

Zeitschrift:	Judaica : Beiträge zum Verstehen des Judentums
Herausgeber:	Zürcher Institut für interreligiösen Dialog
Band:	74 (2018)
Artikel:	The Yishuv of history vs. the Yishuv of revelation : Jacob Rosenheim's 1934 response to Isaac Breuer
Autor:	Greenberg, Gershon
DOI:	https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-960602

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 05.02.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

disharmony between studying the Talmud at home or in the yeshiva of his father and between learning in the *Realschule* established by S. R. Hirsch.

Professor Mordechai Breuer, Isaac Breuer's son, explains in his recording of the Passover *Seder* Night,⁴⁵ that his father continued to celebrate the re-telling of the Exodus at the festive meal according to the Hungarian rite that he knew from his father, Salomon Breuer. Isaac Breuer's socialization in the Hungarian rabbinic tradition is the foundation of his theory of Jewish peoplehood in the 20th century. However, what he could not achieve to materialize on a national level (creating a new Jewish people), he fulfilled in his own family.

The Yishuv of History vs. The Yishuv of Revelation: Jacob Rosenheim's 1934 Response to Isaac Breuer

By *Gershon Greenberg**

In October 1933, Orthodox leaders in Germany sent a memorandum to Chancellor of the Reich Hitler. It cited the religious oppression of Jews and their economic persecution, which was leading to starvation. The signatories, which included Breuer and Agudat Yisrael World President Jacob Rosenheim, suspected that the national government "knowingly had an eye" to "das Ziel der Vernichtung der deutschen Judentums," and that the NSDAP's *Reichsleitung* was after the *Ausmerzung* (elimination) of German Judaism from the German *Volk*.¹ In an apologetic tone, they explained that Jews did not constitute their own *Blutgemeinschaft*, such as to compromise, they implied, a German *Blutgemeinschaft*. Indeed, Jews loved the German

45 National Library of Israel, Nr. CD 5118.

* *Gershon Greenberg*, Department of Philosophy and Religion, American University, Washington D.C. 20016 USA. This text is based on a paper read at an international conference "Isaac Breuer – Studies in his Thought" at Bar Ilan University, 6 June 2017.

1 *Denkschrift an den Herrn Reichskanzler*. Held by the Agudas Israel Organization in London. I am grateful to Yehudah Ben Avner of Bar Ilan University for sharing it with me. According to Morgenstern, the memorandum reflected Breuer's mind-set. MATTHIAS MORGENSTERN, *Von Frankfurt nach Jerusalem: Isaac Breuer und die Geschichte des "Austrittsstreits" in der deutsch-jüdischen Orthodoxie*, Tuebingen 1995, p. 276.

Volk and the German sun. German culture was a part of their very spiritual existence. On behalf of the Orthodox Jews of Germany, the signatories offered to confine themselves to marginalized presence in the land, as long as they could still “exercise their religion and pursue their professions unimperiled and unreviled.” In effect, and from the larger historical perspective, the authors volunteered the return of German Jewry to pre-Emancipation ghetto confinement.²

In early 1934 Breuer left for his second journey to the Land of Israel, and on 15 June 1935, along with Rosenheim, he delivered an address about Jewish settlement in Palestine. Against the background described in the memorandum, the choice to settle could be a matter of life or death. Breuer articulated a triadic inter-relationship between nation, *Torah* and land, with historical activity at the center.

In a 25 April 1934 address published in *Nachlat Z’wi* entitled “Erez Yisroel,” Breuer described his early 1934 experience in Palestine, and did so in glowing terms. It was no longer desolate (see Leviticus 26: 32); the changes underway were, indeed, without comparison in history. The land was entering a new historical period of life, one filled with hope for the future. There were also positive signs for universal alliance: 1) The constitutional support by the League of Nations for the British Mandate reflected fraternity and peace. 2) The greatest world-power, England, had assumed responsibility for administering the area. 3) The Jewish people, a race of humans dispersed across the globe, constituted what was perhaps the greatest world community. As with any historical development, all these should be viewed in terms of a synthesis between freedom of the human will and the divine shaping of history. The historical event of new life in the land, attributable to the idea of Zionism, depended upon the God of history; the historical reverberations of Theodor Herzl’s efforts and the *Balfour Declaration* were providential. God and history correlated dialectically.

As to tensions between Orthodoxy and Zionism: Orthodoxy opposed Zionism, for separating the Jewish people from the sovereignty of *Torah*. Of course, the land had to be conquered by *Torah*. But Zionism was still a Jewish movement, pursuing Jewish life in the popular, national sense – and

2 *Denkschrift an den Herrn Reichskanzler*. Signatories included M. Schlesinger (Halberstadt) and E. Munk (Berlin), representing the Reichsbund gesetzentreuer Synagogengemeinden (Halberstadt). S. Ehrmann and J. Breuer, representing the Freie Vereinigung für die Interessen des orthodoxen Judentums e.V. in Frankfurt am Main; M. Auerbach (Berlin) and J. Rosenheim (Frankfurt am Main), representing the Landesorganisation der Agudas Jisroel in Deutschland, Berlin.

Orthodoxy should recognize it as an instrument for helping to build Jerusalem. Orthodoxy had to do more than fight Zionism and erect a wall to protect the old *Yishuv*. For its part, Agudat Yisrael should invest itself in current historical realities – lest the unprecedented, powerful historical constellation disappear.³

In his 15 June 1934 address, Breuer elaborated upon the synthesis. God's thoughts about creation were transcendental and metaphysical. Creation was realized by means of human freedom, and this took place when human thought became concretized through historical powers. Judaism's innermost existence, Breuer held, was not a matter of religion, but of history. Zionism - albeit a one-time historical phenomenon - was the instrument, under providence, for leading the Jewish nation of *Torah* back to historical grounding, for bringing *Torah* and history together. The current persecution of Jews around the world was both a warning to strengthen loyalty to *Torah*-law a thousand-fold, and an urgent call of providence for return to Jewish history. Breuer admonished Jews to become conscious of Israel's historical meaning, and return to the ground of history.

Breuer identified the 1917 *Balfour Declaration* as a *Shofar*-like call from heaven, for the people of Israel to break out of the diaspora (the *Teki'ah* sound, signalling *Aufbruch*); to break forth (the *Teru'ah*, signalling *Abbruch*); and into the homeland (the *Teki'ah gedolah*, signaling *Einbruch*). Pure Zionists, those for whom Zionism and *Torah*, human history and providence came together, were responding by seeking to establish a theocracy (*Gottesstaat*) and concretizing metaphysical thought into historically-grounded messianic redemption. Breuer rejected the efforts of solely political Zionists, the Revisionists and the *Histadrut ha'ovdim*, who separated between nation and theocracy and who wanted a state in which *Torah* was secularized to a level devoid of religion. While convinced that political Zionism would eventually disappear by itself, *Torah*-true Jews could not merely stand by until messianic reality took hold. They had to be proactive, by reunifying the people under the sovereignty of *Torah*, and usher history into redemption.⁴

3 ISAAC BREUER, “Erez Jisroel. Rede, gehalten am 10. Ijar 5694,” in: *Nachlat Z’wi* 4 nos. 9-10 (June – July 1934), pp. 166-168. See RIVKAH HOROWITZ, “Exile and Redemption in the Thought of Isaac Breuer,” in: *Tradition* 26 no. 2 (1992), pp. 77-78. On his 1933 visit see ISAAC BREUER, “Zu Hause,” in: ISAAC BREUER, *Mein Weg*, Jerusalem / Zürich 1988, pp. 149-150. I am grateful to Michael Brenner for drawing my attention to this text.

4 ISAAC BREUER, “Referat gehalten am 1. Siwan 5694 (15 June 1934),” in *Erez Jisroel und die Orthodoxie. Zwei Referate gehalten von Isaac Breuer und Jacob Rosenheim*, Frankfurt am Main 1934, pp. 6-7.

In sum, for Breuer, history synthesized God's transcendental thoughts on the metaphysical plane, with concrete realization of human freedom. In turn, Zionism under divine providence sought to provide historical grounding to *Torah*. The ultimate goal of the process was to establish a theocracy and thereby guide history into redemption.

In his summer 1934 essay, “*Zurück in die Geschichte*,” Breuer offered context in terms of returning from exile. The Jewish nation was, essentially, an historical phenomenon, and its historical activity lasted until the Jewish center and state in the ancient land were lost. Despite the dispersion and ongoing suffering, the people adhered to their uniqueness – as defined by the prophets. Following Emancipation, new antisemitism, World War I, the *Balfour Declaration* and prosperity in Palestine, they looked back upon their convulsive past, and looked forward into the future to follow God's call and return to a history of their own. Collective consciousness of past destruction yielded a feeling for a national future committed to God, *Torah* and historically-tied efforts to build a national home. The return to history, Breuer warned, must not be for a place of *Hillul hashem*, alien to *Torah*, but a *Torah*-home in God's land, blessed with the *Kiddush hashem* promised by the prophets. The return would combine present life with national past and national future, with consciousness that all of exile was in fact a path of return to the land of God.⁵

Rosenheim's Religious Weltanschauung

For Breuer, historical activity was at the center of a triadic inter-relationship between nation, *Torah* and the land. For Rosenheim, the revealed command to settle the land, *Mitsvat yishuv ha'arets*, was at the center of a triad of nation, history and land. The context was his religious *Weltanschauung*, of a concentrically-structured cosmos. The outer sphere consisted of macrocosmic, metaphysical entities of God's *Kedushah* (holiness) and *Kavod* (glory). God's essence, which was transcendental, eternal, spiritual and holy, acted as a centripetal force which drew all existence towards itself. God's glory was His revelation, and it acted as a centrifugal force through which *Kedushah* flowed into the cosmos.

The metaphysical entities of *Kedushah* and *Kavod* surrounded the microcosmic realms of living organisms, collective humankind, and the people of Israel – all of which emerged from transcendental unity and immanent multiplicity. The implicit tension between centripetal *Kadosh* and centrifugal

5 ISAAC BREUER, “*Zurück in die Geschichte*,” in: *Nachlat Z'mi' 4* nos 9-10 (June–July 1934), pp. 228-236.

Kavod were to be resolved through the process of world history. Specifically, humanity was to apply God's will in history – whereby His centralizing will have impressed itself upon the centrifugal varieties of existence. For its part, the goal of humanity was to be free of the overwhelming power of materiality; to become holy – whereby an inner, divine spark submitted to God the creator.

The people of Israel were located at an interstice between transcendental unity (*Kadosh*) and space-time immanence (*Kadosh-Kavod*). As such, for Rosenheim, they constituted the central organism of humankind, and they acted as a crucible between centripetal (unifying) and centrifugal (variegating) forces. As the people of the *Torah*, they were the unique source for the realities of *Kadosh* and *Kavod*. *Torah* existed before creation. It became available at Mt. Sinai and the Jewish people were to expand it across the globe until all humanity centered around it and God and transformed the world into *Malkhut shamayim*. Each Jew was a “cell” in the “living organism” of the nation, called to ascend to God in spirit, while the people as a whole were called to transcend materiality, with its blood and race, for a spiritual life of freedom, consciousness and thought. They were to utilize the *Mitsvot* of *Torah*, which distilled *Kadosh* and *Kadosh-Kavod* realities, to bring about the kingdom of God on earth. *Mitsvat yishuv ha'arets* had unique weight – balancing out all others, together. Founded in Kattowitz in 1912, Agudat Yisrael provided structure for Israel to carry out its mandate to bring about God's kingdom. It strove to gather the people of Israel around their *Torah* center (their “*Heimat*”); to draw the individual “cells” of the “body” of Jewry together – strengthening the weak, sanctifying life, and enhancing divine rule on earth.⁶

The Land of Israel, according to Rosenheim's description, was the scene of divine revelation and the abode of God's *Shekhinah* – which went into exile with the people and would return with them when exile ended. The

6 JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Aphorismen zur Grundlegung der jüdischen Ethik im Geiste S. R. Hirschs (June 1908),” in: JACOB ROSENHEIM, *Ohalei Ya’akov: Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Ansprachen*, vol. I, Frankfurt am Main 1930, pp. 29-40. JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Agudas Jisroel als Aufgabe und Verwirklichung (September 1923),” in: ROSENHEIM, *Ohalei Ya’akov*, vol. II, pp. 217-235. JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Der agudistische Einheitsgedanke, Elul 5689,” in: ROSENHEIM, *Ohalei Ya’akov*, vol. I, pp. 308-320. JACOB ROSENHEIM, *Agudas Israel Faces the World Scene: Foreign Policy of Agudas Israel World Organization, January 5, 1947*, New York 1947. JACOB ROSENHEIM, *Agudist World Problems*, New York 1941. JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Was will Agudat Jisroel?” (May 1912), in: ROSENHEIM, *Ohalei Ya’akov*, vol. II, pp. 164-173.

land was to concretize the *Torah*-centered organism of Israel and serve as territorial mid-point for humanity as an organism instilled with *Torah*. Insofar as restoration of the land brought *Torah* and history together, it would pave the path to redemption.⁷ *Mitsvat yishuv ha'arets* mandated all Jews to settle in the land - barring life-endangerment, absence of means of self-support, or of *Torah* education and marriage according to *Torah*. The Agudah had the responsibility to enforce *Yishuv* in terms of *Mitsvah* and according to the *Mitsvot* of *Torah* – lest the land become desecrated and redemption be indefinitely postponed.⁸

At present, the Land of Israel was at the crossroads, between the path of Abraham and the path of Nimrod. The path of Abraham belonged to the sovereignty of the kingdom of heaven; it was taken by a people unified under God and ruled by divinely-determined law. The Nimrodic nations of history, by contrast - led by the likes of Genghis Khan, Napoleon, and now Hitler - had the single *raison d'être*, of self-preservation. This inevitably engendered jealousy and fear. As the Indian philosopher Rabindranath Tagore described – Rosenheim recalled – the situation was akin to one in which gaseous particles which were forced into too narrow a space and had to explode. Political Zionism was Nimrod-like, and degraded the Jewish nation into one like all others. It sought sovereignty at the cost of the brotherhood of humanity, and its motives were materialistic. Solely a movement to liberate Jews in Europe from racism, chauvinism and economic misery, political Zionism was devoid of spiritual and religious motives and the land's ingredients of *Torah*, *Shekhinah* and prophecy.⁹ In 1932, Rosenheim spoke of the inevitability of a struggle in the land between *Torah*-true Jews and the “other realm” (*Sitra abra*) – namely Nimrodic political Zionism.¹⁰

7 JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Vorfragen und Grundprobleme der agudistische Politik,” (December 1928), in: ROSENHEIM, *Ohalei Ya'akov*, vol. II, pp. 270-302.

8 JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Vom Sinn der Mizwas Jischuw Erez Jisroel,” in: *Der Israelit* 73 no. 15 (7 April 1931), pp. 1-2. JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Grundzüge einer Erez Jisroel-Politik der Agudas Jisroel” (March 1920), in: ROSENHEIM, *Ohalei Ya'akov*, vol. II, pp. 209-216.

9 JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Der Nationalismus Rabindranath Tagores,” in: *Der Israelit* 62 no. 26 (30 June 1925), pp. 1-2. JACOB ROSENHEIM, *Agudas Israel Faces the World Scene: Foreign Policy of Agudas Israel World Organization, January 5, 1947*, New York 1947. JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Von Klatzkin zu Breuer” (1919), in: ROSENHEIM, *Ohalei Ya'akov*, vol. I, pp. 94-103.

10 JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Erez Jisroel-Problematik,” in: *Der Israelit* 73 no. 13 (March 24, 1932), pp. 1-2.

Rosenheim's *Korreferat*

Later during the day, 15 June 1934, following Breuer, Rosenheim described political-secular Zionism as an artificially constructed phenomenon which was alien to *Torah*. The “*Shofar* call” (as per Breuer) of the Zionist *Balfour Declaration* released an autonomous cultural mind-set, an idolatrous intellectualism and all-encompassing scientific rationality – in sum, a *Sitra ahra* out to overwhelm the land as a sanctuary for divine will and revealed law. To be sure, historical factors tied to the *Declaration* hinted at divine direction – namely closing the doors of Europe to Jews and opening the door of Palestine. But to emphasize its historical importance, as did Breuer, was misguided. “Historical constellations” (Breuer’s term) were disastrously inconsistent and historical experiences were ambiguous. That is, God and history did not correlate dialectically. History was significant solely as a reflection of God. Accordingly, the *Declaration* had value only in terms of *Mitsvat yishuv erets yisrael*, which by itself balanced out all other *Mitsvot*. Settlement in the land in terms of *Mitsvah* sanctified the soul in union with God, contributed to *Torah*’s rightful dominion (*Herrschaft*), and advanced the coming of the messiah. Agudat Yisrael had to take action, Rosenheim declared, to oppose the degradation of the land into a Zionist stage for solely economic intellectual, and cultural achievement. It had to work in the name of the unique ‘*Am segulah* of Israel, which instrumentalized divine rule. Namely, strive to fully implement *Mitsvat yishuv ha’arets* – blending God, nation and the *Shekhinah*’s sacred grounding together.¹¹

A few weeks later, writing in *Der Israelit*, Rosenheim explained that the *Balfour Declaration* had to be seen as something more than a national answer to the “Jewish question” or as a challenge of materialistic nature – such as draining the swamps. It was instead to be seen as a call in advance by the divine guide of generations (*Kore hadorot mirosh*) for *Mitsvat yishuv erets yisrael* in the face of demonically-driven efforts to profane the land. No matter how overwhelming (*vorüberrauschende*) any historical event may appear to be, *Torah* revelation remained the source of truth.¹²

That is, Rosenheim all but emptied historical events of independent meaning: they had value solely as a function of *Torah*. Breuer, by contrast, thought in terms of mutuality. While Zionism was reprobate for separating the nation from *Torah*, it was Jewish in a national sense and served as an

11 JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Korreferat, gehalten am Rosch Chodesch Siwan 5694 in Saalbau zu Frankfurt am Main.,” in: *Erez Jisrael und die Orthodoxie*, pp. 17-31.

12 JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Fehlt es der Orthodoxie am Glauben?” in: *Der Israelit* 75 no. 33 (August 1934), pp. 1, 3-4.

instrument for building Jerusalem. Judaism was essentially an historical process, and Zionism was the means for finding historical grounding for the *Torah*-nation. For Rosenheim, the people of Israel were drawn from *Kadosh* and *Kadosh-Kavod*, and Judaism's essence was *Torah*-revelation. The relationship between *Torah* and Zionism was not mutual. Zionism was an historical phenomenon, a composite of artificially constructed moments – inconsistent and ambiguous. The essence of *Torah* was transcendental.

A Decade Later

The contrast between Breuer's historically and autonomously-validated, *a posteriori*-like disposition and Rosenheim's trans-historical, revelational, heteronomous and *a-priori*-like disposition, re-surfaced in 1944. For Breuer, the people of *Torah* were an historical phenomenon, one with the unique historical mission of uniting nation with the land of *Torah* for a state of *Torah*. In *Moriyah* (1944) he criticized Agudat Yisrael for failing to appreciate that the *Balfour Declaration* (1917) and the British Mandate (1922) were assigned by God. It was not as if – as the Agudah (read: Rosenheim) might have it – it was assigned by Satan. Indeed, the *Declaration* marked a transition from metahistorical *Torah* nation to a nation of history returning to its land – a matter of indifference, it seemed, for the Agudah. He accused the Agudah of failing to comprehend the “Palestine update”: WWI was an historical turning point (*Mifneh histori*) which called for Orthodox Jews to make material sacrifice to settle the land. In sum: Historical events and historical process (led by Zionism), while under God, were to lead the way of Israel.¹³

13 ISAAC BREUER, *Moriyah: Yesodot habinukh haleumi hatorani*, Jerusalem 1945, *passim*. Breuer provided a lengthy appraisal of Rosenheim's work with the Agudah in: BREUER, *Mein Weg* (note 3), pp.127-144. In that same work he was explicit about his difference with Rosenheim when it came to valuing history. For example: “[Rosenheim] entlädt nicht das Zeitengewölk, sondern versucht ihm in die Zeitlosigkeit zu entfliehen oder in vom Zeitengewölk bedeckte und von ihm verdunkelte Einzel- und Gelegenheitsaufgaben, deren letzte Bedeutung im Zeittengeschehen darum nicht erkannt wird. Denn ihn fehlt der geschichtlichen Sinn...Erstaunlich genug, was dieser Self-made-man schliesslich aus sich gemacht hat. Der geschichtliche Sinn blieb unentwickelt...Oft hat Rosenheim, wenn die Hülse sich nicht recht entwickeln wollte, geseufzt: ‘Die Zeit ist für die ‘Idee’ der Aguda noch nicht reif.’ Ich fürchte, er irrte sich. Er war für die Zeit nicht reif.” (BREUER, *Mein Weg* [note 3], pp. 133, 135, 138).

As to himself, Breuer wrote: “Mein Agudismus ruft ganz und gar in die Geschichte, indem er die Wurzellosigkeit der Gegenwart aufweist und betont.” (BREUER, *Mein Weg* [note 3], p. 135).

Rosenheim did not consider Zionism as an historical process with value as the instrument of *Torah* Judaism for building Jerusalem. To the contrary, it veered towards Nimrodic metahistory which could undermine *Mitsvat yishuv ha'arets*. He looked to Agudat Yisrael, representing the *Torah*-ensouled people, to “bridge over the Nazi abyss,” which was a *Tohu vavohu* explosion of Nimrodism, “to a beautiful future.”¹⁴ Rosenheim was also convinced, that Nimrod-like Zionism’s quest for sovereignty would sooner or later disappear – based as it was on a democratic state rather than on Judaism’s thirteen principles of faith.¹⁵

Responding to Breuer in July 1944, Rosenheim affirmed that the Agudah had not been enamoured with the *Declaration*, focused as it was on a national home instead of on a *Torah*-state (*Medinat hatorah*). Nor did its text reflect the absolutist and universalistic dimension of *Torah*. The *Declaration* did provide opportunity to activate large Jewish settlement for bringing the *Torah*-spirit into the land, for the first time since Temple destruction, and for establishing an independent Jewish public which could rescue the holy land for its sacred destiny. But for the Agudah, the immediate sanctification by *Torah* was “a matter of life and death.” Moreover, Agudah’s overriding mission was to revive the spirit of *Torah* which was throbbing within the nation – and this applied to Jews everywhere in the world, not only in the Land of Israel.¹⁶

To Conclude

Breuer and Rosenheim had much in common, as they turned to the land of Israel in the wake of threats to Jewish existence in Germany – which they had voiced in the 1933 memorandum. For both, nation, *Torah* and land were interrelated. But while for Breuer historical process led by Zionism was the means for implementing the triad, for Rosenheim it was *Torah*-revelation – *Mitsvat yishuv ha'arets* in particular.

14 JACOB ROSENHEIM, “*Labat baherev hamithapekhet*,” in: *Kol Yisrael* 22 no. 15 (31 December 1942), p. 2. JACOB ROSENHEIM, “*Bein ye'ush vetikvah*,” in: *Kol Yisrael* 24 no. 28 (19 April 1945), p. 2. JACOB ROSENHEIM, “Agudat Yisrael in War-time,” in: *Jewish Weekly* 7 no. 384 (3 August 1943), p. 1.

15 JACOB ROSENHEIM, *Agudat World Problems*. JACOB ROSENHEIM, “*Agudat Yisrael bein galut vigeulah*,” in: *Kol Yisrael* 25 (7 March 1946), p 2.

16 JACOB ROSENHEIM, “*Medinat hatorah ha'arets-yisraelit*,” in: *Kol Yisrael* 23 no. 38 (6 July 1944): 3-4. The *Kol Yisrael* editor wrote that Rosenheim’s statement was in response to Breuer’s recent articles about *Agudat Yisrael* in the *New York Yidishe shtime* (source uncertain).

For Breuer, the *Shofar* of the *Balfour Declaration* set off a transition from the metahistorical people to the *Torah* nation of history. Accordingly, the moment had come to abandon exile for the land, with Zionism in the lead. Rosenheim would not be drawn away from revealed *Torah* by the forces of historical events. The *Torah* was the soul of the nation of Israel, as the centralizing organism of the metaphysical *Kadosh-Kavod* nexus. Historical events and process were to follow the lead of revelation, which now was concentrated around *Mitsvat yishuv ha'arets*. History became meaningful according to *Torah* – whereupon the historical process would be able to achieve its ultimate, messianic goal.¹⁷

Zukunftshoffnungen aus den Quellen des Judentums nach dem Ende des Ersten Weltkriegs: Isaac Breuers „Messiasspuren“ im Kontext

Von *Hans Martin Dober*

1. Die Erschütterung lebensweltlicher Vertrautheiten

Breuers *Messiasspuren* (1918)¹ lesen sich als ein flammendes Fanal des Diaspora-Judentums nach Neuorientierung. Worin aber besteht der Hoffnungsschimmer am Ende eines Krieges, der die bisherigen Erfahrungen Lügen strafte?² Breuer scheint zum einen die Tendenzen zu einem Welt-Völkerrecht im Blick zu haben, die sich angesichts dieser „Urkatastrophe“ hier und

17 On Rosenheim, see further GERSHON GREENBERG, “Sovereignty as Catastrophe: Jakob Rosenheim’s *Hurban Weltanschauung*,” in: *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 8 no. 2 (1994), pp. 202-224.

- 1 Zit. nach der Ausgabe von 1918 (Verlag Rudolf Leonhard Hammon KG, Frankfurt a. M.). Die Seitenzahlen der Werkausgabe sind nach dem Schrägstrich angegeben (I. BREUER, *Friühe religionsphilosophische Schriften* (Werkausgabe, Bd. I, hrsg. v. M. Morgenstern und M. Hildesheimer, Münster 2017, S. 341-358.). Die in Klammern gesetzten Seitenangaben im Text beziehen sich auf diese Ausgaben.
- 2 „So viel ist klar: die Erfahrung ist im Kurs gefallen und das in einer Generation, die 1914 – 18 eine der ungeheuersten Erfahrungen der Weltgeschichte gemacht hat. Vielleicht ist das nicht so merkwürdig wie das scheint. Konnte man damals nicht die Feststellung machen: die Leute kamen verstummt aus dem Felde? Nicht reicher, ärmer an mitteilbarer Erfahrung. Was sich dann zehn Jahre danach in der Flut der Kriegsbücher ergossen hat, war alles andere als Erfahrung, die vom Mund zum Ohr strömt. Nein, merkwürdig war das nicht. Denn nie