
ASSOCIATION FOR JEWISH STUDIES

AJS

NEWSLETTER

Second Series, No. 4 (#40)

Spring, 1990

Voice from the Margins: Women and Jewish Studies

Susan E. Shapiro

Syracuse University

The Association for Jewish Studies Women's Caucus came into being in 1986 as a result of a conversation among a number of women, during which we remarked on the different status and treatment of women in the field, as well as at the meetings, of the American Academy of Religion as opposed to that of the Association for Jewish Studies. Ellen Umansky and I resolved to inaugurate a Women's Caucus for the AJS such as the one in the AAR (and virtually every other academic professional organization). We arranged for a space and made signs announcing the formation of the Caucus at the Annual Meeting in Boston that year, and the vast majority of women present enthusiastically appeared at the appropriate time with a sense of arrival. The time was clearly ripe—indeed, some would say overripe—for the formation of an organization that would: 1) foster the professional status of women (even as it provided a support group for women scholars) in Jewish Studies; as well as 2) encourage and publicly make a place for the study of women and issues of gender in Judaism.

Over the next few years, the Caucus grew in both size and effectiveness, in large measure because it was (and still is) so needed, but also because of the dedicated work of its members as well as significant support by some on the AJS Board. Ellen Umansky and I served as co-chairs from 1986-1989 when Judith Baskin joined me as co-chair. We have a steering committee of eight members that meets periodically to discuss issues and problems and make necessary decisions. Most of the major decision-making of the Caucus, however, is done at the annual meeting

itself by all those present.

The annual meeting of the Caucus is a breakfast meeting at which reports of the last year and plans for the next are discussed. It is also, importantly, a time for women at various stages in their professional development and at very different kinds of institutions to meet and get to know one another, both personally and professionally. There is time as well reserved for a presentation/discussion on some professional aspect of the field with respect to women. One year, for example, three women of different generations and stages in their careers (Marsha Rozenblit, Paula Hyman, and Judith Romney Wegner) spoke about their experiences and how they thought the field has and has not changed in regard to the training of women (e.g., the issues of mentoring, inclusive subject matters, new methodologies) as well as the progress of their teaching and research careers. Last year, the Caucus discussed the issues of gender-inclusive teaching and curricula and how we had struggled with these matters. Minutes of the annual Caucus meeting, membership lists, and announcements of relevant upcoming events, conferences and forthcoming journals, periodicals, and books are sent to Caucus members. The Caucus is building an archive of gender-inclusive syllabi and curricula to which all AJS members are invited to submit material. Plans for a registry of women in the field are also underway.¹

1. Women who wish to join the Caucus—\$5.00 for graduate students, \$10.00 for professors—and those wishing to submit syllabi and curricula, may contact: Professor Judith Baskin, Chair, Department of Judaic Studies, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, NY, 12222.

In the last several years, there have been a significant number of sessions and papers on women and gender in Judaism at the Annual Meeting, in part because so many were proposed, but also because, under the chairmanship of Robert Seltzer, the program committee accepted them. (I can't help but note here that the success of the last few years should not be taken for granted; people should continue to propose sessions, panels and papers about women and/or gender.) The intellectual and professional marginalization of women in and from the field—a marginalization that had been palpable for women, both in their scholarly training and at the AJS meetings before the formation of the Caucus—has begun to diminish as the number of sessions and papers devoted to matters of women and gender in Judaism have grown. With few exceptions, this emergence into the field has been very positively received, a fact that does credit to the AJS membership generally and to the women and men who have been instrumental in this development. The Caucus has, thus, been successful in augmenting the professional status of women in Jewish Studies, but still has a long way to go.

The Caucus was also formed to foster scholarship about women and gender in Jewish Studies. There has, indeed, been a bursting forth of scholarship about women and gender in the field mostly, but certainly not all, as a result of women writing on the subject. As a recent article in *Lilith*² attests, there is exciting new work on women and

2. Vanessa Ochs, "Jewish Feminist Scholarship Comes of Age," *Lilith*, Vol. 15, #1 (Winter 1990).

Women, cont'd

gender in Judaism being produced in a variety of disciplines, from translations and interpretations of women's Yiddish prayers, poetry and narrative, to studies of medieval Jewish women, American Jewish women, women and Zionism, the analysis of rabbinic views of women, gender and the body, the consideration of matters of gender in Jewish philosophy, and feminist theology.³

How shall we interpret these changes in the field? In what ways has Jewish Studies developed by including matters of women and gender in its domain, and in what ways has it not? What is the significance of these transformations for the study of women and gender in Judaism and for the field generally? These are some of the questions addressed by a panel at the 1989 Annual Meeting of the AJS devoted to analyzing the inclusion of women and gender in a variety of disciplines within Jewish Studies. Panelists spoke about the fields which are usually thought to lack a female presence: Tikva Frymer-Kensky spoke on Bible, Howard Adelman on Medieval and Renaissance history, Judith Baskin on Medieval history, and Ross Kraemer spoke on Jews of diaspora communities in Late Antiquity.

A large and attentive audience composed of both women and men scholars listened as strategies for including the study of women and gender in the curriculum were creatively and effectively addressed. The speakers remarked that much progress toward a "transformed, 'balanced' curriculum"⁴ had been made, despite the persistence of pro-

blematic obstacles, especially in the biased or exclusive assumptions and definitions of particular areas of study. The various disciplines represented had reached different stages of curricular development in their ability to include issues of women and gender. I will not here further rehearse the panelists' conclusions; by considering these developmental stages themselves,⁵ we may have an indication as to how to read the nature and consequences of these changes in the field.

- (1) The first stage is that in which the absence of women is not noted. At this stage, the question "who are the truly great thinkers and actors in history" obviates the recognition of women altogether, both by virtue of the operational definition of "truly great" and because of the nonrecognition of the conditions of oppression and marginalization that both set the terms of and effect women's cultural definition and exclusion.
- (2) The search for missing women is the second stage of curricular change. The recognition of the absence of women from the subject or curriculum leads to a search for the women either not accounted for, or written out of, histories and disciplines. This raises the question of, "Where were and are these women and why were they not included in our histories and disciplines?"
- (3) The third stage is that of the recognition of women as a disadvantaged and subordinate group. This recognition grows out, in part, of the insights of the two previous stages. Once we start to find these missing women of stage two, we also find how they have been "disappeared." That is, we

3. Ibid. for a more complete list and treatment of contemporary feminist scholarship. There are several anthologies and collections on Jewish women's experiences and on women/gender in Judaism forthcoming as well. (Look for works, among others, edited by: Judith Baskin, A.J. Levine, Norma Fain Pratt, Maurie Sacks, Shelley Tenenbaum, and Ellen Umansky and Diane Ashton.)

4. See Marilyn Schuster and Susan Van Dyne, "Placing Women in the Liberal Arts: Stages of Curricular Transformation," *Harvard Education Review*, No. 54 (1984), pp. 413-428. For a consideration of the application of some of these questions and approaches in Religious Studies, see Carol P. Christ, "Toward a Paradigm Shift in the Academy and in Religious Studies," in *The Impact of Feminist Research in the Academy*, ed., Christie Farnham (Bloomington, IN, 1987), pp. 53-76, and in Jewish Studies, especially in the discipline of history, see Paula Hyman, "Gender and Jewish History," *Tikkun* Vol. 3, #1 (Jan-Feb, 1988), pp. 35-38.

find out how women's experience and roles have been devalued, and how women's access to the skills or advantages necessary to telling and preserving, i.e., transmitting, their stories has been systematically limited. The absence of women from the field, disciplines, and histories is no longer simply a matter of their relative invisibility or silence, then, but rather is recognized as resulting from modes of oppression and marginalization that enforce that very absence. Thus, at this stage, scholars ask questions such as, "Why are women's roles devalued?"

- (4) The study of women on their own terms is the fourth stage of curricular change. If the disciplinary definition and position of women is itself part of their oppression and marginalization, i.e., part of what makes them invisible as objects of study, then women must be defined and situated in the disciplines in other terms, indeed, "on their own terms." The appeal to women's experience and the analysis of the importance of the intersections of gender, race, class, ethnicity, and religion in understanding their historical and disciplinary location, becomes central at this stage. The emergence of women as speaking subjects who have distinctive voices that must be listened to and heard in our disciplines also occurs at this stage. Some of the questions addressed at this stage are, "What is women's experience?" and "How do women's experiences differ from each other?"
- (5) The study of women as a challenge to the disciplines and disciplinarity is the fifth stage of curricular development. At this stage, curriculum development progresses past the stage that Gerda Lerner refers to as "add women and stir." The disciplinary pie must not only be made of more ingredients, but must be shaped and cut differently to address the challenge to its definition(s) that these additional subjects and voices implicitly and necessarily pose. Gender as a category of analysis—along with those of race, class, ethnicity, and

Cont'd on p.4

5. Ibid. I am here following Schuster's and Van Dyne's six-stage model of curricular development, although I am elaborating on the relations between the stages.

Association for Jewish Studies

Mailing Address:

Harvard University
Widener Library M
Cambridge, MA 02138

President:

Robert Chazan
New York University
Skirball Department of
Hebrew and Judaic Studies
51 Washington Square South
New York, NY 10003

Newsletter Editor:

Marsha Rozenblit
Department of History
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

The Newsletter of the AJS is published twice a year. The editor welcomes contributions.

Jewish Studies—The Status of the Profession First Thoughts on a Preliminary Analysis of the Data

Rela Geffen Monson

Gratz College

Should the professor of Jewish Studies be the consummate dispassionate academic or a purveyor of Jewish identity? Are these mutually exclusive? What training is necessary to produce an appropriate professor of Jewish Studies regardless of the goals we set? Who are these professors now? Are they mainly men? What fields do they pursue? Are they paid as well (or as poorly) as other professors? Are they publishing? Where were they trained? What is their typical career path? Do they get to teach their specialties?

All of these are unanswered questions. However, the fact that we are even able to ask them reflects the spectacular growth of Jewish Studies. Until the end of the Second World War, just about all of the Jewish Studies professors teaching in rabbinical seminaries and on a few university campuses were products of European yeshivot and universities. It was assumed that it was impossible to produce great scholars in the *treyfe medina!*

But necessity and vision combined to produce an Association for Jewish Studies which today numbers over 1300 members, of whom at least 800 are American scholars currently teaching in the United States and Canada. The optimistic school (transformationists) of sociology of the Jews in America points to the development of a cadre of Jewish Studies professors as an indicator of the flowering of American Jewry.

Much is known about the growth of Jewish Studies in North America, in particular the proliferation of courses on university campuses. Under the aegis of Moshe Davis's Center for the University Teaching of Jewish Studies in the Diaspora, data on programs, departments, and courses were collected and published. Mark Lee Raphael also did work in this area. But little is known about the people teaching those courses.

Until two years ago, the AJS has never undertaken a survey of the profession by asking its membership very basic questions. Three years ago, within the Women's Caucus of the Association, a discussion over the status of women in Jewish Studies led to the more general question of the status of all professors

of Jewish Studies. It was clear that the status of women could not be studied if there were no general base line data about all of those who considered themselves Judaica scholars or at least all of those who were currently members of the AJS. In response, a survey was designed and administered to the AJS membership through the *Newsletter* (Fall 1988 and Spring 1989).

The questions yielded the beginnings of answers to the most basic questions on the status of the profession. The survey was returned by 149 respondents from 76 schools. Of these 76 schools, 8% were Ivy League; 47% public institutions; 28% private; 11% were under Jewish auspices; and 5% were foreign. Sixty of the respondents were women and 89 men. Of the 149 respondents, 135 held doctoral degrees. More than half (53%) were between the ages of 35 and 44; 29% were between 45 and 54 years old; 13% were over 55 while just 6% were under 35.

In this brief research note, two issues which emerged from analysis of the data will be raised for discussion. First, at least half of those professors who responded are isolated, that is, they do not have colleagues in their field present on their campus. They are therefore subject to immense frustration because they often can not teach courses in their own field, and they have no close colleagues with whom to share this sense of frustration.

Second, if the results of this survey are to be believed, there is a significant percentage of professors of Jewish Studies who do not have degrees in Jewish Studies, although they may have taken some courses at the college level. Seventeen percent of the respondents fell into the category of having taken some courses but no post secondary degrees in Jewish Studies. Even more serious is the fact that an additional 19% reported that they had no formal training at all in Jewish Studies at the postsecondary level. Thus, more than one-third of the respondents did not have any credentials in Jewish Studies.

Two career paths predominated among this third of the respondents who classified themselves as professors of Jewish Studies and in every case designated a field of expertise. In the

first path, the person was in an adjunct field and the interest in Jewish Studies was activated through a dissertation topic or later research allied to the field—such as a European history specialist who became interested in the Holocaust. These people had often taken some college or graduate level courses in Jewish Studies. In the second career path, the people pursued no formal studies in Judaica at all, but in the recent past became interested in their own Jewish identity and decided to apply their disciplinary knowledge to Jewish texts (e.g., American Jewish literature or sociology of the American Jewish community).

Since Jewish Studies programs on campuses often consist of courses taught by one or no fulltime Jewish Studies professors and many adjuncts who teach in various departments and then develop one course in Jewish Studies, they did not see their path into Jewish Studies as unusual in many settings. The above phenomena are known to many of us in the field, but we have avoided discussing the parameters of the problem, its consequences, or potential remedies.

There are some conclusions which flow from these very preliminary findings. First, there exists the possibility of isolation of many American scholars of Judaica from their Israeli counterparts because many Americans lack knowledge of general Jewish Studies and Hebrew language. Some scholars will not be able to use relevant materials in their field. Second, there is a potential for bifurcation of the profession into those perceived as "serious" scholars and the "second class" autodidacts. Alternatively, the fields in which there are more fully trained professionals will be considered "core" to Jewish Studies while the others will become peripheral. Third, some students will not get the depth of education to which they are entitled. Fourth, for some professors, isolation will lead to stagnation. Of course isolation and lack of Jewish Studies background are not necessarily correlated. Many new Ph.D.s even in fields such as Bible and Rabbinics take jobs as *kolboiniks* in far-flung colleges and universities. But these people may suffer from stagnation and a yearning

for collegiality.

Possible Remedies

1. Comprehensive departments of Jewish Studies in University and Hebrew College settings should take responsibility for educating colleagues through intersession and summer intensive study programs.
2. These types of programs could also be held for scholars teaching in one-person departments so as to give them a chance to interact with others in their field or others working in similar situations.
3. Regional associations of the AJS should be strengthened and should include on-going faculty study groups and periodic conferences.
4. More attention should be paid to special programs aimed at those in isolation or without general Jewish Studies backgrounds when planning sabbaticals. Opportunities to spend sabbaticals for a year or a semester in cities with major departments of Judaica and/or in Israel should be made more available. The AJS should help match these academics with places.
5. There should be a committee on the status of the profession which deals with these matters.
6. Work has already begun (through the Davis summer seminars in Israel) on the production of books of model syllabi in various fields of Jewish Studies. These need to be widely disseminated.
7. 'Part-time' Jewish Studies professors should be encouraged to become attached to professional associations where they should be guided toward more systematic knowledge of Jewish Studies.

These are just a few observations from one set of findings from the survey of AJS members. Others relating to areas such as the differentials between men and women; the salary structure of the field; the ranks attained in public and private universities by those in Jewish Studies; and the growth of various fields will be forthcoming. Still others, such as the path which people follow to become professors of Jewish Studies and the background factors and identity correlates of this status await future study. I hope that this preliminary report on the state of Jewish Studies faculty will be the beginning of a regularized examination of colleagues so that the status of the profession can be made public, discussed, and implications drawn to further the tremendous progress of the last quarter century.

Shapiro, cont'd

religion—raises the question of the validity of previous disciplinary assumptions, definitions and methods, not only in terms of their justice—i.e., whether they are inclusive or exclusive of the subject of women and of women subjects—but also in terms of their accuracy. Our understandings of what, for example, medieval European Jewish experience was, will necessarily grow and shift as both the subject is altered to include women in the picture and, concomitantly, as different questions are asked. This challenge to the disciplines is, thus, not only a challenge to grow, but a challenge to change by virtue of the inclusive study of women and matters of gender. One of the questions at this stage is, "How does the inclusion of women challenge the definition of both the subject and appropriate methodologies of the field?"

- (6) The "final," sixth stage of curriculum development is the ideal achievement of a "Transformed and 'Balanced' Curriculum." At this stage, women's and men's experiences are considered together in a more integrated manner in which matters of class, race, ethnicity, and religion also persist as important categories of analysis. Not only women's but men's experience as a subject of gender analysis is explicit at this stage, even as it is implicit at stage five. The main question of this stage is, "What can we learn by studying women's and men's experience together?"

The state of the study of women and gender in Jewish Studies ranges through most of these stages, as I have already suggested, not only between different fields and disciplines but within them as well. While we are certainly moving away from stage one, we are also certainly not at stage six, and we have a lot of work still to do at the intervening stages of two through five in all of our disciplines. Although this six-stage model of curricular change is just that, a model, and in some ways, therefore, is typological, it is yet importantly heuristic, illuminating for us not only where we are, but showing us as well where we can and, perhaps, must go.

The Women's Caucus—and the transformative inclusion of the study of women and gender in Jewish Studies

that it fosters—is leading, sometimes slowly and at other times more quickly, to a de-marginalization of women both intellectually and professionally in the field. It is progress, I hope it is clear, from which we may all benefit in Jewish Studies. Indeed, this inclusive turn toward women has the potential as well to provide a model of, and resources for, further strategies of de-marginalizing Jewish Studies in the Academy as well.

Although as a field we have perhaps never been so "accepted" as we are in the University today, our status is still, like Women's Studies, relatively speaking, marginal.⁶ A case could certainly be made that rather than simply imitating the assumptions, definitions, models, and methods of disciplinary discourses that have systematically effaced the study of Jews and Judaism, we in Jewish Studies ought to consider other strategies and modes of inquiry. In a way not so dissimilar from the stages of curricular change outlined above, these new approaches and questions might offer ways not only of discovering and adding "new" (i.e., Jewish) material to mainstream curricula, but of challenging as well those very disciplines and histories that have previously excluded Jews and Judaism from consideration, except under the hyphen of "Judeo-Christian." Perhaps, then, a case might even be made that the welcoming of women and the study of women and gender into Jewish Studies and the welcoming of Jewish Studies into the Academy more generally are linked occasions whose destinies may well go hand-in-hand.

6. See Judith Baskin's forthcoming article, "Integrating Gender Studies into Jewish Studies," *Shofar* (in an issue devoted to "Jewish Women and the New Scholarship," edited by Norma Fain Pratt) for a suggestive discussion of these matters. For a discussion of the ambiguities of the position of Jewish Studies with respect to the current "Great Books of Western Civilization" debate, see Arnold Eisen's "Jews, Jewish Studies and the American Humanities," *Tikkun*, Vol. 4, #5, (Sept-Oct, 1989).



JEWISH STUDIES, JEWISH BOOKS, AND MODERN LIBRARIES

Editor's Note: The following three articles were presented as papers at the AJS Convention, December 1989. Because of their interest to all Jewish Studies scholars, they are reproduced here.

MAKING DO WITH HALF A LOAF: ACCESS TO JEWISH STUDIES MATERIALS IN AN AUTOMATED ENVIRONMENT

Michael Grunberger
Library of Congress

Over the last two decades we have seen noteworthy changes in the way American research libraries have gone about the business of fulfilling their central mission of building, organizing, preserving, and making available the collections in their custody. Here I will describe traditional and automated retrieval tools, outline some of their distinguishing characteristics, and consider the impact of recent developments on the retrieval of Jewish Studies materials in general and on the retrieval of Hebraica in this new automated environment.

In the context of this presentation, it will be important to distinguish between two separate but related automated bibliographic developments: (1) the national cataloging utility; and (2) the local online public access catalog. The first is primarily a cataloger's tool facilitating cooperative cataloging and the second is the user's key to the collections, the link between the cataloging record and the physical item. The machine-readable bibliographic records created on the national cataloging utility are the building blocks of the local online public catalog. In examining the central question of online access to Jewish Studies materials, it will become clear that while substantial progress has been made over the last two years in creating machine-readable cataloging records for Hebraica and Yiddica (and the future is rather exciting and promising in this connection), little if any headway has been made in fashioning online public access catalogs to display, sort, and index these newly created vernacular records.

Since it is only over the last two years that Hebraica has been reintegrated into the cataloging stream of the bibliographic networks,¹ it should come as no surprise that in the United States its integration in the vernacular in online public catalogs has not yet occurred. For many libraries (not all to be sure) the basic product of the catalog-

ing process changed when libraries switched over to online catalogs. The outcome of cataloging used to be a 3"x5" card that was filed into the public catalog. Today, in most research libraries, the outcome of the cataloging process is a machine-readable record. For the end user, in this case the scholar, a different access tool needed to be designed and developed, turning these records—no longer 3"x5" cards but complex and encrypted data entry worksheets—into ones suitable for public consumption. But the systems developed for online public catalogs were not designed to accommodate non-Roman script records in the vernacular. The net effect, then, for scholars using Hebrew and Yiddish materials (as well as other non-Roman script materials) has been less access on-line than through the card catalog, since vernacular Hebrew characters could not be represented online but could and were in the card catalog.

Why then did many large research libraries close or supplement their massive card catalogs? After all, it is difficult to imagine a simpler to maintain and more effective retrieval tool than a card catalog.

What librarians found wrong with card catalogs included a host of problems generally associated with the large files maintained by research libraries: (1) Filing became more complex as the catalog grew in size and mastery of detailed filing rules was required in order to maintain and fully exploit the catalog; the larger the catalog the more difficulty a user had in guessing where a record might be filed; (2) The card catalog was immobile and existed in only one copy; the user had to come to it; (3) Cards got stolen and there was no obvious way to know when something was missing; (4) Cabinets and tables required substantial space; (5) The physical maintenance of the card catalog was labor intensive and expensive; and—perhaps most important—(6) Card

catalogs were inhospitable to large scale change.²

The perceived advantages of online catalogs were many: (1) They could be kept more complete, up-to-date, and accurate than card, book, or microform catalogs, since it is easier to make global changes on them; (2) Automated authority control could ensure consistent terminologies and headings throughout a system; (3) Online searches were faster, enabling access through multiple fields that could be combined using Boolean operators; (4) Several entries could be displayed at once, enabling browsing; (5) Lists and bibliographies could be generated more easily; and (6) An online catalog could be searched from a variety of locations.³

Preparing the way for the creation of the online catalog was the development of the "Machine-Readable Cataloging" [MARC] record in the 1960s and the introduction of online cataloging through the major bibliographic cataloging utilities—the Online Computer Library Center [OCLC] also established in 1967 and based in Dublin, Ohio and the Research Libraries Group, through its Research Library Information Network [RLIN], founded in 1972 and now headquartered in Mountain View, California. Today, thousands of libraries are linked to these online cataloging utilities and contribute bibliographic records to their respective databases.

An additional stimulus to move toward an online environment was the

1. This point was made by Paul Maher at a panel on "Hebrew Online One Year Later—the View from LC" presented at the 1989 annual meeting of the Association of Jewish Libraries in Washington D.C. I am grateful to him for sharing his unpublished paper with me.

2. *The University of California Libraries: A Plan for Development 1978-1988* (Berkeley, California: Office of the Executive Director of Universitywide Library Planning, 1970), pp. 58-59.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 64-67.

growing book and special format arranges in part resulting from the increasing amount of time it took to catalog a book. Problems associated with increases in "throughput" time (ie., the amount of time from acquisition to availability) also seemed to beg a technological solution. Some of the slowness could be traced to increasingly complex cataloging and filing rules. Concerned with growing arranges throughout the research library system, the American Council of Learned Societies issued a statement in 1967 declaring that "it is now reasonable to expect that research library catalogs will eventually move from card files into computerized form."⁴

Bibliographic utilities helped to speed up cataloging by providing libraries with a cost effective and efficient vehicle to share cataloging records. A key by-product of this shared cataloging venture has been the extraordinary growth of interlibrary loans [ILL] since 1978/79, when OCLC implemented its interlibrary loan module.⁵ Though no reliable figures exist for ILLs on a national level, estimates have ranged from 12.8 million transactions per year to 24.9 million.⁶ The data are especially interesting as they relate to the more than 125 or so members of the Association of Research Libraries [ARL], whose annual statistical survey shows that from 1976 to 1986 interlibrary loan borrowing by ARL member libraries increased more than 100 percent. Books borrowed by research libraries are better indicators of ILL use by scholars and researchers than books loaned by ARL libraries—which only increases some 42 percent over the course of the decade—since these include loans to a variety of library types, including research, public, school, and special libraries.

*Interlibrary Loan Transactions by ARL Libraries, 1976-1986*⁷

	1976	1986	Difference	%
Loaned	1,647,221	2,342,269	695,048	42
Borrowed	496,062	998,592	502,530	101
TOTALS	2,143,283	3,340,861	1,197,578	56

4. American Council of Learned Societies, Committee on Research Libraries, *On Research Libraries: Statement...to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries* (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 28, quoted in *The University of California Libraries: A Plan for Development 1978-1988* (Berkeley, California: Office of the Executive Director of Universitywide Library Planning, 1970), p. 65.

5. See review article by Thomas J. Waldhart, "Patterns of Interlibrary Loan in the U.S.: A

Of course, many factors account for this increase, including: (1) shrinking library budgets, always a key impetus to resource sharing; (2) the relative ease, speed, and efficacy of transacting ILLs in an online, paperless, environment; and (3) the availability of location information online (as compared with finding possibly out-of-date information in a printed or fiche catalog). But, regardless of the reasons, the main beneficiary of all this ILL traffic—besides the U.S. Postal Service—has been the library user.

While research libraries with important collections of Jewish Studies materials were able to reap the benefits of the new automated environment for their Judaica, they were left out in the cold for their large collections of Hebraica. Many custodians of Hebraica felt compelled to continue creating Hebrew alphabet card files, usually vernacular title files. As one observer noted: "Most Judaica libraries...resisted transliteration and... chose to wait for computer systems that [would] accommodate records in the vernacular."⁸ Other librarians, usually keepers of Judaica collections that were part of larger university libraries, chose to forgo vernacular access entirely, relying solely on to these collections — a strategy that certainly has "worked", but one that leans heavily on a cadre of linguistically sophisticated catalogers and users.

Now, after almost twenty years, Hebraica is being re-integrated into the mainstream of processing and technical services. Two promising developments are here noted: (1) the implementation of Hebrew cataloging in RLIN; and (2) the loading into OCLC and RLIN of almost 90,000 romanized records representing Hebrew and Yiddish titles held by the Harvard College Library.

In January 1988, the Research Libraries Group through its RLIN network, implemented its Hebraic cataloging component, enabling member in-

stitutions to input and search the database using vernacular data. For the first time, in an online mode, a searcher for a Hebrew or Yiddish work using vernacular access points, could not only replicate the capabilities of the card catalog—apparently no mean achievement judging by how long it took—but could take advantage of the enhanced power characteristic of the online environment. On RLIN, a user can conduct vernacular searches of author and title indexes; she or he can construct search strings that combine scripts; that utilize truncation symbols; and that use Boolean operators. In other words, RLIN catalogs and indexes can now be searched in ways that could not be anticipated by the librarian/catalogers who originally input the data and who assigned a fixed number of predetermined access points to each record.

As of this date, eleven research libraries are contributing Hebrew script data to the RLIN network, including the Library of Congress, Brandeis University, New York Public Library, Yeshiva University, Jewish Theological Seminary, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (Cincinnati, New York, and Los Angeles), Yale University, New York University Law School, Stanford University, University of Michigan, and the University of Judaism in Los Angeles. Membership applications have been approved for both YIVO in New York and Philadelphia's Annenberg Institute.

After only two years, there are more than 26,000 records containing Hebrew in the RLIN database. One important caveat: RLIN was not designed to function as an on-line public catalog. Its complexity would turn routine catalog searches into expensive and inefficient ones, requiring the constant mediation of reference specialists to complete the search.

In October 1989, the Research Libraries Group established the Jewish and Middle East Studies Program (JAMES) whose membership includes RLIN libraries with significant collections of Jewish Studies materials and is not limited to the relatively few that input vernacular records. The program's purpose is to explore various cooperative projects including collection development, bibliographic control/cataloging, preservation, and resource sharing. Especially encouraging is the program's interest in identifying other Hebrew script machine-readable files—wherever they may be—and finding ways to add them to the RLIN database.

Cont'd on p. 15

Review of the Research," [Part I] in *Library and Information Science Research*, vol. 7, no. 3 (1985), p. 216.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 211-14.

7. Statistics extrapolated from: Association of Research Libraries, *ARL Statistics, 1976-1977* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1977), pp. 36-37 and Association of Research Libraries, *ARL Statistics, 1986-1987*, compiled by Nicola Daval and Margaret McConnell (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1977), pp. 50-51.

8. Charles Berlin, quoted in OCLC press release, issued February 24, 1989, p. 2.

Preserving Judaica Research Resources

Zachary M. Baker

YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, New York

On March 7, 1989, on the occasion of The New York Public Library Commitment Day, 44 authors and 40 publishers co-signed a "Declaration of Book Preservation," which was issued under the sponsorship of PEN and the Author's Guild. The purpose of the declaration, which was later [March 16, 1989] published as a fullpage advertisement in *The New York Times*, was to announce the authors' and publishers' "commitment to use acid-free paper for all first printings of quality hard-cover trade books in order to preserve the printed word and safeguard our cultural heritage for future generations." Though it is now scarcely nine months old, the newspaper ad is already turning yellow. In a few years' time it will crumble into dust because of the high acid content of the newsprint on which it is printed.

Anyone who has examined books printed before the last third of the nineteenth century is likely to be struck by the seeming paradox that, although subject over time to the ravages of heat and frost, high and low humidity, infestation by worms and insects, and excessive handling by countless readers, their pages are usually in far better shape than those in books printed only 25 or 50 years ago.

Among observant Jews the word *shemos* refers to any *sefer* containing God's name that is either too deteriorated or that is no longer wanted for use. Traditional Jewish practice is to bury *shemos*, in an act of reverence, rather than destroy it. For many Jewish scholars, the term *shemos* has come to encompass far more than is denoted by its dictionary definition; *shemos* is regarded as the bibliographical equivalent of *shmates*, of unwanted old rags. This is ironic, for until the mid-19th century the durable paper on which books and newspapers were printed was indeed made of *shmates*—of old cotton and linen rags, that is. It was only with the introduction of paper made of ground wood pulp, with its high acidity, that rapid deterioration of printed matter began to constitute a problem. As a result, the scholarly community now confronts a massive headache: Library stacks are lined with literally millions of brittle books that

can no longer be touched without jeopardizing their contents. Over the past decade or two, the alarm over the brittle book problem has been sounded with increasing frequency, and in response, some positive developments are coming about.

The "Declaration of Book Preservation" is one such development; henceforth, at least those publishers who have signed that declaration will have their books produced on alkaline paper, which can be expected to last for hundreds of years. The technology now exists to produce alkaline paper at prices virtually comparable to those for the manufacture of the more acidic paper that has been used in book production since roughly 1870. This economic factor helps to explain why over 30 paper mills in this country are now producing alkaline papers for the book trade.

The presence of authors as well as publishers among the signatories of the "Declaration of Book Preservation" is an indication of the important role that authors can and must play in this effort. Authors need to be aware not only of a prospective publisher's editorial policies and distribution practices, not only about contractual obligations and royalties, but also whether, for the sake of permanence, it has its books printed on alkaline paper.

As any scholar in the Jewish Studies field can attest, Judaica publications do not constitute an exception to the problems arising from the common practice of printing on high-acid-content paper. Before World War II, Poland was one of the great centers of Hebrew and Yiddish printing and publishing. For economic reasons, books were usually printed there on the cheapest paper available—highly acidic newsprint. A library consisting of 20th century Eastern European Hebrew imprints is a library of *shemos*—of disintegrating books with yellow, brittle pages that often can scarcely be turned. Of course, one scholar's *shemos* is the next scholar's *genizah*; neither destruction nor burial of the brittle books lining the shelves of our Judaica libraries is being advised here.

To take a case with which I am familiar, the library of the YIVO In-

stitute for Jewish Research contains hundreds of late 19th and early 20th century Yiddish chapbooks containing tales by such once-popular authors as Nahum Meir Shaikewitz (also known by his nom-de-plume, Shomer), Isaac Meir Dick, and Joshua Mezach, among others. These publications were printed in thousands of copies and circulated throughout Eastern Europe. They were attacked as junk by authors with higher literary pretensions, such as Sholem Aleichem, and indeed, once read, they were soon disposed of by their readers. Today a 19th century Shomer chapbook may be as scarce as a Hebrew incunabulum printed in Guadalajara, Spain in 1482.

Aside from the built-in disposability of these 19th century publications, their availability has been reduced by the annihilation of the Jewish communities in which they were produced and by the destruction of most of Eastern Europe's Jewish libraries. Those few copies that do survive are in extremely fragile shape, moreover. What is true for Eastern European Yiddish chapbooks is all the more true for the full range of Hebrew and Yiddish books, pamphlets, magazines and newspapers.

Libraries and publishers have long employed the unpopular but necessary medium of microfilm for the purpose of preserving newspapers. In the past, Judaica libraries with significant newspaper and periodical holdings have often informally agreed to microfilm serials in areas where they are strong. Much of the American Jewish press has been microfilmed either by The New York Public Library or by the American Jewish Periodical Center at Hebrew Union College, in Cincinnati. YIVO's holdings of the Eastern European Yiddish press were microfilmed in the mid-1960s, with the support, appropriately, of the Ab. Cahan Fund. In more recent years, extensive runs of the Hebrew press and of Jewish periodicals in other languages have been microfilmed by the InterDocumentation Company, of Zug, Switzerland, with most of that company's work being carried out at the Jewish National and University Library, in Jerusalem.

There is, however, an awareness in library circles that periodicals are not the only publications requiring preser-

vation. Many Judaica research repositories have over the years microfilmed deteriorating books in both Jewish and European languages, on either an occasional or a systematic basis, whenever funds have permitted. Selected manuscript collections at many of these same institutions have also been preserved on microfilm or acquired from abroad. Some libraries have published guides to their microform collections. Harvard, for example, has issued numerous finding aids to the thousands of books, pamphlets and newspapers—in Hebrew, Yiddish and Western languages—that it has microfilmed; the most recent of these checklists have themselves been produced on microfiche. Most libraries also communicate relevant information about microfilming to the Library of Congress.

The InterDocumentation Company, working mainly at the JNUL and at Oxford, has preserved either on 35 millimeter microfilm or on microfiche, hundreds of scarce volumes in many areas of Judaic learning, and published a printed catalogue of these titles, all of which are available for purchase. IDC's work in this area can be regarded as a combination of preservation pure and simple, and as an effort to disseminate titles whose physical state may not necessarily be precarious but that in their printed form are nevertheless not widely available. IDC's Jewish Studies catalogue includes extensive listings of periodicals and newspapers in a wide range of Jewish and European languages, along with sections on bibliography, local Jewish history, philosophy and religion, languages and literature, and collected papers, jubilee, and memorial volumes. *A Guide to the Hebrew Press*, prepared by the late bibliographer Getzel Kressel, was published by IDC both as a finding aid to its micropublications and as a reference source in and of itself.

Until quite recently, most microfilming projects took place virtually in splendid isolation from one another. Due to the difficulties involved in coordinating preservation activities among academic institutions, serious efforts have not always been made to complete periodical runs being microfilmed, or to verify whether or not a certain title had already been microfilmed elsewhere. This balkanization was regrettable, and only lately, with the advent of computerized, online bibliographical networks, has it been possible to create mechanisms whereby previously tedious

verification procedures could be streamlined and cooperative projects designed. Through the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), to take one example, it is possible to ascertain whether a particular title has been microfilmed by a member library or, if not, whether another institution has plans to microfilm it. Previously it was necessary to consult the printed or microfiche checklists that had been prepared by such repositories as the American Jewish Periodical Center, Harvard, The New York Public Library, the JNUL and others, along with the *National Register of Microfilm Masters* and other lists and files. Of course, on a retrospective basis, much work remains to be done before the participants in a network will be quickly able to verify what was microfilmed 20 or 30 years ago. In 1988, the Harvard University Library made an important contribution to future cooperative preservation projects when its Judaica Department contributed catalogue records for its entire Hebraica holdings to the two major national bibliographical networks. Microfilms and microfiche are included among the over 100,000 catalogue records that Harvard contributed to the OCLC and RLIN databases.

In cooperative projects, arrangements that formerly may have been tacitly assumed are now formally delineated, by means of what in library jargon are called conspectuses, through which participating libraries' respective areas of strength are identified according to subject profiles based on library classification schedules, and the titles to be preserved by each institution are targeted. Communication among these institutions is now virtually instantaneous, thanks to networking.

The increased awareness of libraries' preservation needs has lately resulted in vastly increased funding opportunities from both private and public sources. The FY 1989 budget for the National Endowment for the Humanities' Office of Preservation was increased almost threefold over the previous year, from \$4.5 million to \$12.3 million. The increase in the NEH preservation budget will, if sustained, provide funding for the microfilming of some three million volumes over the next 20 years, according to George Farr, the Director of the Office of Preservation at the Endowment. These funds are distributed among both individual research institutions and on a cooperative basis. Private foundations have also been generous in their support of preserva-

tion projects. One consequence of this heightened awareness is the emergence in academic librarianship of the preservation specialist, alongside the more traditional professional categories of subject bibliographer, cataloguer, reference librarian, and library administrator.

Coordination of the massive preservation projects now underway has been greatly facilitated by the creation of consortia with access to the databases of bibliographic networks such as OCLC and RLIN. Judaica libraries and archives, each one with its own area of unique strength, form an ideal constituency for such a consortium with cooperation extending, one hopes, beyond the borders of the United States. The Council on Archives and Research Libraries in Jewish Studies has formed two subcommittees, one for library collections and the other for archival repositories, to look into possible arrangements for cooperative preservation efforts in our own field.

Because of the scarcity of much Judaica and Hebraica, preservation microfilming must be carried out not only in American or Israeli libraries and archives, but in Western and Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union, as well. The crucial importance of Polish and Soviet repositories, in particular, has recently come to light. At the initiative of Prof. Samuel Kassow of Trinity University in Hartford, Connecticut, for example, arrangements have been made with the Polish National Library in Warsaw to microfilm extensive runs of the Yiddish and Polish-language Jewish press, including the Polish Jewish daily *Nasz Przegląd*. In Vilnius, to take another case in point, extensive runs of the pre-war Eastern European Jewish press, including major urban dailies and much of the provincial press, are now known to be housed at the Lithuanian State Book Chamber, and YIVO is currently engaged in efforts to have microfilms made of these.

In dealing with Eastern Bloc libraries, Western research institutions are confronted with a world of extreme scarcity, where the basic equipment and supplies needed for microfilming and developing are lacking and must be provided from outside. Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union constitute a new frontier in the realm of preservation, one where—even before they can be preserved—titles and collections must first be identified, located and surveyed, where basic access must be granted. This important work cannot be accomplished solely by the isolated

efforts of individuals and institutions here in the West, but—as with other bibliographic activities—on a cooperative basis, and with assured and adequate funding from private and public sources.

If I have thus far dwelt on microfilming as a mode of preservation it is because it is considered to be the tried and true preservation medium. Given proper storage conditions, microfilms have an estimated shelf life of 100 or more years. The equipment needed for microfilming and developing is standardized, films can be easily and cheaply duplicated, a range of microfilm and fiche readers and reader-printers is available for researchers to use, and hard copy duplicates can even be generated from film, using a copyflow process. In the words of Maxine Sitts of the Commission on Preservation and Access, microfilm "is a very stable archival medium." On the other hand, there are drawbacks to the microform medium.

While film readers can be fast-forwarded and frames can be indexed, searching is a purely mechanical process; there are no electronic shortcuts to searches for text contained within a reel of film. Microforms have the additional drawback of being a black-and-white medium, since color film is not considered to be permanent. Reading microfilms is wearing on the eye, and sitting at a microfilm reader is not a terribly comfortable experience. Given their preferences, researchers invariably demand to use hard-copy originals when these are available. In contrast, library administrators love microforms. They save enormous amounts of space and are far more durable than most of the printed books whose contents are preserved on them.

Given the preference of most readers for direct access to the printed page, libraries have developed chemical techniques for the mass deacidification of books. Both the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada have been active on this front. The principal shortcoming of deacidification is that while it does prevent further rapid deterioration of paper, it cannot reverse the decay that has already set in. A brittle book, even when it has undergone deacidification, remains brittle. Mass deacidification is a solution that will work mainly for books printed since 1950—books that have not yet begun to deteriorate. The gigantic problem of dealing with the crumbling printed legacy of the past still remains.

Optical disk technologies that are

very exciting in their potential are now emerging. CD-ROMs ["compact disk / read-only-memory"], which are "read" by compact disk players that are hooked up to microcomputers, are often used to store periodical indexes, abstracting services, and full-text reference works—the sort of materials that were traditionally available either in print or, more recently, online.

Unlike microforms, the optical disk medium also offers the possibility of color, sound, and motion. The Museum of the Jewish Heritage, in New York, is developing an "Interactive Encyclopedia of the Jewish Heritage," that in its present form makes use of a personal computer (including a color monitor) and an IBM info-window that combines a 12-inch-laserdisk player and a computer graphics window. When it is completed in 1992, this computerized reference work will store approximately 2,500 articles, along with pictorial matter. Another videodisk project is YIVO's "People of a Thousand Towns," which employs a 12-inch laserdisk for storage of 18,000 photographic images of Jewish scenes in Eastern Europe. These images are searchable through a computer keyboard and they can be copied by using a Polaroid camera that is attached to the laserdisk player. Development of "People of a Thousand Towns" has taken the better part of a decade, and consumed half a million dollars in equipment and staff time. Optical disks are part of a brave new world that does not come cheaply.

There is no question that optical disks are a far more versatile storage medium than are microfilms. But on top of their high development, production, and purchase costs, three factors work against optical disks as a preservation medium: First, it is estimated that CD-ROMs and laserdisks have a shelf life of perhaps no more than 10 to 20 years. This implies that, in order to lend permanence to their contents, they must be rerecorded at regular intervals. Second, and as a corollary to the permanence question, this medium is still quite new, and today's devices for "reading" optical disks may soon prove to be as obsolete as Edison's cylinder photograph became when the turntable was introduced. Thirdly, the resolution of images on the TV and computer monitor screens to which laserdisks are hooked up is unsatisfactory, though this may change in the next decade, when high-definition television is finally introduced. Thus, at the present moment, while optical disk technologies

are promising in terms of the new products that have been developed for them, they leave a great deal to be desired as a preservation medium. For the time being, then, the consensus remains in the research library world—a consensus that is shared by library consortia and by funding agencies—that preservation microfilming, for all its faults, is, in the words of Maxine Sitts, "the only thing that we know works, is cost-effective, and provides for equitable access."

This, in its broadest outlines, is the situation that Judaica research repositories now face: tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands of volumes of scarce and deteriorating publications, as well as significant archival collections in Jewish and European languages urgently require preservation, which in today's terms, at least, means microfilming. The task at hand is enormous. Much important work has already been done. We, in our days, are fortunate to be able to make a significant contribution toward ensuring that the entire documented legacy of past generations will be preserved for the generations that are yet to come.

NEW APPOINTMENTS:

- **Esther Benbassa**, Director of Research, Jewish Studies, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Sorbonne (Paris III), Paris
 - **Richard A. Cohen**, Professor and Chair of Judaic Studies, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 - **Robert Gibbs**, Assistant Professor of Religion, Modern Judaism and Contemporary Jewish Philosophy, Princeton University
 - **Jacob Neusner**, Graduate Research Professor of Humanities and Religious Studies, University of South Florida, Tampa
 - **Jack Nusan Porter**, Assistant Professor of Social Science, College of Basic Studies, Boston University
-

CREATING JUDAICA RESEARCH COLLECTIONS

Linda P. Lerman

Yale University Library

Since the 1970's, academic institutions have witnessed continuous growth in the number of Jewish Studies programs across the United States. The latest study published on these programs, sponsored by the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations and the Association for Jewish Studies in 1979, *Jewish Studies at American and Canadian Universities*, offers insight into the magnitude of such programs. Jewish Studies courses were offered in 346 colleges and universities, and graduate programs existed in 58 institutions, a 15% increase since the previous B'nai B'rith survey published in 1972.

A more recent publication by B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, *Jewish Life on Campus: A Directory of B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations and Other Jewish Campus Agencies*, issued last year, lists more than 400 colleges and universities in the United States and Canada that either participate in joint programs of Judaic Studies, offer courses in that area, and/or grant bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees in Judaic Studies. Unfortunately, the limitations of this study are sufficient to prevent its direct comparison with the earlier surveys. Primary among the limitations is the fact that the publication only lists campuses with Hillel Foundations, eliminating perhaps dozens of additional institutions. Nonetheless, the trend is apparent. This latest directory shows a growth in the numbers of institutions offering Jewish Studies courses and programs.

While many people have discussed the purpose of these programs vis a vis the community and the role of the Judaica scholar, one pragmatic issue that has yet to be addressed is the creation of a Judaica research collection. The primary resource for faculty and students alike on campus is the library. How are the libraries of this growing list of institutions handling the demands placed on them by new faculty, new courses, and new programs? How can a university library with minimal holdings support a newly formed program of study and build a university

level research Judaica collection? What should the priorities be? What resources are necessary and what is available?

Creation of Judaica Collections

The act of creation does not occur in six days, nor six months or even in so many years. Creating a Judaic research collection is a painstaking and ultimately rewarding mission. Clearly the availability of library resources directly affects the quality of teaching and research at any institution.

Unlike the early decades of this century, the availability of major private collections of Judaica is insufficient to meet the current demands for collection development. The handful of great university Judaica collections in the United States, such as those at Harvard, Yale, and Columbia, were built in the early decades of this century with major gift collections.¹

No longer are book dealers packaging core collections for libraries to purchase. Now libraries are competing for scarce resources in a market of Fax machines, trans-Atlantic telephone calls, and a growing number of auctions. Specialized collections continue to be donated to Judaica collections. Arthur A. Cohen's library of 3000 titles of Jewish philosophy and theology and his archival collection of manuscripts and archives was donated to Yale University last year. As valuable as they are, these private libraries, represent but a small segment of the needs of a research level collection. They add to the strengths of a well-rounded collection but cannot form the core on their own.

The scarcity of these collections together with the increased interest in Judaica book collecting, has inflated

the cost of acquiring major collections. The late Prof. Salo Baron's library of 20,000 volumes was acquired in 1985 by Stanford University's Green Library at a cost of \$1,000,000. The Taube/Baron Collection of Jewish History and Culture now forms the core of Stanford's Judaica collection, but it is only a beginning in collection development for them.

In Charles Berlin's article in the *American Jewish Year Book* (1975),² he described the vast library resources available in rabbinical seminaries, research institutions, colleges of Jewish Studies, public libraries, and colleges and universities in the United States. At the time of Berlin's study, only five college/university libraries, namely Brandeis University, Columbia University, Harvard University, University of California at Los Angeles, and Yale University contained substantial Judaica collections of over 50,000 volumes. Twenty-two other colleges and universities held collections of 10,000-40,000 volumes, and 14 others held collections of 5,000-10,000 volumes. Another 50 or so institutions reported holding fewer volumes.

If one agrees with Berlin's assumption that at least 10,000 volumes are required for an undergraduate program in Jewish Studies and at least 20,000 for graduate studies, then only 27 colleges and universities out of the approximately 300 institutions offering college courses in Jewish Studies in the mid-1970's, or 9%, held adequate library collections of Judaica. The numbers of volumes required for 1989 are higher than Berlin's 1975 figures. I estimate that a minimum of 15,000 and 30,000 volumes are now required for undergraduate and graduate work in Jewish Studies respectively and that a research level collection should contain at least 75,000 volumes.

Michael Grunberger's recent paper "From Strength to Strength: Judaica Collections Facing the Future," recent-

1. The creation stories of the great collections at the Hebrew Union College Library, the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, the Library of Congress Hebraica Section, and the Jewish Division of the New York Public Library can be found in Adolph S. Oko "Jewish Book Collections in the United States," *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 45 (1943/44), pp. 47-65.

2. Charles Berlin, "Library Resources for Jewish Studies in the United States," *American Jewish Year Book* vol. 75 (1974/75), pp. 3-53.

ly published in *Judaica Librarianship*,³ refers to the most recent survey of 37 libraries with Judaica collections of 1,400 to 350,000 volumes, conducted by Stephen Lehmann of the University of Pennsylvania. That survey is scheduled to be published in July 1990 as an appendix to Garland Press's *Encyclopedia of Jewish-American History and Culture*. The trend, Grunberger concluded, is that the total number of volumes housed in these libraries has shown a substantial increase from 2 million volumes at the time of the Berlin study to the 3.5 million volume figure in Lehmann's study of 1988.

What I find most striking is the number of libraries Lehmann claims have substantial or even moderate Judaica collections, only 37 out of over 400. Berlin's survey listed 41 college and university libraries in the 5000+ volume category. While awaiting the publication of Lehmann's survey, the inadequacy of many of our libraries' collections is apparent.

Collection Development

As libraries hunt for the collections to fill their lacunae, a systematic approach to collection development must be employed to insure a well-rounded collection and not a haphazard amassing of books. Several volumes on general collection development have been published in recent years. Blaine H. Hall's *Collection Assessment Manual for College and University Libraries*⁴ covers the major issues of collection measurement, client-centered measures, assessment for special purposes such as weeding projects and establishing approval plans, statistical aids, sample survey instruments, and academic library standards as established by the Association of College and Research Libraries. To my knowledge no collection assessment manual has ever been published for Judaica.

Edith and Meir Lubetski's, *Building a Judaica Library Collection*⁵ offers ac-

quisitions information on domestic and international book publishers and book dealers as well as the antiquarian trade. Aware that much of the information is dated, Edith Lubetski and I have agreed to begin work on a second edition this spring.

While several Judaica research libraries have created in-house documents regarding the proposed collection development in a particular subject area, none have been published to date. At the same time, the Research Libraries Information Network does provide the opportunity to create an online conspectus for Judaica with room for an assessment of current levels of acquisitions as well as the depth of the collection. No institution has yet completed a conspectus for Judaica primarily because of the enormous amount of time required to complete a conspectus and the subjective nature of evaluating levels of strength.

Most college and research libraries utilize blanket order or approval plans established with any number of book dealers. These plans allow for the automatic supply of materials in specified subject areas meeting established criteria as set by the library. Only Yeshiva University's Germanic Judaica Blanket order has been published. The plan as described by Shmuel Klein and Zvi Erenyi in *Judaica Librarianship*⁶ is a model to be emulated as it combines an in-depth analysis of the profile, supported by statistical commentary.

Until a collection development manual is developed for Judaica, the models for general collection development can serve as a guide. Each librarian of a Judaica collection needs to develop a method to analyze what is on the shelf and a plan for future collection development.

Collection Assessment

Assessment of a library's collection can be achieved in several ways. Faculty can point to gaps in a collection in their particular areas of expertise. Consultants can be brought in to assess the collection. Bibliographies in various areas can be searched against the collection. Interlibrary loan requests, new book recommendations, development of new courses or areas of study, discussions with students researching senior theses or dissertations, or with other members of the faculty on their current

research interests, are methods of uncovering immediate needs.

New faculty often impell libraries to develop new areas. For example, after Professor Binyamin Harshav joined the faculty in 1987, Yale made a major effort to develop research level collections in Yiddish and Hebrew literature. Previously, Yale's holdings in these areas were minimal, representing only the major authors. In the past year, Yale University has been successful in establishing a significant endowment in Yiddish literature. The initial three years of the endowment allow for the purchase of 10,000 volumes from the National Yiddish Book Center, immediately tripling the size of the previous collection. Yale has created a comprehensive collective of Yiddish literature which now includes reference materials, literary criticism, biography, literature and drama, history, Zionism and numerous other categories of materials. I still am seeking an exhaustive collection or collections of Hebrew literature and have a few leads to follow up. More would be appreciated.

Collection assessment results in the formulation of a picture of the collection. Some subject areas will show strengths to build upon. Other areas may indicate major gaps in the development of the collection. While there should be a core collection of Judaica for most undergraduate programs that will not differ from institution to institution, it is at the research level that an institutions' special collections and depth of collection development is most significant.

Acquisitions

The standard practice in most academic libraries is for book selectors to consult published bibliographies. National bibliographies such as the *British National Bibliography*, *Deutsche National-Bibliographie*, *Bibliographie de la France*, *Bulletin critique du livre francais* are only a few of the two dozen general bibliographies issued weekly, quarterly, or monthly that contain Judaica. Specialized Judaica and Hebraica current bibliographies include *Kiryat Sefer*, as well as regular articles in the *Jewish Book Annual*, *Judaica Librarianship*, and *American Jewish History*. Additionally, some book dealers specializing in Judaica and/or Hebraica issue catalogs of recently published materials or can respond to specific requirements.

3. Michael Grunberger, "From Strength to Strength-Judaica Collections Facing the Future," *Judaica Librarianship*, vol. 4, #2 (Spring 1988 / Winter 1989), pp. 123-127, reprinted from *Judaica Librarianship: Facing the Future: Proceedings of a Conference held at Harvard University on May 2-3, 1988...* Edited by Charles Berlin (Harvard University Library, 1989), pp. 14-26.

4. Blaine H. Hall, *Collection Assessment Manual for College and University Libraries* (Oryx Press, 1985).

5. Edith Lubetski and Meir Lubetski, *Building a Judaica Library Collection* (Libraries Unlimited, 1983).

6. Shmuel Klein and Zvi Erenyi, "A German Judaica Blanket Order: Description and Analysis," *Judaica Librarianship* vol. 2, #1-2 (Spring, 1985), pp. 41-48.

Other titles can be uncovered in reviewing currently received materials. The bibliographies and footnotes found in most scholarly works are an additional method of locating titles in specific subject areas. Organizational newsletters often list pamphlets and in-house publications that never receive adequate publicity in the book trade.

Ephemeral materials such as broadsides, maps, videos, photographs, and sound recordings require an entirely different approach than the standardized book trade. Online databases, themselves another format of published materials, can be searched for additional citations.

There are standard bibliographic sources to consult in selecting Judaica and Hebraica. But for the Judaica bibliographer, creative exploration of all possible avenues results in a well-rounded and comprehensive collection.

Cooperative Collection Development

A small number of Judaica research libraries are represented among the membership of the Council of Archives and Research Libraries in Jewish Studies (CARLJS) which functions under the umbrella of the National Foundation for Jewish Culture. CARLJS provides a cooperative approach in addressing many of the pressing issues facing Judaica libraries such as cataloging, preservation, and cooperative acquisitions programs. Currently there are 37 members including archives, museums, institutes, seminaries, and colleges and universities. Of the 37, only 10 represent college and university libraries with Judaica Studies programs.

Nearly the same group of colleges and universities are represented by a second organization in its first year of existence, the Jewish and Middle East Studies Program (JAMES) of the Research Libraries Group (RLG), the only online bibliographic utility with Hebraica vernacular capability outside of Israel. Development of Hebraica capability was dependent on the continuous pressure and cooperative assistance of the members of CARLJS and the commitment of the academic research libraries that make up RLG.

While only 10 college and university libraries are members of CARLJS, all who are members of RLG can derive cataloging and acquisitions information. Within two months, the majority of all Judaica research libraries in the United States will be utilizing this net-

work or adding their bibliographic records to it.

Collection development also involves preservation of materials. The two groups, CARLJS and the JAMES program of RLG are simultaneously working on microfilming projects to preserve collections by assigning subject specializations to each member library.

Budget

It is obvious that the more funding available, the greater the speed with which to build a Judaica library. Facsimile and microform publishing in particular have become a significant source for acquiring copies of archival documents, out-of-print books, catalogs of libraries, and serial and newspaper runs. A sample of recent microform titles includes:

- *Archives of the Holocaust*, a facsimile series of key documents and photographs from international archives, edited by Henry Friedlander and Sybil Milton. 18 vols, (Garland). \$1850 until 1/1/90, afterwards \$2305.

- *Forverts or Jewish Daily Forward*, (New York) 1897-1988. 693 reels of 35 mm. silver positive microfilm (Norman Ross). \$29,995 until 6/30/90, afterwards \$34,000.

- *Israel Government Publication*. 48 titles on microfiche (Inter Documentation Company). Sfr 32,895.

- *The Jerusalem Post*, Dec. 1919-1986, on microfiche (Inter Documentation Company). Sfr 18,420.

- *Jewish Studies—Reference Works, Selected Bibliographies and Biographies*, edited by S. Shunami. (IDC) Sfr 1,650.

- *Hebrew Books from the Harvard College Library* (close to 5000 volumes selected by Charles Berlin (Saur). \$40,000 silver halide, \$36,000 diazo.

While the costs are great, all libraries creating a research level Judaica collection must inevitably purchase these sets, either to bring new titles to the collection or to preserve materials in a rapid state of decay. Book budgets need to be upwards of \$75,000 and current serials budgets need to be at least \$7,500-\$10,000 to support 500 titles, a minimum for a research collection. Libraries must consider additional budgetary lines for antiquarian titles, purchasing special collections, ephemeral items, and expensive microforms.

As indicated earlier, only a small percentage of institutions offering

classes in Jewish Studies or degree granting Judaica Studies programs have significant Judaica libraries. Fewer still are the number of libraries that employ full time Judaica bibliographers and catalogers whether for lack of funding for such positions or lack of qualified candidates.

Creating research level collection of Judaica requires major support by the institution to respond to the limited availability of traditional resources. It also requires the tenacity to approach collection development systematically and consistently. To be accomplished properly, the development of a collection requires a close, yet supportive and collegial working relationship with the faculty. It also requires the awareness of actual costs of salaries, book and serial budgets, stack space, preservation, and related memberships. The future of research level Judaica Studies in universities demands the close cooperation of university libraries, the scholars in Jewish Studies, and Judaica bibliographers.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION:

- To purchase a copy of the AJS Mailing List please contact A.B. Data Information Management and Marketing Services, (800) 558-6908, and ask for Jill Cohen. In Israel please contact A.B. Data Ltd., (03) 742-5666.

- The scholarly journal *Religion*, an international journal published in London, with European and American editorial boards, welcomes articles from scholars in Jewish Studies. Send all manuscripts (3 copies) to Dr. Ivan Strenski, 3463 Meier Street, Mar Vista, Los Angeles, CA 90066-1701.

ON THE COMPUTER FRONT:

HEBREW—ENGLISH AND MULTI—LINGUAL WORD PROCESSING

Howard Marblestone

Lafayette College

Tzvee Zahavy's article, "Microcomputing and Jewish Studies" (*AJS Newsletter*, Second Series, No. 2 [#38] (Spring, 1989), pp. 1, 13-14), has opened a valuable forum for discussion of these issues, to which Gary Rendsburg has contributed significantly in his "English-Hebrew Word Processing" (Second Series, No. 3 [#39] (Fall, 1989), p. 6). In order to dispute the conclusion of Zahavy, that "scholars who sprinkle occasional Hebrew into English articles will be better served by cutting and pasting or leaving space and typing in the missing words rather than adapting to a new word processor," Rendsburg cites his extensive use of MegaWriter, marketed by Paraclete Software, for Hebrew-English word processing on the IBM PC. He remarks: "I cannot imagine a better word processor for scholars who write in English and need to enter Hebrew words (or vice versa)...", a statement which he supports by describing several excellent features of MegaWriter, including its various word processing capabilities, its support of Greek, Arabic, and other fonts, and its reasonable price. Rendsburg is careful to note that his words imply no commercial endorsement.

In my view the fundamental question is not whether for bi- or multi-lingual writing one needs to "adapt to a new word processor," in the words of Zahavy, for, as he remarks: "Even the best of these complex and not especially user friendly packages demand more commitment and serve up less satisfaction than the best left to right word processing programs around..." (p. 13). Instead, the question for me is whether a scholar/teacher can write all his/her mono-, bi-, and multilingual documents with one comprehensive program that matches in power, versatility, and sophistication the best of the current monolingual programs, such as WordPerfect, Microsoft Word, or Nota Bene. As a classicist with strong interest in Hebrew and Semitics, I write syllabi, class materials, and articles in English with Greek and Hebrew insertions; letters in English sprinkled with Greek and Hebrew; and letters in Hebrew sprinkled with Greek and English. I would like to have one standard medium for word processing, text management, and bibliography

whereby I can both a) deploy bi/multi-lingual materials for my own use; and b) communicate with other scholars or publications, as, for example, by submitting an article on a diskette in a widely accepted format.

Like Rendsburg, I intend here no commercial endorsement, nor do I wish to complicate the picture by pleading for my favorite program. But I have found Nota Bene to be the virtually ideal scholar's workstation for superlative word processing and text management in English and, with its Special Language Supplements, in Hebrew, Greek, and other languages. I shall discuss briefly 1) how and why I have reached this conclusion, the result of two years of investigation; and 2) the special strengths of NB for processing and text management.

For several years I found WordPerfect, through Version 5.0, outstanding for all my monolingual documents. Its current share of the word processing market for the IBM PC, c. 30%, indicates its solid popularity. At the same time I sought long and hard for bi/multi-lingual word processing software that would offer power, flexibility, and sophistication comparable to those of WP as well as the capacity to communicate with it.

WordPerfect Corporation has recently released its own Foreign Language Modules to be used with WP 5.1 (release dated 19 January 1990 or later). These combine standard WP functions with speller, thesaurus, and hyphenation program in the foreign language. The latest modules released are Russian and Greek, so far without speller or thesaurus. As for languages requiring right-to-left formatting, the following is a reliable statement from WordPerfect Corporation:

Worldwide compatibility has long been WPCorp's goal. Language Modules are an interim solution to popular end-user demands. WPCorp will eventually have complete, translated versions of WordPerfect running in many languages (possibly Japanese, Russian, Greek, Arabic, Hebrew, etc). (Corey Freebairn and Ronnie Johansen, "In Russian, With Love," *WordPerfect Magazine*, March, 1990, p.42.)

I do not know whether or not WPCorp plans to release a Hebrew module.

I tried several of the programs men-

tioned in passing by Zahavy. Let me indicate briefly why each of them did not meet my requirements.

MULTIWRITER II, DELUXE MULTI-LINGUAL PACKAGE from Davka Corporation, Chicago, offers most standard features and bi-directional formatting (but not automatic and continuous, as in WP) in English, Hebrew, Arabic, Greek (modern), and Cyrillic scripts. But the program allows at one time only two scripts, of which one must be English and the other "foreign." Hence one may not, for example, write in Hebrew and insert Greek. Printing is graphic mode and only for 9-pin among dot matrix printers; the printing process is intolerably long. In order to use higher-density printers, one loads a MW file into a separate printer program, Polyprint, developed by Polyglot Solutions, Los Angeles, which downloads an elegant Hebrew font. The printing, then in text mode, is rapid. The program has virtually no ASCII capability nor ability to communicate otherwise with other programs. As an English word processor MW II cannot compare with WP.

MULTI-LINGUAL SCHOLAR, from Gamma Productions, Santa Monica, Version 3.2 (released March, 1989) is probably the most effective program for the display and automatic, bidirectional formatting of English, Hebrew, Arabic, Classical Greek, and Cyrillic scripts (see the comments of Stephen A. Kaufman in his review of John J. Hughes's *Bits, Bytes, and Biblical Studies*, in *Hebrew Studies*, XXX [1989], p. 147). A fine variety of printer fonts is offered. The Font Scholar program enables the user to modify existing scripts or even to create one's own. MLS may be configured to start up in many different editing and printing environments. Its word processing features are adequate but not distinguished. It can communicate with other formats through ASCII and its own Configurable Text Interchange Utility, through which it can read Hebrew and Greek biblical texts encoded in the Michigan-Clairemont scheme and in that of the Center for the Computer Analysis of Texts at the University of Pennsylvania. As Zahavy notes (p. 13), the interfacing of MLS with LBASE 4.0 enhances its capacities for

text retrieval and analysis. But among the serious deficits of MLS are cumbersome operation of formatting and text-enhancement commands, inflexibility for customization (for example, no default settings may be changed), and graphic printing, which is so slow that one singled-space page takes nearly ten minutes on a dot matrix printer. I have used MLS to prepare and submit on diskette a book review, in English with Hebrew quotations, for *Hebrew Studies*. But like MW II, MLS as an English word processor cannot compare with WP. To be sure, Gamma promises a much-enhanced update in 1990.

SCRIPTURE FONTS, from Zondervan Electronic Publishing, Grand Rapids is an add-on font and printer utility for WordPerfect 5.0 (those releases after January, 1989) and 5.1, whereby one may write in Greek and Hebrew within the WP environment. I participated in the Beta testing of this program in late 1989, when several serious bugs were being worked out. By now, SF should be available in Version 1.0. If the major bugs have been eliminated, SF has excellent potential.

I list here also, with briefer comment, several bi- or multi-lingual programs that I have not tried, but of which I am aware:

- WORDMILL 5.0, from Intersoft Software Engineering, Jerusalem, is widely used in Israel for Hebrew and English; Arabic is available. The program is full-featured and sophisticated. A major difficulty now is that drivers for the printers most used in the United States are not yet available.

- HEBREW MS-DOS, developed in Israel, is available in the United States from Ron Kiener, Department of Religion, Trinity College, Hartford. Kiener reports on BITNET: "Hebrew MS-DOS allows you to run all existing popular DOS applications, such as Microsoft Works, Lotus 1-2-3, WordPerfect and dBase IV in Hebrew mode and get Hebrew, English, and bilingual input/output."

I mention two programs of which I have only heard and have no direct knowledge: MS WORD in Hebrew, due for release in early 1990, and FONTMAX, another add-on utility for Hebrew, Greek, and other scripts in WP 5.0. Finally, Mr. Hillel Sommer of Yale University, with whom I have corresponded on Hebrew-English word processing, earnestly recommends the installation of a Hebrew chip on the PC motherboard for bi-lingual input and output.

As my search for an excellent bi / multi-lingual program availed not, I decided for two major reasons to try Nota Bene, Version 3.0, marketed by Dragonfly Software, New York: 1) several colleagues had averred that its power, flexibility, and sophistication for scholarly use outstripped those of WP. NB is the only word processing program endorsed by the Modern Language Association. It has also earned superlative reviews in the computer media. 2) NB offers two Special Language Supplements in Release One, 1988 (initial release: fall, 1987): a) a "Language-Subset Supplement" that supports five language groups: Biblical Studies; Classical; European, Set A and Set B; Hebrew; Transliterated. Of these one may use, and print files from, only one group ("subset") at a time, although one can select at any time a different language group. The Biblical Studies Group supports Hebrew, vocalized Hebrew, classical Greek, modern Greek, German, French, and English, whereas *Hebrew* provides Hebrew; vocalized Hebrew; transliterated Hebrew, Coptic, Ugaritic, Akkadian, and Aramaic. EGA, VGA, or other enhanced video display cards are required for use of this supplement. b) The Complete Languages Supplement, which requires further enhanced video display, supports all these language groups at the same time. Both in the Biblical Studies and Hebrew groups vowels are displayed as separate characters to the left of their consonants but printed correctly. A serious deficit now for Semiticists is the lack of Arabic; but Dragonfly promises to include that as soon as possible. NB claims to offer through the SLS the same full-featured excellence for bi/multilingual word processing as for English. In the words of Dragonfly Software: "...we believed that a scholar's workstation of astonishing capabilities could be created for the most modest of hardware...through the integration of word processing with text retrieval and bibliographic data management in a fully multilingual environment" (*Wings* [Newsletter of Dragonfly Software], Spring/Summer 1989, p.8).

I have found that NB is a superb program in significant ways that are the model of crafting for academic use. NB was designed and implemented primarily by scholars, linguists, and writers. It excels in word processing of extraordinary power (indeed surpassing that of WP), endless flexibility (especially for customization and pro-

gramming), and remarkable capacities for search and database management (A detailed review of Version 2.0 [Beta] is found in Hughes's *Bits, Bytes and Biblical Studies*. A future edition of this excellent handbook should include a review of 3.0 and of the SLS, as should also forthcoming issues of *Bits and Bytes Review*. A brief review of the SLS by M. Choker-Nefesh in *Bulletin of Higher Hebrew Education*, Volume 4, No. 1 [Fall, 1989], pp. 35-36, has several inaccuracies). It offers a remarkable new Bibliography Utility that works in all major formats and even switches among them. NB readily communicates with other word processing programs because a) its files are stored in a basic ASCII format (conveniently readable through the DOS "TYPE" command); and b) via DCA (Document Content Architecture), a built-in IBM utility, NB files are readily exchangeable with other word processors such as WordPerfect or Microsoft Word.

But most remarkable of all in my view, the claims of NB for full-featured bi / multi-lingual word processing have proved true. One may do in Hebrew, Greek, or any other language supported by the SLS any and every word processing or textmanagement function available in English, including data entry and search in the Bibliography Utility, whether the primary language of a document is English, Hebrew, or any other supported by the SLS, and whether the formatting is left to right, right to left, or a complex mixture of the two. Further, Dragonfly plans to release this year, perhaps as early as the summer, a new version of the SLS incorporating many enhancements of the program and refinements of its operation. Among the most notable features are support for more printers and greatly improved Hebrew, Greek, and Russian fonts for laser printers.]

In sum, then, Nota Bene has turned out to be the "one comprehensive program" that I can use for all my own mono and bi/multi-lingual work. In my view, NB ought to become the standard for scholars and teachers in the Humanities and Social Sciences and particularly for those who regularly use more than one script. I would be pleased to communicate with anyone interested further, either by mail or by BITNET: MARBLESH@LAFAYETT. Address regular mail to: Howard Marblestone, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Lafayette College, Easton, PA 18042.

Grunberger, cont'd

In a related and equally salutary development—on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary in May 1988 of the establishment of the Harvard College Library's Judaica Division—Harvard presented an extraordinary gift to the two bibliographic utilities and through them to the nation: 90,000 romanized machine-readable records representing its Hebrew and Yiddish holdings, the product of a successful and unprecedented six-year project to convert to machine-readable form its remarkably rich and varied collections.

Surprisingly, Harvard's records take on added importance on the RLIN network, since the RLIN system requires parallel input of vernacular and romanized data to enable member libraries without the special hardware and software needed to display Hebrew script entries to have access to the romanized portions of these records.

Successfully loaded onto both bibliographic utilities in early 1989, the Harvard data have instantly provided the critical mass of current and retrospective records that will enable thousands of libraries to reap benefits previously reserved for non-Hebraic titles. More Hebraica will be cataloged and available for use since throughput time will be cut as catalogers derive all or parts of the Harvard records for their own use. And the presence of a significant number of records online will undoubtedly increase resource sharing

through interlibrary loans among Judaica libraries, as libraries attach their holding symbol to Harvard's bibliographic records. For Hebraica, then, it is likely that the bibliographic utilities will evolve into *de facto* union catalogs, succeeding—but not replacing—the extensive union catalogs maintained by the Library of Congress' Hebraic Section since the early 1950s.

In analyzing access to Jewish Studies materials in an automated environment, several key factors emerge. For roman script materials, automation has, for the most part, yielded the promised results. But for material in non-roman scripts in general and Hebrew in particular, access via vernacular search strings was not enhanced in the new environment; indeed these esoteric materials were for the most part ignored as the bibliographic utilities focused on developing and enhancing access to the most used portions of their members' collections—the collections in roman script. And without the creation of vernacular machine-readable records for Hebrew materials, the spinoff online catalogs affording access in the vernacular to these titles could not be created.

I do not want to leave the impression that none of this nation's important collections of Hebraica are available on local online catalogs. They are available and accessible on tens if not hundreds of local online catalogs (LC and Har-

vard are just two of many examples of libraries with in-house online catalogs that include Hebraica). But these catalogs manipulate romanized data and do not enable users to display, search, and index items in Hebrew script.

To gain access to a Hebrew title using an online vernacular search, today's scholar must depend on the skills of specialist catalogers and reference librarians practiced in the arcane ways of the cataloging utilities. It is hoped that in the not too distant future, the power of these new technologies will be readily and directly available (without intermediaries) to scholars working with Jewish Studies materials through online public access terminals available in reading rooms or remotely via telephone lines. It is no longer a question of technology. Israel's "Aleph" system has been providing its users with sophisticated and comprehensive online capabilities for some time now. Clearly, pressure for this to happen here will increase as a greater percentage of Hebrew titles can be accessed only through the online environment. It is, however, this step—developing local online catalogs capable of exploiting fully these newly created vernacular records—that is the critical one needed to translate these intermediate gains into ones that more directly touch the daily activities of researchers and scholars working in Jewish Studies.

FELLOWSHIPS:

- National Endowment for the Humanities, Travel to Collections Award (\$750). Deadline July 15. Contact Travel to Collections Program, Division of Fellowships and Seminars, Room 316, National Endowment for the Humanities, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20506
- National Endowment for the Humanities, Summer Stipends. Deadline October 1, 1990. Contact Joseph B. Neville, Division of Fellowships and Seminars, NEH, Washington, D.C. 20506
- Southern Jewish Historical Society, grants of up to \$2,500 per year for books or other media on the Southern Jewish experience. This money cannot be used for research or travel. Deadline August 1, 1990. Contact Dr. Sheldon Hanft, Appalachian State University, History Department, 238 Whitener Hall, Boone, NC 28608

PRIZES

- Fraenkel Prize in Contemporary History awarded by the Wiener Library, London. This award of \$7,500 is made for an outstanding work in the fields of interest of the Wiener Library, including 20th century history of Central Europe, modern Jewish history, World War II, fascism and totalitarianism, political violence, and racism. Manuscripts may be between 10,000-100,000 words and applicants should be under 35 years old. Please contact The Administrative Secretary, Wiener Library, 4 Devonshire Street, London W1N 2BH, England.
- B.H. Levy Student Essay Prize in Southern Jewish History, sponsored by the Southern Jewish Historical Society, \$500. Deadline August 1, 1990. Send papers to Mrs. Phyllis Weinstein, 4149 Churchill Drive, Birmingham, AL 35213

UPCOMING CONFERENCES:

- "Hebrew and the Bible in Colonial America: Historical, Literary, and Theological Aspects," May 20-23, 1990, Dartmouth College. For information please contact Shalom Goldman, Asian Studies Program, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755
- "Judaism and Chosenness," sponsored by the Academy of Jewish Philosophy, the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, and the Religion Department, Temple University, June 3-4, 1990, Philadelphia. For more information contact Professor Jacob Staub, Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, Church Road and Greenwood Avenue, Wyncote, PA 19095
- "First International Conference of Judaica and Israeli Librarians," sponsored by the Association of Jewish Libraries of the US, the Israel Society of Special Libraries and Information Centers, the Israel Library Association, and the Israel Minister of Education and Culture, July 2-6, 1990, Jerusalem. For information contact Edith Lubetski, Heidi Steinberg Library, Yeshiva University, 245 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10016-4699
- "Jewish Sects, Religious Movements, and Political Parties," sponsored by the Philip M. and Ethel Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilization, Creighton University, Omaha, October 14-15, 1990. For more information

contact Dr. Menachem Mor, Klutznick Chair for Jewish Civilization, Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska 68178

- "The Role of Geography in Jewish Civilization-Perceptions of Space, Place, Time and Location in Jewish Life and Thought," sponsored by the Melton Center for Jewish Studies and the Ohio State University, October 21-22, 1990, Ohio State University, Columbus. Call for papers. Please contact Neil G. Jacobs, Department of Judaic and Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, The Ohio State University, 256 Cunz Hall, 1841 Millikin Rd., Columbus, OH 43210-1229
- "Yiddish Literature of the Holocaust: Literary, Philosophical, and Historical Implications," sponsored by the Department of the Literature of the Jewish People, Rena Costa Chair of Yiddish Language and Literature, Bar Ilan University and the Institute of Judaic Studies, Florida International University, October 29-30, 1990. Call for Papers. For more information contact Professors Gershon Winer and Stephen Fain, Institute of Judaic Studies, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199
- "Latin American Jewish Studies Association, Research Conference on the Expulsion from Spain and the Jewish Encounter with the New World, October 6-8, 1991, University of Maryland, College Park. Call for Papers by September 1. Contact Prof. Saül Sosnowski, Dept. of Spanish and Portuguese, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

Association for Jewish Studies Newsletter

c/o Meyerhoff Center for Jewish Studies
2106 Jimenez Hall
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Permit - 10 College Park, MD
--

