



ASSOCIATION FOR JEWISH STUDIES NEWSLETTER

No. 29

June 1981

Editor: A. J. Band

President's Message

It is not a simple task to predict the directions of our organization and our field in the challenging period ahead. After all, historical perspective cannot easily emerge from a society which has not yet reached its Jewish majority. Future commentators will undoubtedly study the remarkable emergence of our field, the lively exchanges of our scholars, the multiplication of books and fine journals and the proliferation of our programs. They will examine them against the realities of the social context of America and its educational system of the 1960's and 1970's — questioning how these forces interacted with a native Jewish community increasingly engaged in secularism. Analysts of the AJS will note its youthful membership and vigor, its penchant for self criticism. We can state with satisfaction that the initial goals of the AJS have been accomplished and a community of spirit and of scholars has been created.

Our early years of maturation have been marked by necessary and often patently self-conscious discussions among ourselves and with the wider academic community about the nature of Jewish studies, what it is, what are its fields, its methodologies and where its disciplines should be housed in the halls of higher education. Someday we will be in a position to analyze whether separatism or integration in other departments produced different types of Jewish learning and scholarship. The many discussions of self-definition which our founders and leaders engaged in reflected the tensions inherent in imposing American academic classifications on a field like Jewish studies which doesn't neatly fit into these categories. A fine body of literature on the identity of Jewish studies has emerged during our first decade of activities.

While our interests are as varied as the multi-faceted nature of Jewish civilization itself, our society as well as our annual conferences have provided a spirit of collegiality to a group of frequently isolated scholars. Many of us find ourselves isolated within our respective departments even when we share disciplinary concerns with our colleagues.

During the 1970's the Jewish scholarly enterprise emerged on over 300 campuses in America and Canada. But, it is becoming increasingly evident that some of the very factors which accounted for our growth may emerge as problematic ones in the future. Our expansion corresponded with and indeed was a reflection of an American society receptive to expressions of cultural pluralism, educational innovation and what were perceived as "religious studies" in general. The educational realities of the 1980's are different. Already by 1975, 58% of all undergraduates were enrolled in so-called vocational majors for the first time. This compares with 36% in 1969. As the Dean of the University of California Business School

(Continued on Page 2)

Editorial

In the October 1980 issue of the *Newsletter* we called attention to the paradox of Holocaust Studies in this country: while there seemed to be much activity in the form of conferences, publications, pronouncements, there were few properly trained scholars in the field. In two later issues of *Commentary* (December, 1980 and February, 1981) Lucy Dawidowicz and Robert Alter, respectively, discussed other aspects of the preoccupation with the Holocaust in the past decade. Dawidowicz focussed upon attempts to distort the attested historical facts concerning the Holocaust and mentioned in passing the Institute for Historical Review which now publishes a journal, the *Journal of Historical Review*, whose prime goal is to prove, in ostensibly scientifically researched articles, that the planned annihilation of the Jews by the Nazi regime in Germany never took place. The papers appearing in this journal all have the outward trappings of scholarly articles: footnotes, quotations, authors with present or past academic affiliations. Though careful study of these articles demonstrates that they are, in fact, parodies of academic scholarship, and that their authors have no real expertise in this area or, for that matter, in historical studies, the academic format and paraphernalia have succeeded in deluding some readers both here and in Europe that what they are reading is historical scholarship.

(Continued on Page 2)

IN THIS ISSUE

Editorial	1
President's Message	1
Thirteenth Annual Conference Program	3
News of Appointments	3
Proposal for a New Major	4
Book Reviews	5-19
European Association for Jewish Studies Formed	20
List of AJS Publications	20

ASSOCIATION FOR JEWISH STUDIES

Widener Library M, Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

President's Message (Continued from Page 1)

recently remarked, "The assumption that liberal education is the paradigm of higher education is perhaps for the first time being seriously questioned". Lagging student interest in the humanities on the one hand and the decline of numbers of students in higher education on the other presages sweeping changes in education. If undergraduates are declining arithmetically, we can probably expect the numbers of Jewish students to diminish geometrically correlating with Jewish population trends in general. As we watch how college administrations decide on their longterm commitments to Jewish students and the humanities in general, one question we must confront is: Are we permanent as a discipline in the university or were we (in the eyes of the educational administrators) one more ethnic expression of the 1960's and 1970's reduced to a footnote in the history of the Jews and American education?

It would have been nice to assume the AJS presidency in a period of expanding horizons and to hail our unlimited opportunities matched by ever increasing accomplishments. But that would be irresponsible today; while 56 job listings reached our office in 1975, this year we have fewer than 10. Our most recent survey indicates that 81 scholars will receive their Ph.D's in 1980-81 alone while our 5 year projections foresee 21 job openings. With 755 graduate students currently enrolled in Jewish studies programs by our conservative estimates, we have ample cause for concern. As a professional organization concerned with academic standards as well as professional opportunities we will continue to monitor this situation while exploring the options of alternative career opportunities. Last year we took our first steps towards dialogue with Jewish communal organizations. These conversations will continue while we remain sensitive to the distinction between university perspectives and community needs, between the boundaries that separate Jewish community and Jewish scholarship. We will continue to study the question of graduate studies and graduate programs, utilizing the annual conference as an opportunity to continue the discussions begun last year.

A new presidency of AJS signals continuity rather than change. We will continue to expand opportunities for professional service in our society and will encourage the ongoing active participation of special interest groups which have served to strengthen our interdisciplinary approaches. We hope to strengthen our publications and to deepen our ties with other organic centers of contemporary Jewish scholarship. It is with a sense of pleasure that we welcome, for the first time at our annual conference, a number of representatives of the Hebrew University and look forward to continuing our professional and personal discussions with our Israeli colleagues at the World Congress of Jewish Studies in August 1981. We hope that each member will contribute his energies, suggestions and scholarly productivity to the various activities of our organization. Ultimately, the society of Judaic scholars will maintain its dynamism and leadership through the responsible concern and contributions of each member.

Jane S. Gerber (Graduate Center — CUNY)

Editorial (Continued from Page 1)

The endeavors of the I.H.R. to gain a foothold in the academy and thus "academic respectability" should be of deep concern to all of us whose lives are dedicated to the discovery and teaching of historical truth. Recent events in California reveal just how vulnerable we, as academicians, are. Masquerading as a learned society, this neo-Nazi group (the active participation of such persons as Willis Carto and Arthur R. Butz in the "Institute" is only one index of its orientation) booked conference facilities at Pomona College for their "Second International Conference" in 1980 and even succeeded in booking the Arrowhead conference grounds of the University of California for their Third International Conference to be held at the end of November, 1981. Fortunately, only because of a technicality (the booking was made in the name of a certain Lewis Brandon — the fictive name of William David McCalden) did the university, ever protective of First Amendment rights, find a way to cancel the booking.

While these political events are of special interest to those interested in Jewish history, they should be disturbing to any self-respecting member of the academic community since they are a blatant example of a calculated effort to undermine whatever claim we as academicians have to credibility by their masquerading as a bona fide learned society with a scholarly journal — which continues to be published. What is truly disconcerting is the ease with which this masquerade was accepted as the truth: footnotes, however bogus, make for authenticity; universities have so little confidence in their mission that they confuse demonstrable deceit with academic freedom; professors often forget that they have a responsibility to their profession and this includes action to expose and extirpate imposters. Finally, though greater scholarly strength in Holocaust Studies would not prevent these deceitful incursions into the academy, they might set standards for the serious pursuit of the truth.

* * *

The Eighth Congress of Jewish Studies to be held in Jerusalem this August should provide us with another opportunity for scholarly communication with our colleagues in Israel and Europe. Since the largest group of non-Israeli scholars are Americans, mostly members of our Association, the encounter should be interesting, perhaps demonstrating some of the results of our working conditions in general universities as commented upon by our president, Jane Gerber, in this issue. We appreciate the efforts made by the organizing committee to facilitate the participation of our members, efforts which reflect a growing awareness, long overdue, that there exists in this country a vital community of Judaic scholars.

A. J. Band



AJS THIRTEENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE PROGRAM
20-22 December 1981, Copley Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass.

Preliminary Announcement

I. Interest Groups

A. Medieval Studies

The Perception of Christianity in Medieval Jewish Law and Thought: A Discussion of Jacob Katz's *Exclusiveness and Tolerance*

Chairperson:

David Berger (Brooklyn College and Graduate Center - CUNY)

Panelists:

Haym Soloveitchik (Yeshiva University)

The Halakhic Sources

Robert Chazan (Queens College)

The Non-Halakhic Sources

Participants are requested to re-read Prof. Katz's book.

B. Modern Jewish History

Chairperson:

Marsha Rozenblit (University of Maryland)

C. Biblical Studies

Women in the Bible

Chairperson:

Richard Friedman (University of California - San Diego)

D. Talmudic Studies

Chairperson:

Michael Chernick (Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, New York)

Structure as Ethos in Early Rabbinic

Midrash: The Case of Sifra

Jack N. Lightstone (Concordia University)

Respondent:

David Goldenberg (Dropsie University)

E. Jewish Philosophy

Chairperson:

Seymour Feldman (Rutgers University)

Teaching Jewish Philosophy:

Syllabus and Course Structure

F. Modern Jewish Thought

Chairperson:

David Ellenson (Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, Los Angeles)

The Import of the Theological Context of Jewish Ethics

Elliot Dorff (University of Judaism)

Respondent:

Rebecca Trachtenberg Alpert (Reconstructionist Rabbinical College)

G. Jewish Mysticism

Areas of Future Research in Kabbalah

Chairperson:

Lawrence Fine (Indiana University)

H. Modern Hebrew Literature and Language

Chairperson:

Edna Amir Coffin (University of Michigan)

Response and Responsibility Column: Strategies for Reading a Poem by Dan Pagis

Naomi Sokoloff (University of Arizona)

The Use of Silent Films in Language Classes

Ziona Kopelovich-Hanash (University of Michigan)

I. Holocaust Studies

Chairperson:

Deborah Lipstadt (University of California - Los Angeles)

The Place of Holocaust Studies Within a Jewish Studies

Curriculum

Discussant:

Paula Hyman (Jewish Theological Seminary of America)

J. Jewish Political Studies

New Resources and Methods in Teaching Jewish Political Studies

Chairperson:

Jonathan Woocher (Brandeis University)

II. Panels

1. **Biblical Studies**

2. **The History of Halachah**

3. **Rabbinic Studies**

4. **Medieval Jewish History**

5. **Kabbalah: Texts and Theories**

6. **The Intersection of Philosophy and Kabbalah**

7. **Medieval Literature and Exegesis**

8. **Modern Jewish Thought**

9. **The Work of S.Y. Agnon**

10. **The History of Zionism**

11. **The American Jewish Polity**

12. **The Social Sciences and Jewish Study**

13. **Anthropology and Jewish Studies**

14. **Eastern European Jewish History**

15. **Modern Jewish History**

16. **On the 100th Anniversary of Brenner's Birth**

The membership's response to the "call for papers" has been most encouraging and the program is now set. Further papers, therefore, cannot be considered.

The members of the Program Committee would like to thank their colleagues for their interest and submissions.

Steven T. Katz
Chairman

News of Appointments

Robert Chazan (Tel-Aviv University)	Queens College
Jeremy Cohen (Cornell University)	Ohio State University
Paula Hyman (Columbia University)	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
Alan J. Peck (Brown University-g)	Tulane University

Visiting appointments

Arnold J. Band (University of California- Los Angeles)	Yale University
Moshe Greenberg (Hebrew University)	University of California- Berkeley
Steven T. Katz (Dartmouth College)	Harvard University
Stephen M. Poppel (Bryn Mawr College)	Harvard University

Proposal for a New Major

Title: **Interdisciplinary Studies: The Case of Judaism**

Auspices:
The Center for the Study of Judaism, Brown University

Educational purpose:

In seeking intellectual means for describing, analyzing, and interpreting worlds different from our own, we bring diverse questions, which, necessarily, call our attention to diverse sorts of data. These means for learning, that is, disciplines, generally are mastered one by one. When we utilize several disciplines for the description, analysis, and interpretation of a single corpus of facts (a single, on-going "culture"), however, we gain perspective on what is to be learned from one discipline, what from some other. The exercise of using a number of disciplines for the study of a single culture will be worked out, in the present setting, through the study of Judaism, broadly viewed as a continuing mode of religious, cultural, and social organization and expression. It should be clear that if this interdisciplinary major devoted to the study of Judaism produces useful lessons, they may be shared with such area studies as black studies, women's studies, American studies, and the like.

Description of the major:

Five disciplines, history, literature, sociology, religious studies, and political science, will be available. Each will form a three-course topical module, in which (1) the methods of the discipline are laid out and applied to (2) one Jewish problem or theme, and (3) one other problem or theme of a comparable order. In this way, the manner in which a given discipline addresses the data of a given span of history, kind of literature, social group, religious expression, or political system, will be fully and amply illustrated both for Judaism and, by way of comparison, for some other subject.

Here are examples of two disciplinary-and-topical modules:

1. Defining the nature of a religion (discipline: Religious Studies)
 - Religious Studies 11: Theory of Religion
 - Religious Studies 1: Introduction to Judaism
 - Religious Studies 2: Introduction to Christianity
2. Religions in America (disciplines: History, Religious Studies)
 - Religious Studies 11: Theory of Religion
 - History 177: History of Religion in America
 - Religious Studies 68: American Judaism

Specialists in various disciplines will provide further examples of disciplinary and topical modules, serving literature (e.g., a theory of literary study course, a course in American literature, a course in American Jewish fiction), political science, sociology, and the like. Other models readily come to mind. A module on myth would involve a course in the theory of myth, myth in the ancient Near East, and ancient Israelite myth. A module on the Jews in medieval Western Europe would involve such courses as History 101, Medieval mentalities and personalities; History 197, Interpretations

of History; and a course in the Jews in medieval Western Europe. A module on the Jews in the Renaissance would involve History 107, Renaissance Italy; History 197; and a course in the Jews in the Renaissance. For the Jews in modern Europe, or in America, similar three-part combinations are readily available.

Requirements of the major: 10 courses.

A major will select two of the available five disciplines, so committing six courses. A senior seminar will be offered for all majors, to share within the circle of the majors the lessons learned from the various disciplines and their application and use. One year of Hebrew will be required, either in Biblical Hebrew, at Brown, or an intensive summer course in modern Hebrew (for which Brown generally gives two courses of credit) at an Israeli university. It does seem to me that the discipline of learning a language of Jewish culture is integral to the case of Judaism. Further, academic work in the State of Israel, involving study and travel within the country, provides the major with immediate, material encounter with something beyond the "theory" and problematic of Jewish history, literature, sociology, religion, and politics. Beyond these nine courses, the major will select a tenth, *ad lib.*, but preferably in a discipline in which one of the two chosen disciplines is further exercised.

Staffing of the major:

Brown presently has proposed the creation of a visiting professorship in some aspect of Jewish studies, to be administered by the Center in cooperation with various, interested departments, with the chair moving among departments from one year to the next. This chair would be integral to the disciplinary offerings of the Center, since it would allow for an occasional appointment of a specialist in one of the five disciplines, on the one side, and in some aspect of Jewish learning within one of those disciplines, on the other, whether a sociologist of modern Jewry (e.g., demography), a specialist in literature or art or philosophy or music of the Jews, a historian specializing in medieval or modern history of the Jews in a given region (Western Europe, USA, Asia, or Africa), and the like. Should this visiting professorship come into being, the program of the major will offer a movable feast, from one department to the next, over the years.

In any event, the Center will require appointment, through the authority of the provost, of an interdisciplinary council to administer the major and counsel majors on their disciplinary choices and the organizing of the disciplinary and topical modules. The Council of the Center will include representatives of the departments of political science, English, history, sociology, and religious studies (in some instances, more than a single representative). In Brown are numerous specialists (1) in disciplines relevant to the study of Judaism who (2) possess expert knowledge of important topics of Jewish learning.

Conclusion:

The single most important point is that this is not a major in Jewish studies. It is a major in the study of the interplay of two

(Continued on Page 8)

M. C. Davis, *Hebrew Bible Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections*. Volume 1: Taylor-Schechter Old Series and other Genizah Collections in Cambridge University Library. Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, 1978. 384 pp. 19 plates (*Cambridge University Library Genizah Series*, 2)

Reviewed by Leonard J. Greenspoon (Clemson University)

Catalogues and books of lists, long a staple of scholarly publishing, have recently made their appearance, in a somewhat different form, on general best-seller lists as well. Thus transformed, such volumes are judged according to their accuracy, usability, and entertainment value. While the latter criterion is wont to assume far less significance in the assessment of scholarly books, the former two are essential in any work to which the adjective "reference" is properly to be attached.

The volume under review is a book of lists—in this case listings of over 3,600 manuscript fragments of varying size, all united by their common provenance (the Cairo Genizah), their common 'subject matter' ("Bible" = Hebrew Bible + Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*), and their inclusion, for the most part, in Cambridge University's Taylor-Schechter Old Series, assignment to which was based on "somewhat arbitrary criteria." How then is this volume to be judged when we apply the more than 'somewhat arbitrary criteria' for evaluation I outlined in the first paragraph?

If accuracy is measured by the lack of obvious misprints and other assorted nuisances, then *Hebrew Bible Manuscripts* sets a very high standard indeed, for Davis has managed to oversee the seemingly flawless production of often complex material. Having viewed none of this particular Genizah material in either the original or in microfilm copy, I have only the slightest basis on which to ground any evaluation of the fidelity with which the mostly short descriptive analyses of individual items matches the manuscript fragments themselves. What basis I do have is provided by a series of nineteen plates placed at the end of this volume, which contain a fascinating assortment of the variety of texts a researcher in this material is likely to encounter (although why these particular plates were selected is not indicated). A quick comparison of some of these plates with their written descriptions convinces me that those responsible for this volume have handled their selected material knowledgeably and accurately. Not surprising, perhaps, but comforting nonetheless.

Usability is, in my opinion, a more elusive characteristic, the components of which include such considerations as clarity of purpose, accessibility of material, breadth of coverage, and desirability of providing the particular coverage offered. In a brief introduction the "need" for this catalogue, as one of a series of related publications, is clearly set out. I for one, who am never likely to own S. C. Reif's introductory volume to the entire series, would have preferred to have the present volume's preliminary information substantially augmented, even at the risk of repeating Reif. I simply do not like to be forced to look elsewhere in order fully to appreciate and utilize what I am consulting at the moment.

The "preferred filing order" of fragments, according to such notations as "T-S Boxes A-K" and Or. 1080, is hardly well-suited to my own research needs, which would be far better served if the material was ordered (wherever possible) in the same sequence as the text of the Hebrew Bible. A "canonical index to chapters," which does follow the Biblical sequence (this index, for reasons not given, "includes an entry for every chapter in the Hebrew Bible, even for those few chapters which are not represented in any part of the Old Series, but" inexplicably "for the Apocryphal books only chapters represented in the catalogue are listed"), only in part makes up for the separation of material that I feel belongs together in the body of this volume.

All 3,640 eligible items receive some commentary. To that extent the breadth of coverage is complete. Nevertheless, the decision to include "more information than is normally required in a purely bibliographical tool," while falling "short of being a definitive work of scholarship" of necessity results in some users, such as myself, wanting more on the text and less in the way of measurements. Coming upon several tantalizing fragments in my own area of research, the book of Joshua, I would also have appreciated information on the availability of partial or complete microfilm sets.

Finally, one wonders, even taking into consideration Davis's sensible and by now familiar litany of fiscal constraints, just how valuable even the fullest listing of the Taylor-Schechter Old Series and related material, taken by itself, is, since one will need to consult all four volumes of Hebrew Bible manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections before one can claim to have done more than look at an arbitrary selection of witnesses to various readings of a given Biblical passage (volume 2, for example, is said to contain nearly 6,000 items from the New Series). Again, I express my preference for an order, in publication as well as in listing, which more closely approximates my perceived research interests.

I should not, in measuring the difference between the reality of this volume and the fantasy of the one I would term ideal, pass over the enormous wealth of assorted data contained herein, data on such matters as the cycles of Biblical readings in synagogues, arithmograms, liturgical poetry, colophons — all of which material can be located by consulting a handy "alphabetical subject index." When all four volumes of Hebrew Bible manuscripts, not to mention those covering the remainder of the Cambridge Genizah Collections, are published, we will find that we have been enriched by a collection which puts into proper perspective criticisms of individual parts such as I have proffered.



Jacob Neusner, *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Women*. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1980. 5 vols.

Reviewed by Marvin Fox (Brandeis University)

In these volumes, Jacob Neusner continues his massive work on the history of Mishnaic law. The present work was preceded by *The History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities* in 22 volumes and *The History of the Mishnaic Law of Holy Things* in 6 volumes. Still to come from Neusner himself are the studies of *Seder Moed* and *Seder Nezikin*, while the work on *Zeraim* is being done by his students. For each tractate of the Mishnah, Neusner has provided a translation as well as a translation of the Tosefta for that tractate. His work includes an explanation intended to illuminate particular aspects of the text, and deals extensively with the announced topic, namely, the history of the law of women in Mishnah. Finally, he sets out a most important general theoretical framework for the understanding of Mishnah, and he explores in detail the implications of that framework for the order of Mishnah which is before us.

The translation is by itself a work of much interest to the student of Mishnah, since it is what the author calls a "form-analytical translation." It does not strive for elegance in English, but strives rather to reproduce the Hebrew in all respects as faithfully as possible. Any one who studies this work should pay most careful attention to Neusner's own precise characterization of his translation. He tells us that what he has done is "to present in English the literal sense, order, form and meaning of the Hebrew words." Any translation reflects an understanding of the meaning of the original text, even more so a form-analytical translation which provides a structured version of that text. In deciding how the parts are ordered and how they are related to each other a great deal has already been done to determine how we shall understand the Mishnah which is before us. Any judgment of this translation must concern itself not with the trivial question as to whether words and phrases are rendered accurately in English, since that is hardly likely to be a point at issue. It must rather do the hard work of discerning the meaning which Neusner finds in each section of the text and trying to understand the principles and perceptions which led him to structure it in just the way he does. While determinations of meanings are matters about which there may well be legitimate differences among scholars, no one can have any doubt that Neusner has given us a fresh and most important reading of this ancient text.

The translation is accompanied by an explanation, and Neusner is most careful to stress that it is just that, explanation and not commentary. While a commentary might serve any of a variety of purposes — philological, halakhic, etc. — the explanation in this work is intended to focus only on a single purpose. It wants "to explain in a clear and forthright way what these words meant to the person who framed them in this way and not in some other, what issues can have inhered in them, and what consequences will have been drawn from them by others, placing materials fore and aft, through their tractates, their intermediate divisions and primitive cognitive units." The aim of the enterprise is described by the author as purely historical, and it is to the realization of this aim that he directs his explanation.

Perhaps the most striking feature of Neusner's work is that he treats Mishnah as a document which is (with few exceptions) fully comprehensible by itself and in its own terms. He has, of course, studied the commentaries and all other relevant works, but this has only reinforced his conviction that there is need for a study of Mishnah as what it is in itself and in its own history, rather than what it has become in the hands of generations of students who have had other purposes. Consequently, we find hardly any reference to works other than Mishnah and Tosefta. Very occasionally and almost in passing there will be some note taken of the *gemara* on a particular passage, and similarly there are occasional citations of Maimonides. These infrequent excursions outside of the text of Mishnah-Tosefta only underscore the seriousness with which Neusner takes his claim that Mishnah is best read by itself and in its own terms. Where that proves to be impossible, he prefers to concede lack of understanding rather than to import what would be, in his view, forced explanations from the outside. Thus, in dealing with a passage in *Yebamot*, he concludes that he cannot give a satisfactory account of a saying of Yosé. Having reviewed various possibilities which are not satisfactory, he decides that "we had best concede that, so far as we are unable to interpret the saying solely within the limits of information provided by M. itself, we cannot satisfactorily explain it at all."

This way of reading Mishnah runs counter to the patterns to which we have become accustomed and which we have inherited from the work of many centuries. Just as it never occurred to most of us, particularly those with a traditional education, that it was possible to read Scripture without commentaries, so did it not occur to us that we could read Mishnah without commentaries. In turn, those commentaries were themselves not limited to an exposition of the text in its own terms, but based themselves on a vast range of knowledge of other and later works. They also reflected, as commentaries are wont to do, a variety of interests. Modern biblical scholarship has taught us that it is both possible and valuable to read the Bible as a work of its own time and place (or times and places), not simply as the subject of limitless ingenuity of exegesis. Neusner is attempting to show us, similarly, that there is much to be learned by reading the Mishnah as a fully integrated systematic work with its own meaning and its own history. The effort requires great self-discipline, since it forces us to cast off, as we read, the accumulated baggage of commentary and exegesis which has formed our conventional approach to Mishnah. It demands of us a direct confrontation with the text, a reading which allows the text to speak to us in its own terms, a structuring which deals not only with the organization of a particular segment of the text, but which ultimately tries to understand the whole from the perspective of its parts. There is a kind of intellectual daring and risk-taking here which evokes admiration. More important, there is a detailed implementation of the program which shows us how one scholar does this pioneering work.

The focus, which is so deliberately limited, means that inevitably a great many interesting questions are not touched upon because they do not concern the main purpose to which the work is devoted. M. *Yebamot* 10:1 poses a variety of difficult problems. Together with *gemara*, it has, in fact, been the subject of an extended study

by Shamma Friedman, a study which Neusner in his bibliography labels as "the most important critical reading of Babylonian Talmudic literary problems of our day." Among the problems posed by that Mishnah is a very serious concern that the law is unjust and punitive in ways which offend our moral sensibility. The work of understanding the ethics of the Tannaim is yet to be done, and a passage of this sort is one that urgently requires us to confront issues of the morality of the law. While the reader of Neusner's work wants very much to know what he has to say about this problem, Neusner does not address it at all. Presumably, he sees it as an issue which is not a concern for the authors of Mishnah, but one that arises at a later time and out of different interests. It is testimony to his singleness of purpose in this work that he does not yield to the strong temptation to deal with such issues, however interesting they may be in their own right. Whatever he judges to be outside the scope of the history of the mishnaic law of women is, by virtue of that fact alone, outside the scope of his present study. To introduce it would be to violate his own canon, namely, that we are to understand Mishnah in its own terms and not from the perspective of other times, other works, and other interests.

This rigorous hewing to the line leads occasionally to judgments which seem questionable, although perfectly sound within the context of Mishnah itself. An example occurs in the discussion of Yebamot 1:1. Neusner compares the list of forbidden marital relations in the Mishnah with the list in Leviticus 18 on which it is based. He notes that while the Mishnah includes a man's daughter among the forbidden degrees, that prohibition is missing from the list in the Torah. His only comment on this fact is that prohibition of relations with one's daughter is "obvious". This may be a correct explanation of Mishnah, i.e., that given the other prohibited relationships it seems obvious to Mishnah that the daughter is clearly implied even though not mentioned explicitly in the Torah. However, taken from a larger perspective it is by no means obvious. One wonders why Scripture includes degrees of relationship which are more remote but fails to mention this very close degree. The puzzle is made more complicated by the fact that the *gemara* rules explicitly that a Noahide is permitted to have relations with his own daughter, that is, that the daughter is not among the forbidden degrees (Sanhedrin 58b). Maimonides accepts this source as authoritative and rules accordingly (*Issurei Biah*, 14:10, *Melakhim*, 9:5). There is a subject here eminently worthy of investigation. Why does Scripture overlook the case of the daughter, and why does the *gemara* rule in a way which seems so offensive to common morality? Neusner would argue that, however interesting these questions are in themselves, they are not a proper concern for someone doing his kind of history of mishnaic law. Each reader is likely to come across other such questions which are of great interest to him and which he wishes might have been treated by Neusner. What must always be kept in mind are the precise limits which the author has set on his work. From his point of view, correctly I believe, every pursuit of such interesting bypaths would weaken the work by deflecting it from its main lines.

The strictly historical studies in this work occur partially in the explanations of individual sections of the Mishnah, but above all

in the very important elaborations in Volume 5. Here Neusner sets forth the entire development of the mishnaic law of women as he sees it. The development of this law is set into four periods: before 70; 70 to 140, the time of Yavneh; 140 to 170, the time of Usha; 170 to 200, from the time of Usha to the redaction of the Mishnah. He identifies the various layers within the individual tractates that belong to each of these periods, as well as shows us which tractates are primarily from one period or another. His evidence consists of the attributions to named authorities whose approximate dates we know and of certain topics, subject-matters and styles of ruling which he shows can clearly be traced to a particular period. As in all such historical reconstruction, much depends on the perceptions and insight of the historian who does the work. Inevitably, scholars will take issue with Neusner on particular points. Richard S. Sarason does so in signed footnotes which are included in the book. What matters is the persuasiveness of the evidence for the basic structure and here we can see how strong Neusner's position is.

In his view the earliest stratum of the law of women reveals primarily the concerns and interests of a sectarian group. As he puts it, "Before 70 the authorities whose sayings appear in Mishnah formed a sect, which we tend to identify with the Pharisees of the Gospels' and Josephus' accounts." They were concerned with maintaining the integrity and purity of their own group and had little concern for larger issues. Neusner finds this concern reflected in the legislation which he assigns to this period. These early authorities developed "a set of rules, the salient traits of which appear to serve the social needs of the sect and to omit consideration of those matters which . . . lay beyond the power of the sect to control." After 70 a new historical reality demanded a new perspective. The limited sectarian concerns were no longer sufficient to meet the needs of a society deprived of its cultic center. Neusner never claims that any particular law can be explained as caused by the shift in social and political circumstances. He is much too cautious and disciplined a historian to fall into that elementary trap. What he does argue, however, is that one can discern a general development in the law which can best be accounted for by this social change. At Yavneh it became clear that law and administration would have to provide for a nation developing under new conditions. The process began at Yavneh and was brought to fulfillment at Usha. Yavneh's authorities did not themselves produce the whole range of necessary legislation, but they prepared the ground from which it subsequently emerged. "Yavneh is an interim-period, mediating between the time in which Mishnah's authorities appear to have been sectarian . . . and the age in which the authorities whose opinions register in Mishnah probably were, and surely aspired to be, public administrators." At Usha the practical concerns began to dominate the thinking of the Sages and to bring about the kind of law of women which could operate in a society living under Jewish administration. Even though they were not yet living under their own administration, the Ushans legislated with an eye to that future state in which they would be responsible for managing all of their own practical affairs. Neusner provides us with careful and detailed support for this historical account, support

(Continued on Page 8)

New Major (Continued from Page 4)

(or more) distinct disciplines of the humanities and social sciences through the study of how these disciplines deal with both Judaism and some other subject. In this major, Judaism serves as a rich source of cases, problems, and examples, to be considered in the context both of comparable cases deriving from other settings, and also of self-conscious discourse in problems of method. Method discussed apart from data leads to a certain empty abstractness. Data discussed apart from method tend toward a claim of self-evidence. Kept in tension, study of the use of diverse methods through their application to the problem of describing, analyzing, and interpreting diverse data, seems to me to promise a useful educational result. It is, specifically, to prepare the student to confront a world of puzzlement with some of the equipment needed to take apart, and put together, puzzles of culture, familiar and unfamiliar, at one and the same time.

Requested response:

My present purpose is to lay out a theory of a major and to request the comments of colleagues as to its educational merit within a liberal arts B.A.

Jacob Neusner
Director, Center for the
Study of Judaism,
Brown University

Fox (Continued from Page 7)

which merits the most careful consideration of every serious student of these matters.

While Neusner claims to limit these volumes to a study of the history of the mishnaic law of women, this is in certain respects an overly modest description. The theoretical framework for all of his studies of Mishnah is, in this reviewer's opinion, itself a major contribution to our thinking. Neusner argues that Mishnah should not be understood simply as a system of law in the narrow meaning of that term. It is rather a work which contains and reflects ideas and doctrines of the highest interest both for the history of ideas and the history of religions. It has been suggested by some contemporary thinkers (among them Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik) that the *halakhah* is the most important single source of Jewish thought, since it crystallizes and puts into objective form the major ideas of the Jewish religion. Various people have paid lip service to this assertion, but very few have taken it seriously enough to make it the theoretical basis of a serious scholarly study. Yet this is precisely what Neusner is attempting to do in the larger work of which the present volumes are a part.

For him what makes Mishnah ultimately important is the world-view which informs it, the implicit metaphysics on which it is based and to which it seeks to give expression through the medium of law. As such, Mishnah is not simply a historical document which

expresses historically conditioned views. It is a profound religious work which transcends history while being deeply involved in historical reality. "The meaning of Mishnah will only be discerned," he says, "when the whole system of Mishnah has been laid forth as it must be. This is to see Mishnah as a historical thing which endures, makes sense of a world to which happenings, the facts of history, are essentially irrelevant." He wants to study the total context, to respond with perception to that which is included and that which is excluded, to reflect on the whole, and to perceive the world-view of Mishnah as a whole.

This is the most intellectually challenging and exciting aspect of Neusner's work. The meticulous study of each section of the text, the dealing with countless details, even the formulation of a sound historical account of the development of Mishnah's law, these are all valuable in themselves, but they are even more valuable as the necessary means to the higher goal of grasping the central doctrinal thrust of Mishnah. As one moves from the small particulars to the large overarching insights the risk increases, but so do the rewards. There is less danger of error in working on the small scale materials. If one stops there, however, he rests with comparatively unrewarding certainties. The move to the highest level of comprehensive and systematic meaning is hazardous, since here the likelihood of seeing what we want instead of what is there increases considerably. The risk is worth taking for the privilege of a breadth and depth of vision which we can get in no other way.

For Neusner the sages of the Mishnah were not small scale legalists working with petty ideas. They were serious and original thinkers, concerned with the highest matters, both human and divine. The law was for them the ideal medium in which to work out and express their world view. It provides the disciplined connection to the details of human life, relates those details to the divine, and becomes the vehicle through which profound religious ideas are given a form which makes them a permanent part of the structure of society.

We cannot here detail the world-view of Mishnah as it begins to take form in Neusner's work thus far. To do so would be to do him and the ideas themselves an injustice, since a necessary condition of dealing with these ideas responsibly is to see them as they emerge from the detailed legal contexts. There is no greater challenge to students of Mishnah than that which Neusner directs at them by insisting on the philosophical-theological significance of that great document. If, when he completes the entire work, he can sustain and give full expression to this vision of Mishnah, he will have enriched Jewish thought immeasurably. This last achievement will put us in his debt even more than all he has done so far to clarify the meaning of Mishnah and to set forth its history

Gersonides, *The Wars of the Lord, Treatise III: On God's Knowledge*. Translated by Norbert M. Samuelson. Toronto. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1977. 323 pp.

Reviewed by T. M. Rudavsky (Ohio State University)

Although one of the most interesting of medieval Jewish philosophers, Gersonides' philosophical works have been relatively neglected until recently. His major work *Milhamot haShem* (*Wars of the Lord*) is a compilation of a number of problems central to the 14th-century Jewish-Aristotelian synthesis: these include the immortality of the soul, prophecy, God's omniscience and divine providence. No complete critical edition or translation of the Hebrew text yet exists, although portions of the work have been translated. (A summary of available Hebrew texts and current translations is given in M. Kellner's helpful paper, "R. Levi Ben Gerson: A Bibliographical Essay", *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore*, 12 1979.) Hence Samuelson's recent translation of treatise III of *Milhamot Hashem* is a welcome contribution to this growing body of literature.

Treatise III is devoted to the problems associated with God's omniscience, and is closely related to treatises II and IV which examine the implications of this knowledge with respect to prophecy and divine providence. Treatise III comprises six chapters, roughly divided as follows: chapters one and two critically assess the views of Aristotle and Maimonides concerning God's knowledge of particulars; chapter three contains an exhaustive critique of Maimonides' theory of equivocal predication; chapter four presents Gersonides' own characterization of the nature of God's knowledge; and finally, in chapters five and six this theory is shown to be both self-consistent and consistent with Biblical teaching.

Gersonides is one of the very few Jewish medieval philosophers who, in answer to the paradox of divine omniscience and human freedom, upholds incompatibilism. Unlike his predecessors, most notably Maimonides, who claimed both that God has foreknowledge of future contingents and that human freedom is unimpeded by this knowledge, Gersonides claims that God does not know future contingents as particulars; rather his knowledge extends to them only *qua* universals. Recently, a revival of interest has been occurring among contemporary scholars concerning medieval discussions of divine providence and omniscience; in light of this resurgence, Samuelson's edition is a particularly timely contribution to medieval Jewish discussions of the problem.

This edition provides an accessible translation for the reader interested in the formal aspects of the problem of divine omniscience. Samuelson's work is in two parts: first, a critical introduction to Gersonides' works in general, and second, the translation of treatise III of *Milhamot haShem*. In the lengthy critical introduction (80 pages), Samuelson not only lays out the formal aspects of the arguments contained in the third treatise, but also supplements his discussions with a brief synopsis of those aspects of Gersonides' thought that are crucial to an understanding of his arguments. These include discussions of his metaphysical scheme of essences as well as epistemological and logical distinctions. Samuelson's synopses

are informative for the general reader who is unacquainted with Gersonides' metaphysics. However, since few references are given to sources other than those already mentioned in the textual notes to treatise III, this synopsis is less helpful for the reader who wishes to follow up these discussions in other parts of *Milhamot haShem*.

By far the most invaluable aspect of Samuelson's edition are the textual notes and commentary. In contradistinction to the historical notes found in most translations of medieval Jewish philosophical texts, Samuelson's notes are analytic and serve to unpack the particular logical arguments found in Gersonides' work. The contrast between the historical and analytic approaches becomes explicit when we compare Samuelson's work with that of Charles Touati who in 1968 published a French translation of treatises III and IV of *Milhamot haShem* (*Levi ben Gerson, Les guerres du seigneur, livres 3 et 4*, transl. C. Touati, Paris, 1968). Both Samuelson and Touati base their translations on a number of manuscript editions which correct Kellerman's edition and German translation (Leipzig, 1866); a list of manuscript variations is given by Samuelson on page 87. The most striking difference between the two editions, however, occurs not in the text itself but rather in the commentaries. Whereas Samuelson's textual notes are critical, Touati's are historical; whereas Samuelson is concerned primarily with the logical arguments used by Gersonides, Touati is concerned with tracing his historical sources and influences. A brief comparison of several passages should suffice to exemplify this difference.

In chapter II of treatise III, Gersonides offers eight arguments refuting those philosophers who have argued that God must know particulars. In the course of discussing the sixth of the arguments, Touati notes the striking similarity between Gersonides' presentation and that of Averroes in the *Decisive Treatise*, although he is careful to point out that Gersonides might have been unfamiliar with this work (Touati, *op cit*, p 48). Samuelson, on the other hand, does not comment upon Averroes' treatment; rather, he analyzes the logical structure of the sixth argument both in his introduction (pp 15-18) as well as in the textual notes (pp 116-120). Both analyses make extensive use of Aristotle's sea-fight paradox (first presented in Aristotle's *De Interpretatione*, chapter 9) which reflected the dilemma surrounding the status of propositions about future contingent events. Samuelson's use of the sea-fight example is a bit confusing, however, for rather than explicitly discussing Gersonides' own solution to the paradox, Samuelson extrapolates from treatise III what Gersonides *might* have said. In light of the importance of Aristotle's sea-fight paradox for later discussions of divine omniscience, it might have been illuminating to present pertinent passages from Gersonides' commentary on *De Interpretatione*, chapter 9.

In chapter III of the third treatise, Gersonides argues in answer to his objectors that although God's knowledge does not extend to particulars, this lack does not constitute a deficiency in God's nature. Touati credits this statement originally to Ibn Daud (Touati, *op cit*, pp. 54; 81). Samuelson does not mention Ibn Daud's contribution to the problem of divine omniscience; in fact, aside from presenting Gersonides' criticisms of Maimonides, Samuelson does not discuss any other medieval contributions to the problem.

(Continued on Page 16)

David Jacoby, *Recherches sur la Méditerranée Orientale du XIIIe au XVe siècle — Peuples, sociétés, économies*. London, Variorum Reprints, 1979. 372 pp.

Reviewed by Joseph Shatzmiller (University of Toronto)

This is the second collection of studies that Professor David Jacoby has published with "Variorum Reprints" of London. As our distinguished colleague from the Hebrew University is not involved exclusively in Jewish history, one understands why seven out of twelve studies of the book say very little, or nothing, about Jews or Judaism. They deal rather with aspects of social, political and legal history of the eastern Mediterranean in the high and late middle ages. Jacoby, a leading scholar in the field, draws not only on the immense bibliography he commands, but also on his discoveries at the *Archivio di stato di Venezia*. The last five articles however, are dedicated entirely to aspects of Jewish history, mostly in the islands of Crete and Candia and in Constantinople. In the longest of the articles (No. VIII in the edition: "Variorum" does not provide continuous page enumeration) we are presented with the history of the Jews in Venice from the 14th century down to the middle of the 16th century.

A document of August 12, 1314, discovered by Jacoby, brings forward precious information about the Jewish community of Crete, its institutions and its relations with the government of Venice. We learn from it that the local inquisitor, Andreas Doto, tried around that time to remove the Jew Shabbetai from his position of *missetarius* (or *messeta*), a public office which gave him responsibility over collecting taxes on all commercial activities. Not surprisingly, the Venetian government did not go along with this "pious" initiative. It rather considered the inquisitor's activities as an intrusion into its own jurisdiction. (*Novitates insolitas et iniusta gravamina*. Compare for other countries of the time, J. Parkes, *The Jew in the Medieval Community*, New York, 1976, pp. 136-141). The opinion of two jurists that the Venetian government solicited on that occasion is made part of an official document issued in August 1314. When the political history of the Jews will again come under scholarly study this precious document will surely constitute a very important source for discussion and analysis.

Social and political history are featured in this collection. Dealing with Venetian Jews in Constantinople (No. XIII), Jacoby traces communal structures, insists rightly on the importance of taxation in formulating these institutions, and also dwells on the relations between Jews and their neighbours. Talking about the Jews of Crete (No. X) our author considers marriage patterns, migrations, and the emergence of communal leadership. Most fascinating, nevertheless, is the story of David Mavrogonato, a Jew of Candia who surfaces in our historical documents in the 1460s, and who was known up to this time to historians only accidentally. For Jacoby his amazing career constitutes a subject for a most interesting investigation (XI, "A Jewish Agent in the Service of Venice—David Mavrogonato of Candia"). Not only do we discover a Mediterranean Jewish businessman who has definite taste

for adventure—for spying and for secret missions in Ottoman territory (he was there on four occasions); David Mavrogonato's position enabled him to act as an emissary (*Shtadlan*) for his Jewish brethren in the island. Indeed he did obtain much for them from the *Consiglio dei dieci*, the governing council of Venice. However, Mavrogonato used his close relationship with the authorities for his personal benefit as well, sometimes at the expense of other Jews. Like many Jews of similar status, he contributed only symbolically to the communal taxation. On another occasion he forced one of his co-religionists to evacuate a house which he coveted. The Jews of Candia were torn between a sense of apprehension for the man and his methods, on the one hand, and sentiments of gratitude for what he had done for them, on the other. They found a way to express their appreciation and recognition: in Hebrew documents of the time David Mavrogonato is mentioned as having the title of *Condestabulo*, a title which was otherwise reserved for communal leaders only. This, Jacoby assures us, in spite of the fact that Mavrogonato was never elected to such a position. From a letter written by the Doge of Venice on December 18, 1470 we learn that David Mavrogonato lost his life "in service" of Venice, probably on one of his missions.

In "The Jews of Venice from the 14th Century down to the 16th Century", Jacoby, unsatisfied with what has been achieved by previous scholars, offers us a critical and up-to-date discussion of almost all aspects of life of the Jewish community in the city of the Lagoon. The monograph deals with their economic (banking) activity, political status, topographic location, and also with the anti-Jewish feelings that existed in the society. The status of the Jews is compared (which is quite rare in our modern literature) with that of other minority groups in the city. Jacoby does not escape the torturing questions as to when Jewish history starts in the city. Can we accept the testimony of a document from 1152 according to which the city then had some 1300 Jews? Jacoby rejects this testimony; for him the document is misdated and was written four hundred years earlier. What about the fact that the Island of Spinalonga was given the name "*Giudecca*" sometime in the 13th century, if not before? This too should not worry us, as the etymology of the term might not at all have to do with "Jew", or "Judaism" but rather with *Zudèga* or *Giudicati* referring to rebels banished to the island in the 9th century. Jacoby's point of view, expressed in 1973, was endorsed recently by another specialist, Benjamin Ravid, in his "The Jewish Mercantile Settlement of Twelfth and Thirteenth Century Venice; Reality or Conjecture" in the *AJS Review* Vol. 2 (1977) pp. 201-225. For both, I presume, the first document asserting Jewish existence in Venice is one written in 1314. From this point on we have an almost unbroken flow of evidence. Thus, to quote one example, in 1329 we meet in Venice four Jews from Zurich, whose residence in the city was temporary. The political status of the Jews is marked by uncertainty through the 14th and 15th centuries. Each charter or *condotta* establishing the conditions of their residence had to be renewed and reconfirmed periodically. It is only at the beginning of the 16th century, with the difficulties that Venice had to undergo, that the authorities decreed a permanent Jewish establishment in the city.

Marion A. Kaplan, *The Jewish Feminist Movement in Germany: The Campaigns of the Jüdischer Frauenbund 1904-1938*. Westport, Greenwood Press, 1979. viii, 229 p. (Contributions in Women's Studies, #8)

Reviewed by Marsha Rozenblit (University of Maryland)

The reigning myth of German-Jewish historiography is that, with certain exceptions, most nineteenth and twentieth century German Jews were extremely assimilated, more concerned with their German loyalties than with Judaism, reminded of their Jewish origins only by a steady barrage of anti-Jewish invective generated by an antisemitic environment and their need to defend themselves from these attacks. Some recent scholarship has begun to erode the standard interpretations. Ismar Schorsch's *Jewish Reactions to German Antisemitism*, for example, cogently argued that the members of the *Centralverein*, the largest Jewish defense organization in Germany, while certainly assimilated and devoted to German *Kultur* were, nevertheless, also deeply concerned with the meaning of their Jewishness. Works by Monika Richarz, Jacob Toury and others have also added to our understanding of the problematic of Jewish identity in Germany.

By turning scholarly attention away from the Berlin-centered, male-centered studies of German-Jewish elites which have dominated historiography, Marion Kaplan's excellent study, *The Jewish Feminist Movement in Germany: The Campaigns of the Jüdischer Frauenbund 1904-1938*, challenges the prevailing notions about assimilation and the depth of Jewish religious sentiments and ethnic attachments in Germany. Her persuasively argued and tightly written analysis of the *Jüdischer Frauenbund* (JFB) reveals that at least among German-Jewish women there was a staunch adherence both to traditional Judaism and to Jewish survival in Germany. The members of the JFB were strongly tied to and identified with the *Gemeinde*, the local Jewish community. Moreover, JFB members — and there were 50,000 of them by the late 1920s, representing about one-quarter of all German-Jewish women — were concerned with religious practice, Jewish education, and establishing largely Jewish social networks. Their campaigns against white slavery, for the vote in the Jewish community, and for more career opportunities for women, derived not only from their feminism, but also from their attempt to strengthen the Jewish community of Germany.

Kaplan coherently argues that the JFB and its activities can be understood only in terms of the intersection of the three-fold identity of its members: as German feminists, as Jews, and as German-Jewish feminists. As German feminists, the JFB fought as part of the *Bund Deutsche Frauenvereine* for common feminist goals. Yet as Jews, these middle-class housewives saw a need to create an organization to deal with specifically Jewish problems, while at the same time provide themselves with a social network within which they could associate largely with other Jews. These Jewish women, under the able leadership of Bertha Pappenheim (Freud's "Anna O"), exemplified the general ambivalence of Jews in Germany. They regarded themselves as patriotic Germans, as well as loyal

Jews, and like most German Jews, saw no contradiction between allegiance to *Deutschtum* and *Judentum*. Yet, they also sought the warmth and congeniality of a largely Jewish social milieu. Finally, as Jewish feminists, they created an organization which confronted the problems and the status of Jewish women, in general, as well as the plight of poor Eastern European Jewish women, in particular. Loyal to Germany, German feminism and Jewish life in Germany, the women of the JFB "enjoyed a feeling of ethnic community and preferred to work together on behalf of their own people" (p. 85).

The merging of the three identities of the JFB is most clearly revealed in Kaplan's excellent chapter on the JFB's campaign against Jewish participation as prostitutes and as pimps in the white slave trade. As feminists, the members of the JFB were opposed to prostitution in general and to the hypocritical regulation of this vice in Germany. As Jews, JFB women campaigned against white slavery because of a concern for the poor Jewish girls who were its victims, and because they wanted to diffuse an issue which could be — and was — exploited by antisemites. Finally as Jewish feminists the JFB members argued that the existence of Jewish prostitutes was a result of the low status of women in Jewish law and in Jewish culture. Consequently, in addition to the practical social work they did for the victims and potential victims of white slavery, the JFB called for a revision of Jewish marriage and divorce laws, improvement in the status of women in Jewish law in general, and for better education for Jewish girls. They viewed these demands as an excellent way to safeguard the continued healthy existence of the Jewish people.

The commitment of these Jewish feminists to the Jewish community of Germany, and to a more elevated place for women within that community, is nicely illustrated by the JFB struggle for female suffrage and leadership positions within the *Gemeinde* itself. In demanding voting rights for women after 1919, when German women were enfranchised, the members of the *Jüdischer Frauenbund* saw themselves as applying the standards of their larger society to the Jewish community. Moreover, as traditional Jews, the JFB based its arguments for voting rights not on abstract notions of equality, but rather on halachic principles. Although they met with only limited success, and the JFB and Jewish women in general continued to encounter a good deal of opposition in their bid for responsible leadership positions within the community, Bertha Pappenheim and her followers passionately argued that female suffrage and participation in *Gemeinde* affairs would serve to strengthen and revitalize Jewish life in Germany.

The nature of the feminism of the *Jüdischer Frauenbund* is the most perplexing and problematic aspect of its identity. Like most German feminists, and in contrast to their American and British sisters, the members of the JFB were neither radical nor suffragettes. The feminism of the JFB was social feminism, that is, it sought to improve the status of women and expand the sphere of women's lives from the home into the public domain through the extension of the traditional female role as mother and housewife. Unlike contemporary American Jewish feminists, the JFB never demanded full female religious equality.

(Continued on Page 19)

Harriet Pass Freidenreich, *The Jews of Yugoslavia: A Quest for Community*. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979. xiv, 323 pp.

Reviewed by Hillel J. Kieval (University of Washington)

Harriet Pass Freidenreich's *The Jews of Yugoslavia* is a detailed and well-documented study of the three major Jewish communities in Yugoslavia between the two World Wars: Sarajevo, Belgrade, and Zagreb. It is a communal history, dedicated to laying bare the essential features of Jewish institutional life in the South Slavic lands in the twentieth century, and herein lies the book's cardinal weakness. Jewish history can be successfully presented in "communal" terms when the moving force in the narrative is an autonomous, living community. One might even argue that such an approach can prove instructive when the official Jewish community is undergoing a process of dissolution, such as occurred generally in Central Europe from the end of the eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century. But to attempt to explain the cultural, political, and social dimensions of as diversified a Jewry as that which lived in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes at the close of World War I in terms of "community" is to reduce its experience to fragments.

Proof enough for this contention lies in the author's inability to satisfy the dramatic expectations which she places before the reader in the Introduction. She points out the disunity in South Slavic history prior to 1918, the "wide spectrum of ethnic and religious diversity," the fanatical hostility between the Eastern Orthodox Serbs and the Roman Catholic Croats, and the existence of a sizeable Muslim minority. In this context Freidenreich correctly adds that the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes allowed for bringing together in one political unit of two distinct groups of Jews — the Sephardim of the former Ottoman territories and the Ashkenazim of the old Habsburg Empire. The author goes so far as to say that the distinction between the Sephardic, Ladino-speaking Jews of Yugoslavia and their Ashkenazic, German- or Hungarian-speaking coreligionists "mirrored to a certain extent the conflict between Serbs and Croats, the East and the West." This might be a suggestive approach to the study of Yugoslavian Jewish history, but unfortunately this is the last one hears of it. Most of the rest of the book is devoted to the deciphering and assimilation of communal records.

Thus, after reading brief descriptions of the three communities of Sarajevo, Belgrade, and Zagreb, one learns such remarkable bits of information as: "the local community formed the basic organizational unit within Yugoslav Jewry"; "the synagogue did not serve as the exclusive focal point of Jewish existence"; "the board of directors was responsible to the membership for its actions." I have taken these quotations from a span of only three pages (72-74). It is sad to report that much of the book abounds in similar banalities. For example, the author recites the duties of the rabbi as defined by the communal statutes of the Belgrade Sephardic community (there were twelve tasks in all, but the tenth duty, "to conduct all other usual religious functions . . . which the communal board delegated to him," seems to cover just about every-

thing), but makes no effort to assess the significance of such a finding. We learn that the Hevra Kaddisha of Zagreb in 1924 was entrusted with the tasks of caring for and visiting the sick, supporting the indigent, burying the dead and preparing the body ritually for burial, reciting prayers in memory of the deceased, and administering legacies and endowments. Is it too presumptuous to assume that the Hevra Kaddisha had been fulfilling the same obligations in hundreds of European Jewish communities for nearly ten centuries before the Zagreb society issued these particular statutes? Throughout the many pages on communal structure and institutions one is forced to ask: What is Yugoslavian about all of this? Why is what is being reported important?

I mention the book's shortcomings with a deep sense of regret, because it does represent — for all of its faults — a valuable contribution to the study of European Jewish history. I cannot think of another monograph, accessible to Jewish scholars, general historians, or undergraduates, which treats Yugoslav Jewry as thoroughly as does Freidenreich. And it is clear from the book's documentation that the author has read enormous quantities of Serbo-Croatian material, including a good deal of contemporary periodical literature, in the preparation of this study. In short this book is all we have on Yugoslavia, and Freidenreich has performed a great service in writing it.

Primarily my feeling of regret stems from the conviction that there must be so much more to say about the topic. Indeed Freidenreich herself touches all too briefly upon a number of issues which deserve closer attention. Why did the Sephardim of Sarajevo remain loyal to Ladino as their primary language longer than the Sephardim of Belgrade (and of Serbia generally)? Why did the Serbian Sephardim acclimate themselves to Serbian language and culture more quickly than their Ashkenazic counterparts? More importantly, perhaps, what is the meaning of the 1895 and 1900 Serbian censuses, in the first of which 80 per cent of the Jews declared Ladino to be their mother tongue and in the second of which only 27% did so? Is this not evidence of tremendous fluidity in linguistic and cultural patterns? Would one be wrong in guessing that the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries were a time of great movement and change in South Slavic Jewish culture? Unfortunately, movement and change are qualities that never seem to find expression in Freidenreich's narrative.

The last quarter of the book, somewhat misleadingly entitled "The State and the Jews," is more satisfying than the rest, precisely because it is at this point that Freidenreich abandons the formal, institutional approach — which imposes an artificial quality of motionlessness on her subject — and allows the inner conflicts and dynamics of Yugoslav Jewry to express themselves. The chapter entitled "Crisis of Identity" suggests a richness of national and cultural positions which will simply not be subsumed under the all-too-frequently-invoked paradigm of Zionism versus assimilationism. Freidenreich touches upon, but does not analyze, a Sephardic version of Diaspora Nationalism, which was fairly widely-held among Sarajevo Jews in the early twentieth century, as well as important differences in emphasis between Sephardic and Ash-

(Continued on Page 19)

Moshe Pelli, *The Age of Haskalah. Studies in Hebrew Literature of the Enlightenment in Germany*. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1979. xi, 255 pages. (Studies in Judaism in Modern Times, volume 5)

Reviewed by Arthur Lesley (University of Toronto)

Moshe Pelli has collected in this volume ten articles he has published in English over the past decade on the writers who contributed to the Hebrew journal in Germany, *ha-Measef*. The articles, five of which address general themes and five of which survey the writings of individual contributors to the *Measef*, have been moderately revised, and the bibliography of each article has been updated. A brief introduction fairly sketches the approach taken in the chapters, and a comprehensive index and bibliography have been added. The scrupulous apparatus of the book lacks only reference to the earlier publication history, in both English and Hebrew, of the articles collected here.

To write about the Berlin *Haskalah* and the *Measefim* between 1783 and 1820 raises expectations of a long overdue revision to the account of the first sustained effort to establish European-style cultural works and institutions among Jews. That the origins of modern Hebrew literature might not be found exclusively in the *Haskalah* was already suggested by Shalom Spiegel in the twenties. And over thirty years ago, in lectures *On our Literature*, Dov Sadan further proposed considering Hasidic and anti-Hasidic writing roughly contemporary with the Berlin *Haskalah*, as being at least equally fundamental to the shaping of modern Hebrew literature. Besides the accumulating impression that the circle of Mendelssohn and his successors was only one of several centers of Jewish literary innovation, a revision of the histories of the *Haskalah* by Klausner, Slousch, Lachover, Zinberg and others might be expected to utilize the current expanded repertory of approaches to writing literary history. Even without attempting to study *Haskalah* in one of the versions of new literary history, such as Israeli historical poetics, a historian of literature might well benefit his study by using the approaches and findings of social and institutional history, of international European intellectual history, of generic and esthetic study as practiced in comparative literature. The historian of the *Haskalah* might also attempt to place the *Measefim* within an expanded overall interpretation of the course of modern Hebrew literature.

Professor Pelli demonstrates in the articles collected here the thorough mastery of the breadth and the detail of *Haskalah* writings that could be put to use in any of these kinds of revision. The reader acquainted with other articles by Pelli will be aware of some effort in the direction of generic study and close study of single belletristic works¹. In the articles brought together in this book, with a few exceptions, Pelli writes as both a revisionist and as the final continuator of those historians whose accounts of the *Haskalah* are still so well represented in the encyclopedias. Pelli's revision is ultimately a completion of what his predecessors attempted, and his articles become most interestingly revisionist where, seemingly against his will, his learning briefly takes him beyond the conceptual boundaries established by this method.

In the introduction, Pelli declares the purpose of his book to be

revision of the scholarly consensus about the *Measefim*: "One notes the growing tendency of some scholars to accept past judgment and past evaluations without the necessary scrutiny of the original texts and without first-hand knowledge of the total works of their authors." (p.1) These articles amply demonstrate Pelli's own exercise of these scholarly virtues. Defining the *Haskalah* as an attempt "to reshape and re-form Judaism and the Jews in accordance with the needs of modern times and the requirements of the European Enlightenment milieu" (p.2), he intends to consider "ideological topics concerning religious beliefs, religious practices and religious education . . . as . . . a prerequisite for an in-depth understanding of the literary, cultural and spiritual phenomena of the movement." (p.3) To trace the attitudes of the Berlin *Maskilim* on these ideological topics — reform to Jewish education and religion — Pelli accumulates statements from the whole range of their writings.

In the first two chapters, on "the impact of deism" and "intimations of religious reform," Pelli presents an intellectual background to the arguments discussed later. The discussion of deism, which represents all the external influences for change in Judaism, draws upon an eccentric combination of old classics of Enlightenment scholarship (Carl Becker, Paul Hazard and Ernst Cassirer) and pedantically chosen original sources. The nearly total disregard of Enlightenment scholarship from the past fifty years and the frequent use of question-begging descriptions of *maskilim* ("conservative"/"moderate"/"extremist" or "right-wing"/"left-wing") unfortunately render much of the discussion unconvincing. One of the fundamental distinctions made throughout the book is between "the extremists who wrote mainly in German and the moderates who expressed themselves in Hebrew" (p.26). After drawing the necessary conclusion, that these two groups wrote for different audiences, Pelli does not explore further either the rhetorical consequences of the choice of language or the inviting implications of his assertion that the "extreme positions [of some Hebrew *maskilim*] were different entirely in essence and in tone from the ones held by the German-Jewish enlighteners" (*Ibid.*) Instead he keeps resolutely to his intention of documenting the range of opinion of the *Measefim* about the reform of Jewish religion, education and social behaviour.

The third chapter illustrates both the conceptual limitations of such an approach and the way that they are sometimes overcome by Pelli's conscientious reporting of the surprising findings that his diligent scholarship has uncovered. Taking up a hoary scholarly commonplace, Pelli asks, "Did the Hebrew *Maskilim* 'Hate the Talmud?'" In answering the question, he justifiably restricts the *maskilim* to those who wrote in Hebrew, because a long chain of scholars — from Delitsch, Graetz and Bernfeld to Slousch, Mahler, Shohet and Barzilay — has credited this hatred to them. In defining Talmud as "an embodiment of the Jewish civilization, its thought and philosophy of life, and as a creative expression of the Jewish people" (p. 50), however, he risks obscuring the reason that traditionalist opponents of the *maskilim* would have made the charge in the first place. For them the Talmud was a sacred text, an

(Continued on Page 19)

Todd Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714-1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society*. Philadelphia. Jewish Publication Society, 1979. 370, xiv pp.

Reviewed by Paula Hyman (Columbia University)

For Jewish historians the processes of the acculturation and social integration of Jews are central to our understanding of Jewish modernity. Much of the literature in the field, however, has focused not so much upon behavior as upon the development of new attitudes to Gentile culture and society, stimulated first among the upwardly mobile Jewish haute bourgeoisie and expressed ideologically in movements for enlightenment and religious reform. In a major contribution to the field of modern Jewish history Todd Endelman has used the experience of Jews in Georgian England to reexamine commonly accepted notions of Jewish adaptation to the new socio-political conditions of the modern world and to illuminate the nature of Jewish modernization in general.

England has generally been considered a backwater of modern Jewish history. A small Jewish community, with only 15,000 members in 1800, it produced no intellectual figures of stature and seemed distant from the significant events which were happening on the Continent, and primarily in Germany. Endelman persuasively argues in this social history of a "minor" and "deviant" Jewish community that "no single overarching historical model can be employed to discuss the modernization of all segments of European Jewry." Moreover, he suggests that it is the Germanocentrism of much of modern Jewish scholarship which has led to the emphasis upon changing Jewish consciousness as the hallmark of modern Jews.

Endelman's investigation of the Jews of England reveals that significant change in behavior can precede, or occur in the absence of, ideological justification for such practices and without the stimulus of a sudden change in political status. Like Azriel Shohet he argues that abandonment of traditional customs happens through social contact and social imitation. Unlike Shohet, who relied to a great extent upon rabbinic condemnation of deviant behavior, Endelman makes innovative use of a wide variety of less tendentious sources, including the records of the Old Bailey. Further, Endelman rightly points out that social assimilation is not a phenomenon limited to the middle and upper classes. While he illustrates the accommodation of socially aspiring middle class Jews to the lifestyle of their Gentile peers, he also devotes considerable attention to a generally overlooked process, the parallel adaptation by the Jewish poor to the habits of the English lower classes. Thus, members of the Anglo-Jewish elite shaved their beards, became lax in religious practice, moved to London's West End, and acquired country estates. Only after they had achieved a high degree of acculturation and a significant measure of social acceptance did the Anglo-Jewish leadership abandon its indifference to politics and press for emancipation. Living in close contact with the English poor, the Jewish hawkers and street traders who comprised the majority of English Jewry as late as 1850 indulged in behavior which was typical of their class. They deviated from traditional Jewish religious observance, were no strangers to street fighting, and regularly appeared in court as pickpockets and receivers of stolen goods.

It was the criminal activity of the Jewish poor which attracted the paternalistic interest of Anglo-Jewish leaders concerned with the impact upon their own status of the negative Jewish stereotype inspired by the poor.

The acculturation of English Jews to the social patterns of their respective classes was facilitated by conditions particular to the British Jewish experience. In the first place, the authority of the Jewish community in England, in comparison to its continental cousins, was relatively weak. Moreover, British Jewry in the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth was essentially a community of immigrants, with regular infusions of Ashkenazim, primarily from Germany. Endelman might have placed even greater emphasis upon the ways in which the dislocation of migration facilitates the adoption of new forms of behavior. One wonders also whether immigrants from the Continent were those who had chafed the most under the constraints of the traditional Jewish community.

The characteristics of Britain as a host society also shaped the development of its Jewish minority. As the state which pioneered in the development of liberal political and economic thought, Britain was relatively tolerant towards the Jewish population. The liberal state in theory extended its protection to individuals regardless of origin. Moreover, the tiny Jewish settlement was only one of several religious minorities; Catholics stimulated more concern than did Jews. While the Jews were not fully emancipated until 1858, the restrictions imposed upon them were relatively slight, particularly in comparison with the rest of Europe, and scarcely interfered with their economic activity. Indeed, Endelman reaches the conclusion that a liberal society is conducive neither to Jewish group survival nor to creativity.

The nature of Christianity in England also favored toleration of the Jews. While Christian antisemitism survived into the Georgian period, it became secularized from the middle of the eighteenth century and was not as strong as on the Continent. Endelman cites the decline of religious fervor in the Anglican Church and attributes considerable influence to philo-Semites, who drew upon England's Puritan tradition. Although their ultimate goal was the conversion of the Jews, they tended to favor the amelioration of the Jews' political status.

Endelman's analysis of the interplay of British Jews with the English environment is so intelligent that one wishes he had transcended the periodization of British dynasties and brought his story to its conclusion with the political integration of the Jews in 1858. Had he done so, he might have answered a number of questions which his study raises. Was the influence of British philosemitism as significant a factor in the status and political fortunes of the Jews in the nineteenth century as he suggests it was earlier? Given the relative tolerance of English society which Endelman has illustrated, why were full political rights conferred upon the Jews only in 1858? Did the growing concern of Anglo-Jewish leaders with the attainment of full equality find expression in a belated ideological justification of social and religious change?

Written in a graceful style, *The Jews of Georgian England* is a fine example of the contribution which the concerns and techniques of social history can make to Jewish historical literature. As rich in insight as in information, it is important reading for all students of Jewish history.

Allon Gal, *Brandeis of Boston*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1980. xi, 271 pp.

Reviewed by Deborah E. Lipstadt (University of California, Los Angeles)

Ever since Yonathan Shapiro posited his revisionist theory that it was political self-interest and the desire to further his own career which motivated Louis D. Brandeis to affiliate with the American Zionist organization and assume active leadership of it, debate has raged over this issue. Shapiro contends that Brandeis was rejected (1913) by President-elect Woodrow Wilson for a cabinet position because he lacked the support of the Jewish community.¹ Varying theories had been previously offered to explain Wilson's actions. Some believed it was the result of the opposition of established business interests to the inclusion of the "People's Lawyer" in the cabinet. Others argued that it was the Massachusetts Democrats who did not wish such a powerful post to be awarded to one who had never been a party regular and who had repeatedly acted as a political independent.²

Shapiro explains it otherwise. He attributes the rejection to the opposition of Jacob Schiff and Louis Marshall, two of the most prominent Jewish communal leaders, both of whom objected to Brandeis' candidacy because he was not actively identified with the Jewish community.³ When Schiff was asked to evaluate Brandeis for Wilson, he wrote: "I have been asked from time to time recently whether Mr. Brandeis may be considered a representative Jew, and to this I was able to give a qualified reply only, but he is without doubt a representative American."⁴

As a result of this rejection, Brandeis recognized, Shapiro argues, that it was imperative for him to establish a power base within the Jewish community if he were to win a national appointment in the future. He discovered that the entrenched leaders of organizations such as the American Jewish Committee neither shared his political, social and economic beliefs nor were willing to share their power with him. He therefore turned to that group which was suffering the serious and debilitating consequences of the absence of prominent leaders: the American Zionist Organization. The strategy which Shapiro imputes to Brandeis was successful, as was proven in 1916 when Wilson nominated him to the Supreme Court. This time Schiff could find no reason to oppose him and Brandeis was confirmed.

Shapiro's theory has been actively contested by those who believe that

"... Brandeis' personal attachment to Zionism and his sense of honor are too well known and attested to by individuals who knew him personally to permit any credence to be given to suggestions that he could have acted with political calculation and deliberate self-interest in his service to the Jewish people."⁵

Brandeis' conversion to Zionism was, it is argued, the logical outcome of the confluence of political conviction and personal beliefs.⁶

This debate is fueled in part by the paucity of concrete indicators of Brandeis' interest in or connection with either the Jewish community as a whole or the Zionists in particular prior to his *seemingly*

sudden assumption of the leadership of the Zionist movement. His newly discovered concern appeared to be founded on an almost complete void. Nothing in his previous history seemed to allow one to predict, or even suspect, that in 1914, at age 58, he would become virtually obsessed by the fate and fortune of the Zionist cause. The impression of a sudden conversion was fortified by Jacob De Haas, Brandeis' major Zionist factotum and the man who made his rule—even in absentia—possible. He wrote that until Brandeis affiliated with the Zionists, he was not "regarded as a Jew locally or nationally."⁷

Much of the energy expended on this debate can now be directed elsewhere as a result of the publication of Allon Gal's *Brandeis of Boston*. Gal traces Brandeis' earliest years in Boston, starting with his enrollment in Harvard Law School, his decision to open a law practice in that city, his political activities, and his connection with the local Jewish community. He does so against a background of the city's political, ethnic and social climates in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. An interesting and provocative analysis, it casts serious doubt on Shapiro's theory and essentially disproves it.

The ethnic realities in Boston at the turn of the century, particularly the open hostilities between the Yankee and Irish communities, rendered it almost impossible for an individual to avoid being associated with his ethnic group. Oscar Handlin observed in his study of 19th-century Boston that one's societal stature was determined on the basis of occupation, income and "ethnic affiliation."⁸ Those who did not choose to identify were identified against their will. Among those particularly conscious of their "own separateness"⁹ were the Jews. As a Jewish attorney, Brandeis was acutely aware of this situation, since attorneys were generally confined to serving those in their own ethnic group. Although Brandeis did have non-Jewish clients, the old monied Yankee interests did not frequent his firm.

In addition to his ethnic identity, Brandeis bore other "handicaps," which served to isolate him further from sectors of the Boston non-Jewish community. He had not attended Harvard College, was a Southerner, a Progressive, and a Jew married to a Jewish woman with a distinctly Jewish-sounding name. Despite his publicly acknowledged intellectual stature and material success, Brandeis suffered what must have been painful social isolation. This was particularly so in Dedham, the home of many prominent Boston Brahmins, where the Brandeis family spent a portion of the year. Gal documents Brandeis' peripheral contacts with his Dedham neighbors as well as his ostracization, professionally and personally, by those in the Boston Bar.

His support of labor, attacks on banks and utilities, and challenges to established local and national political interests made him an anathema in many circles. Although his social isolation must be understood as being inextricably bound up with his political activities, it was not this alone which alienated him from the circles of the powerful Bostonians. His political causes only served to further strengthen the hostile atmosphere which already prevailed as a result of his being an outsider, a Jew and, nonetheless, successful.

While ethnic and social realities forced him consciously to think of himself, however peripherally, as a Jew, his association with the

(Continued on Page 16)

Lipstadt (Continued from Page 15)

Jewish community and his Jewish identity did not result solely from the Brahmin antisemitism he endured. Brandeis had a definite conception of a Jewish mission which was tinged with a feeling of family pride. His ancestors' Frankist background, of which he was well aware, may have been a determinant of his dissenting political tradition. Certainly his pride in identifying as a Jew was strengthened by his conviction that the primary importance and essential validity of Judaism lay in its inherent social and moral values. For the pre-Zionist Brandeis the Jews' task was to ensure that these values helped to realize the improvement of civic and moral life. His conception of the Jewish mission was to grow in depth and breadth as he moved closer to Zionism. His interpretation of Judaism *qua* humanism would expand to include a sense of Jewish individualism and nationalism.

Through most of the first decade of this century his Jewish activities were limited to regular, although minimal, contributions to the Jewish Federation appeal and the United Hebrew Benevolent Association. He maintained close business and social relations with Jews who were actively identified with the Jewish community. On occasion he did more than make financial contributions as, in 1902, when he played a role in the abrogation of the United States-Russia commercial treaty.

It was not, however, Jewish issues *per se* which drew him closer to the community. Rather, his Jewish consciousness grew as a result of his involvement in social reform movements. As the decade progressed, he increasingly came in contact with East European Jews, many of whom were social workers involved in social welfare reform. Their progressive tendencies appeared to him to be a natural offshoot of their Jewish heritage.

It was his participation as mediator in the 1910 New York City garment workers' strike that firmly established his conviction that Judaism was bound up in an intimate and inseparable way with a particular social ethos. The demeanor of the strikers and the manner in which the Jewish owners treated them, despite the serious differences which existed between them, made an indelible impression on Brandeis. It also made an impression on the Jews of Boston, who now considered Brandeis as their leader and their community's spokesman.

In the period following the strike, as a result of increasing contacts with East European Jews (many of whom were Zionists) and with Zionists leaders such as Nahum Sokolow and Aaron Aronsohn, Brandeis began to work the component of Jewish uniqueness and Jewish national identity into his conception of the Jewish mission. No longer did he believe Judaism valid only because of its socially moral philosophy. His commitment to cultural pluralism as the ideological framework for the composite American ethnic identity was evolving during this period. It provided an harmonious basis for his growing pride in Jews' contributions, not only as social reformers and political activists, but as Jews to pluralistic America.

Allon Gal's intriguing and convincing analysis of *Brandeis of Boston* answers a question that has perplexed many and substantiates that which others, such as Ben Halpern and Melvin Urofsky, have already posited. Ultimately, Louis Brandeis' commitment to Zionism must be understood not as a sudden conversion, but as the

natural culmination of a variety of forces. They include his long-standing but continuously evolving Jewish identity, which increased in intensity as a result of both his rejection by his fellow Bostonians and the values he shared with his fellow Jews, as well as his conviction that Zionism and Zionists represented the best of those Progressive ideals — ingenuity, integrity, conviction and experimentation — to which he had devoted his professional and personal self.

By August 1914, when he accepted the leadership of the Zionist organization, he was convinced that the Zionists were the "new Puritans." They looked to the future in the context of an age-old tradition, a tradition which Brandeis, during his years in Boston, had come to consider as his own.

NOTES

¹Yonathan Shapiro, *Leadership of the American Zionist Organization, 1897-1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971), pp. 61-66.

²A.L. Todd, *Justice on Trial: The Case of Louis D. Brandeis* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964), p. 67.

³Shapiro, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

⁴Jacob H. Schiff to Max Mitchell, February 17, 1913 (Brandeis Papers), as cited in Shapiro, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

⁵Ben Halpern, "Brandeis' Way to Zionism," *Midstream* October 1971, p. 3.

⁶Melvin I. Urofsky, *A Mind of One Piece: Brandeis and American Reform* (New York: Scribner's, 1971).

Melvin I. Urofsky, *American Zionism: From Herzl to the Holocaust* (New York: Anchor Press, 1975), pp. 117-133.

⁷Jacob De Haas, *Louis D. Brandeis: A Biographical Sketch* (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1929), p. 29.

⁸Oscar Handlin, *Boston's Immigrants: A Study in Acculturation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 219.

⁹*Ibid.*

Rudavsky (Continued from Page 9)

Samuelson is quite aware of these differences between his own treatment of Gersonides and more "standard" treatments. Since his method is described so clearly in the preface, Samuelson's statement is worth quoting:

the main concern of these notes is analysis and explanation of the meaning of the text. It should be emphasized that what is explained is what Gersonides said and not what Gersonides said in the light of his predecessors and contemporaries . . . No question is raised within the scope of this book concerning the accuracy of Gersonides' exegetical conclusions . . . Nor is any attempt made to show all of the sources of Gersonides' thought . . . All that is said here is that the purpose of this commentary is primarily philosophic and not historical, and that there is enough material of philosophical interest to justify this limitation on the scope of the work. (p xi)

For those who desire a historical treatment of the problem of divine omniscience, Touati's edition supplies ample historical references. In contrast, Samuelson has clearly demonstrated the abundance of philosophical material contained in Gersonides' argument. Ideally, one might hope for a synthesis of these two approaches. However, Samuelson's edition of treatise III of *Milhamot haShem* is an admirable reminder that inasmuch as medieval Jewish thinkers were no less philosophically rigorous than their Christian and Islamic contemporaries, they surely deserve as critical scrutiny.

John F. Morley, *Vatican Diplomacy and the Jews During the Holocaust, 1939-1943*. New York, Ktav Publishing House, 1980. 327 pp.

Reviewed by Monty Noam Penkower (Touro College)

"We can say," Joseph Goebbels exhorted readers of *Der Angriff*, "that an understanding of this eternal enemy is more crucial to the building of the German racial community than an understanding of any secular big power." Writing a year before *Kristallnacht*, the Nazi propaganda chief identified his subject: "those close-mouthed prelates of the Roman Curia with their bejeweled crucifixes," whose steadfast policies century after century now ruled almost four hundred million faithful with unique strength. Since National Socialists knew best that "the faith that moves mountains makes history," the citizens of the Third Reich were enjoined to keep increased vigil over the Vatican and its influence worldwide.

His colleagues, all through their bloodstained appearance on the stage of history, agreed in viewing the Catholic Church's power with anxious admiration. Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* expressly noted Rome's very effective techniques of mass persuasion, and the NSDAP assiduously adapted many of these characteristics for its pseudo-religion: messiah, martyrs, apostles, an elaborate hierarchical structure, pilgrimages to the Nuremberg rally, the twisted cross as symbol, an emphasis on complete obedience and order. The July 1933 Concordat, pressed from the Church's side by then Secretary of State Pacelli, satisfied both sides claiming a common adversary in the Soviet Union. *Reichsführer* SS Heinrich Himmler, who modeled Germany's racial elite after the Jesuit Order, allowed its officers to partake publicly of Communion. The Nazi leadership never provoked the Vatican during World War II. A mutual truce, if strained at times, continued to the day of the *Führer's* suicide.

This *modus vivendi*, according to most students of the subject, persisted as well in the face of the Holocaust. Even when confronted by the most monstrous crime in mankind's annals, a deafening silence reverberated far beyond the corridors of Vatican City. The researches of Guenter Lewy, Saul Friedländer, and Carlo Falconi provide impressive support for the fundamental charge levelled in Rolf Hochhuth's pioneering drama *The Deputy* (1963), Pinchas Lapide's apologia notwithstanding. The consistent unwillingness of Pope Pius XII (formerly Pacelli), a cold individual with prior diplomatic service as nuncio in Germany and a phobia about Communist domination over postwar Europe, to confirm the "Final Solution" publicly and then impose religious sanctions against its perpetrators has been carefully documented by these and other scholars. Sam Waagener uncovers no substantiating evidence for claims that the Church provided aid for thousands of Jews evading death in southern France and Italy. In sum, there is precious little to celebrate in this record.

Vatican serial publication in recent years of its archival materials relating to World War II only buttresses the severe indictment. John F. Morley's *Vatican Diplomacy and the Jews During the Holocaust, 1939-1943*, the critical effort of a Roman Catholic priest on Seton Hall University's faculty, is an able summary of relevant materials from the project's nine volumes to date. His analysis by country amply demonstrates that the nuncios, Secretary of State

Maglione, and, most of all, the Pope, opted for the criteria of reserve, prudence, and a diplomatic presence at all capitals in determining their goals. This policy, while helping baptized Jews and those seed of Abraham married to Catholics, precluded vigorous opposition to Nazi racial laws and the ultimate destruction of European Jewry despite striking evidence received in Rome of the latter. Nuncios Cassulo in Bucharest and Burzio in Bratislava proved exceptional in their attempts, however limited, to intercede on behalf of the one people marked for murder during that global conflict. Yet here, too, indifferent superiors remained content to focus on narrowly defined Catholic interests. The diplomacy of the Holy See, Morley concludes, therefore failed not only Jewry and many Church members under Nazi control, but betrayed its self-professed ideals of humanitarian responsibility and justice.

The author's primary reliance on the *Actes et Documents du Saint-Siege relatifs à la Seconde Guerre Mondiale* perforce sets limits to the inquiry undertaken. The investigation halts deliberately in *medias res*, he explains, because the *Actes et Documents* presently extend only to 1944 and the majority of the doomed Jews "had already been killed by then." One of the series' editors assured Morley that the published materials accurately reflect the Vatican archives on the Holocaust, but the claim must remain moot so long as scholars are still denied free access to the vital collection. Aside from information kept beyond the ken of academe, matters ignored in these volumes include the Pope's talks with German ambassador Weizsäcker and U.S. special envoy Myron Taylor, the mass slaughter of Jews, Gypsies, and Serbs in the war-bred Catholic state of Croatia, SS Col. Kurt Gerstein's thwarted attempt to tell Nuncio Orsenigo in Berlin about Belzec and Treblinka, and the efforts of some Catholic village priests to rescue Jews on their own initiative. The writer resorts to other (particularly Jewish) archives for supplementary material, but significant gaps remain.

Morley's arbitrary cut-off date forsakes a complete perspective, especially by neglecting the martyrdom of Hungarian Jewry. This paradigm *par excellence* of the Holocaust, given respective responses in the Jewish, Allied, and German camp, equally serves as the quintessential reflection of Vatican diplomacy during that epochal event. Pius XII possessed a detailed report on Auschwitz-Birkenau by two Jewish escapees who reached Slovakia at the end of April 1944 (not 1943, as Morley cites an Italian writer on p. 95); his special courier's resultant interrogation of these Jews; information from Nuncio Rotta and other Catholic clergy in Budapest; the American government's urgent request on May 25 that he threaten Hungary's predominantly Catholic population with religious sanctions. After an entire month passed, the Pope wrote privately to the Regent to help those "persecuted because of foreign race or nationality." (The country's Prince Primate, Cardinal Seredi, followed suit — after the deportations to Auschwitz-Birkenau had ceased.) His cautious approach, masking Jewry's singular agony and abdicating moral leadership, did not undergo any transformation following the pro-Nazi Arrow Cross coup in October.

Morley's concentration is constricted in other ways. Except for Croatia and Poland, his examination excludes countries not in diplomatic contact with the Holy See. Nothing therefore is learned, in relief, from the aid given Belgian Jews by Cardinal Van Roey and

(Continued on Page 18)

Penkower (Continued from Page 17)

Bishop Kerkhofs, or the outspoken stance against the deportations in the Netherlands taken by Archbishop de Jong. (There is no mention, at the same time, in the chapter devoted to Germany of Münster's courageous Bishop von Galen.) The author also avoids discussion of alternatives outside of diplomacy then available to the papal court. One may well argue, however, that public condemnation and the threat of excommunication against killers professing Catholicism — beginning with Hitler himself — cannot be divorced from Rome's conduct of foreign affairs, especially when the darkest nihilism enveloped Europe's landscape. More can be added about individual state attitudes, popular and nationalist, as determining factors in Christian reaction to the Holocaust, while some comparison should be made with other churches' reactions during those tragic years.

The failures of Vatican diplomacy in this regard, Morley properly ends, must finally be laid upon the individual who set what he characterizes as its "tone and pace." The only private contemporary communication about the war in Pius XII's hand which has come to light, a letter to Bishop Preysing in Berlin, is typical: The Vicar of Christ "acted charitably" in dispensing sizable American funds for rescue work and in having his previous Christmas message include a word about German actions against "non-Aryans." Papal caution was justified therein as a way of avoiding greater evils, but could anything surpass the demonic unchecked implementation of the Final Solution at the moment of this writing on April 30, 1943? Maglione gave the apparent answer, telling Weizsäcker during the Nazi roundup of Rome's Jews six months later that the Holy See wished to avoid giving "the German people the impression that it has done or wished to do the least thing against Germany during this terrible war." At the end of June 1944, the Pope expressed to Charles de Gaulle his "chief solicitude" for Deutschland's citizenry, coupled with his fear of Soviet expansion, only five days after dispatching his secret, circumscribed letter to Hungarian Regent Miklós Horthy. Even when the horror of liberated Buchenwald allowed the world to peer into the abyss which had claimed six million innocent human beings throughout Europe, the holder of the Keys of St. Peter, reported Great Britain's delegate to the Holy See, tried to distinguish between a minimum of war criminals and a docile, deluded majority of the German nation (at least 50 percent Catholic).

His predecessor suggested a radically different understanding. Falconi pointedly observes that Pius XI's March 1937 *Mit brennender Sorge*, opposing Nazi "blood" doctrine, failed to condemn the persecution of Jews (referred to as the classic deicides). Yet in June 1938, the same religious leader also commissioned the American Jesuit priest John La Farge to compose an encyclical including an assault on racism and antisemitism, which linked the contemporary persecution of Jews with its predominantly Christian sources from antiquity onwards. Apparent machinations by LaFarge's Jesuit Polish superior and Pius's death the following February, on the eve of a scheduled address by the Pope comparing Hitler with Nero, aborted the issue of *Humani Generis Unitas*. The next Pius

employed LaFarge's title for his first encyclical, but excised the section opposing racial theory and practice.

Appropriately, a later pontiff who did much on his own to save some of the Bible's Chosen People in their bleakest travail improved the ethical balance. As the Vatican's Apostolic Delegate to Turkey and Greece, Monsignor Angelo Roncalli moved energetically to save Jews in the Balkans. Together with Maglione and the head of the Section for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, Tardini, in mid-1943, he worried over the idea of Jewish hegemony in the birthplace of Christianity. (This fear, concurrently shared at least by prominent American Catholics and their denominational press, suggests a still nebulous connection between the Church's unwavering position on the Holy Land and its actions during the Holocaust which Morley and other sensitive specialists can probe in greater, more profitable depth.) Roncalli never permitted these hesitations to override the primary humanitarian imperative, however.

Pius XII sidestepped a request in September 1945, made during a private audience by the World Jewish Congress's Leon Kubowitzki (subsequently Aryeh Kubovy) with the encouragement of Jacques Maritain, that the Vatican issue an encyclical repudiating the charge of deicide. Roncalli, assuming the Throne of Peter years later as Pope John XXIII, fully realized by contrast that Rome could no longer escape its centuries-old guilt as first root cause of the Holocaust. The Church's statement on Jews in *Nostra Aetate*, repudiating antisemitism while not outrightly negating the traditional theology, signified unmistakably his inaugurating spirit of *aggiornamento*. John XXIII also planned to extend formal diplomatic recognition to Israel to coincide with publication of the Second Vatican Council's Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Churches, but his death consigned the noble intention to limbo. Pope Paul VI, expertly schooled in Vatican diplomacy during World War II as chief of the Section for Ordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs Montini, disregarded that idea upon his succession. Papal acknowledgment of the present stage in Jewish history remains outstanding.

"There is a time to be silent and a time to speak," counsels *Ecclesiastes*. The supreme hour for the Holy See to champion its claimed ideals struck with the advent of Adolf Hitler and the Holocaust. That clarion call was conspicuous by its absence, as Morely's monograph bolsters the increasingly evident record. Stark failure of the imagination and the will consequently prevailed. Other bastions of power, as I shall demonstrate in a forthcoming volume, deserve to be faulted in similar fashion. Since, however, the Vatican personifies spiritual mission on earth, in retrospect a harsher verdict needs be meted out as well: failure of the heart.

The Columbia University Center for Israel and Jewish Studies has published a catalogue of a library exhibition entitled *Perspectives on Jewish Messianism*. 66 rare books and manuscripts related to the theme are listed and described, and there are 18 full-page illustrations. Copies may be ordered directly from the Center for Israel and Jewish Studies, 511 Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

Lesley (Continued from Page 13)

exposition of the constitutional law of all Jewish communities, the source of authority for all rabbinic decisions up to the present. That is the Talmud that could provoke hatred in some, and uncompromising loyalty in others. In effect, Pelli has redefined the question to be, "Did any of the Hebrew *maskilim* have anything good to say about the Talmud?" That is a quite different question. Pelli answers it affirmatively with his usual fastidious documentation. He concludes that "[The Hebrew enlighteners'] depiction of the Talmud as an enlightened work of the Hebrew mind is comparable to their conceptualization of the Jewish religion *in toto*" (p. 54). Once Pelli recognizes that the enlighteners' citation of the Talmud to justify studying "secular" sciences is a tactical, rhetorical move, he recovers the polemical situation that his definition of the Talmud originally obscured. "The *maskilim*'s glorification of the Talmudic sages of yore is intrinsically related to their negative appraisal of their contemporary rabbis" (p. 71). In spite of the basic conceptual flaw in his definitions, Pelli has accepted, and partly digested, a conclusion that makes his original question uninteresting except as a prelude to a deeper understanding of the rhetoric of the Hebrew *maskilim*. A conscientious return to the sources has allowed him to revise the question, even more than the answer. It is this conscientious fastidiousness that is the greatest virtue of the book and its most promising contribution to Hebrew literary history.

The second half of the book, which surveys the writings of five major Berlin *maskilim* — Wessely, Gumpel, Satanow, Berlin and Euchel — demands less conceptual adroitness than the thematic essays, and demonstrates to greater advantage Pelli's scholarly virtues of mastery of the sources and attention to detail. Quite often his thorough familiarity with the primary and secondary material allows him, in the space of a footnote, to expose a historian's mistake, to trace a vendetta, or uncover an unsuspected biographical fact of significance. These virtues make the five final chapters the best accounts in English of the five authors studied.

All in all, the flaws of *The Age of Haskalah* belong to the school of writing history of ideas to which it belongs. It is the thoroughness and reliability of Pelli's documentation that makes the book valuable. The absence of any mention of pertinent work by such scholars as Simon Halkin, Peter Gay, Isaiah Berlin and, except for a slight exception, of Jacob Katz, would have been a graver flaw if the author's faithfulness to the sources did not frequently make a citation more suggestive than the concept it is intended to illustrate.

The Age of Haskalah is a perfect example of the perplexity in which all literary historians of Hebrew, to a greater or lesser extent, find themselves. As in Thomas Kuhn's account of *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, we are all aware that the customary ways of "doing literary history" are inadequate, and we all are attempting to systematize the unsettling questions that are posed even by our established conclusions. Competing paradigms of literary historiography abound, and eventually this agitation will be quieted by the recombination and predominance of some of them. It is possible to imagine a merger of Pelli's kind of expertise on a well-defined

school and period with the capacity for formulating developmental models exemplified by Israeli practitioners of historical poetics, and with the sensitive practical criticism that is no longer rare in Hebrew criticism. In the meantime, *The Age of Haskalah* makes its modest revision of the current scholarly consensus and exposes more primary material for inclusion in a future one.

¹ Notably in a series of articles in the *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, XX, XXII, XXIV.

Rozenblit (Continued from Page 11)

Kaplan argues that the conservative feminist posture of the *Frauenbund* was a source of its strength. The JFB was able to press for fairly far-reaching feminist goals and attract a large and diverse membership because it avoided abstract principles and spoke in terms of extending women's traditional role as nurturer in order to serve the larger Jewish community. The members of the *Frauenbund*, almost all middle-class housewives, were attracted by its social work program and might have been repelled by a more radical feminist program. The non-radical stance and "lady-like" approach of the organization enabled Jewish housewives, feminist or not, to feel comfortable within the JFB and to push for other demands which challenged a male-dominated world.

This book begins with a plea for non-elite history to revise the assimilationist picture generated from a study of elite groups alone. Yet, in studying the *Jüdischer Frauenbund*, Kaplan herself has studied an elite group, albeit a non-traditional one. She has discussed the ideology and activities of the leaders and propagandists of a mass-based organization. One is left wondering how the rank and file members of the JFB — or indeed all Jewish women in Germany — regarded feminist goals, the role of Jewish women in Jewish communal affairs, the nature of German-Jewish life, or the role of Jewish tradition in German-Jewish identity. Fortunately, Dr. Kaplan is now working on a social history of Jewish women in Imperial Germany (1870-1914). The tantalizing questions and possibilities of this book will, hopefully, be fully explored in that one.

Kieval (Continued from Page 12)

kenazic interpretations of Zionism itself. These are the kinds of issues over which the author might have paused at greater length in order (a) to consider parallels and contrasts with other multinational regions of Europe and (b) to arrive at some conclusions concerning the nature and direction of Jewish culture in twentieth-century Yugoslavia.

JEWISH STUDIES AT AMERICAN AND CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES: AN ACADEMIC CATALOG (Revised 1979)

Edited by Samuel Z. Fishman and Judyth R. Saypol

Published by the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations and the Association for Jewish Studies

Available only from B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, 1640 Rhode Island Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036

European Association for Jewish Studies Formed

The European Association for Jewish Studies was founded at a meeting called for that purpose at the Oriental Institute, Oxford University, on May 11-13, 1981, by the Center for the Study of Judaism at Brown University. Representatives of Jewish studies in Britain, France, Germany, Netherlands, Austria, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Hungary, the Nordic countries, as well as the State of Israel and North America, participated. Brown University financed the project with further grants from The Dover Foundation (Mr. Richard Scheuer), The Alperin-Hirsch Family Foundation (Mr. Max Alperin), and the Max Richter Foundation.

The first international meeting of the European Association for Jewish Studies will be held at Hertford College, Oxford University, on July 18-21, 1982. Officers of the Association for the coming year are as follows: President, Geza Vermes, Oxford; Secretary, H. E. Gaylord, Groningen; Treasurer, Philip Alexander, Manchester; Executive Committee, Gabrielle Sed-Rajna, Paris, Peter Schaefer, Cologne, and Paolo Sacchi, Turin.

Members of the Council of the Association for 1981-82, encompassing all who participated in the founding meeting, are as follows: for Britain, Geza Vermes and David Patterson, Oxford, Philip Alexander, Manchester, Bernard Jackson, Liverpool Polytechnic, Albert Friedlander, Leo Baeck College, Raphael Loewe and Michael Weizman, University College, London; for France, R. Goetschel, Strasbourg, Haim Zafrani, Paris, Gabrielle Sed-Rajna, Paris; for Germany, Peter Schaefer, Cologne, Arnold M. Godberg, Frankfurt, Martin Hengel, Tuebingen (by reason of illness absent from the Oxford meeting); for Switzerland, Clemens Thoma, Lucerne; for Spain, Angel Sainz-Badillos, Granada; for Austria, Guenther Stemberger, Vienna; for the Nordic countries, Helmer Ringgren, Uppsala; for Hungary, Alexander Scheiber, Budapest; for Italy, Paolo Sacchi, Turin, Daniela Piattelli, Rome, Mauro Pesce, Bologna; for the State of Israel, Uriel Tal and Zvi Malachi, Tel Aviv, Daniel Sperber, Bar Ilan, and Uriel Rapaport, Haifa; and for The Netherlands, Albert vanderHeide, Leiden, H. E. Gaylord, Groningen.

American consultants at the Oxford meeting were Eric Meyers, Duke University, for organization; William Scott Green, University of Rochester, for program; and Richard S. Sarason, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, for publications. The liaison committee for the 1982 meeting consists of Drs. Vermes, Patterson, and Green (who will be French Visiting Professor at Oxford in the coming year). Dr. Sed-Rajna will serve as chairman of the program committee for the meeting, Dr. Vermes, organization committee, and Dr. Gaylord, publications.

During the coming year the European Association for Jewish Studies will produce a bulletin, edited by Dr. Gaylord, along the lines of the Association for Jewish Studies Newsletter. A membership solicitation will be undertaken. The principal project for the first year is the organization and planning of the 1982 meeting. Founding memberships, at \$30, regular memberships, at \$20, or student memberships, at \$10, may be sent to Dr. H. E. Gaylord, Theological Faculty, Groningen University, Nieuwe Kijk in't Jatsstraat 104, Groningen, The Netherlands.

Publications of the Association for Jewish Studies

These AJS publications are available only from our distributor, KTAV Publishing House, 75 Varick St., New York, New York 10013.

The Teaching of Judaica in American Universities

The Proceedings of a Colloquium

Edited by Leon A. Jick
1970

Religion in a Religious Age

Proceedings of Regional Conferences Held at the University of California, Los Angeles and Brandeis University in April, 1973

Edited by S. D. Goitein
1974

The Role of Religion in Modern Jewish History

Proceedings of Regional Conferences Held at the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Toronto in March-April 1974

Edited by Jacob Katz
1975

Jewish Languages: Theme and Variations

Proceedings of Regional Conferences Held at the University of Michigan and New York University in March-April 1975

Edited by Herbert H. Paper
1978

Studies in Jewish Folklore

Proceedings of a Regional Conference held at the Spertus College of Judaica in May 1977

Edited by Frank Talmage
1980

Studies in Jewish Mysticism

Proceedings of Regional Conferences Held at McGill University and the University of Judaism in April 1978

Edited by Joseph Dan and Frank Talmage
1981*

AJSreview

Edited by Frank Talmage
Volume I, 1976
Volume II, 1977

Volume III, 1978
Volume IV, 1979
Volume V, 1980
Volume VI, 1981*

*in press