THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE SYNAGOGUE

By William G. Tachau

The study of the Synagogue is the study of the history of Israel. No period of its existence is conceivable without this place of public worship and religious instruction. Very early the Synagogue became the central institution of Judaism and owing to its existence, later on, after the dispersion, the very life of the faith was preserved.

The Synagogue, then, was the center of activities of each community, just as the Temple at Jerusalem had been the center for the entire people. Indeed, the Synagogue became for each scattered community a sanctuary in miniature in compensation for the loss of the Temple. Therefore, no matter how details may vary in different countries, Synagogal worship was the most important visible expression of Judaism, and it was the chief means of uniting the Jews scattered throughout the world.

It is probable that the Synagogue existed even during the period of the Temple, but it is certain that places of congregation during the exile in Babylon offered the beginning of the present houses of worship. The word "Synagogue" comes from the Greek and means an assembling together. The word itself, of course, came into use long after the captivity, but places of assembly and prayer existed throughout the land long before they were mentioned in history by the name of Synagogue.
To give an adequate, critical survey of synagogal plan, it is necessary to trace its history from its inception. The earliest actual place of worship of the Jews is known as the tabernacle, which, in arrangement, was fundamentally a repetition in movable tents of the triple Egyptian Temple system that consisted of court, hall and cella. The enclosure around the tabernacle formed a court twice as long as it was broad; there were twenty-one columns upon the sides and eleven upon the front, erected like tent poles. These supports had silver capitals and stood in sockets of bronze. White immovable hangings were fastened between these columns, except at the entrance on the eastern front where movable curtains of blue, purple and scarlet linen filled the open spaces.

1. ELEVATION AND PLAN OF MOSAIC TABERNACLE

The tabernacle itself (figure 1) was placed near the western end of the enclosure and in the square place in front of it (a),
rose the altar of earth and wooden sheathing (c) for burnt offerings, and near at hand stood the laver of brass (d). The tabernacle was enclosed on three sides by boards overlaid with sheets of gold (b), held in place by double sockets of silver, which in turn were clasped together by bars that fitted into golden rings. The eastern front was limited by five gilded columns (e). The roof again recalled the tent form—its covering being of colored linen and the skins of animals.

The tabernacle, like the Egyptian Temple, was three times as long as it was broad, and was divided into two unequal compartments—the front (f) being twice the depth of the Holy of Holies (g), the altar for incense (h) standing in the center of the first space and the table for the shewbread being placed next to the northern wall (j). In the southwestern corner stood the seven-armed candlestick (k). The Holy of Holies, square in plan, was separated from the larger ante-chamber by four gilded columns, which also stood in sockets, and it contained the Ark of the Covenant (m)—a coffer of acacia wood, borne upon poles fixed in golden rings, whose lid bore figures of two cherubim, carved in wood and overlaid in gold.

The form and arrangement of the tabernacle are, in the main, quite well defined, but this, unfortunately, is not true of the monumental temple erected by King Solomon. The accounts and descriptions of this building are both confused and conflicting, as may be expected from writers ignorant of art. It seems generally agreed upon, however, that the Temple consisted of an open vestibule (Ulam), the Holy Place (Hekal) and an inner chamber known as the Holy of Holies, which was elevated above the level of the Temple proper. In front of the vestibule sprang two columns, Boaz
and Jachin; a large court surrounded the Temple. In the Holy of Holies nothing was visible but the cherubim, intended to enshrine the Ark of the Covenant, in which the Tablets of the Law were kept. An altar of incense and a large table for the twelve loaves of shew-bread were enshrined in the sanctuary. The seven-armed candlestick also appears, just as in the tabernacle, to which were added ten lamp-holders and other lesser utensils. Inside the vestibule were placed a large iron altar and a spacious reservoir called the "Iron Sea", which was supported upon twelve iron bulls; groups of three were so arranged that they turned in the direction of the cardinal points of the compass.

There are many and varied attempted restorations of Solomon’s Temple. In accordance with the descriptions of this famous structure, each author, while apparently conforming strictly to these instructions, supplied architectural details within his own knowledge or forms dictated by his own personal prejudices, so that an amazing variety of impressions has resulted. Every known style of architecture is therefore represented, ranging from Egyptian and Assyrian, through the Classic and Gothic, to all forms of the Renaissance.

As a matter of fact, it is impossible to determine to what extent this noted building was affected by the art of the surrounding countries, or which influence really predominated. The strongest stimulus undoubtedly came from Egypt, as the palace of the Queen, adjoining the Temple, must have been vividly reminiscent of the splendor of her native land. It must also be remembered that the Israelites had grown to a people upon the banks of the Nile and, without doubt, transplanted many artistic conceptions and methods of construction to their own land.
There is no good reason to believe that there existed a really distinctive Jewish ancient art, for no matter how insistent an initial urge there may have been for a national expression, it must soon have languished. The position of the country as a highway between the neighboring powerful states, precluded that seclusion necessary for the development of a native art, and the close contact with an art already highly advanced, made it easier to borrow than to create. This whole subject, though very interesting, is purely speculative, for the sole actual remains of that period—Solomon's Temple—which could have been the most significant testimony, are now merely the base of a fortified wall.

After the return from captivity, another item for speculation presents itself. If public worship became sufficiently important to demand special housing other than in the reconstructed Temple, then the structures were undoubtedly largely Assyrian in character. The Temple has always been looked upon as the true prototype of the Synagogue, even though there is but a slight physical resemblance between the two buildings. Nevertheless, there are certain features in the Temple that undoubtedly left their impress upon the Synagogue.

The main body of the Synagogue, for instance, easily recalls the porch (Ulam) which, in the Temple, was the space given over to the needs of the congregation. The suggestion that the porch corresponds to the pronaos of the Christian basilica or the narthex of the Gothic church, is refuted by the fact that practically all of the earliest synagogues had no vestibules. The Hekal, which was reserved for the priests and contained the seven-armed candlestick, the table for the
shew-bread and the altar of incense, is now symbolized in the synagogue by the Bima or "Almemar." This is a raised dais which is used for the reading of the Torah and contains a table on which the Torah is laid, symbolic of the old order of table for the shew-bread. The elevation of the Holy of Holies of the Temple is recalled in the steps and platforms in front of the ark from which the Torah is taken and exhibited to the congregation with prescribed ceremonies, and after its reading, is replaced in the shrine.

These two elements are usually separated from the rest of the synagogue area, and are connected by an aisle which provides space for processionals. The Almemar is either square or octagonal in plan, is raised above the floor and has seats protected by a balustrade. Very often it is covered with a baldachino and is constructed of wood, iron or sometimes stone. The termination of the steps leading to the Holy Shrine, as part of the Hekal, is indicated by the placing of the Hanukkah candlestick (Menorah), usually on the south side, which is probably a substitute for the seven-armed candlestick of Solomon.

The Holy of Holies, originally designed as the space for the Ark of the Covenant, is always raised above the floor level, and is placed against or in the wall that lies nearest to Jerusalem. A richly embroidered curtain (Parodet) usually hangs before the door of the shrine as a symbol of the partition between the Hekal and the Holy of Holies that was used in the Temple. These two elements then, the Holy of Holies (Ark) and the Almemar, from earliest times, formed the basis of the plan of the Synagogue, and occurred in all structures and were used even as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century. The term "Almemar" is a corruption
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of the Arabic "Al-mimbar," which means the chair or pulpit, and is more commonly used than the Talmudic word "Bima."

This theory concerning the origin of the two elements of the synagogue plan is substantiated by the Talmud: "The ark is built to receive the scrolls of the law." Furthermore, Maimonides says: "They put a platform in the middle of the house so that he who reads from the law or he who speaks words of exhortation to the people may stand upon it and all may hear him." According to the same author, the elders sit facing the people, who are seated in rows, one
behind the other, with their eyes turned towards the elders and toward the Holy Place. (No mention, however, is made in this connection of the women’s gallery.) "As far as touches the Bima, this shall not be built higher than eight steps; no one shall sit between the Bima and the Hekal (the shrine is here meant), for their backs would be turned to the Ark and this would not be seemly. This was forbidden because, whenever the person who stands on the Bima turns in prayer, he might lead others to believe that he is bowing to those who are [sit] before the ark."

Other Talmudic regulations regarding the building of synagogues are:

The Elevation of the Synagogue (Megillah' section 3): The Talmud prescribes that the Synagogue be erected on a "raised space," so that it may tower above all the houses in the city; moreover, it cannot be torn down until another synagogue is there (Meg. 27). Synagogues were built on knolls, street corners and gateways (Proverbs of Solomon, 1, 20, 21); also, outside of the city on the banks of a running stream and in the open fields. This was particularly the law of the third and fifth centuries, C. E., in Babylonia, which strictly required the building to be upon a hill and which prophesied the downfall of those cities whose houses were higher than the House of God (Shabbat 11 a). There is, however, an important regulation which wisely recognizes the need of exceptions under certain conditions and circumstances. To quote again: "However, if any emergency arises,—for example, that the authorities own a building, so that it will not be permitted that any other over-top it, then a lower one may be erected and the structure used as the 'House of God'.”
Orientation and Entrance: The question whether the Holy Shrine should look toward the east or toward the west occupied the minds of the teachers even in Talmudic times. Thus, for example, Rabbi Abin (Jerus. Berakot 4,8c) remarks that the aspect towards Jerusalem and the Temple could be effective only for the time of the duration of the latter. Quite contrary are the opinions of Rabbi Ishmael (second century), and Rabbi Oshaya (third century), who said on this question: "The head of God is over all" (Baba Batra 25a). Finally, Rabbi Sheshet (fourth century), forbade the eastward aspect as a heathenish use. The prescription of the Shulhan Aruk reads as follows: "The door may not be otherwise set than opposite to that side toward which one prays in the particular city. If one prays to the west, the door should be on the east side, so that one can bow towards the ark from the door."

The Women's Section: There seems to be no mention in the codes of the women's part in the services in the synagogue. In the Bible (Deut. 31, 12) the duty of women to be present at the public reading of the Law is prescribed. It also appears that the injunction (1 Cor. 14,34), "Let the women keep silent in the church," was strictly observed.

There are further legal references which it might be interesting to quote, although they have no direct bearing on the arrangement of the plan. "Honor should be paid to synagogues and houses of study. People must not conduct themselves lightly nor laugh, mock, discuss trifles, or walk about therein; in summer they must not resort to it for shelter from the heat, nor in winter should they make it serve as a retreat from the rain. Neither should they eat or drink therein, although the learned and their disciples may do so
in case of emergency. Every one before entering should wipe the mud from his shoes; and no one should come in with soiled body or garments. Accounts must not be cast in the synagogue or house of study, except those pertaining to public charity or to religious matters; nor should funeral speeches be delivered therein, except at a public mourning for one of the great men of the time." 'A synagogue or house of study which has two entrances should not be used as a thoroughfare; this rule was made on the analogy of that in the Mishnah (Ber, ix, 5) forbidding the use of the Temple mount as a thoroughfare.'

Some honor is to be paid even to the ruins of a synagogue or house of study. It is not proper to demolish a synagogue and then to build a new one either on the same spot or elsewhere; but the new one should be built first (B. B. 3b), unless the walls of the old one show signs of falling. A synagogue may be turned into a house of study, but not vice versa; for the holiness of the latter is higher than that of the former and the rule is (Meg. iii, I): 'They raise up in holiness, but do not lower in holiness.'

"The synagogue of a village, being built only for the people around it, may be sold on a proper occasion, but a synagogue in a great city, which is really built for all Israelites who may come and worship in it, ought not to be sold at all. When a small community sells its synagogue, it ought to impose on the purchaser the condition that the place must not be turned into a bath-house, laundry, cleansing-house (for vessels) or tannery, though a council of seven of the leading men in the community may waive even this condition (ib. 27b)."

It is a known fact that these laws were not all strictly observed, even in the earliest synagogues on record, and in
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more recent times, especially since the early part of the nineteenth century, they have been more honored in the breach than in the observance.

There are numerous ruins of synagogues scattered throughout Galilee which were first discovered in 1852. Some of them have since been excavated. The period of their construction has not been definitely fixed, as there are no inscriptions yet unearthed that give an actual date, but a comparison of their details of decoration with other buildings of this locality places them somewhere between the second and the fourth centuries C. E. Until that period, then, the study of the synagogue is entirely documentary, so that in these ruins we have the first real concrete evidences of the synagogual plan. In the very capable work, "Antike Synagogen in Galilaea," Messrs. Heinrich Kohl and Carl Watzinger, not only have illustrated the actual conditions of the excavations of eleven of these ruins, but have produced very interesting ideas for their restoration. There is great similarity in these structures which are all of the basilica type, showing three entrance doors in the wall nearest to Jerusalem, in every example but one. The buildings are divided into a nave and two side aisles by two rows of columns which support a balcony on three sides. The roof is supported by superimposed columns.

The ark, according to these authorities, is placed between the last two columns in such a way that the central door is blocked, which forces the real entrance through the two side doors. The reason for the main door, which is shown not to have been used for entrance, is obscure. There are no actual remains of the Almemar or the Ark, which were probably movable and constructed of perishable material.
The plan of Tell-Hum, which is here given, shows an open court with a row of columns on three sides. The floor is paved with rectangular slabs of stone. The stairs to the balcony appear at the northwest corner, and there were stone benches all around the room, except at the entrance wall. At Irbid, owing to conditions of the building site, the entrance is from the east and the nave is dropped several steps below the aisles.

In 1921, a synagogue at Aim Duq, near Jericho, was unearthed, which also is in the basilica form, and the floor of the nave is covered with interesting mosaic, divided into three large panels. The first panel represents a Menorah; the second shows the Signs of the Zodiac beautifully drawn with all of the emblems; and the third depicts the scene of "Daniel and the Lions." There are inscriptions in Hebrew entirely intact, but the figures, especially the faces, are partially destroyed, and this is a sure indication to some authorities that the work of destruction was done by the Jews themselves. These findings of the last mentioned synagogue have as yet not been published, but this information is due to the courtesy of Mr. E. L. Sukenik. It can readily be seen that most of the Talmudic laws are violated in these Galilean buildings, although there is strict observance of the code of orientation.

Relying on the discoveries made in these buildings, there are those who claim that the Talmudic laws were formulated only at a later date. There is no doubt that human and animal figures were introduced in the decoration, which is explained by the assertion that at first the law against "graven images" forbade their worship, but not their presentation, and that the modern interpretation was an after-
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growth. The remains of the decorative motives prove them to be Greco-Roman, and they show startling resemblances to the Byzantine character of ornament, as exhibited in Constantinople and even central France. The workmanship was crude, as might be expected in structures that represented unimportant communities.

There is a belief that the plan of the synagogues of Galilea was derived from Greek edifices (there are buildings of this type at Delos and at Miletus), and the synagogue at Alexandria which was of an earlier date than these, is described as a basilica or "like a big basilica." Undoubtedly this theory which formulates the belief of a Greek origin, could be applied to synagogues of a much earlier date, but it is logical to suppose that these buildings of Galilee, which show such decided resemblance to the neighboring Roman edifices, were copied from them, or at least were inspired by Roman influence.

It is interesting to note that the synagogue derived its main form from the same source as did the Christian Church, and at an even earlier era. The Roman basilicas existed in all parts of the Empire and were the most convenient structures then existing for purposes of congregational worship. They were used by the Romans for law courts, the merchants' exchange and market hall, no province being entitled to municipal privileges which did not possess one. The principal room in the palace or large house was called a Basilica and was constructed on the same plan.

Here was an arrangement, already at hand, quite suited to the needs of religious services which served as a model for the synagogue, as it did later for the Christian church. The plan was uniform, consisting of a parallelogram, divided into
three parts, longitudinally, by two rows of columns or pillars, with galleries over the two outside divisions, supported by the columns and the exterior walls. At one end was a tribune for the judges, arranged in a semi-circle. In a few instances, there was a tribunal at each end, with the entrance at the side. This general plan for the synagogue, like that of some Christian churches, has persisted until the present day.

At first, the space set aside for the women was placed on the ground outside of the main mass of the structure, but as the
available ground area became limited, especially in the cities, this space was moved to the upper stories, and finally, with the relaxing of a strict law to house the women behind screens, the galleries were turned over to them. Connected with the synagogue (again analogous to the atrium of the Christian basilica) was an open Court, in the center of which was a fountain or basin for washing before entering for services. This court also served for various ceremonials which had to take place under the open sky. Here weddings were celebrated, the blessing of the New Moon was chanted, and the Sukkot services were held. In many of the crowded Ghettos, the streets were interrupted by open spaces, where communal outdoor ceremonies might take place.

One of the first changes in the basilica plan that manifested itself in the Christian churches was the introduction of a transept, thus producing the cruciform plan. In the western part of the Roman Empire, the plan developed was that of a Latin cross—the transept being short and the nave long. In the eastern part, the plan developed was that of a Greek cross, the four arms being of equal length. The synagogue plan never developed the Latin form, but there are examples of the Greek type in those localities in the east which came in contact with the similar forms in Christian churches and Mohammedan mosques. In very recent times, there is a distinct tendency towards this Greek form, as will be shown later, which curiously enough was reinspired by eastern models, aided by the principle of modern construction and the desire to seat as many persons as possible near the reading desk.

There is still another type of plan of which there are many examples in Central Europe that persisted from the eleventh
to the eighteenth centuries. This showed a hall divided into two aisles by a central row of columns, usually limited to two in number. One of the oldest synagogues of this character is found at Worms. Indeed, it is accredited by some to be the oldest synagogue still standing in which services are held. The entrance is through a single door in the south. To the right are steps that lead to a balcony, on the left are the alms boxes. The main room is divided into two aisles, by means of two columns, and between them is located the square Almemar, served by steps on either side. The Ark is placed against the east wall on the axis of the room, flanked on either side by brass Hanukkah candlesticks. The women's section is to the south, its ceiling vaulting springs from a single column in the center of the room. To the west, stands the so-called Rashi Chapel, which to-day serves as a reliquary. This type of two-aisled plan is found not only in the old synagogue at Worms, Germany, but also in Prague, Bohemia; Regensburg, Austria; Passau, Galicia; Astrog, Russia; and Damascus, Syria.

It is claimed by some authorities that the employment of
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two columns was not accidental or occasioned by constructive necessities, but that they were consciously used to represent the two columns—Boaz and Jachin—that flanked the entrance to Solomon's Temple. But a more advanced research reveals numerous examples in German Christian churches, where the two piers or columns have been employed to divide the building into two aisles and to decrease the span of the vaulting. Examples of such buildings are: the Nikoli Chapel, St. Marien and Zurhoheg at Soest; the churches Berschis, Bedim and Methler at Paspels. In the small Church of the Holy Cross at Krakau, a single pier in the center of the church supports the vaulting of the ceiling, which is just the same type that is found in the women's section in the synagogue at Worms. Beyond a doubt, then, this style of two-aisle synagogue was borrowed from co-existing religious edifices, and we must abandon all thought that here at least the Jews had developed a distinct architectural motive of their own.

And so it is evidenced that the synagogue in general adopted three types of plan, namely, the basilica, the Greek cross, and the two-aisle type. But no matter which one of the three types was selected, the arrangement for the conduct of the services and rituals remained fixed, and continued unchanged until the nineteenth century. The Ark was placed against the short wall, situated nearest Jerusalem, and was elevated upon a platform and served by steps. The Almemar or reading desk, also elevated above the floor, stood in the center of the room facing the Ark, and a wide aisle, connecting the two, furnished ample space for the procession and ceremonials. The women, being assigned to a separate section that was located either on the ground floor
or in an upper story, had no view of the services; indeed, they were actually cut off by a pierced partition or by a grille, and no provision of any kind was made for their comfort. This arrangement is still adhered to in the edifices of Orthodox congregations, the only modification being a little more favorable to the women who, though still segregated, may enjoy the privilege of seeing and being seen.

The early part of the nineteenth century saw great changes in the condition of the Jews. Their emancipation from the seclusion of the Ghetto brought them into closer association with the refinements and culture of their neighbors. The long centuries of restraint were cast behind them, and they felt free to participate in the common life of the community, and therefore had the desire to express themselves and reveal something of the powers that were stirring within them.

The hold of tradition upon the individual became less significant, external religious observances gradually lost some of their importance, especially within the family, so that the synagogue became more and more the center for the preservation of Judaism. The Jews found that the religious edifices of their neighbors made an appeal to the emotions of the worshippers through beauty of form, through the subtle charm of subdued lighting, and through harmonious sound, and so they began to emulate these characteristics in order to stimulate the religious interests of their own people. It was, therefore, not merely the love of ostentation that caused these changes, but a real desire to make the synagogue an inspiring place of worship to the congregation.

The first synagogue in which reforms were carried out was
the Reform Temple Verein at Hamburg in about 1817, and it was at this period that the name Temple came to be used to designate the synagogue of the reform congregation. This use of the term "Temple" was the result of the position taken by advocates of Reform Judaism that Israel was no longer in exile and that every house of worship was a temple just as sacrosanct as had been the Temple at Jerusalem.

The curtailing of the ritual made the greatest changes in the plan of the building. The large space surrounding the Almemar was eliminated, as it was no longer needed after the suppression of the processional, and the reading desk was moved to a platform directly in front of the Ark, the elimination of this aisle space permitting an increase in the number of seats. The high lattice or grille concealing the women was abolished and they were even allowed to take their places beside the men of the family. The organ was introduced with a choir, and was placed either near or above the ark, or directly opposite to it in the balcony over the entrance; stationary benches or pews were introduced superseding the old movable desks. The fore court was reduced to a simple vestibule and in many cases no thought was given to orientation, so that the congregation no longer faced Jerusalem when at prayer. A large section of the Jews, however, did not subscribe to these changes, and their buildings retained much of the older arrangement for services, but even they abolished the high screen, though the women were still segregated. It was at this time that the galleries, which existed in the basilica type, began to be utilized exclusively for the women, and this procedure came into general use and with few exceptions continues to be the most popular form today.
One interesting variant, however, is to be found in the new Mikve Israel Synagogue in Philadelphia. Here it was decided that it was too much of a physical hardship for the women to climb to a high gallery, so the old idea of stationing the women's section near the ground level was revived. It is arranged on either side of the building, and can easily be reached by a few steps leading from the common vestibule, which lies in front of the hall of worship. The Almemar is near the long west wall between the two entrance doors for men and opposite the ark, which is here developed into the principal architectural motive of the interior. An aisle, large enough to permit of the processional, connects the Almemar with the ark. It is probable that this synagogue boasts the only arrangement of this character in America.
Another interesting variant occurs in the plan of the Shearith Israel Synagogue in New York. The location on the west side of an avenue, forced the entrance in, the east wall of the building. In order to retain the proper legal orientation, the ark is placed between the entrance doors, and the congregation is veered about on entering, so that in prayer, they may face the ark and look towards the east. This arrangement is like that of the Galilean synagogues, but was arrived at independently, as at the time of construction the Galilean excavations had not been completed.

Types of plans other than the Basilica (except in some few instances in the east) were gradually abandoned during the nineteenth century by both the Orthodox and Reform synagogues of Europe and America. Tradition was strongly in favor of this form and it was the only one that adequately
fulfilled all the requirements then known. The growth of congregations, the increased demand for seating space, and the high cost of building sites, which necessarily confined the ground area, made the retention of the galleries almost imperative.

Those activities which were connected historically with places of worship, such as school rooms and halls for social purposes, began to take on a more important rôle, and as these rooms were almost invariably placed in the basement under the Synagogue, it was found that the long narrow type of plan afforded a greater area for admitting outside light. The columns that supported the galleries, continuing up, also made the construction of the roof more simple, and the narrow auditorium was easily lighted by side windows, even if placed on a narrow court, which was usually the case in large cities. This basilica type of plan was carried to the highest development with important vestibules, staircases and elaborate arrangements of piers and vaulting. An example of this style may be seen in the Synagogue at Munich.

No sooner, however, had this plan been settled upon than defects of great importance became evident. As the building grew larger, the depth of the Hall became so great that those in the rear had difficulty in hearing and seeing the services. The galleries were uncomfortable, and it was hard to see from such a distance the activities taking place around the ark. There was also the extra effort of climbing the stairs. All these discomforts tended towards making the seats in the galleries undesirable, and those that were forced to take them, were of necessity, the less wealthy members of the congregation. This ultimately led to certain demoralizing social distinctions. Furthermore, the columns that sup-
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ported the balconies and roof obscured a clear view of the ark, and consequently were a source of annoyance.

The architects strove valiantly to overcome these defects and resorted to many expedients, but none of them proved entirely satisfactory. The floor was inclined towards the ark to counteract the great depth of the auditorium, and this improved the view and had a consequent psychologically beneficial effect upon the hearing. Likewise, the steppings in the balconies were increased in height, and this somewhat improved the sight lines, but it did not increase the comfort.

In some cases, the stairs leading to the balcony were arranged to ascend from the body of the Hall instead of from the vestibule, so that at least there would be no distinction on entering and leaving the building. This arrangement, however, increased the difficulty of exit after services, the noise of those mounting the stairs was often distracting, and the stigma of balcony seats remained. The columns supporting the balcony, following the precedent of the theaters of the day, were reduced to a minimum in size, and they, with the accompanying decorations of wrought iron arches and brackets, were left exposed. This reduced the interruption of sight lines but detracted largely from the dignity of the interior.

Such was the condition that existed in the beginning of the twentieth century, throughout Europe and America. It will be interesting to follow the difficult paths of the architects who tried to correct, as well as they could, the defects that have here been indicated.

The first effort to do away with the annoyance of columns was naturally to reduce them in numbers, and to place those that were retained in such a manner as to interfere as little
as possible with the view of the ark. The columns above the gallery and those supporting the roof were eliminated entirely. In the smaller buildings, the side balconies were omitted altogether, as seats situated there were of little value, and the supporting columns were the most troublesome to handle. The rear balcony was retained and was carried back over the entrance vestibule, for the few columns required for its support annoyed few seatholders in the rear of the hall.

In the larger synagogues, the desire to bring all the seats as near to the ark as possible necessitated enlarging the width of the hall, and the pews were placed on a curve, with the pulpit as the center. The slanting floor was retained.

The widening of the Auditorium made the plan more nearly square in form. The elimination of the columns supporting the roof required a change in the ceiling arrangement and construction. It was still felt that the demand for increased seating capacity necessitated the retention of the balcony.

The designer now began to search for an architectural form that would best express these requirements, and found it in the churches and mosques of the near east. The Greek cross plan supporting a pendentive dome seemed a splendid solution which was strengthened by historical precedent. The square plan was achieved, the arms of the cross furnished ideal recesses to receive the balconies, and a graceful roof covering was assured.

The cantilever system of support that had been developed in theater construction was a modern idea that could here be used to good advantage, and it was soon seized upon, with the result that the columns under the balcony could be
eliminated. A number of buildings of this type have been erected, usually however with many variations upon the original prototype. One favorite device is to eliminate the masonry under the four arches supporting the dome, and to hold them up by a single column at the corner intersection. This treatment, however, is found to produce an effect of instability, with a consequent loss of dignity. Recently, a number of plans have been developed in circular, elliptical and polygonal forms, which again owe their inspiration to Byzantine influence.

To obtain the imposing effect that such designs require, the dome must be of a lofty character, and so pretentious a venture can only be accomplished at great cost; and in many instances such height results in poor acoustics, a very serious defect in an auditorium.

Some architects, either because they have an aversion for the Greek cross type, or because the conditions of the site necessitate it, have changed this Byzantine form by widening the lateral arms, which brings the plan back more nearly to the Basilica type. When this occurs, the side balconies are usually omitted, as are all supporting columns; and the roof is treated flat with coffers or panels. There are also examples of the Greek cross plan and its variants, which are surmounted by a square or octagonal dome. This plan is advantageous because an appearance of height may be attained, although the ceiling remains low enough to avoid acoustical difficulties. As will be shown later, these type
plans, although inspired by the Byzantine, have been successfully carried out with classic details and ornamental adjuncts.

The development of synagogal plan has now been traced from earliest times to the present day, and this development is seen to differ in no respect from the evolution of all architectural forms over a period of years. It has been a gradual yielding to the stress of usage and a continual correction to
meet practical requirements. That it has, perhaps, not grown as freely as other forms, is due to the fact that there have been interruptions without number, that there has been at no time a large, skilled body of artists and craftsmen endowed with a great aesthetic purpose and the zest of continuous application to one architectonic thought (as in all other ecclesiastical expressions) and to the continual destruction of monuments that might have acted as impelling forces or at least have served as guides to those who came after.

A distinct style of architecture has ever been the result of an extremely slow development of architectural forms by a large body of artists who put forward each new effort only after careful consideration of preceding attempts, and whose single-minded purpose is to create something more rarely beautiful and more fitting than was ever created before.
These artists must be sheltered from too great an outside influence, and the conditions must include a mental and physical tranquillity. What is called character in a building, emanates from the repeated use of certain forms in the construction of that particular class of structure, which in time becomes symbolic. These conditions never prevailed during the long course of synagogue construction, and without all those beneficent factors so necessary to the development of an individual art, how can there be a distinct Jewish style of architecture?

Even when they were a compact nation, the Jews had but few craftsmen skilled in the building trade, as may be deduced from the fact that they borrowed their workmen
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from Phoenicia and Egypt when they erected Solomon's Temple. And later, periods of continuous tranquillity came at rare intervals. First expelled from one country, then settling in another, they were at the mercy of artisans in their adopted land; so we inevitably find synagogues built in the style of architecture that happened to flourish at the particular time in which they found themselves in some temporary abode.

Even in the days before the nineteenth century, when a comparative freedom was allowed the Jews, they made little attempt at distinct characterization in the construction of their houses of worship. Indeed, there seemed to be a definite effort to suppress any features that might distinguish them from neighboring houses, and to render them as inconspicuous as possible. The law that synagogues should dominate the surrounding structures was of necessity abandoned, and the desire for effacement was carried to a point where the buildings were actually unrecognizable as synagogues.

It is interesting to note the differences between the lavishness of the interior, free from the gaze of hostile eyes, and the simplicity of the exterior. One of the earliest examples of an attempt to express on the exterior the arrangement of the interior, and at the same time give it a distinctive character, is found at Frankfort-on-the-Main. Behind a low wall are seen the steps to the women's gallery; the balcony level is clearly expressed by large windows, and two colonettes are employed to flank the main mass, which were undoubtedly intended to recall the two columns of Solomon's Temple,—Boaz and Jachin. To the right is the main entrance, and the open court is enclosed by a low wall.

In the synagogue at Leghorn, Italy, the three aisles and
balcony levels are frankly expressed on the façade, which undoubtedly has influenced many designers of a later date. It can be clearly noted that the details of these synagogues followed closely the prevailing types of architecture then in vogue in the various countries. The architectural arrangements of the interiors are very similar, the only variation being in the position of the Almemar. This is always placed on the axis of the ark, usually in the center of the room, but in some cases nearer to the opposite wall.

To illustrate these points, a number of buildings are here reproduced, to show how the various problems were solved in different countries:

ITALY:—The synagogues at Siena and Pesaro and the building of the five synagogues in Rome cannot be distinguished from the secular buildings of their own period. Rich interiors at Padua in the Italian Renaissance style show a vault in the ceiling over the aisle between the Almemar and the Ark.

FRANCE:—There are numerous synagogues in the various French styles of architecture which show the prevailing influence of the period.

HOLLAND:—The synagogue at Rotterdam takes on the characteristics of other Dutch buildings. (See The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. XI, p. 624.)

JERUSALEM:—A building which resembles a mosque, even including a minaret, and the synagogues at the graves of Rabbi Meir in Tiberias and of Rabbi Simeon ben Jochai near Safed show a decided feeling for Eastern tradition.

ENGLAND:—Here are to be found many synagogues that resemble the churches of Sir Christopher Wren and Inigo
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Jones, as exemplified in the fine interiors of Great St. Helene and Dukes Place in London.

**Germany:**—A Romanesque synagogue in Worms, and a graceful Gothic structure without aisles in Frankfort-on-the-Main.

**Bohemia:**—Interesting Gothic Synagogue in Prague.

**Japan:**—A synagogue at Nagasaki which is not easily distinguishable from a native pagoda.

47. **Wooden Synagogue at Wilkowisk, Poland**

**Galicia:**—A building that resembles a fortified castle whose battlement might well have served for defence.

**China:**—Kai-Fung-Foo of the distinctly Chinese type.

**Russia:**—Many synagogues with the elaboration and confusion of detail which are characteristic of Russian architecture, also numerous interesting wooden synagogues which
are decidedly native in character and show no Jewish characteristics.

Spain:—A magnificent synagogue built in the fourteenth century at Toledo, which afterwards became the church of Nuestra Señora de San Benita (del Transito); also the synagogue that is now called Santa Maria la Blanca, both very handsome buildings, revealing the Spanish impulse and now preserved as national monuments. These two examples together with the Alhambra, served as models for innumerable buildings throughout Europe and America in the nineteenth century.

Canada:—Synagogues very much like those constructed in London.

United States:—The little synagogue at Newport, R. I., built in 1763, designed by a noted architect of the day, an early synagogue in New York, and the first synagogue to be erected in Charleston, South Carolina, are all built in the Colonial or Georgian style, and show that even in America, local types in the prevailing style of architecture were adopted by the Jews for their houses of worship.

A very interesting development in synagogual plan that has confronted the architect in the last few years is the establishment of a “social center” in connection with houses of worship. The idea sprang from a desire to widen the scope of religious influence and to awaken the interest of the younger members of the community to their religious and social obligations. These centers express the impulse once again to make the synagogue the center of the community in all things Jewish, and so they are really but an attempt to go back to early historic conditions. These buildings are usually placed in conjunction with the Sabbath School, so
48. DETAILS OF DECORATION IN SYNAGOGUE OF TOLEDO
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that the classrooms during the week days can be used for various social activities.

The chief element is the Auditorium, which is primarily the Assembly Room of the Sabbath school, and it usually has a stage at one end that can be used for theatricals and the showing of motion pictures. It can also be utilized for
58. FIRST FLOOR PLAN, 59. SECOND FLOOR PLAN, KENNESETH ISRAEL SYNAGOGUE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

dances and other social affairs. A gymnasium is considered to be a necessity. A series of rooms are also required for women's activities, in which Girls' Clubs can meet and
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where classes in sewing, cooking and the domestic arts find adequate space and comfort. The kitchen is usually placed conveniently near the auditorium and the ladies' room. Boys' club rooms are also included in the scheme and a swimming pool and bowling alley are part of the program. Very often a Chapel forms one unit in the group of buildings, which is reserved for weddings, funerals and summer services, and when necessary, it can be utilized to house the overflow that gathers on holidays. This building, when grouped with the synagogue, composes an interesting mass, although there are instances, especially in the large cities, where area space is at a premium, where one tall building houses both the social and the religious activities, the synagogue occupying one or two of the lower floors.

History has revealed the fact that a distinct style of architecture existed in all countries at all times, up to the beginning of the last century. Artists, therefore, were not embarrassed with the selection of decorative details, as all of them quite naturally used the same prevailing forms. And so with the designers of synagogues. They followed the existing modes without question, contenting themselves with the introduction of a few characteristic Jewish symbols to distinguish their buildings from those of their Christian neighbors.

At the beginning of the last century, however, all stylistic developments languished; indeed, art as a universal language became almost inarticulate, and the architects having nothing new to say, a series of revivals of the older forms of architecture was resorted to. For the first time in history the strange phenomenon occurred, that in each country of the world, buildings of quite different styles were simul-
taneously in course of construction. America suffered the most. Owing to the lack of definite tradition and to the mixed character of the people, its architectural form became exaggerated and confused and the style of a building was determined by the personal predilection of the owner or the architect.

There is ever inherent in a people the desire to express their ideals in concrete form, and architecture has ever been the noblest medium. The Jews of today are no exception to this rule, and there is an urge among them, amounting to an almost passionate demand, that their religious ideas should find visible expression in the creation of their houses of worship. The difficulties of accomplishing this seem to be fourfold:

(a) The large mass of Jewish people, having assembled from many different countries, bring with them definite ideas as to what a synagogue "should look like", so that each community or even each congregation has ideas of its own particular artistic expression. And there is no central body to dictate, or even to suggest a clarification of conflicting tastes.

(b) The great size of the country makes difficult the communing of the artist and the study of existing monuments, so that each effort is individual and not a part of a concerted movement.

(c) There are but few symbols that may be used to characterize the synagogue, which will give instant recognition to a Jewish house of worship.

(d) The abandonment of the ritual reduces the interior of the synagogue to a simple lecture hall, scarcely distinguishable from secular buildings serving the same purpose. For
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its proper functioning, the sight lines must be conserved, excellent acoustic properties must be attained, and there must be sufficient light in all parts of the room to permit of reading.

These practical requirements often conflict with those elements that have always produced deep religious emotions and have made the Gothic cathedrals so awe-inspiring. The repetition of piers and arches produces noble perspectives suggesting the infinite; vaulting, soaring heavenward, exalts the spirit, and the dim religious light that stirs the imagination and creates mystery, must all be abandoned to meet modern synagogual requirements.

Many exotic styles of architecture have been employed in the attempt to achieve a distinctive type,—among them
the Moorish, the Assyrian and the Egyptian, but these fortunately have generally been abandoned when they were found to be inelastic and unsuited to dissimilar climatic conditions and to different building materials.

In going over the field of recent endeavor, it would seem that the styles selected by architects have narrowed down to only two—a free interpretation of the classic, or some form of the Byzantine. Each type has produced interesting and successful examples. There are many arguments in favor of each, but only time can tell which one will survive, or if indeed either will be final.

This question of style relating to American synagogue construction is inseparable from the general question of a distinctive American style of architecture, and has been the topic for great discussion during the past years, and it is indeed today, still far from final solution.
67. EXTERIOR OF NEW TEMPLE EMANUEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

68. INTERIOR VIEW OF SAME

Bakewell & Brown, Architects
70. TEMPLE TIFERETH ISRAEL, CLEVELAND, O.

Charles R. Greco, Architect

71. TEMPLE RODEPH SHOLOM, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Palmer & Hornbostel, Architects
72. SINAI TEMPLE, MT. VERNON, N. Y.

73. INTERIOR VIEW OF SYNAGOGUE AT STRASSBURG, FRANCE
74. ISAIAH TEMPLE, CHICAGO, ILL.
If there were any Jews within the territorial limits of the present United States before 1654, they were either transitory sojourners or they cannot be positively identified as Jews. The first Jewish settler or permanent resident, however, was Jacob Barsimson who undoubtedly arrived at New Amsterdam, in New Netherland, August 22, 1654, in the Pereboom. The record of his arrival is sufficiently full: it shows that he left Holland in the vessel on the preceding July 8, and that he paid thirty-six guilders for his passage.

Barsimson was followed to New Amsterdam, September 5 or 6, 1654, by a company of twenty-three Jews voyaging from Pernambuco, Brazil, in the St. Charles. They left Brazil, when Pernambuco, earlier in that year, was reconquered by the Portuguese from the Dutch, and their journey to and arrival in New Netherland were surrounded by difficulties and vexations. Indeed, they became involved in litigation over the payment of their passage and, in addition, Governor Peter Stuyvesant documented his "welcome" to
them in a letter, dated September 22, 1654, and addressed to the authorities of the Dutch West India Company in Holland. It reads as follows:

"The Jews who have arrived would nearly all like to remain here, but learning that they (with their customary usury and deceitful trading with the Christians) were very repugnant to the inferior magistrates, as also to the people having the most affection for you, the Deaconry also fearing that owing to their present indigence they might become a charge in the coming winter, we have, for the benefit of this weak and newly developing place and the land in general, deemed it useful to require them in a friendly way to depart; praying also most seriously in this connection for ourselves as also for the general community of your worships, that the deceitful race—such hateful enemies and blasphemers of the name of Christ—be not allowed to infect and trouble this new colony, to the destruction of your worships and the dissatisfaction of your worships' most affectionate subjects."

In due course this epistle reached its destination. Thereupon the Jews of Amsterdam, Holland, came to the defence of their coreligionists overseas. The directors of the chartered company, among whom there was in all likelihood not a single Jew, were memorialized by the Amsterdam Jewry. It was pointed out in this writing that the Jews of Dutch Brazil had shed their blood and sacrificed their wealth in the defence of Pernambuco, that the presence of the Inquisition in Spain and Portugal prevented their return thither, that Holland had always guaranteed the Jews complete equality before the law with its inhabitants of other faiths, and that a number of Jews were financially interested as stockholders in the fortunes of the Dutch West India Company. Finally, February 15, 1655, the directors resolved to permit the Jews at New Amsterdam to remain there and, April 26, 1655, they wrote to Stuyvesant saying, that in consideration of the losses sustained by
"This nation, with others in the taking of Brazil, as also because of the large amount of capital which they still have invested in the shares of the company... These people may travel and trade to land in New Netherland and live and remain there, provided the poor among them shall not become a burthen to the company or the community, but be supported by their own nation."

This grant of privileges confirmed the Jews in their legal rights as residents of New Netherland and thus constitutes the earliest American Jewish charter.

Pending the receipt by Stuyvesant of the company's answer, and thereafter, other Jews joined the first settlers at New Amsterdam. They engaged in trading operations but were not permitted to acquire real estate as freeholders. Nor was the community suffered to exercise its form of worship in public although, July 14, 1656, the authorities granted them "a little hook of land situate outside of this city for a burial place." This, located on the present New Bowery near Oliver Street, in New York, is still in existence, a monument to the pioneers.

Again, while legally entitled to reside in New Netherland, the Jews had to bear a disproportionately large share of the tax-levy, especially the payment of a monthly charge in lieu of their performance of military service. The latter disability, however, was removed through the courage of Asser Levy who, on April 20, 1657, was admitted as a burgher of New Amsterdam and thus became subject to the privileges and obligations of all its other citizens.

While the Jews of New Amsterdam, as early as the year 1655, began to hold formal religious services in the privacy of their homes, the public worship according to the traditions of their religion was not tolerated until 1674, when New Amsterdam had definitely become New York and the rule
of the Dutch had been decisively exchanged for that of the English. They occupied leased premises on Mill (the present South William) Street as a synagogue, 1682, but this site did not come into their ownership, nor did they proceed with the erection of a building on it adapted to such a use, until 1728.

In the seventeenth century, the Jews residing in the colonies on the Atlantic seaboard were principally traders although, as in New Amsterdam, strictly forbidden to open or maintain shops for retail commerce.

As early as January 24, 1656, Jacob or John Lumbrozo was a resident of Maryland and, February 23, 1658, was there tried in court on an indictment under the statute to prevent blasphemy. He was charged as a Jew with having denied Jesus of Nazareth to be the son of God. The trial resulted in Lumbrozo's conviction, subjecting him to the punishment of death and the forfeiture of all his property. These severe penalties, however, were not visited upon him and he was released owing to the opportune promulgation of the general amnesty upon the accession of Richard Cromwell to the lord protectorate of Great Britain.

Jews are said to have come to Newport, Rhode Island, from Curacao in the West Indies, as early as 1657 and to have brought with them the degrees of Freemasonry. Twenty years later, several Jews must have resided at Newport, for at this time they acquired land there for a burying-ground. In other sections of New England, where the Puritans controlled the government and forms of life, only occasional Jewish settlers were found and, in most instances, their identity as Jews has not been satisfactorily established. The fact that Jews did not settle among the Puritans to any
appreciable extent is all the more remarkable when one re-
calls the latter's interest in the Hebrew theocracy laid down
in Scripture as providing a model for their own state. More-
over, the Puritans evidenced an active, as opposed to an
academic, zeal in identifying the Red Indians among whom
they dwelt with the descendants of the Lost Ten Tribes of
Israel.

The American Jewish community of the seventeenth and
early eighteenth centuries grew slowly, and its members,
who resided principally at New York, Newport, Rhode
Island, and in adjacent parts, confined themselves to their
activity as traders. One of them, Rabba Couty, of New
York, owned a ketch, the Tryall, which was seized and con-
demned while in the waters off the island of Jamaica. The
attachment was grounded on the circumstance that the
owner of the vessel could not be an Englishman because he
was a Jew, the Navigation Act of 1660 restricting com-
cmercial operations in the colonies to British subjects. Rab-
ba Couty appealed the decree of forfeiture of the court in
Jamaica to the Council for Trade and the Plantations in
London. The higher tribunal, December 20, 1672, reversed
the Jamaica decision, holding that Rabba Couty, as a Jewish
merchant and denizen of New York, had the lawful right to
trade with Jamaica under the Navigation Act.

At this period, too, the restrictions in the case of Jews, laid
down by the earlier rulers of the colonies, began to be eased.
Jewish settlers and residents acquired the rights of burghers
or were granted letters of denization for specific colonies
even before the famous Act of 1740 was passed to provide
for the naturalization of foreign Protestants and others in
the plantations. Jewish traders, moreover, were gradually permitted to operate without limitation.

When, for example, Jewish worship at New York was suffered to be exercised publicly and the first synagogue owned by the congregation was built, the local communal life developed intensively. The synagogue was formally consecrated on the seventh day of Passover, 1730; the following year beheld the opening of a congregational school for the religious and secular education of the children of the members. In Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the acquisition of a burying-ground, 1740, preceded the foundation of the Congregation Mikve Israel, 1745, just as in New York and in Newport. The first Jewish settlers of Pennsylvania were active as traders. From Philadelphia these Jewish traders set out and established homes further west in Pennsylvania; they thus helped to lay the foundations of the great company of merchant venturers which accomplished so much of importance for the development of the hinterland.

Between Philadelphia and Charleston, South Carolina, before 1750 there were only a few scattered Jewish settlers. They dwelt apart on farms and plantations and marketed the produce of their acres. South Carolina presents a different condition from that obtaining in some of the colonies to the north, for its first settlement, 1670, occurred under the charter embodied in the "Constitutions" drawn up by the famous John Locke. In this instrument it was provided that any seven or more persons agreeing in any religion shall constitute a church or profession. Under this guarantee Jews, settled at Charleston as early as the end of the seventeenth and in the first years in the succeeding century, acquired rights as denizens and prospered as merchants. Their
synagogue, Beth Elohim, was formally established in 1750. Forty-one Jews settled in Georgia, July 7, 1733, soon after the colony had been established earlier in that year. Among them were Spanish, Portuguese, English and German Jews. Benjamin Sheftall, one of these pioneers, was a native of Bavaria. While the colony had been patented to a group of proprietors in London, who decreed that religious liberty should be guaranteed to all its inhabitants save Roman Catholics, and while the London Jewish community had contrived arrangements to dispatch a number of poor German Jews thither, yet the proprietors did not wish to accept these as colonists and, in point of fact, ordered all Jews settled in Georgia to remove from its confines. That this order was not executed was due to the action of James Edward Oglethorpe, who administered the colony for the proprietors, in calmly disregarding it.

Philip Minis, a Jew, born July 11, 1734, is declared to have been the first white child, native to the colony of Georgia. Benjamin Sheftall the younger, another Jewish child, was born in 1735. By 1737 a formal religious establishment, the Mickve Israel synagogue at Savannah, had already been organized. Three years later, through the removal to Charleston, South Carolina, of most of the members, the congregation was allowed to slumber; it was not permanently reestablished until 1774. The first communal burying-ground was acquired in 1773.

As late as September 23, 1737 the Assembly of New York resolved that Jews could not be admitted as witnesses in a contest involving the question of the election of a member to a seat in that body, since Jews had not the right to cast their votes for such representatives. Three years later the
British Parliament passed an act (cap. 7 of the thirteenth year of George II) providing for the naturalization in the colonies of such Jews as had resided there seven years, with an allowance of two months for necessary absence. Under this law many Jews (one hundred and eighty-nine in all) were admitted as citizens: one hundred and fifty-one in the island of Jamaica, thirty-five in New York (the last in 1766), as well as the remainder in various other localities.

The colonial Jews were not completely engrossed in their mercantile concerns. A number of them were benefactors of the early collegiate foundations like Yale at New Haven, Connecticut, and Brown, at Providence, Rhode Island; others, belonging to the younger generation, entered as students at Columbia (founded as King's) College at New York, and the University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia. As early as 1742, two licensed Jewish physicians were practicing their profession at New York, a fact which strikingly proves that the Jews of this period were not exclusively traders. Moreover, Jewish merchants contributed of their substance to worthy causes: in 1711 when funds were needed to enable Trinity Church at New York to rebuild its damaged steeple, local Jews were among the contributors. Judah Monis, although he was converted to the dominant faith, deserves mention as an early instructor of Hebrew at Harvard University at Cambridge, Massachusetts, and as the author of a pioneer Hebrew grammar published in America. Jews, too, were intimately associated with the beginnings of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry in America and, as if to compensate for the Jewish support of American institutions of higher learning, President Ezra Stiles of Yale evinced a deep interest in the fortunes of our coreligionists, especially
of those united in the community of Newport, Rhode Island.

During the French and Indian War 1754–1763, the Jews in the American colonies, although quite insignificant in numerical strength, rendered useful service to the British as army contractors in several instances. The younger men among them were active combatants. The importance of these army contractors is apparent, however, because of the large amounts involved in, and the extended duration of their transactions with the British government. They included members of the prominent Franks family and others, whose claims against the government thus developed to considerable sums. To discharge in part its obligations the government patented large tracts of land in the American hinterland to these purveyors. They utilized the patents in their trading operations, opening up the lands to settlers and thus extending the "map" of the future United States. Joseph Simon, Levy Andrew Levy, Barnard Gratz and Michael Gratz were the principal Jewish associates of the members of the Franks family in these ventures.

Other Jewish merchants like Aaron Lopez of Newport, Rhode Island, who owned and operated trading vessels voyaging all over the western hemisphere and to parts of Europe, were important figures in the life of the time. Such of them as could, converted their craft into privateers and, in this manner, rendered useful service to the British.

With the close of the French and Indian War, immigration into the English colonies on the Atlantic seaboard greatly increased, as did the number of Jews among these immigrants. By the time the irrepressible conflict between the colonists and the mother-country impended, the little
American Jewish community had grown larger. Its members had fully participated in public and civic affairs while maintaining their own communal organization, feeble as the beginnings of this were, in strict accordance with the traditions of their faith. In this connection an important link binding the Jews with the non-Jews of the day existed in the early Masonic lodges.

II

We have seen in this summary review of the events of the first hundred years of American Jewish history, how the ground was laid for Jewish participation in the Revolution, and with the preliminaries and the incidents of this momentous period in the development of the United States we shall now deal.

In 1763 there were about two million persons residing in the English colonies on the Atlantic seaboard, among them approximately two thousand Jews. Ten years later the Jewish population had grown to three thousand souls. During the war the preponderating majority of the Jews residing here threw in their lot with the patriots. They were undoubtedly influenced by the example of their friends and neighbors of other faiths who warmly espoused the same ideals. They had probably learned to appreciate this point of view through their membership and active participation in the work of the early American Masonic lodges. As the great majority of the Americans of the time were steadfastly patriotic, so the Jews among them were equally ardent adherents of this cause.

The actual resort to arms was preceded by ten years of almost uninterrupted clashes between the colonists and the representatives of the mother-country. These conflicts were
the outcome on the one hand of the British attempts to tax the colonists for their share of the cost of government and the wars, and on the other of the colonial efforts to prevent the levy of taxes without the consent of the taxed.

The strict enforcement of the Stamp Act of 1765 by the British authorities moved a number of merchants of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to band themselves together under a formal agreement not to import into the colonies any goods subject to the provisions of this odious impost. Among them were the following Jews: David Franks, Benjamin Levy, Samson or Sampson Levy, Barnard Gratz, Michael Gratz, Hyman Levy the younger, Moses Mordecai or Mordeca, Mathias Bush, and Abraham Mitchel. Similarly, the agreement of 1770 of the New York traders, not to import dutiable or tax-exempt commodities into the colonies, included the names of two Jews: Isaac Pinto and Isaac Solomon. Other New York merchants of the time, among whom were Jonas Phillips, Hayman Levy, and Isaac Seixas, expressed their opposition to the signing and acceptance of a non-importation agreement, not because they were affiliated with the supporters of the British government, but because they contended that the operation of such a protocol would fruitlessly subject them to considerable commercial loss.

When we come to fix the number of Jews who saw actual service in the field with the patriot troops during the Revolutionary War, we shall have to rely on the careful researches of painstaking students of the subject, rather than on the traditions which indubitably have crept into and distorted this part of the fabric of history. According to the results of research, then, we find that no fewer than forty-six Jews
served in the regular army during this struggle, twenty-four of whom rose to the rank of officers of the line (four lieutenant-colonels, three majors, six captains). If to the forty-six regular soldiers the Jewish "home defenders" and occasional members of the militia be added, it is fair to assert that fully one hundred Jewish patriots bore arms in the course of the Revolution.

A number of these Jewish officers distinguished themselves. Isaac Franks, in whose house at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, President George Washington resided during the epidemic of yellow-fever, 1793, enlisted as a volunteer, 1776. From 1777 to 1780 he served at New York in the department of the quartermaster-general; 1781 and the succeeding year saw him an officer of the regular line. In the Pennsylvania militia, Franks rose to be a lieutenant-colonel. In the same service, Solomon Bush and Lewis Bush reached the rank of major; the latter died as the result of the wounds he received at the battle of the Brandywine, 1777.

David Salisbury (or Solebury) Franks, who was a kinsman of Isaac Franks, served throughout the war and attained the grade of lieutenant-colonel. Active in the military operations in Canada and New York, he was for a long time a member of the staff of Benedict Arnold. With the latter's treason Franks was entirely unconnected. His innocence, rectitude and blameless conduct were triumphantly demonstrated before the military court of inquiry into the affair. Franks was at Marseilles, France, 1785, where he served as vice-consul of the United States.

Benjamin Nones, a native of Bordeaux, France, and after the war a distinguished resident of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in which city he died, 1826, was a major in Pulaski's
regiment during the Revolution. Isaac Israel was a lieuten-
ant in the eighth regiment of Virginia troops, Jacob Cohen a
captain in the cavalry from the same state, and Philip Moses
Russell a surgeon's mate in the infant American army and
navy. A colonel of the name of Isaacs is discovered among
the militia troops from North Carolina, while David Sar-
zedas and Abraham Seixas each served as a lieutenant with
the militia raised in Georgia. Of those who served as privates
in the ranks the names of Cushman Pollock or Polack, from
Georgia, Jonas Phillips, from Pennsylvania, and David
Hays, from New York, have come down to us. Asher Levy,
also known as Asher Lewis, who is said to have been de-
scended from the famous Asser Levy, of New York, was a
member of the forces from New Jersey.

The number of Jews in the troops raised by South Car-
olina was considerable. The Charleston company of Cap-
tain Richard Lushington, or Lushington's Company of the
Charles Town Regiment of Militia, as it was known, in-
cluded ten to fifteen Jews in its full enrollment of sixty men,
1779–1780, at which time the organization participated
actively in the military operations. The following twenty-
three names, derived from the memoranda of an eye-witness,
comprise those of the Jewish soldiers of this troop during the
years mentioned: David Cardozo, a subaltern, Isaac N.
Cardozo, David Sarzedas, whom we also found serving with
the Georgia militia, Myers Solomon, Isaac Solomon, Fred-
erick Jacobs, Ezekiel Levy, Philip Hart, Sampson or Samuel
Simons or Simon, Isaiah Isaacs, Philip Minis, also a member
of the Georgia levies, Zodiack or Zadok Solomons, Aaron
Henry, Solomon Aarons, Ephraim Abrams, Moses Cohen,
Attival Moses, Bernard Moses, — Moses, Nathan Phillips,
Solomon Polock, Jacob I. Cohen, the eye-witness, and Joseph Solomon. The last-named fell in action at Beaufort, South Carolina, 1779. Isaac N. Cardozo of this list served in other South Carolina military groups; as did Samuel Mordecai, a grenadier, Marks Lazarus, a sergeant-major, and Manuel Mordecai Noah, the father of the celebrated Mordecai Manuel Noah of later days. Jacob de la Motta and Jacob De Leon, of Charleston, South Carolina, are said to have been aides on the staff of Baron De Kalb, and the active service of Francis Salvador resulted in his untimely death at the outset of the war. Of Salvador appropriate mention will be made later.

Finally, it should be noted that when the British laid siege to Charleston, South Carolina, 1780, a large number of its inhabitants petitioned Lincoln, the American commander, to surrender the city to avoid further unnecessary bloodshed. Three petitions were then circulated: that of divers civilian residents, which carried the names of fifteen Jews out of a total of three hundred signatories; that of one hundred and eleven country militia, which embraced no names of Jews; the second petition of three hundred and forty-six country militia, which included fourteen Jewish names. Five Jews were confined on the Torbay in Charleston harbor when this vessel was used as a prison-ship by the British.

During the Revolution several Jewish merchants were enabled to render the country useful and patriotic service as controllers of privateering operations. Among them were Moses Michael Hays, of Boston, Massachusetts, Isaac Moses, Michael Gratz, Benjamin Seixas, Solomon Marache,
and Abraham Sasportas, all of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as well as Joseph Simon, of Lancaster, in the same state.

Among the private soldiers with the Hessian mercenaries sent to America in the British service were Alexander Zuntz and Joseph Darmstadt. Both liked their taskmasters so little and the land in which they thus found themselves so well, that they became permanent residents of the United States. After the Revolution, Zuntz became a merchant of New York and Darmstadt one of Richmond, Virginia.

Before we deal with those Jews who rendered valuable service to the patriots behind the lines and thereby helped importantly to carry on the war, we must concentrate our attention on the Jewish Tories. David Franks, a royal purveyor and connection of the patriot Frankses, was commissary-general of British prisoners throughout the Revolution. His sister Phila and his daughter Rebecca married British general officers. Myer Hart of Easton, Pennsylvania, was a commissary of British prisoners, and Moses Nunes, of Savannah, Georgia, a searcher of the port. In October, 1776, a group of New York Tories presented a loyal address to General Sir William Howe and Admiral Richard, Lord Howe, his brother; among the signers were fifteen Jews. These included members of the Gomez, Hays and Hendricks families, others of which were staunch adherents of the Americans.

This division of allegiance among members of a family is paralleled by the action of different members of the same mercantile community. Thus, Aaron Lopez and the Riveras, prominent merchants of Newport, Rhode Island, were such uncompromising supporters of the Continentals that they removed from this locality when it fell into British hands;
their removal was a blow to the commercial importance and prosperity of Newport, from which that city has never recovered. Not even Isaac Hart and one Pollock, Tories who remained in Newport throughout the struggle, were able to outweigh the patriotic influence of Lopez and the Riveras. It is interesting to note that, after the Revolutionary War, Isaac Moses, Jacob Mordecai, and Philip Jacobs, of New York, with many others, were among the purchasers of the attainted and forfeited properties of the fleeing Tories, including those of Isaac Hart.

We must bear in mind that the Tories residing here did not have to enlist in the army of Great Britain; the regulars and the mercenaries sent to America usually sufficed for the execution of such military operations as the British undertook here. Yet, the question is in order: What moved the Jewish Tories, forming only an insignificant fraction of the American community at the time of the Revolution, to throw in their lot with the loyalists? The answer to it resides in the persistence of their early associations and sentiments, as well as their wish to continue their former intimate family and trading relations with England. Like most of the non-Jewish Tories, these few Jews were wealthy men and substantial merchants irreconcilably opposed to what they regarded as spelling the dismemberment of the British Empire.

That the Jewish Tories were few in number was a fact proved, for one thing, by the testimony of contemporary observers like Dr. Richard Rush, that the conduct and the sentiments of nearly all the Jews in America were on all fours with those of the patriot Whigs. Moreover, when important and affluent Jewish merchants removed from Newport,
Rhode Island, and the congregation of New York transferred itself bodily elsewhere, because these places had fallen into the control of the British, we are provided with telling bits of evidence to prove that the testimony of such eye-witnesses reposed upon truth.

Further examples of American Jewish patriotism were comprised in the services rendered by members of the community to the newly-established government in other than the capacity of warriors. It is almost needless to remark that the soldier and the sailor are not the only ones upon whom nations depend to wage war. Those who provide the sinews of war are of prime value and service to the actual fighters for, without such aid, the work performed by the latter is useless and, certainly, ineffective.

Robert Morris, as superintendent of finance for Congress during the Revolution, had three Jewish aides: Haym Solomon, of Philadelphia, Jacob Hart, of Baltimore, and Isaac Moses, of New York. Benjamin Jacobs signed the Continental currency bills, March 9, 1776; in December 27 of the same year Benjamin Levy functioned similarly. Levy Solomons and Samuel Judah, of Montreal, Canada, victualled the American troops during their northern campaign. The victuallers of the Pennsylvania troops of the line were Joseph Simon, of Lancaster, and Barnard Gratz, Michael Gratz, and Aaron Levy, of Philadelphia. Cushman Pollock, also of Philadelphia, with the help of Minis & Cohen, of Savannah, Georgia, discharged the identical duty to the levies from Georgia. Mordecai Sheftall and Sheftall Sheftall, his son, of Savannah, were the patriot fiscal officers for South Carolina and Georgia, 1778; the former at the same time was the chairman of the so-called patriot parochial committee
of Savannah. In the course of their service both Sheftalls suffered capture and imprisonment by the British. Finally, Francis Salvador promised to accomplish a great deal on behalf of the patriots in South Carolina, while Meyer Moses and Mordecai Meyers served this state in a financial capacity. Simon Nathan, Michael Gratz, Isaac Levy and Myer Michaels extended financial aid to Virginia, and Gratz and Levy of those just named became pioneers in the development of the Illinois country. This activity will be discussed subsequently.

Of two of the men referred to in the foregoing summary we must now speak at greater length. Haym Salomon, the first of these, was born at Lissa, Poland, 1740. He arrived in America shortly after the partition of his native land by Russia, Austria and Prussia, 1772, was consummated. Between 1776 and 1785, on January 6 of which latter year he died, he was a resident of New York and then of Philadelphia. In the latter city he became quite conspicuous in Jewish communal affairs; he was a member of the mahamad or governing board of the Congregation Mikve Israel, 1783.

At the outbreak of the Revolution, Salomon at once enlisted in the American service at New York. When the British occupied the city, September, 1776, they arrested and imprisoned him as a person dangerously inimical to their interests. Subsequently he was liberated because the British wished to make use of his ability as an interpreter to the Hessian and other mercenary troops, but he remained more or less under a strict surveillance. Two years later the British again imprisoned Salomon; this time he was charged with being a spy. He was condemned to death and kept in close confinement until he succeeded in effecting his escape,
August 11, 1778. He proceeded immediately to Philadelphia and actively espoused the patriot cause; a fortnight after his escape he presented a petition to the Continental Congress praying for suitable employment in the public service. From this time to his death he remained in Philadelphia; there he started in business, 1781, as a dealer in bills of exchange on France, St. Eustatius in the Dutch West Indies, and Amsterdam, Holland. Entering into partnership with Jacob Mordecai in the spring of 1784, he opened an office as broker, factor and auctioneer at New York.

Salomon's outstanding service to the cause of his adopted country comprised his successful effort, abetting that of Robert Morris whose so-called "right hand" he became, to maintain the credit of the new government through the negotiation of bills of exchange. He was the official broker to Morris' office of finance and to the French consul. In addition he was the treasurer of the French army, fiscal agent of the French minister to the United States, and the largest individual depositor in the Bank of North America at Philadelphia. Morris, as his manuscript diary amply attests, valued Salomon's help highly; between August, 1781 and April, 1784, the latter's name is mentioned about seventy-five times in this document. Besides advancing as a broker considerable sums for the special requirements of our government, as indicated, Salomon extended pecuniary aid in the same way to eminent figures in the councils of the new nation, among others to James Madison, our fourth President, and James Wilson, of Pennsylvania. He also supplied the secret agent of the king of Spain in the United States with the funds this intermediary urgently needed. Madison, in a number of letters that have been preserved, acknowl-
edged the assistance thus accorded him by Salomon.

When he passed away, Salomon left a widow, Rachel, the daughter of Moses B. Franks, and two young sons. He then owned over three hundred and fifty thousand dollars at their par or nominal value in stock-certificates of the government loan-office and treasury, covering the negotiations he had made on behalf of the Congress, as well as shares in the fiscal emissions of Virginia. Apart from these properties his estate was insolvent.

Francis Salvador, the second figure, was born abroad, 1747, and arrived at Charleston, South Carolina, 1773. He must have controlled some pecuniary means for, by the succeeding year, he was recorded as an important landowner in the colony. He was elected a member of the Commons House of Assembly and, on the outbreak of hostilities with the mother-country, immediately took up the cause of the patriots. As a whole-souled American he was a member of the first and second Provincial Congresses of South Carolina meeting respectively, June and November, 1775, and at the same time continued to represent his constituents in the Commons House of Assembly. He exchanged the council-chamber for the field early in 1776; July of this year found him a leader of the patriot expedition against the Tories and loyal Indians of South Carolina. In the engagement, August 1, 1776, between the two forces, at the early age of twenty-nine years, he found his death.

There were two other Jews adhering to the American cause during the Revolution whose careers demand brief consideration. One was the charlatan, mystic and popular philosopher known as Jacob Philadelphia. While the war ran its course he sojourned in Germany and there came in contact with Frederick the Great, king of Prussia. On the
king's ministers he urged the assumption of amicable relations and commercial intercourse with the United States.

The second, a humble supporter of the popular cause, was Gershom Mendes Seixas, born at New York, 1745, minister and hazzan of the local Spanish and Portuguese Congregation Shearith Israel, 1766, to his demise, July 2, 1816. Seixas is remembered as the patriot Jewish minister of the American Revolution.

When New York fell into British hands, 1776, Seixas decided to remove to a locality free from their control. In this resolve he was supported by the preponderant majority of the members of his congregation and, accordingly, their religious organization was set up and divine services were held at Stratford, Connecticut, 1776–1780. When the British occupation of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, had completely ended, 1780, the Stratford Jewish community, with Seixas at their head, repaired thither. There Seixas remained until March, 1784, by which date New York, too, had been evacuated by the British. In Philadelphia, he filled an important and effective rôle, officiating at the consecration of the first freehold synagogue of the Mikve Israel Congregation, September 13, 1782, and serving it in the capacity of its minister throughout the period of his sojourn.

The blank page in the records of the New York congregation stands for the years over which the Revolutionary War extended, a striking bit of evidence which demonstrates the complete and wholehearted identification of both minister and congregation with the American cause. At the first congregational meeting after the return to New York a loyal address to Governor George Clinton was the initial item of business thus transacted.
Seixas was named a trustee of Columbia College under its new charter, 1784; he served this office almost to the day of his death. In addition, he entered fully into the life and shared the secular ideals of his fellow-citizens of different creeds. He was the first Jewish minister in this country to preach to his congregation in the English language and occupied the pulpit of St. Paul's Chapel, Trinity Parish, in New York, by invitation.

Because of the British occupation of New York the numerical strength of the Philadelphia congregation increased. It had existed in modest circumstances from its establishment, 1745, to the close of the colonial period; under the stimulating leadership of Seixas, 1782, the community, then numbering about five hundred souls, circulated subscription lists to defray the cost of acquiring a site for and building thereon a synagogue. Haym Salomon, the principal benefactor of the congregation at this time, contributed one-fourth of the necessary funds from his own means. Two years later, as a result of the return of the New York members to their homes, Mikve Israel experienced financial stress. Despite this it succeeded in founding a school and adequately responding to the claims of its deserving poor. Meanwhile a number of the members of the congregation were actively concerned in establishing the lodge of perfection of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry in Philadelphia.

In colonial and revolutionary times the number of professional men in America corresponded to the need of their services by the population. The earliest Jewish lawyers hailed from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Moses Franks was enrolled a student of law at the Inns of Court in London, 1774. Moses Levy, born at Philadelphia, 1757, was grad-
uated from the University of Pennsylvania, 1776, and admitted to the local bar, 1778. After the Revolution he served in the legislature of the commonwealth and, subsequently, for many years was judge of the criminal court in Philadelphia. It was only after he had been elevated to the bench, that Thomas Jefferson seriously considered him for the post of attorney-general of the United States, then vacant. Another early judge in Pennsylvania was Samuel D. Franks, the son of Isaac Franks, the revolutionary soldier; Samuel Levy, Daniel Levy and Zalegman Phillips were members of the bar of Philadelphia in this period.

New York and Savannah, Georgia, were the seats of the first Jewish doctors of medicine in America. Doctors Joel Hart and Isaac Abrahams practised their profession in New York, and Doctors Moses Sheftall and Jacob de la Motta in Savannah, and Charleston, South Carolina.

The people of Virginia, 1785, by direct vote passed the statute which guaranteed religious liberty to all the inhabitants of the state. Thus the attempt to preserve, in the form of a religious establishment at this date, the government grant to the Anglican episcopacy of colonial times proved abortive. Prior to this enactment, however, the Jewish community of Richmond, the principal city and capital of the state, had come into existence; early in 1781 Jacob I. Cohen, the patriot soldier from Charleston, South Carolina, joined Isaiah Isaacs, the pioneer settler there. Their mercantile firm of Cohen & Isaacs soon achieved a position of influence in the business life of the city. In the succeeding years, other Jews followed the first residents, among them being Marcus Elcan, Jacob Mordecai, Joseph Darmstadt, the former Hessian mercenary, and Israel I.
Cohen. The Congregation Beth Shalome was founded while the new thirteen independent states still struggled under the Articles of Confederation; by 1791 twenty-nine Jewish heads of families were domiciled in Richmond and a Jewish burying ground was already in existence.

In several other states the close of the war marked the beginnings of their Jewish communities. In Delaware, members of the Bush family settled in this period. The number of Jews residing in New Jersey and New England, other than Rhode Island, was gradually augmented. Finally, David Emanuel, born in Pennsylvania, 1744, settled in Burke County, Georgia, 1768 or 1770, was at this time a local magistrate and member of the legislature. He had been a scout and member of the patriot executive council of the state during the Revolution. His subsequent career brought him to the chair of the chief magistrate of Georgia, of which he was the sixth governor early in the nineteenth century. One of the counties of that state is named for him.

Already the Jewish settlers in the states along the Atlantic seaboard had given thought to the opening up of the country lying beyond the Alleghenies. We saw that Joseph Simon, Barnard Gratz and his brother Michael Gratz, and Levy Andrew Levy were associated "with non-Jews whose interest in the western lands was active and productive of fruitful results. The successful outcome of the revolutionary struggle increased their activity markedly. Aaron Levy, one of their friends, founded Aaronsburg, Pennsylvania, 1786, the first plotted town in Northumberland County. The western pioneers, however, continued their business transactions with the existing commonwealths and foreign countries on a scale which even surpassed the magnitude of
their similar operations in colonial days. Barnard Gratz and Michael Gratz acted as purchasing agents of the Board of Trade of Virginia. They dealt in tobacco and owned and operated a snuff-mill within the borders of this state. In consequence of their relations with the new state government, the Gratz brothers came into possession of scrip warrants, issued by Virginia, for tracts of land situated on the Ohio River. Similarly Joseph Simon, Aaron Levy and the other Jewish victuallers during the Revolution were the owners of a considerable amount of such land-scrip. The lands of which these men thus acquired possession were by them utilized and developed with the purpose of obtaining a legitimate return on their investment and, coincidently, with that of extending the "map" of the United States. Joseph Simon, for one, was among the first American merchants who traveled as far west as the banks of the Mississippi. The descendants of these men in the next generation fully developed the spirit and ideals of the pioneers. These, early in the eighties of the eighteenth century, had financed an expedition to Detroit, Michigan, and developed the country surrounding Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The sons realized in the harvest the seeds thus sown, by extending the scope of their operations.

Our tale has been thus brought to its close: the eve of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and the establishment of the new system of government provided in this instrument. Under our first chief magistrate one of the earliest demonstrations of loyalty crystallized in the addresses presented to President George Washington on behalf of the six Portuguese Jewish synagogues then existing in the country. This act of homage is notable in that it fully ac-
cords with the consistent ideal of patriotism which ever informs the acts of the Jews of America. Their forerunners of colonial and revolutionary times thus transmitted to later generations the love of country which their deeds displayed.
The purpose of these lines is to set before the readers of the American Jewish Year Book a brief character sketch of the late Dr. Israel Abrahams: to trace here the full story of his life would be both impossible and undesirable. This is not the place for a detailed biography. But the American Jewish Year Book would indeed be incomplete if the issue for 5687 lacked a tribute to the memory of one who was so staunch a friend of American Judaism in general and of the Jewish Publication Society in particular. The year book for 5686 was graced—and joyously graced—by Abraham's appreciation of the work of the Publication Society; the year book for 5687 is graced—but mournfully graced—by the Society's appreciation of the work of Israel Abrahams. His loss is still so recent that to measure his worth in due perspective is a matter of difficulty. In general, when a great man dies there is at first a danger of exaggerating his importance: a short interval, however, tends to clarify the vision and restore a more accurate sense of proportion. But in the case of Israel Abrahams—as in the similar instance of Joseph Jacobs—time has elapsed and yet our verdict remains as it was. Our estimate of Israel Abrahams is not modified as the poignance of grief becomes assuaged. Why is this? Because his sudden death has meant the cessation of so many noble enterprises in which his initiative and driving force were but dimly suspected. With sorrow must it be confessed that his place knows him no more. "The King is dead"—but we cannot say "Long live the King", for no successor has yet become manifest. Though well
nigh twelve months have elapsed since he went to his rest, the gap is visible but too plainly; we re-echo the plaintive words, "thou shalt be missed, for thy seat will be empty."

The essential facts of his life may be briefly summarized. The first of these is that he was born in London; more than that, he was a true cockney, for it was within the liberties of the City proper that, from the day of his birth onward, his early years were passed. This fact seems but trivial: in reality it was important. Abrahams was ever noteworthy for his practical common-sense: he knew how to set about things quickly, and how to get them done efficiently. He never lost time through setting to work in the wrong way. Surely this was natural to him because he had grown up in the bustle and rush of the Metropolis, because he had picked his way to school amid the busiest traffic in the whole world, because day by day he had rubbed shoulders with the most varied types that humanity can produce, because he had learnt at the unrelenting hand of bitter experience how to fend for himself in the struggle for existence. So it was that he developed certain characteristics for which he was ever remarkable—punctuality, exactitude, a master eye for visualizing essential points and a master-brain for selecting instinctively the best method for any and every task. The day of his birth was the Friday before Parashat Vayyesheb, 19 Kislev, 5619, or November 26th, 1858. His father, the Rev. Barnett Abrahams, was a Dayyan of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation and the Principal of Jews’ College. His untimely death occurred on November 13th, 1863, and of his father, Israel Abrahams had not preserved even the faintest memory. This circumstance is due to the indefatigable diligence of Barnett Abrahams. He left his
house for early service before the children were dressed; he returned late at night after a day at the College and an evening at the *Beth Din*. This capacity for hard work was a trait which Barnett Abrahams bequeathed to his son. But robbed as he was of a father’s care, Israel Abrahams owed an immense debt to his mother’s fostering love. Mrs. Abrahams was a Rodrigues-Brandon and a worthy descendant of this famous family. Adversity served but to bring out her latent strength and, as if in compensation for not having known his father, Israel Abrahams was never weary of recalling her memory. His mother’s personality was constantly before him. It was this maternal influence which implanted in him that intense love for Judaism which burned in every word he uttered, that appreciation for Judaism in the home and family which he never ceased to praise. To this environment in his impressionable years may confidently be attributed the well-nigh unique position that Abrahams occupied as a religious teacher. He combined the most precious elements in the old and the new. His aim was ever to make the old a living reality. He was conservative without being reactionary and progressive without being iconoclastic. He came not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law.

His school and academic career at Jews’ and University Colleges must be passed over with the remark that he was the first student of Jews’ College to proceed to the M.A. degree at London University. This was in 1881. It is typical of the man that he gained the first prize for Logic and Philosophy of mind. At an early age he gave evidence of that versatility which characterized his later life. Although his career was destined to be spent in the sphere of Rabbinics, he attended many lectures in other subjects. But
he did more than attend lectures: his studies were exhaustive as well as extensive. In mathematics as in philosophy he gained numerous distinctions, and here can be traced another of the qualities that rendered his work so valuable, the appreciation of a fact not only for itself, but for its relation to the environment. Neither a specialist pure and simple nor a superficial dilettante could achieve this ideal. To the end of his life Abrahams was a regular reader of Nature (an English paper devoted to advanced Natural Sciences): the technicalities of science were of no less interest to him than the minutiae of Rabbinics. This far-reaching quest for knowledge was the outcome of his student days: the habit acquired at College stamped his life. The last book he wrote, in fact every line he wrote, brings out this great faculty of his. The title of his more recent American lectures, "Permanent Values," sums up finely his ideas of the real purpose of learning, first the discovery of truth and secondly the assignment of the discovery to the proper place in human life and thought.

Abrahams had entered Jews' College in 1872; he was connected with this institution for 31 years. On his graduation he became lecturer in English and mathematics (1881–1899) and homiletics (1894–1903). From 1899 till 1905 he acted as Senior Tutor. His influence was very great indeed. Nearly all the Jewish Ministers in England and not a few in America were his colleagues or pupils. What he did for his students is incalculable. Shy and immature lads, feeling themselves at a loss in their new academic surroundings, found in him a friend who understood these troubles. Elder students came to him with their problems. How many a "trial sermon" did he re-write! A candidate for a position
would bring up an address on which much thought and erudition had been expended but which lacked homogeneity and balance. "A capital text," he would observe, "now let us see what we can make of it." Or "An excellent collection of Haggadah; cut half of it out and you will still have too much."

During this London period Abrahams worked incessantly for the Community. His great book, "Jewish Life in the Middle Ages," first made his name. Edition after edition has been reprinted—and pirated. Abrahams had shown that he could combine learning and style. The same charm pervaded his regular contributions to the Jewish Chronicle, which were a weekly feature of that important paper. In these columns and still more in the Jewish Quarterly Review, which he and Mr. Claude Montefiore conducted for twenty years, Abrahams did more than establish his own reputation, he made those of others. He encouraged scholars not only by kindly and judicious criticism of their publications elsewhere but by inviting them to contribute to the Review. Many a future Professor thus owed to "I. A." his introduction to the field of letters. In the same way Abrahams, who was one of the foremost founders of the Jewish Historical Society and who, till his death, edited the Society's Transactions, was ever on the lookout for new blood. Of no man can unselfishness be more strikingly predicated.

It was while he was at Jews' College that an incident occurred which played a great part in his life. The Maccabæan Club went on a pilgrimage to Palestine. The Pilgrims included Israel Zangwill, Herbert Bentwich and Solomon J. Solomon. Just before the Pilgrims started, Abrahams returned from a similar quest. He went alone to view the land. Palestine made a lasting impression on Abrahams. In his
"Studies in Pharisaism" he used, in his essay on the "Cleaning of the Temple", with telling force, his observations of the Easter Ceremonies at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. In Palestine he met his dear friend and collaborator David Yellin. For Palestine he felt an affection which was as keen as it was judiciously directed. He repudiated the theory of secular nationality, but his attitude to Palestine was the reverse of negative. Any project that tended to the development of the land could count on his adherence; he showed no preferences. The Evelina School and the University— to which he gave many of the best treasures in his library— were equally dear to him: whether the institution was British or Foreign, Zionist, or non-Zionist, it made no difference to him; with his pen or by word of mouth he was an ardent propagandist.

When Dr. Schechter went to New York, Abrahams succeeded him in the Cambridge Readership of Talmudics. Of his Cambridge life a word will be said below: here it may be mentioned that it was in Cambridge that his American "episodes" took place. Abrahams' interest in America had long been latent. Possibly it was due, to some extent, to his friendship with Zangwill to whom the freedom of America and its potentialities had always been beloved themes. But Abrahams saw in America a new center of Judaism, where problems would find their own solution, possibly on lines undreamt of. Speculations about this future fascinated him and awoke in him a desire to play an active part in preparing the way. He had many friends in America, he corresponded with American scholars and introduced many American books to English readers. One by one English scholars stole across the Atlantic: by tens American scholars and friends visited Abrahams at Cambridge. Finally the mo-
ment was ripe and he himself made the journey. Of the enormous success that attended him it is unnecessary to dwell in pages that will be read in the towns where he wandered and lectured. What he thought of America stands imprinted in the address, spoken on the spur of the moment and revealing his innermost thoughts, which he delivered to the Jewish Publication Society of America at the annual meeting and which is published in the Year Book for 1923–24. America inspired him to his best: “Permanent Values” and “The Glory of God” stand in a category by themselves. They were the fruit of his sojourning in the States.

His Bibliography would occupy many pages: it is not compiled, it never will be fully compiled. No one will ever plumb the depths of Abrahams' own versatile output, no one will rescue his *anonyma*. Nor will anyone ever know the books which he recast for others, and which bear their names and not his own. No one can possibly count the books which he caused to be written or the authors whom he helped to secure publication. Reference has been made to his unfinished works. Some of his books will appear shortly: his “Ethical Wills” is on the list of this Society. “Some Jewish Stars” are being Prepared for Press by Dr. Stokes. His “Legacy of Judaea” will be issued by the Oxford Press. But perhaps the greatest of all his projects, never, alas, likely to be realized, was a great Cambridge Jewish History, a composite scheme on the lines of the famous ancient, medieval and modern histories which his University has produced.

What Cambridge thought of Abrahams may be inferred from the unprecedented tribute offered by the University. The small Synagogue was incapable of accommodating all who wished to attend the Memorial Services, and so the
Vice-Chancellor took a step never heard of previously and offered the use of the Senate House for a ceremony as unique as it was impressive. On October 22nd, 1925, the ancient building was filled with the Heads of Houses, Professors and University Officials. For the first time in history the Jewish liturgy was ready within its walls. Two speakers testified to the honor with which the name of "I. A." was revered. On the Christian side Professor F. C. Burkitt spoke, concluding his touching remarks with an allusion to the "Glory of God" which had just appeared. "Of Abrahams indeed can we recite the Jewish benediction uttered on meeting a sage, 'Blessed he He who has given of His glory to flesh and blood.'" Burkitt's sentiments were re-echoed from the Jewish side. The following address by the Jewish speaker shows how great was the love which his Cambridge friends and pupils bore to I. A.:

"Because our Synagogue is too small to hold all who would wish to consecrate in prayer the memory of our beloved friend and teacher, we have assembled in this venerable hall where our University careers have their beginning and their consummation. Within these walls, which though hallowed by most solemn associations are yet not usually devoted to religious worship, there is neither bond nor free, neither Jew nor Greek, but the doors stand open continually, yom mam va-lailah lo yissageru, welcoming every seeker after truth, irrespective of his race or creed. That we have been accorded the great privilege of meeting here is consonant alike with the spirit of universal brotherhood on which our

1 Abrahams had died in vacation, hence the delay in holding the service. The date of his death was the second intermediate day of Tabernacles, 18 Tishri 5686, corresponding to 6 Oct. 1925.
academic life is based and with the character and ideals of him whom we commemorate. It is a fine tribute to his memory, perhaps the highest that the University can accord, an exceptional token offered in honor of an exceptional man. All mourn for him because all, non-Jew and Jew indifferently, were led by him in their quest for knowledge along the path that leads to God. To each one of his pupils and friends he gave of his best in equal share, a share so generous that each might claim to have received a double portion of his spirit, little recking of the bounty as freely given to his fellow, deeming it beyond belief that one man could do so much for so many. Therefore the thought of him links us in one common tie of gratitude and love transcending every difference of outlook and bringing us, one and all, side by side before the heavenly throne.

"This is not the occasion to review his life's work. Inadequate must be any fleeting summary of his activities, for they were so manifold and so far-reaching. His works shall praise him in the gates. Let us fix our attention on one or two only of the many things he did and did so well. Let us think of Israel Abrahams in Cambridge, first as a teacher of the University, secondly as a Jew and last as a member of the Cambridge Hebrew Congregation. For in concentrating on these three aspects of him, we may isolate from his many other noble characteristics certain specific ideals which we, above all men, should strive to make our own; we above all men, since we have been given his friendship and his teaching; we, above all men, since we stand in peculiar need of these ideals, of intellectual courage and honesty, of fairness to others, of fidelity to God and of service to man. Of these let us speak."
"Adjoining this house stands the building which, more than any other, brings his picture before our eyes. It was in the Library that we knew him best and that he was at his best—if we except his own home—for he disliked the formality of the lecture room only one degree less than the examination hall. The pages which his name fills in the Library Catalogue are an abiding testimony to his scholarship, but many more than the titles ascribed to him are the books which he inspired, created, remodelled or perfected and which are entered under the names of other authors. The mention of the University Library recalls to us instantly those hours of his precious time which he spent on us there, hours given to us and our elementary questions, torn from his scanty leisure which was ever devoted to important research. We, indeed, may be full of misgiving as we remember what we took from him so light-heartedly and as we realize now that what we had then the world has lost for ever. But he never thought so. Ungrudging was his help. He lived for his pupils, for his colleagues, for visiting scholars and for those who consulted him from distant lands. Many a letter from abroad, from poor students unable to come here, did he receive and answer. How often would we find him in room Theta, busily engaged in copying manuscripts for other editors to use, giving his labour, always without reward, sometimes without acknowledgement, to those who sought his aid. Is there one of us here who does not cherish recollections of Room 12, where he used to sit, surrounded by the Hebrew books he knew and loved and which he taught us to know and love? Al kiso lo yeshev zar, in that chair in Room 12 let no man sit who is alien to his spirit, who has not inherited his glory. His love of books
was all-embracing. He yielded to none in his bibliographical appreciation of an *incunabulum*; his knowledge of early Hebrew typography and of palaeography was immense. So was his estimate of a book as a contribution to literature and scholarship. But the commonest, cheapest text meant no less to him than did the rarest *editio princeps*, for he looked to the spark of humanity which its pages might enshrine. He possessed a genius for reading the writer’s message and for translating it into life, nor did it matter to him by whom or when the message was written so long as it rang true. Not merely Room 12 but the whole Library was his domain. There was not a section in which he was not at home. His power of co-ordination was amazing. He would take us from Rabbinics to English, traversing law, history, culture and art in his progress to find parallels, matching science with religion, equating past and present, demonstrating the links which unite man to his fellow, bringing out the finest gems that lie hidden in the mines of Judaism and Christianity. The keynote of his life was intellectual courage and honesty. He followed truth fearlessly and faithfully, never doubting that it would lead him to God, never concealing adverse facts, never exaggerating arguments beyond their due worth, always fair to his opponents, ever sound in his judgments. His method was first of all to amass his data and he had a marvellous gift in selecting material. Often he would change his mind after weighing the evidence before him. He never wrested his conclusions to suit a preconceived theory. Let these sterling qualities be our legacy. The lesson he taught applies to every one of us, whatever creed we hold, whatever path of learning we pursue; may we learn from him to combine boldness with reverence; to see the other side at its
best, to uphold the honour of our fellow-seekers after knowledge who may be treading different ways to a common goal.

"If we turn to consider Israel Abrahams as a Jew, we find these same characteristics pre-eminent. His impartiality was the outcome of a deep sense of religion, not of indifference. He was essentially a devoted Jew, whole-hearted in fidelity to his ancestral faith. To emphasize this fact, so obvious to all who knew him, may seem strange. But it is desirable to state it in the most unequivocal terms since he has sometimes been misunderstood. In truth, it was his uncompromising adherence to Judaism that enabled him to appreciate other religions: his intense love of God caused him to understand all ways of worshipping Him. Within Judaism it was the same. Israel Abrahams was an unhyphenated Jew. To him controversy and party labels were anathema, he could see good everywhere. He never attacked others, and when they attacked him or the principles for which he stood he would grant them the barren victory of the last word, leaving polemics to die of inanition. But then he would state his own case positively and objectively, emerging triumphant, perhaps all the more triumphant by reason of his complete indifference to misrepresentation. When, however, he was confronted with differences within Judaism, honestly felt and reasonably urged, he was a tower of strength. Sincerity of motive he always understood. The reconciliation which he labored to promote was ever a harmonious union of the best in each side, never a soulless compromise. So he was at once orthodox and liberal, both parties can justly claim him, for his deep rooted love of the Jewish past was coupled with a perfect realization of the needs of the present. His earnest hope was to make the Jew of today
both know and love the faith, history, literature and ritual of his forefathers, neither sinking this heritage in oblivion nor permitting the particular and the ephemeral to crush the universal and the eternal, or suffering a dead past to strangle a vigorous present. Between the extremes of formalism and iconoclasm he walked in balanced equipoise, a steadfast Jew, true to his God, a lover of his brethren. So he revealed himself to us Sabbath after Sabbath in those happy hours which we were privileged to spend with him and his wife and family—whose sorrow we share and on whom we would invoke the tenderest consolation of our Father in Heaven. We think of his deep spirituality, of his indomitable boldness of mind, of his unswerving allegiance to truth which impregnated his general scholarship and which, no less vividly, marked his Judaism. Truth and frankness at all costs, but truth joined to love and sympathy. In his life lovingkindness and truth were met together, righteousness and peace had kissed. When we stand before the Scroll of God and thank Him for giving us a Law of Truth and for planting in our midst life everlasting, may those solemn words convey to us their fullest import. It was a Law of Truth that Israel Abrahams taught all the days of his life, truth at all hazard and tolerance to all honest belief. May the Law which Israel taught ever remain the inheritance of the Congregation of Jacob!

"Thirdly we think of his loss to this Congregation. For twenty-one years he guided us, helping us by his personal inspiration. For many years previously he had been in touch with our Synagogue, as his printed addresses testify. How can that pulpit from which he spoke and which has twice within one year been so cruelly, sadly bereaved, be
filled? Will there again arise a teacher like him who will speak to us, with a living soul, having beheld God face to face? He knew our Community in four different buildings and wherever we met for worship his influence made our modest room worthy of the Shekhinah, as though it rivalled King's Chapel in splendour. Ever were his thoughts for us. At the very close of his days he was pre-occupied with our future and amid many urgent calls found time to prepare an appeal for a permanent building. How many men did he lead from an idle, worldly life to a knowledge of God! The Law of truth was in his mouth and equivocation was not found on his lips and many did he bring back from sin. May his spirit abide with this Congregation, a spirit of wisdom and understanding, a spirit of strength and might, a spirit of knowledge and the fear of God!

"We have to think of the future: we have to be true to his trust. It is ours to see that, in the words of the liturgy, the Word of God is our support, dispelling causeless hatred and implanting in our midst love and brotherhood, peace and friendship. For it is not over the trivialities of life but over the most precious of all our possessions, the very Memra Adonai, that causeless hatred may arise. And so Viyehe Memra dadonai be-saadekhem, veyifros sukkath shelomo alekhem, viyesalleg sinnath hhinnam mib-benekhem, ve-yitta benekhem ahabah ve-ahhavah, shalom vere'uth. Unless we remain loyal in this way to the glorious traditions of the Cambridge Hebrew Congregation, Israel Abrahams has lived for us in vain. If we preserve that spirit, then has he really risen from the dead. With the help of Him Who bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up, we solemnly vow ourselves to abiding fidelity.
"Lastly, returning from the particular to the universal, let us leave this place with one thought of his personal grace, of his friendship for all, of his readiness to pardon wrong. He never bore a grudge. He wrote these words as a hymn for the Day of Atonement and this hymn will ever recall his memory to us when we ask the divine forgiveness for our shortcomings:

   In suppliance before the Lord
      We stand, and pardon crave
   For cruel deed and wrathful word;
      O Father, deign to save!
   For mercy unto Thee we pray,
      O teach us also mercy's way!

   Healing from Thee we freely seek,
      Shall we not strive to heal?
   Do we, on others, anger wreak,
      And dare for grace appeal?
   O, in our hearts may pardon live,
      Ere we entreat Thee to forgive!

   To fellow-men, whom rancour lured,
      Let us forbearance show;
   Forgive the hurt we have endured,
      Then to our Father go.
   Let flesh 'gainst flesh from anger cease,
      And find at one Atonement's peace!

"And now when we have thanked Almighty God for the gift of a noble man, when we have, in the words of the Kad-dish, sanctified His holy name and acknowledged the justice
of His decree, let us silently, peacefully and hopefully go hence, carrying with us in affection the undying memory of our revered teacher, may his rest be in peace and his name for an eternal blessing."
KAUFMANN KÖHLER

By H. G. Enelow

"The Holy One," according to the Rabbis, "does not raise a man to leadership without first trying and testing him." Dr. Kohler, at the time of his death, on the 28th of January, 1926, was universally regarded as the foremost exponent of Reform Judaism. But to that high position he had risen after a life of toil and struggle in behalf of his ideals. "His is an intellect," Dr. Schechter said, "devoted entirely to what he considers the truth, and a heart deeply affected by every spiritual sensation: he delights to engage in what he considers the Battles of the Lord." All his life Dr. Kohler gave to the quest of truth, to the defense and furtherance of his faith. "You can judge," he wrote as a young man, "what an irresistible compulsion to reach clearness and truth drives me on." From that time forth he never wearied, and when more than fourscore years old he might have repeated the words of the octogenarian biblical hero, Caleb the Kenizzite, longing to conquer yet another mountain: "I am as strong this day as I was in the day that Moses sent me; as my strength was then, even so is my strength now."

I

In his early youth, none would have dreamt of him as a future leader of Reform Judaism. Everything in his antecedents and environment seemed to pledge him to strictest Orthodoxy. He was born, in the year 1843, on the 10th of
May, at Fürth, Bavaria, which, with its rabbinic academy and Hebrew printing-press, had formed, for many generations, a stronghold of Orthodoxy. His maternal ancestry and his relations included several rabbis of the old school. Moreover, all his teachers were of the same group; first, disciples of R. Wolf Hamburger, the head of the famous Fürth Yeshibah, who preferred to see that old establishment, founded by one of his ancestors, go to pieces rather than put secular studies into its course, as the government in 1826 had decreed; and then, successively, Dr. Marcus Lehmann, of Mayence, R. Jacob Ettlinger, of Altona, and, finally, R. Samson Raphael Hirsch, of Frankfort on the Main.

To all those masters—famous in the annals of modern Orthodoxy—young Kohler had gone for learning and inspiration, and it was Rabbi Hirsch, the most active and attractive of them all, that had made upon him the deepest impression. "The man who exerted the greatest influence upon my young life," he wrote after many years, "and imbued me with the divine ardor of true idealism was Samson Raphael Hirsch." When at Frankfort, Kohler was in his twenty-first year; at that time he was still so whole-heartedly devoted to Orthodoxy that he never visited a Reform synagogue, nor, though two sons of Geiger were fellow-students of his at the Gymnasium, did he go to hear Abraham Geiger, whose Urschrift had been out for several years and who was just then giving his masterly lectures on Judaism and its History, the first volume of which was issued in 1864.

What changed Kohler's attitude were some discoveries he made soon after entering the University of Munich. Various causes, or experiences, serve in different individuals to shake the foundations of an old inherited faith. In the case of
Kohler it was philology, a subject he took up at the university. In his study of Arabic, it dawned upon him that his old adored teacher, Samson Raphael Hirsch, was wrong in regarding Hebrew as the original language of the human race and in basing much of his teaching on that assumption. Dr. Kohler never forgot the dismay with which that sudden realization filled his soul. It was a blow to the faith, the ideas, he had imbibed from his parents and masters. Nor could Rabbi Hirsch, to whom he went for help, do more than assure him that he would get over his doubts in course of time, and that they were an inevitable part of experience—"the torrid zone" in one's journey through life.

But his doubts did not disappear. On the contrary, at the University of Berlin, to which he removed, they grew even more intense and perplexing, while the lectures of Professor Steinthal on psychology and ethnology served more and more to oust the simple notions of religion and history upon which he had been brought up. Those were sad days for him—days of spiritual anguish—especially as there was none to assist him with counsel and guidance. Zunz and Steinschneider were lecturing in Berlin; but he found them cold and uncongenial: he was not made for bibliography. Fortunately, he neither neglected his talmudic studies, nor allowed himself to fall into the mood of skepticism and irreligion which many others embraced. While his Orthodoxy was gone, the spirit of faith remained a vital force within him.

II

The effect of his university days we find in Dr. Kohler's first printed work, _Der Segen Jacobs_, which appeared in 1867. It was the thesis he submitted at the University of Erlangen
for his doctor's degree, but it attracted much more attention than such theses usually gain. For one thing, it showed a great deal of learning, both rabbinic and classic. Upon the study of the Blessing of Jacob it brought to bear a variety of knowledge gleaned in many fields, from the talmudic Midrash to Hellenic mythology. Then, it employed boldly the critical method, trying to determine the period of Hebrew history to which the Blessing belonged and the conditions it reflected. Incidentally, it gave an outline of the development of the God-idea in ancient Israel, and sought to show that the prophetic movement represented a continuous progress of ideas and was reflected in the Pentateuch, as well as in other parts of the Bible. All this, including the assumption of tribal polytheism among the pre-Mosaic Hebrews, was bound to please some as well as to irritate others. Yet, the most striking thing about that work, I think, was the Introduction, in which the author discussed the conditions of his own age and demanded more attention on the part of leaders to its spiritual needs.

"One is moved to write," says the young author, whom I am translating, "by a feeling of discontent with the present and what it offers. On the one hand, discontent with science, which is so ready to regard itself as finished and closed, while, as a matter of fact, we see everywhere mere beginnings toward a better state of knowledge, and with every branch of knowledge coming forward as an enemy to all the others, presuming to displace and supersede all others; and, on the other hand, discontent with life, which has been torn into so many contradictions, breaking up men in their religious, political, and social aims into ever new parties by such catchwords as Forward or Backward, Liberal or Conserva-
tive, without attempting to bring about unity or harmony. However, as concord and unity must emerge from the strife of contrasts, it rests upon every one who would work for a fairer future to contribute his share.” “Above all,” he demands, “is it not necessary to try to achieve such unification and harmonization in the realm of religion? Is it not true that representatives and teachers of religion have helped to create the sad disunion of the present and are still nourishing the unholy strife? In the name of religion, everything that is old and traditional is called holy, while all that is new is as such condemned, as well as all progress. In the name of religion, men are not allowed to think, to gain spiritual independence and maturity. That foolish principle has served to transplant crass ignorance and pollution to Jewish soil, also; a principle, the harshness and cruelty of which is felt in its full force by him only who, through love of truth and in the service of faith and by a sense of deep union with Judaism, has struggled for freedom of thought and has had to pay for it dearly step by step.” “Shall the young generation,” he asks, “attain freedom through frivolity, or shall not its education rather aim from the outset to transform external religious forms into inward religiousness, the naïve customs of the fathers into conscious morality? Is it not imperative that children be taught nothing in the name of religion which, the next hour, would be contradicted or nullified by the teacher of the natural sciences? Shall we, by our attitude, help to make religion ridiculous, or undermine it?”

“Religion,” he argues, “is eternal. Man will never be able to dispense with it. It can never be displaced by cold philosophic statements or ethical abstractions. Mankind can
never dispense with the higher unity of action and thought, of will and duty, yes, with the idea of a Deity which has given to the free will its ethical laws and to the world of the senses its natural laws, no matter what different forms the Deity might take on in the conception of the individual. Religion, however, must try to adopt the form in which it can best serve the struggle of the age towards truth, unity, and ethical freedom, and thus connect the traditions of the past with the ideals of the future. And what are the ideals of the future of mankind, if not those which Judaism, or to speak more generally, Prophetism, put forth more than twenty-five hundred years ago, namely, that the time would come when men, united by a love of peace and truth, would regard and love one another as the children of one God?"

Surely, an unusual preface, this, to a doctor's dissertation! It was the combination of enthusiasm for practical work with the critical study of the past that probably earned for the author the anathema of his old teacher, Dr. Lehmann, as well as the ardent commendation of that matchless champion of both historic study and progressive effort, Abraham Geiger.

Diverse things have been written about "The Blessing of Jacob." Dr. Emil G. Hirsch said that it marked the beginning of an entirely new conception of revelation (which, in view of Geiger's many years of prior work, I doubt); Dr. Kohler himself regarded it as the first disclosure of the existence of the prophetic element in the Pentateuch, and as the unacknowledged source, in that respect, of Kuenen's History of the Religion of Israel. One thing, however, is certain: its publication destroyed the author's prospects for a rabbinic position in his own country. His best friends and
admirers could see that much. At Fürth there was nothing short of consternation at the news that a book by one of its native sons had been put under the ban by Dr. Lehmann. Dr. Loewi, an old friend of Kohler's, leader of the local "neologues," who had hoped to put him into the rabbinate of Nuremberg, upbraided him for imprudence. Even Geiger, it would seem, could see no hope, and advised him to prepare for an academic career. Dr. Kohler actually entered the University of Leipsic for that purpose, taking up further studies in Oriental philology. But, after all, one cannot thwart nature. He was not made for an academic career. Though he diligently studied Semitic languages, and wrote articles for Geiger's magazine on some minute philological themes with all the punctiliousness of a born grammarian, his spirit was not content. He could not confine himself to the past, nor to the lure of Semitic particles. It was the preacher in him that demanded expression; the man of spiritual action, of religious leadership, strove to the fore through his academic activities and disquisitions. "There was in me," we read in his Reminiscences written on his seventy-fifth birthday, "something of that fire of which the Prophet Jeremiah says that it cannot be quenched."

III

There was but one solution—America. Dr. Geiger warmly recommended him to the leaders of Reform Judaism in America as a desirable acquisition; he himself, on the strength of Geiger's introduction, corresponded with Dr. Einhorn, a native of his own province, and wrote to Dr. Samuel Adler (the letter was recently published by Dr. David Philipson). Finally, he was invited to become the rabbi of Congregation
Beth-El of Detroit. When he reached these shores, on August 28th, 1869, he was met by Dr. Einhorn, one of whose daughters he married just a year after his arrival, and whose successor and biographer (not to say apostle) he was destined to become later on.

Just a week after landing, on Saturday, the 4th of September, 1869, he preached his Inaugural Sermon at Detroit, in German, taking as his theme, The Qualities of a God-called Leader of Israel. It was based on the call of Moses, and as we read it, we not only admire its maturity and force, but also we can see why it had proved impossible for Dr. Kohler to remain in the seclusion of collegiate pursuits. He felt the call, we are told, to enter the service of God. He felt the call of the God of the Spirits—Elohe Ha-ruhoth; Go lead thy people, become a leader of the community of Israel, lead young and old to the flaming God-mountain, into the sanctuary of Religion! Moses he took as his model, discerning in him two spiritual qualities—humility and compassion—and two mental qualities, namely, an historical sense for the old, and a frank, sympathetic understanding of the tasks and achievements of the new age, of the demands of the present and the future.

It is not on record what the Jewish pioneers of Michigan thought of that lofty address and prophetic program. But it is said that they were pleased with his ministry, and that among them he even achieved some minor practical reforms. I have heard it stated that one of his meritorious acts in Detroit was to abolish the tallith. But whether that is so or no, it was not in that direction that lay Dr. Kohler's forte, or desire. His main concern was the Reform idea. Into its exposition and defense, he put all his strength and ardor.
He was distinctly the intellectual champion of the significance and purpose of Judaism as construed by Reform. And in that capacity he revealed himself soon after he came here, not only to his congregation at Detroit, but to the entire country. He attended the Rabbinical Conference at Philadelphia. Moreover, he promptly began to contribute to the Jewish journals, to one of which—The Jewish Times—he had indeed sent at least two essays before leaving Fürth, writing on both historical and contemporary questions, but especially on the need and meaning and legitimacy of Reform. None could doubt but that an important force, as Geiger put it, had been added to Judaism in America.

IV

From Detroit, after two years, Dr. Kohler was called to the pulpit of Sinai Congregation of Chicago. Reaching that city soon after the fire that had laid it waste, he turned his Inaugural Sermon—preached on the 11th of November, 1871—into a message of comfort and hope. As text he took the quickening words of the sixty-first chapter of Isaiah: “To give unto them a garland for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the mantle of praise for the spirit of heaviness.” That vibrant verse he developed into a threefold message for the desolate city, forecasting its great future and urging it to seek salvation through hope, solace through love, and freedom through faith, while aiming to found its new grandeur upon a spirit of communal solidarity and righteous living. One can easily imagine the salutary effect the address must have had upon the melancholy mood of his new congregation.
In Chicago, we are told, he was the first to introduce Sunday services. But, again, it was not the Sunday service as such that concerned him. What he wanted was an opportunity for teaching and vitalizing the Jewish religion, and making it an active influence in the lives of the people. His chief aim was to show that Judaism was not a mere relic of the past, that its truths were still alive and necessary, and that it was in harmony with the intellectual forces of the new age. He started a service on Sunday mornings because that seemed a good time to assemble the people, in view of the decay of synagogal attendance on the Sabbath, but neither then, nor later on, did he waver in his adhesion to the sanctity of the historic Sabbath.

It was for the promotion of the Reform idea of Judaism that he inaugurated the Sunday service, and the keynote he struck in the address he delivered at the opening service, January 18th, 1874, and called "The New Knowledge and the Old Faith" (*Das neue Wissen und der alte Glaube*). The title probably was suggested by David Friedrich Strauss's then recent work on the Old and the New Faith, and the theme, by the lively discussion on the relation of Science and Religion which was going on at the time, as a result of Darwin's epoch-making works on the Origin of Species and the Descent of Man, published in 1859 and 1871 respectively. Dr. Kohler sought to show that the new physical sciences, with the doctrine of evolution taught by Darwin, were not necessarily a menace to religion; that they could not be expected to remove or supersede religion; that, on the contrary, the more one learnt of the marvels of Nature, the more genuine must grow one's adoration of God; and that, finally, Judaism which had always been an unshackled and spiritual religion,
had nothing to fear from the spread of knowledge. Dr. Hirsch has rightly praised that address for its clarity and comprehensiveness; and even today it has not lost its value.

Religion and science, Dr. Kohler argued, were not rivals, but partners in the spiritual life of mankind. Like sun and moon, each had its place in the sky of the human spirit. Increase of knowledge does not mean diminution of the content of faith. The light of faith must shine ever more brightly in the sunlike radiance of science. Religion and science must illumine each other, and become as one. Not mutual belittlement, but reconciliation and unity, is their goal. Harmony of mind and spirit—of the whole man—that is their aim.

While paying tribute to the achievements of science and its contribution to human enlightenment, he pointed out its inadequacy to satisfy the human spirit. "Is it not strange and significant," he asks, "that just during the ascendancy of the physical sciences a weary melancholy vein of resignation has possessed the cultured circles of society? While our age celebrates the proudest triumphs of the intellect, marching forward with steam and electric power; while progressive intelligence keeps on uncovering new inexhaustible sources of well-being and extending ever farther the goal and outlook of the future, the pessimism of Schopenhauer and Hartmann has become the popular wisdom of the day, and the dreary philosophy of Buddha, the sad fate of dissolution into Nirvana, into dreadful nothing, finds a deep echo in the hearts of men?"

He could see no peril to Judaism in modern science, which culminates in the conviction that the world was not created by one act, but has evolved, and that man also was not
created perfect, but has grown gradually. That he regarded as the essence of what was then the new Darwinian doctrine. And shall that teaching lead to atheism? On the contrary. "I have a higher conception of the wisdom of the Eternal than if I believed that He must from time to time rush in to help or improve His own work; for, the eternal laws of Nature are His eternal wisdom, His immutable will. He were not the Eternal were He forced ever to change His Will."

Nor does man forfeit his distinctive place in creation, he thought, by the acceptance of the evolutionary teaching. The distinction of man lies in his capacity for growth. "The beast remains standing where Nature has placed it; man does not remain in the same position. He is driven by the creative forces farther and farther from his root, away from his natural origin toward the higher, the infinite; away from the transient shell towards the eternal. If nothing else, that would prove that more of the creative energy and the creative mind inheres in him than in his fellow-creatures. As all Nature, reaching from the inanimate upward toward living forms finally attains to man, the crown of creation, so man, with whom a new empire of the spirit seeks to be born, strives toward God, the Highest. In Nature, development takes place toward the external; in the spirit, it is inward. Thus, everything that stamps man as man—language, reason, art, the sciences, morality, and religion—our entire culture, has grown from rude beginnings into ever higher perfection."

Is not such a view of the world, he demands, which regards advancement and development as the law of Nature and of the spiritual life, and which says to man: Strive upward and forward; triumph over the lower world from which thou
didst spring; not behind thee but before thee lies Paradise!—is not such a view of the world the fairer praise of the Creator? Does not such continuous progress prove the sway of a supreme wisdom and goodness, which leads all toward completion? And does not such a view harmonize entirely with our own religion, the history of which is perennial progress and the goal of which is the highest ideal for the future of mankind? Is it not in accord with our particular conception of religion, which beholds its essence not in form but in reform, which sees its vital force in the eternal renewal of Judaism, and its Messianic mission in the movement toward a perfected mankind? "We do not die to the old faith," he concludes, "we let the science of the new age quicken our spirit anew and declare before the world the works of God and the goal of mankind."

Nine years Dr. Kohler remained at Sinai Congregation, and they were full of activity. Energy was one of his characteristics; Reform Judaism his passion. He longed to expound the contents of the history and the religion of the Jew in the light of Reform, and during his many years of study at rabbinical colleges and universities he had stored up a fund of knowledge which now came to his aid and fed his literary fecundity. His sermons often sought to elucidate important phases of the Jewish past, and the adaptation of old doctrines and practices to the new conditions. They invariably blended the academic with the practical, the research of the scholar with the fire of the preacher. Nor was their effect limited to his own congregation. Many of his addresses, in both German and English, appeared in the Jewish journals of those years. *The Jewish Times*, published in New York, is full of them. Besides, he wrote occasionally
on purely academic themes. His interest in scholarly work never abated, especially in the study and interpretation of the Bible, the beauty and glory of which he was always eager to make known to the people. Thus, he published, in 1878, a new German translation of the Song of Songs, accompanied by a scholarly analysis of its content and style, and dedicated it to Dr. Einhorn and Dr. Samuel Hirsch, on the occasion of the marriage of the former’s daughter to the latter’s son, Emil G. Hirsch. No less devoted was Dr. Kohler to the religious education of the young, which, like other heroes of Reform Judaism, such as Geiger and Holdheim, he treated as one of his chief tasks. In behalf of the young, he began, in 1876, to publish a history of biblical times, under the title, “A Jewish Reader for Sabbath Schools,” and later became editor of “The Sabbath Visitor,” which he filled with a mass of historical and ethical material, just as still later, in 1899, he issued a “Guide for Instruction in Judaism,” which has gone through many editions.

V

When in the year 1879 (less than four months before his death) Dr. Einhorn retired, it was quite natural that Dr. Kohler should be made his successor as rabbi of Temple Beth-El in New York. Here with the same zeal and ardor he continued his work as exponent of Judaism from the standpoint of Reform. “The Principles and the Purpose of Reform Judaism:” that was the subject of his Inaugural Sermon which he delivered, in German, on the 6th of September, 1879—the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary, as it happened, of the death of Moses Mendelssohn. He was still convinced, as he was when he wrote the preface to the
Blessing of Jacob, that Judaism is a religion which had gone through a process of development in the past and was capable of further evolution, that it is a mobile and not a fixed faith, that it contained a most valuable spiritual message for modern man, and that, moreover, Religion, as such, was needful to mankind, with nothing else to take its place. Judaism, he felt, was the religion of the future. “The idea of progressive Judaism alone,” he affirmed, “has given us the consciousness of a lofty mission, the victorious confidence and expectation of an incomparably great future, of which no current of culture or fashionable philosophy can rob us any more!” Ethical Culture, he was certain, was no substitute for religion, though just then it was being thus played up, to the delectation of numerous New Yorkers.

This was the doctrine Dr. Kohler was trying to spread, when Dr. Alexander Kohut, soon after his arrival in America in the year 1885, attempted to make naught of all the efforts of Reform Judaism, by declaring it to be no Judaism at all. He who disowns on principle the statutes and ordinances of Mosaico-Rabbinical Judaism, he proclaimed, forfeits the name of Jew. Dr. Kohut’s renown as a scholar was calculated to give weight to his utterance and to jeopardize the work of Reform Judaism. Immediately, Dr. Kohler took up the challenge. Though late in the season, after the Confirmation Service, when people begin to scatter for the summer, he gave a series of sermons under the general title, “Backward or Forward?” in which he offered a new and fervid exposition of the evolutorial nature of the Jewish religion and of the demand for a continuance of the process of adjustment, and for a reconciliation of the ancient faith with the knowledge and the needs of the new age. Through-
out these addresses, however, Dr. Kohler showed again some of his inherent traits: he never attacked his opponent personally, he denied not his linguistic erudition nor his right to his own convictions, he showed no lack of reverence for the past. On the contrary, piety to him was part of true progress; the two went together. But so much the more positive was he in the defense of his own position.

Those sermons, originally given in German, were published by Dr. Kohler’s Congregation in an English version. But they had an even more important sequel. They led to the Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference which Dr. Kohler convened in the autumn of the same year, and which adopted a declaration of principles which is still regarded as the most authoritative corporate declaration of the doctrine and aim of Reform Judaism. No wonder the Central Conference of American Rabbis, on the occasion of Dr. Kohler’s eightieth birthday, issued a reprint of the proceedings of that historic Conference as a tribute to its author.

During his New York ministry, Dr. Kohler gave himself freely to the various tasks engendered by metropolitan life. The Jewish community was growing, particularly as a result of European persecutions; needs were increasing. Of course, Dr. Kohler sought to stimulate the charitable activities of the community; first, his heart was sensitive and generous, and, then, as a scholar he knew that philanthropy or social service (or whatever might be the label of the moment) had always formed an integral part of Jewish religion and conduct. Often he spoke and wrote on the conception of charity in Judaism, and on its history. Nevertheless, Dr. Kohler never allowed himself to become a mere adjunct to other people’s jobs; or a mere advertiser of other people’s laudable
endeavors. He never lost sight of the substance of his rabbinic function, namely, to conserve Judaism—the Torah—by study and instruction, by the kind of teaching upon which ultimately all practice depends.

The multitude of essays and addresses he kept on printing witness to his unceasing diligence. The Jewish Times, the Jewish Reformer (which he edited and the caption of which he had adorned with miniature portraits of Mendelssohn, Geiger, and Einhorn), the Zeitgeist, and other periodicals, are filled with a variety of his contributions on both historical and polemical topics. In every important controversy his voice was heard: whether it be on the Sabbath, or Sunday service, the establishment of a synod, or mixed marriages, or the reception of proselytes, or the relation of the Jewish laws of marriage and divorce to civil legislation. Great figures of Jewish history frequently formed his theme: from Moses to Mendelssohn, from Hillel to Zunz, from Philo to Lazarus. Repeatedly, also, he wrote on the history of the Jewess, and her relation to Judaism. On the other hand, he produced some original critical studies, such as his essays on the Pre-Talmudic Haggada (in the Jewish Quarterly Review) and on the Origin and Basic Forms of the Liturgy (in the Monatsschrift). Besides, he edited, in 1880, a volume of Dr. Einhorn’s Selected Sermons, a second edition of which he brought out in 1911, with a fine biographical essay, in honor of the centenary of Dr. Einhorn’s birthday, which had occurred in 1909.

His great literary opportunity, however, came with the publication of the Jewish Encyclopedia, which, under the management of Dr. Isidor Singer, began to appear around the year 1900. Dr. Kohler was one of the chief supports of
that magnificent project, and some of its most important and authoritative pages were written by him. He was the editor of the departments of Philosophy and of Theology, in both of which, for encyclopedic purposes, a good deal of pioneer work had to be done. But, besides, he himself contributed some three hundred articles, especially on Pharisaic and Hellenistic Judaism, and on the origins of Christianity, subjects he had studied with particular devotion and construed from a standpoint of his own.

VI

Before the Encyclopedia was completed, in the year 1903, Dr. Kohler was elected to the presidency of the Hebrew Union College. That event was regarded by some as one of the ironies of history. They had not forgotten the feud which existed between Isaac M. Wise, the founder of the College, and the leaders of Reform Judaism in the East. Dr. Kohler was supposed to have belonged to the latter group. Fortunately, neither Rabbi Wise nor Dr. Kohler was a fanatic. Whatever their differences, they had not been blind to each other's merits. As a matter of fact, it was Dr. Kohler who had delivered the Sabbath address at the first graduation of the Hebrew Union College, as he had also presented some important papers at the meetings of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, founded by Rabbi Wise, and taken a leading part in the making of the Union Prayer Book, issued by the Conference, incorporating in it a good deal of Dr. Einhorn's book of prayers. Dr. Kohler's coming to the College, therefore, was not as illogical as to some it appeared. At any rate, it was hailed with joy by
those who were zealous for the maintenance of high academic
and spiritual ideals at that institution.

Nor were they disappointed. Dr. Kohler breathed new
life into the College, amplifying and improving its course of
studies, and setting before it his own high academic stand-
ards. But it was the spirit of the College he cared for most,
which he sought to express and to stimulate in every address
he delivered, whether within its own walls or elsewhere.
Some of those utterances found their way into the volume
called, "Hebrew Union College and Other Addresses," pub-
lished in the year 1916, as a companion to Dr. Schechter's
"Seminary Addresses"—volumes, by the way, which, stand-
ing side by side, aptly commemorate the friendship which,
despite doctrinal differences, existed between these two il-
lustrious leaders. During his presidency, the College moved
to its new buildings, the dedication of which was graced by
the presence, and enlivened by an address, of Dr. Schechter,
while the number of students increased, in spite of the dif-
ficulties that some new enemies of the President and of
Reform Judaism tried to create.

More and more the College came to feel the benign influ-
ence of Dr. Kohler's personality. Both the faculty and the
students delighted to honor him whenever occasion offered.
In honor of his seventieth birthday, in 1913, the faculty
issued a volume of Studies in Jewish Literature, with con-
tributions by European and American scholars; while the
students got out special numbers of their journal on the
occasion of his seventy-fifth anniversary, in 1918, and again
on his retirement, in 1921, after eighteen years of service.

Though absorbed in the work of the College, Dr. Kohler
found time for other important activities. For the Central
Conference of American Rabbis, which, on his election to the presidency of the College, had made him its own honorary head, he prepared several learned papers, such as on Assyriology and the Bible, on the Origin and Function of Ceremonies in Judaism (in which he defines the place of ceremonies in religion, and while recognizing the foreign origin of some old Jewish ceremonies and their obsoleteness, insists upon the need of suitable ceremonies to the conduct of the religious life); on the Harmonization of the Jewish and Civil Laws of Marriage and Divorce; on the Mission of Israel and its Application to Modern Times; and on the Theological Aspect of Reform Judaism (in opposition to the proposal made by a certain scholar that the Conference prepare a creed of Reform Judaism for final adoption by a Synod). In the latter paper the author offered a thorough critique of old Jewish creeds, as well as of the new one proposed, and took the position that any attempt at formulating a creed for one section of Judaism, with the exclusion of the rest, was a dangerous proceeding, which should by all means be discouraged, as it tended to create a schism, in antagonism to the spirit and tradition of Judaism.

Moreover, it was to the Conference that he originally presented the biographic essay on Dr. Einhorn, which later was incorporated in the Memorial edition of Dr. Einhorn's Selected Sermons. Dr. Kohler also took a leading part in the defense of Reform Judaism, which was being attacked just then from various quarters. Withal, he continued to produce occasional critical studies, as, for instance, on the Creed of Maimonides—a German version of his Conference paper on the subject, on the Zealots, and on the Documents of Jewish Sectaries (discovered by Dr. Schechter). Be-
sides, from 1908 to 1915, he acted as one of the editors of the English Bible issued by the Jewish Publication Society, which had previously printed his own translation of the Book of Psalms. Similarly, he served as a member of the Jewish Classics Committee of that society.

VII

One of the most gratifying results of Dr. Kohler’s connection with the College, was the publication of his work on Jewish Theology. In addition to fulfilling the duties of the presidency, he acted as professor of theology and of Hellenistic literature. In that capacity, he was led to co-ordinate the many studies in these branches which he had carried on for many years, and to prepare them for systematic presentation. There was need for such a work, the lack of which Zunz had deplored a century before. The Berlin society for the promotion of Jewish knowledge invited Dr. Kohler to prepare it as part of a series it was publishing, and when it appeared, in the year 1910, it was recognized forthwith as an important contribution to Jewish literature.

A large work it is, with a long title: “Outline of a Systematic Theology of Judaism on an Historical Basis.” But the title is justified by its contents. Indeed, judged by the wealth of its material, it is succinct. No wonder the late Professor Neumark—whose vast erudition made no spatial compromises—was amazed at its brevity. “Questions,” he says quaintly, “the full discussion of which would require several volumes, are kept in evidence by concise and exact linguistic formulations.” Dr. Neumark, also, commended it to the student-reader for “the complete references to the sources in the Notes.” “For the expert reader, however” (he
adds) "the all important fact is decisive that the presentation itself shows so minute a familiarity with the sources and the scientific literatures devoted to the same, that no scholar ever so great and recognized, is supposed to be possessed of it as long as he did not actually demonstrate it *ad oculos*.

As a matter of fact, Dr. Kohler's work tried to cover every aspect of Jewish theology, on both the theoretic and the practical side. Divided into an Introduction and three main parts, it seeks, first, to define the general concepts of theology and of Judaism, then to determine the essence of Judaism and its basic beliefs, and, in more than fifty chapters, to present the Jewish teaching concerning God, Man, and the Mission of Israel. Every chapter is pervaded by Dr. Kohler's central view concerning the history and the nature of Judaism.

Jewry and Judaism, to him, belong together. Without Judaism, Jewry is a body without a soul. It is a long, eventful history Judaism has had—spiritually and intellectually eventful, as well as politically—having come into close contact, and reciprocal action, with numerous currents of thought. Within Judaism itself, various tendencies and mental types have found expression—legal and lyrical, national and universal, ritualist and rationalistic. "But one thing is clear," according to Dr. Kohler, "the core and center and purpose of Judaism (as they appear in Scripture and in the liturgy of the Synagogue in the form of teaching and hope) is the doctrine of the One only holy God and of the upbuilding and spread of His Kingdom of truth, righteousness, and peace in the world, and the development and propagation of that doctrine is indissolubly linked with it as the historic mission of the Jewish people." Judaism is a
progressive religion, in the sense that it has passed through a process of evolution, while its goal is to hallow the life of the Jew, to fill it with spiritual radiance and ethical power, and to make Israel the priest-servant of mankind for the purpose of bringing about in the end the kingdom of God.

No phase of religious thought or practice is overlooked in Dr. Kohler's work. Whether it be divine love and justice or human duty, whether it be charity or revelation or immortality, whether it be the life of the synagogue or the relation of Judaism to other religions, all is discussed. Everywhere there are indications of the author's learning, but no less so of his temperament. While it is designed as an historic portrayal, the personal element is not absent. The entire book, which appeared in an English version in 1918, is written with warmth, with devotion and reverence, con amore, with such blend of love and reason as its author regarded as peculiar to Judaism itself, and, in spite of its polemic against non-Jewish doctrine, with generous recognition of the worth and work of other religions. It formed a fitting consummation to Dr. Kohler's years of toil in that field.

VIII

Retiring from the active presidency of the College, Dr. Kohler returned to New York. But that did not mean either withdrawal of interest from the College or cessation of literary work. On the contrary, he straightway set about certain new tasks. The Dante anniversary, in 1921, revived his interest in certain studies he had made of that poet, who appealed to the esthetic element in him, as well as the theologic. One of the fruits of his new leisure was a book on "Heaven and Hell," published in 1923, wherein he traced
Dante's eschatological conceptions back to various older creeds and mythologies. It was an essay in Comparative Religion and folklore; a return, in a way, to an old love of his university days. For the Hebrew Union College Annual, he wrote an essay on the Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions and their relation to certain early Christian prayers—again a comparative study. But, above all, he devoted himself to a work which he had had in mind for many years, namely, on the Beginnings of the Synagogue and the Church, and their Interrelation.

That was a subject with which, in its diverse phases, he had dealt off and on for several decades, and concerning which he held definite views. The Synagogue he regarded as originally a creation of the biblical Hasidim, or Saints, from whom, in the course of time, sprang the Essenes, who, in their turn, produced the first Christians. Jesus, he believed, was a disciple of the Essene ascetics, if not an actual member of their sect. At first, the Essenes were merely members of the Pharisaic group bent upon a rigorous exercise of religious duties and cultivation of the mystical virtues; but gradually they adopted certain concepts from alien sources and ended by being disowned by the Pharisees. Drifting more and more away from interest in the present life and into speculation about the hereafter, the Essenes inspired a good deal of what is known as Apocalyptic literature, the heroes of which were great figures of the past, such as Abraham, Enoch, and Moses. Out of their midst sprang the Christian Church, with its emphasis on the other world and with Jesus as its hero.

This subject, which Dr. Kohler had presented fragmentarily in previous writings, he meant now to treat as a whole.
True, the theory of the interconnection of the Hasidim, the Essenes, and the early Christians was, as far back as 1867, rejected by Joseph Derenbourg (in his famous Essay on the History and Geography of Palestine) as an attempt to explain the unknown by something equally unknown and obscure; and his view was shared by Abraham Geiger. But that did not daunt Dr. Kohler. He had actually finished his work, and revised half of it, when he died. The last article from his pen, however, which appeared before he passed away, was a contribution to the Jubilee Volume of the Hebrew Union College Annual, 1925, where, among other things, he advocated the establishment at the College of a Chair in the History of Religion, or Comparative Religion. It would, indeed, form a proper tribute to his memory if such a chair were created and associated with his name.

IX

"They are happy men," says Francis Bacon, "whose natures sort with their vocations." Dr. Kohler, I think, belonged to that class. Calling and character in his case went together. He was a born preacher, a trained scholar, and, withal, an indomitable idealist. The exalted dreams and hopes of the idealists never lost their hold upon him. It is a great thing, says the Roman moralist, to play the part of one man: magnam rem puta unum hominem agere. Such unity marked Dr. Kohler's life. "The Lord is my banner!" Adonay nisi; with that cry he began and closed his career.

The persistent unity of his thought was part of his greatness, but also of his romantic nature. A romantic he was, like his teacher, Samson Raphael Hirsch, though their goals lay far apart, and he himself disliked the term. To the one,
romance meant a return to the past, a retention of the past, by no matter what fanciful means. To Dr. Kohler romance meant freedom, unhampered pursuit of truth. It meant re-forming of the past, spiritual mastery of the present, and adventure into the land of the prophetic future. A knight of the spirit was he. He believed in progress, and never ceased extolling it, whatever the say of latter-day cynics. It was man's distinctive mark, he held with Robert Browning.

Progress, man's distinctive mark alone,
Not God's and not the beast's: God is, they are;
Man partly is, and wholly hopes to be.

Nor was his belief in the Mission of Israel blighted by recent attacks. Ideas and ideals live, he asserted.

His undying, undiminished enthusiasm, also, was part of his romantic nature. Others, though buoyant and fervid at the outset, have their disillusionments, their seasons of doubt, even bitter moments. Not so Dr. Kohler. One of those was he of whom the Psalmist says that in old age also they flourish. In his autumnal garden the roses of faith and hope still continued to bloom. He was active, ardent, enthusiastic to the very last—personifying, as well as professing, the deathless romance of the Jew.
HENRY MALTER

By Alexander Marx

It is not an easy task to give an account of the life of a scholar like Henry Malter. There are no high lights in the story of his life, no great events of general interest. He was a quiet, unostentatious devotee of Jewish learning who shunned publicity. He was permeated with a high idealism and fervent devotion to learning. It would require an artist to write an adequate sketch of the silent martyrdom undergone by this sensitive personality in the struggle with the needs of daily life. In his trials he had numberless predecessors in many generations of Jewish scholars. But he felt that he lacked the compensation they received in the general recognition of their labor in the vineyard of the Torah. In our country we are too much concerned with the problem of economic adjustment after the new exodus to give proper attention to those who spend their lives in the unprofitable business of reconstructing the past of our people, and in trying to bring nearer to our contemporaries the spiritual treasures of former generations. We have not yet learned to appreciate spiritual values in their proper perspective and we lack laymen with a background of Jewish learning who share to some extent the interests of the scholar and follow his efforts with sympathetic understanding. The Jewish scholar is a lonely man here, and there are very few places
where he can find companionship and encouragement. Dr. Malter suffered under this loneliness, yet he could not get himself to associate with men whose materialistic view of life prevented them from appreciating that intellectual aspect of Judaism so dear to him.

There is no record of the early life-story of Dr. Malter, though he occasionally referred to the hardships of his student years. For his early childhood we have a very characteristic account from his own pen in a Hebrew autobiography of which unfortunately only two short chapters were written. Consequently we can only give a brief outline of the years preceding his arrival in this country.

Malter was born in a small village Banse, near Zabno, Galicia. He gives a vivid sketch of the life there in his autobiography. It is characteristic of his early surroundings that he was not quite sure of the year of his birth, his father adding or deducting a few years in order to excite his ambition for progress in his Hebrew studies, or to boast to others of his accomplishments. The probable date of his birth was March 23 (Shushan Purim) 1864.

He devoted his youth to Talmudic studies under the guidance of his scholarly father, and early acquired a mastery of this vast literature. But these studies did not satisfy the very gifted young man to whom articles in the Hebrew weekly Ha-Maggid had brought the tidings of other fields of Jewish learning and of the combination of Jewish studies with modern culture. As this paper was published in Lyck he directed his steps to that small town in Eastern Prussia, which he reached after great hardships, walking much of the way.
Further wanderings led him to Berlin, where he lived over a decade adapting himself completely to Western standards, though originally many of the German customs seemed very strange to him. He earned his living by teaching Hebrew, meanwhile acquiring the secular education which enabled him to qualify for admission to the University in 1889. At the same time he continued his Jewish studies and enlarged their scope under Steinschneider at the Veitel Heine-Ephraimsche Lehranstalt, 1890-1898, and came very close to the famous master, of whom Malter and Poznanski became the favorite pupils at this period. It was the influence of Steinschneider which very largely shaped Malter's scientific career. At his suggestion, the latter selected as the subject of his doctoral dissertation a philosophic treatise by the famous Mohammedan theologian Al-Gazzali in Hebrew translation. He tried to reconstruct the lost Arabic original on the basis of other works of the same writer, and he displayed in his first essay his thorough familiarity with Arabic philosophic literature, as well as with the mediaeval Hebrew terminology of the translators. He received his Doctor's degree from the University of Heidelberg, in 1894, and his Rabbinical diploma in 1898 from the Lehranstalt (now Hochschule) fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums, which he had attended for five years. At the latter institution it was Martin Schreiner who particularly attracted the young scholar, as he shared his interest in mediaeval philosophy.

During his student years Malter, although of a retiring nature and of a pessimistic frame of mind, gained the respect and friendship of the best and most serious of his fellow students. The bonds between him and such men
as Samuel Poznanski, David Neumark and especially Micah Joseph Berdycewsky lasted throughout their lives.

Malter took a great interest in the publishing society *Ahiasaph*, which at that time had its publications printed in Berlin, and for this society he translated one of Steinschneider’s chief works, his “Jewish Literature.” In this book, Steinschneider had for the first time given an outline of the vast field of the literary pursuits of the Jewish people in its dispersion of a thousand years, classifying it by periods and subjects. In the Hebrew translation by Malter the book became accessible to much larger circles and exerted a great influence. Malter’s translation is remarkable for his Hebrew style which showed his pronounced purism, avoiding Germanisms and foreign words as far as possible, and replacing them largely with terms he had gathered from mediaeval literature which had been forgotten by modern writers. He also frequently coined new terms which have since been generally accepted. The basis of his work was an authorized English translation which had appeared forty years before, but he added notes, taking account of the progress made in the various fields since that time. Steinschneider’s longer notes were left for an appendix which never appeared, though in 1908 and 1909 Malter translated and supplemented these additional notes in collaboration with the present writer. If he had been informed beforehand of the new edition which appeared in 1923, we should probably possess this standard work in a complete and up-to-date form. It is to be hoped that with the new interest in Hebrew publications, a publisher will be found for these additions to his work on which he spent much time and effort.
A common devotion to our great teacher ripened in Malter and the present writer the plan of an edition of Steinschneider's collected works, the first volume of which appeared after Malter's death. It contains a fine, comprehensive sketch of the master from his pen.

Malter's writings show a wide range and a remarkable versatility: His interest in bibliography found an early expression in his contribution to Glassberg's book on Circumcision (1896). Later (1899), at Steinschneider's suggestion, he was charged with the very difficult task of cataloguing the books and MSS. left by the well-known book dealer Fischel Hirsch. The collection included many fragments of very rare and even unknown books and leaves of MSS. the identification of which required an unusually wide acquaintance with obscure branches of Jewish literature. It was probably his extensive bibliographical knowledge which led to Malter's appointment as Librarian of the then recently established communal library of the Berlin Community, a position which he held only one year.

In January 1900 Malter was appointed Instructor in Mediaeval Philosophy and Arabic at the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, and in September of the same year he married Bertha Freund in Saaz, Bohemia. He remained in Cincinnati till 1907. During these years he taught not only the subjects for which he was appointed, but also Bible, Mishnah, Talmud, Shulhan-Aruk and Ethiopic. For a while he also filled the office of Rabbi of Shearith Israel Congregation. Malter did not feel happy in his new surroundings and resented the attacks on the works of the Jewish past made by writers who in his opinion were not competent to deal with such matters. Though hardly
an admirer of the *Shulhan-Aruk* herself, we find him defending it against aspersions in one of the Jewish weeklies. As a convinced nationalist he could not reconcile himself to the philosophy of Reform Judaism and he tried to expound his personal views on this question in a series of articles in the *Hebrew Union College Journal*, 1902-03, under the characteristic title "Backward, then Forward". In this series he tried to show that, without the idea of Jewish nationalism and culture, Judaism could not endure as religion pure and simple. Neither Orthodoxy nor—much less—Reform would be able to carry on successfully the old struggle for survival. The final article which was to give the author's own solution of the inner Jewish problem was not permitted to appear.

Being at variance with the leaders of the institution as to the fundamentals of the theology of Reform Judaism which the Hebrew Union College represented, Malter could not long remain a member of its faculty, and, in 1907, he resigned and came to New York where he devoted himself to literary work, collaborating for a while on J. D. Eisenstein's Hebrew Encyclopedia to which he contributed a number of articles, including a comprehensive one on Aristotle in Jewish literature.

Two years later (1909) the Dropsie College was opened and Professor Malter was given the chair of Talmudic Literature, which he filled to the time of his death, April 4, 1925. His teaching was by no means limited to the interpretation of the Talmud and to discussing the literary and introductory questions connected with it. Besides interpreting chapters of the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmud and various Midrashim we find him reading the chief
philosophic works of the Judaeo-Arabic period. At the same time he lectured on bibliography, on mediaeval Jewish literature in general, as well as on its various branches, such as Talmudic, Halakic, philosophical, ethical, historical, exegetical, poetical and liturgical literature.

With the conscientiousness which was characteristic of Malter in everything he did, he took his teaching very seriously and tried to give his students the best possible training. Where only incorrect texts were available, he did not hesitate to procure MSS., in order to be able to get as close to the exact wording as possible and to introduce his students into the secrets of textual criticism. He had great pedagogic gifts and I have heard him praised by his pupils, particularly as a most excellent teacher of Talmud. He paid attention to philological accuracy as well as to clear understanding of the subject matter and never left a passage until every aspect was clarified.

The same painstaking exactness characterized all his literary work from the very beginning. Before writing on any topic he made himself familiar with the whole literature, no matter whether he was working on an article for an encyclopedia, a review, or an original paper.

His favorite subject was Judaeo-Arabic philosophy. He started a series of articles on the influence of Arabic philosophy on Judaism, of which only the general introduction and the article Al-Kindi has appeared (Ha-Shiloah VI, 38–52, and XV, 99–115). In his dissertation he announced the plan of publishing the most important work of the Arabic philosopher Gazzali, "The Intentions of the Philosophers," in the Arabic original, utilizing the various Hebrew translations for fixing the text. He had procured
photographs of the two Arabic MSS., but I do not know whether he had proceeded far with the actual work.

The book which was to crown his labor in this field was to be an adequate edition of Judah Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation of Saadia's great philosophic work, *Emunoth we-Deoth* which tried to reconcile Judaism with Arabic philosophy. Some twenty years before, he had prepared a very elaborate commentary to this book and had revised the text on the basis of the Arabic original. He realized, however, the necessity of procuring access to the MSS. of the Hebrew translation in order to be sure to put before us the text in the form in which it had actually come from the hands of the translator and had made its mark in Jewish literature. While he was engaged on other commissions given him by various bodies, he never lost sight of the great task he had chosen for himself. In his last year he finally had his material together and felt free to revise his earlier work and to prepare the edition of which he had always dreamt. Of the 320 pages of the text, he told me a few days before his premature death—at the age of sixty-one—he had covered 240, when a malignant disease began to sap his vitality. While suffering unbearable pain, he managed to go over another sixty, and only twenty pages were awaiting final revision when his power of resistance was broken. Near the goal of his dreams, a cruel fate took the pen out of his hand, but his last thoughts were occupied with this and other projected works which he had to leave unpublished.

The most important of Malter's published works is his exhaustive volume, "Saadie Gaon, His Life and Works", opening the Morris Loeb Series issued by the Jewish
Publication Society. This volume is regarded by many critics as the best and most scholarly biography of a Jewish worthy we possess in the English language. Here the scanty material hitherto gathered as to the life and personality of the greatest Gaon, which had been largely enriched by the revelations of the Genizah, was subjected to searching criticism in copious footnotes, on the basis of which an interesting and well-written sketch of Saadia's life was made. The works of the many-sided scholar are classified and described in the second part of the volume. Their influence on later generations is illustrated in a special chapter showing how they spread to all lands of the Diaspora. The bibliography of these works is discussed separately in the third part covering over a hundred pages. Here the author with uncommon thoroughness puts together a great range of references in the widely scattered literature of the subject, and the comprehensiveness of his work is amazing even to the specialist. He bestowed a great deal of care on the literary form of his presentation, and in spite of his 660 footnotes Malter succeeded in producing an attractive and readable volume.

Another of Malter's particular interests was Shem Tob Palquera, a later philosopher of less originality, but in many ways an interesting personality, who lived in Southern France in the thirteenth century, and whom Malter regarded as a representative of the wide culture of his country and period; he appealed to the scholar also as an excellent stylist. Malter sketched the life and activity of this "enthusiastic champion of learning and enlightenment", in a very interesting essay (Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series Vol.I, p. 151-81), and published his "Treatise on Dreams" with a
lengthy introduction (Ibid. 451-501). Several notes to this text developed into short articles such as "Dreams as a Cause of Literary Compositions" (in the Studies in Jewish Literature in honor of K. Kohler). One of his students at his suggestion selected another work of Palquera as a thesis, while Malter himself intended to edit a third of the smaller unpublished writings of the same philosopher.

During his last seven years, Malter was engaged in the task of establishing a correct text of the treatise Taanit of the Babylonian Talmud on the basis of all the extant MSS. The text he established, together with an English translation, is in the press and will soon appear in the Schiff Library of the Jewish Classics. But the full significance of his tremendous work will only become manifest when his complete notes with all the various readings and his critical remarks will be published. The American Academy for Jewish Research, of which he was the secretary, has undertaken this task and will carry it out as soon as it has the necessary means at its disposal. This work of patient labor and critical acumen which led him back to the Talmudic studies of his youth will, for the first time, show what liberties the copyists took with the wording of their Talmud texts and the critical method required in order to fix the original version.

There are other works of Malter which he kept in his desk, awaiting an opportunity to have them published, such as an author-index for Ben Jacob's famous bibliography of Hebrew books, and a Hebrew translation of the Arabic treatise of the early Karaite scholar Kirkisani on Jewish sects, and others. It is to be hoped that ways and means will be found to make the numerous unpublished works of Malter accessible in the near future.
Malter contributed many articles to the *Jewish Quarterly Review* and to various German and Hebrew scientific journals and popular periodicals.

To dwell in conclusion upon the personality of this remarkable and many-sided scholar, he was most painstaking in his work and shirked no labor in order to reach reliable results. He was very regular and systematic in his working hours as in his habits of life, and this made it possible for him to accomplish so much. His scholarship was of a very high order. He always tried to give his best and to present the results of his researches in a pleasing form. While he disliked to rewrite what he had written, he took great pains to formulate his sentences properly before putting them on paper. His style was clear, lucid, and even elegant. He wrote German and English equally well, but his fine Hebrew style was more characteristic than either.

Malter had a pronounced sense for the esthetic and laid great stress on proper appearance. His health was delicate and he suffered very much. He was a lonely man who did not make friends very easily and, being an intellectual aristocrat, he had a high standard for those he considered worthy of his friendship. In many respects he was a man of strong convictions, with a pronounced feeling for justice. However, he had also strong prejudices and he took no trouble to hide them. "I regard it as worthy of little men," he says in one of his articles, "to advocate the golden mean, this travelling in the middle of the road, which as everybody knows is reserved for beasts of burden, when the pavement on either side is intended for men." He never left people in doubt as to which side
he took. It was not easy for him to adapt himself to his surroundings. His nature was not a very happy one, but in a congenial circle he would show the whole charm of his attractive personality. With a whimsically ironical, yet good-humored smile, he would give amusing characterizations of persons as well as of books and events and he could be a most entertaining conversationalist. To those to whom he gave his whole-hearted friendship this was a rare and highly appreciated gift, and they could count on him in every respect. Altogether he was a marked individuality who exerted a strong influence on the scholars and the few laymen who cared for scholarship with whom he came into contact.
A life rich with activity, devoted to service, dedicated to the noblest ideals of humanity and justice—such was the life of Ephraim Lederer. Modest though fearless, kindly though firm, sympathetic though steadfast, uncompromising in his religious and political views, yet most tolerant and liberal toward the views of other people, he enjoyed the friendship of many and the admiration and respect of all who were privileged to know him and to come in contact with him. His actions were characterized by deep thought blended with fine emotions, by a sincere desire to be of service to human progress in all its manifold manifestations, by an entire forgetfulness of self in the work which engaged his attention. And this work embraced a large variety of activities. National and local politics, religious thought and practice, communal endeavor in all its aspects, and especially Jewish education in both its elementary and advanced forms—all of these and many more found in him a devoted worker, a most efficient promoter, and an ardent advocate. And all this was accomplished by him in so quiet and unobtrusive a manner as to make him known only to those who worked with him and were close to him in the various activities which crowded his life. He, of course, had his political opponents as well as those who differed with him in religious matters,
but all of them knew and felt the purity of his motives and the nobility of his aims, and admired him for these. We shall endeavor to give in the following paragraphs a brief outline of a life so exalted, a model of righteousness and of the highest idealism, and a pattern of Jewish loyalty and devotion.

* * *

Ephraim Lederer was born in Philadelphia, on January 24, 1862, and died in that city, September 11, 1925. His father, Leopold, came to this country from Meseritz, Poland, and his mother, whose maiden name was Fannie Weyl, came here in girlhood from Petchau, Bohemia, and lived with a sister until her marriage. Leopold Lederer was a man of a high sense of duty, devoted to his religious practices and observances, and well versed in Jewish lore. There is a tradition in the Lederer family that one of their forebears was the only sister of Moses Mendelssohn, although the surviving members are unable to trace the line of descent. Leopold Lederer was a great admirer of learning and of culture, was himself well-versed in German literature, having been a member of the Deutsche Gesellschaft of Philadelphia for many years, and was actuated by a great ambition to have his children trained in advanced learning, both Jewish and secular. Mrs. Lederer was a very modest woman, extremely industrious and possessing the power of application and tenacity in whatever she undertook. The Lederer home was conducted in the old orthodox style; attendance at synagogue was regarded as a matter of course, and all the many home ceremonials of the Jewish religion were carried out with scrupulous care.
Ephraim was their oldest son, and he was from childhood brought up in the elevating environment provided by a devout Jewish home, and saturated with the ideals of the Jewish life which found concrete and frequent expression in his immediate surroundings. In addition to his secular studies which he prosecuted in the public schools of the city, he was provided with private teachers at home for Hebrew and German and also attended at the same time the classes of the Hebrew Sunday School Society, where he came in contact with Jewish women of culture and refinement who were filled with an ardent love for their religion and its institutions. He was graduated from Central High School when he was but sixteen years old, after which he studied law in the office of Judge F. Amedee Bregy, and at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. He was admitted to the bar when he was twenty-one years of age.

One of his teachers in the Public School, Professor Andrew J. Morrison, appears to have had an especially strong influence on his character and on his professional and civic life. Professor Morrison was a man of noble ideals and of a high sense of duty, and Mr. Lederer often spoke of him with reverence and affection, regarding him as a model of proper conduct. Mr. Lederer was a prominent member of the Morrison Association, composed of the former students of the widely-beloved teacher, and attended the annual functions of the society regularly.

Even before he was entitled to vote, he showed an intense interest in honest politics. He was often a watcher at the polls, and would exercise his influence in every direction towards the maintenance of the high ideals which
he entertained for the proper exercise of the functions of officers of the state. He was for a short time connected with the Sheriff’s office, and, although quite young, he stood up manfully for the improvement and reform of the office in accordance with the principles of honesty and fairness. In his profession as a lawyer he was most discriminating and exacting in his choice of clients. Anything that had the slightest shadow of suspicion of falsehood was abhorrent to his soul. He entertained most exalted views of the responsibility of the lawyer and he had the courage to live up to his convictions in a most scrupulous manner. He did not succeed in amassing riches, but he acquired what is much more to be desired, the honor and respect of the members of the legal fraternity, both at the bar and on the bench.

In his political affiliations, Mr. Lederer was identified throughout his life with the Democratic Party, and he was a sincere admirer of the two great Democratic Presidents, Grover Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson. The great value of his services to his chosen party were recognized by appointments to several important committees of the national organization and later by his appointment, by President Wilson, in 1913, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, an office which he filled with dignity and with general approbation for eight consecutive years. The duties of this office were extremely onerous. The Income Tax law, which was then new and untried, increased the work of the Collector’s office enormously. Besides a thorough knowledge of the law in all its details, the Collector was expected to know the spirit of the law and to entertain a large and comprehensive view of all its
implications, in order to be able to adjust doubtful points, which were constantly coming up, in an equitable manner. Mr. Lederer approached his new duties with the same feeling of responsibility and earnestness that were characteristic of his life. He exercised fine perception, a deep understanding and keen sympathy in the discharge of his duties, and his integrity and exalted sense of honor stood him in good stead in coping with the many difficult situations which are inseparable from such an office. He would not allow the slightest shadow of suspicion or of favoritism to be cast upon his office, nor upon any of his assistants or co-workers, and he even went to extremes in order to maintain the highest standards of purity and unsullied integrity in his office and among his staff. Upon the completion of his eight years of service, a public dinner was tendered to him by his many friends and admirers. "The purpose of this dinner," in the words of the invitation, was, "to show in some measure public recognition of his sterling qualities as a citizen and appreciation of his services as Collector of Internal Revenue, the duties of which office he discharged with the highest integrity and greatest fidelity to the Government and the public, reflecting credit upon our city and the large collection district of which he had charge for eight years." The highest encomiums were paid to him on that occasion by men of national fame, including the President, cabinet officers and other dignitaries of the nation and of the state. Even his political opponents had nothing but praise for the manner in which he discharged his important duties. He did not cease his political activity after he left his office, but continued his labors for the maintenance of the highest standards of clean government,
with the same vigor and enthusiasm, until his physical powers began to wane and he could not devote himself as much to the work which he regarded most sacred in the life of a citizen.

* * *

It was only natural that the Jewish community in which he lived all his life should come to recognize his fine qualities of heart and mind and make demands on his time and energy in behalf of the various charitable and cultural activities in which it was engaged. It was mainly in these activities that Mr. Lederer's exalted ideals of duty and of service manifested themselves. From his early youth, he gave himself unstintingly to various communal movements, and contributed, by his knowledge, by his energy, and by his powers of executive direction, a great deal to the development of the Jewish institutions of Philadelphia, many of which were in their infancy when he first became connected with them. He was a leading spirit in the Associate branch of the Young Men's Hebrew Association when he was still in his teens, and his connection with this organization continued throughout his life. He served as Director, Secretary, Vice-President and later as Honorary Director, and the fine progress of this premier organization of young Jews is due in no small degree to his guidance and conscientious direction. When the present Jewish Publication Society was organized in 1888, Mr. Lederer was appointed to the office of Clerk, later changed to Assistant Secretary. This post he held until 1890, and soon after that he was elected a member of the Board of Trustees, an office which he held to the end of his life. He was also active as a mem-
ber of the Board of Directors of the Jewish Hospital Association, succeeding the late Mayer Sulzberger as Solicitor for the Association in 1894, and for many years held the responsible position of Chairman of the Committee on the Lucien Moss Home, connected with the Hospital. He served as a delegate from Philadelphia to the American Jewish Committee since 1912, and was identified with many other movements, of both local and national scope, which aimed at the alleviation of the sufferings of his brethren here or abroad.

His main interest, however, was in the spiritual and cultural endeavors of his people, and to these he gave of his best powers and abilities. Mr. Lederer was a conscious Jew, staunch in his adherence to the teachings and practices of his religion and zealous for their preservation. He was deeply attached to the synagogue and regarded it as one of the strongest bulwarks against Jewish disintegration. To him the synagogue was not merely a place of worship and religious devotion, but also the academy where the adult Jew should receive guidance and instruction in matters pertaining to the proper Jewish life and conduct. He formed the habit of attendance at Synagogue early in childhood and this habit he continued throughout his busy life. On reaching manhood, he joined the Mikve Israel congregation and became strongly attached to the quaint tunes and rites of the Sefardic service, although he was brought up in the Ashkenazic ritual, having become Bar-Mizvah at the Beth Israel Synagogue, with which his father was then affiliated. He also entertained a reverent affection for all the ancient ceremonies connected with the Jewish home and observed them in his private life.
Mr. Lederer's interest in Jewish education almost amounted to a passion. Any movement for Jewish education, whether of the most elementary or of the most specialized kind, engaged his strongest sympathy and active cooperation. He felt most keenly the great danger to the preservation of Judaism and of Jewish ideals in a generation that is devoid of a knowledge of the Jewish past and an appreciation of Jewish achievements. To further the cause of Jewish education was the keynote of his life, and to this he devoted his best energies and his best thoughts. In this absorbing interest of his life, he was aided and stimulated by his wife who has been closely identified with educational movements from her girlhood. Mr. Lederer married Grace Newhouse in 1901, and her activities in the Hebrew Sunday School Society, as teacher, principal, and later as President of the organization, an office which she is still holding at the present time, brought him in close and intimate relations with the concrete needs and the various problems of Jewish education.

He was for many years active on the Board of the Hebrew Education Society, one of the oldest organizations for the promotion of Jewish learning in America, which aimed at providing Hebrew training to children, and technical training to immigrant adults. Mr. Lederer was a great admirer of the character and the sterling piety of the late Dr. Sabato Morais, and when the latter organized the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York and a branch of the Association was established in Philadelphia, he became its devoted secretary, giving to his work much energy and perseverance for a period of more than thirty-five years. He often pleaded the cause of Jewish education in the press
and from the platform and was instrumental in giving the impetus to several movements which aimed at the improvement and extension of Jewish education. When the Kehillah was organized in Philadelphia in 1911, Mr. Lederer was appointed the chairman of its Education Committee and it was under his direction that a comprehensive survey of the status of Jewish education in Philadelphia was carried out. The revelations made by that survey were so startling that the leaders of the community were stirred into taking definite action in order to remedy the deplorable condition. Under the chairmanship of Mr. Lederer, a public meeting was held at Gratz College, in May, 1913, for the purpose of considering the situation. Many still remember the stirring words pronounced by Mr. Lederer on that occasion. The sorrow and concern expressed by him over the dangerous state of affairs, when only one-third of the Jewish child population was receiving any kind of Jewish education, touched his audience to the quick, and his plea for energetic steps to cope with the emergency moved the assembly to a state of high enthusiasm. The result of the meeting was the formation of a Central Board of Education for the entire community, representative of the various types of institutions—Talmud Torahs, Congregational schools, Sunday Schools and others. This Board, of which Mr. Lederer was elected Chairman, met at frequent intervals, and the exchange of views among the leaders of different types of schools helped to pave the way towards a clearer understanding among the various elements of the community and indicated the possibility of greater coöperation and helpfulness. The Board lacked what is the most essential requisite for any movement; it had no funds and,
therefore, its work of necessity remained merely academic and led to no immediate tangible results. It gave, however, the impetus to union, and in time led to the formation of the Associated Talmud Torahs, which have eventually become an integral part of the enlarged Federation of Jewish Charities.

As President of the Board of Trustees of Gratz College, the oldest institution in America for the training of Jewish teachers, Mr. Lederer had the opportunity of coming in close touch with the intimate problems of elementary and secondary Jewish education and of contributing his share toward the solution of some of them. He accepted the office, after the death of the former President, Moses A. Dropsie, in 1905, only temporarily, allowing himself to be influenced by the urgency of the situation, but, once in office, he gave himself up with his accustomed devotion and wholeheartedness to the progress and growth of the institution. It was during his administration that the course was extended to four years, that the School of Observation and Practice of the Mikve Israel Congregation was made an important adjunct of the College, that extension courses for Sabbath School teachers were established and that many another wholesome reform was introduced in the work of the College. He often visited the class-rooms during the hours of instruction and he never failed to be present at the annual Commencement exercises or at any other public function conducted by the College. His addresses on these occasions were marked by stimulating and inspiring sentiments and by forceful and dignified presentation, and the student body looked forward to them with pleasurable anticipation. He always took a personal
interest in the welfare of the students of the College, even after their graduation, and their advancement in life was always to him a source of joy and of pride.

Indeed, his sympathy with young students and his kindly interest in their progress manifested themselves in many ways even when he was still a young man, himself struggling to gain a footing in life. He freely gave of his time and of his knowledge to many young students who were endeavoring to obtain an education or enter upon a professional career. "To me and many other struggling students of Southern Philadelphia," writes a former student of his, "Ephraim Lederer was the guiding angel, the inspirer of things noble, grand and uplifting. Whatever success in life and whatever Jewish knowledge I and many other poor boys of the southern part of Philadelphia have acquired is due to the advice and encouragement of Ephraim Lederer, the good and devoted Jew. It was he who encouraged us to continue in our studies in face of hardship and struggle, such as poor students had to endure in those days." His kindly sympathy and considerateness were supported by sound judgment and penetration into the position and the state of mind of those whom he was anxious to help. He was a democrat in politics and a democrat in all his social relations as well, and there was not a tinge of snobbery or condescension in his dealings with people of any class or social position. The thing that he abhorred most was dishonesty, in any and every form, and his dislikes were often strong and abiding, but he never allowed his inclination, whether favorable or not, to carry him into doing a thing which might in the least have been unfair or inequitable. His modesty bordered on self-effacement, and his
services to his people or to his country were marked by an impersonal devotion and an utter lack of self-consciousness or a desire for self-advancement. He always thought in terms of the community as a whole, and his strong sense of responsibility and community—consciousness raised his actions on behalf of others, even such as were of a most trivial nature, to a high plane where personalities did not exist and the welfare of the group or the promotion of an ideal was the central point. His friends and beneficiaries were made to feel that what was done for them was not a personal matter, but part of a duty that he owed to the general community, thus making every little kindness, every word of sympathy and encouragement, every act of courtesy and good-will, part of a general scheme of service to a cause or to an ideal which he held sacred.

Mr. Lederer was a man of broad culture, a very close observer and an assiduous reader of good literature. He was fond of music and the drama and possessed a fine sense of humor. He was at home in German literature and was especially attracted to the works of Heine, with whose writings he dealt in several thoughtful essays. His Hebrew knowledge was not extensive, but he acquired a familiarity with Jewish classic literature, available in translation. He was a forceful and convincing public speaker and his earnestness always evoked a hearty response on the part of his hearers. He never resorted to sensationalism, either in his writings or in his spoken utterances. For the last twenty years of his life he was the chief editorial writer for the *Jewish Exponent*. His contributions always bore the stamp of authority and of conscious responsibility. He had a fine grasp of Jewish world movements and was
familiar with the many currents of thought of the various elements of Jewry in the different parts of the world. He never allowed his personal predilections to obscure his judgment, and while he held definite views on the questions of the day, he treated the opinions of others with unfailing courtesy and fairness. His style was clear and trenchant, rarely impassioned, though always revealing the deep sincerity of the writer. His writings are characterized by the same high sense of duty and the same practical idealism which were the outstanding features of his whole life.

Quietly and modestly he lived and labored, but the extent of his influence for civic virtue and Jewish loyalty has transcended his immediate sphere of activity. To those who knew him, his friends and associates, the mention of his name brings up at once the picture of the law-abiding citizen, the devout Jew, the honest man. Through his writings and public service, the fine qualities of his soul indirectly affected a much larger circle and reached out to many hundreds. Such a life has not been lived in vain and its memory is indeed for a blessing.