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One of the most intriguing topics in the study of Haskalah literature, which has not been addressed in the critical literature so far, is the “reception” of early German Haskalah in the nineteenth century.

We know that at the end of the nineteenth century, the Berlin Haskalah was severely criticized by various Maskilim and post-Haskalah writers. However, what is less known is the historical and literary process that led to this critical position. That is to say, the transition in attitude toward early Haskalah as the centers of the Haskalah moved to the Austro-Hungarian empire and Galicia as well as to Russia, Lithuania, and Poland. The latter part of the Haskalah was the area of concentration of the late professor David Patterson, whose work in Hebrew Haskalah and his contribution to Jewish studies we are commemorating here.

In this context, the following questions are raised: What was the attitude toward the Berlin Haskalah in the various other phases of Haskalah? How did the later Maskilim regard the literature of early Haskalah, and if indeed there was a change in attitude, when did it take place? What is the essence of this change, and what brought it about? In this essay, I will try to address some of these questions, especially in the area of reception.

As a working hypothesis, I can state, on the basis of first-hand impression from reading eighteenth- and nineteenth-century texts, that the reception of early Haskalah in the second period of Haskalah, in the Austro-Hungarian empire, especially in Galicia and Italy, and in the beginning of the third period in Russia was generally rather positive.

My assessment of the reception of early Haskalah is based on four general criteria of literary acceptance as guidelines.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Early Haskalah’s Reception

The first general criterion of reception looked for reprints and new editions of books, periodicals, and articles from the early period, which were reproduced in the nineteenth century; similarly, reprints of biographies of the early Maskilim, and lists of published books by printers and publishers for these reprints.

Another criterion examined the influence of early Haskalah: namely, in imitation of style, themes, and genres from the early period; also, the acceptance and recycling of early Haskalah’s ideas and ideology, or the possible rejection thereof.
A third criterion is based on memoirs of nineteenth-century Maskilim who reported about the impact of early Haskalah on them and the reception of its authors.

The fourth criterion examined in-depth as well as cursory evaluation of early Maskilim and their works by nineteenth-century authors and critics and their assessment of the formers’ contribution to the development of Haskalah. Also, inclusion in literary histories and surveys of Haskalah literature.

The theory of reception, such as the one proposed by Hans Robert Jauss, is not included in this essay.¹

Editions of Early Haskalah Books Republished in the Nineteenth Century: Hame’asef and Scriptures

The first criterion that may be used to assess the reception of early Haskalah is based on studying reprints and new editions of early materials. My general impression is that early Haskalah books were published in many editions in the first part of the nineteenth century and afterward, and actually provided seminal materials to Maskilim who wished to read about the foundation of Haskalah and its ideology.

Among the basic books that could be found on the proverbial “Jewish bookshelves” were many of the Haskalah books. Displayed prominently were the editions of Scriptures with translation into German, commentaries, and introductions by the Maskilim, as well as Hebrew textbooks, and works on grammar and linguistics.

A full treatment of this subject will require a detailed, comprehensive bibliographical probe, which is beyond the scope of this essay. Here I propose to present examples of major categories of important Haskalah material that was recycled in the nineteenth century. My intention is to show the prevailing trends in Haskalah reception. It should be emphasized, though, that these examples deal with the quantitative aspect of Haskalah materials, disregarding at this point their qualitative evaluation.

In the future I may expand this study and attempt to address the topic of reception by checking the actual circulation and dissemination of these early books, and the presumed number of readers, authors, and literary activists.³ But this kind of information is scarce, if available at all.

The starting point of my discussion is the reception of Hame’asef, the Hebrew monthly of Haskalah, published from 1783 to 1811 with some interruptions. An early phenomenon that attests to the impact of the work of the early Maskilim may be found in the republication of articles, essays, and poems from Hame’asef in Bikurei Ha’itim. Published in Vienna from 1820 to 1831, this journal of Haskalah represents the second phase of Haskalah in the Austro-Hungarian empire. Bikurei Ha’itim published some 207 different items (of the sum total of 1,916 entries in Bikurei Ha’itim) taken from the first four volumes of Hame’asef. This is a clear indication of the continuous influence of the first journal and the special role it continued to play beyond its own time and place. The material was recycled without any editing or changes, and thus it became sort of a semicanonical body of literature in early modern Hebrew. In my book on Bikurei Ha’itim I discuss the question of the recycled material and the editor’s policy regarding materials that were eliminated from republication.⁴

An indication of the viability of Hame’asef even beyond the mid-century point was the republication of Hame’asef in 1862 as the Galician writer and editor Meir Halevi Letteris published a new edition of volume one of Hame’asef for the year 1783/84.⁵

A similar trend may be discerned by several attempts to revive the periodical (Hame’asef) and to issue something that resembled it. In 1829 Rephael Fürstenthal issued a publication under the same title, Hame’asef, for 1829. And in 1866 Yehuda Leib Reinhartz published a one-time volume which was also called Hame’asef.⁶

The continuous influence of Hame’asef on rank-and-file Maskilim may be seen also from a few attempts to write such a periodical with the title Hame’asef. Walter Röll discovered a manuscript titled Hame’asef Kassel of 1799,⁷ and I found at the Rosenthaliana library a manuscript of a periodical titled Keter Torah Hame’asef from the years 1815–16.⁸ Neither of these manuscripts was published. In addition, in 1818, there was an attempt to issue selections from the original Hame’asef by the editor of the German Jewish periodical Jedidja, Jeremiah Heinemann, and the poet Moshe Büschenthal.⁹ It was not published.
Even more impressive was the republication of Haskalah editions of the Hebrew Scriptures, which were very popular in the nineteenth century, having been printed in several editions and were widely circulated. Mendelssohn’s Be’ur—the commentary on the Torah with translation into German in Hebrew characters—had a long-lasting impact on Haskalah Judaism, and it was republished in nine different editions by various printers during the century. Following the Be’ur, other Maskilim followed in Mendelssohn’s footsteps and published commentaries and translations of other books of the Hebrew Bible. Such was the Sefer Mishlei (Proverbs) by Yitzhak Euchel, which was published in five different editions in thirty years following its initial edition in 1790.

Among other works were the Five Scrolls by Aaron Wolfssohn and Joel Brill, with Mendelssohn’s translation into German of Song of Songs, Brill’s edition of Psalms, and Juda Leib Ben Zeev’s introductions to the books of the Hebrew Bible. These books and others came out in many editions during the nineteenth century and afterward.

It should be pointed out that traditional editions of Hebrew Scriptures with the classical commentaries were generally in wide circulation, being a permanent feature in Jewish homes. Yet, the dissemination of Haskalah editions is definitely indicative of their reception by nineteenth-century Maskilim. However, at the end of the century we have a report by Berdichevsky that most people bought traditional texts rather than the Maskilim’s editions.

**Republication of Literary Materials in Chrestomathies, Primers and Catechisms, Ideology Books and Belles lettres**

Another category of republished books of early Haskalah is found in the practical Hebrew language textbooks, primers, chrestomathies, and catechisms, which were much needed “products” in Jewish schools and among private teachers and Maskilim.

The Hebrew linguistics books and textbooks of Ben Zeev, one of the prolific Haskalah linguists and writers, were widely circulated in many editions throughout the nineteenth century. The literary historian Joseph Klausner reported twelve different editions of Ben Zeev’s Talmud Leshon Ivri, published from 1796 to 1874, while the bibliographer Chaim Dov Friedberg noted fifteen editions. Similarly, Ben Zeev’s lexicon Otzar Hashorashim had five editions. Klausner summarized its influence by writing that this book “showed ten of thousands of young people the linguistic treasures of the Bible [. . . ] and thus taught them the Hebrew language.” Ben Zeev’s catechism, Beit Hasefer, was printed in nine editions.

Similarly, primers, catechisms, and language textbooks recycled literary texts such as fables, parables, moral tales, and stories, written by the Me’asim—the circle of writers contributing to Haméasef—and published initially in Haméasef, for the use of students and young Maskilim.

An important source of information about the reception of early Haskalah and the acceptance of its ideology in the following century may be found in the republication of its ideological books. Issuing new editions of such books is indicative of the need to examine and to explore the ideas and ideals of early Haskalah.

One of these books was Naftali Hertz Wessely’s educational treatise Divrei Shalom Ve’emet. It is one of the basic ideological books of early Haskalah and the most seminal one. In it, Wessely delineated in 1782 the ideological platform advocating the introduction of reforms—especially secular subjects—in Jewish education. His writings had a great impact on the Maskilim of its time and afterward. The demands for educational reform continued to be expressed by nineteenth-century Maskilim, and the republication of Wessely’s book in 1826, 1827, and 1886 is indicative of its popularity and its acceptance.

Early Haskalah ideas have been circulating in later writings, signaling the influence of the founding fathers of Haskalah. Thus, echoes of Wessely’s proposed educational reforms are resonating in the writings of later Maskilim, such as in Téudah Beyisrael by the influential Russian Maskil Yitzhak Beer Levinson, and others.

Also, the acceptance and reception of original works of prose and poetry may be deduced from their republication at a later date. For example, Wessely’s biblical epos, Shirei Tiferet, which was origi-
nally published in Berlin in 1789, was published in a complete edition in 1809, after Wessely's death, and then appeared in seven subsequent editions. Moreover, as I shall discuss later, Wessely's masterpiece inspired many Haskalah authors to write similar biblical epics and dramas.

Another bellettristic work, the travelogue *Masa Ba'arav*, by the Italian Maskil Shmuel Romanelli, was printed in nine editions (including in the twentieth century) since its publication in 1792. The biblical drama *Meluchat Sha'ul*, by Yoseph Ha'efrati, which was also published first in 1792, was reissued in twelve different editions. These new editions and many others are definitely impressive signs of acceptance, which will be elaborated upon below.

**Commentary on Classical Texts and Linguistics, Books on Science, and Biographies of Early Maskilim**

Commentaries on classical texts, in addition to early Maskilim's commentaries on biblical books, which I discussed before, serve as another source for evaluating reception in our context. One such book is *Yen Levanon* by Wessely, which is a commentary on *Pirkei Avot*. The book was published in three editions.

The study of Hebrew linguistics, grammar, and etymology, to which many of the early Maskilim have devoted their creative energies in their desire to revive the Hebrew language, is another popular channel of influence. Wessely's *Gan Na'ul* deals with synonyms and terms of “wisdom” in the Bible. It was published originally in Amsterdam in 1765 and then, being quite popular at this age of “reason,” it was published in six more editions.

One of the stated goals of Haskalah was to foster secular studies among the Jews, particularly in general and natural sciences. Among the first Maskilim in Germany who wrote on natural sciences was Baruch Linda. He published a series of articles on science in *Ham'easef*, which were published in 1789 in his book *Resheet Limudim*. Subsequently, six more editions were published, as an indication of the book’s popularity and reception. A further acknowledgment of Linda's acceptance as late as 1873 is found in Shalom Yaakov Abramovich's own book in natural science, *Toldot Hateva* (1862–73), where he paid tribute to Linda's work.

The category of biographies, either republished or new biographies, on the founding fathers of Haskalah in Germany serves as an indicator of their reception by later Haskalah. Some of these biographies were written to glorify the exemplary figures of early Haskalah such as Mendelssohn and Wessely. The first Hebrew biography by the editor and Haskalah activist Yitzhak Euchel on Mendelssohn, titled *Toldot Rabenu Moshe Ben Menahem*, was first serialized in *Ham'easef* and then published in 1789 as a book. This biography was republished in three more editions in the next century.

Not only did reprints of biographies mark their acceptance but also new biographies written on the luminaries of early Haskalah. One such biography on Mendelssohn was published in 1820 in *Bikurei Ha'itim* (German, in Hebrew characters).

The other major figure in German Haskalah, Wessely, was the subject of several biographies in the nineteenth century. It started with the biography by the Amsterdam Maskil David Friedrichsfeld in 1809, and another, serialized in 1857 in *Hamagid*, and then in 1886 two more biographies by Kalman Schulman and Shlomo Mandelkern. Those four different biographies of Wessely testify to the high esteem he has been accorded in later Haskalah.

Among other Maskilim who were deemed to be worthy of a biography in nineteenth-century Haskalah was Yitzhak Euchel. Its author, Meir Halevi Letteris, felt a special empathy, if not an affinity, with Euchel, the editor of *Ham'easef*. Letteris, an editor himself, had a special place in his heart for *Ham'easef* as I mentioned before; he reprinted a new edition of volume one of *Ham'easef* for the year 1783/84.

**Publishers’ Listings and Personal Libraries; Imitation of Styles and Genres Prevalent in Early Haskalah**

Another reliable source of information about the potential dissemination and possible circulation of Haskalah books in the nineteenth century may be found in publishers’ lists of books they had published.
From book lists circulated by the Viennese publisher Anton Schmid and the Prague publisher Moshe Landau—to cite two of the important printers and publishers—we can learn about the republication of Haskalah books, and in effect to reconstruct the contents of the maskilic “bookshelf.” An earlier list of available books published by the Haskalah publishing house in Berlin, נוער חכום, is found at the end of Nahman Barash’s book Ein Mishpat, and it reflects the maskilic book production at the turn of the century.

Searching for information about personal libraries and special collections of Hebrew books may bring interesting results. For example, in 1783/84 Hamasef published several notices about Judaica libraries. It is known that some of the late Maskilim, such as Yocheved Perl, had comprehensive libraries in Hebraica and Judaica. Further investigation of the contents of these libraries can give us information about the availability of early Haskalah books. The Hebrew critic and editor Reuven Brainin reported in his memoirs that he had started some sort of a “library.” This aspect should be investigated further.

One of the ways to assess the influence of early Haskalah authors and their writings on later writers is to probe any emulation of style, themes, and literary genres that were prevalent in early Haskalah. Thus, it will be rewarding, for example, to look into the impact of Wessely’s Shirei Tiferet on other biblical epics.

There are references to its impact on the following writers and their epics: Shalom Hacohen’s Mataei Kadem Al Admat Tzafon (1807) andadir David (1834), Bernhard Schlesiner’s Hashmonaim (1816), “Toldot Yoseph” by Moshe Mendelssohn-Frankfurt in Pnai Tevel (1872), and Ziskind Rashkow’s Hayei Shimshon (1824). The literary historian Fischel Lahover reported that there were some twenty imitations of Wessely’s Shirei Tiferet. But this requires another study.

Some authors openly acknowledged their indebtedness to early Haskalah writers. The Breslau Maskil, Ziskind Rashkow, for example, declared in the introduction to his biblical epic Hayei Shimshon (1824) Wessely’s influence on his work. Also the Amsterdam Maskil Gavriel Polak asserted in the introduction to Kikayon Leyonah (1853), an epic on the biblical story of Jonah, that he followed in the footsteps of Wessely. Even if Polak attempted to promote his own book by such an acknowledgment, it nevertheless serves as an indication of some affinity to Wessely’s epos and his continuous influence.

Emulating literary genres that were prevalent in early Haskalah by later writers is another indication of reception; for example, “the dialogues of the dead,” a popular genre in eighteenth-century Enlightenment literature. This genre continued to be used by late Maskilim throughout the nineteenth century; these writers were Shlomo Levissohn, Juda Leib Mieses, Meir Halevi Alter (in Bikurei Ha’itim), and others, as a testimony of a continuous impact of early Haskalah.

A study of literary motifs may be rewarding as well, and it may show some affinity to an early literature. Such is the use of the “spring” motif that continued to be cited in Haskalah poetry throughout the century.

Literary Assessment of Writers and Critics; Authors’ Memoirs about Reception

Comprehensive literary analyses and critical discussions of early German Maskilim and their writings may serve as good indicators for reception and acceptance. Thus, Shlomo Levisohn’s literary analysis in Melitzat Yesurun in 1816, which deals with theories of poetics and rhetorics, discussed Wessely’s literary work. It is indeed indicative of Wessely’s reception at that time as a canonical writer.

Also, the Galician poet Dov Ginsburg in his essay on poetics cited Euchel’s poetical definitions of Wessely’s epos (from the former’s review published in Hameasef in 1790), and carried on a serious discussion about them. Obviously, this is another indication of the impact of Haskalah’s early writings.

More discussion on direct assessment of the early literature will be discussed in another article.

Another important criterion for assessing early Haskalah’s acceptance in the nineteenth century is based on Maskilim’s memoirs. These memoirs may shed light on the question of the circulation of Haskalah books, specifically, whether the early Maskilim’s books and the volumes of Hameasef were available to second and third generation Maskilim.
For example, the Galician and Russian Maskil Avraham Gottlober reported in his memoirs that thirty-five years after Mendelssohn's death, namely in 1821, when he—Gottlober—was ten years old, there were in his hometown copies of Mendelssohn's Be'ur, some of Wessely's books, Ben Zeev's grammar books, and volumes of Hame'asef. He also mentioned that he saw Saul Berlin's satiric work Klav Yosher (published in 1795). But Gottlober was unique in that his father allowed him access to these books, whereas many young Maskilim did not have such privilege.

Nineteenth-century autobiographies serve as another source of information. Mordechai Aharon Gunzburg related in his autobiography, Aviever, that in his youth he had read Mendelssohn's Phaedon, after which Mendelssohn gained esteem in his eyes. Another autobiographer, Moshe Leib Lilienblum, reported that he had purchased the apocryphal book Hochmat Shlomo with Wessely's commentary Ru'ah Hen, and that he was very much impressed by it. He also reported of having access to other Haskalah books which were originally printed in Koenigsgburg—thus, transposing him metaphorically through this medium of literature closer to the center of Haskalah in Germany; among other books, he also reported seeing Ben Zeev's Talmud Leshon Ivri. Reuven Brainin, too, reported of the influence of Ben Zeev's Talmud Leshon Ivri on him as well as of Mendelssohn's Be'ur.

We can assume that in the centers of Haskalah in the nineteenth century, early Haskalah books have been handed over from one Maskil to another. In more remote and secluded places, there were apparently no Haskalah books unless owned by an established Maskil who lived there. Thus Lilienblum, for example, related how he got acquainted with a young man who owned Haskalah books. Also Brainin wrote in his memoirs about a teacher-Maskil who had in his possession "a trunk full of Haskalah literature," yet he mentioned the difficulties to get Haskalah books. Another young writer, Mordechai Zeev Feierberg, wrote to Ahad Ha'am that when he grew up he did not have (Haskalah) books.

This, however, changes in the 1860s upon the emergence of the critical approach to German Haskalah literature, expressed by such writers as Abraham Uri Kovner, Avraham Yaakov Paperna, and especially Peretz Smolenskin. But this is a topic for another essay.
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