

9 23 1914
A Poem and the Poet—By Emil G. Hirsch.

The REFORM ADVOCATE



Published at CHICAGO 7 S. Dearborn St.

in honor of his fortieth anniversary of his ministry in this city. Dr. Mendes' congregation presented him with a purse of \$4,000, \$100 for each year of the forty, in commemoration of this event.

The Rev. Harry S. Lewis, M. A., the Lewisohn lecturer during this year, will remain here permanently, having been chosen as director of religious education and social service work for the Eastern Council of Reform Rabbis. Mr. Lewis is well fitted for this sort of work, having labored along similar lines in the Whitechapel district of London for many years. His election was rendered possible through the munificence of a number of wealthy and prominent members of the local community.

Dr. Emil G. Hirsch of Chicago and Borough President Marcus M. Marks are the Jewish representatives on the board of trustees of the new Church Peace Union, endowed with the sum of \$2,000,000 by Andrew Carnegie last week.

The fifth annual series of traveltalks by E. M. Newman of Chicago will open here on the 8th of March. They will be given in two series, on Sunday evenings as heretofore at Carnegie Hall and on Monday afternoons at the New Amsterdam Theatre. The course will deal with important and interesting European cities, and Mr. Newman, through the success of his earlier presentations, is assured of large and appreciative audiences.

A representative company of members of the community with their ladies gathered at the Jewish Theological Seminary on Tuesday evening last to entertain the board of editors of the new Bible translation to dinner. The board completed their labors last Thursday after working on the subject six years, and this dinner was given in honor of this event. Jacob H. Schiff presided and in his address paid a glowing tribute to the work of the translators. Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, of Cincinnati, the first speaker, thought the translation was a unique work, carefully prepared and free from all bias. Dr. Solomon Schechter discussed the need of a Jewish commentary on the Bible. Dr. Cyrus Adler of Philadelphia spoke on the Publication Society and Dr. David Philipson of Cincinnati on the Central Conference, the two organizations which had collaborated in the production of the work, and the topic of the last speaker, Dr. Samuel Schulman, dealt with "The Bible and the Pew."

In connection with the annual meeting of the Widowed Mothers' Fund Association, held last week, it was reported that the Council of Jewish Communal Institutions had formally reversed its action of some years ago, disapproving of the creation of this body.

In several addresses delivered here last week Senator William P. Dillingham of Vermont contended for the further restriction of immigration to this country. At the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, held yesterday at a public school on the lower East Side, Jacob H. Schiff, the principal speaker, made a distinct plea against the one advanced by Mr. Dillingham, and asked that this country maintain the "open door" policy toward all honest aliens arriving here. Other addresses at this function were delivered by Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson, Congressman Henry M. Goldfogle, and Abram I. Elkus.

The new home of the Young Women's Hebrew Association is now approaching completion and at the annual

meeting of this body, held on yesterday, it was announced that \$45,000 are still needed to free it from debt. The outgoing officers were re-elected.

Rosy Bloom gave \$550 of her fortune of \$2,000 to various orthodox institutions by her will filed here last week.

The Emanu-El Brotherhood will celebrate its tenth anniversary next week by means of a meeting at which ex-President William H. Taft will be the principal speaker.

The engagement is announced of Mr. I. D. Magnes brother of Dr. J. L. Magnes and Miss Stella Dorothy Haberman of St. Louis.

"Occasional."



Tradition and Dogma.

Sermon delivered in the Stockholm Synagog on October 3, 1914 by IGNAZ GOLDZIHNER.

Translated for the Reform Advocate by J. H.

Continuation.

We are all acquainted with the noble sentiments and sublime emotions produced for short moments by the temporary galvanizing of something long defunct and no longer in living unity with our consciousness, that may thus apparently be preserved as a still living force. Religious tradition is not inherent in such feigned, phantastic semblance, that sometimes masks under the holy name of piety. On the contrary, religious traditions lives only in actual living facts and truths, in identical and close connection with development and progress. They cannot be brought forth on special occasions from the collections of museums of antiquities, in which they are carefully preserved "pro aeterna memoria" as holy embalmed mummies to be exhibited from time to time in order to encourage the piety of the later descendants. True religious tradition is alive and in union with our own soul and its development is being constantly created anew, expanded from generation to generation and is prevented through the care of the continuously changing conditions of organic life and activity from falling into decay or perishing. By means of such evolution the holy tradition of the God idea has developed from the earliest long dead fetish worship into the pure, ethical conception of the God ideal. The tradition of revelation by this means has shed its anthropomorphous integument and all other religious traditions have been endowed by each generation with such interpretation as adequately conformed with its own level of culture and understanding. Such changes and evolutions were not produced mechanically nor by command from any authority but simply by the moral need of conforming with the better knowledge and establishing anew the unity between tradition and the inward deeper sentiments and

convictions of newer truths and greater knowledge. We all agree as to the powerful influences contributed to such evolution by great Individual moral forces, such as for instance the Prophets of Israel and what share of progress in the intellectual religious evolution is due to these prominent leaders. At no moment during the entire historical development did the actual substance of tradition suffer any injury nor lose its vitality. On the contrary, it preserved its full strength and power throughout all changes and evolutions as long as it was in harmony with life and did not set itself up in stubborn opposition to the newer attainments and knowledge, that the methods of serious research and deeper science had drawn from its very own oldest documents.

Hence it would hardly be fair to suspect all forms of tradition as inimical to all intellectual progress. True, tradition is often placed into that very position towards the intellectual interests of mankind and it must be admitted, that this is only owing to the aid and abetting of those, who under the banner of tradition try to oppose science and who believe they can by that aid defeat or arrest progress and thus carry on a warfare that in the long run will be bound to prove in vain. I might cite here a few remarks made recently by a popular writer and which serve to illustrate in general the doubtful frame of mind produced on the modern consciousness upon hearing such sentiments proclaimed. "History teaches over and over again, that tradition is the greatest enemy of all progress. The new always entails the breach with the time honored and progress is impossible without the sacrifice of the old established conceptions, unless it be that we are dealing with a discovery of actual facts that seemingly or unexpectedly have no direct bearing upon what had been formerly known or conceded."

We can readily endorse this judgment as far as it applies to dead tradition. All dead tradition can easily clash with the powerful influences making for the development and the advances of our knowledge and cause fatal retardation. Active and living tradition will, however, never be the tool of such detrimental and fatal retardation. Through its very nature it will prove a prolific ethical element in the advance of our intellectual attainments. To be in conflict with these would tend to paralyze its own life and existence and expose it to decline and decay. As long as tradition retains a living force it must continue to remain a part of the actualities of life, for only within these can it continue to live and it dies when it becomes a mere semblance or relic.

We now have gained the true aspect from which to consider the essence of life within the religious traditions on the one hand and on the other to understand its position within our cultural consciousness. Hence such scientific attainments as the trained scholar may share with the inquiring layman do not come into any conflict with religious tradition, as to require the services of theology for adjustment. On the contrary, such knowledge brings about the consciousness of the close and uncontradicted homogeneousness between science and tradition and the analysis thereof becomes the duty of religious philosophy, while the fostering care and duty thereof is the religious education in the family and the schools, but foremost within the family circle. Tradition finds its most direct transmission within the family circle; the family is the elect soil to propagate and transmit the inheritance from the forefathers. From that circle start the radi-

ating beams, which form the common center for the joint elements of tradition for the entire community. The religious congregation is the expression of numerous families joined and united by the possession of the same religious tradition.

Thus the conception of living tradition forms the joint central pivot of religious family and congregational life. This prevents unbending dogma from fastening its slavish unbearable shackles and in place thereof we nurture the living tradition in its cohesion and coexistence with our cultural consciousness. Such tradition, while immutable in substance, is constantly enlarging and increasing the wealth of our intellectual attainments. Every step in advance in our knowledge and science will have its favorable influence upon the organic development and the harmonious evolution of our lives and thoughts in consciousness with our religious traditions.

This has furnished us one of the most important attributes of the living tradition. In the presence of living issues it cannot and does not tolerate the mere forms or the stability of an old defunct tradition. It refuses decisively to attribute an absolute value to theories or practices of merely relative merit and will not brook the demand for uniformity in its own expression or activities. The congregational union or community is only an abstract factor; actual and active life within that community is only possible to the religiously endowed individual and to the family permeated by the educating influence of such intellectual religiosity. In the soul of every individual tradition is created and endowed anew and such new creation and endowment are required by the entire spiritual life of each individual and by his peculiar method of reflecting his own impressions upon the education of his own family. The recognition of the autonomy of the religious consciousness of each individual against the demands of dogmatic decrees, apparently in harmony with the spirit of the age, which would only lead to renewed stunting and ossification of the tradition, must be recognized as the necessary corollary of what we consider the effect of the living tradition. True, this furnishes the spectacle of thousands of differentiations in a domain that has erroneously been considered the restricted province of an unchangeable eternal regulation. But through this very individual and manifold variation pulsates all life and also the continuously operating living tradition, recreating itself anew through our own intellectual co-operation.

Thus we have here two conflicting views on religious matters facing one another: doctrine or dogmatism against the living tradition and from all moral grounds it should not prove difficult to give the latter the preference over the former.

Doctrine and dogmatism set up the claim to be the only undisputed possessor of the truth. By the very nature of this assertion it excludes from consideration all other dogmatic contentions, that have originated, been fostered and are being taught among other spheres of religious thought with equal pertinacity, as these conflict with what the other doctrine sets up to be the only truth. Doctrine A must necessarily be the inexorable enemy of doctrine—A. They fight each other with fire, the sword and nowadays principally with printers ink. Such tolerance as may be permitted in this kind of religion is nothing more than the concessions wrung from other powers under duress. That tolerance is only the repugnant sacrifice made by dogmatism to the necessities of social

organization and civic life or the acknowledgment of its own weakness.

Our conception of religious tradition does not claim infallibility or exclusiveness. Nothing is more removed from it than the assertion: "I alone can bring salvation". It does not claim jurisdiction over Heaven and Hell. What it does claim: "We have inherited from the past generations, with whom we are in continuous moral and spiritual relation, certain thoughts and institutions, which animated the inward lives of these ancestors and had become the organs expressing their proven moral and noble minded spirituality and their idealistic conception of the duties of life, tested through the afflictions of centuries and thousands of years. The ideals of their lives, of their individual characteristics and their family cohesion are compressed within and expressed through such thoughts and institutions. They have progressed with the history of mankind, in their evolution they have adapted such intellectual shadings as were communicated to them by the constantly striving human intellect with which they never can conflict. These traditions of thought and institutions live within us as our own religious principles and institutions. They furnish our idealism its moral worth and give it the consecration of a historical continuity."

This is our own conception and judgment, without attempting to obtrude or presuming to interfere with the sphere of tradition of others. We do not attempt to convince others thereof, neither do we controvert them nor dogmatize. In the domain of the religious life we do not try to establish the final truth in philosophy, mathematics, natural sciences, geology or ancient history. We only aim to furnish the answer to the question: "What were the principles and institutions, that enobled the lives of our ancestors, whose legitimate historical heirs we are, and that gave them the peace of soul, strength to sustain the vicissitudes of life and their misfortunes and the unshaken faith in their God, so that we, too, might apply them to our own lives and make them the prominent feature in the education of our families and in turn transmit them to our own successors." Whatever value we attribute to our own traditions in keeping our ideals alive, in strengthening the moral foundations of life and giving it content and happiness, we cheerfully will grant to the traditions of other thought-centers. Every form of religion bears the stamp of tradition. Every one is entitled to his own peculiar religious views. This conception contains the notion of tolerance in its very seeds. It is not a concession to be secured only by dint of force. Intolerance, disdain, derision or even uncharitable persecution of the traditions of others are from this viewpoint not only ethical aberrations but also illogical absurdities.

Should we ask the question: "What is the position of our own transmitted conception in relation to such religious interpretation?" we can readily reply, that we are in full accord with it. Our rich traditions have ability to unnnnnnnshrd Qh???,fl shrdlu shrdlu slr furnished proof during thousands of years of their ability to undergo evolution and continuous development. That means, they have conserved their activities and life, have stood the test of meeting the requirements of all periods and of all localities and of keeping apace with all intellectual progress. Independent of all local or temporal limitations, they are not identified with any particular historical period nor attached to any special form or degree of culture, the decadence of which would entail their own decay.

Should, however, our traditions no longer be capable of further evolution and should we fail to recognize the present day religious life as a transmitting link able by the facts, that since its very inception doctrine would be great danger of the ultimate ossification thereof and that it would only present a phantasmagorical picture, that would lose all power and influence upon the religious soul.

The favorable position of our Jewish religion in relation to the ideas before mentioned is readily provable by the facts, that since its very inception doctrine and dogmatism have been entire strangers to it. I say this in the fullest conviction of its truth and with ample historical religious testimony to support the statement. I am well aware, that there has been considerable controversy on the subject, whether Judaism recognizes doctrine and dogma or not. This is really a useless question. The advocates of the negative side were able to cite the expert testimony of the classical scholar Moses Mendelssohn, who in a well-known passage of his work "Jerusalem" denies all inherence of doctrine or dogmatism within the Jewish teachings. There were at all times others insisting that dogma regulated the Jewish religion. In defense of this assertion these partisans could only produce literary arguments.(1*)

It was proven as incontrovertible facts, that the Jewish religious literature embraces a considerable bulk of writings, in which our scholars and thinkers tried to state the teachings of Judaism in a subjective manner under the co-operating influence of their own philosophic deliberations. There were probably as many scholars, following other methods, who attacked and successfully controverted these attempts.

The motives underlying these repeated attempts of codification of theoretical questions of faith or belief were more so the necessity of presenting a proper defense to outside attacks than a desire for uniformity among the Jewish men of learning. There were many literary attempts but no authoritative and definite codification of either liturgy or dogmas of belief. Judaism at all times has been the essence of the living tradition and at no time a system of doctrine or dogma.

The main object always has been to remain within the lines of the inherited tradition and to be the chosen messenger for the perpetuation of the principles thereof, has been and still is considered to be the historical mission of Judaism.

In this consideration we should not lose sight of the fact, that the sound religious philosopher, who first gave expression to the Jewish spirit, at that time still in limited national form, Judah Ha Levi, the poet and scholar, is one of our earliest classical authorities in the refusal of the acceptance of dry dogmatism and the adaptation, in lieu thereof, of the living active tradition, in which alone true religion can be efficacious. The philosophy of Judah Ha Levi is reproduced in a better and newer form by Moses Mendelssohn, as his earliest teacher was the author of a scholarly commentary to Ha Levi's book of Cuzare.

As we must arrive at the conclusion, that the life in all religion is inseparable from the evolution of the tradition, the student cannot fail to draw the deduction, that from our own viewpoint this conception of tradition becomes the principal factor in our own religious activity.

(1*) Compare: Leopold Loew, Jewish Dogmas, Budapest, 1870.

Our position is fully warranted by all historic facts. Our religious consciousness is based in theoretical relation upon historic considerations and in actual practice upon historic evolution of events. Thus we, as adherers to tradition, more so than the dogmatists, must be deeply interested in the scientific cultivation of our ancient literary treasures. The education in this traditional consciousness is indissoluble from the appreciation of our antiquity in its historic significance, its importance, its consecration and its sanctity. The piety for tradition, rising above the level of confused enthusiasm and obscure romanticism, cannot be achieved by mere sentimental love for the past, but must be acquired by serious, truthful research. Only such toil will fortify our reverence and love for the evolutionary history of our traditions, that is marked by the blood of martyrs. In first line there is the holy language in which our oldest documents and the revelations of our traditions have been preserved for transmission to all generations. Then the other documents garnered in a literature wherein each letter spells resignation and ethical self-sacrifice. Further we possess the oldest versions of our traditions and their interpretations as expounded by our ancestors in past centuries in the garb of those periods and in keeping with the intellectuality of the past generations. The careful and reverend research of that language and those literary treasures should not lack in the educational curriculum of all those, whose religious consciousness is discontented with inflexible ceremony, but where such religious consciousness is the result of historic discernment and reveals itself through the fostering care of that active, living constant stream of tradition. May we hope, that the educated modern Jews shall not permit this tradition to disappear from the living stream of constant and continuous evolution.

"The Two Doors."

By Hannah Berman.

(Continued from page 11.)

Chanalle felt choking. She could not have uttered a sound if it had been to save her life. On the instant she made up her mind to go to Reb Velvel the very next day, and not only repay him in full every kopek he had given her husband; but, also give him something towards helping the poverty-stricken on whose behalf he collected money.

Meanwhile, she had a great deal to do before her house would be even passably clean and tidy. She never paused a moment in her work of washing and scrubbing, and mending.

As she could not very well carry the money about with her, she wrapped it in an old piece of linen, and hid it safely out of sight, behind a loose board in the lintel of the kitchen-door. As the floor was only sanded, she could not hide it under the boards, as she would have liked to do, covering the crevice with a chair or a table.

It was late in the afternoon of the following day when she at last found herself free to go to Reb Velvel to repay him the debt of honor which her husband had contracted. She dressed herself as tidily as if she were going to interview the over-lord of the district himself. And, when she was quite ready to start off, having taken the big stick she was in the habit of carrying, from its corner behind the stove, she went

to get her money. She was rather surprised to find the loose piece of wood of the door lintel hanging downwards, almost dropping off. She pushed in her hand, suspecting nothing, and drew in out empty. The money was not there. She searched right and left, tearing out nearly the half of the door-post, swept the whole house, and peered into every nook and corner, holding a candle almost at her very nose. She poked about the mud which lay inches thick in the yard, and even peered down into the bottom of the well which stood in the very middle of the yard. But it was all to no purpose. Her little hoard, her fortune was gone, as completely as if it had been spirited away—as if the earth had swallowed it up. It was not until she was positive that she had not left even the remotest nook which she had not searched over and over again, many times—it was only then it struck her to connect the disappearance of the money with her husband. Yes, she remembered now that he had stayed in all the evening, and followed every movement of hers with his eyes wide open, so to speak. And, though it was his habit to leave the house soon after he got up, that morning he had gone out unusually early, in fact before she had come into the kitchen.

There was not the shadow of a doubt but that he had watched her hiding the money, and had stolen it—robbed her shamelessly of her hard earned rouble-notes.

However, there was no use in standing there and deploring her fate. She must watch Tevya before he had spent it all, and recover the money. She would be sure to find him at the inn, drinking.

She did not take the road that led into the village. She preferred to cross the innumerable fields, and ditches, and broken hedges, since they made a short cut, and would bring her to the inn at least a quarter of an hour sooner than going by the road. Mud and ruts, and sodden.

She could hardly contain her astonishment when, on arriving at the inn, she found her husband had not been there at all. Nor could the inn-keeper tell her where he might be found.

The only person who would be likely to know of his whereabouts was Reb Velvel. He was the only person she had ever known Tevya to speak of as his friend. No one else had ever sympathized with him, and, certainly no one else had ever given him anything, so far as she knew. The whole village held him in abhorrence for his drunken habits.

She soon arrived at Reb Velvel's house. And, as she wished to keep the object of her visit a secret from everybody, she deliberately went around to the other side of the house, rushing past the door through which the villagers came and went, in a constant stream, from morning till night. She would knock at the other door—the one which looked out over the balcony, and ask for Reb Velvel, and confer with him in secret.

The little wooden steps creaked and groaned under her weight, as she ascended them, testing each one before she finally stepped on it. She was glad to see that they were overgrown with green mould. There would not be anyone else by to interrupt her colloquy. It seemed that few persons ventured into the upper story of the house. Probably the steps were too high and narrow to suit the convenience of the villagers who never were accustomed to steps, having none in their own houses. And, also because they came and went so frequently. Reb Velvel being the real leader of the village in all communal matters, despite