

## The Process of Modernization of Eastern Sephardi Communities

ESTHER BENBASSA

**I**N TRADITIONAL JUDAISM the present is seen as an attempt to perpetuate the ideals of the past; the latter serves as a model for the former.<sup>1</sup> Up until the first half of the nineteenth century, the Sephardi communities of the Near East fit this model of traditional Jewish society. This is not to say that these communities remained static and immutable. On the contrary, the Sephardi communities, like any society, underwent constant change as each generation made its own contribution to the traditional heritage.<sup>2</sup>

Change, however, is not synonymous with modernization. Modernity must be understood as a specific type of civilization which originated in Europe and spread throughout the world in various political, ideological, and economic forms.<sup>3</sup> Nor must the internal dynamics of non-Western societies be underestimated. In Europe, modernity was the fruit of endogenous evolution. Its spread to other lands, on the other hand, took place only amid the antagonism between external forces and the forces at work within the traditional societies themselves.<sup>4</sup> The reaction of traditional societies to the diffusion of modernity depended on several factors: (1) the level of relations with the West which developed in the countries where these societies, whether Muslim or Christian, were settled; and (2) the position of strength of each country relative to the Western powers from which it borrowed most heavily during the modernization process.

One type of relation between Western powers and the countries of the East was that of direct colonization, as was the case with the Austro-Hungarian colonization of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Another type of relation was that of the nation-state, such as Bulgaria, which had a European orientation and borrowed certain characteristically European ideas, such as nationalism. In the Ottoman Empire, it was a question of semi-colonization in economic terms. There were as many different sets of conditions as there were countries in a Near East which was looking more and more to the West. In Jewish societies, moreover, the influence

of several particular modernizing currents, which were reaching the Levant through Eastern Europe, could be felt. Among these currents were the Haskala and those emanating from the second generation of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* scholars active in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Through communication and exchange among the intellectual elite, such currents of ideas spread throughout the Jewish world in renewed forms.<sup>5</sup>

In traditional Jewish societies, modernization was not a passive process. The determination and action of local elites played a significant role. Bankers, financiers, and wealthy merchants who formed the economic elite found some of their own ideas and plans supported by those of certain intellectuals of the Haskala. The aspirations of these two groups converged. Mechanisms for change were taking shape in a Jewish bourgeoisie which was opening to the West. Not only did rich bankers encourage maskilic production; they also took the necessary steps to see that the projects of the Haskala were carried out, as had been done in Eastern Europe, with the participation of the maskilim.

As these two elite groups were not always able to rely solely on their own resources, they turned to their Western counterparts for support. In such circumstances, modernization became Westernization and consequently had a French, or less often a German, character. Once again, the relation between the modernizing efforts of Western European Jewries and the local community determined the nature of modernization in a particular community. In many cases the modernizing Jewries of the West played the role in the East which was filled in the West by the nation-state, which, in the name of uniformity, fought all corporate identities and sought to modernize its Jewish subjects through authoritarian means.<sup>6</sup> Jewish leaders in Western Europe, while interpreting local reforms in light of their own experience, felt that direct intervention in the Jewries of Islam was a justifiable means of helping these communities adapt to new contexts and circumstances.<sup>7</sup>

The next step in modernization involved the establishment in the Eastern communities of institutions and organizations representing the opinions and ideals of various European Jewish groups. Among these groups and organizations were the Alliance Israélite Universelle (AIU), the Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden, and the World Zionist Organization. Some of these participated in the French or German "civilizing mission" in the context of European imperialism of the period. This interventionism could not have been carried out without the complicity of the local elites in the Jewish communities of the Sephardi culture area in the East. These elites were predisposed to change and ready to join in the efforts of European Jews.

Thus, modernization in the Sephardi world took on various forms. Several different modernization movements underwent parallel developments. These

movements were diversely interpreted by the Jewish communities according to the local history of each, and the conditions under which each had established contact with the West. This variety of interpretations came about in spite of the fact that, although diverse, these communities all shared a common culture and historical origin.<sup>8</sup> There is yet another distinction to be made, although it is not an easy one, between the process of change within the communities and the influence of the models of more advanced societies upon this process.<sup>9</sup>

According to the local context and the possibilities it offered, the multiple processes of modernization generated internal transformation in many directions, sometimes going beyond the initial premises of any one particular modernizing movement.

In the middle of the nineteenth century, even before modernization was imposed upon them, Sephardi Jewries in the Balkans and Asia Minor were looking to the West for renewal, especially through the intermediary of its intellectuals. The contemporary evolution of West European Jews had a significant influence on the process of renewal in the East, as is demonstrated by the literature and journalism of the period. When Sephardi Jews began to turn to the West, Hebrew letters were relegated to a position of secondary importance and reserved for scholars and religious circles, although the nineteenth century did see the production of a vast rabbinic literature. For the rank-and-file, Judeo-Spanish became the principal vehicle of modernization.<sup>10</sup> Significantly, this language also served to maintain a link with the Spanish past of the early immigrants to this area.

In the eighteenth century, the popularization of rabbinic literature had maintained the vitality of the vernacular. This trend was begun in 1730 by Jacob ben Makhir Houlli with the publication of the first *Me'am Lo'ez* (From the speakers of a foreign tongue).<sup>11</sup> Such publications flourished again in the nineteenth century, in the form of new editions of already published volumes as well as original work.<sup>12</sup> Houlli's book was followed by others, such as the *Koplas de Yosef Hašadik* (Verse of Joseph), 1732, and the *Maasiot del sinyor de Yakov Avinu* (Stories of the Patriarch Jacob), 1748 (reedited in 1870), both works in verse.<sup>13</sup>

The translation of works addressing Jewish issues from Hebrew and other languages into Judeo-Spanish began as early as the first decade of the nineteenth century. This trend became stronger among the maskilim, encouraged by the influence of the second generation of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*.<sup>14</sup> Next to the translated were works of historiography. In fact, the passion for history of this period, not only Jewish history but also world history, represented both a certain secularization and a desire to learn one's own history and origins before they were swept away in the wave of modernization.

After the 1880s, imported modernization gave a new impetus to the publi-

cation of historical works, biographies, collections of poetry, plays, doctrinal works, pedagogical texts in diverse disciplines, works on Ottoman law, sermons, and ritual prayers with poems in Judeo-Spanish. This mixture of translations and original works in the vernacular, borrowing as much from traditional as from secular literature, was a reflection of the complex evolution of Sephardi Judaism of that period.<sup>15</sup> The Protestant mission based in Istanbul also contributed to the diffusion of Judeo-Spanish culture, both through the newspaper *El Manadero* (The Source) (1855–58) and through Jewish and Christian religious works.<sup>16</sup>

There followed, at the beginning of the twentieth century, a wave of novels translated from French, Italian, Russian, and Hebrew; it continued until the 1930s.<sup>17</sup> This literature, which included the best foreign works of the period, was published in newspapers in installments, generally adapted and significantly abridged. These serial installments were then bound and sold to the general public. They were extremely popular. "Romance" novels, intended for women in particular, were also published. Western models thus found their way into the culture, first influencing women and then, through them, reaching families. Editors, writers, and journalists also translated the great authors of contemporary Hebrew literature into Judeo-Spanish. They similarly translated texts from Yiddish literature, such as those of Sholom Aleichem, Isaac Loeb Peretz, and Sholem Asch, thus establishing a link with the rest of the Jewish world.<sup>18</sup>

This profusion of translations stifled local literary creation. The end of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century were not notable for the production of great original works. The authors and journalists, writers of original novels in Judeo-Spanish, could not compete with the novelists for whom they themselves were often translators. More emphasis was placed on the production of didactic works. Developments in modern teaching methods and theories made this type of work indispensable; it brought the most recent advances of the sciences to the people in a vulgarized form. Along with the prodigious growth of French in the Ottoman and Bulgarian cities, the publication of primers in Judeo-Spanish increased, while the learning of Hebrew continued to decline.<sup>19</sup>

The role played by the press, both in disseminating the key ideas of modernity and in protecting traditional culture—at least the popular Judeo-Spanish version of that culture—cannot be disputed. The press saw its most important development between the years 1870 and 1880. This period witnessed the production of solid, serious newspapers which were to continue to appear for a long time to come. There was, in this period, a proliferation of newspapers in Judeo-Spanish but only a few publications in French, in spite of the success that language enjoyed at the time.

Journalists such as Saadi Betzalel (Saadi Beşalel) Halevy, his son Sam (Shemuel Saadi) Levy, Yehezkel Gabai, David Fresco, David Florentin, and David Elnecavé shaped this Jewry, each defending the ideology of the camp to which he belonged. Each acted as spokesman for the new current of ideas which was permeating the Jewish world, yet none of them ever denied their Jewishness or their cultural and historical patrimony.

The Haskala movement played a role parallel to that of literature and the press, which were instruments of modernity and, at the safe time, guardians, at least as concerns language, of a certain aspect of the traditional Jewish world. The Haskala did not encounter the strong opposition that other sources of imported modernization did. Introduced through Eastern Europe by Jewish intellectuals, the Haskala movement was neither imposed from above nor truly institutionalized. Furthermore, it affected only a small number of people. The Sephardi maskilim came from traditionalist milieus, as did the originators of the movement in Western Europe and the majority of their Eastern European counterparts. There was not a variety of currents in the religious spheres of the Sephardi world comparable to that of the Ashkenazim (where there were Hasidim, the Reformers, and the Orthodox), so no organized front was formed against the Haskala.<sup>20</sup> If the social credo of such maskilim as Yuda Nehama and Barukh Mitrani was modern education and "productivization," they nonetheless did not advocate assimilation or a move away from Judaism. The Haskala did not develop assimilationist tendencies in the Sephardi culture area as had certain maskilic currents in Eastern Europe.

The second generation of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* found in Abraham Danon, a maskil from Edirne, one of its best representatives in the eastern Sephardi world. A student of Joseph Halevi, who brought the Haskala to Edirne, Danon devoted himself to scientific and literary study. While working at the *beit din* (rabbinic court), he also contributed in large measure to the opening of the AIU school in his city. In 1879 he was among a group of young people who founded *Hevrat Shoharei Tushiah* (Society of the Friends of Practical Wisdom), also called *Dorshei ha-Haskalah* (Friends of the Haskala). This group was inspired by the desire for learning and the hope of bringing the Jews out of moral and material impoverishment.<sup>21</sup> The organization was devoted to the discussion of the Hebrew and Judeo-Spanish press and the popularization of Jewish history and literature, drawing on the work of important scholars.<sup>22</sup>

In 1882 the *Dorshei ha-Haskalah* created an apprenticeship and training program, *ha-Pe'ulah* (Action), with the financial assistance of the AIU. Another goal of the *Dorshei ha-Haskalah* was to bring Ottoman Jewry into the European *Wissenschaft* movement.<sup>23</sup> At one point, the group was involved in the publication of a journal which was to encourage studies on Ottoman Jewry and report

on the most recent research. It may be that even those who spoke in favor of modernization feared that their traditional patrimony would be overshadowed through this rapprochement with the West. This realization of a potential break with the past was in itself a sign of the modernity of which Danon had appointed himself spokesman. In 1888 the first issue of his journal was published, both in Hebrew under the title *Yosef Da'at* (Growth of Knowledge) and in Judeo-Spanish (also in "Hebrew" characters), with the name *El Progreso* (Progress).<sup>24</sup> The journal survived only from March to December 1888, when it was suspended by the government. Danon was seeking to establish harmony between traditional learning and Western science. He called for the study of the texts of Maimonides and of languages other than Hebrew while maintaining the importance of a Hebrew language renaissance and of the preservation of the mother tongue, Judeo-Spanish.<sup>25</sup> A scholar of international renown and founder of the Rabbinical Seminary of Turkey in 1891, Danon had much in common with the creators of the second generation of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*.

Other maskilic societies were formed in the Ottoman Empire. Since they were developing in parallel to imposed Westernization and because of their particular objectives, these societies were soon transformed into centers for the strengthening of Jewish identity. It was not by chance that the Kadima (Forward) Society—founded in Salonika in 1899 by *talmidei hakhamim* (traditional scholars) who, after having studied in the *yeshivot* (religious academies), undertook the study of French and secular subjects—joined with the *Fédération sioniste de Grèce* in 1918.<sup>26</sup> The goal of these societies was to cultivate Hebrew and create public interest in the language, to bring instruction to the masses through Hebrew, and to clarify and affirm religious faith through the development of Jewish studies. This program carried out a revival of what these societies claimed was tradition while using methods inspired by the most recent developments among Western Jews.

These associations and the maskilim called for a certain kind of modernization; at the same time they served to soften the shock of modernization being imposed from the outside. They established a kind of bridge between modernity and Jewish nationalism. Although their impact on the Jewish community at large was not considerable, they contributed to the education of a new generation of intellectuals who, in their own way, brought about this passage. Work begun by the Haskala and the second generation of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* was continued by a whole succession of historians of Sephardi Jewry. They strove to record the histories of their communities and were equally inspired by the romanticism of a paradise lost. Among these historians, who were at once promoters of modernity and guardians of a past era, were Salomon Rosanès (1862–1938), from Bulgaria;<sup>27</sup> Abraham Galanté (1873–1961), an intellectual from

Istanbul; Joseph Nehama (1880–1971), director of one of the AIU schools in Salonika; and Michael Molho (1891–1964), also from Salonika. Other scholars set about documenting various aspects of Sephardi folklore, and the press followed the course set by the scholars.

Another movement within the varied responses to modernity took shape at the end of the nineteenth century among the Sephardi Jews of Bosnia in the context of emancipation in Central Europe. It was precisely in areas where conditions seemed most favorable for the development of modernization that the "Sephardist" movement was born. Although modernization advocated the elimination of particularisms, particularism in its Sephardi form emerged as an alternative to the Ashkenazi environment and to the unification proposed by Zionism in representing a means of preserving Jewish identity against the wave of total assimilation. In 1898 there arose a group of Sephardi students in Vienna, among whom was Vita Hayon from Sarajevo, who was later to become the spiritual leader of the movement. After having been exposed to Western ideologies through their studies, this group created *La soysedad akademika de djudios espanyoles: Esperansa* (Academic Society of Spanish Jews: Hope).<sup>28</sup> These students sought a way to effect an organizational and cultural awakening among Sephardi Jews in order that they might contribute to Judaism as a whole and, in so doing, protect their own historical and linguistic heritage.

Many Sephardi intellectuals participated in this association. What began as a cultural movement eventually became an ideological movement. The Sephardim envisioned the development of a Zionism in diaspora; their goal was to carry out their work both in the Diaspora and in Palestine. The Zionists of Zagreb, dominant in the movement, were opposed to this idea.<sup>29</sup> In 1925 at the second Sephardi World Conference, organized in Vienna, the representatives from Yugoslavia decided to create a *Fédération Sépharade* whose center was originally intended to be established in Jerusalem, but which was finally located in Paris.<sup>30</sup> There began a considerable conflict between those who held to the Sephardist proposition and the Zionists, who had tried to unite Sephardim and Ashkenazim under the same banner. The Sephardim from Belgrade created their own branch of the *Fédération*, which was concerned not only with cultural issues in the Diaspora but also with the improvement of the status of the Sephardim in Palestine. The violent polemic between the Zionists and the Sephardists, known as the "Sarajevo dispute," continued until 1928. The Sephardist ideology, however, hardly influenced the next generation of Sephardim.

The modernization of states and that of these eastern Jewish communities were necessarily different processes, for there were different issues at stake among the ethnic-religious minority groups. The modernization of European Jews had taken place within the state as part of a natural internal development,

the process reaching completion there where it had begun. As has been observed, there were many differences between that kind of internal modernization and one which was exported to other societies.

In the Sephardi culture area, modernization was imposed upon the Jewish populations who were perceived, first of all, as a religious minority. There is no doubt that this perception bound the Jews to their condition of Jewishness. They could not aspire to assimilation; when they did so aspire, they failed. Furthermore, even within the limits of the Sephardi communities it is difficult to generalize about the effects of the modernization process, for circumstances varied considerably from one region to another. Where nation-states were involved, Jewish members of the state had no sooner been assimilated than they began to consider new developments and possibilities in the Jewish world, in particular, nationalism and Zionism.

In cases where modernization was of an assimilationist tendency, the same obstacles were met. Assimilation, when it existed, involved only certain regions and appeared only late in the process of modernization. In the Ottoman Empire, the AIU wanted the Jews to be integrated into the societies in which they lived. By teaching French to the Jews and by inculcating Western values in them, the AIU impeded their integration through a paradox which is of the very essence of this type of modernization. The AIU, in fact, cultivated Jewish particularism in spite of itself, contrary to the ideology inherent in the modernization process.

Zionism, also imported, became a stumbling block to integration through its strengthening of Jewish identity. Even the intensive "Bulgarization" carried out in Bulgaria did not lead to assimilation; Zionism caused it to change course. In Yugoslavia, which represents a case similar to Bulgaria but in which the AIU was not involved, the development of Zionism was not as spectacular as in Bulgaria. The Sephardim developed a Sephardist movement which was to reinforce Jewish identity, in a certain measure, and offered an alternative to Zionism. In Greece, on the other hand, Zionism succeeded in gaining strength.

In sum, there was neither a single model of modernization nor a single modernization process in the Eastern Sephardi world. Responses to modernization were, in their turn, multiple. Imposed modernization was thwarted by a certain number of those concerned. Modernization was a source of conflict; unsuccessful in completely supplanting tradition, it had to adapt tradition to a new context instead, and was unable to reach the masses except through an alliance with tradition. When it was divorced from tradition, modernization was used only as a means to an end by certain elites seeking to take over community leadership. So it was that the Sephardim remained for a long time in a position between what could be called a declining tradition and a still fragile modernity.

## NOTES

1. Jacob Katz, *Tradition and Crisis: Jewish Society at the End of the Middle Ages*, 3d ed. (New York: Schocken, 1977), p. 214; Jacques Le Goff, *Histoire et mémoire*, 2d ed. (Paris: Gallimard, 1988), p. 43.
2. S. N. Eisenstadt, *Tradition and Change and Modernity* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973), p. 153; Katz, *Tradition*, p. 214.
3. S. N. Eisenstadt, ed., *Patterns of Modernity*, vol. 1 (London: Frances Pinter, 1987), p. 5; Le Goff, *Historie*, p. 61.
4. Eisenstadt, *Tradition*, p. 259.
5. For the Haskala in Central and Eastern Europe, see Jacob Katz, ed., *Toward Modernity: The European Jewish Model* (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1987).
6. On the formation of the French nation, see Pierre Rosanvallon, *L'Etat en France de 1789 à nos jours* (Paris: Seuil, 1990), pp. 100-110.
7. *Archives Israélites*, no. 17 (1856), pp. 504-5, 511.
8. On the reinterpretation of modernity, see Dominique Schnapper, "The Jews and Political Modernity in France," in Eisenstadt, *Patterns*, vol. 1, p. 158; I. M. Lapidus, "Islam and Modernity," in Eisenstadt, *Patterns*, vol. 2, p. 91.
9. C. E. Black, *The Dynamics of Modernization* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 50.
10. See the essay in this volume by David M. Bunis (chap. 13).
11. Michael Molho, *Meam Loez: Encyclopédie populaire du séphardisme levantin* (Salonika, 1945).
12. Abraham Ya'ari, *Reshimat sifrei ladino ha-nimsaim be-veit ha-sefarim ha-le'umi ve-ha-universitari bi-Yerushalayim* (Catalogue of Judeo-Spanish books in the Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem) (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1934), pp. 7-8.
13. Moïse Franco, *Essai sur l'histoire des Israélites de l'Empire ottoman* (Paris: Centre Isaac Abravanel, U.I.S.F., 1980 [1897]), p. 123.
14. Franco, *Essai*, pp. 266-75; Abraham Elmaleh, "Ha-sifrut ve-ha-štonut ha-spanyolit" (Judeo-Spanish literature and press), *Ha-Shiloah*, 26, no. 1, part 1 (1912):70-71; Zvi Loker, ed., *Pinqas Ha-Qehillot—Yugoslavia* (Encyclopaedia of Jewish communities—Yugoslavia) (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1988), p. 208.
15. Michael Molho, "Sefarim be-yehudit-sefaradit she-nidpesu be-Saloniqi" (Judeo-Spanish books printed in Salonika), in *Salonique: Ville-Mère en Israël* (Tel Aviv: Centre de Recherches sur le Judaïsme Salonique, 1967), p. 70.
16. Franco, *Essai*, p. 276; Elmaleh, "Ha-sifrut," p. 73.
17. Ya'ari, *Reshimat*, pp. 59-89.
18. Molho, "Sefarim," p. 100.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
20. Simon Marcus, "Le-toldot ha-yehudim be-Adrianopoli" (Contribution to the history of the Jews of Edirne), *Sinai* 29 (1951):334.
21. *Bolitinio de la soysedad Dorshei ha-Haskalah* (Bulletin of the Society Dorshei ha-Haskalah) (Adrianople: Press of the State, 5649 [1889]), pp. 3-4.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

26. Archives de l'Alliance Israélite Universelle, Grèce I. G. 3, J. Nehama, 13 January 1903 (date of receipt).
27. See the essay by Jacob Barnai in this volume (chap. 2).
28. Harriet Pass Freidenreich, *The Jews of Yugoslavia: A Quest for Community* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1979), p. 151; Loker, *Pinqas*, p. 210.
29. Freidenreich, *The Jews of Yugoslavia*, pp. 147–48.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 149. On the Fédération, see, for example, the following documents from the Central Zionist Archives: Z4/2447, World Organization of Sephardi Jews (report), 1923; M. Ussishkin to World Zionist Organization, 1 January 1924; A. Romano to World Zionist Organization, 24 February 1925; J. Jacobs to L. J. Stein, 9 March 1925; Z4/3222 Ia, Saul Mézan to Zionist Executive, 29 April 1925.