A STUDY OF THE RISE OF MODERN JEWISH CONSCIOUSNESS IN LUDWIG AUGUST FRANKL'S "JEWS IN THE EAST"

NANCY MORRIS
DEPARTMENT OF JEWISH STUDIES
MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL

SUBMITTED JULY, 1990
A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER III
"THE JEWS IN THE EAST" AND MODERN CONSCIOUSNESS

CHAPTER IV
FRANKL AND THE JEWS IN JERUSALEM

A STUDY OF THE RISE OF MODERN JEWISH CONSCIOUSNESS IN LUDWIG AUGUST FRANKL'S "JEWS IN THE EAST"

NANCY MORRIS
DEPARTMENT OF JEWISH STUDIES
MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL

SUBMITTED JULY, 1990
A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER III
"THE JEWS IN THE EAST" AND MODERN CONSCIOUSNESS

CHAPTER IV
FRANKL AND THE JEWS IN JERUSALEM

CHAPTER V

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

I would like to thank my advisor, Professor Eugene Orenstein, and all the other professors who guided me through my years at the Department of Jewish Studies.

I must express my gratitude to the Austrian Government for providing a large part of the funding for my research in Vienna, and for having the courage to allow an exploration of this too undervalued aspect of its own history. I would like to thank Dr. Nikolaus Vielmetti for his invaluable help, and also to thank the staff at the various libraries and archives, especially the most helpful librarian at the Handschriftensammlung in the Wiener Stadtbibliothek, Herr Meesar.

Finally, I would like to thank the friends who supported me through my challenging year in Vienna, and without whom it would not have been as enjoyable.

A B S T R A C T

In the history of Austrian Jewry, the year 1848 marked a crucial turning point. Although there had been a rapid succession of changes in the lives of Jews in Central Europe, 1848 was a definitive beginning on the road to "modernity" from which there could be no turning back. Ludwig August Frankl was a distinguished representative of this generation of Jews living in the Habsburg realm. He believed in the revolutionary ideals of 1848, and yet was paradoxically not a radical. He was, rather, a representative of that now often forgotten group of Jews who believed in an evolutionary path to modernity that seemed to offer the logical and triumphant culmination of a hundred years of cultural assimilation. Modernity became their identification and their aspiration, and also led to a new perception of their own Judaism. Ludwig August Frankl brought the elements of this new identity to his mission to found the first secular Jewish school in Jerusalem in 1856, the Laemel School.

A B R E G E

1848 marque un point tournant dans l'histoire des Juifs Autrichiens. Apres une rapide succession de changements dans la vie des Juifs d'Europe centrale, l'annee 1848 peut être interprétée comme le début d'un mouvement sans retour vers la modernité. Ludwig August Frankl etait un digne représentant de cette génération juive vivant sous la juridiction des Habsbourg. Bien qu'adherent aux ideaux revolutionnaires de 1848, Ludwig August Frankl ne peut être qualifié de radical. Il était plutôt un membre representatif de cette faction juive, maintenant souvent oubliee, qui croyait en une évolution graduelle vers la modernite, dénouement logique et triomphant, selon eux, d'un siecle d'assimilation culturelle. Ils s'identifierent et aspirèrent a la modernité ce qui les mena à une nouvelle perception de leur judaisme. Ludwig August Frankl apporta avec lui les éléments de cette nouvelle identification lorsqu'il fonda la première école laique juive à Jérusalem en 1856: l'école Laemel.

The ultimate cause of all great revolutions, which lies deeper than the effective cause, is not in the accumulation of unwholesome conditions, but in the exhaustion of the cohesive factor that has enabled the souls to enjoy an artificial contentment.

--Robert Musil, The Man Without Qualities, Volume Two

Adapting themselves to the milieu of the people or country where they live is not only an external protective measure for Jews, but a deep internal desire. Their longing for a homeland, for rest, for security, for friendliness, urges them to attach themselves passionately to the culture of the world around them. And never was such an attachment more effective--except in Spain in the fifteenth century--or happier and more fruitful than in Austria.

--Stefan Zweig, The World of Yesterday

. . . the possibility of political understanding, the ability to write a newspaper article, the vigour required to believe in new movements in art and literature, and countless other things, are wholly founded on a talent for being at certain hours convinced against one's own conviction, for splitting a part off from the whole content of one's consciousness and for spreading it out to form a new state of entire conviction.

--Robert Musil, The Man Without Qualities, Volume Two

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. THE PROBLEM

The Laemel School, founded in 1856 by Ludwig August Frankl, still stands today on Isaiah Street 13 in Jerusalem. Its German inscription "Simon Edler von Laemel-Schule," (school named after the noble, Simon von Laemel), stills bears testament to its fundamental roots in the history of the German-speaking Jews of Vienna. The connection of the Laemel School to the evolution of Viennese Jewry is a crucial one, and will be the focus of this thesis.

Jews had had a long connection with the city of Vienna, from the first settlement in the twelfth century, to their return in the 1690's after the expulsion of 1670, and subsequent steady influx and growth throughout the nineteenth century, until the final tragic results of the Anschluss of 1938 with Germany. The early settlement in the middle ages grew, synagogues were built, and Jews flourished to the point where in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Vienna was recognized as the leading community of German Jewry. It became a refuge for victims of persecution from other areas during the late fourteenth century, but with an expanding burgher class came an increasing resentment against the Jews who were seen as competitors, and ultimately the Jews were expelled in 1421. The Jews were to slowly return throughout the fifteenth century, a cemetery was noted in 1582, but were again persecuted during the Thirty Years' War (1618-48), and in 1624, confined to a ghetto by Ferdinand II. This ghetto was the beginning of what is today known as Leopoldstadt, Vienna's zweite Bezirk or second district. This area of Vienna was to henceforth

be dominated by Jews, and Frankl too, was to have a connection to this district of Vienna. Again, in the seventeenth century, Jews thrived and did business, produced famous rabbis and scholars, until the end of the century. Hatred of Jews was abetted by the Catholic Bishop Kollonitsch, and influenced Leopold I. This seething resentment, as well as an eye to the potential gains to the treasury which could result by expelling the Jews, led to the expulsion of 1670. As we will see later, the heroic efforts of ancestors of Ludwig Frankl ensured the preservation of the Jewish cemetery during the years of this expulsion. The Jews left, all remnants of Jewish life were left to ruin and neglect, and the Great Synagogue became a Catholic Church, the Leopoldskirche. Again avarice precipitated a reevaluation of the expulsion, and the Jews were allowed back in the 1690's, but only in very limited numbers and actually only the wealthy, who could afford the heavy taxation, were allowed the privilege of "tolerance." In actual fact, though, the Jewish community of Vienna was never to be the same.

This was the period of the great Court Jews, such as Samuel Oppenheimer, Samson Wertheimer and the Baron Diego Aguilar. The princes used the financial and commercial services of these wealthy men, or Court Jews. In setting up a centralized administration, which was a fundamental goal in the time of Maria Theresa, and later her son, Joseph II, Jews were of great service with their trade and commercial connections. With their far-flung connections throughout Europe and the Levant, by granting commercial credit and ready cash, providing food, clothing and weapons to the army, these Court Jews were essential to the development of the nation-state. In return, Jews were given a limited official standing, and by direct access to the prince, Court Jews at times, could ameliorate the condition of their co-

religionists. Samuel Oppenheimer and Samson Wertheimer were perhaps the most famous Court Jews in the history of the Habsburgs. The Viennese Karlskirche and the opulent Schoenbrunn Palace were financed by Jewish loans. We can therefore see a gradual adaptation of these Court Jews to gentile culture.

After their return there was no provision for an autonomous Jewish community or Kehillah of the traditional type, and no synagogues were allowed. From the end of the seventeenth century, until 1826 with the consecration of the Seitenstettengasse synagogue, there was to be no public synagogue in the city of Vienna. Until this time, Jewish worship could only take place in private homes. This lack of an organized and recognized community had a part to play in the later evolution of the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde [Israelite Religious Community], with which Frankl was to be so intimately connected. The Kultusgemeinde or IKG, the first officially recognized Jewish organization, was not to achieve official recognition until the 1850's.

The nineteenth century was a time of expansion for the Jewish community of Vienna. With more mobility, freedoms and growing tolerance, as well as an open niche in the expanding bureaucracy of the Empire, Jews flocked to Vienna from other parts of the vast Empire. They came first from Bohemia and Moravia, then Hungary, and finally in huge numbers from the eastern regions, Galicia and Bukovina. A large factor was the phenomenon of Jewish identification with German Habsburg culture, which often far outweighed their attachment to their actual place of birth in other areas of the Empire. This will later be discussed at greater length. The first officially allowed synagogue was consecrated in 1826, a Hebrew printing press was extant from the end of the eighteenth century. In 1825, the famous rabbi Isaac Noah Mannheimer was appointed director of the

religious school. The 1830's saw the growth of the only tacitly recognized Israelitische Kultusgemeinde, not to achieve official recognition until twenty years later. And, into this fray of growth and expansion, Frankl, born in Bohemia, came to Vienna in the first waves of migration to study at the University of Vienna.

The above serves as introduction to the Vienna of Ludwig August Frankl, which, as this paper will attempt to demonstrate, was far more responsible for the existence of the Laemel School than was almost any other single factor. This school has been described as the beginning of modern Jewish educational instruction in Jerusalem (1). In many assessments of the life work of Ludwig August Frankl, his founding of the Laemel School in 1856 is described as his greatest and most memorable accomplishment.

Yet, in all detailed accounts of his voyage to found the school in Jerusalem, one can clearly discern the opposition he faced and the terrible disappointment that caused him. In fact, the mission can, in many ways, be seen as a failure. Could this same journey of accomplishment have also been the occasion for him to write contemptuously of the Russian and Polish Jewish inhabitants of Jerusalem, then seen as "backward" by modern, "progressive" Western Jews, "Is this Polish-Russian rabble the watcher over Zion?" or could it have been the occasion which moved him to compare himself to a parody of the prophet in the Lion's Den (2)? All the evidence points to the fact that this journey was not the great success it was often touted as being. This thesis will be concerned with his voyage to found this school, and how this fact related to Frankl as a representative of the rise of "modern" Jewish consciousness.

The conflict arises from the problem of expectation versus reality. The founders of the Laemel School were a group of Jews with a very specific vision

which arose as a result of conditions of time and place. They willed their vision upon Zion and were unprepared for, and perhaps incapable of dealing with the reality of an ever-increasing "Polish-Russian rabble' in Palestine.

The Jews of the Habsburg Empire, and especially Vienna, were reacting to huge changes in the cultural, social, political and legal aspects of their existence within the Empire. They responded to increasing freedom and political acceptance with great optimism. They wanted to contribute to the social, cultural and political life of their country, and were ever more readily permitted to do so. The general European upheavals of 1848 had a tremendous impact upon their consciousness of themselves as a group and of their potential within the Empire.

The recognition of this potential and the desire to realize it is what inspired the invaluable contributions of Jews to European culture. It was an acceptance of, and a desire to be accepted by Europe. The achievements that resulted from this are what helped to shape what we call "modernity."

The argument of this thesis will be that it was the embrace of the modern elements of European society within the Viennese context that informed the initial desire of the founders of the Laemel School, and that it was the modern Jewish consciousness of Ludwig August Frankl that influenced his ambivalent reaction to the reality of Palestine in the mid-nineteenth century.

B. THE METHOD

In the last few years, the field of intellectual history has enjoyed increasing recognition and legitimacy. The historians Janik and Toulmin, in their Wittgenstein's Vienna discuss the necessity of understanding the context of thought in order to have an accurate comprehension of the ideas it generates. When exploring the development of a

creative individual and his or her ideas, they claim, the elements of this study should include his or her social and political development, the general aims and preoccupations in different contemporary fields of art and science, his or her personal attitude to the question of morality and value, and how the area of endeavour was understood in that specific place and time (3). This paper will utilize the above as its underlying method in the exploration of Frankl and his travel account.

C. FRANKL AND 1848

The first crucial point in understanding the social and political development of Ludwig Frankl is to understand the immeasurable impact of the events of 1848. Stefan Hock, who edited the memoir of his uncle, Ludwig Frankl, says of him, "he, who was to me, 1848" (4). The above-mentioned memoir is informed throughout by the spirit and memory of 1848. This year was the highlight of Frankl's life and the source of his inspiration. The entire tone of Sonntagsblaetter, the periodical he was editing during the days of the "March Revolution," changed after the first triumphant battles of March, 1848. He numbered the issue of the first Sunday after the revolution, Number One. All the issues until that point were declared null and void, and he did not hesitate to borrow the language of the creation in Genesis. This event was, for him, in a sense, a creative rebirth. One need only think of the rousing speech delivered by Adolf Fischof on the first glorious day of revolution in March, 1848. In order to understand its significance in a study of Frankl, the following points should be understood: it was the first sign of mass protest against the state, it was delivered by a Jew, and it was quoted at length in Frankl's memoir:

> Let us think of the striving and
> idealistic Germans, the tenacious,

> industrious and steadfast Slavs, the noble and spirited Magyars, the clever and clear-seeing Italians working for the cooperative endeavour of State with a united and wholly concentrated power. We can have no doubt that the place of Austria amongst the states of Europe must become an imposing one . . . To Austria and its glorious future! (5)

This year, 1848, was the beginning of modernity for Frankl. It was the crowning result of a protest that could only lead eventually to the realization of his greatest dreams, and the dreams of all modern, progressive Jews. No greater proof of its impact can be given to us than the words of Frankl himself in Sonntagsblaetter:

> Now it has all changed, as it was 50 years ago in beautiful Austria. The most natural right is once again given to us--we are permitted to speak, and by God, we want to speak. (6)

The fervent optimism, the sense that things had indeed changed irrevocably and forever permeated the consciousness of Vienna's Jews. This ecstatic confrontation with the future is expressed in the most ancient words of Jewish tradition, the words of Genesis:

> The academic youth spoke: Let there be light, and there was light. In six days the world was created, Austria in two days. The multitudes of the Monarchy have transformed themselves into a civilized state. The guard dogs of the secret police and censors have ceased, the armies have become a nation. (7)

D. THE EMPIRE

We will now take a brief look at the most important events in the history of the Habsburg Empire. These events were to have a large influence on the status of Jews in the Empire, and hence on Frankl and his thought. The first thing one must understand is the crucial character of the concept of the dynasty. The Habsburgs were the Empire. They had claims on a huge area of land stretching from what is now the Soviet Union in the East, Germany in the West, Italy and Yugoslavia in the South, and Czechoslovakia and Poland in the North, and encompassing what are now Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and parts of Poland, the Ukraine, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Italy. Governing such a variety and number of peoples, it was always difficult to discern just exactly what was this Empire, and what unified it. A.J.P. Taylor described the situation in this way, as peoples being "a complication in the history of the dynasty" (8). Taylor says that the Empire was preserved over a period of centuries by having had a "mission." In the sixteenth century, he says, the Habsburgs saved Europe from the Turks, in the seventeenth they promoted the Counter-reformation, in the eighteenth they propagated enlightenment, and in the nineteenth they served as a barrier to a greater German national state. What others achieved by warfare, they achieved by alliance, marriage, patience and the myth of a "great" professional army.

The achievements of the eighteenth and nineteenth century are of particular interest to us here. In 1772, the Habsburgs acquired Galicia, thereby acquiring large populations of Poles, Ukrainians, and Jews. The Empress Maria Theresa took the concept of Empire very seriously, and cleverly utilized the modern tools of centralization and

bureaucracy to consolidate her power. Her son, Joseph II, took this even further by adding modern ideas of education. He clearly saw the power of education in shaping and moulding model citizens of the Empire.

Joseph II and his reforms are of crucial importance to understanding the place of Jews within the Empire and the identity and consciousness of Jews such as Frankl. Joseph II was not only motivated by self-serving reasons of Empire-building. It is hard to say definitively what was, in the end, the most powerful motivation for his Edict of Toleration of 1781. But that it had an inestimable impact on what was to follow is unquestionable. In October, 1781 he issued the Edict, the highlights of which were to grant freedom of worship and civil equality to Lutherans, Calvinists and Greek Orthodox (with some remaining restrictions on churches); to permit Jews to conduct commerce, attend state schools, abolish the Jewish head tax, to draft them into the army, and to restrict the powers of the traditional Kehillah or autonomous Jewish community, only to matters of "religion" (they could not vote or own land until 1849); and to abolish 400 "parasitic" monasteries not engaging in education or care for the sick. The reforms regarding Jews caused Joseph II to be romanticized and mythologized in later writings of Jews, especially those who embraced unquestioningly the concepts of liberalism. Frankl was a Jew of this category. The reforms regarding Catholics and Protestants caused Joseph II to be looked upon suspiciously, as the Catholic Church saw its powers slipping away and usurped by the state.

E. ENLIGHTENMENT AND LIBERALISM

As mentioned before, the reforms were a combination of state-building, centralization and sincere belief in the winds of change: enlightenment, religious

tolerance, education. The eighteenth century Enlightenment thinkers saw the importance of education or Bildung. In Dohm's On the Civic Betterment of the Jews, he saw the "problem" of the Jews not as a fault of their own making, but rather as a result of their oppression by others. This "problem" was their backwardness, their insistence upon "parasitical" occupations, their baseness. All this could be easily rectified by granting them the rights of other citizens, educating them and stopping all oppression. Emancipation was the humane and compassionate response to centuries of oppression, and the solution. Yet, underlying this was the assumption that the end result would be the Jews' recognition of the superiority of Christianity. When there was no longer any oppression, emancipated Jewry would in all likelihood recognize the inevitability of a Christian humane society. It would be unfair to say that this attitude characterized all Christian thought, but it was definitely the majority opinion.

In the early years of this type of religious tolerance, there was exchange between Jews and Christians. These early exchanges between Christians and Jews were taken as a sign by Jews that there was to be a "neutral ground," a place where they could meet that did not take into account matters of faith. This neutral ground was an intellectual meeting place where Jew and Christian were equal.

The Enlightenment led to liberalism. Liberalism esteemed education and hard work, reward based on merit rather than privilege. It championed the mind over the body and the rationalism of science which led to social progress. In contrast to what he calls these "moral and scientific" values, the historian Carl Schorske outlines the "aesthetic" values of liberalism. If one could never become part of the nobility, one could at least adopt the aesthetic values of the nobility. The centralizing and urbanizing Empire

created an expanding bourgeois class in its wake. The Jews, historically barred from both traditional classes, nobility and peasantry, found a natural niche for themselves in this societal group. It was an economic class of entrepreneurs, professionals and white-collar workers, but it also became a cultural class. Culture was to become a ticket to respectability. Arthur Schnitzler would later say how his father could never feel comfortable eating at the table of a prince, but he could feel comfortable sitting next to a prince at the theatre. Carl Schorske calls this a type of assimilation through culture. Ludwig Frankl is an excellent representative of this cultured bourgeois class that combined the values of the Enlightenment and liberalism.

F. NATIONALISM AND THE EMPIRE

It is crucial to understand one thing when studying the development of the Habsburg Empire; its fundamental problem of self-definition. We have stated above the different "missions" of the Empire in successive centuries, but the sense of mission grew increasingly impotent in the nineteenth century, confronted with the birth of nationalism. This huge conglomeration of peoples and lands ruled by a dynasty did not even have a name; it was more than just "Austria," which itself did not even have a clear definition. At one point it was the "Holy Roman Empire," but this became increasingly difficult to maintain as Germany, or Prussia of the time developed its own sense of identity. In fact, it was not until the 1860's and 1870's that it became clear that Germany and Austria-Hungary were not going to become one realm. It was the "Empire," the "Habsburg Empire," and it was K.u.K. "kaiserlich und koeniglich," or a realm under "Kaiser" (Emperor of Austria) and "Koenig" (King of Hungary). After the union of Austria and Hungary--with which the Habsburgs gave up all real control over Hungary--the Ausgleich of 1867, and even

before, it was "Austria-Hungary" or the "Dual Monarchy." It was not until 1804 that Francis I proclaimed himself "Austrian Emperor," and at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the Holy Roman Empire became a loosely defined "German Confederation."

This undefined and hardly unified Empire encompassed Germans, Poles, Italians, Magyars, Ukrainians, Rumanians, Czechs, Slovaks, Slovenians, Croats, and Serbs. They had a changing self-perception throughout their history under the Habsburgs, but one thing united them; a growing desire for independence. During the nineteenth century this became an increasingly frightening concept for the ruling Habsburgs, and helps explain the paranoia that often lay under the surface of all legislation. Franz Josef, who came to power in 1848, probably believed until his death in 1916 that he could keep these nationalistic desires at bay. Perhaps it was the power of this belief alone, of course buttressed by often odd juxtapositions of circumstance, that managed to keep it together for so long, contrary to all rational expectation. William Johnston, in his excellent study The Austrian Mind, explains this Habsburg will to survive as follows:

> Franz Joseph I, Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary, and inheritor of some twenty other titles, symbolized more than he achieved. Reigning from December, 1848, to November, 1916, longer than any other European monarch, Franz Joseph became a living embodiment of the will to survive. Grandson of the Biedermeier emperor Franz I and nephew of the befuddled Ferdinand I, he perpetuated their adherence to tradition. Although enjoying a veto over all legislation, he

> granted demands for constitutional rule in 1860 and 1867 and permitted universal suffrage in Austria in 1907. Regarding himself as a dynasty personified, Franz Joseph could still in July, 1914, address a proclamation of war "To My Peoples" (An meine Voelker), with stress on the adjective. (9)

And, in this cauldron of nationalistic aspiration, only the Jews saw themselves as "Austrians." Taylor says, "The Jews alone were not troubled by the conflict between dynastic and national claims; they were Austrians without reserve" (10). The Jews alone had no territory to claim. They had lived in European lands for over a thousand years, and had always been loyal to their rulers. Even in the outlying areas of the Empire, the Jews learned German, the unifying language. They had nothing to lose and everything to gain by an unquestioning identification with German culture. There were sometimes exceptions to this unifying factor, such as the strong Magyarization that took place in Hungary, and which often greatly influenced and affected the Jews as well. After the reforms of Joseph II, it was logical for them to see the promise of the future in staunch loyalty to this Habsburg dynasty that had "reformed" them and hinted at the granting of emancipation.

As merchants, involved in commerce, the hope of the Jews lay in national unity and the end of internal legal and economic barriers (11). Hence, the unifying principle, the Habsburg family, became their rulers and masters without question, and they never wavered in their loyalty. It is therefore not surprising to see poems and songs written by Jews dedicated to various Habsburg rulers. Joseph II was often depicted as a type of liberator in Jewish art, and in this Ludwig Frankl was no exception. One of his first epic

books of poetry, Die Habsburglied [Ode to the Habsburgs], published in 1832, is entirely devoted to Habsburg rulers, with the most heroic poems dedicated to Joseph II. This unwavering loyalty and dedication was a crucial underlying factor in his voyage to Palestine, and in his reaction.

The irony of the development of the late nineteenth century becomes almost poignant in light of the above. Growing nationalism among all the indigenous peoples of the Empire led to greater anti-semitism. To the various nationalities, the Jews were identified with the powers that ruled them, and from whom they wanted to break away: they spoke German, they identified with German culture (except in certain isolated cases such as that of Hungary and strong Magyar, or Hungarian nationalism) and they were often very visible as bureaucrats and Habsburg representatives. To the threatened Germans the Jews were untrustworthy, not truly "German." It was a combination of this type of anti-semitism, the recognition that they would never be accepted as true Austrians, and a very sincere and growing sense of positive national identity that led, finally, to Jewish nationalism. This nationalism was not monolithic, conceived in as many gradations and varieties of thought as there existed varieties of Jews, and it is beyond the scope of this paper to grant it a closer analysis. But, in relation to Frankl, the paradox is as follows: Frankl, who lived in a time of complete identification with the Empire, who never questioned his loyalty and place within it, embarked upon a journey which would later give sustenance to ideas of a Jewish homeland. He founded a school, in part, in gratitude to the glory of Habsburg benevolence, with the portrait of Franz Josef in a place of prominence on the school-room wall. The reality of this school, and the reevaluation of the national identity that it symbolized, would at least be a small step on the road to later cravings for national

autonomy, which cravings among other national groups, were a large factor in tearing apart the same Empire that had been an inspiration for the school.

G. THE CONCEPT OF "MODERN" JEWISH CONSCIOUSNESS

We must now look at the problematic nature of the use of the term "modern" Jewish consciousness in the title of this paper. The word "modern" has been a source of much historical dispute, it is open to interpretation and therefore must be questioned whenever it is used in a rational historical analysis. Yet, the term "Jewish consciousness," as well, is open to interpretation.

It may be instructive for us to look at various prominent historians' views on the place of Jews in nineteenth century Central Europe in order to get a clearer picture of the elements of this question of "modernity." Peter Gay, a respected scholar of German history, sees the "modern" question as distorted. He believes that the delegated place of Jews in the vanguard of modernity is over-emphasized. He believes that, although the Jews may have taken part in various aspects of modernity out of proportion to their numbers in the population, their dominant place is exaggerated. He further claims that at least vis a vis their modernity, their Jewishness had no part to play. That is, that they were not Jewish modernists, but rather modernist Jews. He says that with regard to the quality and character of their work, there could be no way to deduce that the artists were Jewish (12). The overarching thesis behind all this is that Jews took part in German society as Germans, not as Jews, that they were as good Germans as anyone else. Yet, he also discusses the rise of modern anti-semitism as an irrational prejudice of traditionalists threatened by the modern world. To these anti-modern anti-semites, the Jew concentrated in his person, all the aspects of modernity that were to them most

unsettling: participation in trade, commerce, industry, the stock exchange, journalism, radical politics and the arts. If Jews represented all this, then were they not, in some sense,"Jewish modernists?"

Other historians recognize this paradox and attempt to explain the connection. Frederic Grunfeld, in his Prophets Without Honour, sees this place of Jews in the vanguard of modernity as a direct result of their position on the fringes of society. Never wholly accepted by mainstream, conservative society, they had less to lose by postulating and advocating the new. Not only risk was involved. Grunfeld also believes that this position on the fringes of society also gave them a better vantage point to see and contribute to new trends. He believes that their logical indifference to revealed truth pushed them to their front-line position in new movements. John Murray Cuddihy uses this idea to explain the impetus behind three of the greatest "modernist" movements of the last century and a half: Freudian psychoanalysis, Marxist theory, and the sociology of Claude Levi-Strauss. Because these three experienced Western society as a disguised form of Christianity, he claims, they could, as Jews with a natural aversion to Christianity, openly resist it as such.

Carl Schorske sees developments in the modern period as a Hegelian dialectic, a synthesis of old and new. He recognizes that very often the "modern" is a reactionary answer to present trends. The "modern" political movements of Lueger, Von Schoenerer and Herzl, all originating in Vienna, at the end of the nineteenth century, are actually reactions to the failings of modern liberalism. He calls it the politics of the Old Left becoming the New Right.

Jacob Katz attempts to explain the movement of Jews out of the ghetto at the end of the eighteenth century. He is opposed to the idea that Jews somehow abandoned all

their traditions in order to embrace the promise of "the new." In his book, Out of the Ghetto, he traces the intellectual trends and legal changes that made it possible for Jews to move "out of the ghetto." His conclusion is that it was not a rejection of the old that inspired their movements, but rather a process of justifying change within the accepted limits of the tradition. He sees it not as disintegration of traditional Judaism but as transformation. This concept becomes increasingly problematic as the nineteenth century progresses.

Let us look at this idea of "progress." Jehuda Reinharz in his Fatherland or Promised Land sees 1848 as a turning point. Up until this year, "enlightened" opinion about Jews was to see them as "human beings" like Christians, capable of educating themselves and becoming prepared for Western "civilized" society. After 1848, he argues, this idea of education, "civic betterment" and gentrifying themselves, becomes subsumed in an all-encompassing idea of "progress." All their actions are designed to perpetuate and further the idea of "progress," it is the telos and the "good" of civil society.

This idea of "progress" can be seen clearly reflected in the writings of Ludwig Frankl. Optimism about, and firm belief in, the success of progress is the common thread in his periodical, Sonntagsblaetter. It could also be argued that Frankl so firmly believed in this spirit of progress as a result of his position on the fringes of society. Despite quite tolerant acceptance into the circles of the elite, educated and artistic, Frankl was always the "Jew." In an impressive audience with the Emperor in the 1830's, Frankl is asked why he does not pursue literature or philosophy at the University, and he responds that Jews are not allowed to follow these programmes in Vienna. His friend, the respected novelist Karoline Pichler, who in all other ways treats him as an equal in the field of

literature, describes Frankl's character without failing to put it in terms of his Jewish ancestry.

Finally, the historian Steven E. Ascheim in Brothers and Strangers, describes this nineteenth century "modernizing" trend of Jews as certainly due in large part to a positive identification with the West, but also given impetus by a very strong negative dissociation from the "rabble" of the East. These new "modern" Jews had left the ignorance, narrow-mindedness, filth and intolerance of their Eastern European brethren behind. Thus, their modernity became a kind of dissociation from the past. It would be difficult to argue the relative degrees of association and dissociation since the two must of necessity be simultaneously present. But, it is important to recognize the existence of this distaste and desire to extricate themselves from the Jews of the East. This desire is clearly seen in Frankl and his reaction to the "Polish-Russian rabble" in Jerusalem quoted at the beginning of this chapter.

H. JEWISH ACTIVITY IN THE EMPIRE

In the year 1847 there were approximately 403,000 people in Vienna, and approximately 1,600 "tolerated" Jewish families, but closer to 4,000 Jews in actual number in Vienna (13). The second half of the century was a period of large migrations of populations and huge transformation in the demographic structure of Vienna. A loosening of restrictions, greater freedom of movement, led to a mass influx of people into Vienna, especially after the "triumph" of liberalism in 1867.

The first large influx of Jews into Vienna were Jews from Bohemia. Frankl was part of this first migration, coming from Chrast in Bohemia to study at the University of Vienna in 1828. Marsha Rozenblitt explains this mass migration of Jews into Vienna as being a result of growing

nationalisms in the outlying areas, the attempt to squeeze out the competition of Jewish businesses, growing opportunities in urban centres, and increased poverty in the areas of origin.

As far as Frankl is concerned, the primary explanation would be the growing opportunities for Jews that resulted from the factors listed above: increasing "tolerance," expanding educational opportunities, increasing desire to exploit these growing educational opportunities, and a desire to integrate into Western culture which was a result of the promise that the increased tolerance inspired.

The first great educational reforms occurred in the 1850's, under the direction of Count Leo Thun. They were based on German and French models and emphasized research and empirical inquiry over religion and unquestioning obedience to the state (14). Study at the Gymnasium was lengthened from six to eight years, and became more specialized and put more emphasis on natural sciences. The students had to study Latin for eight years and Greek for five or six years.

Although Frankl had attended school before these reforms, we can form an impression about what ideas were permeating the atmosphere. William Johnston describes how this emphasis on rote learning of Latin and Greek must have instilled awareness of a great tradition dating back centuries (15). One need only look at Frankl's articles in Sonntagsblaetter, or read his descriptions of Greece in The Jews in the East to validate this observation. He had truly been influenced by his education in the Classics, and it is clearly evident in the reactions to his mission in Palestine.

The change in demographic structure and education led to a change in occupation. Jews who had been merchants in the rural areas of the Empire, found a whole new field of

endeavour open to them in the expanding urban centres. While the greater number of Jews remained in the field of commerce, they took advantage of the open and unexploited field of white-collar occupations. The expanding bureaucracy and administration necessitated by a centralizing and industrializing Empire offered a wealth of opportunity to the Jews who had been historically barred from entering the traditional occupations of farming, owning land, and who had been severely restricted in artisanry and guild membership. Better access to education made them especially suited to enter the new occupations.

While most Jews entering these new occupations remained in administrative posts, and clerkships, many utilized their better educational opportunities to enter medicine and law, traditional "professions" where they were tolerated. Ludwig Frankl is an excellent example of one of these Jews. He entered medicine, despite his profound desire to continue studying history, philosophy or write poetry, because being a doctor represented just about the highest social pinnacle a Jew was capable of reaching. As a Jew, he would never have been allowed a university professorship in history or philosophy.

Yearning for opportunity helps explain the voracious desire of Jews to enter completely new and expanding areas of occupation such as journalism, literature, music. Improvements in printing, better education, loosening of censorship, increasing realization of the power of the press, all led to a massive expansion of journalism of which Jews took full advantage.

Ludwig Frankl became the editor of Sonntagsblaetter in 1842, a periodical containing a cornucopia of articles on every subject one can imagine from arts, literature, folk tales, statistics, local events, feuilleton, to science and nature. Everything, in fact,

except politics. It is considered one of the best periodicals of the Vormaerz (Pre-March), the period just prior to the revolutionary events of March, 1848.

I. CENSORSHIP IN THE VORMAERZ

In order to understand Frankl, it is instructive to take a look at his views on censorship. One of his greatest beliefs, even obsessions, was in the necessity of freedom of speech. Fear of the freedom of speech was also a dominant factor in the Vormaerz period, especially the years 1815 to 1848. This is the "Metternich period," a period in which Prince Metternich, the ubiquitous and powerful Foreign Minister, essentially ruled the Empire with an iron fist and a growing fear of the power of the printed word as expressed by popular will. The subject of politics was completely banned from journalism.

Metternich did not censor things out of ignorance, but out of a profound recognition of the power of words. Frankl, too, recognized the power of words, but he believed that they must be said. His memoir is filled with references to the censors, their stupidity, their narrow-mindedness, their backwardness. He was very interested in Metternich's views on the power of the press, and quoted them at length in his memoir:

> The printed word has a different character than the thought which is unlimited in its freedom, and than the spoken or written word! The printed word becomes a commodity and commodities require a market; herein the thought treads in to the field of commercial speculation; it becomes corporeal and places itself among the category of commercial materials. They then become irrefutable realities. . . . (16)

Frankl's purpose in quoting this was to demonstrate the calculated thought behind Metternich's censors, and to deplore the result of this calculated thought. Yet, Metternich's and Frankl's recognition of the power of the press, though their responses were different, is a testament to their "modern consciousness."

J. JEWISH ORGANIZATION IN VIENNA

On the third of April, 1849, the Emperor Franz Josef addressed a Jewish representative with the word "Israelite Community." This representative was Ludwig August Frankl. It was not until 1852 that the "Statutes" of the Jewish community achieved official recognition by the state. Frankl's journey, which came fast on the heels of 1852, could not but have been an expression of this new official recognition and legitimization of the Jews and their community within Vienna (17).

Although Jews had lived in Vienna for hundreds of years, with a few interruptions for periods of expulsion, they had never enjoyed the legitimacy of an officially recognized Jewish autonomous community since the expulsion of 1670. Frankl became the secretary and archivist of the Jewish community in 1838, but it was only in 1852 that it became officially recognized as the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde or IKG (Israelite Religious Community). It was to perform religious and charitable activities. By the end of the nineteenth century, there was to be an intricate network of Jewish organizations, from social and humanitarian ones such as the B'nai B'rith, nationalist ones such as the Kadimah (a response to anti-semitism and the need for positive national Jewish identification) which was a reversion back to a type of Jewish exclusiveness, to various political ones such as the Juedische Volkspartei. But in the early years, the IKG had almost free dominion over the activities of the Jews in Vienna. It was linked to

the establishment of the new synagogue in Seitenstettengasse in 1826.

It has often been said that Frankl was selected as Secretary of the IKG more for his stellar social connections and cultural influence than for his devout Judaism. In a closer analysis of Frankl and his interests, we will be more able to see the dominant interests of the founders of the Jewish community, and just how appropriate a choice Frankl was in these early years of liberal optimism.

It would be unfair and anachronistic to see the development of the Jewish community in the early nineteenth century as a process of extrication from the "backward" world of their Jewish ancestors. Yet it is crucial to recognize the very sincere desire to integrate into Western culture, to embrace it in gratitude for the opportunities it was increasingly providing. Peter Gradenwitz, in his essay, "Jews in Austrian Music," illustrates this point, when discussing the selection of Schubert as composer of a great musical work for the new synagogue:

> That the Jewish community of Vienna turned to Beethoven for a musical work for the new synagogue and, when he refused, commissioned another, only slightly less prominent non-Jew to compose a sacred cantata, points to the trend prevailing in Austrian Jewry at the time. (18)

This trend was optimism and faith in a new world, a world that presented opportunities for Jews that had heretofore been unthinkable. They saw no contradiction in wanting Beethoven, the greatest German composer, to compose a musical work for the wonderful new synagogue. Frankl was one of these Jews, and this simple faith was part of his faith in modernity.

K. FORESHADOWING OF LATER EVENTS

The irony of the progression of modern anti-semitism does not negate the modernity of Jews like Frankl. It is ironic because it was to a large degree the very identification of Jews with "modern" liberalism that made them a target of resentment and even hatred when liberalism failed. Liberalism failed to appeal to the nationalities of the Habsburg Empire, and especially to the growing masses of the proletariat. And the Empire was, more or less, just a huge heterogeneous conglomeration of national minorities, with Germans claiming the right to cultural dominance, despite the fact of being a minority themselves. Jews, not yet classified as a "national" minority, made the smooth transition to being Germans of the "Jewish faith."

Resentment against the hegemony of the German Habsburgs, growing national awareness and desire for independence, and the failure of liberalism to respond to these feelings led eventually to the defection of once-staunch believers in liberalism. Many of these defectors, such as the failed racist nationalist, Georg Von Schoenerer, would use the Jew, representative of the quintessential "Liberal," as a focal point for these resentments. The Jew would become the one rallying point around which all could agree. The Jew was urban, industrialized, radical, anti-traditionalist, capitalist, socialist, Habsburg lackey, and alien all wrapped into one.

The other irony was that this rejection by the very Western society in which they had put their faith, which they had so embraced, led to their own "national" consciousness, the rise of Zionist organizations and other national Jewish organizations, even political parties. The optimism that had inspired Frankl to found a school in Jerusalem, belief in Western values and education, a desire to glorify the benevolence of the Habsburgs, had been the

first step on the road to what would eventually lead to modern Zionism, a symptom of the pessimism which was a reaction to the modern world he had so wholeheartedly accepted and even celebrated.

But we must not overlook the very positive aspects of Zionism, which also, after all, form part of the continuous chain of Jewish aspiration over two thousand years. Shlomo Avineri elaborates on this continuity over centuries:

> For in the Zionist idea one can discern both the legacy of Jewish tradition and the challenges of the modern age, the Sturm und Drang of nineteenth and twentieth century European history combined with a historical heritage going back thousands of years. (19)

L. SUMMARY

This chapter has attempted to outline the intellectual concerns of a study of Ludwig August Frankl and his journey to Palestine in 1856. It is a study not so much concerned with the "facts" of the journey, but with the cultural atmosphere that it represented. The various sections of this chapter were concerned with introducing this atmosphere and the historical events that led up to them. It attempted to explicate the aspects of Viennese life with which Ludwig Frankl was concerned, what influenced him, what his aspirations were as Jew and Viennese "citizen," and what were the aspects of "modernity" that related to him.

Above all, this chapter has been an attempt to illustrate the profound excitement and inspiration that the Jew found in the modernizing world. Perhaps, as Peter Gay believes, it was not true that Jew=Modern, but for a significant group of Jews in a particular place and time,

the "modern" caused a quickening of the pulse, and provided a source of aspiration. Stefan Zweig, remembering a time not long after Frankl's youth, said:

> In fact we scented the wind before it crossed the frontier, because we constantly lived with quivering nostrils. We found the new because we desired the new, because we hungered for something that belonged to us alone, and not to the world of our fathers, to the world around us. (20)

N O T E S

1. Nikolaus Vielmetti, "Der Wiener Juedische Publizist Ludwig August Frankl und die Begruendung der Laemelschule in Jerusalem 1856," Jahrbuch des Inst. fuer Deutsche Geschichte 4 (1975): 167.

2. Frankl, Ludwig, Briefwechsel zwischen Anastius Gruen und Ludwig August Frankl (1845-76), Dr. Bruno von Frankl-Hochwart, ed., vol. 1 of Karl Emil Franzos, ed., Aus Dem Neunzehnten Jahrhundert: Briefe und Aufzeichnungen (Berlin: Concordia Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1897) 82-83.

3. Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin, Wittgenstein's Vienna (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1973) 16.

4. Frankl, Ludwig August, Erinnerungen von Ludwig August Frankl, introduction and ed., Stefan Hock (Prague: Josef Koch, I.G. Calve'sche K.u.K. Hof u. Universitaets Buchhandlung, 1910) viii.

5. Frankl, Erinnerungen 326.

6. Ludwig August Frankl, "Sonntagsrede," in Ludwig August Frankl, ed., Sonntagsblaetter: fuer Heimathliche Interessen vol. vii (1848): 129.

7. Ferd. Kuernberger, "Die Wiener Revolution," Sonntagsblaetter, vol. vii (1848): 130.

8. A.J.P. Taylor, The Habsburg Monarchy: 1809-1918 (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1976) 10.

9. William M. Johnston, The Austrian Mind (1972; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983) 33.

10. Taylor, Habsburg 17.

11. Peter G. J. Pulzer, The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria (U.S.A.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964) 8.

12. Peter Gay, Freud, Jews and Other Germans (1978; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979) 95.

13. Marsha L. Rozenblitt, The Jews of Vienna: Assimilation and Identity (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983) 17.

14. Johnston, Aust. Mind 67.

15. Johnston, Aust. Mind 68.

16. Frankl, Erinnerungen 204-205.

17. Wolfgang Hauesler, "Katalog: Die Revolution von 1848 und die oesterreichischen Juden," Studia Judaica Austriaca I vol. 1 (1974): 62.

18. Peter Gradenwitz, "Jews in Austrian Music," The Jews of Austria, ed. Josef Fraenkel (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co. Ltd., 1967) 18.

19. Shlomo Avineri, The Making of Modern Zionism: The Intellectual Origins of the Jewish State (New York: Basic Books, 1981) introduction x.

20. Stefan Zweig, The World of Yesterday, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964) 43.

CHAPTER II

LUDWIG AUGUST FRANKL AND HIS TIME

A. EARLY LIFE (1810-1827)

Despite a rather extensive description of his childhood and youth in his memoirs, the early life of Ludwig Frankl is sketchy. Most other biographical accounts relate similar details of his youth, leading one to believe that they gleaned the details from Frankl's own description. Frankl is often a painstakingly detailed memoirist, yet he is often lacking in immediacy, and a feeling of emotional closeness to his subject. It is not difficult to discern what was important to him intellectually, but personal feelings and emotions are scarce. In over 300 pages of his memoir, there is not even a reference to his children.

The period 1810-1827 are the years from his birth in Chrast, Bohemia until his departure to study at the University of Vienna. In any discussion of Frankl's ancestry, one crucial episode is always mentioned. His family was traced back as far as Kopel Fraenkel and his sons Isak and Israel. The Fraenkel family was allegedly one of the richest families in the Vienna ghetto in the late seventeenth century. When the Jews were blamed for the miscarriage of Kaiserin Margarethe, the Emperor's wife, they were told to leave Vienna and Lower Austria in 1670. Kopel died before the expulsion date, but his sons Isak and Israel managed to secure the safety of the Jewish cemetery in Rossau by paying 4000 florins to the City of Vienna. The declaration of the city concerning the Jewish graveyard is still extant in the Stadtarchiv Wien, and is dated July 12, 1671 (1). The graveyard was to eventually come in to the possession of the famous Court Jew, Samuel Oppenheim, in 1696, after the Jews returned from exile.

The above story is interesting for what it demonstrates about Frankl's personality. It legitimizes

Frankl's Jewish ancestry, while demonstrating its "noble" roots. Its quality of myth and legend would have appealed to Frankl's poetic interests, and hence his probable reason for often recounting it.

Frankl's expelled ancestors went to Fuerth, near Nuremberg, and according to his account, recognition of their profound devoutness made them representatives of the community. After about a century, they were to return to the Empire. In Kuttenplan, Bohemia, Lazar Frankl, through marriage, became involved in the tobacco business.

The history of the tobacco business in Europe went back to the fifteenth century and the voyage of Christopher Columbus. It quickly grew from being a luxury article to a mass consumer commodity. Exiled Jews of Spain had played a large part in spreading the cultivation of tobacco. Hamburg became a centre of the tobacco trade, and many Jews came from Hamburg to other parts of Central Europe and leased ducal tobacco monopolies. This monopoly concession system was practised in Austria and the South German states. It was a risky but potentially lucrative business. By the early eighteenth century, the biggest tobacco monopoly in Austria was held by the above-mentioned Court Jew, Diego d'Aguilar. By the end of the century the Bohemian and Moravian monopolies were in the hands of the Dobruschka, Popper and Hoenig families.

Lazar Frankl married the daughter of Israel Hoenig Edler von Hoenigsberg, who became the Regierungsrat [government representative] for Lower Austria, and Tabakgefaellendirektor [Director of the Tobacco Industry] in 1783 after the birth of the Austrian Tabakregie [Tobacco state monopoly]. Thus, Hoenigsberg was the head noble Jew in what was called the "hereditary lands." After Lazar's death, his wife Marianne Frankl moved to Chrast in Bohemia, in 1792, with her seven children. She managed the

Tabakdistriktsverlag herself until her son Leopold attained the appropriate age to take it over.

Ludwig Frankl, in his memoir, described Leopold, his father, as a stately, educated and "worldly" figure, who had appropriated his culture and worldly ways during long visits to relatives in Vienna. He described the "natural" attraction of Leopold for Ludwig's mother, country-raised, beautiful and brought up in a strictly religious home, and knowing the Pentateuch, Prophets, Psalms, and the sayings of the sages in "their high German translation" (2). The multiple influences of his parents, as well as a number of aunts and uncles who had converted to Christianity could not have been without impact upon the young Ludwig.

In biographical accounts of Ludwig's early life, one often reads of his parents having secured instruction for him in Latin by a Catholic cleric. Yet, in one obituary account in Die Deborah, 1894, it says that his early instruction in the original Hebrew text of the Bible came from this same Catholic cleric (3). Thus, even his early formative Jewish education came from Christians rather than Jews. Frankl had very specific ideas about Jewish-Christian rapprochement, and his early years of instruction in his parents' home by a Catholic, cannot but have had seminal influence on these ideas. The Encyclopedia Judaica entry on Frankl mentions the great influence of his relative Zachariah Frankel on Ludwig's Jewish education, but this "fact" has been questioned. This Frankel, Zachariah, was the first Bohemian rabbi who had undertaken a secular academic education, and subsequently became the director of the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau. His reforms were later to influence the conservative movement in the U.S..

Frankl attended the Piarist school, which though situated in a Czech town, gave instruction in German. This,

though, was not so uncommon in many Bohemian towns, where German was the dominant cultural influence. German was also the language spoken at home. German was often the mother tongue of Jews, no matter where they lived in the vast Empire. It was the language of forward-looking Jews who identified with Habsburg culture and hegemony. It was the language of "modern" Jews. It is very unclear whether Frankl knew Yiddish, which was the lingua franca of all European Jews. He certainly never admitted to it, and when he arrived in Jerusalem in 1856, he described the Yiddish that was spoken there as a German dialect. Peter Gay says that to not speak Yiddish was one thing that German Jews did as good Germans. Yiddish was the language of the past, of the ghetto Jews who were not forward-looking enough to see the superiority of German culture, and who could not appreciate the promise of the "modern" world.

Ludwig therefore attended the German Piaristenschule, and then the Piaristen Untergymnasium in Prague, until the death of his father in 1825. After Leopold's death, Ludwig attended the Piaristengymnasium in Leitomischl, Bohemia, which he called a boring provincial town. William Johnston describes the Piarist fathers as,

> . . . members of a teaching order, established in 1597, [who] shared the openness of Bohemian Josephinism, teaching Jews without any effort to convert them. At Prague, the Piarist elementary school was preferred by Jewish families because of the excellence of its instruction. (4)

These brothers were earnest in preparing students for University. They taught Luther, Homer, Sophocles, Virgil and Ovid, but more for their religious content than for purposes of an aesthetic education. Nevertheless, Ludwig's

love for poetry was already in evidence in these early years.

Ludwig was always to look back on this early education with nostalgia and sentimentality for the brothers who taught him and fostered and encouraged his poetic aspirations. It is also important to take account of this period in order to understand the profound influence it must have had on his later thinking.

Despite his love for and preoccupation with poetry, his goal was the University of Vienna, where he wished to study medicine. As mentioned before, medicine was one of the few fields open to Jews at the University, and was one of the few professional occupations where a Jew could attain prestige, affluence and advancement. He arrived in Vienna in 1827, where he entered the faculty of Medicine. Throughout his student years in Vienna, he was to maintain a connection with literary circles, and continued to produce and publish his poems in journals and newspapers.

B. VIENNA STUDENT YEARS

After his father's death, Frankl's family had to scrimp for money, and Frankl was obliged to tutor in order to earn a living while studying medicine in Vienna. Except for a short period of expulsion in 1848, suspected of "revolutionary activities," he was to live in this city for the rest of his life. In every way, even ironically in the fact of his expulsion, Frankl was the quintessential Viennese "burgher." He spent his student years making contacts and immersing himself in Viennese cultural life. A turning point in his career was the 1832 publication of his Das Habsburglied, heroic poems dedicated to Habsburg monarchs. It is interesting that he chose this as his first great poetic theme. He was granted an audience with the Emperor in order to present his poetic collection, and was openly accepted in prominent literary circles thereafter.

He made his most lasting connections in the circle of the novelist Karoline Pichler, which he described:

> Its glory [her salon] dates, actually, to the preceding century, when the parents of the writer, the father as Hofrat to Kaiserin Maria Theresia, the mother as courtier, attracted a richly influential society of statesmen and diplomats. The presence of these poetic and musical greats, such as Blumauer and Metastasio, Haydn and Alringer, Sonnenfels and Mozart, lent the salon an exalted glamour and spirit. (5)

In his first years in medicine, Frankl lived in the inner city with Ignaz Polinski, a student from Pest. Ignaz became his friend, and expressed shock when he learned that Ludwig was unacquainted with Goethe and Schiller, both of whom had been considered "dangerous" reading by the Piarist fathers. The impact that the greats of German literature were to have on him was immeasurable. He read these formerly "forbidden" works, and wrote:

> It was as if a dense cloud melted and an unimaginable elevated mountainscape was revealed in enchanted moonlight. It was curious that a spiritual dread of my earliest youth was again awakened and followed me into my dreams in the night. (6)

He and Polinski had long discussions on aesthetics and literature, which were far more important to him than his discussions on anatomy. It was to be the auspicious beginning of Frankl, the German liberal "modern." In order to comprehend the importance to him of what he found in these "dangerous" works, let us look at the passage from

Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's Nathan der Weise, that Frankl was later to quote in his poetic collection, Libanon:

> Come, we must be friends! Scorn my
> people as much as you may. We both have
> not selected our people. Are we "our"
> people? What does the people mean? Are
> Christian and Jew, Christian and Jew
> before human beings? (7)

These early years in Vienna were also a time for him to immerse himself in the prevailing intellectual preoccupations of the time. He discussed the huge impact that the rebellion of the Poles in 1830 had upon the intellectuals of the time, and the sympathy it evoked, despite the fact that it was censored from mention in any contemporary Austrian periodicals.

In 1836 he travelled to Italy, where he completed his medical doctoral dissertation in Padua in 1837. During this time he became a self-confessed "pilgrim" to the classic sites of Italian art. This was also the beginning of his subsequent wanderlust which was a contributing factor to his voyage to Palestine in 1856. Wanderlust was a symptom of an opening world, with better access to travel in the middle of the century. A magnetic attraction to the ancient world was also, paradoxically, a driving factor in the "modern" desire to travel.

After his graduation, Frankl decided not to practice medicine, perhaps he had never intended to. He looked for a way to pursue his artistic interests, and in 1838, the job of Secretary to the Jewish Community fell in his lap.

C. THE 1840'S AND SONNTAGSBLAETTER

In the early 1840's, Frankl continued to pursue his artistic interests, and in his descriptions of the groups of artists and intellectuals that gathered, one can

discern the already-present longings that would lead to the revolution of 1848. In 1840, an artistic group of the biggest names in Austrian literature formed under the title Concordia, later known as Vormaerzliche Concordia. This led to other groups, and in 1842, the juridisch-politisch Leseverein formed, a reading association, a group of people from the circles of the high bureaucrats, legal, military, doctors, writers, theologians, which was to be called by the famous head of the censors, Sedlnitzky, the "cauldron of the Revolution." This was probably not an unjustified accusation, as Frankl described the activities of the Verein as follows:

> Each individual reported from his own circles about his lively thoughts and experiences. The thought pervaded their consciousness, answer to their spiritual longing, that a new, a different order of things must come. (8)

With the Sonntagsblaetter, one gets a comprehensive picture of the range of Frankl's interests, the ideas and movements that preoccupied him, what, in a sense, made him tick. The conclusion that one comes to is that he was interested in almost everything, capable of being stimulated by all that was new and all that was old. But, for him, the old was a path to the new. His interest in history can be seen as having been imbued with the "modern" preoccupations of the nineteenth century. An interest in history was more and more tied in with love of country, the nationalistic spirit, a desire to legitimize one's place in the great European tradition. The nationalistic interest was a modern one, and history was its handmaiden. Frankl described this new preoccupation in his Inschriften des Alten Juedischen Friedhofes in Wien [Inscriptions of the Old Jewish Cemetery in Vienna], a work

which was encouraged by the IKG for which he worked, and which beautifully illustrates this unconscious striving for legitimization. In it, the Jews are shown to be a people as much a part of Austrian history and soil as any other. But, one must not see this anachronistically, i.e., as a conscious attempt to legitimize their claim as a historical people of Austria. Among the gravestones from which he quoted are those of Samuel Oppenheimer, who died in 1703, and Samson Wertheimer, who died in 1724. These two very famous Viennese Court Jews evoked passionate and tragic epitaphs. Upon their graves are passages about "grief-filled hearts" of the mourning Jews, and looking upon these men with the "pleasure of our eyes."

Frankl, and the modern liberal Jews like him, truly believed that they were part of Austrian history. They did not see it so much as rationalization, but as natural historical research, as much a part of contemporary research as other research of the time:

> During a period of years, whilst the European destiny is struggling to be decided, historical research has become more and more active, and not only concerned with the larger life of countries. Their historical monuments, artistic treasures, graves and monuments have been more than ever illustrated, considered and reviewed. The completion of cathedrals, the erection of statues, the many written tributes to famous men create a picture, next to the political movements, with a characteristic outline of the greatest decades in Germany. And while we turn our eyes ever more to the surrounding flood, serious men come

> together in order to contemplate this vanishing life and collect, guard and look critically at the antiquities of preceding centuries. (9)

Frankl did not just speak glowingly of these pursuits, he lived his life acting out his belief in the necessity of studying history. He was fascinated by antiquities and this fascination was clearly, even obsessively evident in the six years in which he edited Sonntagsblaetter. It is also crucial to our understanding of what eyes he used to observe contemporary Palestine. They were the eyes of a Central European modern liberal, and a Jew. The strange way in which these two factors combined make his reaction to his mission so interesting and so complicated.

Stefan Hock, who can be accused of being partisan, called Sonntagsblaetter "without a doubt the best belletristic periodical of the Austrian pre-March" (10). And, its quality and scope and range of subject matter are indeed quite amazing. It had regular sections on literature, music, theatre, local events and news, art, books, history and reports on historical research being done, excerpts from contemporary literature, news on science and industry, world statistics, as well as, finally in 1848, a report of political events. The list of collaborators is a "who's who" of contemporary Austria: Grillparzer, Anastasius Gruen, Karoline Pichler, Leopold Kompert, Josef Rank, Hammer-Purgstall, Nikolaus Lenau, the music critic Hanslick etc., many of whom got their "break" through the encouragement of Frankl. Later assessments of Frankl always credit him with a generosity of spirit that welcomed and fostered young talent in whom he believed.

In reading through its pages, one can have a clearer picture of what things moved Frankl. He included

countless pieces, mostly feuilletons or other factual travel accounts, about Italy. Italy was, for him, the centre of all artistic spirit, "In Italy the sense of beauty and art swims in the air, a voluptuous aroma. They breathe it and imbibe it with their mother's milk" (11). He had articles on contemporary medical problems, he displayed a concern with a problem that was increasingly preoccupying doctors, and the public in general, that of the insane. Art and literature of the time was filled with this preoccupation. Ideas of nineteenth century humanism and romanticism fill its pages. He did not overlook another growing preoccupation of the time, a changing outlook on women and their capabilities.

In an amazingly foresightful look at contemporary views of women, he chastised parents who encouraged their daughters in the accepted bourgeois pursuits of the time; domestic activities, and especially forcing them to become accomplished but mediocre pianists. In the course of an angry diatribe against this mediocrity, Frankl displayed all the attributes of the most advanced educational thinking of his period:

> Learn, above all, to think more--read a page in world history, learn why water becomes steam. I mean, cast a glance at natural history. . . . I love woman, when her attributes are full of soul, when thoughtfulness shines from her eyes. . . . but do not chop at wood with your white fingers, do not study music for hours on end! Think! (12)

Sonntagsblaetter was the perfect vehicle for a man like Frankl. It allowed him to indulge his manifold interests, to meet and work with the greatest figures in the artistic world, to advance his modern views and opinions on

an entire range of subject matter, and then in 1848, when even the possibility of political commentary was permitted, Frankl was in his element. One can truly understand what 1848 must have meant to him, what limitless vistas it opened for him. It is important to understand how Frankl saw art and national feeling and historical consciousness as intertwined. All of it was integrated into an all-encompassing world view. In an early piece included by Frankl in Sonntagsblaetter, Dr. Sternau discussed this intertwining of history and art:

> Literature has meaning only as follows: that it is the expression of the general, living, self-conscious spirit of humanity, as it develops in the individual nationalities, and out of these into generality. It must become national and world literature. . . . The history of a people is its being, its education, the development of its Volksgeist, its life. (13)

In this age, before the divisions of "social sciences," "humanities," "the arts," when all knowledge was seen as somehow interrelated, anything could and did have a connection to everything else. Stefanie Dollar, who wrote a dissertation about Frankl and Sonntagsblaetter in the early 1930's, described it in this way:

> From the highest conception of the daily paper as an echo of the people, that in it was mirrored the spirit and will of the people, the journalist of pre-March attempted to impart the news with more than a mere recounting of the facts, rather to expose inner relationships in

> order that the still naive people could learn the art of politics. (14)

Politics was everything to the early modern liberal. It related to everything and everything led to politics. It would be fascinating to explore Dollar's reasons for choosing Frankl as a subject for her dissertation in Vienna in the early 1930's. Perhaps it can be seen as a continuum, a culmination of history beginning with the Enlightenment, through liberalism, romanticism, disillusionment, and finally an inability to believe in the inevitable coming disaster, and Frankl had been a part of this continuum. It is poignant to see the valiant attempts that Dollar made to establish Frankl as one of the leading lights of Austrian nationalism. She described his "programme" for the new weekly as,:

> . . . . ostensibly that of presenting "regional interests," but permeated with the interest to awaken and foster love of Fatherland. (15)

With the hindsight of history, we can see this as a tragic attempt to legitimize the rightful place of Jews within Austrian tradition. At the time it must have seemed no more than obvious and logical to see Frankl as a leading figure in the development of modern Austria.

Yet, in establishing Frankl's well-earned place in the birth and development of modern Central European consciousness, we must never make the mistake of seeing him as a radical. He was modern, but always in step with the times, not an extremist. It was because of his ability to espouse the new, yet balance it with propriety, respectability, contain it in love of Fatherland and the ruling dynasty, the Habsburgs, that he managed to live a rather comfortable and acceptable life within the Viennese Jewish bourgeoisie. He could encourage the advancement of

the new, and still remain Secretary of the IKG. He could gain the respect of the "establishment" Jewish community, as well as the artistic establishment and the Austrian authorities. It is perhaps because of this ability to balance, to be moderate, to never really overstep the bounds of acceptability, that he is little remembered today. Yet, it was this very moderation, even moderation in radicalism, except for a tiny minority, that was so characteristic of Viennese Jews of his time. It is what makes him such a representative figure in the rise of "modern Jewish consciousness." This moderation and balance is poignantly illustrated by an assessment of Sonntagsblaetter that Dollar quoted in her thesis:

> Frankl's Sonntagsblaetter became, from a belletristic literary journal, almost a completely political one. Structurally it remained the same from beginning to end, as it did as well in tone and language. Although by Autumn [1848] it went "too far to the left," the editor never surpassed the bounds of propriety. (16)

D. FRANKL AND HIS RELATION TO JUDAISM

We cannot go further without taking at least a brief look at the elements which made up Frankl's relation to Judaism. These elements are amply displayed in Frankl's recounting of his journey, and are also indirectly hinted at in the very factors which motivated him in undertaking such a journey. Yet, we find ourselves confronting a very thorny problem; the problem of reading history backwards, looking upon what happened then through the perspective of what followed. In confronting this devilishly complex issue of the nature of Frankl's Judaism, this paper will attempt to show its complexity rather than present a closed picture of

what Frankl was and thought.

Frankl seems to have been inspired by the quote from Byron, "The dove has its nest/The Fox its hole/Man his homeland; Juda--only the grave." He used this poem on many occasions, from collections of poetry, beginnings of essays, to punctuate verses of his own poetry. It is interesting that he should have been so moved by the poetry of a non-Jewish English poet to describe the Jews. Vielmetti explains this phenomenon as follows:

> Besides, L.A. Frankl's relation to Judaism and Eretz Israel was solely based on aesthetic impulses, which did not spring from the roots of Jewish tradition, so much as having been inspired by scholars such as Joseph Hammer von Purgstall. (17)

Though there are grains of truth in the above assertion, it would be unfair to see this as the complete picture. The tendency to want to see things in clarity without ambiguity can often obscure a more complicated picture of the truth. Vielmetti describes the difficulty in seeing a wholly positive affirmation of Judaism in the biography of Frankl. Surely his relation to Judaism was as complex and multi-faceted as any Jew, but this would not mean that it was not a "positive" affirmation. He probably did not follow a strict Jewish observance, but there was certainly a deeply ingrained relation to his Jewish cultural, ethnic and even religious roots. It might be fairer to see the verity in Vielmetti's relation of Austrocatholicism to Austrian Judaism:

> They lived in an environment, in which the solid but milder religiosity of Josefinist Austrocatholicism had made a deep impression, and which inclined

> them, as well, to practice their Judaism in a similar manner. Thus, a precise discussion between Orthodoxy and Reform, in contrast to the German cities, never occurred in Vienna. Instead they quickly found a "middle ground." (18)

Again we see the moderation, the balance, that was so characteristic of mainstream Austrian Judaism. Vielmetti's thesis is confirmed in a discussion by Frankl himself in his Zur Geschichte der Juden in Wien [On the History of the Jews in Vienna] about the reforms in the liturgy in the first half of the nineteenth century. He lauded the "careful sentiments" and the "religious conviction and honourable longing" of those involved in the changes. He was careful to quote the intentions of the "reformers" as being in no way a desire to deviate in the "narrowest point of belief" from the Israelite religion, and he mentioned their complete lack of sympathy with "sectarianism" (19). Obviously, Frankl agreed with these changes; such as maintaining the oldest and most important prayers in Hebrew, but introducing German into song and prayer, as well as into Jewish education, in order to "awaken" devotion, and also the introduction of the organ to "elevate" the spirit. This does not demonstrate a lack of Jewish feeling, for why would he care at all about something he did not wish to identify with? His views were in perfect accordance with the Judaism of the time. Judaism combined with optimistic identification with the winds of change, as well as the symbols of tradition, the Habsburgs, was perfectly acceptable in that place and time, and symbolized no lack of religious feeling. Frankl quoted Mannheimer, the famous rabbi, consecrating the new synagogue in 1826; thanking God and Emperor Franz in the same sentence:

> Gratitude is also a religious, a God-serving duty imprinted on the minds and prayed for by the Israelites. To each hope that this building inspires--To each wish that springs forth from the hearts of Israelites--To each joyful sensation over this successfully completed work, is tied the feeling of greatest gratitude to the anointed God and our illustrious Monarch and the father of our homeland, Kaiser Franz the First! (20)

Loyalty to the ruling authorities was traditional among Jews, and did not symbolize a departure from Judaism. Frankl was proud of the fact, and never tired of describing the Jews' great contributions to Austrian history and their loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty and armies.

Frankl's ideas about Judaism were nevertheless very influenced by the secular romantic spirit of the time. His statements are infused with heroic pomposity, he lauds the elements of sacrifice, poetic tragedy, sublime spiritual beauty that are present in his religion. Surely, his imagination was attracted to the "aesthetic impulses" present in Jewish religion. This romanticizing aestheticism is well-captured in a passage from his travel account:

> There is something infinitely moving and poetically beautiful in the description of the object of a Jew's journey written on his passport: "In order to die at Jerusalem." What strength of faith, what joy in sorrow and self-denial are expressed in these few pathetic words! How powerful must be the influence of that uncontrollable longing, which

> induces a man to snap asunder all ties of home, of family, and of daily associations, and to leave the land of his birth for another distant land, that he may live poor and despised amid the mighty memories of his glorious ancestors, dream of the splendour of the temple, and the light of the cherubim, amid heaps of ruins, weep over the graves of kings, of judges, and of prophets, and then "die at Jerusalem." (21)

His mind was more attracted by the "idea" than the actual deed. It suited his aesthetic impulse to view his co-religionist as a tragic sacrificial and heroic spirit, yet he was always somewhat removed from it all. He translated the sacrifice into poetry. His interest was in memorializing, eternalising, not in participating.

His attitude to "talmudists" was not concealed. While in Jerusalem he decided to enter the forbidden "holy of holies" despite the prohibition against it:

> I had no scruples about my own personal purity or fitness for admission into the holy place, and I was certainly not disposed to deprive myself of a pleasure, which could never be forgotten, because some foolish talmudist has prohibited it. (22)

In the same book he remarked, somewhat condescendingly, how the Palestine Jews only celebrate one feast day, rather than two as in the Diaspora because of uncertainties about the accurate measuring of time, even though "their knowledge of astronomy can scarcely be held superior to that of their brethren in Europe" (23). He decided to pillage an ancient

sepulchre of its skulls for the "benefit of science," thereby risking severe condemnation and perhaps physical punishment. These remarks indicate that Frankl was perhaps willing to sacrifice respect for Jewish laws and traditions, that he was unwilling to give up his modern affiliations and pretensions for his Jewish faith. This conclusion would be simplistic. If we are to believe his own words--and there seems no reason we should not, because the entire body of his work seems at least unified in one aspect, its honesty--he was ever respectful of Jewish faith, and did not believe that he was stepping over any boundaries. He, personally, at least saw no contradictions. He always felt himself to be a good Jew and believer, whatever else he may have had an interest in;

> How deeply rooted in the Jewish mind is that faith, which, like a perennial fountain, has poured forth its waters for thousands of years. . . . The study of sacred and profane literature, which was always tolerated, nay, even commanded, could not fetter the wings of Jewish faith, as it soared aloft towards the One Invisible; persecution, shame, derision, death, could not destroy it. What more striking proof can there be that science, study, knowledge, are not opposed to pure faith or pious feeling? (24)

Certainly, as the above illustrates, Frankl took liberties in interpreting Jewish faith and tradition, but there is no evidence that he ever believed he was going beyond the permissible margins of interpretation. It would, though, be incorrect to say that Frankl did not deviate from ancient Jewish tradition. Although he himself may not have believed

that his Judaism was anything outside the acceptable norms of his time, his way of thinking was indeed new. It was a product of the Enlightenment and the secular intellectual currents of the time in a more extreme way than had ever before been conceived in the history of European Jewry. In no preceding century could a Jew have addressed a group of Jews as Frankl did on his seventieth birthday. He was facing a group of Jewish religion teachers at the Volks-Buerger-Mittelschulen:

> Poetry is certainly related to religion as the other preponderant parts of the spirit, and has its roots in the tragedy and pleasure that all humans experience. In a few words: To you religion is poetry, to us poetry--religion. (25)

E. JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Frankl had very modern views on Jewish-Christian rapprochement and it is very evident in his travel account, and is, in a sense, tied to his relation to Judaism itself. We have already seen how the Enlightenment opened up possibilities of Jewish-Christian contact. It is also interesting to note that Jewish interest in Palestine seemed to be increasing at just the same time as a renewed Christian interest in the "Holy Land." Frankl's travel account was translated into English almost immediately upon its publication, by a Protestant English reverend. There is no doubt that the subsequent birth of Zionism, later in the century, was dynamically tied in with renewed Christian interest in Palestine.

Marsha Rozenblitt discusses Jewish conversion to Christianity in The Jews of Vienna. She establishes that overall there was only a small percentage of conversion, and it was probably due mostly to a desire for unhampered career advancement, rather than a real change in belief. She

establishes that half the Jews who abandoned Judaism, converted to become Protestants or declared themselves konfessionslos [without religious affiliation], rather than to become Catholics. These are remarkable statistics when one takes into account the overwhelmingly Catholic nature of Austria. Nevertheless, she admits that the percentage of Jewish conversions was higher in Vienna than in the rest of Europe. Thus, it would not be surprising to find Jews having a greater fascination with Jewish-Christian relations in Vienna than other places.

That Frankl had close contact with Christians from early childhood has already been established. One of the most moving scenes in his memoir is a description of his departure from the Pater President of his school in Leitomischl:

> "It should not offend you," he addressed me for the first time with du, "that a Catholic Priest blesses you." He placed his hand on my head: "May the God of your fathers be with you!" I kneeled before him and kissed his hands. Two tears rolled from his eyes. "Go, my beloved son!" Already very distant, I looked back and saw the black figure still standing by the cross. (26)

It is clear throughout his travel book that he had no high regard for conversion, either those who convert or those who induce Jews to convert. He discussed how they used "golden nets" to entrap unsuspecting Jews, and even called the conduct of the Christians who encourage conversion "immoral and bad." Yet, the fact that he had great respect for Christianity, even, one could say, reverence at times, is quite clear. He waxed poetical about Jesus while in Nazareth:

> The Jewish Rabbi Jischo [sic.] little dreamed of the revolution he was destined to effect, but his word at an after period was the only sound in a cold world, that could roll the avalanches from the mountains. They buried, though this was not intended, the eternal principles of Judaism, the religion, which before the advent of Christianity had announced the doctrine of love on its tables of stone at first only to one people. He did not come to destroy the law of Moses, but to fulfil it, and to impart the knowledge of it to the many nations still sunk in heathenism. (27)

From a cynical twentieth century perspective, in the light of crimes perpetrated against the Jews in our century, this can seem naive, even painful to read. Yet, one must attempt to see it in its historical context. This rosy view of the relation between Judaism and Christianity was appropriate for its time, for a time of growing optimism among Jews for mutual understanding with Christians. But this view of Christianity was, like his view of Judaism, suffused with the aesthetic spirit of nineteenth century romanticism. Upon seeing the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, legally forbidden to Jews at this time, Frankl became lyrical; "The songs of Tasso, the verses of Klopstock, composed in honour of the world-renowned sepulchre, are still sounding in my ears like the solemn peal of an organ" (28). He visited many Christian holy places. The reader begins to perceive these visits as equal in importance to visits to the Jewish sites. It was all part of an intellectual adventure, the living out of a poetic dream

wherein there was an inextricable tie and historic connection between Judaism and Christianity. For Frankl there was no contradiction. He recounted both Jewish and Christian legends, he even began to gain a poetic reverence for the Moslem, the quintessential representative of the romantic "East."

Yet, he was ever aware of being a Jew. He sincerely and fervently believed in an almost covenantal connection between Jews and Christians, but there is no evidence that he himself ever thought to convert. In 1858 he sent a present of holy water from the Jordan to his friend Anastasius Gruen, the famous writer and liberal politician:

> Accept another Pilgrim's gift on this Christmas Eve; water from the Jordan for your child's baptism, so that it may bring fortune and greater perfection to the youth. I hope that the holy flow has not lost its consecrating powers because it has been drawn by a Jew. (29)

Frankl almost seems to have seen this connection as an insurance against further oppression of Jews by Christians. As long as they were so inextricably tied together in history and fate, and as long as enlightenment was furthered, education became ever more advanced, there would be no need to fear any mutual misunderstanding in future. As we have seen above, though, he saw them as bound together, but different. Thus, Frankl may have thought much about Christians but the object was never to be one.

F. FRANKL AND THE HABSBURGS

In a discussion of Frankl and his times, it is useful to at least take a brief look at the part the dynasty played in his consciousness. We have already seen how

Joseph II and his Edict of Toleration of 1781 acted upon the Jewish imagination and inspired optimism for the future of Jews within the Empire. The Habsburgs, who ruled a vast Empire of diverse peoples, encompassing a huge variety of languages and cultures, really had little choice but to be benevolent monarchs. While they did not exactly encourage strong ethnic identity, the history of their rule is marked by a type of benevolent "laissez-faire." As long as the people did not revolt and basically carried out whatever duties were required of them, they were left alone. As we have seen, the centralizing aims of Maria Theresa, and the Enlightenment ideas of Joseph II changed things. The people were still pretty much left alone, but were not allowed to forget the superiority of German culture and language, and Vienna as the capital and aspiration of the Empire was ever more ingrained upon the consciousness of the ruled. The Habsburgs, due to longevity, and an inexplicable aura that they possessed, managed to surround themselves with an almost mythological sense of greatness. They were rulers and emperors, almost holy, and people of all backgrounds, not least the Jewish people, revered them as such. Their portraits were displayed throughout the vast ruled territories. They were talked about and dreamed about, which was no doubt due in part to ruling a large heterogeneous nation, which was unified by a capital city with a reputation for splendour, wealth, luxury and where outer appearances were everything. The long years of their reign were characterized by a tenacious insistence on appearances at the expense of almost everything else. In 1832, Frankl presented his poetic ode to the Habsburgs, Das Habsburglied, to the Emperor, dedicated to Ferdinand the Fifth. It mythologized them in poems about their acts of heroism, their benevolence, their forward-looking policies and beliefs, and their respect for the lowly but noble

"working man." Throughout his memoir and even in his Sonntagsblaetter, Frankl frequently mentioned his frustrating encounters with the censors, but was always careful to absolve the Habsburgs of direct connection to the ignorant and arbitrary judgments of these censors, even though the orders came from above in a line leading eventually to the monarch himself. Frankl was specific in his praise for Kaiser Franz as a "good Catholic free from fanaticism." He felt compelled to describe the Edict of Toleration as follows:

> Only thirty recognized families of Jewish faith lived in Vienna, when the eternal Kaiser of great humanity felt compelled to bestow the most natural right of men, tolerance of all beliefs. (30)

The modern Jews of the nineteenth century truly did see this Edict of Toleration as an act of "great humanity." It was their ticket to tolerance in mainstream culture. It did not occur to them to see it as a convenient way for the authorities to integrate Jews into German culture, and they hoped, eventually Christian society. Indeed it was at least, in part, this above-mentioned convenience that underlay the Edict, but the desire of Jews to integrate was very real. Frankl, at least, never seems to have seen it as anything other than a heroic and humane act.

Frankl included in his memoir a letter written to him by his mother after he was presented with a type of honourary vase by the Kaiser as a reward for his Habsburg poems. It beautifully captures the awe and magic that surrounded the ruling family, and especially the almost unquestioning loyalty and reverence of the Jews towards their perceived benefactors:

> My dear, beloved son! In our house, at present, it is like a church where the holy of holies is being displayed. People make pilgrimages to us, to see the present which the young King of Hungary--may the Lord of Hosts protect his hallowed head--gave to you. First came the people of Chrast who could hardly believe that a youth, and more, a Jewish youth, whom they had watched grow up, could receive such a high honour. The Dean and chaplains came and I had to bring the vase to the Bishop, as he also wished to be convinced of the miracle that God had allowed to blossom forth from our house. And the Jews from surrounding communities! They could not marvel enough. . . . My beloved, dear son! Remain modest and true to our holy faith. Then will God--glorified in heaven and earth, as King David says in his Psalm--always help you and allow blessings to fall on you as drops of dew. Amen! (31)

This long quotation perfectly captures the reverential relationship of Jews towards their Habsburg rulers, and manages to hint at that slight twinge of anxiety about the continuation of their faith that exposure to this great world of splendour threatened. It also leaves us no doubt as to why almost the first thing Frankl did upon establishment of the Laemel School in Jerusalem, was to hang a portrait of Franz Josef upon the wall.

G. FRANKL AND THE HOLY LAND

Finally, while looking at Frankl and his times, we should glance at the elements of his world view that were to shape his reaction to his journey.

Frankl's official purpose, in the establishment of a school based on Western ideas of instruction, was primarily a pedagogic one. He was quite struck by the ignorance he encountered, and as a Europe-oriented thinker, especially the ignorance about Europe. Talking about Palestinian Jews he encountered, he wrote:

> Another did not know in which quarter of the globe he was living, and was ignorant that there is one particular part of the earth that bears the name of Europe. All other parts of the world, apart from Palestine, were known to him as Chuzelorez, i.e. outside the Holy Land. . . . (32)

Frankl, as a medical doctor and "modern" thinker, was a firm believer in the power of rationality and logic over superstition and irrational religious beliefs. Again, he was struck by the prevalence of illogic and irrationality that reigned in "The East." At one point during his visit, he felt sick and had to be attended by an Arab doctor. Though contemptuous of the superstitious beliefs surrounding him, he pandered to the attitude of his medical attendant, who actually expected the reply that Frankl was wise enough to give:

> "It is not I, but the medicine, that can help thee. Dost thou believe in the power of medicine, or in the mysterious powers?"

> A pupil of the modern sceptical school in Vienna, I replied that I doubted the power of medicine, and believed in the mysterious powers. (33)

In the first chapter, we saw to what type of occupations Jews were attracted. The Enlightenment idea of making Jews turn away from their formerly "indolent" and "unproductive" occupations, educating them and integrating them into "productive" areas of endeavour was not without influence upon the Jews' own attitude toward themselves. They, too, began to see many of their traditional occupations as "unproductive," and themselves took up the cause of counteracting this. This attitude coloured Frankl's view of the Jews in Jerusalem. He despised those who he viewed as taking advantage of the system of alms collection, and even seemed to despise the whole concept itself. This ancient system of alms collection, Halukkah, had had as its purpose the maintaining of the Jews in Palestine so that they would devote themselves to religious study and piety. It was considered an honourable, even a holy act, for Diaspora Jews to give money to support their brethren in the Holy Land, and the system had been perpetuated on a grand, organized scale, for centuries. Yet, new trends in thought were emerging. Frankl so obviously had adopted the European concept of the nobility of fruitful, physical labour:

> But when whole families, whose children and descendants are inevitably exposed to moral and physical decay, and who are themselves sunk in the deepest poverty, and are yet averse to labour, travel to the Holy Land for the sake of alms, it appears to us that Government, as the

> guardian of the people, should at least try to warn and dissuade them. (34)

This is the result of a whole way of thinking engendered by enlightenment and liberalism, and an attitude leading all the way back to Dohm's On the Civic Betterment of The Jews. It was part of a new conception of what type of activities Jews should be involved in, what type of standards would make Jews worthy of being considered "productive," and therefore worthy of being an esteemed "citizen" of Western European liberal society. As we have seen, this was tied in with an unconscious attempt to extricate themselves from the Eastern "rabble." These "indolent" unproductive Jews were part of Eastern, not cultivated Western European society. We cannot overlook this unpleasant reality in a study of Frankl's reaction to Jerusalem and its inhabitants:

> Of course no longing for the Holy Land has brought them [most Jews] here; it is rather a contemptuous feeling for their native place, the daily sight of which has produced a feeling of ennui, or at least it is not surrounded by that enchantment which distance lends to view. Destitute of knowledge and of that poetical feeling, which always attracted their ancestors and their forefathers to this place, they are nothing else but idle vagabonds, in whom every sentiment of honour has been extinguished by the reception of alms. (35)

Yet, it would be unfair to overlook Frankl's dominant attitude of enchantment and wonder in confrontation with the wealth of diversity in the world. This enchantment was particularly inspired by his experiences in the Holy

Land. The unlimited range of interests, as seen in Sonntagsblaetter, was piqued by his encounter with Palestine. There was nothing that he overlooked and noone who could not inflame his imagination, and this optimism in and celebration of diversity was one of the most "modern" aspects of his consciousness. It was testament to a changing world of growing communication, interaction and contact between starkly different cultures and peoples that was one of the dominant factors in nineteenth century imperialism and nationalism. This movement and dynamism, this recognition and celebration of cultural diversity was so much a part of the rise of modern Jewish consciousness and was amply visible in Frankl:

> Equally striking and picturesque are the groups of men in their strange costumes; the Mohammedan walks with dignity in his flowing robes, the Bedouin, in his white and brown striped cloak, glances as if he were in search of plunder; the Polish Jew, dressed in a black silk caftan, hurries after him. . . . A Franciscan, with a broad-flapped hat and a cord around his body, is gazing at an unveiled female--she is a Jewess. A Greek priest, with a beautiful beard and long flowing locks, is walking as cheerfully by the side of a dervish, with a round yellow cap, as if they were both of the same faith. . . . (36)

H. SUMMARY

In this chapter we have seen the various aspects of Frankl's biography that influenced his attitude and outlook. We saw how his youth in Bohemia, his early instruction by Catholic Piarist fathers, even his family

antecedents fostered an attitude of tolerance and openness in matters of religion. His attachment to German culture, his optimistic belief in the future of Jews within the Habsburg-led Empire, were a direct result of legal and attitudinal changes engendered by the Enlightenment and the consequent rise of liberalism. Belief in free speech, abolition of censorship, equality for all men, and open access to participation in culture and society were unquestionable tenets of Frankl's philosophy. Open communication and mutual understanding of Jew and Christian were the results and the goal of this type of thinking. The Empire and the dynasty that ruled it were a unifying factor for the adherents to the belief in modern change and "progress." Finally, the complex of attitudes that resulted from these changes in thought and law was evident in Jews such as Frankl, and was to inform his reaction to the Holy Land.

N O T E S

1. Frankl, Erinnerungen 29.
"Declaration Concerning the Jewish Graveyard"
(July 12, 1671)
We, citizens and council of the Residence City have agreed and promised, that in connection with their graves and headstones as they were at the time of their departure, they should be boarded up, and we have in true deed ensured them with our seal.

2. Frankl, Erinnerungen 44.

3. Albert Rosenfeld, "Ein Dichterleben," Die Deborah: Juedisch-Amerikanische Familienzeitung Cincinnati 12 April. 1894, obit.

4. Johnston, Aust. Mind 68.

5. Frankl, Erinnerungen 104.

6. Frankl, Erinnerungen 70.

7. Ludwig August Frankl, ed., Libanon: Ein Poetisches Familienbuch (Vienna: L.C. Zamarski, Universitaets-Buchdrueckerei, 1855) 153.

8. Frankl, Erinnerungen 276.

9. Ludwig August Frankl, Inschriften des Alten Juedisches Friedhofes in Wien: Beitrag zur Altertumskunde Oesterreichs (Vienna: n.p., 1855) iii.

10. Frankl, Erinnerungen Introduction xiii.

11. Ludwig August Frankl, "Die mediceische Venus und der toskanische Bauer," Sonntagsblaetter, vol. iii (1844): 21.

12. Ludwig August Frankl, "Toechter und Musik," Sonntagsblaetter, vol.i (1842): 340.

13. Dr. Sternau, "Literatur und Geschichte," Sonntagsblaetter, vol. ii (1843): 182.

14. Stefanie Dollar, "Die Sonntagsblaetter von Ludwig August Frankl, 1842-48," diss., University of Vienna, 1932, 3.

15. Dollar, "Die Sonntags." 36.

16. Dollar, "Die Sonntags." 221.

17. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 190.

18. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 187.

19. Ludwig August Frankl, Zur Geschichte der Juden in Wien: Der Alte Freithof, Der Tempelhof (Vienna: J.P. Sollinger, 1853) 52.

20. Frankl, Zur Geschichte 69.

21. Frankl, Ludwig August, The Jews in the East, [Nach Jerusalem], vol. ii, trans., Rev. P. Beaton, M.A. (1859; Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1975) 115.

22. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 193.

23. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 61.

24. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 193.

25. Die Feier des Siebzigjaehrigen Geburtstages Ludwig August Frankl's Ritter von Hochwart: Familien-Manuskript (Vienna: Friedrich Jasper, Feb. 3, 1880) 20.

26. Frankl, Erinnerungen 68.

27. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 299.

28. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 156.

29. Frankl and Gruen, Briefwechsel 94.

30. Frankl, Zur Geschichte 32.

31. Frankl, Erinnerungen 169.

32. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 34.

33. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 326.

34. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 118.

35. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 117.

36. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 101.

CHAPTER III

"THE JEWS IN THE EAST" AND MODERN CONSCIOUSNESS

A. THE LAEMEL FAMILY

In this chapter we will look at the text of The Jews in the East and see how it relates to the various elements of modernity that were prevalent at the time. Crucial to this analysis is an understanding of what exactly the intention of Elise Herz Von Laemel was in donating the money needed for founding the school.

Simon Von Laemel was born in Northern Bohemia, in a town called Tuschkau near Pilsen, in 1766. He was an independent businessman by the age of twenty-one, and opened a wholesale firm in Prague. He raised sheep and produced wool wares. During the Napoleonic wars he rushed to the defense of the Empire by providing money for arms to the treasury, and was eventually praised and recognized for his contribution by the Imperial authorities. Simon Laemel became ennobled and thus Simon Edler Von Laemel in 1812, and was given an unlimited permit to reside in Vienna, the Imperial City. At the Congress of Vienna he was outspoken in advocating equal rights for his co-religionists. The historian Salo Baron quoted Laemel's speech to the Congress in an article about the "Jewish Question" at the Congress of Vienna:

> If only the general principle by which the Israelites and all their remaining co-religionists could be given equal status in law with respect to living, business, and possession laws, could be proclaimed by our Eternal Majesty. (1)

Baron called Laemel a man "alien to Orthodox prejudices," who worked earnestly for a modernization of the Jewish religious service in Vienna. He was not only involved in commerce and Jewish philanthropical projects, but knew

Goethe, and was one of his invited guests at Karlsbad. Laemel died in 1845, but not before giving utterance to a wish to found a philanthropical establishment for his "brothers" in Jerusalem (2).

Elise, his daughter, was to make his wish into reality. She was said to have had an excellent religious and general education and married a merchant named Herz in Prague. Apparently not much more is known of him than name and occupation. She was widowed in 1850 and lived in Vienna where she was elected as representative to the board of the newly opened kindergarten in the Leopoldstadt. She had three daughters who married into noble families. One of these noble families was that of Dr. Ignaz Hofmann Von Hofmannsthal. Thus, Elise was the grandmother of Hugo Von Hofmannsthal, the famous poet and playwright.

This short history of the Laemel family illustrates a common course for the Jews of Habsburg lands who moved to Vienna during the nineteenth century. From Bohemia to Vienna, from merchant to great modernist poet and playwright, this was to be the path of a significant group of the Empire's Jews. It is also interesting to note that it was this family, who was to have descendants involved in the vanguard of culture and society, who was also to become the founder of the first modern Jewish educational establishment in Jerusalem. Simon Von Laemel's dying wish was realized in 1856, when Elise Herz Von Laemel secured 50,000 Gulden and entrusted it to Ludwig August Frankl in order to establish the Laemel School in Jerusalem.

The Laemel family was not the first to have the idea of carrying out philanthropical works in Palestine. Martin Gilbert, in his study of the history of Jerusalem discusses the different nineteenth century philosophies about aid to Palestine that prevailed among Diaspora Jews:

> Whereas Russian Jews tended to send money to support religious institutions, and a life of prayer and study, western Jews were more concerned with the setting up of hospitals, and schools for the education of children in "useful" trades and professions. (3)

Gilbert dates the beginning of this western aid on July 11, 1854 and the arrival of an Austrian Jew, Albert Cohn, with funds from the French Rothschilds to set up an industrial school for boys, a school for girls and poor relief for women. Thus, Frankl was not the first Austrian to enter Jerusalem with western European ideas of labour, industry, "productiveness" and education. Frankl's was, nevertheless, the first successful educational venture. As Gilbert says, it "constituted the first educational intrusion by modern, European Jewry" (4). Many Jews had heard of the terrible situation of Palestine Jews after the Crimean War in the mid 1850's, and some decided to take steps to alleviate the situation. Dr. Hildesheimer, the rabbi of Eisenstadt, a town which was also part of Habsburg lands, took it upon himself, in 1858, to oversee construction of houses for the Jewish poor and pilgrims to Jerusalem. What is most noteworthy about many of these ventures is the fact that they all seemed to proliferate at a specific time, around mid-century, and many of them were given the assistance and full cooperation of the European authorities present in Palestine.

B. EDUCATIONAL CONCEPTIONS BEHIND THE LAEMEL SCHOOL

We will now attempt to look at general conceptions of education that influenced Frankl and his benefactress, as well as the roots of the kindergarten in Vienna.

Ideas of "progress" and scientific type of study were already in the atmosphere in the eighteenth century, as

can be discerned in this document written by a prince in the Austrian State Chancellory in the second half of the eighteenth century:

> Curtail general studies and direct them rather to practical sciences than speculations, form citizens rather than scholars, give as a consequence less time to dead languages such as Latin, Greek etc. than to those that are of practical use, less time to abstract sciences than to Arts. . . . (5)

New were thoughts of the value and purpose of education, and even by the beginning of the nineteenth century, methods of education. Maria Theresa and her son Joseph II, in their attempts to centralize, created an ever expanding bureaucracy which was primarily located in the Imperial City, Vienna. Vienna was also to be the administrative centre of an industrializing Empire. All these changes created a breakdown of traditional social structures and a change in the position of the historic nobility. The nobility was losing many of its privileges, and thus saw their future more and more as administrators, bureaucrats or military officers in the service of the Emperor, which also affected ideas on education. This put them in competition with a rising bureaucracy that was taking advantage of the new educational opportunities. A large proportion of this rising bureaucratic bourgeoisie was Jewish.

A changing educational system was also, in part, motivated by a desire to unify the Empire. A standard and unified education could be an excellent means to create the desired "citizens" of Austria-Hungary. As we saw in chapter I, part of Joseph II's intention in his Edict of Toleration was to oblige Jews to attend State Schools. Thus non-Jews

and "modern" Jews alike attempted to "reform" the traditional heder education of Jews, which they saw as a contributing factor to the "backwardness" of Eastern Jews:

> Commentators constantly argued that only with the total reform of the traditional Jewish school, the heder, was progress conceivable. This institution, above all others, was held to be at the root of the "distortions" of Eastern Jewry. Dark, dank, overcrowded, chaotic, as indeed it was, it was here that the seeds of spiritual and physical degeneration were sown. (6)

Jews of the Empire who had benefitted from educational reform and saw themselves as "modern," thus felt called to a type of "mission." Vielmetti calls this feeling of being called to a mission Sendungsbewusstsein, an actual missionary consciousness:

> The European Jews felt themselves called to a mission, as they, through enlightenment and equality, were raised to a higher level and wanted to impart their philanthropy as much as they were able. (7)

This missionary consciousness is evident in the thought behind the Laemel School. It was not to be one of these dark, dank heder schools, but an "enlightened," bright institution to attain a modern education apart from mere Bible and Talmudic study. The children were to study Bible and Hebrew, but also writing, mathematics, and modern languages, which intention was lauded by Heinrich Graetz in a report on his trip to Palestine in 1872 (8).

The roots of the idea behind the Laemel School can be traced directly back to the merchant-philanthropist,

Joseph Wertheimer. In a publication on the ninetieth anniversary of the israelitische Kinderbewahranstalt, a school for young Jewish children, in Vienna, it was proclaimed:

> Rightly do we praise him [Wertheimer], also abroad, as the people's educator, to whom we owe the introduction of pre-school education in Austria. . . . At the time that Wertheimer appeared, there were still as few pedagogical as political or social considerations contained in the ideas of relief for small children. (9)

Joseph Ritter Von Wertheimer, great-grandson of the Court Jew Samson Wertheimer, was born in 1800, a son of a jeweller, in Vienna. He began to run his father's business in 1821. His travels during the years 1824-28 inspired his interest in education. He was most influenced by a book written by Samuel Wilderspin, the Director of the Central Children's School of London, about early childhood education. The book was entitled Infant Education or Remarks on the Importance of Educating the Infant Poor, and Wertheimer translated it into German upon his return to Vienna, in 1826 (10). The book discusses problems of the working classes, and relates criminality among youth to lack of education and suggests the remedy of "infant schools." Wertheimer's translation was an immediate success, especially outside of Austria-Hungary in Prussia (11).

Wertheimer was a ubiquitous figure in Vienna. He was not only involved in education, but attached his name to a multitude of other philanthropical projects. He is known as the "father" of the IKG, and published works on Jewish history in Austria, such as Die Juden in Oesterreich, vom Standpunkte der Geschichte, des Rechtes und des

Staatsvortheiles [The Jews in Austria from the Standpoint of History, Rights and the Interests of the State], published anonymously in 1842, and he even published plays in the 1830's (12).

It is important to understand the difference between the Kinderbewahranstalt and the more common Kindergarten. In brief, the Kinderbewahranstalt was founded on social principles, education as relief for poor working parents, and the Kindergarten was founded more on ideas of pedagogy (13). The more socially motivated Kinderbewahranstalt was based on eighteenth century ideas of humanism and the growth of industrialization and an urban working class. It originated in English industrializing society, and the concept of a "Christian spirit" combining ideas of aid to both the corporeal and spiritual realms. The Kinderbewahranstalt was more immediately successful in Austria-Hungary, due to the suspicion of the clergy against the more secular and naturalist aims of the Kindergarten. Wertheimer was struck by these educational and socially-motivated ideals, and as a result of the ideas he translated, the first Kinderbewahranstalt in the Empire was opened in Budapest in 1828. This was followed by the first such establishment opening in Vienna in 1830, and was closely connected with the Viennese clergy. It was after the events of 1848 that the philanthropic shelter concept of a Kinderbewahranstalt became mingled with the pedagogical ideas of the Kindergarten, and it became understood as "a place of instruction for the 'enlightened bourgeoisie', because it set up the correct educational setting for the bourgeois family" (14).

Yet, Wertheimer was ever conscious of the implications of education for Jews. He fought for the expansion of artisan training for Jews to combat the "one-sidedness" of Jewish trade occupations. In this way, he was

convinced by Enlightenment arguments for the "civic betterment" of Jews. In the same ninetieth anniversary publication, the Kinderbewahranstalt is lauded for its success in combatting these "backward" tendencies:

> It accomplished the great service of not only feeding, caring for and protecting children of great poverty, but of awakening in them the desire and will to work, and with it the joy in their existence. (15)

This anniversary was a celebration of ninety years of the first Jewish Kinderbewahranstalt opened in 1843 in Oberen Donaustrasse in Vienna.

Thus, we can see the modernist tendencies inherent in all aspects of the Laemel School project. It contained the seeds of modern educational philosophies, a modern attitude to humanist social aid and poor relief, a response to modern industrial society, and combat of ancient "backward" occupational tendencies of Jews. There was even a Habsburg connection in the founding of the israelitische Kinderbewahranstalt in Vienna. The Kaiserin Mother (mother of the Emperor) became the school's royal protectress. In 1844, Frankl's Sonntagsblaetter noted a greatly celebrated visit of the Kaiserin Mother to the school, and glowingly remarked on her gracious praise of the "order, purity and instruction of the children" (16). Again in 1845, it reported a celebration of the Kaiserin Mother at the school, and uncritically applauded the great progress of the bright children in math, Hebrew and music (17).

From the above evidence, we can conclude that Frankl was closely involved in the progress of this type of education and believed in it as Wertheimer did. He was probably in complete accordance with the modernist aims, and endorsed the introduction of these ideals to Jerusalem. We

will later see how inappropriate his ideals were, especially in relation to the complete miscomprehension of the social situation in Palestine of the time.

C. THE "HOLY LAND" IN NINETEENTH CENTURY THOUGHT

The Jews in Europe, and everywhere else for that matter, had a messianic view of the Holy Land that was built into their prayers. The destruction of the Temple and subsequent exile of the Jews had played a role in all subsequent Jewish consciousness; religiously, historically, socially, and politically. This Jewish concern with exile and consequent messianism, caused problems for European Jews during the debates on emancipation for they were often accused of disloyalty to the state due to their belief in the restoration in Zion. It caused even greater problems in the nineteenth century, when Jews were integrating ever more into modernizing secular society, and when nationalism, and with it ideas of biological blood purity were becoming more and more a dominant ideological force. Yet, in the nineteenth century, the religious messianic ideas of Judaism became only a part of the thought on Jewish return to the Holy Land.

With the growth of imperialism, and the contending powers of France, England, Russia, Austria-Hungary, and increasingly Prussia, the Near East was seen more and more as a strategic location. This struggle for a power base was accompanied by non-Jewish religious ideas of Jewish return to the Holy Land. This gentile religious attitude was exhibited most strongly in England, where fundamentalist evangelical groups began advocating a return of the Jews to Palestine or alternatively, increased their will to carry out missionary activity in Palestine. In 1839 the London Globe published articles advocating an independent state in Syria and Palestine, and with it mass settlement of Jews (18). After the "Damascus Affair" of 1840 wherein a number

of Jews were accused and punished for the ancient and baseless charge of ritual murder, and which evoked mass outrage in the West, even "modern" Jews began thinking of Jewish return as a solution to prejudice and persecution. Better access and desire for travel led to a substantial increase in visitors from Europe and America to Jerusalem after the Crimean War in 1854. In 1854, the first photographs were taken of the Holy Land which increased awareness and knowledge of Palestine. The popular guide books of Baedeker and Thomas Cook began to include sections on Jerusalem in the 1850's.

Thus, Jew and non-Jew alike began to look at Palestine with new eyes and new attitudes. As a demonstration of this new modern attitude, the Palestine Exploration Fund was founded in 1865 in London. It was a group of scholars, churchmen and public figures who wished to research and explore the history and sites of Jerusalem (19).

But, as with many "modern" conceptions, the new was mingled with the old. Fascination and interest in the Holy Land was buttressed by the ancient romanticized ideas of the "Orient." As an excellent example of the old mingled with the new, Frankl included an essay about the problem of stale rigidity in art that he felt was present in the German lands. He saw the solution to the lack of freshness in art in a turning to the East, a re-evaluation of the romantic "Orient":

> As the Crusades accomplished for Europe, so can the modern artist through travel to the Orient, inject a new, fresh and spiritual excitement into the life of German literature. . . . Here are new material, new scenes, new costumes and new colours for heaven and earth. (20)

Frankl, ever the modernist in his aims, once again combined ancient and modern ideas to create something that was completely new. Frankl saw himself as a modern poet, but did not hesitate to utilize ancient Jewish traditions and ideas about the Holy Land in his contemporary heroic poetry. In so doing, he was using both ancient messianic conceptions of the Holy Land, and new modern interest in the Holy Land to create art that was wholly in the tradition of modern nineteenth century romantic poetry. Much of Frankl's poetry on this subject proliferated just prior to his voyage to Palestine. A long romantic poetic epic is his Rachel, published in 1842, a tribute to the Biblical Rachel:

Begeistert Weib von meinem Stamme,
Ein Sohn des lichten Morgenlands,
Begruess ich mit der Dichtung Flamme
Aus weiter Ferne Deinen Glanz. . . .
Kanaan! du Land der Vaeter,
Wo in Stroemen Honig fliesst,
Wo ein ewig blauer Aether
Sich um Cedernwipfel giesst. . . .
Land der Harfen, Land der Psalmen,
Gottverheissnes Wunderland
Aus dem Schatten deiner Palmen
Ist den Volk verbannt, verbannt!
[Inspired woman of my People,
A son of the luminous Orient,
I welcome with poetic fire
From afar your luminous brilliance. . . .
Canaan! Land of the Patriarchs
Where honey flows and gushes
Where an ever-blue ether
Surrounds the cedar tops. . . .
Land of harps, land of Psalms
Wonderland promised of God

Out of the Palm's shadow
Are the People banished, banished!] (21)

This highly romantic view of the Holy Land was very much indicative of its time; the passionate and extreme language, the Biblical allusions, the tragic reference to the exile. Frankl obviously found this material rich in possibilities, and he did not hesitate to impose his own interpretations upon it. Indicative of his mental attitude towards the subject of the Holy Land, is his other poetic anthology, Nach der Zerstoerung [After the Destruction, i.e. of the Temple], published in 1856 just prior to his voyage. It is a collection of poems unified by the theme of Jewish exile after the destruction of the Temple, but replete with Frankl's own distorted and romanticized interpretations of the material. He was being true to his word, as quoted in the second chapter, poetry was his religion. Judaism was his poetic source material. In a poem from this collection, "Weiss-Blau [White-Blue]" (referring to the traditional colours of the Jewish tallith) he wrote:

Der Jude kehrt nach Ost den Blick
Und seiner Seele Sorgen;
Er denkt an seines Reiches Geschick
Und an der Freiheit Morgen. . . .
Die Farben sind's des theuern Land's,
Weiss-Blau sind Juda's Graenzen:
Weiss ist der priesterliche Glanz
Und blau des Himmels Glaenzen
[The Jew turns his gaze eastward
And his spirit's woe
He thinks upon his realm's destiny
And upon freedom tomorrow. . . .
The colours were those of his treasured land
White-blue are Judah's borders

White is the priestly brilliance
And blue the sparkle of heaven] (22)

These poetic renderings had little to do with the actual physical and historical Palestine of Frankl's day, the Palestine that he was about to see. It is little wonder that he was to be quite disappointed in his visit. The Jews he encountered were not the woeful eastward-gazing heroes clad in white and blue. The "Polish-Russian rabble," as he saw them, for whom he had such contempt, were the result of two thousand years of exile in Europe, and had little remaining connection to those tragic martyrs of the years "Nach der Zerstoerung."

The unfolding of this same two thousand years of history had also created Frankl. It was the historical events of the eighteenth century, enlightenment and reform and modernisation that had turned Judaism from a way of life into a "religion." And once Judaism became merely a "religion," the traditional messianic longing for a return to the Holy Land was to change as well. Frankl may have capitalized on the rich material of Jewish exile and longing for return, but he never advocated an actual historical return. Although the events he participated in may have contributed to the eventual development of a Zionist ideology, he was wholly a European and "modern" man of the "Jewish faith." Frankl was part of the group of Jews who were represented by the Chief Rabbi of Vienna, Moritz Guedemann, who proclaimed:

> Judaism is a religion, and in this lies its significance for the world. And if all the Jews of the world were united in a free community in Palestine, this would mean no more to Judaism as a religion than would the gathering of all

> friends of truth and enlightenment on a desert island. . . . For centuries the Christians have accused the Jews of isolating themselves. And suddenly such isolation is to be a panacea? (23)

Guedemann was responding to the rise of the Zionist movement, and, in particular, to the activities of his Viennese co-religionist, Theodor Herzl, which he saw as a turning away from the principles of liberalism which he felt was the answer for European Jews. Frankl may have utilized the material of Zionist longing, but it was strictly for his own modern romantic nineteenth century poetic purposes. He, too, would have loathed the isolationism implied in Zionism, and he went to his grave a believer in the principles embodied in 1848.

D. NATIONALISM AND FRANKL

This section will attempt to deal with the difficult relation between conceptions of nationalism in Europe and the attitude of Frankl, which naturally affected his attitudes to the Holy Land and the situation he found there. Already in the eighteenth century, we saw the birth of the nation-state and philosophies governing its development. The French Revolution was the most powerful symbol of this birth in the eighteenth century, but as already mentioned, Maria Theresa and her son Joseph II had their own ideas about nationhood and a vision for the development of their nation-Empire. The document we saw earlier, which appeared in the State Chancellory in the late eighteenth century, contained definite notions about nationalism as well as about education, and even saw a connection between them:

> It is crucial to inspire love for the prince as their common father, and for the nation as their nurturing mother;

> submission to its orders, fidelity, obedience. And finally, it is crucial to impart the greatest idea of reward that follows in this world or in the next--sacrifice--that they give their life in service of their sovereign. (24)

Eighteenth century philosophies introduced ideas of a Volk, an ethnic people united in language, history, blood and "soul." The Volk idea had an almost mythical, mystical quality about it. The state was the organ of the Volk, connected organically in spirit and purpose. All these elements combined--education and service to the state, a Volk united in blood, culture, language and history connected to the state, the state as organ of the Volk, ideas of national independence and self-determination--to form the dynamic forces of nineteenth century nationalism. And a growing sense of nationhood, apart from the ancient identity of "European Christendom," served partly as impetus for the revolutionary upheavals of 1848. This Volk formed a people, and the people had rights, and they were no longer mere "subjects" of arbitrary monarchical will. The state was to serve the people or Volk, not vice versa, and 1848 was a demonstration of the people's determination to accomplish this.

A new national, secular identity served the purposes of modernizing Jews fed on Enlightenment philosophy. The new nation could be the neutral meeting ground to which they had aspired. The Jews could be part of this Volk, they too were tied to the Germans by language, culture and history. As the nineteenth century wore on, these Volkish ideas became more and more racist, developing intricate and increasingly mystical conceptions about blood, power, superiority and dominance, attributing comparative

values to different cultures, becoming exclusivist in the "right" to Volk membership, and leading ultimately to eugenics theories and Nazism.

It is not within the scope of this paper to give a detailed study of Volk theory and nationalism, but it should be noted that nationalism developed quite differently in different countries. As far as the German lands are concerned, nationalism in what became Germany was different than in Austria-Hungary, and this also had important implications for Jewish history as well. But, in 1848, the Jews of Vienna were just part of a united people acting out their destiny; to combat the forces of dark and arbitrary ignorance in order to create a nation founded on the principles of secular enlightened humanism. Frankl found his symbol for the nation in the university. His poem "Die Universitaet" ["The University"] became the rallying cry of the 1848 Vienna Revolution:

Was kommt heran mit kuehnem Gange?
Die Waffe blinkt, die Fahne weht,
Es naht mit hellem Trommenklange
Die Universitaet. . . .
Das freie Wort das sie gesangen
Seit Joseph, arg verhoehnt, geschmaeht,
Vorkaempfend sprengte seine Spangen
Die Universitaet. . . .
Und wendet ihr euch zu den bleichen
Gefall'nen Freiheitsopfern, seht:
Bezahlt hat mit den ersten Leichen
Die Universitaet.
Doch wird dereinst die Nachwelt blaettern
Im Buche der Geschichte, steht
Die lichte Tat mit gold'nen Lettern:
Die Universitaet!
[What approaches with daring tread?

> The guns flash, the flag waves,
> It comes with light drumbeats
> The University. . . .
> They sang the free word,
> Angrily derided and reviled since Joseph,
> Ready for battle, it escaped its chains
> The University. . . .
> And they turned themselves to the pale
> Fallen freedom martyrs, seeing:
> Paying the stiff price with the first corpse
> The University.
> And some day the following generations will proclaim
> In the history books, showing
> The inspirational act in golden letters:
> The University!] (25)

And with the student demonstration on March 13, 1848, a nation was born. But the most amazing, unbelievable fact was that it had all begun with--the "free word" had been spoken by--a Jew, Adolf Fischof. In a report on the leading figures of the Revolution in Sonntagsblaetter, Adolf Fischof is described as follows:

> Fischof broke out of the crowd in the court of the Staendehaus on the 13th of March, and since then has never for an instant come down from the stage of the Revolution. . . . Now Fischof has been elected to the Reichstag, elected in Vienna, the capital of Austria, as a representative of the inhabitants, in the midst of whom Jews were never other than "tolerated" and obliged to pay a shameful tax for sojourns of fourteen days. (26)

Jews did therefore not only believe in and identify with the Revolution and the nation it created. They were in the forefront of the action which had forged it. Jews were among the first of these "pale martyrs" who fell in March, 1848. In this battle Jew and Christian were equal, both members of a developing Austrian nation. No better example of the truth of the belief in this equality and oneness in service to the new "Fatherland" is the speech given by Isaak Noah Mannheimer, the Chief Rabbi of Vienna, at the graves of the fallen martyrs. In this speech, Jew and Christian are of equal merit in their service. Their graves, as well as their revolutionary ideals, were the "neutral ground" so desired by Jewish believers in the Enlightenment:

> As a servant of God's word I come to this grave in order to say a prayer for the holy spirit of our departed brethren who fell in battle for their Fatherland . . . . I pray for them and their Christian brothers who are to all of us, and in my heart, equal to the others in worth and dearness. (27)

Frankl never tired in his service to the Revolution. The people had spoken, and would never quietly agree to return to the previous darkness. Vienna had become a light unto the nations, and the focal point of the new Austrian nation:

> Time rushes ahead; each hour yields a chronicle, each minute an event. . . . Vienna, the burning centre of the Austrian monarchy has become the new Light of Freedom and the people's happiness. (28)

It is crucial to understand the significance of 1848 and its tremendous impact upon Jews in Europe, and especially upon Frankl, in order to understand his attitude toward his mission in Palestine, his reaction to what he found, and the relation he saw between the mission and his duty as an Austrian "citizen." The new Austrian "Fatherland" was more than just a geographic territory, it was an idea that encompassed psychic and geographic space. In a poetic ode that Frankl wrote in the 1860's, a dialogue leads to an exploration of the question, "What is Austria?:"

Was ist des Oesterreichers Vaterland?
Ist es die gruene Steiermark
Wo Eisen ist der Berge Mark?
Ist's wo der Oelbaum gruent am Meer,
Der Wald von Goldorangen schwer?
Nein, nein, nein
Sein Vaterland muss groesser sein!. . . .
Das ganze Oesterreich soll es sein!
Giess, Herr Gott! Kuehnen Muth uns ein,
Dass Fuerst und Volk, vereinter Kraft,
Das Vaterland uns neu erschafft,
Das soll es sein,
Das ganze Oesterreich soll es sein!
[What is the Austrian Fatherland?
Is it green Styria
Where the mountains are chiselled in iron?
Is it where the olive tree reflects green upon the sea?
Or where the forest is laden with golden oranges?
No, no, no
The Fatherland must be greater than this. . . .
Is must be the entire Austria!
Let us steel ourselves with fearless
bravery, Oh God!

The prince and the people combined in strength
Have created anew the Fatherland,
And that must it be,
The entire Austria must it be!] (29)

Frankl thus saw no contradiction between being an Austrian "citizen" of the newly created Fatherland, and being a Jew with emotional and historic ties to Palestine. The Austrian "idea" did not only exist in space; it was culture, language, history, identity. Judaism was a "religion," a belief that could be held anywhere and at any time. Frankl expressed this attitude in The Jews in the East:

This feeling of nearness to God,
altogether independent of fixed places
of worship, on every spot on earth and
without the intermediation of a praying
or chanting priest, seemed to me a
beautiful expression of the belief in
the omnipresence of God. . . . (30)

Therefore, there was no contradiction in being a Jewish "citizen" of Austria. The ancient ideas of Judaism that saw the Holy Land as spiritually different, as a more valid spot in which to carry out the laws of the mitzvot were no longer binding for Frankl. They had been replaced by a new relationship and a new attitude to Judaism and its connection to the modern world. The Jews were a people of a specific faith, just as Austria encompassed peoples of many different faiths, who could participate in this new "neutral ground" of Austrian nationhood. The scene at the opening of the Laemel School elegantly illustrates Jewish identification with Austria and its ruling dynasty, the Habsburgs, and the Jewish sense of "mission" in Palestine as carriers of European enlightenment to their more ignorant co-religionists:

> The day fixed for opening the institution had now arrived. The house which we had hired for it was gaily adorned with red and white flags, in honour of our guests. The school-room was adorned with the Austrian colours, and with a portrait of his Imperial Majesty, the Emperor of Austria, which was presented by the foundress. Opposite to it was placed the portrait of her deceased father, Simon Von Laemel. (31)

These enlightened Jews from Europe had even ensured that the traditional methods for alms distribution would no longer be carried out with the "corruption" with which they felt it was being done by the Palestine Jewish oligarchy. Again, we see the ubiquitous presence of Samson Wertheimer in the setting up of this above-mentioned system. They undertook practical measures to make sure that the alms sent from the Empire, intended for Austrian subjects, would be distributed by the Consul. They demonstrated their greater faith in the impartial effectiveness of their secular rulers than in their own Jewish brethren. Their identification with Austria and its rulers was complete.

The Austrian model of nationalism also had its effect upon Jewish consciousness. In Austria, Jews could be Austrian, as well as a nation among other nations, although such notions were not to appear until quite late in the history of Jewish presence in Vienna. The contradiction between Jewish "nationhood" and Austrian "nationhood" was never as much of a problem as it came to be in other places, such as Germany. The very Austrian attitude to nationhood, not applying specifically to Jews, is demonstrated in a piece appearing in Sonntagsblaetter in 1848:

> Freedom is the mind of a people, nationality is its body!. . . . As long as nations exist, freedom is only possible in the nation, and where different nations are bound to one realm, only in the brotherhood of these nations can their differences be respected. (32)

Frankl was a staunch believer in the form of nationhood advocated above. There was no reason not to have peace and brotherhood between nations, and he saw irrational types of separation and distinctiveness as petty and unnecessary. He demonstrated this attitude on many occasions in his writings. At one point he commented on dietary restrictions of different religions, and did not disguise his obvious disdain for such petty and illogical regulations:

> What better subject could there be for a chapter on the weaknesses and inconsistencies of our common nature! Here were three men, with three palates all exactly the same, and yet food touched by the one would have been an abomination to the other two. We have all heard of sacred places, but here were sacred palates. (33)

Thus, Frankl's "modern" attitude was to see all men as equal and capable of rational thought and action. He obviously felt that they should be governed by rationality, and that if they were, all discrimination and prejudice would fall away, and all would be equal and free. He did not seem to see the contradiction that in imposing rationality he was as much imposing his own dogma upon the world as were those with the "sacred palates." At this

time, though, Frankl's humanist liberal progressive and universalist view was the "modern" one.

E. THE IMPERIAL POWERS IN PALESTINE

As has already been alluded to, Frankl's mission in Palestine was very intricately connected to European interests as well as Jewish ones. We have seen how conceptions of nationalism were developing at the time, and how these conceptions affected Frankl and his reactions to the situation in Palestine. Also connected to nationalism was the increasing interest of the imperial powers to have a base in the Near East. The Crimean War, begun in October, 1853, was a symptom of this increasing interest and led to a change in the power balance in Europe, and Austria's loss of Russian friendship. Much of the conflict revolved around a power struggle over the Near East. This interest in the Near East was a recognition of its crucial strategic location between the Mediterranean and Asia. The European powers realized that they would need to secure a foothold in the Near East in order not to lose out on the great possibilities promised by the construction of the Suez Canal, begun in 1854. This new power struggle in the Near East led to modern strategies of warfare and statecraft, multiple alliances between nation-states, provided the birth of modern global trade by greatly facilitating transport between east and west, signalled a beginning for modern diplomacy, and sowed the seeds of World War I, the first great modern war.

The first great European power to recognize the strategic importance of Palestine was Britain, which opened a consulate in Jerusalem in 1839. There were many reasons for the sudden interest in Palestine; as well as strategic ones, there was the growing interest in the Holy Land among fundamentalist Christians as noted before, growing interest in ideas of Jewish resettlement in the Holy Land, as well as

missionary interest to convert the Jews already present in Palestine. Thus missionary interests to make connections with Jews in Palestine, combined with political ones which saw Jews as potentially sympathetic subjects of strategic importance. Although it is never directly stated, it is probably true that the British saw the tiny Jewish population in Palestine as a connection to attaining the sympathy of Jews of wealth and influence--which wealth and influence had always been greatly exaggerated and distorted in the minds of gentiles--in Europe.

In January 1839, the first British Vice Consul to Jerusalem, William Tanner Young, received an instruction to protect Jews as part of his general duties. In 1839 the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews obtained permission to buy land in Jerusalem. Martin Gilbert claims that there was a dual British policy; that of official protection through the consulate, and a private campaign of conversion through the British missionaries. The British Vice Consul was made a Consul in 1841. In 1843, Prussia, Sardinia and France opened consulates in Jerusalem, and finally in 1849, Austria opened one as well.

The development of British influence in Jerusalem is interesting, and is worth a few words. In 1845, James Finn became British Consul and remained so until 1862. Although portrayed by Gilbert as a Christian zealous to convert Jews, Albert M. Hyamson who edited the collection of diplomatic documents called The British Consulate in Jerusalem in relation to the Jews in Palestine 1838-1914, published in 1939, described Finn in admirable terms as a man of conscience and sensitivity, sympathetic to Jews and their plight. Throughout the 1840's, Finn managed to increase British influence over Jews by offering Jews under Russian authority the right to transfer to British authority. Russia was happy to alleviate its problems with

Jews and agreed to this arrangement, only later regretting it. Even Hyamson mentioned that many objected to Finn's "missionary zeal," but from the documents it is clear that he was not only missionary in his aims, and had genuine concern for the Jews under his authority.

But, it was not only political-military strategy and missionary zeal that guided the actions of the imperial powers. They, too, were convinced of the righteousness of a European "mission," the spread of balanced, enlightened and "civilized" ideology in the backward Orient. In a memo of Finn to Sir Stratford Canning, the Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs, in 1851, he said:

> In these [Jews] as well as in the Christian elements cooperating in Palestine, it is Europeanism alone, which keeps the province from sinking, and which gives a tone to affairs and politics unknown in other Turkish provinces--these elements are not likely to sleep again, being sustained by a deep religious feeling of the people and support of European powers. (34)

Finn undertook action to spread the European influence, opening various institutions such as hospitals and a literary society. This same society was praised by Frankl in his travel account, demonstrating his approval of preading European enlightenment in the Holy Land:

> The Literary Society, founded by Mr. Finn, the English Consul, has already a considerable library, containing valuable and learned works in the principal languages of Europe and Asia. The Museum is first in importance. (35)

As far as Austria is concerned, apparently the Austrian Consul supported the accusations against Finn's zealotry, and must have seen Britain as a rival for influence in the Near East. An interesting Britain-Austria connection comes in the figure of Abraham Benisch, an Austrian Jew who came to settle in London. He advocated an increase in British influence in the Near East by resting it on the premise of Jewish support. While at the University of Vienna, he had formed a society for the Settlement of Jews in Palestine. We will look more closely at this phenomenon in a later discussion of ideas of Jewish resettlement in Palestine.

Austria, as we saw, established a consulate in 1849, and was the first power ever to open a post office in Palestine, in 1859, issuing its own "Levant" stamps (36). Visits of important figures were a symbol of the increasing strategic importance of the Holy Land in the minds of Europeans. "On the last day of June, 1855, Jerusalem received its noblest Christian visitor since the time of the Crusades, Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian of Austria" (37). The Archduke was the heir to the Habsburg throne.

Into this cauldron of rivalries and struggle for political influence, in 1856, came Ludwig August Frankl. He had a very interesting relationship with the Austrian authorities. Elise Herz Laemel had expressed a desire for her school to be in regular contact with the Austrian authorities, and three Austrian ministries become connected with it: the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Culture (38). The Consul was Joseph Von Pizzamono (1808-1860). Pizzamono was a descendent of a noble Venetian family, whose father had been encouraged by the Austrian authorities to enter into government service. Pizzamono is described by Finn as:

> A practised man of the world, of easy manners in society, and good tempered. M. Pizzamono was confident that no nation could match the Austrians in diplomacy, a science in which they had long been unrivalled. (39)

This cool confidence in Austrian powers of diplomacy is indicative of the general European attitude to Austria at this time, as well as of Austria's attitude about itself. It was only later that all began to realize the impotence of traditional Austrian diplomacy when faced with the unravelling forces of nationalism and the quest for national independence.

Pizzamono was a conscientious man who also took his role as protector of Jerusalem's Jews seriously. It was soon clear that those under protection of the Austrians outnumbered those under protection of all the other consulates put together. The huge majority under Austrian protection were Galician Jews. When the suggestion was made of giving over protection of Galician Jews to the British, Pizzamono protests in a report to the external ministry:

> This last way, on the one hand, sets itself against mercy, and on the other hand, overrides political considerations, because immediate upon our release of Jews, the conversion-addicted English consulate gains a foothold. As well, a growth of the Protestant community opposed to Catholics, already opposed by Armenians and Greeks is thoroughly undesirable. (40)

Pizzamono was interested in the Jews, and took a great interest in the project proposed by Frankl. He went so far as to offer precise recommendations connected to the school, and proposed a leader for the project. Frankl is

granted all the cooperation and weight of Consular authority, which as we will see, was required as a result of violent opposition to the project. The prospect of the school affronted the sensibilities of the traditionalist orthodox Jews, and caused violence, opposition and riots. After a condemnation against the school was read in the synagogues, Pizzamono took it upon himself to take action against the rioters and even imprisoned five of them for three days. The phenomenon of Jewish orthodox opposition will be discussed at greater length in the next chapter.

The important point in all this is the crucial role played by secular European authorities in the foundation of a Jewish school in Jerusalem, and the reliance of Frankl upon these same authorities. He did secure the support of the Hakham Bashi, the leader of the Sephardim, but most important was Frankl's belief in and trust of the Austrian authorities rather than Jewish ones:

> Where shall we find a hand strong enough to grasp the reins and direct the movements of this hard-mouthed brute [Palestine and its inhabitants]? In the first place, the representatives of the different European powers must give up their mutual jealousies, and cause their united influence to be felt; and, above all, there must be a real government, instead of the decaying empire which now casts its sinking shade over this gloomy scene. (41)

Therefore, Frankl was supporting a Jewish European cause in his establishment of the Laemel School. In so doing, he was complementing the aims of the imperial Austrian authorities in Jerusalem, as well as spreading the forces of Enlightenment and modern rational thought. It was

not by accident that Elise Herz Laemel ratified the mandate to found an institute in Jerusalem, that would from that time forward remain under Habsburg protection, on the twenty-fifth birthday of the Emperor Franz Josef.

Related to the subject of imperial power in Palestine is the reception of Frankl by non-Jewish authorities, already briefly hinted at above. Frankl may have been supporting a Jewish European cause in his establishment of the Laemel School, and demonstrating his complete identity with European goals and ideals, but on the part of the Christian authorities as well, Frankl was seen as a promoter of European ideals. A demonstration of this Christian endorsement of such projects is the positive account that Finn gave of Frankl in one of his diplomatic memos in 1858:

> The difficulty experienced by Sir Moses [Montefiore, the famous British Jewish philanthropist who visited Jerusalem on many occasions and began the first Jewish settlement outside the ancient walls of the city] in promoting European education among the Jews of Jerusalem, has equally affected the intentions of the great Jewish families of Paris and Vienna: for all have been obliged to modify their plans on account of the fanaticism of the Rabbinical authorities, who will not suffer their people, especially in the holy city, to learn the ways of the heathen. Sir Moses was even ex-communicated by some of the synagogues, and insulted by the populace in the street. A Dr. Frankel of Vienna, a man of considerable Jewish

> and other learning, came here in 1856, provided with large sums of money for establishing schools and rich presents to pacify the synagogues--the Austrian consulate lavished its means of authority and display on his behalf, but they merely succeeded in establishing a Talmud school, and that for the Sephardim only. The Ashkenazim prohibited the members of their synagogues under penalty of ex-communication from even passing along the street of the new school to this day. (42)

Thus, Jewish intentions in Palestine, as long as they coincided with modern European notions of Enlightenment and education were fully endorsed by the authorities. Frankl's endeavour was seen as one of these. The authorities were even willing to use their power to intervene in inter-Jewish disputes that related to these projects. The Austrian Consul Pizzamono wrote a letter to the Jewish community on June 12, 1856, stating in no uncertain terms his displeasure about the opposition to Frankl's project. The letter was quoted in an anonymous feuilleton published in Jerusalem:

> The unpleasant news has come to me from many parties that certain individuals from your community have made opposition to the projected Institution funded by Elise Herz Von Laemel, and against Dr. L.A. Frankel [sic]. It is far from what I expect of those of your religious conviction and I make you answerable for each indecency and each demonstration,

> and put the Institution under the protection of his Majesty the Kaiser. The K.K. government will follow the strictest letter of the law against any further opposition or offence to any person. (43)

Frankl's endeavour was therefore one which complemented the most modern intentions of the European authorities, and was even seen to merit their most diligent protection. In this way the Laemel School conception was a symbol for the rise of modern Jewish consciousness in Europe. At the same time this concept contained many of the elements of the most ancient of Jewish longings, a strong presence and involvement with the Holy Land.

F. SUMMARY

In this chapter, we have seen how the most fundamental contemporary issues of the day influenced or were connected to the foundation of the Laemel School. The Laemel family themselves were representative of the movement of Jews in the Empire from Bohemia to Vienna, and from traditional to "cultured," participating in cultural, social and political movements that were in the vanguard of modernity.

Conceptions of education were influenced by and influenced all other aspects of life in Austria-Hungary. They were influenced by the Enlightenment and consequent ideas of "progress" and Bildung. Education came to be seen as a method of creating model "citizens." New ways of thinking led to an attitude of "mission," spreading modern education to the unenlightened parts of the world. Modern methods of education were seen as a solution to the problem of industrializing society. Keeping youth occupied while their parents worked, as well as educating them was the antidote to the rut of poverty and crime. Joseph Wertheimer

spread the notion of the Kinderbewahranstalt to the German-speaking parts of Europe, and it was his direct influence that led to the idea of the Laemel School.

A new awareness of the Holy Land was also created in the nineteenth century. Romantic conceptions about the exotic and mysterious "Orient" were combined with Protestant fundamentalist ideas of the conversion of the Jews in Palestine, colonization in the Holy Land, as well as imperialist interests in the Near East The rise of nationalism, notions of creating the model "citizen" of the new nation-state, unified by language, culture, history and ethnic roots, were all dynamically tied to the most modern movements of the nineteenth century, including the events that created 1848. Frankl could come to see himself as an Austrian citizen of the "Jewish faith" without any inherent contradiction, and it influenced his attitude to his mission in Jerusalem.

Finally, imperialism combined ideas of nationalism and a European "mission" to spread enlightenment. It was also a result of strategic recognition of the geographic situation of the Near East, the passage between West and East. Missionary activity was also a part of imperialism. Austria was the first European power to open a post office in Jerusalem, and thus gain a permanent foothold in the Holy Land. Austria saw the mission of Frankl to found a school in Jerusalem as uniquely suited to furthering its own interests and thus gave it full support.

NOTES

1. Salo Baron, Die Judenfrage auf dem Wiener Kongress (Vienna: R. Loewit, 1920) 144.

2. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 172.

3. Martin Gilbert, Jerusalem: Rebirth of a City (New York: Viking, 1985) 78.

4. Gilbert, Jerusalem 92.

5. Fuerst Wenzel Kaunitz-Rietberg, "Manuscript from State Chancellory of Maria Theresa," in Geschichte des oesterreichischen Bildungswesens, vol. iii Von der fruehen Aufklaerung bis zum Vormaerz, by Helmut Engelbrecht (Vienna: Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1984) 487.

6. Steven E. Ascheim, Brothers and Strangers (Wisconsin: The U of Wisconsin Press, 1982) 19.

7. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 192.

8. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 203.

9. Max Gruenwald, 90 Jahre israelitischen Kinderbewahranstalt 1843-1933 (Vienna: n.d.)

10. Helmut Engelbrecht, Geschichte des oesterreichischen Bildungswesens, vol. iv Vom 1848 bis zum Ende der Monarchie (Vienna: Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1984) 98.

11. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 177.

12. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 179.

13. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 175.

14. Engelbrecht, Geschichte vol. iv 101.

15. Gruenwald, 90 Jahre forward.

16. "Die israelitische Kinderbewahranstalt," Sonntagsblaetter, vol. iii (1844): 783.

17. "Die israelitische Kinderbewahranstalt," Sonntagsblaetter, vol. iv (1845): 157.

18. Walter Laqueur A History of Zionism (London: Wiedenfeld and Nicolson, 1972) introduction.

19. Gilbert, Jerusalem intro xvi.

20. Ludwig August Frankl, "Stoff Zum Malen und zum Meisseln," Sonntagsblaetter, vol. i (1842): 121.

21. Ludwig August Frankl, Rachel: Romantisches Gedicht (Vienna: n.p., 1842) 1, 24.

22. Ludwig August Frankl, "Weiss-Blau," in Nach der Zerstoerung: Hebraische Elegien, by Ludwig August Frankl (Vienna: M. Aver, Mariahilf, 1856) 32.

23. Josef Fraenkel, "The Chief Rabbi and the Visionary," in Fraenkel, Jews of Austria 116.

24. Engelbrecht, Geschichte vol. iii 486.

25. Frankl, Erinnerungen 322.

26. Welser, "Silhouetten der Reichstagsabgeordneten," Sonntagsblaetter, vol. vii (1848): 627.

27. I.N. Mannheimer, "Am Grabe der Gefallenen," Sonntagsblaetter, vol. vii (1848): 137.

28. Ludwig August Frankl, Advertisement for "Taegliches Ergaenzungsblatt," Sonntagsblaetter, vol. vii (1848): 183.

29. Ludwig August Frankl, Nach Funfhundert Jahren in Wien (Vienna: Leipzig: Oskar Leiner, 1865) 13.

30. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 74.

31. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 113.

32. Dr. I.V. Hoffinger, "Freiheit oder Nationalitaet?" Sonntagsblaetter, vol. vii (1848): 189.

33. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 253.

34. Albert M. Hyamson, introduction and ed., The British Consulate in Jerusalem in Relation to the Jews in Palestine 1838-1914, Part I: 1838-1861 (London: Edward Goldston Ltd., 1939) 178.

35. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 50.

36. Gilbert, Jerusalem 103.

37. Gilbert, Jerusalem 84.

38. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 193.

39. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 193.

40. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung" 195.

41. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 121.

42. Hyamson, The British 257.

43. "Feuilleton: Ludwig August Frankl in Jerusalem," (Jerusalem: [Fac. of Stadtbibliothek Wien], 23 June, 1856)

CHAPTER IV

FRANKL AND THE JEWS IN JERUSALEM

A. GENERAL ATMOSPHERE: FACTIONS AND SOCIAL SITUATION

In this chapter we will look at Frankl's journey in relation to matters of Jewish internal interest. One of his greatest surprises was the great number of Jewish factions he found in the holy city, and their often hostile relations with each other. It is clear from his reactions, that he was completely unprepared to deal with this situation and had been ignorant of the magnitude of the problem, especially how it would manifest itself in opposition to his project. In the same letter to Anastasius Gruen quoted earlier, an excellent indication of his immediate reaction to his mission, he said:

> It is not because I promised you that I now write; rather it is the egotistical need--if only by writing and only momentarily--out of the midst of barbarism to seek refuge in culture. . . . So much squalor, insanity, baseness, and folly has never been gathered together in one city, and indeed! that the most profound feeling of people throughout the world towards this place should be poetic and beautiful! (1)

In fairness to Frankl, this letter seems to have been written in the heat of the moment of despair, and was modified upon more reflection and distance. What did he find there that so enraged, to move him to call it barbarism? An incident that transpired just as he was approaching the gates of Jerusalem could not but have made a big impression upon him. We can only try to imagine the excitement and anticipation he must have been feeling as he neared the entrance of Jerusalem, when he was encountered by

a knife-wielding Jew who forced Frankl to rent his clothes and say, "Zion is turned into a desert, it lies in ruins" (2). This was only the preliminary for many other shocking incidents.

As he began to learn about the large number of different Jewish sects and the huge differences between them, his contempt grew. He reported on the Sephardim in Jerusalem. He discussed their origins, the countries they came from, their leader, the Hakham Bashi, who was the Jewish leader recognized by the Turks, and their political-social structure. Although Frankl was most positive about this group, still the majority of Jews in Jerusalem although the Ashkenazim were gaining numbers very quickly, he stated his qualms about their oligarchy and their methods of alms collection. He could not hide his preconceived "enlightened" European ideas about eastern Jews by stating, in a contemptuous manner, about the elite "Chachams" or sages of the community that they were "exclusively occupied in learning Talmud, to the neglect of all those studies that would enlarge their views" (3). Frankl talked suspiciously about their methods of collecting money and the uses to which they put it. Two things affronted his "modern" sensibilities the most; ancient structures of oligarchy that perpetuated privilege and often used questionable means of financing this privilege, and the lack of any modern education:

> They simply divided the money in true Turkish fashion among themselves, though they were in comfortable circumstances . . . . However incredible this fact may appear, it is surpassed by another. At the period of my arrival in the city, which the Jews esteem to be the holiest on earth, there was not even a single school, such as the

> smallest and poorest community of Europe would be ashamed not to possess. (4)

Frankl meant a school for general education, as small Yeshivot did exist. He also discussed the existence of deep resentment on the part of many poor Jewish Jerusalemites towards their leaders.

Yet, greater than any contempt he felt towards the Sephardim was his reaction to the Ashkenazim. He reported that there nad been a plague in Safed in 1812, where most of them had lived at the time, and many of them consequently chose to move down to Jerusalem. This population, plus a growing number of Ashkenazim from, primarily, Russia and Galicia, but also from other parts of the Habsburg Empire, contributed to a huge increase in the numbers of Ashkenazim in Jerusalem as the century wore on. There were factions even among the Ashkenazim, and the "worst" of these for Frankl, the Perushim, were narrow-minded, backward, fanatical, prejudiced, and even "irreligious." He deplored their attitudes to education:

> The Aschkenasim have never had a school of the higher class for the education of youth, not even a Talmud Thora; they rather allow the minds and bodies of their children to be cramped by the Rabbis in those filthy, damp, little rooms, which are known as Chedorim. I shudder at the remembrance of these hotbeds for the growth of ignorance--of these dark dens of disease and misery. (5)

A quick overview of the Jewish population of Jerusalem of the time reveals a constellation of factions and especially small sects of Ashkenazim. The historian Yakov Yaari-Poleskin claimed that the population of

Jerusalem at this time consisted of four thousand Sephardim and seventeen hundred Ashkenazim. The Sephardim were officially recognized by the Turks, with their authorized leader being Hayyim Nissim Abulafia, or the "Hakham Bashi," considered the Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem. The Sephardim originated in the different provinces of the Ottoman Empire: Egypt, Tunis, Tripoli, Morocco, Algiers, Persia, as well as from India, and had Ladino as their common language. Many had migrated to these areas after the tragic Spanish Inquisition in the fifteenth century had expelled all Jews from the country. The leaders, or "Chachams," not elected but chosen, in turn chose the Chief Rabbi, or Haknam Bashi. Under him were three "Pakidim" or presidents to manage secular and economic affairs. This made up the non-elected government. Despite not having been elected, they were, in theory, responsible to their people. During our period, there was a growing dissatisfaction among large numbers of the population about the running of their affairs by their leaders. Suspicion was growing about the fairness of the distribution of money. The Sephardim had four synagogues in Jerusalem, and thirty-six Yeshivot. The leaders had the right to seize the property of the dead to be sold "for the benefit of the community," a right which was becoming increasingly suspect. Corruption and greed was rampant, and the population no longer completely trusted their leaders.

An overview of the Ashkenazim of the time reveals a slightly more complicated picture. As stated above, they came from Russia, Galicia, Hungary, Bohemia, Moravia, Germany and Holland. The dominant group were the Perushim, disciples of the Vilna Gaon who had immigrated to Palestine. They were the largest group that had fled the Safed earthquake in 1837. Stemming from territories that had been incorporated in the Russian Empire, they looked to Vilna as the Diaspora center of their religious orientation. Many of

them had out-stayed their permitted time in the Holy Land and had thus been renounced by Russia. Austria gave many of them protection as did Britain, but they were not Austrian or British "subjects." A most noteworthy development among the Perushim was that they had somehow come to be able to appropriate the money sent from Jews in Austria to the Jews of Jerusalem. A system had been set up whereby the Austrian Consul was to distribute the Halukkah or alms money that had been collected in the Habsburg Empire, but Frankl observed that only the "respectable" Rabbis of Vienna and Eisenstadt actually sent the money through the Consul. The Perushim had connections in Hungary, Germany, Prussia, Bavaria and Holland, as well as Vilna. Frankl had the most contempt for this group, seeing them as the most "backward" and highly "corrupted." Then, there was a large group of Hasidim, who themselves were divided. There were the Volhynian Hasidim, who had also settled in Safed, and only recently had established a community in Jerusalem. Their leader was Nisan Bak. The Hasidim who were Austrian subjects originated in Galicia and Cracow, and resembled the Volhynian Hasidim. Their center of support in the Diaspora was Lemberg, and they received the largest proportion of their financial support from Galicia. The Habad Hasidim (Lubavitch), had had their chief settlement in the Holy Land in Hebron, and there were still at this time very few of them in Jerusalem. Their spiritual center was in Byelorussia. Then the Warsovians were, according to Frankl, partly Perushim and partly Hasidim. Disputes over money had played a role in the separation of the Hasidim into the above-mentioned factions. The Warsovians received the majority of their financial support from Poland. Finally, the Anshei Hod originated in both Holland and Germany, hence their name (Hod as the Hebrew abbreviation for "Holland and Deutschland"). They clad themselves in the "Polish costume"

according to Frankl, whereby their German descent was "barely perceptible." They intermarried with the Perushim. This group actually received the largest proportion of funds from the Diaspora, from many different countries. Unlike the Sephardim, the Ashkenazim had no spiritual head in Jerusalem, and collectively they only had one synagogue in Jerusalem. Despite the resentment of the Sephardim towards the Ashkenazim and vice versa, there was enough resentment left over for the Ashkenazim of specific groups towards other Ashkenazic groups. The term "Hasid" was derisive for a "Porish" and vice versa. Frankl dwelt on the tendency of the Ashkenazim to concentrate on Talmud over the Bible with much contempt.

And he went on to outline the squabbles between the Ashkenazim and the Sephardim, and in-fighting among the groups themselves; for monopolies on meat slaughter, for money (Halukkah), the selling of graves, and the most contemptible, the bidding for the post of Sheliach (messenger) to collect alms abroad.

Frankl entered this "lion's den," as he saw it, ignorant of what he would find, and unaware of the very real needs of the people he found there. He came as a modern educator, to bring enlightened European culture to his fellow Jews in Jerusalem. He did not know how alien his ideas were to the reality of Jerusalem. Yet, to call him completely ignorant would be untrue. He had been warned. In 1856, just a few months prior to his departure, he had received a letter from Zacharias Frankel, mentioned earlier, a professor and director of the Breslau Rabbinic Seminary:

> Why should I hide anything from you, my dear friend? The erection of a Kinderbewahranstalt in Jerusalem belongs, in my view, to folly: the time for such luxuries is not yet ripe in the

> Orient. And anyway, the Jews in Jerusalem will only greet such a new establishment with distrust, will not recognize nor wish to recognize, the philanthropy of such an establishment . . . . In the Orient, the need to preserve small tender children in institutions has not yet been felt . . . . Over-refined Europe, with its inexpressible misery and disruptively chaotic urban lodging conditions has faced a multitude of dangers . . . there, the Kinderbewahranstalt is the necessary expression of humaneness . . . and in the Orient, where mothers have not left the house, can this mere exotic and superfluous plant thrive? (6)

Apparently there was also a warning sent by the Austrian Consul to the Jews in Vienna about the impractical nature of such a mission even before Frankl departed. Can we thus see Frankl as a driven missionary, willing to extol the virtues of his project even in the face of violent opposition? Did he think his friend Rabbi Frankel misguided or ill-informed? It is very difficult to speculate about what impression this letter made upon him. It does not seem to have affected his intentions in any way. Frankl wrote in his Kol Mevassar, published in 1856, which admittedly was probably written prior to receipt of this letter:

> Parents can breathe easier knowing their children are in a secure place, where under the supervision of an honourable teacher, nothing malicious can befall them. During the time in which the father is far from home earning the

> daily bread, and noone is at home, the children will be supervised. While the wife is occupied with the care of the sick in one corner of the house, she can console herself, and find peace in her heart, that her children are receiving care, such as bread to satiation and clothing. They will be led on the right path, and prepared for school. . . . (7)

It seems obvious that Frankl was quite ignorant about the situation of Jews in Palestine. His mission was a modern European one rather than a plan to deal with the realities of Jerusalem Jews, and therefore he was shocked by what he found.

B. IDEAS OF JEWISH RESTORATION TO THE HOLY LAND

Although Frankl himself never directly commented on ideas of Jewish restoration in Palestine, it is interesting to take a brief look at this phenomenon as it does give us an insight into the type of thinking exemplified by Frankl. We have already seen how the Enlightenment opened up possibilities for Jews to enter European civil society, dominated by Christianity. Through compassion and recognition of past oppression, the Christian began to see the Jew as "redeemable." With education, or Bildung, the Jew could be improved and made fit for European society. In a sense, the Jew became a "human being" of the Jewish persuasion, rather than mere "Jew." This attitude is displayed in a memo written by the first British Vice Consul, Young, to the Foreign Secretary, Palmerston, in 1839:

> If a Jew, My Lord, were to attempt to pass the door of the Church of the Sepulchre, it would in all probability

> cost him his life--this is not very Christian-like, considering Christ Himself was a Jew. . . . But by intercourse with the Jew, My Lord, I am taught they are not wanting in many of the best feelings of our nature. (8)

We must attempt not to see the above anachronistically. It was a new perception. It showed a vision of the Jew as human being, like the Christian. Perhaps the Jew was not the highest exemplar of humane European Christian society, but he had potential, he was improvable, capable of "civic betterment." Frankl believed this, and felt himself to be a product of this "civic betterment." Through education and enlightenment, he had made himself fit to be a part of a new liberal European society.

Again, brief mention has been made of the importance of understanding the significance of the 1840 "Damascus Affair" for Jews. N.M. Gelber, who published his book Zur Vorgeschichte des Zionismus [On the Pre-History of Zionism] in 1927, said that the tragic events of 1840 showed the Jewish leaders of the world that the ridiculous ritual murder accusation levelled at Jews throughout history, was still capable of arising at any moment, in spite of enlightenment, and despite the gains made in equal rights (9). And the significance of the events was not lost on religious thinkers. Gilbert discusses the reaction of the famous rabbi born in Sarajevo, Judah Alkalai:

> Alkalai regarded the Damascus affair as the work of God, intended to shock all Jews--"complacent dwellers in foreign lands"--into a greater awareness and concern for the remoteness of Jerusalem. (10)

Many factors combined in the new thinking towards the "Holy Land." A most interesting example of this new thinking was a plan put forth by Abraham Benisch. Benisch was born in 1817 in Bohemia, and studied medicine at the University of Vienna. He was therefore, in some ways, similar to Frankl in background and outlook, although Benisch had more Jewish religious education than Frankl had. Benisch met Moritz Steinschneider in 1836. Steinschneider had begun a movement in Prague, which had as its fundamental idea, the independence of Jews and restoration in Zion. Steinschneider was to become known as the "father of modern Jewish bibliography" due to his copious output of catalogues and bibliographies and his introductions to Jewish literary histories. He was to later turn against the idea of political Zionism. But in the 1830's he influenced two students, Benisch being one of them, who went to England to present plans of Jewish independence and colonisation in Palestine. It is fascinating to read his proposal in terms of its significance for modern Jewish consciousness. Benisch was a Jew from Bohemia, a part of the Habsburg Empire, who took ancient ideas of Jewish return to Palestine and used them for new purposes and based them on wholly modern premises. Benisch's plan was enclosed in a British diplomatic memo in 1842, and it is instructive in our analysis of modern Jewish consciousness and its relation to Frankl and Jews like him:

> England would find in this colony a new, sure and stable market for her goods, where the known activity of the Jews and their connections throughout Asia would open to them new paths for exportation. It would assist the endeavours of England to strengthen the Porte by converting a now useless portion of her

> subjects into an active community, an example that would not be lost upon the other subjects, and at the same time increase both the revenue of Turkey, and the welfare of Syria. Civilization which so deeply interests England, would thus be promoted in this country; and the Jews by their tractability and dispersion, are eminently adapted to its propagation. It behoves the government of a country where Protestantism has taken the deepest root--where a large and respectable portion of their citizens manifest their benevolence towards the Jews--It behoves, I repeat, the government of this country, to extend its benevolence towards a nation through which Christianity has received its highest gifts--a nation which according to the Sacred Book--the standard of faith for both religions--will once again act a high part. (11)

The above is quoted at length in order to demonstrate its neat summary of all the aspects of modern Jewish consciousness in relation to Palestine, and many elements that we have already seen demonstrated in Frankl's attitudes as well. We see the recognition of the strategic location of Palestine for modern imperial interests, the deeply ingrained attitudes about Jewish "unproductivity" and a desire to change this into a "useful" Jewish contribution, there is an understanding of modern diplomacy and strategy, a reference to Christian-Jewish brotherhood and a recognition of Christian "benevolence" towards Jews. Finally, we see that most dominant of European ideas--the

desire to spread "civilization." Frankl was therefore not the first of his type, and although he was never a "Zionist," he was nevertheless an excellent representative for the attitudes that were evolving at his time, as demonstrated by Benisch.

C. IDEAL AND REALITY

The conflict in Frankl between ideal and reality in his vision of the Holy Land has been alluded to throughout this thesis. It was a crucial factor in his travel account. One moment he waxes poetic about a pastoral or sublime Biblical scene, the next moment he is barely concealing his repugnance at actual sights he encounters. There is no doubt, however, that he set off on the journey with the greatest and most positive expectations. In 1855, he wrote a letter to his friend Gruen, which displays an attitude of excitement, anticipation and a feeling of good fortune at having the opportunity to set out on the trip:

> I depart from Triest to the Ionic Islands, to Athens, see Greece; from there through Smyrna to Constantinople . . . . then Cyprus and Rhodes to Beirut. Through Lebanon--I prophetically named my last book thus--through all of Biblical Canaan to Jerusalem. . . . through the great desert to Cairo. . . . Alexandria, Marseilles, Paris, Vienna! Is there a more wonderful voyage in the world? (12)

Of course, it could be argued that Frankl's excitement was perhaps more a result of the anticipated voyage than the mission in Palestine. There is, however, ample evidence, as we have seen, that Palestine was to be the highlight, and that he took the project of founding the

school very seriously. But, as mentioned in the third chapter, Frankl's attitude to Palestine had been nurtured by poets such Byron, Calderon, Goethe, Gruen, Heine, Herder, Racine, all writers that he had included in his Libanon, as much as by Jewish religious writings and the Bible. He had grand romantic scenes in his mind's eye. It is no wonder that he, like other modern visitors who had fed on the sublime beauty of romantic poetry, was disappointed by what he found in Jerusalem. The most common words used by visitors to Jerusalem at this time were "filth," "stagnation," "ruin." Herman Melville, who visited in 1857, likened the Jews of Jerusalem to "flies who have taken up their abode in a skull" (13).

It is thus no surprise, that Frankl, having more in common with these modern European visitors, was inspired to similar feelings of outrage and disgust. He wrote:

> A faithful picture of the social and moral condition of the inhabitants of Jerusalem must excite grief, and indignation, and sympathy in every heart. We have not painted these scenes, and groups, and figures for the purpose of awakening these sentiments in our readers; our object has been to prepare their minds for the all-important question--how can this state of things be remedied? (14)

Even in this reaction, the profession of a belief that things can be done, a situation can be dealt with and alleviated with modern methods and ideas, he was identifying himself as a modern "civilized" European and believer in "progress."

As stated earlier, a factor involved in identification with modern Europe, was an attempt to

dissociate oneself from the "primitive" Ostjuden (Eastern European Jews). Steven Ascheim describes this process:

> For assimilating was not merely the conscious attempt to blend into new social and cultural environments but was also purposeful, programmatic dissociation from traditional Jewish cultural and national moorings. (15)

Association with traditional Ashkenazic Jews became undesirable, and the modern progressive Jews who identified with the West began to see the Sephardim in a new light. The Sephardim were romanticized and ennobled. The Ahkenazic form of Judaism was now seen by them as "primitive." "Enlightened" German-speaking Jews such as Leopold Zunz, Abraham Geiger and Heinrich Graetz saw Hasidim as savage, ignorant and their way of thinking as lazy ("Denkfaulheit"). Talmudic thinking was seen as distorting, focused on minor quibbling points. Therefore, both the "irrational" (Hasidim) and the superrational (Talmudists) exemplified the ghetto and Jewish parochialism (16). The "eastern" Sephardim, coming from the exotic "orient" provided an alternative. They were, in modern Jewish eyes, free from the centuries-long Talmudic quibbling of the Ashkenazim, and they were free from Hasidic irrationality. Frankl, too, was prone to this attitude towards the Sephardim. In his account of the Jews of Jerusalem, he was much kinder to the Sephardim than the Ashkenazim. He described the Hakham Bashi, the Sephardic leader, in glowing terms:

> I found the old man, who is more than eighty years of age, seated on a divan in a spacious apartment. His hair was covered by a light blue turban, which was wound round his head, while his long white beard flowed over a wide woollen talar. He made two of his servants lift

> him up, to enable him to salute me. A truly venerable, patriarchal figure. (17)

Overall, then, he was far more positive about the Sephardim than the Ashkenazim who fiercely opposed his project. Yet, he was not uncritical. Perhaps the Sephardim were higher up on the hierarchy of "civility," but they were still prone to narrow religious prejudice, and were as yet unappreciative of the superiority of European "civilized" society:

> All institutions founded by Europeans for the purpose of promoting education and civilisation are not regarded by them as benefits in any sense of the term, but rather as a sort of amusement, to which some of their co-religionists in Europe treat themselves. (18)

This was an echo of a common "enlightened" European attitude. A Christian pilgrim to Jerusalem, Titus Tobler, who also published a travel account, in 1859, remarked upon the opposition that Frankl had faced in his mission. He expressed contempt for the "fanatics" who opposed the project and said about the school:

> One was not only establishing youth formation and education, and with it utilizing the most effective measures against laziness, poverty, and the old ways. . . . (19)

Thus, Frankl was merely echoing the more common "modern" attitude towards traditional, orthodox Jews as "lazy" and unproductive and merely perpetuating their own poverty by their intransigence. And he was undertaking a project, the basis of which was sympathetically condoned by "progressive" European thinkers.

Thus, in his eyes, the Sephardim were perhaps slightly more worthy of admiration than the "narrow-minded" Ashkenazim, but they were by no means ideal Jews. Describing the Sephardic chanting, he said:

> On the whole, their singing is not quite so disagreeable to the well-cultivated ear of a European as what is called Polish singing, but it is certainly not provocative of piety. (20)

Yet, the phenomenon that Ascheim describes seems to have been present in Frankl. About the Ashkenazic Perushim, quintessential representatives of what he and other modern Jews were trying to dissociate themselves from, he was, in no uncertain terms, contemptuous:

> Fanatical, bigoted, intolerant, quarrelsome, and, in truth, irreligious, with them the outward observance of the ceremonial law is everything; the moral law little binding. . . . (21)

One could say, that in general, he felt removed from them all. In fact the book was not written particularly for the Jewish reader at all. His ideal audience was the enlightened of Europe. He explained all Jewish concepts and terms, as if he were writing for a non-Jewish audience. His choice of language always removed him somewhat from the reality of what he saw, as though he were protecting his ideals over reality at all cost. His descriptions of the Jerusalem holy sites are always written as if from afar, as an objective "observer" rather than as someone with a vested interest in what he saw. He called the remaining wall of the destroyed Temple, the "wailing place of the Jews," in a manner which removed him from all real connection with it. Frankl was aware of this conflict within himself between ideal and reality:

> My first walk in Jerusalem led me through the lively bazaar with its motley picturesque population--through steep, narrow, unpaved lanes, which grew lonelier and quieter as I left the bazaar behind. As I passed between lofty stone houses, with closed doors, and narrow wooden latticed windows, stumbling at times over dead cats and dogs, and finding, in one place, the street barricaded with the body of a dead camel, I felt the utter incongruity between the feelings which I had cherished as a pilgrim and the objects which surrounded me. . . . (22)

He was disgusted by much of what he found, not the least of which was the social situation he found among his co-religionists:

> The idleness of the parents produces its natural effect on the children, the feeling of honour, even when excited, is soon blunted by the universal receipt of alms. . . . (23)

And, amidst all this, he was torn between being a Jew, a concept which had seemingly been rather abstract to him until that point, and being an enlightened European modern man of German culture. He attempted to approach the Jews he found, and then he distanced himself. It was a constant battle, a battle within himself between ideal and reality, imagination and observed facts. An example of this distancing, and catering to the audience he had as his ideal is his description of the Yiddish-speaking Ashkenazim. He had so removed himself from this traditional Yiddish-speaking Jewish way of life, that he did not even describe

the language as Yiddish. This attitude, though, was not so uncommon among many "modern" Jews. He described them as speakers of "corrupted" German:

> The term German is so far justly applied to them, as they all understand the German language, of which they speak a strange dialect, with a still stranger accent. (24)

Frankl was thus so far from this traditional background that it had become merely "strange." The travel account is therefore a kind of mental map. In his descriptions, Frankl betrays expectation, ideal, reality and the resulting conflicts that arise between them all. It is a study of the evolution of a modern Jewish attitude. Frankl had been brought up on the Biblical accounts of the history of the Jewish people in Palestine, but as seen by modern Europeans. He loved these stories and hated to give up his cherished ideas about Judaism and Jews merely because he had come face to face with a way of life that he did not see as particularly noble He therefore tried to rationalize it, call it "irreligious," distanced himself from it, relativized it, saw it as not truly "Jewish." There were indeed moments when he was truly moved, swept away by the emotion of what he had the opportunity to experience, but usually these were moments that complemented his ideal and confirmed his illusions:

> There are moments in our existence, when the past and the future are blended into one--when the mind realizes all that is separated by time and space as actually present, and is borne along on the unfettered wing of fancy as in a waking dream. . . . We are swept away, as it were, by the flood of joy and sorrow

> that seizes upon us. All that has been done in past generations and centuries passed in review before me; I saw a father preparing to offer up his son as a sacrifice; I saw the pillar of fire marching through the wilderness, and the mountain of thunder, with its flames; I stood as a listener in the temple of Jehovah; I heard the Royal bard of Israel strike the harp inspired of God. A countless multitude was thronging in the court of the Temple, and the High Priest, in his white robes, brought forth the sacrifice of atonement. I witnessed apostasy and treason against God, and weak kings rising in rebellion, and devouring flames licking the beams of cedar in Jehovah's temple! (25)

It was a description completely in accord with the ideals of romantic poetry. When Frankl could see Jerusalem in this way, he was not disappointed. When it presented him with poetic material in tune with his own European attitudes, it was no disappointment, rather a magnificent realization of all his dreams. The world view exemplified by Frankl is excellently described by one of the early German Zionists. These Zionists were people attracted by the idea of Jewish return and Jewish independence and self-determination, but had never any intention to actually immigrate to Palestine themselves. It was an ideal, but the reality was their Weltanschauung imbued with the spirit of European enlightenment and liberalism, and their ties to German language and culture. This early Zionist was Max Bodenheimer:

> Our heart belongs to the land where we first tried to understand the meaning of life. Despite the strong impression which the visit in the Holy Land, the land of our forefathers has made on me, it seemed to me that my relationship and feeling toward Palestine, in comparison with my feelings toward my German homeland, was of a dream-like quality . . . . After my visit to Palestine, it became clear to me how difficult it must be for a West European Jew to become a Zionist. (26)

Ideal and reality: they could appreciate the land, but its reality could not mirror their ideal. The enlightened Jews of this time were still too attached to the European culture they had come to identify with, and it was through it that they approached Judaism rather than the previous approaching of secular culture through the eyes of traditional Judaism. A poignant illustration of this attitude is Frankl's departure from Palestine. After all the disappointment, all the bitterness and conflict that he had to confront, he managed to muster up only positive words for Palestine. Yet, the beauty he praised was the beauty of past history, and the only present beauty he found were ruins:

> And, now, gentle reader, let us say farewell to the land of Palestine, so wonderful in its past history, so beautiful in its present ruins. (27)

D. THE LAEMEL SCHOOL

This section will examine the events surrounding the opening of the school, and especially the fierce opposition that Frankl had to confront. It was in this

confrontation that the forces of tradition and modernity came into conflict. This struggle encapsulated all the elements of an ancient way of life having to face powerful new ways of thinking that threatened its very existence.

Our first task in understanding this opposition is to take a look at events that preceded Frankl's arrival. There had been other proposed projects and attempts to bring modern ideas to the Holy Land, and all had met with opposition from the traditional, and especially Ashkenazic population of Jerusalem. We can thus see the opposition to Frankl as just another manifestation in a history of conflict presented by bringing modernity to Palestine.

The relation between the Jews and the imperial powers in Jerusalem was a paradoxical one. On the one hand, the imperial powers afforded a certain amount of benevolent protection and security to the Jews who were often abused and discriminated against by the Turks. On the other hand they presented a threat, in the form of heretical secular ideas. In some ways, modern secularism as represented by the European powers, was far more threatening to orthodox Jews in Jerusalem than was the previous threat of bodily harm represented by brutal Turkish rulers or the ancient religious Christian forces such as the Greeks, Armenians or Roman Catholics, present in Palestine.

A hospital opened by the British inspired a violent opposition. Its very existence threatened the orthodox Jews who saw it as a means to convert Jews. This opposition was stated in no uncertain terms in a document sent to the British Consulate in 1845 by the Ashkenazi Jewish community in which any Jew who even visited the hospital was barred from Jewish burial:

> Moreover, notice and warning is hereby given, that no Child of Israel, whether a man or a woman, is permitted to be

> employed in the service of the said hospital, and if anyone transgresses these our words, then shall his sons not receive the rites of circumcision, and no lawful meat shall be given to him. (28)

Throughout the history of the British Consulate in the 1830's, 1840's and 1850's, there were constant exchanges and conflicts with the Jewish community that opposed all modern schools, any measures which threatened the rabbis' privileges in alms distribution, and even modern European hospitals. They were particularly opposed to the introduction of instruction in "gentile languages" which, Finn reported, they felt "would only expose them the more to the seductive arguments of the Christian missionaries" (29). Yet, this same Jewish community had written a letter to the consulate in 1840 after an attempt on the life of Queen Victoria:

> Aware of the great goodness of Her Majesty, Victoria, Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, towards the House of Israel in Her Dominions, and under Her Protection--and remembering especially the merciful interposition of Her Government in the late persecution of our brethren at Damascus, we feel ourselves bound, to praise the Lord of All, for that He has wrought a great redemption in preserving Her life from danger. (30)

Thus, the relation had always been ambiguous. As we see above, there had been moments of genuine good feeling towards the ruling European imperial powers. The Jewish community saw these European powers as a benevolent

protector, but eventually the benefits paled in light of the acute threat posed by modernity and the way of thinking that it engendered. And, into this growing tension and resentment came Frankl and his Laemel School, backed up by the full authority of the Austrian consular officials.

The magnitude of Frankl's and his compatriots' ignorance of the traditional Jerusalem Jewish population was displayed in their plans to take the children in as Austrian subjects, and as a "sign of their tolerance," to even include Christians and Moslems in the school population. As a result of the warnings given by Zacharias Frankel and the Consul before Frankl's departure for Palestine, the plans did undergo some change. They decided to make it an exclusively Jewish school, and to change it from a Kinderbewahranstalt to a school for young children over the age of six years, in order to better serve the needs of the population.

Upon Frankl's arrival in Jerusalem, he managed to secure the support of the Hakham Bashi, that "venerable patriarchal figure," who promised to help him. Yet, in order to speed up the proceedings, Frankl had to pressure the Hakham Bashi to assemble the communities' presidents in order to decide on the proposed institution. Stormy discussions ensued, but they finally decided to allow the school to open in a vote of eighteen to six. Frankl wrote:

> This resolution was a victory of the Sepharedim over the Aschkenasim, whose oppression had become more and more intolerable. (31)

It is not absolutely clear why the Sephardim would have been so much more positive about the project than the Ashkenazim. There were indeed the elements of a power struggle present. Yet, Frankl also recounted how the Sephardim had felt "deep shame" for not having a school, and

not having the means to establish one. Perhaps not irrelevant was the fact that a circular had recently been sent by the Chief Sephardic Rabbi of the Turkish Empire recommending the opening of schools that would provide a religious and secular education for youth.

Even Frankl, by now aware of the situation in Jerusalem, realized the elements of a power struggle in this resolution. The Sephardim as well, were being confronted by a growing threat to their power, as the Ashkenazic population of Jerusalem was increasing at a fast pace. He discussed the surprise among the Sephardim that they were still able to prevail over the Ashkenazim in this matter. Nevertheless, the opposition was bitter and powerful. As we saw in the last chapter, Consul Pizzamono felt compelled to write a letter to the Ashkenazic community in order to stop their violent manifestations of opposition.

The course of the conflict is outlined in a long "Feuilleton" published anonymously in German in a Jerusalem newspaper. In his account, Frankl mentioned a visit by a "haggard-looking man, with an unsettled expression" who introduced himself as a correspondent from a Jerusalem newspaper, originally from Central Germany. Probably it was this man who wrote the "Feuilleton." In any event, this "Feuilleton" went a lot further in outlining the extent of the opposition and violence than even Frankl had. Perhaps Frankl was understandably attempting to tone down the conflict, in order for his readers to focus on the success of the mission, rather than the opposition with which it had been confronted. The anonymous "Feuilleton" writer described Frankl's reception at the Western Wall on his first Friday evening in Jerusalem. The "fanatics" yelled to him:

> We want no school, here is holy ground
> and here all must remain as in ancient

> times until the Messiah comes; only he can help. Here, amidst destruction, no building is permitted. (32)

Frankl left Jerusalem for a few days in the middle of his mission to visit other areas of the Holy Land, and he reported on what transpired in his absence. He said that a "hate campaign" had begun and that the opposition went so far as to write insulting placards that attacked him personally. He reported that they eventually ceased their opposition after the threats of the Austrian Consul, but he was aware of their denunciations and protests sent to their brethren in London, Amsterdam and Altona. As we saw, they read a protest in the synagogue, and had shouted beneath Frankl's window:

> Up, up! Come sing, "Eiches," songs of lamentation. Religion is in danger! Up, come, ye faithful ones of Zion, up! (33)

Frankl remained as faithful to his mission, convinced of its righteousness, as did the "zealots" to their opposition. He saw himself as a type of prophet of progress, truly a "missionary" bringing modern European education to his Jewish brethren. He remained convinced that the majority did not oppose his mission, and that they saw the need for such an institution. Commenting upon the grand opening of the school, he said:

> I was deeply moved at seeing so many poor creatures weeping, entreating, crying, and praying. There could not be a clearer proof that the outcry made by the fanatical zealots, who call themselves leaders of the communities, did not express the feelings of the people at large, and that the poor in

> Jerusalem were languishing in deep misery, in spiritual oppression, in hunger and despondency. I felt myself elevated to my task, and elevated with joy; I only regretted that all could not share in the advantages of the noble institution. (34)

Frankl reported that mothers accosted him in the street to beg entry for their children. The school was only able to admit less than fifty students, with preference given to children between the ages of five and nine.

One of the last, ironical acts of opposition that Frankl faced illustrates many of the elements involved in the conflict between old and new, traditional and modern. He described the night before the school's opening:

> The restless, idle zealots contrived to give me considerable annoyance to the last. The night before the ceremony of inauguration I was woke up and informed that the report had been spread by the Russian Jews that there was a crucifix in the institution. I imagined that a crucifix might have been wantonly thrown into it, or painted on the walls. I hastened to the house, but I could discover nothing, till my attention was directed to the fact that the Grand Cross of the Emperor's own Order was painted on his breast. (35)

Titus Tobler alluded to this incident in his own travel account, calling the portrait "maimed" as a result of Jewish "fanaticism," again echoing a general European sentiment about Jewish orthodox attitudes which had influenced Frankl. This was a coming together of all the

elements involved in the struggle of ancient and modern Jewish consciousness. On one side was an ancient tradition that dictated an entire way of life based on religious faith, and on the other side was a new way of thinking in which "religion" could be separate from the other aspects of living. This new way of life embraced the achievements of the Enlightenment: modern ideas of education, "freedom," free speech, modern culture, pluralism, tolerance and the dominance of secularism based on ideas of humanism. The evolution of modern consciousness led to ideas of nationalism--which admittedly had different attributes in different nations--(and which had a very specific character in Austria-Hungary), and the possibility of furthering imperial power. The presence of the Emperor's portrait in a place of prominence on the wall of the Laemel School embodied these new ideas, the Jewish acceptance of them, and pointed the way to a different future that would come ever more in conflict with the ancient ways. Frankl, in his person and in his mission, was a symbol for the evolution of this conflict.

E. SUMMARY

In this chapter we have seen how the modernity of Frankl came into conflict with the traditional Jews of Jerusalem. We examined the various Jewish sects that existed in the holy city, and the lack of preparation that Frankl had had to deal with this fact.

Enlightenment notions of humanity and tolerance led to a new perception of Christian compassion for Jews, seeing Jews as "human beings" who were capable of improvement and bettering themselves. This compassion, combined with modern imperial interests and a desire to have a base in the Near East, as well as with Protestant fundamentalist missionary zeal, led to a re-exploration of the question of Jewish restoration to the Holy Land.

We then took a look at the conflict between ideal and reality within Frankl. We saw how his excitement about the proposed journey, buttressed by romantic nineteenth century conceptions in poetry and literature formed an ideal image in his mind, and how this was challenged by the realities he encountered in Jerusalem. In general, though, Frankl wrote about all the Jerusalem Jews and their reality as if from afar, distanced from it all. He recognized the conflict within, and tended to be moved more by things that confirmed the ideal he had created for himself. He suddenly had to confront the recognition of having more in common with his non-Jewish compatriots than the vast majority of his co-religionists. This perspective was more and more influencing Central European Jews, especially those of Vienna.

Finally, there was the shocking, to Frankl, opposition to the setting up of the Laemel School. There had been a history of opposition to modernity and modern institutions by the Jews of Jerusalem. They began to feel threatened by the increasing tide of outside people and ideas into their traditional enclave of Judaism. The balance of power, long held by the Sephardim, was beginning to be challenged by an influx of Ashkenazim to the holy city.

NOTES

1. Frankl and Gruen, Briefwechsel 82-83.

2. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 2.

3. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 22.

4. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 25-26.

5. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 33.

6. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung," 181.

7. Vielmetti, "Die Begruendung," 180.

8. Hyamson, The British 6.

9. Dr. N.M. Gelber, Zur Vorgeschichte des Zionismus: Judenstaatsprojekte in den Jahren 1695-1845 (Vienna: Phaidon, 1927) 125.

10. Gilbert, Jerusalem 22.

11. Hyamson, The British 45.

12. Frankl and Gruen, Briefwechsel 80.

13. Gilbert, Jerusalem 96.

14. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 114-115.

15. Ascheim, Brothers 5.

16. Ascheim, Brothers 15.

17. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 4-5.

18. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 68.

19. Titus Tobler, Titus Toblers Dritte Wanderung Nach Palaestina im Jahre 1857 (Gotha: Justus Perthes, 1859) 316.

20. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 62.

21. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 27.

22. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 3.

23. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 66.

24. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 26.

25. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 15-16.

26. Jehuda Reinharz, Fatherland or Promised Land (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1975) 133.

27. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 390.

28. Hyamson, The British 70.

29. Hyamson, The British 133.

30. Hyamson, The British 31.

31. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 56.

32. "Feuilleton" [Fac. of Stadtbibliothek Wien]

33. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 105.

34. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 95.

35. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 113.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis was to demonstrate the historical context for the rise of a type of modern Jewish consciousness in the Habsburg Empire, and to relate it to Ludwig August Frankl, as a uniquely suited representative of this phenomenon. The focus was on his travel account, The Jews in the East, as the specific point from which to study this phenomenon. This travel account excellently illustrated aspects of Frankl's world view and attitude toward Jewish matters, as well as alluded to many of the crucial elements of modernity that had influenced him and fostered this attitude.

In the light of subsequent history of the Jews in Central Europe, and in Europe in general, it is fascinating to see the extent of Jewish identification with the politics, ideologies, culture and world view of the Empire which they inhabited, and which very close identification, at least in part, eventually caused them to be objects of suspicion and contempt. The Jews' identification with European secular culture in the Habsburg Empire came to be more and more a liberal, capitalist, secular one with a great respect for the sovereignty of the Habsburg dynasty. This was their modern consciousness. Judaism was their "religion" and Austrian was their "nationality." When many of these advancements began to fall apart as a result of either opposition or lack of support or economic collapse, the Jew, who was seen as a symbol and representative for a conglomeration of these modern advancements, also became the symbol towards whom the hatred was directed. The anti-secular and/or anti-Jewish Catholic, the modern socialist, the anti-liberal, the racist German nationalist could easily find a direction and focus for their opposition in the Jew.

As far as Frankl is concerned, his modern consciousness developed at a time before the challenges to these modern advancements. The modern, for him, still represented promise and created a sense of thrill and dynamism. The Enlightenment had opened the door for Jews to enter general culture, and they took full advantage of it. The very fact that Frankl could have been educated by Catholic Piarist fathers in a neutral manner, without attempt at conversion, symbolized that something in Europe had changed for Jews. They were now to be tolerated, as Jews, and as long as they followed the general rules, educated themselves, behaved within the guidelines of accepted decorum, dressed like everyone else, and at least tacitly acknowledged the hegemony of Christian humanist ideals; in other words, did not act "too Jewish," they would be offered the opportunity to take part in general society and culture as never before.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the general feeling among many Jews was unrestrained excitement about these new opportunities. Jews thought they were to become the Christians' brothers and peers. They were, they felt, to be afforded the opportunity to become as Austrian as everyone else. German became, for many, the first language, and the stronger the attachment to German language and culture, the stronger the modernity and attachment to progress. An interesting incident which illustrates the extent to which Frankl had been influenced by modern Enlightenment ideals occurred during a trip he made to Rome in the 1830's. He went to present a book about Hebrew grammar, a homage from the Rabbinic College in Padua, to the famous scholar and linguist, Cardinal Mezzosanti. Mezzosanti decided to converse with Frankl in German, but later Frankl claimed that "Bohemian" (Czech) was his mother tongue. The Cardinal asked him why he did not then write in

Czech, and Frankl, the universalist, answered, that it did not matter in what language one wrote. Mezzosanti, fluent in a vast number of languages, claimed that that was not at all so, and that no language could be to him as Italian was. The irony in this story is instructive. Here was Frankl, whose mother tongue may have been Yiddish, claiming that Czech was his mother tongue, choosing to write in the language of the dominant culture, German, while at the same time, as an enlightened universalist humanist, proclaiming that the language one chose was unimportant. He was there as a Jewish representative, to present a token of homage to a Roman Catholic Cardinal, as a symbol of Jewish-Christian rapprochement. It was on this same visit, that he was to kiss the slipper of the Pope. We must strive to see this deed within its historical context. The fact that he felt he could kiss the slipper of the Pope, as a Jew, was revolutionary, and wholly modern.

This was the time in which the Jews felt an opening into general culture was being made for them, and they wanted to participate. In return, they offered complete loyalty to the Habsburgs. Ideas of progress and equality, so crucial to this participation, made a huge impact upon their consciousness, and hence their disproportionate involvement in the events of 1848. For "modern" Jews, 1848 represented all that they had hoped for: equality, freedom, free speech, unrestrained involvement in the most advanced cultural and political and ideological movements of the day, citizenship, modern education. It is no surprise then, to note the tremendous impact of 1848 upon Frankl's world view, and his huge attachment to these events in all his subsequent thought and writing, as well as his large involvement in the events themselves. It was his poem that became the "Marseillaise" of the Vienna 1848 Revolution, his Die Universitaet, the song of a Jew, the

rallying cry of Vienna--1848.

This involvement, as far as Jews were concerned, was never meant to symbolize disloyalty to the monarchy. In fact Frankl, in many respects, took his inspiration from the Habsburgs and their government officials. It is quite remarkable that Frankl chose to end his memoir, written a quarter century after the events of 1848, with a conversation he had had with Fuerst Windischgraetz, leader of the government forces against the revolution. He had approached the prince in order to "clarify" some of the events of the "March days" of 1848. The report is almost reverential in its respect for the prince. Much of it was still secret and confidential, and Frankl chose to respect this and never reported fully on the conversation. He proclaimed Windischgraetz a "distinguished figure," and benevolent, and seems to have been most moved by Windischgraetz' perhaps sincere, perhaps ironic evocation:

> Each government that rules with the sword cannot last and it cannot be otherwise. One cannot stay forever under seige; a milder form must follow. That is, so to say, a consequence of natural law. (1)

These words spoke to Frankl's heart, and represented his most cherished ideals, and it was because of this that he chose to end his memoir with this meeting. Ironically, it was the very attachment that Jews felt to the Empire that was progressively "emancipating" them, that inspired Elise Herz von Laemel in her project to found a school in Jerusalem. She wished to honour the memory of her father, but chose to do it on the Emperor's birthday. She sent Frankl to hang a portrait of her father on the wall of the school, but only in equal prominence to a portrait of the Emperor. Changed cultural attitudes far more than

ancient messianic Jewish longing informed the Laemel School project.

The Laemel School was most immediately influenced by the advancements in childhood education introduced to Austria-Hungary by the Jew, Joseph Wertheimer. The idea of early childhood care and education, although introduced and embraced by Jews, was a modern, rather than a Jewish one. It had come about as a result of new sociological thinking about societal problems such as crime, the consequences of rapid industrialization and subsequent neglect of young children, as well as new approaches to, and methods of education. Education was to create enlightened people who would be good citizens and lawful and productive contributors to society. These conceptions underlay the initial Laemel School project.

But, in addition to this educational advancement, there was the fact that this school was to be founded particularly in Jerusalem. The problem of the riot of complexities contained in the idea to found the school particularly in Jerusalem, rather than elsewhere, was addressed in this paper. The Jewish traditional approach to the Holy Land was to regard it as the object of messianic longing. It was the place to which they would return after the coming of the Messiah. It was the land God had given them, where He had established their Kingdom and from which He had banished them due to their "sins." If they atoned and remained faithful to His Law and His will He would restore them to their land and their glory in the fullness of time. This dwelling in past history, and future miraculous restoration, rather than in present reality, was what had characterized the Jewish attitude towards Palestine for a millennium. It was a place where the devoutly religious went to die, or to where Diaspora Jews sent alms. It was also the only land where the mitzvot, or daily

regulations of Jewish behaviour could be properly and wholly carried out. The "modern" thinking inspired a new attitude. At this early time, 1856, the new attitude was still very diffuse, unfocused. It was still influenced by old, traditional Jewish thinking, but increasingly felt the influence of imperialistic, modern philanthropical, and nationalist aims of the great European powers. It was also influenced by a new Christian revisionism. A new missionary spirit as well as a new sympathy for Jews, in part aided by greater interest in and access to travel, led to a new exploration of projects for Jewish return to the Holy Land.

Frankl arrived on the scene at exactly the right moment. His mission came at a time when rival imperial interests had not yet become too bitter, when all were still vying for a position, when access was more or less still open, and when a project such as the Laemel School could still be seen as advantageous by the Austrian authorities. His modern intentions complemented those of the secular powers. His was a great moment in history, when most of these modern forces could still meet at a common point. In the Laemel School project, in the friendly reception by Austria, we see one of the last optimistic and positive manifestations of modern Jewish and modern Christian European harmony and cooperation, blessed by modern secularism, modern Jew and traditional Habsburg.

The only problem was the Jerusalem Jews, who had no interest in these modern ideas and movements. The Ashkenazim, a population growing ever larger in the holy city of Jerusalem, were always ambivalent about imperial forays into the Near East. They saw them, at least in part, as beneficial to themselves in the protection these powers afforded against the often tyrannical whims of the ruling Ottomans. The beneficence of England, especially, was gratefully received. But gradually, the danger of the ideas

they brought with them far outweighed the benevolence of their protection. Frankl, although a Jew, was regarded as one of these alien, dangerous representatives of the destructive force of modernity. In fact, he was in a sense more dangerous, because he conducted his business as a Jew. He brought with him all the ideas that were most destructive to the traditional, orthodox way of life in Jerusalem: secularism, modern education, contempt for "unproductive" ways of living and alms collection, trust in European authority over traditional Jewish authorities, and a strong belief in the necessity for cultural assimilation, symbolized by the study of "profane" languages.

As for Frankl, we saw how he reacted to what he saw as the "backwardness" of his own people. During this trip he came to the very conscious and often shocking realization that in many ways he had far more in common with a Christian modern European than many of his own co-religionists. He may have sensed or even intellectually accepted this fact before, but with this voyage he came to really know it. The voyage forced him to dispel all the romantic notions he had held about his own history, and about the Holy Land. It forced him to struggle with his own most dearly held illusions. In the end, he came out of the experience only the more firm and confident in his modernity, really unreconciled to the paradox of being a Jew in a modern and modernizing world.

The figure of Frankl is an interesting one. In an assessment of his life work, written not long after his death, the author wrote that "Frankl was no pathfinder, pointing the way to the new, no milestone. . . ." (2). It is fascinating to realize the truth of the enigma; that Frankl, the 1848 revolutionary was, indeed, in a sense not a pathfinder, not a revolutionary. He was evolutionary. He logically followed the path that had been laid out years

before by Joseph II in 1781 in his Edict of Toleration. This document had set the course for the introduction of Jews to modernity. Indeed, Frankl had been exiled from Vienna after 1848 as a "suspicious" revolutionary, but the ban only lasted a few months, and did not deter Consul Pizzamono from receiving him as an honoured Austrian citizen, and giving Frankl the full weight of Austrian support, nor did it stop Frankl from living out the rest of his life among the respected bourgeoisie of Vienna. In order to understand this, it is useful to return to the nature of Austrian politics. The revolution of 1848 was eventually crushed by Windischgraetz' forces, but things were never quite the same again. That year was a turning point, perhaps the year that was the logical starting point on the course to 1914. Clamouring for national independence, and greater rights and freedoms, incessant political and national rivalries were to be the legacy of 1848 and the destiny of the Habsburg Empire throughout the nineteenth century. And, the Habsburgs were to spend the next sixty-five years or so attempting to appease all these interests and ultimately, satisfying none. The Habsburg, "Austrian idea" was never to receive unanimous backing. A.J.P. Taylor writes:

> The "Austrian idea" became an idea like any other, competing for intellectual backing; and the dynasty survived not on its own strength, but by maneuvering the forces of rival nations and classes. The year 1848 marked the transition from an unconscious way of life to the conscious search for one; and, despite the victory of the Habsburg army, the

intellect remained the deciding
consideration in Austrian politics. (3)

The Habsburgs realized but never quite accepted this. Nevertheless, in this cauldron of seething rivalries, the Jews were at least identifying "Austrians," and better to have as allies than as enemies. For this reason, there was always a certain tacit alliance between the Jews and the dynasty, if not between the Jews and elected government. It must have been partly due to this, and Frankl's prominent position in official Viennese Jewish life, a strong dynastic supporter, that he was able to lead such a peaceful and respectable life in nineteenth century Vienna. But as Taylor states, there were competing ideas and rival interests throughout the period, and the Habsburgs did not really ever have a clear or focused enough conception of what the "Austrian idea" truly was, and therefore those sixty-five years were a succession of ill-advised actions and blunders that led to the dissatisfaction of all parties. Taylor quotes the apocryphal statement of the British Prime Minister, Gladstone, in 1880, "There is not a spot upon the map where you can lay your finger and say, there Austria did good" (4).

Frankl, in fact, led not only a respectable bourgeois life, but he was a much-loved figure. In an 1894 obituary, it reported that Frankl's funeral procession was one of the largest that Vienna had ever seen, attended by the leading lights of the Jewish as well as the gentile community. In 1910, a hundred years after his birth and sixteen years after his death, the "Neue Freie Presse" of Vienna printed an original, commemorative poem to Frankl:

Ein Edelmensch, doch niemals traumverloren,
Versahst du auch ein schoenes Mittleramt
Und schufst ein Haus, wo Kindern, blindgeboren,
Des Mitleids Sonne hell entgegenflammt;

Und dass zu Wien wir Schillers Denkmal schauen
Und dass uns Gruens und Lenaus Bildnis gruesst,
Bedanken wir dem schaffenden Vertrauen
Das wach in dir, zur Tat geworden ist.
[A noble man, never lost in dreams,
You provided a wonderful service
And created a house where children, born blind,
Could face the compassionate warmth of the sun
For that in Vienna we look upon
Schiller's memorial
For that we are greeted by the
likenesses of Lenau and Gruen,
We must be grateful to the creative
spirit
That awoke in you to become action.] (5)

Again we see his creativity in the will to commemorate other great pathfinders. Yet it was his uncanny ability to recognize, if not be in the forefront of, the greatness of the new that formed, in part, his own greatness. His own nephew, Stefan Hock, listed the three great watchwords of Frankl's life: loyalty, benevolence, and reverence for the great. His characteristics were thus to be completely in step with evolutionary, rather than revolutionary change. His modernity followed a smoother progression. He was in the vanguard of accepted change. His consciousness reflected the mass trend among Central European Jewry, not the more exceptional radicals. It is the recognition of this fact that can aid us in understanding why a man who inspired one of the largest funeral attendances Vienna had ever known was virtually forgotten after 1910. Why was one of the best representatives of the evolution of modern Jewish consciousness practically forgotten in this century? Why is there almost nothing written about a man with so many

notable achievements in art, journalism, construction of memorials to some of the greatest figures in German and Austrian history, with one of the most prolific epistolary outputs of his time, such prominent participation in the official Jewish community of Vienna, founder of a score of philanthropic institutions, and friend to the greatest figures in nineteenth century art, music and literature?

In order to answer this question, it is necessary to understand the crucial importance of the Holocaust in Jewish history. Perhaps it is the very fact that he was not one of these more radical pathfinders, that he followed a perhaps more smooth evolution of modern Jewish history, which so strongly believed in the eventual triumph of liberalism and which so strongly identified with secular European culture that accounts for why he is so little remembered in this century. This was, in the light of subsequent history, the path to disaster, and consequently perhaps we do not wish to believe that the vast majority of Jews followed this path to modernity. We tend to focus more on the radical innovators because they are the ones who seem to have recognized imminent disaster, but they were by no means the majority. Frankl was the representative of what came to be majority opinion in Central Europe. It was his modernity that informed the character of nineteenth century Central European Jewish identity. For this reason, it is crucial that we understand his attitudes and world view.

It was Gabriel Riesser, the great German Jewish political leader and 1848 revolutionary who said:

> There can be no doubt that, when once the basic principles of religious freedom have penetrated deeply into the life of the state and its legal system, the removal of civic discrimination will soon be followed by the disappearance of

> the social barriers and of the prejudice that they generate and foster. (6)

This was a reflection of mass Jewish opinion in the nineteenth century. It was the legacy of the Enlightenment and eventual rise of liberalism. On the exploration of the question of nationhood, Riesser believed, "The question of Jewish nationhood no longer exists, since . . . the sense of nationhood is inseparable from a state, or at least a territory" (7). It was this attitude that would have characterized Frankl as well. It is therefore highly ironic that projects such as the Laemel School, based on a solid identification with the Austrian "fatherland," would help lead to a wholly new exploration of the profound question of the nature of Jewish "nationhood."

Frankl considered himself a Jewish Austrian national, and European and world citizen. This characterized the evolution of a type of modern Jewish consciousness. Ernst Toller concluded his autobiography by saying:

> Pride and love are not the same thing, and if I were asked where I belonged I should answer that a Jewish mother had borne me, that Germany had nourished me, that Europe had formed me, that my home was the earth, and the world my fatherland. (8)

It is the recognition of such a prevalence of this feeling among Jewish intellectuals and "moderns" that makes the tragedy of the fate of European Jewry all the more poignant. The Jews were as German, and as Austrian as the most fervent patriot. It is essential to explore this question, understand the optimism and belief in "European culture," far more than the admittedly great achievements of the more extremist innovators, in order to truly understand

the history of Jewry in modern Europe. Frankl aids us in understanding this. The eventual disillusionment caused by the collapse of this belief and optimism was never less than monumentally tragic. We, of the twentieth century "fin de siecle" can perhaps never fully comprehend the monumentality of it. It was not a naive belief, but a logical consequence of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. As Stefan Zweig so eloquently put it, remarking on the events just prior to World War II:

> It was too painful for me to cast another glance at the beautiful country which had fallen prey to gruesome devastation through foreign guilt; Europe seemed to me doomed to die by its own madness; Europe, our sacred home, cradle and Parthenon of our occidental civilization. (9)

And that is just exactly what it seemed to them: madness. The Jewish optimism had been logical, but the nineteenth century had been ruled by anything but logic. Frankl was the prototypical example of logic. The evolution of much of modern Jewish consciousness, at least until the end of the nineteenth century, had been logical. But mass logic had led to the illogical irrationality of the masses. Let us contrast Frankl to Herzl. Theodor Herzl's brand of Western Zionism was in many ways, an ironic legacy of the new thinking about Palestine, and the return to ideas of Jewish restoration in the Holy Land. It was a pessimistic outcry and reaction to the tremendous rise of European anti-semitism, yet it could not have surfaced without the modern attitudes to Palestine which had resulted from projects such as the Laemel School. Whereas Frankl had exemplified the evolution of Jewish logic, Herzl was a logical consequence of the illogical intolerance and bigotry that was increasing

against Jews. Herzl had had his revelation while witnessing the reaction to the famous Dreyfus trial in Paris in the 1890's. He came to realize the potential mass hysteria of crowds, and how crowds could develop their own illogical momentum. A great leader could manipulate this momentum for great good or great evil. Herzl recognized the manipulative potential of the crowd, was afraid of it, while at the same time recognized the power of it. He used his own charisma to foster the growth of his Zionist movement. While at a Zionist rally in London, he commented upon this inexplicable crowd momentum, "I saw and heard my legend being born. The people are sentimental; the masses do not see clearly" (10).

Herzl was thus an indirect result of the zigzag path upon which Frankl had set. Both men, though, were clearly formed by Europe, the "sacred home, cradle and Parthenon" of the occidental civilization of which Zweig had spoken. It was Europe that influenced their approach to the Holy Land, it was modern attitudes and ideas that informed their attachment to Palestine, and it was the dominant influence of Europe that directed the course of Western Zionism. Frankl was a Jew of European culture, and this culture distinctly shaped his reaction to the voyage. Much of it was so ingrained, so profoundly a part of his character, that he could not have articulated what formed his Jewish identity. We in the twentieth century have inherited this dilemma. Where does general culture end and Judaism take over, and what is the difference between them? How do we separate our Jewish identity from our general identity with secular culture? It is this dilemma that characterizes modern Jewish consciousness, and creates an almost palpable sorrow when we reflect upon our last two hundred years. Frankl himself was not wholly unaware of the sorrow. Upon conclusion of his mission, the opening of the school, he wrote:

> My task was now happily accomplished. I prepared, therefore, to take my departure, enriched, indeed, with experience of a peculiar kind, but overpowered with a deep feeling of sorrow. It was not from this place, that the songs, which I have devoted to the Holy Land and its prophets, drew their inspiration; they owed their birth chiefly to my own imagination. (11)

Yet the imagination of which he spoke had been formed by European enlightened culture, and was to dominate the course of the evolution of modern Jewish consciousness.

NOTES

1. Frankl, Erinnerungen 359.

2. Richard Maria Werner, "Ludwig August Frankl: Ein Erinnerungsblatt," in A. Mayer, ed., Oesterreich-Ungarische Revue 3rd ser. 16 (1894): 166.

3. Taylor, Habsburg 57.

4. Taylor, Habsburg 166.

5. A.D. Weltner, commemorative poem, Neue Freie Presse 4 February 1910.

6. Moshe Rinott, "Gabriel Riesser: Fighter for Jewish Emancipation," Leo Beck Institute Yearbook VII (1962): 30.

7. Rinott, "Riesser," 18.

8. Frederic V. Grunfeld, Prophets Without Honour (U.S.A.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979) 131.

9. Zweig, World of Yesterday 398.

10. Amos Elon, Herzl (U.S.A.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975) 207.

11. Frankl, The Jews, vol. ii 228.

WORKS CONSULTED

WORKS BY LUDWIG AUGUST FRANKL:

BOOKS

Frankl, Ludwig August. Erinnerungen von Ludwig August Frankl. Ed. Stefan Hock. Prague: I.G. Calve'sche K.u.K. Hof u. Universitaets Buchhandlung, 1910.

---. Zur Geschichte der Juden in Wien: Der Alte Freithof, Der Tempelhof. Vienna: J.P. Sollinger, 1853.

---. Inschriften des Alten Juedischen Friedhofes in Wien: Beitrag zur Altertumskunde Oesterreichs. Vienna: n.p., 1855.

---. The Jews in the East. Trans. Rev. P. Beaton. 2 vols. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1859. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1975. Trans. of Nach Jerusalem.

POETRY

Frankl, Ludwig August. Das Habsburglied. Vienna: Edler v. Ghelen'schen Erben, 1832.

---. Libanon: Ein poetisches Familienbuch. Wien: L.C. Zamarski, Universitaets-Buchdrueckerei, 1855.

---. Nach der Zerstoerung: Hebraische Elegien. Hebrew Trans. Max Letteris. Vienna: M. Aver, 1856.

---. Nach Fuenfhundert Jahren in Wien: Knittelverse. Leipzig: Oskar Leiner, 1865.

---. Der Primator. Vienna: I. Knoepflmacher and Sons, 1861.

---. Rachel: Romantisches Gedicht. Vienna: n.p., 1842.

PERIODICALS

Frankl, Ludwig August, ed. Sonntags-Blaetter: Fuer Heimathliche Interessen. Vienna: Pfautsch & Compagnie, 1842-47. Vienna: Moerschner's Wwe. u. W. Bianchi, 1847-48.

LETTERS

Frankl, Ludwig August. Briefwechsel Zwischen Anastasius Gruen und Ludwig August Frankl (1845-76). Ed. Bruno von Frankl-Hochwart. Berlin: Concordia Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1897. Vol. 1 of Aus Dem Neunzehnten Jahrhundert: Briefe und Aufzeichnungen. Ed. Karl Emil Franzos.

GENERAL BOOKS CONSULTED

Ascheim, Steven A.. Brothers and Strangers. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.

Avineri, Shlomo. The Making of Modern Zionism: The Intellectual Origins of the Jewish State. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Cuddihy, John Murray. The Ordeal of Civility. New York: Beacon Press, 1987.

Elon, Amos. Herzl. U.S.A.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Englebrecht, Helmut. Geschichte des oesterreichischen Bildungswesens: Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Oesterreichs. 4 vols. Vienna: Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1984.

Die Feier des Siebzigjaehrigen Geburtstages Ludwig August Frankls Ritter von Hochwart: Familien-Manuskript. Vienna: Friedrich Jasper, 1880.

Fishman, Joshua A. Ideology, Society and Language: The Odyssey of Nathan Birnbaum. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers Inc., 1987.

Fraenkel, Josef, ed. The Jews of Austria. London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co. Ltd., 1967.

Gay, Peter. Freud, Jews and Other Germans. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Gelber, N.M.. Zur Vorgeschichte des Zionismus: Judenstaatsprojekte in den Jahren 1695-1845. Vienna: Phaidon, 1927.

Gilbert, Martin. Jerusalem: Rebirth of a City. New York: Viking, 1985.

Grunfeld, Frederic V.. Prophets Without Honour: A Background to Freud, Kafka, Einstein and their World. U.S.A.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Grunwald, Max. 90 Jahre Israelitische Kinderbewahranstalt 1843-1933. Vienna: n.p., [1933?].

---. Vienna. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1936.

Hyamson, Albert M., introduction and ed. The British Consulate in Jerusalem in Relation to the Jews in Palestine (1838-1914). 2 vols. London: Edward Goldston Ltd., 1939.

Janik, Allan and Stephen Toulmin. Wittgenstein's Vienna. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1973.

Jeiteles, Israel. Die Kultusgemeinde der Israeliten in Wien: Mit Benuetzung des statistischen Volkzaehlungsoperates b.J. 1869. Vienna: S. Rosner, 1873.

Johnston, William. The Austrian Mind. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983.

Kann, Robert A.. Austrian Intellectual History. U.S.A.: Octagon Books, 1973.

Katz, Jacob. Out of the Ghetto. New York: Schocken Books, 1978.

Laqueur, Walter. A History of Zionism. London: Wiedenfeld and Nicolson, 1972.

May, Arthur J.. The Habsburg Monarchy 1867-1914. Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Mosse, George L.. Germans and Jews. New York: Howard Fertig, 1970.

Pulzer, Peter J.G.. The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria. U.S.A.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.

Reinharz, Jehuda. Fatherland or Promised Land: The Dilemma of the German Jew 1893-1914. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1975.

Reinharz, Jehuda and Walter Schatzberg. The Jewish Response to German Culture. Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1985.

Rozenblitt, Marsha L.. The Jews of Vienna. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983.

Schorske, Carl E.. Fin de Siecle Vienna. New York: Vintage Books, 1981.

Tal, Uriel. Christians and Jews in Germany. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975.

Taylor, A.J.P.. The Habsburg Monarchy 1809-1918. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Tobler, Titus. Titus Toblers Dritte Wanderung Nach Palaestina im Jahre 1857. Gotha: Justus Perthes, 1859.

Wolbe, Eugen. Ludwig August Frankl, der Dichter und Menschenfreund. Frankfurt a.M.: J. Kauffmann, 1910.

Wolf, Gerson. Das Hundertjaehrige Jubilaeum der isr. Cultusgemeinde in Wien im Jahre 1864. Vienna: Herzfeld & Bauer, 1864.

---. Vom Ersten bis zum Zweiten Tempel: Geschichte der israelitischen Cultusgemeinde in Wien (1820-1860). Vienna: Wilhelm Braumueller, 1861.

Zweig, Stefan. The World of Yesterday. U.S.A.: The University of Nebraska Press, 1964. Trans. of Die Welt von Gestern: Erinnerungen Eines Europaers.

ARTICLES CONSULTED

Baron, Salo W.. "The Impact of the Revolution of 1848 on Jewish Emancipation." Jewish Social Studies 11.3 (1949): 195-248.

Cahnmann, Werner J.. "Adolf Fischof and his Jewish Followers." Leo Beck Institute Yearbook 4 (1959): 111-139.

Eckert, Willehad Paul. "Ludwig Philippson und seine 'Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums' in den Jahren 1848/49: Die Revolution im Spiegel der Zeitung." Studia Judaica Austriaca I: Das Judentum im Revolutionsjahr 1848 1 (1974): 113-122.

Elrod, Richard B.. "Realpolitik or Concert Diplomacy: The Debate Over Austrian Foreign Policy in the 1860's." Austrian History Yearbook 17-18 (1981-82): 84-97.

Gelber, N.M.. "l'Toldot Yasod Bayt ha'Sefer 'Laemel' b'Yerushalayim [A Study of the History of the Founding of the Laemel School in Jerusalem]." Yerushalayim: Shanah Rishonah. (1948): Hebrew numbering.

Hausler, Wolfgang. "Katalog: Die Revolution von 1848 und die oesterreichischen Juden: Eine Dokumentation." Studia Judaica Austriaca I: Das Judentum im Revolutionsjahr 1848 1 (1974): 5-62.

---. "Orthodoxie und 'Reform' im Wiener Judentum in der Epoche des Hochliberalismus. Studia Judaica Austriaca VI: Der Wiener Stadttempel 1826-1976 6 (1978): 29-56.

"Ludwig August Frankl." Boehmens deutsche Poesie und Kunst: Monatschrift ueber alle Gebiete des Schoenen 7.8.9.(17.18.19.) No. 2 (1892): 335-347.

Rabinbach, Anson G.. "The Migration of Galician Jews to Vienna, 1857-1880." Austrian History Yearbook 11 (1975): 44-54.

Rinott, Moshe. "Gabriel Riesser: Fighter for Jewish Emancipation." Leo Beck Institute Yearbook 7 (1962): 11-38.

Vielmetti, Nikolaus. "Der Wiener Juedische Publizist Ludwig August Frankl und die Begruendung der Laemelschule in Jerusalem 1856." Jahrbuch des Inst. fuer Deutsche Geschichte 4 (1975): 167-204.

Werner, Richard Maria. "Ludwig August Frankl." Oesterreich-Ungarische Revue 16.3 (1894): 166-185.

Yaari-Poleskin, Yakov. "Abraham Eliezer Frankl." Sefer Meah Shanah. Eds. Isaac Triwaks and Eliezer Steinman. (1938): 179-205.

NEWSPAPER ITEMS

"Frankl's Birthday." The American Israelite Cincinnati, 10 Feb. 1882: n.p.

"Frankl's Eightieth Birthday." The Jewish Voice: A Weekly Newspaper Devoted to the Cause of Judaism and the Jewish People St. Louis, 14 March 1890: 4.

"Frankl's Knighthood." Wiener Zeitung 6 Feb. 1877: n.p.

"Ludwig August Frankl." Deborah: Ein Volksblatt zur Belehnung und Unterhaltung fuer Israeliten Vienna, 10 June 1866: n.p.

"Ludwig August Frankl." Illustrierte Gemeinde Zeitung: Centralorgan fuer die politischen, religioesen und culturinteressen der israel. Cultusgemeinden in Oesterreich-Ungarn Vienna, 3 June 1885: 6.

Rosenfeld, Albert. "Ein Dichterleben." Obituary. Die Deborah: Juedisch-Amerikanische Familienzeitung Cincinnati, 12 Apr. 1894: n.p.

Weltner, A.D.. "Memorial Poem." Neue Freie Presse 4 Feb. 1910: n.p.

DISSERTATIONS

Dollar, Stephanie. "Die Sonntagsblaetter von Ludwig August Frankl, 1842-48," Diss. University of Vienna, 1932.

PAMPHLETS

Ein Amtsjubilaum in der Wiener Cultusgemeinde. Vienna: publication of weekly Die Neuzeit Nr. 12, 1863.

Ludwig August Frankl: Nach dem biographischen Lexicon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich. [Vienna]: [Fac. of Handschriftensammlung, s.n. 9637, Austrian National Library], n.d..

REFERENCE WORKS

Encyclopaedia Judaica. 16 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971.