THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO

MODERN JEWISH PHILOSOPHY

Edited by Michael L. Morgan
Indiana University

Peter Eli Gordon
Harvard University

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521813129

First published 2007

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Morgan, Michael L., 1944–
The Cambridge companion to modern Jewish philosophy / Michael L. Morgan and Peter Eli Gordon.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN-13: 978-0-521-81312-9 (hardback)
ISBN-13: 978-0-521-01255-3 (pbk.)
1. Philosophy, Jewish. 2. Philosophy, Modern. 3. Jewish philosophers.
4. Judaism – History – Modern period, 1750–. I. Gordon, Peter Eli. II. Title.
B755.M67 2007
181′.06–dc22 2006031065

ISBN 978-0-521-81312-9 hardback
ISBN 978-0-521-01255-3 paperback

5 Hermann Cohen: Judaism and Critical Idealism

ANDREA POMA

[Translated by John Denton]

Was Hermann Cohen a Jewish thinker or a German philosopher? Did he belong chiefly to the tradition of Jewish philosophy or instead to the classical tradition of critical idealism, of which Kant is the paradigmatic figure and fundamental reference point? Contemporary opinion of Cohen was marked by controversy. In Jewish circles, although he was respected and acknowledged as an authoritative voice, he was also criticized and accused of denying his Jewish identity. Meanwhile, his philosophical works, notwithstanding respectful attentions, were not always successful in the academic world, where he more than once encountered problems because of his Jewish origins. In this chapter, I shall address the question of Cohen's status as a Jewish philosopher chiefly by examining Cohen's occasional texts on Jewish topics and contemporary controversies that affected the Jewish community in his day.

1. COHEN'S LIFE: A BRIEF SKETCH

Hermann Cohen was born in Coswig (Anhalt) on 4 July 1842, the son of Gerson Cohen and Friederike Salomon. At the age of eleven, he was sent to the grammar school in Dessau. At the age of fifteen, though still enrolled in the grammar school as an external student, Hermann entered the theological seminary in Breslau, where he commenced his rabbinical training. As soon as he had received his school certificate, he also left the seminary, as he was now drawn to philosophy and philology. In 1861, he enrolled in the University of Breslau, and in 1864, he moved to Berlin to study at the University there.

In 1865, Cohen was awarded a doctorate in philosophy at Halle, with a thesis entitled *The Philosophers' Doctrines Concerning the Antinomy of Necessity and Contingency* (*Philosophorum de antinomia necessitatis et contingentiae doctrinae*). Although he subsequently continued his research, his efforts to forge an academic career in Berlin met with considerable difficulties. In 1871, he published *Kant's Theory of*

Experience (*Kants Theorie der Erfahrung*), a work that indisputably marked a new and original phase in the interpretation of Kant's philosophy. The book soon attracted the attention of Friedrich Albert Lange (1828–1875), the author of the *History of Materialism (Geschichte des Materialismus*).[1]

In 1873, Lange, who was teaching at the University of Marburg at the time, invited Cohen there as a "Privatdozent." A few years later, in 1875, Cohen was appointed to an "Extraordinariat" in the same university, and after Lange's death in 1876, was appointed to the chair of philosophy that Lange had held before him. Thus began a long period of teaching at Marburg, during which Cohen developed his philosophical system, founded a veritable "school," and brought renown to the university, becoming one of the more prominent figures on the German philosophical scene between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

During his years in Marburg, Cohen further developed his interpretation of Kant and also worked out his own philosophical system, a foretaste of which is to be found in his writings on Kant. At the same time, Cohen often found himself called upon to defend the cultural position occupied by his school. Its influence was undoubtedly hampered, both academically and politically, by the fact that some of its leading members were Jews, including Cohen himself. Most unpleasant of all were Cohen's encounters with anti-Jewish propaganda, which was then on the rise both within Germany and beyond. Amongst these episodes the most significant was the controversy begun by Heinrich von Treitschke in 1879–80, in which Cohen also took part.

In 1912, Cohen, at the age of seventy, retired from his chair at Marburg and moved to Berlin, where he began teaching at the "Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," and continued through published essays to take an active part in the debates concerning German Judaism. It was in this period that Cohen devoted most of his philosophical research to the investigation of religion, a theme related closely to his own Judaism but also linked to his systematic philosophy. The most mature results of this investigation are to be found in *The Concept of Religion in the System of Philosophy* (*Der Begriff der Religion im System der Philosophie*), published in 1915, and, especially, *Religion of Reason out of the Sources of Judaism* (*Religion der Vernunft aus den Quellen des Judentums*), published posthumously in 1919.

Cohen's final years were a mixture of challenge and triumph. While in Berlin, Cohen met the young Franz Rosenzweig, who was struck by the personality and philosophy of this old teacher, and established a close relationship with him. In 1914, Cohen traveled to Poland and

Russia, where he had the satisfaction of great personal success. But upon his return to Berlin, the momentary light of his success was soon darkened by renewed nationalist disputes, even with his devoted friend Paul Natorp. The outbreak and progress of the war sharpened tensions between Germans and German Jews and enflamed the smouldering embers of anti-Jewish feeling. Cohen again found himself obliged to defend his difficult but deep-rooted belief in an idealized synthesis of Judaism, Germanism, and ethical universalism. For this he was strongly criticised on the German side, not only from the anti-Jewish factions, but also from those invoking German patriotism (a patriotism that Cohen himself claimed to endorse, as can be seen in his dispute with Natorp). He also met with criticism from Jewish circles, who looked upon his sincere adherence to the German cause with suspicion.

Cohen died in Berlin on 4 April 1918, a witness to Germany's impending defeat (it surrendered a few months later). Cohen had already seen the end of his philosophical school, and now he also saw the fall of Germany, a decline due not only to political-military causes but primarily to its deviation from the ideals of "Germanism" to which Cohen adhered. And yet he was spared the greatest tragedy of all, the violent systematic persecution and physical annihilation of German Judaism, a tradition to which he belonged by birth and by choice. This was a persecution to which his wife Martha Cohen was later subjected: she outlived her husband only to die a victim of the Nazis in the Theresienstadt concentration camp.

2. COHEN AND JUDAISM

In his "Introduction" to Cohen's *Jewish Writings*, published by Bruno Strauß in 1924,[2] Franz Rosenzweig offered a compelling portrait of Cohen's relation to Judaism, a portrait many now regard as definitive. In an opening passage, Rosenzweig furnishes this guide to Cohen's relationship to Judaism:

> The road that led to this discovery and self revelation was a long one – the two things were parallel, the second even more significant than the first – it was a road of further development and conversion and return. There is only one Hebrew word that describes both the man of conversion and the man of return, and the Talmud says that his place in heaven is where not even the perfectly righteous are allowed. A speaker at a banquet honoring Cohen after his return at the age of nearly 72 from an important

> journey to Russia, called him "Baal teshuvah" meaning that he was now once again devoting himself to his brothers in the faith. At that point, with his hearing finely attuned to tones and their underlying harmonics, he interrupted to exclaim: 'Well, I have been a Baal teshuvah for the last thirty-four years!'. He was backdating the beginning of his 'return' to 1880 when he hurled himself into the ongoing controversy, that 'Profession about the Jewish Question' which, on two fronts, against Treitschke on the one hand, and against Graetz and Lazarus on the other, was to provoke more anger in his own party than amongst his anti-Semitic adversaries. But he was aware of having started then along the route he was now still following.[3]

According to Rosenzweig's portrait, although Hermann Cohen had grown up in a religious environment, after quitting the seminary to pursue philosophy he had also neglected his Judaism; he steeped himself in German scientific and philosophical culture and lost all his essential links with Jewish religion and identity, except those ties of affection that bound him to his family. In Rosenzweig's view, only one important "bridge" remained between Cohen and the Jewish tradition: socialism, a political ideal to which Cohen felt an enduring devotion and which he filled with the contents of Jewish prophecy and messianism.[4] His encounter with Friedrich Albert Lange, which had proven decisive for his academic career, also indicated a human agreement beyond their different religious backgrounds, in shared socialist idealism. Rosenzweig recalls a short, significant dialogue as reported by Cohen himself:

> Lange asked: 'Are our views on Christianity different?' Cohen answered: 'No, because what you call Christianity I call prophetic Judaism.' The author of 'Arbeiterfrage' [i.e. Friedrich Albert Lange] understood what he meant, and was able to indicate the passages in the Prophets he had underlined in his copy of the Bible. Cohen finished the story thus: So ethical socialism united us, in one blow, beyond the barriers of our religions.[5]

The year 1880 marked the beginning of Cohen's long "return" to Judaism. Heinrich von Treitschke, a prominent and well-regarded member of the German academic world, started the controversy referred to earlier with an anti-Jewish article, published in 1879. Cohen responded a year later with an essay, "A Profession about the Jewish Question" ("Ein Bekenntnis in der Judenfrage"),[6] which began with the significant phrase: "We are again obliged to bear witness."[7] From this point

onwards, Cohen never shirked the responsibility of bearing public "witness" in defence of Judaism with political, academic, philosophical, and other public statements, and also engaged in planning and setting up institutions and promotional activities supporting Judaism. In Rosenzweig's view, Cohen's philosophical writings were also increasingly cognisant of, and in certain cases even inspired by, specifically Jewish concepts. Such was particularly the case for two defining features of Judaism, which Cohen saw as its special contribution to German culture: the uniqueness and spirituality of God, and messianism.

The Ethics of Pure Will[8] (the second part of Cohen's philosophical system, published in 1904, followed by a second edition in 1907), along with other writings from the same period, demonstrate a truly philosophical style of thought strongly influenced by concepts derived from Judaism.[9] In his maturity, then, Cohen had returned to his Judaism to such an extent that Rosenzweig could observe of *The Ethics of Pure Will* that "for the first time in a universal philosophical system the parts dealing with the philosophy of religion are oriented towards the concept of the religion of Judaism."[10] At the same time, Cohen achieved a true synthesis between the newly discovered dimension of Judaism and Kantianism, which for him was philosophically primary, and signified "German" philosophy in the highest sense. Thus Rosenzweig summarized Cohen's stand:

> Towards the end of this period, in 1911, in a commemorative piece for Ludwig Philippson, he gave his opinion on the German Jew's duty to split his activity between work on German culture, without reservations and ulterior motives and work on the survival of his own prophetic-Jewish religion; this split of activity 'endows our spirit alone with true unity and truly our spirit with natural orientation and the core of life'. It was in accordance with these words (. . .) that he lived.[11]

Nevertheless, claimed Rosenzweig, Cohen's return to Judaism remained incomplete. If Cohen had found again (or partially never lost) the philosophical meaning of the conceptual contents of Judaism, and had elaborated a synthesis between these contents and the German philosophical tradition, what was still missing and what this very synthesis risked hiding from view was the *specificity* of the Jewish religion with respect to philosophy. The "historical" return to the concepts of Judaism in philosophy followed the approach of "the great idealists of the beginning of the [nineteenth] century" and was therefore still oriented

towards the acquisition of the contents of religion for the sake of philosophy itself, ultimately going beyond religion.[12]

Cohen's further and most decisive step in his "return" to Judaism was only realized in his later years after the move to Berlin. It was there, after retiring from the academic world and even while continuing his philosophical research that Cohen devoted his efforts more intensely to religious thought, and composed his last works on the subject, works in which he formulated a systematic theory of the Jewish religion. Here Cohen offered a profound and original reflection on the correlation between man and God, a correlation by which religion now revealed itself to be the requisite field for conceiving the bond between the living God of faith (a God irreducible to the philosophical Idea) and man as a concretely existing individual (an individual irreducible to abstract, universal humanity).[13]

Yet notwithstanding its nuance and authoritative standing, Rosenzweig's portrait of Cohen as summarized here is in fact quite controversial. It has been challenged (in my view cogently) by a number of scholars, including Alexander Altmann.[14] Indeed, we now realize that in many respects it is more significant as a reflection of Rosenzweig's own biography and philosophical perspective than it is a faithful reconstruction of Cohen's development.

Nonetheless, the parable that characterizes Cohen's life and thought as a long return to Judaism was not only Rosenzweig's creation; it also reflects Cohen's own self-image. This is evident if we recall once again the words with which Cohen began his 1880 pamphlet against Treitschke: "We are again obliged to bear witness."[15] Cohen later claimed that his own return to Judaism dated from that precise moment.[16] Two additional documents serve to mark this new self-awareness with chronological precision. First, as proof of his earlier neglect of Judaism we have a strongly emotional letter from 1872 addressed to Louis and Helene Lewandowsky, in which Cohen described his participation in the family Passover *seder*, yet openly admitted that his "Jewish romanticism" (*jüdische Romantik*) was grounded only in family affections and not truly religious sentiment.[17] Second, we have a report marking his definitive return to Judaism in words uttered when he was old and ill, as related by Rosenzweig: "I can still see him, when he had recovered once again from his illness, lying on the sofa and saying happily:

> That I, of all people, I, Ezekiel the thirty sixth – that was his Hebrew name – should come to cause Ezekiel the first to be newly honoured!', then, in Hebrew, almost to himself: 'Repel all your

> sins. . . . give yourselves new hearts and new spirits', and again, in a hardly audible whisper: '. . . . repel . . . and give yourselves . . . give'.[18]

This sketch of Cohen's relation to Judaism is relatively straightforward. Yet we must now admit that the situation was in fact rather more complex. First, while it is true that the young Cohen decisively addressed philosophical research, especially on classical idealism (Plato and Kant), we should also note that he started out in this direction under the guidance of Chajim Steinthal, and he published his first essays in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, edited by Steinthal and Moritz Lazarus. The context was admittedly scientific rather than religious, but the context was nonetheless Jewish in character. Second, we should not neglect the fact that beginning with his 1880 response to Treitschke, whenever Cohen was called upon to defend Judaism against outside attacks, he always retained the unambiguous conviction that Jewish identity is grounded in Judaism's *religious* meaning, and that all attempts to shift the Jewish question in a political or ethnic direction meant missing Judaism's very essence. Already in *A Profession about the Jewish Question*, Cohen had declared: "My intention is to treat the Jewish question particularly from this *religious* viewpoint; not as the spokesman of a Jewish party, but as a representative of philosophy in a German university and as an individual who professes Israelite monotheism."[19]

A third point to keep in mind (although it may seem to contradict what has just been noted) is that for a great while, Cohen was convinced that the most significant contents of the Jewish religion and the profound, inspiring influence of "German" culture would eventually lead Judaism to its completion beyond the status of a specific religion, ultimately to be absorbed into the general culture of humanity. Only in his old age did he acknowledge that religion had its own unassailable "peculiarity" (*Eigenart*). But even at that stage, although Cohen conceived of religion itself as Jewish monotheism and as a religion "from the sources of Judaism," he also discerned in Judaism a truth of universal value for the whole of humanity. He therefore considered the survival of Israel for the indefinite future as a requirement, since Israel was to bear continued witness to the truth of monotheism and messianism within a culture where that truth had not yet been wholly absorbed.

Lastly it should be noted that, although one cannot doubt Cohen's explicit hostility toward Jewish nationalism (which he judged as the Jews' political-cultural withdrawal from universal culture, especially the German culture he saw as endowed with a universalist vocation), he nonetheless fought for the Jews' political identity within a single

pluralist state. To be sure, he remained opposed to all forms of Jewish nationalism, and he strenuously opposed the views of both Heinrich Graetz[20] and Moritz Lazarus.[21] Above all, as illustrated in his clash with Martin Buber, Cohen was always openly hostile to the "Palestinian party" (Zionists).[22] Still, in his last years, Cohen developed a uniquely ethical notion of "nationality" – as distinguished from the naturalistic category of "nation" – which permitted him to endorse the continued persistence of different group-identities (specifically, Jewish identity) within the context of a single, unversalist but pluralist state.[23]

3. THE SYNTHESIS BETWEEN CRITICAL IDEALISM AND JUDAISM

There can be little doubt that an integral synthesis between critical idealism and Judaism was Cohen's lifelong purpose. The whole of Cohen's work testifies to this right from the outset. In the 1869 essay, *Shabbat in its Culture-Historical Meaning* (*Der Sabbat in seiner kulturgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*),[24] Cohen suggested provocatively (and to the horror of some) that the Jewish Sabbath and Christian Sunday should coincide so as to facilitate greater Jewish integration in German society and to spread the ethical and social meaning of the Sabbath more effectively throughout the wider culture. The aforementioned 1880 response to Treitschke also revisits Cohen's persistent theme of an inner accord between Judaism and German culture (even between Judaism and Christianity), an accord grounded ostensibly on the ethical culture of universal humanism.[25] In response to the criticism raised by his friend Rabbi Adolf Moses, Cohen again reiterated his fundamental conviction that faithfulness to the spirit of Judaism did not imply separation, but rather active *integration* within a universalist culture.[26]

However, by the end of his long career and after many years of intense reflection, Cohen had considerably revised his views: he was no longer capable of the earlier suggestion concerning a Jewish Sabbath on Sunday, a change of heart also due no doubt to changes in the historical context.[27] Yet, of the synthesis between Judaism and philosophy he remained as certain as ever before. On 5 February 1918, two months before his death, Cohen reaffirmed in a letter to Franz Rosenzweig's mother Adele his "profession of faith" (*Bekenntnis*) in the unity of the Jewish religion and philosophical culture, a unity he saw just as he had in 1880:

> And yet we are living in a new barbarian invasion and a new epoch appears to be bursting upon us. Thus important political disquiet

> impinges on private worries for me as well. It's an advantage for us that in this confusion we can follow a clear direction. The positive thing about it lies in the fact that our cultural philosophy [*Kulturphilosophie*] is in full agreement with our religion. This is a proof that, first of all, it is authentic and that, besides, it could never be overtaken by any other profession [*Bekenntnis*] with the same clarity and precision.[28]

This theme – that there is a strong agreement between the Jewish religion and philosophy, and especially ethics – recurs throughout Cohen's writings. Such an agreement, he believed, was not merely extrinsic or happenstance, but was clear proof of the founding influence of Jewish monotheism on culture. Cohen was convinced that universal humanist culture, as manifest in the philosophical tradition of German critical idealism, had its deepest roots not only in Greek scientific thought, but equally so in Jewish monotheism and messianism, from which it continued to draw inspiration for its most basic ethical principles.

Given Cohen's devotion to this fundamental theme, we may regard Cohen as both inspired by and a contributor to the great Science of Judaism movement for the reform of Judaism and culture, a movement deriving from Moses Mendelssohn and the Haskalah (Jewish Enlightenment), which was especially active during the first half of the nineteenth century. Cohen was arguably one of its leading members in the generation that followed its founding (by Zunz, Jost, and others).[29] Not only was Cohen a protagonist in its official organizations (for example, *Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums*), to which he contributed both lectures and essays,[30] he also assumed an active role in the *Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* in Berlin. This was not merely labor alongside but incidental to Cohen's philosophical research; the two were in fact closely intertwined. As Dieter Adelmann has noted, Cohen's posthumously published *Religion of Reason out of the Sources of Judaism* was originally conceived and composed as a treatment of the theme, *Ethics and Philosophy of Religion* (*Ethik und Religionsphilosophie*), and was intended as a contribution to the more wide-ranging project, a so-called *Compendium of the Whole of the Science of Judaism* (*Grundriss der Gesamtwissenschaft des Judentums*) under the direction of the *Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums*.[31]

Cohen's contribution to the Science of Judaism was not limited to organization and publishing; it was above all theoretical. His chief aim was to demonstrate and further develop the idea of a symbiosis between

Judaism and philosophical culture. This no doubt required a reinterpretation of the entirety of the Jewish religion in the light of the Kantian and critical idealist conception of humanist-universalistic ethics. But for Cohen this did not require draining Judaism of its independent meaning, since on his view philosophical culture *itself*, and especially ethics, had its roots in Judaism. Two complementary tasks – opening Judaism to its universal ethical significance, and revealing the Jewish foundations of universal philosophy – were therefore united as one. The relation between Jewish thought and critical idealism was not merely a matter of Cohen's intellectual biography; it was also the constant theme and the unifying vision for all his work.

Alongside the major publications, this theme makes a constant reappearance in several of the lesser-known works and throughout the various stages in Cohen's development. In *Religious Postulates* (*Religiöse Postulate*),[32] a lecture he presented before the Second Congress of the *Verband der deutschen Juden* in 1907, the aforementioned theme comes out clearly, to the extent of suggesting among the "religious postulates" of German Judaism the setting up of university chairs in the Science of Judaism and Jewish theology and exegesis (one of the priorities of the Science of Judaism).[33]

Foremost amongst the "postulates" Cohen identified was monotheism itself, the postulate of the one and unique God.[34] Monotheism on his view was not only the foundation and essence of the Jewish religion, but was also itself the very source of morality. More specifically, it was the specific meaning of Judaism *inasmuch as* it is the source of morality for the whole of humanity. Here we should recall Cohen's aforementioned claim that the vocation of Judaism is its function as an inspiration for universal culture: Judaism affirms its specificity inasmuch as it functions within culture. Here Cohen explained that the growing indifference of Jewish youth for monotheistic religion was due not to the increasing influence of culture and philosophy (as was widely believed), but rather to a cultural and philosophical *crisis*. "Recently – Cohen wrote – aversion to religion, however, has been on the increase in educated circles, owing to a mistrust and a lack of modesty in respect of philosophy."[35] Moving away from religion was therefore a sign of a "mistrust" in philosophy. This was because the Unique God of Judaism is not, like the mythical gods, a particular belief, in opposition to the universalist trend of culture, but, on the contrary, the inspiring idea of universal ethical culture. Therefore, there is no alternative, rather there is full, unbreakable unity between Jewish monotheism and philosophical humanism.

> *There is no general culture* [*Bildung*] *nor any European culture* [*Kultur*] *nor any ethics without the idea of the Unique God and the God of morality.* There is no foundation and stability of culture without a *scientifically grounded* morality. For this reason the idea of the Unique God is necessary. Morality does not need other gods: but it does need the Unique God. *Therefore there can be neither European culture nor ethics without the fundamental participation of Judaism*.[36]

The second "postulate" – Jewish messianism – followed as a direct consequence of the first. Against those who out of concern for the particular identity of the Jewish "people" resisted participation in the German state and in the universal culture of humanity, Cohen argued that the authentic sense of Jewish messianism lay in the vocation of the people of Israel to live amongst other peoples precisely so as to promote universal humanity: "The Unique God has deprived us of our homeland to return it to us in humanity,"[37] Cohen observed. "If we did not have, or no longer had, this mission, there would be no *Jewish* sense in preserving our ethnic identity."[38] The core meaning of this statement lay in the phrase "Jewish sense." This special sense of Jewish identity consisted in surrendering any conception of this identity as separation and instead adopting an identity dedicated to the realization of universal humanity. Today, this claim may be difficult for readers to accept, given our knowledge of the tragedy of the Shoah. Although Cohen was keenly aware of anti-Jewish persecution, he could never have imagined that there might be the real risk of the total annihilation of Jewish life and that the historical situation could present itself in which the Jews could consider their very existence, even in the religious sense, as a "commandment."[39] But it hardly follows that our new perspective, forced upon us by historical tragedy, has drained Cohen's argument of all validity.

In 1910, Cohen published an essay, *The Inner Relations of Kant's Philosophy to Judaism* (*Innere Beziehungen der Kantischen Philosophie zum Judentum)*,[40] which attempted to demonstrate the thoroughgoing harmony between Kant and Judaism, the latter as represented by medieval Jewish philosophy. The essay is an apt illustration of Cohen's particular method: Judaism, Cohen argued, exhibited a fundamental agreement not only with Kantian ethics but also with the basic, logical premises of transcendental philosophy as such. The very concept of critical reason corresponds to basic themes that inspired the great Jewish philosophers of the medieval period – that is, the absolute rejection

of blind fideism and absolute trust in the rational character of the contents of revelation.[41] Moreover, Cohen underscored the full agreement between Judaism and Kant's most important ethical themes: the rejection of eudemonism,[42] the conception of the moral principle as law,[43] and the concept of autonomy,[44] which in Kant is also not contradicted by the acceptance of a supreme law-giver, the Unique, spiritual God, and the idea of God.[45] Cohen further emphasized Kant's two-fold thesis concerning the unity of reason and its dualistic application – that (1) reason is the common ground for both natural-scientific knowledge and morality, even while (2) nature and morality remain rigorously distinct. Kant had thereby avoided pantheism, on Cohen's view the antithesis of Judaism and the philosophical error *par excellence*.[46] Cohen made further reference to the ideas of immortality,[47] humanity, cosmopolitanism, political equality, and eternal peace – all Kantian themes that bore a marked resemblance to prophetic and messianic ideals.[48] Even Kant's idea of "radical evil," Cohen claimed, was related to a theme innate to Judaism itself (a unique claim that Cohen had already developed thoroughly in the second, 1910 edition of *Kant's Grounding of Ethics*[49] and to which he returned constantly up until his very last work, *Religion of Reason*).[50]

While we cannot pursue a thorough analysis of Cohen's argumentation here, it is worth pausing to consider its major themes. Let us first consider the framework of this essay (originally a lecture presented on 3 January 1910 at the *Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*), which will permit us to make explicit a crucial theme in Cohen's notion of the synthesis between Judaism and critical idealism. Cohen admitted that Kant's infrequent remarks on Judaism were largely negative, thus implying that the relation was anything but close. Hence at the beginning of the essay Cohen introduced a distinction between "history of literature" and "history of philosophy, as (. . .) of the sciences."[51] For in the history of literature, everything written by an author is considered of importance since its purpose is to provide a thorough reconstruction of the entirety of a philosopher's written corpus. For the history of philosophy, however, what counts is only the philosopher's original contribution within his own sphere of expertise. It is thus methodologically defensible to ignore Kant's remarks on Judaism since, in Cohen's words, Kant was not "competent on questions of Jewish religion and the Science of Judaism."[52]

In his *Inner Relations* essay, Cohen was not concerned with an interpretation of Kant's philosophy itself but rather with the "inner relations

[*innere Beziehungen*]" between the latter and Judaism. He accordingly put aside not only the history of literature but also the history of philosophy, so as to address a possible comparison at another level – that is, the "philosophy of religion." We should recall here that Cohen was himself a committee-member of the *Compendium of the Whole of the Science of Judaism* and known to be "specialized in the field of 'Ethics and Philosophy of Religion.'"[53] Before his audience at the *Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, he spoke of the objectives and fundamental method of the philosophy of religion. The main objective was not to describe religion in all its various historical aspects but to identify the *essence* – the fundamental meaning – of religion. To do so, the method to be pursued was not a neutral or aseptic reconstruction of empirical data in which religion happens to appear but rather the "*conceptual idealization of its fundamental thoughts*." For such a task one could not let the imagination run arbitrarily and subjectively wild. One must instead turn to the critical, philosophical method of the idea.[54]

This was and remained the essence of Cohen's conception of the philosophy of religion. It informed all of his thoughts on the relation between Judaism and culture, between Judaism and philosophy, and between Judaism and Germanism.[55] At this point, we may sum up by noting that *Judaism for Cohen is always the "conceptual idealization" of Judaism*: i.e., prophecy, moral teaching, universalism, and humanism, which, when taken together, constitute the "eternal essence of our religion."[56] Yet we should add that for Cohen, the synthesis between Judaism and philosophical and scientific culture was not only an ideal; its method was also of decisive importance for the continued vitality of Judaism as a living tradition. Cohen's commitment to the Science of Judaism derived from his belief that Judaism cannot be reduced to a static or repetitive preservation of tradition. On his view, there is no alternative between tradition and innovation; they are in fact complementary. If innovation does not have its roots in tradition it is arbitrary, while if tradition is not continually fed with new life by innovation, it will be drained of the very contents it wishes to preserve (and by innovation Cohen meant philosophical culture). The "sources" and "concept" of Judaism are accordingly the two poles between which Judaism as a living faith must proceed.

The 1916 essay *The Polish Jew (Der polnische Jude)*[57] was written to overcome German resistance, even on the part of some German Jews, to Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe. While acknowledging the great suffering of Polish and Russian Jews as well as the religious vitality they might contribute to German Judaism, Cohen also called attention

to how the latter (as embodied in the Science of Judaism) might help to improve Eastern European Jewish identity: "I have often had the opportunity of noting that the intellectual sensibility of the Eastern Jew is torn by a spiritual fracture: there is no mediation in it between orthodoxy and religious indifference."[58] At issue, Cohen believed, was an excessively static religious tradition that would ultimately lead to desertion and indifference. Cohen contrasted the "stasis" of Eastern European Jewry with the legacy and ongoing achievements of German Judaism, specifically the Science of Judaism:

> Although this fracture is also present in Jews integrated into European culture [*Kulturjude*], in this case it is, at least partially, compensated for by much despised religious liberalism. Moses Mendelssohn did not only teach us the German language (. . .), but also built up for us a sturdy defence against the attacks of modern culture on our religion. All marginal facts, which would seem to contradict this, fall before the historical fact that it was (. . .) actually we German Jews who alone created *the Science of Judaism*.[59]

Cohen hastened to add that this route was not merely pragmatic. The idealized synthesis between Judaism and culture ("the revelation of the science to our religion and starting off from it")[60] also serves as a regulative idea of history, without which one would be unable to comprehend the special relation between Judaism and German culture: "This is the great example and paradigmatic meaning that the German Jew has for the future of Judaism, for Judaism in the whole world in its religious evolution," he explained. "We were able to posit the interpretation of our history and continuation of our religious practices in harmony with the most intimate motives of our religious tradition and, at the same time, with those of universal culture."[61]

4. THE IDEAL SYMBIOSIS BETWEEN JUDAISM AND GERMANISM

We now briefly consider one of Cohen's most interesting though frequently criticized essays, *Germanism and Judaism* (*Deutschtum und Judentum*).[62] Here Cohen fashioned a true apologia for the intimate relation between Judaism and Germanism. He did so not only to convince Germans and German Jews that they shared a common cultural spirit, but also to invite all the Jews of Europe and America to acknowledge their cultural debt to German Judaism and, consequently, to Germanism

itself, to such a degree that even in the midst of war they might be moved to recognize Germany as the bearer of universal humanism, messianic socialism, and perpetual peace (that is, the eternal ideas comprising the essence of Judaism).

Cohen developed this argument by conceiving "Greekness" as a common source or "*tertium comparationis*"[63] between "Germanism" and "Judaism": The Greek spirit (specifically, Platonism) is a source of philosophical idealism, and is accordingly *both* in intimate agreement with Jewish monotheism and messianism *and* an inspiration for Christianity, ultimately leading to the Lutheran Reformation and from there to Germanism. Cohen's larger purpose was to demonstrate that idealism (that is, the critical idealism of Nicholas of Cusa, Leibniz, and Kant) constitutes the very essence of German philosophy and culture and therefore inspires Germany in its special historical vocation to promote universal humanism, socialism, equality, and social justice, a confederation of states, and perpetual peace. At the same time, Cohen wished to demonstrate that for this vocation, Germanism had not only drawn inspiration from Jewish sources, its very realization in the "classical" era was achieved thanks to the decisive contribution of German Jews. By the same token, this Jewish involvement in the development of German classical culture had also encouraged the maturity and reform of German Judaism itself (in the direction of scientific and ethical idealism). Here Cohen assigned the leading role to Moses Mendelssohn and the representatives of the Science of Judaism who were his heirs.[64]

The general thesis presented in Cohen's essay is indeed provocative. Gershom Scholem remarked in his diary: "[Uncle Georg] gave me *Germanism and Judaism* by Hermann Cohen, an impossible piece. The connections he conjured up are [such] that one would like to run away."[65] With few exceptions, reactions to the essay from both Jews and Germans were largely hostile.[66] Jacob Klatzkin's response is particularly noteworthy.[67] It took him little effort to expose the apparent relationship between Greekness and Judaism as an illusion, and he observed that elsewhere in his writings Cohen himself had actually acknowledged the differences between them.[68] Klatzkin made a similar objection to Cohen's arguments concerning the apparent relationship between Judaism and Christianity.[69] Moreover, Klatzkin also noted that to embrace Cohen's claim that idealism was the true source of German culture required that one first confine the meaning of idealism to critical, humanist, universalist, and messianic rationalism, the values in which Cohen saw a point of convergence between Germanism and Judaism. But this meant expelling Hegel from German philosophy and ignoring all other

influential figures with divergent tendencies – for example, historical materialism, the historical school of law, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and romantic Spinozism.[70] Finally, as for the direct contribution of Jewish intellectuals to German classical culture, Klatzkin objected that any such participation was not crucial, as Cohen had supposed, and that it was no more important than the contribution Jews had always made to different cultures to which they have been assimilated while nonetheless *retaining* a distinctive cultural identity.[71]

If Cohen's contemporaries had no difficulty finding facts by which to refute the arguments in *Germanism and Judaism*, the same is perhaps even easier and more necessary for readers today, burdened as we are by the tragic memory of the Shoah. In Cohen's defence, one might argue that he could hardly have been expected to foresee those future developments. But such a defence would be at once sterile and (partly) false: it would be sterile because it would banish Cohen and his ideas to a dead past with no relevance for the present, and it would be false because even while Cohen could never have foreseen Nazism and the Shoah, he could have realized, like Klatzkin and so many others like him, that the current state of German culture, as of Judaism, certainly did not correspond to his ideal. Cohen's main thesis, for example, was: "German philosophy is idealism."[72] It is this thesis that supports and mediates the ideal-construction of the relation between Germanism and Judaism. But in Cohen's own time, German culture was no longer predominantly guided by the universalist, humanist idealism of Kant and Schiller in philosophy[73] or Bach, Mozart and Beethoven in the arts,[74] but included as significant strands quite different leaders and trends. Of course, Cohen was hardly unaware of such trends. Yet he believed (or perhaps wished to believe) that cultural figures such as Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Wagner were ephemeral stars in the German cultural firmament, doomed to fall since they were "unGerman" in Cohen's idealist sense. Of course German history did not transpire as Cohen hoped. And even Judaism as understood in Cohen's era was very different from the concept of Judaism he imagined: trends in the direction of differentiation from European culture and national separatism (represented most especially by Zionism) were not, as Cohen believed, only secondary phenomena, but were instead the predominant course of European Judaism at the time. In sum, at the time Cohen was writing, Germans and Jews, far from uniting in a common idealist spirit, were already on divergent paths.

For such reasons, more recent commentators have remained largely critical of the abstract and historically unreal character of Cohen's essay,

a character they have identified with the abstract quality of Cohen's philosophical method overall. Emil Fackenheim, for example, noted "a strange abstractness, a shadowy sort of idealism which ascribes to ideas and ideals far greater power and responsibility than they ever can carry." He further remarks: "Such abstractness, a grave fault in any case, becomes altogether fatal when it assumes a dreamlike quality; when everything is staked on ideas and ideals – in this case, those of Kant, Goethe and Schiller – which, so far as any historical efficacy was concerned, had long vanished into the past."[75]

Against such accusations of intellectual abstraction and historical blindness, Steven Schwarzschild responded in defense of Cohen and reasserted the contemporary relevance of his vision.[76] Schwarzschild brought forth documentary evidence to show that notwithstanding Cohen's idealized conception of a symbiosis between Judaism and Germanism, Cohen himself bitterly acknowledged both publically and privately the unsettling condition of German society at that time.[77] Cohen's theses, then, were not based on an analysis of the actual situation, but were intended programmatically to suggest an ideal paradigm so as to ground both critical judgement in the present and the tasks for the future. "Idealization," therefore, is the interpretative key for properly understanding Cohen's perspective on the relationship between Judaism and Germanism and, more generally, between Judaism and philosophy, and Judaism and culture.[78] Having provided a brief illustration of Cohen's technique of "idealization,"[79] Schwarzschild concludes:

> In this light we can finally translate into our language what Cohen's thesis of 'the German-Jewish symbiosis' was meant to signify. It was not essentially a descriptive proposition but a regulative one. It said in effect: there are a number of social and intellectual forces at work in both the German and the Jewish historical cultures which can and should be used so as to advance as much and as quickly as possible whatever dynamic force they possess toward the goal of a cosmopolitan, humanistic, ethical world society.[80]

The principle of "idealization" recurs throughout Cohen's writings and is perhaps the best means to understand his true intentions. It is not Germany but the "concept" of "Germanism" that concerned him. The latter is an ideal: it is the archetype, critical paradigm and infinite task for German culture, just as Judaism is for Cohen the "concept" of Judaism, gaining its initial definition through "reason" as the primary and a priori source and simultaneously via the "sources of Judaism."[81] Ultimately, the true foundation of Cohen's life and work was critical *idealism*, for

which he turned both to the philosophical tradition of Plato and Kant and to the Jewish tradition of monotheism and messianism.

Yet notwithstanding this defense one must squarely acknowledge that Cohen believed (or at least would like to have believed) that the ideal would actually have come about in German culture, and that warped philosophical, artistic, social, and political signals were merely marginal phenomena and would soon be overcome. On this point he was undoubtedly wrong. This does not mean, however, that the relevance for today of Cohen's thought can only be salvaged, as is the case with Schwarzschild, by seeing its realization in other places and other times (for example, the symbiosis between Judaism and American culture)[82] or (and this appears to me to be a more interesting perspective) restating the regulative value of Cohen's ideal for an increasingly more positive co-existence of different "socio-historical entities" in general.[83] Such a prospect could be true, even after the Shoah, for German culture as well.

Notes

1. F. A. Lange, *Geschichte des Materialismus und Kritik seiner Bedeutung in der Gegenwart*, Baedeker, Iserlohn 1866.
2. F. Rosenzweig, *Einleitung*, in H. Cohen, *Jüdische Schriften*, edited by Bruno Strauß, with an introduction by Franz Rosenzweig, Schwetschke, Berlin 1924, Vol. 1., pp. XIII–LXIV.
3. Ibid., pp. XXf.
4. Cf. ibid., pp. XXIIIf.
5. Ibid., pp. XXVf.
6. H. Cohen, *Ein Bekenntnis in der Judenfrage*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., pp. 73–94.
7. Ibid., p. 73.
8. H. Cohen, *System der Philosophie. Zweiter Teil: Ethik des reinen Willens*, Bruno Cassirer, Berlin 1904, 1907 (second ed.); reprinted in idem, *Werke*, cit., Vol. 7., Georg Olms, Hildesheim – New York 1981.
9. Cf. F. Rosenzweig, *Einleitung*, cit., pp. XXXIff.
10. Ibid., p. XXXVI.
11. Ibid., p. XXXVIII.
12. Cf. ibid., pp. XXXVf.
13. Cf. ibid., pp. XLIIIff.
14. Cf. A. Altmann, *Hermann Cohens Begriff der Korrelation*, in *In zwei Welten. Sigfried Moses zum 75. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von H. Tramer, Bitaon, Tel Aviv 1962, pp. 377–399. See also A. Poma, *Die Korrelation in der Religionsphilosophie Cohens: eine Methode, mehr als eine Methode*, in *Neukantianismus. Perspektiven und Probleme*, ed. by E.W. Orth and H. Holzhey, Königshausen & Neumann, Würzburg 1994, pp. 343–365; Eng. trans. in idem, *Yearning for Form and Other Essays on Hermann Cohen's Thought*, Springer, Dordrecht 2006, pp. 61–85.
15. See note 7.

16. See pp. 83–84, 87–88, this volume. Cohen, *System der Philosophie. Zweiter Teil: Ethik des reinen Willens*.]
17. Cf. H. Cohen, *Briefe*, ausgewählt und herausgegeben von Bertha und Bruno Strauß, Schocken Verlag/ Jüdischer Buchverlag, Berlin 1939, pp. 38ff.
18. F. Rosenzweig, *Einleitung*, cit., p. LII.
19. H. Cohen, *Ein Bekenntnis in der Judenfrage*, cit., p. 74.
20. Cf. ibid., p. 86.
21. Cf. ibid., pp. 81ff.
22. Cf. ibid., p. 85. On Cohen's clash with Buber over Zionism, see H. Cohen, *Zionismus und Religion. Ein Wort an meine Kommilitonen jüdischen Glaubens*, von Geh. Regierungsrat Prof. Dr. Hermann Cohen, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit, Vol. 2., pp. 319–327; M. Buber, *Begriffe und Wirklichkeit. Brief an Herrn Geh. Regierungsrat Prof. Dr. Hermann Cohen*, in "Der Jude," no. 5, August 1916, pp. 281–289; H. Cohen, *Antwort auf das offene Schreiben des Herrn Dr. Martin Buber an Hermann Cohen*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., pp. 328–340; M. Buber, *Zion, der Staat und die Menschheit. Bemerkungen zu Hermann Cohens "Antwort,"* in "Der Jude," no. 7, Oktober 1916, pp. 425–433 (all these essays have been reprinted in the new critical and annoted edition of Cohen's *Kleinere Schriften VI*, ed. by H. Wiedebach: H. Cohen, *Werke*, cit., Vol. 17., Georg Olms. Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 2002, pp. 211–275). In the collection of essays containing the Italian translations of these writings (H. Cohen, *La fede d'Israele è la speranza. Interventi sulle questioni ebraiche (1880–1916). Con due lettere di Martin Buber a Hermann Cohen*, ed. P. Fiorato, with a postscript by G. Bonola, Giuntina, Firenze 2000), there are some interesting comments by P. Fiorato on the Cohen-Buber controversy (*Introduzione*, pp. 38ff.) and also by G. Bonola (*Urgenze del lealismo e travagli dell'identità. Dietro le quinte e intorno alla polemica Cohen-Buber*, pp. 283ff.).
23. On this subject, see S. Schwarzschild, *"Germanism and Judaism" – Hermann Cohen's Normative Paradigm of the German-Jewish Symbiosis*, in *Jews and Germans from 1860 to 1933: "The Problematic Symbiosis,"* ed. by D. Bronsen, Carl Winter – Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg 1979, pp. 129–172; H. Wiedebach, *Die Bedeutung der Nationalität für Hermann Cohen*, Georg Olms, Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1997. See also A. Poma, *La risposta di Hermann Cohen all'antigiudaismo*, in *Atti del II Convegno tenuto a Idice, Bologna, nei giorni 4 e 5 novembre 1981*, "Associazione Italiana per lo Studio del Giudaismo. Testi e Studi n.1," eds. F. Parente and D. Piattelli, Carucci, Roma 1983, pp. 59–75; Eng. trans. in idem, *Yearning for Form and Other Essays on Hermann Cohen's Thought*, cit., pp. 1–20.
24. H. Cohen, *Der Sabbat in seiner kulturgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., pp. 45–72.
25. Cf., for example, H. Cohen, *Ein Bekenntnis in der Judenfrage*, cit., pp. 75ff., 91ff.
26. Cf.. H. Cohen, *Zur Verteidigung*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., pp. 95–100.

27. In 1912, Cohen stated that he had changed his mind on this point (cf. the note by Bruno Strauß in H. Cohen, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., p. 470), although he certainly did not deny the original intentions behind this proposal, as can be seen from a 1917 essay: cf. H. Cohen, *Mahnung des Alters an die Jugend*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., pp. 175s.; reprinted in idem, *Werke*, Vol. 17., cit., pp. 577s.
28. H. Cohen, *Briefe*, cit., pp. 82f.
29. It should be recalled here that the Breslau seminary, where Cohen studied, was one of the most important centres for the Science of Judaism, and that Cohen's teachers there were among the most important members of the movement.
30. See, for example, H. Cohen, *Die Errichtung von Lehrstühlen für Ethik und Religionsphilosophie an den jüdisch-theologischen Lehranstalten*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., pp. 108–125; idem, *Zwei Vorschläge zur Sicherung unseres Fortbestandes*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., pp. 133–141; idem, *Zur Begründung einer Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., pp. 210–217; reprinted in idem, *Werke*, cit., Vol. 17., cit., pp. 625–635.
31. See D. Adelmann, *Die "Religion der Vernunft" im "Grundriss der Gesamtwissenschaft des Judentums,"* cit., which I have drawn on for much previous material.
32. H. Cohen, *Religiöse Postulate*. Rede, gehalten am Frankfurter Verbandstage der deutschen Juden am 13. Oktober 1907, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 1., pp. 1–17; excerpted in Hermann Cohen, *Reason and Hope*, Eva Jospe, trans. (W. W. Norton, 1971), 44–51.
33. Cf. ibid., pp. 12ff.
34. Cf. ibid., pp. 1ff.
35. Ibid., p. 2.
36. Ibid., p. 4.
37. Ibid., p. 7.
38. Ibid.
39. Cf. E. L. Fackenheim, *God's Presence in History* (New York University Press, 1970), 85.
40. H. Cohen, *Innere Beziehungen der Kantischen Philosophie zum Judentum*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 1., pp. 284–305. Excerpted in Cohen, *Reason and Hope*, 77–89.
41. Cf. ibid., pp. 287ff.
42. Cf. ibid., pp. 290f.
43. Cf. ibid., pp. 291f.
44. Cf. ibid., p. 292.
45. Cf. ibid., pp. 293f.
46. Cf. ibid., pp. 294ff.
47. Cf. ibid., p. 297.
48. Cf. ibid., pp. 297ff.
49. H. Cohen, *Kants Begründung der Ethik*, Dümmler, Berlin 1877; Bruno Cassirer, Berlin 1910 (second ed.); reprinted in idem, *Werke*, cit., Vol. 2., Georg Olms, Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 2001, pp. 335–343.

Previous remarks in this direction are to be found in, for example, H. Cohen, *System der Philosophie. Zweiter Teil: Ethik des reinen Willens*, cit., pp. 303, 626f.

50. H. Cohen, *Religion der Vernunft aus den Quellen des Judentums*, edited by B. Kellerman, Fock, Leipzig 1919; edited by B. Strauß, J. Kaufmann, Frankfurt a.M. 1929 (second ed.); reprinted J. Melzer, Köln 1959, pp. 212f., 372.
51. Ibid., p. 284.
52. Ibid.
53. D. Adelmann, *Die "Religion der Vernunft" im "Grundriss der Gesamtwissenschaft des Judentums,"* cit., p. 20.
54. Cf. H. Cohen, *Innere Beziehungen der Kantischen Philosophie zum Judentum*, cit., pp. 303f.
55. Cf. H. Cohen, *Religion der Vernunft aus den Quellen des Judentums*, cit., pp. 1ff.
56. Cf. H. Cohen, *Innere Beziehungen der Kantischen Philosophie zum Judentum*, cit., p. 304.
57. H. Cohen, *Der polnische Jude*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., pp. 162–171; reprinted in idem, *Werke*, cit., Vol. 17., cit., pp. 189–202. In the quotations that follow, the page numbers are from *Jüdische Schriften*, followed immediately by those in *Werke*.
58. Ibid., pp. 165/193s.
59. Ibid., pp. 165f/194s.
60. Ibid., pp. 166/195.
61. Ibid., pp. 166/195s.
62. H. Cohen, *Deutschtum und Judentum. Mit grundlegenden Betrachtungen über Staat und Internationalismus*, in idem, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., pp. 237–301; reprinted in idem, *Werke*, cit., Vol. 16., Georg Olms, Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1997, pp. 465–560. Also excerpted in Cohen, *Reason and Hope*, 176–184. In the quotations that follow, the page numbers are from *Jüdische Schriften*, followed immediately by those in *Werke*.
63. Cf. ibid., pp. 237/469.
64. Cf. ibid., pp. 266ff./511ff.
65. G. Scholem, *Tagebücher nebst Aufsätze und Entwürfe bis 1923*, *I. Halbband 1913–1917*, unter Mitarbeit von H. Kopp-Osterbrink edited by K. Gründer and F. Niewöhner, Jüdischer Verlag, Frankfurt a.M. 1995, p. 207f.
66. See the remarks by Bruno Strauß in the note in H. Cohen, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit., Vol. 2., p. 476, and those by H. Wiedebach, in H. Cohen, *Werke*, cit., Vol. 16., cit., p. XXXIII, note 81.
67. Cf. J. Klatzkin, *Deutschtum und Judentum*, in idem, *Hermann Cohen*, cit., pp. 57–93 (already published by Klatzkin in "Der Jude," 1917, no. 4 and 5/6.: cf. B. Strauß in H. Cohen, *Jüdische Schriften*, cit. Bd. 2., p. 476).
68. Cf. ibid., pp. 59ff.
69. Cf. ibid., pp. 70ff.
70. Cf. ibid., pp. 71ff.
71. Cf. ibid., pp. 79ff.

72. H. Cohen, *Deutschtum und Judentum. Mit grundlegenden Betrachtungen über Staat und Internationalismus*, cit., pp. 239/471.
73. Cf. ibid., pp. 249f./487f.
74. Cf. ibid., pp. 251f./490.
75. E. L. Fackenheim, *Hermann Cohen – After Fifty Years*, Leo Baeck Memorial Lecture 12, Leo Baeck Institute, New York 1969, p. 10.
76. Cf. S. Schwarzschild, "*Germanism and Judaism" – Hermann Cohen's Normative Paradigm of the German-Jewish Symbiosis*, cit., p. 138.
77. Schwarzschild (cf. ibid., p. 139) refers to the preface to the second edition of *Ethik des reinen Willens*, from 1907 (cit., pp. Xf.) and to Cohen's letter to Natorp dated 27 October 1916 (H. Holzhey, op.cit., Bd. 2., pp. 451ff.).
78. Cf. S. Schwarzschild, "*Germanism and Judaism" – Hermann Cohen's Normative Paradigm of the German-Jewish Symbiosis*, cit., p. 142. This obviously has nothing to do with the insinuations by Jacques Derrida that in *Deutschtum und Judentum*, Cohen is in something of a delirium, without even the pretence of objectivity (cf. J. Derrida, *Interpretations at War. Kant, le Juif, l'Allemand*, in *Phénoménologie et politique. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Taminiaux*, Ousia, Bruxelles 1989, pp. 230ff.); here Derrida goes so far as to gratuitously insult Cohen (cf. ibid., pp. 255ff.).
79. Cf. S. Schwarzschild, "*Germanism and Judaism" – Hermann Cohen's Normative Paradigm of the German-Jewish Symbiosis*, cit., pp. 147ff.
80. Ibid., p. 154.
81. This is developed further in A. Poma, *Religion der Vernunft und Judentum bei Hermann Cohen*, in *Zeit und Welt. Denken zwischen Philosophie und Religion*, edited by E. Goodman-Thau, Universitätsverlag C. Winter, Heidelberg 2002, pp. 57–71; Eng. trans. in idem, *Yearning for Form and Other Essays on Hermann Cohen's Thought*, cit., pp. 111–128.
82. Cfr. S. Schwarzschild, "*Germanism and Judaism" – Hermann Cohen's Normative Paradigm of the German-Jewish Symbiosis*, cit., p. 157.
83. Cf. ibid.