'a⁵³ (Joshua's Face).

Sforno, Ovadia. Or Amim⁵⁴ (Light of Nations).

Rabbi Shlomo Yitzhaki. Liqutei ha-Pardes⁵⁵ (Collections of the Orchard).

Shlomo of Chelm. Merkevet ha-Mishneh.⁵⁶

⁴⁹See Middot, p. 173; Eder ha-Yeqar, pp. 2, 3; Minhat Biggurim, p. 15; Gam Elleh, ch. 49, commentary 19. See also supra, p. 24, note 13.

⁵⁰See Beit ha-Tefillah, pp. 6, 10, 12; Mishlei Asaf, ch. 35, commentary 17. Satanow mentions David Kimhi frequently in most of his writings.

⁵¹Beit ha-Tefillah, p. 24; va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 31.

⁵²Minhat Biggurim, Introduction. Also see p. 49.

⁵³Responsa on the Shulhan Arukh (1st ed. Amsterdam: 1715). See va-Ye'etar, p. 38.

⁵⁴Polemics against heretics. (1st ed. Bologna: 1513). See Middot, p. 279; Imrei Binah, p. 10.

⁵⁵A compilation of few early "Poskim" including chapters from the Pardes by R. S. Itzhaki. Zunz believes the book was compiled by R. Asher's disciple, Shmuel who also wrote Sefer Yere'im. See Eder ha-Yeqar, pp. 6, 7, 8, 9, 12; Rivot, II, 69; Zemiroth Asaf, ch. 20, commentary 21. Satanow opposes Emden who does not believe that Liqqutei ha-Pardes was written by Rashi.

⁵⁶Commentaries on Maimonides' Mishneh Torah. See va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 84. See p. 73.

Shmuel, Ben Meir. Perush Rashbam la-Torah⁵⁷ (Rashbam's commentary on the Torah).

Shrira Gaon.⁵⁸ (Probably the Epistle).

Serkes, Joel. Bayit Hadash⁵⁹ (A New House).

Vitri, Simha. Mahzor Vitri⁶⁰ (The Vitri Prayer Book for the Holidays).

Wessely, N. H. Yein Levanon⁶¹ (The Wine of Lebanon).

III. Cabbalah

Ari⁶² (Isaac Luria).

Fano, Menahem Azaria. Asara Ma'amarot⁶³ (Ten Epistles).

⁵⁷Gam Elleh, Introduction to part III; Megillat Hasidim, Introduction; Rivot, II, 50; Zemirot Asaf, ch. 31, commentary 17; ch. 32, commentary 8.

⁵⁸The community of Cairowan asked Shrira "How was the Mishnah written?" The epistle is his reply to this question. He believes that the Mishnah was actually written at the time of Judah the Prince. Before that it was transmitted orally from generation to generation and that is the reason for different versions that occur in the Mishnah. In that epistle Shrira also discusses the relationship between the Mishnah and the Tosephta and the development of the Gemara and the Gaonate up to his own time. We have two versions of the epistle. The Sephardi one (1st ed. Istanbul: 1566) which is the more accurate, and the French one (1st ed. Berlin: 1805). See va-Ye'etar, p. 36.

⁵⁹Commentary to the Arba'a Turim by Jacob b. Asher (Cracow: 1631). See Beit ha-Tefillah, p. 9; va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 38.

⁶⁰Prayers and religious laws concerning the Holidays by Simha of Vitri a disciple of Rashi, see Beit ha-Tefillah, p. 22.

⁶¹Commentary on Avot. See va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 71.

⁶²The Ari is mentioned numerous times in all of Satanow's writings, mainly to support his grammatical points but also to buttress his ethical ideas. See Satanow, Middot, pp. 114, 132; Megillat Hasidim, ch. 29, commentary 19.

⁶³Articles on different subjects according to Lurianic Cabbalah. See Middot, p. 89; Beit ha-Tefillah, pp. 11, 36, 37; va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, pp. 15, 86; Imrei Binah, p. 19.

- Hayat, Yehudah. Minhat Yehudah⁶⁴ (The Offering of Judah).
 Herrara, Abraham. Sha'ar ha-Shamayim⁶⁵ (Gate of Heaven);
Beit Elohim⁶⁶ (God's House).
 Karo, Joseph. Beit Yoseph⁶⁷ (The House of Joseph).
 Meir, Ben Gabai. Tola'at Ya'aqov.⁶⁸
 Nahmanides. Mavo la-Torah⁶⁹ (Introduction to the Torah).
 Qordovero, Moses. Pardes. Pardes Rimoni⁷⁰ (The
 pomegranates' orchard).
 Shapiro, Nathan. Mazat Shimurin.⁷¹

⁶⁴Commentary on the Cabbalistic book Ma'arecket ha-Elohut by Peretz ha-Cohen. Hayat's commentary includes also explanations of portions of the Zohar (1st ed. Ferrara: 1558). See Imrei Binah, p. 10. Hayat is included in a list of Cabbalists.

⁶⁵An explanation of the Lurianic Cabbalah. Originally written in Spanish, translated into Hebrew by Isaac Abohav (1st ed. Amsterdam: 1655). See Zemirot Asaf, ch. 5, commentary 10; Imrei Binah, p. 10.

⁶⁶A philosophical and Cabbalistic explanation of Ma'aseh Merkavah. Originally written in Spanish and translated into Hebrew by I. Abohav. (1st ed. Amsterdam: 1655). See Ibid.

⁶⁷Commentary on the Arba'ah Turim by Jacob b. Asher which includes all previous legal literature about the laws and Karo's binding decisions. See Zemirot Asaf, ch. 3, commentary 6; ch. 20, commentary 11.

⁶⁸Cabbalistic commentary on the prayer book (1st ed. Istanbul: 1520). See va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 40. Ben Gabbai's name appears in a list of Cabbalists.

⁶⁹See Middot, p. 209; Minhat Biqqurim, pp. 44, 45; Rivot, II, 22; Imrei Binah, p. 19; Megillat Hasidim.

⁷⁰An introduction to Cabbalah and commentaries to many passages of the Zohar. (Salonica: 1552). See Imrei Binah, Introduction, also pp. 5, 19; Rivot, II, 12; Gam Elleh, ch. 34, commentary 13.

⁷¹Cabbalistic commentaries on religious laws. See va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 7.

Srug, Israel.⁷²

Vergas, Joseph. Shomer Emunim.⁷³

Vital, Hayim. Etz Hayim⁷⁴ (The Tree of Life); Pri Etz Hayim⁷⁵ (The Fruit of the Tree of Life).

Midrash ha-Ne'elam.⁷⁶

Sefer ha-Bahir.⁷⁷

Sefer Yetzira.⁷⁸

IV. Current Events

Barash, Nahman. Ein Mishpat⁷⁹ (Spring of Justice).

Wolfsohn, Aaron. Mahberet Avtalion.⁸⁰

Comedy⁸¹

⁷²A desciple of the Ari. Brought the Lurianic Cabbalah with his own interpretation to Italy and from there it spread to Poland. See Imrei Binah, p. 10. Srug's name appears in a list of Cabbalists.

⁷³On the essence of the Cabbalah. (Amsterdam: 1737). See Zemirot Asaf, ch. 5, commentary 6.

⁷⁴This book is mentioned numerous times throughout Satanow's writings. He does not mention Vital but accepts the latter's attribution of the book to the Ari.

⁷⁵See Zemirot Asaf, ch. 5, commentary 6.

⁷⁶See Imrei Binah, p. 12; Midrash ha-Ne'elam is the Zohar on Megillat Ruth (Venice: 1546).

⁷⁷va-Ye'etar Yitzhaq, p. 10; Beit ha-Tefillah, p. 9; Gam Elleh, Introduction to part II; Sefer ha-Bahir is a Cabbalistic book attributed to Nehunia Bar ha-Qaneh (Berlin: 1706).

⁷⁸Minhat Biqqurim, p. 6; Imrei Binah, p. 32; Mishlei Asaf, ch. 5, commentary 7; ch. 30, commentary 9; Gam Elleh, ch. 32, commentary 13; Zemirot Asaf, ch. 36, commentary 27. See supra, p. 120.

⁷⁹Minhat Biqqurim, p. 3. See supra, p. 35.

⁸⁰Minhat Biqqurim, p. 28. See supra, p. 89.

⁸¹Minhat Biqqurim, p. 3. The reference is in all likelihood to Wolfsohn's Yiddish comedy, Lichtzine und Fremelie (Berlin: 1797) one of the first comedies in Yiddish.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. For Satanow's Works, see pp. 23-29.

II. On Satanow

- Altman, Alexander. Moses Mendelssohn. Univ. of Alabama Press, 1973.
- Bernfeld, Shimon. Dor Tahapukhot. Warsaw, 1897.
- Blau, Ludwig. Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliography, VIII, ed. A. Freiman and H. Broody. Frankfurt A.M., 1904 (January-February), pp. 19-20.
- Delitch, Frantz. Zur Geschichte der Jüdischen Poesie. Leipzig, 1836.
- Euchel, Isaac. Toledot ha-Rambaman. Berlin, 1789; Vienna, 1814.
- Feder, Tovia. Lahat ha-Herev ha-Mithapekhet. Vilna, 1866.
- Finn, Shmuel J. Knesset Yisrael. Warsaw, 1876.
- Friedberg, Hayim D. Toledot ha-Defus ha-Ivri be-Polania. Tel-Aviv, 1950.
- Graetz, Zvi. Divrei Yemei ha-Yehudim, IX, trans. from German to Hebrew by S. P. Rabinowitz. Warsaw, 1916.
- Hurewitz, Pinchas E. Sefer ha-Berit ha-Shalem. Warsaw, 1876.
- Kantor, Yehudah L. "Dor ha-Meassfim," ha-Meassef le-Mefitzei Haskalah be-Russia. Addition to ha-Asif, 1877.
- Kassel, David. Qorot Am Yeshurun, trans. by D. Radner. Vilna, 1887.
- Kayserling, Meir. Moses Mendelssohn. Leipzig, 1862.
- Klausner, Joseph. Historia shel ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha, vol. I. Jerusalem, 1960.
- Lachover, Fischel. Toledot ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha. Tel-Aviv, 1963.

- Letteris, Meir. Introduction to the 2nd edition of ha-Meassef (1784). Vienna, 1962.
- Mendelson, Moses (of Hamburg). Pnei Tevel. Amsterdam, 1872.
- Pelli, Moshe. Isaac Satanow (ha-Min ha-Ma'amin be-Sifrut ha-Haskalah). Be'er Sheva, 1973 (mimeographed).
- Reggio, Joseph S. Iggeret Yashar El Ahad mi-Meyuda'av. Vienna, 1834.
- Shapiro, Hayim N. Toledot ha-Sifrut ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha. Kaunas, 1938.
- Verses, Shmuel. "Al Yitzhaq Satanow ve-Hibburo Mishlei Asaf," Tarbitz, LII. Jerusalem, 1962-63.
- Zeitlin, William. Bibliotheca Hebraica Post Mendelssohnianna. 2 auflag. Leipzig, 1891.
- Zinberg, Yisrael. Toledot Sifrut Yisrael, vol. 5, trans. from Yiddish to Hebrew by B. Karu. Tel-Aviv, 1959.
- Zunz, Leopold. Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters. Hildesheim, 1967.

III. The Eighteenth Century and the Berlin Haskalah

- Abbt, Thomas. Vom Tode für's Vaterland. Berlin, 1761.
- Balaban, Meir. Toledot ha-Tnu'a ha-Frankit. Tel-Aviv, 1934.
- Barash, Nahman. Ein Mishpat. Berlin, 1796.
- Barzilay, Isaac. "The Background of the Berlin Haskalah," Essays on Jewish Life and Thought. New York; Columbia Univ. Press, 1959, pp. 183-197.
- _____. "The Ideology of the Berlin Haskalah," PAAJR, XXV. New York, 1956, pp. 1-37.
- _____. "National and Anti-National Trends in the Berlin Haskalah," JSS, XXI (July, 1959), pp. 165-192.

- Bendavid, Lazarus. Etwas zur Charakteristik der Juden. Leipzig, 1793.
- Berlin, Saul. Besamim Rosh. Berlin, 1793.
- Callenberg, Johan H. Bericht an einige Christliche Freunde von einem Versuch das arme jüdische Volk zur Erkenntnis und Annehmung der Christlichen Wahrheit anzuleiten. Fortsetzung 9, Anderer Theil. d. dritten Forts., s. 36, Forts. 7, s. 144.
- Condorcet, Marquis de. Outline of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind. London, 1796.
- Diderot, Denis. "Intolerance," Dictionnaire encyclopedique. London, 1772.
- Dinur, Ben Zion. Sefer ha-Ziyonut. Tel-Aviv, 1938.
- Dohm, Christian Wilhelm. Concerning the Amelioration of the Civil Status of the Jews, trans. by H. Lederer. Cincinnati, 1957.
- Eliav, Mordekhai. ha-Hinukh ha-Yehudi be-Germania ve-ha-Emanzipazia. Jerusalem, 1961.
- Erik, Max. Etuden zu Der Geschichte Fun Der Haskoleh. Minsk, 1934.
- Eschelbacher, J. "Die Anfänge allegemeiner Bildung unter den deutschen Juden vor Mendelssohn," Festschrift M. Philippons. Leipzig, 1916.
- Ettinger, Shmuel. Toledot Am Yisrael ba-Zeman he-Hadash. Tel-Aviv, 1969.
- Eybeschuetz, Jonathan. Ya'arot Devash. Karlsruhe, 1779.
- Friedlander, David. Akten Stücke, Reform der Jüdischen Kolonien betreffend. Berlin, 1793.
- _____. Sendschriften . . . an Teller. Berlin, 1799.
- Gregoire, Henri. Essay sur la Regeneration Physique, Morale, et Politique des Juifs. Metz, 1789.
- Halkin, Shimon. Mavo la-Siporet ha-Ivrit. Jerusalem, 1959.
- Hazard, Paul. European Thought in the Eighteenth Century, trans. by L. May. London, 1954.

- Kleinman, Moses. Demuyot ve-Qomot. Paris, 1938.
- Kraushaar, Alexander. Frank ve-Adato, trans. from Polish to Hebrew by N. Sokolow. Warsaw, 1859.
- _____. Frank i Frankisci Polscy. Cracow, 1895.
- Lanson, Gustave. Histoire de la Literature française. Paris, 1916.
- Locke, John. "A letter concerning Toleration," The Works of John Locke, VI. London, 1823.
- Mahler, Refael. Divrei Yemei Yisrael, Dorot Aharonim, vol. II. Merhavia: sifriyat Po'alim, 1954.
- Maimon, Solomon. An Autobiography, ed. by M. Hadas. New York: Schocken, 1967.
- ha-Meassef. Koenigsberg, 1784-1786; Berlin, 1788-1790; 1794-1797.
- Mendelssohn, Moses. Jerusalem and Other Jewish Writings, ed. by A. Jospe. New York: Schocken, 1969.
- Messer-Leon, Jehudah. Nofet Zufim, 1st ed. Mantua, 1480; Jerusalem: Makor, 1971.
- Montesquieu, C. L. The Spirit of the Laws, trans. by T. Nugent. New York, 1949.
- Palmer, R. R. A History of the Modern World. New York, 1950.
- Pelli, Moshe. "ha-Reforma ha-Datit Shel ha-Rav ha-Haredi Shaul Berlin," HUCA, XLII (1971).
- Sachar, Howard M. The Course of Modern Jewish History. Dell Pub., 1963.
- Schnaber, Gumpel. "Ma'amar ha-Torah ve-ha-Hokhma," ha-Meassef. Koenigsberg, 1784, pp. 183-186.
- Schohet, Azriel. Im Hilufei Tequfot. Jerusalem, 1960.
- Scholem, Gershon. "ha-Tenu'a ha-Shabta'it be-Polin," Beit Yisrael be-Polin, II, ed. by I. Halperin. Jerusalem, 1954.
- _____. "Mitzva ha-Ba'a be-Avera," Knesset, II (1937).

- Smith, Preserved. A History of Modern Culture, II. New York, 1933.
- Stern, Moritz. "Der Jugendunterricht in der Berliner jüdischer Gemeinde Während des 18 Jhdts," JJLA, 1928/29 (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Gemeinde Berlin, Heft 5). Berlin, 1934.
- Tindal, Matthew. An Essay Concerning the Power of the Magistrate and the Rights of Mankind in Matters of Religion. London, 1879.
- Toland, John. Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews in Great Britain . . . a Defense of the Jews Against All Vulgar Prejudices in All Countries. London, 1714.
- Vereker, Charls. Eighteenth Century Optimism. Liverpool, 1967.
- Voltaire, François. Dictionnaire Philosophique. Geneva, 1765.
- _____. "Tolerance," Oeuvres Complètes de Voltaire . . . par Condorcet. Paris, 1883-88.
- Wessely, Naftali H. Devrei Shalom ve-Emet. Berlin, 1782; Warsaw, 1886.
- _____. Introduction to I. Satanow's Sefer ha-Hizzayon. Berlin, 1775.
- _____. Shirei Tif'eret. Prague, 1829.
- Wolfsohn, Aaron. Jeschurun. Breslau, 1804.

IV. Related Literature

- Abravanel, Isaac. Pirkei Abot Im Perush. Ventia, 1545; New York, 1935.
- Aristotle. Sefer ha-Middot (Ethics), trans. to Hebrew by Meir Alguadez. Berlin, 1790.
- _____. Poetics, trans. by H. Fyfe. London, 1927.
- Ashkenazi, Eliezer. Ma'ase Adonai. 1st ed. Venice, 1543; Lwow, 1858.
- Barukh of Shklov. Amudei Shamayim. Berlin, 1776-77.

- Barzilay, Isaac. Between Reason and Faith. Mouton, 1967.
- Ben-Sira, Yehoshu'a. Hokhmat Yohoshu'a Ben-Sira, trans. J. Y. Ben Ze'ev. Breslau, 1798.
- Blau, Joseph. The Christian Interpretation of the Cabbalah in the Renaissance. New York, 1944.
- Boileau, Nicola. L'art poétique. Strasburg, 1909.
- Cassirer, Ernest. The Renaissance Philosophy of Man. Chicago, 1948.
- Eliyahu of Pinchev. Mlekhet Mahshevet. Berlin, 1765.
- Emden, Jacob. Megillat Sefer. Warsaw, 1897.
- _____. Mitpahat Sefarim. Altona, 1765; Lwow, 1831.
- _____. Sefer Shimush. Altona, 1758.
- Ergas, Joseph. Shomer Emunim. Amsterdam, 1736.
- Ernst, Fritz. Der Klassizismus in Italien, Frankreich und Deutschland. Zurich-Leipzig-Vienna, 1934.
- Euclid. Uclidos, trans. to Hebrew by Barukh of Shklov. The Hague, 1780.
- Friesenhausen, David. Sefer Kelil Heshbon. Berlin, 1796.
- Gans, David. Zemah David. 1st ed. Venice, 1587; Warsaw, 1878.
- Gilson, Etienne H. Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages. New York, 1938.
- Gottsched, J. C. Versuch einer Kritischen Dichtkunst. Berlin, 1799.
- Guttman, Julius. ha-Philosophia Shel ha-Yahadut, trans. from German to Hebrew by Y. Barukh. Jerusalem, 1951.
- Ha-Levi, Yehudah. ha-Kuzari. Tel-Aviv: Mahbarot le-Sifrut, no date.
- _____. ha-Kuzari, ed. I. Satanow. Berlin, 1795.
- Hechis, Eliyahu. Sefer Shevilei Rakia. Prague, 1784.

- Herrara, Abraham c. Beit Elohim, trans. from Spanish to Hebrew by I. Abohav. Amsterdam, 1655.
- _____. Sha'ar ha-Shamayim, trans. from Spanish to Hebrew by I. Abohav. Amsterdam, 1655.
- Hokhmat Shlomo, ed. by N. H. Wessely. Berlin, 1780.
- Ibn Ezra, Abraham. Perush al Qohelet. Bnei Brak, 1960-61.
- Ibn Ezra, Moses. Shirat Yisrael, trans. from Arabic by B. Z. Halper. Leipzig, 1924; Jerusalem: Mazhef, 1967.
- Ibn Verga, Shlomo. Shevet Yehudah, ed. by A. Shohet with introduction by I. Baer. Jerusalem, 1947.
- Immanuel of Rome. Mahbarot Immanuel, ed. by H. Brody. Berlin: Eshkol, 1926.
- Isserles, Moses. Torat ha-Olah. Prague, 1530.
- Klemperer, Victor. Idealistische Literaturegeschichte. Bielfeld und Leipzig, 1929.
- Lessing, Ephraim G. Laokoon, Nathan the Wise and Mizna von Barnhelm, ed. by W. A. Steel. London: Everyman Library, 1949.
- Levi, Rafael. Tekhumat ha-Shamayim. Altona, 1755.
- Levinson, Isaac B. Te'uda be-Yisrael. Vilna, 1828.
- Luzzato, Ephrayim. Qol Shahal, ed. by I. Satanow. Berlin, 1790.
- _____. Elleh Bnei ha-Ne'urim, ed. by M. Leteris. Vienna, 1839.
- Luzzato, Moshe H. Leshon Limmudim. Mantua, 1797.
- _____. la-Yesharim Tehilla. Berlin, 1780.
- Luzzato, Simha. Ma'amar Al Yehudei Venezia, trans. from Italian to Hebrew by Dan Lattes. Jerusalem, 1941.
- Maimonides, Moses. Be'ur Milot ha-Higgayon, ed. by I. Satanow. Berlin, 1794.
- _____. Moreh Nevukhim, ed. by I. Satanow. Berlin, 1789.
- _____. Moreh Nevukhim, commentary by Joseph Kaspi. Solomon Verbluner Pub., 1848.

- Margolioth, Jehudah L. Beit Middot. Prague, 1778.
 _____ . Or Olam. Frankfurt am Oder, 1777.
- Megillat Yehudit, ed. by J. L. Ben Ze'ev. Vienna, 1779.
- Medigo, Joseph S. Del. Elim. Amsterdam, 1628-29.
 _____ . Matzref la-Hokhma. Odessa, 1864.
- Modena, Jehudah L. Ari Nohem. Jerusalem, 1929.
 _____ . Beit Yehudah. Venice, 1835.
- Pope, Alexander. An Essay on Criticism. London, 1711.
- Rossi, Azaria De. Me'or Einayim, ed. I. Satanow.
 Berlin, 1794.
- Shlomo of Chelm. Merkevet ha-Mishneh. Salonica, 1742.
- Spinoza, Benedict. Theologie-Political Treatise, trans.
 by R. H. M. Elwas. New York, 1951.
- Steinschneider, Moritz. Die hebräischen Übersetzungen
 des Middlealters und Die Juden als Dolmetscher.
 Gratz, 1956.
- Talmud. Shabat, Yoma, Hagigah, Sota 49, Baba Kama 82.
- Tishbi, Yesha'ya. Mishnat ha-Zohar. Jerusalem, 1948-1961.
- Tovia ha-Rofeh. Ma'ase Tovia. Venice, 1707.
- Vital, Hayim. Etz Hayim, ed. by I. Satanow. Koretz, 1782.
 _____ . Torat Etz Hayim, ed. by I. Satanow.
 Koretz, 1782.
- Worms, Anshel b. Wolf. Mafte'ah ha-Algebra ha-Hadasha.
 Frankfurt am Main, 1721.