

JOSHUA HESCHEL SCHORR: MASKIL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN REFORMIST¹

EZRA SPICEHANDLER

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati

I.

THIS article constitutes an attempt to rectify an imbalance in Reform Jewish historiography. It presents a critical-biographical treatment of the career of Joshua Heschel Schorr (1818?-1895), a leader of the radical wing of the Galician *Haskalah*, who was active during the crucial second generation of the German Reform when the theoretical groundwork of the movement was being laid. Like a number of other Galician scholars Schorr was involved in the development of Reform theory. As the leader of the left wing of the Galician *Haskalah*, he maintained close contacts with Jost and Geiger and published in their pro-Reform, German-Jewish periodicals. *החלוץ*, the Hebrew magazine which he edited and published, was widely circulated not only in Galicia and Germany but in the Russian-Polish pale as well. Its iconoclastic attacks on Orthodoxy and the *Halachah* did much to undermine their authority among Eastern European Jewish intellectuals. *החלוץ* was likewise read by some of the leading American Reform Rabbis of Schorr's day. At least one prominent American Reform Rabbi, Bernard Felsenthal, considered himself to be Schorr's disciple and was greatly influenced by his views.²

The fact that historians of Reform Judaism make little or scant reference to Schorr's career may be attributed to their general tendency to minimize or ignore the influence which the Galician and Russian *Haskalah* and *post-Haskalah* movements have exerted upon Reform Judaism. This oversight may be ascribed to a number of

¹ I use the term reformist to designate those men or ideas which were pro-Reform but were not an actual part of the organized Reform movement.

² See Ezra Spicehandler פלונטחהל שור אל ברוך פלונטחהל in *HUCA*, XXVIII (1957), pp. 1-26 [Hebrew section] and Wiener-Spicehandler: "Bernard Felsenthal's Letters to Osias Schorr," *Essays in American Jewish History* (Cincinnati, 1958, pp. 379-406. See particularly footnote 6a on p. 380. Felsenthal's views on Judaism were in many ways closer to those of contemporary American Reform rabbis than the views of Isaac M. Wise. Cf. Abraham J. Karpf: "The Father of American Reform Judaism," *Judaism*, VII (1958), pp. 361-62.

factors. In the first place, the writings and ideas of Eastern European reformist writers never led to institutional results: no Reform congregations were formed in Eastern Europe.³ Moreover, the historians of the *Haskalah*, with the exception of Simon Bernfeld, Max Raisin and Joseph Klausner, had strong prejudices against the German Reform movement and consciously or unconsciously avoided associating it with the (for them) more palatable *Haskalah*. This omission was paralleled by reformist historians who were either unfamiliar with Hebrew literature, or who simply disdained Eastern European Jewry. David Philipson, for example, barely mentioned the Galician *Haskalah*, and devoted only a few lines to the reformism of the last generation of Russian *Maskilim*.⁴ Finally, since most standard histories of Reform Judaism were published before the American movement crystallized, their authors could hardly be expected to foresee the strong impact which the Eastern European elements were destined to exert upon it.

Simon Bernfeld was the first historian of Reform Judaism who understood its relationship to the Eastern European *Haskalah*. In his *תולדות הריפורמציון הדתית בישראל*, he devoted a number of pages to the Galician *Haskalah* and in particular to the radical *Maskil* Joshua Heschel Schorr.⁵ He failed, however, to recognize religious reformist elements in the Russian *Haskalah* of his own day. Max Raisin in his *The Reform Movement as Reflected in Hebrew Literature*⁶ also described in general terms the contributions of the Galician writers Krochmal, Erter, Rapoport and Judah Mieses to Reform thought, but likewise overlooked the ideas of the Russian *Haskalah*. Much detailed work has yet to be done in this area.

The *Haskalah* and *post-Haskalah* movements, as they developed in Eastern Europe, exerted a decided influence upon both the German

³ The *Maskilim* did advocate and introduce certain aesthetic reforms in the Eastern European synagogue life and established a number of modern schools. They, however, made no real change in the liturgy and theology of the synagogue. The first known modern synagogue and school were established by Josef Perl in Tarnopol. Modern synagogues and schools sprang up in a number of other large cities: Brody, Lemberg, Riga, Warsaw, Odessa and others. The Jewish masses described these synagogues as *Daitsh shulen*. The Brody synagogue in Odessa even introduced an organ.

⁴ He mentions the activities of Rapoport, Reggio and Nahman Krochmal in Galicia (*The Reform Movement in Judaism*), p. 41 and Judah Leib Gordon, Moses Leib Lilienblum and Reuben Asher Braudes in Russia (*Ibid.*, p. 563).

⁵ Simon Bernfeld, *תולדות הריפורמציון הדתית בישראל* (Cracow, 1900), pp. 108-09, 234-38.

⁶ *CCAR Year Book*, XVI (1906), pp. 285-95.

and the American Reform movements. As early as the thirties and forties of the last century, at the very period when the German movement was crystallizing its ideology, its leading spokesmen were engaged in a lively commerce of ideas with the leaders of the Galician *Haskalah*. Geiger, Jost and Zunz were in direct contact with Krochmal, Rapoport, S. D. Luzzatto⁷ and their disciples in Galicia. They published in the Galician Hebrew journals and were involved in the same ideological politics. On the other hand, the scientific works of Luzzatto and Rapoport and the lesser lights of the *Haskalah* were as much a part of Jewish scholarship of the period as were the works of their German contemporaries. They formed a single historical-critical movement. During the second generation of the Galician *Haskalah* (1835–1860), a particularly close relationship developed between the left-wing *Maskilim* and their counterparts in Germany. Joshua Heschel Schorr was the leader of this radical wing.

The influence of the Galician movement on the early American Reform movement has not been fully investigated. We do, however, know that *כרם חמר* and *החלוץ* were read in America, and that Isaac Mayer Wise claimed that he was ordained by Rapoport himself.

With the infiltration of Eastern European Jews into the American Reform Rabbinate at the turn of the century, a second wave of *Haskalah* ideas, this time of Russian origin, penetrated the movement. It is no accident that in 1903 Abraham Rhine, an American Reform Rabbi, wrote a rabbinical thesis on Judah Leib Gordon, a Hebrew poet who was himself influenced by Schorr. Rhine stressed “the struggle between the old order of things and the new, between medievalism and modernity — a story of the longing of the Jewish soul for emancipation.” And he added that “incidentally, a study of the 19th century Hebrew literature cannot but tend to raise the Russian Jew in the estimation of his American [i. e., German-Jewish] brother and bring about a clearer understanding between them.”⁸ Rhine’s “incidentally” clause might very well indicate his real motivation. At this early date Eastern European members of the American Reform movement were extremely anxious to demonstrate that they, too, had acceptable credentials. During the following decades of this century, *Maskilim* or their sons became leading members of the American Reform rabbinate. Jews of Eastern European origin became the preponderant majority in

⁷ Luzzatto was, of course, Italian but spiritually he and his group were deeply involved in the Galician *Haskalah*.

⁸ The thesis was published in 1910, under the title of *Leon Gordon an Appreciation*, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia. The quotations are from the preface on p. 7.

the ranks of American Reform Judaism. Although their readiness to join the Reform movement usually grew out of their desire to adjust to the new milieu, we must not underestimate the direct and indirect role which the *Haskalah* had in undermining the authority of Orthodoxy for many of them or their parents even before they left the European continent. The Reformist ideas advocated by men like Schorr, Judah Leib Gordon, Moses Leib Lilienblum and Reuben Asher Braudes influenced a generation of *Maskilim*.

The rise of *Aḥad Haamism* and cultural nationalism in Russia was also reflected in Reform Judaism, either directly or through the Reconstructionist version. David Neumark, who was a member of Aḥad Haam's circle, taught philosophy at the Hebrew Union College. His disciple Samuel S. Cohon, a product of the Eastern European *Haskalah*, played a significant role in the formulation of modern Reform theology. A significant number of other scholars and rabbis of Eastern European origin held key positions at the College and in the Reform rabbinate, and they in turn have influenced at least two generations of American Reform Jews. They introduced many *Haskalah* and Aḥad Haamist ideas into Reform Judaism, ideas which not only had a determining effect upon the Columbus platform (1937), but which continue to affect the Reform movement to this very day.

The *Haskalah*, therefore, justly deserves a place in the history of Reform Judaism which has hitherto been denied to it. A proper and balanced evaluation of American Reform Judaism requires that we re-study those Eastern European elements which merged with the earlier German strain and with it formed perhaps the strongest Jewish Reform movement in our long history. In such a re-evaluation Joshua Heschel Schorr emerges as a significant figure.

Simon Bernfeld appreciated the role which Schorr played in the development of Reform theory. In his pioneer work on the movement he said:⁹

"Joshua Heschel Schorr . . . was certainly not the equal of Geiger in practical knowledge, but was sharper than he in critical acumen and in his remarkable satirical skill . . . he is significant for us because he loathed half-baked scholarship more than extreme orthodoxy and respected Solomon Kluger, the fanatical *maggid* of Brody and Abraham Tiktin more than he did Zachariah Frankel and Rapoport, the moderate liberals . . . He was an uninhibited critic of Biblical Judaism and a powerful opponent of Talmudic Judaism. He based his anti-Talmudism on a theoretical system . . ."

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 235-36.

Joseph Klausner, likewise, clearly understood Schorr's significance as a key figure of the Galician *Haskalah*.¹⁰ Anyone working in this general area is particularly indebted to Klausner's work. Although he has amassed a treasure-house of detail, and his treatment of Schorr's החלץ period is very good and indispensable to any student of his times, Klausner skimmed over Schorr's earlier career. This is hardly surprising, because much of the data on this earlier period was buried in the anonymous articles which Schorr wrote for the German-Jewish press, in obscure collections of the published correspondence of his contemporaries, and in the extant letters which Schorr sent to his colleagues. Yet, it was precisely in this period that Schorr developed his ideas and made his contacts with the German movement. By collecting Schorr's letters, by identifying most of his German articles and by tracking down the references to him in the works of his contemporaries, I have, to a considerable extent, uncovered this obscure chapter of his life.¹¹

This monograph will concern itself primarily with Schorr's career as an Eastern European Reformist. It shall discuss his reformist ideas and his links with the German reformers. At the same time, because of Schorr's importance as a leading figure in the history of Hebrew scholarship and literature, it shall also deal with his scholarly and literary achievements.

II.

Joshua Heschel Schorr was probably born on September 18, 1818 in Brody, the commercial center of Galicia.¹² His family was well-to-do, and connected with the prominent merchant families of that city.

¹⁰ היסטוריה של הספרות העברית החדשה IV² (Jerusalem, 1953), pp. 58-77, and especially pp. 71 ff.

¹¹ See my bibliography of Schorr's works, "The Writings of Osias Schorr," *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* II (1955), pp. 20-36. I have since identified a number of articles which appeared in Phillipsohn's *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*. See pp. 17-20 of this article. I have also published Schorr's letters to Felsenthal in *HUCA* XXVIII (1957), [Hebrew section] pp. 1-26.

¹² The name which Schorr used in German was Osias H. Schorr. Our sources are not in agreement as to the date of his birth. Until recently most scholars believed it was May 22, 1814, basing their information on the date Gershom Bader gave in the necrology he wrote for הפרדס, III (1896), p. 181; i. e., 3 *Sivan* 5574. This date was approximated by Hirsch Seidel; ספר חולרות הרב החכם הגדול והמבקר מוה"ר רבנו יהושע (Drohobycz 1888), 4, who says Schorr was born in *Iyyar*, 5574. The death notices published by Leo Herzberg Fränkel in the Vienna Jewish press also gave

Shalom Schachnah, his father, was a prosperous merchant, reputed to be both scholarly and orthodox.¹³ His mother, Sarah Leah, was the daughter of Ariele Lieb Byck,¹⁴ one of the wealthiest men in Brody. Avigdor (Victor) Gruenberg and Berish Bernstein, his two brothers-in-law, were distinguished *Maskilim* and likewise members of the Brody commercial oligarchy.¹⁵

Schorr was thus born into the upper stratum of Brody society. In the first half of the 19th century, Brody was the largest and wealthiest Jewish community in all Galicia. Its affluent merchants dominated much of the trade between Russia and the West. They were among the leading buyers at the great Leipzig fair, and from there shipped their goods into Russia via the port of Odessa, and the commercial center in Berdichev. From Odessa itself they exported wheat and middle eastern goods into Central and Western Europe. At the close of the 18th century, they came into contact with the German *Haskalah* in Leipzig and soon, wherever they went, the Brody merchants carried the new enlightenment with their wares. The Austrian authorities in Galicia usually encouraged the *Haskalah* and supported the Germanophile merchant *Maskilim* in their endeavors for enlightenment. By the time Schorr was a school boy, the *Haskalah*

1814 as the year of his birth (*Neuzeit* XXXV [1895], p. 414.) *Brüll's Monatsblätter* XV (1895), p. 244 and *Bloch's Wochenschrift*, XII (1895), p. 661, a date which was also accepted by RBM (Reuben Brainin?) הוצפירה, XXII (1895), p. 752. However, Moses Steinschneider, a literary associate of Schorr, gave 8 *Tishri* 5577, Sept. 30, 1816, in *Catalogus Librorum Hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, 2573/7146. George Kohut, in the American magazine *Menorah* XIX (1895), pp. 305–306, agreed with Steinschneider. In his old age Schorr believed that he was born on September 18, 1818, and said so in a letter which he wrote to his nephew, which I shall append to the second part of this article. This date was also implied in one of Schorr's letters to Felsenthal *HUCA*, XXVIII (1957), [Hebrew section], pp. 21–22. See also Joseph Klausner, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 58, footnote 4a and N. M. Gelber, ערים ואמהות בישראל: חולדות יהודי ברודי, VI (Jerusalem, 1955), p. 213 n. 206.

¹³ Gelber, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

¹⁴ The Byck family were patricians who had become extremely wealthy in the first half of the 18th century. One of Schorr's maternal uncles, Ozer Byck, was a prominent wholesaler. The other, Jonah Byck, was a member of the Kehilah Council. Gelber, *op. cit.*, pp. 91–93.

¹⁵ Samuel David Luzzatto corresponded with Gruenberg [See אנרות שד"ל (Przemysł, 1882–1894), pp. 328, 338] and enquired about Schorr's relationship to him in his second letter. He was an advance subscriber to Luzzatto's *Prolegomeni ad una grammatica ragionata della lingua ebraica*, (Padova, 1836), p. 232. Berish Bernstein was listed as an advance subscriber to M. M. Juval's book רוח חיים (Lemberg, 1831). See Gelber, *op. cit.*, p. 213 n. 210.

was firmly entrenched among many merchant families in Brody and in the larger Galician towns such as Lemberg and Tarnopol.¹⁶

According to Hirsch Seidel, Schorr "at five could read and fully understand Hebrew in all its fine grammatical detail. At six he began to study Talmud and at eight he knew the Bible by heart."¹⁷ Notwithstanding Seidel's penchant for exaggeration, it is, nonetheless, rather clear that Schorr was a child prodigy and that his education was strictly along traditional lines. At an early age, undoubtedly under the influence of his two older brothers and his brothers-in-law who were *Maskilim*, he, too, became a *Maskil* and was brought into contact with many of the key figures of the *Haskalah*.¹⁸

Avigdor Gruenberg, one of his brothers-in-law, belonged to the circle of *Maskilim* who gathered around Naḥman Krochmal. According to Seidel, Gruenberg once took his brother-in-law (then barely fourteen) with him to Zolkiew to visit the great Galician sage. Krochmal was so impressed by the precocious youngster that he asked him to read a few pages of the manuscript of his projected *מורה נבוכי הזמן*.¹⁹ When Krochmal returned to Brody for a two-year stay (1836–1838), Schorr must have become a junior member of his circle.²⁰ His friendship with Krochmal's son, Abraham, in all likelihood dates from that time. We may also assume that it was then that the two young scholars studied together under the guidance of Rabbi Solomon Kluger, the *maggid* and *ab beth din* of Brody.²¹ At Gruenberg's home Schorr also met Samson Bloch, the author of the geographic lexicon *שבילי עולם*.²²

¹⁶ For details on the role of the Brody merchants in the spreading of the *Haskalah* in Galicia and South Russia see N. Gelber, *op. cit.*, particularly pp. 153 ff. and 173–219. Israel Zinberg, *די געשיכטע פון דער ליטעראטור ביי יידן* (Vilna, 1937), VII part 2, pp. 254–55 and VIII, part 2, pp. 25–9. For the social and political basis of the *Haskalah* see Raphael Mahler: *דער קאמף צווישן השכלה און חסידות אין גאליציע* (New York, 1942), pp. 39–82. I do not agree with all of Mahler's conclusions.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 4.

¹⁸ Schorr's two older brothers were Naftali Mendel Schorr (d. 1883), a Galician author of some prominence who later settled in Lemberg and usually signed his articles *י. ל. ש.*, i. e., 'נפתלי מנדל' שור', (see Gelber: *op. cit.*, p. 218), and Isaac Schorr, who possessed a very large Hebrew library and together with Jacob Goldenthal published an article in *כרם חפר* II (1836), pp. 194–201. Isaac Schorr and Luzzatto both competed in bids for the purchase of Judah Halevi's *Divan* from the bookdealer J. Cohin of Livorno. Luzzatto won the bid and, to avoid hard feelings, decided to dedicate his edition of the *Divan* to Schorr in honor of his marriage. See *אגרות שד"ל*, p. 618.

¹⁹ Seidel, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

²⁰ Gelber, *op. cit.*, p. 186. *אגרות שד"ל*, pp. 387, 392, 675.

²¹ *החלוץ* IV (Breslau, 1859), p. 16. Abraham Krochmal also lived in Brody from 1842–1869. See Gelber: *Op. cit.*, p. 218.

²² Schorr's older brother Naftali edited vol. III of Bloch's *שבילי עולם* after its

About this time Schorr wrote a book called *אגרות מה* which he sent off to the poet Meir Letteris, then employed by Anton Schmidt, the famous Viennese publisher of Hebrew books. The book, which was probably written under the influence of Erter, was praised by Letteris, who, however, lost the manuscript.²³

Schorr's relationship with Erter began in 1831, after Erter returned to his native Brody to serve as a medical practitioner.²⁴ Despite the difference of age between the two men, Schorr soon became his close friend and collaborator.²⁵ Erter had a profound influence on Schorr. In his later writings, the younger scholar adopted Erter's satirical style and employed many of his characteristic literary devices such as dream-sequences and personification of abstractions. Yet, despite their warm friendship, Erter could be condescendingly critical of his young colleague. When Schorr published a hostile critical notice on Isaac Ber Levinsohn's *בית יהודה*,²⁶ Erter wrote to Levinsohn:

"According to my judgment the critic was wrong to cast aspersions on your honor and was impolite to do so to a scholar of your caliber. But your critic is a boy and he had no intention to do you harm. He only wanted to show off his sharp pen. Youth has its own rules and rights and we older men ought to treat it benevolently and forgive its sins."²⁷

Erter belonged to the left wing of the Galician *Haskalah* and tended towards religious reformism. The left wing of the movement had become increasingly dissatisfied with the literary leadership of Rapoport and the editorial policy of its organ, *כרם חמר*. By 1851 Erter, Schorr and a number of radical Brody *Maskilim* launched their own journal

author's death under the title of *זרב שביה* (Lemberg, 1855). In the dedicatory poem with which he introduced the work, he speaks of the friendship of their youth. Schorr himself reviewed Bloch's translation of Zunz's work on Rashi in *ציון II* (1842), pp. 111-12, 126-27, 142-44 and 147-50.

²³ This was the title which Letteris used in his letter of November 10, 1835 to Schorr. (Letteris file of the Sharon Autograph collection Hebrew University Library.) Seidel called it *שיחה בין המתים* and reported that the book contained 500 pages. According to Seidel, the book was rediscovered in 1891 and attributed to Erter, *op. cit.*, p. 5. See also Gelber, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

²⁴ The University of Budapest only granted him a degree of *magister chirurgiae* and he served as a practitioner: "praktischer Arzt."

²⁵ Luzzatto frequently sent regards to Erter in his letters to Schorr. The first time he did so was on 29 *Heshvan* 5597=1836. *אגרות ש"ל*, p. 357. In a letter to Luzzatto dated 10 *Elul* 5605=1845, Erter refers to "our dear friends Schorr and *Shalosh* (Hirsch Mendel Pineles)." *הצופה לבית ישראל* (Vienna, 1864), p. 108.

²⁶ *Israelitische Annalen*, II (1840), p. 152.

²⁷ *באר יצחק* (Warsaw, 1899), p. 62.

—החלוץ.²⁸ Their long friendship ended with Erter's untimely death in 1851, just before the first issue was published.

Another writer who had a decided influence upon Schorr was the great Italian Jewish scholar Samuel David Luzzatto, who for many years acted as his guide and mentor in the field of Jewish scholarship. The two men carried on a lengthy correspondence which is our major source for Schorr's activities between 1832–1852. Unfortunately, only two of Schorr's letters to Luzzatto have been preserved and we must in the main rely on Luzzatto's letters for a picture of the period.²⁹ Schorr was strongly attached to the older scholar, often acted as his secretary and gave him much financial assistance.³⁰ In later years, long after Luzzatto's religious conservatism had led to the rupture of their close relationship, he became rather critical of Luzzatto's romanticism and even discounted his significance as a thinker.³¹

The correspondence between the two began when Schorr was 14 years old, (if we accept 1818 as the year of his birth). In a note which he later appended to a letter that he sent to Solomon Rapoport on January 13, 1832, Luzzatto remarked: "On the ninth of *Adar I*, I wrote a letter to the young man Joshua Schorr of Brody and enclosed a letter to my good friend, the scholar *Shir* (Solomon Judah Rapoport)."³² Schorr copied this letter and sent it on to Tarnopol for publication in *כרם חמר*.³³ Together with his reply Schorr must have enclosed an article on biblical philology, because the following letter by Luzzatto contained a scolding criticism of the younger man's callow scholarship and his disregard for grammatical rules:

"Do not rush to utter whatever enters your mind at first glance but gradually accustom yourself in philological matters Your statements and explanations are all born of haste and the love

²⁸ *אנרות שד"ל*, p. 1096.

²⁹ The letters appeared in Victorius Castiglioni, *Epistolae ad Sciadal* (Tereste [Trieste], 1900), pp. 91–96.

³⁰ Schorr copied many of Luzzatto's letters for transmission to *כרם חמר* and probably covered the postal charges. See *אנרות שד"ל*, p. 229. He advanced Luzzatto money for the publication *בית האוצר* (Lemberg, 1847), (see introduction, p. iii and *אנרות שד"ל*, p. 965), and for *המשחרל* (Vienna, 1847). *אנרות שד"ל*, p. 999. He also paid for the publication of *בתולת בת יהודה* (Prague, 1840), which Luzzatto dedicated to him as a wedding gift.

³¹ Luzzatto's last letter to Schorr was written in 1852. *אנרות שד"ל*, pp. 1149–51. Schorr's later views on Luzzatto appear in a letter which he wrote to Felsenthal (*HUCA*, XXVII [1957], Hebrew section, p. 20).

³² *אנרות שד"ל*, p. 229.

³³ Most Hebrew articles were published in the form of scholarly letters. This particular letter was not published (*אנרות שד"ל*, p. 229).

of novelty.^{33a} They demonstrate a lack of both knowledge and *Sprachgefühl*”

Schorr must have been deeply hurt by Luzzatto's severe remarks. He did not have the courage to renew the correspondence until four years later on the 24th of *Nisan*, 5596 = 1836. From Luzzatto's response we can surmise that Schorr had written a self-effacing letter in which he had accepted the older scholar's reprimand and had assured him that he had continued studying diligently and was now seeking his counsel and guidance. This time Luzzatto's reaction was warm and fatherly. He all but apologized for the imperious tone of his earlier letter and reassured Schorr of his sympathy for him as well as for all younger scholars.

“Indeed I now see . . . that during the past years you have increased in both wisdom and understanding . . . but nevertheless remove pride from your heart and avoid self-satisfaction with your intellectual abilities. Let your goal be the increase of knowledge and the discovery of truth . . . However if you take pride in discounting the words of others and in seeking novelty, you will never attain truth.”³⁴

By the end of 1836, Schorr was already involved in the literary politics of the day.³⁵ At that time Luzzatto was engaged in a controversy with Ber Blumenfeld over the authorship and the date of the Book of Job.³⁶ He was concerned about the reaction of this wealthy and influential *Maskil*, and implored Schorr to assure Blumenfeld that his “intentions were peaceful and respectful.” His inquiries about Isaac Erter, his age and his medical training indicate that Schorr must have written to his mentor of his growing friendship with Erter.³⁷

Early in 1837, the letters took on a more scholarly bent. Schorr wrote a long letter dealing with the dating of the *Targumim*, the Mishnah and the Talmud, in which he agreed with Luzzatto's view that these texts were not committed to writing until after the close of the Talmud. In doing so he opposed the views of both Zunz and Isaac Ber Levinsohn who believed that they were written down much

^{33a} *Ibid.*, pp. 230–31.

³⁴ April 29, 1836 — *ibid.*, p. 335. The letter was published in *כרם חמר*, III, pp. 208–11. It was dated 12 *Iyyar* 5596 = April 29, 1836, and not 2 *Tammuz* (April 29 *sic!*) as listed erroneously by Gräber. In one of the letters Luzzatto wrote to Victor Gruenberg at the time, he made an enquiry as to the latter's relationship to Schorr. *אגרות שד"ל*, p. 338.

³⁵ Letter of November 9, 1836; *ibid.*, pp. 356–57.

³⁶ See *כרם חמר* I (1835), pp. 54–58; II (1836), pp. 119–25.

³⁷ *אגרות שד"ל*, p. 357.

earlier.³⁸ In addition, he suggested a number of biblical emendations which Luzzatto again rejected with his usual admonition about the rash and flippant manner in which Schorr rushed into the difficult area of biblical philology.³⁹

The earliest indication of Schorr's budding religious reformism appeared in a letter which Luzzatto sent him on May 28, 1837.⁴⁰ Schorr had mailed him an article dealing with theological matters which he intended to submit to *כרם חמד* for publication. Luzzatto was shocked by its radicalism and warned him not to dare publish it as it stood:

"You must remove (from your article) everything you said . . . concerning the belief in the immortality of the soul. If you do not, I shall be compelled to answer your remarks without favor (this matter involves the profanation of the Name). I shall be compelled to say in my statement that whoever says I believe thusly but I do not believe that Moses believed so, is really asserting that he denies the divine revelation of the Torah. He turns Moses into a scholar like other scholars and does not believe that he received God's word at all. For how can a man accept the prophecy of Moses and yet, for all that, believe in doctrines which according to him are the very opposite of what Moses believed. All of this is what I should have to answer you publicly before Israel. I am reluctant to spoil your reputation before your countrymen. Therefore heed my advice. Do not publish these words. On another occasion I shall privately and lovingly refute your statements."

The article never appeared. It is quite possible that Rapoport, the editor of *כרם חמד*, rejected it even after the necessary deletions were made and that Schorr's subsequent hostility to him dates from this period. Schorr was never able to publish an article in *כרם חמד* until Rapoport disassociated himself from its staff.

The severity of Luzzatto's reprimand must have hurt the young scholar deeply, since the correspondence between them broke off again and was not resumed until after a lapse of nearly nine months. Schorr made the first conciliatory gesture by sending Luzzatto a book as a gift. The latter responded warmly. In his next letter he expressed his surprise at discovering that Volume III of *כרם חמד* did not contain the controversial article.⁴¹ For the time being, at least, there was to be no published evidence of Schorr's nascent radicalism.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 367-68 letter of January 1, 1837.

³⁹ Schorr published an elaboration of this letter in the *Israelitische Annalen*, II (1840), p. 160.

⁴⁰ *אגרות שד"ל*, pp. 386-87.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 414, 431.

However, soon he was to emerge as a personality of considerable significance in the Galician *Haskalah*. This occurred in 1837, when a critical point in the evolution of the movement was reached as a result of serious differences which arose between Rapoport and the more conservative *Maskilim* who controlled *כרם חמר*, the literary organ of the movement, on the one side, and the more radical Brody *Maskilim* led by Erter and Schorr, on the other. The two friends began to plan the publication of a competing periodical which would be free of Rapoport's control and which would publish, if not actually reflect, their more radical views.

The split was particularly painful because as late as the early months of 1837, the radicals had still considered Rapoport to be closer to them. They had in fact twice rallied to his support when he was under fire. Upon hearing that a group of young right wing disciples of Krochmal had planned to attack Rapoport (as well as Luzzatto) in the second volume of their yearbook, *הרואה*, Schorr and a number of Brody *Maskilim* became so incensed that they used their influence with the Lemberg censor and succeeded in having the unfavorable volume banned.⁴² Later that year, when Rapoport was elected *ab beth din* of Tarnopol, they hailed his appointment as a great victory for the movement in the Jewish press and rushed to his defense in the face of orthodox opposition.⁴³ In doing so they chose to ignore the fact that even before his arrival in Tarnopol, and, in all likelihood, in anticipation of his appointment, Rapoport had begun to disassociate himself from his more extreme friends.

One of the first things Rapoport did was to insist that Geiger remove his name from the list of sponsoring scholars which appeared at the head of the *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*. In fact, after permitting Geiger to use his name for three years, he now accused him of printing it without authorization. In his published reply, Geiger angrily pointed out that the accusation was unjust, and announced that Rapoport's name would no longer be listed.⁴⁴

⁴² See Luzzatto's letter of June 20, (p. 431) in reply to Schorr's letter of Feb. 20. For further information on the רואים (as this group was called) see S. Bernfeld, *חולדות ש"ר* (Berlin, 1898), pp. 98-100, Klausner, *op. cit.*, II, p. 245, and Luzzatto's letters to the two רואים Jacob Bodek and Nahman Fischmann, *אגרות ש"ל*, pp. 426-27, 429. *הרואה*, II was finally published in Ofen (Hungary) in 1839. When this volume was imported into Galicia, its authors were fined 25 ducats for evading censorship. See Bernfeld, *loc. cit.*, and N. Gelber: *אנציקלופדיה של גלויות: לבוב* (Jerusalem-Tel-Aviv, 1956), pp. 243-44.

⁴³ See *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, II (1838), pp. 88, 91-92, 95.

⁴⁴ *WZJT*, IV (1839), pp. 472-73. The disagreement with Geiger dated from 1837 (see p. 473).

About the same time Rapoport wrote a letter to the Jewish community of Krotoschin attacking Geiger's radicalism.⁴⁵ The letter was subsequently used by Geiger's opponents during the well-known Geiger-Tiktin controversy. So concerned was Rapoport about his association with the *Haskalah* that he even tried to sever his relationship with **כָּרָם חַמַּד** but he was prevailed upon not to do so.⁴⁶ Shortly following his election as *ab beth din* in Tarnopol, he became alarmed at the jubilant and provocative statements published by some of the radical *Maskilim*. In a letter to his son-in-law Hirsch Bodek, he implored Bodek to prevail upon both Schorr and his older brother Naftali Schorr to desist from attacking his orthodox enemies with their usual venom. He complained that under the guise of their respect for him, they were doing him a disservice.⁴⁷ Rapoport's protestations had the desired effect, at least upon Naftali Schorr. About a month later, Naftali wrote a letter to his younger brother deprecating Luzzatto's trenchant criticism of Maimonides and Abraham Ibn Ezra as dangerous to the cause of the *Haskalah*.

"Will anyone heed the teachings of a man whom he hates Until recently, he [Luzzatto] only disparaged Maimonides, but now he . . . speaks ill of Ibn Ezra. Yet for all that, he expects to bring us light and to brighten our darkness . . . Words like these will increase their stubbornness [of the unenlightened] and as long as he persists in defiling the honor of such sages, he will increase their hatred for wisdom"⁴⁸

Naftali Schorr's letter reflected the growing concern of many moderate *Maskilim* with Luzzatto's daring scholarly conclusions. We must, however, bear in mind that Luzzatto was not a radical *Maskil*. During the next two decades he, too, would take his side with the conservatives. However, at the moment his concern with scientific truth and the less oppressive atmosphere of the Italian Jewish *milieu* led him to make more radical pronouncements. Schorr sent a copy of Naftali's

⁴⁵ In the *A. Z. d. J.*, II (1838), p. 435, a correspondent reported the fact that Rapoport intended to attack a certain German rabbi — the anonymous rabbi appears to be Geiger. Bernfeld **תולדות ש"ר** p. 60, mistakenly believed that the correspondent was Schorr. The letter, however, was submitted from Posen. See also **אגרות ש"ר**, p. 644.

⁴⁶ Bernfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 78. Rapoport spoke bitterly of the plot Jost was engineering against him in a letter to Luzzatto **אגרות ש"ר** [Przemyśl, 1885], pp. 105-06) and said that of all the German scholars only Zunz had remained his friend.

⁴⁷ See Israel Wilens: **יוסף פערל'ס יודישע כתבים** (Vilna, 1937), pp. LXXV-LXXVI.

⁴⁸ Schorr sent a copy of Naftali's letter to Luzzatto. It is reproduced in **אגרות ש"ר**, pp. 564-65. The editor omits the date of Naftali's letter but the ordinal number assigned to it indicates that the copy was received by Luzzatto in August, 1838.

letter to Luzzatto. In his reply, Luzzatto not only re-asserted his position but enumerated his list of grievances against Rapoport:

“I wrote my words just as they were dictated to me by my love of truth, Torah and Israel. I have no doubt that my words will be approved by the *Maskilim* and will be of benefit to them . . . How long must we wait? Will the eyes of the fools ever be opened, if the *Maskilim* keep silent? I had congratulated myself with the thought that Rapoport’s election to the chair in Tarnopol was made in heaven so that he might be able to save the Jews of your country from their obscurantism and defilement. Consequently I wrote my paean in his honor. But whoever published it did both of us harm. And now I see in the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, No. 108, that Rapoport intends to write an attack against a German sage⁴⁹ who formerly was his friend, in order to disassociate himself from the new ideas. Goldenburg has also informed me that he [Rapoport] has written an article censuring me and intends to publish it in *כרם חמד* (I have not even seen it!) From all this, I conclude that not only is he unable to rise up against the imbeciles but feels compelled to become one of them.”⁵⁰

Above all, the rumors which had reached Luzzatto about the forthcoming volume of *כרם חמד* were most exasperating. Schorr, who had by now become a violent opponent of Rapoport, abetted the developing conflict between the two scholars by transmitting to Luzzatto every bit of literary gossip that he was able to gather.⁵¹ Klausner’s contention that Schorr was motivated “by the hatred of a young unknown scholar for an older, conservative and accepted colleague”⁵² does not tell the whole story. He must have certainly resented the rejection of his articles by the editors of *כרם חמד* and could hardly abide the cavalier manner in which Luzzatto was treated; nevertheless, his real motive was his uneasiness about Rapoport’s growing conservatism. To him this looked like a betrayal of the “cause.”

Like most of the preceding volumes of *כרם חמד*, Vol. IV was edited by Goldenburg only in name. The actual editor was Rapoport. Luzzatto was therefore quite correct in holding Rapoport responsible for the article which attacked him. The immediate cause which prompted the attack against Luzzatto was a controversial article on

⁴⁹ *Allgemeine Zeitung*, II (1838), p. 435. This appears to be a projected attack against Geiger. See Bernfeld, *תולדות שי"ר*, p. 60. Rapoport did write an attack on Geiger in a letter which he sent to the community of Krotoschin in 1839. The letter was used by Geiger’s opponents during his controversy with Tiktin. See also Geiger’s response in *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*, IV (1839), pp. 472–75.

⁵⁰ *אגרות שד"ל*, p. 565.

⁵¹ Bernfeld, *תולדות שי"ר*, p. 59. Klausner, *op. cit.*, II, p. 75.

⁵² Klausner, *loc. cit.*

the redaction of the Mishnah which he published in Vol. III (1838).⁵³ In it he took issue with Geiger's earlier assertion⁵⁴ that the Mishnah was written down during the Tannaitic period and insisted that it was not recorded until the days of the *Saboraim*. After marshalling his proofs and refuting those of Geiger, Luzzatto asserted:

"I have dealt at length with this problem because of its great importance. For we live in a generation in which an understanding of the basic principles of our faith is necessary and more compelling than it has been in past generations, although we have hardly begun to understand them. As long as we are unaware of the fact that the sages refrained from writing down the oral law so that the courts of each generation might be free to revise and to change (it) in accordance with the place and the time, we will not understand the principle of the oral law."⁵⁵

Curiously, this radical statement with which Luzzatto concluded the first part of his article was hardly noticed by his opponents; the second part of the article was for them most irritating. They resented the bitter attack on Maimonides which it contained and Luzzatto's assertion that Maimonides presented a distorted view of Judaism.⁵⁶

Maimonides was the great white god of the *Haskalah*, — the hero of every *Maskil* from Mendelssohn to Krochmal; such iconoclastic remarks could hardly remain unanswered. Moreover, this was not the first attack which Luzzatto had made against a rationalist medieval philosopher. Besides Maimonides whom he criticized several times, he had also written disparaging remarks about Abraham Ibn Ezra. Above all, by criticizing Luzzatto, the conservatives could express their growing concern over his radical friends. A concerted attack was therefore

⁵³ Letter V, pp. 61-76.

⁵⁴ *WZJT*, II (1836), pp. 482-85.

⁵⁵ כרם חסד, III (1838), p. 66.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 70. Luzzatto based his accusation on three points:

(1) By codifying rabbinic law and deliberately omitting the differences of opinion which were preserved in the Talmud, Maimonides eliminated the legal basis for change and reform.

(2) His Aristotelian view that the essence of soul is intellect led him to the intolerant view that non-Jews whose religious opinions do not conform with the correct religious view are denied salvation. Judaism, Luzzatto insisted, does not believe "that God will punish the nations because of their mistaken faith or because of their paganism but only because of their ethical failings."

(3) Finally, and this is inferred from Maimonides' preoccupation with "intellect," his attempt to define the dogmas of Judaism violates the spirit of Judaism. "For the prophets, the *Tannaim* and the *Amoraim* and the *Geonim* never set limits in matters of belief. They never stated that he who believes thusly or he who does not, is excluded from the community of Israel."

launched against him in Volume IV of *כרם חמד*. The poet Jacob Eichenbaum wrote an article in which he sought to explain a difficult passage in Ibn Ezra's *יסוד מורא* which Luzzatto had previously attempted to expound.⁵⁷ In the introduction to Eichenbaum's article, an anonymous author from Odessa remarked: "A few days ago I received Volume II of *כרם חמד* and read the article by the great scholar Samuel David Luzzatto which dealt with this passage . . . I was astounded to discover that a scholar of his caliber makes such empty and insipid statements and congratulates himself over them."⁵⁸ Naḥman Krochmal, in the same volume, took up the cudgel for Ibn Ezra and Maimonides in a gentler article.⁵⁹ Rapoport himself included certain strictures which he made concerning Luzzatto's views. Moreover, Rapoport had not only failed to send him advance copies of these critical articles, but had actually deleted certain portions of Luzzatto's own articles before printing them.⁶⁰ To add insult to injury he reproduced a poem which Luzzatto wrote in honor of his election to Tarnopol despite the latter's urgent request to Goldenburg to return it to him.⁶¹ To the volatile Luzzatto all this had the trappings of a conspiracy against him. In an acid letter, he penned "a bill of divorcement" to Rapoport and withdrew as a contributor to *כרם חמד*.⁶² Luzzatto was also convinced that Krochmal had had a hand in the plot against him and remained very cool to Krochmal, despite Schorr's attempts to effect a reconciliation between them.⁶³

As a result of Luzzatto's withdrawal from *כרם חמד*, no volume of the magazine was published in 1840. Schorr and Erter could now count upon Luzzatto's support for the more radical periodical which they were planning to publish. In a letter to him they suggested that the defunct *העתים בכורי* be revived and be published by Anton Schmidt in Vienna.⁶⁴ Luzzatto supported the move but insisted that they should not use Moses Landau of Prague as publisher "since he is tied hand and foot with Rapoport and Krochmal."⁶⁵ He significantly suggested that the new magazine include translations of the more

⁵⁷ *כרם חמד*, II (1836), pp. 70-84.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, IV (1839), p. 113.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 260-74.

⁶⁰ *אגרות שד"ל*, p. 616.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 561. The poem appeared in *כרם חמד*, IV (1839), pp. 257-58.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 615. The text of the anti-Rapoport poem which Luzzatto composed for the occasion was reprinted by I. H. Weiss in *זכרונותי* (Warsaw, 1895), p. 102.

⁶³ *אגרות שד"ל*, p. 675.

⁶⁴ Anton Schmidt was the original publisher of *בכורי העתים* (1821-1833), and also published the first two volumes of *כרם חמד*.

⁶⁵ M. J. Landau was the publisher of *כרם חמד*.

important articles of Geiger, Zunz, Philippson and Jost, the leading advocates of German Reform.⁶⁶ Meir Letteris was Anton Schmidt's Hebrew editor at the time and in all likelihood opposed the publication of another Hebrew magazine, particularly by the opponents of his great teacher, Naḥman Krochmal. At any rate, nothing came of the proposal.⁶⁷

III

After severing his connection with *כרם חמד*, the only Hebrew periodical then available, Luzzatto was compelled to submit his articles to the Judeo-German press. Schorr, to whom *כרם חמד* was also closed, probably followed his master's example and thus launched his literary career. His earliest contributions, although originally written in Hebrew, were published in Ludwig Philippson's new magazine, *Die Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*.⁶⁸ Philippson's liberally oriented magazine was considered hostile to the Austro-Hungarian regime, and although Schorr did not sign his articles, the police were aware of his participation. A police report dated 1837 noted: "H. Schorr is a younger son of the Brody merchant Schacher (sic) Schorr. He has no occupation, spends his time studying, and is said to be vain and snobbish. Among the Jews, he is considered to be handsome."⁶⁹

The anonymous character of all articles sent in from Brody makes their identification very difficult. Volume I (1837) of the magazine contained only a single, insignificant news item which could possibly be attributed to Schorr.⁷⁰ Of greater importance were the articles which he probably wrote in Volume II (1838).⁷¹ The more significant ones dealt with the election of Rapoport to Tarnopol. As I have already indicated, these articles hailed the appointment with enthusi-

⁶⁶ אגרות שר"ל, p. 676.

⁶⁷ *בכורי העתים* was revived in 1845 by Reggio. Only a single volume of the new series was published.

⁶⁸ Gelber, ברורי, p. 214, n. 212.

⁶⁹ Quoted by Gelber, *ibid.*, p. 214. The archives were kept in the old Ministry of Interior which was destroyed by fire in 1922. The date given in Gelber is a misprint and should read 1837 not 1835. This information is garnered from a private communication which I received from Dr. Gelber.

⁷⁰ *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, I, p. 449, s. v. *Brody*, November 29, 1837.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, II, p. 25, s. v. *Brody*, December 22, 1838; p. 88, s. v. *Brody*; pp. 91-92, s. v. *Tarnopol*, January 23, 1839 (probably the second part of the previous article); p. 92, s. v. *Russische Grenze*, February 1; p. 249, s. v. *von der russischen Grenze*, April 30; p. 250, s. v. *Brody*, May 1; pp. 283-84, s. v. *Brody*, April 23; p. 383, s. v. *Brody*, July 18; literary supplement No. 26, p. 104, s. v. *Brody*; p. 459, s. v. *Brody*, August 31.

asm and were full of disparaging references to his orthodox opponents. Rapoport's election had elated not only the *Maskilim* of Galicia but their German colleagues as well. Numbers 22-24 of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* devoted a great deal of space to the event. The articles dated "Brody" and "Russische Grenze" were probably written by Schorr or by his brother Naftali. The latter must also have penned the one sent in from Tarnopol.⁷²

The first literary article which Schorr published was *Über einige neuere hebräische Dichter*⁷³ which contained a short evaluation of the works of a number of Hebrew writers.⁷⁴ Interesting were his caustic remarks about Naḥman Fischmann and the articles which he had published in the two volumes of *הרואה*. "In the two pamphlets he reached the peak of vulgar calumny and personal defamation and he and his colleagues celebrate a true triumph of baseness."⁷⁵

Schorr's fearless and somewhat irreverent attitude also led him into writing a short but severe attack against Josef Perl's *בוהן צדיק*, which appeared in 1838. In Perl's story, Obadiah, the main character, had spent about three weeks in Abduri (a thinly veiled reference to Brody) and had made some very biting observations about the arrogant comportment, the superficial culture, the gross materialism and the blatant dishonesty of its merchants and *Maskilim*.⁷⁶ Schorr, who appeared to be unaware that Perl was the anonymous author of the work, or at least feigned ignorance of the fact, denounced the unfair picture of his city in very strong terms:

"He (the author) has the nerve to insult the entire Jewish population of Galicia and especially that of Brody in the most revolting manner, accusing them of the worst vices and denouncing them publicly."⁷⁷

A strong rebuttal of this severe attack upon the great lay leader of the Galician movement was soon published in the magazine under the signature of M. L. K. of Zloczow.⁷⁸ Shortly after Schorr's article, Perl, who had been ill with cancer for some time, died.

⁷² N. Gelber, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

⁷³ *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, II (1838), literary supplement No. 26, p. 104.

⁷⁴ The authors he discussed were: N. J. Fischmann, Z. Landau, L. Kinderfreund, J. Eichenbaum, M. Strelitsker and A. B. Gottlober.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, II, p. 104, s. v. *Brody*, September 8, 1838. Luzzatto must have referred to these remarks when he praised Schorr for his criticism of the *רואים* in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, see *אוצר נוסד*, IV (1864), p. 108. See also *אגרות שר"ל*, p. 568.

⁷⁶ Perl's racy description of the busy and harried life of Brody's rising merchant class was also most interesting. See *בוהן צדיק*, pp. 62-63. The attack on their morals appeared on pp. 56-75. Schorr particularly took exception to the remarks on p. 76.

⁷⁷ *Allgemeine Zeitung*, III (1839), p. 46.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 483.

The reasons which prompted Schorr's attack may have been personal, but there is no evidence to support this contention. Perl as a leader of the right wing of the *Haskalah* had strong prejudices against the *Maskilim* of Brody because of their more radical views.⁷⁹ He was also closely associated with Rapoport. It was natural for Schorr, the young leader of the left wing, to aim his shafts at Perl. Despite the controversy which his first anti-Perl article excited, Schorr was not deterred from repeating in greater detail his criticism of Perl in an article which he wrote for Jost's *Annalen* later that year.⁸⁰ Rapoport was of course incensed at this second attack and in the necrology which he published in honor of Perl in *כרם חמר*, V (1841),⁸¹ he bitterly castigated the author of "this evil calumny" which was printed in the German newspaper. Subsequently, in a letter to Luzzatto, Rapoport declared that despite his quarrel with Schorr over the Perl articles and Jost's attempt to aggravate the situation, he (Rapoport) had kept Schorr's friendship. Moreover, Rapoport insisted, he had not "repudiated the good hopes which we entertain concerning him (Schorr) provided he weighed his words more carefully."⁸²

Schorr's account of the various "sects" among Galician Jewry more or less confirmed the picture given by his contemporaries.⁸³ After describing the two prevalent orthodox parties (*Ḥasidim* and *Mithnagdim*), he presented an interesting, if at times sarcastic picture of the disunity which pervaded the camp of the enlightened.

"The main characteristics of the enlightened or Moshe Dessauer party, as they are called here, are: inner disunity, which among some people becomes half-conviction, indifferentism . . . (they remain indifferent when their comrades are attacked) . . . lack of firmness and unity . . . This party contains the following subdivisions: (1) the ultra-liberals who reject all tradition just because it is tradition, even if it be good and useful . . . (2) the pseudo-enlightened who are going in the wrong direction, finding the meaning of enlightenment in luxury and splendor and rejecting all propriety . . . (3) friends of the *juste milieu* whose number however is only insignificant."

⁷⁹ See his letter to Letteris: *זכרון בספר*, pp. 98-99. See Samson Bloch's *הרב שב"ה* (Lemberg, 1855), part 2, pp. 25-30. Bloch's abject apology for his "error" in praising the "wise men" of Brody was a sad testimony to the power of Perl and the helplessness of an impoverished *Maskil*.

⁸⁰ *Annalen*, I, (1839), pp. 345-47. For a disparaging picture of Perl's activities in Galicia see Raphael Mahler: *op. cit.*, pp. 164-202.

⁸¹ *כרם חמר*, V (1841), p. 167.

⁸² *אגרות שי"ד*, pp. 105-06. The letter was dated 28 *Nissan* 5601 = 1841.

⁸³ "Charakteristik der jüdischen Sekten in Galizien," *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, II (1838), pp. 283-84, s. v. *Brody*, April 23, 1838.

He went on to say that social contact and marriages between the various sects were rare.

“The factitious spirit has a disturbing influence upon social life; apart from business dealings the factions have no communication. Marriages between families of the first and second parties (*Mithnagdim* and *Hasidim*) are rare; between the first and third faction (*Mithnagdim* and *Maskilim*), if not for the sake of money, only in exceptional cases; between the second and third party (*Hasidim* and *Maskilim*), never. A strict Talmudist shies away from *Hasidim* even more than from the enlightened.”

Thus we see that although Schorr criticized Perl's description of Brody's *Maskilim* as being one-sided, he too was aware of their shortcomings. Erter, too, had spoken of the empty and half-educated, sybaritic *Maskilim* with contempt. On the other hand, one is surprised to find no mention at all of the division within the third group between the traditionalist *Maskilim* who, like Perl, sought both *Torah* and *derech erez* and the more radical *Maskilim* of Schorr's ilk.

Schorr's articles in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* were sketchy as are most first literary fruits and their significance is merely bibliographical. With Volume III, Schorr's association with this periodical came to an end.

In January, 1839, J. M. Jost, the historian, began publishing a more erudite periodical, called *Israelitische Annalen* in Frankfurt-am-Main. Jost had been in contact with both Luzzatto and the Galician school. Although Luzzatto had once quarreled with him and had accused him of radicalism,⁸⁴ the two had effected a reconciliation soon after the break with Rapoport. Now Luzzatto and Schorr moved over to the *Annalen* and became frequent contributors to its pages.⁸⁵

Like his articles in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, those which Schorr wrote for the *Annalen* were unsigned and were translated from the Hebrew. Schorr must have realized that these articles were of greater importance, because he referred to them in his later works, whereas those he published earlier in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* he subsequently ignored. These *Annalen* articles reflect his growing maturity and are most significant for our understanding of Schorr's reformist views.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ At one point Luzzatto even attacked Rapoport for his relationship with Jost. His earlier attitude was reflected in his letters to Rapoport. See *אגרות ש"ל*, pp. 178 ff., 192, 212-13, 565, where Jost appears to be the non-believer to whom Luzzatto referred. See Bernfeld: *תולדות ש"ר*, p. 60.

⁸⁵ In a letter dated 8 *Iyyar*, 5600 = 1840, Luzzatto remarked, “Philippon dislikes me because I deserted him for Jost”; *אגרות ש"ל*, p. 687.

⁸⁶ See my “Writings of Osias Heschel Schorr,” *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore*, II (1955), pp. 20-36.

The theoreticians of Reform Judaism were deeply concerned about the need for a *continuum* of Jewish tradition. They realized that the times required a major revision of the *Halachah* but they were aware of the dangers which such a revision implied. A principle of authority had to be maintained if Judaism were not to disintegrate into a multiplicity of religions. Tactically, too, Reform had to be defended against the charge that it was schismatic and "Karaitic."

Schorr's first article in the *Annalen*, entitled *Der gegenwärtige Streit zwischen Autorität und Kritik*, constituted one of the earliest attempts to lay down a theoretical basis for the reformation of the *Halachah* without denying the need for a principle of authority. With Geiger, Schorr identified himself as a "traditionalist" and denied that he intended "to join the Karaites."

"I am of the party of tradition and honor its followers; yes, I think they [the Rabbis of the Talmud] have developed their deductions from the Written Law in honest piety and in order to administer it more correctly. [They also] vigorously protected and preserved our holy religion . . . Without them it might have disappeared entirely . . . but the yoke which they have placed upon our coreligionists to prevent error is in our time oppressive and could easily lead people to throw it off entirely . . . Our contemporary sages and teachers [must make] a sharp and thorough scrutiny of all the regulations . . . and after recognizing what is unsuitable for our time [must] . . . abolish these and establish new institutions more in accordance with present conditions."⁸⁷

This, Schorr explained, could be done if we understood that while the Torah is of divine origin, the oral law "is throughout the work of mortal men and subject to error" and that although the oral law once preserved Judaism, now "it surrounds the holy Torah with an iron wall, keeping out any ray of light."⁸⁸

Unlike the Karaites, then, the new reformers did not assert that the "oral law" was a fraud. On the contrary, it once had historic validity, but with the changing of the times, that validity had been lost.

As a Galician *Maskil*, Schorr envied the progress of German Jewry in the face of the challenge of modern times. He congratulated its leadership for undertaking "with true religiosity . . . to discuss their often differing opinions in the periodicals."⁸⁹ He regretted the fact that most Galician Rabbis and scholars did not read German and until recently had no way of learning about the new ideas. Fortunately, he declared, Luzzatto's Hebrew article on the redaction of the

⁸⁷ *Annalen*, I, p. 170a.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 169b.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 170b.

Mishnah which had appeared in the last issue of *כרם חמר* had provided certain theses which could have far reaching implications for the reformation of the *Halachah*.⁹⁰

Schorr presented the following as Luzzatto's major conclusions:

- “1. The Mishnah and Talmud were originally not compiled to serve as codes of law which would be valid for all times. They merely represent a recorded collection of the various legal decisions.
2. The ancient sages had never intended to prevent their descendants from altering, amending or abolishing any of their decisions if conditions in later times required such changes.
3. They recorded varying and individual opinions and decisions in order that [subsequent generations] would be able to choose one or another view.”⁹¹

Schorr therefore concluded that the Mishnah and the Talmud were thus denuded of divine and even legal authority. Modern Judaism was free to alter, amend or abolish any of their regulations to fit the needs of the hour.

But even more significant was Schorr's conviction that it was tactically wrong for the Reform party to argue for Reform on a *halachic* basis. This was fighting the enemy on his home grounds and by his own rules. It could only lead to defeat. Reform could only be justified on historical, critical grounds. The theoreticians of Reform must destroy the myth of talmudic infallibility. They could do this best with the aid of their scientific weapons. They must point out the errors, corruptions and inconsistencies which abounded in *halachic* literature.

“I wish to point to one advantage which the party of criticism has not utilized so far . . . and which is in my opinion the only one which could succeed in making the authority of the Talmud doubtful. Until now our . . . criticism was always based on *halachic* grounds and we tried to prove that the *Halachah* itself offers a way out through its rules. Naturally, our opponents found it easy to crush our arguments by quoting the numerous sayings of the other authorities. What chance does a single saying in the Talmud have against a great mass of opposing decisions? As long as the Talmud itself is acknowledged as a perfect and infallible monument to the divine tradition, it cannot be used as a means for reform. But why not start to uncover the inner imperfections and the many undeniable errors in the Talmud. In this manner we would prove beyond any doubt that we have before us a work of mortal men!”⁹²

⁹⁰ *כרם חמר*, III (1838), pp. 61-76.

⁹¹ *Annalen*, pp. 170b-171a.

⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 171b-172a.

Here then was the formula for the new reformist criticism. For Schorr it became the very basis for the many iconoclastic and anti-Talmudic articles which he later published in his magazine *חולון*. He was to use his great knowledge of the *Halachah* to prove its human origin and to point out its absurdities and errors.

It must be said that Schorr's enthusiasm led him to exaggerate the originality of his views. Geiger, in an early article published in the *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift*, had already asserted that the Talmud was only one of the many documents of the tradition and that the tradition was broader than the Talmud and not dependent upon it. "The principle of tradition which is the source for all the talmudic and rabbinic literature is nothing but the principle of continuous development, not in the sense of slavish adherence to the letter of the Bible but to its spirit and true religious consciousness."⁹³ The difference, however, lay in the tactical suggestions of Schorr. Writing as he did for the Galician milieu where the authority of the Talmud was supreme and where the "enlightened" knew the talmudic tradition, he sought to launch a program to humanize the Talmud and disarm its authority. German reformers had another audience and that audience had other problems.

Underlying all of Schorr's views was the liberal, rationalist spirit of his generation:

"One must recognize the truth and be prepared to sacrifice his own ideas even if they are ancient. Antiquity is no proof of truth, nor is mere tradition binding upon posterity."⁹⁴

Again and again he repeated his contention that scientific criticism had no intention of destroying the *halachic* system nor even the Talmud itself:

"The fear that the critical handling of the Talmud will shake the foundations of religion is tasteless and groundless. Criticism need not destroy the whole work, nor must the old be disregarded merely because it is old. The unbridled eagerness for novelty brings nothing good in and of itself. However it should lead to an investigation of every aspect. Where the damage is found, the building ought to be repaired . . . and made a fit dwelling-place for God. It should not be a heap of ruins. This task is gigantic and difficult and requires many labors. Many obstacles lie in its path and time presses for its fulfillment. Therefore, it is the duty of every expert to join in and cooperate [in its fulfillment] and God will

⁹³ "Der Kampf christlicher Theologen gegen die bürgerliche Gleichstellung der Juden etc." *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*, I (1835), p. 349.

⁹⁴ *Annalen*, I, p. 275.

give His blessing to it . . .⁹⁵ Suppose I were to concede . . . that all regulations, rules and decisions of the Talmud form indeed a real and unaltered tradition . . . (although this is not the case). Such a concession would not invalidate the statement that the source of this tradition, as we now have it, is no longer preserved in its purity. Even before the authors of the Gemara were to add their commentaries to the Mishnah, it already contained errors. They based their own commentaries on these very errors. The fact that these commentators on the Mishnah, who developed regulations from each single word of the text, did not even notice the errors upon which they based their decisions is in itself ample proof that they did not write their works under divine inspiration, but under the influence of their human reason. As a result, they drew at times wrong conclusions.

Once we have proved that the Mishnah is not free of errors, it follows that each word it contains need no longer be regarded as sacred. Critical scholars, then, should be asked to examine the Mishnah with greater scrutiny and to illumine it.

Moreover, a valid [legal] principle demands that we must not derive legal decisions directly from the Mishnah. We must, therefore, stick to the Gemara. Yet the sad critical condition of the Gemara is known to every expert. It contains, besides the frequent interpolation of whole passages as the famous letter of R. Sherira . . . has recorded, . . . glosses which were made by later scholars (Tosaphoth to Kethuboth 2a). Asulai, a reliable expert in talmudic literature also confirms [this view and states that] he has seen manuscripts of the Talmud which lacked many difficult passages (שם הגדולים, II:3) . . . If we likewise bear in mind that the Talmud contains many insignificant stories, speeches, jokes, partially distorted dialogues, etc., are we not taxing common sense when we insist that all [its contents] . . . be accepted as pure, true and unalterable . . . religion subject to neither questioning nor scrutiny? In view of the intellectual as well as moral damage caused by such superstition, who can blame contemporary scholars for resorting to criticism in order to separate the false from the true, preserving that which is still useful and applicable while discarding that which is antiquated and inadmissible. Have not our old and new enemies reproached us sufficiently with the sayings of the Talmud and exposed us to ridicule, hatred and persecution on their account? Why should we not discard the dross in order to preserve the pure doctrine."⁹⁶

He also pointed out that the *Shulhan Arukh* was even more cumbersome than the Talmud and contained rules that "were purely pulled out of the air." Many of these were of kabbalistic or Persian origin.⁹⁷ (In subsequent articles, published in *החלוף*, he returned to

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, I, pp. 281-82. The reference to our "new enemies" was to Alexander McCaul's attack on the Talmud in *נהיבות עולם* (Frankfurt, 1839).

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, I, p. 292.

this problem of the interrelationship of Persian and Jewish civilizations in greater detail.)

In an article entitled *Kritische Studien*,⁹⁸ Schorr proceeded to prove his contention that the Mishnah was a disorganized compilation. In doing so he associated himself with Isaac Reggio's opinion⁹⁹ that despite Geiger's brilliant attempt to discover an organizing principle to explain the redaction of the Mishnah,¹⁰⁰ it was clearly not an organized code. To bolster Reggio's contention, he marshalled two further arguments: (1) Sherirah Gaon specifically stated in his Epistle that Rabbi Judah had not established a specific ordering of the *masechtoth*. (2) There existed a *halachic* principle which maintained that if what appeared to be an established law turned out to be, in a subsequent passage, a matter of controversy it lost its validity and that, if on the contrary, a point of law which at first was in dispute was resolved in a later passage, it became an established law. This principle applied only if in either case the sequence was within the identical *masechta*. This latter requirement, argued Schorr, implied that according to tradition there was no sequence within an order (*sefer*) but only within a single *masechta*. Schorr then proceeded to demonstrate that even within a chapter, and often within a single *masechta* itself, inner contradictions existed:

"These considerations are obviously very consequential for the fixing of the degree of authority which can be accorded to the Talmud. For there is a great difference between a code of law which is well planned and is firmly grounded in tradition and a compilation which is unorganized and, in many points, clearly inexact. The old Talmudists relied only in part upon the text and drew further conclusions which are, therefore, on shaky foundations. We are almost inclined to believe that the main intention of all the talmudic scholastics was to fetter the spirit to religious ideas and to occupy it with legal matters and to keep alive the study of the sources. This aim is certainly praiseworthy and we can condone much of the *pilpulism* and the casuistry on these grounds. However, it is obvious that this method of study is not appropriate nowadays, and that since its results often rest upon error we cannot consider all of them (the results) as equally authoritative."¹⁰¹

Despite his earlier insistence that any attempt to base reforms on *halachic* grounds was futile, Schorr, the erudite Talmudist, could not

⁹⁸ *Annalen*, II (1840), pp. 248-50.

⁹⁹ ברם חמד, III (1838), pp. 77-81.

¹⁰⁰ "Einiges über Plan und Anordnung der Mishnah," *WZJT*, III (1836), pp. 471-93.

¹⁰¹ *Annalen*, II, p. 249.

resist the temptation to demonstrate that even on *halachic* grounds, the traditionalists' objection to change was invalid. A major argument against any alteration of the *Halachah* was based on the interpretation of the well-known Mishnayoth *Eduyoth* 1.5–6. These Mishnayoth seemed to declare that “no court can annul the decision of another court unless it was greater than the former in wisdom and in the number of its members.” The traditionalists, of course, brandished this weapon with all the vigor they could muster. As a result, a number of reformist scholars wrote articles in which they attempted to demonstrate that the Mishnah was no stumbling block for their program of reform.¹⁰² Schorr, likewise, joined the fray. He insisted that these Mishnayoth had been misinterpreted by both traditionalist and reformist scholars and that, if properly interpreted, the Mishnayoth need not inhibit the search for reforms in accordance with the *Halachah*. The Hebrew text of the difficult Mishnayoth reads: ולמה מוכרין דברי יחיד בין המרובין הואיל ואין הלכה אלא כדברי המרובים שאם יראה בית דין את דברי היחיד [יסמוך] ויסמוך עליו שאין ב"ד יכול לבטל דברי ב"ד חברו עד שהיה גדול ממנו בחכמה ובמנין . . . אמר ד' יהודה אם כן למה מוכרין דברי היחיד בין המרובין לבטלה שאם יאמר אדם כך אני מקובל יאמר לו כדברי איש פלוני שמעת.

Schorr proposed a rather ingenious interpretation of the text which took into account the variant Tosefta text dealing with this problem.¹⁰³

¹⁰² Geiger in *WZJT*, II (1836), pp. 482–85; Luzzatto in *כרם חמד*, III (1838), pp. 71–76, Reggio, *ibid.*, pp. 83–87.

Geiger interpreted the Mishnah more or less in keeping with Maimonides' and Bertinoro's views except that while they believed the prohibition included courts of different periods as well as contemporaneous courts, he insisted that the courts involved were only those of the same period. Geiger's translation reads: “Why do they mention the words of the individual together with those of the majority when the usage is not to reckon with the former? So that if a court — in a practical decision — recognizes the view of the individual as valid and follows it, then no court can invalidate the opinion of the same unless that court is greater than it in wisdom and in the number of its members — something like a court of appeals.” (p. 482).

Luzzatto rejected Geiger's view because he felt that the text would not support it. He therefore accepted the traditional explanation that the law applied to future courts as well. In his opinion, it was first instituted by Rabbi Judah Hanasi in order to strengthen the authority of the Mishnah. After the redaction of the Mishnah, no man or court could rule against a mishnaic law unless he or it could find support in a minority dissent recorded in the Mishnah. Nevertheless, a few sages in Rabbi Judah's time did not accept his position. The Braithoth and Toseftoth frequently record their dissent (pp. 73–74).

Isaac Reggio, after examining the differences between Geiger and Luzzatto against the background of the disagreement of Maimonides and the *Rabad* on the meaning of the Mishnah, decided that the Mishnah as it stands is unexplainable.

¹⁰³ *Eduyoth* I:4 (Zuckerman, second ed., p. 455): לא הוזכרו דברי יחיד בין המרובין: אלא שמא תיצרך להן שעה ויסמכו עליהם.

Eduyoth 1.5, he explained, contained two separate laws. The first stated, "Why do we mention the view of the individual (minority) if the *halachah* follows only the view of the majority? If a court in an exigency decided to accept the view of the minority it can base its decision upon this view."¹⁰⁴

The second law, however, did not speak of an exigency but of the power to annul. It stated:¹⁰⁵ [that] a court cannot annul the view of another court unless it is greater than it in wisdom and in membership. Schorr believed that Rabbi Judah's question in *Eduyoth* 1.6 made sense only if we interpret the Mishnah in this fashion. Rabbi Judah asked: "Why do we mention the view of the individual for the purpose of annulment (לְבַטְלָהּ)? — that is to say: *Eduyoth* 1.5 explained why we mentioned the minority opinion in cases of exigency, but what purpose was served by mentioning it in cases of annulment when the view of the minority was of no consequence. Rabbi Judah then answered: "If a man shall say I have [a contrary] tradition, one will then be able to say to him that this tradition was according to Rabbi X's view [and since Rabbi X's view was a minority view, it had no validity]."

Schorr went on to assert that, contrary to Geiger's view, the Mishnah also referred to courts which were not contemporaneous as *J. Abodah Zarah* II.9 and *J. Shabbath* 1.7 indicate. He also believed that the application of this law was limited to the eighteen *halachoth* which were taught in the attic of Hezekiah (*Shabbath* 1.4).¹⁰⁶ In subsequent articles Schorr returned to this Mishnah and pointed to it as a *halachah* which led to the fossilization of Judaism.¹⁰⁷

One of the problems which faced the *Maskil*-reformers was of course the bitter opposition of the orthodox Rabbinate. Schorr drew a pessimistic picture of the Galician religious leadership. He reserved his bitter criticism for those rabbis who, because of family position and wealth, had been exposed to enlightenment and yet had refused to champion the *Haskalah* out of selfish considerations. Like his fellow *Maskilim*, Schorr trusted the Austrian monarchy and hailed the government regulation which had ordered that by 1846 all new rabbis should be required to have had formal training in philosophy and

¹⁰⁴ Here he inserted the Tosefta variant.

¹⁰⁵ He argued that the particle 'ו in the word שְׁמַיִן need not be translated as "because" and that in our text it is interchangeable with 'ו "and."

¹⁰⁶ Schorr claimed that his views agreed with Rabbenu Asher, but I have not been able to locate the passage. The commentary תפארת ישראל to the Mishnah gives a similar explanation of שְׁמַיִן as יָמִין.

¹⁰⁷ הַחֲלוּץ, I (1851), pp. 49–50; II (1853), pp. 49 ff.

education. However, he believed that unless a modern Rabbinical seminary on the style of that in Padua were established for Galicia, the law would simply be ignored.¹⁰⁸

The remainder of Schorr's significant articles in the *Annalen* appeared in Volume II (1840) of that periodical, under the general heading: "Literarisch-kritische Briefe" and consisted, in the main, of a series of book reviews. Although these articles were scholarly and not polemical, Schorr's reformist *tendenz* clearly showed up in each of them.

His review of Franz Delitzsch's *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie*¹⁰⁹ reflected Schorr's deep interest in the evolving modern Hebrew literature and testified to his acumen as a literary historian. To this day it remains a valuable commentary on Delitzsch's pioneer work.¹¹⁰

The *Maskilim* of Germany and Galicia were highly flattered by Delitzsch's book on modern Hebrew poetry. He was the first European scholar to deal with contemporary Hebrew literature and to do so sympathetically. But unlike his colleagues, who were overawed with the compliments paid them by the gentile professor, Schorr was not one to be deterred by such ulterior considerations. His severe criticism of Delitzsch was a testimony both to his rugged honesty and his scientific impartiality. "Denn die Wahrheit allein ist mein Ziel."¹¹¹ The young Galician scholar found "mistakes and errors on every page"¹¹² of the book and recorded (not without irony) his surprise that these occurred despite Delitzsch's heavy reliance on Dr. Julius Fürst.

He took exception to Delitzsch's designation of Isaac Satanow as the founder of modern Hebrew poetry, and quite correctly maintained that it would be equally wrong to claim this distinction for Moses Ḥayyim Luzzatto. He went on to make some very incisive remarks about the Yiddishisms and the Germanisms which abounded in the Hebrew style of the *Maskilim*. He also disagreed with Delitzsch's contention that the Russian Hebrew authors wrote a more authentic Hebrew because they were not influenced by German. Astutely, he pointed out that they were influenced not only by German, the language of the *Haskalah*, but by German literature as well.¹¹³ Hebrew

¹⁰⁸ *Annalen*, I, (1839), p. 253.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, II (1840), pp. 120, 128, 135-36, 143-44 and 152.

¹¹⁰ See G. Kressel: קריית ספר, הסטוריה של הספרות העברית החדשה, קלוזנר יוסף (1941-42), p. 233.

¹¹¹ "For truth alone is my goal," p. 120.

¹¹² *Annalen*, II, p. 120.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 135-36.

stylists (particularly the prose writers), insofar as they find biblical diction inadequate for their purposes, would do better, he believed, if they would resort to later "talmudic" Hebrew rather than to foreign languages. The elegant prose style of the Italian Hebrew authors drew his highest praise.

Politely but firmly, he rejected Delitzsch's contention that Rapoport was a first-rate Hebrew poet. His *שארית ישראל* was replete with Germanisms and Gallicisms. Delitzsch even appeared to be unaware that the poem was an adaptation of Racine's *Esther*. "We do not intend to belittle Rapoport's reputation in the least when we call attention to his many shortcomings in diction anymore than we malign Krochmal when we find that his style is difficult and similar to that of Ibn Tibbon."¹¹⁴ Schorr called attention to the work of Aryeh Leib Kinderfreund (1798-1837), a competent Hebrew poet who, in his opinion, had been ignored or at least underrated.¹¹⁵

He concluded this lengthy review with a very sarcastic criticism of Isaac Baer Levinsohn's *בית יהודה* and as a result earned Levinsohn's life-long enmity. Schorr cited Levinsohn's introduction to the work and challenged the pretentious attempt to present in a single thin volume a comprehensive analysis of Judaism and Jewish history from its origins to the present day. "Heavens," he declared, "how can a work dealing with so many sublime subjects, each of which requires a profound exegesis that can only be exhausted in voluminous works, be dashed off in twenty-five pages?"¹¹⁶ He therefore accused Levinsohn of "unforgivable superficiality" and proceeded to castigate him for his many errors "which, were I to uncover them, would require a thick volume."¹¹⁷ He also upbraided Levinsohn for reading into talmudic texts ideas which were never intended and for misquoting texts to suit his purposes. True to his radical position, Schorr could not abide Levinsohn's *Doppelgängerei* (two-facedness). One could not be both a *Maskil* and a defender of superstitions at the same time.¹¹⁸

Both Delitzsch and Levinsohn reacted to these articles: the former in a series of letters which Jost published in the *Annalen* together with Schorr's rejoinder,¹¹⁹ and Levinsohn in an open letter attacking the young upstart which was circulated among the enlightened.¹²⁰

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 143. Schorr was very much impressed by Kinderfreund. See אורח שד"ל, pp. 386-87, where there is evidence that Schorr wrote an article on Kinderfreund for *כרם חסד* in 1837; it was not printed. See also Schorr's article in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, II, Literary supplement, p. 104.

¹¹⁶ *Annalen*, II (1840), p. 152.

¹¹⁷ *Loc. cit.*

¹¹⁸ *Loc. cit.*

¹¹⁹ *Annalen*, III (1841), pp. 116-17.

¹²⁰ באר יצחק, (Warsaw, 1899), pp. 84-85.

Delitzsch's reaction was at first confined to private correspondence. However, early in 1841 Schorr published a short article in the *Annalen* on Erter in which he accused Delitzsch of criticizing Erter rashly and in an uninformed manner.¹²¹ As a consequence, Delitzsch wrote a very sharp letter to the *Annalen* in which he attacked both Schorr and Jost for maligning him unjustly. The letter concluded with a caustic sentence which cast aspersions on their religious liberalism: "Moreover, I am a Christian and do not appear before the forum of a cosmopolitan morality which rejects an ancestral religion for a few hollow concepts."¹²² Both Schorr and Jost did not flinch in the face of the inuendo, and Jost closed the argument with a remark that he "lacks the inclination or the desire to enter into a religious controversy."¹²³

In an unpublished letter to Abraham Dov Gottlober, Levinsohn related that "the great scholar Abraham Geiger wrote a long letter to Brody in praise of my book *בית יהודה* . . . and castigated the critic, [i. e., Schorr] who attacked it for no good reason."¹²⁴ I have already cited Erter's apology for Schorr's youthful exuberance.¹²⁵ Levinsohn never forgave Schorr for criticizing his work so severely.¹²⁶

Schorr's uncompromising attitude toward "half-baked" *Maskilim* is also reflected in his review of Zvi Hirsch Chajes' book *מאמר אגרת* *מאמר אגרת על התרגום והמדרשים הבקורת על התרגום והמדרשים*.¹²⁷ He was in no way inhibited by the fact that Chajes was a close friend of Nahman Krochmal and had earned the respect of the enlightened by his tolerance toward them. After the perfunctory compliments about Chajes' diligence, he insisted that those elements of the book which were correct had already appeared in previous works, while those which were original were either incorrect or worthless. He also deplored the fact that Chajes did not refer to existing works on the subject, and concluded with the hope that the author's projected larger work would be clear of the many "barbarisms" which the present book unfortunately contained.

¹²¹ *Annalen*, III (1841), p. 7. This article subsequently appeared in Hebrew (ציון), II, 1842, pp. 29-32), but without the criticism of Delitzsch. In a postscript to his German article, Schorr referred to a letter which Delitzsch sent to a certain L. D. in Hamburg criticizing Schorr.

¹²² *Annalen*, III, p. 116. In all likelihood Delitzsch learned from the more traditional opponents of the *Annalen* that Jost and Schorr were reformists, hence this cutting phrase.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

¹²⁴ Quoted by Klausner: *op. cit.*, III, p. 79, n. 265. ¹²⁵ באר יצחק, pp. 62-63.

¹²⁶ Levinsohn wrote a series of sarcastic epigrams aimed at Schorr, *ילקוט ריב"ל* (Warsaw, 1878), pp. 41-49. Schorr responded in kind, *החלוץ*, XII (1887), p. 128.

¹²⁷ *Annalen*, II (1840), p. 180. See also his remarks in the letter reprinted in *Epistolae ad Sciadal*, (Trieste, 1900), p. 92.

Schorr was even less sympathetic in his treatment of Solomon Cohen's translation of Jost's history.¹²⁸ He was particularly incensed by Cohen's introductory remarks to the translation in which he stated that he often disagreed with Jost's conclusions, particularly whenever Jost "goes against the tradition of the sages." Schorr pointedly remarked that notwithstanding this opening reservation, Cohen's book was nothing less than a verbatim translation of Jost's work. Characteristically he could not forgive this meaningless and overly pious nod toward the tradition.

This critical review likewise provides us with a glimpse into Schorr's views on Jewish historiography. While he believed that the Bible contained an objective and highly readable historical narrative, he felt that the Rabbinic sources and Josephus were very unreliable. Even worse were the chronicles of medieval Jewry. The persecutions and insecurities which medieval Jews suffered did not permit the peace of mind so necessary for the writing of objective history. Consequently, Jost's book was in his opinion a great pioneer work despite the fact that its author had omitted many historical details, particularly those which had been amassed as a result of the intensive research which had been pursued during the previous decade (1830-40). Because he treated the sources critically and with caution and made use of many non-Jewish sources, Jost had surpassed all his medieval predecessors.

In a short article on the *Targumim*,¹²⁹ Schorr elaborated on a statement which he had made in an earlier letter to Luzzatto in 1837.¹³⁰ He then supported Luzzatto's view that the *Targumim* (and for that matter the oral law too) were not written down until the post-talmudic period and argued that neither Zunz (*Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, Chapter V), nor Geiger (*WZJT*, III, p. 106), proved their contention that they were written earlier. Curiously, Schorr omitted a talmudic source in support of his position which Luzzatto had called to his attention at the time.¹³¹ He was to develop his views on this subject further in the long review he later wrote on Geiger's *Urschrift* in *החלוץ*, IV (1859), pp. 70-83.

The concluding article of this series was a severe review of the second volume of *הרעותה*,¹³² the anti-*Haskalah* magazine published by a number of "renegade" *Maskilim*. He took N. J. Fischmann and Mendel Mohr to task for attacking Reggio, Luzzatto and Rapoport

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 240-41, 250.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 160.

¹³⁰ *אנורת שד"ל*, p. 366.

¹³¹ *Shabbath* 115a.

¹³² *Annalen*, II (1840), pp. 256-57.

and demonstrated the faultiness of their scholarship. Luzzatto was delighted by this skillful rebuttal of his enemies and praised Schorr highly for "fighting my battle against the false and wicked people."¹³³

As I have already indicated, Schorr wrote all his articles in Hebrew and they were translated into German for publication. The only significant Hebrew magazine, *כרם חמר*, remained closed to him as long as it was controlled by Goldenberg and Rapoport.¹³⁴ When Mordecai Creznach and Jost began publishing their Hebrew magazine, *ציון*, in 1840, Schorr must have been delighted to find a periodical which would publish him in his original Hebrew. Once *ציון* began appearing, he practically ceased writing for the *Annalen*.¹³⁵

ציון was the first Hebrew monthly ever published. Its editors, Jost and Creznach, were both committed to Reform and to the program of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. Writing its opening editorial, Jost charged Creznach with these words:

"You and your colleagues are toiling and laboring to disseminate science among Israel and to awaken the people from its slumber, so that they might hear and understand . . . their laws and their history . . . Speak the truth to your brothers who understand (the Hebrew says: speak) the holy tongue and who can discern between truth and falsehood. Let them unite as one to build one more house for the children of Israel in which all who know the law, who investigate antiquities, who love wisdom, science and morality can meet together . . ."

Of the six articles which Schorr published in *ציון*, only one, "A Critique of Some Matters in the Talmud," was blatantly reformist.¹³⁶

"During the last generation, no one had the courage to approach the castle of the Talmud and to illumine its chambers with the candle of criticism and intellect. All feared the wrath of the hypocrites and the zealots . . . But nowadays the fear of man no longer displaces the fear of God when it comes to truth and religion. Every day the number of those who love their God and their faith increases . . . and they place the Talmud in the testing furnace

¹³³ אגרות שד"ל, p. 705. See also *Epistolae ad Sciadal*, p. 92.

¹³⁴ Vol. VII, the last volume of *כרם חמר* under Goldenberg, appeared in 1843. Goldenberg died in 1846. In 1854 Senior Sachs undertook to revive the periodical and subsequently published two volumes: VIII (1854) and IX (1856). Schorr participated in the revived *כרם חמר*.

¹³⁵ The third volume of the *Annalen* (1841), contained these minor items by Schorr: the translation of the article on Erter (pp. 7-8.) and the exchange of letters with Delitzsch (pp. 116-17) mentioned before and probably the news items from Galicia and Brody on p. 190 and on p. 335. The latter was a short necrology of Judah Landau, Schorr's father-in-law.

¹³⁶ *ציון*, II (1842-43), pp. 10-12.

in order to sift out of its dross the many golden nuggets which it contains. If the scholar and philosopher Nahmanides found it necessary to declare that everything in the Talmud is the word of the living God, including the fantastic and corrupt *Aggadoth*, contemporary scholars need not agree with him . . . I have already said (*Annalen*, 1839, No. 22)¹³⁷ that the sages of our generation who love 'the good and the useful' will do well to view the Talmud with a critical eye . . . Subsequently I have presented to the scholar Jost a number of statements which I found in the Babylonian Talmud which indicate that the Amoraim misunderstood either a Mishnah or a Baraitha."¹³⁸

Thus Schorr launched his program of talmudic criticism with the avowed intention of shaking the authority of the Talmud. The earlier volumes of *החלוץ* would be filled with similar catalogues of talmudic errors and discrepancies.

The remainder of his articles were in the area of *reine Wissenschaft*. Unlike his scientific reviews in the *Annalen*, few of these articles betray his reformist *tendenz*. There was, undoubtedly, a subconscious motivation for his biography of Aharon al-rabi, or as he is better known Aharon Abulrabi.¹³⁹ Reform scholars were fascinated by Jewish heterodoxies. In their battle for religious liberalism, they took special delight in pointing to historical antecedents which reflected unorthodox views.¹⁴⁰ One receives the distinct impression that Schorr, too, identified himself with this rationalist, fifteenth-century Rabbi and with the quasi-heretical image which he drew of him. He was prompted to report on Abulrabi because he had acquired a rare copy of the first edition (16th century) of the latter's commentary on Rashi.¹⁴¹

Among other things, Schorr believed that Abulrabi inferred that the Torah was first written in Arabic.¹⁴² He was mistaken. As Perles clearly demonstrated, his view was based upon a misinterpretation of

¹³⁷ *Annalen*, I, pp. 169–72.

¹³⁸ *ציון*, II, pp. 10–11.

¹³⁹ Aharon b. Gershon Abulrabi, see *E. J.*, I, pp. 657–58. Klausner need not have hesitated to make this identification, *op. cit.*, IV², p. 51, n. 10a. The *Jewish Encyclopedia* mistakenly states that Schorr misnamed Abulrabi's father. The error was made by Karpeles: *Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur*, (Berlin, 1886), p. 771 and by David Cassel, *Lehrbuch für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur* (Leipzig, 1879), p. 344. Schorr's article appears in *ציון*, I, pp. 166–68, 193–96.

¹⁴⁰ Thus for example Geiger's and Reggio's interest in Leone da Modena.

¹⁴¹ Mr. Moses Marx of the HUC Library staff informed me that the Library possesses one page of another edition of the four commentaries from the same general period.

¹⁴² *ציון*, I (1840), p. 194.

a number of passages in the commentary.¹⁴³ On the other hand, notwithstanding Perles' assertion that Abulrabi cannot be characterized as a rationalist because he believed in Cabbalah and astrology,¹⁴⁴ Schorr was, I believe, quite correct in considering him as such. There were 15th century neo-Platonists who believed that the Cabbalah and astrology were sciences and, who, therefore, for their time, could be described as rationalists. Schorr also relished Abulrabi's rather harsh treatment of rabbinic authorities whenever he disagreed with them.¹⁴⁵

His long review of Samson Levi Bloch's translation of Zunz's book on Rashi,¹⁴⁶ although basically a list of scholarly emendations to Zunz's work, gives us some insight into Schorr's attitude toward Zunz and his translator. "The two scholars," he declared, "are famous. It is superfluous in my opinion to praise their work. A man can rest on his reputation. One can be certain that neither will ever put out anything which is not well wrought."¹⁴⁷

I have already alluded to Schorr's contact with Bloch in earlier years. At the close of this article, he expressed his hope that Bloch would publish the volume of his geography which deals with Europe.¹⁴⁸ His opinion of Zunz bordered on exaltation. The Hebrew University autograph collection contains a letter which Schorr wrote to Zunz in 1862, in which he stated:

"I am your son and you are my patron father. I am entirely your disciple and you are my guide. I am your grateful and faithful pupil and you are my forgiving master and teacher . . . When I stayed in Leipzig eight years ago I used to visit your home . . ."¹⁴⁹

¹⁴³ Perles: "Aharon b. Gershon Abulrabi" [offprint of *Revue des Etudes Juives*, XXI] (Paris, 1891), pp. 4-6. Luzzatto called this fact to Schorr's attention and was incensed at Schorr when the latter refused to correct this mistake. אנרוח שריל, p. 1174. The abbreviation הח"ט which Schorr quoted either indicates, as Luzzatto believed, הצור חטים פעלו (*loc. cit.*) or is a misprint in the original print for 1420 = הק"פ as Perles suggested, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

¹⁴⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 20. Schorr was aware of this interest in Cabbalah and astrology. ציין, I, p. 195.

¹⁴⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 167, 194-95.

¹⁴⁶ Zunz's original article was entitled "Salomon ben Isaac" and appeared in the *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, I (1822), pp. 277-384. Bloch's book was published in Lemberg, 1840, and Schorr's article in ציין, II (1842), pp. 111-12, 126-27, 147-50.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

¹⁴⁸ The volume was edited and published posthumously by Schorr's brother Naftali. שבילי עולם, והב שביח. III (Lemberg, 1855).

¹⁴⁹ There is no evidence that Schorr dwelt in Leipzig for any length of time. The Hebrew root יעב could refer to a prolonged visit. As a Brody merchant he must have visited Leipzig a number of times.

In 1884, on the occasion of Zunz's 90th birthday, Schorr wrote to him:

"When I studied your book *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* I underwent a metamorphosis. The blindness fell from my eyes and there was light. I attempted to follow your path, to probe the roots of your research and from then on, to this day, in your light do I see light. If at times I succeeded in coming up with a worthwhile remark — it came from you, O mighty sage. Indeed, all of us, your contemporaries who have made scholarship their guiding light . . . , all of us are your disciples."¹⁵⁰

Unfortunately, *ציון* like the *Annalen* was short-lived. Creiznach, its chief editor, died in the autumn of 1842, and Jost who had to close the *Annalen* because he claimed that his journalistic labors interfered with his more scholarly pursuits, announced the demise of *ציון*. With the cessation of *ציון*, Schorr's literary output fell off. Between 1842 and 1851, when he launched *ההלוך*, he wrote only four articles. Three of these were published in letter form by Senior Sachs, the editor who renewed the publication of *כרם חמר* in 1854. The last appeared in German translation in Geiger's *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift*.

The relationship between Schorr and Sachs dated back to 1839–40, when Sachs lived in Brody and became a member of the Erter-Schorr circle. Later, when Sachs edited *היונה* (Berlin, 1851), and *התחיה* (Berlin, 1850), Schorr corresponded with him.¹⁵¹ Sachs published these letters (written in 1849–50) in the revived *כרם חמר*.¹⁵² From their tone we learn that Schorr considered himself to be Sachs's teacher and mentor. Both he and Erter, Schorr remarked in the opening letter, were "dissatisfied with the sharp and satirical words which Sachs employed against great and able men." Odd counsel from Schorr, who never could resist brandishing his satirical rapier in his critical articles!

We learn that Schorr was in Odessa in 1849,¹⁵³ and that in 1850 he had strained his eyes so badly that he was unable to read for an entire

¹⁵⁰ This letter appeared in *עברי אנכי*, XX (1884), pp. 339–40. Schorr also contributed an article to the *Festschrift* published in honor of the occasion: הלכות גדולות, הלכות קצובות, הלכות פסוקות, *Jubelschrift zum neunzigsten Geburtstag des Dr. Leopold Zunz* (Berlin, 1884), pp. 125–46.

For bibliographical completeness, we note Schorr's articles on the halachic compendia *שבלי הלקט* (*ציון*, I, pp. 93–98; 110–15) and *ספר התניא* (*ibid.*, pp. 147–48). In his edition of *שבלי הלקט* (Vilna, 1887), Solomon Buber praised the former article but indicated that he disagreed with many of his conclusions (p. 2, n. A.). In addition he also wrote a review of Erter's short story *השליך* (*ציון*, II [1841], pp. 29–32). Erter's story was published by M. Landau (Prague, 1841). This review first appeared in a German translation in *Annalen*, III (1841), pp. 7–8.

¹⁵¹ See frontispiece to *היונה*, (Berlin, 1851).

¹⁵² *כרם חמר*, VIII (1854), pp. 54–63.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 60. Schorr indicated he was in Odessa in *Elul* 5609 or *Tishri* 5610.

month.¹⁵⁴ Although he frequently complained of his preoccupation with business affairs,¹⁵⁵ he nevertheless found time to acquire new manuscripts for his library, to examine various manuscripts available in Odessa and even to copy numerous quotations from these works.

Schorr's relationship with Sachs was destined to deteriorate. Sachs, like many of Schorr's other friends, could not abide Schorr's rationalism and radicalism. In 1858, he attacked Schorr's "mockery of our rabbis of blessed memory" in a lead article which he wrote for *המניד*. He had the courtesy to cushion his sharp blows with a reference to their "boyhood friendship."¹⁵⁶ Two years later, he repeated his attack on both Schorr and Abraham Krochmal (Nahman Krochmal's son), insisting that he was writing without rancour but with regret.¹⁵⁷

The article which he wrote for Geiger's magazine was entitled "*Nissim ben Jakob und sein מנעולי התלמוד*"¹⁵⁸ and was likewise of a scholarly nature. Schorr described in detail a seventeenth-century (1619) Italian manuscript of Rabbenu Nissim's commentary which Schorr's brother Isaac possessed,¹⁵⁹ expanded upon Rapoport's remarks on the work and corrected a number of his errors.¹⁶⁰ To this day, the article remains a basic study of *ספר המפתח* although Schorr erroneously believed that it was only written for tractates *Berachoth*, *Shabbath* and *Eruvin*.¹⁶¹

During this period Schorr became strongly attached to Geiger and henceforth remained his firm admirer. His acquaintanceship with Geiger's scholarly work dated back to the beginning of the forties.¹⁶² By 1841, they were firm friends and corresponded with each other.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.

¹⁵⁶ *המניד*, II (1858), p. 173.

¹⁵⁷ קיקיון יונה (Paris, 1860), pp. 7-8, n. 1.

¹⁵⁸ *WZJT*, V (1844), pp. 431-45.

¹⁵⁹ Jacob Goldenthal, a mutual friend of the Schorr brothers, published the manuscript in Vienna, 1847. Oddly enough, Goldenthal did not refer even once to Schorr's article in his introduction; he did, however, acknowledge that the manuscript was from Isaac's library.

¹⁶⁰ בכורי העתים, XII (1831), pp. 56-83. Rapoport dealt with the book on pp. 57-58.

¹⁶¹ This was the extent of the manuscript he possessed, but an apparent fragment of the *מפתח* to Sanhedrin was found in the Cairo Genizah and was published by Israel Levi "Un fragment du *Maftéah* de R. Nissim," *REJ*, XLIV (1902), pp. 294-97. See Poznanski, *אנשי קירואן* (Warsaw, 1909), p. 37.

¹⁶² Schorr first referred to Geiger in his article on the Targumim (*Annalen*, II [1840], p. 160). Luzzatto mentioned Geiger's magazine in a letter dated December 12, 1838, *אגרות שד"ל*, p. 567) but Rapoport may have called Schorr's attention to the magazine earlier.

¹⁶³ *אגרות שד"ל*, pp. 724, 733. Schorr was by then transmitting Luzzatto's letters to Geiger. See *ibid.*, pp. 784, 841.

Ludwig Geiger published six long letters which his father wrote to Schorr in 1853.¹⁶⁴ They were edited and unfortunately stripped of any personal allusions. Schorr's letters were not preserved. The topics which Geiger discussed covered a wide range of subjects, including Karaitica, Geiger's rather negative attitude to modern Hebrew, Reform, Orthodoxy, Luzzatto, and what Geiger called, the romantic-orthodox school of Jewish scholarship.

Perhaps the only major difference of opinion between the two friends was over the role of modern Hebrew. Geiger felt that writing in modern Hebrew inhibited clear expression and led to anachronistic modes of thought. "One does not translate (his ideas) into one's own mode of thought but (mistakenly) gets to be at home in the rabbinic-talmudic way of thinking with which the language has in the course of time been identified."¹⁶⁵ For this reason, he asserted, the Spanish Jewish scholars exercised good judgment when they wrote their major non-halachic works in Arabic.

Characteristically, he brusquely dismissed Schorr's question regarding Abraham Mapu's literary talents with the following remark: "These new aesthetic products in Hebrew are almost without exception worthless in the aesthetic sense . . . A dead language is not suitable for fiction. It is more suitable for scientific works where the contents and not the form is essential . . . Do not counter with the Hebrew poets of the Middle Ages. Arabic is so closely related . . . and yet the best poets of that school often sound harsh and non-Hebraic. There are only two who really could claim the name of poet: Gabirol and Yehuda Halevi . . . Even worse stuff is the later modern Hebrew poetry."¹⁶⁶

Unlike Geiger, Schorr was profoundly interested in the development of modern Hebrew. As we have seen, his long critical article on Delitzsch's *History of New Hebrew Poetry* testified to both his keen scholarship and his literary discrimination. Later, as editor of *החלוץ*, he was to write with real affection for the Hebrew language. This love of Hebrew was typical of all factions within the Galician school and sharply contrasted with the usual indifference and even the condescension which most Germans of Geiger's generation maintained toward modern Hebrew. This difference of attitude can be attributed to the particular social and political conditions of the Galician community. Its large, unemancipated Jewish population, a minority within a

¹⁶⁴ "Literaturbriefe aus dem Jahre 1853," *Nachgelassene Schriften*, II (Berlin, 1875), pp. 277-369.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

¹⁶⁶ Letter IV, pp. 327-29.

land of minorities, maintained the old group loyalties to people, language and religion.

By 1853, Schorr must have agreed fully with Geiger's remarks about Luzzatto: "a mixture of biblical beliefs and free-thinking criticism."¹⁶⁷ Years later, in a letter to Felsenthal, Schorr had this to say about his relationship with Geiger:

"I received Volume II of Rabbi Geiger's *Nachgelassene Schriften* which contained 'the literary letters of 1853' which were written to me. They were greatly altered but I do not know whether they were altered by the author or his editor [Ludwig Geiger]. I carried on a very friendly correspondence with him for five years.¹⁶⁸ When his great work the *Urschrift* was published, I criticized it impartially, but I did not tell the whole story (חלוץ IV) [pp. 70-83]. Later I expressed the opinion that he overdid his Zadokite theory — a highly tenuous theory by which he squeezed an elephant through the eye of a needle. A hint to the wise is sufficient."¹⁶⁹

Geiger was deeply interested in Schorr's activities and was one of the more active contributors to החלוץ. The six articles¹⁷⁰ which he wrote, however, dealt with *Reine Wissenschaft* rather than with reformist ideas. Geiger felt that Hebrew was unsuitable for modern polemics. With the exception of אף שברי לוחות מונחים בארון, a stringent treatment of Rapoport's ערך מלין his articles contained little of *Haskalah* politics. Geiger was the last to withdraw as a contributor to the magazine.¹⁷¹ His opinion of the significance of Schorr's contribution to Jewish scholarship was reflected in the many review articles which Geiger published in both his *Jüdische Zeitschrift*¹⁷² and in the very

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 331.

¹⁶⁸ This is inaccurate. The correspondence appears to have lasted much longer.

¹⁶⁹ See my Schorr letters, *HUCA* (1957), [Hebrew section] p. 5. In an article which he published in עברי אנכי, XIV (1878), p. 329, Schorr relates that he visited Geiger's home and mentions that Geiger sent him every volume of his magazine *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* except Vol. X. "This dear Rabbi of blessed memory was my friend and ally for about thirty years."

¹⁷⁰ a) מאמר על ר' לוי בר' אברהם בר' חיים, II (1853), pp. 12-27.

b) הערות קטנות בחכמת הלשון, III (1856), pp. 74-80.

c) אף שברי לוחות מונחים בארון, IV (1859), pp. 50-59.

d) סומכוס המעתיק היוני, V (1860), pp. 26-31.

e) בחולה בעמיו, V (1860), pp. 73-75.

f) על איזה מחלוקת אשר בין הצדוקים והגלויים עליהם ובין הפרושים וכו', VI (1861), pp. 13-30.

¹⁷¹ He published his last article in Vol. VI; his was the only one in that volume written by an author other than Schorr.

¹⁷² *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, IV (1866), pp. 67-80 and VIII (1870), pp. 168-71.

important German orientalist periodical *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.¹⁷³ In a long review which he published in the *Jüdische Zeitschrift*,¹⁷⁴ he complimented Schorr for the fresh and youthful tone of his magazine and congratulated him for including in its scope not only biblical and talmudic studies but also medieval studies. Schorr, in his opinion, was a profound and brilliant scholar and החלוץ, in contrast to many other periodicals, possessed lasting value.

In his later reviews, Geiger, while still complimentary, tended to stress the weaker elements in Schorr's scholarship. In his second article in the *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, for example, he expressed the view that Schorr's Iranian-Jewish studies contain many "rash" philological analyses, and he gently suggested that Schorr should return to his talmudic (particularly Jerushalmi) and medieval studies, areas in which his competence is unquestioned.¹⁷⁵ His last article on Schorr in the *ZDMG* criticized him for repeating ideas in biblical scholarship which have already been published, and gently rebuked him for not being *au courant* in his reading.¹⁷⁶ Both these critical articles were written after Geiger withdrew from החלוץ and their tone may reflect a cooling of their friendship, although it must be said that throughout his life Schorr retained a very high esteem for Geiger's scholarship.

IV.

The personal image of Schorr in his twenties and thirties, which emerges from the sources, is that of an energetic, successful and amiable young man. Like most Eastern European youths of his class, he was at first free from the task of making a living and devoted all his time to scholarly pursuits. By 1842, he had published numerous articles in the German-Jewish press and was admitted to the inner circle of Jewish scholarship of his day.

Schorr's commitments to Judaism, Jewish studies, and Hebrew were typical of his fellow *Maskilim*. Yet, despite his strong desire to preserve these values, he was not prepared to compromise with scientific truth. He might speak of the *juste milieu* but if a traditional idea conflicted with *truth*, it had to go. Not only was he prepared to question the authority of the Talmud and to doubt fundamental doctrines of orthodox Judaism, but he was ready to emend Scripture as well.

¹⁷³ *ZDMG*, XI (1857), pp. 332-34; XIII (1859), pp. 713-14; XV (1861), pp. 416-19; XVI (1862), pp. 287-94.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, IV (1866), pp. 67-80.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, VIII (1870), p. 171.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, XVI (1862), pp. 287-94.

Like his fellow reformers of the period, he believed that Judaism would survive only if it were prepared to change in the face of the new situation and if it were made to conform with scientific truth. The changes he advocated were not to be justified on *traditional-halachic* grounds, but on the understanding of the historical processes of Judaism.

In his quest for truth the young Schorr gave no quarter to personal considerations. He was ready to jettison friendships in its service. He could be merciless in his criticism, and his strong satirical bent had already begun to develop. On the other hand, little of his subsequent bitterness was manifest in this period. He was socially well-adjusted, a good and warm friend and an enthusiastic advocate. Although here and there we have some evidence of his later miserliness,¹⁷⁷ he usually appeared to be generous of both his time and his money.

His scholarly success was paralleled by the good fortune he enjoyed in his personal life. In 1840 (1839?)¹⁷⁸ he married Zisla (Naomi) Landau, the daughter of Judah Landau, the wealthy head of one of Brody's first families.¹⁷⁹ With Zisla came a sizeable dowry and soon an appointment to the Community Council. In honor of the wedding Luzzatto dedicated his edition of Yehudah Halevi's poetry to the young couple and even alluded to the bride's father in the title which he selected for the book: *בתולה בת יהודה*.¹⁸⁰ The marriage was a very happy one and was blessed by a son, Jacob Schorr, who in turn was both gifted and successful.

Soon after his marriage Schorr suffered severe financial reverses.

¹⁷⁷ See for example Luzzatto's remarks about his "penny pinching" when it came to the publication costs of *בתולה בת יהודה* (אגרות שד"ל, p. 652).

¹⁷⁸ According to Klausner (*op. cit.*, IV, p. 60) they were married on the Friday preceding Shabbath Naḥamu 5599 = 1839. This is based on a reference to that date in one of Luzzatto's letters (אגרות שד"ל, p. 620). However, subsequent letters seem to indicate that they were married later (*ibid.*, pp. 655, 659), and only in the letter of May 11, 1840 (*ibid.*, p. 689) did Luzzatto indicate that the marriage had taken place.

¹⁷⁹ Judah Landau (1778–1841) served as the head of the Brody community for many years. His other daughter Minna married Leon Ephrusi, the Odessa banker, with whom Schorr's son Jacob was later associated. Landau was a *Maskil* who was friendly with Letteris and with Levinsohn. (The poem *חולעים* was dedicated by Levinsohn to his son Eliezer and not to Landau himself as Gelber reported.) He was a signatory of a petition to the Kaiser presented in 1830, asking that the Jews be permitted to make mortgage loans, to acquire civil rights, to be elected to the Town Council and to establish a Rabbinical seminary in Brody. He was the chief proponent of the Jewish *Realschule* which was established in Brody in 1823 (Gelber, *ברודי*, pp. 213–14, 174, 185, 188–89, 244, 255; *Annalen*, III [1841], p. 335).

¹⁸⁰ *בתולה בת יהודה* (Prague, 1840).

According to Seidel, he had invested the dowry which he received with some prominent merchants but the enterprise failed. He was, fortunately, able to recoup his wealth in 1848 through an association with his brother-in-law Leon Ephrusi, a wealthy Odessan banker and merchant, who accorded him an agency for the sale of tallow and woolen goods.¹⁸¹ The unexpected crisis and the new commercial venture which followed in its wake probably accounted for the decline in Schorr's literary productivity after 1842. It is also quite likely that, following the custom of the day, after his father-in-law's death in 1841,¹⁸² the young scholar was cast into the business world and had less free time for study. At any rate, we find that Schorr made several business trips to Odessa during this period.¹⁸³

He kept abreast of international Jewish affairs. In 1841, he reprimanded Luzzatto for not informing him of Lilienthal's mission to Russia and the role which Luzzatto played in this abortive attempt to "civilize" Russian Jewry. This evoked Luzzatto's apology that he was pledged to secrecy, because Uvarov, the Russian minister of education who suggested the mission, insisted upon it. Luzzatto also expressed his dismay that both Zunz and Geiger had been unable to contain themselves and had made the news public.¹⁸⁴

He was also occupied with communal politics, particularly during the stormy period of the revolution of 1848. The revolution made a deep impression on the Brody community. Of all the "Jewish" cities in Galicia, only Brody elected a Jew to Parliament; he was the Viennese "preacher" Isaac Noah Mannheimer. Schorr was a member of the Brody election committee and signed the election report as a *Gemeindevorsteher*.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 6. Seidel claims that in 1851, when Schorr published the first volume of *החלוץ*, he was unable to pay the printer and had to get the money from Moses Kalir. This seems unlikely because according to Seidel himself he recouped his losses in 1848. (See Klausner, *op. cit.*, p. 60, n. 16).

¹⁸² Judah Landau died on September 21, 1841 (*Annalen*, III [1841], p. 335).

¹⁸³ At least three trips are mentioned in our sources, in 1848 [Seidel, *op. cit.*, p. 11], in 1849 (*כרם חסד*, VIII [1854], p. 60), and in 1850 (*החלוץ*, IX [1873], p. 6).

¹⁸⁴ *אגרות ש"ל*, II, p. 753. Lilienthal had written to Luzzatto asking him to describe the curriculum of the school and to suggest the names of alumni of the *Collegio rabbinico* who might be considered for teaching posts in Russian schools which he planned to found. In a note to his first letter he told Luzzatto that Uvarov had expressly prohibited the publication of any news of the project. See David Philipson: "Max Lilienthal in Russia," *HUCA*, XII-XIII (1937-38), p. 827 [English translation, p. 829.]

¹⁸⁵ The document is reprinted by Gelber, *op. cit.*, p. 390. Among the other signatories is Isaac Erter.

This we know: the success of the revolution prompted Schorr and Erter to launch their new organ *החלוץ* in 1851. With the appearance of *החלוץ*, Schorr emerged not only as the apostle of the left wing of the Galician movement, but as one of the leaders of *Jüdische Wissenschaft* in his day.

(To be continued)

The author wishes to thank Mrs. H. Lederer, Rabbi Theodore Wiener and Dr. Arie Kahana for assisting him in the translation of the German materials quoted in this article.