

Eastern European Jewish community and were committed to the traditional way of life made them more reliable, in the eyes of the Jewish public, than other individuals who grew up in southern and the more central regions of Russia.

Although their paper's emphasis on internal community matters caused them to view world events through a Jewish prism, the editors' high degree of familiarity with and sensitivity to the socio-political and spiritual problems of the Jews in Eastern and Central Europe enabled them to reexamine the primary assumptions of traditional Jewish society. Rejecting the separation of traditional Jewish culture from the evolving realities of European society, the two put forth a vision of Jewish modernization, treating two sets of issues: tradition versus *Haskalah* and the Jews' emancipation versus their national revival. Although other Jewish leaders sought to develop models in which both goals in each respective set could be realized, Gordon (and to a certain extent Silbermann) was the most influential.⁴

Gordon was far more a man of the world than Silbermann, possessing the better Jewish and general education. Yet Silbermann was more generally respected—being awarded medals for his public service by the Prussian government. As a professional team, the two men complemented each other: Silbermann was occupied chiefly with the financial and political aspects of publishing *Ha-Maggid* and Gordon was in charge of the paper's content. Nevertheless, it was the evolution of Gordon's national consciousness, as expressed in *Ha-Maggid* from the 1860s to 1886, that deserves the greater focus here.

From 1860 to 1880, known as the period of the forerunners of Zionism, and through the time of the *Hibbat-Ziyyon* movement, considered to be a reaction against the pogroms of 1881–1882, Gordon was among the important figures who played a central role in developing a Jewish ideology responsive to the times. Other activists such as the rabbis Kalisher and Alkalai, or the socialist thinker Moses Hess, initially played vital roles but died before the beginning of the second period.

Ha-Maggid's self-proclaimed *raison d'être* was to strengthen world Jewish solidarity through the medium of the Hebrew language, which would be, said Silbermann, “the common denominator binding the scattered children of Israel.”⁵ This tendency to promote Jewish cultural-national awareness, a sense of peoplehood through a common language, can be seen in Silbermann's establishment of the Mekizei Nirdamim Society (1862), which published rare medieval Hebrew manuscripts.

Gordon first addressed himself to the possibility of large-scale Jewish settlement in Eretz Israel as a result of the founding of the Society for the Settlement of the Land of Israel (Frankfurt, 1860). He applauded the plan to establish agricultural settlements in Palestine for

Jews who were already there and for those who were going to come. He did raise some doubts about the viability of the plan, as the Jews residing in Palestine were far removed from agricultural pursuits, and the Jews from Europe, he predicted, would be deterred from coming to a land which still lacked minimum physical security. Only if certain protective measures were taken by the Ottoman régime, Silbermann believed, could the program have the necessary firm foundation.⁶ (*Ha-Maggid*, and its readership at that time, still evaluated all Jewish initiatives to settle Israel in terms of their likelihood to make the existing Jewish community there productive and self-supportive.)⁷

A year after Silbermann's initial response to the activities of the Society, several articles in *Ha-Maggid* acknowledged that these ideas opposed the religious points of view—as epitomized by the verse in Psalms 127:1, “Unless the Lord builds a house, its builders labor in vain on it”—that a Jewish return to the land of Israel had to be brought about by God's initiative alone. This traditional view of redemption from exile prevailed among Orthodox Jews but was rejected by Gordon. He urged the Society to publish Rabbi Kalisher's book, *Derishat Ziryon* (A Concerned Inquiry about Zion),⁸ whose argument, also based on rabbinic sources, refuted this view.

In the summer of 1862, when Moses Hess's *Rome and Jerusalem* appeared, Gordon openly and enthusiastically supported the book. He cast the author in the role of a *ba'al teshuvah* (a returning lost son), in order to denounce the Reform movement's attitude toward the Jewish tradition, rather than emphasizing the book's subtitle, *Die Letzte Nationalitätsfrage* (The Last Problem of Nationalism).⁹ It is possible that Gordon played down the main thrust of Hess's book—Jewish nationalism—either because of a lack of full agreement with Silbermann or because he himself was still ambivalent about the consequences of a national-territorial Jewish position.¹⁰

In January of 1863, *Ha-Maggid* clearly still held that political integration of the Jewish community into general society was both possible and desirable. The process of Jewish emancipation in Europe was seen as one involving more and more countries—in all of which, wrote the editors, Jews must comply with the demand of their host nations that they acquire a general education and adopt more productive livelihoods in exchange for their liberation.¹¹ In April 1863, however, Gordon came out with a dramatic series entitled *Be-Shuva ve-Nahat Tivashfun* (You Shall Triumph by Stillness and Quiet; Isaiah 30:15), in which he publicly began to articulate nationalist ideas.¹² In an unexpected switch, given his reaction to *Rome and Jerusalem*, Gordon now contended the Jewish settlement of Palestine should be envisioned as the cornerstone to the national-political redemption of the Jewish people in his time.

What brought Gordon to express such ideas publicly? Some histori-

ans have ascribed this development to the influence of Hess and Kalisher.¹³ Yet Gordon's nationalistic articles were published more than six months after the appearance of *Derishat Ziyon*, and we have already mentioned his reaction to *Rome and Jerusalem*. The *immediate* factors influencing Gordon to call for the re-establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine were the 1863 Polish uprising against Russia, when Jews were caught between the warring sides; and the expressions of Christian support for a Jewish return to Palestine. The real cause of Gordon's metamorphosis—political events rather than a religious debate—can readily be seen in articles and editorials from this time of upheaval.¹⁴

Following the example of Hess, Gordon aimed his attack at the two poles of the Jewish community: the Orthodox and the Reform. He accused the Orthodox of rejecting reality by refusing to be open to the demands of modern life, and chastised Reform Jews for their unjustifiable haste in jettisoning Jewish tradition.¹⁵ The attitudes of both groups, Gordon wrote, had had a disastrous effect on both facets of the Jewish cause: the immediate political and civil integration of the Jews of Europe and their ultimate redemption in their own land. By rejecting *Haskalah*, Orthodoxy undermined the Jewish struggle for emancipation—conditional, Gordon insisted, upon some degree of compliance with general societal norms—and destroyed Jewish prospects for a final redemption in Palestine, an outcome he regarded as dependent upon the goodwill of the dominant European powers.¹⁶

The Reform movement, on the other hand, by rejecting national redemption in Palestine, ignored the fact that European Jews were regarded as foreigners in their lands of birth. Moreover, Gordon wrote, Reform Jews were losing their "temporary success" (i.e., Christian support of emancipation) due to their misunderstanding of the psychology of "decent people" among the Gentiles, who would dissociate themselves from a people who fled their own heritage.¹⁷

By arguing along these lines, Gordon did not intend to disparage the hopes of many Jews for emancipation, though he considered their goal to be a "temporary achievement," limited to only a few countries. He stressed also that he had no desire to upset the politically and civilly more advanced position of Western Jews.¹⁸ Nevertheless, he stated his personal hope that the Jews would regain their homeland from the ruins of the Ottoman Empire, as had other peoples who succeeded in throwing off the imperial Turkish yoke.¹⁹

Gordon, who had grown up in the midst of Jewish Orthodoxy, did not romanticize it as did Hess and Ernst Laharanne (an official in the court of Napoleon III, who wrote a book advocating the return of Jews to Palestine).²⁰ Rather, he vehemently rejected any Orthodox argument against Jews returning to Zion that was based on halakhic or other tradi-

tional norms.²¹ The national revival of the Jews was of interest to the entire world, Gordon argued; as the Jews had contributed so much to Western civilization, they could bring enlightenment to Asian and African nations.²² The Jewish national revival was not a pipe dream but an actual ongoing process. He pointed to the establishment of new international Jewish organizations as a sign of this phenomenon's vitality. Gordon's most important assertion at this time lies in his evaluation of the historical function of the society for the settlement of the Land of Israel as a key to the final redemption of the Jewish people, via the founding of an independent Jewish state in Palestine.

During the years 1863–64, the dying-out of the Society for the Settlement of the Land of Israel aroused the lament of *Ha-Maggid*. Gordon had hoped that cooperation in furthering Jewish nationalist ideas would overcome the dissension between the different branches of Jewish society, thus uniting the traditional and *maskilic* camps ("the Pious and Enlightened").²³ In reality, the nationalist awakening was not strong enough to unite even the moderates in each camp. Jewish leaders in the large Western European cities (i.e., Berlin, Breslau, Paris, and London) who appeared to have been caught up in this awakening did not succeed in generating sufficient enthusiasm for it in their communities and, in the end, deserted the cause.²⁴ Gordon's disillusionment was great. He blamed the failure on the Society's leadership, especially on Moses Montefiore and Cremieux who, he understood only years later, were figureheads whose public activities did not stem from an authentic nationalist commitment.

In an 1865 article, Gordon surveyed the situation of Jews in various countries and waxed optimistic about the chances for civilian integration in the Diaspora. Clearly, at that time, his hopes for an immediate Jewish national revival in the land of Israel were dissolving. Instead of territorial redemption, Gordon's new paradigm called for a Jewish self-identity based on historical memories. "This nation still holds its particular spiritual treasure: its wondrous generation and events, which are deeply inscribed in its heart and make it a living soul," he wrote.²⁵ Gordon imagined that this collective Jewish soul could be revived in the Diaspora.

About six years after his first, Gordon came out with another set of nationalist proclamations. The explanation for this time lag is that, since 1863, nothing significant had happened to cause him to hearken back to earlier ideas. The Society for the Settlement of the Land of Israel simply disintegrated, a subject on which he editorialized, and the hoped-for rapprochement between the *maskilim* and the Orthodox had not occurred.²⁶

When Gordon did return to his nationalist ideas, it was in response to the Reform synods²⁷ in Leipzig (1869) and, ultimately, to the prepara-

tory convention in Kassel (1868).²⁸ His renewed focus on an improved quality of life for Jews in Europe stemmed from the failure of proto-Zionist activity to engender large-scale Jewish support, and the optimism that was sparked in him by the final stages of Jewish emancipation in Prussia, Austria, and Hungary.²⁹ Although buoyed by their achieving an equitable legal status, Gordon was distressed by Prussian Jewry's increasing secularization, and reissued the call for a synthesis of Jewish tradition and enlightenment as a means to stem the tide of assimilation and prevent the expansion of the radical *Haskalah* in Eastern Europe.³⁰

At the outset of 1869, the mood of *Ha-Maggid* editorials underwent another dramatic change. No longer sanguine, Gordon's writing reflected the desperate straits of Russian Jewry subsequent to the famine of 1868–1869, and the deteriorating legal and social status of Russian and Romanian Jewries, in the second half of the decade. *Ha-Maggid* played an important role in discussing these crises and suggested two possible solutions: the transformation of Russian Jewry into a more productive element within Russia, or its emigration to America.³¹ Emigration to Palestine was not discussed.

Beginning on July 14, 1869, Gordon initiated a new series of articles under the title, "Davar be-Ito: Al Derekh ha-Ye'ud ha-Leumi shel ha-Uma ha-Yisraelit" (A Timely Word on the Path of the National Destiny of the Jewish Nation). In this series, Gordon presented an overview of the trends and ideas competing to shape the social and spiritual future of the Jewish community.³² He launched a concentrated attack on Abraham Geiger, one of the leaders of the German Reform movement. Geiger had rejected both the traditional and the reformulated idea of the return to Zion and the national resurrection of the Jews, arguing that these anachronistic concepts had no basis in reality nor in the Jewish heart. He wanted any mention of national return/renewal stricken from the Jewish liturgy.

Gordon made his opposition to Geiger's proposal clear by calling for an international gathering of Jews in Palestine to actualize the national revival. He contended that the Messianic hope was central to all of Jewish history and claimed that Geiger's ideas bore a close resemblance to those of anti-Semites who wanted to see the liquidation of Jews as a national entity. In addition to his direct sallies upon Geiger, Gordon attempted to refute the Reform idea of the existence of a Jewish mission in Europe, insisting it was the French Enlightenment that guided European nations in the nineteenth century, and not the influence of Judaism or of the *Haskalah*.³³ (Those who argued for full Jewish integration into European society did so by essaying the special position of the Jews as a people with a mission to enlighten and civilize their Gentile compeers, while most of those who argued for the retention of a

Jewish national identity rejected the notion of any special privileges, preferring to base their claim to normalization on equality.)

Rejecting the Reform contention that emancipation depended on a revision of the traditional Jewish way of life, Gordon maintained that Jewish emancipation was part of a general process affecting European states, one that was beneficial to the Jews and other ethnic minority groups. The Jewish hope for a national renaissance was not outdated and therefore invalid, but was, in accordance with the spirit of the times, part of the regeneration of the European nations.³⁴ A national awakening was integral to the modernization of Jewish society. Thus the Reformers were contradicting themselves in eschewing nationalism, as they claimed to be modernizers of the Jewish community.³⁵ To reinforce his argument, Gordon cited the Gentile millenarian ideas voiced in his day, which tied the redemption of the world to the Jewish return to Zion.³⁶

In conclusion, Gordon stated, the Reform rejection of Jewish nationalism had no basis or justification "in our holy Torah, in reason, or in the spirit of the times."³⁷ He maintained the Jewish exile was a result of sin and its punishment and had nothing to do with any mission to the nations of the world. The Reform movement, in the eyes of Gordon, was merely another manifestation of nihilism (as was Marxism), an ideology whose only content was "materialistic freedom," which it understood as "the ultimate aim of mankind."³⁸ To support his theory, Gordon cited two main sources: Laharannes's treatise and *Rome and Jerusalem*. From the former he quoted the passages criticizing the *Haskalah* and its ideological offshoots, particularly the tenet that the Jews abandon their messianic hopes for a return to Eretz Israel. He also quoted Laharanne's criticism of the European nations' attitude toward Jews, as well as the author's belief in France's promise to help realize a Jewish return to Zion and in the mission of the Jews to promulgate Western culture in the East.³⁹ Gordon also cited passages from *Rome and Jerusalem* rejecting the *Haskalah's* political and social advocacy of Reform and assimilation.⁴⁰ He used Hess to attack the *Haskalah* movement in Eastern Europe, which placed all its hopes on the productivity of the Jews as the total solution to the Jewish problem in Russia and, in so doing, Gordon deserted the initial stand of *Ha-Maggid*, which previously had strongly advocated Jewish productivity.

By way of practical suggestions, Gordon proposed the establishment of agricultural colonies in Palestine (an idea supported by Silbermann nine years before) for the suffering Jews of Romania, Serbia, Persia, and Morocco. Contrary to prior recommendations in *Ha-Maggid* to solve Eastern European Jewish social problems by settling Jews in America or even in colonies in the interior of Russia, the only desirable solution

was, as Gordon now reported, Jewish settlement in Palestine. Unlike many of his cohorts who did not distinguish between forms of support for Palestine resettlement, Gordon urged the Alliance Israelite Universelle to change its philanthropic stance toward Palestine to a nationalistic one.⁴¹

More than anyone else in the 1860s, Gordon was influenced by Hess and was the first thinker to make extensive use of *Rome and Jerusalem* in developing his nationalistic doctrine. He laid great emphasis on the fact that even a secularist like Hess agreed the settlers of Eretz Israel should behave in accordance with Jewish ritual law.⁴² The importance of Hess's writing to Gordon has been overlooked by historians, leading them to conclude Hess's Zionism was just an episode that left no lasting impression on his contemporaries, save Peretz Smolenskin.

Reactions to Gordon's articles, written at the close of the decade, varied. Advocates of the Society for the Settlement of the Land of Israel strongly supported him.⁴³ His criticism of the spiritual and lay leadership of religious Russian Jewry, however, worked against his efforts to attract that community to his ideas.⁴⁴ He was even accused by it of being sympathetic to the Reform movement.⁴⁵

Gordon was not discouraged. On the contrary, he reiterated his views in another series of articles, issued under the title "*Devarim Ahadim al Dvar ha-Yi'ud ha-Le'umi shel Am Yisrael*" (Some Comments on the Question of the National Destiny of the Jewish People),⁴⁶ in which he declared he had not come to his nationalist ideas out of pessimism over Jewish existence in the Diaspora,⁴⁷ but instead arrived at his views through an ideological negation of exile. He no longer justified, nor allowed for the justification of, Jewish exile according to traditional religious or universalist ideas. For Gordon, the Jews in exile were now like Gypsies.⁴⁸ This was his first direct expression of a nationalism based on the idea of normalization of Jewish life, which played such a large role in later Zionist thought.⁴⁹

Shortly after the Reform conferences at Kassel and Leipzig, an effort was made by Rabbi Zvi Hirsch Kalisher to establish the Society for the Settlement of the Land of Israel in Berlin. Not only did this initiative fail to elicit the support of German Orthodoxy, but German Orthodoxy tried to undermine it. Rabbi A. Hildesheimer, the recently appointed rabbi of the Congregation Adath Israel of Berlin (1869), established the Hevrath Israel Organization, the purpose of which was to organize material support of the Jewish community in Israel within the framework of *Tzedakah* (charity). The intention of Hildesheimer was to undermine the national aspirations of Kalisher and his colleagues.⁵⁰ A similar organization was founded by the leaders of the Orthodoxy in Frankfurt. The leaders of the Society for the Settlement of the Land of Israel fell into despair, doubting the chances of the Society ever realizing its aims in

the Land of Israel.⁵¹ In 1871, Rabbi Y. Alkalai traveled to Palestine, intending to revitalize the Society there. However, he met with strong opposition to his plans from both the Sephardic and Ashkenazic communities already in residence.⁵²

Groups of Jews in Romania, the Balkans, and Russia that expressed a willingness to take an active part in carrying out the plans of the Society did not receive the requisite public support. Apparently these setbacks caused Gordon to desist, more or less, in attempting to further his nationalist ideas from 1872 until 1880. Nevertheless, various aspects of his nationalistic thought continued to develop and be expressed. In 1871, Gordon published a series of articles defending the idea of Israel as the Chosen People in the framework of a polemic against the Reform movement.⁵³ He declared certain ethnic, spiritual, and moral characteristics to be peculiar to the Jewish people, and claimed a Jewish uniqueness in the realms of physical health and sanitation. From time to time, Gordon also publicly expressed support for settlement of Israel⁵⁴ and sympathized with the activities of the Moses Montefiore Fund (Keren Mazkeret Moshe Montefiore).⁵⁵

In 1881, Gordon was spurred to action by the rise of racial anti-Semitism in Germany and the Romanian government's evasion of the terms of the Berlin Conference (1878), which required that equal rights be granted to Romania's Jewish population.⁵⁶ Gordon was ahead of his time in regarding the settlement of the Land of Israel as a solution to the anti-Semitism of Europe. In an answer to the Gentile charge that Jews were not engaged in productive work, Gordon wrote "that only in the Land of Israel could the Jewish people be productive."⁵⁷ Although he did not reject the possibility of establishing Jewish agricultural colonies in Russia in order to provide some immediate relief for Jewish poverty and to disprove the anti-Semitic claims, he continued to insist the Jewish future, for the long term, was in the Land of Israel.⁵⁸

In July 1880, Gordon took over ownership of *Ha-Maggid*, declaring that "in our opinion the strengthening and propagation of hope in the national destiny is one of the sacred obligations of the publisher of a Hebrew periodical. It is our duty, and we are going to carry it out."⁵⁹ It is worth noting that around this time (September 1880), Gordon was optimistic about the political future of Russian Jews and even repeated some of his hopes, originally declared in the late 1860s, for political integration of Jews into Russian society.⁶⁰

However, in reaction to anti-Semitic manifestations in Germany, France, and Austro-Hungary, *Ha-Maggid* called for a Jewish national revival. The outbreak of anti-Semitism was attributed to resentment of Jewish efforts toward total social integration into Western European society. As part of the solution, Gordon demanded the Jews define themselves as a nation. He suggested that within the structure of a multi-civic

state, Jewish national rights could be legitimized as could those of other far-flung minorities.⁶¹

It took the April–May 1881 pogrom in Russia to make Gordon refine his previously sketchy nationalist ideas. The foremost change in his thought in the 1880s is to be found in his deep pessimism concerning the physical existence of the Jews in Europe. The fulfillment of Jewish nationalism was no longer envisioned as a natural outgrowth of emancipation but rather the result of its failure. Gordon wrote, “Those who try to adjust their spiritual and nationalist feelings to the surrounding communities are laboring in vain because people like Treitschke, Stoecker, and Henrizi (well-known extreme anti-Semites) have not died and will never die.”⁶² Gordon’s Zionist solution was no longer reserved for suffering Jews in peripheral areas but was also applied to successful Jews who believed they were secure—the Jews of Germany, the Hapsburg Empire, and the Russian Empire. In keeping with this revised outlook, his focus of discussion turned from internal Jewish affairs, such as disputes between traditionalists and Reformers, to the irreparably damaged relations between Jews and the people of the Gentile nations in whose midst they lived. “This [anti-Semitic] hatred is caused by the traits of these malicious and degenerate people. To change their heart is not in our hands.”⁶³

In January 1881, a few months after he purchased *Ha-Maggid*, Gordon invited the young writer Simon Bernfeld to share the editorship with him. As Bernfeld wrote some of the unsigned editorials when the pogroms broke out, it is not easy to identify which ideas are whose.⁶⁴ According to Bernfeld’s memoirs, his explanation for the new anti-Semitism differed from Gordon’s. The latter originally saw this European anti-Semitism as due to economic jealousy over Jewish success and, even more so, Jewish business misconduct.⁶⁵ Now he emphasized that the Jew was a stranger in European society and anti-Semitic hatred stemmed from the nature of Gentiles.⁶⁶ Bernfeld maintained that anti-Semitism occurred independently, regardless of Jewish behavior, being purely a product of economic competition and, from the Gentile’s perspective, the strangeness of the Jew.⁶⁷

Ha-Maggid became the voice of Jewish nationalism, attracting the new generation of nationalist writers at a time when other Hebrew periodicals such as *Ha-Zefirah* (Warsaw) and *Ha-Meliz* (St. Petersburg) still hesitated to support it. Among those who now wrote for the periodical were Isaac Kaminer, Judah Leib Levin, Mordecai ben Hillel ha-Kohen, and Eliezer Ben-Yehuda.⁶⁸ Even before the pogroms in Russia, *Ha-Maggid* had explicitly proclaimed its belief in the need to establish a Jewish political entity in Palestine. Its assumptions were that anti-Semitism was a general phenomenon involving even such progressive states as France and Germany, where hatred of the Jews did not stem from reli-

gious feeling alone but from the belief that Jews had become a burden to European society. By resettling many Jews in Palestine, *Ha-Maggid* suggested, others among their co-religionists might be able to live in peace in Europe. The interest of the European states in getting rid of Jews might lead them to support the reconstruction of Palestine as a Jewish state, where the Jews would be able to develop a flourishing state capable of transmitting Western achievements to Asia. Should the Jews not voluntarily emigrate, *Ha-Maggid* warned, they would be forced to leave Europe.⁶⁹

These ideas were voiced anew when reports of the pogroms reached Lyck.⁷⁰ *Ha-Maggid* was one of the first Jewish periodicals to accept certain anti-Semitic contentions and turn them into nationalistic solutions. It admitted there was a "Jewish problem" in Europe, and the solution was "to gather many of the scattered Jews to their homeland."⁷¹ Even if hatred of the Jews should break out in the Near East, it would not be the racist hatred of Europe, and so would be tolerable.⁷² *Ha-Maggid* attributed the denial of Jewish social (and other) rights in Europe to the fact that the Jews were an ethnic minority. Explaining that such rights were dependent not on the extent of the contribution or the duration of a given group in a country but on their status as a major ethnic group, *Ha-Maggid* insisted that Jews become a majority in their homeland.⁷³

It should be noted that the analyses of Jewish existence in Europe that are usually attributed to Pinsker, Lilenbaum, Nordau, Herzl, Lazare, and others were first developed by Gordon. A pathfinder in the field of practical solutions as well as nationalist thought, he proposed the establishment of an international Jewish congress to deliberate various answers to Jewish problems, as well as to found an emigration society of Palestine.⁷⁴

During the debate over the destination of Jewish émigrés from Russia, Gordon preferred Palestine to Spain or America, arguing that the traditional attachment of Jews to Palestine was stronger than to any other possible destination; the Jewish national movement would succeed only by directing emigration there.⁷⁵ Thus, Gordon's proclamation anticipated a debate that occurred twenty-two years later at the sixth Zionist Congress, when the issue of Jewish settlement of Uganda was raised. As a result of his attack on the Alliance for its preferring Jewish emigration to America, Gordon was invited to a secret meeting with the ideologically sympathetic French Jewish leadership. This session was followed by the massive support of Baron Edmund Rothschild for the new settlement in Palestine.⁷⁶

The time was ripe, Gordon believed, for carrying out both the international diplomatic and internal aspects of his Jewish program.⁷⁷ The movement for a return to Palestine would bring many Jews back to their people after disillusionment with their Gentile compatriots. Living in

Palestine, the new settlers would enjoy a greater respect and, in return, would remain loyal to their religion and people.⁷⁸ For Gordon, the alliance of Jewish nationalism with Jewish tradition was a given.⁷⁹ He published articles written by opponents of his nationalist ideas, such as Nahum Sokolow and Judah Leib Levin, only in order to refute their reservations on the point.

The prospects for the realization of Zionism, in Gordon's view, depended heavily on its ability to attract people from the mainstream of Jewish life.⁸⁰ He was certain his ideas could influence people and, in fact, Gordon's articles were translated and appeared prominently in the English-language press.⁸¹

It is noteworthy that from the time of the pogroms and on, *Ha-Maggid* dedicated all of its pages to a national Jewish revival, though this contributed to a decline in its readership (which was also due in part to the stiff competition it faced from other Hebrew and Russian Jewish periodicals which had appeared at that time).⁸²

The uniqueness of Gordon's nationalism lies in its synthesis of elements from both the forerunners of Zionism and the *Hibbat Ziyon* movement. His Zionism possessed both cultural and political aspirations, incorporating both a romantic attachment to the historical homeland and a sharp and thorough examination of the contemporary Jewish community. It was a Zionism that based its ideas on an eventually pessimistic analysis of the future of the Jews in exile, along with an optimistic outlook for the future of the historic homeland. It was a Zionism that attempted to solve the "problem of the Jews" and "the problem of Judaism," conceiving both a "practical Zionism" and a "spiritual Zionism."⁸³ Finally it was a Jewish nationalism that did not ignore problems such as the issue of the Arab presence in Palestine but after careful consideration decisively advocated a national-political revival in light of the dangerous European status quo.

BEN GURION UNIVERSITY

NOTES

1. The best previous article about *Ha-Maggid* is L. Zitron's "Notes on the History of the Hebrew Press" (Hebrew), *Ha-Olam*, Nos. 10–12 (March 1912); Nos. 2, 4, 6, 8 (April–June 1912). See also H. Toren, "Ha-Maggid and Its Editor" (Hebrew), *Anack* (1954), pp. 232–241. The best article about Gordon's ideas is I. Barzilai, "Ha-Maggid and the Beginnings of the Nationalist Movement" (Hebrew), *Bizaron* 37 (1957–58), pp. 78–88, 178–190, in particular, pp. 84–88. The most updated bibliographical survey is *Lexicon of Hebrew Periodicals* (Hebrew), by Menuha Gilboa (Jerusalem, 1992). (Henceforth referred to as Gilboa). For a

very important remark about the role played by Gordon in educating his Jewish readers to modern political thought, see Benzion Dinur, *Historical Writings* (Jerusalem, 1972), p. 43, R 71.

2. As a Prussian citizen, Silbermann would not have been granted a license to publish a newspaper in Russia. It should, however, be remembered that *Ha-Maggid* was censored when it was imported into Russia, where, of course, the majority of its readership lived. See Zitron, "Notes on the History," *Ha-Olam*, No. 12, p. 18, and Barzilai, "*Ha-Maggid* and the Beginnings," pp. 86–88.

3. On the role of the press in Russia at the time see J. D. Klein, "The Jewish Question in the Reform Era Russian Press, 1855–65," *Russian Review* 39, No. 3 (1980).

4. Others who were identified with this trend, to various degrees of radicality, were Yehiel Brill, the editor of *Ha-Levanon*; Y. D. Frumkin, the editor of *Ha-vatzelet* in Palestine; Y. Cohen-Tzedek, the editor of *Ha-Mevasser* in Galicia; and Yehiel Michael Pines in Russia. Gilboa (p. 120) claims that *Ha-Maggid* was the central periodical of the moderate Jewish religious society. For the conservative Maskilic trend, which was close to that of *Ha-Maggid*, see Shmuel Feiner, "Ha-Mifneh be Harachat Ha-Hassidut," *Zion* 51 (1986), pp. 167–210. Feiner identifies additional exponents of this trend.

5. *Ha-Maggid* (1856), No. 3, p. 1; No. 6, pp. 2, 3; No. 7, p. 27.

6. *Ibid.*, No. 33 (1860), pp. 129–130.

7. *Ibid.*, No. 36 (1861), p. 226; No. 42 (1862), p. 335.

8. *Ibid.*, No. 36, p. 226. On Silbermann's opinions, see Zitron, "Notes on the History," No. 12, p. 18.

9. *Ha-Maggid* No. 35 (1862), pp. 279–280.

10. Gilboa, p. 125. Mark Baker ("The Reassessment of Haskala Ideology in the Aftermath of the 1863 Polish Revolt," *Polin* 5 [1990], p. 236) claims Silbermann adopted a positive stance toward Jewish nationalism after the Polish Revolt of 1863. For more information about the Jewish dilemma, see M. Opalski and I. Bartal, *Poles and Jews, A Failed Brotherhood* (Waltham, Mass., 1992), pp. 2–11.

11. *Ha-Maggid*, No. 1 (1863), pp. 1–2; No. 2 (1863), pp. 9–10.

12. *Ibid.*, Nos. 14–18.

13. Zitron, "Notes on the History," No. 12, p. 18; Nos. 1–2, p. 8; S. Bernfeld, "David Gordon" (Hebrew), *Ha-Olam* Nos. 23–24 (1926), pp. 449–450; G. Kressel, *David Gordon—Mivhar Maamarav* [David Gordon—Selected Articles] (Tel Aviv, 1942), pp. 8–9; Y. Klauser, *Behit'orer 'Am* [The Awakening of a People] (Jerusalem, 1962), p. 38.

14. *Ha-Maggid* No. 12 (1863), pp. 89–90; No. 13 (1863), pp. 97–98; see also *ibid.* Nos. 14–16. See also Barzilai, pp. 178–179, and Baker, p. 237.

15. *Ha-Maggid* No. 14 (1863), p. 105.

16. *Ibid.*, No. 14, p. 106; No. 15, p. 113.

17. *Ibid.*, No. 14, p. 106; No. 18, p. 137.

18. *Ibid.*, No. 18, p. 138.

19. *Ibid.*, No. 15, p. 113; No. 16, p. 121; No. 17, pp. 129–130.

20. Ernest Laharanne, *La nouvelle question d'Orient: empires d'Egypte et d'Arabie; reconstitution de la nationalité juive* (1861).

21. *Ha-Maggid* No. 18, p. 137.

22. *Ibid.*, No. 17, pp. 129–30.

23. *Ibid.*, No. 43 (1865) p. 337.
24. *Ibid.*; Leaders such as M. Sachs, Berlin; N. Adler, London; and A. Cohen, Paris.
25. D. Gordon, "On the Situation of the Jews and What They Underwent in the Last Year," *Bikkurim* 2 (1865), p. 149–150.
26. *Ha-Maggid* No. 43 (1865), p. 337.
27. M. Meyer, "The Jewish Synods in Germany" (Hebrew), *Mehkarim* 3 (Haifa, 1975), pp. 239–274.
28. *Ha-Levanon* 5, No. 34, p. 541; No. 40, p. 638; *Ha-Maggid* No. 51 (1868), p. 405.
29. *Ha-Maggid* No. 45 (1867), pp. 353–354; No. 19 (1868), p. 150; No. 20, p. 158.
30. *Ibid.*, No. 46 (1867), p. 362; No. 47 (1867), p. 369–370.
31. *Ibid.*, No. 20 (1869), pp. 152–154, and subsequent numbers, also No. 49 (1869), pp. 385–386.
32. *Ibid.*, Nos. 27–34.
33. *Ibid.*, No. 29, pp. 214, 221. Gordon repeated these arguments at the beginning of the 1880s. See *ibid.*, No. 28 (1881), p. 230.
34. *Ibid.*, No. 29, (1869) p. 221.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*, p. 222
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*, No. 28, pp. 221–222.
39. *Ibid.*, No. 29, pp. 229–230.
40. *Ibid.*, No. 31, pp. 245–246.
41. *Ibid.*, No. 34, p. 269. Gordon later repeated this distinction; *ibid.* No. 43 (1881), pp. 81 and 355.
42. *Ibid.*, No. 32, pp. 253–254.
43. *Ibid.*, No. 38 (1869), pp. 298–299.
44. See the letter signed by twenty Jewish communities in White Russia and eastern Poland, *ibid.*, No. 39 (1869), p. 309.
45. *Ibid.*, No. 26 (1870), p. 204. This contention might have been based on several articles that appeared in *Ha-Maggid* on behalf of the Reform synods; see Meyer, "The Jewish Synods," p. 265.
46. *Ha-Maggid* Nos. 4–5 (1870).
47. *Ibid.*, No. 4, p. 29.
48. *Ibid.*, No. 5, p. 38.
49. Even Y. Kauman, who believes the main element of Jewish nationalism is the physical redemption of the Jewish people from exile and who, therefore, rejects the notion that Smolenskin and Hess were forerunners of Zionism, should have included Gordon in that category. However, for some reason he overlooked him. Zitron, however, in his *Toledot Hibbat Ziyon* [A History of the Hibbat Ziyon Movement], (Odessa, 1911), p. 73, correctly argues that Gordon's ideology embraced the entire modern concept of Zionism.
50. *Ha-Maggid* No. 26 (1870), p. 204; No. 45 (1870), p. 355.
51. *Ibid.*, No. 3 (1871), p. 18.
52. *Ibid.*, No. 28, p. 220; No. 29, p. 228.

53. David Gordon, "The Characteristics of the People of Israel," *Ha-Maggid* Nos. 8–11 (1871).

54. See, for instance, Gordon's reaction to the plan of Montefiore to establish a society similar to the Society for the Settlement of the Land of Israel. *Ha-Maggid* No. 3 (1875). See also Barzilai, pp. 182–183.

54. *Ha-Maggid* No. 26 (1875), p. 224; and No. 23 (1878), p. 215; No. 40, p. 318; No. 42, p. 335.

56. M. Meyer, in his article, "The Great Debate on Anti-Semitism," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 11 (1966), pp. 137–170, does not tackle the reactions in the Hebrew press.

57. David Gordon, "On the Settlement of the Land," *Ha-Maggid* No. 26 (1880).

58. *Ibid.*, No. 30, p. 247.

59. *Ha-Maggid* No. 35 (1880), pp. 295–296.

60. *Ibid.* See also the series of articles "On the Question of Agricultural Labor" (Hebrew), *ibid.* (1880), from No. 32 and on; No. 45, pp. 377–378; "On the Question of Our Nation in Russia" (Hebrew) [1881] from No. 2 on; reports about the "Society to Propagate *Haskalah*," No. 41 (1880), pp. 350–351.

61. *Ibid.*, No. 17 (1881), pp. 133–134.

62. *Ibid.*, No. 8 (1881), p. 61; No. 46 (1880), p. 386.

63. *Ibid.*, No. 23 (1881), p. 186; No. 31, pp. 255–256.

64. G. Kressel in his *Lexicon of Hebrew Literature* maintains that Bernfeld wrote all the editorials from the beginning of 1881 to 1884. It is clear that Bernfeld played a central role in *Ha-Maggid* from January to October, 1881, when he left for Königsberg. He continued to write for *Ha-Maggid* after this, but in 1883 ceased, due to his rejection of Gordon's nationalist views. Therefore, we can ascribe only some of the editorials in 1881 to him. See S. Bernfeld, "David Gordon," *Ha-Olam* Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23–24 (1926). It is also clear there was coordination between the two, see *ibid.*, Nos. 23–24, p. 450.

65. *Ha-Maggid* No. 35 (1880), p. 295; No. 46, pp. 387–388.

66. *Ibid.*, No. 14 (1881), p. 109; No. 24, p. 194.

67. *Ha-Olam* Nos. 23–24 (1926), p. 449.

68. In 1879 *Ha-Maggid* had rejected Ben-Yehuda's article "A Serious Question" (Hebrew), but published it in *Ha-Maggid* (1880) Nos. 35 and on, also see *ibid.*, No. 39 (1881), pp. 321–322.

69. *Ibid.*, No. 18, pp. 141–143. This article was written by S. Bernfeld, cf. Gilboa, p. 129.

70. *Ibid.*, No. 22, pp. 177–179.

71. See the series of articles, "The Jewish Problem," *ibid.*, Nos. 21–29, No. 23, p. 186. Jacob Toury, who traced the term, was not aware of Gordon's articles. See J. Toury, "The Jewish Question: A Semantic Approach," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 11 (1966), p. 106, n. 88.

72. *Ibid.*, No. 25 (1881), pp. 229–230.

73. *Ibid.*, No. 35, pp. 287–288; No. 36, p. 299.

74. *Ibid.*, No. 25, p. 205; No. 27, pp. 221–229; No. 36; p. 299.

75. *Ibid.*, No. 26, p. 213; No. 34, p. 282.

76. Zitron, "Notes on the History," No. 8, p. 12.

77. *Ha-Maggid* No. 36 (1881), p. 299.
78. *Ibid.*
79. *Ibid.*, No. 33, p. 271.
80. *Ibid.*, No. 29, p. 238.
81. *Ha-Olam* No. 6 (1912), p. 12.
82. *Ibid.*, No. 3, pp. 12–13.
83. "The Jewish Problem," No. 28, p. 229–231.