

**TWO NEO-ORTHODOX RESPONSES TO SECULARIZATION  
PART I: SAMSON RAPHAEL HIRSCH**

by *ELIEZER SCHWEID*

Rabbis Samson Raphael Hirsch and Abraham Isaac Kook were two of the leading proponents of the school within modern Jewish thought usually known as Neo-Orthodox. This is not a formal movement with a specific body of generally accepted tenets, but rather a diverse collection of ideas, within which there is a certain tension between two distinct and even contradictory tendencies: a non-Zionist trend, originating in Western Europe, from which the anti-Zionist Agudath Israel drew a certain inspiration; and the Neo-Orthodoxy of Eastern Europe, which harbored distinctly Zionist leanings. Hirsch is the outstanding thinker of the former school, while Rabbi Kook is the leading figure associated with the latter. Despite their differences, both share the rejection, rooted in traditional religious premises, of any alteration of the halakhah (traditional Jewish religious law, based upon the Talmud as its central text), while selectively accepting certain positive values of secularization. Thus, any discussion of their thought will present us with the central ideas of Neo-Orthodoxy and its principle internal conflicts. In my opinion, such a discussion is of more than merely historical interest, in view of this movement's far-reaching influence to the present day both in Israel and in the Diaspora.

---

Eliezer Schweid is Professor of Modern Jewish Thought at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. This paper was originally delivered at the Tenth International Seminar of the Kutlar Institute for Judaism and Contemporary Thought, held at Kibbutz Lavi in June 1980. Translated from the Hebrew by Yohanan Eldad. The second half of this paper will appear in *Immanuel* 20.

To avoid lack of clarity and misunderstanding, I shall begin by defining the terms "Orthodoxy" and "Neo-Orthodoxy,"<sup>1</sup> as I understand them. By "Orthodoxy," we refer to the simplest, most uncompromising, fundamentalist reaction of traditional Judaism to the Emancipation. This reaction is *ab initio* a negative one: Emancipation is perceived as a dangerous temptation, bringing about the destruction of the Jewish way of life, which had always been based upon and guided by halakhah. In other words, modern secularism is a phenomenon to be resisted, from which the religious Jew should remain aloof. Even if in his daily struggle for a livelihood he cannot entirely avoid contact with the secular world, such contact should be restricted to the barest minimum, and to the pragmatic and the utilitarian realm alone, without any confrontation on the level of ideas or values. Upon further reflection, however, Orthodoxy is open to the idea that secularization has certain positive aspects for Gentiles, and is therefore, indirectly, "good for the Jews." The attitude of the secular, humanist Gentile towards the Jews may be preferable to that of the religious Christian. Nevertheless, the Jew's true purpose is to study Torah and to observe the commandments; these elements alone make his life a Jewish one. Let the Gentiles be Gentiles and the Jews, Jews, and all will benefit.

Neo-Orthodoxy, on the other hand, is a kind of "second thought" on the Emancipation from a traditional religious viewpoint. While affirming the basic premises of Orthodoxy, Neo-Orthodoxy does not entirely reject either the Emancipation or its outcome, secularization. It leaves room for a positive approach to Emancipation, or at least to some of its manifestations, even from the Jewish point of view. Thus, Jews not only may, but ought to play an active role in secular culture, and even incorporate some of its elements into their own Jewish way of life. Obviously, such a "second thought" widens the concept of Judaism itself, facilitating a deeper and broader understanding of its own sources as well as of the values of the secular world in which it lives. Both Hirsch and Kook were spokesmen for this trend; the central problem with which they both grappled was how to determine the intrinsic criteria for their evaluation of secularization, and to establish the golden mean between acquiring these values and maintaining the Jewish life of Torah study and observance.

---

1. {The study of Orthodoxy as a historical movement is still in its infancy. For an overall survey of its major streams and personalities, with bibliography, see: Samuel C. Heilman, "The Many Faces of Orthodoxy," *Modern Judaism* 2 (1982), pp. 23–51, 171–198; "Orthodoxy," *Encyclopedia Judaica* XII: 1486–1493; David Vital, *Zionism: The Formative Years* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 204–229; M. Samet and I. Ta-Shema, "Shinuy u-Masoret" ["Change and Tradition" (Heb.)], *ha-Enzeflopedyah ha-Ivrit* XXXII:186–201. Much of the literature cited uses the term "Orthodoxy" to refer indiscriminately both to what the author designates above as "Orthodoxy" and to "Neo-Orthodoxy." |Ed.|}

## I. Samson Raphael Hirsch

We shall start with the earlier of the two, Samson Raphael Hirsch (1808–1888), who served as rabbi of the community of Frankfurt-am-Main. His work covers a wide and rich gamut of subjects, but his essential ideas were already clearly and comprehensively articulated in his first small treatise, *Nineteen Letters on Judaism (Iggerot Zafon)*, first published in 1836.<sup>2</sup> Taking into account the epistolical form of this treatise, we will be able to identify both the audience to which this work was addressed and the cultural environment as understood and interpreted by Hirsch. The author is a rabbi with a European intellectual background, who attempts to keep his correspondent, a young man on the verge of completely abandoning his Jewish identity, within the fold. Towards this end, he must demonstrate understanding and sympathy, while appealing to the young man's dormant Jewish sentiments, of which he himself is unaware. This sympathetic attitude is characteristic of Hirsch's writing; the desire to save the younger generation of Jews from that assimilation which already grips them so firmly determines his attitude towards humanist civilization in general. While their belief in humanist values propels the younger generation towards complete assimilation, it is also responsible for their willingness to listen to Jewish teaching. We must appreciate the complexity of the situation this created. *Ab initio*, the

---

2. [Ben Usiel (pseud.), *Neunzehn Briefe über Judentum* (Altona, 1836). English: *Iggerot Tzafon: The Nineteen Letters on Judaism* (New York, 1942), tr., B. Drachman. For his collected works, see: *Gesammelte Schriften*, 6 v. (Frankfort a. M., 1902–1912). Other major works of Hirsch available in English include: *Horeb: a philosophy of Jewish Laws and Observances*, 2 v. (London, 1962); *The Pentateuch*, with translation and explanations by S.R. Hirsch, 5 v. (London 1963–65<sup>2</sup>), tr., I. Levy; *Siddur Tefillot Yisrael: The Hirsch Siddur* (Jerusalem, 1972); *The Psalms*, 2 v. (New York, 1960–66). See also the collections of his writings, *Judaism Eternal: Selected Essays*, trans. & ed., I. Grunfeld, 2 v. (London, 1956); *Timeless Torah: an anthology*, ed., J. Breuer (New York, 1957). The only monograph on Hirsch's thought to date is Noah H. Rosenbloom, *Tradition in an Age of Reform: The Religious Philosophy of Samson Raphael Hirsch* (Philadelphia, 1976), which focuses upon Hirsch's philosophy of the *mitzvot*, especially his *Horeb*. For other critical analyses of Hirsch, see: R. Liberles, "Champion of Orthodoxy: The Emergence of Samson Raphael Hirsch as Religious Leader," *AJS Review* 6 (1981), 43–60; S. Japhet, "The Secession from the Frankfurt Jewish Community under Samson Raphael Hirsch," *Historia Judaica* 10 (1948), 99–122; I. Heinemann, "Supplementary Remarks," *Ibid.*, 123–134; J. Rosenheim, "The Historical Significance of the Struggle for Secession..." *Ibid.*, 135–146; I. Heinemann, "Samson Raphael Hirsch: The Formative Years of the Leader of Modern Orthodoxy," *Historia Judaica* 13 (1951), 29–54; Noah H. Rosenbloom, "Religious and Secular Co-Equality..." *Jewish Social Studies* 24 (1962), 223–247. The Hebrew reader may see also: I. Heinemann, *Sinai* 24 (1949), 249–71; *idem.*, "The Relationship between S.R. Hirsch and his Teacher Isaac Bernays" (Heb.), *Zion* 16 (1951), 44–90; *idem.*, *Ta'amey ha-Mitzvot be-Sifrut Yisra'el* (1956), II: 91–160; E. Schweid, *Toldot he-Hagut ha-Yehudit* (Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem 1978), pp. 291–309; Mordecai Breuer, "'Neo-Orthodoxy' — Old and New Aspects" (Heb.), *Zehut* 2 (1982), 31–39; Z.E. Kurzweil, *Sinai* 45 (1959), 358–370; Y. Immanuel, "be-Iqvot gedoley Ashkenaz," *Ma'ayan*. For general background, see: "Samson Raphael Hirsch," *EJ* VIII: 507–515; "Neo-Orthodoxy," *EJ* XII: 956–958. [Ed.]

teacher's views differ profoundly from those of his pupil; he is committed to Judaism as a totality, while at the same time he struggles with the problems posed by the prevailing cultural climate, "borrowing," so to speak, the views of his young contemporary. It is as if he were to say, "If humanist values are generally accepted by the younger generation, let us consider them in our discussion, and show that Judaism does not negate them. Let us explain to this young man why he is mistaken in his belief that Judaism and these positive humanist values are contradictory. Let us then tell him what Judaism really is, and make it clear to him that humanism and its values receive substance and can be turned into reality only by means of such a Jewish interpretation." Such is Hirsch's apologetic strategy and his pedagogic approach.

Clearly, such an approach is not merely a stratagem, but expresses a genuinely held dialectical conviction rooted in post-Kantian idealism. Like most 19th-century German-Jewish theologians, Hirsch regarded Kantian idealism as the bridge between Judaism as a religious world-view and modern, secular humanism. The infinite pursuit of scientific truth; the centrality of man's moral actions; the rejection of the eudaemonistic, utilitarian ethic which regarded human happiness as the ultimate goal; the grounding of moral behavior in the categorical imperative as the goal of human reason; the aspiration for the unification of mankind and its life by the acceptance of the categorical imperative as an infinite challenge and task — all these basic tenets of humanist idealism are accepted and affirmed by Hirsch. Even though they may not be aware of it, due to the historical conditions created by life in the Diaspora, young emancipated Jews are drawn towards Judaism by their dedication to these ideals. Moreover, these elements of modern, humanistic civilization are indicative of a rapprochement between European society and culture and Judaism. The willingness of this culture to improve the civil status of the Jews springs from moral, humanistic motivations; hence, the Jews ought to accept the hand extended to them and participate in this undertaking, to which they may make their own specific contribution. One may easily argue that the idealistic syndrome — which was characteristic of those trends within Jewish thought which affirmed the Emancipation, who regarded it as an opportunity to fulfill the Jewish mission of propagating universal ideals — in the case of Hirsch's philosophy constituted a common denominator with the Jewish Reform movement. In view of this idealistic syndrome, it is also not difficult to understand why he rejected the national-political definition of Judaism and the will for a non-messianic, historical return to Zion. In his view, Jews not only can be loyal citizens of the country in which they live, but are in fact commanded to be so by the Torah. As Jews, they must be enthusiastic patriots and contribute with all their energy towards the social, moral and spiritual development of their country. As the prevailing view in their country makes this possible, the Torah not only allows, but even commands them to so behave. However, according to Hirsch, this does not mean that halakhah may be altered.

If there are trends in humanistic society which challenge the authority of the Torah, or which seem to make such change desirable, these are aberrations that must be rejected. Judaism will resist them, not only for its own sake, but for the common weal.

Hirsch claims that the alienation of the younger generation of Jews from Judaism, and even their development of strong feelings of aversion towards it, must be understood in terms of historical developments. The long Exile left its impact on the national life of the Jewish people. Hundreds of years of ghetto life, persecutions and discrimination made Jewish life seem, at least superficially, gloomy, depressing and narrow-minded in terms of intellectual and artistic creativity. Whoever does not know from within the light and joy which permeates Jewish family and community life despite external circumstances and who yearns for the latitude and freedom offered by secular society must reject Judaism as an obsolete, repulsive religious culture. The younger generation, who grew up in Jewish families already well along the way towards assimilation, found itself in this situation. All they knew of Judaism were the poor, dull residues that are obstacles rather than stimulating spiritual values. Hirsch does not deny that the temptation to break with the tradition had been very strong for many parents. Much in community life needs change: the educational system must be significantly improved, and in this much can doubtless be learned from the non-Jewish world around us. It is therefore natural that many were tempted by Emancipation to embrace the abundance seemingly offered by the outside world and to repel the ghetto image of Judaism. Nevertheless, they made a fatal mistake and threw out the baby with the bath water. Reforms in the way of life of the Jewish people and in its educational system (which Hirsch distinguishes clearly from halakhic reform) are necessary in order to reveal the hidden light in all its splendor.

We must now examine the negative element in secular humanist culture, which Hirsch attempted to counter with all his might, in order to contain the secularist attack on Torah and halakhah. In his view, this element appears even in the loftiest expressions of secular humanism — i.e., in Kantian Idealism. Kant derived the foundations of his ethics not only from the categorical imperative, but from autonomous reason. Indeed, a careful reading of his philosophy shows that he based his criticism of “heteronomic” Judaism precisely upon this concept of autonomy. According to Hirsch, this ideal of autonomy, in wishing to base everything on man’s own immanent powers, exemplifies the secular element in modernity. But this is also the essential error and inner contradiction in modern humanism, as the pursuit of autonomy does not allow it to realize its own moral ideals and, contrary to Kant’s intentions, brings about an utilitarian, materialistic ideal. On this point, Orthodox Judaism must take a stand against secular culture with all its might and authority; only Judaism offers a solution, for its principle of

heteronomous commandments can alone safeguard the positive elements within humanism.

Hirsch's main criticism of the concept of the autonomy of reason is based upon the fact that autonomous ethics cannot demand commitment: this, because autonomy presupposes human independence, while moral commitment is based upon the recognition of a higher authority to whom one is committed. Even were a rational being to acknowledge that rational considerations are preferable to instinctual impulses, reason itself affords him no criterion for assessing good and evil other than that of utility or happiness. Kant himself becomes ensnared in this contradiction when he demands that good and proper deeds be performed even when they cause us to suffer, yet when he attempts to define good deeds, he has no criteria other than that which is useful to one's fellow man and which causes him happiness. Eudaeomony, expelled through the main gate, thus returns through the rear door. According to Hirsch, this contradiction cannot be resolved within the framework of secularism. Moreover, what in Kant's philosophy appears as a merely theoretical contradiction becomes an existential conflict in society. Modern humanism preaches moral ideals, but acts in accordance with the principles of happiness and material success, which are the inevitable consequence of man's pursuit of autonomy and his alienation from religious commandments. Thus, as it defies man, secular culture becomes increasingly pagan. It would not be an exaggeration to state that, for Hirsch, the concept of autonomy, whose guiding principle and ultimate goal is eudaeomony, lies at the root of paganism. Hirsch declared total war against this motif of secular culture in the name of the Torah, in the name of the divine commandment which commits man to that above and beyond himself.

In order to properly understand Hirsch's position, we must note a dialectical tension in his critique of secular eudaeomony. Hirsch is far from presenting Judaism as an ascetic way of life demanding abstention from a useful life, happiness and the temporal joys of life. True, this is the image of Judaism in the eyes of the younger generation, who yearn for the expansiveness and latitude promised by non-Jewish culture: to them, Judaism is a dark and narrow path, filled with restrictions and suffering; but Hirsch attempted to counteract such an image. Just as he wished to reveal the moral light concealed in Judaism, so did he wish to display the true joy of life, depth of thought, broadmindedness and pleasure which Jews never lost, even under extreme conditions of persecution. There is a dialectical tension between these two poles: happiness is not man's ultimate goal, but it is nevertheless, even in its material aspects, a positive and desirable value. Man is destined by God for joy and pleasure, not as goals in themselves, but as a reward for his deeds. Thus, joy and pleasure are essentially positive moral values, although one who regards happiness as the object and criterion of his deeds will never be truly happy. He will always be dissatisfied, because "no one leaves this

world with even half of his desires satisfied.” There is a paradox here: one who seeks happiness will always be unhappy, while one for whom it is not the ultimate goal will find it and not flee from it. Thus, secular humanism contradicts, not only its own moral ideals, but even the yearning for happiness which motivates it, while the heteronomous doctrine of Judaism ultimately upholds both. Hence, the young Jew who, in his truly Jewish idealism and eager longing for happiness, seeks these things elsewhere is tragically mistaken.

In dwelling on this paradox, we have capsulated those principles of Neo-Orthodoxy represented by Hirsch. According to his line of thought, there is no need to adapt the Torah to life, as does Reform Judaism; the true remedy needed by society is acceptance of the Torah with all its commandments. The hidden light of the Torah must be revealed to all those who cannot see it; i.e., the commandments and teachings of the Torah must be explained to the contemporary generation in language comprehensible to them. This requires an almost unqualified openness towards all that is true and beautiful in modern culture. Hence, the synthesis in a nutshell: the halakhah remains unchanged, but is incorporated within humanist culture by explaining its justification in terms borrowed from the culture. Indeed, the emphasis in Hirsch’s writings is upon the elucidation of the reasons behind the commandments (the discipline known in the tradition as *ta’amey ha-mizvot*), which constitutes the focal point of his entire involvement with halakhah. Hirsch makes no new halakhic rulings; what is new in his work is his interpretation of the reasons underlying specific commandments. In this sense, he is a citizen of two worlds, which meet in and through him. This is characteristic not only of Hirsch, but of Neo-Orthodoxy in general; a similar basic approach appears in Rav Kook’s writings. Both were convinced that if only their eyes could be opened, the new generation of Jews would immediately see that the Torah given on Sinai is closer to the lofty ideals of humanism than anything else they believe. Everything depends upon the correct interpretation of the commandments, through which their inherent humanist ideals are revealed. Such an interpretation will doubtless also disclose the negative and misleading aspects of secular humanism, thereby fulfilling part of Judaism’s universal mission. The Neo-Orthodox Jew is thus integrated into the modern world by his positive attitude towards its ideals, combined with his constructive criticism of its mistakes. Indeed, this very attitude is his mission.

Thus far we have dealt with theory alone. It must, however, be stressed that this theoretical speculation is an essential part of the Hirschian solution, as integration depends upon creating one’s self-image against the background of the surrounding world. It is precisely this need to create a self-image that is expressed in his enterprise of *ta’amey ha-mizvot*. Education is thus the first, and perhaps the most important, task for Neo-Orthodoxy, as it has the potential to change the Jew’s emotional and ideological stance and thereby enable him to remain faithful

to the Torah by reinterpretation of a seemingly unchanging way of life. While on the one hand one can say that nothing has changed, on the other hand everything has changed, at least on the level of its meaning — although not only there. The acquisition of a general education and the process of social integration naturally causes changed behavioral patterns, ways of learning, social activities, manners and even outward appearance. Thus, Hirsch's reinterpretation of the commandments raises a number of practical questions pertaining to the halakhic way of life. He was compelled to provide some guidelines concerning certain crucial practical questions: e.g., What is the exact dividing line between the realm of internal Jewish life, governed by the commandments, and that of social activity in the non-Jewish environment? How can one avoid the undermining of the traditional way of life by outside pressure? How do these two spheres influence one another? In other words, to what extent does secular culture influence the halakhic way of life and how, according to Hirsch, can the specifically Jewish mission be accomplished in a secular environment? These fundamental questions obviously touch upon many other practical questions, for the answer to which we must turn to the "blueprint" of the Neo-Orthodox model.

The first desideratum is the social model. Hirsch argues that, in principle, Judaism can persist even if only one Jew remains faithful to the Torah. Hence, the object and ideal goal of his pedagogic theory is the *Jissroel-Mensch*, i.e., the individual whose humanity is expressed in his study of the Torah as the word of God and his strict observance of the commandments. At the same time, Hirsch recognizes that this Jewish way of life can only be sustained within a community of Jews. Judaism must thus be understood as a way of life intended for individuals insofar as they belong to a nation. In this context, we must emphasize that, despite his reservations regarding a political understanding of Jewish unity, Hirsch unreservedly referred to the Jews by the term "Nation," albeit for him the term does not imply statehood, or even the aspiration for statehood, but to a communal form of organization which ensures those conditions needed by the Jew to observe the *mizvot* in the country in which he lives; no more, but certainly no less. Commitment to the Torah is absolute, and therefore has priority over all other commitments. In other words, a Jew must first observe the commandments that apply to him here and now, and only then may he turn to other activities. It should be added that, beyond safeguarding the observance of the commandments, Hirsch is not interested in any organized communal activities, in either the political or the social and cultural spheres. These priorities determine the character of the Neo-Orthodox "model." In fact, two clearly-defined and distinct fields of activity exist: Jewish activities in accordance with the commandments, and general, social activities beyond the sphere of the commandments. The foci of the former are family and communal institutions (particularly synagogue and school), which constitute first priorities, demanding the Jew's unconditional devotion and absolute discipline. In Hirsch's writings,



such discipline is the most strongly emphasized aspect of Neo-Orthodox education. The words, "We will do and we will hear," are interpreted as meaning, "We will obey and only then will we search for meaning" — although one may always be sure to find this meaning. A good Jew is an obedient Jew. Although this concept is presented as a natural continuation of the traditional Jewish view, it nonetheless involves a radically new element, which flows directly from the reality of emancipation. The Jewish way of life is no longer a kind of "atmosphere" which completely envelops the Jew in his everyday life and work; he may no longer take for granted, as a matter of habit, life in a closed Jewish society, not even in terms of the traditional Diaspora community. This new way of life tests his will-power every day, repeatedly, and therefore Judaism cannot exist without inner discipline. A Jew must decide, once and for all, to observe the commandments unconditionally, and to withstand the temptations of the environment to pursue a life of material happiness. This predisposition to discipline is also manifest in Hirsch's theology. To him, faith is the spiritual decision to listen, to obey and to accept the burden of the commandments. Faith is disciplined action, while prayer is judgment.

The Jew's encounter with the outside world in the realm of action is conditioned by this spiritual preparation. Here, too, the rule of discipline applies. The Jew is commanded by the Torah to obey the laws of the state, as does any other good citizen, but only insofar as these do not contravene the Torah and its commandments. In the latter case, a Jew must obey the Torah and even be prepared to undergo martyrdom for its sake — although Hirsch was sure that the liberal state of his time was incapable of such arbitrary and tyrannical demands. Having opened its gates to the Jews and granted them civil rights, one must take care to insure the existence of a sufficiently broad extra-halakhic area, in which the Jew may become integrated, making his own contribution and providing for his needs, as well as fulfilling his duty as citizen and useful member of society.

Up to this point, we have discussed the emphasis upon the principle of absolute commitment to the Torah. We shall now examine the other side of the coin: the clear and definite limits of those activities to which the halakhah applies. The Torah's commandments, as accepted by all generations until the Emancipation, are of course binding, but beyond what was actually and formally commanded, there lies the vaguely delineated area of the "permitted," to which the terms "commanded" and "forbidden" in the halakhic sense do not apply. It is within this sphere of the "permitted" that the Jew can become integrated, and it is this which must be kept "neutral" in terms of halakhah. Of course, like all spheres of life, it is ultimately rooted in halakhah, but only in the sense that it belongs to the general category of that which is permitted without requiring the application of detailed halakhic norms. Hirsch considers it vitally important that this sphere be maintained and not reduced, as the solution proposed by Neo-Orthodoxy is

impossible without it. In essence, this view implies the canonization of halakhah as it had been shaped over the generations, and hence the rejection of its extension or application to the new. Entirely new spheres of activity were opened to Jews, of which the halakhah approves without offering detailed norms. In these fields, norms other than the halakhic ones must apply — be they professional rules, civil laws or the rules of common social behavior. We must again stress that Hirsch's work contains many explanations for the reasons for the commandments and summaries of existing halakhah, but hardly any new halakhic ruling. The existing halakhah of the *Shulḥan 'Arukh* is affirmed, but is increasingly surrounded by an undefined sphere of that which is allowed or even recommended. This third halakhic category, over and above the commandments and prohibitions, within which Neo-Orthodoxy finds its sphere of life. This typically modern tendency is indicated by Hirsch's attitude towards custom. Prior to the Emancipation, custom had always been an important tool of traditional Jewish society for extending the scope of halakhah; by its means, halakhah had "conquered" new domains. Hirsch not only dissociated himself from custom, but even challenged it. His approach to custom may be characterized as one of halakhic "purism" — only that which has been formally stipulated in the halakhic codes is binding, while custom is not only not obligatory, but oughtn't to be considered in halakhic deliberations. This is not to say that custom does not permeate the Neo-Orthodox way of life — something that would be impossible to imagine. But custom has nothing to do with halakhah, and thus it becomes the vessel through which integration with the style and social behavior of the non-Jewish environment becomes possible.

It should be clear that these two spheres deeply influence one another, and that, at a certain point, this influence must be deliberately checked. Unlike traditional pre-Emancipation Jewish society, the Neo-Orthodox community envisioned by Hirsch refrains from the attempt to build a completely Jewish world. It consciously assimilates the sphere of the "permitted," attempting to expand this sphere insofar as halakhah permits. In this sphere, Hirsch believes, the Jew is commanded by the Torah to be as German as the Germans, as French as the French, as American as the Americans — or even more so, as a Jew's behavior ought to be exemplary. But the *terminus ad quem* of such assimilation is also clearly demarcated — i.e., that point at which an halakhic ruling exists. Whenever this point is reached, the precept "we shall do and we will hear" is strictly valid and must be willingly carried out. One of the characteristic features of Neo-Orthodoxy is its extreme consistency, as reflected in two different areas. The result is the joining together of two halves from two different worlds: joining, not unification. The two realms dwell peacefully together, alongside one another. On the one hand, there is a powerful tendency to unite them, but on the other, an insistence that clearly defined borders be maintained between them.

The manner in which these halves coexist finds its clearest expression in the educational system inspired by Hirsch's teachings. His ideology endeavored to construct an integrated, complete world for the *Jissroel-Mensch*, but in practice the concept of *Torah 'im derekh-erez* ("Torah and worldliness") implied the combination of the study of specifically religious subjects, on the one hand, with that of entirely secular ones, on the other. The former were the ends; the latter, merely means. The former drew borders; the latter integrates. This pattern still exists; it "works," and therefore is satisfactory. Is it possible to arrive by this means at an integrated Jewish-humanistic culture, even in the Land of Israel? I am inclined to answer this question in the negative. But in order to discuss the Neo-Orthodox patterns of education that have developed in the Land of Israel, we must turn to the creative and highly influential thought of Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook, which radically differs from that of Hirsch.

(To be continued in *Immanuel* 20)

*Immanuel* 19 (Winter 1984/85)