

## JOSHUA HESCHEL SCHORR — THE MATURE YEARS

EZRA SPICEHANDLER

Hebrew Union College - Biblical and Archaeological School, Jerusalem

JOSHUA Heschel Schorr's major contribution to the *haskalah* begins with the founding of החלוץ in 1852.<sup>1</sup> Schorr was not only one of the founders of this periodical but served as its sole editor and publisher during its long, although sporadic existence. In its pages he published all his major articles and through them influenced several generations of Eastern European *maskilim*. During the 1870's and 1880's he also wrote frequently for עברי אנכי, a weekly Hebrew magazine which was published in his native city of Brody. The purpose of this article is to examine Schorr's career as an advocate of religious reform during his mature years, with particular reference to his literary activity.

### I.

The idea of publishing a new Hebrew magazine which would take the place of the defunct כרם חמד<sup>2</sup> and at the same time reflect the ideology of some of the more militant Galician *maskilim* arose after the revolution of 1848. In תולדות החלוץ, the unfinished programmatic article which Erter wrote for the first volume of החלוץ and which appeared shortly after his death in 1852, he relates that a group of his friends urged him to found the magazine in 1851. The prime mover appeared to have been Schorr, who had entertained the idea at least as early as 1850.<sup>3</sup> Other members of the circle were Abraham Krochmal, Hirsch Mendel Pineles and Mordecai Dubs.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *HUCA*, 31 (1960), pp. 181-222.

<sup>2</sup> כרם חמד ceased publication in 1843; Goldenberg died in 1846. Later Senior Sachs revived the magazine in 1854, publishing two additional volumes (8 [1854] and 9 [1856]) in Berlin.

<sup>3</sup> אמרות שד"ל, p. 1096, December 2, 1850 (Luzzato to Schorr): שמחתי באומרים לי: מחברת בלה"ק [בלשון הקודש] תצא על ידך ועל יד החכמים שלישי [הירושמי מנדל פינלש] וערטער ויהי בשנת תרי"ט או תרי"י: עליה על לבבי להוציא לאור מכתב עתי ואמהר לגלות את אונן [של שד"ל] In the second edition of החלוץ I (1866), p. 144, Schorr writes: Gelber states that Schorr and Abraham Krochmal proposed the publication of a Hebrew magazine in the 1840's

Klausner's assertion to the contrary, the revolution of 1848 did have an impact upon the Hebrew press but the immediate response was delayed not because the press was "removed from life" but because of the censorship<sup>5</sup> and the general disruption of daily life. The only Hebrew periodical which appeared with some regularity at the time was Stern's *כוכבי יצחק* and it suspended publication as a result of the political ferment;<sup>6</sup> when *כוכבי יצחק* (vol. 13) resumed in 1850, Stern explained the circumstances in a lead-article in German which describes the consequences of the revolution. The following volume opens with a poem by Rachel Marpurgo hailing the great event<sup>7</sup> and the next (15th) contains a festive declaration penned by Jacob Toprover of Brody in 1849.<sup>8</sup>

For Erter and his circle the revolution marked a watershed in Jewish history. "We spoke about current events," wrote Erter,

the daily changes which have occurred in our lands, and the good fortune . . . which God in his love had bestowed upon . . . the house of Israel, after the Revolution. . . . We asserted that from the day on which we received the rights of man and the laws of the kingdom no longer discriminated between us and the rest of the population . . . our authors no longer need to fight the battle against the enemy without . . . Now all writers must turn inwardly to fight the battle against the enemies within; a battle of knowledge against an ignorance which does not know its own language (i. e., Hebrew) or the plain meaning of our Scriptures and is unaware of Jewish history, the history of its

---

at Schorr's expense and that the major deterrent was the fear of the censors (תולדות יהודי ברודי, p. 215). Luzzato may have referred to a similar suggestion in his letter to Schorr of February 9, 1842 where he states that it would be impossible to publish a magazine in Northern Italy because of the censorship (אגרות שד"ל, p. 763). That it was Schorr and not Erter, as Letteris would have it (פתח דבר, הצופה to Senior Sachs on February 14, 1851: ידידנו יה"ש העיר את רוחו בשובי לביתי . . . לתת ידי אתו להוציא לאור מדי שנה: תולדות 14, 1851), is clear from Erter's letter to Senior Sachs on February 14, 1851: ידידנו יה"ש העיר את רוחו בשובי לביתי . . . לתת ידי אתו להוציא לאור מדי שנה: תולדות 14, 1851). Erter also indicates in תולדות 14, 1851 that he first refused the urging of his friends (החלוץ) that he first refused the urging of his friends (החלוץ) [1852], p. 3).

<sup>4</sup> Dubs was a wealthy Lemberg *maskil* who worked closely with Schorr (See Klausner, היסטוריה של הספרות העברית החדשה, IV<sup>2</sup>, p. 57, note 3).

<sup>5</sup> Klausner, *ibid.*, II<sup>2</sup>, p. 45. The role of censorship in the Hebrew press can be gathered at random from Luzzato's correspondence, *supra*, n. 3, pp. 763, 1034.

<sup>6</sup> We can surmise that the reason there is no mention of the revolution in volume 12 (1848) is because the volume went to press before the outbreak. See also the poem by Alexander Landbank in volume 13, pp. 48-51.

<sup>7</sup> *כוכבי יצחק*, קורות הזמן 14 (1850), p. 35.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* 15 (1851), pp. 64-67: את המכתב בארצנו. הנה כהבתי עור בשנה העברה אחר נתינת הקאנשטיטוציאן [יעקב טופרובך] בכוורי העתים and not in *כוכבי יצחק* as reported by Gelber and is signed [יעקב טופרובך]. י.ט.

sages and the light which their life-story . . . sheds upon their sayings; a battle of science against the boorishness which darkens the fire of faith.<sup>9</sup>

Erter's article, although full of insights, had many of the characteristics of a first draft. He began by bemoaning the economic difficulties which hamper the development of a Hebrew press, rambled off to condemn the failure of the Galician rabbinate, made some remarkably intelligent suggestions as to how to convert Hebrew into a living language, and urged the need for the opening of Jewish secondary schools to reinforce the education of the children of the enlightened. At this point, Erter's part of the article ended, and Schorr took up the argument. After indicating that he was completing the article at the behest of his colleagues, he proceeded to outline their program:

Lift high the banner to the spirit of the times . . . combat every regulation (תקנה), law or custom which has . . . become obsolete . . . let your journal be a precious stone of happiness and wisdom and let it light the way . . . by a critical examination of the Torah, Prophets and Hagiographa and the Talmud, Midrashim and the earlier and later rabbis. Let (the fire of) criticism burn in the fields of Israel consuming its thorns and thistles. Let the people walk in the light of your fire.<sup>10</sup>

The major innovation was to be the publication of articles dealing with "the problem of the times."<sup>11</sup> In the Galician periodicals of the Haskalah's first generation the social, economic and cultural problems of Eastern European Jewry were touched upon quite infrequently. Both *בכורי העתים* and *כרם חמד* concentrated primarily on Judaic studies with some space given over to *belles lettres*. In contrast, the early volume of *החלוץ* featured "problem articles" which were written in a crisp, missionary and polemical style that was hitherto unknown in Hebrew letters. Moreover Nachman Krochmal, Rapoport and most of their generation were rather conservative in regard to the orthodox religious leadership and the role of the Talmud in Jewish life. While they felt free to attack Hasidism and Kabbalah, they studiously avoided any outright confrontation of the rabbinical establishment or the talmudic tradition.<sup>12</sup> *החלוץ* had no such inhibi-

<sup>9</sup> *החלוץ* I, p. 3.

<sup>10</sup> *החלוץ* I, p. 18.

<sup>11</sup> Erter in his letter to Sachs *העבר* I, pp. 157–158 states: ואחת טראשי התכליות אשר נרדפה במחברותינו היא להעיר את לב רבני ארצנו ולהראותם כי עת להקל היא העת הזאת ונס לבטל תקנות נושנות ולשום אחרות תחתיהן. ואם יתמכנו חכמי ישראל במכתביהם, נקוה להצליח בדרכנו.

<sup>12</sup> See Klausner, *supra*, n. 4, II<sup>2</sup>, pp. 158, 193 f., 261.

tions. It openly chastised the Rabbinate for its failure of leadership and its refusal to keep up with the changing times. It rejected the view that Talmud and the entire posttalmudic legal tradition were infallible.

Schorr, then, became the leading spirit of the new enterprise serving as both editor and publisher. In his editorial tasks he was assisted by his close friend Abraham Krochmal, who, like him, also published several articles in each of the first five volumes of *החלוץ*.<sup>13</sup>

An analysis of the contents of volume I indicates this new approach. Besides completing Erter's article, Schorr published two polemical articles: *משא הרבנים* which castigated the Austro-Hungarian rabbinate, and *דבר נחוץ*, a proposal on improving Jewish education. He also published a critical study on the Mishnah and Talmud, an essay on the biblical *masorah*, and annotated editions of a number of manuscripts from medieval Jewish literature.

*משא הרבנים*<sup>14</sup> constituted a direct attack upon the rabbinate. Schorr opposed the attempts of the Hungarian rabbinate to establish, with royal approval, a hierarchical control over rabbinical appointments, which would, in his opinion, prevent the election of modernist rabbis.<sup>15</sup> He called upon the lay-leaders of the Galician communities to "rise and unite whether orthodox (תורני) or enlightened (נאור) . . . to thwart the designs of the rabbis . . . who hasten to deny our traditional right to choose our rabbis."<sup>16</sup> He urged that political action (preparing petitions and even sending delegates to Vienna to lobby against the proposal) be taken against these schemes. In the second half of his article he asserted that the rabbis were unalterably opposed to the Emancipation. Their growing opposition to allowing Jewish merchants to circumvent the Sabbath restrictions by halachic means, a practice which rabbis condoned in earlier times when the cases involved were infrequent, must have reflected the needs of the new rising Jewish merchant class in an economy now entering a capitalist phase which found it increasingly difficult to lose Sabbath trade. He devoted greater space to the rabbinical opposition to Jewish attempts at agricultural settlement and the purchase of farm lands which was motivated, he claimed, by fears that Jewish farmers would violate the Sabbath.

<sup>13</sup> Abraham Krochmal's position in *החלוץ* may be inferred from a letter he wrote to Hirsch Mendel Pineles in 1852, where he stated: "I inform you that we received an article by the scholar Geiger for publication in *החלוץ*." "We" obviously means Schorr and Krochmal. See Klausner, *op. cit.*, IV<sup>2</sup>, p. 82, n. 3.

<sup>14</sup> *החלוץ* I, pp. 36-46.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 40.

Schorr's article on Jewish education<sup>17</sup> called for the establishment of modern Jewish schools in Galicia. While he condemned the antiquated *heder* system, he was equally appalled at the growing practice among the enlightened of sending their children to non-Jewish schools and providing for their Jewish education after school hours. His argument had a decidedly contemporary ring. "If you think that by teaching your children one or two hours a day of Hebrew . . . you fulfil your obligation, you are wrong. . . . Special Hebrew schools for the instruction of children when they are free from normal school fail to teach them the religion of Torah. . . . Religion cannot be acquired by the children . . . unless it is taught in the same place which is devoted to all matters of education."<sup>18</sup> Once children finish primary school, he believed, they would be sufficiently indoctrinated and could then be sent to the general secondary schools while receiving their Jewish training after school hours. Educational reform, he insisted, is far more important than the establishment of temples and choirs.

Schorr's propagandistic predilections motivated many of his quasi-scientific articles as well. He introduced *שימת עין על המשנה והגמרא*,<sup>19</sup> a critical examination of the authority of the Mishnah and Talmud, with a short essay called *דבר בעתו*,<sup>20</sup> which clearly stated that his purpose was to dislodge that authority. Even the title of the preface, printed in bolder type than that of the article, underscored not only the timeliness of his subject but the significance which the Haskalah put on historical time itself. As Natan Rotenstreich has suggested: "The most significant innovation of 19th century Jewish thought was its viewing of Judaism within a historical context."<sup>21</sup> In his introductory paragraph Schorr contended: "Not all times are equal, not all ideas are equal, what is suitable for one (age), is difficult for another . . . the Talmud is the work of men . . . and it must be tested in the crucible . . . and be purified. If we pay attention to the spirit of the times . . . we cannot help seeing that even simple folk have broken the yoke of the Torah and have spurned the *mitsvot* . . . because the burden is too heavy."<sup>22</sup>

He repeated the contention which he had first made in a German article in the *Israelitische Annalen* that the religious crisis grew out of

<sup>17</sup> דבר נחוץ על אודות בתי הספר וכי', *ibid.*, pp. 116-120.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 50-56.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 47-50.

<sup>21</sup> המהפכה היהודית בעת החדשה I (1966), p. 21.

<sup>22</sup> החלוקה I, p. 47.

the central role which the Talmud has played in Jewish life.<sup>23</sup> While in past generations this role was positive, it no longer is. "You must clearly declare that they (the sages of the Talmud) were men of equal rank with us . . . Just as they had the right to change, annul or issue regulations (תקנות) in accordance with their time and place, so do our sages have the authority . . . I do not complain against the early sages of the Mishnah . . . it never occurred to them to shackle later generations . . . only the Amoraim distorted the intention of the earlier sages and those who followed continued to distort. . . ."<sup>24</sup>

He then proceeded to point out the numerous errors in the talmudic literature to prove that its sages were fallible human beings.

Schorr's article on the masoretic text of the Bible was one of the first articles of scientific biblical criticism in modern Hebrew. He defended his critical approach in the name of scientific truth. "Know, dear friend, that in such investigations and in all honest search, the heights of pure faith will not fall and no damage will, God forbid, be incurred." He argued that critical studies of the biblical text occurred in every period of Jewish history.<sup>25</sup>

His reformist bias is sometimes revealed in the choice of the manuscripts which he reproduced and edited. Several of them were selected because of their antitraditional contents.<sup>26</sup>

While Schorr's articles make up the bulk of the contents of volume I, it also contains contributions by a number of other *maskilim*. Abraham Krochmal wrote three articles,<sup>27</sup> Mordecai Dubs published his correspondence with Samuel David Luzzato dealing with biblical exegesis<sup>28</sup> and Hirsch Mendel Pineles a review of Nachman Krochmal's *מורה נבוכי הזמן*.<sup>29</sup>

Although thirteen volumes of *החלוץ* appeared intermittently between 1852-1889, it functioned as the organ of the radical Haskalah for only a comparatively brief period. Schorr, who was an opinionated and authoritarian man, lacked the personality to sustain his leadership or to retain, if not to expand, his circle of authors. His "all-too-

<sup>23</sup> I (1839), pp. 169-172.

<sup>24</sup> *החלוץ* I, pp. 49-50.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 98 ff.

<sup>26</sup> שיר הלונה על הרבנים *ibid.*, p. 159, and רברי ר' יוסי עלילו *ibid.*, pp. 160 f.

<sup>27</sup> תולדות שמואל ירחינאי *ibid.*, pp. 66-89; מאמר סוד העיבור *ibid.*, pp. 133-143; מוערי חשבון הזמן *ibid.*, pp. 143-148.

<sup>28</sup> מכתב לשר"ל *ibid.*, pp. 90-94.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 123-133. Pineles belonged to Nachman Krochmal's circle. He soon broke with Schorr. The latter published a very critical review of Pineles's book *דרכה של תורה* (Vienna, 1863) defending his views against Pineles's attacks (*החלוץ* 7, pp. 144-157).

honest" criticism quickly alienated even his closest friends. Consequently only volumes 1-5 (1852, 1853, 1856, 1859 and 1860) can be considered to have been a periodical in which several contributors, in declining numbers, participated. Krochmal broke with Schorr before volume 5 (1860) was published.<sup>30</sup> This volume contains articles by Schorr, Mordecai Dubs and Geiger. Geiger was the last to go; his final article is included in volume 6 (1861). Thereafter החלוץ became a private yearbook, in which Schorr published his own articles in the field of Judaica and ceased writing polemical essays.<sup>31</sup> He did not change his radical views but simply became reconciled to the fact that his reformist goals were not going to be attained in Galicia. His radicalism now reflected itself in his choice of scholarly problems, his critical approach to the tradition, and in scattered *obiter dicta*. Schorr's reformist views may be extracted from the purely polemical<sup>32</sup> essays and from a number of his polemically motivated scholarly articles<sup>33</sup> which appear in the first five volumes of החלוץ.

Three articles each entitled **משא הרבנים** were open attacks upon the contemporary rabbinate. Schorr did not hesitate to allude to contemporaries, but as a concession to sensibilities he uses **ראשי היבות**. Klausner has suggested that the anticlericalism which animates Schorr's view of the rabbis was influenced by the anticlericalism of the European Enlightenment.

It is not hidden from any student of history that the love of power . . . , not for the sake of heaven, has caused no little evil . . . and the evil is greater . . . when those who pursue power were

<sup>30</sup> The break must have occurred in 1859. Krochmal published two articles in Michael Wolff's **שרה צופים** (Lemberg, 1860), pp. 1-57, 99-100. They seem to have written for החלוץ or at least in its spirit. (See Klausner, *supra*, n. 4, IV<sup>2</sup>, p. 82.) Schorr's devastating review of Krochmal's **הכתב והמכתב** (Lemberg, 1873) (חלוץ 10 [1877], pp. 70-103) in which he accused his former collaborator of plagiarizing several of his biblical emendations hardly served to heal the breach. There is no evidence that the two were really reconciled despite a remark by Krochmal in **עיון תפלה** (Lemberg, 1885), p. 25, referring to Schorr as **ירידי ורעי**. The Klau Library of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, possesses a copy of **הכתב והמכתב** which contains a friendly dedication to Schorr in Krochmal's handwriting. Both gestures may simply indicate Krochmal's courtesy toward his older colleague.

<sup>31</sup> The last such article, **הותרה הרצועה**, appears in חלוץ 5 (1860), pp. 1-11.

<sup>32</sup> Three articles entitled **משא הרבנים**, which he signs with his pseudonym **אני יהושע שור** [גליציא] (חלוץ 1, pp. 36-46; 2, pp. 28-37; 3, pp. 47-74); two articles which bear the date of the particular Jewish year in which they were written (חלוץ 2, pp. 1-12), (חלוץ 3, pp. 1-19); and **אחרי הפרגוד** (חלוץ 4, pp. 1-21) and **הותרה הרצועה** (חלוץ 5, pp. 1-11).

<sup>33</sup> In particular three articles entitled **דבר בעתו** (חלוץ 1, pp. 47-65; 2, pp. 37-58; 5, pp. 31-54); and **מכתב על העתק התנ"ך** (3, pp. 89-118), **שבדי לוחות** (4, pp. 53-65), **תפלין** (5, pp. 1-26), and **תוכחה מגולה** (5, pp. 75-91).

crafty enough to disguise themselves in cassocks (אדרות שער) in order to lie and seduce the people (by saying) that only fear of God and faith is their girdle. This is recorded in the prophets, repeated in our nation's history after the prophecy and reiterated again in the history of every nation. There is no difference between a crooked (עקש דרך) rabbi and a deceitful priest.<sup>34</sup>

The Christian clergy at least claims divine authority; "Not so the rabbis, who only have it in their hands to decide that which is permitted or prohibited (דיני אסור והיתר), matters of defilement or purity, etc., and even in these matters they have no greater authority than scholars who are not rabbis."<sup>35</sup> In this modern age, Schorr argues, the clergy has lost its exclusive authority. "We must praise God . . . who has given royalty the courage to limit the authority of the clergy."<sup>36</sup> He urges public-minded people to oppose the attempts of Rabbi Moses Sofer (Schreiber) of Pressburg to create a centralized rabbinate for the Empire with the support of the regime. The *maskilim* must protect the freedom of individual communities to choose their own rabbi. By anthologizing poorly written, mediocrally narrow-minded rabbinic responsa and dicta, he holds up the ignorance and prejudice of the rabbis to public ridicule. In these anthologies he includes a healthy sampling of sexual material,<sup>37</sup> a rather daring feat for a Hebrew writer of his day. Over and over again he expresses his moral disapproval of the use of halachic devices or talmudic casuistry even for the progressive purpose of abrogating antiquated laws: "Avoid the way . . . of ruses and craftiness . . . (even) if you have no other way of correcting abuses . . . in accordance with the time and place; besides the חילול השם before . . . the eyes of the gentiles, you will sow the seed of falsehood in the hearts of the sons of Israel."<sup>38</sup>

His picture of the contemporary rabbinate is devastating: "Some waste their days in vain pilpulism and some with meaningless *halakhot*, some with abstruse kabbalistic works and some with arid (שרופות קרים — blasted) investigations . . . these are your rabbis, teachers and preachers, O Israel; they are laden with the burden of books, regulations (תקנות), limitations (סיינים) and severe interpretations (חומרות) . . ."<sup>39</sup>

Schorr recounted the famous attempt of Rabbi Jacob Orenstein of

<sup>34</sup> החלוץ 1, pp. 36 f.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.* 1, pp. 41-46; 2, pp. 29 f.; 3, pp. 59-64, for example. These are also used as examples of rabbinic ignorance of the rudiments of biology.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.* 2, p. 35.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* 3, pp. 47 f.



Lemberg to place *maskilim* like Mieses, Rapoport and Erter under a ban citing the text of the *herem* as an example of rabbinic intolerance.<sup>40</sup> He holds out little hope that the orthodox rabbinate would ever be capable of introducing any reforms.

Particularly poignant is his description of the tragedy of young *maskilim* in the remote Jewish townlets of Eastern Europe who are subjected to cruel social persecution by their ignorant correligionists. The experience he describes would become a *leitmotif* in modern Hebrew literature. One could well imagine young Moses Lieb Lilienblum, who read החלוק during the traumatic period in which he lost his faith, tearfully identifying himself with the young *maskil* portrayed by Schorr<sup>41</sup> as he stealthily pored over its pages.

Schorr formulated his antitalmudism in his first article in the *Annalen*. In החלוק he repeated the basic theme over and over again.

Our religious condition has its source in the Talmudim . . . from which are derived all the decrees (גזירות) and the regulations (חקנות) of the early and late (post-Shulḥan Arukh) rabbis . . . As long as you do not render your judgement regarding the prevalent notion that the founders of the Talmud were inspired by God and their words are the living words of God and declare clearly that they were men as we and that just as they had the authority to change, annul or initiate regulations in consonance with time and place, so do the sages of every generation have such authority . . . you too will degenerate. . . .<sup>42</sup>

Schorr carefully qualified his attack on talmudism. The tannaim were wholly within their rights when they legislated for their times. The distortion occurred when Rabbi Judah introduced the well-known mishnah recorded in *'Eduyot* 1:5<sup>43</sup> in order to bolster his authority. This mishnah did not bind his immediate followers but the "amoraim . . . misunderstood the intention of the first scholars and they strayed from the path, and their successors continued the distortions . . . placing a yoke upon the necks of the people."<sup>44</sup>

Consequently Schorr considered it his duty to show that the entire framework of Rabbi Judah's *mishnayot* is shaky "and cannot really sustain the structure which the rabbis of the Talmud had erected." In a series of articles he pointed out the mistakes, inconsistencies, and organizational shortcomings of the Mishnah and

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 56 f. See Klausner, *supra*, n. 4, II<sup>2</sup>, pp. 223–225 for details.

<sup>41</sup> החלוק 3, pp. 67 f.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.* I, pp. 48 f.

<sup>43</sup> See *HUCA* 31 (1960), pp. 206 ff.

<sup>44</sup> החלוק I, pp. 49 f.

Talmud.<sup>45</sup> "This Talmud is a collection of matters which have no proper order . . . and contains statements made for the time and place by people who differed in manner or character, matters which contradict one another . . . ; it (also) contains improprieties which have been amassed. Such a collection has no sanctity in and of itself. . . ."<sup>46</sup>

Schorr gave his penchant for satire full rein in תרי"ג and תרי"ד — two articles whose titles designate the year of their composition — and in two articles אחרוי הפרגור and הותרה הרצועה, which could have been designated respectively תרי"ט and תר"כ, since all four articles belong to the same *genre*.

The literary style of these articles was clearly influenced by Erter. In תרי"ג the author dreams of a visit by the *amora* R. Simlai, the author of the famous dictum that תרי"ג מצוות נאמרו לו למשה בסיני, an obvious play on the Hebrew date תרי"ג and the title of this article. Many of Erter's works and Schorr's satires were built upon a dialogue between the author and his imaginary interlocutor. Unlike Erter who employed an almost biblical style, Schorr used a mixture of biblical and rabbinic Hebrew.

תרי"ג contains a summary of Schorr's objectives. Seeking out the causes for the decline of Judaism, Schorr discovered that the rabbis have erected barrier upon barrier around the Torah in order to preserve it. They have become so preoccupied by the task of protecting the walls that they have neglected the shrine within. Now they are unable to remove the clutter of legislation because of Rabbi Judah Hannasi's restrictive ruling that "no court may annul the decision of a fellow court except if it is greater in wisdom and number." Judah's decree is responsible for the stagnation of Judaism. By studying the career of Judah, Schorr came to the conclusion that he was a very arrogant man, less capable than many of the tannaim. Judah's authoritarianism led him to decree this unfortunate ruling. "Out of a zealotness for Judaism and God," Schorr declared, "I have proclaimed that which I discerned after proper investigation of Judah's Mishnah and his character. (This was done) not to diminish his honor but to increase the honor of the Torah. . . . I said to myself, even if his honor would thereby be lowered, he does not matter. Where there is a profanation of God, His Torah, His faith and His people, one must neither concern himself with the honor of a rabbi nor of *Rabbi* (Rabbi Judah Hannasi)."<sup>47</sup>

<sup>45</sup> החלוק 1, pp. 50-56; pp. 56-65; II, pp. 43-58.

<sup>46</sup> החלוק 2, p. 38.

<sup>47</sup> החלוק 2, p. 2.

Rabbi Simlai agrees with the author. Moreover, he is shocked by the attitude of subsequent generations toward the oral law and the literalness with which Jews accept every banality and superstitious statement uttered by the rabbis of the Talmud and the Mishnah as divine fiat. Appalled in particular by the popularity of kabbalistic views, he concludes by charging the author to fight against all blasphemies and distortions of Judaism.

The small-town rabbi in תר"ד tells the author that in searching for the correct interpretation of a mysterious dream he visited among others a rabbi (a *mitnaged*), the Rabbi of P--- (i. e., of Prague, undoubtedly Rapoport) who is a modernist, and a hasidic *rebbe*. Schorr skilfully parodies each of the styles of the respondents: the pilpulistic learning of the talmudist, the quasi-modernist scholarship of Rapoport and his forced apologies for the tradition, and the folk superstition of the hasidic *rebbe*.

Schorr concludes this essay with one of his rare declarations of religious belief. For him the essence of Judaism is its belief in the unity of God (אחדות הבורא). Most of the mosaic commandments have one purpose: "to separate and sanctify the unique people (עם סגולה) for the one and true God." He mentions circumcision and the Sabbath, as important examples of such commandments. The goal of settling in the promised land was a unifying device conceived by "men of God inspired by the heavenly spirit," but once having settled in Canaan the people lost their will and backslid. The monarchy unified Israel but when it declined, the prophets preached the idea of Messianic redemption. "This sublime hope quickly became the rallying (uniting) point which gave life to the dry bones and strengthened the spirit of the nation. . . . But many scriptures prove . . . that the essence of the promise, to inherit the land of Canaan, and (the Messianic hope) was only to strengthen the . . . faith in the unity of God."

For centuries this belief was obscured and became of secondary significance to the *halachah*; Judaism has become a matter of laws and pilpulism. This degeneration may be justified to some degree since it served to preserve the uniqueness of the Jew in the face of medieval persecution. However, "when times, places and conditions change, ideas change and the devices which were proper in their time for strengthening the belief in one God . . . [lose their efficacy]. . . . If we do not . . . seek out other proper means of attaining this desired end in consonance with our place, time and condition, then this precious treasure will be lost . . . God forbid. Therefore, whoever is for God must gather strength to clear a straight path before the people toward this goal . . . and demonstrate to all men that ours is a

pure and holy faith . . . so that all nations might walk in the light of its flame."<sup>48</sup>

The central theme of *אחורי הפרגוד* is an attack upon the modernist neo-orthodox rabbis. Schorr chose Zachariah Frankel and Solomon Judah Rapoport as the major butts of his satire. The literary situation he devised was a *bet din* composed of orthodox rabbis of the old school, whose name he thinly disguised behind *ראשי תיבות*: Solomon A. Tiktin (ט"א), Geiger's orthodox rival in Breslau; Solomon Kluger (שק"ר), the rabbi of Brody; and Hirsch Edelmänn (צ"ח = צבי מחבר חמדה = ננוה).<sup>49</sup> The court was assembled in order to try the reform rabbis who have challenged the *halachah*; veiled mention is made of Geiger and Holdheim.<sup>50</sup> However, assuming that these reform rabbis would not honor the summons issued by a court whose authority they reject, the *dayyanim* decide to invite the testimony of the middle-of-the-road rabbis (הרבנים הממוצעים) who, although modern, oppose the radicals. Among those invited are Zachariah Frankel and Rapoport.<sup>51</sup>

Like other radical *maskilim*, Schorr held the middle-of-the-roads in contempt, sharing the view of Reform rabbis like Josef Maier of Stuttgart, chairman of the Braunschweig Conference of 1844.<sup>52</sup> His description of the pontifical Rapoport is one of the earliest satires of a neo-orthodox rabbi. Rapoport appears clad in elaborate robes of office; he boasts of visits to the baths at Carlsbad, his great popularity even among handsome young men and elegant young maidens, his homiletical talents and his custom of intoning the priestly benedic-

<sup>48</sup> החלוק 3, pp. 17-19.

<sup>49</sup> I am grateful to S. J. Agnon for identifying this *ראשי תיבות*.

<sup>50</sup> החלוק 4, p. 2. Geiger is described by Tiktin as *מנהיגי העדה* בחרו בו מנהיגי העדה *האיש אשר בחרו בו מנהיגי העדה* and Holdheim as *חכמי התלמוד* כי ספריו עם ספריו *הרב אשר אמר בפומבי עם ספריו כי חכמי התלמוד* על פני להיות להם לרב ולמורה אורחותיהם עקשים ונלחים . . . ויציאו משפטים מעוקלים לעניין קידושין ושבעות. הוא הרב אשר זכה להתיר החתן בבנותיהם.

<sup>51</sup> Again neither is designated by name. Frankel is called: [פרנקל] הרב היקר מפי' (פרנקל) זכריה היווני or זכריה [איש לפידור] (since he was the author of "Über den Lapidarstyl der talmudischen Historik," *Monatschrift* I (1852), pp. 203-220; 403-421). Rapoport is called מלך הכבוד, pp. 2-3.

<sup>52</sup> See for example his book *Die erste Rabbinerversammlung und ihre Gegner*, Stuttgart, 1895. An English translation of his specific remarks on this subject appears in David Philipson, *op. cit.*, pp. 224-225: "as a matter of fact the rabbis of the old thoroughly orthodox school were far more careful, honest and honorable than those of the chiaroscuro type of today. The former declared art and science, in short all culture except of a purely religious character, as absolutely incompatible with Judaism . . .; this attitude was consistent and intelligible; the latter however advise that modern schools be attended by Jews, and the arts and sciences be cultivated by them, but denounce all such who advocate a reform of the ritual and the cult, because these do not harmonize with modern culture — this attitude is inconsistent and unintelligible."

tion. "Not only this," he concludes, "but one of the princes of the realm who heard of my reputation paid a call to my home . . . to indicate that he respects the Talmud and sympathizes with us and not with these all too clever innovators."<sup>53</sup>

The "authentically" orthodox rabbis view these remarks with utter contempt. They invite Zwi Hirsch Chajes (רצ"ח), who reads German, to act as a court translator. Chajes regales them with an anthology of quotations from the Hebrew works of the neo-orthodox to demonstrate their utter ignorance of proper Hebrew style. "They write German because they cannot write Hebrew." Not only is their Hebrew inept but their talmudic knowledge is quite superficial and leads to ludicrous errors. Rabbi Edelman describes Frankel's "Lapidarstyl" in these words: "Even if he sometimes does not plumb the simple meaning of the words and takes them out of context, after all his intentions are honorable."<sup>54</sup>

Rapoport, מלך הכבוד, appears as a pompous, cantankerous, hypocritic who accuses Chajes of a long-standing prejudice against him. Chajes makes allusions to Rapoport's youthful radicalism and his former scholarly liberalism and this, of course, elicits a fierce reprimand of Rapoport by Solomon Kluger, the uncompromising rabbi of the old school. As if to prove his zealotry for his newly acquired orthodoxy, Rapoport denounces Schorr for apostasy and calls him "the free-thinker (הפוקר) JHS, the חלוץ (avant garde) who marches in the forefront of those who have rebelled against the Torah and the faith, etc."<sup>55</sup>

Chajes charges Rapoport with hypocrisy in regard to החלוץ since he did not attack Schorr until the appearance of the second volume containing the critique of Rapoport's ערך מלין. "Why, then, was the rabbi silent . . . and only after volume 2 had appeared did he cloak himself with zeal?"<sup>56</sup>

The article concludes with a mock inquisitional scene. The accused, Schorr, is set upon by fanatic and neo-orthodox alike, dragged to the dock and forced to confess. In the form of the traditional וירי he lists each of his sins, including the names of his antitraditional articles. The court demands that his confession also include an anthology of all the literary attacks which *maskilim* published against him. Finally, Schorr awakes from the nightmare.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>53</sup> החלוץ 4, p. 3.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 17-21.

אחורי הפרגוד was Schorr's response to the attacks which the moderate *haskalah* launched against him. Despite his battle with the orthodox, he respected their consistency. Schorr and Abraham Krochmal once had studied under Rabbi Solomon Kluger,<sup>58</sup> and the old rabbi, although he was chagrined at the heresies of Schorr, is reputed to have continued to admire his rabbinic erudition.<sup>59</sup> On the other hand, Schorr viewed the position of the moderates as hypocritical and logically untenable.

The older *maskilim* were undoubtedly shocked by the tone of החלוץ.<sup>60</sup> Luzzato received volume 1 sometime in the late spring of 1852, but because of a personal tragedy, did not finish reading the volume until July 24. His remarks are rather mild: "In those evil days, I received החלוץ . . . and (in it) found good matters which made me happy and bad matters which upset me. . . . I rejoiced that the manuscripts which belonged to . . . Reggio gained much by falling into your hands. . . . I rejoiced over your article about the schools. . . . But I was very upset at your tampering with scriptures when there was no need to do so and (your tampering) with plain sense and . . . syntax."<sup>61</sup>

Luzzato went on to criticize Schorr's view that certain psalms were Maccabean and his identification of the Hezekiah mentioned in Proverbs with Hezekiah ben Garon.<sup>62</sup> Luzzato thus confined his criticism entirely to scholarly matters, ignoring Schorr's call for religious reform and concluded by evading his invitation to contribute to החלוץ for reasons of age. Obviously while determined not to be associated with the new venture, he was trying not to break with his disciple and friend.<sup>63</sup> "And now, having crossed the border of the fiftieth year, I shall return (home) from the army and shall not march with the *avant garde* (חלוץ). Let the young men do battle for us or

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>59</sup> Solomon Kluger was reputed to have said: "Leave Heschel Schorr alone, he has all of the Bavli in his left pocket and all of the Yerushalmi in his right pocket." However, Kluger later denounced Schorr in a letter which he wrote on behalf of Moses Harmelin; see Gelber, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

<sup>60</sup> According to Klausner, *op. cit.*, IV<sup>2</sup>, p. 56, Harmelin wrote ספר החולץ, a diatribe against החלוץ, in 1852. This seems unlikely. At all events the book was not published until 1862. Frankel dismisses החלוץ with a short note in the lead article to his *Monatsschrift* 3 (1854), p. 12, footnote, but confines his criticism to what he considers to be Schorr's shoddy scholarship.

<sup>61</sup> אגרות שד"ל, pp. 1149 f. (July 25, 1852).

<sup>62</sup> Here Luzzato is quite correct, since Hezekiah ben Garon lived in the first century A. D.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1151.

for our foes. I myself will try to publish my exegesis and the rest of my books and will not send my articles (מכתבים) to magazine editors except this letter." And firing a parting shot, he adds: "For several years I forgot to tell you that the ראשי חיבות found in Aaron Alarabi's book is הצור תמים פעלו for הת"ף."<sup>64</sup>

That Luzzato expected Schorr to publish his remarks is apparent from his last letter to Schorr, dated December 23, 1852: "And if you publish a second החלוץ and if you love truth, you must mention some of my remarks (but) without publishing my letter . . . also . . . the matter of הת"ף."<sup>65</sup> Schorr chose not to do so, and with this letter the correspondence ends.<sup>66</sup> Luzzato published a repudiation of Schorr's biblical emendations in the revived כרם חמד but without attacking his radical views;<sup>67</sup> almost five years later (April 14, 1857) he gives vent to his feelings about Schorr in a letter to Raphael Kirchheim. "And how I deeply regret the amount of time which I wasted — the amount of labor which I spent for over sixteen years from the 12th of Iyyar, 5596 (1836) until Tisha'ah Beav 5612 (1852) in writing, and (now) this "calf," החלוץ 3 has come out. Let us leave Joshua of the dirty clothes."<sup>68</sup>

Luzzato's break with Schorr was a comparatively quiet affair; however, the quarrel which developed with Rapoport soon descended into a raw exchange of mutual recriminations. Reference has already been made to Schorr's involvement in both the controversies between Rapoport and Luzzato and Geiger and Rapoport. The old smouldering rancor now burst forth into full flame as a result of Schorr's scathing review of Rapoport's ערך מלין in volume 2 of החלוץ.<sup>69</sup> Rapoport's

<sup>64</sup> See *HUCA* 31 (1960), p. 214, n. 143.

<sup>65</sup> אגרות שד"ל, p. 1174.

<sup>66</sup> Schorr answered Luzzato on 11 Elul 5612 (1852) and accepted one or two of Luzzato's corrections but insisted: "Nevertheless it is clear as the sun that there are text corruptions in the Torah and we have the right to emend them . . . and this is not, God forbid, חילול השם." Schorr goes on to say that Luzzato did not respond "perhaps because he took to heart the rabbinic maxim that one does not make rejoinder to an *epikoros*." (החלוץ 3, p. 90.) In the second edition of החלוץ 1, Schorr states that the final cause for their rupture was his refusal to publish an article submitted by Luzzato (החלוץ 1<sup>2</sup> [1866], p. 144). He adds that Geiger wrote him that Luzzato would contribute to the magazine if its name were changed; cf. *HUCA* 28 (1957), p. 20.

<sup>67</sup> Vol. 8 (1854), pp. 83 f. See Schorr's rejoinder on pp. 211 f.

<sup>68</sup> אגרות שד"ל, p. 1294. Luzzato is inaccurate; the correspondence lasted twenty years. His last letter was, as we indicated, written in December 1852, his first letter in January of 1832. See *HUCA* 31 (1960), p. 189. Perhaps this last letter was never mailed, since Schorr does not mention it when describing in 1856 his break with Luzzato. החלוץ 3, p. 90.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 2, pp. 117-153.

book was not so much a bad book as it was an anachronistic one. The times had simply passed over the older scholar. Judaic studies in Germany and Galicia had by then acquired more scholarly tools and criteria and were less bound by traditional inhibitions or by the inner and external apologetics of the older generation. Schorr was of course closer to the scholarly world of Rapoport than he is to our own. His works still contain hundreds of *haskalaisms*, particularly when he attempts to do comparative philology, but his writings are permeated by awareness of the need for scholarly objectivity. Rapoport never reached this stage.

Schorr's article in volume 2 is straight criticism and he tries not to be offensive. The Jewish scholarly world, he tells us, has long awaited two major works: *אמונה צרופה* (i. e., *מורה נבוכי הזמן*) by Nahman Krochmal and *ערך מלין* by Rapoport. Both have now appeared. The former has been reviewed in several places, and now Schorr will review Rapoport's book fairly and objectively: "I shall not deny that Rapoport's manner . . . toward the critics of his books frightens me . . . he delights in pouring out mockery and derision upon all who judge the praiseworthy works of his hand. . . ." <sup>70</sup>

He proceeds to compare the approaches of Krochmal and Rapoport to the detriment of the latter. Krochmal's writing is concise and always to the point; Rapoport's is long-winded, rambling; he argues too much with other scholars; he feels impelled to impart everything which is remotely connected with his subject; he posits half-proven hypotheses. Schorr concludes his introduction by disclaiming any desire to denigrate Rapoport. "Let us depart from this line, lest the reader accuse me of desiring to praise Krochmal and disparage Rapoport. God knows . . . I very much love both of them. May men like them increase in Israel." <sup>71</sup>

These disclaimers, of course, did not avail Schorr. The old personal animosities were undoubtedly in some part responsible for Rapoport's violent response; but they were not the only cause. The older scholar was genuinely shocked by the radicalism of the younger generation. Having refrained from attacking volume 1, the personal attack now impelled him to respond, and his response was typically "Rapoportian," sharp and eminently unfair.

Rapoport's diatribe was printed in *ישורון*, a periodical which appeared in Lemberg under the editorship of Joseph Koback.

Until now our trouble-makers were only those who had tried to introduce religious innovations . . . but they did not (attack) our

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 117.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118.



sages and ancient teachers, the recipients and the inheritors of our transmitted Torah (תורה הנמסרת). . . . Such a base act was unheard of until but recently. . . . What our enemies did from of old is now done by the enemy within . . . one bares his teeth at the last of the tannaim . . . and another wags his tongue against certain rabbis of the Talmud; another speaks brazenly against the entire Talmud. . . . (But God) will save his people from the teeth of these carnivorous animals. . . . they are ignorant . . . and . . . in error. They know something but do not perceive its inner essence. From the little knowledge which they have . . . they want to inflate themselves like a frog which proclaims I am a bull (שור) and not a crawling animal (שרץ).<sup>72</sup>

The gauntlet was now thrown down and Schorr and Geiger renewed their old feud with Rapoport in full fury in the subsequent volume of החלוץ.<sup>73</sup> We shall confine our remarks to Schorr's rejoinder. After citing a long quotation from the article which contains the paragraph which we have quoted above, he dismisses the diatribe as "the words of the most brazen of drunken women who sit in the butcher shops. . . ." Then, he skillfully posits a satirical thesis that the later Rapoport and the earlier Rapoport are really two separate persons. The first is a liberal *maskil*, a colleague of Geiger, Zunz and Krochmal, while the latter is a hypocritical, honor-seeking, traditionalist. The whole satire is extremely well done and replete with allusions and pieces of literary gossip which are of great value to the student of the *haskalah* and which have not as yet been completely probed.

Schorr's anthology of the unfavorable comments printed against him in the Jewish press, which appears in אחרוני הפרגוד, contains in addition to quotations from Rapoport, Luzzato and Frankel also those made by Hirsch Edelman, Issacher Baer, Markus Jost and Raphael Kirchheim. The latter, who called Schorr the Galician Voltaire,<sup>74</sup> was singled out for further attack in two later articles.<sup>75</sup> Among the other *maskilim* whom he also attacked in subsequent volumes are Eliezer Zweifel, Isaac Baer Levinson and Moses Schatzkes.

In several of his polemical articles, Schorr also commented upon the Reform Rabbinical Conference which took place in Braunschweig

<sup>72</sup> I ישרון, pp. 19 f.

<sup>73</sup> Schorr: אף שבירי לחות (ibid., pp. 53-65); Geiger: שברי לחות (4 החלוץ), pp. 50-52).

<sup>74</sup> *Univers Israelit* (1857), as quoted in החלוץ 4, pp. 19 f.

<sup>75</sup> Kirchheim published anti-Schorr articles in *Univers Israelit* (1857) and in השחר 5 (1874), pp. 104-109. Schorr's articles are תוכחה מגלה (5 החלוץ) (1860), pp. 75-91) and חשובה מאונס למבקר מרצון (in the supplement to החלוץ 9 [no date, but probably 1875], pp. 1-13).

in 1844. His main remarks appear in a postscript to דבר בעתו.<sup>76</sup> He felt that the conference failed because Geiger invited only rabbis and preachers to the meeting but ignored the nonrabbinical liberal scholars. Such scholars are men of means and influence within their communities and could have been of invaluable help to the rabbis who were after all dependent upon the opinions of others for their livelihood and subject to their pressures. Schorr believed that a similar conference should be convened for Austria-Hungary, this time together with the nonrabbinical scholars, and urged it to be done as soon as possible.

In אחריו הפרגור he quoted copiously from תורת הקנאות, the polemical antireform pamphlet directed by Western European orthodox rabbis at the resolutions of the Braunschweig Conference, in order to demonstrate the superstition of the opponents of the Reform and their ignorance of Hebrew.

## II.

It is not within the province of this article to deal with Schorr's purely scholarly articles except insofar as they were motivated by his reformist views. In this category belong his articles in the field of biblical criticism. Schorr certainly deserves to be credited as the first Hebrew writer who approached the Bible text objectively and without any religious inhibitions:

Know, dear friend, in researches like these, in the quest for truth in every matter there is no danger that pure faith will fall from its high level and . . . be injured just as it was not harmed by the emendations of the Scribes or the changes made by the elders who translated the Septuagint for Ptolemy or the variants between the first set of the Ten Commandments and the second, although these form the basis of the faith; for in truth the letters and the words are like dead bodies, only the spirit, the spirit of God hovers over Scripture. . . . It is (the spirit) which keeps the nation alive, raising it as an ensign to the nations. . . ."<sup>77</sup>

Schorr's contribution to biblical scholarship is his suggestion that an examination of biblical quotations in Jewish literature (Mishnah, Talmud, Midrashim and medieval texts) indicates that there were a large number of *variae* in the period before the invention of the printing press. Extant texts reflect the readings of the early printers of the Bible and could be altered or amended to render a more accurate

<sup>76</sup> החלוץ 2, pp. 56-58.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.* I, p. 98.

meaning. He did not hesitate to propose emendations even to the Torah text.<sup>78</sup>

Schorr also wrote several scholarly studies to justify his reformist views. Among these are his analysis of the rabbinical designation of *למשה מסיני*,<sup>79</sup> the evolution of the custom of wearing tefilin,<sup>80</sup> and the circumcision of proselytes.<sup>81</sup> Similarly, a number of the manuscripts which he published were motivated by his radical views in that they reflect antitraditionalist views.<sup>82</sup> Likewise in an attempt to discredit the doctrine of talmudic infallibility, he wrote the series of articles entitled *דבר בעתו*,<sup>83</sup> which have already been mentioned, and several articles "demonstrating" that the Jerusalem Talmud is superior to the Babylonian Talmud.<sup>84</sup>

Attention must also be drawn to two pioneering, scholarly theses which Schorr proposed and which to this day have not been thoroughly explored. He was among the first Jewish scholars to suggest that Zoroastrianism had influenced rabbinic Judaism. Schorr was originally attracted by the idea that Jewish angelology and daemonology was of foreign origin and thus not inherently Jewish,<sup>85</sup> but his scholarly imagination led him to explore many aspects of the interrelationship between Zoroastrianism and Judaism. Zoroastrian studies were then at their beginnings and hardly readily available to a self-taught scholar sitting in Brody, yet Schorr was *au courant* with the latest linguistic and historical literature on the subject. The state of Zoroastrian studies at the time and Schorr's *haskalah*-influenced penchant for discovering philological analogies, which were often based on mere coincidence, led him to posit a number of grotesque and hardly plausible theories. However, his articles (really books) on the subject are full of fruitful insights which should be pursued.<sup>86</sup>

Similarly his studies of the use of Greek in midrashic literature,

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 101 f. Schorr's important articles in biblical studies are, *פשטיה דקרא*, ודרך בעלי התלמוד בפירוש הכתובים חקירה על העתק התנ"ך שבידינו וכו', *ibid.* 1, pp. 95-116; *ibid.* 3, pp. 89-118; and תוכחה מנולה, *ibid.* 5, pp. 75-91.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.* 4, pp. 28-50.

<sup>80</sup> תפלין, *ibid.* 5, pp. 11-26.

<sup>81</sup> מילה לגר, *ibid.* 11, pp. 67-74.

<sup>82</sup> שירת הלונה על הרבנים, *ibid.* 1, p. 159, and אלה רבדי יוסף עלילו, *ibid.*, pp. 160 f.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.* 1, pp. 47-65; 2, pp. 37-58; 5, pp. 31-54.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.* 6, pp. 47-55; 11, pp. 1-7. His other articles on the Jerusalem Talmud are *ibid.* 8, pp. 120-126; 10, pp. 60-68; 11, p. 134; 13, pp. 1-24 and pp. 24-46.

<sup>85</sup> He anticipated Kohut's article "Über die jüdische Angelologie und Dämonologie" in the *Deutsche morgenländische Abhandlungen* 4 (1866), no. 3, which he incidentally reviewed in Leopold Löw's *Ben Chananja* 9 (1866), pp. 325-328.

<sup>86</sup> Schorr's articles in this field appear in ההלוח 7, pp. 1-88; 8, pp. 1-120.

although likewise flawed by his *maskil*-philology, are pregnant with original scholarly insights. As shoddy as most of his analogies seem to be, the basic idea that the *darshanim* often used Hebrew-Greek puns seems to be sound and should be reexamined by scholars having a sounder philological training than he had.<sup>87</sup> A polemical critique of Schorr's Greek philology was published by Meir Bistriz-Cohen, an orthodox opponent of Schorr's,<sup>88</sup> but its author knew less Greek than Schorr.

By the time volume 6 (1861) of *החלוץ* had appeared, the handful of *maskilim* who had rallied about Schorr had abandoned him. Only Geiger had remained and he was not a Galician. Even at the start, most contributors, including Geiger, published scholarly and philological rather than polemical articles. Only Abraham Krochmal and Schorr propagated the radical cause.

As already indicated, Schorr's failure to attract contributors can in no small part be attributed to his difficult personality. His eccentricities increased as he grew older. They were aggravated by his loneliness after his wife's death in 1863<sup>89</sup> and by the tragic death, ten years later, of his son Jacob, a successful young business man who had settled in Odessa but moved to Paris shortly before his death.<sup>90</sup> Hirsch Seidel relates that sometime before 1865 Schorr became ill with "epilepsy" as a result of his difficult scholarly labors. His wife's death may also have been a contributing factor to whatever nervous ailment he may have suffered.<sup>91</sup>

By the 1870's Schorr was a lonely, aging scholar whose learned friends had either left his city or had died. He maintained his contacts with some of the leading Jewish scholars of the day, among whom were Solomon Buber, Joseph Derenbourg, Heinrich Graetz<sup>92</sup> and Leopold Zunz. His admiration for Zunz, with whom he became personally acquainted in 1866 (?) during an extended stay in Leipzig, knew no bounds. In a lead-article which he published in *עברי אנכי*

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.* 9, part 1, pp. 1-77; part 2, pp. 1-83; 10, pp. 1-32, 46-70, 109-110.

<sup>88</sup> *ביעור טיט היין* (Pressburg, 1889). For Schorr's negative opinion of Bistriz-Cohen, see his letters to Felsenthal in *HUCA* 28 (1957), Hebrew Section, p. 25. A detailed listing of Schorr's articles was published by me in *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 2 (1955-56), pp. 20-36.

<sup>89</sup> *החלוץ* 6, (1865), frontispiece.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.* 9, pp. iii-viii.

<sup>91</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>92</sup> The Shwadran collection at the National Library at the Hebrew University contains several letters to Solomon Buber and one to Zunz. Letters from Derenbourg and Graetz are mentioned in a letter to Felsenthal, *HUCA* 28 (1957), Hebrew Section, p. 21.

on the occasion of Zunz's ninetieth birthday he wrote that he first read his book in 1832 as a young man and used it as a model for his subsequent scholarly articles.<sup>93</sup> In a letter which he sent Zunz on October 5, 1874, apparently in response to a note of condolence on the death of his son Jacob, Schorr wrote: "You are my father and I am your genuine disciple. You were my guide and I your faithful heir, appreciative of your goodness."<sup>94</sup> Schorr also contributed an article to the *Festschrift* published in honor of Zunz's ninetieth birthday.<sup>95</sup>

Brody folklore is full of stories about Schorr's miserliness and meanness. He refused to assist his brother Naftali, who lived in poverty in Lemberg.<sup>96</sup> He himself lived the life of a recluse with an elderly niece, Mrs. Leiblinger, who served as his housekeeper, and with a manservant. He walked about the streets of Brody in shabby clothes, hoarding every penny he earned. By the time he died in 1895, he had amassed a fortune worth 140,000 Austrian florins which he bequeathed, together with his superb library, to the Vienna Rabbinical Seminary. According to another Brody tradition, he always dressed in the same clothes, which he had worn on the day he received the telegram informing him of his son's death, and ate the same diet of buckwheat (*kashe*) and gizzard every day, because he had been eating that particular dish when the fateful news arrived.<sup>97</sup>

Despite his antisocial behavior, Schorr continued his scholarly work with deep dedication. Sometime between 1874 and 1876 he issued the supplement to volume 9 of *החלוץ*, which contains a rejoinder to an article against him published by Kirchheim in *השחר*.<sup>98</sup> The supplement also contains an attack upon the *שומר ישראל*, a pro-German organization of *maskilim* with whose views Schorr usually agreed.<sup>99</sup> In 1879, he became embroiled in a fierce controversy with a newly formed orthodox party, *מחויקי הדת*, and for several years pub-

<sup>93</sup> עברי אנכי 20 (1883-4), pp. 339 f.

<sup>94</sup> In the letters to Zunz, Shwadran collection.

<sup>95</sup> הלכות גדולות, הלכות פסוקות, הלכות קצובות, *Jubelschrift zum neunzigsten Geburtstag des Dr. Leopold Zunz* (Berlin, 1884), pp. 125-141. Reprinted in *החלוץ* 12, pp. 81-94.

<sup>96</sup> See G. Bader, יהושע השיל שור, in *הפרדס* 3 (1895), p. 181; Leo Herzberg Frankel's necrology in *Popular-wissenschaftliche Monatsblätter* 15 (1895), pp. 245 f.; and Josef Margoshes, עראיערונגען פון מײן לעבען (New York, 1936), p. 55.

<sup>97</sup> This tradition was related to me separately by both Gershom Bader shortly before his death and, in *יבלח״א*, by S. J. Agnon and Prof. Dov Sadan. See also N. Gelber, חולדות ברודי ויהודיה, p. 218.

<sup>98</sup> Kirchheim's article appeared in *השחר* 5 (1874), pp. 104-109. Schorr refers to his rejoinder in his first letter to Bernhard Felsenthal (September 1, 1875). See *HUCA* 28 (1957), Hebrew section, p. 3.

<sup>99</sup> Supplement to *החלוץ* 9, pp. 13 f.

lished many diatribes against its program and leaders in Brody's Hebrew weekly עברי אנכי.

Schorr played an important role in עברי אנכי during this period and appears to have been the main advisor to its editor Jacob Weber. Young Weber had inherited the journal after his father's death in 1876 but, unlike his conservative father, identified himself with the more liberalized and Germanized *haskalah* elements in Brody. His Hebrew knowledge was rather scant by the standards of the day, and in all likelihood he solicited the aid of Brody's famous old *maskil* who became a regular contributor until 1887.<sup>100</sup> Joseph Margoshes attributed Schorr's involvement with Jacob Weber to the feebleness of old age, "his spirit had weakened and he was an עובר בטל."<sup>101</sup>

His main contributions to the journal were a series of satires, written for the most part in verse form although sometimes in prose, which appeared either under the heading of [אני שור] רשפי א"ש or אי"ש. These were directed against the party מחזיקי הדת, which was organized by extreme orthodox and hasidic circles in Galicia with the encouragement of Rabbi Joshua Rokeach, the Belzer Rav,<sup>103</sup> and Rabbi Simon Schreiber (Sofer), the Rabbi of Cracow and the son of the famous חת"ם סופר (Moses Schreiber). Among the leading laymen of the movement were Aryeh Shmuel Margoshes, Moses Weismann Chajes and Mordecai Pelz (Ensner), a *maskil* who became a fanatic *Belzer hasid*.<sup>104</sup>

מחזיקי הדת was founded in Lemberg in 1878.<sup>105</sup> One of Simon Sofer's early circulars is addressed to every Jewish community in Galicia and calls upon them to oppose the plans of the שומר ישראל Society to establish a modern rabbinical seminary in Lemberg.<sup>106</sup>

<sup>100</sup> Evidence of Schorr's role is to be found in an outrageous diatribe against Schorr which appeared in מחזיקי הדת 2 (1880), p. 2 (July 1, 1880), in which Jacob is called עבדו הנער העברי. The vicious attack mocks Schorr's physical infirmities (he limped and was smooth-faced). Weber reprinted the attack in עברי אנכי 16 (1880), p. 334. See also רשפי אי"ש, no. 32 (*ibid.* 16 [1880], pp. 89 f. and p. 342).

<sup>101</sup> *Supra*, n. 96, p. 57. Margoshes's father was a leading figure in the מחזיקי הדת and Margoshes is therefore hardly objective.

<sup>102</sup> For a full listing, see my bibliography of Schorr's works in *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 2 (1955-56), pp. 20-36. Cf. G. Kressel in קריית ספר 18 (1941), p. 233.

<sup>103</sup> Not Rebbe; see Margoshes, *supra*, n. 96, p. 20.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15. Pelz's father, Moses Essner, was a well-known *maskil*.

<sup>105</sup> See Josef Naftali Stern's biography of Simon Sofer in ספר מכתב סופר (Jerusalem, 1952), p. 52b.

<sup>106</sup> The call for the seminary was published in *Der Israelit*, the organ of the שומר ישראל Society, the pro-German *Haskalah* party (1878, no. 13).

All their thought is to turn the entire land [i. e., Galicia] to heresy. . . . At this first meeting they decided to build a seminary or *Vorbereitungsschulen* to prepare rebellious rabbis and teachers. . . . They will be taught gentile subjects most of the days and will only study Bible, Mishnah, Gemarah and Poskim for ten hours per week. From these will be received rabbis for all the holy congregations of our land. Go and see the achievements of the seminaries established in . . . Prussia and Italy which have spawned rabbis (spelt רעבני"ם = gluttons) and judges (spelt מורי הרעות = "teachers of evil" [i. e., הַרְעוּת] or "of vanity" [i. e., הַרְעוּת] instead of מורי הוראות) and preachers (פרדינער not דרשנים), foxes who ruin the vineyards of the Lord of Hosts, who have lost their faith and who publicly deny the oral law as they privately do the written law; they are heretics and libertines who call themselves philosophers and scholars. It is they who have turned the majority of the congregations of Germany to heresy. . . . this society which calls itself שומר ישראל aims to appoint them as rabbis (מורי הוראות) and in their shadow they shall live among the gentiles a life of lawlessness (הפקר).<sup>107</sup>

Simon Sofer calls upon the leaders of Galician orthodoxy to sign a manifesto against this plan for presentation to the authorities.

A second objective of the מחוקי הדת was to oppose the candidates that the שומר ישראל Society supported for election to the Austrian parliament and the Galician Sejm. The organization of Galician orthodoxy for political action reflected a subtle change in orthodox circles. Hitherto the orthodox had ignored political problems, allowing the *maskilim* to represent them *vis-à-vis* the Austrian-Hungarian officialdom.

In the inner politics of Galicia, the *maskilim* were Germanizers and supported the pro-Austrian constitutional party. In contrast, the leaders of the orthodox group allied themselves to the Polish party,<sup>108</sup> and thus threatened to disrupt the political alliance between the *maskilim* and the Austrian regime which had existed since the beginning of the century. As a candidate from the district of Kolomeya-Senyatin and Buczacz they nominated Simon Sofer, who, to the dismay of the *maskilim*, was elected to parliament in 1879.

Schorr and Jacob Weber of course supported the שומר ישראל Society, advocated the establishment of the Rabbinic Seminary and warned that the unholy alliance with the "reactionary" Poles would

<sup>107</sup> ספר מכתב סופר, pp. 52b-53a.

<sup>108</sup> The Polish party, called the *Club*, cultivated the orthodox leadership. Mr. Dobzhansky, the editor of the Polish paper *Gazeta Narodowa*, was instrumental in establishing this alliance.

endanger the political position of the Jewish community, since the Polish majority could more easily afford to ignore the Jews while the Austrians needed their support against the Polish nationalists.<sup>109</sup> Schorr accused the מחזיקי הדרת of making alliances with rightist, Catholic elements in the Austro-Hungarian parliament.<sup>110</sup> He criticized their attempt to close the modern Jewish school which the *maskilim* had established in Galicia with state support. The Rabbis and the Catholic clergy, he asserted, agreed that it was preferable for the children of enlightened Jewish families to attend gentile schools and assimilate completely rather than Jewish schools which combined a general education with Jewish studies. The children of the orthodox would thus not be "contaminated" by *haskalah* teachers.

Schorr was particularly vehement against Jews who supported non-Jewish candidates in districts where Jews formed a majority. In this respect only could he be described as "a fervent Jewish nationalist."<sup>111</sup> As an antiromantic he opposed the budding חייבת ציון movement, the pre-Zionist romanticism of Peretz Smolenskin and, of course, all orthodox attempts to collect money for the חלוקה.<sup>112</sup> It is against this background of inner Galician Jewish politics that we must read the rather obscure verses and articles which make up רשפי א"ש and which are replete with veiled allusions to persons and events that were familiar to Hebrew readers of the period.

The satirical verse which Schorr wrote for עברי אנכי<sup>113</sup> is a literary *genre* which critics have ignored. Schorr followed a medieval literary tradition which was revived in the polemical literature of the *haskalah*. The orthodox who quickly adopted many literary techniques of the *maskilim* in their battles against them also took up this form. Their journal מחזיקי הדרת contains many such verses, often penned by M. L. Harmelin (who also wrote a book against Schorr),<sup>114</sup> leveled against the *maskilim*.

Schorr's satirical verses were directed against the rabbinic and

<sup>109</sup> Typical attacks on the מחפלים ("Polanizers") are in עברי אנכי 16 (1879-80), pp. 61, 231, 358, 385; 18 (1881-82), pp. 151 f.

<sup>110</sup> For example *ibid.* 18 (1881-82), p. 200, he quotes an imaginary letter by Simon Sofer: . . . ובפרט הכומרים הוהיקים . . . לא ישיבו פני דיקם . . . הכומר הוהיק אבא [פטר] נרייטער הוא שלי, רבי הפולנים הם שלי.

<sup>111</sup> Seligman in *JE* XI, p. 109b; Klausner: *op. cit.*, IV<sup>2</sup>, p. 75.

<sup>112</sup> Schorr has many attacks on Smolenskin and the חייבת ציון movement. Examples are to be found in עברי אנכי 18 (1880-81), pp. 127 f., and 19 (1881-82), pp. 165-167. Attacks on the חלוקה appear *ibid.* 18, pp. 71-73, 127 f., 165.

<sup>113</sup> In החלוץ they are called גרייטע בסימא (1887), pp. 125-128, and 13, (1889), pp. 129 ff.

<sup>114</sup> ספר החולץ (Lemberg 1862).



lay-leaders of *מחזיקי הדת* (particularly against Simon Sofer),<sup>115</sup> moderate *maskilim*<sup>116</sup> and German orthodox leaders.<sup>117</sup> It would take a separate article to identify all the allusions to events, persons and movements that played a role not only in Galician Jewish life of the time but also in the *haskalah* of Eastern Europe.

With this battle against the orthodox Schorr's reformist activity came to a close. His intensive participation in *עברי אנכי* ended in 1882, but he continued to write sporadically for this periodical until 1888 when he also published the last (13th) volume of *החלוץ*.<sup>118</sup> We know, however, that he continued his literary activity at least until 1890. In July of that year he informed Bernhard Felsenthal that volume 14 of *החלוץ* was almost ready for the printer. This manuscript was preserved until it was lost or destroyed during the Nazi holocaust.<sup>119</sup>

An interesting, if ancillary, aspect of Schorr's career is his correspondence with Bernhard Felsenthal during his twilight years (1875–1890). The letters not only indicate his influence upon a leading American Reform rabbi, but through him, upon several significant American rabbis to whom Felsenthal sold copies of *החלוץ*. These include Max Lilienthal, Morris Spitz, Solomon Adler, Benjamin Szold, Kaufmann Kohler and perhaps others. The correspondence also indicates that Schorr remained an unshaken religious liberal who expressed his vague hope that the unfulfilled dreams which he had for Reform in Europe might very well be realized in the United States.<sup>120</sup>

### III.

Schorr lived beyond eighty. By the time of his death in 1895, the reformist *haskalah* was no longer a major factor in the Jewish life of Eastern Europe. The religious question had been by-passed, for the time being, by the new generation of Hebrew writers. Religious ref-

<sup>115</sup> Also against Joshua Rokeach of Belz, Samuel Margoshes, Mordecai Pelz and many others. The attacks of Simon Sofer are too numerous to list, but these are a few of the more significant ones: *עברי אנכי* 15, pp. 344, 387–8; 16, pp. 133 f., 190, 254 f.

<sup>116</sup> Isaac Baer Levinson, Eliezer Zweifel, Peretz Smolenskin, Yehiel Brill.

<sup>117</sup> Azriel Hildesheimer, M. Lehmann and Samson Raphael Hirsch.

<sup>118</sup> In 1888, he appears in *עברי אנכי* with renewed frequency.

<sup>119</sup> For details see *HUCA* 28 (1957), Hebrew Section, p. 25, n. 10. Seidel says it contained an introduction to *Jerushalmi Berakhoth* which Schorr wrote at the urging of Heinrich Graetz; cf. *HUCA* 28, p. 26.

<sup>120</sup> *HUCA* 28 (1957), pp. 7, 18.

ormation no longer interested an intellectual community which felt that religion itself had become obsolete, and which turned to the exciting, new secular solutions to the Jewish problem whether they were Zionist, Socialist or Yiddish-nationalist.

Schorr, of course, had influence on Lilienblum who had dreamed of a religious reformation in Russia before the traumatic pogroms of the 1880's propelled him into *Hibbat Zion*. Judah Leib Gordon, the last and greatest poet of the *haskalah*, also considered himself a disciple, but after 1880 Gordon's views, too, no longer interested the new generation of Hebrew readers who were by then converted to the Zionist cause.

Schorr died an unregenerate *maskil* and reformist. The epitaph which he himself composed for his tombstone proclaimed the philosophy which he held to his dying day:

פ"נ יהושע העשיל (החלוץ)  
 בן ר' שלום שכנא שור  
 מיום עמדו על דעתו עד רדתו בור  
 לו לחם שערים עם מורדי אור  
 אחלי יהי זכרו שמור לדור ודור.<sup>121</sup>

<sup>121</sup> This is Seidel's version and not the one cited in Klausner, IV<sup>2</sup>, p. 77, and in N. Gelber's *תולדות יהודי ברודי*, p. 218, n. 231.