

THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO
MODERN JEWISH
PHILOSOPHY

Edited by Michael L. Morgan
Indiana University

Peter Eli Gordon
Harvard University



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

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

© Cambridge University Press 2007

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

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

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

I Introduction: Modern Jewish Philosophy, Modern Philosophy, and Modern Judaism

MICHAEL L. MORGAN AND PETER ELI GORDON

What is modern Jewish philosophy, and is there such a thing at all? If there is, what makes it modern? What makes it Jewish? And what makes it philosophy? Indeed, who asks such a question and for what reason? Do such questions convey a challenge to the very existence of a species of philosophy that is genuinely Jewish and modern as well? Do they call upon one to respond, perhaps in order to be an advocate on behalf of modern Jewish philosophy and to defend it against its detractors? These questions are puzzling. While they may seem simple in content and easily dispatched, even a moment's scrutiny will expose how difficult they are to answer, and even to understand.

A skeptic might argue that there is no such thing as Jewish philosophy. For philosophy (our bold interlocutor might explain) is the pursuit of universal questions. And the methods we use when posing such questions can display no particular identities and can be bound by no particular commitments other than the devotion to philosophy itself. Julius Guttman, one of the twentieth century's greatest scholars on this debate, accordingly entitled his 1933 survey *The Philosophy of Judaism* (*Die Philosophie des Judentums*). The title seems to have implied that notwithstanding the particular object in view, the method remained nonetheless universal and purely rational: a philosophy of Judaism, but not a *Jewish philosophy*. So our imaginary skeptic may well have a point. If philosophy is simply a human impulse, then "Jewish philosophy" would have to be understood as the application of a general philosophical approach to specific themes (Judaism, Jewish existence, and so forth). But matters are hardly that straightforward. The impulse to approach matters in a philosophical fashion does not arise at all times and in all places. It is a defamiliarizing impulse, an attitude of wonder (in Greek, *thaumazein*) at things normally taken for granted. More recently, in the analytic tradition, philosophy has been understood as the application of logic, or an analysis of ordinary language, to conceptual muddles. Wittgenstein likened it to a therapeutic cure: "showing

the fly the way out of the fly-bottle." The image suggests a dislocation or dissolution of conventional error. Philosophy therefore arises most of all, perhaps, when tacitly shared commitments are in some fashion challenged or are cast in an unfamiliar light, such that they seem to require explicit and vigorous justification if they are not to be abandoned.

This notion may help to explain why Jewish philosophy is not timeless but seems on the contrary to be a characteristically *modern* pursuit. To be sure, there were Jewish philosophers as early as Philo of Alexandria. And Maimonides (arguably the greatest Jewish philosopher of them all), whose works synthesize Judaism with Islamic and Hellenistic sources, made his home in Old Cairo in the twelfth century. Jewish philosophy would therefore appear to be as old as the Jewish confrontation with Greece. But in the pre-modern world, the shared understandings that comprised the intellectual background of Jewish life remained largely intact, its changes more or less confined to the normative processes of interpretation (*midrash*) and innovation (*chidush*) under the careful guidance of the rabbinical establishment. It was only with the expulsion from Spain and the ensuing dislocations of the Jewish community throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the deeper edifice of Judaism was exposed entirely to scientific and philosophical scrutiny. From that point on, Jewish life could no longer rest comfortably upon a taken-for-granted foundation of shared belief. With accelerating frequency, various challenges arose in a seemingly inexhaustible supply to cast that foundation in doubt: scientific naturalism, the Enlightenment, assimilation, secularism, socialism, and nationalism – all of these accompanied by rising waves of conflict and diversified modes of Jewish response. To be sure, there has always been diversity within the Jewish world. Since its inception, perhaps, Judaism has grown accustomed to frequent challenges, both internal and external. It has not only adapted but also grown stronger because of them. But perhaps the most distinctive feature of Jewish modernity is that such dislocations now seem to be less the exception than the norm. Jewish philosophy – *if*, indeed, it is a sign of dislocation – now seems an inescapable feature of the modern Jewish condition.

It has been said that the problem of Judaism and modern philosophy is one dimension of the more general dilemma of "Athens and Jerusalem," or (to invoke a different couplet), "Hellenism and Hebraism." Jewish thinkers such as Leo Strauss, Emmanuel Levinas, and Emil Fackenheim took this relationship to be deep and important, not only for Judaism but indeed for all of Western civilization and culture.¹ Levinas, for example, claimed that the Jewish tradition contained a key

insight regarding the fundamentally ethical character of social existence. This insight, however, had been obscured by Greco-Western civilization and needed to be discovered anew. Levinas therefore believed that philosophy and Jewish philosophy were not ultimately distinct enterprises. Rather, traditional philosophy was part of a world that needed to recall its roots, and in this regard, Western philosophy and Jewish philosophy did not differ at the core. All philosophy needed to be refashioned to see its way to a new understanding of human existence and its ethical foundations; all philosophy needed a new first philosophy. But such a view is only one strand in the variegated and complex web that is modern Jewish philosophy. What indeed is the larger pattern of that web?

Suppose we begin with the question that might seem easiest: is there such a thing as modern Jewish philosophy? The simplest response might be to say, "of course there is." And we would then proceed to list figures who appear to fit that categorization – Baruch Spinoza, Moses Mendelssohn, Nachman Krochmal, Samson Raphael Hirsch, Ludwig Steinheim, Hermann Cohen, Martin Buber, Franz Rosenzweig, Julius Guttmann, Samuel Hugo Bergmann, Nathan Rotenstreich, Emil Fackenheim, Emmanuel Levinas, and Horace Kallen. Yet this proposal would immediately generate several demurrals. First of all, the list seems at once too long and too short. It is too long because it includes some who are students of Jewish philosophy but not really Jewish philosophers, and at least one who is neither, but rather a Jew who was also a philosopher. It is too short because it leaves out so many figures of great importance, among them Moses Hess, Isaac Breuer, Moses Maimon, Mordecai Kaplan, Abraham Joshua Heschel, Leo Baeck, Joseph Soloveitchik, Lou Silberman, Bernard Martin, Marvin Fox, Michael Wyschogrod, Louis Jacobs, Steven Schwarzschild, Jacques Derrida, David Hartmann, Eugene Borowitz, and even Gershom Scholem and Walter Benjamin. But one might interrupt: did not the question ask specifically about philosophy and hence for *philosophers*? Surely, many of these figures are not that: Buber, Kaplan, Heschel, Baeck, and Soloveitchik, for example. And if the question were about Jewish philosophers, we must admit that not all of those named merit that title, if to be a Jewish philosopher means to be someone who wrote *philosophical* works specifically addressed to Judaism or Jewish matters. Must we therefore dismiss Buber, Kaplan, Heschel, Baeck, Soloveitchik, Scholem, and Benjamin? If so, our list would have to be considerably reduced indeed.

Constructing such a list is no easy task. Is this to ask what *criterion* to use in selecting who should be on it and who should not? But that means one would need to ask what makes modern Jewish philosophy

what it is – modern, Jewish, and philosophical. In order to determine whether there is and has been such a thing as modern Jewish philosophy, perhaps we cannot avoid asking what it is. But even if we felt driven to provide a criterion, where, indeed, would one find it?

As we have suggested, *modern philosophy in general* comes into being with the fitful emergence of the modern-scientific perspective over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the challenge this perspective posed to traditional modes of thought – scientific, philosophical, moral, political, and religious. In terms of influence and importance, the thought of René Descartes marks a, if not *the*, turning point for modern philosophy. A host of others soon followed, either to resist him or to radicalize his claims: Arnauld, Gassendi, Hobbes, Spinoza, Leibniz, and beyond. Jewish philosophy itself long predates the seventeenth century and the rise of modern natural science. But *modern Jewish philosophy*, if it is to be called “modern” in the sense intended here, must surely have something to do with this same confrontation between the new science and traditional habits of Jewish thought.

But what would make such thinking “Jewish” in the relevant sense? What would make it not just philosophy written by Jews but Jewish in character? One suggestion is that to be Jewish it must address Jewish beliefs and concerns; it must be or be part of an attempt to articulate the nature of Jewish doctrine or existence in some way. What would make it Jewish, that is, would be its subject matter: Modern Jewish philosophy would be one kind of effort to say what Judaism is. But need it be the case that such an effort be guided primarily or exclusively toward that goal? What if it were aimed in another direction, if its goals were otherwise, and yet along the way it said interesting or valuable or significant things about Judaism and the Jewish way of life? Would this be sufficient to make such an effort an episode in modern Jewish philosophy? If it were not, then the justification for including someone like Spinoza, for example, would be weak indeed, as would the justification for including Strauss or Levinas or Derrida or Benjamin. Surely, it would require some energy and cleverness to argue that their work, even in part, was *primarily* and *intentionally* aimed at articulating the meaning of Jewish existence. It would be sufficient, then, if the work or figure in question contributed in some interesting and fruitful way to the enterprise of articulating the meaning of Jewish existence, even if it were not aimed at that goal and if the philosopher were not primarily engaged in such a project. But clearly the philosopher’s work should touch on provocative and important issues on Jewish matters, and do so in a philosophical way.

With such considerations in mind, we have felt it best to adopt here what might be called a “hermeneutic” or “pragmatic” criterion of modern Jewish philosophy. The latter does not have to meet formal or substantive standards set in advance of its occurrence. It simply must involve a result that is gotten through a broadly construed process of interpretation. Modern Jewish philosophy has been, and continues to be, whatever is the outcome of a multifaceted engagement between, on the one hand, thinking about issues relevant to understanding the Jewish condition or the meaning of Judaism and Jewish life, and, on the other hand, philosophical thinking that is indebted to and responds to the tradition of modern Western philosophy and, perhaps, to the entire tradition of Western philosophy as it has been appropriated and modified in the modern period. Such a definition of Jewish philosophy has several noteworthy marks. First, it is *interpretative*, in the sense that the major exponents of modern Jewish philosophy *have come to be understood as Jewish philosophers* by virtue of an ongoing process of conversation and critique that has developed over time and continues even today to generate its own criteria of inclusion, sometimes, in fact, revising past criteria as well. Second, such a Jewish philosophy is *episodic*. Certain figures contributed to modern Jewish philosophy a vast corpus of work, systematic treatises, and so forth. Others left us only essays, suggestions, or fragments. A thinker such as Gershom Scholem, although he conceived himself as a historian rather than a philosopher, nonetheless made an important contribution to modern Jewish philosophy by means of his historical investigations as well as his occasional reflections on Jewish doctrine. Someone like Franz Rosenzweig, however, is a modern Jewish philosopher in the strong sense, since his major works are richly and self-consciously philosophical and set out to clarify recognizably philosophical questions about Jewish existence.

Characterizing modern Jewish philosophy this way would seem to imply a further assumption: that modern Jewish philosophy, like all Jewish philosophy (indeed, like all philosophy), is a historically changing phenomenon, variable rather than eternal in its marks. How it proceeds methodologically and what topics it explores depend upon the historical context in which it occurs. And such a historical context is itself contingent upon various cultural features and compelling habits of thought, as well as social problems and political events. Modern Jewish philosophy is not the same in all respects as earlier, ancient, or medieval Jewish philosophy. Nor should we expect it to be uniform or self-identical through time and space. What such a philosophy meant for Spinoza or for Mendelssohn is hardly what it was for Rosenzweig or Benjamin,

Fackenheim or Soloveitchik. Such historicity is indeed a common feature of philosophy itself in the West: much of Western philosophy either assumes a historically conditioned notion of what philosophy is or it raises the very question of the nature of philosophy as a contested issue that can only be answered in reference to the values of its time. As Hegel observed, philosophy is its own age reflected in thought. So, too, in the Jewish sphere, the question of what counts as Jewish philosophy and what methods or topics it should embrace has changed with the changes history has brought. Finally, we should note that viewing modern Jewish philosophy in such a historical fashion seems to be a special characteristic of our own situation at the beginning of the twenty-first century. We live in an age when much of our philosophical efforts seem stamped by that panoply of approaches we call “post-foundationalist” or even “post-modern.” Whether we welcome such labels or despair of their influence, the hermeneutical and interpretive character of human life is indisputably a touchstone of philosophy – and Jewish philosophy – in our time.

It may not be that all the contributors to this volume would accept this way of defining its boundaries. Individual chapters may imply different and even contrary assumptions concerning both the character of modern Jewish philosophy and the proper manner in which it is to be pursued. But in creating this volume, our approach has been guided by certain basic criteria, as we indicate next.

One such criterion is that modern Jewish philosophy reflect the crisis of scientific naturalism. A central challenge of the new scientific thinking in the seventeenth century was that it introduced the possibility of conceiving human life in an exclusively naturalistic fashion – that is, one that left no obvious room for a non-naturalistic conception of value or for a commitment to a realm other than that of material nature. One of the most distinctive features of modern Jewish philosophy is that it attempts to make Jewish normative commitments intelligible even while it pays explicit acknowledgment to the quintessentially modern vision of scientific naturalism. For some Jewish philosophers, the new naturalism seemed to call into question the trans-historical validity of Judaism itself. Spinoza, to take only the most obvious example, was ready to embrace philosophical naturalism seemingly without qualification. He concluded that Judaism itself was nothing more than a historical-political order specific to the Ancient Near East and no longer binding upon its members. And even the God of the Jews was in Spinoza’s eyes susceptible to naturalistic reduction. God was no longer an artificer and legislator standing beyond nature; God was instead identical

with nature itself: *Deus sive Natura*. Spinoza's major work, the *Ethics*, lays down its claims against a background of traditional Jewish themes, which it then rejects or modifies. And Spinoza's *Theological-Political Treatise* speaks directly about central Jewish issues – from prophecy and miracles to chosenness and the ritual law – all of which are cast in an unfamiliar and naturalistic light. From his own day to ours, Spinoza's philosophical proximity to Judaism has remained a topic of heated dispute. Some reject his ideas altogether, while others find much in his philosophy that continues to appeal.² It therefore seems appropriate that our collection begins with Steven Nadler's contribution to the ongoing discussion as to whether Spinoza is a Jewish philosopher.

In the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Jewish belief was brought into increased contact with the central tenets of the Enlightenment – freedom, rationality, and the principled dissociation between reason and faith. Shortly thereafter, Jewish philosophy found new sources of inspiration in the movements of German Romanticism and German Idealism. How well it negotiated this encounter is the subject of several chapters in this volume. Alan Arkush provides a critique of Mendelssohn's attempt to join Judaism and political liberalism. Kenneth Seeskin discusses the post-Kantian confrontation between autonomy and traditional authority. And Paul Franks explores key Platonic themes in Kantian philosophy and their later resonance in the writings of figures such as Solomon Maimon, Nachman Krochmal, and Isaac Breuer.

It is worth noting that much of modern Jewish philosophy from Mendelssohn through World War II is located in German-speaking culture. Although the German-Jewish relationship has been widely hailed and roundly attacked, its philosophical achievements should not be forgotten. These chapters explore the German-Jewish encounter at a time when the credentials and character of philosophy was changing in intriguing ways, from the formal rationalism of the Leibnizian-Wolffian tradition, through the enormous novelty of Kant's transcendental, critical philosophy, and onward through Romanticism to the grandly systematic philosophies of German idealism in all its forms. The three chapters mentioned mark distinctive moments in this troubled but richly productive encounter.

In the first part of the nineteenth century, modern philosophy as it was being practiced in Germany underwent a series of dramatic transformations, thanks to the chorus of philosophers who arose in rebellion against German Idealism, such as Feuerbach and Marx, Schelling and Kierkegaard. By the last third of the nineteenth century, this diverse group had further fragmented into a host of competing philosophical

movements. Neo-Kantianism, one of the foremost trends in academic philosophy, was represented in one of its most characteristic forms at the University of Marburg by Hermann Cohen (the first Jew to hold a full professorship at a German University).³ Elsewhere in both Germany and France, philosophers such as Wilhelm Dilthey and Henri Bergson developed new theories of human temporality and historicity – popularized as “life-philosophy,” “Weltanschauungs-philosophy,” and “vitalism.” Such theories found a ready audience in a younger generation that was already drawing various and often contradictory lessons from both the Christian existentialism of Dostoyevsky and the corrosive atheism of Friedrich Nietzsche. By the time of World War I, such currents were supplemented by more popular movements such as neo-romantic socialism and socialist Zionism and, in academic philosophy, by new bids for philosophical rigor such as phenomenology, as developed by Edmund Husserl (himself a baptized German Jew).

Here, too, Jewish thinkers sought to understand Judaism in the context of this new intellectual ferment and at a time when urban life was dramatically transformed and people in the cities of Europe were facing new cultural and social crises.⁴ It was during this period, from the turn of the century through the Weimar Republic and the rise of Nazism, that Judaism itself faced a new and rapidly changing modernity. In this history, Martin Buber is a central figure at nearly every stage in his long career, from the period of his youthful engagement with Zionism through his recovery of Hasidic texts and profound interest in mysticism in Judaism and throughout world cultures, to the formulation of his dialogical philosophy and his study and translation of the Hebrew Bible. In her wide-ranging chapter on Buber’s thought, Tamra Wright demonstrates the integrity of these various strands.

Between World War I and the end of the Weimar Republic, another figure of critical importance for modern Jewish philosophy was Franz Rosenzweig, whose existential vision of Jewish life continues both to inspire and perplex even today. Peter Gordon, in his chapter on Rosenzweig, pays special attention to the nuances and tensions of Rosenzweig’s major philosophical system, *The Star of Redemption*. Rosenzweig was only one philosopher within the manifold movement of German-Jewish thought that came to prominence in the 1920s. Another was Leo Strauss, whose influential (and, to some, controversial) political philosophy and unique interpretation of the Jewish tradition are explored in the present volume in the chapter by Steven Smith. Also of central importance for modern Jewish philosophy was the historian of Jewish mysticism, Gershom Scholem, whose historical reflections on

the Kabbalah and Jewish messianism left a demonstrable imprint upon the philosophical writings of his friend, Walter Benjamin. In his wide-ranging chapter on the significance of modern Jewish messianism, Pierre Bouretz attempts to distinguish two different kinds of messianism in the writings of Strauss, Rosenzweig, Benjamin, Cohen, and Ernst Bloch.

In the years just prior to World War II, and even in the period that immediately followed, Jewish philosophy in Israel remained largely in the hands of historians. Meanwhile, in North America, the native Jewish thought of Mordecai Kaplan, a blending of sociology and pragmatism and a form of religious naturalism, took root just as America was undergoing the kind of urbanization and secularization that had characterized Europe a half-century before. But at the same time, many immigrant Jewish philosophers and young Jewish intellectuals in the New World were beginning to appropriate the existential philosophy then fashionable in North American intellectual culture for their own purposes. This existentialism had been originally developed in both Weimar Germany and in France by such thinkers as Martin Heidegger, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Albert Camus. In Christian circles, young readers also looked back for inspiration to Karl Barth, Rudolph Bultmann, and Paul Tillich. In the 1950s and 1960s in America, the outcome of this "importation" of French and German existentialism was an interdenominational movement of Jewish theologians, some of them philosophers, whose approach to Judaism was grounded in the historicity and situational rootedness of human existence. Amongst them were Michael Wyschogrod, Lou Silberman, Bernard Martin, and Emil Fackenheim. And there were others, more theological than philosophical, who should be mentioned in association with these developments: Will Herberg, Abraham Joshua Heschel, and Eugene Borowitz. In these early post-war years, alongside naturalist Jewish philosophy and its existential opponents, there were also traditional Jewish philosophers such as Marvin Fox, and traditional Halakhic thinkers such as Joseph Soloveitchik. In his chapter on Soloveitchik for this volume, Lawrence Kaplan clarifies Soloveitchik's significant philosophical debts to both Marburg Neo-Kantianism and to Platonism.

Until the mid- to late 1960s, the shadow of the Nazi death camps was an ever-present but virtually unacknowledged background to Jewish life and belief in Europe, Israel, and North America. But when our attention at last turned to confront that shadow with greater intellectual precision, amongst those who did so were a number of Jewish philosophers. Hannah Arendt was one such philosopher (although she always abjured the title of "philosopher," preferring instead "political theorist"). Indeed,

Arendt was probably the earliest. Her comments on Judaism reflect her complex relation to Zionism, while her probing (if sometimes controversial) reflections on Nazism, the death camps, and the origins of totalitarianism also had roots in political philosophy and existentialism, and continue to be of singular importance for Jewish philosophy today. But the Holocaust also raises a host of more general and strictly philosophical questions about the meaning of Jewish suffering and the significance of evil as such: how can one reconcile the notion of a benevolent God with the experience of unqualified cruelty? Is not God as conceived by Judaism a God of history, and if so, how can we still confirm God's presence in history given the dismal historical record of our own modern era? Does the traditional Jewish explanation for evil still hold true, or must it be revised in light of the Holocaust? Such issues are discussed most fully in Berel Lang's chapter on the role of evil and suffering in modern Jewish philosophy. Related themes were addressed by traditionalist thinkers such as Eliezer Berkovits. But it was undoubtedly Emil Fackenheim who first attempted to raise such questions to a truly philosophical plane. In his chapter on Fackenheim, Michael Morgan discusses Fackenheim's life-long encounter with the Holocaust from the early post-war years through the publication of *To Mend the World* in 1982.

At least two themes in late twentieth-century intellectual culture have forced Judaism to the center of attention of many intellectuals, both European and American. One theme is that of the "Other," a term signifying a person or collective defined by their exclusion from the social whole. Many historians and political theorists have claimed that the Jew has functioned as the traditional paradigm of the Other in the West; this has been the case since the rise of Christianity in antiquity, when the Church defined itself at least in part in opposition to Judaism and Jews.⁵ A second and related theme is the special role that the Holocaust and Nazism have come to play as signifying the end of modernity and the so-called end of philosophy as conventionally understood. When one considers these two themes in concert, one can better understand why the image of the Jew-as-excluded-Other has come in philosophical discussion to occupy a fascinating (and, paradoxically, central) position as the primary signifier for alterity, or otherness as such. Such categories – difference, otherness, exclusion – have been especially important for two of the most prominent philosophers of post-war Europe: Jacques Derrida and Emmanuel Levinas. Both were French Jews, although they hailed from different cultures – Derrida was born in Algeria, Levinas in Lithuania. And both of them, albeit in distinctive ways, made creative use of European intellectual traditions in both phenomenology and the

philosophy of language. In his chapter on Levinas, Richard Cohen helps us to understand how Levinas's thought represents a special reinterpretation of Jewish monotheism. And in her wide-ranging chapter on language and interpretation, Leora Batnitzky calls attention to the special role that language plays in Derrida's thought.

Yet, notwithstanding the philosophical merits of Jewish difference, we must also admit that one of the most pervasive features of the modern Jewish condition is the simple fact of inclusion. The ideals of the Enlightenment eventually led to civic emancipation, and however ferocious the opposition, the basic provision for civic equality between Jews and non-Jews would now appear to be largely uncontroversial, and in any case inalterable. To an extraordinary degree, modern Jews today now participate (or, at least, are legally and culturally permitted to participate) in the full range of social and intellectual life in the West. This in itself is a fact to be celebrated. But the experience of inclusion has also raised a great number of philosophical questions as to how best to reconcile the singular commitments of Jewish life with the moral-political requirements of universal inclusion: does modernity require Jews to surrender their particularism entirely? Or does there remain the possibility of a more subtle dialectic between universalism and particularism? Philosophers have attempted to negotiate such a dialectic with varying degrees of success. Indeed, Judaism's entry into the modern world is so pervasive a feature of modern Jewish history that one might well argue that the continued tension *between* universalism and particularism is at the heart of all responsible modern Jewish thinking. In his chapter on Moses Mendelssohn, Alan Arkush explains why Mendelssohn's struggle with political liberalism was ultimately unsuccessful. And, in his essay on Hermann Cohen, Andrea Poma examines Cohen's philosophical and political efforts to achieve a reconciliation between Kantian universalism and Jewish distinctiveness.

Zionist aspirations unleashed a great number of intellectual reflections, some of which, such as Hess's *Rome and Jerusalem*, are strongly philosophical in character. But perhaps more importantly, the growth of Zionism as a cultural and political movement among Jews made demands upon Jewish philosophers to come to grips with Judaism's historical and political nature, its conception of messianism, the nature of the relationship between Judaism and the State of Israel, and, indeed, broader questions concerning the very existence of both a Jewish state and Jewish life in the Diaspora. From Buber to Heschel, from Fackenheim to Yeshayahu Leibowitz, Jewish philosophical thinkers have felt moved, if not compelled, to respond to these matters. One might argue that

reflections on Israel took on a different sense of urgency and a different content after the Six-Day War and the linkage, in popular Jewish consciousness and imagination, of the rise and defense of the Jewish state with the Holocaust and the destruction of European Jewry. The prominence of Israel in public life after that war, through the 1970s and into the 1980s, made it somehow imperative for Jewish philosophers to come to grips with the state and its meaning for Judaism, both as a historical reality and as an element in Jewish conceptual self-understanding.

Discussion about the roles of women in Judaism has only recently become a central feature of Jewish philosophy. It no doubt drew considerable inspiration from the sophisticated streams of feminist theory that emerged in the wake of the civil rights movement, the New Left, and the ethnicity- and identity-politics of the United States since the late 1960s. The increased sensitivity to issues of gender and general issues concerning human sexuality and the body has had a tremendous impact on both Jewish social experience and Jewish intellectual life as well. Most decisive of all was the impact of Simone de Beauvoir's landmark treatise on feminist theory, *The Second Sex* (1949), which forever dissolved the myth that male experience can be identified with the universal. So, too, much of twentieth-century philosophy has evinced a new seriousness about the gendered or embodied character of human existence. Philosophers such as Heidegger and, even more so, Merleau-Ponty have alerted us to the primacy of existential and affective factors in the constitution of experience. Merleau-Ponty was especially attentive to the role of the body in human perception. Anglo-American philosophy, by contrast, has seemed predominantly rationalist. But we would do well to recall that even philosophers such as Spinoza, Hume, Hutcheson, and the Romantics thought with great nuance about human psychology and its moral implications. Similarly, while modern Jewish philosophy has had its rationalist side, it has also demonstrated a deep appreciation for non-rational features of Jewish life. Yet a pronounced sensitivity to diversity and embodiment has become a central and perhaps even a defining feature of recent feminist work within the orbit of Judaism. In her wide-ranging chapter on Jewish feminist philosophy, Tamar Rudavsky sets out the philosophical dimensions of this discussion and takes special note of its embeddedness in recent social and historical developments within the Jewish world.

Modern Jewish philosophy has not come to an end. But its historical development has perhaps come to a point when reviewing that history and its most significant characteristics might prove to be a rewarding task. Today there are new and emerging ways of understanding the

demands of Jewish life and thought that break with some traditions of the past, only to cling to others. Modern Jewish philosophy presents us with an array of attempts to negotiate this challenge. The modern tradition as we see it today is rich, provocative, and adaptive, yet also restive and iconoclastic. It is itself a tradition to be appreciated and examined as efforts are made either to extend that tradition or to call it into question. Looking to the future, it is best to get one's bearings. The present volume is an attempt to help us do just that.

Notes

1. See especially Leo Strauss, "Jerusalem and Athens," in Leo Strauss, *Jewish Philosophy and the Crisis of Modernity*, ed. Kenneth Hart Green (SUNY, 1997), 377–405. And for Levinas, see various essays in *Difficult Freedom, In the Midst of the Nations*, and *Beyond the Verse*. In addition to *Encounters Between Judaism and Modern Philosophy* (Basic, 1973), a notable example of Fackenheim's examination of the shortcomings of modern philosophy and of what Judaism can contribute to it occurs in his book *The Religious Dimension of Hegel's Thought*. See also his essay "Hermann Cohen: After 50 Years," originally a Leo Baeck Institute lecture in 1970, reprinted in Michael L. Morgan (ed.), *Jewish Philosophers and Jewish Philosophy* (Indiana University Press, 1996).
2. For discussion, see Chapters 5 and 4 by Poma and Franks, respectively, in the present volume.
3. Along with the neo-Kantian school centered at Marburg, one should recall the crucial intellectual developments associated with the "Southwest" school (at Heidelberg and Freiburg) led by both Wilhelm Windelband and Heinrich Rickert.
4. The turbulence of the age is reflected, in among other places, the work of thinkers such as Max Weber and Georg Simmel, the latter born a Jew and trained as a philosopher, whose classic work *The Philosophy of Money* (1900) portrays the economic, social, and psychological character of modern urban life.
5. This is a central theme of Steven B. Smith's *Spinoza, Liberalism, and the Question of Jewish Identity* (Chicago, 1997).