

The relationship between Orthodox and non-Orthodox Jewry has been a subject of debate for over a century. Rabbi Ellenson of Congregation Ahavas Achim in Keene, N.H., discusses a classic response to this topic. Research for this article was sponsored in part by The National Foundation for Jewish Culture and The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture.

## A RESPONSE BY MODERN ORTHODOXY TO JEWISH RELIGIOUS PLURALISM: THE CASE OF ESRIEL HILDESHEIMER

The Jewish community of Western and Central Europe experienced profound economic, social, and political transformations during the latter part of the 18th century and throughout the 19th. Prior to this era, the Jewish community in Europe had largely adhered to the cultural values and norms of rabbinic teachings.<sup>1</sup>

As the structure of medieval Judaism began to collapse in the late 18th century, new Jewish responses to the changed character of the modern world emerged. Indeed, the birth of Reform, Conservative, Zionist, and modern Orthodox movements throughout the 19th century indicate a Jewish pluralism. For the Reform and Conservative movements, the advent of religious pluralism within Judaism posed no real problem. As Charles Liebman has succinctly stated:

While Conservative and Reform see themselves as legitimate heirs to the Jewish tradition, neither claims to be its exclusive bearer.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, Liebman observes:

Orthodoxy perceives itself as the only legitimate bearer of the Jewish tradition . . .<sup>3</sup>

Consequently, it is fair to say:

*A Response by Modern Orthodoxy to Jewish Religious  
Pluralism: The Case of Esriel Hildesheimer*

Since neither the Reform, nor the Conservative lays claim to exclusive doctrinal "truth," they are free to cooperate with one another, with Orthodoxy, and even with secular Jewish groups . . . The doctrines of Orthodoxy, on the other hand, . . . are by definition beyond compromise or even the appearance of compromise.<sup>4</sup>

What type of relationship Orthodox Jewry will maintain with heterodox Jewish groups has been the subject of discussion since the rise of Haskalah and Reform<sup>5</sup> until the present.<sup>6</sup> There is a broad spectrum of opinion ranging from cooperation to no cooperation with non-Orthodox Jewry. This paper will concern itself, namely with one particular response to this problem: the attitude of Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer (1820-1899) of Germany, the founder of the *Berlin Rabbinerseminar* in 1873 and one of the great leaders of Orthodox Jewry in Germany during the last century. Hildesheimer's stance concerning the relationship between Orthodox and non-Orthodox religious institutions, as well as his position with respect to Orthodox involvement in non-Orthodox charitable and civic organizations, will be analyzed. In addition, Hildesheimer's position will be contrasted with Samson Raphael Hirsch's views.

Esriel Hildesheimer was born in Halberstadt, Germany, in 1820, the son of a distinguished rabbinical family. As a boy, he attended *Hasharat Tsvi*, in Halberstadt, the first Orthodox Jewish school in Germany to include a program of secular studies in its curriculum.<sup>7</sup> At the age of seventeen, he enrolled in the yeshiva of Jacob Ettlinger (1798-1871) of Altona and while there was permitted to attend the lectures on philosophy which Isaac Bernays, the Rabbi of Hamburg, delivered on Saturday afternoons.<sup>7a</sup> Both Ettlinger and Bernays encouraged their outstanding students, such as Hildesheimer, to engage in secular studies.<sup>8</sup>

Moreover, Ettlinger and Bernays fought actively against the advances of Reform. Meir Hildesheimer, Esriel's great-grandson, writes:

## TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

Rabbi Ettlinger did not enclose himself within the four ells of Halak-hah, but waged a stormy war against the Reform Movement and for this purpose founded the weekly journal, "The Faithful Guardian of Zion." The Hakham Bernays also fought aggressively against the Reformers. The example of these two . . . men taught him (Esriel Hildesheimer) that a rabbi in Israel is obligated to take an active part in improving the religious situation (of Jewry).<sup>9</sup>

Exposed to and made conscious of Reform during his days in Altona, Hildesheimer himself spoke of the growing dominance of Reform and of the sorrow and consternation this caused him. He said:

The lawless who denied Torah were dominant everywhere, . . . and those who feared God cowered before these enemies and despisers of religion . . . Such a time of distress had never been visited upon Israel previously.<sup>10</sup>

Following the examples set by his teachers Ettlinger and Bernays, Hildesheimer felt compelled to take up the cudgels against Reform and wage an active fight against it. At the urging of his rabbis, Hildesheimer went to Berlin in 1843. There he attended the University and majored in the study of Semitic languages for two years. Transferring to the University of Halle in 1846, he received a Ph.D. degree for a dissertation entitled, "The Correct Way to Interpret Scripture." Hildesheimer became one of the few, perhaps the only, Orthodox rabbi in Germany up to that time to receive a secular doctorate. Armed with this degree, and thus capable of elevating "the estimation of our party" in the eyes of the public,<sup>11</sup> Hildesheimer felt himself capable of doing battle with those groups which had deviated from normative Judaism.

Hildesheimer returned to Halberstadt in 1847, and became secretary of the community. Reform came to Halberstadt in that year, and Ludwig Philippson (1811-1889), the editor of the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, began to campaign on its behalf in the pages of his journal. When Philippson convened a meeting of all the Jewish communities in Saxony on October 22, 1847, in the town of Magdeburg, for the purpose of adopting a reformed prayerbook, Hildesheimer wrote a pamphlet entitled,

*A Response by Modern Orthodoxy to Jewish Religious  
Pluralism: The Case of Esriel Hildesheimer*

"The Necessity of Protest Against the Actions of the Reformers," and circulated it among all the delegates who had attended the Magdeburg Conference.<sup>12</sup> In addition, Hildesheimer employed the Leipzig periodical, *Der Orient*, to defend Orthodoxy. Writing on November 20, 1847, Hildesheimer described the feelings motivating his involvement in this dispute. He wrote:

When I began to fight with Philippon and his lawless peers, . . . I was very bitter that no one else seemed to be upset over the situation, that no great man stood up in order to overturn these licentious persons who disrupted the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts . . . Finally, when I saw that no one acted, I felt that this was no time to refrain from expressing my thoughts on account of embarrassment or humility . . .<sup>13</sup>

As a result, Hildesheimer not only attacked Philippon and Reform in journal articles, but, in 1848, when eight members of the community wished to secede from the general community on grounds of religious conscience, Hildesheimer, in conjunction with the rabbi of the community, issued a legal responsum forbidding these Reformers to withdraw and threatening them with loss of all communal rights (e.g., burial) if they did.<sup>14</sup> Secession was thus prevented and the unity of the community maintained.

Hildesheimer's refusal to compromise on religious issues and his unwillingness to cooperate with non-Orthodox Jewish institutions on matters of religion is underscored by his attitude toward the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau, which was under the direction of Zacharias Frankel, the "father" of "positive-historical" Judaism. When the community of Trier asked Hildesheimer whether it would be permissible to select a Breslau graduate as rabbi of the community, Hildesheimer replied negatively, stating that if a Breslau graduate were selected then observant Jews should secede from the community.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, Hildesheimer held that religious unity between traditional graduates of the Breslau Seminary and the graduates of his own school was impossible because the Breslau Seminary was not totally committed "to the words of the Sages and their customs."<sup>16</sup> Indeed, one of the major reasons why Hildesheimer established a rabbinical school was so "the Children of Israel in Germany will no longer

need to request rabbis from the Seminary in Breslau."<sup>17</sup>

Inasmuch as Hildesheimer believed that the fundamental assumption of Judaism was that "the Oral Law was given us from the mouth of the Almighty without any intermediary,"<sup>18</sup> he could not refrain from condemning Frankel for his work on the development of the Oral Law. While Hildesheimer respected Frankel's learning,<sup>19</sup> he branded him as a heretic and considered his seminary an unfit place to train for the rabbinate. Moreover, Hildesheimer's hatred of the religious views of Heinrich Graetz, the famed 19th century Jewish historian and faculty member at the Breslau Seminary, meant that Hildesheimer could "never give his approval" to the Breslau Seminary and could never cooperate with it concerning religious matters.<sup>20</sup> Graetz earned Hildesheimer's enmity because he claimed that Isaiah 52 was written by a second Isaiah who lived during the time of Ezra. Moreover, Graetz, in the same article stated that the "servant of the Lord" passages referred not to a personal messiah who would arise from the House of David, but to the people Israel. Hildesheimer responded by writing an article that set forth as a basic belief of the Jewish faith the coming of a personal messiah as referred to in that Isaiah passage. To deny this belief, Hildesheimer stated, was akin to denying God's revelation at Sinai.<sup>21</sup>

Given his religious beliefs, it was no surprise that Hildesheimer commented negatively on the propriety of Graetz's teaching in a rabbinical seminary:

Graetz teaches one class there (the Breslau Seminary) in Talmud. What a mockery under the guise of being Judaism. It is an unprecedented disgrace. Anyone who witnesses this needs to overcome a feeling of genuine grief. One sees innocent children being led there to the slaughter, one after another, and they are reduced to a lower level than that of common sinners in Israel. They are made into hypocrites, Jesuits, and heretics just like Graetz, who, as I know from a reliable source, waves the *lulav* in his hands on *Sukkot* as if he were a Hasidic rebbe . . .<sup>22</sup>

It is not surprising too that Hildesheimer upbraided a classmate from his Berlin schooldays for teaching at Breslau, for he boasted:

*A Response by Modern Orthodoxy to Jewish Religious  
Pluralism: The Case of Esriel Hildesheimer*

For a long time I have had the merit of dissuading youth from going to Breslau to study, for they can only be transformed there into hypocrites and worse.<sup>23</sup>

Finally, to the *Hochschule fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, the Reform rabbinical seminary established by Abraham Geiger in 1872, Hildesheimer applied the words, "Raze it, raze it to its very foundation."<sup>24</sup> Hildesheimer's fierce opposition to the notion of religious pluralism in modern Judaism is reflected in his condemnation of both the moderate and extreme reformers. Hildesheimer wrote:

How little is the difference between these reformers (the Breslau people) who do their work with silk gloves on their hands and the Reformer Geiger who strikes with a sledgehammer.<sup>25</sup>

Though Hildesheimer recognized distinctions between Frankel and Geiger, both, in Hildesheimer's judgment, practiced and taught an inauthentic Judaism, a Judaism which, because of contemporary conditions, had to be tolerated, but which could not be seen as legitimate.

Moreover, even to cooperate with these other branches of Judaism on *religious* matters was, according to Hildesheimer, unthinkable, for to do so might lead the unsuspecting into thinking that Orthodoxy sanctioned non-Orthodox varieties of Judaism. Consequently, under Hildesheimer's direction, the Orthodox rabbis in Germany, in 1897, seceded from the "General Union of Rabbis in Germany" to form the "Union of Torah-Faithful Rabbis."<sup>26</sup> And in 1883, when a group of non-Orthodox rabbis issued a circular to counteract the charge that Judaism promulgated an internal and external morality, Hildesheimer argued that Orthodox rabbis should not sign it, for to do so would have implied that non-Orthodox rabbis could legitimately speak for Judaism. Instead, Hildesheimer offered another memorandum for Orthodox rabbis to sign.<sup>27</sup>

Hildesheimer's opposition to religious pluralism within Judaism was clearly evidenced by his support of Samson Raphael Hirsch over the issue of Orthodox secession from the general Jew-

## TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

ish community in the Germany of the 1870s. As the struggle between the Reform and Orthodox continued throughout 19th century Germany the discord between them escalated. The Orthodox, soon outnumbered in most large communities by followers of Geiger or Frankel, felt that their religious needs could not be achieved so long as they remained a minority within general Jewish communities. Religious pluralism, however, was not sanctioned in Germany: all Jews were required by law to pay a tax to the Jewish community regardless of their personal religious beliefs. Indeed, the Prussian Jew Law of 1847 raised each Jewish community to the "status of a public body" and required each Jew "to become a member of the community of his place of domicile."<sup>28</sup> The only way to escape this obligation was to convert to Christianity, an alternative unpalatable to most Jews.<sup>29</sup>

In 1873, however, the Prussian Parliament promulgated a bill, "Concerning Secession From the State Church," which granted to every Christian the right to secede from the State Church without thereby severing connection with Christianity.<sup>30</sup> The passage of this law granted an excellent opportunity for modification of the Prussian Jew Law of 1847. As Salo Baron notes:

Eduard Lasker, the Jewish leader of the then powerful National Liberal Party, suggested on March 19, 1873, that, in accordance with the general principle of equality of all citizens, the government also be asked to submit a bill on the right of secession from the Jewish community. When a conservative deputy . . . objected that the Jewish community would thereby lose a precious privilege safeguarding its unity, Lasker argued that this prerogative, based upon the denial of the liberty of conscience, was a *privilegium odiosum* and that the Jewish community itself should concur in its removal. The government promised to prepare a bill in due course.<sup>31</sup>

Lasker's proposal provoked great controversy within the Jewish community itself. Non-Orthodox Jews and representatives of both the Hochschule and the Breslau Seminary opposed it, claiming it would lead to the destruction of the Jewish community.<sup>32</sup> On the other hand, political liberals and certain Orthodox Jews, notably Samson Raphael Hirsch, labored long and hard on its behalf.

Hirsch himself appears to have been the major catalyst behind

*A Response by Modern Orthodoxy to Jewish Religious  
Pluralism: The Case of Esriel Hildesheimer*

Lasker's proposal. Taking advantage of the Christian *Kulturkampf* and the dominant general trend that favored religious freedom, Hirsch wrote a pamphlet, "The Principle of Freedom of Conscience . . .," arguing that compulsion could not bring a religious community into existence. Only a sense of shared religious duty could do that. Hirsch concluded:

The divergence between the religious beliefs of Reform and Orthodoxy is so profound that when an individual publicly secedes he is only giving formal expression to convictions which had long since matured and become perfectly clear to himself. All the institutions and establishments in the care of a community are religious in nature, and they are . . . intimately bound up with the religious law . . .<sup>33</sup>

Hirsch viewed Judaism solely in religious terms.<sup>34</sup> Consequently, it was logical for him to serve as the catalyst for the bill and urged its passage. When, on July 27, 1876, the Lasker Bill was passed, the lion's share of the credit for its success was attributed to Hirsch. The bill stated:

Every Jew is entitled without severing his religious affiliation, to secede, on account of his religious scruples, from the particular community to which he belongs by virtue of a law, custom, or administrative regulation.<sup>35</sup>

Throughout this struggle Hildesheimer supported Hirsch and urged passage of this law. To the Prussian Chamber of Deputies in 1875 he wrote:

The gulf between the adherents of traditional Judaism and its religious opponents is at least as deep and wide as in any other religious faith; in fact, it is larger than in most and much bigger than what is permitted by law.<sup>36</sup>

Hildesheimer, like Hirsch, believed that compromise involving issues of religious principles was impossible. No less than Hirsch, Hildesheimer denied the validity of religious pluralism in modern Judaism and in light of his other stances *vis-a-vis* non-Orthodox Judaism, it is not surprising that he supported Hirsch in this struggle which wracked German Jewry.

II

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to view Hildesheimer purely as a religious sectarian opposed to religious pluralism. For, as Isaac Unna has pointed out, Hildesheimer believed that "Jews of various nations were organs of the body of one nation."<sup>37</sup> Hildesheimer reflected this conviction early in his life, when, as a student in Berlin, he wrote to his fiancée, Henriette Hirsch, sister of the wealthy metal firm owner, Joseph Hirsch:

The life of a religious Jew is never an autonomous one. [Judaism] is not a personal matter, closed or individual. In his thoughts, and also in his feelings of joy as well as pain, the Jew finds himself connected with the rest of his people.<sup>38</sup>

Hildesheimer had a strong notion of *Klal Yisrael*, the community of Israel. Alone among 19th century German rabbis he argued for the reinstitution of Jewish courts and on behalf of the superiority of Jewish civil law.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, even though he did advocate secession from the general Jewish community on matters of religious dispute, Hildesheimer "never considered secession the ideal; on the contrary, as far as possible, he maintained unity for the idea of '*Klal*,' the feeling of solidarity with all Israel."<sup>40</sup> This is borne out by correspondence between Hirsch and Hildesheimer on the issue of secession.

Hirsch, in a letter dated July 6, 1876, assured Hildesheimer that Orthodox Jews would not exploit the secession law. Secession, Hirsch stated, would take place only in rare communities and would occur only on account of substantive religious issues.<sup>41</sup> This letter indicates that Hildesheimer only reluctantly accepted the notion of secession, and Hirsch's obvious attempts to alleviate Hildesheimer's anxieties shows that Hirsch was much more enthusiastic about the new law. In addition, Hildesheimer was disturbed over the opposition to the law expressed by Seligman Baer Bamberger, the "Wueraburger Rav". Bamberger felt secession from the general Jewish community by Orthodox Jews was legitimate only in the most extreme instances, and he and Hirsch disputed publicly over the issue in an exchange of open letters.<sup>42</sup> While Hildesheimer agreed with Hirsch, he nevertheless wrote:

*A Response by Modern Orthodoxy to Jewish Religious  
Pluralism: The Case of Esriel Hildesheimer*

This sad matter has distracted me from my work many hours, and it has caused me many sleepless nights in which I have shed many tears.<sup>43</sup>

Hildesheimer refused to comment publicly on the dispute between Bamberger and Hirsch for fear that no beneficial result could be derived from public comment. Moreover, while he acknowledged that Hirsch had "restored the traditional Judaism of our day to its place of prestige,"<sup>44</sup> in a letter to Hirsch he said:

I do dissent from several passages (in your open letter) directed against Bamberger, which appear to me to be too strong. They make it even less likely for a bridge to be built from your congregation to those who are "secessionists".<sup>45</sup>

Hildesheimer's obvious ambivalence toward secession and its attendant division of the Jewish community indicates that he was not the sectarian that Hirsch was. His greater sense of Jewish solidarity is reflected in several other actions he took. While Hirsch wrote, "An Orthodox Jew must not consider joining a B'nai B'rith group, for it threatens traditional Judaism,"<sup>46</sup> Hildesheimer became an active participant in the Berlin lodge.<sup>47</sup> Another incident is even more telling. Hirsch noted that Hildesheimer delivered an address at a meeting of the Berlin chapter of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, a Paris-based Jewish educational and charitable organization. Non-Orthodox Jews, including graduates of the Breslau Seminary, were members of the group, and its Parish head, Adolph Cremieux, was not only non-Orthodox, but permitted his wife to have their children baptized.<sup>48</sup> As a result, Hirsch wrote:

I have absolutely no connection with the Alliance . . . I fail to see how a man imbued with proper Jewish thought can attach himself to a group founded for the sake of a Jewish task, when its founder and administration are completely removed from genuine religious Judaism . . . Indeed, it is very painful for me to see an honored name like Dr. Hildesheimer united with the Alliance and the men of the Breslau Seminary . . .<sup>49</sup>

Hirsch concluded by stating that this was not the way of the pious men of old who dwelt in Jerusalem and separated themselves

absolutely from the rest of the community for the sake of preserving Judaism.

Hildesheimer disagreed. Replying to Hirsch, Hildesheimer stated that an article published by the famed Eastern European Orthodox rabbi and proto-Zionist Zvi Hirsch Kalisher (1795-1874) on behalf of the Alliance and its charitable activities persuaded him to join. Citing the charitable activities of the Alliance, Hildesheimer wrote, "I feel myself obligated to promote the unity of various Jewish communities."<sup>50</sup> Hildesheimer informed Hirsch that their common opponents delighted in Orthodox isolation, for when groups performed positive functions, these opponents were able to claim that the Orthodox were negative and isolationist. Cremi  ux was not, in Hildesheimer's view, a fit representative of Judaism. Nonetheless, Jews were still obligated to join the Alliance because they promoted positive functions.<sup>51</sup>

Hildesheimer's moderate approach to the problem of Orthodox cooperation with the non-Orthodox Jewish world is further illustrated when he received a Rabbi Ungerleider who had come to discuss plans for a rabbinical union between Orthodox and non-Orthodox rabbis in Germany. Hirsch charged that Hildesheimer had committed "an offense against the holiness and truth of our cause."<sup>52</sup> Hildesheimer simply dismissed Hirsch's complaint. He stressed that he had no intention of sanctioning such a union, but that refusing to see Ungerleider would have demonstrated a real lack of common decency (*derekh erets*).<sup>53</sup> Indeed, Hildesheimer had friendships with several non-observant Jews. His correspondence demonstrates that even when he vitriolically denounced his opponents' religious views, he was careful to distinguish between the person and the person's views.<sup>54</sup>

Hildesheimer's openness in dealing with non-observant Jews on matters of communal concern is demonstrated clearly by his support in establishing an orphanage in Jerusalem. In 1872, Heinrich Graetz and two companions, one of whom, Gottschalk Lewy, was a friend of Hildesheimer's toured Israel. Upon their return, the three men issued a report describing the depressed economic and social condition of the Jewish settlement.<sup>55</sup> Particularly disturbing to Hildesheimer was their description of the number of orphans who were neglected, both spiritually and

*A Response by Modern Orthodoxy to Jewish Religious  
Pluralism: The Case of Esriel Hildesheimer*

physically, by the existing Jewish communities in Israel.

Hildesheimer had long toiled on behalf of the Jewish settlement in Israel and throughout his career had raised significant funds to support it. As early as 1858, he and his brother-in-law, Joseph Hirsch, had established the "Society for the Support of *Erets Yisrael*," which supplied housing for Jews living in the old city of Jerusalem. His strong attachment to the "Land of His Fathers" was reflected even more visibly in 1882 when, at a Berlin meeting of Jewish representatives gathered from all over the world to deal with the problem of Russian Jewish refugees fleeing from the 1881 pogroms, Hildesheimer was the only delegate to recommend that the stream of refugees be directed toward Israel, not America. In 1885, he wrote:

America or Palestine—on religious grounds I plead for Palestine.<sup>56</sup>

And again, in 1894, Hildesheimer wrote:

Israel is our homeland and—especially during a time of anti-Semitism—our only hope.<sup>57</sup>

Hildesheimer was deeply disturbed by Graetz's report, and he wholeheartedly supported Graetz's suggestion that an orphanage be established to ensure proper care for these youngsters. In a memorandum circulated in December, 1872, Hildesheimer called for the immediate establishment of these orphanages in Israel. Because he distrusted the means of distribution used by the rabbis in Israel, Hildesheimer advocated placing the administration of the orphanages in the hands of a committee located in Europe, which, in turn, would appoint a local committee in Israel to administer the orphanage. Finally, in accordance with Graetz's suggestion, Hildesheimer stated that while the education of these youths would be based upon the "Holy Torah," secular subjects would be added to the curriculum to ensure that these youngsters would be able to lead an independent life.<sup>58</sup>

There was opposition to Hildesheimer's proposal. Rabbis in Israel were adamant in their critique of Hildesheimer's proposed

## TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

orphanage, both because it threatened their autonomy and because of the proposed religious and secular curriculum of the school. Hildesheimer replied that the world was changing and that "the need for this knowledge [i.e., secular] grows everyday."<sup>59</sup> More important for purposes of this study, however, is that opposition to this plan arose in Europe not because of the proposal's merits or demerits, but because the "heretic Heinrich Graetz" had first proposed it.<sup>60</sup> Hirsch wrote to Hildesheimer:

I feel myself obligated to inform you . . . that the idea to establish an orphanage in Israel both to rescue the orphans from the hands of the missionaries and to raise the level of culture is the idea of Graetz . . . A man like this is not fit to be trusted by us . . .<sup>61</sup>

Hildesheimer responded both to Hirsch and other critics who opposed supporting any plan Graetz advocated by reconfirming his opinion that Graetz was a "religious heretic." No one, Hildesheimer stated, had fought Graetz and his heresy as adamantly as he.<sup>62</sup> Yet, he wrote:

A grave situation has arisen in opposition to my program among circles who do not wish to distinguish between the heresies of Graetz and his reports regarding established facts in our times; and there are great dangers bound up with this approach.<sup>63</sup>

Hildesheimer stressed the importance of distinguishing between a man's religious views and other aspects of his person. Though a man such as Graetz might hold, in his opinion, despicable religious beliefs injurious to the continuity of Judaism, Hildesheimer did not hold that one should therefore totally isolate oneself from such a Jew. He put it bluntly:

"The truth is the truth even if it be on the side of our opponents."<sup>64</sup>

Hildesheimer's proposed orphanage never achieved fruition, and ultimately he abandoned his efforts on its behalf. Nevertheless, this episode, his reservations concerning secession, and his participation in the Alliance, indicate that his position regarding the non-Orthodox Jewish world differed from Hirsch's. For he had a very real and strong sense of both the Jewish people and their religion.

*A Response by Modern Orthodoxy to Jewish Religious  
Pluralism: The Case of Esriel Hildesheimer*

III

Esriel Hildesheimer was a man of unbending religious principle who refused either to cooperate with or acknowledge the legitimacy of non-Orthodox religious bodies on matters of religious import. While a proponent of modern culture, he was not in sympathy with that spirit of the time which advanced a benign attitude toward religious pluralism. On the other hand, he was not a narrow, rigid sectarian. His love of the people Israel caused him to participate, whenever possible, with his fellow Jews, both Orthodox and non-Orthodox, on matters of common concern. By refusing to adopt a totally sectarian stance, Hildesheimer telescoped a vision of modern Orthodoxy which permitted it to participate in the total Jewish world and which allowed it to remain true to its own principles.

NOTES

1. See Jacob Katz, *Out of the Ghetto* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973).

2. Charles Liebman, "Orthodoxy in American Jewish Life," in Marshall Sklare, ed., *The Jewish Community In America* (New York: Behrman, 1974), p. 134.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Ibid.*

5. Katz, *Out of the Ghetto*, Chapter 9.

6. For example, see Leo Levi, "The Relationship Of The Orthodox To Heterodox Organizations," *TRADITION*, 9 (Fall, 1967), pp. 95-102. Several other articles relating to this question have appeared in *TRADITION* throughout the last decade.

7. Mordechai Eliav, *Jewish Education In Germany During The Era Of Haskalah And Emancipation* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Sivan Press, 1969), pp. 227-239.

7a. Both Ettlinger and Bernays, who were also the teachers of Samson Raphael Hirsch, were unique among the Orthodox rabbis of their day for they preached and taught in German, not Yiddish.

8. Meir Hildesheimer, "The Rabbi And His Student," (Hebrew) *HaMaayan* (1972), p. 41.

9. Meir Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards A Portrait of Esriel Hildesheimer," (Hebrew) *Sinai* (1961), p. 69.

## TRADITION: *A Journal of Orthodox Thought*

10. Cited by Zvi Benjamin Urbach, "A Biography of Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer In His Hometown of Halberstadt," in *Festschrift For Yehiel Jacob Weinberg* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: 1969), p. 232.

11. Azriel Hildesheimer, ed., "Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer on Zacharias Frankel and the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau," (Hebrew) *Ha Maayan* (1953), p. 65, hereafter referred to as "Hildesheimer on Frankel."

12. Urbach, "A Biography of Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer in His Hometown of Halberstadt," pp. 234-5.

13. Mordechai Eliav, ed., *Rabbiner Esriel Hildesheimer Briefe* (Jerusalem, 1965), p. 17 (Hebrew Section). Hereafter referred to as *Hildesheimer Briefe*.

14. Esriel Hildesheimer, *Responsa*, Vol. I (Tel Aviv: 1969), pp. 11-14.

15. "Hildesheimer on Frankel," p. 69.

16. *Ibid.*

17. Meir Hildesheimer, "Writings Regarding The Founding of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary," (Hebrew) *Ha Maayan* (1974), p. 29.

18. "Hildesheimer on Frankel," p. 71.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 72.

20. *Ibid.* Hildesheimer wrote, "So long as Graetz remains in the institution, we will never give our approval to the students educated there."

21. Meir Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards A Portrait of Esriel Hildesheimer," p. 78.

22. "Hildesheimer On Frankel," pp. 68-9.

23. *Ibid.*

24. Meir Hildesheimer, ed., "Writings Regarding the Founding of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary," p. 13.

25. "Hildesheimer On Frankel," p. 66.

26. Herman Schwab, *The History of Orthodox Jewry In Germany*, translated by Irene R. Birnbaum (London: 1950), p. 95.

27. *Hildesheimer Briefe*, pp. 195-7.

28. Schwab, *The History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany*, p. 60.

29. Salo Baron, "Freedom and Constraint in the Jewish Community," in Israel Davidson, ed., *Essays and Studies in Memory of Linda R. Miller* (New York: 1938), p. 12.

30. Schwab, *The History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany*, p. 66.

31. Baron, "Freedom and Constraint in the Jewish Community," pp. 12-3.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 14. For a fuller discussion of this whole matter against the background of the times, see Uriel Tal, *Christians and Jews In Germany: Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870-1914*, translated by Noah Jacobs (Ithaca: Cornell Press, 1975), Chapter 2.

33. Schwab, *The History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany*, pp. 68-9.

34. Ismar Schorsch, *Jewish Reactions To German Anti-Semitism, 1870-1914* (New York: Columbia, 1972), p. 10.

35. Quoted in Baron, "Freedom and Constraint in the Jewish Community," p. 15.

36. *Hildesheimer Briefe*, p. 109.

*A Response by Modern Orthodoxy to Jewish Religious  
Pluralism: The Case of Esriel Hildesheimer*

37. Isaac Unna, "Ezriel (sic) Hildesheimer," in Leo Jung, ed., *Jewish Leaders* (New York: 1953), p. 227.
38. Quoted in Meir Hildesheimer, "Contributions Towards A Portrait of Esriel Hildesheimer," p. 72.
39. Esriel Hildesheimer, *Rabbiner Dr. I. Hildesheimer: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Meir Hildesheimer, ed. (Frankfurt: 1923), "Das biblisch-talmudische Recht."
40. Isaac Unna, "Ezriel (sic) Hildesheimer," p. 226.
41. Azriel Hildesheimer, ed., "A Selection of Letters Between Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer and Samson Raphael Hirsch and His Supporters," (Hebrew) *Yad Shaul* (Tel Aviv: 1953), p. 236.
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 236-8. Also see Schwab, *The History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany*, Chapter 9.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 238.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 233.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 240.
46. Quoted by Isaac Heineman, "Rabbi Marcus Horovitz," in Leo Jung, ed., *Jewish Leaders*, p. 263.
47. *Ibid.*
48. Azriel Hildesheimer, ed., "An Exchange of Letters Between Esriel Hildesheimer and Samson Raphael Hirsch on Matters Relating to the Land of Israel," (Hebrew) *HaMaayan* (1954), p. 50. Hereafter cited as "Hildesheimer and Hirsch on Israel."
49. *Ibid.*, pp. 48-9.
50. *Ibid.*
51. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
52. *Hildesheimer Briefe*, p. 199.
53. *Ibid.*
54. See Schorsch, *Jewish Reactions To German Anti-Semitism*, p. 35, where he describes Hildesheimer's friendship with Samuel Kristeller, a non-observant Jew. Also note his attitude toward Graetz as described below.
55. This report is found in J. Meisl, *Heinrich Graetz* (Berlin: 1917), pp. 101-105 and 142-151.
56. *Hildesheimer Briefe*, p. 205.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 244.
58. "Hildesheimer and Hirsch on Israel," p. 41.
59. *Hildesheimer Briefe*, p. 54 (Hebrew Section).
60. "Hildesheimer and Hirsch on Israel," p. 44.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
62. *Hildesheimer Briefe*, pp. 90-1.
63. "Hildesheimer and Hirsch on Israel," p. 44.
64. *Hildesheimer Briefe*, p. 48 (Hebrew Section).