



---

Torah im Derekh Erez in the Shadow of Hitler

Author(s): MARC B. SHAPIRO

Source: *The Torah U-Madda Journal*, Vol. 14 (2006-07), pp. 84-96

Published by: Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, an affiliate of Yeshiva University

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40888145>

Accessed: 26-08-2016 07:22 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



*Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, an affiliate of Yeshiva University* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Torah U-Madda Journal*

MARC B. SHAPIRO

## *Torah im Derekh Erez in the Shadow of Hitler*

**T**he *Torah im Derekh Erez* philosophy, which was shared by virtually all German Orthodox Jews in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, began to be challenged in the years following World War I. This came about through a combination of factors. To begin with, the ideology had grown stale, with no new developments in its thought. New anti-religious philosophical trends, developments in science, biblical criticism, resurgent anti-Semitism, and Zionism also contributed significantly to the transformation of German Orthodoxy, and in the post-war years many of the German Orthodox no longer viewed themselves as part of cultured German society. Not surprisingly, this led many to turn away from the *Torah im Derekh Erez* philosophy which was taken for granted in previous years, and which was so tied in with Western, i. e., German, culture.

For much of the younger generation, the post-war disillusionment meant that German culture was no longer viewed as relevant, and was in need of replacement by “true” Jewish values such as Torah study, Ḥasidism, and Musar. Although in previous years it was the Orthodox of Eastern Europe who often felt somewhat inferior when confronted with the pious and cultured Orthodox of Germany, the tables had turned and it was now the German Orthodox, especially the young, who were often embarrassed by their form of Orthodoxy. Their cultural superiority no longer counted for much, and they felt inferior when comparing their level of Torah knowledge with that of their East European brethren.

---

MARC B. SHAPIRO holds the Weinberg Chair in Judaic Studies at the University of Scranton. His book, *Studies in Maimonides and His Interpreters*, will appear in 2007.

Many of the young Orthodox were no longer interested in intellectually grappling with religious and philosophical problems. Rather, they were looking for an easier solution, which they found in East European Orthodoxy. The Orthodoxy of the East, with its mystical or Talmud-centered approach, was much simpler than German Orthodoxy, lacking as it did all the intellectual and cultural baggage of the latter.<sup>1</sup>

With the coming to power of the Nazi regime, and the governmental determination to remove Jews from all aspects of German culture and public life, *Torah im Derekh Erez* took another hit. Here was a philosophy that was so tied to German society and culture, and now Jews were being told that they were not welcome in Germany. Could R. Samson Raphael Hirsch's philosophy still have a future in such circumstances? Many thought no, and this certainly pushed young German Orthodox Jews in different directions, such as to the yeshiva world and religious Zionism.

I have discussed all this in detail in my biography of R. Jehiel Jacob Weinberg, and there is no need to repeat matters here.<sup>2</sup> I would, however, like to add some information to my discussion there of R. Simon Schwab, since it is relevant to the essay published below. R. Schwab was a native of Frankfurt who had studied in Lithuanian yeshivot. There he became close to a number of East European sages, whose opposition to secular studies influenced him. In 1934, when he was only twenty-five years old, he published his book *Heimkehr ins Judentum (Coming Home to Judaism)*. This was the first detailed rejection of the *Torah im Derekh Erez* philosophy by one who had grown up in the Hirschian environment.<sup>3</sup> In this book one sees clearly the disillusionment with German culture in general and R. Hirsch's *Torah im Derekh Erez* philosophy in particular. R. Schwab argued that the Hirschian vision was "meant to be nothing more than a temporary emergency measure, not an ideal state of affairs." It was designed for nineteenth-century circumstances that were no longer applicable.<sup>4</sup> R. Schwab also described the Hirschian approach as utopian. Since it was almost impossible for people to achieve greatness in both Torah and secular studies, something had to be given up. Reflecting the Nazi era, R. Schwab added that his critique takes on added cogency when there is no connection between the religious and the cultural. In such times, it is only the Torah that can provide comfort and fulfillment.

R. Schwab also sent a letter to a number of East European sages, asking if it was permissible to study secular subjects. Here was an issue that was already long settled in Germany, but R. Schwab was questioning whether R. Hirsch's and R. Esriel Hildesheimer's enthusiastic approval of

secular studies was still valid. If this is all there was to the letter, it would be significant enough, but there is actually more. R. Schwab published what he later claimed was his letter in *Ha-Pardes* (December 1939).<sup>5</sup> Here he discussed the halakhic issues relevant to studying non-Torah subjects, but missing from the published letter is a large introductory section that was included in the original letter.<sup>6</sup> In this section R. Schwab begins by pointing out that according to the Hirschian philosophy secular studies should be joined together with Torah, “and all that the spirit of man achieves positively in the world, in other words, all that is called *Kultur* in German,” comes from a divine source, as it is God who grants wisdom to man. He also points out that the German Orthodox believe that through this joining of Torah and culture they are able to show the non-believers that one can be a Torah Jew and also a cultured and intellectual man of the world. R. Schwab continues that the followers of R. Hirsch have carried this philosophy even further, “and according to their outlook, one is permitted to study all manner of secular books, be they science and philosophy, or the writings of heretics, or poets and even novels which mix words of wisdom and science with love and romance.” The German Orthodox also think that it is permitted to attend a university and study all matters, and also to attend the theatre, claiming that one can ignore the sensual elements and focus instead on the larger picture. He concludes this introductory section by asking the sages he turned to if the expression *yafeh talmud Torah im derekh erez* (*Avot* 2:2) can be understood in the way the German Orthodox explain it, especially since this approach appears to have been instituted as an emergency measure which would prevent it from being established on a permanent basis.<sup>7</sup> With these words R. Schwab expressed the negative view towards *Torah im Derekh Erez* that had become a part of the culture of the younger generation of German Orthodoxy.

Yet there were also those who stood firm in their beliefs, who would not grant Hitler another victory by agreeing to give up their precious philosophy. One such individual was Maximilian Landau, a rising star among the German Orthodox intellectuals. Biographical details about him are hard to come by, but we know that he came from Poland, studied at the Rabbinical Seminary of Berlin, and from 1936 until its closing on Kristallnacht taught Jewish history there.<sup>8</sup> With the Seminary closed he tried to come to the United States, and in December 1938 R. Jehiel Jacob Weinberg wrote a recommendation for Landau that was sent to Yeshiva College.<sup>9</sup> From Landau’s own letter to R. Bernard Revel, dated January 27, 1939, we learn the most about his life:

I have been for the last years professor of history at the Rabbiner-Seminar in Berlin, as successor on the chair of the late Dr. Fremann. Before that time I was a close collaborator of Prof. Hoetzsch and Prof. Staehlin at the Berlin University in Modern and Mediaeval History, and in History of Eastern Europe in particular. In 1933 I was on the point of entering the academical career as Privat-Dozent of history at the Berlin University, already approved by the members of the Faculty, when the Nazi régime came up and frustrated my plans. The publication of my biography of the Polish poet and thinker Adam Mickiewicz by the Osteuropa-Verlag at Koenigsberg, a part of which had been already printed, was cancelled by the publisher on the ground of racial discrimination. I was one of the founders and leading members of the Slavonic Society in Berlin, afterwards dissolved by the Nazi authorities, and a member of the Gesellschaft zum Studium Osteuropas.

Beside my research work I took a lively part in public life and wrote a great number of essays, leading articles, book reviews and criticisms in the German and the Jewish press. Apart from my duties as a professor I gave a great many lectures in various Jewish and Non-Jewish institutions on historical and current topics.<sup>10</sup>

The last record we have of him is a letter sent from Warsaw, dated June 26, 1939, also related to securing a position at Yeshiva.<sup>11</sup> Unfortunately, like so many others with so much to offer, Landau never made it to the United States and perished in the Holocaust.

Landau's words in the essay published here were a response to developments in Germany some seventy years ago. They testify to an abiding faith in *Torah im Derekh Erez*, even as German Jewry was nearing its final hour. Yet Landau's interpretation of R. Hirsch's achievement also speaks to those today for whom the Hirschian vision is not a time-bound compromise, but an eternally vibrant philosophy of life.<sup>12</sup>

• • •

### *Text of Maximilian Landau's Essay*

## **RABBI SAMSON RAPHAEL HIRSCH AND OUR TIME<sup>13</sup>**

The gestalt of Samson Raphael Hirsch has recently been the subject of lively dispute. From different points of view come critical probings of his spiritual work and its historical results. In place of a positive view of his lifework, which used to be held almost universally, we now find ever

more a tendency to place in doubt, or at least significantly reduce, the value of his achievement for our era.

It is obvious that this criticism, when it arises from poorly hidden dislike for traditional Judaism and identifies the person of S. R. Hirsch with Orthodoxy, is not worthy of a serious examination. Yet the critical attitude which has developed around Hirsch also in religious circles is worth careful consideration. This is so for it suggests important shifts in the mentality of the German Orthodox, and makes necessary a fundamental examination of our position vis-à-vis Samson Raphael Hirsch.

The reservations are expressed against Hirsch from various positions and in different directions, but they all agree on one point: Hirsch's achievement, in large measure, is to be regarded as time-bound and its validity for our time is no longer fully recognized. Even the Hirschian apologetics, which has tried to weaken this trend, sees itself forced to abandon some of the secondary aspects of Hirsch's work in order to emphatically stress the timeless value of what remains.<sup>14</sup>

What is the source of this changed attitude towards Samson Raphael Hirsch among the German Orthodox? This attitude has not arisen by chance, but is the result of a lengthy spiritual process. Its final cause is that of a lack of inner confidence that was found in German Orthodoxy in the decades after the World War. The encounter with the world of East European Jewry and the intensive involvement with the Jewish spiritual problem undermined the prior confidence and calm consciousness of German Orthodoxy that it was on the proper path. The distance between it [i.e., German Orthodoxy] and the ideal, complete Judaism [of Eastern Europe] was clearly revealed, and evoked a feeling of terrible non-satisfaction and of a great need for completion. People began to reexamine the foundations of the worldview that until then was established in German Orthodoxy, and found that it was defective in a number of ways. Compared to the self-contained and vibrant intensity of East European Judaism, the German Orthodox conception was regarded as deficient in many respects.

This ever more urgent doubting centered around the guiding principle of *Torah im Derekh Erez*, which has so far been the pride of German Orthodoxy. People began to lose faith in its supposed blessings and disputed its right of existence in a perfected Judaism. Although respect for the greatness of Hirsch did not permit its complete rejection, nevertheless one attempted to strip it of its original character through increasingly narrow interpretations. In this manner it was, as it were, decontaminated and made innocuous, and it could continue to be used

as a harmless, traditional slogan. For the youth, which yearned strongly for a complete, unbroken Judaism, this principle appeared to be a doomed half-measure, a theory happily granting license, a temporary makeshift solution, which had to give way to newer and better insights. Gradually there developed in wide circles the view (often uncontradicted) that the lifework of Samson Raphael Hirsch was nothing more than an attempt born from the urge of the moment, in order to stand firm as best as possible in a difficult spiritual-religious situation. This approach was able, under particularly unfavorable historical circumstances, to skillfully save that which was still able to be saved. But this attempt must be regarded as a failure, having no more contemporary validity, and only East European Judaism, with its uncompromising attitude and pure Jewish way of life, can be the model and standard. The events of the recent past, in particular the removal of Jews from German cultural life, intensified this view as well as the distrust of the entire range of matters described by the following expressions: European culture, *Bildung*, *Wissenschaft*, and *Derekh Erez* in the Hirschian sense.

Where such tendencies grow based on tradition and conviction, and on independent reasoning, only one interested in regimenting spiritual life would deny their right of existence. But if they want to use Samson Raphael Hirsch in making their case, and attribute their way of thinking to him, this must be emphatically denied. The advocates of these opinions are well aware of Hirsch's achievement and intention. There can be no doubt that for Hirsch the involvement with world culture was not regarded as a necessary evil, but rather something sincere and heartfelt. The *Torah im Derekh Erez* principle did not arise from opportunistic considerations, but from a deep conviction that the best of human culture constitutes a favorable addition and enriching of the complete Jewish personality. Just as Hirsch was convinced that the implementation of Jewish ideals is the highest achievement of humanity, he was also firm in his opinion that the inclusion of exalted human values within Jewish civilization will contribute to the intensification and perfection of Jewish existence.

Hirsch grasped the essence of his era, and understood that a new time also requires a new word. He saw that with the beginning of the nineteenth century a centuries-long epoch had run its course, and that a *completely* new turn of events had occurred, which required a *completely* new attitude. He did not try to weakly hold up the falling ghetto walls. Rather, he put all his energy into holding onto the people who were being scattered in various directions. He focused on leading them in

disciplined unity into a new home, one that is brighter and more comfortable while also not any less committed to Torah and mitzvot. Thus, Hirsch's merit as a rabbi and author contributed not only to his own time, and he was not simply an outstanding link in the chain of great *aḥaronim*; he was something more than this, something different than this: He was the one who proclaimed a new watchword, the forerunner of a new epoch, and in this sense he certainly was—as he was accurately termed—a “true revolutionary.”

If now, in view of the still inadequate practical results of the Hirschian system of education, many, moved by understandable concern for its future development, wish to conclude that the entire system is lacking, they have certainly misjudged the character and extent of the Hirschian educational work. A motto [*Torah im Derekh Erez*] of such magnitude and power to transform was for Hirsch not intended for one generation alone, but was meant to serve as an introduction to a new spiritual-historical era in Judaism. Future generations would be responsible for developing this inheritance further. The effect of the [Hirschian] principle is to be calculated over a long period, and therefore the experience of a few decades can in no way offer conclusive judgment about its value, or lack of value. Instead of rashly proclaiming the complete failure of the *Torah im Derekh Erez* principle, those who treat it with scorn should themselves have realized that it has only begun to be implemented. Instead of rejecting the entire system lock, stock, and barrel, they should have rather tried to develop it from its rudimentary state, so that it could reach the desired goal.

The critics are correct in pointing to the deplorable condition of Torah knowledge and the lack of Jewish substance and depth among the German Orthodox. But the simple prescription that they offer to improve matters, namely, the separation from European culture and science and a return to the ghetto, cannot bring healing. It is certainly a moving phenomenon—and at the same time characteristic of the high moral level of German Jewry—that an important Jewish community publicly acknowledges its own deficiencies, rejects what previously had been its way of life, and is ready to adopt in full the way of thought and lifestyle of another segment [of Jewry].

Yet isn't there a good bit of exaggeration in the self-criticisms? Is this deprecating of one's own achievement either justified or permitted? It would be a grave injustice to the living and to the previous generations of German Jewry to unhesitatingly answer this last question in the affirmative. Not only would the life's work of such persons of stature as

S. R. Hirsch and Esriel Hildesheimer be diminished thereby, but also a great number of people from all social strata and levels of education would be set back undeservedly, people who in their way of thought and practice, at home, in the community, and in public, lived an exemplary and unblemished Judaism. It is not true that German Jewry is inferior to any other Jewish group. It is *different*. It may sometimes appear strange and unfamiliar to an East European Jew, but it is no less Jewish. It is *sui generis* and developed as such organically. There is no denying that its shortcomings are compensated for in some respects by other unique qualities, and it is an indispensable part of the Jewish people. It has played a significant role, which cannot be prized enough, and will continue to do so.

The centers of Judaism in the western countries are not alone in having been strongly influenced by Hirsch's approach. East European Jewry also owes a great deal to German Orthodoxy. The strengthening of the Torah-true element in East European public life would be inconceivable without the assistance and stimulation of the German Orthodox. Even spiritual life in the East, above all the strength of conviction of its youth, finds indirect support and guidance from the presence of Western Judaism, shaped by Hirsch. A sudden jump into the East, which has been falsely romanticized and idealized, and an uncritical acceptance of its ways of thought and life, as is propagated by well-meaning but dreamy youth, would mean not simply the erasing of its [i. e., German Orthodoxy's] own glorious past, and the denial of all that was regarded as holy and dear by previous generations and many contemporary Jews as well. In addition to this, the great sacrifice entailed would itself be inorganic, artificial, and in bad style, as well as a psychological and historical impossibility which would fundamentally offer no solution.

It is perhaps not clear to all that East European Judaism is but a small remnant of a great past, and that its original, one hundred percent Jewish form, as glorified in literature and oral tradition, is today found, at best, only in the oasis of a yeshiva or a ḥasidic court. This was a great world, but the form in which it existed until now is irretrievable. What the German Jews should take from the East is an *attitude*, a *life-feeling*: the vitality, depth of feeling, intimacy, immediacy and originality of Jewish peoplehood, national consciousness and connectedness to the nation. But a naïve *restoration* of this world in all its aspects is not possible and not to be aspired to. The East has not yet found the creative formula to safely transfer its eternal values into a new form of life, so that they can stand regenerated and rejuvenated in both the present and

future. It would be an unparalleled absurdity if that part of Orthodox Judaism, which is itself *actually* in fortunate possession of a formula of such creativity and ability to develop, would voluntarily part with it for the sake of vague and romantic sentiments.

That the German Jews have finally learnt to look with envy upon the vitality of the Judaism of the East is certainly pleasing. But they must make clear to themselves that all this [i. e., East European Judaism] grew slowly out of special conditions, and it cannot be transferred in finished form to another milieu. If German Jewry truly wants to attain a level and density of Judaism that is *comparable* to that of the East, it will not be attained by simply *copying* the East. German Jewry must try to develop this from *its own* historical and psychological premises, from *its own* disposition, in *its own style*, so that it develops in an independent and original fashion, which can run parallel to the other line of development, but not coincide. (The expressions Eastern and German Jewry are not geographic descriptions, but rather refer to different outlooks, without any relevance attached to where on the globe its advocates are found.)

Certainly, all is not perfect with German Jewry. Yet the cure is not in abandoning and destroying its own foundations, but in their preservation and strengthening. through sensible, intellectual, vigorous, and rational development. The cure is not in turning away from the teachings of Samson Raphael Hirsch, but in emphatically heeding these teachings and developing them so that they are up-to-date.

• • •

*Developing and advancing.* These are the unavoidable demands that the inheritance of Hirsch places upon our time. Just as the rejection of the *Torah im Derekh Erez* principle and submersion into spiritual patterns of the East as an infallible panacea means a final abandonment of the Hirschian line, so also in rigidly preserving the Hirschian system in its original form one gravely sins against its spirit and inner sense. The inheritance of Hirsch, which in every generation is to be newly acquired through active spiritual repossession, awaits renewed unlocking and interpretation of its intrinsic meaning for our time. The *Torah im Derekh Erez* principle, the key principle of the Hirschian Weltanschauung, appears to us today in a different and deeper meaning. The popular and bourgeois interpretation of *Torah im Derekh Erez* as a pleasant versatility, as a fine paraphrase of the practical motto, "For God and for People," is not sufficient for us any longer, for it cannot develop from its superficiality to a higher spiritual sphere. After a half-century of matured experience and

years of learning accompanied by many sacrifices, we believe today that we recognize the true nature of this prophetic maxim.

The popular translation of *Torah im Derekh Erez* is the synthesis of Judaism and world culture. But what Hirsch wanted was not “synthesis.” His ideal, the *Mensch-Jisroel*,<sup>15</sup> was not the product of an interconnection or even a fusion of two different worlds. Rather, these were regarded as *balanced*, a unity in all phases of development, a single tree growing from one root that sends its branches out in many directions. This is the Jewish archetype, which is without seams and fractures, and removed from all dualism, and who, *as a Jew*, perceives and shapes the world and lives his Judaism from the great abundance of human existence. This is so because Judaism and culture are not commensurable terms that are on one level. Culture is not immutable and unchangeable, with only two ways to relate to it: either complete and unrestricted affirmation and devotion, with all the consequences, or timid avoidance and panicked flight, as before something evil and pernicious. Rather, *culture is a process*, something that is constantly developing and subject to our conscious intervention, whose last expression is determined by the intensity of our collaboration. It is a *function* of our creative power.

From such a realization arises an *unbiased*, confident attitude, which permits a new assessment. Nowadays culture is for us—since we, as it were, have already arrived at the journeyman years of our involvement in cultural life—no longer the wondrous animal that we gaze upon from a proper distance with a mix of respect and fear. It is no longer surrounded with the aura of infallibility or regarded as wicked. We have a freer and more intimate relationship with it, and have the ability to *competently choose* to incorporate into our lives those elements that are useful in the structure of our Jewish personality. It is no longer a foreign continent at whose outermost edge we shyly, and with a bad conscience, settle. Rather, it is *a piece of our own world*, and here, as in all other areas of our lives, the Jewish task and mission is to prove itself.

The feared conflict between faith and knowledge, between is and should, impulse and obligation, or however else one may term the opposing pairs, does not, however, only arise in this sphere. It was only as a matter of convenience localized in this area. In reality, it has nothing to do with the question of Judaism and culture, since this eternal, primordial conflict in the soul of man is found in every place and time, and no matter in what guise, encompasses even those Jews who limit themselves to the narrowest range of things Jewish.

*Torah im Derekh Erez* offers, now more than ever, a creative and fer-

tile principle, full of vitality and unlimited possibilities for development. If its original meaning is *properly understood* and implemented, it opens undreamt of perspectives for participation of the Jewish intellect within secular culture, and for the fertilization of the spiritual life of humanity through the Torah outlook. As a result of such a changed mentality of Torah-true Jews and their newly won confidence, flexibility, and spiritual range, undreamt of creations are conceivable. Imagine if Bergson, Freud, and Husserl would have been Jews in the Hirschian sense. European culture would today have a different face.

Yet it must be said that if the level of Torah knowledge of Western Jewry is not increased beyond what it has been until now, the great idea of Hirsch will remain a farce and will lead to a collapse [of Western Orthodoxy]. Rich and living Torah knowledge is the indispensable prerequisite for any reform and new orientation. Torah and secular culture are a system of communicating channels. Only if one is truly and deeply filled with Torah knowledge and Torah spirit is there a guarantee for a healthy, all-around development of the Jewish personality. But the acquisition of Jewish knowledge does not need to exclude the simultaneous acquisition of other forms of education. It is a question of teaching technique, or proper organization and division of time, so as to impart to the young people a sufficient amount of Jewish and secular knowledge which will lead to a harmonious education. This does not depend on often undigested quantities of knowledge, but instead upon their suitability for conversion into a living and integral component of the total personality.

For the last century, on its march to destiny, the Jewish people has been in a new age, signaling an arrangement with the culture of humanity. This development is irrevocable. Spiritual processes can no longer be cancelled out. Despite political restrictions and economic difficulties that have arisen here and there, the Jewish people will not let itself be robbed of its participation in general cultural life. Faithful implementation [of Jewish participation with general cultural life] shall, in the end, be a blessing for Jewry and mankind, and will bring about that great and fruitful watchword, which an ingenious leader with far-reaching foresight proclaimed across the boundaries of time, the motto: *Torah im Derekh Erez*.

## Notes

This is the third installment of my project aimed at making available important German Orthodox articles relating to Torah u-Madda. For the previous two installments, see “Rabbi David Zevi Hoffmann on Torah and Wissenschaft,” *Torah u-Madda Journal* 6 (1995-96): 129-37 and “Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer’s Program of *Torah u-Madda*,” *Torah u-Madda Journal* 9 (2000): 76-86.

1. See Moses Auerbach, “Zur Geistigen Struktur der Deutschen Orthodoxie der Gegenwart,” *Festschrift für Jacob Rosenheim* (Frankfurt, 1931), 206ff.
2. See *Between the Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy: The Life and Works of Rabbi Jehiel Jacob Weinberg, 1884-1966* (London, 1999), chs. 4, 6.
3. He was later to revert to an appreciation of *Torah im Derekh Erez*. See his *These and Those* (New York, 1966), and *Selected Speeches* (New York, 1991), 243. He was also the author of the anonymous defense of German Orthodoxy, “Mikhtav be-Inyan Shitat Frankfurt,” *Ha-ma’ayan* 6 (Tammuz 5726 [1966]): 4-7.
4. *Heimkehr ins Judentum* (Frankfurt, 1934), 114-115.
5. See Jacob J. Schacter, “Torah u-Madda Revisited: The Editor’s Introduction,” *Torah u-Madda Journal* 1 (1989): 15, n. 1.
6. One of the original letters is preserved in the R. Joseph Rozin collection at the Yeshiva University library.
7. אבקש לידע בבירור פירוש המשנה “יפה ת”ת עם ד”א” אם אפשר בעולם לפרשה על אופן שפרשו תלמידי הג’ רש”ר הירש זצ”ל להתאם תורה וחכמות אחרות יחד, כי כמדומה שהיתה בזמנם אז הוראת שעה אך אין להביא ראוי מש”ס ופוסקים ליסוד הוראת שעה שאין הלכה כמותה בשאר העתים.
8. There is a picture of him in *Between the Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy*, 142. He is standing directly behind Jakob Freimann.
9. Yeshiva University Archives, Jacob A. Hartstein Administrative Files, Drawer 13/3, Folder: “Foreign Faculty.”
10. Yeshiva University archives, Bernard Revel Papers, 13/3-40.
11. Letter to Henry Friedenwald, Yeshiva University archives, Bernard Revel Papers, 13/3-40. Mordechai Eliav and Esriel Hildesheimer, *Beit ha-Midrash le-Rabbanim be-Berlin* (Jerusalem, 2001), 72, incorrectly state that Landau was killed in a driving accident in Berlin in 1938. They also state that he taught at the Reform Hochschule beginning in 1937, yet this too is in error. With the Nazis no longer permitting Jewish students to attend universities, the Rabbinical Seminary and the Hochschule arranged for joint lectures for their students. It was here that Landau lectured. See Jacob Neubauer’s recommendation in Yeshiva University archives, Bernard Revel Papers, 13/3-40; Ernst Simon, “Jewish Adult Education in Nazi Germany as Spiritual Resistance,” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 1 (1956): 85; Richard Fuchs, “The ‘Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums’ in the Period of Nazi Rule,” *ibid.* 12 (1967): 20-22; Isi Eisner, “Reminiscences of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary” *ibid.*, 48; and my *Between the Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy*, 140.
12. Coming from a more conservative Hirschian perspective, Jacob Rosenheim criticized a number of Landau’s formulations. See “Zu Auseinandersetzung über S. R. Hirsch und seine ‘Torah im Derech Erez’-Devise,” *Der Israelit*,

- April 15, 1937. In this article Rosenheim also criticized R. Jehiel Jacob Weinberg's essay on Hirsch (reprinted in Weinberg's *Das Volk der Religion* [Geneva, 1949], ch. 5. On pp. 72-73 Weinberg refers to Landau's essay.) Unlike Landau, Weinberg replied to Rosenheim. See *Nachlath Zwi* 7 (1936-1937): 186-193 (on pp. 186-187 he explains where he differs with Landau).
13. "Samson Raphael Hirsch und unsere Zeit," *Nachlath Zwi* 7 (1936-1937): 27-35.
  14. It is interesting to note that after rejecting his earlier view and assuming the role of Hirschian apologist, R. Simon Schwab indeed followed this approach. See Lawrence Kaplan, "Torah u-Madda in the Thought of Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch," *BDD* 5 (Summer 1997): 28 n. 25, with reference to two letters of Hirsch about the non-binding nature of the Sages' scientific statements:

In my memorable phone conversation with Rabbi Schwab . . . our conversation at one point turned to the recent important collection of writings of Rabbi Hirsch, *Shemesh Marpeh*, edited by Rabbi Eliyahu Klugman and published by Rabbi Schwab himself. . . . I took the opportunity to express my surprise that these two letters of Rabbi Hirsch to Rabbi Wechsler were not included in the volume, which purports to include all of Rabbi Hirsch's major Hebrew writings, published and unpublished. Rabbi Schwab replied—and I am citing him practically verbatim—"Yes, you are correct. The editor [Rabbi Klugman] consulted with me, and I advised him not to publish them. I told him that the letters are controversial and likely to be misunderstood, and that his publishing them would just bring him unnecessary grief (*tzoros*)."

15. "One of the key concepts of S. R. Hirsch's teaching about Judaism is *Mensch-Jisroel*, 'the human being and Jew,' which in essence means that 'pure humanity' is a basic value concept of Judaism, and 'Jew' a higher rung of humanity" (Mordechai Breuer, *Modernity Within Tradition*, tr. Elizabeth Petuchowski [New York, 1992], 27).