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Chapter 7
Varieties of Haskalah: Sabato Morais’s Program of Sephardi Rabbinic Humanism in Victorian America

Arthur Kiron

The philosophical question of the relationship between the one and the many has been debated since antiquity. From monality to monothelism, from Plato to the American penny’s *e pluribus unum*, successive cultures have struggled to make sense of how particular elements participate in and belong to universal categories.¹ Recent debates over the historical definition of the term *Haskalah* echo this ancient dilemma, which is inextricably bound up with a key ideological controversy concerning the modern Jewish experience.² The German-Jewish experience, it has been argued, provides a “mirror of modernity” for all modernizing Jewish experiences.³ Whatever regional variations may exist in Jewish experiences of enlightenment and modernization, according to this argument, these details pale beside the profound and overarching commonalities intrinsic to the trends first manifested and consciously, programmatically articulated by Jews in German-speaking lands. Until recently, alternative accounts of Jewish modernization have largely been erased, delegitimized, or downplayed. Revealingly, the experiences of Jews in Muslim lands and in the western diasporas of England and America have been particularly widely ignored. Jewish modernization in these areas did not follow the familiar pattern of hope, crisis, despair, emigration, and national rebirth that was influentially staked out as paradigmatic by a generation of historians of German and Eastern European Jewry. The traditional definition and circumscription of the term *Haskalah*, thus, has contributed in part to the exclusion, until recently, of both these regions from the mainstream of modern Jewish historiography.⁴

I would here like to challenge this regnant model of Haskalah, not by
offering a new definition but by posing a counterexample. Sabato Morais, the main figure in this account, played a central role in shaping an enlightened Jewish religious culture in the United States in the second half of the nineteenth century. Morais was the preeminent exponent and programmatic disseminator of a distinct form of what I would like to call rabbinic humanism, that in its own time was variously referred to as “historical Judaism” and/or “enlightened orthodoxy.” What I here will try to explicate is what Morais and his contemporaries understood by the seemingly oxymoronic phrase “enlightened orthodoxy” and ask how this outlook functioned for Jews living in a Victorian, English-speaking milieu.

Best known as one of the founders of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City in 1886, Sabato Morais remains a curiously forgotten figure in the history of American Jewry. In his own time, however, as Kasriel Sarasohn, publisher of the orthodox Yiddish newspaper Tageblatt, put it in a memorial tribute, Morais was widely regarded as “without doubt the greatest of all orthodox rabbis in America.” Morais was born in Livorno, a port city in the Italian duchy of Tuscany in 1823, and raised there amid the nationalist and revolutionary ferment of the Risorgimento. His mother was of Ashkenazic descent, and his father a poor Jewish butcher whose ancestors were Portuguese conversos. “Sabatino,” as he was affectionately known, was the third of their nine children. Morais’s father Samuel and his paternal grandfather Sabato, after whom he was named, were both fervent advocates of the Republican cause. Radical activists regularly visited his childhood home where they gathered to eat, drink, and sing patriotic songs; his own father, reportedly, was once imprisoned by the Livornese authorities who suspected him of involvement in a seditious plot.

Morais’s early education in Livorno was heavily influenced by this atmosphere of political turbulence and also by an enlightened merchant reform program that introduced new pedagogical methods to the teaching of the city’s poorer youth. Morais received his rabbinic training from the city’s haham (Sephardi rabbinic authority), Abraham Barukh Piperno. The rabbinical degree of “Maskil,” the equivalent of a teacher’s certificate, was conferred on him in 1846. Driven by the need to find employment, Morais then left Livorno for London, where he became a teacher at the Jewish Orphan School attached to the Spanish and Portuguese congregation Sha’ar Shamayim, at Bevis Marks. Morais spent five years in London, where he formed friendships with many of the Italian nationalists living there in exile, including Giuseppe Mazzini, the leading intellectual voice of the Risorgimento. During this time he also mastered the English language, acculturated to Victorian manners of dress and decorum, and eventually, to warm encouragement, began to preach publicly in English. In 1851 Morais reluctantly left London to apply for the newly vacant position of Hazan (cantor) across the Atlantic at Philadelphia’s Spanish and Portuguese congregation Mikveh Israel. Though he lived the majority of his years in Philadelphia, there is clear evidence that the revolutionary environment of his formative youth in Sephardi Livorno and Victorian London made a decisive impression on the religious and political program that he was to teach and disseminate in America until his death in 1897, at the age of seventy-four.

Throughout his nearly fifty-year ministry in the United States Morais promoted his Italian Sephardi heritage as part of a programmatic vision of what Jewish life in his new American homeland might become. He offered a rationale for Jews to remain observant that addressed the open, pluralistic character of the American environment. He also articulated reasons for being Jewish that were consonant with the ideology of American exceptionalism and the emergent Victorian culture of refinement he found there. Morais’s outlook took hold after the Civil War as part of what Jonathan Sarna has called a “Great Awakening” of Jewish culture in America. It was Morais’s outlook and program of religious education in short, and not, as has often been assumed, the positive-historical teachings of Zcecharias Frankel, that ultimately provided the ideological underpinnings of the early Jewish Theological Seminary that he founded, aided by a group of supporters, in 1886.

Golden Ages, Promised Lands

On his first Thanksgiving in Philadelphia in 1851, Morais preached to his congregation a vision of regenerated Jewish life in America based upon an image of Sephardic cultural openness. Taking as his starting point the so-called golden age of medieval Jewry in Muslim Spain, Morais traced the migration of this tradition to “the Italian schools” following the rise of “bigotry and fanaticism” after the Christian reconquista that culminated in the expulsion of 1492. Coming from Livorno and London, Morais hoped to extend this diasporic chain of Jewish cultures to America. The achievements of Andalusian Jewry provided him with his key historical paradigm. Morais called on his coreligionists to imitate this “illustrious example”: “Religious and secular lore flourished among them,” he declared, “poetry,
American exceptionalism. For Morais, America was indeed different: it was a promised land unfettered by the corrupting legacy of a feudal past. Sephardi history and culture that he admired, but consciously formulated as a bulwark between us and the despotism of the old world, achieved nothing less than revolutionary change. To realize these ends, he perceived a doxical link he perceived between the medieval Sephardi experience and the actual program of Jewish religious education and cultural regeneration. The discovery of America had been a providential event. The dramatic articulation in America of the Sephardi tradition. The address is a programmatic articulation in America of the Sephardi tradition. The address is the ideological centerpiece of a concrete plan to cultivate a cadre of young Jews that in some senses resembled Mazzini’s “Young Italy” movement.

Crucial to the argument of Morais’s sermon was the seemingly paradoxical link he perceived between the medieval Sephardi experience and American exceptionalism. For Morais, America was indeed different: it was a promised land unfettered by the corrupting legacy of a feudal past. Morais rearticulated in Jewish terms the familiar Protestant notion that the discovery of America had been a providential act. America, Morais told his congregation, provided a refuge for the oppressed and a haven for religious liberty, protected by “this mighty [Atlantic] ocean, that heavenly constructed bulwark between us and the despotism of the old world.” Morais never abandoned this basic belief in American exceptionalism. Forty years later, on Thanksgiving Day, 1891, he once again spoke of the essential difference between America and Europe, the inquisitorial past which “reeks with the smoke of burning pyres into which young and old were pitilessly cast.”

Even as he praised America for its exceptional attributes of freedom and republican government, however, Morais recurrently looked to the European medieval Jewish past for models of virtue. As he characteristically put it in a Passover sermon published in 1881, Morais considered America to be the “virgin soil” “in which the . . . ritual system governing Judaism (will) be regenerated.”

The twenty-seven-year-old Morais’s 1851 Thanksgiving address, delivered only eight months after his arrival in Philadelphia, was the first programmatic articulation in America of the Sephardi tradition. The address is “programmatic” in the sense that Morais did not merely evoke elements of Sephardi history and culture that he admired, but consciously formulated them as the basis of a practical curriculum of models for imitation. He planned and subsequently set about implementing and disseminating an actual program of Jewish religious education and cultural regeneration. The golden ages of Iberian and Italian Jewry with which he identified formed the ideological centerpiece of a concrete plan to cultivate a cadre of young Jews that in some senses resembled Mazzini’s “Young Italy” movement. Morais planned to educate and organize a new generation of educated, refined, and ritually observant Jewish citizens of the American republic to achieve nothing less than revolutionary change. To realize these ends, he pleaded for communal support for the “literary associations” recently formed in Philadelphia, asking not only for financial sponsorship, but also the most stirring poetry which speaks to the heart and breathes pious sentiments, was cultivated in their academies. No knowledge, however abstruse, no philosophy, however profound, was neglected by the luminaries of our nation.”

For hands-on tutelage. “Let men of talents step forward to (young people’s) aid,” Morais exorted, “let men of science mingle among them, let the (force) of their eloquence give a new impulse.” Jewish leaders, Morais believed, must “impress these youths with the important idea that it is not for their sake alone that they must study but for the sake of [all Americans] . . . as well as for the honor of Israel.” The community leadership must “[m]ake them understand that it is not by hoarding . . . silver and gold that they can bring their [might] to the advancement of humanity,” but that goal must be attained through “learning and wisdom.”

On its face, this outlook resembles what Ismar Schorsch has called “the myth of Sephardi supremacy” in modern Jewish history. According to Schorsch and others who have studied the phenomenon in German-speaking lands, late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century enlightened Ashkenazi intellectuals in Berlin and elsewhere turned to the Sephardi legacy because to them it represented “cultural openness, philosophic thinking and an appreciation for the aesthetic.” Morais’s use of the Sephardi legacy, however, differed from that of these Ashkenazi intellectuals in several important respects. First, he promoted this topos in Philadelphia, which had neither an entrenched Ashkenazi rabbinical establishment against which to rebel nor a history of political exclusion to overcome. Second, his emphasis on biblical rather than talmudic study as the basis of a devout Jewish religious curriculum did not represent a break with orthodox tradition, as it did for the German Maskilim, but rather only replicated the model of Sephardi education he had received in Livorno. Third, while Morais shared the identification of some Ashkenazim with the Sephardi rationalist tradition, and particularly with the figure of Maimonides, he did so as a Sephardi Jew and without articulating a challenge to his traditional values and educational priorities. He openly embraced, for example, a Newtonian view of the universe about planetary motion and gravity, while claiming that these doctrines were fully consonant with theistic teachings. Similarly, he found no theological objections to the study of astronomy and believed that William Harvey’s theory of the circulation of blood was already present in the Talmud. In this respect, his views were entirely in keeping with what David Ruderman has shown to be the acute Anglo-Jewish engagement with the culture of Newtonianism and scientific discovery, exemplified in particular by David Nieto, the early eighteenth-century rabbi of the Sephardi synagogue in London, whose works Morais had read closely. Morais’s primary concern was not, however, with scientific or philosophical speculation but with moral philosophy: the studied reflection on what constitutes
a virtuous life. Fundamental to Morais's religious program was the biblical teaching that the "fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Nonetheless, he firmly believed that scientific research and rational reflection supported rather than undermined Jewish teachings and were continuous with a long tradition of Jewish scientific inquiry. In each of these respects Morais did not challenge either the traditional hierarchy of values or the educational curriculum of the Sephardi culture from which he came. In sum, while Morais turned to his own Sephardi legacy in order to rejuvenate American Jewish culture in its image, he did not invoke it in order to displace or overthrow traditions he regarded as oppressive and obtuse. In fact, he emphatically rejected on several occasions the assertion by some Sephardim of their genealogical superiority to their non-Sephardi coreligionists. He did not share their belief in a distinct and superior Jewish lineage descended directly from the tribe of Judah, and could not accept the aristocratic exclusiveness of Sephardim who refused to "intermarrу" with Ashkenazim (Morais himself, to recall, was the product of such a "mixed marriage"). In this respect it is noteworthy that Morais never called the Andalusi heritage, admired by him as well as by German-Jewish Maskilim, "Sephardi," perhaps preferring to see in the history of the Jews of Muslim Spain a legacy belonging to all Jews, both Sephardi and Ashkenazi. While he embraced the "Sephardic mystique," Morais opposed any hint of "Sephardic superiority."

The approach Morais adopted to the sensitive topic of liturgical reform illustrates his willingness, in the interest of preserving communal unity, to accommodate and even support Ashkenazi demands at the expense of the traditions he held personally dear. The "ritual question," as it came to be known in the 1870s, divided American Jews accustomed to the Sephardi rite from those familiar with the sounds and order of prayers of the Ashkenazi service. The variety of pronunciations and orders of prayer, however, was only one obstacle to liturgical consensus. Difficult theological disputes arose over whether to retain passages referring to animal sacrifices in the Jerusalem Temple, whether to do away with references to certain messianic doctrines such as bodily resurrection, and whether to eliminate the hope for a national restoration of the Jewish people in the Land of Israel. Due to the widespread perception of the service as burdensomely long, there also were repeated calls for the excision of various poetic accretions (piyyutim). To further complicate matters, individual ministers began creating and publishing their own prayer books, each different in its details and orientation from the next.

Following a controversial decision in 1875 by a formerly traditional congregation in New York City, Bnai Jeshurun, to "reform" the prayer service, public pressure began to build for Morais, as a leading representative of the enlightened orthodox religious camp, to respond. In seven serialized installments, first published in the Philadelphia Jewish Record and subsequently reprinted in various other nationally circulating Jewish newspapers, Morais laid out his plan for acceptable modifications of the prayer service as a step toward arriving at a uniform liturgy for American Jews. At the outset, as was typical of him, Morais rhetorically urged Jews to allow "humility and not pride" to shape the course of future actions on this divisive issue. He then proceeded to announce the practical concessions he was ready to make. Morais explicitly accepted the benefits of a simpler, abbreviated service based in large part on the Ashkenazi order of service, and expressed his willingness to omit such traditionally central elements as references to temple sacrifices.

The specific elements Morais regarded as essential to retain, however, remained unpublished. His most detailed statement on this matter is found in a handwritten marginal note in his personal scrapbook, today found at the Center for Advanced Judaic Studies Library at the University of Pennsylvania. From that annotation, we know that Morais's central liturgical concession was his willingness to accommodate a non-Sephardic majority by sacrificing the Sephardic order of prayer. He responded to the challenge of modifying the prayer service by abbreviating it, adapting it, and accepting translations of it. He accepted the removal of historical accretions of sacred poetry that he regarded as extrinsic to the sacred liturgical core discussed in rabbinic sources. Yet he also defended the retention of the poetry of certain Sephardic medieval Hebrew poets, including Solomon ibn Gabirol, Judah Halevi, Moses and Abraham ibn Ezra, and the "touching exhortation at the end of [Babyl] ibn Pakuda's] Chobot Hallehabot, each paragraph of which begins Nafshi [my soul]." He demanded that Hebrew be the language of prayer, but allowed for the provision of vernacular renderings "worthy of the original to interest those who cannot enjoy the Hebrew." Morais's compromises were never implemented, but the selections he defended and excisions he permitted reveal the essence of what he valued: a form of worship that retained elements of the Sephardi musar (moral-pietistic) tradition but which was deeply modified to meet the practical expectations of an Ashkenazi majority.

Prayer, even communal prayer, belongs to one of the most personal of religious experiences. On an intellectual level, however, in contrast to the
stress on interior personal development in the Germanic tradition of Bildung, Morais’s Sephardi program tended to place little emphasis on the inward state of the individual. Morais was chiefly interested not in questions of personal development but in the needs of the group in relation to a universal whole. In this sense, his concept of the task of the individual differed from that of any of the stages of German Bildung, which David Sorkin has characterized as shifting from an early eighteenth-century emphasis on “moral individualism,” to a new ideal of “aesthetic individualism” in the latter half of the century, and which George Mosse has diagnosed as fundamentally “nationalist” in character in the nineteenth century.57

Contrastingly, in eighteenth- and particularly nineteenth-century Italian and Italian-Jewish moral and political philosophy (especially as found in the writings of Giuseppe Mazzini and Samuel David Luzzatto, who most directly influenced Morais), the position of reason was always subordinated to claims of intuition and emotional sentiment. For Morais, in keeping with this tradition, reason existed as a tool—a means to an end—but did not serve as an autonomous source of authority or knowledge. Individual ethical knowledge for Mazzini, for example, originated in the feelings of the individual heart, but required an outward moving confirmation or recognition in the feelings of other people as well as in the traditions of the past.48 For Luzzatto, too, the ultimate criterion of truth was emotional, not rational. Truth originated in the experience of suffering and in the ability to feel empathy for others.49 For Mazzini in particular, and Morais in his footsteps, religion was conceived to be the foundation of a virtuous republic: “religion is the supreme, educative principle, politics are the application of that principle to the various manifestations of human life.”58

The key difference between Morais’s view and that of German and German-Jewish advocates of Bildung was that Morais believed religious self-cultivation was precisely supposed to lead away from the self, through a process of abnegazione (or self-abnegation), and toward intensified political and social activity.51 In general, Morais endorsed a particular religious mission for Jews as a priestly people chosen by God and willing to make individual sacrifices to achieve universal social justice. His program functioned similarly to that of Germanic Bildung as an agent of embourgeoisement, but it radically differed from the latter model in its structural emphasis on notions of duty and sacrifice in the active service of a religious republican revolution.

The structure and direction of Morais’s outlook on the “mission” of Judaism moved outward, from the individual to the experience of the ethnic group to the interests of the nation, and then to the universal collective. Morais’s program for Jewish cultural regeneration in America foreshadows (perhaps ironically, given that Morais opposed political Zionism)52 Louis Brandeis’s famous adage that to be a good American, a Jew must be a Zionist, insofar as furthering the work of Zionism in the Land of Israel contributed to the spread of American democratic principles around the world.53 According to Morais, by strengthening one’s attachment to Judaism in America, one became a better American and thus participated in the improvement of all humanity. His outlook also might be contrasted with the rational individualist, the moral and aesthetic individualist, as well as nationalist models of German liberal thought in which the universal claims of reason were centered in each individual or in the needs and character of the Volk. Different from the exclusivist nationalism that George Mosse has shown to be built into the nineteenth-century German conception of Bildung, Morais cast Jewish cultural regeneration in America as a universalist project.54 To that end, he recast the American holiday of Thanksgiving in terms of Jewish universalism, offering “gratitude to God” for providing America as an asylum from persecution, where Jews were able to participate in the “march of modern civilization.”55

The establishment and development of youth-oriented cultural and educational institutions were central to Morais’s implementation of his programmatic vision of Jewish revitalization. There is clear historical evidence for his continuous efforts in this regard both before and after the Civil War. In 1873, eight years after the war’s end, Morais’s name appeared on a broadside endorsing the organization of a new “Hebrew [Literary] Association.”56 According to the announcement, the stated object of the proposed association was to “gain an insight into the Jewish learning of the past,” through the study of all subjects that “may expand the range of human thought and impart a knowledge of what is good and useful.”57 Following the association’s establishment, meetings were “held in various places every two weeks.” “These [meetings] were well attended, and there was always an instructive literary program with a Jewish tinge, as well as music and recitations.”58 Morais “served as president for a period, and addressed (the members) at all meetings.”59 Among the leaders of the association were Nathan Weissenstein, a student of Morais from the Jewish Foster Home, and other Morais students including Jacob Voorsanger, who would later become a prominent rabbi, and the sons of Philadelphia Jewish leaders, such as Lewish W. Steinbach, Hyman P. Binswanger, Harry B. Som-
mer, and David Solis-Cohen. Marcus E. Lam, a student of Morais from Maimonides College (the “first American Jewish theological seminary”), served as secretary.60

Two years later, in 1875, the Philadelphia Young Men’s Hebrew Association (YMHA) opened its doors. The YMHA, according to its founders, was explicitly patterned after this earlier Hebrew Association and quickly became a popular literary and cultural meeting place for young Jews, male and female, in their teens and twenties.61 The group that formed the YMHA included most if not all of the young men involved in the Hebrew Association. These young Jews formed a core of Jewish activists seeking a “revived Judaism.”62 What they perceived to be at stake was not merely the entertainment nor the edification of individual Jews, but the very survival of Judaism and the Jewish people in America.

In his study of the Jewish cultural revival in America that began during the 1870s, Jonathan Sarna sees in the group that coalesced around the Philadelphia Jewish “Y” a cadre of defenders of the Jewish religion and its ritual observances.63 It is noteworthy that all of these activists were students, congregants, or disciples of Morais. The knew him from Mikveh Israel, from the Jewish Foster Home and Hebrew Sunday School, from the Hebrew Education Society (a kind of “Hebrew high school”), from Maimonides College, from his involvement as a sponsor and mentor at their literary associations, and from private classes and discussions held at Morais’s home. In practice, Morais’s home functioned as an informal private school and salon where students and friends regularly gathered for study and discussion.64 Cyrus Adler, one of Morais’s students and a future president of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, reflecting on this aspect of Morais’s role as an educator, wrote: “It is true that when he saw the absolute necessity, he established the [Jewish Theological Seminary], but in Philadelphia, in his own house, with his own books, and at all hours, he taught all that would come.”65 Indeed, Morais’s final hours before his death in November of 1897 reportedly were spent at his home with two of his students, Gerson Levy and Isaac Husik (later to become a respected scholar of medieval Jewish philosophy), reading and discussing with them the poetry of Judah Halevi.66

This circle of young Jewish intellectuals later established, according to documents discovered by Sarna, a secret covenant “for God and Judaism” that they called Keyam Dishmaya.67 They pledged to restore pride in Jewish traditions and specifically to revive the importance of observing Jewish holidays. In the late 1870s, sometime after the founding of the YMHA, these Philadelphians set about organizing the “Grand Revival of the Jewish National Holiday of Chanucka.”68 In this period, tellingly, Jews were experiencing new external threats, such as conversionist pressures, social discrimination, and incidents of exclusion such as the notorious Seligman Affair of 1877.69 This and other anti-Jewish, discriminatory incidents, including that which occurred at Manhattan Beach on Coney Island in 1879, instilled a new sense of foreboding and anxiety among Jews in America. If the stated intention of the Hanukkah pageant was to affirm ethnic pride and religious observance, it took place against a backdrop of new and disturbing hostilities toward Jews as a group.70

In turning to the festival of Hanukkah, a minor holiday in the traditional Jewish calendar, these activists also were highlighting a historical event that Morais had repeatedly emphasized in his pulpit sermons and public addresses as a symbol of Jewish national consciousness, an episode during which Jews had willingly endured martyrdom in defense of their faith.71 The pageant was thus not simply an attempt to focus Jewish attention away from the temptations and distractions of Christmas. The event also positively celebrated a tradition of duty and sacrifice, affirmed the group identity of the Jews as a nation, and utilized the contemporary means of street pageantry to communicate these messages, all in defiance of a climate of increasing religious and ethnic intolerance.72

Morais and his students invested a large portion of their time and energies in strengthening and focusing Jewish communal life through these various forms of extrasynagogal social, educational, and cultural activities. It was the distinctively Sephardi cultural and religious outlook of Morais and the young activists he inspired that most sharply distinguished them from the Reform leadership and their students, centered in Cincinnati. Refusing to become a passive benchmark against which all modern Jewish experiences of reform or assimilation were measured, Morais and his circle defended a traditional, observant, and culturally open alternative to the confessional, denationalized “American Judaism” of Jewish Reform.

**Polemics**

In response to the various challenges he faced, Morais frequently found himself engaged in polemical exchanges in the local and national press. In his polemical pieces, Morais adopted a style of discourse similar to what Ernst Curtius has called “affected modesty.”73 In this humanist rhetorical
Morais, then thirty-one, took issue with Wise’s History of the Israelite Nation, which tried to “explain naturally, what is supernatural,” to allegorize various biblical passages concerning miracles, for distorting, according to Morais, the literal and grammatical meaning of the biblical text, and perhaps most grievously in his eyes, for misrepresenting medieval and early modern Sephardi commentators on the Bible, such as Abraham ibn Ezra and Isaac Abrabanel.

In a polemical exchange published in the Philadelphia Sunday Dispatch in February 1859, Morais responded to various Reformers’ attempts to eliminate or allegorize Jewish ritual observances. In the course of his argument, Morais elaborated on his understanding of mitzvot as an instrument of Jewish national survival for which Jews throughout their history had been willing to suffer martyrdom. In support of his view he cited rabbinic sources, such as Pirque Avot, and Sephardi philosophers such as Judah Halevi and David Nieto. “The supreme object of [the Jewish people’s] existence,” he explained, is the “glory of God.” What was ultimately at stake, Morais argued, was God’s reputation on earth: “Let all thy actions aim at the sanctification of the Deity.” The phrase “sanctification of the Deity,” of course, is a figure of speech that in Hebrew also refers to the ultimate worship of God through martyrdom (qiddush ha-shem). Morais, in fact, explicitly connected the two ideas, by recalling how Jewish “religious observances have preserved our nationality, what the Maccabees gallantly staked their lives for, and what our progenitors have ever fulfilled despite the bloody mandates of an Antiochus and the boiling cauldron of the Spanish Inquisition.”

Three decades later, during the 1880s, as the battle between the Reformers and the enlightened orthodox camp intensified, Morais refused to change the long-standing tone and style of his polemics. Responding to one of the many highly personal attacks that characterized this dispute, Morais declared: “my aim is not animadversion. I look not through the jaundiced spectacles of fanaticism, and harp on every sentiment that may differ from the accepted notions of Israel’s faith; for although I can understand lo kol ha-de’ot shaveh, ‘all opinions are not alike [equal],’ and as we have never been enjoined to believe blindly, so I would deem it a sinful presumption to cast obloquy on any man whose religious principles conflict with those established.” Over the course of his nearly five-decade ministry in America, despite his apparent flexibility on various ritual questions, Morais remained consistent in his commitment to his Sephardi rabbinic humanist heritage, to the obligations and purposes he detected behind ritual observance, and to the enlightened moral-theological message he saw inscribed in the books of Moses.

Translation

Morais also introduced his Sephardi rabbinic humanist heritage to his students through translation. The legacy of the Jewish experience in Muslim Spain and Renaissance Italy again occupied a paradigmatic place in his thinking. In fact, Morais once drew upon the image of a medieval Sephardi Jewish translator to make his point. Writing about Hasdai ibn Shaprut, the tenth-century minister to the successive courts of Abd al-Rahmān III and his son Al-Hakam II in Muslim Spain, Morais held up the circumstances of his rise to power “as an exemplification of the advantages derived from (secular) knowledge.” Morais then recounted the story of how the only
man able to translate from Greek into Arabic a rare copy of a medical treatise on pharmacology (by Dioscorides), sent as a gift by the Byzantine emperor, Constantine VII, to the Cordovan caliph, “was the Jew, Hasdai ben Isaac [Shaprut].”80 Subsequently, through the influence Ibn Shaprut gained by his talents, “the refining agencies of science and literature were set to work,” Morais explained. Ibn Shaprut’s knowledge of nonsacred subjects not only brought him favor with the Cordovan ruler, Morais writes, but it also “gained for him the power which he used to the noblest ends.”81

Through his translations of Sephardi and Italian-Jewish texts into English, Morais himself served as a conduit, transferring Jewish learning “from east to west,” from Europe to America. Significantly, Morais’s translations were often directly related to his practical work as an educator. In the fall of 1872, shortly before the closing of Maimonides College, where Morais held the position of “Professor of the Bible and Biblical Literature,”82 he published a serialized English rendering of Samuel David Luzzatto’s “Lessons in Jewish Moral Theology,” in the Philadelphia Jewish Index, a newspaper edited by two of his students.83 After the closing of the college, and consequently the Jewish Index, Morais turned to the Philadelphia Jewish Record, founded in 1875 by Alfred T. Jones, to continue disseminating translations of Luzzatto’s works, including his autobiography, and other highlights of Italian Jewish literature.84 At the Young Men’s Hebrew Association as well as at the Jewish Theological Seminary, Morais delivered numerous lectures on medieval Sephardi and Italian Jewish literature, and published translations of these texts in the journals associated with these institutions.85 He and his students produced the first translations into English of a numbers of works of medieval Hebrew poetry and philosophy.86 Morais’s daughter Nina, knowledgeable in French, Italian, and Hebrew, completed her father’s translation of the Book of Jeremiah for the Jewish Publication Society after his death.87 Solomon Solis-Cohen, another Morais disciple, produced the first English translations of medieval Hebrew poetry dating from the golden age of Spanish Jewry.88 The content of the poems selected for translation suggests that Morais and his students turned to the act of translation as a means to educate Jews and to defend Judaism. They sought to counter the allure of crude materialism, religious reform, evangelical revivals, and other challenges to Jewish tradition and identity as they understood them. Cultivating linguistic competency in the multiplicity of Jewish languages and sources was the linchpin of Morais’s pedagogical program. Through the practice of translation Morais weaved together and inculcated among his students his Sephardi rabbinc humanist views about politics, religion, and moral conduct.

These acts of translation not only served to defend Judaism against the looming threats to it that Morais perceived, but also functioned as a Jewish version of religious-cultural refinement in the vernacular language of America. By utilizing English translations to disseminate enlightened Jewish religiosity based on Sephardi and Italian sources, Morais introduced a strand of Jewish classicism into Victorian Jewish culture. His translations paralleled the simultaneous rise of classical and Renaissance translations in the Anglo-American literary world. The study of these venerated traditions of learning, and the emulation of their models of honor and virtue, was a key activity for members of the rapidly expanding middle classes of the nineteenth century who sought refinement, or at least its outward veneer. Classical motifs and values were widely reproduced in the poetry, literature, history-writing, architecture, and home furnishings of the Victorian milieu. The city of Philadelphia, for example, publicly embraced classical architecture in its buildings, landscapes, and monuments, while Philadelphians adopted modes of dress and purchased furniture and interior home decorations that reflected this anxious culture of refinement. American Jews entering and undergoing upward mobility in this English-speaking environment were caught up in these same cultural trends, and their poetry, novellas, travel essays, and translations, as exemplified by the work of Morais and others, reflect the impact of Anglo-Victorian culture on the world of Jewish letters. Morais’s enlightened orthodoxy amounted to a refined version of the vita activa in religion and politics, as well as in the emergent Atlantic Jewish “republic of letters” of the nineteenth century.89

Translation also served for Morais and his circle as a vehicle for Jewish acculturation in an English-speaking environment. In his own writings, Morais’s choice of words was often founded on a precise vocabulary translated from other languages. He sometimes used specific terms in English that derived from his Livornese Jewish upbringing to convey basic concepts and ideas. The word abnegation is perhaps the most vivid example of a word infrequently used in English, but much used by Morais.89 This term translated the Italian abnegazione—a word carrying several nuanced layers of religious and political meaning, connoting duty, sacrifice, service, and humility. In America, Morais often used this word to define and inspire attachment to enlightened orthodox Judaism. For example, in a sermon delivered in December of 1887, on the eve of the opening of the Jewish Theological Seminary, Morais declared that the Maccabees’ “abnegation—
the regard for duty before life”—ought to be taken as a model for all Jews to follow. The memory of the martyrs’ willingness to die for their faith, Morais hoped, would inspire all Jews to observe “the sabbath of the Decalogue, the covenant of Abraham and the dietary laws.” ³⁹³ Thirty-six years after coming to America, Morais still resorted to this distinctly un-English term to capture the essential difference between what he believed in and the laxity of ritual observance he opposed.

Central to the mission of the early Jewish Theological Seminary was the cultivation of religious ideals in accordance with Morais’s views about humility and abnegation. Morais, in fact, stated that the principle of humility was to be the basis of the proposed institution in a Sabbath sermon he delivered at Congregation Shearith Israel in New York City on January 30, 1886, the day before the founding of the seminary. “The basis of [the seminary],” Morais declared, “shall be humility, not hostility, its sustaining pillars, steadfastness of purpose and fealty to ancestral traditions, not boastfulness and vainglory.” ³⁹² Continuing throughout 1886 on an almost weekly basis while he rallied financial support for the seminary, Morais delivered a series of lectures on the Sephardi Jewish experience, focusing on the biographies of leading rabbis from the golden age of Jewish life in Spain and from his native Italy. ³⁹³ These lectures cumulatively amounted to the formulation of a pantheon of rabbis for study and imitation. When taken as a whole and in the context of the reason for their delivery, these documents provide a clear vision of the ideals according to which Morais believed enlightened orthodox American rabbis should be trained. In these lectures Morais repeatedly stressed the importance of character formation and humility as guiding principles. These words were in no sense empty rhetorical gestures, but referred to a specific group of idealized Sephardi and Italian Jewish historical examples for imitation. During the foundation of the Jewish Theological Seminary, as he had done throughout his career, Morais repeatedly returned, as minister, teacher, public speaker, writer, and translator, to the ideals of Sephardi and Italian Jewry he programmatically introduced in 1851.

What, then, was meant by the term “enlightened orthodoxy”? For Morais, the Sephardi heritage offered one answer to the question of how to be a truly enlightened and believing citizen. It was, in his eyes a harmonious model that combined openness to general cultural trends—poetry, science, and reason, as well as to universal social justice—with devout adherence to particular revealed religious doctrines and practices. In politics, as in religion, Morais exhorted each individual to abnegate the self in the service of a greater public purpose, rather than to retreat from the collective to the private interests of the individual. The radical character of Morais’s republican politics paralleled, ironically, a very conservative understanding of the submission of the self before God and the authority of tradition. This harmonization was possible, he believed, only because Enlightenment and Orthodoxy complemented rather than opposed each other.

This paradigm also suited the nineteenth-century Victorian culture of refinement in which Morais lived. Enlightened orthodox Judaism, qua Sephardi rabbinic humanism, functioned as a model of Victorian classicism in Jewish terms during a period of intensive upward mobility. Translation, in particular, served as a vehicle by which Jews could become “respectable” on their own terms. By means of translations, they gained access to their own refined models of ancient wisdom and classical learning in the vernacular of their new homeland, and thus also were able to popularize Jewish classics among non-Jews. Morais disseminated the Sephardi legacy in particular in order to remind his Jewish contemporaries of their heroic religious traditions of martyrdom, duty, and sacrifice, and thus to inspire Jews in America to remain ritually observant and communally steadfast against the threats that faced them. Throughout his ministry, indeed, including the very last day of his life, Morais promoted a Sephardi version of Haskalah modeled upon imagined golden ages of the past, in order to shape and secure future Jewish life in the hopefully promised land of America.
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