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Abstract
Lily Montagu, with Claude Montefiore, helped found Liberal Judaism in England. However, despite recent scholarship restoring Montagu’s biography, there has been little analysis of the ways in which she applied Montefiore’s Liberal theology, in particular his vague conception of holiness. Indeed, while Montefiore’s definition of kedushah broke with biblical/rabbinic understandings of God’s separateness, he found defining a Liberal version of holiness difficult. This article analyses the ways in which Montagu expanded on Montefiore’s definition of kedushah to demonstrate God’s immanence in the everyday. To Montagu, revealing the holy in day-to-day routines was essential to her quest to bring the holy to spiritually disengaged Anglo-Jews. Moreover, under Montagu’s guidance, ensuring each religionist’s “realisation of God’s presence” became a vital component of the burgeoning Liberal Jewish movement.

Lily Montagu (1873-1963), along with Claude Montefiore (1858–1938), played a vital role in the administrative, spiritual and liturgical development of Liberal Judaism in London. Montagu not only developed the first Anglo-Liberal liturgy,¹ but was one of the first Anglo-Jewish women to preach and minister to an established synagogue.² In particular, Montagu devoted her life to Anglo-Liberal Judaism and its intellectual progenitor, Montefiore.³ Montagu’s vast corpus is testament to her commitment to expounding Montefiore’s theoretical elucidation of Liberal Judaism and its universalistic principles. In fact, her role in garnering support for the Jewish Religious Union (JRU),⁴ which aimed to vitalise Anglo-Jewry,⁵ has resulted in Montagu being dubbed the “real founder” of Anglo-Liberal Judaism.⁶ However, the marginalisation of Montagu’s role in the establishment of Liberal Judaism is well documented.⁷ Despite recent contributions to the restoration of Montagu’s biography considerable gaps remain,⁸ including examination of her practical application of Montefiore’s Liberal theology. This is specifically true of his definition of kedushah (holiness) which broke with traditional understandings of God’s separateness.⁹ Accordingly, this article first analyses Montefiore’s conception of holiness and its divergence from the biblical and rabbinic traditions. Consequently, the article examines the ways in which Montagu applied Liberal Judaism’s definition of kedushah to relativize the movement’s claim that religionists should try to engage with God themselves.¹⁰ Montagu, echoing Montefiore, believed that “through faith ...
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life in its entirety is made holy.”¹¹ Montagu’s commitment to demonstrating God’s immanence pervades her sermons, essays, monographs, lectures, letters, liturgies and papers, and her novel, Naomi’s Exodus, the hero of which experiences kedushah in the everyday.¹² For Montagu, revealing the holy in daily routines was a necessity given her awareness of growing inter-marriage, secularisation, and diminishing interest in traditional forms of worship.¹³ Montagu lamented that the “treasures of Judaism lay hidden” from some Anglo-Jews and that “there were many who chafed at the old teaching and found the observances meaningless.”¹⁴ In particular, Montagu hoped to show religionists the means by which they could bring kedushah to their own lives, “whatever they were doing,”¹⁵ to necessarily avoid not only what she identified as “spiritual lethargy,” but Anglo-Jews jettisoning faith altogether.¹⁶ This would entail, Montagu argued, the organisation of a new movement capable of ensuring each religionist’s “realisation of God’s presence.”¹⁷

In the Tanach kedushah is explained through a clear dichotomy between pure and impure.¹⁸ The Holiness Code in Leviticus 17-26 demands kedushah in all aspects of communal life.¹⁹ Indeed, “Ye shall be holy; for I the LORD your God am holy” (19:2).²⁰ Thus, for the impure – separation is required.²¹ The application of the Holiness Code is exemplified by the statement: “love the LORD your God” and “walk in all His ways” (Deuteronomy 11:22-24). God’s holiness is identified by the seraphim in Isaiah 6:3: “Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory.”²² Isaiah is saved only by the seraphim absolving his sins (6:6-7).²³ Rudolf Otto claimed that the book of Isaiah provides the definition par excellence of God’s holiness.²⁴ God is transcendent, other,²⁵ separate,²⁶ and beyond words.²⁷ The profane and the holy are incompatible. Thus, when Uzzah “put forth his hand to the ark ... God smote him there for his error; and there he died” (2 Samuel 6:6-7).²⁸ The holiness of God inspires terror, meaning that in Exodus 20:14-15 Moses must mediate between God and the Israelites. The divine rejects anything unholy.²⁹ Kedushah requires that any person not pure be separated from God.³⁰ Rabbinic Judaism built on the biblical understanding of holiness and its emphasis on separation.³¹ For the rabbis, “The way of the Holy One, Blessed be He, is in holiness. … He is fearful and mighty in holiness” (Berachoth 13a);³² certainly, God’s “holiness is above your holiness” (Genesis Rabbah 90:2).³³ The rabbinic tradition explained God’s
presence in the Torah through *Shekhinah*. This presence signified God’s immanence and was necessary given that *Kadosh Barukh Hu* was distinct from humanity.\(^3^4\) *Shekhinah*, at least in rabbinic tradition, was not a distinct personality; rather, *Shekhinah* was a manifestation of God.\(^3^5\) After the destruction of the Second Temple the question of holiness was resolved with the new assumption that *kedushah* was not dependent on locality.\(^3^6\) Rabbinic Judaism refigured *kedushah* so that it could be experienced anywhere through prayers and/or Torah-study.\(^3^7\) Holiness was projected through Torah, and its rabbinic interpretation, into the realm of everyday life.\(^3^8\) Therefore, association with the holy (*kodesh*) became dependent on spiritual devotion (*kavanah*) and a preliminary stage in the struggle for *chasiduth* – being saintly.\(^3^9\) In fact, any act that transgressed Torah was considered impure.\(^4^0\) Alternatively, the completion of a *mitzvah*, combined with *kavanah* and avoidance of *tumah*, in effect, imitating God, enabled holiness.\(^4^1\) In rabbinic tradition holiness refers to “*Imitatio Dei*.”\(^4^2\) In fact, “The Holy One, blessed be He, says to man, ‘… If you return it to Me in the same state of purity that I give it to you, well and good; if not, I will destroy you’” (Leviticus Rabbah 18:1).\(^4^3\) Therefore, on the basis that “purity leads to holiness” (Avodah Zarah 20b), seeking to be “God-like” was essential.\(^4^4\)

Montefiore, in identifying both the “flowers” and the “weeds” of rabbinic tradition,\(^4^5\) struggled with the notion of God’s *separateness*. Todd Endelman describes Montefiore as a “theological radical.”\(^4^6\) Montefiore openly confessed to being more likely to sympathise with “‘Lib. [sic] Christians and Unitarians than with many (not all) Orthodox Jews,’”\(^4^7\) and was convinced that aspects of the Christian scriptures belonged to Jewish tradition.\(^4^8\) However, Montefiore was committed to maintaining a modern variant of Judaism.\(^4^9\) His Liberal Judaism accordingly rejected allegedly obsolete “ancient doctrines” and “legal elements” in favour of a universalistic emphasis on the “‘prophetic’” elements of Jewish tradition.\(^5^0\) Montefiore’s theological vision for Liberal Judaism adopted classical liberal principles while jettisoning the nationalistic/ritualistic elements of the tradition.\(^5^1\) Montefiore argued that Liberal Judaism’s theology was a product of “biblical criticism” and based on “progressive revelation.”\(^5^2\) Perhaps unsurprisingly therefore, Montefiore claimed that Liberal Judaism “rejects the idea of ‘holiness’ as attaching to things as well as to persons in a real, serious, and out-
ward sense.” Montefiore alternatively argued that the “character of holiness is acquired by holy deeds” rather than legal premises. Accordingly, it was necessary to “promote HOLINESS” by sanctifying the “drab of every day” and “our most familiar tasks.” Religionists would have to relate “the most trivial of our doings” to the “glory of God” and to try to lead a holy life. Montefiore was necessarily concerned that his definition of holiness be subjective. He claimed: “we must not break it upon the wheels of definition or seek to drive it into the prison of the categories.” Montefiore thus labelled holiness, rather tentatively, as “purity in body and soul,” permitting religionists a degree of individual interpretation. Contradicting rabbinic tradition, Montefiore contended that religionists need not fear being unable to attain holiness. Instead, he claimed that religionists were to “learn to love God and to commune with him” directly, marginalising rabbinic Judaism’s use of Shekhinah to explain God’s presence in the earthly realm. Montefiore was clear that while the rabbis felt it “necessary to over-emphasise the otherness” of God, “for any relations to exist between God and man, they must be able to communicate with each other.” It is hardly surprising then that Montefiore claimed that defining holiness was a “terrible affair.” The difficultly lay in trying to align holiness with the everyday.

Montagu was determined to fill the gaps in Montefiore’s definition of holiness. The conception of kedushah Montagu outlined is not dissimilar to Melissa Raphael’s linking of the holy, albeit in a very different context, to “service to God through the conditions of everyday life.” Montagu was intent on forging a “personalistic, ethical theology” of relatedness between Liberal religionists and God. Montagu, based on her reading of Montefiore, spoke about the necessity of forging spiritual connections in the everyday. Indeed, Montagu claimed:

I saw all around me how men and women were dropping Judaism because it seemed out of date and did not belong to their lives, and I had been shown by Dr Montefiore that they had not understood the meaning of their inheritance. They must be called back (“An Autobiographical Note,” 168).

Despite growing up in an orthodox household Montagu struggled to equate her own spiritual aspirations with those of her father. She would later claim that as a child “I was not con-
scious of any personal spiritual experience stimulated by the... festivals." Montagu’s early-teenage years were characterised by “spiritual anxiety.” She first came to experience God’s immanence and the value of the prophets through her tutor, Simeon Singer. But it was only when she met Montefiore that Montagu realised the possibility of redefining Judaism to account for her own spiritual aspirations. Montagu noted retrospectively that “The teaching of Liberal Judaism had set me free.” In fact, Montagu admitted to owing “a great deal to Mr Montefiore,” referred to him as “teacher” and herself as “his disciple,” and modestly claimed to be reliant on his help. In fact, beyond her close interest in the prophets, Montagu confessed to knowing little about the rabbinic or midrashic texts and refused to see herself in a scholarly capacity.

Despite her modesty, Montagu established the West Central Jewish Girls’ Club and accompanying congregation. Likewise, it was Montagu who inspired support for a formal movement in 1899. In The Faith of a Jewish Woman (1943) Montagu wrote that:

He [Montefiore] was too big a scholar for that position [leader]. But when I received letters from my correspondents to whom I submitted principles underlying the spiritual possibilities of my faith, he told me that he was prepared to accompany me in my adventure into the unknown. From that time, Mr. Montefiore’s leadership was given to the formation of the Jewish Religious Union (28).

The JRU was formed in 1902 and would later be renamed the JRU for the Advancement of Liberal Judaism (1909). Certainly, Montefiore himself described Montagu as the “originator and inspirer of the Jewish Religious Union.” Equally, Montagu claimed in retrospect that she:

longed that her friends might know what Judaism really meant, and should speak unto the generations by the fidelity of their lives. The faith of our fathers could not easily be cast aside. I felt impelled by a strong desire to found a movement to revitalise Judaism and rekindle the ancient lights so that these should cast a glow over the whole of life for all time (The Faith of a Jewish Woman, 27).

Daniel Langton argues that Montefiore was happy to let Montagu set the direction of the movement. Similarly, Lawrence Rigal and Rosita Rosenberg state that while Montefiore was the scholarly/intellectual influence behind Liberal Judaism, Montagu was the spiritual
Montagu was concerned that Liberal Judaism needed to modify the tradition to accommodate all religionists, regardless of gender, and pointed to the necessity of a “living faith” and the “actual need for contact with God.” To explain Liberal Judaism’s break with traditional practices Montagu, along with Israel Abrahams, claimed that the Law was not necessarily enduring, but was historically relative and open to subjective interpretation.

According to Montagu, the ceremonial elements of the tradition could only be preserved if they were able to infuse everyday life with holiness. Montagu believed that a “conscious relation between God and man” was essential. Therefore, she was critical of biblical/rabbinic understandings of kedushah and “the doctrine that sin separates us from God.” For Montagu, the purpose of Liberal Judaism was to encourage Anglo-Jews:

to join the search, and experience veneration in the presence of God. … The children must learn that the active, conscious search after God cannot be confined to morning and evening prayer, nor begun and ended on Sabbaths and festivals. The believing Jew and Jewess must seek guidance from God in the morning, be conscious of his presence throughout the day, and pray for a renewed inspiration at night (“Spiritual Possibilities of Judaism To-Day,” 226).

Montagu hoped that Liberal Judaism would bring God into the lives of its religionists; thus, holiness equated to a theologically inspired duty. This involved bringing the holy into the home and the workplace. Therefore, “The whole of life is holy” and even the “imperfect being can strain towards the perfect Creator.” Montagu claimed:

I believe in the God of Righteousness, and kinship with God makes human righteousness not only possible but desirable. “Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord Thy God am holy.” We think that through efforts and righteousness we can approach our God. The problem of faith versus works hardly presents itself to us because faith leads to righteousness. The two aspects of the religious life are closely related. By contact with God we can renew our power of righteousness (The Faith of a Jewish Woman, 67).
Specifically, holiness “mattered to God” given “his people had been called to be a holy people.” Montagu argued that it was vital that religionists realise “our Oneness with the Infinite Life” – “men” must become “God-men.” On this point Ellen Umansky suggests Montagu diverged from Montefiore, who claimed in Outlines of Liberal Judaism that “God is other than man. He is pure spirit. He is the source. He is perfect. Man is none of these. Immense, then, is the difference between them. Man is not God, or a part of God.” Montagu nevertheless agreed with Montefiore that kedushah must be sought independently. This belief was based on the assumption that “Because we have the power to attain holiness we are kin to the High and Lofty One … Our kinship with God is inevitable.” Like Montefiore, Montagu accepted that religionists imagine God in different ways. She therefore advised that kedushah was applicable to all:

freedom is a part of human holiness, which is akin to the divine. The thought of our kinship with God should make us disregard all that is fleeting and ephemeral. … Our hope is in God, as we endeavour humbly to walk with Him, doing justice and loving mercy when we catch a Ray of His divine light. … We cannot deny the glory of the sinner’s humanity without denying our own, for the God who conditions that glory is the Universal God, who dwells in every human soul to redeem and to save it for good. The point of contact between man and God is holiness (“Kinship with God,” 116, 118-19).

Moreover, Montagu angrily described halakhic prescriptions relating to niddah as “sordid sex disqualifications”:

I used to listen with horror, the skin of my face very cold, my hands hot, when I was told about some of the customs, especially as they affected women and children. … During menstruation, girls were considered unclean, and were not allowed then to touch any vessel used for ritualistic observance. They were not entitled to pray at these times, even if they were in great agony of spirit … Even before I began to reason about the meaning of religion, I knew this was wrong and a travesty of real faith (The Faith of a Jewish Woman, 22-23).

Instead, Montagu contended that “God casts out fear, ugliness, hatred and impurity,” implying it is only necessary to “let Him enter into our hearts.” Montagu hoped that Liberal religionists would interpret God’s words in their own personal way.

In particular, this is what Montagu meant when designing prayers for the members of her West Central Club. These prayers only had utility when they reflected the experiences of each member, as Montagu noted:
Only such prayers were used which had a meaning for modern Jews and Jewesses in the actual circumstances of their lives. … I believe we must not expect to succeed until there is a general realization of God’s presence. … We must believe that the truth of Judaism is co-existence with life, but it is a progressive force, as is life itself, and its presentation cannot be changeless if it is to fit every generation of believers (My Club and I, 45-47, 50).

Montagu described the prayers as the product of a shared determination to seek out God. Specifically, the prayers were intended to re-engage religionists with employment commitments and unable to regularly attend synagogue. Titles accordingly included: “Prayer for Those Who Are Unavoidably Prevented from Keeping the Sabbath” and “A Prayer for Girls Entering Domestic Service.” Montagu also encouraged members to develop their own prayers, stating:

it had never occurred to them that they might approach God in prayer on their own account and He would listen. … I tried to show my girls how prayer came spontaneously to normal people … We believed ourselves always in contact with God, when we were at home, and when we were away from home; whatever our occupations, whether in work or play (The Faith of a Jewish Woman, 21).

For Montagu it was essential that religionists be able to accommodate God in the context of their own lives. Therefore, Liberal Judaism had to be personally relevant. Montagu’s novel, Naomi’s Exodus (1901), builds on Montefiore’s interpretation of kedushah in that she spells out the application of the holy to the everyday. The purpose of Naomi’s Exodus is to demonstrate the holy in an immanent, ever-present God.

The novel is probably autobiographical and tells the story of Naomi Saul’s struggle with traditional ritual and consequent spiritual enlightenment. Accordingly, Naomi’s Exodus begins with the character's awareness that she had “Never … realized the presence of God, or even thought much about Him” (6). Consequently, Naomi, alluding to Montagu’s own childhood, begins to “question the significance” of the “observances which were rigidly followed in her home” (5). The story, according to Umansky, is a sermon “set in the framework of fiction” and “aimed at a female, Jewish … audience.” Naomi’s Exodus also applies Christian Evangelicalism’s veneration of women as morally and spiritually redemptive. These qualities were expressed in philanthropy, domestic and social work. In fact, Naomi’s Exodus has even been described as a conversionist story. The protagonist aptly possesses “the finest perceptions of truth, beauty, and purity, the greatest capacity for self-restraint and for
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the highest joys of self-sacrifice." Moreover, Naomi’s awakening is inspired by a Christian friend, Mrs. Finch, who “one evening, while she was standing by the graves of those she loved, a beautiful peace had crept into her life, and the next morning she was able to take Communion in her church” (7). Mrs. Finch’s own awakening, echoing Liberal Judaism’s critique of rabbinic tradition, is not the product of the Law, but of peaceful reflection. Hence, Mrs. Finch’s faith is reinvigorated; in turn, Naomi is inspired by her friend’s “triumphant struggle with doubt” (7-8).

Consequently, it is clearly Montagu’s intention to elucidate the ways in which Naomi experiences the holy in her everyday life, but it is only at the end of the novel that she realises that God has been with her all along:

A strange peace … crept into her heart and she was happy. … The unrest had fled for ever. The God to Whom she had appealed in her terrible loneliness, Who had given her strength …, that God in his infinite pity had led her into communion with Him. … Having once realized the existence of God within and without her, she would never again lose sight of Him. She would find Him in the religious customs of her people, and in the small duties of her daily life (196-97).

Naomi’s experiencing kedushah starts with her visit to the National Gallery. Suddenly the “pictures spoke a language which the girl could not understand, she felt for the first time humbled in the presence of their beauty.” Likewise, when listening to music Naomi is unexpectedly “more susceptible to emotion than she had ever been before. There was a curious excitement in her heart, and a feeling of tension in her limbs.” These moments that interrupt the profane culminate in Naomi bursting into tears and pleading for God’s help. This plea reflects Montagu’s belief in the necessity of pausing in silence to reflect on God’s presence:

After sobbing for time in silence, she cried from the depths of her heart, – “Oh, God, what shall I do? Oh, God, help me!” That was the first prayer Naomi Saul had ever made. Almost immediately her troubled spirit seemed somewhat soothed. The tension on her feelings was relieved as she gave herself up to the Power not herself of which she was becoming conscious. She lay for a whole hour, half waking, half sleeping, in communion with her God (26).

Nadia Valman describes this scene as “the advent, through suffering, of an ethical impulse in Naomi’s life.” Unlike with art and music, where the holy is experienced in subtle and unexpected ways, by communing with God Naomi is directly subject to the numinous. For Montagu, it is only through “contact with God we can renew our power of righteousness. We re-
fresh ourselves in His rivers of life.” Therefore, Naomi is aware that this is only the beginning of her spiritual quest.

As she begins her exodus from the “little Ghetto-shop” of her childhood, to the consternation of her aunt and angry suitor, Jacob, Naomi is conscious of something powerful guiding her that her family will not be able to understand (42, 196). Naomi leaves her orthodox home with the “racial pride of her ancestors” (40-41), but is taken in, along with a baby, by four Christian girls. Sharing their room Naomi was profoundly touched by the kindness of these strangers. She and the child had been taken in by the four rough occupants … for no other reason than that they were alone and needed help. Here was no question of terms, no question about respectability; here was simply love; here, although Naomi hardly realized it, was religion (61).

In this moment Naomi unwittingly experiences the holy in the warmth demonstrated by her new friends. Consequently, Naomi takes a room at the Working Girls’ Club and Home, where she is guided by its leader, Miss Miles, who encourages her to live her life according to faith (66, 133). Naomi thus takes up work as a domestic servant and as a secretary for Clement Marks, a “Liberal Jewish social worker” and dilettante, who immediately falls in love with her only to later reject her, much to his eventual regret. Echoing Montagu’s claim that “work brings one to joy,” these toils will bring sanctity to Naomi’s faith. Following the end of her relationship with Clement, Naomi again calls for God’s help:

After a time her head leaned up against the iron leg of the bedstead, and her lips murmured, “God! God! What shall I do – God?” The prayer was spoken in utter exhaustion of spirit; the soul realised its weakness and could no longer find rest within itself. It threw itself on the God without for help in its sore need. And the help was given. … It seemed as if she snatched from the inmost depths of her being the love, faith and hope which she had planted there for Clement, and with that cry to God threw them at His feet. And He accepted them (162).

At this point Naomi is vitalized – her very soul is attuned to the numinous. She can now return home, joyfully revealing to Miss Miles: “I feel something of God’s great peace in my heart. … It has come to me without the help of ceremonies or anything, simply because I wanted it so dreadfully” (170). This comment reinforces Montefiore’s claim about the necessity of communing with God. This dialogue is only possible, as Naomi realises, if religionists actively “seek Him.” Indeed, for Montagu religionists had to be able to directly relate with God.
Arriving home Naomi accordingly savours the Sabbath (190). The imminent ceremony is exciting and infused with renewed meaning. Naomi can now experience the holy in the Sabbath rituals and in the sacred items which are invested with mystical qualities and associated with God’s presence:126

her aunt was preparing to receive the Sabbath, the holy guest. Naomi felt an inexplicable thrill of excitement at the thought that … she was again to join in that ceremony of welcome, … There was the high dresser, with its rows of plates and dishes shining … brightly … But the prosaic application of hot water could never have given them the splendor with which to Naomi’s eyes they seemed endowed on this evening of her home-coming. The Sabbath candles, too, appeared strangely unfamiliar to-night. The glow which they threw on the spotless tablecloth, seemed possessed with a mysterious sanctity (190-91).

In the Sabbath, Naomi can now sense the sanctity of its observances, reflecting Montagu’s concern that ritual only has utility if imbued with the holy.127 Naomi can now appreciate kedushah in the everyday.128 This conclusion is predicated on Montagu’s belief that the prophets encouraged religionists to be holy based on the premise of God’s holiness; this was a plea that religionists learn to emulate the divine.129 Naomi thus traces her reverence for Sabbath to her first appeal to God – the initial prayers that had enabled her spiritual growth (196-97). Echoing Liberal Judaism’s remit to re-engage secularised and lax Anglo-Jews, it is Naomi’s exile and consequent return that ensures she will understand her entire life through the lens of the holy.130 Indeed, for Montagu each individual can experience not only God, but the sanctifying quality of the divine.131 According to Montagu:

Jewish teaching gives us a Holy God transcending, and immeasurably excelling the human ideal; but it also suggests kinship with that ideal. … The power of direct communion constitutes one of the glories of our faith: but without the sense of kinship the language of prayer … would fail us … Human love in its finest reflects the divine in its inclusiveness (“Kinship with God,” 114).

This communion is made possible by Montagu’s assumption that life in its entirety has the potential to be infused with holiness.132 This is the purpose of Naomi’s Exodus, to demonstrate the holy in the everyday and to suggest that the requirement to experience the numinous is merely to “seek and discover God.”133 This was essentially about re-engaging those secularized Anglo-Jews who Montagu’s father had labelled “dead leaves.”134 Montagu noted that:

Isaiah had seen a vision of God Himself, and he had been overwhelmed by the realisation of God’s greatness and holiness. He believed himself to be called to work for God, but he did not think that he was qualified for the undertaking. … Then suddenly he felt that he himself was in contact with the divine spirit. He experienced a feeling of exaltation and purification. In contact with God, his
Similar to Isaiah, Montagu’s “favourite” prophet, she hoped that Liberal-Jews would learn to sense the holy in their own lives. She based this assumption on Isaiah 55 and its demand that religionists seek God. Montagu argued that holiness – awareness of God’s immanence – was attainable to all through discipline, pious devotion and perseverance. Montagu was convinced that kedushah was an achievable ideal for anyone dedicated to God:

The holiness of God implies an absolute standard of love, truth and righteousness. May not man’s holiness be attained in the effort he makes to approach this standard, disciplining himself to obedience, even at the cost of material self-advancement and convenience (“Kinship with God,” 114).

Moreover, Montagu not only believed that religionists should converse with God in synagogue and the home, but also in the workplace. For Montagu, the Shema demonstrated the necessity of loving God wherever possible. Thus, closeness to God was attainable at any time. Holiness is therefore relevant to each religionist:

In our home services, then, we must emphasize above all things the necessity of real intelligent communion with God, and our worship must therefore include some ‘made-up prayer’ spoken in all simplicity, sincerity and reverence in the language most familiar to the worshippers (“Bringing up Jewish Children,” 137).

Montagu was all too aware of dwindling interest in the tradition. Hence, it was essential that all religionists, however disengaged, work towards God and the sanctification of their daily lives. In particular, Montagu was concerned that:

There are vast numbers whom we have not been able to win to Sabbath service. Indeed, … we could never interest the average member in institutional Judaism at all. …But I believed then, as ever afterwards, strongly in the power of worship, and was convinced that the habit of not attending services was rooted in the boredom which a traditional service evoked. A year or two of workshop life seemed to wipe out the small knowledge of Hebrew which most of our girls had acquired as children (My Club and I, 44-45).

Montagu accordingly hoped that Liberal Judaism would re-engage lapsed Anglo-Jews. For Montagu, even “imperfect spirits” could learn “to seek direct communion with God at all times.”

To conclude, while Montagu believed that God was separate to the earthly realm, she was convinced that religionists should persevere to commune with the divine.
her life, Montagu helped give Montefiore’s theology and conception of holiness practical meaning and utility in the daily lives of Liberal Jewish congregants. Montagu’s mission was predicated on bringing *kedushah* to all religionists “at all times.” Accordingly, holiness had to be associated with the day-to-day routines of each religionist. Contradicting the biblical and rabbinic traditions, Montagu argued that *kedushah* could be experienced not only in the synagogue, at home, and at work, but by menstruants, converts, so-called sinners and members of her congregation uninterested in the tradition and its prescriptions. Thus, Montagu vowed:

> We shall … assign to observances, which had been worshipped as the end, their proper place and function as means for the attainment of holiness. … The lesson of God’s omnipresence may be best enforced by a constant variety of service, and by the introduction of passing events and the incidents of daily life as themes for prayer (“Spiritual Possibilities of Judaism To-Day,” 226).

Liberal religionists would therefore learn that the holy was not confined merely to prayers and ceremonies, but could be experienced at any time of the day. In this way religionists, “in contact with God, our Teacher and Friend, our Master and Leader, … can each become a true servant.” This was vital to Montagu’s foundational promise that holiness would be at the root of Liberal Judaism’s project and also explains her frequent use of Leviticus 19:2: “Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord Thy God am holy.” In sum, Montagu’s mission to adjust Liberal Judaism to modernity would only be complete, as she herself admitted, when “there is a general realisation of God’s presence.”
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30 Solomon Schechter, “The Rabbinical Conception of Holiness,” Jewish Quarterly Review 10, no. 1 (Oct., 1897): 5; Grossman, The Long Schoolroom, 179-81. For Blumenthal (Facing the Abusing God, 27; idem, God at the Center: Meditations on Jewish Spirituality (North Vale: Jason Aroron Inc., 1994), 237. God’s otherness is such that the “human flees the holy”: “Moses pleads inexperience,” “Isaiah pleads impurity,” “Jeremiah pleads youth,” “Ezekiel must be coerced,” and “Jonah takes flight.” Raphael alternatively suggests that the “command to holiness is an ethico-aesthetic commandment” (Judaim and the Visual Image: A Jewish Theology of Art (London: Continuum, 2009), 54; see also Raphael’s discussion of “female holiness” (85).

31 According to Eliezer Diamond the rabbis employed kkedushah in much the same way “the word is employed in biblical literature” (Holy Men and Hunger Artists: Fasting and Asceticism in Rabbinic Culture (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 76; see also Emmanuel Levinas, Beyond the Verse: Talmudic Readings and Lectures (London: Athlone Press, 1994), 119; Peter Losonczi, “From First Theology to Political Theology,” in The Future of Political Theology: Religious and Theological Perspectives, eds. Peter Losonczi, Mike Luoma-Aho, and Aakash Singh (London: Routledge, 2016), 78.


Holiness in Anglo-Liberal Judaism


36 Jacob Neusner, *The Emergence of Judaism* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 8; Neusner notes, for example, Mishnah Hullin 5:1: “[The prohibition against slaughtering on the same day] ‘it and its young’ ... applies (1) in the land and outside the land, (2) in the time of the Temple and not in the time of the Temple.” See also Jacob Neusner, *Performing Israel’s Faith: Narrative and Law in Rabbinic Theology* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2005), 162.


40 In aspiring to *kedushah* Israelites were obligated to avoid imitating “jealousy,” “devious ways,” “revenge” and “exaltation” as these were God’s “instruments.” “Idolatry,” “adultery” and “the shedding of blood” (*tumah*) were particularly “impure,” as were “forbidden foods” and lack of personal and domestic hygiene; see Schechter, *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, 202, 204-8. “Purity” however is not necessarily the same as “holiness”; according to Lawrence Hoffman “Purity is the desired end of the system; holiness is a quality to be sought by its parts”; see his *Covenant of Blood: Circumcision and Gender in Rabbinic Judaism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 159.


52 Montefiore quoted in Langton, *Claude Montefiore*, 81; according to Langton, Montefiore offered “a straightforward challenge to ‘Historic or Traditional Judaism.’”


57 Montefiore, *Truth in Religion*, 89.
Kedushah in Anglo-Liberal Judaism

59 Montefiore, Truth in Religion, 97.
60 Montefiore, Truth in Religion, 101.
61 Raphael Patai, The Hebrew Goddess (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990), 99-101. One of Montefiore’s tutors, the scholar Solomon Schechter (Langton, Claude Montefiore, 5-6), in his Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (217), noted that for the rabbis the term “Holy Spirit” (Shekhinah) was applied instead of “God.” He claimed that in rabbinic tradition “The crowning reward of Kedushah ... is ... communion with the Holy Spirit.” For Schechter, in the Talmud “superior holiness” meant “utter withdrawal from things earthly.”
62 Montefiore, Outlines of Liberal Judaism, 56; Boyarin, Carnal Israel, xi.
64 In Liberal Judaism “Prayer is communion with God” (Israel Mattuck, The Essentials of Liberal Judaism (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1962), 95). Mattuck, who in 1912 became “spiritual leader” of the Liberal Jewish Synagogue (Umansky, Lily Montagu, 85), defined holiness as “supreme exaltation.” For Mattuck it was essential that religionists experience “feeling for God” in “emotional” and “personal” terms.” This meant that prayer, for Mattuck, was a means to “converse with Him.” Mattuck claimed that while “God ... cannot be seen ... His attributes, His qualities, can be, and are, perceived by men” (see Mattuck, The Essentials, 1, 14, 10, 95).
65 Melissa Raphael, The Female Face of God in Auschwitz: A Jewish Feminist Theology of the Holocaust (London: Routledge, 2003), 73-74, 83; for Raphael, the “holy” as “a category of willed relation” – a “perception of the personal and moral relation between created things and God.”
66 Raphael, The Female Face, p. 79; of course, Raphael was not talking about Montagu, but the terms used are applicable; see also Blumenthal, Facing the Abusing God, p. 7.
67 Raphael, The Female Face, 73; Montagu, The Faith, 29. Ellen Umansky was the first scholar to rigorously analyse the influence of Montefiore on Montagu (see “Lily H. Montagu: Religious Leader, Organizer and Prophet,” Conservative Judaism 34, no. 6 (Jul./Aug., 1981): 17.
68 Umansky, “Lily H. Montagu,” 18. Montagu claimed her father was “influenced more by the sense of discipline ... than by the actual experience of God” (Samuel Montagu First Baron Swything: A Character Sketch (London: Truslove & Hanson Ltd., n. d.), 30.
69 Montagu, The Faith, 8.
70 Umansky, “Lily H. Montagu,” 18; Conrad, Lily H. Montagu, 14, 35.
73 Montagu, The Faith, 33.
74 Umansky, Lily Montagu, 194-97.
75 Umansky, Lily Montagu, 181, 189, 194-97; Lily Montagu, Thoughts on Judaism (London: R. Brimley Johnson, 1904), 1.
77 Umansky points to the significance of the “conference” in 1899 during which fellow religionists “voiced concerns similar to her own” (“Lily H. Montagu,” 21). In another article Umansky suggests that it was Montefiore who “helped spur” Montagu “to action” with his comment in 1900 about the possibility of “a distinct liberal movement” (“The Origins of Liberal Judaism in England: The Contribution of Lily H. Montagu,” Hebrew Union College Annual 55 (1984): 311-12. See also Montefiore’s “Liberal Judaism in England: Its Difficulties and Duties,” Jewish Quarterly Review 12, no. 4 (Jul., 1900): 649.
79 Montefiore, Liberal Judaism and Hellenism, v; Conrad, Lily H. Montagu, 46.
80 Langton, Claude Montefiore, 77-78. Langton even refers to Montagu’s “revolutionary fervour” (77).
Montagu maintained a fundamental belief that “men and women were different by nature”; she even assumed that “the differences between the sexes precluded women from assuming certain roles.” Unsurprisingly, she was initially cautious about “preaching” at the Liberal Jewish Synagogue (see Lily Montagu, ed. Umansky, 157).

Montagu, The Faith, 118.

Montagu, “Kinship with God,” 118.


Montagu, “Spiritual Possibilities,” 226, 229; idem, Thoughts on Judaism, 115 n. 1.


Montagu, Thoughts on Judaism, 120; Lily Montagu, “The Sabbath,” in Lily Montagu, ed. Umansky, 76.

Montagu, “Kinship with God,” 118.

Lily Montagu, ed. Umansky, 118, 120 n. 6.

Montagu, Thoughts on Judaism, 60, 88.

Montagu, “Kinship with God,” 118.

Montagu, Thoughts on Judaism, 23.

Montagu, My Club and I, 49.


Montagu, My Club, 41; Umansky, Lily Montagu, 123.


Umansky, Lily Montagu, 123.


Umansky, Lily Montagu, 133; Devine, “Imagining,” 78.

Umansky, Lily Montagu, 134.


This is what Otto referred to as “Devotional Silence” (The Idea, 216).


Montagu, Naomi’s Exodus, 9; Otto, The Idea, 49.
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112 Montagu, Naomi’s Exodus, 26; Otto, The Idea, 12, 15.


117 Montagu, Naomi’s Exodus, 40; Devine, “Imagining,” 79; Otto, The Idea, 64.

118 Montagu, Naomi’s Exodus, 61; Otto, The Holy, 145; for the holy in “people” see Blumenthal, Facing the Abusing God, 37.


121 Raphael, The Female Face, 73; Montagu, The Faith, 29.


123 Montefiore, Liberal Judaism: An Essay, 27.


125 Montagu, My Club, 50; idem, “Paper to be Read on October 13th 1918,” London Metropolitan Archives, ACC/3529/3/7, 1.

126 Otto, The Holy, 67; Blumenthal, Facing the Abusing God, 23; Kadushin, Worship and Ethics, 216.

127 Umansky, Lily Montagu, 130; Blumenthal, Facing the Abusing God, 37.


129 Montagu, “Kinship with God,” 114.

130 Blumenthal, Facing the Abusing God, 39.

131 Lily Montagu, “Here am I: Send Me,” in Lily Montagu, ed. Umansky, 128.


135 Umansky, Lily Montagu, 151; Otto, The Idea, 52.

136 Montagu, The Faith, 41.


138 Montagu, My Club, 47; idem, Thoughts on Judaism, 82.

139 Montagu, Letters to Anne & Peter, 70.


142 Montagu, My Club and I, 49; idem, “For Reform-Synagogue,” 329.

143 Montagu, “Kinship with God,” 115; Umansky, Lily Montagu, 83.

144 Montagu, Letters to Anne & Peter, 70.

145 Montagu, “Kinship with God,” 114.

146 Montagu, Letters to Anne & Peter, 70; idem, My Club, 45, 47; idem, The Faith, 23, 29; idem, “Spiritual Possibilities,” 228; idem, “Club Letter No. 139,” in Lily Montagu, ed. Umansky, 143; idem, “Kinship with God,” 118-19.


148 Montagu, “Here am I,” 129.

149 Montagu, “Spiritual Possibilities,” 229; idem, “Here am I,” 129; see also idem, The Faith, 67.

150 Montagu, “For Reform-Synagogue,” 329-31; idem, My Club and I, 47.
WORKS CITED


Hanson, A. “Claude Montefiore, a Modern Philo.” *Modern Churchman* 20, no. 3 (Spring, 1977): 109-14.


Kedushah in Anglo-Liberal Judaism


______. “Address given at the Girls’ Club at 8 Dean Street, Soho, on 26th November, 1911.” London Metropolitan Archives, ACC/3529/3/7.


Kedushah in Anglo-Liberal Judaism

______. “Paper to be Read on October 13th 1918.” London Metropolitan Archives, ACC/3529/3/7.
Kedushah in Anglo-Liberal Judaism


Kedushah in Anglo-Liberal Judaism

_____.


_____.


_____.


_____.


_____.


Kedushah in Anglo-Liberal Judaism


