A COMMITMENT TO SCHOLARSHIP

The American Academy
for Jewish Research, 1920—2020

edited by
DAVID SORKIN

A COMMITMENT TO SCHOLARSHIP

AAJR

AAJR

editorial board

Part I

Hasia Diner
New York University

Jeffrey Gurock
Yeshiva University

Deborah Dash Moore
University of Michigan

Part II

Todd Endelman
Univeristy of of Michigan

Martha Himmelfarb
Princeton University

David Sorkin
Yale University

A Commitment to Scholarship

The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1920–2020

edited by
DAVID SORKIN

The editor thanks Sarah Zager,
a PhD candidate at Yale University,
for ably organizing a multipurpose index of the Proceedings.

Text editing
Aviva Arad

Design
Magen Shvidler, Studio EDAS

Copyright 2021
by the American Academy For Jewish Research

Cover
Menachem Schmelzer and Anna Kleban, Jewish Theological Seminary of America

foreword

This volume honors the centenary of the American Academy for Jewish Research, the oldest scholarly organization in the United States dedicated to Jewish Studies. The Academy's Executive Committee envisioned a volume that would critically evaluate the organization's history, measuring its aspirations and substantial accomplishments against its acknowledged shortcomings and failings.

The volume falls into two distinct sections. The first is a history of the organization. Professor Dana Smith has plumbed the organization's archive and published sources to produce the first account of the Academy from its founding to the present day. She has traced the organization from inception to efflorescence, from stagnation to revival.

The second section is an evaluation of the Academy's scholarly contributions through its journal, *The Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* (1930—1997). Six of the Academy's fellows, each a recognized expert in her/his specialty, has combed the *Proceedings*' pages to assess seven decades of scholarship. Another fellow has set the stage for these essays by depicting the international situation of academic Jewish Studies (*Wissenschaft des Judentums*) in the first decades of the twentieth century.

The Executive Committee hopes that this volume, by recognizing the Academy's history, will herald its continuing leadership in the disciplines of Jewish Studies.

contents

foreword v

contributors & editors viii-ix

1 **The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1920—2020** 1
DANA SMITH
Keene State College

II The Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research (1930—1997): An Evaluation

PAAJR at Inception: Novelty, Growth, and Birth Pangs in the Post—World War I Era 90
DAVID N. MYERS
University of California, Los Angeles

A Text in Search of a Method: Where Is the Talmud in the Scholarship on Jewish Antiquity? 104
CHRISTINE HAYES
Yale University

Understanding the Trajectory of Medieval Jewish Studies 119
EPHRAIM KANARFOGEL
Yeshiva University

The Geniza 133
MARK COHEN
Princeton University

The Early Modern Period in the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 145
ELISHEVA CARLEBACH
Columbia University

Modern Jewish History in the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 157
JOHN EFRON
University of California, Berkeley

Communal Record Books (*Pinkassim*) 192
GERSHON HUNDERT
McGill University

Fellows, 1920-2020 208

contributors

Elisheva Carlebach
Salo Wittmayer Baron Professor of Jewish History, Culture and Society
Columbia University

Mark Cohen
Khedouri A. Zilkha Professor Emeritus of Jewish Civilization in the Near East
Princeton University

John Efron
Koret Professor of Jewish History
University of California, Berkeley

Christine Hayes
Robert F. and Patricia Ross Weis Professor of Religious Studies in Classical Judaism
Yale University

Gershon Hundert
Leanor Segal Professor of Jewish Studies
McGill University

Ephraim Kanarfogel
E. Billi Ivry Professor of Jewish History, Literature and Law
Yeshiva University

David N. Myers
Sady and Ludwig Kahn Professor of Jewish History
University of California, Los Angeles

Dana Smith
Assistant Professor Department of Holocaust and Genocide Studies
Keene State College

editors

Hasia Diner
Paul and Sylvia Steinberg Professor of American Jewish History
New York University

Todd Endelman
William Haber Professor Emeritus of Modern Jewish History
University of Michigan

Jeffrey Gurock
Libby M. Klaperman Professor of Jewish History
Yeshiva University

Martha Himmelfarb
William H. Danforth Professor of Religion
Princeton University

Deborah Dash Moore
Frederick G.L. Huetwell Professor of History
and Judaic Studies
University of Michigan

David Sorkin
Lucy G. Moses Professor of History
Yale University

1

The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1920–2020

DANA SMITH
Keene State College

The Founding Decades: 1920–1945

In 1920, a small group of scholars founded the American Academy of Jewish Research (AAJR), an organization meant to further Jewish scholarship in the United States. Its founding Fellows envisioned this new academy as contributing vital scholarship to the wider community of Jewish learning, not only domestically but also abroad. The Academy's original cohort of Fellows included such luminaries of the field as Talmudist Louis Ginzberg (1873–1953), a leading figure in the Conservative Movement and longtime professor at the Jewish Theological Seminary; Saul Lieberman (1898–1983), also a scholar of Talmud and professor at the Jewish Theological Seminary; Jewish historian and biographer Alexander Marx (1878–1953), who served as a librarian at the Jewish Theological Seminary; and Harry Wolfson (1887–1974), a historian of philosophy and professor of Hebrew literature and philosophy at Harvard.[1] These founders, considered "the most eminent scholars devoted to Jewish science in the United States," sought to replicate the style of the great European academies, and to elevate Jewish scholarship in the

United States to the highest international standing.[2] They embraced an ideal based on the domestic and transnational exchange of academic research and discourse that placed American scholarship on par with Europe. Their ideals persist until today—nearly a century later, the Academy is the longest-standing organization of Judaic scholars in North America.

Louis Ginzberg organized the first meeting of the American Academy for Jewish Research in the living room of his apartment in Morningside Heights, the Upper West Side neighborhood that also served as home to the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City. Twelve additional Judaic scholars participated—mostly men who found their institutional home in one of three Jewish institutions of higher learning: Dropsie College, Hebrew Union College, or the Jewish Theological Seminary.[3] They gathered to discuss issues related to professional concerns and their research, and to exchange new ideas or information. Early meetings took place in an open room at the Jewish Theological Seminary or, sometimes, at Ginzberg's home.[4]

The ranks of Academy members in this first decade included a healthy number of experts in Talmud and rabbinics, history (ancient and medieval), Semitics, and philosophy. Over the course of the coming years, additional scholars joined them. As the circle expanded, its original organizers sought to formalize these informal gatherings. A process of membership developed to ensure the Academy included only the highest-ranking scholars active in Jewish learning and research in the United States. Existing members voted in new members among their peers through anonymous ballots at an annual meeting where invited scholars read papers. A new lexicon developed: these men became "Fellows" of the American Academy for Jewish Research.[5] In 1928, the Academy gained accreditation as an incorporated entity within the state of Maryland. And then, a year later, Alexander Marx led the American Academy for Jewish Research's first official public meeting.

During this meeting, Marx, presiding as the Academy's acting president while Ginzberg held a visiting appointment at Hebrew

University in Jerusalem, recalled the Academy's first informal gathering of June 15, 1920, nearly a decade earlier. "Some years ago, a small number of American Jewish scholars, recognizing the great need of such co-operative work, banded together and founded the Academy for Jewish Research. While fully aware of the fact that it is a task requiring the co-operation of Jewish scholars all over the world," he explained, "they felt that a start would have to be made in our country with the hope that future developments would make possible co-operation with the leading Jewish scholars abroad."[6]

Before introducing the evening's academic program, Marx took it upon himself to introduce the history and aims of the Academy, and to situate these goals within the broader international scope of Jewish scholarship. His history of Jewish scholarship began in Europe. The previous century ushered in important progress in academic research, particularly in the humanities, Marx explained, with much of this progress beginning in the German university system before spreading throughout the continent. Marx then offered a brief account of contemporary intellectual endeavors in the "great European academies," especially those in Berlin, Paris, and Vienna, listing the Akademie für Wissenschaft des Judentums, the Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums, and the Société des études juives.[7] These European centers of scholarship supported scientific research excavations, undertook significant thesaurus, dictionary, and glossary projects, and published critical editions of large-scale series as well as smaller-scaled proceedings. European academies, he continued, supported the most important scholarly contributions to most every branch of learning, from history and philosophy to mathematics and science. Furthermore, these academies offered individual support to scholars.

Marx then added, "No adequate body of this kind has Jewish literature as its province" in the United States.[8] He outlined a bleak domestic situation whereby a scholar had to "shift for himself," collecting materials when and where he could "according to personal whims."[9] Marx's omission of American-based institutions for supporting

Jewish scholarship did not mean they did not exist. These institutions did not, however, meet standards of high-level scientific research. The Jewish Publication Society of America (1888) and the American Jewish Historical Society (1892) both formed at the end of the previous century; the *Jewish Quarterly Revi*ew and the *Hebrew Union College Annual* remained the lone English-language journals devoted to Jewish scholarship.[10] Yet the Jewish Publication Society and the American Jewish Historical Society veered more toward popular and apologetic work, rather than academic publication, while the American Jewish Historical Society also self-limited to scholarship on the United States.[11]

In 1916, Bernard Revel (1885–1940) attempted to address the frail state of Jewish scholarly organization in the United States. Revel, a talmudic scholar and the first president of Yeshiva University, established the Society of Jewish Academicians that autumn; the society consisted of Revel and a ten-member executive committee—and, despite the planning, never succeeded in holding an actual meeting. Membership required "strict adherence to Orthodox Judaism." The future Fellows of the American Academy for Jewish Research reacted to Revel's society with a mixture of humor and disdain. They worried that the religious requirement would invite "ridicule" from abroad as scientific study would give way to honoring tradition. Max Margolis (1866–1932), then a professor of biblical philology at Dropsie College, referred to it as "a piece of hutzpah;" Ginzberg, who was not invited to join, said he did not know which was lacking, his scholarly prowess or his Orthodoxy; while Henry Malter (1867–1925), an expert in rabbinical literature and professor at Dropsie College, cynically doubted whether any of the society's members would be involved if other alternatives existed.[12] Established scholars in the United States rejected the society and it fizzled into oblivion within a few years. However, its founding did draw attention to the need for an American-based organization to foster scientific Jewish scholarship within the country. Having rejected Revel's organization, leading American scholars brought forth their own idea.

Thus, harkening back to his history of the Academy's founding in 1920, Marx presented the Academy as an entity designed to fill a gap and provide an overarching structure to further scientific Jewish learning and scholarly research in the United States—and, by extension, to integrate American scholarship within the international scope of Jewish scholarship. "We need more comprehensive undertakings," Marx proclaimed in his inaugural address, "if we are to put Jewish research in its right place in the republic of learning."[13] According to its bylines, the Academy possessed a six-fold purpose:

> The furtherance of Jewish learning through periodical meetings at which learned papers shall be presented and discussed; the formulation and carrying into effect of scholarly undertakings of a co-operative character; the issuance of publications; the promotion of relations of fellowship and co-operation between scholars and learned organizations in America and those in other countries; furnishing opinions upon scholarly projects submitted to the Academy; and through such other means as may, from time to time, be determined by the Academy.[14]

The Academy consisted of a small group, only twelve living Fellows in 1929, who sought to create a space for collegial academic exchange separate from their home institutions.

Conceptually, rooting the Academy's scholastic lineage within the traditions of European-based Jewish scholarship legitimized the importance of the Academy and the work produced by its Fellows. At the time, Jewish scholarship found its traditional academic home in Europe; linking the Academy to Europe and the traditions of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* imbued the Academy's existence with this scientific tradition. It spoke to the desire for serious, professionalized Jewish study in the United States.[15] Such self-presentation bolstered efforts at situating American Jewish scholarship not only as a leading voice in the English-speaking

world, but also as an important contributor on the world stage.[16] It also served to strengthen American Jewry. Studying Judaism in the modes of modern scholarship enhanced the academic product and, by extension, the minds of those who studied these works—at least in theory.[17] On a more basic level, the link to Europe also represented an issue of familiarity. Many of the Academy's early founders and Fellows were European born and trained. The Academy's Fellows knew the European tradition because many were educated in it.

Academy leadership also sought to situate their newly founded scholarly organization within a global network of Jewish scholarship in a physical, tangible way. In 1929, the Academy began producing its annual publication, the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*. The *Proceedings* reached libraries throughout the world. By 1933, only four years after its first publication, sixteen American academic institutions and thirty-five international academic institutions received copies of the *Proceedings*. Of these thirty-five international institutions, German institutions constituted the largest majority (11), making Germany the largest institutional recipient of the Academy's *Proceedings* outside of the United States. Further, more individual German scholars, twenty-one, received a copy of the *Proceedings* than any other foreign nationality in 1933.[18]

Despite its early growth and success in producing a quality academic journal, the Academy's origins occurred at a moment of domestic and global uncertainty that often limited the group's aims. Financial instability wrought by the Great Depression created long-lasting issues. In 1932, mere years after the Academy's official incorporation, Marx noted a great need for the "cooperation of all those who appreciate Jewish learning, especially at the present time, when our ranks have been thinned by death and also by the depression."[19] Most of its early revenue came from a tiered paying membership structure that existed outside the academic domain of the Fellows. These additional tiers included "patrons," "contributing members," and "members." Patrons consisted of "persons interested in Jewish learning" who contributed at least an annual

$100 to the Academy. Contributing members were "persons interested in Jewish learning" who gave at least an annual $25 (but less than the $100 necessary for patrons) to the Academy. And the final category, members, were "persons actively or sympathetically interested in Jewish learning" who paid the $5 annual dues. Inclusion in any one of these three tiers brought with it a copy of the *Proceedings*.

Relying on financial support from donors and individuals committed to Jewish scholarship produced a constantly fluctuating financial situation. As the global financial crisis continued, fewer individuals chose to support the Academy's research when facing financial constraints of their own; it represented an expendable expense. A rabbi in Chicago wrote to Alexander Marx in September 1934, apologizing for his inability to pay his membership dues for the last four years due to illness and "economic vicissitudes." Yet, he wrote, he still wanted to retain his membership and assured Marx his "interest in the Academy is just as strong now as it ever was, and it is my intention to pay all my dues as soon as my financial condition begins to improve."[20] Marx assured him his membership remained active. The rabbi in Chicago was not alone in facing economic hardships. Academy community membership ranks reached their peak in 1928 with 248 fee-paying patrons and members. Yet the upcoming decade witnessed a steady decline in membership, during which time approximately a hundred members discontinued their support. The Academy recorded its lowest number of members during this early period of existence in 1938, with only 141 nonacademic community members. In the space of a decade, the Academy saw its membership reduced by half. Membership did not substantially increase again until after 1945, when it reached a total of more than two hundred members.

Academy leadership also failed to find a willing philanthropist to fund its research projects. In 1933, Marx wrote to Hattie Guggenheim (1872–1946), wife of Adolf Guggenheim (1864–1926), appealing to her "interest in things Jewish" and inviting her to become a contributing member of the Academy to help sponsor an ongoing Maimonides project.[21] She declined.[22]

Leadership adjusted their goals accordingly. In 1932, the Fellows agreed that publishing should be curtailed "in view of the present financial status of the Academy."[23] The above-mentioned Maimonides project became its first large-scale scholarly and publication undertaking. Drawing on the example of European academies and their propensity to sponsor extensive (even multivolume) projects,[24] the Academy sought to publish a comprehensive collection of research on the works of Maimonides, including republications of his writings in the original language, on the occasion of the eight hundredth anniversary of his birth—an ambitious and expensive undertaking.[25] Financial concerns arose, especially considering the added costs of printing foreign characters, that hampered the project. As a result, the Academy was not in a position to pay its contributors for their work on the collection. Instead, the Academy committee in charge of overseeing publications compensated authors with a certain number of copies of the volume.[26] The Depression also made it difficult to raise the funds necessary to underwrite research fellowships—one of the Academy's stated main agendas, alongside publication—in the forthcoming years. With the rise of Nazism in Germany in 1933, however, the expansion of research fellowships became one of the Academy's primary goals.

Across the Atlantic, the ascent of Adolf Hitler in 1933 marked the beginning of the end of European centrality in the world of Jewish scholarship. State-legislated persecution forced publicly employed Jewish academics out of their careers before the first full academic semester under National Socialism even came to a close. Then, scholarship itself became a target as "spontaneous" book burnings sought to remove scholarly works by Jewish academics from "German" libraries.

In mid-June 1933, the American Academy for Jewish Research Executive Committee held a meeting to address the plight of their

colleagues in Germany.[27] Leadership swiftly acknowledged the threat of National Socialism and tried to undertake immediate steps to aid persecuted scholars. The Academy decided to establish research fellowships "under the auspices of the Academy" in order to bring German Jewish scholars over to the United States.[28]

Historian Salo W. Baron (1895–1989), who a few years prior had been appointed to the first chair in Jewish history within an American university history faculty, and Alexander Marx soon publicly revealed their plans for a refugee scholar research fellowship program administered through the Academy. They set forth the goal of aiding the escape of persecuted Jewish scholars active in areas of Jewish scholarship. The Academy's leadership and its Fellows committed themselves to protecting Jewish scholars and Jewish scholarship while preserving the traditions of Jewish learning in the face of National Socialist persecution and, later, extermination. Personal and professional connections between Academy Fellows and their colleagues in Germany likely accelerated the speed at which Academy leadership heard details of Nazi persecution—and thus prompted their relatively quick response. Between 1933 and 1941, the Academy successfully brought eleven scholars to the United States: ten men and one woman.[29] While the men of the Academy had plans for more extensive aid efforts, the realities of financial constraints and international politics curtailed the scope of their desired impact.

At this same time, the Academy continued to expand its scholarly productivity and strengthen the place of Jewish scholarship in the United States. Outside of its efforts at rescuing Jewish scholars from the web of Nazi persecution, Academy Fellows sought to sustain greater academic support and exchange with scholars in Palestine. Further, Fellows utilized the Academy's institutional structure in an attempt to protect Jewish scholarly sources and material in Russia. The Academy also undertook a new research program unlike anything it had previously sponsored: a short-lived Committee for Musicology.

In a letter sent out to Academy colleagues during the summer of 1933, Marx, by then the Academy president, underscored the serious

nature of the Nazi threat—both to their individual colleagues and to Jewish scholarship as a whole. "The catastrophe of German Jewry has deeply affected Jewish scholarship at one of its vital centers," he wrote. "Many eminent professors and librarians have been dismissed from the various universities. The existence of Jewish seminaries and other schools of higher learning and the subsistence of their faculties are seriously imperiled. All these men are victims of blind race-hatred," he observed, "and suffer for reasons altogether irrelevant to their personal or scholarly qualifications." Thus, Marx pressed, "It is of vital interest also to American Jewry that these men of great scientific achievement should continue serving the cause of creative scholarship in the field of Jewish studies."[30] The persecution and suffering of German Jewish scholars was relevant to American Jews, he urged, not merely as a humanitarian matter.

Early Academy plans laid over the summer of 1933 sought to establish four fellowships of $2,500 each, for a total of $10,000, to aid in the emigration of German Jewish scholars. The funds would cover institutional support and some living costs necessary for one year in New York City, with the possibility of extension.[31] Yet, the execution was limited by the Academy's ability (or perhaps better, inability) to raise the large sums required. Academy leadership reached out to a variety of individuals and organizations, from Academy membership and their acquaintances among nonaffiliated fellow academics and rabbis to well-known socialites and philanthropists. Marx and Baron stressed the urgency of a quick reply to these financial requests.[32] But by September 1933 they had made little financial headway.[33]

A full year later, in 1934, the Academy entered into a relationship with the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars, which enabled the Academy to complete its first concrete plans to sponsor German Jewish scholars. By the autumn of 1934, the fate of German Jewish scholars and Jewish scholarship in Germany had been a frequent topic of Academy discussion. Over the course of the previous year the Academy developed a list of scholars to bring over to the United States, eventually reducing

the first list to a shorter one, and finally, to the final candidate. Professor Guido Kisch (1899–1985), formerly a faculty member in law at the University of Halle, topped the list. Academy leadership believed Kisch had the best likelihood of all their candidates to receive additional subventions from the Rockefeller Foundation and other sources, as well as the greatest probability of finding an academic position in the United States. If doubts did exist—Kisch specialized in German law and did not speak English—this remained their official position.[34] While support from the Rockefeller Foundation did not pan out, the Academy's partnership with the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars helped the Academy bring over a number of refugee European scholars.

Stephen Duggan (1870–1950), then director of the Institute for International Education, founded the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars in May 1933. Over the course of the next decade and a half the Emergency Committee became the most prominent aid organization in the United States, facilitating a transatlantic link between European refugee scholars and American academic institutions.[35] The Emergency Committee faced its own problems in gaining traction for financial and institutional support in its attempts to aid persecuted scholars. Thus, they heavily vetted all potential scholars—a lengthy process. The committee's assistant secretary, Edward Murrow, wrote to Albrecht Mendelssohn-Bartholdy (1874–1936), a trusted Jewish colleague based in Germany who had been providing Murrow references regarding the work of the American Academy for Jewish Research and their proposed scholars. He lamented what he considered the short-sighted nature of American academic reactions to National Socialism. He begrudged the amount of bureaucracy, the "politics and wire-pulling," that providing relief for German refugees required. Murrow, moreover, remained deeply concerned with the "indifference" of American scholars.[36] Facing such difficulties, he argued, kept him from providing additional assistance to Academy efforts despite his personal wish to do more.

Still, Academy efforts proceeded, albeit slowly. Baron used his summer trips to Europe to discuss the Academy's refugee fellowship possibilities with potentially interested scholars, including Guido Kisch.[37] Kisch grew up in a well-off, academically inclined family that included a number of important rabbis, physicians, and scholars in Prague. His father, Alexander Kisch (1848–1917), was a prominent rabbi who trained at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau and, later in life, became the leader of Prague's Jewish community. Guido Kisch began his formal higher education in law at the University of Prague and then the University of Leipzig, where he also passed the examinations to become a judge. In 1922, he moved to the University of Halle (the Martin-Luther-University of Halle-Wittenberg). He taught history of law and political theory, and in 1925 was named the dean of the Faculty of Law and Political Science. During these Halle years, Kisch's research focused on the history of medieval German law, including late-period works on censorship of Jewish books in Bohemia and Jews at the University of Prague during the years 1348–1848.[38] He remained at Halle until 1933, when he was fired as a result of the Reich Civil Service Laws. For the next year Kisch lived the uncertain life of a *Wanderredner*—a wandering lecturer. He gave lectures on "Jewish topics" in Cologne, Chemnitz, Nuremberg, Kassel, Prague, and Breslau.[39]

In early 1934, Kisch received a letter from Ismar Elbogen (1874–1943), a renowned Jewish historian from Berlin's Hochschule (later Lehranstalt) für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. Elbogen informed Kisch about the possibility of attaining a research fellowship in New York City through the American Academy for Jewish Research. Kisch followed up on the conversation and wrote to the Academy. A few months later, Baron arranged an interview with Kisch. Baron, in Europe for his honeymoon, traveled from Vienna to Prague to interview Kisch in the middle of Kisch's sister's living room during a hot summer day in 1934. The two men impressed each other.[40]

After considerable communication, assurances, and reassurances regarding Kisch's academic reputation, Marx finalized plans

for the Academy to cosponsor Kisch along with the Emergency Committee. Kisch's grant amounted to an annual $2,000, lasting for a year beginning in January 1935, with the possibility of renewal. He and his wife boarded a ship and battled near-constant seasickness before arriving in New York City on January 29, 1935. As required by National Socialist law, emigrating Jews could only bring with them a small amount of money. The couple, who had to leave their sick son back in Germany with relatives, arrived at the harbor with the equivalent of $10 and not knowing a word of English. Baron and his wife Jeannette Meisel Baron (1911–1985) met them at the harbor and formed a collegial friendship with the couple as they navigated a new life in a new country with a new language. Jeannette Baron taught Kisch English; the Barons and fellow Academy Fellow Israel Davison (1870–1939) and his wife invited them to the cinema and attempted to integrate the new research fellow into American life.[41] Academy secretary Anna Kleban (1899–1990) helped furnish their apartment within their limited means and acted as a translator throughout the process.[42]

Kisch renewed his fellowship numerous times throughout the course of the next decade. The fellowship from the Academy allowed him to research and write an authoritative study on the legal position of Jews in the Middle Ages.[43] Yet he faced challenges, both academic and mundane. He experienced a professional culture shock during his first years in the United States: he could not find the right primary source materials required for his research in medieval Jewish law; he was annoyed at the American library system, which did not allow him to take books out of the library; and photocopying proved a luxury too expensive for his budget. Eventually, Alexander Marx successfully arranged a small office workspace at the Jewish Theological Seminary library for Kisch, alleviating some of his academic distress.[44]

Yet Kisch felt his career stagnating as he had difficulty adjusting to academic life in the English-speaking world. He turned to his connections through the Academy. One summer, on a "strikingly hot"

day, Kisch approached Cyrus Adler (1863–1940), an Honorary Fellow of the Academy, with a request. Adler, at the time the head of the Jewish Theological Seminary and Dropsie College, rarely interacted with Kisch. That day Adler sat behind his desk with a large electric fan loudly circulating air throughout the room. Between the speed at which Adler spoke, the noise from the fan, and Kisch's own insecurity in his English-speaking abilities, the meeting was a disaster. Kisch told Adler of his experience teaching in Germany and asked to teach Jewish history at the seminary. Adler listened and replied, "*You* want to teach?" The whole episode lasted less than three minutes.[45] Rejections later came from City College, Brooklyn College, and Hunter College. He tried expanding the scope of his teaching to include Czech history and Slavic languages. A friend arranged for Kisch to meet with Clarence Manning (1893–1972) at Columbia University, a professor in the Slavic language program. As the meeting drew to a close, Manning did not ask about Kisch's pedagogical philosophies or teaching experience, but rather ended with "Are you Jewish?" Kisch never heard back.[46] In the fall of 1937, however, Baron arranged a position for Kisch at the Jewish Institute of Religion, a liberal rabbinical seminary in New York. Kisch taught medieval and modern Jewish history while continuing his research.[47] In 1949, the Academy sponsored the publication of his book, *Jewry-Law in Medieval Germany*, which had been researched and written during his time as a refugee research fellow.[48] Kisch remained involved in the Academy until he reemigrated to Europe in 1962, even holding leadership positions in the Executive Committee.[49]

Academy efforts to bring over individual persecuted scholars tapered off after Kisch successfully landed in New York City's harbor, yet its Fellows initiated other projects of foreign-based concerns. In the mid- to late 1930s, several Fellows sought to situate the Academy as an international academic broker of sorts. Baron spent the spring academic term of 1937 abroad, where he took advantage of the opportunity to meet with old colleagues and forge

new connections.[50] Upon his return, he brought two issues before the Academy Fellows: initiating international cooperation among Jewish scholarly societies (particularly in Palestine) and aiding academic access for scholars in Russia.

During his trip Baron met with a group of scholars in Palestine who sought to establish some sort of link between the Academy and a loosely defined group of Palestinian scholars based at Hebrew University in Jerusalem. At the meeting, these men discussed the possibility of Hebrew University and the Academy joining together to create a means of international cooperation between Jewish scholarly societies in various countries. Yet, in the view of the Academy Fellows, the Palestinian organizers did not provide a concrete enough proposal, and the Fellows held off further steps until they could formulate more official ideas.[51]

A different set of circumstances faced Jewish scholarship in Russia: a lack of consistent scholarly access to materials. During his 1937 trip, Baron also met with Russian scholars and foreign scholars attempting to conduct research in Russia. A group of Jewish scholars based in Moscow asked Baron if the Academy would be willing to use its influence to press for academic cooperation with the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow. In particular, scholars faced difficulties in gaining access to important medieval Hebrew and Yiddish manuscripts held at the Academy of Sciences. These scholars felt that the Academy could act as something of an "academic clearing-house" to aid and gain cooperation with the Russians.[52] Officially, the Academy decided to address a letter to the Academy of Sciences in Moscow, to the VOKS (All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Lands), and to the Russian embassy in Washington DC, "calling their attention to the difficulties experienced by American scholars in obtaining manuscript materials from Russian libraries."[53] Unofficially, Baron also made an informal suggestion that individual scholars in the United States, both the Fellows he addressed in the room and their colleagues outside of the Academy, should try to aid these Russia-

based researchers with any important publications they could concerning Hebrew and Jewish subject materials in Soviet Russia.[54] However, the approaching war in Europe appears to have hampered these designs, and plans were either delayed or scrapped.

All the while, the already-difficult situation facing German Jewry escalated drastically at the close of 1938. On the evening of November 8, 1938, the Academy Executive Committee met with a group of nine New York City rabbis to further discuss sponsoring refugee German Jewish scholars.[55] The meeting opened with Louis Ginzberg's remarks on the "peculiar problem" of German Jewish scholars. He addressed the specific purpose of the Academy's relief efforts in Germany, clarifying that it was not the Academy's "task" to "look after" rabbis or Jewish scholars in "non-Jewish fields." Thus, for example, Ginzberg rejected an application filed on behalf of a professor in Paris because he studied Islamica and not Judaica.[56] Further, he reminded those at the meeting, other institutions or aid organizations existed to aid rabbis or scholars working in other fields. Still, an underlying sense of urgency and an acknowledgment of the difficulties Jews faced in Germany informed the discussion. The gathered men assembled a list of nineteen scholars they believed most in need of the Academy's aid. They ordered the proposed scholars by a number of factors meant to rank their projected success in securing visas: physical fitness to travel and migrate, age, and marital status. Young, healthy, and unattached scholars reached the top of the list. The plan, at least at the time, was to sponsor five of these men for American visas. Nathan Stern (1878–1945), rabbi of the West End Synagogue in New York City, suggested costs could be kept lower, and the process helped along, if some seminaries provided dormitory housing to the scholars.[57] This was, of course, an easier living arrangement for placing single young scholars rather than an older scholar with a wife and family.

Following along these lines, Ginzberg argued that some scholars would likely be better off emigrating to countries other than the United States—particularly older scholars, such as Samuel Krauss

(1866–1948) and Victor Aptowitzer (1871–1942).[58] The Academy aided these men as best they could, using their individual personal contacts with foreign-based scholars and institutions to advocate on behalf of their colleagues in Germany and Austria. They also received limited amounts of Academy-funded aid through a specially designed program, the "nonresident research fellow" program. The plight of Austrian-based scholars in the wake of the March 1938 Anschluss—when Nazi Germany took control of Austria—proved a particularly personal subject for Baron, who received his education and training in Vienna. By July 1938, European scholars "inundated" Baron with letters asking for his help.[59] Krauss, seventy-two years old at the time, was born in Ukk, Hungary. He had been a professor of Bible and Hebrew literature and Jewish history at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Vienna since 1906. Yet in March 1938, when Germany annexed Austria, his safety in Vienna grew more and more threatened. Neighboring countries, fearing a spike in emigration across their own borders, tightened their quotas. In the aftermath of the Anschluss, emboldened Nazi students stole and destroyed the scholar's library and papers.[60] In late 1938 Krauss moved to Cambridge, where he received limited short-term support through the Academy's nonresident fellowship program. His colleague Victor Aptowitzer experienced a similar trajectory of uncertainty. Aptowitzer, sixty-seven years old at the time of the Anschluss, was a former child prodigy in Talmud born and raised in Tarnopol, Galicia. He moved to Vienna for training, where he later became a professor of Talmud, Bible, midrash, and Jewish philosophy at the Jewish Theological Seminary. His former students included Baron. In March 1939, the Executive Committee voted to appoint Aptowitzer, then living in poverty in Jerusalem, as a nonresident research fellow in the field of Geonic literature. It was a two-year appointment bringing an annual stipend of $450.[61]

Less than twenty-four hours after this meeting, however, the crisis facing German-speaking Jewry reached a new level of emergency. On the night of November 9–10, 1938, Germans—ordinary

citizens and Stormtroopers alike—carried out violent attacks against Jewish individuals and property in Germany, Austria, and the Sudetenland. Kristallnacht accelerated the Academy's aims as they sought to expand their reach and sponsorship. The first Executive Committee meeting after the violent outbreak focused entirely on the topic of aiding German Jewish scholars in their emigration. The committee decided to reach out anew to the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, as well as to individual influential members of the committee, in order to "impress upon them the Academy might become an important agency in bringing over a score of approximately fifty Jewish scholars now in need, provided that the Academy is given adequate financial support by the J.D.C. and similar organizations."[62] Their new goal of providing for fifty persecuted scholars was quite an increase from the five scholars they hoped to support less than a month prior, yet it represented a response to an unprecedented emergency. The long-term plans for these scholars remained uncertain, yet the immediate goal to get as many Jewish scholars out of the Nazi web as quickly as possible persisted. As Honorary Fellow Cyrus Adler put it when questioned about the long-term career prospects of these European scholars: "What is the alternative? To rot in a concentration camp?"[63]

In addition to their own internal efforts at fundraising with the purpose of sponsorship and employment placement, Executive Committee members also decided to coordinate with the National Coordinating Committee for German Jewish Refugees and the Joint Distribution Committee "in order to facilitate the work of aiding Jewish refugee scholars."[64] Similar measures occurred at the Fellows' home institutions. Julian Morgenstern (1881–1977), an Honorary Fellow and at the time a member of the Academy's Executive Committee, reported on the steps he initiated at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, where he presided as president, to accommodate "a score" of refugee scholars.[65] Morgenstern, a Bible scholar, hoped to create some form of cooperative agreement between the Hebrew Union College and the Academy to facilitate

the wide-ranging sponsorship of numerous scholars.[66] The Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City also enacted a similar process to sponsor refugee scholars and rabbis whose research met their institutional standards and who could teach students in English.[67]

Fellows immediately moved to nominate two men for research fellowships: Bruno Strauss (1889–1969) of Berlin and Aron Freimann (1871–1948) of Frankfurt am Main. Strauss studied at the University of Marburg and the University of Berlin, receiving his doctoral degree from the latter in 1911; he honed an expertise in the works of Moses Mendelssohn. The Civil Service Law forced him into early retirement after being a professor in Berlin from 1912 until 1933. From 1933 until 1938 he worked for Berlin's Jewish community. The Academy approved him for a two-year research fellowship in his field of specialty, modern Jewish philosophy, at an annual salary of $2,000.[68] His fellowship enabled him to gain an entrance visa to the United States, shortly thereafter moving on to Shreveport, Louisiana, where he had extended family. He joined the faculty at Centenary College in 1939, teaching history and German language and literature until his retirement in 1964.[69]

The Academy apparently dropped their recently discussed desire to bring over younger scholars in the case of Freimann; or, perhaps, relaxed their restrictions in the aftermath of Kristallnacht. Freimann, born in Posen in 1871, was sixty-seven years old in 1938. He attended the University of Berlin and received his doctoral degree from the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg in 1896, where he studied history and oriental languages. From 1879 until 1933 he worked at the City Library in Frankfurt am Main. Freimann headed the library's Hebrew Department. Over the course of his nearly twenty-five-year tenure he developed and catalogued the largest collection of Judaica and Hebraica in Europe.[70] His expertise and reputation garnered him international recognition. On his sixtieth birthday his friends and colleagues throughout the world organized a Festschrift in his honor; Alexander Marx wrote an introduction to the volume.

Freimann "retired" due to the 1933 Civil Service Law. National Socialist cultural officers closed public access to his Judaica and Hebraica collection in 1937. The following year, the collection became a bartering pawn between Frankfurt am Main's mayor, Friedrich Krebs, and Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg. After Kristallnacht, Krebs offered to give the Nazi Party full control of the forty-thousand-volume collection if the party agreed to place an antisemitic research institution in the city. Rosenberg pounced on the offer, wanting to use the collection as the cornerstone holding of his newly conceived Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question. Yet so much competition existed for control over Freimann's Frankfurt collection that Rosenberg did not get full custody, and its contents scattered throughout the Reich.[71] After the war, the Academy sponsored a project to recompile Freimann's bibliography.

Personal torment followed on the heels of this professional insult. On the night of November 10, 1938, Freimann avoided arrest and imprisonment due to his advanced age. He attempted to intervene on behalf of those imprisoned, but with little luck.[72] Even after Kristallnacht, Freimann's sense of dedication to the Gemeinde kept him in Frankfurt am Main. In April 1939, however, fully realizing the severity of the situation facing German Jewry, Freimann and his wife, Therese Horovitz Freimann (1882–1965), left for the United States with the help of the Academy. In addition to his Academy fellowship, he soon started teaching Jewish history at Yeshiva College.[73] He also gained additional subventions from the Emergency Committee and the New York Public Library, where he worked as a consultant in bibliography.[74] His first official title with the Academy labeled him a "Research Fellow in Hebrew Bibliography." The fellowship covered his research for two years with a stipend of $1,000 annually.[75] In 1940, the NYPL appointed Freimann a research librarian for a term of five years, beginning in January 1941.[76] One year later, in 1942, Freimann joined the ranks of Academy Fellows.

The number of research fellowships awarded by the Academy increased significantly after Kristallnacht. Three factors likely spurred the increase in fellowships: Kristallnacht, the forced closure of Jewish seminaries in Germany, and the beginning of war. Over the course of the following two years the Academy extended new fellowships to the following European refugee research fellows: Berthold Altmann (1896–1992), Samuel Atlas (1899–1977), Adolf Kober (1879–1958), Wolf Leslau (1906–2006), Alfred Sendrey (1884–1976), Bernard D. Weinryb (1905–1982), Rachel Bernstein Wischnitzer (1885–1989), and Y. Yunovitch. Some, such as Altmann, received financial sponsorship with funds raised through the Academy membership and supplemented by the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars. Altmann, formerly of Berlin, held a fellowship in medieval Jewish history.[77] Further, the Emergency Committee made it clear they expected Altmann to receive a permanent paying position with the New York Public Library upon his arrival.[78] During his time as an Academy research fellow, Altmann also worked as a part-time teacher in a local high school while continuing with his research. In the autumn of 1940 he completed a study on the medieval Jewish community in Regensburg, an important center of early Jewish scholarship in Germany.[79] His work, "Studies in Medieval German Jewish History," was published in the 1940 edition of the *Proceedings*.[80]

The Emergency Committee also helped sponsor Rachel Bernstein Wischnitzer's emigration. Wischnitzer—the first woman affiliated with the Academy in any sort of academic capacity and eventually, many decades later, the first female Fellow—trained as an art historian and achieved a "considerable reputation as an authority on early and medieval ecclesiastical art."[81] Her groundbreaking work in Jewish art history and architecture provided the foundation for a new discipline within Jewish scholarship. During the early years of National Socialism, she attempted to create a photo archive of illuminated Hebrew manuscripts at the Prussian State Library. The archive never materialized. State authorities

denied her entrance to the library. In 1935 she finished her first book, *Symbole und Gestalten der jüdischen Kunst*.[82] National Socialist cultural officers confiscated the manuscript. Three years later, Wischnitzer, her husband, and their young son left for Paris.[83]

Wischnitzer balanced tragedy and separation while preparing for emigration. Her mother committed suicide after she moved to Paris. Her husband, also a scholar, went missing somewhere in Spain during the civil war. According to her letters of support, she had not been able to communicate with him for some time.[84] Then, in 1940, she received news of her Academy fellowship based in New York City. At the time of her fellowship, her current research examined symbolism in the paintings of the Dura-Europos synagogue, the topic of her future book manuscript.[85] Despite being a widely published and well-respected scholar, she felt it necessary to obtain the appropriate American academic credentials to really succeed in her new home. While in New York City on the Academy fellowship she enrolled as a graduate student at the Institute of Fine Arts at New York University, where she earned her master's degree. In the meantime, her husband joined the family in the United States with support from the United Jewish Communities; he later taught at Yeshiva University.[86] The same year Wischnitzer achieved her master's degree, in 1944, her son returned to the United States from service with the American army. He had to inform his mother that the Nazis murdered her father in July 1944, on one of the final convoys of Parisian Jews sent to eastern Europe. She learned of his fate the week of her doctoral examinations. Heartbroken and grieving, she never finished her doctoral degree.[87]

Wischnitzer faced her personal tragedies by diving deeper into her research. In 1941, she published "The Samuel Cycle in the Wall Decoration of the Synagogue at Dura-Europos," an article based on her Academy fellowship research, in the *Proceedings*.[88] And in 1948, she expanded this article into her first English-language book, *The Messianic Theme in the Paintings of the Dura Synagogue*.[89] Wischnitzer remained in New York City for the rest of her life. In the mid-1950s

she founded the Fine Arts Department at Stern College for Women and taught Jewish art history until her retirement in 1968.[90]

The Academy sometimes failed in its efforts, in large part due to monetary constraints. In early 1941, an Academy sponsorship for historian Raphael Mahler (1899–1977), whose research focused on the importance of economic and social influences in Jewish history, fell through because the Emergency Committee did not have the funds to match the Academy's financial contribution.[91] Often, the Academy looked elsewhere to help supplement their own funds, with varying degrees of success. Money came from creative sources, such as the scholar's own family. Samuel Atlas, an expert in medieval rabbinics, lived in England while his wife lived in Canada. She approached the Academy and offered to deposit $2,000 with the Academy if they could sponsor her husband and bring him over from England. The Academy leadership agreed.[92] She deposited a total of $2,400 designed to sustain him for the next two years.[93] Eventually, Atlas joined the faculty at the Hebrew Union College.

The Academy also continued to expand its academic scope during this period. Notably, in December 1941 the Academy ushered in a scholarly project unlike anything its Fellows had previously undertaken: the Committee for Musicology. The Committee for Musicology was the Academy's first "committee" on a single academic field. Further, until this point, they had neither nominated a Fellow who specialized in musicology nor had they backed a publication related to the topic of musicology. The recently established Esco Fund, based in New York City, funded the committee.[94] However, it had a short life; the Academy's Committee for Musicology disbanded by 1946. During its brief existence it aimed to provide "new stimuli" toward the "scientific exploration of the history, bibliography and sociology of Jewish music through the active cooperation of expert musicologists and specialists in various fields of Jewish learning."[95]

By December 1942, the committee maintained high hopes for publication; they reviewed multiple manuscripts and selected two for forthcoming publication within the year.[96] Yet unforeseen

circumstances curtailed these earlier expectations, and by 1943 the Academy failed to publish any musicological research.[97] Alfred Sendrey's *Bibliography of Jewish Music* appears to be the only finished project to reach publication. Sendrey was a European-born musicologist and conductor; he was also a refugee from Nazism. Prior to 1933, his career as a conductor spanned across Europe, including appointments in Germany, Austria, and the United States. In 1933, he worked for the Central German Radio in Berlin before he and his family fled the Nazi capital to Paris. From 1933 until 1940 he worked as the director of the Radiodiffusion Nationale. The German takeover of France spurred Sendrey and his family's emigration to the United States. In 1940, he accepted a position to teach at a local YMCA in New York City.[98] By 1944, the Academy's Committee on Musicology received his manuscript and deemed it fit to publish.[99] However, the project faced significant delays. Columbia University Press published Sendrey's *Bibliography of Jewish Music*, in part thanks to Baron's influence, in 1951. The bibliography contains a number of primary sources from prewar European library archival collections, with supplemental materials Sendrey found in American libraries after his emigration.[100] Sendrey's research, and his eventual publication, reflected an increasingly important component of the Academy's commitment to Jewish scholarship at home and abroad, with a particular focus on rebuilding European Jewish scholarship and culture through a number of research and bibliography projects.

The Era of Ascendancy: 1945–1969

President Louis Ginzberg led the Academy into a flourishing postwar era of productivity in 1945—a period which lasted for nearly two and a half decades before drawing to a close in 1969. At the end of World War II, the American Jewish community represented the largest and wealthiest Jewish community in the world. The changing position of American Jewish scholarship reflected this more general realignment of the importance of American Jewry in the wake of

European catastrophe. Initially, in the 1920s, the Academy's founding Fellows looked to Europe as the example and inspiration for establishing high scholarly standards steeped in the scientific traditions of *Wissenschaft*. After the Holocaust, however, the United States—along with Israel—became a dynamic center for Jewish scholarship.

The composition of the Academy Fellows in this period reflected the state of the field in the United States: Jewish studies remained dominated by men based in the Northeast Corridor, centered around New York City and the Jewish Theological Seminary. This demographic composition endured throughout this postwar period, even as the total number of Fellows grew incrementally after 1945, with anywhere from one to five men elected annually. During this time, forty new Fellows were elected to join the Academy's ranks.[101] By the end of this period, the Academy consisted of forty-five active Fellows and two Honorary Fellows: Julian Morgenstern, of the Hebrew Union College, and Abraham Neuman (1898–1970), of Dropsie College. Many of these new Fellows elected after the war were born in Europe, thereby maintaining something of the European-centric feel of the Academy's earlier generation; however, by the end of this period a noticeable increase occurred in the number of scholars who finished their higher education in the United States. At the time of their nomination, half of the Academy's new Fellows taught at one of the country's main seminaries or one of the traditional university homes of Jewish learning either in New York City, Cincinnati, Chicago, Los Angeles, or Philadelphia.[102] On average, a new Fellow entered the Academy at the age of fifty-five; throughout the period, however, the average age of all Fellows remained steady at sixty-six years of age. The Academy continued to be the academic domain of the established, elder men of the field.

Acknowledgement of the Academy's elevated stature in the post–World War II era resulted in some debate concerning control of the Academy and institutional representation. Two issues arose in the latter years of the 1940s and the beginning of the 1950s: the geographical home of the Academy and the composition of its Fellows.

Fault lines developed as Fellows from outside of New York City questioned the prominent role in Academy affairs of the city in general, and the Jewish Theological Seminary in particular. Although relatively minor in scope and length, these debates acted as surrogates for broader concerns: who got to determine the shape of elite, high-ranking Jewish scholarship in the United States, and thus influence the direction of the field of Jewish studies.

Beginning in 1948, a small contingent of Fellows voiced their concerns over the direction of the Academy and perceived biases within its institutional structure. Dropsie College professor of rabbinics Solomon Zeitlin (1892–1976), an authority on the Second Commonwealth, first raised the issue at the December 1948 Fellows meeting in New York City, pointing to the "great need of reorganization." He failed to offer any specific points in need of reform or any means to achieve the desired reorganization. His general critique, however vague, succeeded in opening the floor for discussion.[103]

The first debate to emerge from Zeitlin's broad critique concerned geographical representation, pitting Cincinnati versus New York City—the Midwest versus the Northeast, the country's main Reform seminary versus the country's main Conservative seminary. Fellows from the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati extended an invitation to host the next year's annual meeting (1949) in Cincinnati. From 1920 onward, Academy meetings occurred exclusively in New York City—generally in any open seminar room, or office, on the Jewish Theological Seminary campus. The Executive Committee "considered very seriously" Cincinnati's proposal—at least officially, according to the recorded minutes.[104]

The request from Cincinnati came at a period of administrative transition at the Hebrew Union College, during which time its leadership sought to address the floundering financial and enrollment issues that had been plaguing the college since the Great Depression.[105] Nelson Glueck (1900–1971), an expert in biblical archaeology, took over as the college's president in 1947, replacing Morgenstern.[106] Glueck's era began with a campaign to centralize

the training of the entire American Reform rabbinate through the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. Hosting the Academy's annual meeting would lend further legitimization to Cincinnati and the Hebrew Union College's place in the landscape of American Jewry at a time when its administration actively sought to reverse decades of Reform decline—and as Conservative Judaism gained momentum throughout the country. As a host to a serious scholarly meeting, Cincinnati could take advantage of the Academy's prestige to bolster its claims as an important home to serious Jewish scholarship.

Personal biases outside of the institutional and denominational rivalries between the Hebrew Union College Fellows and the Jewish Theological Seminary Fellows likely influenced the dispute as well. On top of the professional fault lines, some outside of the metropolis simply did not like New York City. According to Michael A. Meyer's history of the Hebrew Union College, "Glueck did not enjoy being in New York; he felt ill at ease there in an environment which offered neither the polite atmosphere of Cincinnati nor the romantic lure of Jerusalem and the Palestinian desert."[107]

Yet a year later, the 1949 annual meeting again convened in Alexander Marx's office at the Jewish Theological Seminary. Hebrew Union College's Isaiah Sonne (1887–1960), a historian of Italian Jewry, began the meeting by reading a prepared statement condemning the Academy leadership's failure to hold the meeting in Cincinnati. Sonne, who joined the Academy's Executive Committee a year later, also expressed anger over not receiving an official invitation to the Fellows' meeting. This incident, he argued, highlighted the difficulties scholars living outside of New York City faced in remaining abreast of, and involved in, Academy affairs. A counterargument to Sonne's statement claimed "no definitive commitment" to holding the 1949 meeting in Cincinnati had ever been made, despite the earlier claims of seriously considering Cincinnati's bid to host the meeting the year prior.[108] A geographical move never came. The Jewish Theological Seminary remained the Academy's home base and hosted its annual meetings until the 1990s.

Similar concerns over the close relationship between the Jewish Theological Seminary and the Academy existed regarding the prevalence of the Jewish Theological Seminary faculty and staff dominating the Academy's leadership positions. During the 1950 annual meeting, Zeitlin took issue with what he perceived to be either instances of personal favoritism or personal animosity determining the election or blocking of new officers. Zeitlin placed particular emphasis on the number of Fellows with connections to the seminary. His complaints regarding a seminary monopoly among Academy officers had a basis in reality. The year prior, the Executive Committee consisted of five men: Alexander Marx, Saul Lieberman, Israel Efros (1891–1981), Abraham Halkin (1904–1990), and Guido Kisch. Marx, Lieberman, and Halkin all worked at the Jewish Theological Seminary; Efros attended the seminary; and Kisch found his first academic home in the United States in the seminary library. Each of the officers lived and worked in New York City, and each had some sort of connection to the seminary. Zeitlin extended his claim beyond merely recognizing the overrepresentation; he felt the seminary clique created an active form of bias against other Fellows seeking leadership positions. He claimed, "The Seminary had previously always blocked the election of officers of other institutions." He offered a solution: to limit the number of officers who could be nominated to leadership positions from a single institution in order to better represent all institutions (or at least a greater number of institutions). A "heated discussion" ensued. Louis Ginzberg, then a member of the Academy Executive Committee, outright rejected Zeitlin's claims, calling them "shameless and impudent." Zeitlin doubled down and refused to withdraw his statement about the seminary. Nor did he withdraw his statement that personal politics greatly influenced the inner workings of the Academy. However, he did withdraw his motion to limit the amount of individual institutional representation in leadership positions.[109]

Others outside of the Academy also noted the strong connection between the Academy and the Jewish Theological Seminary. In 1951, *Hadoar*, the Hebrew-language New York–based magazine, published a letter claiming the Academy existed as a branch of the seminary. Fellows discussed the letter, along with what they viewed as its "erroneous opinion" at the next annual Fellows meeting that December. In the end, the consensus decided not to respond to the letter. However, leadership did make it a point to always ensure that public statements made it clear the Academy was not "dependent" on any individual institution.[110]

Administrative connections between the Fellows and the seminary likely caused outsiders to further blur the lines between the Academy and the JTS. Not only did more Fellows come from the JTS than any other institution, but its administrative work all took place at the seminary campus. Anna Kleban, the Academy's secretary for its first forty years of existence, ran the day-to-day behind-the-scenes work that kept the Academy functioning. She worked as a staff member at the JTS library for over fifty years, first as the personal secretary to Alexander Marx and later as the director of community education and field activities. Kleban had a reading knowledge of seven languages and could speak five languages fluently—which undoubtedly helped her smoothly run the administrative tasks of an organization that frequently corresponded with international scholars and academic bodies.[111] She split her time between the seminary library and the Academy office until the Academy workload became too heavy in 1967.[112] Then Geraldine Rosenfield (d. 2005) took over; Rosenfield also worked at the JTS library, further overlapping the lines between the seminary and the Academy.[113]

These arguments passed, however, and by the 1950s, the Academy achieved a level of security in terms of membership and finances, thus ensuring its long-term viability. The Academy continued to nourish its reputation as a standard-bearer of

high-quality scholarship through its meetings and its publications. Still existing as the lone scholarly organization dedicated to Jewish scholarship in the United States at this time, its annual meeting provided an important venue for scholars to exchange ideas and present their current research. The Academy's annual journal, the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, remained the country's premier scholarly Jewish publication. Often, the *Proceedings* and the annual meeting bolstered each other, as the *Proceedings* regularly included papers first delivered at the annual meeting. In addition, from 1950 onward, the Academy's leadership also began pursuing new objectives: "aiding needy or young scholars" and "supporting publications."[114] These objectives intertwined with both postwar reconstruction and participation in international modes of academic exchange.

Throughout the years, the American Academy for Jewish Research held its annual meeting in late December on the JTS campus. Over time, the meeting moved from Ginzberg's living room, Marx's office, or any open seminar room to the seminary's auditorium, as a response to growing crowds. Perhaps harkening back to its early days, leaders in the field, such as Baron and Lieberman, met informally at a colleague's home the evening prior to the official public meeting. The men privately caught up and discussed their research or other academic issues.[115] Then, the next day, the public meeting began.

In those days, both scholars and interested members of the public could attend the Academy's annual meeting. The event lasted for one day, a Sunday. Typically, two to four scholars read papers in the morning, and four scholars read papers in the afternoon. Fellows and non-Fellows alike could give papers and attend. Between the morning and afternoon sessions, Academy executives delivered an annual report to the Fellows, summing up the activities

of the past year and highlighting upcoming goals. Future Fellow Michael A. Meyer attended his first Academy annual meeting as a doctoral student in 1962. Meyer, a scholar of modern Jewish history but at the time a doctoral student at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, recalled sitting in the audience "as an odd doctoral student" among a crowd of faculty members and established scholars.[116] Future Fellow Robert Chazan, who studied in New York City at Columbia University and the Jewish Theological Seminary in the 1960s, remembered the annual meetings of these years as the place to go to listen to the most important names in the field as they delivered new research.[117] For younger scholars, he recalled these annual meetings as "the place where you made your debut." Chazan presented his first paper at the Academy's annual meeting as a doctoral student: "It was a scary experience because all the luminaries were going to be sitting in the audience."[118]

Presenting a paper at the annual meeting also presented another opportunity: publication. In the 1950s, nearly half of the articles printed in the *Proceedings* were first delivered as papers at the annual meeting. Established Fellows generally filled the journal's remaining pages. Abraham Halkin, a leading scholar in the fields of Bible and Judeo-Arabic texts, edited the *Proceedings* until 1969, during which time the journal grew into one of the premier journals publishing on Jewish topics at a period when few alternatives for publication existed. Halkin's own broad scholarly interests informed the selection of articles published in the *Proceedings*. As Fellow Gerson Cohen (1924–1991), a Jewish historian and former chancellor of the Jewish Theological Seminary, wrote of Halkin upon his death, "He considered nothing alien to his interest" and "he sought to present this broad approach in the pages of the *Proceedings*."[119]

Trends evident in the *Proceedings* provide insights into the ways Academy Fellows conceived of Jewish studies at that particular time. While Halkin served as editor, a fairly consistent cast of Fellows served on the Academy's publishing committee, anchored by Baron, Shalom Spiegel (1899–1984), a professor of Hebrew

literature at the Jewish Theological Seminary, and Leo Strauss (1899–1973), a political philosopher who taught at the University of Chicago. In general terms, a cast of "regulars" produced numerous articles throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, led by Baron, Strauss, Semitics scholar and historian of science Solomon Gandz (1883–1954), Talmudist Boaz Cohen (1899–1968), Semitic language and literature expert Joshua Finkel (1897–1983), French Jewish historian Zosa Szajkowski (1911–1978), and Zvi Ankori (1920–2012), a scholar of Karaite Judaism.[120] With a few exceptions, Jewish studies remained the purview of men. During this period, only one article written by a woman appeared in the *Proceedings*. To extend this further, men wrote all but three articles published from its first issue through the 1960s. In 1940, Ilse Lichtenstadter (1907–1991), a German refugee and authority in Middle Eastern languages who later taught at Harvard, published "Some References to Jews in Pre-Islamic Arabic Literature." Lichtenstadter came to the United States in 1938, taking up a position at the Jewish Theological Seminary as a cataloguer of Judaica. She never became a Fellow. A year later, future Fellow and then-current Refugee Research Fellow Rachel Bernstein Wischnitzer published "The Samuel Cycle in the Wall Decoration of the Synagogue at Dura-Europas," an article based on research undertaken during her Academy fellowship. After these two European women, however, another woman's research did not appear in the *Proceedings* until 1953, when Sarah Heller-Wilensky published an intellectual history entitled "Isaac Arama on Creation and Structure of the World." Heller-Wilenski based the article on the paper she presented at the Academy's annual meeting.

Certain areas of study printed in the *Proceedings* cycled in and out of vogue, although articles on Bible and rabbinics remained at the journal's core throughout its existence. In its first two decades of publication, from 1928 until 1948, articles on medieval history, intellectual history, Bible, and rabbinics dominated. In 1950, however, the composition temporarily shifted to include modern topics, predominately modern history and modern religious thought. By

the 1950s, the number of articles on modern topics nearly doubled from the previous decade, accounting for approximately a quarter of all articles published in the journal. Further, by the mid-1950s, scholars other than Baron began publishing on modern topics. Joshua Finkel, a professor of Semitic languages at Yeshiva University, published on religious studies topics related to the modern era. Zosa Szajkowski, affiliated with the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, which relocated to New York City in 1940 from Vilna, published extensively in the 1955 through 1959 volumes of the *Proceedings*. His numerous articles examined aspects of French Jewry at the time of the Revolution, as well as broader social histories of French Jews at various points in history, including the twentieth century. Jewish historian Isaac Barzilay (1915–2006) also published a series of articles on the Berlin Haskalah in 1955, 1956, and 1960–1971.

Additionally, a small number of contemporary topics also appeared in the *Proceedings* for the first time after 1945. In the 1948–1949 volume of the *Proceedings*, Philip (Filip) Friedman (1901–1960) published the only article on the Holocaust ever published in the journal, "The European Jewish Research on the Recent Jewish Catastrophe."[121] Friedman, a Polish-born historian based at Columbia University, survived the Holocaust in hiding in the "Aryan section" of Lvov. At the end of World War II, Friedman, who lost his wife and daughter in the Holocaust, remained in Poland and taught history at the University of Lodz while simultaneously serving as the director of the Central Jewish Historical Committee, which sought to document and record National Socialist war crimes. Friedman dedicated the rest of his academic career to studying the destruction of European Jewry. His work in immediate postwar documentation led to his testifying at the Nuremberg Trials, where he met Salo Baron—a connection which likely resulted in the above-mentioned article being published in the *Proceedings*. In 1948, Friedman relocated to the United States, holding various research fellowships and lectureships at Columbia. Ten years later, in 1958, Academy

Fellows elected him into their ranks.[122] Perhaps guided by Baron's own research at the time, the *Proceedings* also published contemporary Soviet history in the late 1950s and early 1960s, that is, during the period Baron worked on his study, *The Russian Jews under Tsars and Soviets* (1964). In 1959 and 1962, Alfred Greenbaum published articles on Soviet Jewry, his first article examining Jewish historiography in the Soviet Union, and his second article looking at the topic of "Nationalism as a Problem in Soviet Jewish Scholarship."

The burst of articles on the modern period during the 1950s quickly reverted back to its pre-1950s level by the mid-1960s. Additionally, the foray into publishing on contemporary topics proved short-lived. By the 1960s, the medieval period came back into vogue in the pages of the *Proceedings*, accounting for 40 percent of the material published in the journal. These years also saw a revival of an earlier focus on intellectual history, as well as renewed interest in critical editions of Judeo-Arabic texts—perhaps as a reaction to the social and cultural revolutions beginning to gain steam throughout American culture in this decade.

Beyond the *Proceedings*, the Academy also offered subsidies and grants to scholars publishing on Jewish topics who could not find funding from other institutions. The Academy provided financial backing to Mordecai Margolioth (1909–1968), a scholar of Kabbalah, that allowed him to finish the fifth volume in his critical edition of Vayikra Rabbah, and for Max Kadushin (1895–1980) to continue his studies in rabbinic theology, for example. Yet the majority of its grants-in-aid went to scholars working within one of two "special projects" begun at this time: the Epstein Fund text and series project, and the Academy's work with the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany.

In 1949, Academy Fellow Louis Epstein (1887–1949), a scholar of Jewish law, died at the age of sixty-two. Fellows described his death as an "irretrievable loss," leaving the American Jewish community "bereft of one of its most illustrious rabbis, and historical Judaism . . . deprived of one of its foremost exponents."[123] Born in

a small village in Lithuania, Epstein immigrated to Chicago at the age of seventeen. His education took him East, where he studied at Columbia University and the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City. In 1925 he took up a position at Kehillath Israel in Brookline, Massachusetts, where he served for twenty-five years. "Dr. Epstein was elected fellow of the academy when he became rabbi emeritus and dedicated all his time and energy to the making of further original contributions to Jewish learning," reflected Fellows Cohen and Ginzberg upon his death. "But he was also one of its devoted patrons," they admitted. Cohen and Ginzberg outlined Epstein's commitment to Jewish scholarship and, in particular, the Academy. "Well-nigh from the very inception of the Academy, he saw to it that the community over which he presided made a generous contribution to the Academy every year. This inspired other communities to vie with his in support of the Academy," they observed. "In his last will and testament, he left the bulk of his estate, which comprised a substantial sum, to the Academy with the proviso that the income from the funds be used to further the publication of scientific works of merit."[124] Epstein's bequest to the Academy, which consisted of savings bonds, stocks, and property in Chicago, totaled $41,000.[125] A New York City brokerage firm invested the gift in a variety of stock holdings, and by February 1967 its value exceeded $200,000.[126]

Epstein's will stipulated that at least two-thirds of the initial funds from his estate be designated for the "Louis M. and Winnie W. Epstein Fund" to allow for the "publication and dissemination of works in the field of Jewish Research and Literature."[127] A portion of the bequest bookmarked money specifically for reprinting Epstein's own works, translated from English to Hebrew, and circulating the translated works in Israel.[128] The Academy also published a six-volume "special project"—the "Louis M. and Minnie W. Epstein Series"—to support endeavors the Fellows deemed in need of research. The research supported through the Epstein Series ranged widely in topic from *Maimonides' Epistle to Yemen*

(edited with an introduction and notes by Abraham Halkin; 1952) to *Jewish Labour Law*, based on the examples of England and Israel (Shilem Warhaftig; 1969).[129]

In 1955, the Academy initiated a nearly two-decade relationship with the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (referred to as the Claims Conference for short). The Claims Conference originated in the autumn of 1951 after a meeting of twenty-three major American and international Jewish organizations. Claims Conference leadership negotiated with West German governmental officials regarding material damages and claims of Jewish victims of the Holocaust. A year later, the Claims Conference and the West German government reached an agreement with two guiding protocols: first, the creation of a set of laws to compensate directly the restitution claims of Jewish victims of Nazi Germany; and second, an agreement to provide funds for the relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement of Jewish victims of Nazism.[130]

The Academy fit into the Claims Conference mission through both means: aiding individual victims of Nazi persecution and contributing to the rebuilding of European Jewry. According to the Academy's initial acceptance letter from the Claims Conference, "all funds from the Conference shall be used for the employment of individuals who qualify as Nazi victims."[131] In February 1955, the Academy received its first installment.[132] The Academy allocated half of the funds for the republication of scarce books printed in Germany and Poland (later this expanded to Europe more generally, particularly eastern Europe), and split the remaining amount between Adolf Kober, a historian of German Jewry, who began his connection with the Academy through a refugee scholar fellowship, and Osias H. Babad, a historian who began his studies at the University of Vienna prior to the Anschluss. Academy leadership also requested an additional smaller payment to sponsor the research of legal historian Abraham Berger (1882–1962) as he continued his work on the history of the Jews of the Roman Empire.[133]

This first funding initiative covered two expansive survey

and cataloguing projects. Until October 1955, Kober had been working on cataloguing German Jewish periodicals from the late eighteenth century (since the Enlightenment, beginning with *Ha-me'assef*) until 1938. He completed his German periodicals survey in the autumn of 1955 and shortly thereafter began his examination of periodicals in the states neighboring Germany. His envisioned end product had two focal points: a classification of all the material and a short history of the periodicals.[134] Kober worked on the volume in conjunction with the Leo Baeck Institute, which now holds the manuscript in its archives.[135] Babad's research involved creating a bibliography of books printed in eastern Europe. Upon the Academy's request, Babad cross-referenced his lists with the catalogues of the four largest libraries in New York City at the time: the Jewish Theological Seminary library, the New York Public Library, the Jewish Institute of Religion library, and the Yeshiva University library (and, if possible, the "extensive library" of the Lubavitcher Rebbe). The Academy also asked Babad to mark the books of most importance, presumably to help identify books most in need of collection or republication.[136] In 1958, the Academy sought funding from the Claims Conference to combine Kober's and Babad's research projects and published a single bibliography of Jewish books and periodicals published in eastern and central Europe; it is unclear if the bibliography was ever published for distribution.[137]

The Academy's next project with the Claims Conference began in the summer of 1955, when Fellows agreed on a need for the republication of the text *Sefer ha-ʿittur*—a compilation of halakhic laws of practical applications by Isaac ben Abba Mari of Marseilles in the twelfth century—with the commentary by Rabbi Meir Jonah of Swisloch (Vilna/Warsaw) originally published between 1874 and 1885.[138] According to Saul Lieberman, then president of the Academy, "The importance of this work is the Commentary which is exceedingly useful and just as exceedingly rare. It is also our plan to append additions by the same author included in another of his books called 'Har ha'Moriah.'"[139] By the 1950s, *Sefer ha-ʿittur*

had long been out of print and, according to Lieberman, "cannot be procured and commands fantastic prices when a bookdealer lays his hands on it. Moreover, Rabbi Meir Jonah, the author of the Commentary has this work as virtually his only monument, and it certainly deserves preservation."[140]

Republishing *Sefer ha-ʿittur* represented the Academy's goal to seek out and identify the "accessibility and availability" of materials in the field of rabbinic literature and, later, European Jewish manuscripts and publications more broadly.[141] The physical destruction of European Jewry and its institutions during World War II and the Holocaust made the reproduction of any remaining rare books of utmost cultural importance. The Academy completed the *Sefer ha-ʿittur* republication project by that next winter.[142] The Executive Committee sent fifty complimentary copies of the text to Israel, presumably to a mixture of individual scholars and libraries, while "a number" of copies went to scholars and libraries throughout the United States. In total, by mid-October 1956, less than a full year since its republication, two hundred copies had been sold.[143]

The Academy's work in producing bibliographies continued apace. In the early 1960s the Academy received support from the Claims Conference to fund a revised edition of Arthur Zacharias Schwarz's (1880–1939) catalogue of Hebrew manuscripts in Austrian libraries.[144] Baron and Halkin both considered the project "of considerable significance to Jewish scholarship." They maintained that the "salvage" of the manuscripts catalogued in the publication would be "for the benefit of the Jewish community at large."[145] First, the Academy had to complete the project, which remained unfinished at the time of Schwarz's death. His widow, who had since moved to Israel, as well as several of Schwarz's friends, sought out the Academy in order to oversee a completed and revised edition of his work, including photographic reproductions, a description of the additional manuscripts found in Schwarz's papers after his death, any additions or corrections gathered from these newly found papers, and an introduction that included a bibliographical section. Baron

and Halkin hired Abraham N. Z. Roth, a victim of Nazi persecution originally from Budapest but at the time then living in Munich, to revise, edit, and add new information to the original bibliography.[146]

The Academy also joined the Claims Conference to fund a new project undertaken by Zosa Szajkowski in 1957; he became an Academy Fellow in 1960, three years after he first became associated with the Academy.[147] Szajkowski was born in a small village in the Russian Partition (an area that is today part of Poland) in 1911. He left his hometown in 1927 and settled in Paris as a newly-convinced communist, sparking an interest in France that later informed much of his academic work. In the late 1930s, as he later told colleagues, he left the Communist Party due to disillusionment with Stalinism and the Great Terror. Szajkowski then obtained a fellowship with the YIVO–Yiddish Scientific Institute in Vilna, beginning his research on French Jewish history. At the start of World War II, he joined the French Foreign Legion, during which time he was wounded in battle. In 1941, he arrived in the United States, again serving in World War II, this time in the United States Army as a paratrooper. Szajkowski became an instrumental (notorious, even) figure for hiding and smuggling tens of thousands of archival materials from France.[148] After the war, he became a research associate at YIVO in New York City; he held this position for nearly forty years.[149] In 1957, he received funding from the Claims Conference and support from the Academy for his project on the Jewish community in France during the Revolution (1789–1800). Szajkowski's project dealt with important broader questions, including "the struggle between large and small Jewish communities, Jewish deaths, [and] relations with state."[150] His joint Academy and Claims Conference fellowship began a period of significant scholarly output on the topic of French Jewry. Szajkowski published his findings in each annual volume of the *Proceedings* from 1955 through 1959.

Funds from the Claims Conference also allowed the Academy to oversee the completion of Aron Freimann's bibliography, a "Union Catalogue of Jewish Manuscripts in European and American

Libraries," which the Academy later published as *Union-Catalog of Hebrew Manuscripts and Their Location*—perhaps the largest and most extensive of the Academy's bibliography projects.[151] After his death, Freimann left behind a large collection of handwritten bibliographic cards. Initially, Academy Fellows remained unsure of how to proceed with this new, largely handwritten cache of additional information. Originally, Baron thought the catalogue could be compiled and then translated into either Hebrew or English, but a closer look at the extent of the material changed his mind. As he wrote to Mark Uveeler, the executive secretary of the Claims Conference, "On closer examination, however, we came to the conclusion that it would not be easy now to assemble a staff competent to do this job." Baron further explained "that it would require many years before it could be completed, and that the cost would run into a quarter million dollars or more."[152] The Fellows decided on a more short-term solution, to "publish this large and enormously important collection in photographic form" so that scholars worldwide could benefit from the reproduction sooner rather than later.[153]

The bibliography also had an additional importance: as Baron noted, "some of the collection [referred to in Freimann's bibliography] may not be extant today." As such, in the post-Holocaust period Freimann's bibliographical collection not only provided stimulus for scholars and research, but also potentially enabled scholars "to locate some of the lost manuscripts" or at least to gauge the extent of scholarship lost.[154] Indeed, the significance of the Freimann bibliography grew in the aftermath of Nazism after it became clear that the Frankfurt am Main collection had largely been dispersed throughout the continent and parts of it destroyed (either deliberately or as collateral damage during World War II). As Halkin explained to the Claims Conference representatives, "[Freimann] gathered an enormous amount of material which he was unfortunately prevented from finishing. The value of the work can hardly be overestimated."[155] Future Fellow Menahem Schmelzer, a librarian

at the Jewish Theological Seminary, completed the extensive task of indexing the project.

Baron described the catalogue's publication as a "significant volume representing a lifetime of work by a distinguished and unforgettable scholar. We hope that its publication will stimulate others to follow suit. Perhaps some day," he mused, "a group of scholars, specializing in individual aspects of Jewish history, literature and religion will be able to publish a collective and more comprehensive catalogue of Hebrew manuscripts extant in the world libraries including some private ones."[156] Indeed, Freimann's bibliography would again be revisited by the same library where Freimann began his research. Since 2011, the University of Frankfurt am Main, whose university library comprises the remains of the old city library collection, together with the Center for Jewish History in New York City and the National Endowment of the Humanities, has been attempting to complete Freimann's collection by using his original bibliography. The bibliography, which has been digitized, is now named the Freimann Bibliography and is easily accessible online, thus fulfilling Baron's dream.[157]

Decline and Stagnation: 1969–1995

The academic world into which the Academy republished Aron Freimann's bibliography project in 1972 held very little resemblance to the academic world Freimann himself knew—something that also held true for many Academy Fellows at the time. A post–World War II boom in higher education expanded the American university system and fostered greater academic inclusion, particularly in the humanities. During the 1960s, social revolutions swept across the United States. These began with the struggles for equality initiated by the civil rights movement, and then spread to protests against the Vietnam War. In the 1960s women organized to press for equal rights, including the integration of prestigious all-male universities. A similar movement for gay rights emerged and took

inspiration from the women's movement. Students engaged in all of these movements for social change, in the process challenging the academic character and goals of universities. In response, research and curricular growth in "area studies" and "ethnic studies" developed, reflecting a broadened scope of university research and teaching. Jewish studies benefited from these general changes within American academia. Increasingly, Jewish scholarship entered the secular university and college system.[158]

As Jewish studies became part of the academic mainstream, by way of secular university and college inclusion, the American Academy for Jewish Research remained largely out of step with the evolution of the field. Its membership, composed largely of male professors teaching at seminaries or one of the six original university homes of Jewish scholarship, saw no significant alterations in the decades that followed. Indeed, by the late 1970s, nearly two-thirds of Fellows still came from one of the institutions represented in the Academy's first decade of existence, despite the fact that, by that decade, approximately 375 four-year universities and colleges offered coursework in Jewish learning.[159] Further, despite the proliferation of Jewish studies taking place in all corners of the country, Academy Fellows still came overwhelmingly from the northeastern part of the United States. In 1976, for example, four of the five officers—Salo Baron (Columbia, president), H. L. Ginsberg (1903–1990; professor of rabbinic literature at the Jewish Theological Seminary, treasurer), Isaac Barzilay (Columbia, secretary), and Arthur Hyman (1921–2017; professor of philosophy at Yeshiva University, recording secretary)—came from New York City. Only vice president Alexander Altmann (1906–1987) found himself at an institution outside of the city—although Brandeis University, where in 1976 he served as professor emeritus, located in Waltham, Massachusetts, was not too far up the coast; beginning that year, he was also a visiting professor at nearby Harvard University.

Nor did Academy Fellows see a need to enlarge membership ranks to better incorporate the expansion of the field. During a Planning Committee meeting in the autumn of 1979, Franz

Rosenthal (1914–2003), then teaching Arabic literature at Yale, reiterated his conviction that the Academy not increase its number of Fellows because it would dilute the quality of its Fellows: "The Academy should remain elitist," he affirmed during the meeting. Jacob Neusner (1932–2016), a recently nominated Fellow working on rabbinic Judaism at Brown University who, at forty-seven years of age in 1979 was nearly two decades younger than Rosenthal, pushed back against this belief. Neusner told the committee that even if the number of Fellows increased from forty-eight to eighty over the course of a few years, this number still represented only 4 to 8 percent of scholars engaged in Jewish studies in the United States. In essence, he argued, the Academy could still significantly expand its number of Fellows while maintaining its elitist nature.[160] No expansion occurred.

At this time, however, the world of Jewish studies in the United States began to change. After 1969, an alternative to the American Academy for Jewish Research developed: the Association for Jewish Studies (AJS). A group of male scholars concerned with the future of Jewish studies in the United States, who saw the Academy as unable to adequately address changes within academia, held the association's first public meeting at Brandeis University. According to Paul Ritterband and Harold Wechsler's research on the history of Jewish studies in the American university system, the establishment of AJS developed as a result of the Academy's unwillingness to adapt to the changing nature of the field. The founders of the Association for Jewish Studies viewed the Academy as representing the "older generation" of scholars whose members had "little enthusiasm for a new organization seeking to address expansion in the field, and initially failed to acknowledge that Jewish studies in America was in the process of developing far beyond Cambridge and Morningside Heights."[161] AJS's initial steering committee consisted of ten men: Arnold Band, Charles Berlin, Gerson Cohen (1924–1991), Nahum Glatzer (1903–1990), Irving Greenberg, Baruch Levine, Michael A. Meyer, Yochanan Muffs (1932–2009), Nahum Sarna (1923–2005), and

Frank Talmage (1938-1988).[162] Of these, only the historian Gerson Cohen maintained membership in both the American Academy for Jewish Research and the Association for Jewish Studies in 1969. At the time, Cohen served as Academy secretary, and at forty-five years old, was the youngest member of the Academy officers. The founders of the AJS intended to "bring together a new generation of Jewish studies scholars in order to discuss their work and address problems in the growing field."[163] The AJS steering committee consisted of a younger group of scholars than the Academy's leadership. Its initial steering committee averaged forty years of age; the youngest, Frank Talmage, was thirty-one years old at the time, while Nahum Glatzer, the eldest steering committee member at sixty-six, was two decades older than the next oldest member. By comparison, Academy leadership was, on average, sixty-four years of age for its officers and sixty-seven for the entirety of its fifteen-member Executive Committee—ranging in age from Cohen to talmudic scholar Louis Finkelstein (1885–1991), then eighty-four years old and, in 1969, in his final years of serving as chancellor of the Jewish Theological Seminary.

At its core, the mission of the Association for Jewish Studies overlapped with that of the American Academy for Jewish Research: to stimulate Jewish learning and advance Jewish scholarship. Yet, the key differences emerged in how the two organizations sought to stimulate and advance scholarship. By the early 1970s, the men who founded the Association for Jewish Studies perceived the Academy as resistant to change.[164] Whereas they viewed the Academy as exclusive, old fashioned, and elitist, the Association for Jewish Studies founders saw their association as younger, full of optimism, tuned in to the trends of American university life, and more inclusive. These men sought to "resituate" Jewish scholarship,[165] and to "dust off the cobwebs" of the field.[166] They presented the Association for Jewish Studies as a younger, more democratic alternative to the American Academy for Jewish Research. AJS would be an open organization for scholars of Jewish studies well-versed in the experiences of

the American university system and cognizant of the challenges facing the field during this period of growth.[167] A total of forty-seven scholars attended the first meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies in 1969. Columbia's Baron, then president of the Academy, and Harvard's Wolfson, who served on the Academy's Executive Committee, notably chose not to attend. The absence of the field's two luminaries, both longtime Academy Fellows, hinted at initial tensions between the leading figures of both organizations.

A few Academy Fellows did acknowledge the changes afoot and urged the Executive Committee to adapt. Suggestions generally went unanswered. In the autumn of 1966, Robert Gordis (1908–1992), "the quintessential rabbi-scholar of his generation,"[168] who taught Bible at the Jewish Theological Seminary and held a number of additional adjunct positions, wrote to Abraham Halkin, then serving as Academy vice president, with ideas to "strengthen, expand and revitalize the AAJR." Gordis continued, "The AAJR should take advantage of and give added impetus to the new trend of appointing professors of Judaic studies in history, philosophy and especially in religion departments in secular American colleges and universities." Writing the letter on his Temple University letterhead, he pointed out, "This new trend may well be the crucial factor in the future of Judaic studies in America and therefore in the effort to strengthen, expand and revitalize the AAJR, which hopefully can become <u>the</u> organization of Jewish scholars in America."[169]

Still, the Academy continued to operate as it had in the first half of the century. Even in 1980, the majority of its Fellows came from the same handful of institutions as did the Academy Fellows of the 1920s and 1930s. On the one hand, the Academy's slow reaction to the changing realities of a now-university-dominated field may have simply been the result of its strict membership guidelines. New hires in these university departments throughout the country may

not have had enough time to meet the Academy's standards, which included having made a significant impact in the Fellow's field of scholarship; as a rule of thumb, for which there were exceptions, the Academy looked for scholars who had published at least two books or had established a high academic reputation through article publication. On the other hand, the older Academy Fellows at the helm of its leadership may also have held preexisting biases about what constituted Jewish studies and where it was studied, biases which undoubtedly would have influenced their reactions. Michael A. Meyer later suggested that the Academy's older generation simply came from a different world and could not imagine serious Jewish scholarship taking place in the American secular university system after it had failed to take root in Germany.[170]

The Academy leadership of the 1970s more or less remained removed from the changes occurring around them—perhaps due to an unwillingness to change, perhaps due to the belief that university inclusion would not stick. Yet a generational shift evident at the close of the decade ushered in the start of a new era. In 1976, Solomon Zeitlin died at the age of ninety. Zeitlin, who had written over four hundred articles and multiple books during the span of his career, represented that first generation of productive, elite, European-born, European-educated Jewish scholars who, for the most part and with a few notable exceptions, taught in seminaries or Jewish institutions. As Talmudist David Weiss Halivni and historian Sidney Hoenig (1907–1979) noted in the Academy necrology, Zeitlin's death marked the "end of an era in Jewish scholarship which was initially identified with early training in East European academies and which, its subsequent Westernization notwithstanding, remained rooted in that rich milieu."[171] His career reflected the typical path of a Jewish scholar of his generation. He began at the Jewish Theological Seminary, where he taught alongside other early Academy founders and Fellows Louis Ginzberg, Israel Davidson, and Alexander Marx. From there he moved to Dropsie College, where he taught for the rest of his career. Zeitlin was a Jewish scholar who taught in Jewish institutions

of learning. His professional life, like that of the majority of his peers, took place in the sphere of seminaries and Jewish institutions, not in the secular American college and university system. Most of the men of Zeitlin's era were generally unfamiliar with the American university situation: they had not studied there and did not teach there. In short, they were not part of that milieu, and, arguably, it did not interest them.[172] It simply was not their world.

The expansion of Jewish studies into the university system also renewed an old question: What constituted Jewish studies? Upon the occasion of the Academy's fiftieth anniversary of its first public meeting, Saul Lieberman published an article in the *Proceedings*' jubilee volume entitled, "Achievements and Aspirations of Modern Jewish Scholarship." Lieberman outlined the future of modern Jewish scholarship by looking backward. He drew attention to the "pure research" of Jewish studies as a discipline rooted in a deep knowledge of rabbinic literature, philology, history, and "strict scholarly integrity." He did not include newer modes of research, such as social history, sociology, or women's studies. Further, his take on modern Jewish scholarship used exclusively male pronouns, reflecting his assumption that rabbinical training and Judaic studies training overlapped.[173] For Lieberman, Jewish studies still comprised men active in biblical and rabbinical studies, history, and philology.

Lieberman's formulation left out women as scholars of Jewish studies, a notable omission in the wake of the cultural revolutions, including the feminist movement, of the 1960s and 1970s. Indeed, the rise of the feminist movement in the 1960s transformed academia. Women entered the American university scene in significant numbers as students and, although much more gradually, as faculty. Likewise, the Jewish feminist movement developed within the context of second wave feminism. Centered in New York City before spreading throughout the country, it sought the equality of women and men in all aspects of religious, intellectual, and social life. In academic terms, as women more easily gained access to traditional modes of training, they could offer fresh interpretations and pose

new questions of old material. Further, as women entered academia they clustered in such fields as social history, American Jewish history, and women's history—areas of study which the men of the Academy hesitated to accept as part of Jewish studies.[174] Thus, despite the significant changes to the academic world and the Jewish communal world, women's entrance into Jewish studies, a field traditionally dominated by men, occurred later and at a slower pace than in academia at large.[175]

Lieberman's gendered understanding of Jewish studies aligned with the Academy's past election of Fellows. Indeed, the Academy Fellows did not elect a female Fellow into their ranks until 1981. That year, Rachel Bernstein Wischnitzer became the first female Fellow of the American Academy for Jewish Research—at the age of ninety-one.[176] Over the course of her career, Wischnitzer had achieved international renown as a noted art historian and an expert in synagogue architecture. Decades prior, in 1955, she published her second book in English (not her mother tongue), *Synagogue Architecture in the United States*, which she followed with another volume on *The Architecture of the European Synagogue* (1964). In 1991, hoping to secure funds for an Academy-based research grant in architecture and art history that never developed, Fellow Schlomo Eidelberg (1918–2010), a scholar of contemporary American Judaism, wrote to Wischnitzer's son, informing him that his mother "was probably the first female fellow" of the Academy.[177] Apparently no one knew for sure. In her late nineties, it is doubtful she attended Fellows meetings or found herself otherwise active in Academy affairs. Wischnitzer existed in an Academy limbo of sorts, and her nomination at the age of ninety-one hinted at a cross between a lifetime achievement award and tokenism. At times her name appeared as a Fellow listed in the *Proceedings* and in various other publications that featured a list of Fellows. At other times the official lists omitted her name. Nor did the Academy ever publish a necrology upon her death in 1989, the standard procedure for memorializing Fellows. She existed on the margins, as did most female Jewish academics of her generation.

Academy leadership began slowly to acknowledge the necessity of changing with the times. In 1981, the Academy's president, Isaac Barzilay, took the opportunity of its loosely interpreted "50 years of activity in the service of Jewish scholarship" anniversary to write a letter, mailed to the Academy's Fellows, supporters, and potential members, addressing the state of the field.[178] Rather than reflecting on its past, however, the main impetus for the letter revolved around the future and the need to "expand" and "reach out to many more people than in the past."[179] Barzilay replaced Baron, his former teacher, as Academy president. Like many of its early leaders, Barzilay was a European; he was born in Lithuania in 1915 and spent most of his youth in Bialystok, Poland. Unlike this earlier generation, however, he acquired his education in Palestine and the United States. In 1939 he received his master's from Hebrew University; in 1946 he emigrated to the United States, where he obtained his doctorate nine years later from Columbia University. He then taught modern Hebrew language and literature at a number of institutions and colleges in New York City.

"The world today, and that includes the scholarly world, is far from what it was when the Academy began its career in 1928," Barzilay wrote in his anniversary letter. "There were then relatively few Jewish scholars in America who devoted themselves exclusively to Jewish scholarly activity. It was in Europe that the bulk of Jewish scholarship was being pursued, and it was largely from there that we received our Jewish academicians." Barzilay went on to reflect upon the tragic past. "Alas, World War II and the Holocaust befell us; and even with a revival of Jewish learning on the European continent, it is now overwhelmingly Israel and the United States that constitute the center and hope of continued growth in Jewish research." This new situation required a different response from the Academy, which "has long been recognized as the leading independent organization in America, whose officers and membership consist of scholars and supporters of every shade of opinion." Barzilay then summarized all of the Academy's accomplishments: "It has published annually

the Proceedings. It has offered grants in aid of publication of serious Jewish scholarly works. It has conducted annual meetings which are open to the public, and has in general set the tone for a high level of Jewish scholarly research both in this country and the world over."

However, what the Academy did in the past was not sufficient for the present. "The Academy has begun to invite and attract more younger Jewish scholars of achievement and of promise, and to sponsor and co-sponsor more publications of scholarly merit; and it is now offering the lay community more public meetings in the course of the year, not only in the greater New York metropolitan area, but hopefully also in other major Jewish centers in the country."[180] Yet Barzilay presented a fairly tepid response to the "substantial changes;" he admitted that the circumstances facing the field had changed dramatically and that the Academy needed to adapt, yet none of the examples mentioned in his letter were actually new. Nor did Barzilay's letter recognize another "substantial" change in the field: the American Academy for Jewish Research no longer represented the lone scholarly organization of scholars of Jewish topics in the United States.

Any moves toward significant alterations to the Academy largely remained dormant for another decade. The same issues discussed in the early 1980s were those discussed in previous decades, and these same discussions continued as the 1980s yielded to the 1990s. By the end of his term as president in 1989, Barzilay laid out his continued belief in the Academy's purpose and place in the scholarly landscape. He wrote to Academy Fellows, "Allow me, please, to express my sincere conviction that the Academy constitutes a most important scholarly institution which contributes greatly, directly and indirectly, to the level of Jewish scholarship in the United States and elsewhere."[181] Yet it had grown obvious that the changes in the American academic world affected Jewish scholarship in new ways, and that the Academy had, to that point, failed to keep up with these changes.

A brief discussion opened up among Fellows with ideas on how, and how not, to move the Academy forward. They began to earnestly address the need to reorganize the Academy in the late 1980s,

with discussion centering around the composition and quality of its Fellows. First the establishment, and then the flourishing, of the Association for Jewish Studies prompted the Academy to look inward and ask if it should follow the AJS lead and become larger and more open, or if it should dig in and remain a small and exclusive organization. Barzilay sought to retain the "elitist nature of the Academy" and viewed its elitism as a "necessity" of its continued existence.[182] Jakob Petuchowski (1925–1991), a professor of theology and liturgy at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, agreed with Barzilay: "I firmly believe that the Academy should retain its 'élitist' character, particularly in view of the fact, to which you refer in your letter, that the field of Jewish Studies is now a matter for '*kol hane'arim*' [all the little boys]."[183] In Petuchowski's opinion, the very nature of the Academy's elitism separated the Academy from the AJS: "When I was elected a Fellow of the Academy, I regarded it as a very great honor. At the time, the Fellows of the Academy still constituted, I believe, a somewhat exclusive body."[184] Herbert Davidson, a professor of Hebrew in UCLA's Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, similarly approved of this sentiment. He urged leadership not to change the "original spirit" of the Academy without having a clear replacement plan in place. One aspect of the Academy's annual meeting that worked especially well, according to Davidson, was the Fellows' breakfast. He wrote, "I believe I was present on two occasions, and it was definitely worth my while to have a chance to socialize with peers." The breakfasts provided a meeting point for Fellows to get to know one another and informally discuss their research or academic concerns. Davidson ended his championing of the breakfast, claiming, "It's awfully elitist, but elite meetings were certainly in the original spirit of the Academy. If not their original purpose.[185]

Arguably, however, not all of the founders' original ideas were being implemented by that time. For one, it is unlikely the founders

foresaw a largely inactive group of Fellows. By the mid-1980s only a "small amount" of active Fellows attended the annual meeting and concerned themselves with internal Academy affairs.[186] Further, as Barzilay pointed out, "the actual work of the Academy is carried out by a very small number of individuals."[187] Petuchowski pointed to the annual increase in Fellows as the main culprit in diluting the pool of outstanding and engaged scholars. He argued, "I am also not sure that it is a good thing that we feel under an obligation to increase the number of Fellows every single year. If we keep that up, there soon may be no distinction between being an ordinary member of the AJS (where membership is open to graduate students) and being a Fellow of the American Academy for Jewish Research."[188]

Yet other Fellows expressed concern over the Academy's nominating process. Cyrus Gordon (1908–2001), a scholar of Semitic languages working at that time at New York University, warned that the Fellows must "beware of electing those whose main qualification is that they are friends or colleagues of the Fellows who recommend them."[189] David Ruderman, then a professor of modern Jewish history at Yale, reiterated this point with even greater force five years later: "For the AAJR to have any credibility as a distinguished scholarly society, we must objectify the process by which new members are chosen. Such decisions cannot [b]e made by a 'kitchen cabinet' on the basis of hearsay and other subjective criteria. … [The issue] is about the quality of our membership, the fairness of our procedures, and the ultimate value and rationale for such an honor society for American Jewish scholars in 1992."[190]

Fellows' concerns over the nomination process and maintaining the "elite" nature of the Academy occurred around the same time as the AJS became a constitutive member of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS)—an honor not bestowed upon the Academy. Franz Rosenthal, for one, was disheartened to hear the news regarding the AJS. He wrote to Barzilay in the late spring of 1985, telling him, "Another thing I hear was that the Association for

Jewish Studies (or whatever the correct name is) has been accepted as a member of the American Council of 'Learned' Societies. I do not know whether it is a fact, but it certainly is very bad (and undeservedly bad) news for the Academy."[191] The American Council of Learned Societies denied the Academy membership; they considered its membership ranks too small and its economic means too limited.[192] By comparison, in 1985, the Academy had a total of sixty-two living Fellows and twelve Corresponding Fellows.[193] Ten years prior, in 1975, the AJS had already achieved a membership totaling eight hundred individuals.[194] The American Council of Learned Societies, founded in 1919, constituted the foremost private nonprofit federation of scholarly organizations in the humanities and social sciences. Acceptance from the American Council of Learned Societies would have further bolstered the Academy's place in academia at large as a serious and professional organization.

Some, such as Petuchowski, wanted the Academy to move forward as a small organization, and to dig in with further insularity from the external changes influencing Jewish scholarship at the time: "Under the circumstances, it would be best for a body like ours, in spite of outside criticism, to maintain the earlier standards of Jewish scholarship, and to preserve them unsullied until such a time when the present fads will have gone the way of all fads."[195]

Such conservative sentiment eventually fell to the wayside. Over the course of the previous decades Jewish studies underwent a transformation that, by the late-1980s, became increasingly difficult to write off as a "fad." As part of the secular university, Jewish studies developed new avenues of enquiry, including the social sciences, classics, and modern history and literature. In 1989, during an Executive Committee meeting in November, Academy president David Weiss Halivni decided to open Academy membership to areas "hitherto not included for candidacy." These areas included scholars working in the following fields: literature, Holocaust studies, sociology, and American Jewish history.[196]

Women only slowly gained entrance into the Academy. Indeed, with only two individual exceptions, women remained outsiders until the mid-1990s. In 1986 American Jewish historian Naomi Weiner Cohen (1927–2018), one of the first female professors of Jewish studies, was nominated as a Fellow of the American Academy for Jewish Research. Cohen taught and researched twentieth-century American history and American Jewish history; she received her doctorate from Columbia. At the time of her nomination she taught American history at Hunter College of the City University of New York. Upon her nomination, Barzilay informed her that she held the honor of being "the first American-born Jewish woman to have gained this high honor"[197]—as well as being the first active female scholar upon her time of nomination. Cohen, however, had been around the Academy for decades. Her husband, Gerson Cohen, was a long-standing Fellow. In 1970, the Academy's Executive Committee nominated Cohen—along with Adele Ginzberg (1886–1980), Jeannette Baron, and Judith Lieberman (1904–1978)—to the newly formed Hospitality Committee: where the women could serve the coffee.[198] All four of these women were wives of Fellows. And all four were important figures in their own right.[199] Yet they were relegated to an official capacity as Academy hostesses. It took sixteen years before Cohen received appropriate recognition for her own scholarly achievements.[200]

Although some older Fellows expressed resistance to the suggestion of increasing the number of new Fellows, by the end of the 1980s Academy leadership saw the increase as a necessity. In January 1989, Barzilay sent all Fellows a letter outlining the current state of the Academy. Among his top points of concern, he noted that membership had "stagnated" over the last couple of years and that the Academy very much needed "an infusion of new blood by younger members." Academy leadership designed a campaign to target students from the various Jewish institutions in New York City and nearby cities.[201] They also initiated an attempt to more actively involve younger graduate students and early-career schol-

ars. At the same time, retaining the hierarchical structure between members and Fellows allowed for expansion while maintaining the "elite" nature of the "Fellow" title. Petuchowski even suggested reinforcing this hierarchical relationship through seating arrangements separating the Fellows and the members during the annual meetings.[202] These ideas never quite panned out.

Financially, the Academy simultaneously had ample funding and struggled. The previous decades of financial growth, aided in large part by Baron's astute stock market investments, slowly stagnated. By the 1980s, the Academy's economic outlook once again posed a main concern. Accounting fees rose regularly, as did publication expenses and administrative maintenance costs.[203] In total numbers, the Academy was doing well enough—at least from a cursory glance. During the year 1987, the Academy's assets amounted to $903,290.00, a steady increase built on previous annual increases. Yet a significant portion of its money sat in "restricted funds," meaning the funds could only be used for specific purposes; most of the time this meant specific publishing ventures. The prevalence of restricted funds presented a problem. Money existed, but the Academy Fellows could not use it.

Cuts in external funding exacerbated the issue. The National Foundation for Jewish Culture (NFJC, subsequently the Foundation for Jewish Culture) provided the most significant source of external funding. The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (now the United Jewish Communities), established the National Foundation for Jewish Culture in 1960 as a means of responding to the cultural needs of the post–World War II American Jewish community, particularly in areas of academic and scholarly interest. In 1985, the foundation provided $31,065.00 for the Academy's general use. By comparison, in that same year the income raised through membership fees totaled a mere $4,651.00, contributions from other supporters equaled $6,044.00, and royalties amounted to $1,286.00. The only significant sources of income for general use outside of the National Foundation for Jewish Culture grants

came from dividends and interest on investments, which had been greatly expanded and diversified under Baron's guidance. When it came time for the National Foundation for Jewish Culture to reexamine its financial commitment to the Academy, however, they based their grant package on the total Academy income, including the restricted funds. Thus, from their perspective, the Academy appeared to be on solid financial footing and could maintain its current state without their financial aid. In 1986, they cut funding by nearly half, and in the following year their annual grant declined to only $4,520. By 1989 the NFJC funding disappeared completely.

This "drastic decline" in National Foundation for Jewish Culture funding caused the Academy's leadership considerable anxiety. They went into 1989 expecting to operate at a deficit "due to the unilateral withdraw of funds in the amount of $32,000." The expectation proved correct. In 1989, the Academy had an approximate $25,000 deficit.[204] Leadership urgently sought ideas from its Fellows on how to raise more funds to cover the financial loss.[205] The proposed ideas included creating "a drive for funds from outside sources,"[206] reducing the number of the *Proceedings* published, looking for ways to incorporate advertising, raising membership dues by 20 percent, possibly changing the printer, reducing the number of grants the Academy awarded, and campaigning for increased membership.[207] Leadership called for further studies to assess the financial situation. In the end, small-scale changes occurred in short order. Committee members looked for a cheaper printer, in both Israel and the United States. They reduced costs associated with the *Proceedings* by enforcing a shorter page limit on articles. Leadership also took on board the suggestion to start incorporating studies in areas of scholarship hitherto overlooked in the *Proceedings*, such as sociology, women's experiences, and American Jewish history, hoping to expand the journal's readership.[208]

On top of membership concerns and the return of financial difficulties, those steering the administrative demands of the Academy also grappled with the issue of location. Fellows had long debated

where they should hold their annual meeting. While acting as president, Barzilay issued a letter to Fellows expounding the need to "overcome somewhat the sense of insularity of the Academy's existence and work" due to its long-term location in New York City.[209] Petuchowski made it clear that while he supported "elitism" and "would like the Academy to preserve it," holding the overwhelming majority of annual meetings in New York City limited participation by Fellows outside of the area. "I am not," he declared, "committed to parochialism."[210] Petuchowski's call for geographical variety echoed a similar concern first expressed by Isaiah Sonne, another Cincinnati-based scholar, and Solomon Zeitlin, of Dropsie College, decades prior: that limiting the Academy's activity to New York City suggested a self-imposed isolation that failed to acknowledge Jewish scholarship taking place outside of the city. Practical matters dominated the discussion. Transportation to the city was expensive, as were hotels in the city, and some Fellows expressed trepidation that they did not feel safe in the seminary's Morningside Heights neighborhood during the afternoon and evening sessions. "Besides," as Petuchowski wrote to Barzilay, "there are institutions of Higher Jewish Learning in other parts of the country, even as there are universities with good departments of Jewish Studies in various regions of the United States."[211] Louis Feldman (1926–2017), a longtime professor of classics at Yeshiva University in New York City, expressed a similar sentiment, noting, "I believe that these sessions should be held in various cities and not only in New York, since our fellows are now more widely distributed in this country."[212]

The Academy's hitherto failure to address the shape of its "future direction," to move on reforms, and to grapple with the issue of internal stagnation caused tensions within its ranks. Shaye J. D. Cohen, then Brown University's Ungerleider Professor of Judaic Studies and a scholar of Hebrew literature and philosophy, became incensed at the lack of adequate procedures and evaluation undertaken by the grants committee, which was "failing its mission of maintaining uniform and objective standards of excellence." In late

1994, a recent graduate of the Jewish Theological Seminary applied for a research grant from the Academy. The committee turned down his application due to the lack of an anonymous reader's report. The rejection letter implied that the applicant himself should have been responsible for arranging the reader's report, although such a requirement was not clear in the application material. Cohen found the situation "absurd," and argued that no one involved in the committee had actually read the work themselves. However, his complaint went beyond the specifics of the committee. He argued that this mirrored the state of the Academy as a whole. It reflected "the administrative ineptitude for which the AAJR is famous."[213]

Cohen wrote again to Chazan a year later, voicing his concerns over failures to address his issues with the grants committee in particular and in the Academy in general. "Bob, you may be Muhammed," he wrote, "but you cannot move a mountain. The mountain is the AAJR. I hereby resign from the Publications Committee (or the Grants Committee—whatever the exact identity of the committee chaired by Paula [Hyman] on which I served)."[214] The committee's mix-up brought about necessary changes in how they decided to evaluate proposals and bestow grants. Yet the changes had not been officially incorporated into practical Academy policy—and, as Cohen brought up, a long-standing typo, "evealutate," had still not been changed in the application form. Cohen outlined his year-long efforts at enacting changes to strengthen the committee, but "nothing has changed. ... How I can [*sic*] support procedures that are flawed in the extreme and, to my knowledge, unparalleled in academe?"[215] Cohen's frustration with the state of affairs within the Publications Committee reflected a larger general issue facing the Academy: organizational stagnation and disarray. "The Academy at the time was in shambles," recalled Michael A. Meyer.[216] Indeed, as Cohen's letter highlighted, not even a typo could be fixed in an efficient manner. By the mid-1990s, Academy leadership could no longer turn away from the need for significant changes.

Reforms and Revitalization: The Academy after 1995

By the beginning of the 1990s, a full decade of discussing possible reforms and changes within the Academy had passed without leadership enacting any meaningful changes. The Academy fell into disarray due to years of neglect. Newly elected Fellows, such as modern Jewish historians Todd Endelman from the University of Michigan and David Ruderman from Yale, expressed little desire to participate in Academy affairs during that time. "What was there to do?" Endelman recalled.[217] The annual meeting marked the only Academy event for Fellows to attend. Yet by then it had lost much of the luster of its former reputation, and a closed group of elder scholars dominated the papers delivered.

Salo Baron's death in November 1989 forced a moment of internal reflection. If Solomon Zeitlin's death in 1976 marked "an end of an era," Baron's passing in 1989 marked the closing of a significant chapter—not only in the Academy, but in the field of Jewish history. Medieval Jewish historian Robert Chazan, one of Baron's many former students from Columbia University, remarked that his death "brought to an end an era of creativity of half a century."[218] Baron had a similarly strong impact on the American Academy for Jewish Research. Nominated as a Fellow in 1928, as a young scholar recently arrived in the United States, he remained active in Academy affairs for six decades. Between 1940 and 1980 he served four multi-year-long terms as president. In total, these terms amounted to more than twenty years in the position. Baron stepped down in 1980, yet he "continued to dominate the thinking of the Academy, almost to his death."[219] In addition to his academic pursuits, Baron also made wide-ranging contributions to the practical side of Academy operations. His long-standing commitment to the Academy gave it academic prestige, and his acumen in the financial world provided the Academy with a certain degree of financial security during his tenure.

Now, the Academy leadership had to steer the group forward during a precarious point in the organization's existence without the presence of someone who had been an Academy stalwart for over half a century. Chazan drew attention to the transitional moment represented by Baron's death at the December 1989 annual meeting. He remarked, "The future direction of the Academy is of concern to the Fellows; new needs brought about by changing times; a new generation of scholars active in many universities and colleges here and abroad; new disciplines within the realm of Jewish Studies and research have emerged."[220]

Only a few years later, by the middle of the decade, Chazan took over as president of the Academy. His presidency began in 1995 and ushered in a new phase of the Academy's existence—a "movement toward changes" that had been "long and arduous."[221] Modern historians David Ruderman and Paula Hyman (1946–2011), along with medieval philosophy scholar Alfred Ivry joined Chazan on the Executive Committee. For the first time, the Academy Executive Committee consisted entirely of scholars who taught at secular American universities: Chazan and Ivry at New York University, Ruderman at the University of Pennsylvania, and Hyman at Yale University. Further, these were all scholars who held active membership—and even leadership roles—in the Association for Jewish Studies, in addition to other academic bodies.

With this group at the helm, the Fellows took on the task of reorienting the Academy. Chazan bridged the gap between the older and newer generation of scholars. He had studied at the Jewish Theological Seminary and Columbia University, where he earned his doctoral degree in 1967. As a graduate student in the 1960s, he attended the Academy's Sunday evening meetings in late December when the Academy was at the height of its academic prestige. He presented his first academic paper at one of these annual meetings, which was later published as "The Blois Incident of 1171: A Study in Jewish Intercommunal Organization" in the 1968 volume of the *Proceedings*.[222] However, he lost contact with the Academy upon

taking up his first academic position at the Ohio State University, where he taught history and served as director of the Melton Center for Jewish Studies. In 1981, he returned to New York City—first to Queens College, before moving to New York University as the Scheuer Professor of Jewish Studies. He reconnected with the Academy, becoming a Fellow in 1981. Then forty-five years of age, he became known as "the youngster"; the elder Fellows and Executive Committee members referred to him as "Young Chazan."[223]

Over the course of the next decade, Chazan's administrative engagement with the Academy grew. He had previously acquired significant administrative experience at Ohio State, building up its Jewish studies program. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, David Weiss Halivni urged Chazan to consider heading the Academy—thus setting in place the beginning stages of the Academy reform process. Halivni played a crucial role in the early stages of the Academy's transformation. Ruderman recalled having long discussions with Halivni where they batted around various ideas on how to turn around a moribund organization and make it relevant again. Halivni, only ten years older than Chazan, also found himself grouped among the younger generation of Academy Fellows at the time. Yet the older generation respected Halivni, which gave his pleas an added punch. "He got a hold of me and said you have to take on the presidency of the Academy," Chazan recalled. Still, he hesitated. Eventually, Chazan said, Halivni "laid on a fabulous guilt-trip: you know how important the Academy used to be. You have to do it."[224] Chazan accepted the challenge of revitalizing the Academy.

A loosely defined "committee" of sorts developed and took it upon itself to begin thinking about reforming the Academy. They enacted a series of changes, which Endelman later remembered as a "coup," given that the group's reforms never went before the Academy as a whole for a vote.[225] The group consisted of the Academy's officers and Executive Committee—Chazan (president), Ruderman (vice president), Paula Hyman (treasurer), and

Ivry (secretary), as well as Arnold Band, David Berger, Endelman, Halivni, and Arthur Hyman of the Executive Committee—plus Michael Stanislawski and Michael A. Meyer.[226] They undertook a seemingly simple search: to find out what resources were available to the Academy for use. After a quick look at the Academy's bookkeeping they discovered that the Academy actually had a significant amount of money at its disposal—as much as $1,000,000 or $1,500,000, the majority of which sat there unused.[227] One problem confronted the group, however. Most of this money sat in restricted funds, such as the Epstein Fund. A long process ensued to open up the Academy's endowments for general use. The next task was slightly more difficult: to figure out how to use these resources to better the Academy and find a place for it within the contemporary academic landscape. Indeed, the group recognized that the Academy's primacy in the realm of Jewish studies in the United States no longer existed, and that changes would not necessarily return the Academy to what it once was. Yet, they also recognized the Academy potentially still had an important role to play; it just had to reorient itself to the changed nature of academia.[228]

According to Ruderman, the group focused on situating the Academy alongside the Association for Jewish Studies. In their minds, as scholars who participated in both, the two organizations represented two very different scholarly bodies; rather than compete with the AJS, the Academy's new leadership sought to carve out a specific niche that offered something new.[229] The Academy, for example, could not compare in size to the AJS membership. Nor would the Academy be able to host an annual conference or meeting comparable to the size of the AJS conference. Indeed, at the beginning of the 1990s, the Academy's annual meeting attendance averaged between fifty and a hundred people—mostly consisting of local members of the public.[230] But while the Academy could not compete with the size of the AJS conference, the Academy had something significant to offer the Association for Jewish Studies: senior scholars, leaders in their respective fields, whose presence

could bolster the academic prestige of the AJS conference program. Further, the idea of "symbolically" organizing an Academy panel at the annual AJS conference, as well as sponsoring an Academy luncheon, was a way to link the two organizations while also maintaining the Academy's own separate identity.[231] This arrangement also helped engage more Fellows with Academy affairs, given that most Academy Fellows also regularly attended the AJS conference and would already be on hand.[232]

The reforms committee also decided to institute a biennial meeting, referring to the new meeting as a "retreat." According to the Academy mission statement published in the autumn of 2000, the establishment of the Association for Jewish Studies annual conference made the Academy's annual meeting "less important."[233] The Academy's annual meeting no longer represented the only chance scholars had at meeting with each other during the year. Further, limiting the meeting to the campus of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City year after year "proved increasingly constricted."[234] Instead of a late December meeting, in June 1998 the Academy hosted its inaugural "Fellows retreat," organized by historians Michael A. Meyer and Marc Saperstein of Georgetown University. From Sunday to Tuesday, Academy Fellows met at Brandeis University in Waltham, Massachusetts, for two-and-a-half days of papers, panels, and scholarly exchange.[235] An overarching theme of situating the Academy and Jewish studies into the contemporary academic world guided the retreat. Overall, the program featured seven sessions. Only four panels overlapped; two sessions relating to issues and disciplines occurred simultaneously once a day.[236]

As president, Chazan opened the inaugural retreat with a paper entitled, "The Role of the AAJR in American Jewish Scholarship and the Larger Intellectual Community," which examined the recent reforms meant to revitalize the Academy. Responses came from David Ruderman and Michael Stanislawski, followed by general discussion on further ideas and recommendations for future

changes.[237] The retreat also featured four other sessions spread over two days on the topic of "Issues and Disciplines within Jewish Studies": Louis Feldman oversaw the topic of "Ancient Judaism" in one room while Alfred Ivry led a discussion on "Medieval Jewish Thought" in another room. The next day, Paula Hyman moderated an afternoon session on "Modern Jewish History" while Arnold Band tackled the topic of "Modern Jewish Literature." Four additional sessions occurred separately, each addressing "morally problematic texts" that dealt with "ethnic and religious outsiders" as well as "the morally problematic treatment of groups within Judaism, such as women and homosexuals."[238]

Twenty Fellows attended the retreat at Brandeis, although "relatively few of the senior members attended."[239] The intimate nature of the program allowed participants to attend most sessions. Indeed, such programming reflected the original design of the Academy's annual meetings, which gave scholars the opportunity to hear research on a wide variety of topics, thus expanding their knowledge base and facilitating interdisciplinary exchange. At the retreat's end, its organizers remarked, "it was an extraordinary success."[240]

Amid these changes, however, Academy leadership sought to maintain certain aspects of its organizational structure. Leadership believed the Fellows' selection process represented the most valuable aspect of the Academy's heritage. Chazan noted that being nominated as a Fellow of the Academy represented a "mark of recognition by the scholarly community."[241] Judicious changes slightly altered the selection process: the number of Fellows expanded to better reflect the growing nature of Jewish studies as an academic field in the United States since the 1960s. In 1996, the final year the *Proceedings* included a printed list of Fellows, the number of Fellows totaled sixty-two individuals—approximately the same number of Fellows active in the 1980s.[242] By 2018, this number doubled to 124 Fellows.[243] Newer Fellows increasingly came from public universities and colleges throughout the United States, and not just the Northeast Corridor. Additionally, membership opened to non-Jews—a reflection

of the field's normalization process within the academic world as Jewish studies entered the mainstream American university system. Fellowship also opened to scholars employed in Canadian universities. This expansion accompanied a decision to eliminate the category of "Corresponding Fellows," which overwhelmingly consisted of scholars based in Israeli universities. This decision, like other decisions made by those in charge of the reforms process, was never ratified by the general membership of Fellows.[244] Likewise, the Academy ceased its paying-membership categories of variously tiered subscribing members.

At the same time, the Academy leadership sought to create a younger and more diverse membership. Reflecting on his own tenure with the Academy, Chazan noted the marked generational difference in demographics. During his younger years, a large number of participating Fellows were in their seventies and eighties, or even older. During the late 1990s and 2000s, however, only very few active Fellows remained in that age group.[245] In addition, by the late 1990s the overwhelming majority of Fellows were born and trained in the United States. This differed greatly from the founding days of the Academy.

The Academy also began to more actively integrate female scholars at this time. Women slowly gained greater entrance into the Academy. In 1994, the men of the Academy nominated two female Fellows: Paula Hyman, a modern European and American Jewish historian with a specialty in women's history, and Ruth Wisse, a professor of Yiddish literature and comparative literature at Harvard.[246] Hyman quickly acclimated to the Academy, and almost immediately became involved in committee work and executive leadership. At the time of her nomination Hyman directed Yale's program in Jewish studies, the first woman to hold this position, after years at Columbia University and the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City. In many ways, Hyman's place in the American Academy for Jewish Research exemplified the changes taking place in the Academy at the turn of the millennium. Hyman

received her PhD from Columbia University in 1975, focusing on modern French Jewish social history; she was American born and trained, a social historian, a modernist, a feminist, and a woman. In addition to her work on French Jewry, she also published pioneering scholarship in Jewish women's history, both American and European—in many ways a natural outgrowth of her feminist activism in Jewish women's circles in New York City during the early 1970s. Her research integrated women's experiences as crucial components of history, and in groundbreaking ways at the time, she studied women as key actors in the historical narrative, not as marginalized afterthoughts to a male-dominated historical gaze.

Despite being a leading scholar in the field, however, it took multiple years for Hyman's election as an Academy Fellow. In 1991, Ruderman drew attention to the fact that he nominated Hyman as a candidate, but for reasons which remained unclear her name never made the ballot. Ruderman wrote that "Professor Hyman is one of the leading figures in the field of modern Jewish history and she is by far the leading female historian." At the time she had held a chair as the Lucy Moses Professor of Modern Jewish History at Yale University since 1986, which she took after leaving the Jewish Theological Seminary, where she had served as the first female dean of the Seminary College of Jewish Studies. She had also recently published another monograph, *The Emancipation of the Jews of Alsace: Acculturation and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century*, the same year her name failed to show up on the nominating ballot. Ruderman continued his objections to Hyman's absence, writing, "I am most distressed that her nomination was ignored and apparently in her place, someone with considerably less credentials was nominated. By every objective criteria, this was a bad decision and it fully illustrates the obvious flaws in the nomination process. I intend to nominate her again next year."[247]

But not until 1994 did the Fellows elect Hyman as a member. She quickly climbed the leadership ranks. The following year she took over as treasurer—the first woman to hold a position on the

Executive Committee in the Academy's then-seventy-five-year history. A few years later she served as the Academy's vice president. Ten years into her tenure as a Fellow, from 2004 until 2008, Hyman reached the pinnacle of leadership as the first female president of the American Academy for Jewish Research.

Hyman's research was instrumental in integrating women into the historical record; additionally, her presence in the Academy was instrumental in integrating female scholars into the elite ranks of the field. She opened the door for other female scholars, and after her election more women began receiving Academy recognition for their professional work. While, in general, most Fellows were committed to addressing the gendered composition of the Academy, the method of inclusion became a source of heated debate. David Ruderman recalled one conversation with Hyman where she insisted on instituting a requirement that for every four scholars nominated to be Academy Fellows, one had to be a woman.[248] Ruderman, for his part, opposed this quota system.[249] While that quota formula may not have developed, it represented her continued commitment to gender equality in Jewish scholarship.

During her presidency, Hyman gently pushed the Academy into a new arena: politics. Working alongside the Association for Jewish Studies, Academy leadership took an official public stance in support of academic freedom and exchange as Israeli universities and academics faced backlash over Israeli political decisions throughout the 2000s. Three specific instances came under scrutiny; all involved boycotts of Israel. The first occurred in 2005 when the British Association of University Teachers proposed a boycott of three Israeli universities: Haifa University, Bar-Ilan University, and the Hebrew University "over their alleged complicity in governmental policies and their purported discrimination against a faculty member on political grounds."[250] Similar boycotts were organized by the United Kingdom's University and College Union in 2007 and 2009;[251] and in 2013 boycotts were organized by the Association for Asian Studies and then later joined by the American Studies

Association and the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association, which passed resolutions to boycott Israeli academic institutions to "honor the call of Palestinian civil society."[252]

Academy leadership consistently condemned academic boycotts against Israeli scholars, reflecting the organization's long-term commitment to academic freedom, intellectual exchange, and the international movement of scholars and ideas. In a joint press release signed by then-Academy president Paula Hyman and then-AJS president Sara Horowitz, a scholar of comparative literature, in 2005, upon the first British boycott, the Academy and the AJS expressed opposition to the boycott and stood "in solidarity with our fellow Israeli academics." The condemnation stated that "the boycott is an egregious assault on academic freedom and a woeful misreading of the role of Israeli academics and the Israeli university. Academics have an obligation to support the free exchange of ideas and to participate in international dialogue, not to shun and restrain them."[253] Further, the press release pointed to an unfair singling out of Israeli academics, stating, "It is indeed ironic, and offensive, that in a world where many governments muzzle their faculties, and academic freedom is rare, the AUT should focus solely on Israeli universities, which have maintained academic freedom and diverse student and faculty communities under difficult circumstances."[254] Indeed, the issue of maintaining academic freedom remained a consistent component of the joint Academy and AJS statements. In 2013, in response to American association boycotts, then-president Elisheva Carlebach, an early modern Jewish historian at Columbia University, released an official statement declaring that the Academy "deplores the institution of boycotts or other restrictions on free association in any area of academe" and views such boycotts as "inconsistent with our belief that academic freedom is the bedrock of our enterprise." Her response continued, claiming, "Scholars should be free to associate with colleagues and institutions without fear of political pressure or reprisal. We urge our colleagues to condemn the boycott as we do."[255] Carlebach's

condemnation also reflected the international character of Jewish studies in the twenty-first century. The United States and Israel both represented important centers of Jewish scholarship, and collaboration between individuals and institutions in both countries bolstered research and learning.

By the 2000s, the Academy also brought an end to the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*. From 1930 through 2001, the *Proceedings* published 565 articles covering a wide span of subjects, fields, and methodologies. During its early decades, the *Proceedings* sustained a highly regarded reputation as an internationally preeminent publication in Jewish studies. However, in more recent decades the prestige of the *Proceedings* declined as newer journals developed, and as general academic journals began publishing articles on Jewish studies topics. Over time, the *Proceedings* failed to receive the same quality of contributions and its importance to the field diminished.[256] The sixty-third installment of the *Proceedings*, its final printing, covered the years 1997 through 2001 in a single volume consisting of six articles.

Finally, throughout this process of change the Academy leadership also instituted a commitment to "the next generation of scholars" through supporting graduate students and younger scholars in "a series of new initiatives."[257] A biennial graduate student seminar workshop was instituted at an American university campus over the course of three days; the University of Michigan hosted the inaugural seminar, with later seminars held at, among other locales, the Hebrew Union College, Brandeis University, Vassar College, New York University, the University of California at Irvine, and the University of Pennsylvania. The workshop brought together around a dozen graduate students in all areas of Jewish studies who study under the guidance of two or three Academy Fellows. The workshop provided participants with an opportunity to present their dissertation research to established faculty scholars as well as to their peers, to receive constructive feedback, and to create an academic community. Likewise, the Academy also developed a biennial workshop for

untenured faculty, providing a venue for early career academics to network and discuss issues related to their research, teaching, and service, along with issues specific to the field of Jewish studies.[258] In 1998, the Academy leadership also began supporting postdoctoral fellows. The postdoctoral fellowship series emerged as "an entirely new initiative of the AAJR" in response to "the grave challenges faced by new Ph.D.'s in Judaic Studies." The fellowship program supported a recent PhD's research and teaching plan for an academic year spent at "any major North American university with a Jewish Studies program."[259] Additionally, the Academy established the annual Salo W. Baron Book Prize for the best first English-language book in any field of Jewish studies published within seven years of the author receiving a PhD.

After nearly one hundred years of scholarly activity, the American Academy for Jewish Research succeeded in its revitalization program. It incorporated elements that hark back to its earlier years, especially fostering an atmosphere of collegial intellectual exchange and support. At the same time, the Academy leadership chose to risk innovation in order to remain relevant to a dynamic field of Jewish studies scholarship. Looking back, Chazan noted that the changes he enacted in the mid-1990s, as well as the various subsequent activities that emerged afterwards, were useful, although not "earth shaking." He viewed the reforms of his era as "academic leaders trying to help out the field in modest ways. … Something younger scholars can aspire to" join.[260]

The academic world of today is unrecognizable from the scholarly world of 1920, when a small group of a dozen scholars met at Morningside Heights in Louis Ginzberg's living room to discuss issues related to undertaking Jewish studies in the United States. Over the course of a century, the Academy evolved from an upstart organization composed of a cadre of mostly European-born and European-trained men generally teaching at Jewish educational institutions to the longest-standing organization of Jewish studies scholars in the United States,

comprised largely of male and female scholars educated and employed in American secular universities. Throughout the decades, the various generations of the Academy's Fellows found themselves confronting a variety of changes—from the evolving understanding of what Jewish studies entailed to the expanding nature of who studies Jewish topics and where. Since the 1990s, Academy leadership has actively reevaluated its existing programs and either reshaped its activities to better cater to contemporary concerns or discontinued aspects that are no longer relevant. At its core, however, the Academy remains in tune with its original mission set a century before, namely, to foster "the furtherance of Jewish learning" in the United States.

Appendix A. Founders of the American Academy for Jewish Research, 1920

Name	Dates	Place of Birth	Doctoral Institution
Blondheim, David	1884–1934	Maryland	Johns Hopkins University
Davidson, Israel	1870–1939	Lithuania	Columbia University
Deutsch, Gotthard	1859–1921	Austria	University of Vienna
Friedländer, Israel	1876–1920	Ukraine	University of Strasbourg
Ginzberg, Louis	1873–1953	Lithuania	University of Heidelberg
Husik, Isaac	1876–1939	Ukraine	University of Pennsylvania
Lauterbach, Jacob	1873–1942	Galicia	University of Göttingen
Malter, Henry	1867–1925	Galicia	University of Heidelberg
Margolis, Max	1866–1932	Lithuania	Columbia University
Marx, Alexander	1878–1953	Germany	University of Berlin
Neumark, David	1866–1924	Galicia	University of Berlin
Wolfson, Harry	1887–-1974	Russia	Harvard University
Zeitlin, Solomon	1892–1976	Russia	Dropsie College

Appendix B. AAJR Fellows Elected between 1946–1969

Name	Dates	Place of Birth	Doctoral Institution
Täubler, Eugen	1879–1953	Poland	University of Berlin
Epstein, Louis	1887–1949	Lithuania	Jewish Theological Seminary
Marcus, Jacob Rader	1896–1995	Pennsylvania	University of Berlin
Weiss, Abraham	1895–1970	Galicia	University of Vienna
Heschel, Abraham Joshua	1907–1972	Poland	University of Berlin
Orlinsky, Harry M.	1908–1992	Canada	Dropsie College
Fischel, Walter	1902–1973	Germany	University of Giessen
Rosenthal, Franz	1914–2003	Germany	University of Berlin
Abramson, Shraga	1915–1996	Poland	Hebrew University
Joffe, Judah	1873–1966	Russia	
Atlas, Samuel	1899–1978	Lithuania	University of Giessen
Dimitrowsky, Haim Zalmon	1919–2011	Palestine	Hebrew University
Rawidowicz, Simon	1897–1957	Poland	University of Berlin
Friedman, Philip	1901–1960	Poland	University of Vienna
Goldin, Judah	1914–1998	New York	Jewish Theological Seminary
Speiser, Ephraim	1902–1965	Ukraine	Dropsie College
Zucker, Moshe	1902–1987	Poland	University of Vienna
Altmann, Alexander	1906–1987	Hungary	University of Berlin
Bickerman, Elias	1897–1981	Ukraine	University of Berlin
Perlmann, Moshe	1905–2001	Russia	University of London
Szajkowski, Zosya	1911–1978	Poland	
Werner, Eric	1901–1988	Austria	University of Strasbourg
Mendelsohn, Isaac	1898–1965	Ukraine	Columbia University
Rivkind, Isaac	1895–1968	Poland	
Goitein, Shelomo Dov	1900–1985	Germany	University of Frankfurt am Main
Margalioth, Mordecai	1910–1968	Poland	Hebrew University
Belkin, Samuel	1911–1976	Poland	Brown University
Leslau, Wolf	1906–2006	Poland	University of Paris
Cohen, Gerson	1924–1991	New York	Columbia University
Twersky, Isadore	1930–1997	Massachusetts	Harvard University
Netanyahu, Ben-Zion	1910–2012	Poland	Dropsie College
Ankori, Zvi	1920–2012	Poland	Columbia University
Greenberg, Moshe	1928–2010	Pennsylvania	University of Pennsylvania
Nemoy, Leon	1901–1997	Russia	Yale University

Notes

A number of individuals and institutions made this research possible. I wish to thank the American Academy for Jewish Research for sponsoring the postdoctoral project, as well as the Center for Jewish History for being my institutional home during that year. I particularly need to thank Deborah Dash Moore, Hasia Diner, and Jeffrey Gurock for advising me throughout the project, for their time spent reading and shaping the essay, for their professional advice, and for the chats over coffee. Additionally, I am also indebted to the American Jewish Archives for their fellowship support while researching and writing.

1 Israel Friedländer (1876–1920) ranks among those listed as the founding fathers of the Academy. It is worth nothing that Friedländer was murdered on July 5, 1920, while on a Joint Distribution Committee of American Funds for the Relief of Jewish War Sufferers mission to distribute relief aid to victims of war and pogroms in Ukraine. Fellows noted Friedländer as being instrumental in early 1919 and 1920 efforts at organizing the informal meeting of Judaic scholars that later became known as the Fellows of the American Academy for Jewish Research.

2 Cyrus Adler to Edward Murrow, October 4, 1934, "Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records," New York Public Library (NYPL), box 134, folder 16.

3 For a list of these founding Fellows, see appendix A. Biographical information, for this appendix as well as the following article, including spelling of names, is based on information published in the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* or the AAJR archival collection.

4 According to Salo W. Baron, and Isaac E. Barzilay, the original cohort included: David Blondheim, Israel Davidson, Gotthard Deutsch, Israel Friedländer, Louis Ginzberg, Isaac Husik, Jacob Lauterbach, Henry Malter, Max Margolis, Alexander Marx, David Newmark, Harry Wolfson, and Solomon Zeitlin. Later additions throughout the 1920s included: Ben Zion Halper, Jacob Mann, Salo Baron, and Louis Finkelstein. Baron and Barzilay, "Preface," 1, American Jewish Historical Society (AJHS) I-508, box 3, folder 12.

5 During these early years, the presidents of Hebrew Union College, the Jewish Theological Seminary, and Dropsie College held the title of "Honorary Fellow" within the Academy. The nature of an Honorary Fellow, rather than a Fellow, is unclear. Julian Morgenstern, for example, held leadership positions in the Executive Committee during his tenure as an Honorary Fellow—suggesting the terminology did not inhibit the Honorary Fellow's role in the Academy or his possibility for upward mobility in leadership ranks. Over time, the category of Honorary Fellow fell to the side.

6 "Address of Acting President Alexander Marx, December 26, 1928," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* (*PAAJR*) 1 (1928): 6.

7 Marx, "Address," 3.

8 Ibid., 4.

9 Ibid.

10 Ira Robinson, "Cyrus Adler, Bernard Revel and the Prehistory of Organized Jewish Scholarship in the United States," *American Jewish History* 69, no. 4 (1980): 498.

11 Jonathan D. Sarna, *JPS: The Americanization of Jewish Culture* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989); Paul Ritterband and Harold S. Wechsler, *Jewish Learning in American Universities: The First Century* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 132–38.

12 The men who constituted the Academy's founding fathers did not invite Revel to join in the beginning stages of their new academic organization. Further, Revel never received a nomination to become a Fellow. Robinson, "Prehistory," 499–502.

13 Ibid., 5.

14 The "Introductory Statement," which includes the Academy's original statement of purpose, can be found in the front matter of all volumes of the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*.

15 Jonathan D. Sarna, "Cyrus Adler and the Development of American Jewish Culture: The 'Scholar-Doer' as a Jewish Communal Leader," *American Jewish History* 78, no. 3 (1989): 382–94.

16 Nearly all official Academy correspondence and record keeping occurred in English. That said, however, Fellows speaking with Continental European scholars, institutions, or libraries on behalf of the Academy generally communicated in German.

17 Naomi W. Cohen, *Encounters with Emancipation: The German Jews in the United States 1830–1914* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1984), 210.

18 The total number of individuals who received a copy of the *Proceedings* broken down into nationalities was: Germany (21), England (15), Palestine (15), Austria (6), Hungary (5), Holland (5), Poland (4), France (3), Czechoslovakia (2), Italy (1), Russia (1), Egypt (1). For names, see the complete list in: AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 9.

19 Alexander Marx to Dr. Friedman, September 28, 1932, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 1.

20 Rabbi David Bronstein of Chicago to Alexander Marx, September 1934, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 1.

21 Alexander Marx to Mrs. Adolph Guggenheim, January 20, 1933, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 1.

22 Mrs. Adolf Guggenheim to Alexander Marx, January 24, 1933, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 1.

23 American Academy for Jewish Research Minutes, December 9, 1932, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 1.

24 Marx, "Address," 3.

25 Salo W. Baron, ed., *Essays on Maimonides: An Octocentennial Volume* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941).

26 Copies of correspondence from the Academy to numerous scholars, December 17, 1930, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 1.

27 In June 1933, City College professor Morris Raphael Cohen informally

formed a group within what became the Conference on Jewish Relations to discuss the rise of Nazi Germany and its impact on American Jewry. The conference was not formally established until 1936. The conference "represented the response of a group of scholars, with the support of a limited number of businesspersons, to an increased threat of American antisemitism aggravated by worldwide developments." Robert Liberles, *Salo Wittmayer Baron: Architect of Jewish History* (New York: New York University Press, 1995), 225.

28 Alexander Marx to Sol M. Stroock, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 1.

29 Guido Kisch (1899–1985), Bruno Strauss (1889–1969), Aron Freimann (1871–1948), Berthold Altmann (1896–1992), Samuel Atlas (1899–1977), Adolf Kober (1879–1958), Wolf Leslau (1906–2006), Alfred Sendrey (1884–1976), Bernard Weinryb (1905–1982), Rachel Bernstein Wischnitzer (1885–1989), and Y. Yunovitch. The Academy finalized plans to aid scholar Lazar Gulkowitsch (1898–1941), a scholar of Hebrew and Aramaic languages, who received both his PhD and MD from the University of Königsberg in Germany. In 1934, he was appointed chair of Jewish studies at the University of Tartu; he held this position until the Soviets abolished the chair and then dismissed him from the university. The Academy's scholarship offer arrived too late. Gulkowitsch was murdered in the summer of 1941 after the Nazi invasion of Estonia.

30 Letter sent to Fellows of the American Academy for Jewish Research, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 2.

31 According to undated reports placed in local newspapers, Baron raised $1,600 of the projected $10,000; he hoped to raise $5,000 more in contributions from individual rabbis and scholars, and to fill the remaining gap with donations from outside organizations and philanthropists. See "Newspaper clippings," AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 10, and AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 2.

32 Letter to Fellows, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 2.

33 Alexander Marx to Mr. Goldman, August 9, 1933, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 1.

34 "Minutes," AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 3.

35 The Emergency Committee was founded in 1933 and existed until the end of World War II in 1945. It sought to aid German (and later, after 1938, European) scholars who were persecuted under Nazism for their racial or ethnic heritage or political views. Estimates suggest that nearly 40 percent of German university professors and staff were forced out of their academic positions prior to the outbreak of war in Europe, thus creating a large cadre of scholars seeking foreign employment—and later, seeking to save their lives. By 1945, the Emergency Committee succeeded in sponsoring 335 scholars at universities or academic institutions throughout the country, although more than 6,000 European scholars applied for aid (a slightly less than 18 percent application approval rating).

36 Edward Murrow to Albrecht Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, June 20, 1934, "Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records,"

NYPL, box 134, folder 16.

37 Baron was also involved in the refugee initiatives with the Conference on Jewish Social Studies. The two organizations had different aims, however; while the Academy focused on intellectuals researching in Jewish topics, the Conference on Jewish Social Studies sponsored intellectuals and professionals in a broader sense. Here: Liberles, *Salo Wittmayer Baron*, 267–68.

38 Shlomo Eidelberg, "Guido Kisch (1889–1985)," *PAAJR* 53 (1986): 7.

39 Guido Kisch, *Der Lebensweg eines Rechtshistorikers: Erinnerungen* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1975), 107–8.

40 Ibid., 98–112.

41 Ibid., 114–15.

42 Ibid., 127.

43 Alexander Marx to Edward Murrow, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 3; Correspondence from the Emergency Committee to the AAJR, November 1934, AJHS I-508, box 1, folder 2.

44 Kisch, *Lebensberg*, 124.

45 Ibid., 128.

46 Ibid., 129.

47 Ibid., 133.

48 Guido Kisch, *Jewry-Law in Medieval Germany* (New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1949).

49 Kisch served as the vice president of the American Academy for Jewish Research from 1953 until 1959.

50 This was, incidentally, Baron's last regular trip to Europe. Until 1937 he visited the continent annually. Liberles, *Salo Wittmayer Baron*, 282.

51 "Minutes of the Meeting of Fellows," December 26, 1937, AJHS I-508, box 11, folder 2.

52 Ibid.

53 Ibid.

54 Ibid.

55 The identity of the rabbis is unclear. They may have consisted of rabbis affiliated with the Committee on Refugee Jewish Ministers, which Cyrus Adler helped establish in October 1938.

56 "Meeting of the Executive Committee at 4:30, March 30, 1941," 2, AJHS I-508, box 11, folder 2.

57 "Minutes of the Academy Meeting with N.Y.C. Rabbis on Refugee Jewish Scholars," November 8, 1938, AJHS I-508, box 11, folder 2.

58 Ibid.

59 Liberles, *Salo Wittmayer Baron*, 269.

60 Herbert A. Strauss and Werner Röder, eds., *International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Emigrated 1933–1945*, vol. 2, pt. 1, *A–K* (Munich: K. G. Saur, 1983), 659.

61 "Report of the Executive Committee," *PAAJR* 8 (1937): xix.

62 "Meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Academy for Jewish Research," December 4, 1938, 2, AJHS I-508, box 11, folder 2.

63 Adler died in 1940, before the Nazi regime established its extermination camp

apparatus. Cyrus Adler, *Selected Letters*, ed. Ira Robinson (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1985) xxii.

64 "Report of the Executive Committee," *PAAJR* 9 (1938): xvi.

65 See Michael A. Meyer, "The Refugee Scholars Project of the Hebrew Union College," in *A Bicentennial Festschrift for Jacob Rader Marcus*, ed. Bertram Wallace Korn (Waltham, MA: American Jewish Historical Society, 1976), 359–75.

66 "Report of the Executive Committee," *PAAJR* 9 (1938): xvii.

67 Marsha Rozenblit, "The Seminary during the Holocaust Years," in *Tradition Renewed*, ed. Jack Wertheimer, vol. 2 (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1997), 273–98.

68 "Meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Academy for Jewish Research," December 4, 1938, 1, AJHS I-508, box 11, folder 2.

69 Catherine Epstein, *A Past Renewed: A Catalog of German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 307–8.

70 Salo Baron to Mark Uveeler, February 8, 1962, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

71 Rachel Heuberger, *Aron Freimann und die Wissenschaft des Judentums* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2004), 68–135, particularly 80–96.

72 Ibid., 133–36.

73 Jewish Telegraph Agency, "Yeshiva College Adds 2 Refugees to Faculty," 4.

74 Stephen Duggan to Louis Ginzberg, October 11, 1939, "Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records," NYPL, box 134, folder 16.

75 Freimann's stipend was made possible through a charity gift by the Aaron Mendelsohn Jewish Charities Fund in Detroit through the offices of Fred H. Butzel. "Report of the Executive Committee (1938–1939)," xv.

76 "Annual Fellows Meeting, December 25, 1940," Center for Jewish History (CJH), I-508, box 11, folder 2.

77 "Report of the Executive Committee (1938–1939)," xv; "Meetings of the Executive Committee," November 21, 1940, AJHS I-508, box 11, folder 2.

78 Betty Drury to Ralph Marcus, October 22, 1941, "Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records," NYPL, box 134, folder 16.

79 Ralph Marcus to Betty Drury, October 9, 1940, "Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records," NYPL, box 134, folder 16.

80 Berthold Altmann, "Studies in Medieval German Jewish History," *PAAJR* 10 (1940): 5–98.

81 Ralph Marcus to Betty Drury, October 9, 1940.

82 Rachel Wischnitzer-Bernstein, *Symbole und Gestalten der jüdischen Kunst* (Berlin: Siegfried Scholem, 1935).

83 Claire Richter Sherman, "Rachel Wischnitzer: Pioneer Scholar of Jewish Art," *Woman's Art Journal* 1, no. 2 (1980): 42–46.

84 Ralph Marcus to Betty Drury, October 9, 1940.

85 "Meetings of the Executive Committee," November 21, 1940, AJHS I-508,

box 11, folder 2.

86 Mark Wischnitzer taught Jewish history at Yeshiva University from 1948 until his sudden death in 1955. His papers are housed in the YIVO Archives at the Center for Jewish History in New York City.

87 Sherman, "Rachel Wischnitzer," 45.

88 Rachel Bernstein Wischnitzer, "The Samuel Cycle in the Wall Decoration of the Synagogue at Dura-Europos," *PAAJR* 11 (1941): 85–103.

89 Rachel Bernstein Wischnitzer, *The Messianic Theme in the Paintings of the Dura Synagogue* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948).

90 Sherman, "Rachel Wischnitzer," 42–46.

91 Betty Drury to Ralph Marcus, January 15, 1941, "Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records," NYPL, box 134, folder 16.

92 "Meeting of the Executive Committee," March 30, 1941, 1, AJHS I-508, box 11, folder 2.

93 "Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee," May 25, 1941, 1, AJHS I-508, box 11, folder 2.

94 The Esco Fund paid at least three installments to the Academy for the purpose of sponsoring research on Jewish music: the initial $2,000, a decreased amount of $800 the following year, and then another $2,000 during the third year. See the "Front Matter" section of the *Proceedings* from 1943 through 1945.

95 "Annual Report of the Executive Committee," *PAAJR* 12 (1942): xi.

96 Ibid.

97 "Annual Report of the Executive Committee," *PAAJR* 13 (1943): x.

98 Röder and Strauss, *International Biographical Dictionary*, 1074.

99 "Annual Report of the Executive Committee," *PAAJR* 14 (1944): ix.

100 See Alfred Sendrey, *Bibliography of Jewish Music* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).

101 For a list of the Fellows elected between 1946 and 1969, see appendix B.

102 Eight taught at Jewish Theological Seminary, five taught at Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, one taught at Dropsie College, and a total of six taught at one of the six traditional university homes of Jewish studies (University of California, University of Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Pennsylvania).

103 "Minutes of the Meeting of Fellows," December 25, 1948, 1, AJHS I-508, box 13 folder 6.

104 Ibid., 2.

105 Samuel Karff, ed., *Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion at One Hundred Years* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1976), 172–80.

106 Unlike earlier presidents who were given the title of "Honorary Fellow," Glueck had been a Fellow of the Academy since 1942.

107 Ibid., 186.

108 "Annual Meeting of the Fellows of the American Academy for Jewish Research, Minutes," December 17, 1949, 1, AJHS I-508, box 13, folder 6.

109 "Meeting of the Fellows of the American Academy for Jewish Research," December 24, 1950, 2, AJHS I-508, box 13, folder 7.

110 "Minutes of the Fellows Meeting of the American Academy for Jewish

Research," December 1951, AJHS I-508, box 13, folder 7.

111 "Obituaries: United States," *The American Jewish Year Book* 92 (1992): 590–604, here 599.

112 "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting," September 21, 1967, 2, AJHS I-508, box 11, folder 5.

113 Ibid.

114 "Report for the Year 1955," *PAAJR* 24 (1955): viii.

115 Robert Chazan, interview by author, New York, New York, May 24, 2018.

116 Michael A. Meyer, interview by author, Cincinnati, Ohio, July 10, 2018.

117 Robert Chazan, interview by author, May 24, 2018.

118 Ibid.

119 Gerson D. Cohen, "Abraham S. Halkin 1904–1990," *PAAJR* 57 (1990): 2.

120 Solomon Ganz researched Semitics and the history of science at Dropsie College; he published on Jewish studies of mathematics and astronomy in the Middle Ages. Boaz Cohen researched and taught Talmud at the Jewish Theological Seminary. Joshua Finkel specialized in Judeo-Arabic studies and taught Semitic languages at Yeshiva University. Zosa Szajkowski, a researcher at YIVO, published extensively on French Jewish communities. Zvi Ankori, a scholar of Karaite Judaism, taught at the Ohio State University during these years.

121 Philip Friedman, "The European Jewish Research on the Recent Jewish Catastrophe in 1939–1945," *PAAJR* 18 (1948): 179–211.

122 Salo W. Baron, "Philip Friedman," *PAAJR* 29 (1960): 1–7.

123 Boaz Cohen and Louis Ginzberg, "Louis M. Epstein (In Memoriam) 1887–1949," *PAAJR* 18 (1948): xix.

124 Ibid., xxi.

125 Estate of Louis M. Epstein, Account of Executors as at March 1, 1951, "Surrogates Court: New York County," 2, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 11.

126 Saul Lieberman to Samuel Epstein, May 12, 1967, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 11.

127 "Extract from the Will of Louis M. Epstein," 1, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 11.

128 These works included: *The Institute of Concubinage among the Jews* (1935); *The Jewish Marriage Contract: A Study in the Status of the Woman in Jewish Law* (1927); *Marriage Laws in the Bible and the Talmud* (1942); *Notes on the Status of the Jewish Woman in Antiquity* (1924); and *Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism* (1948).

129 For a full list of the Epstein Fund publications, see "Separate Publications of the Academy," *PAAJR* 37 (1969): xxvi–xxvii.

130 Judah Shapiro to Moshe Davis, July 5, 1956, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

131 Judah Shapiro to Louis Finkelstein, February 17, 1955, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

132 Ibid.

133 Saul Lieberman to Judah Shapiro, September 14, 1955, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

134 Adolf Kober to Saul Lieberman, October 10, 1955, CJH I-508, box 2, folder 5.

135 Just prior to his death, Kober intended to publish his bibliographical catalogue under the title *Jewish Periodicals in Germany 1784–1938*. The Academy began discussions on planning for its publication after his death, although the bibliography does not appear to have reached publication. Today, the notebooks containing Kober's work on German Jewish periodicals can be found at in the Leo Baeck Institute archives at the Center for Jewish History in New York City under: Adolf Kober Collection, 1700–1956 AR7188 / MF 524, box 5, folders 16, 17, and 18. Kober's manuscript, with the English title *Jewish Periodicals in Germany, 1784–1938* crossed out and replaced with the German title *Jüdische Zeitschriften und Zeitungen in Deutschland, 1784–1939*, included an English-language introduction by Theodore Wiener, a former librarian at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. The manuscript can be found in box 5, folder 20. See also: Abraham Halkin to Solomon Tarschansky, September 28, 1962, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

136 Saul Lieberman to Judah Shapiro, October 12, 1955, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

137 Saul Lieberman to Mark Uveeler, June 26, 1957, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

138 Rabbi Isaac of Marseilles, *Sefer ha-ʿittur* (New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1955).

139 Saul Lieberman to Judah Shapiro, June 8, 1955, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

140 Judah Shapiro to Saul Lieberman, June 9, 1955, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

141 Judah Shapiro to Saul Lieberman, December 16, 1955, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

142 Saul Lieberman to Judah Shapiro, December 5, 1955, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

143 Abraham Halkin to Judah Shapiro, October 22, 1956, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

144 "Recommendation on the Application of: American Academy for Jewish Research, New York," AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

145 Correspondence from Salo Baron and Abraham Halkin addressed to Academy Fellows, June 22, 1959, 2, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

146 The final project was published in 1973: Arthur Zacharias Schwarz, et al., *Die hebräischen Handschriften in Österreich* (New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1973).

147 Abraham Halkin to Mark Uveeler, May 27, 1957, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

148 Szajkowski's legacy with the smuggling, and later theft, of archival materials from France is complicated. What began as smuggling material from wartorn and occupied France during World War II continued after the war until 1961, when there was no longer a need to safeguard the materials. Regardless, the largest amount of the sources he brought to the United States from France are now housed in the archives and libraries of Brandeis University, Hebrew Union College, the Jewish Theological

Seminary, and YIVO. This material represents a significant collection, and it was the backbone of early research by the first cohort of American historians who undertook research on modern French Jewish history, such as Arthur Hertzberg and Paula Hyman—both Academy Fellows (and, in the case of Hyman, the first female president of the Academy). For more information on the ambiguity of Szajkowski's actions, see Lisa Moses Leff, *The Archive Thief: The Man Who Salvaged French Jewish History in the Wake of the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).

149 Abraham G. Duker, "Zosa Szajkowski (1911–1978)," *PAAJR* 48 (1981): xxxvii–xliv.

150 Abraham Halkin to Mark Uveeler, May 27, 1957.

151 Aron Freimann, *Union-Catalog of Hebrew Manuscripts and Their Location* (New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1964–1973). The catalogue included an introduction by Saul Lieberman.

152 Salo Baron to Mark Uveeler, February 8, 1962, 1–2, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

153 Ibid.

154 Ibid., 2.

155 Abraham Halkin to Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, June 16, 1961, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

156 Salo Baron to Solomon Tarshansky, January 10, 1971, AJHS I-508, box 2, folder 5.

157 The Freimann Collection can be found at the following address: http://sammlungen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/freimann.

158 Arnold J. Band, "Jewish Studies in American Liberal-Arts Colleges and Universities," *American Jewish Year Book* 67 (1966): 1–30, 3.

159 Ritterband and Wechsler, *Jewish Learning*, 214–17.

160 "Planning Committee Minutes," November 18, 1979, 1–2, "American Academy for Jewish Research," Near Print Special Topics, American Jewish Archives (AJA).

161 Kristen Loveland, "The Association for Jewish Studies: A Brief History" (paper presented at the Association for Jewish Studies, 40th Annual Conference, December 21–23, 2008), 2–3.

162 Ritterband and Wechsler, *Jewish Learning*, 214.

163 Loveland, "A Brief History," 2.

164 Ritterband and Wechsler, *Jewish Learning*, 214.

165 Judith R. Baskin, "Jewish Studies in North American Colleges and Universities: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 32, no. 4 (2014): 12.

166 Robert Chazan, interview by author, New York , New York, May 24, 2018.

167 Leon Jick, introduction to *The Teaching of Judaica in American Universities: The Proceedings of a Colloquium*, ed. Leon Jick (New York: Ktav, 1970).

168 Benjamin Edidin Scolnic, "Robert Gordis (1908–1992)," *PAAJR* 60 (1994): 1.

169 Underlining true to original. Robert Gordis to Abraham Halkin, September 10, 1966, 3, AJA, "American Academy for Jewish Research," Near Print Special Topics.

170 Michael A. Meyer, interview by author, Cincinnati, Ohio, July 10, 2018.
171 David Weiss Halivni and Sidney B. Hoenig, "Solomon Zeitlin," *PAAJR* 45 (1978): xlvi–xlvii.
172 Robert Chazan, interview by author, City, New York, May 24, 2018.
173 Saul Lieberman, "Achievements and Aspirations of Modern Jewish Scholarship," *PAAJR* 46/47 (1979–1980): 369–80.
174 Harriet Pass Friedenreich, "Joining the Faculty Club: Jewish Women Academics in the United States," *Nashim: A Journal of Jewish Women's Studies & Gender Issues* 12 (Spring 2007): 68–101.
175 Ibid., 69.
176 Loose paper, AJA, "American Academy for Jewish Research," Near Print Special Topics.
177 Schlomo Eidelberg to Mr. Winchester, March 25, 1991, AJHS I-508, box 7, folder 9.
178 The Academy's "50 years of activity in the service of Jewish scholarship" extended from 1978 through to Barzilay's 1981 letter. In this formulation, it appears as though Fellows took 1928, the year the Academy became accredited in the state of Maryland, as the "birthdate"—and drew the anniversary out as needed.
179 Isaac Barzilay to Fellows, April 30, 1981, AJHS I-508, box 8, folder 20.
180 Ibid.
181 Isaac Barzilay to Academy Fellows, January 1989, 3, AJHS I-508, box 5, folder 10.
182 Isaac Barzilay to Jakob Petuchowski, July 2, 1987, AJHS I-508, box 3, folder 23.
183 Underlining true to original. Jakob Petuchowski to Isaac Barzilay, June 12, 1987, 1, AJHS I-508, box 8, folder 23.
184 Ibid., 2.
185 Herbert Davidson to Robert Chazan, August 15, 1995, 1, AJHS I-508, box 5, folder 20.
186 "Executive Committee Minutes," June 12, 1984, 1, AJHS I-508, box 12, folder 3.
187 Isaac Barzilay to Academy Fellows, April 11, 1984, AJA, "American Academy for Jewish Research," Near Print Special Topics.
188 Jakob Petuchowski to Isaac Barzilay, June 12, 1987.
189 Cyrus Gordon to Isaac Barzilay, November 19, 1986, AJHS I-508, box 7, folder 7.
190 David Ruderman to David Weiss Halivni, December 26, 1991, 1, AJHS I-508, box 9, folder 6.
191 Franz Rosenthal to Isaac Barzilay, April 30, 1985, AJHS I-508, box 9, folder 5.
192 Loose notes, AJHS I-508, box 7, folder 2; Baskin, "Jewish Studies," 12.
193 "Front Matter," *PAAJR* 52 (1985): xi–xii.
194 Loveland, "A Brief History," 9.
195 The context of Petuchowski's letter does not shed light on what he specifically considered to be the "fads" in Jewish scholarship. He may have had in mind the broader gamut of issues related to the social sciences,

social history, or American history. However, he also possibly meant the inclusion of women into Jewish studies, as both subjects and practitioners. This is the most likely explanation. In 1975, he wrote about the ordination of women rabbis in the same manner, referring to Hebrew Union College's decision to ordain women as succumbing to "every fad which comes along." See Gary Zola, "JTS, HUC, and Women Rabbis—Redux," in *The Sacred Calling: Four Decades of Women in the Rabbinate*, ed. Rebecca Einstein Schorr and Alysa Mendelson (New York City: CCAR Press, 2016), 238. Jakob Petuchowski to Isaac Barzilay, June 12, 1987.

196 "Executive Committee Meeting Minutes," November 12, 1989, AJHS I-508, box 12, folder 8.

197 Isaac Barzilay to Naomi Cohen, January 6, 1986, AJHS I-508, box 6, folder 3.

198 "Executive Committee Meeting Minutes," October 28, 1970, AJHS I-508, box 12, folder 1.

199 Ginzberg played an active role in the Women's League, advocating for equal women's rights; Baron contributed to her husband's research and writing, even writing a few books together; and Lieberman, who received her doctoral degree from the University of Zurich, served as a principal at one of the first yeshivas for girls in Brooklyn.

200 By the time of her election as a new Fellow, Cohen had published widely on American history and American Jewish history. Cohen published four books prior to her nomination: *A Dual Heritage: The Public Career of Oscar S. Straus* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America,1969), *Not Free to Desist: The American Jewish Committee, 1906–1966* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1972), *American Jews and the Zionist Idea* (New York: Ktav, 1975), and *Encounter with Emancipation: The German Jews in the United States, 1830–1914* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1984). She published several books during her decade as a Fellow, including *The Year after the Riots: American Responses to the Palestine Crisis of 1929–1930* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1988), and *Jews in Christian America: The Pursuit of Religious Equality* (New York: Oxford University Press,1992), and additional works, *Jacob H. Schiff: A Study in American Jewish Leadership* (Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press/University Press of New England,1999), *The Americanization of Zionism, 1897–1948* (Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press/University Press of New England, 2003), and *What the Rabbis Said: The Public Discourse of Nineteenth-Century American Rabbis* (New York: New York University Press, 2008) in her retirement. Both *Encounter with Emancipation* and *Jews in Christian America* received the National Jewish Book Award for Jewish History. In 1996, Cohen retired from teaching and moved to Israel.

201 Isaac Barzilay to Fellows, January 1989, 2, AJHS I-508, box 5, folder 10.

202 Jakob Petuchowski to Isaac Barzilay, June 12, 1987.

203 "Executive Committee Meeting Minutes," October 12, 1988, 1, AJHS I-508, box 12, folder 7.

204 "Executive Committee Meeting Minutes," May 3, 1989, 1, AJHS I-508, box 12, folder 8.

205 "Executive Committee Meeting Minutes," November 12, 1989, 2, AJHS I-508, box 12, folder 8.
206 Ibid.
207 "Executive Committee Meeting Minutes," April 22, 1988, 1, AJHS I-508, box 12, folder 7.
208 "Executive Committee Meeting Minutes," May 3, 1989.
209 Isaac Barzilay to Academy Fellows, April 11, 1984.
210 Underlining true to original. Jakob Petuchowski to Isaac Barzilay, June 12, 1987, 2.
211 Ibid.
212 Louis Feldman to Robert Chazan, July 27, 1995, 1, AJHS I-508, box 5, folder 20.
213 Shaye J. D. Cohen to Alfred Ivry, March 20, 1995, AJHS I-508, box 8, folder 2.
214 Shaye J. D. Cohen to Robert Chazan, May 16, 1996, AJHS I-508, box 5, folder 20.
215 Ibid.
216 Michael A. Meyer, interview with author, Cincinnati, Ohio, July 10, 2018.
217 Todd Endelman, phone interview with author, July 15, 2018.
218 "Executive Committee Annual Meeting Minutes," December 24, 1989, AJHS I-508, box 13, folder 14.
219 Robert Chazan, "Salo Wittmayer Baron (1895–1989)," *PAAJR* 58 (1992): 12.
220 Ibid.
221 Robert Chazan to Harvery Ishovsky, October 7, 1996, AJHS I-508, box 5, folder 20.
222 Robert Chazan, "The Blois Incident of 1171: A Study in Jewish Intercommunal Organization," *PAAJR* 36 (1968): 13–32. Robert Chazan, interview with author, New York, New York, May 24, 2018.
223 Ibid.
224 Ibid.
225 Todd Endelman, email correspondence, March 2019.
226 Ibid; Robert Chazan, interview with author, New York, New York, May 24, 2018; Todd Endelman, phone interview with author, July 15, 2018.
227 Much of this total from restricted funds likely came from Baron's investments in the stock market and the Epstein Fund, which Baron personally oversaw during his time at the helm of the Academy. The reform goals and estimated totals come from Robert Chazan, interview with author, New York, New York, May 24, 2018; Todd Endelman, phone interview with author, July 15, 2018.
228 Robert Chazan, interview with author, New York, New York, May 24, 2018.
229 David Ruderman, phone interview with author, July 18, 2018.
230 Ibid.
231 Ibid.
232 Todd Endelman, phone interview with author, July 15, 2018.
233 American Academy for Jewish Research, "Mission," October 30,

2000, retrieved via the Internet Archive: http://web.archive.org/web/20011122052516fw_/http://www.library.upenn.edu:80/cjs/_AAJR/mission.html.

234 Ibid.

235 Michael A. Meyer, interview with author, Cincinnati, Ohio, July 10, 2018.

236 "Program for First AAJR Fellows Retreat," AJHS I-508, box 3, folder 2.

237 Michael A. Meyer and Marc Saperstein to Robert Chazan, "Report on First Retreat of the Fellows of the American Academy for Jewish Research, held at Brandeis University, June 7–9, 1998," 1. A copy of the original is in possession of the author.

238 "Program for First AAJR Fellows Retreat," AJHS I-508, box 3, folder 2; Meyer and Saperstein, "Report on First Retreat," 2.

239 Meyer and Saperstein, "Report on First Retreat," 2.

240 Ibid., 1.

241 Robert Chazan, conversation with the author, New York, February 27, 2018.

242 "List of Fellows," *PAAJR* 62 (1996): viii–ix.

243 "Officers and Fellows," http://www.aajr.org/officers-fellows/.

244 Todd Endelman, email correspondence, March 2019.

245 Robert Chazan, interview with author, New York, New York, May 24, 2018.

246 "Paula Hyman," AJHS I-508, box 7, folder 16.

247 David Ruderman to David Weiss Halivni, December 26, 1991, 1, AJHS I-508, box 9, folder 6.

248 David Ruderman, phone interview with author, July 18, 2018.

249 Todd Endelman, correspondence, March 2019.

250 Polly Curtis and Will Woodward, "Lecturers May Boycott Israeli Academics," *Guardian*, April 4, 2005.

251 American Academy for Jewish Research and Association for Jewish Studies, press release, August 11, 2007.

252 American Studies Association, "What Does the Boycott of Israeli Academic Institutions Mean for the ASA?," https://www.theasa.net/what-does-boycott-mean.

253 American Academy for Jewish Research and Association for Jewish Studies, press release, 2005.

254 Ibid.

255 American Academy for Jewish Research, "Response to Boycott of Israeli Academic Institutions," December 2013.

256 Todd Endelman, phone interview with author, July 15, 2018.

257 Robert Chazan, "Mission," http://web.archive.org/web/20011122052516fw_/http://www.library.upenn.edu:80/cjs/_AAJR/mission.html.

258 "Announcement and Programs," http://web.archive.org/web/20011122050732fw_/http://www.library.upenn.edu:80/cjs/_AAJR/announcements.html.

259 Robert Chazan, "Mission."

260 Robert Chazan, interview with author, New York, New York, May 24, 2018.

II

The Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research (1930-1997): An Evaluation

PAAJR at Inception: Novelty, Growth, and Birth Pangs in the Post-World War I Era

DAVID N. MYERS
University of California, Los Angeles

The ten years between the first organizational meeting of the American Academy for Jewish Research on June 15, 1920, and the appearance of the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* in 1930 were consequential ones in the history of the field of Jewish studies. Of course, they were consequential years in global history, too. The devastating effects of the recently concluded Great War, as Paul Fussell and Jay Winter have shown, altered the psyche, memory, and literary imagination of the Western world.[1] There was a deep sense that humanity had fallen into an abyss from which it might not emerge. At the same time, there were glimmers of hope, even messianic in nature, that a new enlightened world order could emerge, as the new Weimar Republic seemed to augur.

In more mundane terms, World War I's end led to the redrawing of maps, as once-mighty empires were carved up into successor states in Europe and the Middle East. With the boundary lines between new countries still porous, the pace of population movement hastened,

including for thousands of Jews who made their way from the chaotic war zones of eastern Europe to what seemed at the time to be safe havens and new educational opportunities in central Europe.

An important effect of this movement, as the Hebrew poet Ḥayim Naḥman Bialik noted, was that "distant relatives happened onto the same inn."[2] German and eastern European Jews met in Germany and Austria in this postwar era not only as foils who affirmed each group's one-dimensional stereotype of the other, but now, for the first time, as partners in the work of cultural reconstruction that was so urgently needed. Buoyed by an almost frenetic commitment to affirm life after so much death, the meeting of *yekkes* and *yidn* yielded an efflorescence of literary activity in German, Hebrew, and Yiddish.[3] It also inaugurated a Golden Age in Jewish studies, marked by the emergence of innovative new journals and institutions, though also tempered by the Great Inflation of 1923 and the Great Depression of 1929.

It was in this same era of renewal following destruction that the American Academy of Jewish Research took rise. The Academy's officers—president Louis Ginzberg, vice president Gotthard Deutsch, secretary Henry Malter, and treasurer Jacob Lautenbach—were all European-born and German-trained scholars who had jobs where Jewish studies scholars found employment in this period in the United States: at rabbinical seminars such as the Hebrew Union College and Jewish Theological Seminary or at a Jewish college such as Dropsie in Philadelphia. As the Academy's declared mission made clear, the officers sought to raise the level of scholarly research in the field to that found in Europe. This was a heavy lift, given that the United States was not yet the fertile ground for critical Jewish studies that Europe had been for a century. The inauguration of the AAJR marked an aspiration that, to a great extent, has been realized beyond the wildest dreams of its founders. In many regards, Jewish studies in America represents the pinnacle of intellectual and institutional success in the field.

That said, the Academy idea went unrealized for the better part of the first decade, a function, one might surmise, of competing Jewish

communal agendas, economic instability, and insufficient funding. It was only in December 1929 that the AAJR was formally incorporated. In contrast to its present incarnation, membership in the organization was not limited to scholars, but rather was open to three other groups desired for their potential for financial support: patrons, contributing members, and members. (It is curious to see, even at this early stage, how important the role of individual—and overwhelmingly Jewish—donors was to an important institution in the field.)

One of the key expenses that the Academy was to incur was the third of its six goals from 1920: "the issuance of publications." This aim would reach its earliest state of fruition with the inaugural volume of the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Research* (*PAAJR*) in 1930.

Where does the journal fit within the story of Jewish studies publications—and within the larger history of the institutional growth of the field? In seeking to address these connected queries, I will situate the early *PAAJR* in two contextual circles: first, at a midway point in the two-hundred-year history of modern Jewish studies; and second, within the world of Jewish studies in the immediate post–World War I period marked by a frenetic pace of activity.

Marx's Address: Recalling Zunz

Toward the end of his address on December 26, 1928, which was published in the first volume of the journal, acting AAJR president Alexander Marx recalled that "some years ago a small number of American Jewish scholars, recognizing the great need of such cooperative work, banded together and founded the Academy for Jewish Research."[4] Marx, the German-born scholar and librarian at the Jewish Theological Seminary, was filling in during the 1928–1929 academic year for Louis Ginzberg, who was a visiting professor at the nascent Hebrew University in Jerusalem. In his talk, Marx laid out his view of what work the field of Jewish studies must undertake at this juncture in the United States. He began by noting with admiration and longing the kind of state-sponsored

research in the humanities that was common in Europe. In particular, he called to mind the "great European academies," principally German and French, that supported major collaborative scholarly projects such as the *Histoire littéraire de la France* and the *Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum*.[5]

That kind of collaborative work constituted the ideal in European scholarship, but was not the norm in world of Jewish studies that Marx knew. Jewish studies scholars all too often worked in isolation, without coordination, and even in an abject economic state. Marx recalled the case of Raphael Nathan Rabbinovicz (1835–1888), the Russian Jewish scholar who embarked on a critical edition of the Babylonian Talmud in 1867, eventually producing fifteen volumes of *Dikduke Soferim: Variae lectiones in Mischnam et in Talmud Babylonicum* – although he had to labor for twenty years as a traveling bookdealer in order to find the funds to publish the series. Marx saw this as a sad and revealing reflection of the state of Jewish studies.[6]

The challenge at hand was stark. Unlike the European academies, he noted, "no adequate body of this kind has Jewish literature as its province." The role that an academy for Jewish research in America must play was to lift Jewish studies out of the middle ages—or the state of affairs that obtained in classical studies in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This required a new series of critical editions of the Bible, Midrash, and Talmud, "as well as of all the branches of science and literature which have come down to us from our rich past."[7] Work of this sort should be carried out according to the highest scholarly standards without succumbing to an excess of regard for earlier editions. Key to this task was a high-quality journal that could model, critique, preview, and promote the kind of scholarly labor that needed to be done.

In several important regards, Marx's call evokes the founding programmatic essay of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* movement in Germany more than a century earlier, Leopold Zunz's "Etwas über die rabbinische Literatur." Writing in 1818, Zunz sought to

elevate the critical study of Jewish texts to the highest European levels, especially since now, he wrote, "we have access to tools greater than those available to scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries."[8] In related fashion, Zunz believed it essential to undertake wide-ranging research into every sphere of postbiblical Jewish literature, but that such work must rest on "good preliminary works" that included "critical editions of manuscripts, good translations, accurate reference works, biographies and the like."[9]

It is curious that Alexander Marx felt the same need to promote "good preliminary works" in 1928 that Leopold Zunz had in 1818. Hadn't the field of Jewish studies progressed from Zunz's starting point during the past century? In one sense, the field had grown exponentially in terms of the numbers of university-trained scholars and periodicals devoted to it. There was also a new quasi-academic institution, the modern rabbinical seminary, that arose in the mid-nineteenth century to employ serious researchers. But there wasn't yet a broad ethos of scholarly collaboration in the United States; that kind of spirit depended, Marx insisted, on "a large number of members and patrons."[10] Nor had America yet come into its own as a self-standing center of Jewish studies scholarship. But the times were changing, both in terms of the spirit of collaboration and the stature of America in the field of Jewish studies.

PAAJR in the Institutional Marketplace of Postwar Jewish Studies

The first article published in the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* was an evaluation of Isaak Markus Jost, the early nineteenth-century Jewish historian, by Salo Wittmayer Baron. Here Baron gave expression to his long-standing interest in the history of Jewish historiography, comparing Jost to leading Jewish as well as non-Jewish figures in Germany of his day. The issue also included another article focused on the nineteenth century: Israel Davidson's analysis of the study of medieval Hebrew poetry in that period. Also included in this first volume were Louis Finkelstein's discussion of

the origins of the synagogue in antiquity and Isaac Husik's treatment of "the last of the medieval Jewish philosophers," Joseph Albo.

The article by Baron was symbolically significant, coming when it did. He himself was a recent arrival to the United States, having moved from Vienna to New York to begin teaching at the newly established Jewish Institute of Religion in New York in 1927. Three years later, in 1930, Baron took up the Nathan Miller Chair in Jewish History, Culture, and Institutions, which was the first endowed position in Jewish history at an American university. Five years before that, in 1925, another fellow of the Academy, Harry Austryn Wolfson, was named to the Lucius Littauer Chair at Harvard in the field of Hebrew literature.

These two appointments marked a key source of validation for Jewish studies in the United States, anticipating the major expansion of the field in colleges and universities at the end of the century. At the same time, these appointments belonged to a broader synchronic history of institutional growth in Jewish studies in the postwar period. To wit, between 1919 and 1925, three major new scholarly institutions were established, each of which reflected a dual set of aims: on one hand, the need to collaborate more robustly in the wake of the war's destruction; and on the other, the opportunity to innovate and forge new intellectual and scholarly pathways.

The first of these institutions was the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, which was established in Berlin in 1919.[11] The Akademie was originally conceived by Franz Rosenzweig, in concert with his mentor Hermann Cohen, as a site where academic and communal interests would be seamlessly blended. That idea ultimately did not gain sufficient support among potential backers in Berlin. So Rosenzweig transported the idea to Frankfurt and founded there his famed Lehrhaus. Thereafter, the Akademie was reimagined as a site of pure research by its founding director, the distinguished classical historian Eugen Täubler. One of Täubler's first aspirations, which echoes a key aim of both Zunz and Marx, was to create a sweeping *Biblioteca Judaica*,

a compendium of critical editions of all major Jewish texts up to the eighteenth century. This monumental project proved to be beyond the capacity of the new institution. But the Akademie did set up three sections—Talmudic, Philological, and Historical—with teams of outstanding young researchers (e.g., Selma Stern, Fritz [Yitzhak] Baer, Simon Rawidowicz, Chanoch Albeck)—that engaged in collaborative projects, including the production of critical editions and collected writings of leading thinkers such as Moses Mendelssohn and Hermann Cohen. It is no doubt this collaborative impulse to generate scholarly building blocks that prompted Alexander Marx in his address in *PAAJR* to notice that the Akademie in Berlin "is doing very important work in different branches."[12]

The second institution to take rise in this period was YIVO, the Yidisher Visnshaftlekher Institut (Yiddish Scientific Institute), which sought to contest the hegemony of Germany (and the German language) in Jewish studies and to allow a place for the growth of research in and about the Yiddish language. The scholar and activist Nokhem Shtif provided a key impetus for this initiative with his 1924 essay, "Vegn a yidishn akademishn institut" (On a Yiddish academic institute). The essay prompted eastern European Jewish intellectuals and scholars such as Elias Tcherikower, Jacob Lestschinksy, and Max Weinreich to begin to assemble in various locations after the war, principally Vilna, where YIVO made its first institutional home, and Berlin, where the organization's founding conference was held in early August 1925. Similar to the Akademie, YIVO was organized into different sections: Philological, Historical, Economic/Statistical, and Pedagogical. The sections both published scholarly journals and designed large-scale collaborative projects for teams of researchers. A key feature of YIVO's work was its reliance on the work of *zamlers*, amateur collectors of oral and material records of the Jewish people of eastern Europe.[13]

If YIVO and its focus on the material dimensions of eastern European Jewish culture served to counter the more intellectual-historical and German-centered orientation of *Wissenschaft des*

Judentums, the new Yiddish institution also served as an ideological foil to a third center to take rise in this period: the Hebrew University, which formally opened on April 1, 1925.[14] The ideal of creating a national university for the Jewish people in the Hebrew language emerged in the early years of the Zionist movement. But that goal actually stood at odds with another model that had considerable traction among supporters and potential faculty in the 1920s: that of a pure research institute based on the model of European examples such as the Pasteur Institute in France.[15] Accordingly, in its first phase of development, the Hebrew University consisted of research institutes, including the Institute of Jewish Studies, which actually opened in December 1924, before the formal inauguration of the larger university. The institute attracted a cohort of renowned European-born scholars as permanent faculty, such as Gershom Scholem, Jacob Nahum Epstein, Shalom Albeck, Joseph Klausner, Benzion Dinaburg (Dinur), and later Yitzhak (formerly Fritz) Baer. It also drew a roster of well-known scholarly visitors in the late 1920s, including charter fellows of the AAJR such as Louis Ginzburg, Jacob Mann, and Max Margolis.

The three new postwar institutions—the Akademie, YIVO, and the Hebrew University—represented three distinct strands of postwar scholarly culture, operating in three different languages with three distinct cultural ideologies undergirding them (roughly put, German integrationist, Yiddishist/Diasporist, and Hebraist/Zionist). The competition between them created a kind of marketplace of competing institutional models and scholarly ideas. With its emergence, the American Academy for Jewish Research now entered this marketplace, seeking to find its footing as an American upstart with a large number of European-born scholars and with eyes on the model of European research institutes and academies.

A Periodical Renaissance in the Twenties

Alongside the new institutions of research, the postwar age witnessed an efflorescence in Jewish publishing, with books, newspapers, and journals appearing at an astonishing pace. The thirty-five-page inventory of periodicals that appeared in the *Jüdisches Lexikon* included hundreds of new journals and newspapers founded in the 1920s around the world. In Germany alone, there were ninety or so, with seventeen in Yiddish! This was but one sign of the veritable Jewish cultural renaissance underway in Weimar Germany, as Michael Brenner has described it.[16]

Among the new entries was a raft of scholarly organs, including that of the Akademie, the *Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins zur Gründung und Erhaltung einer Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*. The *Korrespondenzblatt* contained reports on the institution's operations, including its financial condition and sources of support, followed by concise articles, mainly by Akademie staff members, on their research in progress. This journal, which first appeared in 1919, joined a number of scholarly publications of older vintage, including the *Monatsscrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, founded by Zacharias Frankel in 1851, and the *Mitteilungen des Gesamtarchivs der deutschen Juden*, established by Eugen Täubler in 1908.

There were a number of important scholarly publications in languages other than German that emerged in Germany in this period. Even before the first meeting of the Historical Section of YIVO in Berlin in 1925, a group of eastern European Jewish activists and scholars transported from Kiev to Berlin a large trove of documents relating to the devastating pogroms in the late stages and after the First World War in Ukraine. Under the guidance of historian Elias Tcherikower, they established the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv, which in 1923 published an important collection of documents in Russian and Yiddish related to the first stage of the pogroms.[17] In the same year, a new journal spearheaded by the poet Ḥayim Naḥman Bialik appeared in Berlin, called *Devir*,

which sought to accomplish a major ideological goal: to overcome the "sin of language" by forging a wide-ranging scholarly idiom in Hebrew rather than German.[18] In an interesting mea culpa, the German scholar Ismar Elbogen, one of the three editors of the journal, declared that "only in it [Hebrew] can the proper expression for the development of each and every discipline and science be found; and only through its aid can a natural connection to living Judaism be found."[19]

While scholars and authors writing in Yiddish and Hebrew found an uncommonly receptive home in Weimar Berlin, there were even larger centers of cultural activity in these languages elsewhere in this period. Yiddish flourished in many settings across the globe, from New York to Buenos Aires to Johannesburg, but Poland was by far the largest, with hundreds of publications appearing in Yiddish in the 1920s. Even before the establishment of YIVO in Vilna, new scholarly journals began to be published in the 1920s, led by the pioneering *Yidishe filologye* in 1924. With the founding of YIVO a year later, a new era of scholarship in Yiddish commenced. In October 1925, the YIVO newsletter *Yedies fun yidishn visnshaftlekhn institut* started to appear, with frequency varying year by year. Each of the scholarly sections of YIVO assembled around it a cohort of researchers who generated journals in their field. The Historical Section, for example, put out three volumes of *Historishe shrift* (1929, 1937, 1939).[20] Meanwhile, two of the key figures in that section, Emanuel Ringelblum and Raphael Mahler, had founded a circle of junior scholars in Jewish history in Warsaw in 1923 known as the Yunger Historiker; the group put out a publication by that name from 1926–1929, which was followed by *Bleter far geshikhte*, which appeared from 1934 until 1938. Back in Vilna, YIVO created its flagship multidisciplinary journal, *YIVO bleter*, in 1931; it survived the later destruction of the extraordinarily vibrant Jewish culture in Vilna by reestablishing itself in New York in 1940.

As Yiddish letters and scholarship were passing through one of the most intense and exhilarating periods of Jewish cultural

production in the modern era—before the *khurbn*, or destruction, of the Holocaust—Hebrew periodical literature was also in the midst of a period of tremendous growth, especially in Palestine. The *Jüdisches Lexikon* inventory, which was not complete, listed some fifty new Jewish publications in Palestine between 1919 and 1929, almost all of which were in Hebrew. They included the important bibliographic quarterly, *Kiryat sefer*, which the incipient National Library began to publish in April 1924. Shortly thereafter, when the new Hebrew University opened in April 1925, the library would be renamed the Jewish National and University Library. In that same year, the university's Institute for Jewish Studies began to publish *Yedi`ot ha-makhon le-madda`e ha-Yahadut*. This publication featured short articles, often inaugural addresses laying out the challenges of their respective subfields, by the Hebrew University's founding faculty in Jewish studies (for example, Gershom Scholem, Shmuel Klein, and Jacob Nahum Epstein). Four years later, in 1929, the university began to publish a general Jewish studies quarterly called *Tarbiz* that continues to exist to this day.

Independently of the university, the Palestine Historical and Ethnographic Society commenced a new journal in 1925 called *Zion*, devoted to the history of the land of Israel. Insofar as the scholarly talent present in Jewish Palestine at the time was affiliated with the Hebrew University, many of *Zion*'s articles were written by professors such as Scholem, Klein, and Simcha Assaf from the university. This version of the journal appeared irregularly until 1933. Two years later, in 1935, the society produced a new series of *Zion* under the editorial control of two Hebrew University historians, Yitzhak Baer and Benzion Dinaburg (Dinur). The purview of this journal was expanded to cover the entire span of Jewish history. To establish this more transnational pattern, the editors included articles in the first volume on the history of Jews in Spain, Egypt, Iran, Poland, and Italy. *Zion* continues to appear until today and serves as one of the most important scholarly platforms in the field of Jewish history.

Conclusion

There are two noticeable features about the era in which the *PAAJR* began to be published. The first is the sheer volume and richness of Jewish cultural and intellectual activity of the day, including in the sphere of scholarly research, which at the time was often understood as an enterprise by and for Jews (in contrast to today's more ecumenical and open-bordered field). The second and related feature is the ideological competition that often underlay Jewish scholarship in this era, particularly among researchers who wrote in Hebrew and Yiddish, who were often affiliated with the Zionist and Yiddish nationalist movements. There was indeed a *Sprachenkampf*, or battle of languages, involving Hebrew and Yiddish, but also German, that played out in Palestine from at least 1913, when a new institution, the Technikum, was established in Haifa.[21] What would be the language of instruction for Jewish students in the country? Or more germane to the interests of this article, what would be the language of scholarship? Early supporters of the Technikum believed that only German could serve the task, but severe opposition and protest from indignant Hebrew activists decided the battle on behalf of that language. Battles of this sort were hardly restricted to Palestine. Jewish activists in eastern Europe fervently demanded that Yiddish be recognized as the Jewish national language and be considered a serious scientific language on a European level.

As noted above, all of this linguistic and ideological competition made for an intense marketplace into which the AAJR and its journal entered. The Academy's founding Fellows were European-born scholars who knew well of developments in other locales and languages. They wrote for scholarly journals in Europe and Palestine.

And yet, the *PAAJR* had its own particular American mission to fulfill. It was to compete in the marketplace of the day by creating in a Jewish studies scholarly voice in the English language that met the highest standards. It was not alone in this task. The *Jewish Quarterly Review*, established in England in 1889, had moved to

Dropsie College in 1910 at the initiative of its president, Cyrus Adler, who later served as one of five founding honorary members of the AAJR. *JQR* was an early indication of the importance of English and the United States for the future of the field. Emerging two decades later in 1930, the *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* served as yet another indication of the future ascendance of the United States as a major world center of Jewish studies. At the same time, it made its own signal contribution to one of the most robust periods of scholarly growth in modern Jewish studies—a period marked by new opportunity and a spirit of innovation, as well as by the grave economic and political challenges brought on in the post–World War I era.

Notes

1. See Fussell's classic *The Great War and Modern Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), and Jay M. Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) and *Remembering War: The Great War between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).
2. David N. Myers, "'Distant Relatives Happening onto the Same Inn': The Meeting of East and West as Literary Theme and Cultural Ideal," *Jewish Social Studies* 1, no. 2 (Winter 1995): 5–100.
3. Michael Brenner, *The Renaissance of Jewish Culture in Weimar Germany* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996).
4. Alexander Marx, "Address of Acting President Alexander Marx, December 26, 1928," *PAAJR* 1 (1928–1930): 6.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., 4–5.
7. Ibid.
8. Leopold Zunz, "Etwas über die rabbinische Literatur," in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Berlin: Gerschel, 1875), 5–6, translated as "On Rabbinic Literature," in *The Jew in the Modern World*, ed. Paul Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 247.
9. Ibid.
10. Marx, "Address," 6.

11 See the *Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins zur Gründung und Erhaltung einer Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* 1 (1920), as well as D. N. Myers, "The Fall and Rise of Jewish Historicism: The Evolution of the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 63 (1992): 107–44.

12 Marx, "Address," 5.

13 On the origins and early growth of YIVO, see Cecile E. Kuznitz, *YIVO and the Making of Modern Jewish Culture: Scholarship for the Yiddish Nation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

14 See the comprehensive volumes on the history of the Hebrew University, *Toldot ha-ʾuniversitah ha-`ivrit bi-Yerushalayim* from 1997 (edited by Shaul Katz and Michael), and Hagit Lavsky (2005 and 2009), published by the Magnes Press in Jerusalem.

15 See David N. Myers, *Re-inventing the Jewish Past: European Jewish Intellectuals and the Zionist Return to History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 47.

16 See the wide-ranging but not exhaustive entry "Jüdische Presse," in *Jüdische Lexikon: Ein enzyklopädisches Handbuch des jüdischen Wissens* (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1930), Band IV/1, xxii–xxiv. For the number of Yiddish journals in Berlin, see Delphine Bechtel, "Les revues modernistes yiddish à Berlin et à Varsovie: La quête d'une nouvelle Jérusalem?," *Études germaniques* 46, no. 2 (April–June 1991): 161–77. See also Brenner, *Renaissance of Jewish Culture*.

17 See Tcherikower's edition, with an introduction by Simon Dubnow, *Antisemitism un pogromen in Ukraine, 1917–1918* (Berlin: Mizreh-Yidishn historishn arkhiv, 1923). See also Efim Melamed, "'Immortalizing the Crime in History …': The Activities of the Ostjüdisches Historisches Archiv (Kiev–Berlin–Paris, 1920–1940)," in *Russian Jewish Diaspora and European Culture*, ed. P. Wagstaff, J. Schulte, and O. Tabachnikova (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 373–86.

18 *Devir* 1 (1923): xii.

19 *Devir* 2 (1923): 15.

20 See Cecile Kuznitz's entry "YIVO" in the online *YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe*, at http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/YIVO on 1 July 2019.

21 On the language battles in Palestine, see, for example, Yael Chaver, *What Must Be Forgotten: The Survival of Yiddish in Zionist Palestine* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2004), 17, as well as the entry "Sprachenstreit" in *Enzyklopädie jüdischer Geschichte und Kultur*, ed. Dan Diner (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2011–), 5:555–57.

A Text in Search of a Method: Where Is the Talmud in the Scholarship on Jewish Antiquity?

CHRISTINE HAYES
Yale University

Approximately 140, or roughly 23 percent, of the articles published in the *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* (*PAAJR*) may be assigned to the broad domain of classical or ancient Judaism, including the fields of Hebrew Bible (5%), Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism (5%), linguistic and philological studies (1%), and classical rabbinic literature (12%). The distribution of articles among these fields remained relatively constant over the course of the journal's history.[1] However, a closer examination of the articles grouped under the broad heading "classical rabbinic literature" reveals important shifts in the perception of rabbinic literature generally, and the Babylonian Talmud specifically, as peripheral or central to the academic study of Judaism.

The Babylonian Talmud is the culminating masterwork of rabbinic Judaism and the central and defining text of the traditional Jewish curriculum. Yet a survey of seven decades of the *PAAJR* turns up only a small number of articles devoted to the Talmud per se, rather than the general talmudic era, highlighting the work's precarious status

within, and fraught relationship to, the enterprise of academic Jewish studies. Natalie Dohrmann has already observed the same pattern in a century's worth of issues of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*.[2]

Echoing Dohrmann, we may ask why scholars of Jewish antiquity publishing in the *PAAJR*, particularly in its first thirty years, chose to channel their scholarly efforts into the text and analysis of the Hebrew Bible, the social and political history of the Second Temple period, Hellenistic Jewish literature, liturgy, targums, and philological and historical researches into rabbinic literature broadly speaking that pointedly did not engage the substance of talmudic discussion and debate. Certainly, the lack of critical editions of rabbinic texts and the poor prospects for producing the same posed an impediment, but two additional factors played an important role: first, the scholarly valorization of what were perceived to be *original*, and therefore culturally authentic, moments of text creation (the biblical period) over commentary (postbiblical literature); and second, the difficulty of applying historical tools of analysis whetted on classical texts to a sui generis work like the Talmud. Unlike the Bible, which had found a place in academic studies some decades earlier, and Hellenistic Jewish historiographic and philosophical writings that yielded more readily to existing canons of analysis, the Talmud was, in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, a text in search of a method. I will suggest that a sea change was presaged in the 1957 issue of the *PAAJR*, with the publication of Simon Rawidowicz's "On Interpretation." This unusual and stirring call to abandon the prejudicial distinction between text and commentary in favor of a paradigm that viewed all textual production as creative "*interpretatio*" invited a deeper engagement with talmudic content, an invitation answered in fits and starts over the next several decades.

Turning to the first thirty years of the journal's existence, how do we account for both the paucity of articles on the Talmud itself *and* the specific nature of the articles that do address classical rabbinic literature? Certainly, the paucity cannot be attributed to the fact that Jewish studies scholars in this period lacked familiarity

with the Talmud and related halakhic texts. Nothing could be further from the truth. In a survey article for the 1979 jubilee volume of the *PAAJR*, Saul Lieberman noted that when the Hebrew University opened its Institute for Jewish Studies in 1929, students were admitted on the basis of their knowledge of rabbinic literature gained from traditional yeshiva study.[3] The plan was that these students would learn the methods of research developed in the academy for the study of Greek and Roman antiquity and Western civilization, and apply them to the Jewish texts with which they were already familiar. And it wasn't only the Hebrew University that adopted this approach. In the early twentieth century, there was a general assumption that no mature-age scholar could successfully undertake the study of rabbinic literature from scratch. Yeshiva training was a sine qua non.

It is worth pausing here to note that the double assumption that one cannot learn rabbinic sources at a mature age, and that one must acquire the texts from a traditional background, created an ethnic and gender barrier reflected in the fact that only one of the *PAAJR* articles in premedieval Judaism produced over seven decades was written by a non-Jew (Morton Smith) and only three were written by women. Notably, two of these women were established scholars in other fields. Ilse Lichtenstadler, who penned "Some References to Jews in Pre-Islamic Arabic Literature" in the 1940 volume of *PAAJR* (10:185–94) earned two doctorates from the University of Hamburg and from Oxford before emigrating to America, where she would eventually be appointed tenured lecturer in Arabic at Harvard's Center for Middle Eastern Studies. Lichtenstadler would write and edit several books on Islam and classical literature. Equally distinguished, Rachel Bernstein Wischnitzer, who authored "The Samuel Cycle in the Wall Decoration of the Synagogue at Dura-Europos" in the 1941 volume of the *PAAJR* (11:85–103), was one of the first European women to receive an architect's diploma, and one of the first scholars to work on illuminated Hebrew manuscripts at the British Museum and the Bodleian Library. Her book on *Symbols*

and Forms of Jewish Art (published in German in 1935) was a major achievement. Fleeing Germany, she became a research fellow at the AAJR in New York, and published a book on the messianic theme in the paintings of Dura Europos, as well as many important studies of Jewish art and architecture. These women were clearly brilliant and accomplished scholars, and their *PAAJR* articles relate to the talmudic *period*, but via a nontalmudic expertise: Arabic studies and art history, respectively. It would be 1984 before a female Talmudist would be represented in the pages of the *PAAJR*. That scholar was Judith Hauptman with her by-now-classic study of the term *tanya nami hakhi*.[4] Hauptman was the third and final woman, and the only female Talmudist, among the authors of the *PAAJR*'s premedieval articles.

But to return to the question of the paucity of articles on the Talmud per se in the journal's first thirty years: If early scholars of Jewish antiquity possessed traditional training in Talmud, why were they slow to direct their scholarly efforts to this classic text of rabbinic literature? Certainly, the lack of critical editions, dictionaries, and other research tools—a situation lamented by Alexander Marx in his 1928 presidential address to the AAJR[5]—affected the quantity and nature of articles engaging the Talmud and related halakhic literature. It was for this reason that the critical study of rabbinic literature as a whole by the scholars of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, from its earliest beginnings in the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century, focused on lower-critical questions, eventually producing—sometimes through remarkable reconstructions—scholarly editions of some smaller rabbinic works, collations of variants and versions for larger works, transcriptions of manuscripts, early printed editions, as well as dictionaries and terminological studies.

While the *PAAJR* was not necessarily the preferred vehicle for this kind of scholarship, from 1930 to the end of the 1950s we do see several articles dealing with lower-critical issues in various rabbinic works: Louis Finkelstein provided two brief articles on the textual difficulties entailed in producing a critical edition of the Sifre and

two longer articles on problems with the text of the Mekhilta.[6] In the same period, Jacob Lauterbach tracked "Substitutes for the Tetragrammaton" through manuscripts and printed editions of rabbinic texts (2 [1930–31]: 39–67) and pointed to ambiguity in the identification of textual witnesses to the "The Two Mekiltas" (4 [1932–33]: 113–29). Michael Higger wrote articles on the confused technical terms that introduce baraitot and on the purported authorship of the Tosefta,[7] while Moshe Zucker penned a Hebrew article that seeks to resolve textual and authorial problems concerning the thirty-two *middot* and the Mishnah of R. Eliezer[8]—a total of nine articles in the first three decades of the journal's existence all focusing on text-critical matters pertaining to specific rabbinic texts.

But the lack of critical editions cannot fully explain the lack of engagement with the *substance* of the Talmud and related halakhic texts. A fuller explanation has to do with the Talmud's precarious status within, and fraught relationship to, the enterprise of academic or scientific Jewish studies—*Wissenschaft des Judentums*—with its valorization of "original" moments of textual and cultural creation and its concomitant emphasis on historical methodologies designed to uncover these original moments.

Beginning in the early nineteenth century, the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* movement advocated the application of historical-critical methods to the study of Judaism to effect the integration of Jewish studies into the humanities. To make the case for the recognition of Judaism and its literature in university research and teaching, Leopold Zunz argued that Jews had made important contributions to all areas of Western civilization, contributions that should be included in the history of the West. To gain acceptance of the study of Judaism into the academy, members of the *Wissenschaft* movement believed they "had to show classicists that their own source material had historical value and justified historical consideration."[9]

Beyond this basic platform, however, there was great disagreement among the early *Wissenschaft* scholars, and the Talmud figured centrally in that disagreement. Reform-minded *Wissenschaft*

scholars, like Abraham Geiger and Samuel Holdheim, internalized Christian and Enlightenment critiques of rabbinism as a suffocating and inauthentic malignancy. The parochial product of a narrow-minded clerical elite deploying outlandish methods of exegesis to control the masses and to erect social and intellectual barriers to integration and secular culture, the Talmud had contributed little to the great story of European civilization and could safely be ignored. These scholars directed their historical-critical energies to unearthing the pure origins of Jewish culture, freed from the arcane and stultifying accretions of the Talmud, and serviceable in the modern progress towards emancipation.

Countering the Reform-minded scholars' prejudicial dismissal of talmudic and rabbinic literature, Leopold Zunz argued for the inclusion of all Jewish literature for the study of the Jewish past, not merely those epochs and texts that served a contemporary agenda. It is true that even some more traditionalist scholars were at times apologetic or selective in their engagement with the Talmud; nevertheless, they were determined to include it and other works of rabbinic Judaism in the *Wissenschaft* project. The challenge was, how?

To counter the claim that the Talmud and related writings are parochial, religious works that stood apart from the great sweep of Western civilization and contributed nothing to it, these scholars ignored the more particularistic and overtly religious aspects of the literature, including its alien modes of exegesis, and focused instead on the nonparochial and nonreligious elements —materials touching on such topics as science, secular and civil law, language, and philosophy. And to counter the claim that rabbinic texts are of poor historical quality and unreliable as historical sources, these scholars defended the texts' evidentiary value, early dating, and general utility for investigating the origins of Jewish life and culture.

Fast-forward some ninety-odd years to the establishment of the *PAAJR*, and we see the enduring legacy of both camps of *Wissenschaft* scholars. On the one hand, in the first thirty years of the journal, there are virtually no articles that engage the substance of

talmudic literature. This would have pleased Geiger and Holdheim, who found this material exotic and embarrassing. On the other hand, the few articles that *are* devoted to rabbinic texts are careful to abide by the circumscribed terms of engagement set forth by the reformers' opponents. Take, for example, an article entitled "The Origin of the Synagogue: A Study in the Development of Jewish Institutions," published in just the second volume of the *PAAJR* (69–81). The year is 1930, and *Wissenschaft des Judentums* has flourished for more than a century, yet the article's author, Solomon Zeitlin, still finds it necessary to justify the historical investigation of what many believed was a rabbinic institution.[10] His justification should sound familiar. First, he argues that just as a full understanding of modern institutions requires a knowledge of the Greek and Roman institutions upon which they are based, so Jewish history of the Second Commonwealth is indispensable for understanding Christian religion and Western institutions, because the latter are directly traceable to the Judaism of that period. Anticipating objections to the study of religious institutions as parochial, Zeitlin asserts that many institutions of a religious character came into existence as a result of social and economic forces, and it is their origin in *secular* forces that renders religious institutions a legitimate object of the scholar's inquiry. In the case of the synagogue, he argues, the very term *bet ha-kenesset* betrays the origin and character of the institution as a place of assembly in which the exiles returning from Babylon met to solve the many social and economic problems they faced. What would become a house of prayer (*bet tefillah*) actually originated as a response to socioeconomic (read: secular) stimuli, placing its study squarely within the purview of the secular historian. Finally, in a statement that may have shocked some, Zeitlin went on to assert that "even some of the halakot were modified to meet material needs, thus showing that religion could be adapted to practical life." In other words, even Jewish religious law could be subjected to the historian's gaze as long as the focus was on the socioeconomic and other secular forces that affected the law's material form.

This emphasis on the historical reliability of rabbinic sources and their utility in the effort to unearth the historical origins of various institutions and practices or to demonstrate the Jewish contribution to general civilization is reflected in the articles published in the first thirty years of *PAAJR*. Jacob Lauterbach argued that despite the sometimes contradictory or confused chronological notes in rabbinic literature, older (tannaitic) references to historical events and epochs are generally reliable.[11] Of the fewer than twenty articles in these three decades that touch on the talmudic era, three focus on the origins of Jewish institutions, including two articles on the origin of the synagogue[12] and an article on the institution of concubinage among the Jews.[13] A further nine articles—all written by Solomon Gandz—focus on Jewish contributions to the so-called universal sciences as attested primarily in rabbinic sources. Bearing such titles as "The Origin of the Gnomon in Hebrew Literature" (2 [1930–31]: 23–38), "Studies in Hebrew Mathematics and Astronomy" (9 [1938–39]: 5–50), "Studies in the Hebrew Calendar: Interpretation of a Difficult Passage in the Palestinian Talmud" (17 [1947–1948]: 9–17), and "The Distribution of Land and Sea on the Earth's Surface according to Rabbinic Sources" (22 [1953]: 23–53), these articles comb rabbinic and other ancient Jewish sources for evidence of Jewish contributions to cosmology, astronomy, mathematics, and more.[14] A further five articles, all written by Boaz Cohen, examine largely secular aspects of Jewish civil law—the law of persons, of possession, of betrothal, divorce, and peculium—as compared to Roman law.[15] In short, through the 1950s, with the exception of a handful of articles devoted to textual and particularly lower-critical issues, most articles in the *PAAJR* touching on the Talmud and related texts employ a historical-critical method in order to reconstruct the origins of an institution or to demonstrate Jewish contributions to areas of universal and especially nonreligious human endeavor.

But the historical analysis of rabbinic texts is a hazardous venture, owing to the very nature of these texts. To their great credit,

early historians adopted a hermeneutic of suspicion according to which historical credence is given to elements of a text that seem counterintuitive. (Saul Lieberman touts this method in his essay for the 1979 jubilee volume cited above.) Unfortunately, however, the criteria by which an element was adjudged counter-intuitive were often drawn from scholars' somewhat prejudicial assumptions about what *ought* to be found in a rabbinic text, rather than an evidence-based inventory of what actually *is* found in rabbinic texts. For example, early scholars assumed that rabbinic sources will always be rather transparently self-serving and self-aggrandizing. Thus, stories that reflect poorly on rabbis or Jews in general or that praise Romans must be authentic historical accounts because the rabbis would never invent negative stories about themselves and the Jewish people, or positive stories about Romans.[16] Of course, one need look no further than the Hebrew Bible to confirm a long literary tradition of Jewish self-criticism. Moreover, the application of historical-critical methods to rabbinic texts tended to produce assertions of their historical reliability and evidentiary value that were rather more optimistic than real. Historians are, after all, well served by the assumption that rabbinic tradents were dedicated to the intact preservation of early teachings; that rabbinic tradents were too pious to intentionally modify or creatively rework orally transmitted traditions; that late tradents and late sources may be taken as historically reliable witnesses to earlier periods because of the high value placed on faithful transmission; and that in general, until proven otherwise, rabbinic traditions are historically trustworthy. Needless to say, these methodological postulates are problematic. In short, the tools and even the questions of the historian proved to be ill suited to a full appreciation and elucidation of rabbinic texts.

I have attempted to account for the paucity of articles on talmudic topics in the early decades of the *PAAJR*, and for the specific character of the few that do exist. I turn now to the 1957 volume, which saw the publication of Simon Rawidowicz's "On Interpretation"

(26:83–126). Hailed as a landmark in Jewish hermeneutics, the article distinguished *explicatio* and *commentatio* from *interpretatio*. Where explication and commentary are essentially reiterations of an original text, interpretation creatively reshapes an earlier text and transforms normative systems by navigating the tension between tradition and innovation, preservation and rejection, continuity and rebellion. Rawidowicz was not dismissive of grammatical-philological and historical scrutinizing of the documents of the past, of the great work involved in editing reliable texts, and of the indispensable annotating and footnoting (89). Yet, he said, one cannot live by that alone. One needs *interpretation*, for all experience is steeped in interpretation and there is no creation that is not at the same time interpretive. This unusual call to view all textual production as creative "*interpretatio*" elevated all textual production to the plane of creative writing and thinking. It reflected larger trends in literary theory that took root in the 1950s and invited a deeper engagement with talmudic content. Suddenly the postbiblical transformations of the biblical heritage were not decadent and inauthentic but vibrant, dynamic, creative, and original.[17]

This is not, of course, to say that philological work ended—it continued and it continues[18]—but after 1957 we see three new directions in *PAAJR* articles touching on the Talmud and related literature. First, most of the few philological articles that appear (the exception is William Braude's presentation of a *piska* of a previously unknown manuscript of Pesikta Rabbati in 1962)[19] move beyond text criticism to new modes of analysis—especially form criticism and redaction criticism—that bear more substantively on textual meaning. Examples include Meyer Feldblum's 1969 article on "The Impact of the 'Anonymous Sugyah' on Halakic Concepts" (37:19–28), Judith Hauptman's 1984 article on the phrase *tanya nami hakhi* (cited above), Moshe Benovitz's 1993 article on "Transferred Sugyot in the Palestinian Talmud" (59:11–57), and Leib Moskowitz's 1995 Hebrew-language article on the missing baraitot of the Palestinian Talmud.[20] In the latter part of the 1980s, Jacob Neusner

abandons his historical researches and presents a few articles driven by form-critical concerns, particularly on Leviticus Rabbah.[21] In the same vein, Reuven Hammer reflects on the "Complex Forms of Aggadah and Their Influence on Content" (48 [1981]: 183–206), while Harry Fox examines "The Circular Proem: Composition, Terminology and Antecedents" (49 [1982]: 1–31).

Second, and more significant, scholars trade the historical lens for a literary and exegetical lens, allowing for a deeper exploration of the creative impulses and narrative forms of rabbinic texts. Rabbinic exegetical techniques—once deemed alien and arcane—find new appreciation in Hebrew–language articles by Naftali Goldstein (1982)[22] and Michael Chernick (1982),[23] and in David Halivni's 1996 "Reflections on Classical Jewish Hermeneutics" (62:21–127). Increased attention to rabbinic exegetical creativity is accompanied by increased attention to rabbinic literary and legal creativity: the literary analysis of a rabbinic story is found in Abraham Berger's 1977 article on the "Captive at the Gate of Rome: The Story of a Messianic Motif" (44:1–17), while rabbinic legal exegesis is the focus of Jacob Neusner's study of the exegetical origin of a rabbinic purity rule.[24]

Third, there is an increased interest in the content and ideas in rabbinic texts. Already in 1958, Judah Goldin published an article exploring the tradition attributed to Shimon the Righteous regarding the three pillars on which the world stands, to be followed by further articles on other traditions in tractate Avot and, of course Avot de-Rabbi Natan (1979 and 1992).[25] Baruch Bokser examined rabbinic responses to catastrophe, Reuven Hammer analyzed the Sifre as a response to the post-Bar Kokhba era, and Adiel Schremer investigated rabbinic views of polygyny.[26]

Articles increasingly exhibit a clear awareness that the historian cannot approach rabbinic sources without due attention to literary and exegetical questions, as in Isaiah Gafni's 1982 Hebrew article on the Bavli's stories about the Sanhedrin, which explicitly addresses the implications of the literary form of the stories for the historian.[27] Such historical articles as remain move from

an emphasis on origins, and examine ideas, events, institutions, and even halakhic developments in their broader cultural contexts, such as Gerald Blidstein's 1973 article on the "Nullification of Idolatry in Rabbinic Law" (41–42: 1–44), Yitzhak Gilat's 1982 Hebrew-language article on the development of the Sabbath laws,[28] Shaye Cohen's 1981 article on "Patriarchs and Scholarchs" (48:57–85), Burt Visotzky's 1990 study of "Anti-Christian Polemic in Leviticus Rabbah" (56:83–100), and in the same year, Yaakov Elman's article on "Righteousness as Its Own Reward: An Inquiry into the Theologies of the Stam" (57:35–67). Scholars begin to juxtapose rabbinic sources with artifacts of material culture or art: Mordechai Friedman compares the mishnaic rules on wife-initiated divorce with Palestinian ketubbot from the Cairo Geniza,[29] and Joseph Gutmann examines the "Illustrated Midrash in the Dura Synagogue Paintings" (50 [1983]: 91–104).

The *PAAJR* ceased publication in 1997. In some respects, subsequent scholarship on ancient Judaism, and especially on the Talmud and related literature, has continued to develop along the course charted in the journal's later volumes, while in other respects, it has entered unchartered waters. As examples of continuity, we may cite the following: text-critical work continues but with increased attention to the role of orality in blurring the boundaries of the processes of composition, redaction, and transmission of the talmudic text; the application of literary theory to the analysis of talmudic texts remains popular, but with increased attention to the relation between Halakhah and Aggadah (inspired by the "law and narrative" movement); the investigation of rabbinic methods of exegesis and argumentation continues to occupy scholars, whose ability to situate the rabbis' interpretive ideologies within broader Near Eastern and Mediterranean trends has improved considerably; the question of rabbinic engagement with the broader cultural environment remains a hotly debated topic, as works that both assert and deny the Hellenization, Romanization, and Persianization of rabbinic Judaism and Halakhah will attest; and the juxtaposition of

material culture and classic rabbinic texts has proven extremely popular as archaeologists and textual scholars build new collaborations.

In addition to these continuities that expand on the trends apparent in the final volumes of the *PAAJR*, contemporary scholars of rabbinic literature, and the Talmud in particular, have set out in exciting new directions that find little or no precedent in the *PAAJR*. The disciplinary tools and methodologies embraced in the last two decades go beyond new historicism and orality studies to embrace discourse analysis, women and gender studies, ritual studies, performance studies, disability studies, the material turn, and more recently, the temporal turn. In addition, scholars of rabbinic literature generally, and the Talmud specifically, are directing their energies to a deeper appreciation of the complex and intersecting cultures of the late antique Mediterranean and West Asian region and the imbrication of rabbinic Judaism in those multidimensional contexts. Challenging the standard taxonomies by which ancient texts and the communities that produced them have long been divided, classified, and even siloed, a new generation of scholars is creating new textual alignments across cultural groups (Jewish, pagan, Christian, Zoroastrian, and more) that transect the traditional disciplinary divisions that held sway in the pages of the *PAAJR* and in the broader study of ancient Judaism generally. Such realignments carry the promise of genuinely new knowledge. A quarter century after the last issue of the *PAAJR*, the Talmud is no longer a text in search of a method; it is, rather, a text whose depths continue to be productively plumbed by a dizzying array of critical and comparative methods.

Notes

1 In the second half of the journal's existence there is a slight drop-off in the number of Bible articles, and a slight increase in the number of articles pertaining to the classical rabbinic period.

2 See Natalie Dohrmann, "100 Years of *JQR* and Rabbinic Judaism," in *JQR* 100, no. 2 (2010): 193–96.

3 "Achievements and Aspirations of Modern Jewish Scholarship," *PAAJR* 46/47 (1979): 369–80.

4 Judith Hauptman, "An Alternative Solution to the Redundancy Associated with the Phrase *Tanya Nami Hakhi*," *PAAJR* 51 (1984): 73–104.

5 "Address of Acting President Alexander Marx, December 26, 1928," *PAAJR* 1 (1928): 3–6.

6 On the Sifre: "Prolegomena to an Edition of the Sifre on Deuteronomy," *PAAJR* 3 (1931): 3–42; "Improved Readings in the 'Sifre,'" *PAAJR* 4 (1932–33): 43–51. On the Mekhilta: "The Mekilta and Its Text," *PAAJR* 5 (1933): 3–54; and "Studies in Tannatic Midrashim," *PAAJR* 6 (1934): 189–228.

7 "The Identification and Classification of the Baraitot," *PAAJR* 9 (1938): 51–55 and "A Yerushalmi View of the Authorship of the Tosefta," *PAAJR* 11 (1941): 43–46.

8 "*lefitaron ba'ayat 32 midot u-mishnat Rabbi Eliezer*," *PAAJR* 23 (1954): 1–39.

9 Catherine Heszer, "Samuel Krauss' Contribution to the Study of Ancient Judaism, Christianity, and Graeco-Roman Culture within the Context of *Wissenschaft* Scholarship," *Modern Judaism* 33, no. 3 (2013): 12.

10 Indeed, Zeitlin felt compelled to attach the following note to the published version of his paper: "The purpose of the paper is to trace the origin of the synagogue as an institution, not the origin of public worship.… I was charged during the discussion of my paper with secularizing Jewish history. History is not sacred nor secular; it is a science that deals with the record of the life of a people. The business of the historian is not only to record events but to interpret them and to show their cause and effect, for events are not the caprice of nature nor of rulers and dictators" (1).

11 "Misunderstood Chronological Statements in the Talmudic Literature," *PAAJR* 5 (1933–34): 77–84.

12 The 1929 article by Solomon Zeitlin cited above is preceded by an unattributed article, "The Origin of the Synagogue," *PAAJR* 1 (1928): 49–59.

13 Louis Epstein, "The Institution of Concubinage among the Jews," *PAAJR* 6 (1934): 153–88.

14 Other articles by Gandz include "Hebrew Numerals," *PAAJR* 4 (1932): 53–112; "The Rōbeh or the Official Memorizer of the Palestinian Schools," *PAAJR* 7 (1935): 5–12; "The Zodiacal Light in Semitic Mythology," *PAAJR* 13 (1943): 1–39; "The Origin of the Planetary Week, or the Planetary Week in Hebrew Literature," *PAAJR* 18 (1948–49): 213–54; and "The Problem of the Molad," *PAAJR* 20 (1951): 235–64.

15 "An Essay on Possession in Jewish Law," *PAAJR* 6 (1934): 123–37; "Some Remarks on the Law of Persons in Jewish and Roman Jurisprudence,"

PAAJR 16 (1946): 1–37; "On the Theme of Betrothal in Roman and Jewish Law," *PAAJR* 18 (1948): 67–135; "Peculium in Roman and Jewish Law," *PAAJR* 20 (1951): 135–234; and "Concerning Divorce in Jewish and Roman Law," *PAAJR* 21 (1952): 3–34.

16 This attitude continued well into the 1970s. An example may be found in the 1979 jubilee volume, in Saul Lieberman's assessment of the famous talmudic story of two Roman envoys who go undercover to study in the rabbinic academy and are so impressed by the Torah that they agree not to report its handful of discriminatory laws to the government. Lieberman argues that because a positive representation of Roman officials is counterintuitive, the story represents an authentic encounter.

17 In a similar vein, Judah Goldin emphasizes the interpretive aspect of all translation in "Reflections on Translation and Midrash," *PAAJR* 41/42 (1973): 87–104.

18 Although great strides have been made, critical editions of all of the works of classical rabbinic literature are still lacking. Increasingly, scholars of rabbinic literature enjoy the benefit of numerous digital tools—online facsimiles of manuscripts and early printed editions, databases of manuscript readings, Geniza fragments, online databases, and search engines. While these are not equivalent to critical editions, they provide the data scholars need to adjudicate a number of baseline lower- and higher-critical questions.

19 "The 'Piska' concerning the Sheep which Rebelled," *PAAJR* 30 (1962): 1–35.

20 "*Od 'al ha-baraitot he-haserot ba-Yerushalmi*," *PAAJR* 61 (1995): 1–21.

21 See Jacob Neusner, "Studying Synoptic Texts Synoptically: The Case of Leviticus Rabbah," *PAAJR* 53 (1986): 111–45; and "Appropriation and Imitation: The Priority of Leviticus Rabbah over Pesiqta Derab Kahana," in *PAAJR* 54 (1987): 141–68.

22 "*Al munahe-qishur midrashi'im ahadim,*" in *PAAJR* 49 (1982): 1–7.

23 "*Hitpathut, tsura, umivneh baderashot shel ribui'im umi'utim,*" *PAAJR* 49 (1982): 105–22.

24 "Scripture and Mishnah: The Exegetical Origins of 'Maddaf'," *PAAJR* 47 (1979–1980): 459–71.

25 "Three Pillars of Simeon the Righteous," *PAAJR* 27 (1958): 43–58; "*Tokh kedey 'iyunim bemasekhet Avot deRabbi Natan*," *PAAJR* 47 (1979): 59–65; and "The Second Pair," in *PAAJR* 58 (1992).

26 Baruch Bokser, "Rabbinic Responses to Catastrophe: From Continuity to Discontinuity," *PAAJR* 50 (1983): 37–61; Reuven Hammer, "A Rabbinic Response to the Post Bar Kochba Era: The Sifre to Ha-Azinu," *PAAJR* 52 (1985): 37–53; and Adiel Schremer, "How Much Jewish Polygyny in Roman Palestine?," *PAAJR* 63 (1997): 181–223.

27 "*Ma'ase beyt-din ba-Talmud ha-Bavli: tsurot sifrutiyot ve-hashlakhot historiyot*" *PAAJR* 49 (1982): 23–40.

28 "*Le-hishtalshelutan shel ha-mal'akhot ha-'asurot ba-shabbat*" *PAAJR* 49 (1982): 9–21.

29 "Termination of the Marriage upon the Wife's Request: A Palestinian Ketubba Stipulation," *PAAJR* 37 (1969): 29–55.

Understanding the Trajectory of Medieval Jewish Studies

EPHRAIM KANARFOGEL
Yeshiva University

From its inception and until publication ceased some seventy years later, the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* offered a steady and at times robust stream of studies dealing with aspects of Jewish history, life, and thought in medieval Europe. To be sure, philosophy and rationalism were the overwhelmingly dominant areas during the first three decades of publication—with Maimonides's writings (and their interaction with Islamic sources) especially prominent. A (modest) turn can also be detected during this period toward biblical exegesis and grammar (including Karaite studies), all of which remained centered within the Sephardic milieu.[1]

The focus on philosophy and rationalism, and on the writings of Maimonides in particular, was a direct reflection of the academic values of the nineteenth-century *Wissenschaft des Judentums* movement. High-achieving Sephardic intellectuals during the medieval period, especially given their immersion in the Muslim philosophical tradition, were seen by many German Jewish writers

during the modern period as clear-thinking and creative scholars, who represented a high point of Jewish learning and cultural achievement. Maimonides, more as philosopher than as halakhist, was the foremost rabbinic figure associated with these developments, followed by Abraham ibn Ezra, Judah Ha-Levi, and Solomon ibn Gabirol.[2]

On the other hand, medieval Jewish law and its history are found in only two titles in the *Proceedings* during this entire thirty-year period.[3] And although Jewry law and Jewish monuments in Germany are discussed in some detail,[4] there is nary a word through 1950 and beyond about Jewish creativity or intellectual history in northern Europe, with the exception of an article by Berthold Altmann.[5]

In the late 1950s, an article appears on the twelfth-century Provençal Talmudist and halakhist, Rabad of Posquieres (although its focus is not so much on matters of Jewish law),[6] along with another study on a polemical handbook produced in southern France by Jacob ben Reuben during the same period.[7] These are followed by two articles that deal mainly with developments in Muslim Spain, the first on the biography of Judah Ha-Levi in light of the Cairo Geniza, and the second (which appeared in 1961) on the story of the four captives as found in Abraham ibn Daud's *Sefer ha-kabbalah*.[8]

Only in the early 1960s, however, do detailed studies begin to appear that are focused on medieval Ashkenaz and its literature. The first, on dream theory in *Sefer Ḥasidim*,[9] was followed five years later by an analysis of the structure of a related pietistic work, and (a decade later) by a similar article on the recensions and structure of *Sefer Hasidim* itself—both from the pen of Ivan Marcus.[10] A Hebrew article published in 1965 seeks to identify the earliest substrate of the *Tosafot ha-Rosh* to tractate *Berakhot* and to account for the formation of this collection of Tosafot as a whole.[11] During the 1970s, an article by Haym Soloveitchik treats in great detail an aspect of the history of Halakhah in medieval Ashkenaz.[12] Another, from the early 1980s, takes up the question of the size and structure of yeshivot in northern France, based primarily on archeological

and other physical evidence,[13] while still another, from the early 1990s, traces and analyzes the full range of theories of communal government that are expressed within medieval Ashkenazic rabbinic literature.[14]

In addition, beginning in the mid- to late 1960s as well, and continuing uninterrupted for a six-year period, Jewish-Christian relations in northern Europe are treated—essentially for the first time—employing a wide array of Jewish and Christian sources, with Robert Chazan authoring most of these papers.[15] A decade later, a Hebrew article published a newly discovered elegy about the martyrs at Blois in 1171, the event which was at the heart of Chazan's initial article in the *Proceedings*. And in 1987, Chazan published an article on the condemnation of the Talmud between 1239 and 1248, in Paris and other locales in northern Europe.[16]

Although analyses of Maimonides and his writings were never absent from the *Proceedings* (and the same can be said, albeit to a lesser extent, for other classics of medieval Jewish thought),[17] the inclusion of these newer themes and issues dealing with the intellectual and religious history of the Jews in northern Europe is difficult to miss, although to be sure, they never become fully dominant. Thus, the 1980s and 1990s see renewed interest in early medieval biblical exegesis in both the East and West, along with treatments of the Geonic academies and the writings which they produced,[18] as well as studies that touch on hekhalot mysticism and astral magic in medieval Spain.[19] Nonetheless, the noticeable turn to Christian Europe in the *Proceedings* that begins in earnest in the mid-1960s, and the texts and other kinds of evidence (and methods) that stand at the core of the studies involved, reflects a rather different emphasis from that which had been prevalent during the first three decades of the *Proceedings*, in which the influence of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* was still strongly felt.

Perhaps equally suggestive is that these shifts and changes were foreshadowed in a number of ways by an article by Salo Baron, which appeared (as the opening piece) in volume 12 of the

Proceedings (1942) and was entitled "The Jewish Factor in Medieval Civilization." This article by Baron is an expanded and lavishly annotated version of the presidential address that he delivered at the annual meeting of the Academy on December 28, 1941. Note that Baron was forty-seven years old at the time that the article appeared, having arrived at his academic post at Columbia in 1930.

Baron indicates that the purpose of his paper (the intriguing title notwithstanding) is to point out the areas of research within medieval Jewish history that have already been extensively cultivated, and to contrast them with those which in his view have not been adequately treated. He begins by noting that until the end of the twelfth century, the overwhelming majority of the Jewish people lived under Islam during the medieval period. However, Jewish historians in the first half of the twentieth century spent so much time receiving training in Hebrew and Arabic, and in rabbinics, and philosophy—in order to penetrate the large and complex body of Jewish writings that was produced in the Islamic orbit—that they were, for the most part, unable to pursue a favored goal of general medieval historians during at this time: to launch successful historical and sociological investigations of the Jewish communities that flourished within the realm of Islamic civilization.

The study of this corpus of Jewish literature required familiarity not only with all of the relevant Jewish texts, but also with the Arabic texts and ideas that might have helped to shape them. However, these investigations did not necessarily require that the works under discussion be situated within their larger societal contexts, nor did they consider the extent to which the Jewish communities consumed these works, or whether they are reflected in any way within them. And they certainly did not attempt to sketch larger historical pictures or descriptions of the Jewish communities themselves or their relationship to the Islamic host culture.[20] In a note, Baron commends Fritz Baer's writing on the history of the Jews of Spain as "a noteworthy example of a successful blending of the two approaches."

Baer wrote, of course, mainly about the history of the Jews in Christian Spain, and Baron immediately turns to provide a lengthy series of specific examples and findings concerning the lives of the Jews in both southern and northern Europe, and their interactions with Christian figures, institutions, and culture throughout the medieval period. These include the size of the Jewish communities, apostasy, economic relationships with Christians—and sexual relations as well—and the contributions of the Jews to European culture. This last category includes the collaborative work of astrologers and philosophers such as Abraham bar Hiyya and Abraham ibn Daud, and Jewish efforts at biblical interpretation in the larger Christian context, as well as Jewish mysticism and magic—along with understanding the goals of the Christian Hebraists and the nature and development of Jewish-Christian polemics.

Baron returns to this last area at the end of the article, following a section that calls for an investigation of the relationships between the Jews and Christian kings and other rulers, and the ways that Jewish self-government was managed in light of these other complex (and sometimes fraught) loyalties. A quite remarkable detail of this section is found at footnote 68, in which Baron cites an almost impenetrable passage from the late thirteenth-century halakhic compendium by Mordekhai b. Hillel (*Sefer Mordekhai* on tractate *Bava Kamma)*, along with a responsum from Mordekhai's teacher, Meir of Rothenburg, about the limits of the halakhic principle, "the law of the land is the law" (*dina de-malkhuta dina*), in situations in which the king tried to exact from the Jews what Baron characterizes as "unaccustomed amercements." For these rabbinic authorities, such exactions delegitimize the ruler and allow for his ordinances to be ignored. And of course, Baron also refers in this note to the contemporaneous views of Thomas Aquinas—as explicated by Henri Pirenne.

It should be noted that despite the criticism that Baron received in later years from reviewers of his *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* (and from other later assessments of his oeuvre), that his

interest in intellectual history generally lagged far behind his fascination with economic and political history and that his later work at times shows signs of a less than full grasp of the relevant rabbinic literature,[21] these shortcomings are not evident in his 1942 article. In any case, it is quite clear that all of this is where Baron thought that the preponderance of future research should now be directed. Baron's prior article in the *Proceedings*, which appeared seven years earlier (in volume 6, 1935), is entitled, "The Historical Outlook of Maimonides," and he produced around the same time as his AAJR presidential address in 1941 articles on Saadiah, Judah Ha-Levi, and Maimonides—along with one about Rashi.[22]

However, as far the *Proceedings* was concerned, the shift in emphasis that Baron advocated is almost precisely what occurred, as can be gleaned from the listing of articles from the 1960s onward that I presented earlier. The older areas of inquiry were not abandoned, and the history and analysis of Jewish philosophical texts and doctrines proceeded along both philological and comparative lines. A particularly excellent example of the kind of Maimonidean studies found in this later era in the Proceedings is A. S. Halkin's article on a later phase of the Maimonidean controversy, "Why Was Levi Ben Hayyim Hounded?," which appeared in 1966. But after two and a half decades, the directional changes that Baron envisioned in his 1942 article became a firm reality in the pages of the Proceedings.

Why this transformation took so long is not fully clear. Not surprisingly, it seems that those who took Baron's advice most to heart were his students (and others) at Columbia. They are the authors of many of the studies enumerated above as representative of these changes. Indeed, at the end of the republication of Baron's 1942 article in a collection of studies that had originally appeared in the *Proceedings*, which Robert Chazan introduced and edited under the title *Medieval Jewish Life* (in 1976), Chazan adds in a note: "The lines of research suggested by Dr. Baron have been pursued extensively by his followers and students. Dr. Baron himself expanded on

many of these themes in volumes 3 through 12 of the revised edition of his Social and Religious History of the Jews."[23] Those volumes were published around 1960, just as the first steps of the shift in the *Proceedings* were beginning, and so whether the authors publishing in the *Proceedings* were led to these new areas by Professor Baron's teachings—or by his writings—is almost moot. Chazan himself studied with Baron, although he completed his doctorate at Columbia under Gerson Cohen, to whom we shall return below.

Baron, however, was not alone. His cause was significantly aided, if not anticipated, by some rather substantial Israeli scholars as well. This serves, on the one hand, to mitigate any feelings that one might have about how much Baron "controlled" the Academy and its *Proceedings*, but also, and much more importantly I think, it provides a clearer understanding and appreciation of the larger changes that were occurring in the field of medieval Jewish studies as a whole. However, before discussing the nature of this similar, parallel effort in Israeli scholarship, I would like to sketch an empirical model that effectively describes, in larger terms, what in fact was occurring.

As outlined in the very first volume of *The Journal of the History of Ideas* in 1940, the discipline of intellectual history may be located on a continuum in which philosophy occupies one pole and social history the other. Thus, the study of intellectual history, or the history of ideas, on the one hand, is based or centered on texts and analyses that trend toward the study of philosophy or related disciplines, while at the same time, it is informed by social developments and phenomena that often play a significant role in shaping the ideas that developed.[24] The authors writing in the early years of the Proceedings on medieval Jewish philosophy and its texts, including such noteworthy scholars as Israel Efros, Isaac Husik, and Harry Austryn Wolfson, to name but a few, were essentially historians of medieval Jewish philosophy if not philosophers themselves.[25]

Baron, however, sought to shift the center of gravity away from philosophy and its particular philological and conceptual

underpinnings, and over to the study of intellectual history and beyond, to include new research and analysis of its social contexts, and indeed, to feature discussions of the political and economic aspects in particular. Such efforts could open up all of the new areas and models that Baron envisioned—a social and religious history of the Jews. The mid-twentieth century also saw increased interest in the study of social history more broadly. Indeed, this field emerged largely as a reaction to older approaches, including the history of great men and great ideas.[26]

As indicated, Baron was also not working in a vacuum in terms of Jewish studies; leading scholars at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, in particular, were making similar strides. This begins in many respects with Fritz Baer (who published his history of the Jews in Christian Spain in Hebrew in 1945, based on an earlier and less complete German version, with a revised and expanded Hebrew edition appearing in 1959, and an English edition in the first half of the 1960s). In addition, Baer, whose work Baron positively recognized, as noted above (even as Baer, among others, criticized Baron for paying too much attention to external causes and factors in Jewish history and not enough to more internal sources and ideas),[27] also authored several lengthy studies which were published mainly in the newly reconstituted Hebrew periodical *Zion*, on themes such as the underpinnings of communal self-government, and the doctrines of the German Pietists and their relationship to Christian society and thought.[28]

Several of Baer's younger colleagues at the Hebrew University produced important studies in other geographic areas and subfields that combined intellectual and social history in different measures. Some leading examples are Eliyahu Ashtor, whose *The History of the Jews in Moslem Spain* was published (in Hebrew) in 1960; Jacob Katz's *Exclusiveness and Tolerance* (in Hebrew, *Bein Yehudim le-Goyim*), which deals especially with the history of Halakhah and related disciplines during the medieval period, as the Jews navigated their way through Christian society (both versions of Katz's work appeared between 1958 and 1961); and Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson's, *Perakim be-toledot ha-Yehudim bimei ha-benayim*, published in 1959.

These works can account for the directions taken by almost all of the other *Proceedings* authors enumerated above who were not students or associates of Baron (although these Israeli works likely impacted at least some of Baron's students in addition). The publication of these Israeli studies suggests that this turn of the field was not simply a moment in the *Proceedings* (or for the American Academy for Jewish Research), but rather a larger academic phenomenon. The work of Gershom Scholem should also be added, even though his influence begins to be felt in the *Proceedings* only a bit later, and then more in terms of Sabbatianism and other phenomena in the early modern period than with respect to medieval Jewish mysticism.

Some of these Israeli influences (and writings) appear to have played a fairly significant role in the thinking of Gerson Cohen, who studied initially at the Jewish Theological Seminary with Alexander Marx and Saul Lieberman, and wrote his doctorate at Columbia (which he submitted in 1958) on Ibn Daud's *Sefer ha-kabbalah*, under the direction of an Islamicist, Arthur Jeffrey. Although Baron may have played a role here as well, the works of Baer and Ashtor are in full evidence in the book-length study of *Sefer ha-kabbalah* that Cohen published in 1967. Cohen went on to direct the doctoral theses of a number of the Proceedings authors noted above, whether at Columbia or at the Jewish Theological Seminary, even as the choice of a dissertation topic can surely be the result of factors that are unrelated to the interests or urgings of one's *doctorvater*.

Another indication that the new directions in the *Proceedings* are emblematic of what was occurring in the field of medieval Jewish studies more broadly can be detected in other venues as well. In the mid- to late 1980s, twenty years after Gerson Cohen published his edition of *Sefer ha-kabbalah*—at which point the shift in the *Proceedings* that has been detailed at length was already well underway—two scholars from within the same academic circles as Cohen, Ivan Marcus and Ismar Schorsch, published articles focusing on the

so-called Sephardic mystique and its impact on several Wissenschaft scholars, which caused them to downplay or even deprecate the rich cultural and communal achievements of Ashkenazic Jewry. Indeed, Marcus also provides examples of the extent to which this preoccupation continued well into the late twentieth century.[29]

As for the continued impact of Israeli scholarship on medieval Jewish studies in North America, the cessation of publication of the *Proceedings* deprives us, among other things, of what surely would have been another instructive if not suggestive point of comparison. Students of Katz, Ben-Sasson, and Scholem (of which there have been many), among other colleagues in Israel, went on to tackle the vast treasure trove of surviving Hebrew manuscripts which had the potential to significantly enhance the quality of research into the medieval period, an activity that only Scholem from among this initial group of mentors had engaged in to a large degree himself.

Much of the North American scholarship in medieval Jewish studies during the past four decades has not kept pace with this development. Israeli manuscript scholarship is at times so overwhelming that the ideas of history can get lost within the complex textual analyses that are being conducted. Nonetheless, it would have been beneficial if North American scholars, who typically remain focused on the development of these ideas, had been able as a group to sufficiently command the manuscript literature as well, so that the new texts and passages being discovered in manuscript could also find a home in the coherent narratives that North American scholars are often able to produce. Instead, there remains to this day something of a gap in this matter between the scholarly communities in the East and in the West, although perhaps the increased digitization of Hebrew manuscripts will help to narrow this gap. In any case, the absence of the *Proceedings* means that there is one less top-tier venue through which to survey and assess these trends in the study of medieval Jewish history.

Notes

1 See, e.g., Isaac Husik, "Joseph Albo, the Last of the Medieval Jewish Philosophers," *PAAJR* 1 (1928–30): 61–72; Samuel Kurland, "An Unidentified Hebrew Translation of Aristotle's *De Generatione et Corruptione*," *PAAJR* 5 (1933–34): 69–76; Harry Wolfson, "Studies in Crescas," *PAAJR* 5 (1933–34): 155–75; Harry Blumberg, "Alfarabi's Five Chapters on Logic," *PAAJR* 6 (1934–35): 115–22; Z. Diesendruck, "Maimonides' Theory of the Negation of Privation," *PAAJR* 6 (1934–35): 138–52; Israel Efros, "Maimonides' Treatise on Logic, *Millot ha-Higgayon* (Makalah fi-Sina'at Al-Mantik)," *PAAJR* 8 (1937–38): 1–65; Joshua Finkel, "Maimonides' Treatise on Resurrection (Maqala fi Teḥiyyat ha-Metim), *PAAJR* 9 (1938–39): 63–105; Leo Strauss, "The Law of Reason in the Kuzari," *PAAJR* 13 (1943): 47–96; A. S. Halkin, "Aknin's 'Hygiene of the Soul,'" *PAAJR* 14 (1944): 37–147; Emil Fackenheim, "The Possibility of the Universe in Al-Farabi, Ibn Sina and Maimonides," *PAAJR* 16 (1946–47): 39–70; Solomon Gandz, "Date of the Composition of Maimonides' Code," *PAAJR* 17 (1947–1948): 1–8; Moshe Perlmann, "Eleventh-Century Andalusian Authors on the Jews of Granada," *PAAJR* 18 (1948–49): 69–90; Moshe Zucker, "Shenei keta'im neged-kara'iyyim," *PAAJR* 18 (1948–49), 1–34; idem, "Ḥelko shel R. Saadiah Gaon be-polmos mi-maḥorat ha-shabbat," *PAAJR* 20 (1951): 1–26; S. L. Skoss, "Saadia Gaon, the Earliest Hebrew Grammarian," *PAAJR* 21 (1952): 75–100 (continued in *PAAJR* 22 [1953] and 23 [1954]); Ernest Mainz, "The Credo of a Fourteenth Century Karaite," *PAAJR* 22 (1953): 55–64; Leo Strauss, "Maimonides' Statement on Political Science," *PAAJR* 22 (1953): 115–30; Sarah Heller-Wilensky, "Isaac Arama on the Creation and Structure of the World," *PAAJR* 22 (1953): 131–50; Zvi Ankori, "Some Aspects of Karaite-Rabbanite Relations in Byzantium on the Eve of the First Crusade," *PAAJR* 24 (1955): 157–82 (continued in *PAAJR* 25 [1956]); Shlomo Pines, "A Tenth-Century Philosophical Correspondence," *PAAJR* 24 (1955): 103–36; Ernest Mainz, "Comments on the Messiah in Karaite Literature," *PAAJR* 25 (1956): 115–18; Norman Golb, "The Hebrew Translation of Averroes' 'Fasl al-Maqal,'" *PAAJR* 25 (1956): 91–113 (continued in *PAAJR* 26 [1957]).

2 See, e.g., John Efron, *German Jewry and the Allure of the Sephardic* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016), 1–3, 61–65; Ivan Marcus, "Beyond the Sephardic Mystique," *Orim* 1 (1985–86): 36–37.

3 See Samuel Rosenblatt, "The Relations between Jewish and Muslim Laws concerning Oaths and Vows," *PAAJR* 7 1935–36): 229–44; and the next note.

4 See Guido Kisch, "Research in the Medieval Legal History of the Jews," *PAAJR* 6 (1934–35): 228–76; idem, "The Jewry-Law of the Medieval German Law-Books," *PAAJR* 7 (1935–36): 61–146 (continued in *PAAJR* 10 [1940]); Adolf Kober, "Jewish Monuments of the Middle Ages in Germany: One Hundred and Ten Tombstone Inscriptions from Speyer, Cologne, Nuremberg and Worms (1085–c.1428)," *PAAJR* 14 (1944): 149–220 (continued in *PAAJR* 15 [1945]).

5 See B. Altmann, "Studies in Medieval German Jewish History," *PAAJR* 10 (1940): 5–98. Like Kisch and Kober (in the above note), Altmann was a

European émigré who was awarded a stipend by the American Academy for Jewish Research to serve for a period as a Research Fellow. See the minutes of the annual meeting as recorded, e.g., in *PAAJR* 6 (1934–35): 370; 8 (1937–38): x; 9–10 (1938–40): vii; 13 (1943): ix, xiv; 14 (1944): xiii; 15 (1945): viii.

6 See Isadore Twersky, "R. Abraham ben David of Posquieres: His Attitude to and Acquaintance with Secular Learning," *PAAJR* 26 (1957): 161–92.

7 See Judah M. Rosenthal, "Prolegomena to a Critical Edition *of Milḥamot Adonai* of Jacob ben Reuben," *PAAJR* 26 (1957): 127–37. See also Arthur J. Zuckerman, "The Nasi of Frankland in the Ninth Century and the 'Colaphus Judaeorum' in Toulouse," *PAAJR* 33 (1965): 51–82.

8 See S. D. Goitein, "The Biography of Rabbi Judah Ha-Levi in Light of the Cairo Geniza Documents," *PAAJR* 28 (1959–60): 41–56; and G. D. Cohen, "The Story of the Four Captives," *PAAJR* 29 (1960–61): 55–132.

9 See Monford Harris, "Dreams in 'Sefer Ḥasidim,'" *PAAJR* 31 (1963): 55–80.

10 See I. G. Marcus, "The Organization of the 'Haqdamah' and 'Hilekhoth Ḥasiduth' in Eleazar of Worms' 'Sefer Ha-Roqeaḥ,'" *PAAJR* 36 (1968): 85–94; and idem, "The Recensions and Structure of 'Sefer Ḥasidim,'" *PAAJR* 45 (1978): 131–54.

11 See Joseph Faur, "Tosafot ha-Rosh le-Massekhet Berakhot," *PAAJR* 33 (1965): 41–65.

12 See H. Soloveitchik, "Pawnbroking: A Study in *Ribbit* and of the Halakhah in Exile," *PAAJR* 38–39 (1970–71): 203–68.

13 See N. Golb, "Nature et destination du monument hebraique decouvert a Rouen," *PAAJR* 48 (1981): 101–82 (with an addendum in *PAAJR* 53 [1986]).

14 See Ephraim Kanarfogel, "Unanimity, Majority, and Communal Government in Ashkenaz during the Middle Ages: A Reassessment," *PAAJR* 58 (1992): 79–106.

15 See Robert Chazan, "The Blois Incident of 1171: A Study in Jewish Intercommunal Organization," *PAAJR* 36 (1968): 13–31; idem, "The Bray Incident of 1192: Realpolitik and Folk Slander," *PAAJR* 37 (1969): 1–18; idem, "1007–1012: Initial Crisis for Northern European Jewry," *PAAJR* 38–39 (1970–71): 101–17; idem, "Anti-Usury Efforts in Thirteenth-Century Narbonne and the Jewish Response," *PAAJR* 41–42 (1973–74): 45–67. See also N. Golb, "New Light on the Persecution of French Jews at the Time of the First Crusade," *PAAJR* 34 (1966): 1–63; David Berger, "The Attitude of St. Bernard of Clairvaux to the Jews," *PAAJR* 40 (1972): 89–108; and cf. Joseph Shatzmiller, "Doctors and Medieval Practices in Germany around the Year 1200: The Evidence of 'Sefer Asaph,'" *PAAJR* 50 (1983): 149–64.

16 See Y. L. Weinberger, "Kinah ḥadashah 'al kedoshei Blois le-R. Avraham b. Shmu'el me-Shpira," *PAAJR* 44 (1977): 39–47; and R. Chazan, "The Condemnation of the Talmud Reconsidered," *PAAJR* 55 (1988): 11–30.

17 See, e.g., Herbert Davidson, "Maimonides' Shemonah Peraqim and Alfarabi's Fusul Al-Madani," *PAAJR* 31 (1963): 33–50; idem, "The Middle Way in Maimonides' Ethics," *PAAJR* 54 (1987): 31–72; Hannah Kasher, "Mashma'uto shel ḥet Mosheh be-mishnat ha-Rambam," *PAAJR* 53 (1986): 29–34; Raymond Weiss, "The Adaptation of Philosophic Ethics to a Religious Community: Maimonides' Eight Chapters," *PAAJR* 54 (1987):

261–87; W. Z. Harvey, "Maimonides and Aquinas on Interpreting the Bible," *PAAJR* 55 (1988): 259–71; Seymour Feldman, "Gersonides' Proofs for the Creation of the Universe," *PAAJR* 35 (1967): 113–38; idem, "A Debate concerning Determinism in Late Medieval Jewish Philosophy," *PAAJR* 51 (1984): 15–54; Robert Eisen, "Reason, Revelation and the Fundamental Principles of the Torah in Gersonides' Thought," *PAAJR* 57 (1991): 11–34.

18 See, e.g., Moshe Sokolow, "Li-kevi'at ha-nosaḥ shel perush Rashi le-sefer ʿIyyov," *PAAJR* 48 (1981): 19–35; idem, "Sa'adiah Gaon's Prolegomenon to Pslams," *PAAJR* 51 (1984): 113–74; Eliezer Schlossberg, "ʾOfyo u-megammto ha-parshanit shel perush R. Saadiah Gaon le-sefer Daniel," *PAAJR* 56 (1990): 5–15; Maaravi Peretz, "Ketaʿ nosaf mi-tokh Kitab Al-Targiah le-R. Yehudah ibn Balam Bereshit," *PAAJR* 57 (1990–91): 1–16; Nahman Danzig, "Teshuvot ha-geonim be-ketaʿ min ha-genizah ve-yaḥasan le-Halakhot Gedolot," *PAAJR* 54 (1987): 13–57; Moshe Gil, "The Babylonian Yeshivot and the Maghrib in the Early Middle Ages," *PAAJR* 57 (1990–91): 69–120; and cf. Jay Rovner, "Ha-re'ayot le-mahadurah kedumah shel perush Rav Ḥanan'el ben Ḥushi'el mi-Kairwan le-Bavli Bava Meẓi'a," *PAAJR* 60 (1994): 31–84.

19 See Elliot Wolfson, "Merkavah Traditions in Philosophical Garb," *PAAJR* 57 (1990–91): 179–242; Dov Schwartz, "Ẓurot shonot shel mageyah be-hagut ha-yehudit bi-Sefarad ba-me'ah ha-yod daled," *PAAJR* 57 (1990–91): 17–47.

20 Cf. I. Schorsch, "Converging Cognates: The Intersection of Jewish and Islamic Studies in Nineteenth-Century Germany," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 55 (2010): 3–7; Efron, *German Jewry and the Allure of the Sephardic*, 190–94.

21 See, e.g., Ismar Schorsch, "The Last Generalist," *AJS Review* 18 (1993): 46–49; Robert Liberles, *Salo Wittmayer Baron: Architect of Jewish History* (New York: New York University Press, 1995), 301–06.

22 See Salo Baron, "Yehudah Ha-Levi: An Answer to a Historical Challenge," *Jewish Social Studies* 3 (1941): 243–72; idem, "The Economic Views of Maimonides," in *Essays on Maimonides*, ed. S. Baron (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941), 127–264; idem, "Rashi and the Community of Troyes," in *Rashi Anniversary Volume*, ed. H. L. Ginsberg (New York: Philadelphia Press of the Jewish Publication Society, 1941), 47–71; idem, "Saadia's Communal Activities," in *Saadia Anniversary Volume* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1943), 9–73; and cf. Liberles, *Salo Wittmayer Baron*, 287–94.

23 See R. Chazan, ed., *Medieval Jewish Life* (New York: Ktav, 1976), 50.

24 See Arthur Lovejoy, "Reflections on the History of Ideas," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 1 (1940): 3–23.

25 See, e.g. Leo Schwartz, *Wolfson of Harvard* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1978), xiii–xix, 85–91.

26 See, e.g., E. J. Hobsbawm, "From Social History to the History of Society," *Daedalus* 100, no. 1 (1971): 20–45; and Theodore Zeldin, "Social History and Total History," *Journal of Social History* 10, no. 2 (1976): 237–45.

27 See Liberles, *Salo Wittmayer Baron*, 353–54; David Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past: European Jewish Intellectuals and the Zionist Return to History*

(New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 120; and Schorsch, "The Last Generalist."

28 See Y. Baer, "Ha-Megammah ha-datit ha-ḥevratit shel *Sefer Ḥasidim*," *Zion* 3 (1938), 1–50; idem, "Ha-yesodot ve-ha-hatḥalot shel ʿirgun ha-kehillah ha-yehudit bimei ha-benayim," *Zion* 15 (1950): 1–41; and see also Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, 121–25. Mention should also be made of Y. N. Epstein, the protean Talmudist who also taught at the Hebrew University. From the mid-1920s through the mid-1940s, Epstein published a series of more than ten illuminating articles on the development of Tosafist literature and its textual predecessors in pre-Crusade Ashkenaz, many of which appeared in the journal that he founded, *Tarbiz*; see Shraga Abramson, "Kitvei Y. N. Epstein: Bibliografiyah," *Tarbiz* 20 (1950): 7–16.

29 See Marcus, "Beyond the Sephardic Mystique," 35–53; I. Schorsch, "The Myth of Sephardic Supremacy," *The Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 34 (1989): 47–66; and cf. H. Z. Dimitrovsky, "Is There a Jewish Middle Ages?" [Hebrew], in *Meḥkarim be-madda'ei ha-yahadut*, ed. Moshe Bar-Asher (Jerusalem: Institute of Jewish Studies, 1984), 257–65. Although the *Jewish Quarterly Review* began with a larger number of articles on the Jews in Christian Europe and their literature, owing to the contributions of Solomon Schechter and others, who were well aware of the extensive Jewish literature produced in Christian Europe and its manuscripts (see, e.g., my "Solomon Schechter and Medieval European Rabbinic Literature," *Jewish Historical Studies: Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 48 [2016]: 17–33), renewed and broadened interests in this area also appear during the time period under discussion, although tracing the contours of those changes more precisely (and correlating them) requires further research.

The Geniza

MARK COHEN
Princeton University

In December 1946, the American Academy for Jewish Research convened a symposium entitled "The Importance of the Geniza for Jewish Learning," marking the half century since Solomon Schechter's journey to the Ben Ezra Synagogue in Cairo and his retrieval of the papers that make up the Taylor-Schechter Genizah Collection at the Cambridge University Library, the largest collection of Geniza fragments worldwide, conservatively estimated by Schechter at 100,000, but now known to contain more than twice that amount.[1] As Alexander Marx put it, Schechter's work constituted an "epoch-making event in the history of Jewish scholarship."[2] Indeed, the Geniza material retrieved from the synagogue, and later on, additional manuscripts found by others in the Jewish cemetery, has played a pivotal role in every branch of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. Unsurprisingly, the Cairo Geniza has been well represented in the pages of the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*.

It is useful first to review the basics, especially as there are recent developments that some might not be aware of. For instance, we now estimate that the treasure trove of the Geniza may number as many as 400,000 folio pages and fragments.[3] They are dispersed over some seventy libraries and private collections

around the world, from Cincinnati in the West to St. Petersburg in the East. Of these fragments the vast majority are literary texts. Genres represented include Bible, late antique and medieval Hebrew poetry, midrashic and halakhic works, responsa, medical texts and prescriptions, philosophical treatises, magical and mystical texts, and prayer books, in addition to thousands of documents from everyday life. Beyond the field of Jewish studies, the Geniza also contains fragments of Arabic belles lettres, including pages of the Qur'ān transcribed into Hebrew letters.

The pages of *PAAJR* show the versatility of traditional Jewish scholarship relying on the Geniza. For instance, using rabbinic fragments from the time of the Babylonian Geonim, Neal Danzig showed that sections of the important ninth-century compilation, *Halakhot Gedolot*, were added later on. His evidence comes from fragments of responsa found in the Geniza, in addition to other non-Geniza texts.[4]

The late Yaakov Elman undertook a survey to show how the Geniza has enriched our knowledge of rabbinic texts themselves. While the Geniza did not produce much that was new in the Geniza's talmudic manuscripts, Elman writes, it uncovered significant materials from the midrash, enabling "the rediscovery and/or restoration of works which were all but lost in the course of the increased emphasis of the study of the Babylonian Talmud."[5]

Menahem Schmelzer highlighted the contribution of the Geniza to the history of Jewish liturgy in an important article published in the pages of *PAAJR*.[6] His assertion that, without the Geniza, the story of Jewish prayer in antiquity and the Middle Ages would be a rather short one is quite accurate. The work done on this subject, beginning with Solomon Schechter himself, would fill tomes if collected in a single publication. And, as Schmelzer comments, there is more yet to be discovered.

The most pathbreaking use of the Geniza added an entirely new dimension to *Wissenschaft des Judentums*.[7] The fragments in question are discrete, self-contained items: documents from everyday life, which we would call "secular." The latest estimate of the

total number of papers of a documentary nature in the Geniza is Marina Rustow's conjecture of 40,000.[8] They date mostly from the tenth to mid-thirteenth centuries, the so-called "classical Geniza period," and are referred to as the "documentary Geniza."

The documentary Geniza encompasses letters, court records, marriage contracts, deeds of divorce, wills, documents concerning pious trusts, business contracts, merchant accounts and letters, book lists, lists of recipients of charity, registers of gifts for charitable purposes, and, most surprisingly, state documents from Islamic chanceries of the Fatimid and Ayyubid periods.[9] Though many of the documents of everyday life are in Hebrew or Aramaic, most of them are written in Judeo-Arabic, that is, Arabic in Hebrew characters, representing a form of Middle Arabic containing vernacular features as well as lexical meanings not found in dictionaries of classical or Modern Standard Arabic. (By exception, the Islamic chancery documents are written in classical Arabic.) Filled with realia about people and their daily life, these sources reveal aspects of economic, social, and family life, as well as of material culture and individual mentalities that were previously completely unknown. With the benefit of the documentary Geniza, we have direct and relatively unmediated access to the ordinary lives of people who lived centuries ago.

The scholar most directly associated with the documentary Geniza, and who gave it its name, is S. D. Goitein, a distinguished member of the American Academy for Jewish Research until his death. Goitein (1900–1985) was a German Jew who studied Arabic and Islam at the University of Frankfurt from 1918–1923. He received his doctorate there, writing a thesis on "Prayer in the Koran." In 1923 he immigrated to Palestine, and in 1928 joined the faculty of the new Hebrew University in Jerusalem as its first instructor in Islamic studies.

Goitein first came into direct contact with the Geniza during a trip to Budapest in 1948, when he had the opportunity to examine some Geniza fragments in the David Kaufmann

Collection. Later, while perusing the Geniza collections in Oxford and in Cambridge, he chanced upon legal documents from the Jewish rabbinical court relating to the medieval India trade, about which at that time hardly any firsthand documentation existed. Upon his move to the United States in 1957 to take up a position at the University of Pennsylvania, Goitein was already deeply committed to Geniza research, focusing on the Mediterranean, while at the same time accumulating additional Geniza documents on the India trade and writing about them.[10]

In hundreds of articles, some of which appeared in *PAAJR*, he published and interpreted scores of Geniza texts. In his monumental opus, the five-volume *Mediterranean Society*,[11] Goitein broke new ground in every respect. He described in minute detail the economic activities, communal organization, family life, material civilization, and mentality of the Arabic-speaking Jews of the medieval Islamic world during the tenth to thirteenth centuries. Moreover, with his deep understanding of Islamic society, he pioneered the notion of the Geniza as a source for Islamic as well as Jewish history.

Goitein's 1954 *PAAJR* article, "What Would Jewish and General History Benefit from a Systematic Publication of the Documentary Geniza Papers?"[12] is a landmark in the study of the Cairo Geniza. It amplifies Alexander Marx's *PAAJR* article, referred to above, "The Importance of the Geniza for Jewish History," published less than a decade earlier.[13] Marx's essay focused on *Jewish* history, especially the important figures of the Gaonate and other individuals about whom very little had been known before the discoveries in the Geniza. Goitein devoted most of *his* time and effort to the Arabic portion of the Geniza. He came to the conclusion that the significance of the hoard of manuscripts extended well beyond the internal life of Jews and Jewish institutions. He was convinced that they revealed details of life in Islamic society in general, details that, for lack of sources, with the exception of the relatively small

number of Arabic papyri from medieval Egypt, were almost totally unknown to Islamic historians. Perhaps most significant were the documents pertaining to the trade between the Mediterranean and India via Egypt. Another example: Geniza letters also disclosed details of the Crusades that were absent from European chronicles.

In the half century following Goitein's clarion call in the pages of *PAAJR* for a "systematic publication of the Geniza documents," little was done to answer his plea, despite his demonstration of the importance of the Geniza documents for Islamic history in articles published in different journals over the next two decades.[14] To be sure, scholars of the documentary Geniza, most of them disciples of Goitein or of his students, contributed their own publications. Today we are witness to a robust third generation of documentary Geniza scholars, and their own students, the fourth generation, who are already beginning to make their mark.[15]

For the most part, Islamic historians have been aware of the importance of the Geniza to their field of study through the five volumes of Goitein's *Mediterranean Society.* Only a handful of non-Judaicists has directly combed the Geniza for information. Importantly, Arabic papyrologists, appreciating the importance of writings from everyday life, have discovered the value of the Geniza for their own discipline, as an ancillary source of historical information and as witness to nonclassical Arabic linguistic forms. One of my former students, Petra Sijpesteijn, now professor at the University of Leiden, discovered the Geniza in my Judeo-Arabic seminar at Princeton and immediately realized its usefulness for deciphering and interpreting Arabic papyri. Petra was one of the founders of the International Society for Arabic Papyri in 2002. She included a sampling of literature on the Judeo-Arabic documents from the Geniza in her first inventory ("Checklist") of Egyptian papyri. Today the ISAP (https://www.naher-osten.uni-muenchen.de/isap/index.html), administered by its president, Andreas Kaplony, an Islamic historian at

the Ludwig-Maximilian University in Munich, includes links to the Princeton Geniza Project in its Arabic Papyrology Database and runs webinars for beginners in the challenging skill of reading Arabic papyri.

Unknowingly responding to Goitein's beckoning call to Islamic historians in his 1954 *PAAJR* article, the eminent German papyrologist, Werner Diem, discovered Goitein's *Mediterranean Society* and the Geniza at the beginning of his prolific career. He abundantly cites Judeo-Arabic lexical items and phrases from Goitein's five volumes in his editions of Arabic papyri. He openly acknowledged the importance of the Geniza for his field by publishing in 1994 a lexical work entitled *A Dictionary of the Arabic Material of S. D. Goitein's* A Mediterranean Society.[16] As if answering Goitein's plea in *PAAJR*, Diem asserts in his introduction that the Geniza documents "are of immense value for everybody interested in the history of Arabic and medieval Mediterranean civilization as a whole."[17]

In 1959, five years after his article in *PAAJR* stressing the importance of publishing the Geniza documents as a whole, Goitein published another landmark article in the journal. It was already known from his poetry that the great poet Judah Ha-Levi had passed through Egypt on his pilgrimage from Spain to the Holy Land. From the Geniza, Goitein collected papers relating to Ha-Levi, including letters in the poet's own hand. He had already presented some of his findings, with texts and commentary, in several Hebrew articles in the journal *Tarbiz*. In his *PAAJR* article, he summarized the information about Ha-Levi's connections with Egyptian Jews while still in Spain and about the poet's stay in Egypt on his way to the Holy Land.[18] The documents revealed fascinating details about his relationship with Egyptian Jews, including the wealthy merchant Ḥalfon b. Netanel. This well-traveled trader did business in Egypt, India, South Arabia, East Africa, Spain, Morocco, and Damascus. Ha-Levi had made his acquaintance in Spain. One of Ha-Levi's autograph letters

to this merchant, written in Spain, explains the origins of the *Kuzari*, written, Ha-Levi says, to refute questions posed to him by a Karaite in Christian Spain. As Goitein explains, Ha-Levi had only begun the work at that time; in his letter he belittles it as merely a "trifle."

Goitein's dream in 1954 about a systematic publication of the Geniza documents themselves had to wait. It was only the coming of the digital age that made it seem possible to respond to Goitein's appeal. The earliest project along these lines was initiated in the mid-1980s at Princeton University, the Princeton Geniza Project. This undertaking focused on the historical documents of the Geniza, the genre that Goitein had made famous. Since inception, over 4,300 such documents have been put into searchable form in PGP (https://geniza.princeton.edu/pgp), and the project continues with the development of detailed metadata.

But the most important breakthrough came with the technology to make digitized images of the entire Geniza. The Friedberg Genizah Project (now incorporated into the Friedberg Jewish Manuscript Society, https://fjms.genizah.org/) has undertaken this challenge, and to date the work is virtually completed. Facial recognition technology has even made it possible to assemble potential links between torn fragments. The historical fragments that Goitein wrote about in his *PAAJR* article in 1954 are mostly in Judeo-Arabic and require specialized linguistic skills. While that article, his *Mediterranean Society*, and hundreds of publications of his own and by his followers in the discipline, do not constitute a systematic publication of the Geniza in Goitein's meaning of the words, they have helped make the Geniza a household word in Islamic studies. That treasure trove is now available in digital form accessible to anyone with knowledge of the Hebrew alphabet. Several histories of the Geniza, documentary films, and a few novels or semi-novels have helped publicize the Geniza and its unique value in the wider world.[19]

Even before the technological breakthrough of the mid-1980s, the *Proceedings* continued to serve as a forum for documentary Geniza studies. Goitein's most prolific disciple is Mordechai Akiva Friedman, emeritus professor of Talmud at Tel Aviv University. Friedman's early articles, an outgrowth of his dissertation written under Goitein's supervision, appeared in the pages of *PAAJR* in 1976. As the title indicates, the subject is "The Minimum *Mohar* Payment as Reflected in the Geniza Documents: Marriage Gift or Endowment Pledge?"[20] Based on Friedman's exacting study of hundreds of ketubbot recovered from the Geniza and on his deep knowledge of rabbinic literature, this article is a complex and learned exposition of the vicissitudes of the *mohar* payment, rooted in the Talmud, during the Geniza period.

Rabbinic literature from the period of the Geniza is represented in the journal once again by Friedman's work on the responsa of Abraham, the son of Moses Maimonides. Friedman entitled his *PAAJR* article "The Responsa of Rabbi Abraham Maimonides from the Cairo Geniza: A Preliminary Review" (1990).[21] He rightly noted that the responsa illuminate both the legal and the sociohistorical fields. The same can be said of the responsa of Abraham's father, the great Moses ben Maimon. For that reason, Paula Sanders, Goitein's research assistant, included the Maimonidean father and son in the "Index of Scriptural, Rabbinic, and Maimonidean Citations" in her indispensable index volume of *A Mediterranean Society*.

In the article on Abraham Maimonides, Friedman's remarks on the India trade as reflected in the responsa offered a taste of what the Geniza holds on that exciting and largely unknown subject. Thanks to Friedman, five Hebrew volumes and a fifth in English, most of Goitein's work on the India trade, embellished by Friedman's own meticulous scholarship, have now been published.[22] This posthumous publication again responds to Goitein's 1954 *PAAJR* article proclaiming the importance of the Geniza for general, as well as Jewish, history.

In Friedman's words, the responsa contain "invaluable information on the everyday life of the Jewish communities in Islamic countries during the High Middle Ages: family crises, business affairs, material culture, intellectual history, cooperation and conflict with non-Jews and more." While preparing his paper for *PAAJR*, his appetite was whetted to pursue a comprehensive study of Abraham's responsa. Friedman's new edition of the responsa, coauthored by his former student and colleague, Amir Ashur, and adumbrated in the *Proceedings*, is currently in the works.

An example showing how the Geniza sheds light on everyday life is the subject of another contribution to *PAAJR* by Friedman, namely, his lecture entitled "Polygyny in Jewish Tradition and Practice: New Sources from the Cairo Geniza," published in 1982.[23] This article, too, served as a *Vorspeise* for a book, *Ribuy nashim be-Yisraʾel: Meḥkarim ḥadasim mi-genizat Kahir* (Jewish polygyny in the Middle Ages: New documents from the Cairo Geniza).[24] After his fashion, Friedman exhausts talmudic traditions regarding multiple wives, particularly a Palestinian tradition frowning on polygyny, and evaluates the Geniza evidence in the light of these ancient tendencies. Among the Geniza Jews Friedman found both a tendency to marry multiple wives and to take slave-concubines, and, especially, the practice of providing equal and separate residences for each of the wives.

Taking a cue from Goitein about the abundant material in the Geniza about proselytes, Alexander Scheiber published a brief article in the jubilee volume of the *Proceedings* entitled "A Letter of Recommendation on Behalf of the Proselyte Mevorakh from the Geniza."[25] This short piece consists of an edition and translation of the fragmentary beginning of what likely was an appeal for help. The Geniza contains a large quantity of these petitions as well as other documents from the Geniza regarding poverty and charity.[26]

Let me close with one final tidbit from Goitein. As scholars often do, Goitein periodically took sections of his *Mediterranean Society*-in-progress and published them as articles. This happened because he

was constantly being asked to contribute to Festschriften and to journals. One example comes from the jubilee volume of *PAAJR* in 1978–1979, celebrating the first half century of the Academy's published scholarship. At the annual meeting on that occasion he lectured on "Dispositions in Contemplation of Death,"[27] a subject whose contents he had assembled mainly from the third volume of his magnum opus, subtitled "The Family," which he had just completed and which appeared the same year, 1978.

At end of his lecture, Goitein offered an apologia. "In conclusion I crave your forgiveness for referring so frequently to my own publications. I did so purposely. The lectures read today are to be included in the Anniversary volume of the Proceedings, and the Fellows of the Academy have been asked to contribute. I thought it would be a good idea to give the members and guests an opportunity to have a look into the workshop of one of the Fellows of the Academy. I am sure you part from this lecture with a feeling similar to that I have all the time. Despite the richness of the material available in the Geniza we can never be sure of having obtained final results. We are always on our way."

No more fitting words could be said about the importance of the Geniza to Jewish and general scholarship, an importance to which Goitein's contributions to *PAAJR* and the contributions of others influenced by his example bear witness.

Notes

1. Rebecca J. W. Jefferson "The Historical Significance of the Cambridge Genizah Inventory Project," in *Language, Culture, Computerization*: *Essays Dedicated to Yaacov Choueka on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday*, ed. Nahum Dershowitz and Ephraim Nissan, 3 vols. (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2014), part II, 9–37.
2. Alexander Marx, "The Importance of the Geniza for Jewish History," *PAAJR* 16 (1946–1947): 183. See below.
3. Personal communication courtesy of Professor Marina Rustow, director of the Princeton Geniza Project.
4. Neal Danzig, "Responsa of the Geonim in a Fragment from the Geniza and Their Connection with Halakhot Gedolot" [in Hebrew], *PAAJR* 54 (1987): 83–57.
5. Yaakov Elman, "The Small Scale of Things: The World before the Genizah," *PAAJR* 63 (1997–2001): 49–85.
6. Menahem Schmeltzer, "The Contribution of the Genizah to the Study of Liturgy and Poetry," *PAAJR* 63 (1997–2001): 163–79.
7. See the special issue of the journal *Jewish History* devoted to the "documentary Geniza" and edited by Jessica Goldberg and Eve Krakowski.
8. Marina Rustow, *The Lost Archive: Traces of a Caliphate in a Cairo Synagogue* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020), 7.
9. The chancery documents are the subject of Marina Rustow's book referred to in the previous note.
10. The work on the India trade was brought to press after Goitein's death by his student Mordechai A. Friedman.
11. *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of* the Cairo Geniza, 5 vols. plus index volume by Paula Sanders (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967–1993).
12. *PAAJR* 23 (1954): 29–39.
13. *PAAJR* 16 (1946-47): 183–204.
14. For instance, "The Cairo Geniza as a Source for the History of Muslim Civilization," *Studia Islamica* 3 (1955): 75–91.
15. For instance, Eve Krakowski's book, *Coming of Age in Medieval Egypt: Female Adolescence, Jewish Law, and Ordinary Culture* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2018). Krakowski earned her doctorate studying with Norman Golb at the University of Chicago, and received substantial guidance from Marina Rustow.
16. With Hans-Peter Radenberg (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994).
17. From Diem's preface, p. vii.
18. "The Biography of Rabbi Judah Ha-Levi in the Light of the Cairo

Geniza Documents," *PAAJR* 28 (1959): 41–56.

19 Examples include the history by Adina Hoffman and Peter Cole, *Sacred Trash: The Lost and Found World of the Cairo Geniza* (New York: Next Book/Schocken, 2011); the documentary film "From Cairo to the Cloud; The World of the Cairo Geniza," by Michelle Paymar, 2018; and Amitav Ghosh's "multigeneric" *In an Antique Land: History in the Garb of a Traveler's Tale* (London: Granta Books in association with Penguin Books, 1992).

20 *PAAJR* 43 (1976): 15–47.

21 *PAAJR* 56 (1990): 29–49.

22 The five volumes in Hebrew were published by Makhon Ben-Zvi and the Rabbi David and Amalia Rosen Foundation between 2009 and 2013. The English volume was published by Brill in 2008.

23 *PAAJR* 49 (1982): 33–68.

24 Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, and Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1986.

25 *PAAJR* 46–47 (Jubilee Volume) (1979–80): 491–94.

26 See, for instance, Mark R. Cohen, *The Voice of the Poor in the Middle Ages: An Anthology of Documents from the Cairo Geniza* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).

27 *PAAJR* 46–47 (Jubilee Volume) (1979–80): 155–78.

The Early Modern Period in the Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research

ELISHEVA CARLEBACH
Columbia University

A survey of the place of early modern Jewish history and culture through three-quarters of a century's scholarly output gathered in the pages of the *Proceedings* allows us not only to observe a historical period and a historiographical periodization (not the same things) struggle to make their way onto the map of academic Jewish studies, but also to see a measure of historiographical consciousness emerge after half a century of obliviousness.

In this centenary retrospective since the founding of the AAJR, I'd like to recall by way of introduction Yosef Yerushalmi's contribution to the fiftieth anniversary volume, his repercussive "Clio and the Jews," which became a foundation of *Zakhor*, his profound meditation on Jewish history and Jewish memory. The opening paragraph of his article is a call to arms:

> The fiftieth anniversary of the American Academy for Jewish Research seems to me a propitious time, not only for celebration, but for pause and reflection. While, happily, research into all corridors and corners of the Jewish past has burgeoned far beyond what the small group that founded the Academy could have anticipated five decades ago, it is curious that a sophisticated history of Jewish historiography, one that would examine its theoretical underpinnings, its methods and goals, remains a desideratum. With but few exceptions there seems to be almost a reticence on the part of Judaic scholars to examine and articulate the latent assumptions of the enterprise in which they are engaged. The lag is especially striking at a time when, partly as a result of the ongoing crisis of the historicist view of the world, the general history of historiography as well as the theory and practice of the historian continue to be subjects of intense and widespread concern reflected in a vast and growing literature. If, as I am persuaded, modern historicism may be even more problematic when viewed within Jewish frameworks, the task of clarification becomes all the more urgent.[1]

Before moving on to the specific concern of his article, the reawakening of what he saw as a genuine outburst of historical writing in the sixteenth century, he found it necessary to define just what was meant by "historical writing." Perhaps the *Proceedings* was a particularly suitable venue for raising this issue, for it does not seem to ever have engaged in larger disciplinary questions about itself or its role as a disseminator of Jewish research; it never categorized or organized its contents by historical period as many other journals did. Metaquestions of periodization were never addressed directly, as far as I could tell. Those of us standing at a retrospective distance, attempting to discern patterns and to impose some meaning on those patterns, must caution at the outset that we are imposing a temporal and historiographical grid on a journal that disdained such categorization throughout its existence. We must also remember that we are looking at one annual journal within a burgeoning number of periodicals devoted to Jewish studies. In his contribution to this volume, David Myers has mapped the

European antecedents of these journals, and the beginnings of American scholarly journals devoted to Jewish studies, such as *Jewish Quarterly Review*. Close successors include, a decade after the *Proceedings* began to be published in 1928, *Jewish Social Studies*, appearing in 1939. The latter became the primary venue for academic work on social history, with many scholars, such as Salo Baron, appearing frequently in both periodicals depending on the subject and method.

A cursory overview of the entire *Proceedings* shows that the articles skewed toward several areas overall. In terms of chronological focus they tended toward a bipolarity, with far greater emphasis on the classical periods (rabbinic antiquity, then biblical studies) on the one hand; with the other pole leaning heavily toward the modern period (defined chronologically) from the late eighteenth century, with emphasis on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The studies focusing on the modern period in the journal placed a heavy emphasis on what we might consider rupture from the preceding era—the French Revolution, Enlightenment movements, and Hasidism. What came before these movements in the world of the *Proceedings* was the medieval period, generally conceived as everything in between the classical and the modern. On both chronological poles, the emphasis remained textual scholarship and intellectual history.

When we note that the historical period we now call the "early modern" struggled to come into view, that is true in two senses. It had not yet begun to emerge as a discrete periodization within Jewish history, even after it had begun to be called by that term in the larger historiographical literature.[2] But the silence goes beyond pronouncing the era—it also was not treated as a proper subject for serious scholarly inquiry. *In the first dozen years of its publication, not a single article in the journal's printed pages dealt with any subject at all in any field of Jewish studies which fell within the chronological period of 1500–1800*. It is as though this three-hundred-plus-year temporal unit had simply disappeared from the history

and culture of the Jews. It is difficult to determine whether such a long period of absence was due to happenstance or to a sense that nothing of importance in the history and culture of the Jews happened between the expulsion from the Iberian Peninsula and the French Revolution. Certainly, the absence of a historiographical identity for the period, which lacked clear definition in terms of its chronology, its content, and its significant features, especially for Jewish history, was both a contributing cause as well as a result of a long period of absence from *PAAJR*'s pages.

The first exception to the absence of contributions touching upon the early modern period seems an exception that proved the rule. Moshe Perlmann contributed an article to issue 11 (1942) titled "A Late Muslim-Jewish Disputation," without specifying what he meant by "late" (pp. 51–58). The article analyzed a disputation between Jews and Muslims in Persia in the last decade of the eighteenth century. Religious polemic was seen as belonging to the medieval world by definition (as well as in Perlmann's scholarship), thus a polemic that took place in the 1790s was "late." Other articles of note in that volume include one by Joshua Starr on "Jewish Life in Crete under Venetian Rule," and the first of Bernard Weinryb's "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry," part A of which is "Community Records and Their Publication." On the subject of communal records, and particularly the contributions of Weinryb, see the article in this volume by Gershon Hundert.[3] I simply note that these articles are the first to focus on the early modern period in the *Proceedings*.

As well, these contributions mark the first appearance of communal records, a significant set of sources essential to understanding Jewish life in early modern Europe. Starr's and Weinryb's approaches offer a striking contrast. Starr presented *takkanot* (communal regulations) drawn up in 1228, redrafted in the mid-fourteenth century, and then updated periodically through 1574. Starr professed scant interest in the regulations per se as an important historical source: there is, he wrote, "little value

in cataloging all of the recorded ordinances" (98). This deliberate neglect of the contents comes despite the fact that the Candia regulations constitute the earliest trace of an ongoing record of Jewish communal ordinances from the medieval into the modern period. (Cassuto and Hartom later printed these ordinances as they were preserved by Elijah Capsali.)[4] Most others appear from the sixteenth century at the earliest, such as Adolph Kober's excerpts from the *pinkas* of Friedberg in volume 17 (1947–48).[5]

Starr's lack of interest in the contents and iterations of these regulations stands in stark contrast to the plea offered by Weinryb to begin collecting and studying these precious records. Much more work still needs to be done today to trace the rise of the ubiquitous *takkanot kehillah* in the early modern period, and those of Crete can be valuable in tracing their origins. Starr attributed the first set of Cretan *takkanot* to the guidance of R. Barukh b. Isaac so the question of whether Northern Jewry played a significant role in fostering the creation and archiving of communal records, or whether Venice and Italian city-states were more influential remains to be answered. The advent of communal record keeping, the combination of Jewish and non-Jewish laws and conditions embodied in written material form, constitutes one of the genuine nova in early modern Jewish communal life, and the *Proceedings* became a significant venue for their publication over the years.

Beyond communal records, the interest in the early modern grew slowly in the *Proceedings*, and rather than provide an itemized catalogue, we can point to several clusters that emerge from a review of the contributions. Perhaps the most prominent such cluster is that pertaining to "the Western Sephardic Diaspora."[6] The now-notorious Zosa Szajkowski, who published prolifically in the *Proceedings* about the Jews of France, devoted a long article specifically to its Sephardic population in the sixteenth through twentieth centuries (vol. 27 [1958]).[7] Several years later, Benzion Netanyahu's 1963 contribution on the status of conversos in rabbinic literature (called in his title "Hebrew sources") appeared. It opened a debate on the Jewishness

of conversos, a debate that was later joined (although not in the pages of the *Proceedings*) by Yosef Yerushalmi in the opening pages of his *From Spanish Court*.[8] These were early contributions to what burgeoned into the entire subfield of early modern Sephardic studies. Beyond citing particulars, Netanyahu offered a significant interpretation of an entire body of sources—responsa literature as a whole—that evaluated the question of the Jewishness of conversos based on criteria that were very different from the inquisitorial dossiers. Yerushalmi differed with Netanyahu in his interpretation of the rabbinic literature, and the discussion is still instructive in the way it forces scholars to step back from the particular evidence they are evaluating and assess the purpose and underlying biases that pervade entire corpora of sources.

Several of the articles in this cluster retain their novelty and power despite the passage of decades. Reading the same bodies of inquisitorial sources as her predecessors, Rene Levine Melammed focused on the role of women in transmitting crypto-Judaism. She analyzed the ways in which the transmission of crypto-Jewish beliefs and practices and their identification by the Inquisition were gendered. Her 1986 article, "The Ultimate Challenge: Safeguarding the Crypto-Judaic Heritage," remains authoritative and suggestive on the subject (53:91–109). It is one of the very few articles that was not only contributed by a female author but also remains a pioneering contribution to Jewish women's history.[9]Another notable contribution to the intellectual history of the Sephardic Diaspora is Alexander Altmann's 1972 article, "Eternality of Punishment."[10] Altmann himself was a scholar whose mastery of the entire scope of Jewish thought and productivity throughout a life filled with displacement and migration remains a remarkable and singular achievement in Jewish scholarship. His major works on Jewish thinkers, from Isaac Israeli and Saadiah Gaon to Moses Mendelssohn, remain landmarks that rescued some of the figures from obscurity and made significant interventions in the way others were interpreted. Many leading figures in the field of Jewish

thought today were trained by Altmann at Brandeis. The spiritual, emotional, and intellectual ferment within the Sephardic Diaspora in Western Europe was not a particularly central focus for him. This makes the achievement all the more remarkable, as his article is a model of scholarship, of careful textual detective work, and of sensitive historical contextualization.

While Altmann billed his article as a rabbinic controversy, in the opening pages, he acknowledged that he went far beyond that, announcing that it concerned a pragmatic as well as ideological issue, and that it was bound on one side by "Marrano sentiment." As the article unfolded, it embraced the attraction of kabbalistic doctrines for neophytes from converso backgrounds in the Jewish community; the ideological fight against the incursion of kabbalistic teachings into the community; Sephardic vs. Ashkenazic rabbinic positions on the matter, as well as ad hominem elements. In addition to the scholarly analysis, Altmann provided the annotated primary texts, none previously published. To its credit, the *Proceedings* allowed this extensive inclusion of primary sources, something rare in many journals today. This article remains a model not only for Altmann's range, and for the *Proceedings*' deep respect for textual as well as analytical material. It also testified to the serious way in which the converso Diaspora and the reestablishment of Sephardic life both in Western Europe and the New World was being viewed by scholars. Honorable mention as well is due to Raphael Loewe's 1981 article on David Nieto's *ʾEsh dat*, another signal contribution to the intellectual vitality of Western Sephardic thought.

By way of contrast, Leo Strauss's article, "How to Study Spinoza's *Theological-Political Treatise*," is worth rereading today if only as a lesson in the distortions of antihistoricism.[11] In it, Strauss made classic arguments (for him) that decontextualize Spinoza from his environment. Such statements as, "Historical understanding, as it is frequently practiced, seduces one to see the author whom one studies, primarily as a contemporary among his contemporaries, or to read his books as if they were addressed to his contemporaries.

The flight to immortality requires an extreme discretion in the selection of one's luggage. A book that requires for its adequate understanding the use, nay the preservation, of all libraries and archives containing information which was useful to its author, hardly deserves being written and being read at all, and it certainly does not deserve surviving its author." This is nothing if not a call to decontextualize Spinoza from the very crucible that had formed him, to a great extent, the world that the Sephardic émigrés had built in Amsterdam.

A second early modern cluster of articles concentrates on the Jews of Italy in this period. Prior to the recognition of early modernity as an era in its own right, Ren-Ref, as it was affectionately called (the Italian Renaissance and the Protestant Reformation), represented the period on university syllabi. Beginning in 1947–48 and 1948–49, Moses Avigdor Shulvass published a series of articles on Jews in Italy in the time of the Renaissance, among them one on knowledge of antiquity among Italian Jews of the Renaissance. (Roth did not publish his *Jews in the Renaissance* until 1965, although his *Jews of Italy* appeared already in 1946.) Two articles on the fifteenth-century Crete-born Paduan Aristotelian philosopher Elijah del Medigo appeared in the *Proceedings*, one by David Geffen in 1973–74, and in 1995, another by Kalman Bland. Benjamin Ravid's 1987 paper on the Jews of Venice until 1509 marks another contribution to the pre–Counter-Reformation period of Italian Jewish life, an emphasis that celebrates its vitality. One more Italian thread of note is the article by Isaac Barzilay comparing the Berlin Haskalah to the "Italian Haskalah" (1960) several years after his initial article on the Berlin Haskalah (1956). Indeed, one might see the Italian Jewish articles in the *Proceedings* as linked to its strong emphasis on the Haskalah; Sephardic Jews, Italian Jews, and those of a third cluster, English Jews of the early modern period, served as precocious avatars of the German and central European Haskalah.

The third group of articles around an early modern subject focuses on the Jews of England, or more specifically, on the process

and personalities involved in the readmission of the Jews into England. In the 1951 volume, Mordecai Wilensky published an article on the controversy over the return of the Jews to England in 1656. A quarter century later, in 1978, Ismar Schorsch published an important corrective to the foundation myth of English Jewry and the intentions of Menasseh in his various writings, including the version of that myth propounded by Wilensky earlier in his 1951 article. Titled “From Messianism to Realpolitik: Menasseh ben Israel and the Readmission of the Jews to England,” that article constitutes something of a departure from Schorsch’s primary research interests. The appearance of very strong contributions in fields that are somewhat beyond a primary area of scholarly specialization is one of the strengths of the *Proceedings*, in that each contribution reflected the live presentation of research to a very supportive but critical group. David Ruderman, who could easily have contributed to virtually any of these early modern clusters, published his article on “David Nieto and Jewish Thought in Newtonian England” in 1992. It was a stepping-stone toward his important intervention on English Jewry, *Jewish Enlightenment in an English Key* (2000), and provides something of a confirmation that the question of Haskalah and its so-called precursors was central to the concerns of the contributions about the early modern period in the *Proceedings*.

In the context of the textual- and intellectual-history focus of the *Proceedings*, we would not expect to find social history, nor attention to gender history; there is nothing of print culture, little notice paid to what can be called popular culture. These are aspects of the Jewish past we don’t expect to find, and our expectations are more than met—they are not there. But a critical strain of early modern culture that ought to have been included by its own terms is also missing: early modern rabbinic culture. Even as it prized intellectual and political history (and made significant place for communal records) the scholars contributing to the *Proceedings* followed, without necessarily being conscious of it, a syllabus that adhered not so much to a general *Wissenschaft* pattern, but to a particular strain of it.

Thus, while rabbinics in classical antiquity is well represented in the *PAAJR*, almost nothing of the entire edifice of rabbinic life and scholarship in the early modern period is represented here. Not only are there no articles about the thought and scholarship of Maharal of Prague, Yair Ḥayim Bacharach, Jacob Emden, Yeḥezkel Landau (Noda be-Yehudah), the flowering of rabbinic *pilpul* in eastern Europe, or the genre of rabbinic responsa as it burgeoned to become a mighty republic of letters—in some cases their names do not ever appear once through all the thousands of pages and citations. Moshe Sofer appears only as the subject of an article about his relationship to the study of German language (1996) as well as a second one on his posture toward Moses Mendelssohn (1994). Nothing about Sofer's own scholarship. Meir Hildesheimer (the author of the two previous articles) contributed an article on the reception of Mendelssohn in nineteenth-century rabbinic thought, but there is not one contribution about the substance of sixteenth- through nineteenth-century rabbinic thought itself. Perhaps because rabbinic culture was too close to the Jewish traditionalism and uncritical Jewish historiography from which many of the academics wished to detach themselves, they favored the movements that were harbingers of change (Haskalah, French Revolution, Hasidism), the ruptures they saw as tearing down the old models and leading the Jews into the modern world. They studied events that signified to them the shattering of the medieval paradigm of persecution and insularity.

The omission of rabbinic thought is just one example of the ways in which scholars of the founding generations of *PAAJR* privileged certain aspects of Jewish history and culture in the early modern period. Without following any conscious syllabus, most contributors to the *PAAJR* who wrote about Sephardic Jews and Marranism, English Jewish history, and Italian Jewry looked toward Jewish communities and individuals who served as models of protomodernity. If all the freighted associations with European modernity were the ideal toward which Jewish society was proceeding, the Jews in these clusters stood at the front of the line in a period viewed as an antechamber to the modern period.

The more traditional Ashkenazic population of eastern Europe and the Sephardic Ottoman Jews in this period, and particularly their rabbinic scholars, stood at the back of the line.[12]

It took the twenty-first century and the distance from the ideological battles of the past for serious new scholarship on the nature of the period to emerge. By the time the *Proceedings* ceased to print, it had largely become a relic of history itself. By failing to encourage reflection about the many new directions that burgeoned in academic Jewish studies, and to include such work in its pages, the *Proceedings* doomed itself to extinction. The organization, however, has taken these lessons to heart and thrives as a major supporter of young scholars and new initiatives.

Notes

1. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, "Clio and the Jews: Reflections on Jewish Historiography in the Sixteenth Century," *PAAJR* 46/47 (Jubilee volume, 1928–29 / 1978–79), part 2 (1979–80): 607–38.
2. On the (still-unresolved) borders and nomenclature of the period see the now-classic article, Randolph Starn, "The Early Modern Muddle," *Journal of Early Modern History* 6, no. 3 (2002): 296–307.
3. See Gershon Hundert's contribution to this volume.
4. E. S. Hartom and H. M. D. Cassuto, eds., *Takkanot Kandi'ah ve-zikhronoteha* [Ordinances and memories of the Jewish community of Candia [Crete]] (Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1943); for a recent study of this community and its records see Rena Lauer, *Colonial Justice and the Jews of Venetian Crete* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019).
5. Adolph Kober, "Documents Selected from the Pinkas of Friedberg, A Former Free City in Western Germany," *PAAJR* 17 (1947–48): 19–59. See the full annotated edition of those takkanot in Stefan Litt, ed., *Protokollbuch und Statuten der Jüdischen Gemeinde Friedberg* (Friedberg: Bindernagel, 2003).
6. Cecil Roth's *History of the Marranos* appeared in 1932. On the romance of *Wissenschaft* scholarship with Sephardic history and culture, see John Efron, German Jewry and the Allure of the Sephardic (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016); Ismar Schorsch, "The Myth of Sephardi Supremacy in Nineteenth-Century Germany," in *Sephardism*: *Spanish*

Jewish History and the Modern Literary Imagination, ed. Yael Halevi-Wise (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012), 35–57.

7 On Szakowski see Lisa Moses Leff, *The Archive Thief: The Man who Salvaged French Jewish History in the Wake of the Holocaust* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

8 Yosef Yerushalmi, *From Spanish Court to Italian Ghetto: Isaac Cardoso: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Marranism and Jewish Apologetics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 1–50.

9 Her subsequent book, *Heretics or Daughters of Israel: The Crypto-Jewish Women of Castile* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) expanded on the subject of the article. In the first quarter century of its existence, from the 1920s to the 1950s, only one female scholar was published in the *Proceedings*, the art historian Rachel Wischnitzer on Dura Europos. There was one in the entire decade of the 1950s (Sarah Heller Wilensky) and one in the 1960s, Yaffa Eliach, and one, Ruth Link-Salinger in the 1970s (two articles). This bleak picture did not change until the 1980s, when women began to contribute to almost every annual volume. Despite this increased representation, the only article that I could identify as relating to the history of Jewish women as actors in their own right (as opposed to subjects of legal history) was the article by Melammed on conversas.

10 Alexander Altmann, "Eternality of Punishment: A Theological Controversy within the Amsterdam Rabbinate in the Thirties of the Seventeenth Century," *PAAJR* 40 (1972): 1–88.

11 *PAAJR* 17 (1947–1948): 69–131.

12 For the concept of traditional societies as excluded from the historical narrative of the West, see Dipesh Chakrabarti, "The Muddle of Modernity," *The American Historical Review* 116, no. 3 (June 2011): 663–75.

Modern Jewish History in the Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research

JOHN EFRON
University of California, Berkeley

The *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* (*PAAJR*) was a multidisciplinary, indeed eclectic journal that represented a blending of traditional philological work in the best traditions of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* with a commitment, in certain cases, to setting Jewish scholarship on new methodological and topical paths. One such new path was the writing of modern Jewish history. That said, the influence of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* was profound and its dedication to exploring early eras in Jewish history as opposed to the modern period was reflected in the *PAAJR*.

Let us begin with some basic facts that illustrate the rather marginal status of that area of specialization and the difficulty it had in gaining traction in America's newest journal of Jewish scholarship. From the *PAAJR*'s first issue, published in 1930, until its last, published in 2001, a total of 442 articles appeared. Of that number, only eighty-seven, or just under 20 percent, dealt with the modern period in Jewish history, which, for the purposes of this essay, and

in the interest of the overall division of labor in preparing this volume, we date from the eighteenth century. More revealing is the fact that from the first volume until the nineteenth, which appeared in 1950, only twelve articles dealt with modern Jewish history. The peripheral representation of modern Jewish history was mirrored by the paucity of women historians in that field. Over the course of its existence there were only eight such articles in the *PAAJR* authored by women. The first was Yaffa Eliach's "The Russian Dissenting Sects and Their Influence on Israel Baal Shem Tov, Founder of Hassidism," which did not appear until 1968, and the last was Rivka Horwitz's "On Kabbalah and Myth in 19th Century Germany: Isaac Bernays" (1993).

In 1928, the very first article to appear in the newly minted *PAAJR* was Salo Baron's "I. M. Jost, the Historian," a commemorative article written to acknowledge the centennial anniversary of the publication of Jost's nine-volume *History of the Israelites* (1820–1828), the first such multivolume history to be written by a Jew.[1] Though Baron described him as a "pioneer," he did not consider Jost a particularly distinguished historian or even an especially intriguing person. In his somewhat clunky English prose, Baron wrote, "The period [in which Jost lived] is far more interesting than the man, and the occurrences of his life engage our attention as illustrations of the history of the time much more than as revelations of his individual character."[2] Indeed, Jost and his work had been largely forgotten, totally overshadowed as they were by his younger compatriot, Heinrich Graetz. As Baron put it starkly, "Science is cruel. Each new truth supersedes the old one almost completely."[3] Because Jost was not, according to Baron, "a man of genius and high aspirations," his article was principally intended to merely introduce to most readers, and reintroduce to a small cognoscenti, a work Baron found more noteworthy than satisfying, more laudably ambitious than qualitatively good, but nevertheless, vitally important for "it was the beginning of modern Jewish historiography."[4]

Baron's essay on Jost appeared in the same year as his vitally important article "Ghetto and Emancipation." With the former, Baron made a claim for the importance of modern Jewish history as a field of inquiry, while with the latter, he set out a blueprint (perhaps inadvertently) for the way it would be practiced. What may we say about the conceptual and methodological approach of scholars who attended to modern Jewish history in the *PAAJR*? From the journal's beginning to its end, almost all the articles dealing with the modern period in Jewish history bore the imprint of Baron's 1928 essay, "Ghetto and Emancipation." While David Engel has correctly adjudged the article's anti-lachrymose conception to apply only to Baron's understanding of the Middle Ages, the concept has nevertheless been interpreted by Jewish historians to apply to all of Jewish history and has served as the methodological approach for most subsequent Jewish historiography in the United States. That "neo-Baronian" approach, as Engel has termed it, also shaped both the contours and content of the *PAAJR*. Hardly any articles other than those written by the historians to be reviewed below dealt with the modern period as Baron actually depicted it, namely, as a time of "sustained crisis, conflict, and insecurity throughout the Jewish world."[5]

The majoritarian reading of Baron's conception of the Jewish past reigned in the academy, even in a post-Holocaust world. One further consequence of how Baron's "Ghetto and Emancipation" has been read is that it has helped produce an emphasis on intellectual as opposed to Jewish social and economic history. And indeed, from the beginning of the *PAAJR* until it ceased publication in 2001, it primarily remained a venue for intellectual history, or at least the history of Jewish thought (*maḥshevet Yisraʾel*). And while Baron certainly tackled the history of ideas in his sweeping synthetic works, his monographs and stand-alone articles were primarily, though not exclusively, works of social history. While those who published in the *PAAJR* (many of whom were Baron's students) subscribed to his anti-lachrymose conception of Jewish history, he had limited success in fostering a commitment to Jewish social and economic history.

Of equal importance in terms of the guild's reading of Baron and its wider impact is the fact that it was the neo-Baronian approach that was most enthusiastically taken up within the Jewish community at large. For them, the advent of an anti-lachrymose conception of Jewish history within the walls of academia was unable to keep at bay the ghost of Graetz and his *Leidens-und Gelehrtengeschichte*. Of course, the catastrophes of the twentieth century only served to reinforce this view of the Jewish past. This was a point that concerned Baron's student Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, a scholar whose work certainly reflected Baron's understanding of the Jewish past, but was even more fully attuned to the history of antisemitism and Jewish suffering over the course of Jewish medieval and modern history. A devotee and practitioner of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*' strictures, he nonetheless fretted over that body of work's impact, or lack thereof, on Jewish society. In his "Clio and the Jews," published in the *PAAJR* in 1980, Yerushalmi wondered "whether, despite what has been achieved, one can say even now that historiography has found a home within Jewry at large is another matter. Whether contemporary Jewry, having lived through its own unparalleled cataclysm, looks to history for meaning, or awaits a new myth, will also bear discussion."[6]

Yerushalmi's fears about the gap between the work of professional historians and the sensibilities of the Jewish public were not entirely unfounded. Where there were a mere two articles on the Shoah in the *PAAJR*, Philip Friedman's "The European Jewish Research on the Recent Jewish Catastrophe in 1939–1945" (1948-49), and J. S. Fishman's "The Reconstruction of the Dutch Jewish Community and Its Implications for the Writing of Contemporary Jewish History" (1978), both of which were more programmatic than substantive in terms of Holocaust history, there were only two that tackled the history of antisemitism. They were Zosa Szajkowski's 1959 article, "Religious Propaganda against Jews during the French Revolution of 1789," to be discussed below, and Naomi Cohen's 1978 essay, "American Jewish Reactions to

Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, 1875–1900."[7] Cohen's article, published on the cusp of what would become American Jewry's wholehearted popular and scholarly embrace of Holocaust memorialization and history, was a critical examination of American Jewry's inability to fully comprehend the nature of modern antisemitism in Europe.[8] Cohen concluded that the fissures and competing interests in American Jewish society rendered it unable to respond with a unified voice to the antisemitic wave that swept across Europe in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and even left it ill "equipped to face the more serious challenges of the twentieth century."[9] In addition to the lack of focus on antisemitism and the Holocaust, there was not one single article on the history of the Yishuv or the State of Israel in the *PAAJR*. Thus, what was absent from the journal is just as revealing as what was published. The lack of attention to these subjects cannot be solely attributed to the influence of Baron, although it surely played a part. More consequential as a marker of the field of modern Jewish history in the United States and the ultimate fate of the *PAAJR* is that as those subjects were coming into their own, scholarship in those areas was accommodated in specialist journals rather than in general ones like the *Proceedings*.

If modern Jewish history writ large took a very long time to make an appearance in the *PAAJR*, eastern European Jewish history was especially poorly represented in the journal, perhaps because, other than Baron, there were simply not many scholars in the United States who specialized in that history. Moreover, many of the most significant historians in that field had been trapped in Europe and perished in the Shoah.[10]

Of the many signal contributions to the *PAAJR*, in what follows, I wish to focus primarily on the work of four scholars. What unites them is that all four hailed from Poland, which had a decided impact on their historiography, and all of them owed a great debt of gratitude to the founder of the *PAAJR*, Salo Baron, either personally and/or intellectually. They are Bernard Weinryb, Philip Friedman, Zosa Szajkowski, and Isaac Eisenstein-Barzilay.

The work of these four, particularly those articles they published in the *PAAJR*, exhibits the influence of Baron in numerous ways. First, like Baron, all were Zionists to one extent or another, with Friedman and Szajkowski also sharing with Baron a strong attachment to a nonterritorial Diaspora nationalism; second, their multiple contributions to the journal were genuinely pathbreaking; third, they attended to the social and economic history of the Jews (Eisenstein-Barzilay being the exception); fourth (and here we can include Eisenstein-Barzilay), all were deeply attuned to the larger historical environments in which Jews lived, a cornerstone of Baron's oeuvre; fifth, like Baron, all displayed a dazzling command of primary sources; sixth and finally, their contributions reflect a Baronian historiographical approach, which dominated the *PAAJR* from its very beginning until it ceased publication.

By way of flagging what follows, I think that what unites these scholars in terms of the intellectual debt they owed Baron is that they took to heart more earnestly than many other historians Baron's pronouncement that "a more critical examination of the supposed gains after the Revolution … indicate[s] that we may have to revaluate [*sic*] radically our notions of Jewish progress under Western liberty." For all of them, Jewish progress in the modern period was stymied by the intellectual and political barbarism that modernity visited upon Jews. Indeed, in his *Social and Religious History of the Jews* (1937) Baron even depicted emancipation as "a permanent source of new conflicts."[11] For Eisenstein-Barzilay, assimilation as an adjunct to Enlightenment ate away at German Jewry from within, while Szajkowski refused to look at the French Revolution through rose-colored glasses and saw that it unleashed both internal Jewish conflicts as well as new expressions of antisemitism. For economic historians such as Friedman and Weinryb, their treatment of modern Polish Jewish history highlighted, among other things, class conflict and economic crisis. And, of course, their postwar historiographies were elegies to all that had been utterly destroyed. They would certainly have concurred with Baron, who in 1928

wrote of the destructive and nihilistic capability of the modern state, which "can levy taxes little short of confiscatory; it can send us to war; in democratic countries, and even more so in Fascist Italy or Soviet Russia, it is complete master of all lives and property."[12] It only remained for Nazi Germany to be added to that list.

On a personal note, Weinryb was a protégé of Baron's, while Friedman and Eisenstein-Barzilay were his students; all three of them taught, at one time or another in their careers, alongside Baron at Columbia University. By contrast, Szajkowski was neither a student nor a colleague of Baron's, but he was linked to him insofar as Baron opened the pages of the *Proceedings* to him and served as his patron, arranging that he get paid work. Like Baron, Szajkowski was also part of what Nancy Sinkoff has described as "the transnational, postwar Jewish intelligentsia … who were grappling with—and often competing with one another over—the fate of postwar European Jewry and its stolen cultural property."[13]

Bernard Weinryb

After having emigrated to Palestine from Poland in 1934, the great historian of Polish Jewry Bernard Weinryb moved to the United States in late 1939. He obtained employment teaching Jewish history first at Herzliya High School in New York, then served as director of the Jewish Teachers' Seminary in New York from 1941 to 1948, and then taught history at Brooklyn College. From 1950 to 1956, he was a lecturer in economics at Columbia University.[14] His overall bibliography includes some sixteen books and over four hundred articles. Weinryb's articles in the *PAAJR* are all the more precious and significant, for they are among the only essays in that publication that focus squarely on Polish Jewry, especially its social and economic history. Moreover, in the first decade and a half of the *PAAJR*, other than Baron, Weinryb was the only other major contributor to the field of modern Jewish history. Weinryb published four groundbreaking

articles, two in 1942 based on records from Cracow and then two in 1945 based on the community records of Poznan. Both studies included an English-language analysis as well as a Hebrew essay comprised of primary source material drawn from *pinkassim* (communal notebooks). The focus on the source material in the essays of 1942 was on the economic life of the community from the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, the period coinciding with the decline of the Polish state and the fortunes of Polish Jewry. The documents operate on two planes: the first dealing with community finances, and the second financial matters involving individual members of the community. Among the fascinating details revealed in the documents, we learn of a loan of 1000 gilders secured to the community from the Monastery of the Order of St. Bernard "on which interest was to be paid in the form of one stone of tallow [*ʾavanim ḥelev*]"[15] per year, or how on 13 Nissan, 1766, "trustees of the Welfare Fund offered one of the best seats in the synagogue as security for a loan of 5½ gold zloty." We also learn that *parnassim* (community leaders) were held responsible for the communal debts, a situation that also obtained in German lands and that the wealthy maskil David Friedlander in Berlin sought to have abolished. In other instances, we learn something of the economic control that communities had over members, when, in a number of instances, the source material reveals how a community took control of a person's assets in return for securing their freedom from, say, incarceration or debt.[16] These granular details offer insights into the social lives of Jews, the link between Jewish religious institutions and the economy, as well as the intimate financial connections between Jews and Christians. Weinryb also noted that the language of these ostensibly economic records was of great philological and thus cultural value. Replete as they were with grammatical and other errors "(characteristic also of the rabbinic literature of the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries)," the Hebrew records nonetheless provided excellent "evidence of the more or less successful efforts to express secular matters in biblical and talmudic terminology."[17]

In 1945, Weinryb published the second part of each article based on sources drawn from Poznan, the city with the oldest, richest, and most intact Jewish communal records. The length of time covered in these records meant that certain assumptions about Polish Jewry could be revised because "in some cases they [the communal records] confirm the fact that certain circumstances previously attributed to the period following the catastrophe of the Polish communities, actually existed prior to 1648." As a concrete example, Weinryb observed that in 1774, the community was 947,000 zloty in debt, while in the middle of the seventeenth century, it was 500,000 zloty in arrears, a sum that was the near equivalent of one million zloty in 1774.[18] A financial crisis, in other words, was well underway long before the period of decline identified by historians of Polish Jewry.

Weinryb's publications on the communal materials clearly betrayed several influences, among them the French Annales school;[19] the call of the nineteenth-century Hungarian Jewish historian David Kaufmann, who had already long bemoaned the fact that Jewish communities had failed to preserve their own records;[20] Simon Dubnow in Russia, who had also called on historians to use the wide variety of communal records; as well as activist Jewish historians in Germany, such as literary historian and editor of the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums* Gustav Karpeles, who declared that his generation had "the obligation … to rescue what can be saved before it is too late." Similarly inspired, the Polish-born archivist Ezechiel Zivier first proposed the founding of such an archive in 1903, as did the historian Eugen Taübler, who established in Berlin the *Gesamtarchiv der deutschen Juden* (Central Archive of the German Jews) in 1905.[21] And finally, writing in 1935 in the shadow of the Nuremberg Laws and widespread discrimination in central and eastern Europe, Salo Baron reiterated previously expressed concerns about the scant and haphazard attention paid to archival materials, imploring historians to now consult them for the valuable clues that they might reveal about Jewish communal responses to crises in the past.[22] Although Heinrich Graetz had been dead for half a century, Weinryb identified him as responsible for the neglect of the

pinkassim as sources for historical analysis: "Due to the enduring influence of Graetz, the following generation of Jewish historians consulted the community archives and published extracts from the Takkanoth and, less frequently, from the Pinkesim."[23] Weinryb's work was, in many respects, a response to the pleas of the great Jewish historians who had preceded him, and was part of an eastern European Jewish commitment to righting the wrongs done by Graetz to Jewish historiography, particularly that of Polish Jewry.

After his publications in the *PAAJR* during the war, Weinryb was now ready to synthesize the data he gleaned from the communal records of Poznan, Cracow, and Wlodawa. In 1950, he published in the *PAAJR* an entire book entitled "Texts and Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry." The sources were extremely detailed, revealing what he said were "patterns" that "were common, in one way or another, to most of the Polish Jewish communities," especially "since two of these three communities were, for centuries, among the largest and most important in Poland."[24] Weinryb thus set out to tell a national history of Polish Jewry in the wake of its national catastrophe.

Accordingly, Weinryb's beautifully detailed reconstruction of the social history of Polish Jewry begins in the most poignant fashion:

Dedicated to the memory of

Maier Balaban 1877–1942

Simon Dubnow 1860–1941

Icchak Schipper 1884–1943

Moses Schorr 1874–1941

Pioneers in the study of Polish Jewish community

records, who shared the tragic fate of the

Jewish communities in Poland

during World War II.[25]

The culmination of Weinryb's decades-long work on Polish Jewish communal history was his monograph *The Jews of Poland* (1972), "one of the main purposes of [which] is to humanize Jewish history in Poland." Having in some ways begun this work when living in Germany, with his dissertation, "Neueste Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Juden in Russland und Polen" (Breslau, 1934), and continued in the *PAAJR*, *The Jews of Poland* was an elegy for a community, his community; it was a history that was neither romanticized nor maudlin. While singularly dedicated to the communal sources he knew so well, Weinryb was too astute and sensitive a historian to not know that "life in the past was more vivid and diversified than is indicated by the rules of conduct that were written down."[26] Weinryb was keenly attuned to the psychology, sensibilities, and subjectivity of Poland's Jews, attitudes he took into account on nearly every page he wrote. None of his work on Jewish economic history, especially that which first appeared in the *PAAJR*, was of an abstract nature. Rather, Weinryb made the communal records speak, and thus his was a fine-grained, deeply personal, indeed, intimate history of Polish Jewry.

Philip Friedman

Other than Weinryb's pained dedication of 1950 to the great historians murdered in the Shoah, barely a word was ever mentioned in the *PAAJR* about the Holocaust. The main exception to the rule occurred in volume 18 (1948), with Philip Friedman's "The European Jewish Research on the Recent Jewish Catastrophe in 1939–1945." Little known today, Friedman was one of the earliest and most distinguished founders of a new field of historical scholarship, namely, Holocaust studies. He was a genuine pioneer and was, according to historian Lawrence Weinbaum, "an outstanding representative of the Galician Jewish intellectual tradition. That heritage was exemplified by such men as Emanuel Ringelblum, Ruben Feldshuh (Ben

Shem), Joseph Tenenbaum, and Artur Eisenbach, all of whom played a disproportionate role in recording the story of the catastrophe that had befallen the Jewish people, including their own families."[27]

A native of Lwow, Friedman studied history in Poland and continued his studies under Salo Baron at the Jüdisches Paedagogium in Vienna; he also enrolled at the city's university. When remembered today, it is mostly for his work on the Shoah. However, before the war, Friedman was already a leading historian of Polish Jewry, with special emphasis on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Galician Jewish history. He is in the company of those other leading lights of his generation such as Emanuel Ringelblum, Yitzhak Schipper, and Meier Balaban, and was as daringly innovative as they were. Indeed, his three-volume *Die galizischen Kampfe um ihre Gleichberechtigung (1848–1868)* (The Jews of Galicia and their struggle for legal equality [1848–1868]) (1929), based on his 1925 doctoral dissertation, was a pioneering work and an early indication of Friedman's desire to till fresh historiographical ground, something he would do several times over. Friedman, who was a teacher in Lodz's leading Hebrew high school, also taught at the city's People's University, as well as at YIVO in Vilna. He also taught at the famed Takhemoni rabbinical seminary in Warsaw. Over the course of his scholarly career, his various teaching commitments were reflected in his scholarship, insofar as he published in Hebrew, Yiddish, Polish, German, and English. He was also extraordinarily prolific. According to Salo Baron, in the twelve years from 1928 to 1939, Friedman produced 144 published items.[28]

Baron, a fellow Galician Jew, was a great admirer of Friedman, not only because he produced scholarship based on painstaking archival research, but also because like Baron, Friedman believed in the need for accessible, synthetic works of history.[29] Friedman had planned a three-volume history of the Jews of Poland, the first volume of which he sent to Baron for comments. Baron was so enthusiastic that he recalled, "Unfortunately I was so impressed by the quality of this work that I read it with dispatch and returned the manuscript with a

number of suggestions to the author early in August 1939. With the author's other papers this manuscript was lost during the turmoil."[30]

Friedman survived the war in hiding on the "Aryan" side of the Lwow ghetto. With the liberation of Poland in 1944, he was appointed director of the Central Jewish Historical Commission.[31] He went on to teach Jewish history at the University of Lodz and also testified at the Nuremberg trials. In addition, he was a member of the Polish State Commission to Investigate German War Crimes in Auschwitz and Chelmno. In 1948, he immigrated to the United States at the invitation of Salo Baron, first serving as a research fellow at Columbia University, and then from 1951 until his death in 1960, held the title of lecturer. In fact, in 1955 at Columbia, he was a member of Raul Hilberg's doctoral committee.[32]

As soon as the war ended, Friedman switched focus from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Polish Jewish economic history, and became one of the earliest historians of the Holocaust. Among his scores of publications, he produced in rapid-fire order *The Destruction of Jews in Lvov* (1945), *This Is Oswięcim* (1946), *Martyrs and Fighters* (1954), a work on the Warsaw ghetto uprising, and a study of Christian rescuers, *Their Brothers' Keepers* (1957). Hardly any of these subjects had historiographical precedents.[33] He felt compelled to write the history of the Holocaust immediately, while survivors were still alive, before any more sources were destroyed or lost, and of course, when his personal pain (his own wife and twelve-year-old daughter were murdered) was most acute.[34] Friedman was also driven by a sense of immediate and irresistible urgency, as if fulfilling Simon Dubnow's command to his fellow Jews as he was being deported from the Riga ghetto, "Shreybt un farshreybt" (write and record).[35] One of the Central Jewish Historical Commission's first projects was the drawing up of detailed questionnaires for Holocaust survivors. By December 1947, 7,300 testimonies had been gathered, their chronological proximity to the Shoah making them extremely valuable. The commission also published thirty-eight books and

the journal *Fun letzten khurbn* (On the recent catastrophe).[36] This feverish productivity was made possible, according to Natalia Aleksiun, because Friedman "created and cultivated an informal network of Jewish historians, witnesses, collectors and educators," all dedicated to pursuing Holocaust research.[37] The urge of survivors to write down their stories astounded Friedman. In October 1947, he observed, "Hundreds and hundreds of people who in their entire lives have never mustered any interest in historical research, now, out of an irresistible inner urge, grab a pen to write." It was, he said, "a mighty social phenomenon."[38]

Friedman coined the term *khurbn forshung*, Yiddish for "catastrophe research," to describe this undertaking.[39] It was this experience that served as the basis for his demand, made in the immediate wake of the war's end, that historians use all kinds of sources and that they not confine themselves to official reports. Rather, they had to also make use of photographic, musical, and artistic sources, which were to be examined, weighed, and used as both historical and judicial evidence. Friedman's use of multivalent and diverse sources became a template for not only Holocaust historiography but Holocaust studies more generally.

Friedman's abovementioned pathbreaking article published in the *PAAJR* in 1949, prepared with the editorial assistance of Salo Baron's wife, Jeanette, laid out the seemingly insurmountable methodological difficulties facing those historians who wished to write a history of what was not yet referred to as the Holocaust. When speaking and writing in English at this stage, Friedman most frequently used the words "Catastrophe" or "Tragedy," both usually capitalized. The article is a remarkable real-time inventory of published and archival sources, a historian's treasure map, pointing would-be scholars in the right direction. But what of these sources? Where were they? What were they? How accessible were they? Friedman notes the unprecedented nature of the task ahead. "Earlier catastrophes in Jewish History," he notes, "were for the most part confined to one country." This one was "spread over

continental Europe."[40] Seeing it within the larger sweep of Jewish history, Friedman says, "Our historiography has always been faced with problems much bigger than the history of any nation." The Jewish historian had to account for political, economic, social, and cultural heterogeneity, but "the Jewish historiography of the recent Catastrophe has an even more multi-levelled basis." There was a "tremendous amount of sources … scattered over dozens of countries, in various languages … compiled by as many governmental, municipal, communal, international and private institutions with diverse ideological and political approaches, with different goals and objectives."[41] Like Kaufmann, Dubnow, Baron, and Weinryb, Friedman, too, called on historians to scour the voluminous documentation—Nazi as well as Allied sources, those of Jewish institutions, as well as those of Jewish French underground forces, sources at the Central Jewish Historical Commission in Poland, documents of the various *Judenräte*, those of Jewish civic courts, and much more besides. The sheer amount of material was overwhelming, but Friedman was immediately cognizant of the unique nature of the documentation and how it reflected the unique nature of the crime. He is worth quoting in full because his observation applies not only to the particular burdens of Holocaust historiography but to the practice of modern history as a whole, especially modern Jewish history. That problem, among others, turns on the demands on the historian to come to terms with the overwhelming amount, variety, and provenance of the sources:

> Our historiography of the recent catastrophe is also confronted with another important problem, namely: the exploitation of sources other than, or beyond the common definition of what is being called archival material. The peculiar feature of this contemporary historiography is that the historian and the archivist are instrumental not only while collecting and exploiting sources but also in producing sources in an abundant manner. Never in history could first hand historical material be obtained and

> compiled from the very acting historical personnel on such a large scale. Each German, satellite, or collaborationist defendant, beginning with the top officials of the axis-regime was bound to deliver detailed information, complete depositions, statements, accounts, evidence.... These are unusual and intimate sources of information on previously top secret and highly confidential topics. No other period in our History could be illuminated by this kind of inside information....However, we may not forget, that all these records are one-sided and apologetically biased. The unilateral character of these records necessitates their being balanced and completed by different ones, namely by Jewish records and statements. This method of producing historical data is being realized by collecting interviews with Jewish survivors, reports, biographical materials....The inner Jewish history, the sufferings and the spiritual reactions are scarcely or rather falsely reflected in the German sources. This has to be completed by Jewish sources....Other important sources are contemporary Jewish (and non-Jewish) memoirs, diaries, journals, wills, poetry, fiction and folklore. The assemblage of this material has just begun....[Similarly] contemporary photographs taken by the Germans and their assistants, produced by Jewish or non-Jewish underground[s], or made after liberation by allied authorities have been collected … [and there] are the collections of Jewish ghetto—camps—underground—and partisan songs [while there are also] collections of ghetto-art [and] all kind of material illustrating Jewish life and sufferings under Nazi-rule, particularly in the camps.[42]

Friedman cautioned historians to be wary of the documents, to treat them very carefully, especially official Nazi documents, because they are written in ways designed to camouflage, disguise, and dissemble. In issuing his warning, Friedman was echoing a contemporaneous claim made by the German Jewish diarist Victor Klemperer, whose *Language of the Third Reich* (1947) was a penetrating study of the way the Nazis manipulated German, inventing new words and phrases that not only reflected but actually became constitutive of Nazism's corrupt and criminal culture.[43]

When looking at the beginnings of a historical canon seventy years after its creation, things said at the foundational moment may seem obvious. In 1818, exactly 130 years before Friedman published his programmatic essay in the *PAAJR*, Leopold Zunz published "On Rabbinic Literature," in which he implored historians to use all manner of sources to write a Jewish history of the Jews. What seems obvious now was once novel. In the mold of Zunz, Philip Friedman demanded that there be a *Jewish* history of the Shoah. And it has come to pass.

Zosa Szajkowski

In addition to Weinryb on Polish Jewish history and Friedman on the history of the Shoah, Zosa Szajkowski began to publish articles in the *PAAJR* from the mid–1950s that represented new directions in modern Jewish historiography. Beginning in the late 1940s and through the 1960s, Szajkowski entered into an extraordinarily productive period. It is a time that also coincides with his serial theft and subsequent sale to libraries in the United States and Israel of French Jewish archival materials.[44] Those sales occurred after he had used the stolen documents for his own scholarship. In the *PAAJR* alone, he published one article per year between 1955 and 1959 on French Jewish history, a subject not addressed previously in the *PAAJR* or in almost any other English-language journal, for that matter. Altogether, he would eventually come to have over three hundred publications.[45] In terms of the conceptual approach Szajkowski adopted in his scholarship, one might claim that after he broke decidedly with the Jewish section of the Communist Party in France in 1938, he, like Baron, rejected the panoply of Jewish political ideologies regnant in the interwar and postwar periods. Instead, Szajkowsi settled for a cultural politics of diasporic Yiddish nationalism, with a strong inclination towards national Jewish autonomy in eastern Europe.[46] What mattered to him above all else was the study of Jewish history, seeing in its lessons an avenue to a secure Jewish future. He also shared with Baron an all-embracing approach to the Jewish past,

seeing Jewish civilization as a patchwork quilt no less singular for its many different parts. And finally, like Baron, it was his unitary view of Jewish civilization that saw Szajkowski traverse real and metaphorical boundaries, producing myriad scholarly studies on French Jewry, on American, eastern European, and Belgian Jewish history, as well as on Jewish languages, the Yiddish press, and the Holocaust. Despite lacking any formal training as a historian, Szajkowski's publications, frequently weighed down by extraneous details, were, nonetheless, sometimes groundbreaking. In fact, no historian before Szajkowski had done more to introduce the modern history of French Jewry to the Anglophone world.

In the first of his *PAAJR* articles, "The Sephardic Jews of France during the Revolution of 1789" (1955), Szajkowski declared his intention to break with the dominant historiographical view that portrayed the Sephardic Jews of France in the eighteenth century as socially and economically superior to their Ashkenazic coreligionists. He shared none of the romantic adulation of Sephardic Jewry that was a staple of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. Because Sephardim faced a welter of occupational restrictions and were forced to "pay large sums of money" for their privileges, "the percentage of rich Jews was small, and most of the others lived poorly."[47] In other words, from a socioeconomic point of view, the differences between them and the Ashkenazim were not so stark. It was, however, Szajkowski's treatment of Jewish political sensibilities, as they cut across ethnic and class lines, that best highlighted the rifts among France's revolutionary-era Jews. Most but not all Sephardim supported the federalist tendencies of the Girondists, while many Ashkenazim and poorer Sephardim threw their lot in with the Jacobins. The multiplicity of Jewish political sensibilities in the eighteenth century would have struck a resonant chord with Szajkowski, for it presaged the political fracturing that beset Polish Jewry in the twentieth century.

This article was an important historiographical intervention, but as was the case with many of his other studies, Szajkowski considered his findings to be of a provisional nature and he was

reluctant to make larger, synthetic, arguments of the kind that one might find in a monograph. Though inspired by the contemporary Annales school of historiography that assembled teams to pore through archival sources, Szajkowski was a one-man show. That, of course, inhibited the scope of his work and ensured that much of it remained "provisional."

While Szajkowski was Dubnowian in seeing the French Revolution as a watershed, if not the starting point of modern Jewish history, he also identified the emergence of new antisemitic tropes in revolutionary France as a further marker, unwelcome to be sure, of its watershed character. After emancipation, the Jews in France may not have been "serfs of the State in public law" to use Baron's somewhat overblown language, however, they were also not fully accepted as French citizens except and most importantly in "public law." Still, hostility to Jews failed to disappear with the new dawn that was the Revolution. In "French Jews in the Armed Forces during the Revolution of 1789" (1957), Szajkowski wrote movingly of the widespread rejection Jews faced when they sought to volunteer for the armed forces, or those instances when, already in uniform, their petitions to be allowed to observe the Sabbath or celebrate Passover were summarily dismissed.[48] He also wrote with great perspicacity about the Catholic Church's opposition to Jewish emancipation. In "Religious Propaganda against Jews during the French Revolution of 1789" (1959), Szajkowski observed that in addition to its official position against Jewish emancipation, the Catholic Church orchestrated a popular antisemitic campaign to whip up anti-Jewish sentiment intended to pressure the National Assembly to withdraw the proposal of Jewish emancipation. However, there was another reason for the campaign, and that was to "provoke an uprising against the new regime."[49] Szajkowski understood, without explicitly stating it, that attacks on Jews during the Revolution were indeed animated by anti-Jewish animus, but also by more than that. He seemed to be suggesting that an attack on the Jews was an attack on modernity itself.

Moreover, without mentioning the words "conspiracy theory," Szajkowski enumerated a string of such sentiments that circulated widely among opponents of the Revolution. There were those who attacked Jews, believing that their emancipation would lead to their control of France, with one newspaper declaring that "should the existing state of affairs continue, all Christians would be forced within thirty years to undergo circumcision." Catholics opposed to the Revolution attacked proemancipationist Catholics such as the abbot Henri-Baptiste Gregoire. Such Catholics who sympathized with Jews "were ridiculed as dishonest deputies who were bribed by the Jews, or as circumcised, hidden Jews, or as rabbis who planned to convert the National Assembly in a synagogue."[50] There were already conspiracy theories involving Jews that circulated in the Middle Ages, but the modern conspiracy theory that centers on Jews seeking to take complete control of nations, indeed the world, was born of the rumors and propaganda that France was awash in during its moment of greatest political and cultural upheaval. If, as Baron observed, "Emancipation was a necessity even more for the modern State than for Jewry," then the conspiracies that Szajkowski identified bolster Baron's claim, especially as it played out in the minds of those opposed to both the Revolution and the Jews.[51] If revolutionaries such as Cleremont-Tonnere understood that for the Revolution to be complete it could not leave the Jews unemancipated, opponents of the Revolution likewise needed an explanation for why and at whose hand their world had collapsed. Both parties, it seems, needed the Jews.

Szajkowski's scholarship pointed out the ambiguous and contested status of Jews in eighteenth-century France, wherein their receipt of emancipation was the result of false dawns and hard-fought battles. This came to the fore in his essay "Protestants and Jews of France in the Fight for Emancipation, 1789–1791" (1956). In this comparative study, Szajkowski examined the Edict of Toleration of 1787 and contemporary interpretations of it. The edict, which was aimed at Protestants, declared that civil rights could not be

limited to Catholics alone. This begged the question as to whether Jews were implicitly included in the group the document labeled "non-Catholics."[52] According to Szajkowski, "The Edict in favor of the Protestants was the first major victory in a fight for the emancipation of a religious minority, and this paved the way for the later emancipation of the Jews, too."[53] That said, Szajkowski also pointed out that Jewish and Protestant interests did not always align, for while there was no organized anti-Jewish campaign among Protestants in Bordeaux, those in Alsace joined Catholics to fight against Jewish emancipation. In some ways, the divided attitude of the Protestants reflected the divided interests among Jews, both Sephardim and Ashkenazim. With regard to emancipation, both communities saw in its coming to fruition different promises, different pitfalls, and different interests.[54] As Szajkowski noted, "The Bordeaux Jews never even tried to help their co-religionists in other communities."[55] Similarly, the Catholic Church in Bordeaux was more preoccupied with its anti-Protestant stance than it was with the fight against Jews. In fact, Protestants in this region frequently complained that they were treated worse than "the Jews who had crucified Christ."[56]

Szajkowski spilled considerable ink on the subject of Sephardic hostility towards Ashkenazim and the limits they went to not only to distance themselves from the latter but to actively try to thwart the state from extending privileges to them. The reason for the Sephardic attitude was, according to Szajkowski, driven by fear of economic competition from Ashkenazim. A sense of Sephardic cultural superiority only sharpened the conflict, but it was not the principal cause. The economic argument Szajkowski proposes is greatly strengthened by his focus on the attitude of wealthy Sephardic *kehillah* leaders who adopted an equally hostile attitude towards poor Sephardim. At various times they prevented them from joining *kehillot*, or from trading in various goods; on certain occasions they even expelled them.[57] The issue of Jewish disunity at moments of historical cataclysm would have resonated powerfully

for Szajkowski, writing as he did in the aftermath of the Shoah, which had been preceded by a period of intense Jewish divisions. That intracommunal divisiveness would also have struck a deep personal chord with Szajkowski, who always felt underappreciated by his fellow eastern European Jews at YIVO in New York, where he was both underemployed and underpaid for many years. Much went into the making of a thief, and a certain desperation over his basic material circumstances should not be discounted as a motive for his transgressions. He felt the sting of rejection at the hands of his own tribe as acutely as the poor Sephardim must have felt at the hands of their own self-interested *parnassim*.

Isaac Eisenstein-Barzilay

In Isaac Eisenstein-Barzilay we have, from the perspective of intellectual history, one of the clearest expressions of a Baronian view of Jewish history. Eisenstein-Barzilay received his PhD in Jewish history under Salo Baron at Columbia University in 1955. He went from being Baron's student to colleague, when, from 1960 until his retirement in 1985, he was professor of Hebrew language and culture at Columbia. Like Szajkowski, 1955 was the year Eisenstein-Barzilay published his first article in the *PAAJR*. Entitled "The Treatment of the Jewish Religion in the Literature of the Berlin Haskalah," it was the first of a number of pioneering articles on the Jewish Enlightenment. Working chronologically, he began with the Berlin Haskalah and later moved on to its eastern European variant. A perusal of the footnotes in these articles demonstrates just how novel Eisenstein-Barzilay's contributions were. With only a handful of exceptions, almost all references in most, but especially in his early articles, are based on primary sources, with little in the way of secondary historiography. More importantly, Eisenstein-Barzilay's various denunciatory articles on the Haskalah, while perhaps too extreme for Baron, are nonetheless reflective of the central thrust of Baron's "Ghetto and Emancipation," namely, that the toll on

Jewish culture and society exacted by emancipation and acculturation was painfully high. Where Baron was more concerned with political culture and the loss of Jewish autonomy, Eisenstein-Barzilay was principally concerned with the impact of modernity on Judaism itself. The maskilim, he believed, set out to weaken "the hold of traditional Judaism."[58] Examining the difference between the Hebrew-language and German-language publications of the Haskalah, Eisenstein-Barzilay found the former to be less overtly hostile to religion than the latter, but held that in substance their views were aligned. None of the authors of the journal *Ha-me'assef* "showed the slightest appreciation for the Talmud." By contrast, the *me'assfim* did speak at considerable length about the sanctity and beauty of prayer. But Eisenstein-Barzilay was not buying it. Bitterly, he wrote, "Nor must one attach genuine meaning to the allegedly pious attitude to prayers often encountered in the writings of the period. The loftiness and exaltation with which many of them spoke of prayers seem traceable to a sense of envy and inferiority evoked in them by the external beauty of the church services rather than to an awakened inner piety."[59] Writing a mere ten years after the Shoah, Eisenstein-Barzilay expressed his belief that modernity had not only laid bare the vulnerability of European Jewry to the predations of external enemies, but at the dawn of the modern era, internal enemies such as the maskilim arose whose ideology "would undoubtedly have brought an end to the national existence of the Jewish people had it been accepted and applied on a universal scale."[60]

Born the son of a rabbi in Lithuania, and having received his traditional Jewish education in Bialystok, features that shaped his identity and *Weltanschauung*, he lambasted the maskilim in particular for their derision of "the Polish Melammedim and many customs which were still widely practiced by the bulk of Jewry."[61] In "The Ideology of the Berlin Haskalah" (1956), Eisenstein-Barzilay was also one of the historians, if not the first, to fully appreciate the role aesthetics played in Haskalah ideology.[62] In their "longing

for beauty in its multiple forms … the Maskilim first turned their attention to the lack of beauty in the external appearance of the Jew. He was, they observed, physically weaker and smaller than the non-Jew." Eisenstein-Barzilay took note of the maskilim's appeal to Jewish "apparel and cleanliness" and the "acquisition of good manners," and how they bemoaned "the synagogue service for its lack of beauty and decorum." And, in particular, he focused on their rejection of Yiddish, which, he said, "was only one aspect of the more general onslaught of the Maskilim upon orthodox Jewry and its outlook on life and the world."[63]

Eisenstein-Barzilay understood the Berlin and eastern European Haskalahs to be an ideology, a feature that distinguished them from the Italian Haskalah, a subject he addressed in "The Italian and Berlin Haskalah (Parallels and Differences)" (1960–1961).[64] This view of the Haskalah as a dangerous ideology remained an article of faith for Eisenstein-Barzilay. His 1986 *PAAJR* article on the maskil and Zionist Peretz Smolenskin's bitter evaluation of Moses Mendelssohn's legacy most clearly illustrates this, and there is no doubt about which of the protagonists enjoys Eisenstein-Barzilay's sympathies. In his studies of the ideology of the Berlin Haskalah from the mid–1950s, Eisenstein-Barzilay spoke derisively of the "lofty humanitarianism" of the Haskalah, seeing in it that which Gershom Scholem would later call an "unrequited love affair" between Jews and Germans. Humanitarianism "divorced from the national frame" was a recipe for self-extinction. His belief that the nation's existence was threatened by internal, disintegrative forces such as the Haskalah's outreach program to Christians is something that drew him to Smolenskin, who, in 1872, offered this withering critique of Mendelssohn: "R' Moshe ben Menahem held to the view of the love of all humanity, and his household and friends followed him. But where did it lead to? Almost all of them converted. He and his friend Lessing both preached the love of all humans. Yet, not even one of Lessing's family, disciples or friends, converted to Judaism, but the followers of

Ben Menahem, they changed their religion."[65] As Shmuel Feiner has written, "Smolenskin was particularly opposed to the notion that Jews formed merely a religious community and not an independent nation. To his mind, the root of all evil was embedded within the Haskalah movement itself, especially in its eighteenth-century German incarnation."[66] This, in a nutshell, was the position of Eisenstein-Barzilay. While he remained pessimistic about, if not contemptuous of, the consequences of the Berlin Haskalah for German Jewry, he spoke with greater, if not mystical confidence about eastern European Jewry. Hailing its ability to stave off the fate that befell German Jewry, Eisenstein-Barzilay noted in his study of Smolenskin, "At the very time the Haskalah was reaching its highest point in Russia-Poland, the sixties and seventies, it was also becoming clear to the more insightful that it was doomed to fail both in consequence of the growing opposition to it in the society at large and *the will for self-preservation that was gaining strength among the Jews themselves*" (my italics).[67] This was Eisenstein-Barzilay's defense of his people and the culture from which he emerged; it was a celebration of that which he believed the Haskalah had taken from German Jewry, namely, its "will for self-preservation." However, it was more than this that energized these Jews. The Haskalah in its eastern European variant was a national liberation movement: "Just as at its beginning, a hundred years earlier, German Jewry revolted against the spiritual tutelage over it by Polish Jewry, now Eastern-European Jewry revolted against the spiritual tutelage over it by German Jewry."[68]

As indebted and appreciative of Baron's approach to Jewish history as he was, Eisenstein-Barzilay was not uncritical of the master. In a sparkling essay that appeared in the *PAAJR* in 1994, Eisenstein-Barzilay compared the historiography of Yitzhak Baer and Salo Baron. While he lauded Baron's contextualization of Jewish history and culture and praised him for embedding the Jews firmly within the larger civilizations in which they lived, he also believed that Baron had gone too far. Alluding to Baron's

expanded *Social and Religious History of the Jews*, he wrote, "Although this extensive approach is, no doubt, a great asset at times, when excessively used, it is likely to detach the reader's attention from the main theme of the discussion, thereby weakening his major interest."[69] By contrast, Eisenstein-Barzilay's preferred genre was the article, highly detailed, singularly focused, and tightly argued.

Moving from the stylistic to the more substantive, Eisenstein-Barzilay was in general agreement with Baron's overall conception of Jewish history, but it would appear that he felt some unease with its universalizing tendencies, just as he was critical of the Haskalah's universal humanitarianism. It is somewhat ironic that the secular Baron claimed Israel was created as the bearer of a historical-ethical nationalism, set on a path directed by God to fulfill a mission to the nations, while the religiously observant Eisenstein-Barzilay placed far more store in those "natural ingredients, such as the Temple, the Monarchy, and even the Land of Israel, [that Baron believed] were of only an ephemeral character in [Israel's] history" (12). Baron stresses the borrowing and adaptation of key elements of Babylonian culture, the historicization of religious festivals, and especially in Jeremiah's epistle to the Judean exiles in Babylonia, that they "build … houses and dwell in them; and plant gardens, and eat the fruit thereof," and take spouses from among the locals in order that "ye may be increased there, and not diminished." It is by highlighting these elements that Baron finds justification for decentering Israel from the national story (15). Moreover, it was in exile in Babylonia that the synagogue took root and the canonization of the Hebrew Bible began to be formed. As Eisenstein-Barzilay pithily understood it, Baron was simply saying, "A Jew can be a Jew even outside Israel" (16). But ever sensitive to complexities, Baron also acknowledged that it was "from among the returning exiles that a new leadership arose," and "established a state, which later developed into the free state of the Hasmoneans" (17).

Eisenstein-Barzilay claimed that Baron was deeply influenced by Nachman Krochmal's understanding of Judaism's historical development during the Second Commonwealth, though he used different terminology. While Krochmal relied on an abstract Hegelianism, Baron employed a sociopolitical analysis to describe the process of what he considered a self-emancipation of the Jewish people from territory, political power, a national language, and other ingredients of a "natural" nationality (18). According to Eisenstein-Barzilay, "Baron was, of course, a nationalist Jew, even a Zionist, though not an ardent one, if such ardor still entailed, as it did in the not too-distant past, an *anti-galut* orientation" (26). However, if with the publication of the first edition of his *Social and Religious History of the Jews* in 1937, Baron was tentative in the way he assessed Zionism, Eisenstein-Barzilay notes that two decades later and with the publication of his book-length essay, "The Modern Age," Baron had become an ardent and enthusiastic Zionist, not "as far as his philosophy of Judaism was concerned" but a Zionist "in the face of the Jewish reality" (27). Eisenstein-Barzilay's mild critique of Baron stands in stark contrast to his far more negative view of "Galut," Yitzhak Baer's book-length essay, wherein he lays out his conception of Jewish history. Here we see Eisenstein-Barzilay use words such as "[un]tenable," "unacceptable," "doubtful," "regrettable," and "hackneyed," and marshal evidence from distinguished scholars such as Gedaliah Alon, Saul Lieberman, Elias Bickerman, and Victor Tcherikover to demonstrate why "some of Baer's views and beliefs may be subjected to criticism, and their validity put under a question mark."[70] And yet, when assessing Baron's notion of "ethical-nationalism," Eisenstein-Barzilay offered, especially in light of his previous scholarship, a scathing assessment. It was, he wrote, "essentially not much different from the formulations of Reform rabbis and maskilim of the 18th and 19th centuries. It is a formula of convenience that obligates the Jew to nothing in terms of actions or beliefs, and behind which the least committed Jew may hide his Jewish indifference." Moreover, Baron's "history is sober and rational, factual and always on the level

of the newest scholarly information, but rarely does he as much as even try to accommodate traditional or national sensitivities" (55–56).

Finally, Eisenstein-Barzilay reserved his strongest objections to Baron's anti-lachrymose reading of the Jewish Middle Ages. Eisenstein-Barzilay saw antisemitism as a constant in Jewish history, a force that changed forms but always with the same consequences. Pointing to medieval expulsions, violence, demographic decline (according to Baron's own estimates), crushing taxation, as well as the teachings and policies of the church itself, he charged Baron with being unjustifiably charitable in face of such persecutions. Moving to the modern period, he claimed that secular ideologies were equally devastating for Jews. In particular, his ire was especially raised by the attacks of the philosophes, just at that time when Europe began to at least recognize the economic utility of the Jews. As far back as 1956 he had written, "I do not know of any other time in the history of Europe, when so many scholars, churchmen and intellectuals, in Britain and on the Continent, banded together in an alliance of such abuse and hate against the Jews and their culture."[71] So thoroughly hostile was he to the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century that in an anguished and wholly teleological *cri de coeur*, Eisenstein-Barzilay declared, "It remained for the brutal and inhuman Nazis to carry out the bequest of that age: the annihilation of the People of the Book."[72]

Conclusion

When it began publication in 1930, the *PAAJR* constituted a new dawn in Jewish historical scholarship. The storm clouds on Europe's horizon meant that German, Yiddish, Polish, and French Jewish historical studies would be forced by history to yield to English, which would take its place alongside Hebrew as the leading languages of modern Jewish scholarship. The *PAAJR* is one important marker of that monumental and inherently tragic shift.

While the number of articles dedicated to modern Jewish history in the *PAAJR* increased after 1950, the concentration of published

articles dealing with the modern period remained relatively thin throughout the life of the journal. For example, in the last five years of its existence, of thirty-two articles published, only six covered the modern period, and in the final issue, volume 63, covering 1997 to 2001, there were no articles that focused on that era.

In 1958, Cecil Roth pointedly critiqued Baron's expanded *Social and Religious History of the Jews*, observing that "there is … an obvious danger in entering into discussions of detail, for one man—not even Professor Baron—cannot master every byway of scholarship."[73] While the *PAAJR* survived into the 1990s, one reason it eventually folded is that it exemplified the very point over which Roth took issue with Baron. Its nurturing of new scholarship notwithstanding, its eclectic nature meant that the *PAAJR* would go the way of the generalist. Specialization in scholarship grew exponentially with the geographic realignment of Jewish studies (and historical studies more generally) after the war, and as a consequence of that development, scholars of modern Jewish history chose to publish in specialist journals.[74]

In 1955, the Second Temple scholar and one of the founders of the American Academy for Jewish Research, Solomon Zeitlin, expressed his bitter disappointment with the body he helped found: "The Academy no longer entertained the ideals of the organizers [after 1925]. It has ceased to function as an Academy for Jewish research. It has become a Society, a Club." And most cutting of all, "the Proceedings of the Academy were 'below the standards of an Academy.'"[75] Zeitlin was unduly harsh. The members of the original circle may have formed a small, insular, and somewhat intimate group of European-born scholars, but that makes their achievement all the more noteworthy. They served as the foundation upon which Jewish studies in America was built. And as for the standards of its journal, like any long-running academic series, the quality of the contributions varies, but in terms of the representation of modern Jewish history within it, there is more than enough excellent scholarship of a pioneering nature—some of it explored here—for which we can be grateful.

Notes

1 A tenth volume dealing with the contemporary period appeared in 1846.

2 Salo Baron, "I. M. Jost, the Historian," *PAAJR* 1 (1928–30): 7. On Baron's English-language publications and disputes with editors over his "idiomatic difficulties" see Robert Liberles, *Salo Wittmayer Baron: Architect of Jewish History* (New York: New York University Press, 1995), 194–95.

3 Baron, "I. M. Jost," 8.

4 Ibid., 7. See also Liberles, *Salo Wittmayer Baron*, 109–16.

5 David Engel, "Crisis and Lachrymosity: On Salo Baron, Neobaronianism, and the Study of Modern European Jewish History," *Jewish History* 20 (2006): 243–64.

6 Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, "Clio and the Jews: Reflections on Jewish Historiography in the Sixteenth Century," *PAAJR* 46/47 (1978–79) [Part 2]: 607–38. Yerushalmi first delivered "Clio and the Jews: Reflections on Jewish Historiography in the Sixteenth Century" as a lecture in Jerusalem in 1977.

7 Naomi W. Cohen, "American Jewish Reactions to Anti-Semitism in Western Europe, 1875–1900, " *PAAJR* 45 (1978): 29–65.

8 See, for example, Jeffrey Shandler, *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), and Michael E. Staub, "Holocaust Consciousness and American Jewish Politics," in *The Columbia History of Jews and Judaism in America*, ed. Mark Lee Raphael (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 313–36.

9 Cohen, "American Jewish Reactions to Anti-Semitism," 65.

10 In recognition of the dire situation in wartime Europe, a report of the AAJR's Executive Committee in 1940 noted that "after considerable discussion the by-laws of the Academy were amended to permit the annual election of one recently arrived foreign scholar in addition to the three scholars eligible for election each year, and to increase the maximum number of Fellows from twenty three to thirty." *PAAJR* 10 (1940): xv. Of course, precious few scholars were able to make their way to the United States at this time.

11 Salo Wittmayer Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1937), 2:260–61.

12 Both quotations in this paragraph appear in Salo W. Baron, "Ghetto and Emancipation," in *The Menorah Treasury: Harvest of Half a Century*, ed. Leo W. Schwarz (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1973), 51 and 53.

13 Nancy Sinkoff, "From the Archives: Lucy S. Dawidowicz and the Restitution of Jewish Cultural Property," *American Jewish History* 100, no. 1 (January 2016): 117–47. On the larger project of salvaging Jewish books in the wake of the Holocaust see Elisabeth Gallas, "Preserving East European Jewish Culture—Lucy Dawidowicz and the Salvage of Books after the Holocaust," *Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook* 11 (2012): 73–89; and in particular on the competition among nation-states as well as Jewish institutions for such items, see Gish Amit, "'The Largest Jewish Library in the World': The Books of Holocaust Victims and Their Redistribution following World War II," *Dapim* 27, no. 2 (2013): 107–28; and most recently, David Fishman, *The Book Smugglers: Partisans, Poets, and the Race to Save Jewish Treasures from the Nazis* (Lebanon, NH: ForeEdge, 2017).

14 For these and further details, see *Yiddish Leksikon* (blog), "Berish Vaynrib (Bernard Dov Weinryb)," posted May 17, 2016, http://yleksikon.blogspot.com/2016/05/berish-vaynrib.html.

15 Bernard Weinryb, "Teʿudot ve-toldot ha-kehillot ha-yehudim be-Polin," *PAAJR* 12 (1942): 8.

16 Bernard Weinryb, "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry I," *PAAJR* 12 (1942): 129–30 and 135–36. On the situation in Prussia, see Michael A. Meyer, *Origins of the Modern Jew: Jewish Identity and European Culture in Germany, 1749–1824* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1967), 66.

17 Weinryb, "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry I," 122.

18 Bernard Weinryb, "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry II," *PAAJR* 15 (1945): 101–3.

19 Weinryb's understanding of the sources revealed that his appreciation for their contents went far beyond his area of specialty, economic history. He understood that in addition to their economic data, they make it possible for the historian, in good *annaliste* fashion, to understand the collective nature of mentalities. For example, he stresses that "minute-books and other Hebrew records are also philologically very valuable" for "despite their numerous grammatical errors and frequent carelessness (characteristic also of the rabbinic literature of the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries) they offer excellent examples of the language then used by rabbis and other community leaders and are evidence of the more or less successful efforts to express secular matters in biblical and talmudic terminology." "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry I," 124. By 1950, Weinryb took a more generous view of the philology of early modern Polish Jewry, noting that he did not set out to standardize the different spellings of the same word in the documents because "this inconsistency is apparently not always the result of carelessness on the part of the community secretary, but stems also from the varying usages. This being part of the cultural history of the Jewish communities in Poland, I was reluctant to correct such inconsistencies or unify the spelling." Weinryb, "Texts and Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry," *PAAJR* 19 (1950): x.

20 On Kaufmann's plea see Mirjam Thulin, *Kaufmanns Nachrichtendienst: Ein jüdisches Gelehrtennetzwerk im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 113–14. David Kaufmann, "Mekorot le-korot bne Yisraʾel," *ʾOẓar ha-sifrut* 2 (1888): 88–118, where he actually mentions the records of the Poznan and Cracow communities, vol. 2, 91; and vol. 3, 1–24.

21 On Karpeles, Zivier, and Taübler see Nils Roemer, *Jewish Scholarship and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Germany: Between History and Faith* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005), 118–21. The work of professional Jewish historians and archivists in Germany was supplemented by an army of amateur historians, local rabbis, as well as cemetery and building preservationists all dedicated to writing local Jewish history and preserving the physical structures and remnants of Jewish communities.

22 Salo Baron, "An Historical Critique of the Jewish Community," *The Jewish Social Service Quarterly* 12, no. 1 (Sept. 1935): 44–49. After lamenting how little was known about Jewish communal life and "social factors" in Achaemenid

Persia, the Hellenistic empires and Sassanian Persia, Baron claimed, "Even the medieval and early modern communities which have left behind literally thousands of scattered records in the form of *takkanot*, minute books, etc., have been analyzed only on the basis of chance sources which happened to have come to light and only in certain countries whose modern Jewries evinced a particular interest in their own communal history" (44). The task was now that much more urgent, for as Baron observed, "The Jewish people are now going through a crisis which has never been rivaled since the days of the first Exile" (49).

23 Weinryb, "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry I," 122.

24 Weinryb, "Texts and Studies," ix.

25 Ibid.

26 Bernard D. Weinryb, *The Jews of Poland: A Social and Economic History of the Jewish Community in Poland from 1100–1800* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1972), xi.

27 Laurence Weinbaum, "Remembering a Forgotten Hero of Holocaust Historiography," *Jewish Political Studies Review* 24, nos. 3–4 (Fall 5773/2012): 133. See also Roni Stauber, *Laying the Foundations for Holocaust Research: The Impact of the Historian Philip Friedman*, Search and Research: Lectures and Papers 15 (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 2009).

28 Salo Baron, "Philip Friedman," *PAAJR* 29 (1960–1961): 2.

29 Letter from Friedman to Baron, 3 December 1955, on the occasion of Baron's 60th birthday anniversary dinner (Dec 6, 1955), RG 1258, box 1, folder 16, YIVO.

30 Salo Baron, "Philip Friedman," 3.

31 Deborah E. Lipstadt, *Holocaust: An American Understanding* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2016), 14. See also Laura Jokusch, "Historiography in Transit: Survivor Historians and the Writing of Holocaust History in the late 1940s," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 58 (2013): 75–94.

32 See Hilberg's memoir, *The Politics of Memory: The Journey of a Holocaust Historian* (Chicago, IL: Ivan R. Dee, 1996), 109.

33 Philip Friedman, *Martyrs and Fighters: The Epic of the Warsaw Ghetto* (New York: Praeger, 1954), and Friedman, *Their Brothers' Keepers* (New York: Crown, 1957).

34 Here he differed from the historian Ben-Zion Dinur and Israel Halpern, director of Yad Vashem in the 1950s, both of whom felt time had to pass before producing synthetic works on the Shoah. See Boaz Cohen, *Israeli Holocaust Research: Birth and Evolution* (Routledge: New York, 2013), 36–45.

35 On early Holocaust scholarship, including Friedman's pioneering role, see Laura Jokusch, *Collect and Record! Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).

36 The Central Jewish Historical Commission reconstituted itself in 1947 as the Jewish Historical Institute. See the entry on the Jewish Historical Institute, by Feliks Tych, YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe, http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Jewish_Historical_Institute. Ruth Gay, *Safe among the Germans: Liberated Jews after World War II* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002), 65.

37 Natalia Aleksiun, "An Invisible Web: Philip Friedman and the Network of Holocaust Research," in *Als der Holocaust noch keinen Namen hatte/Before the*

Holocaust Had Its Name, ed. Regina Fritz, Eva Kovacs, and Bela Rasky (Vienna: Wiesenthal Instituts für Holocaust-Studien, 2016), 151.

38 Quoted in Laura Jokusch, "'Become Historians Yourselves! Record, Take It Down, and Collect!': Jewish Historiography in Times of Persecution," in *Iggud: Selected Essays in Jewish Studies*, vol. 2, *History of the Jewish People and Contemporary Jewish Society*, ed. Gershon Bacon (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 2005), 78.

39 Ibid., 79.

40 Friedman was uncannily prescient. In 2018, exactly seventy years after he wrote these words, the historian Wendy Lower, in an essay on future Holocaust research, took note of the "European turn" in Holocaust scholarship, observing that "by intent, design, and implementation, the Holocaust was a European event. Yet the European dimensions of the Holocaust appear in multiple forms, which are still being identified, researched and compared." Wendy Lower, Tablet, April 26, 2018, http://www.tabletmag.com/jewish-arts-and-culture/culture-news/260677/history-future-holocaust-research.

41 Philip Friedman, "The European Jewish Research on the Recent Jewish Catastrophe in 1939–1945," *PAAJR* 18 (1948–49): 179 , 180.

42 Friedman, "European Jewish Research," 184–86.

43 Victor Klemperer, *The Language of the Third Reich* (London: Continuum, 2006).

44 Those sales occurred after he had used the stolen documents for his own scholarship. As for his productivity, according to the definitive study of Szajkowski, between 1946 and 1961 he published "no fewer than one hundred scholarly articles and six scholarly books, an average of eight publications a year." Lisa Moses Leff, *The Archive Thief: The Man Who Salvaged French Jewish History in the Wake of the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 147.

45 Abraham G. Ducker, "Zosa Szajkowski (1911–1978)," *PAAJR* 48 (1981): xxxvii–xliv.

46 Incredulous, he said of his Bundist friends at the Medem Club in Paris in 1944: "They're still talking a lot of politics and in actuality doing nothing to put damaged Jewish life in Paris back together—politics and more politics!" Leff, *Archive Thief*, 98. On Szajkowski's generally favorable assessment of German Jewry's efforts on behalf of Jewish national autonomy in eastern Europe during World War I, see his "The German Ordinance of November 1916 on the Organization of Jewish Communities in Poland," *PAAJR* 34 (1966): 111–39.

47 Zosa Szajkowski, "The Sephardic Jews of France during the Revolution of 1789," *PAAJR* 24 (1955): 137–64.

48 Zosa Szajkowski, "French Jews in the Armed Forces during the Revolution of 1789," *PAAJR* 26 (1957): 139–60.

49 Zosa Szajkowski, "Religious Propaganda against Jews during the French Revolution of 1789," *PAAJR* 28 (1959): 104.

50 Ibid., 105–6.

51 Baron, "Ghetto and Emancipation," 60.

52 Zosa Szajkowski, "Protestants and Jews of France in the Fight for Emancipation, 1789–1791," *PAAJR* 25 (1956): 119–35. In this he shared the view of the pro-emancipationist Christian Abbé Grégoire. See Paula E.

Hyman, *The Jews of Modern France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 21–23.

53 Szajkowski, "Protestants and Jews of France," 127.

54 Zosa Szajkowski, "Relations among Sephardim, Ashkenazim and Avignonese Jews in France from the 16th to the 20th Centuries," *YIVO-Bleter* 39 (1955): 70–103. Reprinted in Zosa Szajkowski, *Jews and the French Revolutions of 1789, 1830 and 1848* (New York: Ktav, 1970), 235–66.

55 Szajkowski, "Protestants and Jews of France," 128.

56 Ibid., 127.

57 Szajkowski, *Jews and the French Revolutions*, 256–57.

58 Isaac Eisenstein-Barzilay, "The Treatment of the Jewish Religion in the Literature of the Berlin Haskalah," *PAAJR* 24 (1955): 39–68. For a contrary assessment see Moshe Pelli, *The Age of Haskalah: Studies in Hebrew Literature of the Enlightenment in Germany* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 48–72.

59 Eisenstein-Barzilay, "Treatment of the Jewish Religion," 46–47.

60 Ibid., 49.

61 Ibid., 44.

62 On this very subject see my *German Jewry and the Allure of the Sephardic* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016).

63 Isaac Eisenstein-Barzilay, "The Ideology of the Berlin Haskalah," *PAAJR* 25 (1956): 24–26.

64 Isaac E. Barzilay, "The Italian and Berlin Haskalah (Parallels and Differences)," *PAAJR* 29 (1960–61): 17–54. In Italy, he wrote, they "began to study languages and literatures, the sciences and philosophy, to dance, sing and perform, without waiting for ideology to legalize such pursuits from the point of view of Jewish creeds and practices" (29).

65 Quoted in Isaac E. Barzilay, "Smolenskin's Polemic against Mendelssohn in Historical Perspective," *PAAJR* 53 (1986): 12.

66 Shmuel Feiner, "Smolenskin, Perets," YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe, http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Smolenskin_Perets.

67 Barzilay, "Smolenskin's Polemic against Mendelssohn," 13.

68 Ibid., 46.

69 Isaac E. Barzilay, "Yiṣḥaq (Fritz) Baer and Shalom (Salo Wittmayer) Baron: Two Contemporary Interpreters of Jewish History," *PAAJR* 60 (1994): 12. For the citations that follow see the page numbers in the body of the text.

70 Ibid., 45–51 and 60. In the footnotes many more authorities, especially those who deal with the early modern and modern periods, are invoked.

71 Isaac Eisenstein Barzilay, "The Jew in the Literature of the Enlightenment," *Jewish Social Studies* 18 (October 1956): 243–61, n. 4.

72 Barzilay, "Yiṣḥaq (Fritz) Baer and Shalom (Salo Wittmayer) Baron," 68.

73 Cecil Roth, review of *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, by Salo Wittmayer Baron, *Jewish Social Studies* 20, no. 2 (April 1958): 102.

74 One reason the *PAAJR* never became a go-to venue for modern Jewish history was because by the time the field came into its own there were a number of specialist journals in English. The *YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science* (later called *YIVO Annual*, 1946–1996), whose founding editor

was historian and educator Shlomo Noble, began its postwar existence by publishing English translations of many articles that had originally appeared in Yiddish. With the passage of time, the journal became a venue for original English-language contributions, especially in the area of American Jewish history. Historians of American Jewry already possessed a long-established journal dedicated to their specific field of inquiry. Entitled *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, which later switched its name to *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* and is currently called *American Jewish History*, the journal has appeared continuously since 1892. Similarly, the *American Jewish Archives Journal* began publication in 1948. The *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* became the premier journal for the publication of articles on the history of Jews in German-speaking lands as soon as it first appeared in 1956.

75 Solomon Zeitlin, ''Jewish Learning in America,'' *Jewish Quarterly Review* 45, no. 4 (1955): 582–616, and quoted in David B. Ruderman, "Three Reviewers and the Academic Style of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* at Midcentury," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 100, no. 4 (Fall 2010): 556–71.

Communal Record Books (*Pinkassim*)

GERSHON HUNDERT
McGill University

The founders of the AAJR envisioned their organization as analogous to the great European academies of sciences. In an address in 1928, Alexander Marx singled out particularly the French Académie des Inscriptions and its continuing program of publication of medieval manuscript sources related to the literary history of France, and he mentioned similar projects of the academies in Berlin and Vienna. Indeed, for several decades the minutes of the Executive Committee of the AAJR record a list of goals along those lines. The Academy hoped to preside over the publication of critical editions of the Masoretic Text of the Bible, talmudic texts, the writings of Maimonides, and of the corpus of Jewish communal records.

Aside from studies published by Bernard Weinryb that will be the focus here, three other articles appeared in the *PAAJR* that are somewhat related to the topic of communal record books (*pinkassim*).[1] The first part of Berthold Altmann's "Studies in Medieval German Jewish History" addresses rabbinic decisions that contributed to the eventual "constitutions" of Ashkenazic communities, particularly

the interpretation of the talmudic principle that "the law of the kingdom is the law."[2] Shlomo Eidelberg's Hebrew article introducing a then-unpublished book on the customs of the Jewish community of Worms notes that the book includes a brief reference to the temporary expulsion of Jews from Worms in 1615–1616 copied from the communal minute book.[3] There is also mention of a special communal *pinkas* that recorded matters related to the Land of Israel.[4] The last section of Joshua Starr's study of Jews in Crete treats "Communal Life," which seems to have begun in an organized fashion in the thirteenth century.[5] Nevertheless, the only direct studies of *pinkassim* to appear in the *PAAJR* are Weinryb's.

The first reference to Weinryb in the *PAAJR* is in the minutes of a special meeting of the Executive Committee of the AAJR on June 5, 1940, at the home of President Levi Ginzberg. The president announced that the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Scholars had granted the AAJR $1,000 "toward a stipend for Dr. David B. Weinryb for his researches in the social and economic history of the Jews in modern Europe." The committee voted to appoint Dr. Weinryb a Research Fellow of the Academy for the academic year 1940–1941.[6] By the time the AAJR reappointed Dr. Weinryb was as a Research Fellow the next year, the minutes give his name correctly: Dr. Bernard D. Weinryb.[7] He became a Fellow of the AAJR in 1977.[8]

Bernard Dov (Sucher Ber) Weinryb's (1900–1982) scholarly career began in Breslau, where he studied at the Jewish Theological Seminary (1926–1929) and at the University of Breslau (1927–1932). At the university, he studied history under Friedrich Andreae (eastern Europe) and Siegfried Kaehler (Germany). His dissertation, "Neueste Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Juden in Russland und Polen; Das wirtschaftsleben der Juden in Russland und Polen von der 1. polnischen Teilung bis zum Tode Alexanders II. (1772–1881)," was published in 1934 in Breslau by M. & H. Marcus; Weinryb published a revised edition in 1972.[9] In the course of a career that saw him move to Palestine in 1934 and to the United States in 1939, Weinryb published hundreds of studies in German, English, Yiddish, and Hebrew that

addressed issues related to the Jewish settlement in Palestine, Jews in Germany, in Poland-Lithuania, and the Jewish community in the United States. In addition, he devoted a number of publications to the subject of Jewish historiography. Weinryb published three items in the *PAAJR*, all of which concern *pinkassim*. These will be the focus here.

On the Study and Publication of Pinkassim of Polish-Lithuanian Communities

Weinryb's publications in the *PAAJR* drew substantially on the particularly rich surviving records of the Jewish communities in Poznan (Posen) and Cracow. In this, he was continuing work that had begun with Joseph Perles's history of Jews in Posen (1865), and the second volume of Ḥayyim Nathan Dembitzer's *Kelilat yofi* (1893), which included substantial excerpts from Cracow's communal record books.[10] Dembitzer's student and disciple, Feivel Hirsh Wettstein, continued his teacher's work.[11] Wettstein spent his life in Cracow, where he owned a used bookshop at Szpitalna 20. His contributions consisted mainly of the publication of numerous documents from the records of the Cracow Jewish community, of which he had made copies. Weinryb used these copies in his own publication of Cracow materials. For Poznan, he had copies he had made himself from the communal record books as well as others made by Marcus Breger (1905–1975).[12]

Communal records and their preservation became a central concern of historians like David Kaufman, Naḥum Sokolow, and Shimon Bernfeld in the 1880s, and all three issued calls for Jews to preserve and copy such records.[13] These scholars were motivated, like Wettstein, by filiopietistic motives. It was only a few years later, in 1891, that Simon Dubnow issued a similar appeal. Dubnow, however, grounded his plea not only in filiopietism but also in his conviction that the community as an institution and its history constituted the very core of Jewish civilization.[14] The community, as Dubnow saw it, was the continuous expression of Jewish sovereignty during two millennia of diasporic life. This was a turnabout

in Dubnow's thinking. Earlier, he had shared the opinion of Jewish modernizers who saw the communal institutions of Jews as vehicles of oppression.[15] His change of opinion led him to take up the editing and publication of the minute book of the Lithuanian Council.

Abraham Harkavy had already embarked on this project in 1886, but the elders and leaders of the Jewish community of St. Petersburg brought pressure on Harkavy and the editors of *Hamelits* to abandon the project because, in their view, it would contribute to the growth of antisemitism and endanger the Jews of Russia.[16] These were the years of the Pahlen Commission (1883–1888) that, many thought, would determine the future legal status of Russian Jewry. Some testimony before the commission quoted Jacob Brafman's notorious *Kniga kagala* (The book of the kahal: An international Jewish question, 1879) that claimed the *kahal* (Jewish communal government[s]) persisted despite having been abolished formally in 1841, that Jews remained a state within a state, plotting against their neighbors. Among the distortions, forgeries, and libels, the book also includes authentic excerpts from the minute book of the Minsk community. *Kniga kagala* became canonical proof of the Jewish conspiracy against all gentiles for Russian antisemites, including virtually the entire imperial bureaucracy. John Klier called *Kniga kagala* "the most successful and influential work of Judeophobia in Russian history."[17] Consequently, communal leaders were skittish about publishing communal records that might seem to confirm Brafman's allegations.

Dubnow, however, insisted that a policy of covering up the records of the Jewish community for fear of the antisemites "would be followed only by a slave-people that has lost all sense of honour and freedom and is immersed in … despicable cowardice—the desire of servants to please their masters. History may not be sacrificed in the name of diplomacy."[18]

Bernard Weinryb on the Study and Publication of *Pinkassim*

In an article published in Hebrew in 1937, Weinryb suggests that the maskilim were obliged to side with the opposition to communal governments, since in their time they were indeed vehicles of oppression and obstacles to change.[19] He identifies Dubnow as the initiator of a later trend that saw the communal government as "state-like" and emphasized its secular functions and its centrality to the preservation of the Jewish people in the Diaspora. He cites Dubnow's contention that "the secret of Jewish survival depended on the absolute duty to fulfill the ancient prophecy, 'The scepter shall not depart from Judah.'"[20] Weinryb asserts that this orientation led Dubnow, like Graetz before him in a different way, to focus his attention on the organization of the community and its relations with the state, and look almost exclusively at the ruling class. This approach, Weinryb points out, obscures class divisions and contradictions within the community. Yet he also stressed the need for communal discipline and unity—"a powerful community administration"—and he justifies and rationalizes restrictions on individual freedom because of external threats to Jewish security.[21] Weinryb advocates a Weberian sociological-historical analysis that expands Dubnow's approach and takes account of social relations and individual choices.[22] Still, he cautions that the historiography of the Jewish community is insufficiently developed to allow for the construction of "ideal types."

"In order to arrive at the 'typical' one must study the matter itself in all its variety."[23] The orderly arrangement and publication of materials from the communal minute books, he says, will make more nuanced studies of the community possible. Indeed, Weinryb's publication of material from *pinkassim*, mainly in the *PAAJR*, follows a format that groups items by subject matter. Moreover, his multiple studies of Jewish communal taxation, occupational structure, and class conflict in eastern Europe systematically exploit communal record books in an effort to gain control over these complex and interrelated topics.[24] Another study analyzes material drawn from the minute books of the Cracow Jewish

community related to the Council of Four Lands.[25] Thus, while Weinryb insisted on complicating Dubnow's analysis by stressing conflicts and tensions between communal elders and artisans and other lower echelons in Jewish society, his description of the importance of the Jewish community as an institution and the records of those institutions only slightly modifies Dubnow's hyperbole: "The communities were the cells in which Jewish initiative, political and social creativity found a background and form of expression."[26]

Volume 19 of the *PAAJR* consists, after some organizational front matter, of a book in which Weinryb synthesizes and expands the material he had published in the journal in 1942 on Cracow and 1945 on Poznan. The 1950 volume duplicates the items related to Cracow and adds material from the Wlodawa *pinkas* and much more material from the Poznan minute book. While the 1945 publication includes 157 excerpts from the Poznan *pinkas*, the revision in 1950 includes those materials and 243 more documents.[27] The format, in all three cases, includes a brief introduction to each item or group of items in English and a separate Hebrew section presenting the documents in annotated form. The annotation attends closely to identifying individuals mentioned in the materials, but there is also glossing of unusual terms, which includes explanations of more than one hundred words, phrases, abbreviations, and contractions.

The Cracow materials date from the eighteenth century (1690–1766), and derive from both the minute book of the community and the minute book of the communal court. Weinryb, who was working from Feivel Wettstein's copies, does not indicate whether a particular document originates in the court records or the communal record book. This is likely because the materials he had from Wettstein are undifferentiated. He does tell us that "according to [Majer] Bałaban," the surviving communal *pinkas* covered the years 1603–1708 (in addition to the 1595 'constitution'), while the minute books of the Jewish court included records from 1644 to 1782."[28] Of the thirty-six documents related to Cracow that Weinryb published here, all but

two date from after 1708, and thus one can surmise that these came from the records of the communal court.

By contrast, the material from Poznan—four hundred excerpts, constituting about two-thirds of the material in the third volume of the Poznan communal record book that is entitled *Sefer ha-zikhronot*—is dated almost exclusively to the seventeenth century (1593–1689). The much smaller number of documents from the Wlodawa *pinkas* (thirty-six) date to the second half of the eighteenth century and the first decades of the nineteenth century.[29]

As noted, Weinryb arranges the material in the case of each community according to topics.[30] Within each section, the materials, as is the case with the *pinkassim* themselves, are not arranged in chronological order. The topics concentrate on the financial operations of the *kahal* and on matters related to membership, which he terms *ḥezkat ʿironut*. He is also concerned with the power of the communal institutions over the lives of individuals and over associations and guilds. Although this is not the place to present a summary of Weinryb's analyses of each topic, some general remarks about his approach seem appropriate. He stresses the parallels between the *kahal* and municipal governments—both in their relations with guilds and in their control of "citizenship."[31] In his analysis of communal finances, he depicts communities in decline in the eighteenth century. In the matter of the massive communal debts, he says the community (of Poznan) was no less in debt prior to the period of decline, but in the earlier period, the debts were of a very different nature. The creditors in the earlier period tended to be noblemen and burghers; in the eighteenth century, the credits came mainly from churches and monasteries. In the latter case, Weinryb suggests (without citing sources for his claim) that "a great many of the debts were faked." The church would incite attacks on Jews and then demand money in return for protection. They treated this money as a debt on which interest had to be paid.[32]

Weinryb draws attention to the banking operations of the community (of Poznan), which borrowed from large lenders in order to

provide credits at higher rates of interest to local Jews.[33] He stresses his finding that, regardless of the period, the overwhelming majority of communal revenues (80 percent on average) were for external purposes—taxes to the Crown and gifts and payments to government officials and other powerful figures and institutions.

The *kahal* limited and policed marriages of the poor lest the couples become a financial burden on the community, and, especially in the case of Poznan, because of overcrowding.[34] Similarly, the *kahal* forbade servants to marry without a special permit that could be granted only with a two-thirds majority decision of the elders. A gendered analysis of the communal records, something not taken up by Weinryb, would repay an enterprising researcher richly.

Recent Developments Briefly Considered

Since Weinryb's time, Mordechai Nadav, Dov Avron, Stefan Litt, Jay Berkovitz, and numerous others have advanced the study of *pinkassim* and contributed to their publication. This brief discussion will highlight only a small portion of this research. Dov Avron published an edited version of most of the minute book of a sort of communal senate in Poznan that includes material from the period between 1621 and 1835.[35] This rich source complements the material from the communal minute book. Weinryb, in his publication, does not attempt to define *the pinkas* and does not gloss references, even in the material he publishes, to other documents called *pinkas*, such as the *pinkas ha-ḥeshbonot* (account book) in Poznan and the *pinkas* of synagogue pews in Cracow.[36] Nadav, who published the minute book of the Jewish community of Tykocin, notes references to many sorts of *pinkassim*.[37] It might be more accurate to try to reconstruct a communal archive rather than assume that one sort of record book is *the pinkas*. Nadav's publication preserves the text of the *pinkas* as it was, and, therefore, the order is jumbled chronologically. Stefan Litt has published a selection of material from the records that is restricted to ordinances (*takkanot*) enacted in communities and "lands" in

six polities: German lands (Holy Roman Empire); Bohemia; the Netherlands; France; Poland-Lithuania; and Hungary.[38] A chapter entitled "Communal Autonomy and Rabbinic Jurisdiction" in Jay Berkovitz's recent monumental publication of the minute book of the Metz rabbinic court for the two decades preceding the French Revolution explores a topic not much touched upon in earlier work on Jewish autonomy.[39]

In recent years, The Pinkassim Project, led by an international academic committee consisting of Israel Bartal of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jörg Deventer of the Simon Dubnow Institute for Jewish History and Culture at Leipzig University, Gershon Hundert of McGill University, and Adam Teller of Brown University, has been working in conjunction with the National Library of Israel and the Simon Dubnow Institute for Jewish History and Culture at Leipzig University, with the support of the Rothschild Foundation (Hanadiv) Europe. The project's purpose is to stimulate scholarly interest in the records of Jewish autonomy. To this end, a website has been established that, when completed, will include scans of more than 180 communal record books and supporting materials as well as digitized versions of some published *pinkassim* that are not encumbered by copyright restrictions.[40]

I have alluded to the links between Weinryb's and Dubnow's emphasis, rooted in political ideology, on the contemporary significance of communal record books. In Weinryb's earlier articles, there is an unmistakable tone of lament over the losses, human and material, caused by the Second World War. The first sentence in the introduction to the book published as volume 19 of the *PAAJR* in 1950 also reflects its particular context, but introduces a different tone. That article begins: "With the foundation of the State of Israel in May 1948, the last vestiges of Jewish autonomy … disappeared."[41]

Notes

1 Bernard D. Weinryb, "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry I," *PAAJR* 12 (1942): 121–40 (English section); 7–48 (Hebrew section); Weinryb, "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry II," *PAAJR* 15 (1945): 93–129 (English section); 1–66 (Hebrew section); Weinryb, "Texts and Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry," *PAAJR* 19 (1950): 1–110 (English section); 1–264 (Hebrew section).

2 Berthold Altmann, "Studies in Medieval German Jewish History," *PAAJR* 10 (1940): 5–98.

3 *Minhagim de-k"k Vermayza* has now been published (Jerusalem: Makhon Yerushalayim, 1988). And see Shlomo Eidelberg, *R. Yuzpa Shamash de-kehillat Vermayza* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1991).

4 Shlomo Eidelberg, "R. Yiftaḥ Yosef Yuzpa Halevi Mantsepakh mi-Vormaysa: Shamash, ne'eman ha-kahal, ve-roshem reshumot," *PAAJR* 51 (1984): 1–22.

5 Joshua Starr, "Jewish Life in Crete under the Rule of Venice," *PAAJR* 12 (1942): 59–114.

6 *PAAJR* 10 (1940): xviii–xix. In fact, Dr. Weinryb received support from the Emergency Committee through 1944. Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records 1927–1949, b. 34 f. 13, New York Public Library Archives and Manuscripts, http://archives.nypl.org/mss/922#c1429359.

7 *PAAJR* 11 (1941): ix. Weinryb's early publications are signed Sucher B. Weinryb or Sucher Berek Weinryb.

8 A partial bibliography of Weinryb's work can be found in Catherine Epstein, *A Past Renewed: A Catalog of German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933* (Washington, DC: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 334–43.

9 (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1972).

10 For literature on Poznan see Anna Michałowska-Mycielska, *The Jewish Community: Authority and Social Control in Poznań and Swarzędz 1650–1793* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2008). For Cracow see Gershon David Hundert, "Ha-historiografiyah shel Krakuv ha-yehudit," in *Kroke-Kazimierz-Cracow*, ed. Elchanan Reiner (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 2001), 15–27. In 1950, Weinryb believed that the Poznan communal record books were "no longer extant." Those materials do exist and are held by the Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People in Jerusalem. Weinryb, "Texts and Studies," 21. It was Alexander Bein, Israel State Archivist, who brought the Poznan *pinkassim* from Europe to Jerusalem. Dov Avron, ed., *Pinkas ha-kesherim shel kehilat Pozna* [5]381–[5]595 (Jerusalem: Mekiẓe Nirdamim, 1966), xi. Cf., Alex Bein, "Pegishah `im he-`avar," in *Sefer Refa'el Mahler*, ed. S. Yeivin (Merḥaviyah: Sifriyat Poʿalim, 1974), 211–17.

11 Wettstein referred to Dembitzer as "ʾaluf ne`uray." F. H. Wettstein, "Kadmoniyot mi-pinkesa'ot yeshanim: Lekorot Yisra'el be-Polin bikhlal u-ve-Kraka bifrat," ʾ*Oẓar ha-sifrut* 4 (1892): 578.

12 Weinryb, "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry II," 95;

Marcus Breger, *Zur Handelsgeschichte der Juden in Polen während des 17. Jahrhunderts, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Judenschaft Posens* (Breslau: 1932).

13 See, for example, David Kaufman in *ʾOẓar ha-sifrut* 2 (1888): 1–91. Wettstein, "Kadmoniyot," 577, refers explicitly to Kaufman's appeal: "be-ẓedek yarim ke-shofar kolo."

14 Shimon Dubnow, "Neḥapsah ve-naḥkorah: Kol kore ʾel ha-nevonim ba-`am ha-mitnadvim le'esof ḥomer le-vinyan toledot bene Yisra'el be-Polin u-ve-Rusiyah," *Pardes* 1 (1892): 221–42; cf., *Voskhod* (1891): 1–91. And see, for example, Laura Jockusch, "Introductory Remarks on Simon Dubnow's `Let Us Seek and Investigate,'" *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts* 7 (2008): 343–52; Israel Bartal, "Taḥalif le-memshalah, le-medinah ve-le-'ezraḥut: Shimon Dubnow ve-ha-shilton ha-'aẓmi ha-Yehudi," in *Kehal Yisra'el*, vol. 3, ed. Israel Bartal (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar, 2004), 223–32. There is a very substantial literature on Dubnow. See, for example, Simon Rabinovitch, *Jewish Rights, National Rites: Nationalism and Autonomy in Late Imperial and Revolutionary Russia* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2014).

15 [Bernard] Dov Weinryb, "Mi-pinkese ha-kahal be-Kraka: Le-toledot ha-kehilot ve-va`ad dalet ʾaraẓot be-Polin be-teḥilat ha-me'ah ha-18," *Tarbiz* 8 (1937): 185f. Just about two years before his appeal, Dubnow had written that "there were never two more horrible scourges than the *kehilla* in the past and Judophobia in the present." Quoted in Brian Horowitz, *Empire Jews: Jewish Nationalism and Acculturation in 19th- and Early 20th-Century Russia* (Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2000), 164.

16 Shimon Dubnow, ed., *Pinkas ha-medinah* (Berlin: Ajanoth, 1925), xxiii–xxiv.

17 John D. Klier, *Imperial Russia's Jewish Question, 1855–1881* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 281.

18 [Bernard] Dov Weinryb, "Dubnov ve-ha-historiografiyah ha-Yehudit," in *Sefer Shim`on Dubnov: Ma'amarim ve-'igerot*, ed. S. Rawidowicz (London: Ararat, 1954), 72. See also the brief remarks in Bernard D. Weinryb, "Reappraisals in Jewish History," in *Salo Wittmayer Baron Jubilee Volume*, vol. 2, ed. Saul Lieberman (New York: AAJR, 1974), 947f.

19 Weinryb, "Mi-pinkese ," 185, also, Dov Weinryb, *Meḥkarim u-mekorot le-toledot Yisra'el ba-`et ha-ḥadashah* (Jerusalem: Makor, 1975), 1–23.

20 Genesis 49:10; Weinryb, "Mi-pinkese," 187–88. Cf., Dubnow, *Pinkas*, xi.

21 Weinryb, "Texts and Studies," 26 (English section).

22 For an example of Max Weber's influence on Weinryb's work see chapter 5, "The Medieval Polish Jew: A Composite Picture," in his *The Jews of Poland: A Social and Economic History of the Jewish Community in Poland from 1100 to 1800* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1973), 79–103.

23 Weinryb, "Mi-pinkese," 191.

24 B. Weinryb, "Beiträge zur Finanzgeschichte der jüdischen Gemeinden in Polen," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 82 (1938): 248–63; "Beitraege zur Finanzgeschichte der juedischen

Gemeinden in Polen," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 16 (1941): 187–214; Dov Weinryb, "ʿAl yaḥasan shel ha-kehillot be-Polin le-va`ale-melaʾkhah ve-le-fo`alim," *Yedi`ot ha-'arkheʾon ve-ha-muze'on shel tenue`at ha-`avodah* 3–4 (1938): 9–22, also, Weinryb, *Meḥkarim u-mekorot* , 167–80; Dov Weinryb, "Kavim le-toledot ha-kalkalah ve-ha-finansim shel ha-Yehudim be-`are Polin ve-Lita ba-me'ot ha-17–18," *Tarbiz* 10 (1938–39): 90–104, 201–31, also, Weinryb, *Meḥkarim u-mekorot*, 121–65.

25 Weinryb, "Mi-pinkese."

26 Weinryb, "Texts and Studies," 4 and cf., pp. 6, 12.

27 Weinryb, "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry I"; Weinryb, "Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry II" ; Weinryb, "Texts and Studies."

28 Weinryb, " Studies in the Communal History of Polish Jewry I," 125–26; Weinryb, "Texts and Studies," 77–78. Majer Bałaban (1877–1942) was a leading historian of Jews in Poland who wrote a two-volume history of Jews in Cracow.

29 The Wlodawa materials are from a copy of the communal *pinkas* made in 1928 and deposited in the National Library of Israel. Weinryb, "Texts and Studies," 97.

30 The Cracow materials are divided according to the following headings: Financial operations; Ḥazakah; Administrative functions; Foundation of a society; Protection of interests and property; Private affairs. For Wlodawa: Membership; Economic regimentation; Guilds; Taxes and budget; Administration. For Poznan: Membership; Housing policy; Population policy; Economic regimentation; Finances; Taxes; Community budget; Administrative functions; Bonds, Imprisonment, Expulsions; Sumptuary legislation; Education and relief; Branch community Swarzędz; Ḥazakah; Tolls and toll collectors; Economic life; Residence rights; Organization.

31 E.g., "the whole matter of citizenship was handled in a truly 'state-like' manner." Weinryb, "Texts and Studies," 27.

32 Ibid.

33 Ibid., 8–9; 28–31; 42–47. Probably because the book did not reach him, Weinryb does not discuss Ignacy Schipper's conclusion that it was at the end of the seventeenth century that "the *kahal*s turned into banks" (kahały zamieniły się w banki). *Dzieje handle żydowskiego na ziemiach polskich* (Warsaw: Związek Kupców w Warszawie, 1937), 211–20.

34 Adam Teller, *Ḥayim be-ẓavtaʾ: Ha-rova ha-yehudi shel Poznan be-maḥaẓit ha-rishonah shel ha-me'ah ha-17* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2003).

35 Avron, *Pinkas ha-kesherim shel kehilat Pozna*. And see Avron, *Mosedot ḳehilat Pozna u-minuyeha: Darkhe beḥiratam ve-heḳef samkhuyotehem ʿal pi "pinḳas hekhsherim" u-"finḳas zikhronot 3" shel ḳ.ḳ. Pozna* (Tel Aviv: 2001).

36 Weinryb, "Texts and Studies," 69, 180 (Hebrew section).

37 Mordechai Nadav (Markiel Katzykovich), ed., introduction to *Pinkas kehal Tiktin* [5]381–[5]566 (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1996), 20–22. This is Nadav's annotated edition of a copy of the communal record book made by Israel Halpern as a young man. Cf.

above fn. 4.

38 Worms (1650; 1684); Frankfurt a/M (1674/5); Halberstadt (1741); Fürth (1770); Ühlfeld (ca. 1683–1698); Niederwerrn (1747); Neuezedlisch (Nové Sedliště) (1755, 1789–1849); Den Haag (1701, 1716, 1723); Meijerij's Hertogenbosch (1764); Metz (1769); Dubno (1717); Deutschkreutz (1816). Stefan Litt, ed., *Jüdische Gemeindestatuten aus dem aschkenasischen Kulturraum 1650–1850*, Archiv juedischer Geschichte und Kultur 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014). Cf., Stefan Litt, *Pinkas, Kahal, and the Mediene: The Records of Dutch Ashkenazi Communities in the Eighteenth Century as Historical Sources* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

39 Jay R. Berkovitz, *Protocols of Justice: The Pinkas of the Metz Rabbinic Court 1771–1789*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 46–78.

40 The Pinkassim Project, The National Library of Israel, http://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLI/English/collections/jewish-collection/pinkassim/Pages/default.aspx.

41 Weinryb, "Texts and Studies," 3.

Fellows, 1920-2020

Shraga Abramson

Robert Alter

Alexander Altmann

Gary Anderson

Zvi Ankori

Samuel Atlas

Nahman Avigad

Yitzhak Baer

Arnold Band

Salo Baron

Chaya Barzilay

Leora Batnitzky

Samuel Belkin

David Berger

Jay Berkovitz

Adele Berlin

Lawrence V. Berman

Lila Corwin Berman

David Biale

Elias Joseph Bickerman

David S. Blondheim

Bernhard Blumenkranz

Miriam Bodian

Eugene B. Borowitz

Daniel Boyarin

Jonathan Boyarin

Ross Brann

Michael Brenner

Marc Brettler

Ze'ev (William Michael) Brinner

Francisco Cantera y Burgos

Elisheva Carlebach

Vicki Caron

Robert Chazan

Boaz Cohen

Gerson D. Cohen

Mark R. Cohen

Martin Cohen

Shaye Cohen

David Daube

Herbert Davidson

Israel Davidson

William D. Davies

James A. Diamond

Zevi Diesendruck

Haim Zalmon Dimitrovsky

Hasia Diner

Ben Zion Dinur

Abraham Duker

John Efron

Israel Efros

Shlomo Eidelberg

Arnold Eisen

Isaac Eisenstein-Barzilay

Ismar Elbogen

David Ellenson

Yaakov Elman

Todd Endelman

Hyman G. Enelow

David Engel

Louis M. Epstein

Leon A. Feldman

Louis Feldman

Seymour Feldman

Yael Feldman

Joshua Finkel

Louis Finkelstein

Henry A. Fischel

Walter Joseph Fischel

Michael Fishbane

Michael Fox

Steven D. Fraade

Harriet Freidenreich

Aron Freiman

Philip Friedman

Shamma Friedman

Tikva Simone Frymer-Kensky

Amos Funkenstein

Solomon Gandz

Lloyd P. Gartner

Theodor H. Gaster

Harold Louis Ginsberg

Louis Ginzberg

Zvi Gitelman

Nahum N. Glatzer

Nelson Glueck

Shelomo D. Goitein

Norman Golb

Judah Goldin

Calvin Goldscheider

Bernard Goldstein

Jonathan Goldstein

David Goodblatt

Robert Gordis

Cyrus H. Gordon

Arthur Green

Moshe Greenberg

Jeffrey Gurock

Alexander Guttmann

David Weiss Halivni

Abraham S. Halkin

William W. Hallo

Judith Hauptman

Christine Hayes

Samuel Heilman

Moshe Held

Arthur Hertzberg

Abraham Heschel

Michael Higger

Martha Himmelfarb

Gershon Hundert

Isaac Husik

Arthur Hyman

Paula Hyman

Alfred Ivry

Martin Jaffee

Judah Joffe

Max Kadushin

Richard Kalmin

Ephraim Kanarfogel

Samuel Kassow

Steven Katz

Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett

Guido Kisch

Adolf Kober

David Kraemer

Joel Kraemer

Berel Lang

Jacob Z. Lauterbach

Matthias B. Lehmann

Saul Leiberman

Wolf Leslau

Jon Levenson

Casper Levias

Baruch Levine

Bernard M. Levinson

Bernard Lewis

Deborah Lipstadt

James Loeffler

Steven Lowenstein

Alejandro Diez Macho

Shaul Magid

Maud S. Mandel

Jacob Mann

Vivian Mann

Ivan Marcus

Jacob Rader Marcus

Ralph Marcus

Mordecai Margalioth

Max Margolis

Alexander Marx

Benjamin Mazar

Isaac Mendelsohn

Paul Mendes-Flohr

Michael Meyer

Jacob Milgrom

Alan Mintz

Deborah Dash Moore

George Foot Moore

Yochanan Muffs

David N. Myers

Pamela S. Nadell

Leon Nemoy

Benzion Netanyahu

Jacob Neusner

Anita Norich

David Novak

Saul M. Olyan

Harry Orlinsky

Herbert H. Paper

Derek Penslar

Moshe Perlmann

Jakob J. Petuchowski

Antony Polonsky

Benjamin Ravid

Simon Rawidowicz

Adele Reinhartz
Jehuda Reinharz
Isaac Rivkind
Aron Rodrigue
Noah Rosenbloom
Erwin I.J. Rosenthal
Franz Rosenthal
Judah Rosenthal
David Roskies
Marsha Rozenblit
Jeffrey Rubenstein
David Ruderman
Gabriella Safran
Herman Prins Salomon
Marc Saperstein
Jonathan Sarna
Nahum Sarna
Peter Schaefer
Alexander (Sandor) Scheiber
Raymond Scheindlin
Lawrence Schiffman
Hayyim Jefim Schirmann
Menahem Schmelzer
Gershon Scholem
Ismar Schorsch
Seth Schwartz
Naomi Seidman
Jeffrey Shandler
Joseph Shatzmiller
Kay Kaufman Shelemay
Anna Shternshis
Moses A. Shulvass
Eisig Silberschlag
Marshall Sklare
Solomon L. Skoss
Mark Slobin
Mark Smith
Morton Smith
Hayim Soloveitchik
Benjamin Sommer
Isaiah Sonne
David Sorkin
Ephraim Speiser
Alexander Sperber

Shalom Spiegel

Michael Stanislawski

Sarah Abrevaya Stein

Richard Steiner

David Stern

Josef Stern

Menahem Stern

Leo Strauss

Zosya Szajowski

Hayim Tadmor

Frank Talmage

Eugen Taubler

Magda Teter

Jeffrey Tigay

Isaiah Tishby

Isadore Twersky

Abraham L. Udovitch

Ephraim Urbach

Georges Vajda

Jeffrey Veidlinger

Ben Zion Wacholder

Meyer Waxman

Bernard Weinryb

Abraham Weiss

Chava Weissler

Steven Weitzman

Beth Wenger

Eric Werner

Jack Wertheimer

Mordecai Wilensky

David Winston

Rachel Wischnitzer

Ruth Wisse

Elliot Wolfson

Harry Wolfson

Yigael Yadin

Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi

Solomon Zeitlin

Ziony Zevit

Steven Zipperstein

Moshe Zucker

A COMMITMENT TO SCHOLARSHIP

AAJR

The Academy represents the oldest organization of Judaic scholars in North America. Fellows are nominated and elected by their peers and thus constitute the most distinguished and most senior scholars teaching Judaic studies at American universities.

The Academy sponsors the following programs: the Salo Baron Prize for the best first book in Judaic studies, a biennial retreat for the Fellows, workshops for graduate students and early career faculty in Judaic studies, and academic sessions at the annual meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies.

As the senior organization for Jewish scholarship on this continent, it is committed to enhancing Judaic studies throughout North American universities by creating a dynamic fellowship for its members and by providing programs and opportunities for more junior scholars and students entering the field.

Between 1928 and 1997 the AAJR published 63 volumes of "Proceedings" that included scholarly papers in virtually every field of Jewish Studies. The entire collection is now available online.

Please visit the rest of this site for a list of members and officers, for information about the history of this organization, and for detailed information about our current programs.