

DEGEL

תורה וחכמת ישראל מקהילת עלי ציון
TORAH AND JEWISH STUDIES FROM ALEI TZION

פסח תשע"ד
NISSAN 5774

נענו
המטה
בצנינו
בכפרים
נשכימה לכרמים נראה אם
פרחה הגפן
הסמדר
פרח
הנצו הרמונים



VOLUME 6 ISSUE 2

שיר השירים זיב-יג

OVITS WEALTH MANAGEMENT



A wealth of expertise on your doorstep

We provide an experienced wealth management service and offer specialist advice in a wide range of areas including:

- Investment planning
- Retirement planning
- Inheritance Tax planning

For further details contact Marc Ovits on:

Tel: 07866 503 898

Email: marc.ovits@sjpp.co.uk Website: www.ovitswm.co.uk

חג כשר ושמח

**RABBI DANIEL AND NA'AMAH ROSELAAR
DEVORAH, ELISHEVA, NETANEL AND CHANANYA
TOGETHER WITH KEHILLAT ALEI TZION
WISH THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY A HAPPY AND KOSHER חג**

Joshua Freedman

Lucinda, Martin, Azriella, Tsofia and Ashira Glasser

Louise and Harold Greenberg

Alan, Miriam and Gila Levenson

Lauren, Simon and Tamar Levy

Saranne, Neil, Eliora and Elisha Maurice

Mr R Susman on behalf of Gershon Susman



ALEI
TZION

DEGEL

CONTENTS

<i>Editor</i> Elana Chesler	5	Notes from the editor ELANA CHESLER
<i>Editorial Team</i> Judith Arkush Simon Levy	6	Parting Waters: The Mechanics of Jewish love DOV LERNER
<i>Design</i> Simon Levy	11	Hagada Shefokh Hamatkha - Pour forth Your rage...Using Anger as a Pathway to Holiness DANIEL COLEMAN
<i>Founding Editor</i> Ben Elton		
<i>Front cover illustration</i> Yolanda Rosalki	14	Shaalei Tzion (III) - Questions and Answers from Alei Tzion RABBI DANIEL ROSELAAR
<i>Yolanda Rosalki is a calligrapher and illustrator. For more information on her designs for Ketubot, wall murals or art, or to purchase the original art of the front cover, please visit yolandaproductions on facebook or email yolros@gmail.com</i>	19	Kiddush at Seuda Shelishit and the Exodus from Egypt BEN ELTON
	26	The Diversification of Jewish Identity in Imperial Germany ABIGAIL HAYTON

*Degel is a publication of the Alei Tzion Community. Views expressed are not necessarily those of the Rav, community or editors. | www.aleitzion.co.uk
Schaller House, 44a Albert Road, London, NW4 2SJ | degel@aleitzion.co.uk*

Notes from the editor

Classical studies of emotion and reason variously place them in collusion or conflict. On Seder night we seamlessly intertwine them. Through the textual prompting of the hagada we are challenged to explore the nature of freedom and oppression, the composition of national identity and the nuanced interplay of human leadership and Divine intervention. The focus on the one hand is of intellectual engagement. Yet “even if we were all wise and understanding” there remains the emotional and experiential dimensions of the Seder embodied in the transformational imperative for each individual to “look upon oneself as if one had personally left Egypt”.

This edition of Degel weaves together aspects of both the emotion and the reason of Seder.

We offer analysis of two contrasting emotions – that of love and anger. Dov Lerner uses the connection between the splitting of the Red Sea and matrimonial matchmaking as a segue to examine various attributes of love and Daniel Coleman uses the text of Shefach Chamatcha to formulate an approach to handling anger.

Turning to the side of thought and reason, Ben Elton ponders the connection between the

Exodus and the concept of Kiddush at Seuda Shelishit. Continuing in the halachic vein, Rabbi Roselaar provides his much loved Q&A review.

Arguably the Jewish tragedy of our generation is that at a time where we are free to explore both the emotion and reason of Seder night, the majority of the Jewish people remain disengaged, alienated or uninspired by it. Abigail Hayton offers an analysis of the diversification of Jewish Identity in Imperial Germany providing a context for Jewish identity in this generation and hopefully an impetus to consider what might be our response to it.

As ever, the publication of Degel is testament to the ongoing enthusiasm and support of our contributors, funders and editorial team without whom this journal would not see the light of day.

We welcome feedback and future submissions. Please contact us at degel@aleitzion.co.uk

With every best wish for a Seder night that is intellectually stimulating and emotionally resonant.

ELANA CHESLER

Parting Waters: The Mechanics of Jewish love

DOV LERNER

Introduction: A Provocative Parallel

Let us begin with one of the most dramatic moments in Jewish history: the splitting of the Red Sea. In this demonstration of supreme power, the Almighty inserts Himself into nature and ruptures oceanic calm; He submerges those who had become subhuman and escorts His people toward their inevitable destiny. It is using this scene, appropriating this episode, that one sage offers a rather provocative parallel. “Rabbi Yohanan said, ‘It is as arduous to partner people as it is to split the sea’”¹.

Finding a life-partner can be a struggle, at times seeming insurmountable, and the plain sense of this passage speaks to precisely this. To navigate a world of personalities and pinpoint a reliable compatibility isn’t easy; to find true love, one must muster the superhuman strength it would take to tear an ocean in twain. But, with no metaphor arbitrary, no rabbinic phrase flippantly made, this statement must represent more than a mere equation; there is something compelling about the mechanics of this miracle, something telling in the structure of sea splitting that uniquely captures love’s struggle.

Buried beneath a single phenomenon can lie layers of meaning to be unfurled, and in the instance of this phenomenon—Israel’s passage through open waters—we shall explore three of its discrete dimensions, refracting them through the prism of love. Engaging our sages we may discover troves of life’s truths and find ways to enhance our multiple affections, deepen our varied passions, and reveal the hidden realms of the human heart.

Finding Oneself

For the first dimension we turn to the physical dynamics of the divide. As the sea splits and the Earth’s blanket is drawn back, ground forever covered is for the first time exposed—never before seen, the

seabed is struck by direct sunlight, and the tender footsteps of a fleeing people slowly tread upon its surface. To love is to make space for another, to open up and risk vulnerability. One must be open to share secrets; to reveal private hopes and dreams, fears and anxieties, prayers and preferences. In the words of Virginia Woolf, one must be willing to “lay bare the pebbles on the shore of [one’s] soul”².

There is another scene of dramatic exposure where our sages employ the image of displaced water.

There is another scene of dramatic exposure where our sages employ the image of displaced water

In this scene, Judah, with two decades of guilt weighing him down, cautiously confronts Egypt’s viceroy. Having presided over Joseph’s sale and triggered his father’s irrepressible grief, the prospect of Benjamin’s loss makes Judah desperate. He turns to the unrecognised figure that threatens his charge and pleads inaudibly for Benjamin’s release: “Please my Lord, may your servant say a word into my Lord’s ear”³. In surreptitious whispers Judah implores for mercy; despite one Midrash painting his passion vividly—blood streaming from his eyes, rigid chest hairs shredding his garments—we read of a painfully measured plea⁴.

And it seems that he measured his plea to perfection, for as the next chapter opens the ostensible Egyptian unmask himself, revealing their dream ridden brother: “Joseph could not contain himself ...he let out a deafening cry...Joseph said, ‘I am Joseph’”⁵. How incredible for whispered words to exert such force on a man with such power. Isaac Babel once compellingly wrote, “No iron spike can pierce a human heart as icily as a full-stop in the right place”⁶. Our sages, however,

find something other than freezing violence in the potency of impeccable punctuation:

“And Yehuda approached”: it is written, “Deep waters are counsel in man’s heart, a wise man can draw it out”⁷. This can be compared to a deep well filled with cold water—its water cold and fresh, but no one could drink it. Then someone came and tied rope to rope, cord to cord, string to string, and drew the water and drank. Then everyone drew water and drank. In the same way Yehuda did not stir until he had responded to Joseph, word by word, and reached his heart.⁸

Captured in the drawing of water from a well’s depths, Judah’s words reach deep into Joseph’s soul. Tracing the contours of his brother’s heart, Judah’s need binds his words into a chain that spans and survives the fissure between persons. Prodded with phrases fashioned in love, Joseph’s secret emerges and the unseen is unveiled. Ordinarily inaccessible, our recesses are exposed and our deepest suppressions are wrenched from the dark—distorting waters are displaced and that which lies lowest ascends ever upward exposing true character.

In some sense our sages see love branded as the conquest of obscuring waters

In some sense our sages see love branded as the conquest of obscuring waters, as the moments, both with Israel and with Judah, imply the necessity of laying bare the pebbles on the shore of our souls.

The Me’am Lo’ez, in his collection of rabbinic legends, presents an image that reshapes Woolf’s metaphoric pebbles:

The ground dried up and did not form one platform, but rather a mosaic such as those of Royalty, who overlay their floors with marble stones in beautiful patterns.⁹

Both under Mosaic leadership and upon an exquisite configuration, Israel made their way to freedom. It is in this mythic metaphor that love’s consequences, more than its impact, truly appears. Opening up, exposing one’s buried selves, one finds that life’s fragments begin to cohere—that the pieces of disjointed sentiments coalesce into a depiction of a unified being. The wreckage of past failures that we all heap, the chipped hopes and shards of shattered dreams, accumulate in love to compose a stunning wholeness; a mosaic of human personality. Confronting vulnerability and disclosure are among the necessities

of love, as, if it is real love, in loving another we also find ourselves.

Facing Hesitance

A second dimension of love, captured in the split sea, is revealed in the commentary of Rabbeinu Bahya:

The entire sea did not split for them instantaneously, making a long path from beginning to end, but bit by bit. The sea fled incrementally; as they moved, the water moved with them¹⁰.

In crossing the sea, Israel faced the fear of impending death; their fragile frames reflected in the waters that stood stubbornly before them. Having to confront a wall of water, Israel is made to consider its presence. What does water stand for?

The first description that informs may be found in the words of a dying Jacob. As his strength wanes he calls to his sons in turn, offering them each an eye into their essence. Reuben, his first son, is struck with the brunt of a curse and accusation: “You are my firstborn, my might and head of my strength—excellence of dignity and power. Unstable as water, you shall excel no more, because you went to your father’s bed...”¹¹. Despite the opening praise, Jacob rends Reuben’s authority with the harshest words. Avivah Zornberg writes, “Hasty, rash, volatile, Reuben cannot dominate his family, cannot be the force that will bind them into a significant structure. The water image suggests that he had no self-possession”¹².

From time to time the tide’s pulse, its ebb and flow, evokes a sense of harmony; its tranquil cadence is indicative of a global rhythm. But this sense and indication both mask the water’s innate instability; water sits insecure and in flux, always fluid. Unless frozen, water refuses its station—a gentle breeze or light touch is all it takes to disrupt the temperamentally even surface. Occupying the state between gas and solid, water defies either extreme. Distinct borders do not prevent simple penetration; despite a clear boundary, water adheres to intrusions and remains strangely separable.

Dayan Moshe Swift, in reading a verse from Lamentations, laces Tisha b’Av’s grave sentiments with water’s instability. The verse reads, “Your break is as great as the sea, who shall heal you?”¹³. The words summon an image of ruin beyond repair, they intimate fractures of a scale that plant a cruel disquiet in even the greatest optimist. But Swift finds a deeper disquiet, a discomfort that speaks to the instability of the metaphor itself; this, for Swift, is not a quantitative complaint:

A disaster on dry land can be commemorated: the spot is known, a memorial can be set up, a monument erected to remind men of the tragedy that took place on that spot. But if a ship meets disaster on the high seas, the raging waters cover it up. No sign is left, no point can be marked, nothing can be set up to remind men of the tragedy that once took place there.¹⁴

The shimmering seawater represents the extent of Israel's disaster; the ocean is used not as a gauge of physical scale but as a semblance of psychic torture. This is water.

And as Israel move slowly toward Sinai, gently pacing on bared pebbles, their convictions are tested by the proximate presence of unsteady waters. Facing this scene—a scene usurped by our sages to symbolise love—we find ourselves facing an almost insufferable journey.

In love, we hold another's hand, but walk almost blind in the shadows of an unknown future. Without a clear horizon or visible destination, each step, every moment, brings uncertainty. Questions plague our ever tentative minds, as towers of worry contravene our composure. Where will this partnership lead? How will we surpass our next snag? What else could have been? Could I turn back? The paths of incompatible choices threaten to drown our sometimes very trying realities. But Israel, and we take the next step.

Water is a peculiar thing. It quivers and shudders and functions as the curse of Jacob's firstborn, yet it is also the substance that sustains us and functions as the majority of our make-up. Bubbling anxieties are the matter of human life; beneath layers of false confidences there lies a human core of ceaseless insecurities. As human beings we feel the waves that oscillate within us. In loving another, in parting of waters, we refuse to cower to internal insecurities and surpass the uncertainties of self. In the face of deep water we step forwards in faith, confident that it will part, convinced of our path. Love compels a courage that seeks to transcend wavering reservations and demands the nerve to steadily progress. Anything but easy, the bravery that conquers constant uncertainty sees in each stride, every moment, the truly miraculous.

When Mastery Cometh

Love's third dimension is Israel's intention. Both victim and oppressor enter the open channel—but only one survives; for Israel, waters part and shift, for Egypt, gravity resists. The key difference is not their point of departure, but their aspiration.

For Israel, waters part and shift, for Egypt, gravity resists. The key difference is not their point of departure, but their aspiration

Israel chase liberty—in an attempt to secure freedom they dive into the unknown. Egypt, however, hunt human prey; in an effort to expand autonomy and dominion, they pursue a weakened people.

The parallel to love is not so strained as to require a stretch of the imagination. Chaucer's Franklin emphasises that in opening our arms, our hold must embrace not imprison: "When mastery cometh the god of love anon/beateth his wings and farewell, he is gone!"¹⁵ In love one must seek to liberate—oneself and the other—to ignite true passion and re-fuse an ancient bond one must seek to unshackle the chains of service and build a relation of support.

Only two figures are praised in the Talmud as lovers of Israel, Joshua being one. In this case the Talmud details the policies that captured Joshua's love: "Joshua was a lover of Israel—he stood up and established pathways and plazas for them."¹⁶ Not gifts nor palaces, but plazas and pathways are the gifts of love. Endowing Israel with the freedom of passage, freedom of assembly, freedom of exchange, and freedom of movement—that is love.

As if responsive to hidden intentions, in one Midrash, the seabed reflects the minds of those astride its surface:

The seabed dried as if it were rock; but once the Egyptians entered, the pillar of cloud descended and agitated the depths into a thick tar, like the plaster that we paste on walls; so Egypt drowned in tar.¹⁷

Stalking slaves, Egypt is ensnared by the nets of its own trappings. Having tied Israel to tar-pits and centuries of captivity, Egypt's attempt to overturn freedom leaves their feet twisted in the mortar of their own corruption. Each footstep further secures their fall, and, caught in plaster, their deaths adorn, as a warning, history's walls. Suspicious reigns and the cruelty of mistrust have no place in love; an outstretched hand must offer comfort, never ceasing, never seizing, only providing the firm grip of pledged fidelity.

Echoing this value, one commentary, paints a bizarre possibility. Tackling the challenging grammar of a simple verse, the sages employ creative analysis and insert a scene otherwise untold. The verse reads: "And Moses led Israel from the Red Sea..."¹⁸ The Hebrew word for 'led,' as it appears in this verse, is causative (hiphil); Moses didn't solely direct or steer Israel, but

had to drive them forwards. One commentator¹⁹ associates this appearance with its counterpart in Psalms—“He led his people like sheep”²⁰. Israel, however irrational it may seem, were not eager to leave the seabed; Moses had to tow them away. Why?

Rashi, in his gloss on Exodus, revives a Midrash and addresses this question:

Egypt had crowned their horses with gold and silver jewellery and precious stones, and Israel found them all in the sea; the plunder of the sea was greater than plunder of Egypt ... therefore there was a need to drive them out forcefully.²¹

Love remains a journey. Although partnership provides reward, if a relationship turns into an excavation of another's worth, the gleaning of trimmings torn at another's cost, it must change. When love is valued only for its immediate provisions—the glamor and allure of aesthetic presences—it dissolves into sheepish bleating, losing all real meaning. If horizons lie, not unseen, but neglected, and current positions are mistaken for the end, love is lost; noble robes fray into woolly fibres and consumption becomes our only pursuit. When mastery cometh the god of love anon; we must, hand in hand, march for freedom.

In Conclusion: Stronger than Death

Looking through three dimensions of the Red Sea miracle, we have encountered three components of love—the willingness for vulnerability, the courage to face uncertainties, and the liberating intention—all concealed within the single association of Rav Yohanan.

Looking through three dimensions of the Red Sea miracle, we have encountered three components of love

For some faiths a great miracle takes the shape of a very different conquest of water—to walk on the unsteady surface without the slightest disruption; but our miracle, our path to freedom and faith, is not a dreamy escape from water's threats, but the ploughing of nature's challenges. We tunnel beneath our tensions and confront them. Rav Yohanan's love does not transcend the necessities of practical affections, we must refine smooth romanticism into an earned devotion—a devotion that blossoms only with time and with effort. Love isn't magic, its miracle has a mechanic.

Confirming water's valences there is a strange, almost superstitious, custom that immediately follows a

Jewish death: “There is a practice to pour out all the drawn water in the deceased's dwelling.”²² Why? The Shakh, collating the suggestions of other commentaries, submits two possibilities. First, he writes, “the reason is to inform everyone that there has been a death without needing to verbally announce it and cause slander.”²³ There is no surer sign of misfortune than water wasted; the basis of all life is cast into the streets as a signal that death has made its mark; it is a gesture that supersedes all articulation and communicates the troubling truth that words themselves are gone.

The second reason offered is that, “the angel of death lowers droplets of death's blood into the water.” The water we draw, the water we conquer and store, is tainted by loss; the elixir of life turns toxic with the residue of death's presence. The water that sits in our containers, in our freezers and refrigerators, may imply our autonomy over life and death. Water is the potion of our self-possession—it is our testimony that we have mastered the world's springs and oceans. But with this ritual we confess our weakness—even the waters we seize have the taste of decay.

The seas are unstable, the rivers raging, and the oceans in flux. This instability, we noted above, translates into the uneasiness of human emotions, but followed to its inevitable end, this restlessness translates into death. Nothing on this earth is stable, nothing lasts forever. Impermanence and mortality haunt every sip of water, every swallow.

When one plunges into a mikva one may be swayed to associate the purifying power with water's presence. Perhaps though, it is not the water that purifies, but the survival. Plunging below the surface one excises life from one's lungs and absorbs the possibility of death. As we've said, water is a peculiar thing. It is the marker of all life, a draught that quenches every thirst, but it resonates as well with the facts of human frailty, the knowledge that without it we would simply die. Immersing oneself in this awareness, one arises energised; one's eyes open, cognisant and grateful. On surfacing one inhales—lungs expanding, heart pounding—and blesses with new breath. In love we battle waters—we push away uncertainties and challenge death itself.

For centuries our faith has been labelled as unloving. Judaism has been cast as the paradigm of a vindictive obsession with legalism and ritual practice, a system that leaves a nation blinded by heartless observances to the need for compassion. Whether these claims come from other religions or the unreligious, they are crass accusations, for Judaism has always been a religion of love. Ahava is the axiom by which we live—we are told to love the stranger, love our neighbour, and love God.

Perhaps the greatest love poem of all time, Song of Songs, was penned in Jewish ink, and in that great work, we find a fearless conviction—“Love is stronger than death”²⁴. More robust than our own mortality, more durable than any threat, love lives on.

Rabbi Bana’a used to mark the caves of the dead. When he chanced upon the cave of Abraham, he saw Eliezer—Abraham’s servant—standing at the entrance. He said to him, “What is Abraham doing?”, and he replied, “He is sleeping in the arms of Sarah, and she is fondly looking at his hair.”²⁵

After lives of concerted effort, even as death breaks our bodies, love survives. It is not a love easily acquired, nor an affection simply won, but a love whose mechanics have secured its immortality. The journey through parted waters is arduous and taxing, it takes courage, determination, and hope. But with it we edge yet closer to sacred ground, a place flowing with milk and honey, the promise of sweet satisfaction. As the forces of oppressive reluctance gain pace, let us dive in and journey on.

Rabbi Dov Lerner grew up in Belmont. He studied at Yeshivat Har Etzion, Israel, as well as in New York, where he served as a Rabbinic Intern at Lincoln Square Synagogue and was a Tikvah Fellow. He completed an undergraduate degree in English Literature at YU and recently received semikha from RIETS. Currently he resides in Chicago with his wife Miriam, where he is enrolled at the University of Chicago's Divinity School for graduate study. He works for University of Chicago Hillel and teaches for the local YU Torah Mitzion Kollel. Rabbi Roselaar spoke to Dov at his Bar Mitsva and at his wedding, and continues to be his Rabbi.

¹⁶ TB Eruvin 22b

¹⁷ Me’am Lo’ez, Beshalah

¹⁸ Exodus 16:22

¹⁹ Ba’al HaTurim

²⁰ Psalms 78:52

²¹ Exodus 16:22

²² Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De’ah, 339:5

²³ Shakh, Yoreh De’ah, 339:9

²⁴ Song of Songs 8:6

²⁵ TB Bava Batra 58a

¹ TB Sota 2a

² Woolf, V. *The Waves*. London: Harcourt, Inc., 1959. p.89

³ Genesis 44:18

⁴ Genesis Rabba 93:7

⁵ Genesis 45:1–2

⁶ Babel, I. *The Collected Stories of Isaac Babel*. Trans. P Constantine. USA: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2002. P15

⁷ Proverbs 20:5

⁸ Genesis Rabba, Vayigash, 93

⁹ Me’am Loez Beshalah

¹⁰ Exodus 13:17

¹¹ Genesis 49:3–4

¹² Zornberg, A. *The Beginning of Desire*. New York: Random House, Inc., 2011. p.364

¹³ Lamentations 2:13

¹⁴ Swift, M. *Moreshet Moshe*. Israel: Feldheim Publishers, 1992. p247

¹⁵ Chaucer, G. *The Canterbury Tales*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Shefokh Hamatkha - Pour forth Your rage...Using Anger as a Pathway to Holiness

DANIEL COLEMAN

G-d is angry every day ~ Psalms 7:12

Rage, rage against the dying of the light ~ Dylan Thomas

At a recent orthodox chaplains' conference, a colleague expressed her theory that every patient she visits harbours anger. Some are angry about their regular routine being interrupted, others because their meal didn't taste like home or the nurse didn't respond quickly enough. Even the new mothers with lots of reason to celebrate may carry anger at the challenges of child-raising, from lost sleep to day care and tuition.

Certainly it's true that all of us get angry at times. We often fear our anger, partly because we are taught that it is a 'negative' midda that must somehow be eliminated from our repertoire of emotions. Indeed the Rambam¹ stands out in prescribing an emotional diet devoid of anger, conceding that there may be times when it is appropriate to feign it. As a physician, it's very possible he knew some of the science. Explosive, intense and prolonged anger is known to cause high blood pressure, heart disease, lung problems, and wound healing takes longer.

However, in light of contemporary research demonstrating the benefits of anger, I wonder if the Rambam may have altered his position. Studies show for example, that acknowledging anger can help lower stress on the heart and manage pain, while suppressing anger can worsen the experience of pain, put stress on people's cardiovascular systems, and is tied to anxiety and depression².

Reacting with controlled anger rather than runaway anxiety releases less of the body's stress hormone cortisol—too much of which has been linked to bone loss and obesity. Anger can be a motivating force that may make people feel more optimistic and confident.

And letting off steam as it arises (instead of bottling it up and letting it all come out in one explosive fight) has also been found to benefit interpersonal relationships³.

Moreover, anger benefits us by alerting us that something is wrong on an individual, interpersonal, or societal scale; fuelling many of our group decisions for example, healthcare reform, women's suffrage, prison reform, environmental legislation, and/or personal choices to quit a dead-end job or leave an unhealthy relationship.

In nature, we often discover that things we thought were unequivocally unhealthy—like germs or UV rays—can sometimes be good for us. It shouldn't surprise us that the same holds true of our habits and personality quirks. In truth, nothing that God puts in this world is intrinsically negative – it all depends on how we deploy it. Given the considerable costs to our mental and physical health of suppressing anger, how might we embrace a healthier less fearful attitude towards anger and ensure that we aren't enslaved by it? I believe the Seder provides an important insight to help us formulate a holistic Jewish approach to anger.

The Seder helps us formulate a holistic Jewish approach to anger

In re-enacting our personal and national liberation from Egypt and considering possibilities for achieving greater freedom in our own lives, our senses and emotions are heightened. After drinking our third glass of wine, we pour a cup for Elijah and proceed to demand that God pour out in a different way - Shefokh hamatkha el hagoyim.

“Pour out your wrath on the nations that do not know You...Pour out your fury on them...Pursue them in rage & destroy them from under the heavens of the Lord⁴.”

Like veterans re-experiencing the trauma of war, on Seder night our experience of revisiting our darkest places and times (both historical and current) can evoke powerful emotion. Before launching into Hallel and drinking our final toast to freedom, we allow for the emotion of rage. On this night we are free to express a core emotion, and perhaps it is our very ability to give expression to something that remains so often concealed that allows us to feel fully liberated. Evidently, there are times and places where anger is appropriate or even necessary.



Darmstadt Haggada, 1434

In fact, anger in its various forms and expressions occurs over 500 times in Tanakh. Undoubtedly, it is one of the most prevalent Biblical emotions. Jacob is angry with Rachel; Jonah is angry with God; Moses is angry with the people; the people are angry with Moses; Moses is angry with his nephews; Pharaoh is angry with his servants; God is angry with Moses; God is angry with Miriam and Aaron; God is angry with the people; Saul is angry with his son Jonatan; Jeremiah is angry with God; Habakkuk is angry with God and so on.

Anger first appears in the story of Cain and Abel⁵. Cain becomes "exceedingly angry" when Abel's offering is found more acceptable than his. God asks him "why are you angry..." and, (seemingly without waiting for a response,) proceeds to tell Cain that he still has an opportunity to harness his anger, perhaps even channel it to a constructive use. Cain is apparently unable to

rise to God's challenge: to identify and take control over his anger. Consumed by his anger, he kills Abel.

God and our Biblical ancestors appear unafraid to publicly demonstrate their anger, perhaps making them more relatable to later generations. Anger – be it God's or ours – seems to be an inevitable part of life. Unless we believe that we are greater than our Creator, anger would seem to be something that we should welcome and cultivate, rather than attempt to eradicate through piety or training of the mind.

In the aftermath of the Golden Calf betrayal God self-describes as "slow to anger" – not devoid of anger!⁶

God self-describes as "slow to anger" not devoid of anger

The Gemara⁷ teaches us the imperative of *Vehalakhta Bidrakhav* - *Imitatio Dei* – to learn and follow God's ways⁸. Charged with the responsibility of emulating God in my life, I have 'permission' – perhaps even a *mitsva* – to express anger at injustices perpetuated towards myself and others. This attribute (and the episode of the Golden Calf in general) directs us to acknowledge our anger, just as God does. God doesn't apologise or feel shame for having and expressing this emotion. From these teachings, we can infer that God is challenging each of us to 'own' our anger and to take responsibility for it along with our other emotions, to confront our anger rather than avoid it.

With this in mind, we can interpret the question "Why are you angry?" that is sometimes directed at us as: "OK, you're angry. Now what are you going to do with that anger?" Will it be left unchecked, or can it be mastered just as we are enjoined to master every other object and emotion that God puts into our world?⁹ We can also learn to emulate our prophets such as Moses who frequently employed his anger in the service of God, or Torah personalities such as Pinhas who receives Heavenly acclaim for using his anger to defend God's honour¹⁰. This in turn can enhance our fulfilment of the *mitsva* to love God. The Gemara¹¹ offers an interpretation of the unusual word at the end of the verse 'V'ahavta et Hashem... behol meodekha'¹² as 'bekhol midda umidda...' with each and every characteristic that we are endowed with. Implied is our objective to love G-d with the entirety of our being and emotions – including anger.

Anger management is nothing new. Rabbi Ilai asserted that: "A person is known by (his management of) three things: his cup, his finances, and his anger"¹³.

When our anger is ignited, it is our responsibility to cultivate thought-out responses that emulate God's attribute and directive of being "slow to anger."

Shfokh hamatkha reminds us that open – even public - display, discussion, recognition, and validation of anger, rather than avoidance, can be both healthy and necessary. A door opens to forgiveness and reconciliation, just as the door of our home opens to welcome Elija and redemption.

At the Seder we create a safe – and sacred - space for a wide range of emotions. May our emotional and spiritual growth through the Seder’s 15 steps bring us healing and wholeness, and challenge us to embrace our passions and cultivate our Divine gifts for constructive purposes.

A proud husband and father, Rabbi Daniel Coleman was Hasmonean's undefeated long-jump champion 1994-1996, prior to emigrating to the USA. As a board certified chaplain, he provides spiritual care to patients, families, and staff of all faiths and none at North Shore University Hospital, New York. Daniel guides individuals in giving voice to their fears, angst, laments and hopes. Privileged to work at the intersection of medicine and religion, he enjoys frequent daily opportunities to talk to and about God and can be contacted at chaplaindaniel@gmail.com

¹ Hilkhoh Deot 2:3

² “Emotion suppression affects cardiovascular responses to initial and subsequent laboratory stressors”; Quartana, PJ and Burns, JW, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. British Journal of Health Psychology, 2010 Sep;15 (Pt 3):511-28. Epub 2009 Oct 16

“Anger suppression predicts pain, emotional, and cardiovascular responses to the cold pressor”; Quartana, PJ, Bounds, S., Yoon, KL, et al. Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. Annals of Behavioural Medicine, 2010 Jun;39(3):211-21

"The relation between anger management style, mood and somatic symptoms in anxiety disorders and somatoform disorders”; Koh, KB, Kim, DK, Kim, SY, et al. Department of Psychiatry, Yonsei University College of Medicine, Republic of Korea. Psychiatry Research, 2008 Sep 30;160(3):372-9. Epub 2008 Aug 21

³ Art of Anger, Reward Context Turns Avoidance Responses to Anger-Related Objects Into Approach Psychological Science October 2010 vol. 21 no. 10 1406-1410

⁴ Psalms 79:6,7; 69:25; Lamentations 3:66

⁵ Genesis 4:3

⁶ Exodus 34:6

⁷ TB Shabbat 133b

⁸ Deuteronomy 10:12 & 28:9

⁹ Genesis 1:28

¹⁰ Numbers 25:11

¹¹ TB Brakhot 54a

¹² Deuteronomy 6

¹³ TB Eruvin 65b

Shaalei Tzion (III) - Questions and Answers from Alei Tzion

RABBI DANIEL ROSELAAR

The following is a selection of the more interesting she'elot that have been posed to me since last Pesah's edition of Degel. They are presented to me in person, by email and as text messages and cover a range of contemporary and timeless questions.

I forgot that the earliest time for *minha* is creeping later and later and I davened before *Minha Gedola*. Do I need to repeat the *tefilla*?

The Shulhan Arukh¹ states that if one davens *minha* after six-and-a-half halakhic hours into the day it is a valid *tefilla*. The implication of this statement is that if one davened earlier it is not a valid *tefilla* but the Mishna Berura cites dissenting views amongst the aharonim about whether the *tefilla* must be repeated. He leaves the matter unresolved as his final comments in the Shaar Hatsiyun are that the matter requires further consideration. Subsequent works on Hilkhos Tefilla recommend that the prayers should not be repeated though if you feel particularly uneasy about maybe not having davened *minha* you could repeat the Amida as a voluntary prayer (*tefillat nedava*), taking extreme care to ensure that your thoughts are properly focussed from beginning to end².

We're on holiday and we only brought two hallot with us. What should we do about *lehem mishneh*?

Obviously on Friday evening there is no problem as you can place both loaves on the table and make sure to eat only one of them, but on Shabbat day you will find yourself with only one halla. Under the circumstances it would be best to cut the loaf into two so that there is at least a semblance of the mitsva to have two loaves and some sort of commemoration of the double portion of manna that fell in the wilderness on Erev Shabbat³. It is true that there is always a preference to recite hamotsi over a complete loaf, but this is a function of *kavod habrakha* (the respect due a brakha), whereas the requirement of *lehem mishneh* has a basis in the Torah and according to some poskim is actually a Biblically mandated mitsva. When it comes to seuda shlishit you

will not have any complete loaves. Since it is proper to use *lehem mishneh* for this meal also, you should make hamotsi over two slices of bread if you have them⁴. If you have no more bread then seuda shlishit can be fulfilled by eating other foods.

A work colleague has died and the funeral will take place in a Catholic church followed by a burial in a cemetery. Which parts of the ceremony am I allowed to attend?

Numerous contemporary poskim have ruled that one is not allowed to enter a church⁵. Even according to the view cited by the Rama⁶ that contemporary Christians should not halakhically be regarded as idolaters, that is only as far as their own involvement is concerned, but for Jews, Christianity is still regarded as a form of *Avoda Zara*. The view of the Meiri⁷ that civilised religions should not be regarded as *Avoda Zara* is not seriously entertained by the classical poskim. It is true that religious leaders including Chief Rabbis sometimes attend church services, but that is only on State occasions and when there is a consideration of *eiva*, i.e. the long term welfare and security of the Jewish community⁸.

As far as the actual burial is concerned it depends whether the cemetery is the churchyard or a municipal cemetery. The Rama⁹ rules that a churchyard has much the same status as a church itself, unless it serves as a passageway through the area. Consequently if the internment is to take place in the churchyard you will need to excuse yourself from that part of the ceremony also, but if it will be in an off-site burial ground it is permitted for you to attend.

Is it permissible for children to ride bicycles and tricycles on Shabbat?

The use of bicycles on Shabbat has generated a lot of discussion amongst the poskim because there is no obvious infringement of Shabbat that comes to mind. Considerations raised by the halakhists of the last 150 years include the concern that one might take the bicycle beyond the limits of the eruv, that if there is a puncture or

the chain falls off one might come to fix it, and that since bicycles are primarily designed for sporting and commuter use their use is prohibited under the rubrics of *uvdin dehol* (weekday activities). Writing about 150 years ago Rav Yosef Haim of Bagdad adopted a lenient approach, based in part on the grounds that preventative *gezerot* are not usually made in the post-Talmudic era¹⁰. However, contemporary poskim including the Tsits Eliezer¹¹ and Rav Ovadia Yosef have rejected his leniency and rule that bicycles should not be used on Shabbat even in the privacy of one's own back garden¹².

The use of tricycles is somewhat different. Since they lack a chain, have solid tyres, are not used for long distances and are primarily used as a toy the aforementioned concerns are not relevant and children may play on them on Shabbat. Children's scooters are much the same, and whilst some authorities rule that it is permitted to ride on them even in the street (providing there is an eruv)¹³, where possible I would counsel against using them for functional purposes in public.

My in-laws have some kosher l'Pesah diet coke which they bought at an extortionate price. It contains aspartame which is a kitniyot derivative. Based on your Shabbat Hagadol shiur is there good basis to say that I can drink it?

The Shabbat Hagadol shiur regarding kitniyot raised three pertinent considerations regarding this question – i) the discussion in the poskim about whether kitniyot derivatives should be regarded as kitniyot, ii) the circumstances under which the principle of bittul can be invoked, iii) whether the prohibition of kitniyot applies to something which has undergone a significant physical change. Regarding the first consideration the Rama¹⁴ cites the Terumat Hadeshen¹⁵ to the effect that kitniyot oil may be used in lamps on Pesah, and the poskim infer from this that whilst kitniyot derivatives may be owned and utilised, they may not be eaten. Regarding the second consideration the Rama further quotes from the same responsum of the Terumat Hadeshen that if, *bediavad*, some kitniyot ingredients were mixed in with a food it may be consumed on Pesah. Accordingly, though it is prohibited to mix kitniyot with Pesah food with the intention of it becoming halakhically irrelevant (*battel*), if they were already mixed the food is permitted and thus Pesah foods which do contain small quantities of kitniyot may be consumed. The principle that we don't deliberately nullify prohibited ingredients is not relevant in this instance because these foods will have been produced either for a Sefardi market which allows kitniyot, or under an Ashkenazi *hashgaha* which doesn't regard these particular ingredients as kitniyot¹⁶. Consequently, the third consideration becomes academic. Aspartame is derived from corn but has undergone significant chemical changes and is hardly recognisable

as a direct derivative of kitniyot. As such, contemporary poskim are divided about whether it should be permitted or prohibited. But even if the local minhag is not to give a *hekhsher* to foods containing aspartame, once it has been purchased it may be consumed on Pesah because of the principle of *bittul*. As far as the extortionate price is concerned – maybe I should address this in a future Shabbat Hagadol shiur.

My wife forgot to light candles on the 8th night of Yom Tov and thinks that she must now light an extra candle every Friday evening. I told her that it's a *buba maiseh*. Which one of us is correct?

With all due respect to bubas worldwide, in this instance there is merit to both claims. The Rama¹⁷ cites the view of the Maharil that a woman who forgets to light Shabbat candles on week must always light an additional candle as a penalty for the oversight. This position is cited by many subsequent authorities and is regarded as normative. However, the ruling is recorded only with regard to Shabbat candles and since it is something of a *hidush* there is no need to extend it to a woman who forgot to light Yom Tov candles. One of the purposes of Shabbat candles is for the sake of *Shalom Bayit* and we have achieved it with regard to your query – your wife was correct about the concept existing but you were correct that in this instance there is no need for her to light an additional candle¹⁸.

My Shabbat coat has a tear that gets larger every time I wear it and it is beginning to look a bit ridiculous. Am I permitted to repair it on Hol Hamoed?

I have noted in a previous edition of Degel that the halakhot of Hol Hamoed are often overlooked and that the emphasis should be on the Moed more than the Hol. In fact, according to many early authorities, the prohibition against at least some sorts of work is biblical in nature and it is thus often important to clarify whether a particular activity is permitted or prohibited.

If the sole concern about the coat is that the tear will become enlarged every time that it is worn, it would be prohibited to repair the tear. This is because the Shulhan Arukh¹⁹ rules in accordance with the view of the Rosh that the leniency of *davar ha'aved* (that *melakha* is permitted in order to prevent a financial loss) can only be applied if the item in question is in danger of being totally (or at least mostly) ruined. However, if the coat is required for Hol Hamoed or the last days of Yom Tov a different leniency can be applied and it can be repaired in a basic fashion under the rubrics of *tsorkhei hamoed* (something which is required for the festival itself). This means that a sewing machine should not be used and that the stitches should be larger and more randomly arranged

than usual. [Actually, contemporary poskim are of the opinion that nowadays most women should be regarded as competent seamstresses and must sew in a somewhat haphazard manner, but most men are considered to be fairly inept and any repairs that they attempt can be done without any significant change²⁰.]

Am I allowed to give an engagement ring during the “three weeks”?

We are generally attentive to the sombre nature of this period in the Jewish calendar, and rightly so, considering the traumas and travails that the Jewish people have suffered over two thousand years of exile. But an examination of the halakhic sources will reveal that the only formal restrictions that apply during the “three weeks” are with regard to weddings and haircuts²¹ and one is permitted to buy new items up till Rosh Hodesh Av²². However, since the Shulhan Arukh²³ states that it is good to avoid saying the brakha of *she'he'heyenu* during the three weeks, the general minhag is not to purchase items during this time which would require the recitation of the brakha. Whilst the hatan would not recite the brakha upon the purchase of the ring, the kalla should nonetheless recite *she'he'heyenu* when she receives it and thus it would be proper to delay the giving of the ring until after Tisha B'Av²⁴.

We cooked potatoes for a milky meal in a meaty pot. Can we eat the potatoes with milky foods?

With slight variations, such as rice in a milky pot instead of potatoes in a meaty pot, this is one of the most frequent halakhic questions that I am asked. And frequently it is an urgent *she'ela* as dinner is about to be served, but generally the situation is not as dire as people fear.

The Talmud²⁵ asserts that fish that came out of a meaty pan may be served and eaten with milk since there is only an indirect transfer of meaty taste from the pan to the milk. Whilst there is some discussion amongst the Rishonim about the precise meaning of the term “fish that came out of a meaty pan” and whether they were merely placed in hot meaty pan or they were actually cooked in the pan, the halakhic conclusion is that even if they were actually cooked in the meaty pan they may be eaten with milk.

The Shulhan Arukh²⁶ rules in accordance with the approach of most Rishonim to the effect that it makes no difference whether or not meat had been cooked in the meaty pan during the previous twenty-four hours (*ben yomo*). However some Rishonim²⁷ maintain that this rule applies only if the meaty pan was not *ben yomo*, but if meat had been cooked in the pan during the previous twenty-four hours the fish may not be eaten with milk. The Rama²⁸ adopts this position *lekhathila* and rules that

parve food cooked in a *ben yomo* pot should not be mixed with food of the other “gender”. However, if the food has already been placed together it may be eaten. So if it was only as the butter was melting into the potatoes that you realised they had been cooked in a *ben yomo* meaty pot, you may eat and enjoy them. But if you hadn't yet used butter, you would need to use margarine instead.

If the meaty pot that the potatoes were cooked in had not been used for meat during the previous twenty-four hours (*eino ben yomo*) the potatoes may be eaten with milk without any restrictions. Such a situation should not be deliberately generated, but if there are no other cooked potatoes immediately available there is no reason why these should not be smothered with butter.

We are going on holiday to a villa in Spain. How should we *kasher* the barbeque?

In theory the barbeque can be koshered. But since the cooking is achieved with dry heat the koshering process requires what is known as *libbun gamur* which means that it should be heated until it glows red-hot. In practice this is not so easy as it involves either using a blowtorch or sandwiching the grates between charcoal bricks and setting them on fire. Furthermore, the entire barbeque needs to be thoroughly cleaned from non-kosher grease etc that will have accumulated on it and then *kashered* with fire. Since you are only going on holiday, my recommendation would be that unless you will be catering a feast for a colony of ex-pats you should save yourself the hassle and buy disposable barbeques. Enjoy!

I am a Cohen and my office is in the same building as company which is involved in medical research and I believe that they have a human skeleton in their offices. Am I allowed to enter the building?

It is reasonable to assume that the skeleton in question is not that of a Jewish person and thus to a large degree, this is similar to a question that has been asked by many people – may a Cohen visit a museum such as the British Museum or the Museum of London which houses ancient bodies? R' Shimon ben Yohai is of the view that *tumat ohel* (that a corpse transmits impurity to people and objects under the same roof) does not apply to gentile corpses²⁹. Rambam is of the opinion that the halakha is in accordance with this view whilst Tosafot and the Rosh argues against it and maintain that the halakha follows the opposing view of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel. The Shulhan Arukh³⁰ writes that it is proper to avoid gentile graves. This is an interesting formulation in that it avoids ruling definitively in accordance with Tosafot and the Rosh but clearly prefers their position. The gloss on the Shulhan Arukh references the permissive view of the Rambam but also writes that it is proper to be strict.

Predictably there is a range of opinions amongst the aharonim regarding correct halakhic practice, though the general consensus is that it is correct to be strict and that is the general *minhag* amongst observant Cohanim. However, the poskim do discuss a number of exceptional cases where they combine a number of other opinions (i.e. the lenient view of the Rambam, combined with the view of the Ra'avad that nowadays Cohanim are not prohibited from contact with tumat met, combined with the view that if the corpse is in a different room the *tuma* is only ever a rabbinic prohibition) and reach a permissive conclusion. For example, both the Maharsham³¹ and the Avnei Nezer³² discuss whether Cohanim would have to move out of their home on Yom Tov if a gentile corpse were under the same roof. Because of the considerations of oneg and simha of Yom Tov they were able to rely on a combination of leniencies to permit them to remain in their homes. Accordingly, since your job requires you to be present in the company building and for you it is a *tsorekh parnassa*, you are permitted to continue working there.

I need to write an online test as part of job application. Am I allowed to ask someone else to do this for me?

I'm not sure if I am pleased that someone is taking a moral issue seriously enough that they ask a *she'ela* about it, or disappointed that someone should even need to ask a question about something which is so obviously wrong.

Rav Moshe Feinstein³³ was asked whether schools may provide students with the correct answers for matriculation exams in order to increase grades. His response was unequivocal to the effect that it is not merely a transgression of the principle of *dina d'malkhuta dina* which requires a Jew to adhere to secular law, but that it is biblically prohibited on two counts – it is deceitful and thus a form of *genevat da'at* and because it has financial implications (since higher grades will make it easier for people to find employment) it is real theft. Clearly this case is no different and equally reprehensible.

Rabbi Daniel Roselaar is the Rav of Alei Tzion and the Rosh Kollel of the Kinloss Community Kollel, having previously served as the Rabbi of Watford and Belmont Synagogues. He learnt at Yeshivat Har Etzion and received semicha from the Israeli Chief Rabbinate and has an MA in Jewish Education from the University of London.

¹ OH 233:1

² See Shulhan Arukh OH 107:1 & 107:4.

³ Minhat Yitshak 10:24. Someone other than the person making hamotsi should cut the loaf into two and place it on the table, otherwise the hamotsi-maker has just a single loaf of bread and must recite the brakha over that.

⁴ Aruk Hashulhan OH 274:5.

⁵ Rav Moshe Feinstein – Igrot Moshe YD 3:129; Rav Eliezer Waldenberg – Tsits Eliezer 14:91; Rav Ovadia Yosef – Yehaveh Da'at 4:45; Rav Haim David Halevi – Aseh Lekha Rav 1:59.

⁶ OH 156:1

⁷ See for example his comments on Avoda Zara 26b.

⁸ The presence of an Orthodox rabbi at a cathedral service in Washington DC to mark the inauguration of President Barak Obama in 2009 generated a fascinating exchange of views. See TRADITION 44:2 published by the RCA and HAKIRAH, The Flatbush Journal of Jewish Law and Thought Vol. 8.

⁹ YD 149:2

¹⁰ Resp. Rav Pe'alim 1:25.

¹¹ Tsits Eliezer, 7:30.

¹² See also Shemirat Shabbat Kehilkhata (SSK)16:18

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ OH 453:1

¹⁵ Siman 113.

¹⁶ Following this argument through to its logical conclusion it is also permitted to purchase these foods. R' Yitshak Elhanan Spektor in Resp. Be'er Yitshak (OH 11) even allows the manufacture of such products in advance of Pesah. Amongst other considerations he notes that before Pesah kitniyot are not regarded as prohibited foodstuffs so the rule against deliberately nullifying prohibited ingredients is not relevant.

¹⁷ OH 263:1

¹⁸ See also SSK 43 footnote 28.

¹⁹ OH 541:4.

²⁰ SSK 66:51.

²¹ OH 551:2 and 551:4. Sephardim do not apply these restrictions until Rosh Hodesh.

²² OH 551:7.

²³ OH 551:17

²⁴ Rav S Z Aurbach allows the exchange of gifts between hatan and kalla during the three weeks if this is part of the standard engagement procedure, as it has the status of a financial obligation. However in a case where the couple has been engaged a little while and is taking some time ordering and purchasing a ring there should be no need for it to be actually exchanged during the "three weeks."

²⁵ TB Hullin 111a

²⁶ YD 95:1

²⁷ R' Yona – Issur V'heter Ha'arukh, quoted by the Darkhei Moshe.

²⁸ YD 95:2

²⁹ TB Yevamot 61a

³⁰ YD 372:2

³¹ Resp. 2:233.

³² Resp. YD 468.

³³ Resp. Igrot Moshe CM 2:30

Best
wishes to
our friends
at Alei
Tzion

Kiddush at Seuda Shelishit and the Exodus from Egypt

BEN ELTON

We are familiar with two recitations of Kiddush on Shabbat, the first at dinner on Friday night and the second at Shabbat lunch.¹ What of the third meal of Shabbat? Is Kiddush required at seuda shelishit? Perhaps this is an odd question even to ask. Why might we think there would be Kiddush at seuda shelishit? R. Yosef Karo thought it was a good question and he addressed it in Shulhan Arukh²:

It is not necessary to make Kiddush at Seuda Shelishit. א"צ לקדש בסעודה שלישית

As we would expect, the Shulhan Arukh does not elaborate on his reasons for raising and then dismissing the possibility of Kiddush at seuda shelishit, but one approach is implied by the Mishna Berura³:

It is good to acquire wine and make a blessing over it in the middle of the meal (Tikunei Shabbat). טוב להדר לברך על היין תוך הסעודה (תיקוני שבת)

The Shulhan Arukh might be trying to tell us that the wine and its blessing at seuda shelishit should not be confused with a Kiddush

There is a value in having wine at seuda shelishit. Since we always make a separate blessing when we drink wine, even when it is part of a meal and we have already made hamotsi and eaten bread. When a blessing is made over wine at a Shabbat meal it might look like Kiddush. After all, the Kiddush of Shabbat morning minimally consists only of 'borei peri hagafen'. The Shulhan Arukh might be trying to tell us that the wine and its blessing at seuda shelishit should not be confused with a Kiddush. However, the Mishna Berura's source, the Tikunei Shabbat of the Ari z'l⁴ goes further:

It is a mitsva to acquire wine to make Kiddush, although there is no obligation to make Kiddush as there is an obligation at night.

מצוה להדר אחר יין לקדיש ואין בו חיוב נאמר כמו שיש חיוב בלילה

It appears that the Ari z'l was indeed suggesting that there is such a thing as Kiddush at seuda shelishit. It is not obligatory as it is on Friday night and Shabbat morning, but when a blessing is made over wine at seuda shelishit, it effects a Kiddush. Which brings us back to our opening question: Why would we expect that seuda shelishit could begin with Kiddush. I do not intend to pursue the Kabbalistic reasons of the Ari z'l, but to explore the mainstream halakhic literature where the possibility of a real Kiddush at seuda shelishit is also found. To do this, we need to examine the institution of Kiddush from its most basic sources.

Kiddush on Friday night and Shabbat morning

The first iteration of the Ten Commandments instructs us to 'remember the Shabbat day to sanctify it'⁵. This could mean all sorts of things; perhaps to bear Shabbat in mind, to read certain verses, to refrain from particular activities. The Gemara⁶ in Pesahim gives us the practical halakhic meaning of the commandment:

'Remember the Shabbat day to sanctify it' – **remember it over wine** when it begins. This only teaches me about night, how do I know about the day? Because it teaches 'remember the *day* of Shabbat. What is the blessing of the day Kiddush? Rabbi Yehuda said 'who makes the fruit of the vine'.

זכור את יום השבת לקדשו - זוכרנו על היין בכניסתו. אין לי אלא בלילה, ביום מנין - תלמוד לומר זכור את יום השבת.

ביום מאי מברך? - אמר רב יהודה: בורא פרי הגפן.

The Gemara implies that the Kiddushim on both Friday night and Shabbat morning have a biblical basis, as the way to fulfil the mitzva of remembering Shabbat. We make Kiddush on Friday night to sanctify the (halakhic) day at the earliest opportunity and in the morning because the verse contains the word ‘yom’, implying an additional obligation to sanctify the *daytime* further to the sanctification done the previous night. A simple reading also suggests that making Kiddush over wine is part of the biblical injunction.

However, on the basis of a discussion in Nazir 3b-4a, most Rishonim (Rabbenu Tam, Rambam, Ramban, Rashba and others) regard it as rabbinic. The Kiddush of Friday night consists of two blessings: first over wine and second over Shabbat itself. The Kiddush on Shabbat morning comprises *only* the blessing over wine; one need not mention Shabbat at all. This strongly suggests (although it does not prove outright) that the Shabbat morning Kiddush is entirely rabbinic. This is a widely held position, including by the Ran⁷:

The Kiddush of the night, when Shabbat begins, is biblical. However, since the dignity of the daytime is greater than of the night, the Sages saw fit to establish a day ceremony recalling the night Kiddush.

קדושה דאורייתא דליליא
הוא דהוי בכניסתו.
אלא משום דכבוד יום
עדיף מכבוד לילה ראו
חכמים לעשות ביום זכר
לקדושה.

Hazal were concerned for the dignity of the day of Shabbat and therefore they instituted a Kiddush, to sanctify the daytime in its own right. As we have a template for Kiddush from Friday night, the daytime Kiddush has to follow it, by using the same blessing: ‘borei peri hagafen’. Presumably the Ran held that Kiddush on Shabbat morning could only be made over wine (or bread) as on Friday night, otherwise the Kiddush of the day would not be based on the Kiddush of the night. According to the Ran, then, the reference to the word ‘yom’ in Shemot 20:8 is merely an *asmakhta*, and not a genuine source of the Kiddush of Shabbat morning, which is a rabbinic innovation.

According to this logic, there would be absolutely no need to make Kiddush at seuda shelishit. The Torah commanded us to sanctify Shabbat once, which we do at the earliest opportunity, i.e. Friday night. The Rabbis instituted a second Kiddush on the day of Shabbat, which we also perform at the first opportunity, i.e. after we have prayed, before the first meal of the day. Once that Kiddush has been said the daytime has been sanctified and there

is no reason to think that there should be a further Kiddush later in the day. The Rambam codified this position (Hilkhos Shabbat 29:10):

It is a commandment to make a blessing over wine on the day of Shabbat before the second meal, and this is called the Great Kiddush. You only say the blessing over wine, and drink, and after that wash your hands and eat. It is forbidden for a person to eat before Kiddush. This Kiddush must take place in the context of the meal.

מצוה לברך על היין
ביום השבת קודם
שיטעוד סעודה שניה,
וזה הוא הנקרא
קידושה רבא.
מברך בורא פרי הגפן
בלבד ושונה ואחר כך
יטול ידיו ויטעוד,
ואסור לו לאדם
שיטעום כלום קודם
שיקדש, וגם קידוש זה
לא יהיה אלא במקום
סעודה.

The reason the Kiddush of Shabbat morning is called ‘Kidusha Rabba’ the Great Kiddush, is an interesting question in its own right. The Rashbam (on Pesachim 106a) argues that it is because every Kiddush opens with ‘borei peri hagafen’ and this Kiddush is no different. The Ran (also on Pesachim 106a) believes the name is a euphemism, because in fact this Kiddush is of lesser stature. In any event, the Rambam is clear in labelling the blessing over wine before the first meal on the day of Shabbat a ‘Kiddush’. This is not the case when he deals with seuda shelishit.

The reason the Kiddush of Shabbat morning is called the Great Kiddush, is an interesting question in its own right

The Rambam (Hilkhos Shabbat 30:9) makes no reference to Kiddush when he discusses the third meal of Shabbat:

A person is obliged to eat three meals on Shabbat, one in the evening, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. It is necessary to be conscientious with these three meals, not to have fewer, and even a poor person sustained by charity should eat three meals. If one is sick from overeating or always fasts, one is exempt from the three meals. It is necessary to have wine at all three meals and two loaves, and also on Festivals.

חייב אדם לאכול שלש
סעודות בשבת אחת
ערבית ואחת שחרית
ואחת במנחה, וצריך
להזהר בשלש סעודות
אלו שלא יפחות מהן
כלל, ואפילו עני
המתפרנס מן הצדקה
סועד שלש סעודות,
ואם היה חולה מרוב
האכילה או שהיה
מתענה תמיד פטור
משלש סעודות, וצריך
לקבוע כל סעודה
משלשתן על היין ולבצוע
על שתי ככרות, וכן
בימים טובים.

The Rambam says one should drink wine at all three meals, but does not label wine at the third meal as Kiddush, and at first sight there is no reason to think that he means Kiddush. We have seen how the Rambam referred explicitly to the Kiddush of Shabbat morning, using the term several times. That is entirely absent from his discussion of wine at seuda shelishit.

Why might there be Kiddush at Seuda Shelishit?

Nevertheless, the Rosh (R. Asher ben Yehiel) and his son the Tur (R. Yaakov ben Asher), did believe the Rambam was referring to Kiddush at seuda shelishit, and they disagreed with this (presumed) prescription. The Tur recorded the practice of his father, and the reason for it⁸:

The Rambam writes that there should be wine and two loaves at seuda shelishit. My father the Rosh did not make a blessing over wine before the meal because of the connection between day and night regarding Kiddush, just as at night there is only on Kiddush so during the day there is only one.

וכתב הרמב"ם ז"ל שגם
בסעודה שלישית קובע
על היין
ובצוע על שתי ככרות
וא"י הרא"ש ז"ל לא
היה מברך על היין קודם
משום דאיתקש יום
ללילה לענין קידוש
מה לילה סגי בחד
זימנא אף ביום נמי בחד
זימנא

The Rosh ...thought when the Rambam mentioned wine at seuda shelishit he meant that this would be a Kiddush

The Rosh, and implicitly the Tur, thought when the Rambam mentioned wine at seuda shelishit he meant that this would be a Kiddush. They did not follow his ruling because they saw a parallel between Shabbat night and day. Just as there is one Kiddush at night there should be only one Kiddush during the day, and that daytime Kiddush was already accomplished at lunch. This is a strange proof. There are many ways in which the day of Shabbat is not parallel to the night. There is one prayer at night and three during the day (including Mussaf). There is one meal at night and two meals during the day. Nor does the reason of the Rosh quite reflect the consensus of Rishonim regarding the relationship between the Kiddush of Friday night and Shabbat morning. According to their reading of all the relevant sugyot, there is no

equality between the two Kiddushim; the Kiddush of the night is biblical whereas the Kiddush of the day was a rabbinic creation. The remarkable aspect of Kiddush during the day is not that it is said once, as the Rosh implies, but that it is said at all!"

We are left wondering why the Rosh and the Tur should have formed such a strange reading of the Rambam. The traditional explanation is that the Rosh felt that when the Rambam discussed Kiddush at lunch in 29:10 he established that wine at a meal means Kiddush, and therefore he did not need to repeat himself by saying the same regarding seuda shelishit, he merely had to mention wine. This is also not a wholly satisfying explanation. First, the Rambam is usually so clear and precise; we should not need to infer from an earlier halakha what he means in 30:9. Second, by the time he discusses Kiddush at lunch he has associated wine and Kiddush once already; in his description of Friday night, so the account of Shabbat morning is itself a repetition. Third, in 29:10 he defines the Kiddush at lunch as Kidusha Rabba. Presumably he would not regard the third Kiddush as also Kidusha Rabba, and it therefore deserves being identified in its own terms. These reasons and others may be why R. Yosef Karo rejected the reading of the Rosh and the Tur in his Kesef Mishneh⁹:

It is necessary to have wine at all the meals: from the words of the Tur it appears that he interprets the Rambam to mean one should say Kiddush at Seuda Shelishit before the meal, as at other meals. But this is not apparent from the Rambam's words, rather he meant that one should drink wine at the meal, and that is the meaning of 'have wine at the meal', and this is not referring to Kiddush before the meal. This is the meaning of the Rambam in chapter 29 when he writes 'it is a commandment to make a blessing over wine on the day of Shabbat before the second meal, and this is called the Great Kiddush'. It is apparent that the Rambam is referring to the second meal and not to the third.

וצריך לקבוע כל סעודה
משלשתן על היין.
מדברי הטור נראה
שמפרש דברי רבינו
דהיינו לומר שיקדש גם
בסעודה שלישית על
היין קודם סעודה כמו
בשאר סעודות.
ואין זה במשמע דברי
אלא היינו לומר
שישתה יין בסעודה כי
זהו פירוש קובע
סעודתו על היין
לא לענין שיקדש קודם
סעודה
ובפירוש כתב
רבינו סוף פרק כ"ט
ומצוה לברך
על היין
ביום השבת
קודם שיסעוד שניה
וזהו הנקרא קידושא
רבה משמע בהדיא
דבסעודה שניה דוקא
קאמר ולא בשלישית.

The Kesef Mishneh is adamant that when the Rambam means Kiddush he writes Kiddush, and he was merely instructing us to drink wine at seuda shelishit, and did not intend to imply there is a Kiddush at the third meal. If the Kesef Mishneh is correct, and there is no reason to infer from the Rambam in either 29:10 or 30:9 that there is a Kiddush at seuda shelishit, what other reasons might the Rosh and Tur have had to conclude that the Rambam thought there should be Kiddush at seuda shelishit? One approach would be to see if there are considerations which apply to the Kiddushim made at the first two meals of Shabbat, which might also apply to the third.

Ritual Context

One possibility is that the Rosh was performing a piece of reverse engineering from the ritual principle that Kiddush is only effective when it takes place in the context of a meal. We learn in Pesahim¹⁰:

According to Shmuel what is the purpose of Kiddush in the synagogue [on Friday night]? To discharge the obligation of guests who eat, drink and sleep in the synagogue. Shmuel follows his own reasoning, since Shmuel says Kiddush can only take place where the meal is eaten.

ושמואל, למה לי לקדושי
בבי כנישתא? - לאפוקי
אורחים ידי חובתן, דאכלו
ושתו וגו' בבי כנישתא.

ואזדא שמואל לטעמיה,
דאמר שמואל:
אין קידוש
אלא במקום סעודה.

This principle that Kiddush can only take place when there is a meal might work in the other direction and could imply that when there is a Shabbat meal there must also be Kiddush. In other words, just as Kiddush is not Kiddush without a meal, so too a Shabbat meal does not have a full status without Kiddush.

Could it be that just as Kiddush is not Kiddush without a meal, so too a Shabbat meal does not have full status without Kiddush?

This might seem like an odd conclusion to draw, but it is implied by the Meiri¹¹:

For this reason, [Kidusha Rabba] too was instituted, so that the day should be sanctified through it, by making his meal important by including wine.

לכך תקנוה
שיהא היום
מתקדש על
ידו להיות
סעודתו חשובה
כשהיא נקבעת
על היין

The Meiri appears to believe that the status of the meal is elevated by the presence of a Kiddush; it makes a meal important. If that takes place for the first two meals of Shabbat, why should it not be true of the third meal? Why should we not dignify and sanctify seuda shelishit in the same way as we sanctify the earlier Shabbat meals? We know that in general a seudat mitsva (mitsva meal) is preceded by a blessing over wine, for example at a wedding. There is a pattern that we elevate a meal which we want to enjoy a special significance by beginning it with a blessing over wine.

We can answer this point by looking more closely at the Meiri's understanding of the ritual relationship between wine and a meal. The Rabbis wanted us to sanctify Shabbat in the daytime. We do that by combining wine and a meal and the two together are significant enough to generate the necessary kedusha. However, the purpose is not to elevate the meal but to sanctify Shabbat. As we have already established, that only needs to be done once during the daytime and it is achieved at the second meal of Shabbat. There is therefore no need to enhance the status of the third meal for the purposes of kedusha. For sure, according to the Rambam we should have wine at the meal but not for the purpose of sanctifying Shabbat, but to give the Shabbat meal the appropriate status in its own right and for its own sake.

This point, which is implicit in the Meiri, is made explicitly by the Rashbam¹²:

Kiddush can only take place where the meal is eaten, as it says 'and you will call Shabbat a delight' (Isaiah 58:13). The place where you call Shabbat, that is to say make Kiddush, there too you should delight.

אין קידוש אלא במקום
סעודה דכתיב (ישעיה נח)
וקראת לשבת עונג
במקום שאתה קורא
לשבת כלומר קרייה
דקידוש שם תהא עונג.

Alternatively, Kiddush is made over wine (as we learn in Pesahim 106b 'remember it over wine') and wine drunk at meal has a higher status.

אי נמי סברא היא
מדאיבע קידוש על היין
דכתיב לקמן
(קו:) זוכרהו על היין
מסתמא על היין שבשעת
סעודה הוקבע דחשיב

The Rashbam's first explanation makes it clear that the ritual relationship between Kiddush and the meal goes only in one direction. Where there is Kiddush there should be a meal, but not vice versa. His second explanation emphasises that the focus of the combination of wine and the meal is not to enhance the meal qua meal, but to make the wine worthy of making Kiddush.

We can add that there is no constant connection between a seudat mitsva and a blessing over wine. The introduction of a blessing over wine at a wedding came later than a seudat mitsva after it, and one can get married without wine¹³. It therefore seems unlikely that this model of ritual context or a variation on "Kiddush must take place in the context of a meal" "אין קידוש אלא במקום סעודה" was the roots of the Rosh's supposition.

There is no constant connection between a seudat mitsva and a blessing over wine

Ethical Context

A second possibility draws on the function of Kiddush as a matir, it allows a person to eat. One might think that one cannot eat seuda shelishit without making Kiddush. We have seen in 29:10 that the Rambam rules that it is forbidden to eat on Shabbat morning before Kiddush, and he applies the same to Friday night¹⁴:

It is forbidden to eat or drink wine from the start of Shabbat until one has made Kiddush.

אסור לאדם לאכול
או לשתות יין
משקדש היום
עד שיקדש.

What is the connection between permission to eat and the making of Kiddush? There is a general prohibition on eating before performing religious acts whose time has come, as the Shulhan Arukh rules¹⁵:

It is forbidden to attend to your needs or to go on a journey until you have prayed.

אסור לו להתעסק בצרכיו
או לילך לדרך,
עד שיתפלל תפלת.

The Mishne Berura¹⁶ elaborates on the reason for this prohibition:

The Rabbis says about one who transgresses this that the Bible is referring

והעובר ע"ז אמרו חז"ל
שעליו אמר הכתוב ואותי
השלכת אחר גוך אמר
קב"ה לאחר שאכל

to him when it says 'you have turned your back on me' (Kings I 14:9). God says 'after you have eaten, drunk and aggrandised yourself, you accept upon yourself the Kingdom of Heaven'

ושתה ונתגאה קבל עליי
מלכות שמים.

It shows an ethical lack to attend to your own needs before you have acknowledged God. On a weekday morning that consists of praying. On a Shabbat morning it also includes making Kiddush, which praises God who sanctifies Shabbat. You should not be able to enjoy a Shabbat meal until you have acknowledged that God made Shabbat. The argument would go that since seuda shelishit is a Shabbat meal it needs to be preceded by this verbal recognition that Shabbat is the gift of God.

However, this too is an unsatisfying answer. It is unethical to eat until one has discharged one's religious obligations. On Friday night and Shabbat morning that includes prayer and Kiddush. If Hazal did not establish a Kiddush on Shabbat afternoon then there is no outstanding obligation to be discharged before one can eat. One does not eat within half an hour of the time to pray Mincha¹⁷, whether on Shabbat or otherwise, because that is a standing religious requirement which must be discharged before one can eat, but that cannot be true of a Kiddush which does not exist, and this line of reasoning cannot bring it into existence! Certainly the Rambam who ruled explicitly that Kiddush must precede the first two meals never says that wine at seuda shelishit should be drunk first. While this principle of ethical context is important, it does not seem to be determinative in this case.

Conceptual Context

We have explored two possible connections between the concept of Kiddush and seuda shelishit. First, the *ritual context*, based on the principle that Kiddush must take place at a meal, and therefore the reverse might be true, even at seuda shelishit. Second, the *ethical context*, that just as Kiddush is a matir to eat at the first two meals it might be at the third. Neither approach satisfactorily explains why the Rosh and the Tur thought the Rambam ruled that there was Kiddush at seuda shelishit. I want to propose a third approach, the *conceptual context*, which builds on a theme I discussed in an article in last year's *Degel* ('Lehem Mishneh and the Matsot of the Seder', Nissan 5773).

As I noted in my last article, many Rishonim understood that the loaves of bread which define the Shabbat meal are a re-enactment of the miracle of the manna in the desert. The Tur was in this tradition. He explains the position succinctly¹⁸:

Take two loaves at Shabbat meals, and it is brought in the Yerushalmi and Mehilta that at Seuda Shelishit it is necessary to have at least one complete loaf because on Friday two omerim [of manna] fell for each person and two loaves were made from each omer, making four from two omerim. One was eaten on Friday, on Friday night and Shabbat morning, leaving one for seuda shelishit.

בוצע על ב' ככרות ואיתא
בירושלמי במכילתא
דבסעודה שלישיית צריך
לפחות ככר אחד שלם
משום דביום ו' ירד לכל
אחד שני עומרין ומכל
עומר עשו שתי ככרות הרי
ד' לשני עומרין אכל אחד
בע"ש ואחד בליל שבת
ואחד בבקר הרי לו אחד
שלם לסעודה שלישיית

For the Rosh and the Tur every one of our Shabbat meals, including seuda shelishit, re-enacts the eating of the manna in the desert. As we know from 'dayenu', the manna was a miracle flowing from the Exodus; the Shabbat meals are therefore established on and are conceptually an expression of the Exodus. This should be no great surprise, since one of the basic themes of Shabbat as a whole is the commemoration of the Exodus (along with the creation of the world). As the Gemara on Pesahim 106a explains, Kiddush is the way we remember the concept of Shabbat and the ideas that underpin it. That is why Kiddush for Friday night explicitly mentions creation and the Exodus, because Kiddush is the means by which we bring to mind the concepts that Shabbat represents.

*Kiddush is the way we
remember the concept of
Shabbat and the ideas that
underpin it*

It follows that if Kiddush forms a declaration of the underlying concept of every meal (the Exodus) it should precede every meal. That happens at the first two meals, and all other things being equal it should happen at the third meal as well. The only reason it does not is because Hazal explicitly limited Kiddush to once during the night and once during the day. As the same Gemara says, 'remember the day of Shabbat' means make Kiddush during daytime, in parallel to the Kiddush

of the night. Remembering the night is achieved by one Kiddush, therefore remembering the daytime is achieved by one Kiddush, and that is why there is no Kiddush at seuda shelishit, because Kiddush has been limited to two occasions on Shabbat.

I suggest that when the Rosh saw the Rambam's ruling he was informed by this understanding of the concepts of Kiddush and the meal and how they related. The Rosh thought that the Rambam had taken this understanding to its logical conclusion and had ruled that there should indeed be Kiddush at seuda shelishit. The Rosh's argument against the Rambam acknowledged that it made sense for there to be a Kiddush at seuda shelishit, and its absence was simply because Hazal limited the number of Kiddushim to one on the day of Shabbat. This explains the language of the Rosh, which we earlier found perplexing: 'just as at night there is only one Kiddush so during the day there is only one'. In the view of the Rosh we do need to explain why there is one Kiddush during the day not two, and not why there is one rather than none.

However, the Rambam has a different concept of the meals of Shabbat. As I noted last year, the Rambam does not believe that the bread at Shabbat meals recalls the Exodus. Hazal's references to the manna are interesting *asmakhtot*, but the real basis for the two loaves on Shabbat (and Yom Tov) is showing proper honour for holy days. That is why the Rambam rules that there should be two loaves at seuda shelishit, and not one as the Tur rules. For the Tur it was important that there was only one loaf left by the time in Jews in the desert reached seuda shelishit. For the Rambam it was irrelevant. The Rambam discusses the wine of seuda shelishit in chapter thirty of his laws of Shabbat, because that is the chapter dealing with honouring and enjoying Shabbat. Here are two halakhot (1 and 7) which exemplify this:

There are four [aspects] to the [observance of] Shabbat: two originating in the Torah, and two originating with the Rabbis based on the Prophets. In the Torah are the commandments to remember and observe Shabbat. The dimensions explicated in Prophets are honour and pleasure, as it says: 'And you shall call the Shabbat 'A delight, sanctified unto God anhonoured' (Isaiah 58:13)

ארבעה דברים
נאמרו בשבת—
שניים בתורה,
ושניים מדברי סופרים
והן מפורשים על ידי
הנביאים:
שבתורה "זכור"
(שמות כז.)
ו"שמור" (דברים ה.יא.)
ושנתפרשו על ידי
הנביאים,
כיבוד ועינוג, שנאמר
"וקראת לשבת עונג,
לקדוש ה' מכובד"
(ישעיהו נח.יג.)

What is meant by [Shabbat] delight? This refers to our Rabbis' statement that a person must prepare an extra dish and a pleasantly flavoured beverage for Shabbat. All of this must be done within the context of a person's means.

איזה הוא עינוג: זה שאמרו חכמים שצריך לתקן תבשיל שמן ביותר, ומשקה מבושם, הכול לשבת--הכול לפי ממונו של אדם

When the Rambam mentioned wine at seuda shelishit he was talking about giving honour to Shabbat and enjoying Shabbat, the same reason he thought there should be two loaves at seuda shelishit. He did not mean to imply there should be a Kiddush at seuda shelishit. For the Rambam, Kiddush was an entirely different matter with its own distinct concepts. When he wrote 'drink wine' he meant 'drink wine' and nothing else. When the Rosh read his own conceptual basis into the ruling of the Rambam he saw a Kiddush which was never intended, and protested against it.

Kiddush, Seuda Shelishit and the Exodus from Egypt

The Exodus from Egypt is the foundational concept of the Jewish People because it is the event which made us a nation

The Exodus from Egypt, which we will make again this Pesah, is the foundational concept of the Jewish People because it is the event which made us a nation. In this article we have examined the third, 'phantom' Kiddush of Shabbat, the Kiddush of seuda shelishit. This Kiddush does exist, in a moderated form, among followers of the Ari z"l and the Kabbala, but even in the rationalist tradition of halakha, the possibility of a third Kiddush was addressed, if only to be set aside. We concentrated on the Rosh's view that the Rambam ruled that there is Kiddush at seuda shelishit. This seemed to be a difficult reading, which the Kesef Mishna forcefully rejected, but it raised a significant question: Why did the Rosh see in the Rambam's words a reference to Kiddush at seuda shelishit? The two first models of the relationship between Kiddush and the meal, *ritual context* and *ethical context* proved impossible to apply satisfactorily to the case of seuda shelishit.

The model of a *conceptual context* yielded more fruits. The rituals of Shabbat are expressions of the concept of the Exodus from Egypt, which Shabbat

serves to commemorate. The Rambam did not think this extended to the Shabbat meals, with their extra loaves and wine, and which he conceived as based on the concept of honouring and enjoying Shabbat. However, in the view of the Rosh, the bread at all three Shabbat meals stands for the manna we ate in the desert, which was an aspect of the Exodus. Kiddush is the way we remember Shabbat verbally and it mentions the Exodus explicitly. I have argued that Rosh thought that the conceptual basis of the meals must be brought to surface by reciting Kiddush before them, and therefore in the view of the Rosh the only reason we do not make Kiddush at seuda shelishit is because of a specific decision of Hazal to ensure that Kiddush during the day mirrors Kiddush at night and is made only once. All this reaffirms the importance of the Exodus as an essential concept in the religious story of the Jewish People, which we remember on Pesah, on Shabbat and as the Haggada reminds us *כל ימי חיך*, 'all the days of your life'.

Ben Elton is the founding editor of Degel. He is currently a third year semikha student at Yeshivat Chovevei Torah in New York, Rabbinic Intern at the Lincoln Square Synagogue, and Visiting Scholar at the Columbia University Institute for Israel and Jewish Studies. He recently received semikha from Rabbi David Bigman, Rosh Yeshiva of Maale Gilboa.

¹ I am grateful to the editorial and fundraising team at *Degel* for the continued success of this publication. I am grateful to Rabbi Ysoscher Katz for his comments on an earlier draft of this article. I also want to thank Rabbi Roselaar for his constant willingness to discuss points in Torah, which has improved this article and much else in my learning and teaching.

² OH 291:4

³ Ibid, SK 21

⁴ Frankfurt on Main 1725, 49a

⁵ Exodus 20:8

⁶ TB Pesahim, 106a

⁷ Ran, Pesahim 106a

⁸ OH 291:4

⁹ Kesef Mishneh, Hilkhos Shabbat 30:9

¹⁰ TB Pesahim 110a

¹¹ Meiri, Pesahim 106a

¹² Rashbam, Pesahim 101a

¹³ see Shulhan Arukh EHE 34:2 and 62:1

¹⁴ Rambam, Hilkhos Shabbat 29:5

¹⁵ OH 89:3

¹⁶ Ibid, SK21

¹⁷ Shulhan Arukh Arukh Hayyim 232:2

¹⁸ OH 291

The Diversification of Jewish Identity in Imperial Germany

ABIGAIL HAYTON

This article addresses the changes within German Jewry, which occurred from the Emancipation in 1871 up to the twentieth-century and the emergence of German Zionism, which brought about further changes and divisions amongst the Jews in German lands. The essay makes the case for these years as the incubation period of modern Jewish identities, constituting the diverse responses to Jewish Emancipation in the age of modernism, industrialism and emergent secularism. The issues, which divided these communities, are of tremendous significance in terms of the precedents they set for communities today in which questions of religious divisions, innovations and dialogue are still confronted.

The diversification of German Jewry in the age of Emancipation can be understood on both a micro and a macro scale, in terms of communities at large and of the subjective individual perspectives of those who made up these communities. Each form of Jewish identity constitutes a response to *die Judenfrage*, the Jewish question, which can be more broadly understood as a paradigm through which a society strives to normalise minority-majority relations.¹ Three types of responses to *die Judenfrage* from within the Jewish communities of Germany emerge. The first sees Jewish identity denied in favour of other forms of identity, within this type of response is contained conversions to Christianity. The second sees Jewish identity asserted, often in new forms. The third kind of response, the most common but also the most complex contains those forms of Jewish identity which seek to reformulate it in synthesis with the surrounding German culture by allowing Jewish identity to be expressed within a specifically German context.

Each form of Jewish identity constitutes a response to the Jewish question, which can be more broadly understood as a paradigm through which a society strives to normalise minority-majority relations

Assimilation

The question of assimilation is very controversial within German-Jewish historiography. For some, such as Sigmar Ginsburg, it was a positive phenomenon, which could ultimately lead to “liberation from the mental, spiritual and emotional shackles of a medieval way of life.”² For other historians, such as Raphael Mahler and Yitshak Fritz Baer, Jewish ‘assimilationism’ constituted a “decomposition process”.³ Perhaps, these narratives of assimilation, which seek to present it as either a positive, or a negative phenomenon are products of ideology as opposed to purely historical reflections. Rather than positing a decline of German Jewry and consequently rejecting its strategies for self-preservation and development, it would appear more helpful to view the processes through which the Jewish communities of Imperial and Weimar Germany underwent, constituting a diversification, a renegotiation of the relationship between the individual Jew and Jewry and a reevaluation of the relationship of German Jewry to Germany. As W.E. Mosse has identified, new forms of Jewish identity which emerged in this period were “compromises” based on dialectical perceptions of what it meant to be Jewish, Christian or German, rather than simply modern incarnations of either *Deutschtum* or *Judentum* which frequently prejudiced the former over the latter.⁴

Diversification of Jewish Identity

The family of Jewish scholar, Gershom Scholem (1897-1982) provides a microcosm through which we can view the Jewish communities of Imperial and Weimar Germany. One of four brothers, Gershom became a committed Zionist. His siblings chose other paths, one distancing himself from Jewish tradition in favour of a nationalistic German identity, another became a Communist, and the third joined the Democratic Club.⁵ These siblings each provide examples of how Jewishness was retained without Judaism. New forms of Jewish identity emerged in Germany during this period, which did not necessarily involve religious practices. Within this family, the post-Emancipation phenomenon of secularism is evident. This represents a divergence from previous decades in which Jews escaped their Jewishness

through conversion to Christianity. Particularly in the Weimar period, this type of response to *die Judengrage* had become a minority position. In 1921, for example, 259 Jews converted to other religions, whilst 162 non-Jews became Jewish, in most cases this was to enable them to marry Jews. The net loss to the Jewish population through conversion was thus just 117.⁶

Socio-Economic Consequences of Industrialisation

The context in which this new German Jewry emerged is a Germany in flux, where urbanisation and industrialisation with their attendant socio-economic changes were rapidly reshaping all sections of society.

The context in which this new German Jewry emerged is a Germany in flux

Despite the conventional image of the German Jew as the epitome of modernism, of the city and of the bourgeoisie, prior to Emancipation, Jews were often confined to villages or small towns and for the most part survived on low incomes.⁷ Emancipation and urbanisation brought a host of new opportunities for Jews, which were enthusiastically taken up, to the extent that some believed Jewish difference would be organically eroded in the process of socio-economic development.⁸ A crucial aspect of Jewish self-reinvention, which is relevant to all attempts to redefine Jewish identity is the process of *Verbürgerlichung* (embourgeoisement) and *Eingliederung* (integration) in which Jews successfully engaged, they redefined themselves as members of the German middle-class. This meant embracing the values of *Bildung* and *Sittlichkeit*, which would be incorporated into all areas of Jewish life.⁹

Shulamit Volkov has identified four conditions which the Jews had to meet in order to be accepted into the German middle-class, the *Bürgertum*. These were the pursuit of professional careers, the acquisition of the German language, the adoption of ‘German’ educational ideals (*Bildung*) and the adoption of what was seen to be the ethos of the *bourgeois* (*Sittlichkeit*).¹⁰ Notably, none of these conditions would necessarily have a bearing on religious beliefs or practices, though the Jews who lived their lives by them, were, for the most part, secular. One such Jew was Phillipine Landau of Worms. Born in 1869, she had what can be considered a typical Jewish upbringing in Imperial Germany. In an account of her early life written in 1956, she conveys a childhood steeped in middle-class values, with hard-work being prized above all. In and amongst their busy working lives, her parents retained some Jewish traditions such as Yom Kippur but these were kept out of “custom and

habit” as opposed to religious devotion. Landau’s references to her “pious forbears” betrays a consciousness within her and her contemporaries of their own religious laxity in comparison with the strict observances of their ancestors. The religious forms of her local community she described as “surviving externally” without the “supports” which would allow them to stand firm in turbulent times.¹¹ This form of Jewish reinvention is primarily characterised by *Eingleiderung* (Integration). It is a generational process in which German Jews gradually become less and less differentiated from their non-Jewish peers.

By 1933 the majority of German Jews were concentrated in ten large cities of over 100,000 inhabitants, with nearly a third based in Berlin.¹² The process of urbanisation was particularly transformational for Jews, whose religious observances had previously been determined by the often-small rural communities of their ancestors. Within this period such communities declined and with them, what Leo Baeck (1873-1956) has called the *Millieufrommigkeit* (atmospheric piety), they preserved.¹³ Contemporary memoirs reveal an insular world in which “Friday evening” meals were a high point and Sabbath rituals were carefully observed.¹⁴ This is contrasted with urban Jewish life, which saw even the most traditional elements of the community forfeiting religious observance in favour of integration. A striking example of this is the Adass Jisroel community of Berlin, run by Azriel Hildesheimer (1820-1899), considered by some Orthodox Jews to be ‘Chief Rabbi of Germany’.¹⁵ In this synagogue there were special services on Saturday afternoons to accommodate those children who missed the morning services in favour of attendance at the *Gymnasium*.¹⁶

German Identity and Jewish Identity

Jewish self-reinvention, for the most part, constituted a renegotiation of the relationship between *Deuschtum* and *Judentum*. This renegotiation occurred in numerous forms, but it was primarily realised in practice and the practice was often not in line with Jewish ideology. The reconstituting of the relationship between *Deuschtum* and *Judentum* is best explored through an assessment of the development of the Reform movement, which by the late 1870s controlled almost all urban communities in Germany. Reform was the denomination of choice for over 80 % of Germany’s Jewry by the turn of the century, which was concentrated in its urban centres. Despite the radical ideology behind the movement its development was piecemeal and incremental. Synods were convened in 1869 and 1871, but they were not forces of change, rather communities developed according to local custom over time.¹⁷ Changes in Jewish life appear to have been made as part of the process of *Verbürgerlichung* which came about through a desire for social, professional and economic advancement on individual bases as opposed to ideological mandates from on high. As is evidenced by the non-observance of the Sabbath in Hildesheimer’s

congregation, the dictates of leaders in even the most traditional communities could not necessarily override the desires of Jews to take advantage of the opportunities that Emancipation and urbanisation had opened up for them.

In terms of the ideological renegotiation, which occurred in the first half of the relevant period, the goal was always synthesis of identities. However, in practice this was not always possible, especially within a German society which was attached to “the theory of a unitary nation, one and indivisible”.¹⁸ The *Centralverien deutscher Staatsburger jüdischen Glaubens* (C.V.), the governing body of German Jewry exemplifies the inherent tensions between *Deutschtum* and *Judentum*. The first paragraph of its statutes demanded “German-mindedness” from its membership. Jehuda Reinharz has interpreted this as an indication of the prioritising of *Deutschtum* over and above *Judentum* within the C.V.¹⁹ Amongst the Orthodox leadership, which regarded itself as “bearer and guardian of the ancient Jewish faith and tradition”, it is clear that Jewish law was considered far more important than conforming to the social standards of the *Burgertum*, despite indications that traditionalist standpoint would not necessarily extend itself to all nominally Orthodox Jews.²⁰

Neo-Orthodoxy

Self-reinvention was a process in which all German Jews were engaged during the age of Emancipation. Even those of the Ultra-orthodox persuasion were keen, as far as possible to adopt the values of *Bildung* and *Sittlichkeit*, which would allow them to take their places in the German *Burgertum*.²¹ The most prominent leader of this section of German Jewry, which became known as ‘secessionist’ or ‘separatist’ Orthodoxy was Samson Raphael Hirsch (1808-1888) of Frankfurt.



Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch

He staunchly opposed the Reform movement, which came to dominance during his lifetime. He saw it as Judaism ‘reformed’, remodelled as merely a religion, which was entirely compatible with German citizenship as opposed to constituting “an entire life supported by the Divine idea and lived and brought to fulfilment according to the divine will”, which he believed was facilitated by Orthodoxy alone.²² His Orthodoxy, however was the Orthodoxy of ‘Torah im Derekh Erets’, a term he coined, which denoted his own synthesis between Jewish observance and German culture.²³ Despite uncompromising religious traditionalism, Hirsch’s principal arguments have been identified as not only resembling but deepening the worldviews of both reformer Abraham Geiger (1810-1874) and the philosopher of the Jewish Enlightenment, Moses Mendelsohn (1729-1786), both of whom strived to present an apolitical Judaism which would be entirely compatible with an emancipated Jewry. Hirsch maintains that not only was Judaism non-coercive, but that it had always functioned as such. Its continued existence was owed to the loyalty of its followers who formed a definitively spiritual as opposed to political community.²⁴ Hirsch’s Judaism reinvented was a holistic lifestyle, but crucially it contained no national component, which could render it incompatible with full and active German citizenship.

Hirsch’s Judaism reinvented was a holistic lifestyle, but crucially it contained no national component, which could render it incompatible with full and active German citizenship

The Judaism which Hirsch’s ideology was constructed in opposition to was that of the Reformers, whom he referred to as “The Jewish foes of the Law of God”.²⁵ The founders of the movement had originally seen their role as one of bridging the gap between Judaism and Christianity, of showing the two to be closely related and therefore capable of providing a common moral framework for modern Germany.²⁶ They sought to reinvent Judaism as a faith entirely in concert with the values of *Bildung* and *Sittlichkeit* and adjusted their synagogues accordingly, though often these adjustments did not go as far as the original reformers had intended. Certain ideologically motivated changes that defined, what became known as Liberal Judaism were not broadly implemented. These include exclusively German prayer services and mixed-seating in the synagogues.²⁷ However, for the most part Reform Judaism did see Jewish practices move toward greater conformity with what was deemed acceptable religious behaviour by Christians, sometimes by official decree.²⁸

Growing up in the community of Rabbi Leo Baeck in Berlin, Conrad Rosenstein, described the Judaism with which he was raised as definitively insecure, “constantly glancing outside, worried what our Christian fellow citizens might think”, its practices requiring “legitimation from the world outside” above all.²⁹ Reform Judaism was originally seen by some as the first step towards converting the Jews to Christianity, such was the emphasis it placed on cultural conformity.³⁰

Orthodoxy, however, did not necessarily constitute arch-traditionalism. Its dominant ideology in Germany, based on the Hirschian synthesis, can also be viewed as a product of its time, a reinvention of Jewish identity in response to changes from within and without. This ideology in and of itself spurred the creation of what became known as ‘communalist’ Orthodoxy in separating from those traditional Jews who wished to remain part of the main communities following the passing of the secession law in 1876.³¹ This internal division within Orthodoxy was deepened at the turn of the century when separate institutional arrangements emerged for separatist and non-separatist German rabbis.³² Orthodox traditionalism demonstrated its power as an innovative force in the so called ‘secession crisis’. According to Leora Batnitzky’s assessment, the separatist Orthodoxy which emerged out of this episode was “the most modern of modern Judaisms” in that it had moulded itself on the German Protestant model. The so called neo-Orthodoxy which was constructed embraces the nation-state, leaving room for secular politics whilst also making room for a kind of religious pluralism based on separation but toleration.³³

Orthodoxy’s dominant ideology ... can be viewed as a reinvention of Jewish identity in response to changes from within and without

The Turn of the Century

The decision of some Orthodox Jews to remain part of the main communities following the permissibility of secession allowed a situation to emerge, by the turn of the century, in which, for the most part, both Orthodox and Reform coexisted in a unified community (*Einheitsgemeinde*).³⁴ This was also facilitated by the failure of both communities to replace the leaders who had participated in the original Orthodox-Reform conflict, Samson Raphael Hirsch, Zevi Hirsch Kalischer (1795-1874) and Abraham Geiger.³⁵ In these years, Orthodoxy reasserted itself to a certain degree with the formation of the Aguda, an international organisation of Orthodox communities, despite Reform remaining the denomination of the majority.³⁶ Both were, however, to face a different challenge, which caused far more internal divisions, the

reinvention of Jewishness as a national identity within the context of an international political movement, Zionism.³⁷

Conclusion

In the thirty years between Jewish Emancipation in Germany and the dawning of the twentieth-century, multiple Jewish identities emerged in concert with a general trend toward greater assimilation. The divisions between different forms of Jewish identity in this period of German history provide us with a variety of models for the handling of internal diversity. In attempting to understand contemporary Jewish plurality, the consequences of Jewish emancipation in Germany must be consulted.

Abigail Hayton is completing her B.A. in History at Queen Mary, University of London, with a specific focus on the History of Ideas. She plans to undertake a Masters degree in Intellectual History and Political Thought at Jesus College, Cambridge.

¹ Gary Abraham, ‘Max Weber on “Jewish Rationalism” and the Jewish Question’, *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Spring, 1988), pp. 358-391, (p. 358).

² Sigmar Ginsburg, ‘Die Zweite Generation der Juden nach Moses Mendelsohn (1786-1815). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Assimilation der Juden in Deutschland’, *Bulletin für die Mitglieder der Gessellschaft der Freunde des Leo Baeck Institut*, 1, no. 2/3 (1958), pp. 62-72. Cited in Till van Rahden, ‘Treason, Fate, or Blessing: Narratives of Assimilation in the Historiography of German-Speaking Jewry since the 1950s’ in Christhard Hoffman (ed.), *Preserving the Legacy of German Jewry: A History of the Leo Baeck Institute 1955-2005*, (Mohr Siebeck, 2005), pp. 349-375, (p. 359).

³ Raphael Mahler, ‘Geschichte Israels in der neuesten Zion (1961)’, in Michael Brenner, Anthony Kauders, Gideon Reuveni and Nils Romer (eds.), *Judische Geschichte lesen Texte der jüdischen Geschichtsschreibung im 19 und 20 Jahrhundert*, (Munich, 2003), pp. 80-90. Cited in Till van Rahden, ‘Treason, Fate, or Blessing: Narratives of Assimilation in the Historiography of German-Speaking Jewry since the 1950s’ in Christhard Hoffman (ed.), *Preserving the Legacy of German Jewry: A History of the Leo Baeck Institute 1955-2005*, (Mohr Siebeck, 2005), pp. 349-375, (p. 357).

⁴ W.E. Mosse, *The German-Jewish Economic Elite 1820-1935*, (Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 90.

⁵ Marion Kaplan, ‘Redefining Judaism in Imperial Germany: Practices, Mentalities, and Community’, *Jewish Social Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Autumn, 2002), pp. 1-33, (p. 2).

⁶ Sharon Gillerman, *Germans into Jews: Remaking the Jewish Social Body in the Weimar Republic*, (Stanford University Press, 2009), p. 23.

- ⁷ Shulamit Volkov, 'The Verburgerlichung of the Jews as a Paradigm', in Jürgen Kochka and Allan Mitchell (eds.), *Bourgeois Society in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, (Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 367-391, (pp. 367-368).
- ⁸ Robert S. Wistrich, *Socialism and the Jews: The Dilemmas of Assimilation in the Germany and Austria-Hungary*, (Associated University Press, 1982), p. 350.
- ⁹ George L. Mosse, 'Jewish Emancipation: Between Bildung and Respectability' in Jehuda Reinharz and Walter Schatzberg (eds.), *The Jewish Response to German Culture: From the Enlightenment to the Second World War* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1985), pp. 1-16, (pp. 1-7).
- ¹⁰ Shulamit Volkov, 'The Verburgerlichung of the Jews as a Paradigm', in Jürgen Kochka and Allan Mitchell (eds.), *Bourgeois Society in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, (Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 367-391, (p. 373).
- ¹¹ Phillipine Landua, *Memories of My Childhood*, (Private Printing, 1956) in Monika Richarz (ed.), *Jewish Life in Germany. Memoirs From Three Centuries* (Indiana University Press, 1991), pp. 246-252.
- ¹² Sharon Gillerman, *Germans into Jews: Remaking the Jewish Social Body in the Weimar Republic*, (Stanford University Press, 2009), p. 23.
- ¹³ Steven M. Lowenstein, 'Religious Life' in Michael A. Meyer (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times. Volume 3 Integration in Dispute; 1871-1918* (Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 103-124, (p. 105).
- ¹⁴ Willi Wertheimer, 'Erinnerungen', Monika Richarz (ed.), *Jewish Life in Germany. Memoirs From Three Centuries* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), pp. 183-184.
- ¹⁵ Henriette Hirsch, 'Autobiography' in Monika Richarz (ed.), *Jewish Life in Germany. Memoirs From Three Centuries* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), pp. 173-180, (p. 176).
- ¹⁶ David Ellenson, 'German Jewish Orthodoxy: Tradition in the Context of Culture', in Jack Wertheimer, *The Use of Tradition* (New York, 1992), pp. 11-12. Cited in David Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews of Europe 1789-1939*, (OUP, 1999), pp. 618-619.
- ¹⁷ Steven M. Lowenstein, 'Religious Life' in Michael A. Meyer (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, Vol. 3 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 103-124, (pp. 103-111).
- ¹⁸ W.E. Mosse, *The German-Jewish Economic Elite 1820-1935*, (Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 90-91.
- ¹⁹ Jehuda Reinharz, 'Jewish Nationalism and Jewish Identity in Central Europe' in *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, 37 (1992), pp. 147-167, (p. 155).
- ²⁰ Mordechai Breuer, *Modernity within Tradition: The Social History of Orthodox Jewry in Imperial Germany*, (Columbia University Press, 1992), pp. 4-11. Cited in Marion Kaplan, 'Redefining Judaism in Imperial Germany: Practices, Mentalities, and Community', *Jewish Social Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Autumn, 2002), pp. 1-33, (p. 5).
- ²¹ David Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews of Europe 1789-1939*, (OUP, 1999), p. 618.
- ²² Samson Raphael Hirsch, in Isadore Grunfeld (ed.), *Judaism Eternal*, (Soncino Press, 1956), p. 199. Cited in Leora Batnitzky, *How Judaism Became a Religion: An Introduction to Modern Jewish Thought*, (Princeton University Press, 2011), p. 41.
- ²³ Eliyahu Meir Klugman, *Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch: Architect of Torah Judaism for the Modern World*, (Artscroll, 1996), pp. 202-206.
- ²⁴ Leora Batnitzky, *How Judaism Became a Religion: An Introduction to Modern Jewish Thought*, (Princeton University Press, 2011), p. 41.
- ²⁵ Samson Raphael Hirsch, 'Traditional Law as the Basis for Jewish Communities', *Collected Writings of Samson Raphael Hirsch*, (Feldheim, 1990), pp. 75-85, (p. 79).
- ²⁶ Michael A. Meyer, *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism*, (Oxford University Press, 1988), (p. 202).
- ²⁷ Steven M. Lowenstein, 'Religious Life' in Michael A. Meyer (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, Vol. 3 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 103-124, (pp. 108-109).
- ²⁸ George L. Mosse, 'Jewish Emancipation: Between Bildung and Respectability' in Jehuda Reinharz and Walter Schatzberg (eds.), *The Jewish Response to German Culture: From the Enlightenment to the Second World War* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1985), pp. 1-16, (pp. 6-7).
- ²⁹ Conrad Rosenstein, 'The Well: A Family Chronicle', (Israel, 1958) in Monika Richarz (ed.), *Jewish Life in Germany. Memoirs From Three Centuries* (Indiana University Press, 1991), pp. 165-173, (p. 169).
- ³⁰ Susana Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and The Jewish Jesus*, (University of Chicago Press, 1998), p. 195.
- ³¹ David Ellenson, 'Traditional reactions to modern Jewish Reform: the paradigm of German Orthodoxy' in Daniel H. Frank & Oliver Leaman, *History of Jewish Philosophy*, (Routledge, 2003), pp. 732-757, (pp. 751-752).
- ³² Steven M. Lowenstein, 'Religious Life' in Michael A. Meyer (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, Vol. 3 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 103-124, (pp. 115-116).
- ³³ Leora Batnitzky, *How Judaism Became a Religion: An Introduction to Modern Jewish Thought*, (Princeton University Press, 2011), pp. 40-43.
- ³⁴ Steven M. Lowenstein, 'Religious Life' in Michael A. Meyer (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, Vol. 3 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 103-124, (p. 121).
- ³⁵ Steven M. Lowenstein, 'Religious Life' in Michael A. Meyer (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, Vol. 3 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 103-124, (pp. 110-111).
- ³⁶ David Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews of Europe 1789-1939*, (OUP, 1999), pp. 620-623.
- ³⁷ Steven M. Lowenstein, 'Religious Life' in Michael A. Meyer (ed.), *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, Vol. 3 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 103-124, (pp. 110-111), p. 124.

If you are interested in writing in a future edition of Degel, please be in touch with the editors to share your idea.

The editors can be reached at
Degel@aleitzion.co.uk



Degel is a publication of Alei Tzion Community and is available to download at <http://www.aleitzion.co.uk/degel>

Please dispose of this journal in a manner suited to its content