

***The Brothers Tugendhold & Jewish
Censorship in the Nineteenth Century:
Addition and Subtraction in the Warsaw 1853 Humash***

By: ELI GENAUER and DAN RABINOWITZ

In the Russian Empire, censorship of Jewish materials was enforced from the early 19th century until well into the modern period.¹ But it differed fundamentally from earlier examples of censorship of printed Hebrew books that began in Italy in the 16th century. Those were mainly instituted by the Catholic Church and were, in the main, focused on banning books and removing those passages that seemed to denigrate Christianity, its doctrines, or the Church.² These were codified by various indices, the most influential in *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk* by an apostate rabbi, Domenico Gerosolimitano or Yerushalmi (formerly Shmuel Vivas).³ By the 19th century in Russia, the center of power was no longer the Church but the government—the Tsar. Now, not only anti-religious passages fell under scrutiny, but also anti-government/monarchy and, the most significant change, those deemed to undermine secular governmental policy.

¹ For a discussion of the censorship of Jewish books in the USSR, see Arlen Viktorovich Blium, “‘The Jewish Question’ and Censorship in the USSR,” in *The Holocaust and the Book: Destruction and Preservation*, ed. Jonathan Rose (University of Massachusetts Press, 2001) 79-104.

² Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, *The Censor, the Editor, and the Text: The Catholic Church and the Shaping of the Jewish Canon in the Sixteenth Century*, trans. Jackie Feldman (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); William Popper, *The Censorship of Hebrew Books* (New York: Ktav Publishing, 1969). Non-Jewish books were also included in the indices.

³ For a detailed discussion and the complete text of *Sefer Ha-Zikkuk*, see Gila Prebor, “*Sefer Ha-Zikkuk shel Domenico Yerushalmi*,” *Italia* 18 (2008), 9-295. For a biography of Yerushalmi, see Gila Prebor, “*Me-Yerushalayim le-Venizyah: Hayyev shel Domenico Yerushalmi, Hiburav u-Peulotav ke-Cenzur*,” *Pe’amim* 111/112 (2007), 215-242. For a listing of the rules, see Raz-Krakotzkin, *Censor*, 121-23. That is not to say that these were followed in every instance. Rather, there is some inconsistency in the application even by Gerosolimitano himself. See Raz-Krakotzkin, *Censor*, 121.

Eli Genauer is a collector of antique *sefarim* with an emphasis on early printed editions of the Talmud.

Dan Rabinowitz is an attorney practicing in Washington, D.C.

One of the more celebrated examples of Russian censorship occurred in the early 20th century and dealt with a book published in the United States that was critical of Tsar Alexander III. Volume 1 of the *Jewish Encyclopedia* was published in 1901 in New York. The entry for Alexander III provides that “he permitted, and even encouraged the oppression of various foreign residents in Russia and was particularly harsh in his persecution of the Jews.” He is also accused of fostering “hostility against the Jews... in order to divert the attention from the discontented elements, and if possible to suppress” revolutionary elements.⁴ Two years later, volume 3 arrived and contains the entry “Censorship of Hebrew Books.” It discusses the history of censorship of Jewish books and includes a section on current censorship activities in Russia and uses that entry for Alexander III as an example. “The activity of the censor still continues in Russia, being exercised as late as 1901 on the first volume of the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, in which a passage relating to Alexander III was blotted out in copies admitted into the czar’s dominions.” An image of the page from volume 1 with the inked passages accompanies the text, perhaps to further poke the bear.

Censorship of all publications, Jewish and non-Jewish, in the Russian Empire was formalized by an 1826 statute and offices of censorship were established throughout the Russian Empire.⁵ In Poland it was a different story. Since the Partitions of Poland, the area was under the authority of the Russians, but at the same time Poland was permitted some autonomy. Its policies and history regarding the censorship of Hebrew books differed from the rest of empire until the late 1820s. In Poland, Jewish books were subject to censorship even before 1826. This, despite the fact that the 1815 Constitution of the Kingdom of Poland explicitly granted freedom of the press. Nonetheless, Jewish books were still required to be censored. The authorities justified this distinction because it was “well-accepted” that those books contain “the most pernicious teaching, and also such ideas as are in complete contradiction with the good intentions of the government.”⁶

⁴ Herman Rosenthal, in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901), vol. 1, 347.

⁵ Other laws regarding book censorship in the Russian Empire pre-dated this statute; however, the 1826 statute was the first to have a substantial effect on Jewish books. Regarding the censorship of non-Jewish books and in particular religious works, see David Edwards, “Russian Ecclesiastical Censorship during the Reign of Tsar Nicholas I,” *Journal of Church and State* 19, 1 (Winter 1991), 83-93.

⁶ Berl Weinryb, “Zur Geschichte des Buchdruckes und der Zensur bei den Juden in Polen,” *MGWJ* (1933), 279; Israel Zinberg, *A History of Jewish Litera-*

The Tugendhold Brothers

From the inception of the formal censorship laws in their respective jurisdictions, two brothers wielded the censors' pen and had a profound impact on Jewish books in the nineteenth century, holding these positions in the two most important cities for Hebrew book publishing, Vilna and Warsaw. These brothers, Jacob and Wolf Tugendhold, also affected Jewish life throughout Eastern Europe, defending Jews from anti-Semitic attacks, creating and fostering Jewish educational and communal institutions, spreading *haskalah*, and shaping governmental views of Hasidim. Because of these roles, the Tugendholds were among the most influential Jews in eastern Europe, although less obvious than others of similar influence.

According to a family tradition, their surname, Tugendhold, was bestowed upon them to memorialize an extraordinary act. One day their father, Isaiah, came upon a non-Jew drowning and immediately waded in and saved him. Emperor Joseph II was so impressed with this act of bravery that he decreed that Isaiah will bear the name Tugendhold, German for "the virtuous one."⁷ If this story is true, it portends the Tugendholds' subsequent biographies because in many ways their relationships with non-Jews most defined them.

Jacob was born in Dzailowsky, a town near Krakow, in 1794, and Wolf two years later.⁸ The brothers had a traditional Jewish education

ture: Volume XI: The Haskalah Movement in Russia, trans. Bernard Martin (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1978), 194-95.

⁷ Yitzhak Ya'akov Weisberg, "Biography of R. Yeshayahu Tugendhold," in *Divrei Yeshayah*, [5] n*. See also Ephraim Auerbach, "Kol Ha-Meqayem Nefesh Ahat ... Gilgulei shel Nusah, Tahpokhot Tsenzor ve-Eskei Madphesim," *Tarbiz* 1981, 280 n40 [reprinted in Ephraim Urbach, *Me-Olamim shel Hakhamim: Kovets Mebkharim* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2002), 573n40]. But Marcus Jastrow, who knew Jacob Tugendhold personally, in an article published in 1870, claims that the source of the Tugendhold name was unknown. Marcus Jastrow, "Bär Meisels, Oberrabbiner Zu Warschau: Ein Lebensbild auf historischem Hintergrunde, nach eigener Anschauung entworfen," *Hebrew Leader* 15/25 (1870) [English translation Marcus Jastrow, "Baer Meisels, Chief Rabbi," *The Maccabean* XI, 3 (Sept. 1906), 118].

⁸ Jacob's father provides a short biographical sketch of Jacob. See Tugendhold, *Divrei Yeshayah*, 78-81; and see also Hillel Noach Steinschneider, *Ir Vilna: Helek Shenî*, ed. Mordechai Zalkin (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2002), 104. Jacob's nephew also wrote a short biography. J. Nirnstein, ed., *Proverbia Salomonis: Przysłowia Salomona* (Warsaw, 1895), 1-7. Various dates are provided for his birth year, the likely most accurate is 1794. Marcin Wodziński, "Jakub Tugendhold and the First Maskilic Defense of Hasidim," *Gal-Ed* 18 (2002), 27n32. For additional biographical sources, see idem. 16n4 and Marcin

beginning in *heder* and advancing to *beit midrash*. In 1809, Jacob fled Dzailowsky in the middle of the night, leaving his wife behind. He went to Breslau (today Wrocław, Poland, then part of the Austrian Empire) to study in a Protestant grammar school, St. Elisabeth Gymnasium.⁹ After graduating in 1814, Jacob began tutoring for a wealthy merchant in Krakow. His first attempt at censorship occurred a few years later, in 1817. Jacob applied for a position as a censor in Lviv, Galicia (then part of the Austrian Empire, where Jewish books, too, were subject to a censorship regime; Karl Fischer¹⁰ held the head censor position), but his application was rejected.¹¹ By the end of the year he had moved to the Polish capi-

Wodziński, *Hasidim and Politics: The Kingdom of Poland, 1815-1864* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013), 142n87. Wodziński was apparently unaware of Steinschneider's biography of Tugendhold.

Information about Wolf appears in Steinschneider, *Ir Vilna*, 80-82; and Hillel Noach Steinschneider, "Vilna," *HaKarmel*, 4:27 (1864), 218-19.

There was a third brother, but we have been unable to locate any specific biographical information. See Steinschneider, *Ir Vilna*, 80 n1.

⁹ *Divrei Yeshayah*, 16-19; Wodziński, "Jakub Tugendhold," 17; Berl Weinryb, "Zur Geschichte des Buchdruckes und der Zensur bei den Juden in Polen," *MGWJ* (1993), 283n3. Wodziński notes that the selection of this school was despite the fact that at that time there was a well-regarded Jewish school in the mold of the *haskalah* in Breslau, Koenigliche Wilhelmsschule, that offered a comparable array of secular studies in addition to Jewish studies.

Their father was against the brothers moving to Breslau and wrote letters to both, discouraging them from leaving. See Tugendhold, *Divrei Yeshayah*, 26-29. The reasons for their flight are obscure. According to a later history, this was because Jacob was unable to stomach the Jewish fanaticism (perhaps a reference to Hassidim or the *heder* educational system) that was prevalent in Dzailowsky. Yet, Dzailowsky had an unusually large number of supporters of the *haskalah*, casting doubt on this reason. See Marcin Wodziński, *Haskalah and Hasidism in the Kingdom of Poland: A History of Conflict* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005), 47. Letters from Isaiah to Jacob indicate some significant falling out between the two that led to the break. See *Divrei Yeshayah* 15, 25.

¹⁰ For a biography and discussion of his activities as censor, see Iveta Cermanová, "Karl Fischer (1757-1844) I: The Life and Intellectual World of a Hebrew Censor," *Judaica Bohemiae* XLII (2006), 125-177; Iveta Cermanová, "Karl Fischer (1757-1844) II: The Work of a Hebrew Censor," *Judaica Bohemiae* XLIII (2007), 5-63.

¹¹ Wodziński, "Jakub Tugendhold," 17. The exact circumstances of this episode are unclear. From as early as 1787, Herz Homberg was the censor for Galicia. In 1806, the main censorship activities in Galicia were transferred from Lviv to Vienna. See Ch. B. Friedberg, *Toledot ha-Defus ha-Ivri be-Polonia* (Tel Aviv: Friedberg, 1950), 82n3. In 1817, Leopold (Lieb) Harzfeld was active in Vienna and had been since the 1790s. But some sources indicate that Harzfeld was on-

tal, Warsaw, and began tutoring in the home of one of the wealthiest Jews in Poland.¹²

In Warsaw

In 1818, when Jacob arrived in Warsaw, he quickly came to the attention of both Jews and non-Jews. Almost immediately he began trying to set up a Jewish school that incorporated secular studies, but that would not bear fruit for a year. Instead, he published his first book.¹³ During the early 19th century the Polish government hotly debated the “Jewish question”—the issue of how Jews should be treated within the Polish Kingdom. One extreme position was that the Jews should simply be expelled from the Polish Kingdom. This view was articulated in a small pamphlet, published around 1818.¹⁴ That same year, Jacob responded with his own pamphlet in defense of Jews’ rights within the Kingdom.¹⁵ Jacob’s book was well received by Jews and Poles—to such a degree that

ly elevated to the position of censor in 1816, perhaps indicating that there was an opening at that time for which Tugendhold also applied. See Friedberg, *Toledot*, 82n3; Reuven Fahn provides that Harzfeld became censor in 1815, Reuven Fahn, *Kitve Re’uven Fahn: Helek Shenit: Pirkei Haskalah* (Stanslav, 1937), 188. But this is called into doubt as, for example, in the subscriber list to Herz Homberg’s *Imrei Shefer*, published in Vienna in 1808, Harzfeld is identified as “the censor in this city.” See Herz Homberg, *Imrei Shefer* (Vienna, 1808), [10]; see also, Iveta Cermanová, “The Censorship of Hebrew Manuscripts in Vienna in the Early 19th Century, The Case of Abraham Trebitsch,” *Judaica Bohemiae* XXXIX (2003), 98-100.

¹² Wodziński, “Jakub,” 17. But according to Sabina Levin, Tugendhold only arrived in Warsaw in 1819. Sabina Levin, “*Batey ha-Sefer ha-Elementarim ha-Rishonim le-Yeladim Benay Dat Moshe be-Varsha be-Shanim 1818–1830*,” *Gal-Ed* 1 (1973), 70.

¹³ For a bibliography of his works see Steinschneider, *Ir Vilna* 2, 105-06 n1 and for books in Polish, see Karol Estreicher, *Bibliografia Polska: XIX* (Krakow, 1873), 541.

¹⁴ [Gerard Witowski,] *Sposób na Z. ydów* (Warsaw, [1818 ?]). Although the pamphlet is anonymous, scholars attribute it to Witowski. Wodziński, however, in her 2002 article questions attributing *Sposób* to Witowski, but in a later article published in 2009 she accepts that attribution without explanation. See Wodziński, “Jakub Tugendhold,” 26 n30 and Wodziński, “Haskalah and Politics Reconsidered,” in *Yashan Mefnai Hadash: Shai le-Emanuel Etkes*, ed. David Assaf and Ada Rapoport-Albert (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar, 2009), 168. Poles also wrote in opposition to Witowski. See “To ‘Civilize’ the Jews: Polish Debates on the Reform of Jewish Society, 1788–1830,” in Marcin Wodziński, *Hasidim and Politics: The Kingdom of Poland, 1815–1864*, 27-28.

¹⁵ Jacob Tugendhold, *Jerbaat, czyli, Mowa o Żydach: napisana z powodu wyszłego bezimiennego piśmka pod tytułem Sposób na Żydów* (Warsaw, 1818).

others, including a Polish Franciscan Monk, published their own works that imitated Tugendhold's.¹⁶

In 1819 Jacob received permission to open his school and did so at his own expense.¹⁷ The school sought to integrate secular studies, geography, history, and Polish into the Jewish curriculum, thereby aligning with Alexander I's recent educational reforms that sought to integrate Jews into society at large.¹⁸ Yet, Jacob viewed his school as well within the bounds of Jewish life and was not seeking to upend religion. He also was not interested in simply catering to the economic or intellectual elite; rather, he sought out the *hamon 'am* including the poor. The school started the year with ten students and by the end of the school year attendance was at seventy. In May, the first students sat for exams and many important personalities attended, including Warsaw's mayor.¹⁹ Impressed with Jacob's initiative, one year later the authorities created three additional schools and placed him at the helm. Later in life, in 1853, he would lead another educational institution, the Warsaw Rabbinical School.²⁰

A few years later, Jacob would move into his first government position, and his most important, a censor of Jewish books in Poland. Initially, Hebrew censorship was carried out by ecclesiastical authorities; ultimately, official censors were installed. In Poland, in 1822, the Committee on the Censorship of Jewish Books was established and the virulent anti-Semite, Father Ludvic Ciarini, installed as president. He unsuccessfully sought to ban the importation of all Hebrew books from Italy and require all Jewish books to be written in the Polish vernacular.

When the Committee for Censorship was established in 1822, however, they faced a problem of literacy—to effectively censor Hebrew books they required members who were proficient in Hebrew. To remedy that situation, Stanislaw Hoga, a Jewish apostate and missionary

¹⁶ Wodziński, "Haskalah and Politics," 168-169; Mahler, 210; Wodziński, "Jakub Tugendhold," 26-28; Tugendhold, *Divrei Yeshayah*, 79.

¹⁷ Nirnstein, *Proverbia*, 2; see also Sabina Levin, "Batey ha-Sefer ha-Elementarim ha-Rishonim le-Yeladim Benay Dat Moshe be-Varsha, be-Shanim 1818-1830," *Gal-Ed* 1 (1973), 70-72.

¹⁸ See generally, *Everyday Jewish Life in Imperial Russia: Selected Documents 1772-1914*, Chaeran Freeze and Jay Harris eds. (Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2013), 11.

¹⁹ Levin, "ha-Elementarim," 72.

²⁰ Nirnstein, *Proverbia*, 2; for more information regarding the Seminary, see Sabina Levin, "Bet ha-Sefer le-Rabbanim be-Varsha be-Shanim 1826-1863," *Gal-Ed* 11 (1989), 35-58.

(who would eventually re-embrace Judaism), was hired,²¹ as was Jacob, who was appointed the committee's secretary.²² The censorship regulations also encompassed previously printed books, and Hoga and Jacob spent the next few years travelling Poland and inspecting books. In addition to their base salary they collected a per-book fee for each book that they reviewed.²³ Needless to say, Jacob did not endear himself to the wider Jewish public, neither the traditionalists nor the progressives. *Maskilim* sent angry letters to his father and other *maskilim* denouncing Jacob. Likewise, the traditional camp wished for his death, some of their criticism stemming from when he established his school that was seen as a rejection of the traditional *heder* system.²⁴

Jacob, however, saw his role as beneficial for the Jews. Acting as censor, an officially sanctioned government position, afforded him the opportunity to defend Jews and Jewish practice more broadly, which he did almost immediately after joining the Committee for the Censorship of Hebrew books. In 1822, Jews on the Committee, including Jacob, complained of the missionary activities of the London Society for the Promotion of Christianity Among Jews. Two years later, Jacob defended the practice of *halitẓah*, later insisted upon the binding power of divorce law, and generally distinguished himself from his fellow *maskilim* in his insistence on fidelity to religion. He actively sought to promote the study of Hebrew (and not simply limit himself to the vernacular) and translated numerous books into Hebrew.²⁵

²¹ See Shnayer Leiman, "The Baal Teshuva and the Emden-Eibeschutz Controversy," *Judaica Studies* 1 (Summer 1985), 11-17. On his advocacy on behalf of Jewish community and in particular the Hassidic community. *Idem.* 18-19.

²² Weinryb provides 1822 as the date Tugendhold assumed the position of secretary. Weinryb, "*Buchdruckes und der Zensur bei den Juden in Polen*," 280, & Berl Weinryb, "*Zur Geschichte der Aufklärung bei den Juden*," *MGWJ* (1932), 145. Wodziński, however, states that his appointment occurred in 1823. Wodziński "Jakub Tugendhold," 18. Mahler backdates Jacob's appointment to 1820. Mahler, *Hasidism*, 210. Mahler's date is likely in error because the Committee was only established in 1822.

²³ Weinryb, "*Zensur*," 281-82.

²⁴ Nirnstein, *Proverbia*, 2-3; Wodziński, "Jakub Tugendhold," 18; see Levin, "*ha-Elementarim*," 71, regarding traditionalists' opposition to Jacob's school.

²⁵ Wodziński, "Haskalah and Politics," 183-184; Wodziński, *Haskalah and Hasidism*, 59. Even Hoga was involved in protecting Jewish life. He defended a rabbi who had been accused of illegally issuing a *herem*, and convinced the government to divert a road that otherwise would have bisected a Jewish cemetery. *Idem.* 183; for other examples see Leiman, "The Baal Teshuva," 18-19.

In November 1830 the Poles unsuccessfully revolted against the Tsar. Jacob was the only well-known *maskil* to throw in his lot with the Poles and that year even wrote and published a short pamphlet²⁶ expressing his Polish patriotism. He joined the democratic “Patriotic Society” (some of its leading members served in cabinet positions of the newly formed free Polish government), joined the National Guard, a rarity amongst Jews, became a noncommissioned officer, and “forced the Jewish community to pronounce a ban on Jews spying for the Russian army.”²⁷ After the Russians crushed the revolt, Jacob was denounced to the Russian authorities. Contrary to fact, he was able to convince them that he took no part in the revolt and evidence of his participation was in instances he was coerced, and he was reinstated to his position of censor. Some interpreted Jacob’s actions as inspired by his philosophy of absolute fidelity to the government—whichever one is in power—rather than holding Polish nationalistic views.

In the 1860s, a movement sprang up to liberalize the Russian legal regime imposed upon Poland, and Tugendhold assisted in identifying Jews who were involved in that effort. Perversely, despite extracting himself from his association with the 1830 revolt, he would eventually bend over backwards to find evidence that others were engaged in seditious acts, most notably the Chief Rabbi of Warsaw, R. Dov Ber Meisels and Marcus Jastrow. Both were expelled from Poland, although they were eventually allowed to return.²⁸ Jastrow was unsparing in his criticism of Jacob, calling him a “Jewish Satan,” and that Tugendhold’s surname could only be interpreted *be-lashon sagi nabor*, he was really “Mr. Wicked.”²⁹

²⁶ Jacob Tugendhold, *Krotkie Rozpamiętowania I Modły Izraelity Gwardziskiej* [Reflections of a Member of the Jewish Faith Standing Guard] (Warsaw, 1831).

²⁷ Wodziński, “Haskalah and Politics,” 184 n45; Wodziński, “Jakub Tugendhold,” 19.

²⁸ Jastrow, “Baer Meisels, Chief Rabbi,” *The Maccabean* XI, 5 (Nov. 1906), 208-09; *idem*. XI, 6 (Dec. 1906), 246-48. For Jastrow’s activities during that time see Michael Galas, *Rabbi Marcus Jastrow and His Vision for the Reform of Judaism: A Study in the History of Judaism in the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Anna Tilles (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2013), 70-88.

During Jastrow’s time in Warsaw he forged an unlikely relationship with the Orthodox chief rabbi, R. Dov Ber Meisels. Years later, when Jastrow was in America, he still counted Meisels among those who influenced him. See *idem*. 170.

²⁹ Jastrow, “Baer Meisels, Chief Rabbi,” *The Maccabean* XI, 4 (Oct. 1906), 118-19.

Wolf's Transformation from Censor to Reformer

In 1826, Wolf again followed in his older brother's footsteps. At the invitation of a local government official, in 1826, Wolf moved from Breslau to Vilna. The next year he took over the position of the censor of Jewish books that he held until the end of his life.³⁰ Because of his position, he held a unique place in the Russian Empire, being the only Jewish official civil servant.³¹ Despite selecting the same career path and sharing some similar experiences, the Tugendhold brothers would differ in their approach to the current state of the Jews which is represented in their censorship activities and their political advocacy on behalf of Jewish reforms.

Like Jacob, upon Wolf's appointment he became a target for reformers who alleged that Wolf was turning a blind eye to offensive passages, leaving them untouched. He succeeded in acquitting himself of the charges and then, similar to his brother, began drafting a comprehensive defense of the Jews. Wolf did not just address contemporary anti-Semites but also historic ones such as the infamous Johann Andreas Eisenmenger.³²

Yet Wolf was single minded in ensuring that Jewish books would avoid any implication that Jews were disloyal to the Tsar, even when in conflict with his own views. Wolf was counted among the group of Vilna's leading *maskilim* and was actively involved in their efforts to introduce and spread the ideas of the *haskalah*. Nonetheless, in 1834, a group of his *haskalah* friends formed an organization, *Shoharei Or ve-Haskalah*, to publish the first *haskalah* journal in the Russian Empire. Although the articles had been collected and the journal was ready for publication, it never saw the light of day. Not because Wolf didn't agree with the ideals of the organization or the medium; rather, the failure to launch was because of Wolf's overzealous scrutiny in "finding words unfit [that could be read as critical of the government] in which no strict person will find the slightest impermissibility."³³ Indeed, when the Vilna *maskilim* tried a

³⁰ Genrikh Agranovskii, *Evreiskie stranitsy litovskikh arkhivov [Jewish Documents in the Lithuanian Archives]* (Russian), ([Vilnius]: VSI "Saugi Pradzia" and Green Prints Tipografija, 2017), 86 and note 272.

³¹ Agranovskii, *Jewish Documents*, 86n272.

³² Steinschneider, *Ir Vilna*, 81. The book remained in manuscript. For a list of Wolf's published books and notes see *idem*. 81 n4.

³³ Mordechai Aaron Günzburg, *Divir*, vol. 2 (Warsaw, 1883) 83-85. Zinberg, *Toledot Safrut Yisrael*, vol. 6, 179-180. Günzburg had already been working on the journal for five years when he received Wolf's decision. Günzburg's history of Napoleon, *Toledot Ben Porat*, was among the articles that Wolf took issue with.

second time to publish a journal, *Perbei Tsafon*, avoiding anything that could be construed as anti-government, Wolf not only approved of the publication but also contributed an article from his father which was an exemplar of Mendelssohn's influence.³⁴

Wolf himself was a vocal advocate for reform, and thought Hassidim to be among the most pernicious in countering the *haskalah* movement. In October 1831, Wolf sought the intervention of the government to disrupt the influence of Hassidim. Isaac Baer Levinsohn, the figurehead of the Russian *haskalah*, and several other *maskilim* including Wolf, wrote letters to the government that advised that Hassidic presses in the Russian Empire should be closed because they are harmful and contrary to the Tsar's reforms. The government launched an investigation, and his letter was among the documents relied upon by the authorities.³⁵ In 1836, the government shuttered all the presses—Hassidic or otherwise—with the exception of Vilna and Zhitomir which were permitted (i.e., granted a monopoly) to operate.³⁶ Of course, Wolf acted as gatekeeper of the much more significant Vilna press. Wolf was especially proud of his role in this controversy, and as late as 1850, in a letter, he talked fondly of his involvement and ultimate success to thwart the movement.³⁷

The issue of the Hassidic press and the spread of Hassidic ideas offers a particularly striking example of the divergent views of the brothers. In Poland, the viceroy ordered the same investigation into Hassidim be conducted. The Committee for the Censorship of Hebrew Books submitted a report that was written by Jacob and another Jewish censor, Abraham Stern, that disputed that the Hassidic presses posed any concern in the Kingdom of Poland. Contrary to the allegations, Stern and Tugendhold argued that the Hassidic presses did not flood the market

The history would only be published after Günzburg's and Wolf's deaths. Mordechai Aaron Günzburg, *Ha-Morijah: Ketavim Bodedim me-Kitvei ha-Sofer ha-Me'afar Mordechai Aaron Günzburg*, ed. Eliezer Yitzhak Shapira (Warsaw, 1878).

³⁴ *Pirkhei Tsafon*, ed. Shmuel Yosef Fuenn, vol. 2 (Vilna, 1844)196-199. Mordechai Zalkin, "The Periodical *Pirkhei Tsafon* and Its Role in the Social System of the Haskalah Movement in the Russian Empire," *Kesher* 35 (2007), 63-69. Wolf had many other letters from his father and Fuenn hoped that this one demonstrates the value of the materials and will encourage the publication of the rest—and that Isaiah "from Gan Eden, would watch over Vilna." Isaiah's letters were published in 1896 in *Divrei Yesheyhu*.

³⁵ Agranovskii, *Jewish Documents*, 88-90.

³⁶ Weinryb, "Zensur," 283.

³⁷ Agranovskii, *Jewish Documents*, 90n281.

and depress prices or contribute to the spread of harmful values. The report attributed the attempt to close the presses as “a pretext invented for the appropriation, either directly or indirectly, of the entire printing industry.”³⁸

Indeed, beyond Jacob’s defense of the Hassidic presses, he also defended Hassidim in particular.³⁹ On multiple occasions Jacob sought to disabuse government officials of the idea that Hassidim were a sect and outside of normative Judaism, or that they were infused with superstitious ideas and anti-modernity. Rather, according to Jacob, it was Mitnagdim and their strict rationalism that was of most concern to the government. This despite the fact that for many the very foundation of *haskalah* was that rationalism was the driving idea that underpinned its philosophy.⁴⁰ These episodes are consistent with Jacob’s other defenses of traditional practices (and not overzealous loyalty) at the expense of the *haskalah*.

These differences can be explained by the brothers’ views of the role of the censor. Fundamentally, Jacob and Wolf were aligned in carrying out their duties as censor and their duties to “protect” the government. Wolf, however, believed that potentially anti-government statements were not necessarily a misreading of the text but that the existing practices and beliefs of many Jews required reformation to recognize the need to be loyal citizens. The simplest form of loyalty was fealty to the government and the Tsar, but Wolf’s view was that true loyalty extended to the Tsar’s programs and vision for the Jews as fully integrated into modern Russian society. That meant embracing the *haskalah* and its philosophy of incorporating positive secular values into Jewish practice—radical change to Jewish education, occupations, language, and external dress, which was in particular associated with Hassidut.

Wolf’s speech at the inauguration of a *haskalah* school in Vilna is illustrative of his particular views on absolute loyalty to the government that inherently required reformation of Jewish life.⁴¹ In 1841, an Ortho-

³⁸ Wodziński, “Haskalah and Politics,” 188, quoting and translating the report.

³⁹ Jacob vocally defended Jews and books on other occasions as well. See Wodziński, “Jakub Tugendhold,” 23.

⁴⁰ Wodziński, “Jakub Tugendhold,” 25-35. Jastrow, however, writes off all of Jacob’s defenses and friendly relationships with Hassidic leaders (among them R. Yisrael Alter, the Rebbe of Ger), to nothing more than cynical actions for self-benefit including financial. Jastrow, “Baer Meisels, Chief Rabbi,” *The Macabean* XI, 5 (Nov. 1906), 208-09.

⁴¹ Fuenn translated and published Wolf’s speech from German to Hebrew. Shmuel Yosef Fuenn, *Imrei Emet* (Vilna, 1841). Fuenn’s letter describing the

dox school that followed the principles of the *haskalah*, integrating secular studies, teaching the vernacular and an emphasis on ethics, was established in Vilna and led by one of Vilna's most prominent *maskilim*, Shmuel Yosef Fuenn. Wolf delivered an address, in German, at the school's inauguration, whose intended audience was the teachers. He emphasized three areas that should form the core of teachers' lessons, all of which are aimed at ensuring that Jews are viewed in a positive light by non-Jews. The first instruction is to inculcate the students with a love of king and country. According to Wolf, traditional Jewish sources obligate Jews not only to follow the laws of the king but also "to internalize a real respect of the king." Wolf's proof text for this obligation is the verse in *Devarim* 17:16, "you shall place a king upon you," which he interprets to include non-Jewish kings.⁴² The other two areas he discusses are the importance of learning the vernacular "of the country where we live, that protects us... the language of our beloved king that desires and strives to little by little lift us up from our low place."⁴³ Finally, the students should be taught "*Kiddush Hashem*," that "in every interaction with our brothers that are not Jewish they will see our pure hearts, free from hate and all sinister thoughts, and will show them brotherhood that will eventually cause [the non-Jew] to find in his heart" to respond in the same.⁴⁴ All of Wolf's exhortations are directed at improving the perception of Jews which is in need of repair.

The basis of Wolf's ideas is in stark contrast to another *maskil's* view of the underlying educational theory of *haskalah*. Binyamin Mendelstamm, who was also associated with the Vilna *maskilim*, writing about these new schools, discusses the basic elements of a *haskalah* education that needed to be incorporated into the curriculum.⁴⁵ Secular studies, teaching the vernacular, and respect for secular laws all must be part of these programs. But he explained the importance of the teachers' mission in terms of internal Jewish and not external perceptions. He wrote to these pioneer teachers that they must not fail because "all the eyes of the Jews are upon them," and that as the first teachers they have an opportunity to show other Jews the value of these new schools. In turn,

opening ceremony boasts of Wolf's participation. Shmuel Yosef Fuenn, "*Hanukat Bet-Hasefer ha-Hadasim be-Vilna*," in *Me-haskalah Lohemet le-Haskalah Mishmeret: Miḥar me-Kitvei RaSh"Y Fuenn*, ed. Shmuel Finner (Jerusalem: Merkaz Dinur, 1993), 181.

⁴² Tugendhold, *Imrei Emet*, 9-10.

⁴³ Tugendhold, *Imrei Emet*, 11.

⁴⁴ Tugendhold, *Imrei Emet*, 18.

⁴⁵ Zalkin, *Be-Alot ha-Shahar*, 223.

they will send their children and conclude that this approach is “Zot Torat ha-Adam!”⁴⁶

Jacob’s Jewish Positivism

Jacob too sought to use his role as censor to impact Jewish and non-Jewish relationships. Jacob was more focused on changing how Jews were perceived by non-Jews than changing internal Jewish practice. Jacob advanced the view that Judaism was already in harmony with its environment and even the new governmental programs and ideas. When possible, he sought to disabuse the government and non-Jewish society of their negative views and appreciate that Judaism was neither hostile nor was its way of life contrary to those groups. Judaism did not require massive reformation, non-Jewish views did. Thus, Jacob defended current Jewish practices and wrote extensively to expose the wider public to those practices and beliefs because he was fully confident in their validity.

For example, in 1837, the office of censorship was notified of an alleged offensive prayer said on the High Holidays, *Melekh Elyon/Eryon* and *Ma’aseh Enosh ve-Takbbulotav* and sought to ban or censor the *mabzor*. Both were claimed to be directed at the Tsar and it was said that Jews went so far as to laugh at the Tsar during the prayers. Rather than removing the prayer or altering the words, Jacob succeeded in convincing the authorities of the importance of the prayers and their harmlessness. To ensure that these passages would not be subjected to another baseless attack, later *mabzorim* printed in Poland inserted his explanation of the meaning of the prayers.⁴⁷

Similarly, another liturgical text, the *Haggadah*, was saved from an imperfect text and was able to avoid excising any passages that were previously known (in the past) to cause consternation among the authorities. Rather than removal, he opted for marginal notes that interpreted potentially problematic text in a non-controversial manner. This left the user with the choice to accept or reject his comments but have full use of the text.⁴⁸

Jacob’s most comprehensive defense to avoid censorship of Jewish texts began in the mid-1830s. Among the books of particular concern to

⁴⁶ Binyamin Mandelstamm, *Hazon: Asher le-Erets hazah al Masaav be-Erets Moladeto be-Rusyah* (Vienna, 1877), 12-13.

⁴⁷ Weinryb, “Zensur,” 284; B. VV. “*Melekh Eryon*,” *HaMaggid*, 10, 35 (1866). Jacob also defended the book *Shevet Yehuda* against accusations that it contained passages critical of Christianity and the Tsar. Zinberg, *History*, vol. 11, 195.

⁴⁸ See Hayyim Lieberman, *Obel Rachel*, vol. 3 (Brooklyn: Empire Press, 1984) 642-644.

the government was the *Hoshen Mishpat* volume of *Shulhan Arukh*. There are a variety of commercial laws that single out non-Jews, arguably permit Jews to commit perjury in non-Jewish courts, and more fundamentally seem to espouse a different commercial code than the prevailing secular one. Thus in 1836 a special committee was formed to address this particular book. For years the committee debated how to best “correct” the text. In 1842, the “corrected” volume was ready, and a publisher was induced to print it. Yet, it was still not to be, and the project continued to drag on.⁴⁹ That delay afforded Jacob the opportunity to write his most comprehensive defense of Judaism and in doing so, avoid the gutting of the *Shulhan Arukh*. In 1844 Jacob published an apologetic work, in Polish and Hebrew, its Hebrew title, *Keshut Imrei Emet ve-Shalom*, that addressed many of the most common passages that non-Jews found problematic, among those passages in *Hoshen Mishpat*.⁵⁰

The book was published in Hebrew and Polish, but the intended audience was Poles and not Jews. The book’s Hebrew section is mainly comprised of long quotes and has a minuscule amount of actual arguments defending Jews and is all of 32 pages in total, whereas the Polish section is 117 pages. The Polish section covers nearly every trope and historic accusation against Jews, among them: lack of loyalty to non-Jewish leaders, laws, blood libels, acceptance of non-Jewish values, working in occupations other than money lending, and not singling out non-Jews for different treatment under Jewish laws. Apparently, his defense was sufficiently convincing that there was no longer any need to print a revised edition of *Hoshen Mishpat* and the project was never completed.⁵¹

Jacob was convinced that historic prejudices against Jews could be overcome with the correct presentation of Jewish sources and history. The *Hoshen Mishpat* episode proved him right. Nonetheless, Jacob’s confidence was not shared by others in the same position. Karl Fischer was the head censor for the Austrian Empire from the late 18th century until his death in 1844. He was held in the highest esteem and counted among his close friends leading rabbis, R. Eleazer Fleckeles, R. Bezalel

⁴⁹ Weinryb, “Zensur,” 286-288.

⁵⁰ Jacob Tugendhold, *Keshut Imrei Emet ve-Shalom – Skazówki Prawdy I Zgody* (Warsaw, 1844). He completed the book in October 1843. See *idem*. XVIII.

⁵¹ Weinryb, “Zensur,” 288. Zinberg, however, states that the *Hoshen Mishpat* volume was issued. Zinberg, *Haskalah Movement in Russia*, 195. I could find no evidence of its publication in any bibliography.

Jacob discusses passages from *Hoshen Mishpat* and sometimes uses them to defend Jewish practice. See, e.g., 19-20, 22, 32-33.

Ranschburg, and R. Baruch Jeittles.⁵² Fischer too wrote a defense of Jews that contains much of the same material as Tugendhold. Indeed, Fischer wrote to his friend Fleckeles for his opinion regarding the Jewish oath, and is among the responsa that Fleckeles printed in his *Teshuvah Me-Ahava*; Tugendhold quotes extensively from that responsum in both the Polish and Hebrew sections of his book.⁵³ Yet, Fischer did not share Tugendhold's optimism and Fischer's extensive defense remained in manuscript until forty years after his death, after which (and contrary to his express instructions) it was published. Fischer's reason was that publishing served no point: "What actual good would it do? Indeed, no more than that, on the one hand, I would certainly receive praise from favorably inclined, reasonable and impartial readers; on the other hand, however, opponents might come out and trample the most obvious truths and gauge everything in terms of their passions."⁵⁴ Jacob, however, refused to be cowed by such fears.

Returning to Jacob's censorship, unlike many other examples of censorship where we are in the dark as to the criteria used leaving us to fill in motives or guidelines, Jacob left behind a record of how he went about his job. In 1852, there was a meeting of censors in St. Petersburg and Jacob articulated his criteria, dividing those into seven categories. He censored texts that are explicitly directed at Christians and Christianity, those that might lead unlearned Jews to pagan practices, those which promoted Jewish national pride or exceptionalism, laws of idolatry that might be understood to apply today, morally harmful text—sexual or criminal acts, Jewish capital punishment, and passages that might be read to discourage modern education, crafts, or agriculture. Furthermore, he explained that sometimes merely excising the offensive passage was insufficient and instead required amending the text itself. Aside from censoring or altering the text, in extreme cases he appended his own glosses to the text to clear up any ambiguities. This occurred with the *mahzor* when he included in the Warsaw edition of the *Heidenheim Mahzor*, his explanation of the controversial prayer "*Melekh Ehyon*" that he was forced to defend.⁵⁵

⁵² Cermanová, "Karl Fischer, I," 146-158.

⁵³ Eleazer Fleckeles, *Teshuva Me-Ahava* (Prague, 1809) no. 26. Tugendhold, *Keshot*, 27-32 (Hebrew section), 65 (Polish section).

⁵⁴ Cermanová, "Karl Fischer, I," 164-168.

⁵⁵ B. VV. "Melekh Ehyon," *HaMaggid*, 10, 35 (1866).

The Fate of the Warsaw 1853 *Humash*

There is no doubt that Jacob used his position to help Jews, nonetheless that cannot shield him from the inherent harms of censorship. Because Jacob acted in that role for decades at such an important press, with such widespread distribution, those effects are all the more exaggerated. Examination of one edition of the *humash*, printed in Warsaw in 1853, with Rashi's and Ramban's commentary, shows pervasive evidence of Jacob's censorship and clearly aligns with the criteria he provided a year earlier in St. Petersburg. Additionally, an example from another edition of a *humash* further parallels some of the issues highlighted by the 1853 version. An examination of other books published under Jacob will no doubt further yield information as to the extent of his work. Indeed, according to Jastrow, the *Midrash Rabba* printed under Tugenhold's authority is nearly unusable because of his censorship.⁵⁶ The Warsaw *humash* is not listed in most bibliographies, but the Israeli National Library holds one copy. Jacob's deletions appear in both commentaries and there are a number of examples where he not only excised words but also in the process altered the text. Additionally, he separately added apologetic explanations.⁵⁷

Yet, the Warsaw edition not only provides examples of Jacob's theory of censorship, it also demonstrates the fallacy of "good" censorship and ultimate limitations of Jacob's efforts. Historically, any tampering with Jewish texts, even to correct errors, is highly circumscribed. All the more so when one's intention is not accuracy but personal ideals. Thus, we cannot lose sight of harm inflicted on Jewish texts, and especially when the books are among the most fundamental, Rashi's and the Ramban's commentaries. Aside from the historic examples dating to the 16th century of "offensive" passages related to Christians, religion, and the like, now these works were additionally subject to new criteria of what is or is not "appropriate."

⁵⁶ Jastrow, "Baer Meisels, Chief Rabbi," *The Maccabean* XI, 3.

⁵⁷ For analyses of other works that were similarly affected by Jacob, see Noah Prylucki, "Vie Azvi di Rusiya Tzenzur hut Gebalbetavet ein der Baba Ma'aseh," *YIVO-Bletter* III, 358-70; Israel Zinberg, "Di Rusiya Tzenzur un dei Baba Ma'aseh," *YIVO-Bletter* IV, 187-88; Hayyim Lieberman, *Obel Rochel*, vol. 3 (New York, 1984), 642-44; Tuvia Preschel, *Ma'amarei Tuvyah*, vol. 3 (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 2017), 288-89. In at least one instance Jacob's censorship resulted in all of one author's books remaining in manuscript. See Israel Zinberg, *A History of Jewish Literature: Volume XI: The Haskalah Movement in Russia*, trans. Bernard Martin (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1978), 194-97.

Jacob's sensitivity towards anything that might be considered immoral or overly sexual is to such a degree that at times he renders the text meaningless. In *Bereishit* 3:16, the verse reads: "Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy pregnancy; in pain you shall bear children; and thy longing shall be to thy husband ...". Rashi explains that "the wife's longing for her husband" is a reference "to sexual relations and the curse is that despite that desire she is unable to make a request, instead, the man will rule over his wife." In Tugendhold's edition, he removed "to sexual relations" but kept in the remainder of that passage. Now it reads "to her husband she will long. Even though she cannot verbalize her request, he controls her." In this case, the reader will have no idea of the content of the wife's unanswered pleadings.⁵⁸ Another example, although without the confusing result, appears in *Shemot* 21:10, discussing a husband's obligations to his wife. Three are enumerated, *shearah*, *kesutah*, *ve-onatah*. Rashi explains that "*ve-onatah*" is "*tashmish*," sexual relations. Tugendhold excises that statement, thereby leaving out an important component of Jewish marriage.

Another such confusing omission, this time an entire passage, appears in *Bereishit* 4:19. The original explains why the Torah linked Lemach's having two wives with the excess of the generation of the Flood. Rashi explains that this was the practice of that generation, one wife for procreation and one for sex. The latter would drink a solution that prevented pregnancy so that she would be barren, be fed sweets and remain like a bride, and the former would look haggard and be neglected like a widow. Tugendhold's version simply ends after the first two words, "this was the custom." That, however, leaves unanswered why that matters to the description of Lemach and his immorality.

At times Tugendhold attempts to excise only the most limited amount of text possible, but that causes its own problems. In *Bereishit* 33:4, Yaakov and Esau meet and Esau embraces and kisses Yaakov. The word "*vayeshbaku*" (kissed) is dotted in the Torah and Rashi cites a Sifri that provides an explanation of the extraordinary dots, "to indicate that Esau only intended to give a half-hearted kiss, as is aligned with the statement of Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai 'that the *halakha*—the norm—is that Esau hates Yaakov,' [but] here Esau was overcome, and he kissed

⁵⁸ Apparently Tugendhold's sensibilities continue and, in the Rosenbaum and Silbermann translation of Rashi, they leave out the entire passage. See M. Rosenbaum and A.M. Silbermann, trans., *Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haftarah and Prayers for Sabbath and Rashi's Commentary*, Genesis (London: Shapiro, Valentine, 1946), 15.

Yaakov wholeheartedly.” The passage that “Esau hates Yaakov,” is among those that have been censored for centuries and indeed this entire passage in Rashi is lacking in many *humashim*. Yet Tugendhold only surgically excised the three words but retained everything else: “the dots indicate that Esau only intended to give a half-hearted kiss, as is aligned with the statement of Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai that the *halakha*—the norm—is that Esau was overcome that time and he kissed Yaakov wholeheartedly.” Thus transforming R. Shimon bar Yochai’s “*halakha*” of Esau’s extreme hatred of Yaakov to that of affection.

Examples of his doctoring texts that were critical of secular study is found in *Vayikra* 18:4 where Rashi reads:

ללכת בהם. אל תפטר מתוכם, שלא תאמר למדתי חכמת ישראל אלה ואלמד חכמת האמות.

Tugendhold’s *Humash* is missing *שלא תאמר למדתי חכמת ישראל אלה ואלמד חכמת האמות*, erasing the restriction on “*Hakbmat Ha-Umot*.” A passage that is critical of accepted modern cultural activities too was excised. In 18:3, Rashi, quoting *Torat Kobanim*, says:

ובחקתיהם לא תלכו. מה הניח הכתוב שלא אומר? אלא אלו נימוסות שלקהו—דברים שהקוקין להם—כגון טרטיאאות ואצטדאאות, רבי מאיר אומר, אלו דרכי האמורי שמנו חכמים.

Tugendhold excises *כגון טרטיאאות ואצטדאאות*.

Based upon Tugendhold’s biography, it is no surprise that areas of Jewish law were especially sensitive. On the first verse of *Parshat Mishpatim*, 21:1, and *ואלה המשפטים אשר תשים לפניהם*, Rashi comments that *לפניהם* is a limitation on bringing lawsuits to a non-Jewish court, even if they apply the same law as a Jewish one. Tugendhold removed the entire Rashi. But, here, Tugendhold’s concern was not simply with this Rashi, arguably the entire *Mishpatim* is problematic as it creates a Jewish legal system. Thus, he prefaces *Mishpatim* with a lengthy disclaimer:

This section the writer, at the direction of God, placed before the Bnei Yisrael the statutes and laws that their judges should apply when judging them based upon Torah law. The biblical commentators, Rashi the leader of all of them, followed by the Ramban, proceed within the contours of the verses and the path of the *Torah She-be-al Peh* to explain each verse based upon law and textual reading. This, despite the fact that many, and specifically the death penalty, lashes, and financial laws, laws concerning lessors, the institution of a Canaanite slave, and similar ones, are no longer applicable. Because we, the Bnei Yisrael, are protected under the wings of the kings, the righteous and straight that wrote laws and statutes that

we are required to follow, and this is what Ḥazal said, *dina de-malkhuta dina*.

Tugendhold's treatment of rulers similarly undermines the traditional Jewish approach and replaces it with unnecessary praise. In this instance it is Ramban's commentary that Tugendhold altered. 'ואמר ישא ה' עליך גוי מרחוק (פסוק מט)

אבל אחרי היותנו בגלות בארצות אויבינו לא נתקללו מעשה ידינו ולא אלפינו ועשתרות צאננו ולא כרמינו וזיתינו ואשר נזרע בשדה, אבל אנחנו בארצות כשאר העמים יושבי הארץ ההיא, או בטוב מהם שרחמיו עלינו, כי ישיבתנו בגלות היא בהבטחה שאמר לנו (ויקרא כו מד): ואף גם זאת בהיותם בארץ אויביהם לא מאסתיים ולא געלתיים לכלותם להפר בריתי אתם כי אני ה' אלוהיהם. וכבר פירשתי בסדר אם בחקותי (שם טז): סוד הברית הזאת, וכי הוא על זמן גלותנו היום ביד החיה הרביעית. ואחר כן יבטיח בגאולה ממנו.

This is how it is written in the censored Ḥumash:

אבל אחרי היותנו בגלות לא נתקלקלו מעשה ידינו...אבל אנחנו בארצות כשאר העמים יושבי הארץ ההיא או בטוב מהם שרחמיו עלינו כי לב מלכים ביד ה' לתת לנו תקומה ולחסות עלינו בצל כנפי חסדם והגומל כל יריק עליהם שפעת ברכתו ויחוננם באושר נצחי.

Starting from the words “כי לב מלכים ביד ה'” he doesn't just censor by cutting out, rather, he adds a *berakha* for the host nation.

Tugendhold went even further regarding statements that would provide Jews hope that their situation will improve. Because despite whatever positive feelings Tugendhold or others had for the Russian government, there was no doubt that Jews were subjected to numerous anti-Semitic laws, perhaps the most egregious the forced conscription for a period of twenty-five years. Nonetheless, Tugendhold repeatedly altered or removed passages that indicated the Jewish experience might be improved.

In *Vayikra* 26:33 Rashi states:

ואתכם אזרה בגוים. זו מדה קשה, שְׁבִשְׁעָה שְׁבִנִי הַמְדִינָה גוֹלִים לְמָקוֹם אֲחֵד, רואים זה את זה ומתנתחמין, וישְׁרָאֵל נָזְרוּ כְּבַמְזֻרָה — פְּאֵדָם הַזֹּרָה שְׁעוֹרִים בְּנִפְהָ וְאִין אַחַת מֵהֶן דְּבוֹקָה בְּחִבְרָתָהּ

Tugendhold takes away שְׁבִשְׁעָה שְׁבִנִי הַמְדִינָה גוֹלִים לְמָקוֹם אֲחֵד, רואים זה את זה ומתנתחמין, which might have given some people comfort if they thought that they all were in the same place.

An even more disturbing example appears in *Vayikra* 26:41:

והבאתי אתם. אני בעצמי אביאם; זו מדה טובה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, שלא יהיו אומרים, הואיל ונגלינו בין האמות נעשה כמעשיהם, אני איני מניחם, אלא מעמיד אני את

נְבִיאֵי וּמַחְזִירֵי לְתַחַת כְּנָפֵי, שְׁנֵאָמַר (יחזקאל כ"א), "וְהֵעֵלָה עַל רוּחְכֶם הָיָה לֹא תִהְיֶה נְגוּ' הִי אֲנִי ... אִם לֹא בְּיַד תִּזְקָה נְגוּ'"

Tugendhold gets rid of all this:

זו מִדָּה טוֹבָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, שֶׁלֹּא יִהְיוּ אוֹמְרִים, הוֹאִיל וְגַלִּינוּ בֵּין הָאֲמוֹת נַעֲשֶׂה כְּמַעֲשֵׂיהֶם, אֲנִי אֵינִי מְנִיחָם, אֲלֵא מְעַמִּיד אֲנִי אֶת נְבִיאֵי וּמַחְזִירֵי לְתַחַת כְּנָפֵי, שְׁנֵאָמַר (יחזקאל כ"א), "וְהֵעֵלָה עַל רוּחְכֶם הָיָה לֹא תִהְיֶה נְגוּ' הִי אֲנִי ..."

Here is 26:33:

וְהִשְׁמַתִּי אֲנִי אֶת הָאָרֶץ. זו מִדָּה טוֹבָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, שֶׁלֹּא יִמָּצְאוּ הָאוֹיְבִים נַחַת רוּחַ בְּאַרְצָם, שֶׁתִּהְיֶה שׁוֹמְמָה מִיּוֹשְׁבֵיהָ (ספרא):

All Tugendhold leaves is מִדָּה טוֹבָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, שֶׁלֹּא יִמָּצְאוּ הָאוֹיְבִים נַחַת רוּחַ בְּאַרְצָם, and gets rid of שׁוֹמְמָה מִיּוֹשְׁבֵיהָ.

Likewise, Tugendhold alters Ramban's explanation of the kosher laws that articulated a physical benefit for keeping the laws.

וַיִּתְּכֵן מִזֶּה שִׁיזִיקוּ בְּאִיבְרֵי הַזֶּרַע וַיְהִי הַזֶּרַע הַמֵּתָאֲסָף מִן הַלַּחַח שֶׁבֵּהֶם קָרָה וְלַחַח וְלֹא תוֹלִיד כֻּלָּל אוֹ לֹא תוֹלִיד בְּטוֹב וְנִכּוֹן מִלְּבַד שִׁישׁ בְּמוֹתָרִים טוֹבָה יְדוּעָה בְּדֶרֶךְ הַרְפוּאוֹת וְרֵאִיתִי בְּקִצַּת סִפְרֵי הַנְּסִיווֹנוֹת שֶׁחִלַּב הַחֲזִיר אִם יִגַּךְ הַיּוֹנֵק מִמֶּנּוּ יִהְיֶה אוֹתוֹ הַנֶּעֱרַר מִצּוֹרֵעַ וְזֶה לֹאֵת שִׁישׁ בְּכוֹלֵם סְגוּלוֹת רַעוֹת מֵאֵד.

Here he could have kept in this positive part וְנִכּוֹן מִלְּבַד שִׁישׁ בְּמוֹתָרִים but he didn't.

Despite whatever high-minded ideas Jacob held about Jews, his approach to the *Warsaw Humash* fell short. Leopold Zunz, one of the first modern scholars to examine censorship of Hebrew texts, sums up the unenviable position that Jacob and all others who participated in the censorship of Jewish books were placed in. At the end of his article, Zunz leaves no doubt as to his view of censors and censorship. "The worst book is less harmful than the best-intentioned censor, because he locks the door to any responses that the book [or passages] would provoke. Scholarship is unable to tolerate even well-intentioned chains (i.e., censorship), freedom cannot bear forced enlightenment from on high."⁵⁹

⁵⁹ Leopold Zunz, "Die Censur hebräischer Werke," in *Hebräische Bibliographie* I:2 (March/April 1858) 42-44, reprinted in Leopold Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, III (Berlin, 1876) 239-241; see also Urbach, "Kol Ha-Mikayim," 281.