Was There a "Jerusalem School"?
An Inquiry into the First Generation of Historical Researchers at The Hebrew University

David N. Myers
(UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES)

The history of historical writing, Herbert Butterfield announces in Man on his Past, "involves an enquiry into the manner in which men have changed their sentiment for the past, their feeling about the bonds which link one generation with another, their sense of time and their awareness that they are part of the long, unceasing stream of history."1 This symposium marks a welcome, if somewhat belated, acceptance of Sir Herbert's challenge to study how and why perceptions and representations of the Jewish past have varied so widely over time. The urgency of such a task has only increased in the postmodern world, in which the most fundamental assumptions about literary and historical representation—for instance, the possibility of objectivity, the validity of authorial intent—are being called into question.2 In fact, the intense scrutiny of, and attendant skepticism about, the authorial (or historiographical) claim to truth has produced a heightened sensitivity to the vagaries of interpretation, a sensitivity that is no doubt manifested in the essays comprising this volume.

Infused by this sensitivity, the history of modern Jewish historiography must trace the shifting sentiments that both link and divide generations in their views of the past. Toward that end, one would be well advised to take note of an apparent anomaly: namely, that the first generation of modern Jewish scholars, members of the Verein für Cultur and Wissenschaft der Juden, emerged in an era when that past was generally seen as following the contours of the Volk—the dignified nation whose cultural and political creativity was organically rooted in the soil of its homeland.3 Yet at a time when the Monumenta Germaniae Historica was first being collected (with the declared mission of deepening love for the fatherland), the members of the Verein had fixed their gaze not on a material, territorial Jewish nation, but on the more ethereal spiritual force of Judaism. Their historical line of vision was shaped by, and mirrored, their own self-definition as Jews, as members of a religious community (Religionsgemeinschaft).
Conversely, when a new national sentiment began to excite European Jews later in the nineteenth century, the resulting reformulation of group identity seemed to warrant a realignment of historical vision. It now appeared that Jewish scholarship would conform to the model of historiography as the story of a nation. Indeed, this expectation inspired the proto-nationalist Peretz Smolenskin as early as 1869 in his call for a historical-ethnographic study of the “ways of the people.”4 It later informed the autonomist Simon Dubnow in his “sociological” corrective of Wissenschaft des Judentums, as well as Yiddishist scholars in their investigations of Jewish demography, and social and economic history.5 And it also undergirded the programmatic agenda of the first generation of scholars at the Institute of Jewish Studies (IJS) of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Yet before accepting uncritically the idea of an ideological and historiographical bouleversement, it seems sensible to recall that programmatic assertions of dramatic change are not always realized. The truism that revolutions often turn full circle to the original point of departure wisely recognizes that theory and praxis are rarely confluent. Nationalist movements that promise their adherents a transformation of objective reality do not necessarily effect that transformation. Nor do they embody an eternal and organic essence, as partisans often maintain. Indeed, students of nationalism have observed that the once-standard attributes of national status (land or language) may be less significant in defining a national group than are the shifting ideological or mythic constructs of elite propagandists.6 According to this argument, national identity is to a great extent a function of subjective imagining, of a concerted effort to invent a national history on which to base future action.

While important in challenging “foundationalist” claims to national identity, this mode of analysis is also significant for undermining the claims of nationalist ideologies that they speak in the name of a large and undifferentiated collectivity. There is, of course, a danger in such a leveling instinct, one that was apprehended before the current scholarly generation by a prescient, turn-of-the-century thinker with a special interest in Jewish nationalism: Max Nordau. It is not Nordau’s close partnership with Theodor Herzl in Zionist affairs that merits attention here. It is rather his attempt to “deconstruct” the notion of objectivity in history and in group definition. In his *The Interpretation of History*, published in 1909, Nordau not only chastened the great Leopold von Ranke for his naïve desire to “extinguish the Self” in order to render the reality of things; he also objected to an enterprise such as *Völkerpsychologie* (pioneered by two Jews, Mortiz Lazarus and Heymann Steinthal), which grinds diverse individual psychologies into an undifferentiated mass.7 Nordau pointed out the idiosyncratic inheritances of every individual, each a knowing subject who observes and participates in the world. Though hardly the first or most persuasive exponent of this view, Nordau is significant precisely because he was able to see through his own identity as scholar and Zionist to the problematic nature of historical interpretation, especially when it involved assertions of group coherence.

Embedded in nineteenth-century historicist thought, his insights serve as a necessary, if sometimes banal, reminder of the complexity of group identity formation. When applied to the theme of this essay, Nordau’s insights encourage a careful
evaluation of the “Jerusalem school,” a term denoting the movement of Jewish nationalist scholars who assembled at the Hebrew University from the mid-1920s.

The term “Jerusalem school” has entered the parlance of contemporary Jewish historical research as the designation for a more or less coherent scholarly movement possessed of a set of shared assumptions and methodologies and inspired by a single ideological fundament: Zionism. For some observers (usually in the diaspora), affiliation with the “Jerusalem school” is regarded in censorious terms, as submission to a rigid and parochial interpretation of the past whose institutional embodiment is the Hebrew University. For others (usually those in Jerusalem), the designation is one of approbation, meant to herald a movement of objective and unapologetic historical research. Indeed, when celebrants of the sixtieth anniversary of the Institute of Jewish Studies gathered in Jerusalem in 1984, they spoke admiringly of the vanguard role played by the “Jerusalem school” in opening new vistas of interpretation and analysis onto the Jewish past.

The relative ease with which the term is bandied about by Jewish researchers today belies its obscure origins. In a memorandum from December 23, 1926, the Galician-born scholar of Islam, L. A. Mayer, wrote of his ardent desire that a “Jerusalem scientific school” soon arise. In the midst of a pitched debate over the proper balance between research and teaching at the newly established Hebrew University, Mayer chose to emphasize neither the ideological conformity of such a school nor its prospective function in shaping a new national memory. Rather, he placed stress on the potential of a “Jerusalem school” to elevate the wissenschaftliche standards of Jewish scholarship. While this aspiration was widely shared by scholars in Jerusalem, Mayer’s terminology was not. That is to say, researchers at the nascent university, regardless of their own sense of national mission, had precious little consciousness of belonging to a discrete “Jerusalem school.” However, over the course of decades, the term was endowed by scholars and critics with a set of fixed meanings and a degree of coherence that it initially lacked.

If this brief Rezeptionsgeschichte reveals a greater complexity and multivalence in the term “Jerusalem school,” then a useful task has been performed. As Max Nordau might have argued, the very appellation “school,” connoting a uniform body of methods or assumptions, often conceals a considerable diversity of views. One need only think of the Prussian or Annales “schools” of historiography, or the “Yale school” of literary criticism, to be reminded of the imprecision involved in assembling different and even competing positions under one terminological roof. The “Jerusalem school” is no different. Its putative representatives reflect a vast array of opinions, methodologies, temperaments and cultural backgrounds that render the term somewhat nebulous. To reduce this profusion to a single Zionist voice—for instance, to that of Yudke, the legendary protagonist of Hayim Hazaz’s short story, “Haderashah”—is to confuse undisguised propaganda with the manifold perspectives of distinct scholars, some of whom were extraordinarily sophisticated in method and conceptualization. Yudke’s oft-quoted declaration that he “opposed Jewish history”—a history of passivity and oppression—does indeed resonate with prominent strains of Zionist thought, specifically those that advocated the “negation of the diaspora.”
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The movement of Jewish scholars from the mid-1920s.
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Beyond the rather prosaic observation that the term “school” tends to obscure
meaningful differences lies a more specific, even counterintuitive insight. For al-
most all who have use for the term, the “Jerusalem school” represents a deliberate
and radical break with previous generations of Jewish scholars, particularly with the
adepts of Wissenschaft des Judentums in nineteenth-century Germany. The shift
in the locus of Jewish scholarship from Europe to Palestine in the first half of the
twentieth century was not simply geographic. A genuine paradigm shift, it would
seem, had occurred. The object of research was no longer Judaism, the religious
tradition, in its glorious literary evolution. It was now the Jewish nation, a decidedly
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as well as intellectual terms. Researchers who came to Palestine in the 1920s,
though they did not instantaneously regard themselves as a coherent school, none-
theless saw a therapeutic potential in the long-awaited return to Zion. Indeed, by
returning to the ancient national homeland, they were, in a sense, effecting a fusion
of the subject and object of Jewish history, of the critical observer and active
participant. They were, as some imagined it, on the path of return to history itself
after millennia of alienation in exile.

In contemporary terms, it would appear that the scholars in Jerusalem were
embarked on a mission to invent their national community. The shift from religious
faith to Volk as the source of study and collective identity rested on their belated
Romanticism, a perspective not fully developed in the Verein für Cultur und Wis-
senschaft der Juden of the early nineteenth century. As Gershom Scholem remem-
ers, his colleagues succeeded where their predecessors had failed in articulating “a
new attitude to the past, a celebration of the splendor and glory of the past in and of
itself, an evaluation of sources in a new light and with due consideration of popular
forces, and above all—a turn to the study of the people and nation.”

And yet the story of the Jerusalem scholars, as Scholem himself acknowledged,
is a good deal more complicated than one of utter novelty. Often enough, unequivoc-
al claims by those intent on establishing new paradigms of knowledge shield a
fractious process of reformulation. Thomas Kuhn warns that “the road to a firm
research consensus is extraordinarily arduous,” oftentimes strewn with “old data
that lie ready to hand.” An examination of the Jewish scholars who migrated to
Jerusalem in the 1920s confirms the complex nature of shaping new scholarly
paradigms. While programmatically asserting radical innovations against a previous
scholarly model, they were unable to disentangle themselves entirely from their
past. With one exception (David Yellin), there were no native-born Jewish scholars
to staff a national institution of Jewish learning and research in Palestine. Rather, the
first generation of Jerusalem scholars came from Europe, where the vast majority
had either studied or taught in German rabbinical seminaries—the very bastions of
Wissenschaft des Judentums. From these seminaries, they brought models of organ-
ization and disciplinary priorities that were subsequently reflected in the develop-
ment of the Institute of Jewish Studies.

The link to these older models and priorities was reinforced by the prominent
role of diaspora Jews in overseeing the Hebrew University. It was not simply a matter of Zionist authorities such as Chaim Weizmann seeking to control university affairs from London. It was also the active involvement of non-Zionists (Adolph Büchler; the French Grand Rabbi, Israel Lévi; and Felix Warburg, for example) in supporting and administering the IJS. The involvement of these non-Zionists, and their potential to influence personnel appointments, prompted one frustrated Zionist to describe the Institute of Jewish Studies as a “proper ‘Golus’ institution,” an ersatz rabbinical seminary in Jerusalem.

In addition to the organizational and institutional links to the diaspora, there are other abiding continuities between the scholars in Jerusalem and their European forebears. Both generations, seemingly oblivious to their own ideological predisposition, manifested an anxious, even compulsive reliance on the standard of scientific objectivity. Indeed, Immanuel Wolf’s pronouncement in the opening pages of the *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* in 1822 that “Wissenschaft is alone above the partisanship, passions, and prejudices of the base life” was frequently reiterated over the course of a century—and beyond. The unrelenting allegiance to scientific validation suggests that no “crisis of historicism,” no exposé of the frailties of the historiographical medium per se, attended the move from diaspora to Zion. The continuum is clearly illustrated in the nomenclature of Jewish studies. In Germany, Jewish scholars designated their labs *Wissenschaft des Judentums*; in Palestine, scholars intent on overcoming the biases and limitations of their predecessors chose a name, *mada’ei hayahadut*, reminiscent—in fact, it is a nearly literal translation—of *Wissenschaft des Judentums.*

What this confluence reveals is yet another negative attribute (in the tradition of medieval theological proofs of the Divine) of the “Jerusalem school.” So far, it has been suggested that the “Jerusalem school” was not a term uniformly embraced by the first generation of Jewish historical researchers at the Hebrew University. Nor did these researchers ever produce a monolithic methodological or conceptual position. Nor, for that matter, did they represent a complete rupture with past generations of Jewish scholars. Indeed, to gain insight into the first generation at the IJS, it is essential to acknowledge the gap between their own programmatic assertions and actual scholarly practices—or alternatively, between the goal of national consciousness-raising and adherence to existing professional norms.

In exploring these gaps more fully, reference will be made not to a “Jerusalem school” but rather to a looser aggregate of “Jerusalem scholars”—a group born in Eastern and Central Europe in the last quarter of the nineteenth century who immigrated to Palestine in the 1920s and 1930s. These scholars represented the founding generation of professional Jewish historical research at the Hebrew University. They also constitute an intriguing mix of innovation and continuity that necessarily complicates any descriptive account. As such, the Jerusalem scholars shed important light on a broader historical context. For they offer a microcosmic view of the dialectical relationship to the past that has animated the Zionist movement throughout its historical development.

The idea of an institution of higher learning in Palestine that could provide a stable foundation for Jewish scholarship antedated the actual founding of the Hebrew University by more than a decade. The official patron of the Hermann Zvi Schapira, the dashing, enigmatic figure of the 1880s, Schapira beguiled his contemporaries with visions of a Jewish universal academia. Despite Schapira’s original idea of an instituton for Jewish studies in 1897, his efforts were initially rebuffed, but with the support of the central Zionist Organization, the institute finally came into being in 1925. The idea of a Jewish university in Palestine was a significant achievement, and it was a testament to the ingenuity and determination of its founders. Throughout its history, the Hebrew University has been a driving force in the development of modern Jewish studies, and its influence has been felt far beyond the borders of the State of Israel.
University by more than forty years. It also preceded by a decade and a half the formal establishment of the World Zionist Organization, which would become the official patron of the university in its embryonic stages. The first proponent was Hermann Zvi Schapira, a Lithuanian-born rabbi who, remarkably, shifted careers in mid-life to become a professor of mathematics at Heidelberg University. In the early 1880s, Schapira began to advocate in the Russian Hebrew newspaper, Hamelitz, the idea of a Jewish institute of higher learning in Palestine consisting of three faculties: theology, theoretical science, and applied science. This particular conception, the product of a man at the crossroads of Lithuanian rabbinism, Haskalah and incipient Zionism, did not become the dominant paradigm for the Jerusalem university. Most subsequent plans spoke of a secular institution that deliberately excluded theological and/or rabbinical studies. Schapira’s plan also differed from those that followed in the matter of the proposed language of instruction. The Heidelberg mathematician preferred German at this stage, deeming Hebrew an unsuitable language for rigorous academic discourse. Later proposals routinely insisted that Hebrew, as an indispensable agent of Jewish national revival, be the language of instruction at a Jewish university.

Despite Schapira’s somewhat archaic, maskilic notions, it was he who presented the idea of an institution of higher learning in Palestine to the inaugural Zionist Congress in 1897. His short speech was greeted, according to the official protocol, with thunderous applause. However, this spontaneous expression of support was not translated into concrete action by the fledgling Zionist movement. In the first years of the twentieth century, a small group of Zionist dissidents, known as the Democratic Faction, attempted to follow up on Schapira’s call and prod the Zionist Organization into quicker action both on the matter of the university and on other cultural matters. But it was not until 1913, at the Eleventh Congress, that the Zionist Organization as a body took significant steps by appointing a committee to explore the possibility of purchasing land for a Jewish university in Jerusalem.

Throughout its history, the stimuli behind the university idea were varied. Some supporters argued that the primary importance of a Jewish university was to serve as a place of refuge for students, especially from Eastern Europe, who were denied access to higher education in their native countries. Others saw the utility of a university in more proactive terms, as a vehicle to advance the ongoing nationalization of Jewish culture. The effort to generate a holistic national culture covered an expansive spectrum of activities including art, music, literature and scholarship. A university in Palestine, it was believed, could be of great value in hastening this process. Interestingly, among the supporters of a Jewish institution of higher learning in Palestine were a number of self-consciously non-Zionist figures such as the Baron Edmond de Rothschild and the German Nobel laureate in chemistry, Paul Ehrlich. What elicited the support of these non-Zionists was the perceived need and potential to establish both a world center of Jewish academic research and also a general center of academic research staffed by Jews.

An important affirmation of this impulse comes from another non-Zionist, Ismar Elbogen, a fixture in German Jewish scholarly circles in the early twentieth century. Elbogen, who was a professor of history and homiletics at the Hochschule/Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin, joined efforts with two
colleagues in 1922 to create a new scholarly journal in Berlin in the Hebrew language. While both of Elbogen’s coeditors, Jacob Nahum Epstein and Harry Torczyner, moved to Palestine, Elbogen himself turned down an offer in 1938 to teach at the Hebrew University, choosing instead to settle in the United States. Earlier, however, he had proclaimed the imperative of rooting Jewish scholarship in Palestine. Writing in a stiff Hebrew style in the second issue of the Berlin journal *Devir*, Elbogen announced:

Finally the time has arrived for the national consciousness of the Jewish people in the broadest and most refined sense of the word—to begin to honor the national literature. . . . The ultimate goal will be achieved with the opening of the Hebrew University and Academy in Eretz Israel, which gathers within it all of the spiritual aspirations of the Jewish people, and will shed much light and wisdom. With this change of status, the question for Jewish studies of using the Hebrew language becomes a question of survival. Only in [Hebrew] can the proper expression for the development of each and every discipline and science be found; and only through its aid can a natural connection to living Judaism be found. 29

Elbogen expressed the hope that contact with the ancient national homeland and language would render Jewish scholars and their work relevant to a vital, present-day Judaism. His optimism belied a deep frustration over the relegation of Jews, in general, and Jewish scholars, in particular, to the margins of gentile society, even in the cultured ambiance of Weimar Germany. Elbogen seemed to challenge the century-old social contract of Jewish emancipation that mandated the bifurcation of identities into religious and national, private and public realms. He was no longer convinced that Jewish scholarship could flourish in the private domain of the rabbinical seminary; consequently, it must forge its way into the public domain of a national university. It was there that the most comprehensive view of the Jewish past could be obtained. And it was only there, Elbogen seemed to imply, that the Jewish historian could overcome two millennia of alienation in the diaspora.

Such a set of suppositions is quite striking when issuing from the pen of a doyen of Wissenschaft des Judentums in Germany. These views may well have reflected Elbogen’s encounter with scholars from Eastern and East Central Europe such as J. N. Epstein and Harry Torczyner, with whom he shared editorial responsibilities for *Devir*. The presence of these scholars and, more generally, Jewish writers and intellectuals from Eastern Europe, in postwar Berlin ignited a new interest in the idea of Jewish nationalism among German Jewish scholars. This was true not only of the best-known cases (Gershom Scholem and Ernst Simon, for example) but also of older and more established figures such as Ismar Elbogen and Julius Guttmann. 30

Frustration with the unrealized ideal of full social integration into German society spread beyond the circle of hardened Zionists to the less ideologically inclined. Elbogen’s words in *Devir* are testimony that, even prior to Jerusalem, scholars had already begun to demonstrate a shift in ideological underpinnings. Indeed, the fleeting convergence of scholars from East and West in Berlin, with its clear “dis-simulatory” effects, anticipated a more lasting meeting in Jerusalem. 31

The aspiration to unite East and West and, as Ismar Elbogen had urged, to return to the point of historical origins was in the air in Jerusalem on December 22, 1924. On that day, the Insti-
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On that day, the Institute of Jewish Studies of the Hebrew University was formally
inaugurated on barren Mount Scopus. The rhetoric of the opening speakers
expressed their sense that a historic moment was upon them. Paradoxically, the rhet-
oric also resonated with powerful religious tones—a fact that not only underscores
the primal tension in Zionism between secular national and religious impulses, but
signals the often convoluted process by which a new model of Jewish scholarship
was proposed in Jerusalem. Judah L. Magnes, the American-born rabbi and first
chancellor of the university, spoke of the institute as “a holy place, a sanctuary in
which to learn and teach, without fear or hatred, all that Judaism has made and
created from the time of the Bible.” He further relied on religious imagery when he
equated the scientific study of the past with the traditional study of Torah: “We exult
in the ideal of pure science; and there is no place in the world with a genius loci as
suitable for Torah as Jerusalem.” This conflation of modern scholarship and the
core text of Jewish tradition bespoke a desire to reach back to the glorious national
past of the Jewish people, to forge a bond between past and present, as well as
between the ancient and modern land of Israel.

Magne's enthusiasm was echoed by Max Margolis, one of three professors to
offer courses at the IJS in its inaugural year. In his opening lecture, Margolis
declared that the location on which the institute was established, Mount Scopus,
“from which we can see the [remnants of the] Temple—is a sanctuary for us.”
Only in this sacred location could Jewish culture be restored to its pristine glory.
This milieu was particularly therapeutic for the study of the Bible, Margolis' own
scholarly interest. He noted with enthusiasm that “here is the place in which we can
detach ourselves from any external influence in interpreting the Bible, which has
come to us through a sacred spirit that has served us only in this land.”

Until that point, Jewish scholars in Europe had tended to avoid systematic and
critical analyses of the Bible for several reasons: first, because of the deeply in-
grained resistance of religious Jews to a method of study that implied a challenge to
the divine origins of the Bible; and second, because of the suspicion that devotees of
higher biblical criticism were set on demonstrating that the Hebrew Bible was
surpassed in ethical virtue and moral authority by the New Testament. In the face
of this longstanding reticence, Max Margolis called for a modern Jewish reassess-
ment of the Bible. This call, it would seem, was fully consonant with the aims of the
broader Zionist movement to which Margolis, and the audience assembled on
Mount Scopus, owed allegiance.

With the dawn of Zionism, the Bible was invested with new meaning, as the
symbol and source of restored national glory in the land of Israel. Ahad Ha'am
declared in 1895 that the Jewish Volksgeist was forged in the biblical era, and he
insisted somewhat hyperbolically that “the key to the solution to all of our prob-
lems” lay in it as well. Even more symptomatic of the Zionist veneration of the
Bible was David Ben-Gurion, the political leader of the dominant Labor movement
in the prestate Yishuv and Israel's first prime minister. Ben-Gurion routinely took
time from his schedule to conduct study sessions with prominent Bible scholars in
Israel. Moreover, he often placed contemporary acts—ranging from 'aliyah (im-
migration), to the Israeli parliamentary statute stipulating army conscription—
within ancient biblical molds. This recourse to biblical typologies was not merely a
strategy of legitimation. It stemmed from his sincere belief that the Jewish people possessed a "miraculous vitamin that preserves its existence, independence, and uniqueness—a vitamin whose source is in the Bible." 39

Given the decades-old adulation of the Bible, it is both ironic and curious that no permanent professor of Bible was appointed at the IJS for more than a decade and a half. One explanation for the torpid pace of development was the dearth of qualified candidates, understandable in light of the limited engagement of nineteenth-century Jewish scholars with critical Bible study. A more compelling explanation was the opposition of important diaspora overseas of the institute to critical approaches to the Bible. The chief rabbis of France and England, Israel Lévi and Joseph Hertz, both of whom were members of the governing council of the IJS, rejected use of the analytical tools of modern biblical criticism, preferring the more reverential approach of medieval commentators. Their opposition surfaced in deliberations over the first candidate proposed for the Bible position, Hirsch Peretz Chajes (himself a religiously observant Jew). It persisted in subsequent discussions of candidates throughout the 1930s (who included H. L. Ginsberg, Benno Jacob, Yehezkel Kaufmann, and Shalom Spiegel). At various times, the idea was advanced that, in order to break the impasse, two positions in Bible should be created: one for a traditional scholar and the other for a scholar steeped in critical methodology. 40 This idea was never implemented, and as a result, instruction was restricted throughout the 1930s to the later Writings and Pseudepigrapha—to the great dismay of those students at the institute who were anxious to study the Pentateuch itself. 41

Only in 1938, fourteen years after the IJS’s establishment, was a full-time Bible professor appointed: Umberto (Moshe David) Cassuto. Cassuto was an Italian polymath who had studied under Hirsch Peretz Chajes in Florence as well as at various Italian universities. Though appreciative of the acuity of some of the higher critics, Cassuto rejected without qualification the documentary hypothesis that informed much of modern biblical criticism. He attempted to explain apparent discrepancies in language, style, and story line in the biblical text not as the product of distinct authors or redactors, but as the convergence of different cultural traditions that nonetheless yielded a literary and ideational unity. 42 Cassuto did open new scholarly vistas, especially in his use of midrashic and talmudic literature to illuminate the Bible. Yet it was not he who fulfilled Max Margolis' hopes for biblical studies in Jerusalem. Instead, it was Yehezkel Kaufmann, twice rejected for positions in Jerusalem, who was called from the Reali High School in Haifa to teach at the Hebrew University in 1949.

In his eight-volume Toledot haemunah hayisreelit (The History of Israelite Faith), Kaufmann argued that the “Israelite religion is apprehended here as an original creation of the Israelite nation . . . [which] is utterly distinct from all previous pagan creations.” 43 Building upon this supposition, Kaufmann proceeded to offer a detailed reconstruction of nearly a millennium of Jewish history—from pre-Israelite paganism to the Hellenistic period. Some of the methods used, such as source criticism, had been developed by Christian Bible scholars. However, the conceptual framework was not in the least derivative; Judaism was no longer situated on a ladder of evolutionary development. 44 Thus, Kaufmann insisted that the ethical monotheism of the Prophets was not to be seen as a refinement of a cruder Israelite

---

Wass er eine “Jerusalemisierung” der deutschen Religion. Nor war das Christentum eine monotheistische Religion. Rather war das Christentum eine Mischung von monotheistischen und nicht monotheistischen Elementen. Die Geburtsstätte des Israel nahm eine religiöse und ideologische Relevanz für die moderne und jüdische Welt, auch wenn sie nicht in Jerusalem stattfand. 45 

The story of biblical studies is the story of a nationalistic movement. Rather than looking at the Bible as a document of exile, it was seen as the Bible of the modern Jew. This movement was led by scholars who were committed to the study of the Bible as a Jewish text. The institute’s openness to Jewish scholarship was reflected in the appointment of the first full-time professor of Bible, Umberto Cassuto, who was an Italian Jew. Cassuto’s work was characterized by a commitment to the traditional interpretation of the Bible, but he also recognized the importance of critical methods. He was able to use midrashic and talmudic literature to illuminate the Bible, thereby opening new vistas for study.

Dr. Joseph Haberman was appointed as the Chief Rabbi of the Jerusalem community. Leading personality in the community, he aimed to create a religious and educational base for the community, which was short on religious infrastructure. His opening lecture...
that the Jewish people, independence, and
civic and curious that no more than a decade and a
dearth of qualified nineteenth-century
generation was the critical approaches to
deliberations over Zvi and Joseph Hertz,
rejection of formalism and inductive analysis
was the approach to the
more reverential
Covetz Chajes (himself a
critic of candidates
Jacob, Yechezkel Kaufman
advanced that, in order:
for a traditional
theology. This idea was
d helped throughout the 1930s
of those students at
f. was a full-time Bible
uto was an Italian
as well as at various
different. This hypothesis that informed
apparent discrepancies
the product of distinct cultural traditions that
did open new scholarly
rature to illuminate the
s for biblical studies
ected for positions in
Haifa to teach at the

story of Israelite Faith),
led here as an original
tinct from all previous
proceeded to offer a
ory—from pre-Israelite
s used, such as source
However, the conceptual
no longer situated on a
insisted that the ethical
rent of a cruder Israelite
religion. Nor was Christianity to be regarded as a more developed mode of Israelite
monotheism. Rather, the genius of the monotheistic tradition was fully formed at
the birth of the Israelite religion. With this conclusion undergirding Toledot haemunah
hayisreelite, Kaufmann laid the foundation for a biblical scholarship at once
modern and Jewish. However, it must be recalled that, for a number of institutional
and ideological reasons, it took a quarter of a century before Kaufmann was invited
to teach in Jerusalem.

The story of biblical studies at the Institute of Jewish Studies suggests that the
formation of a national scholarship in Jerusalem, liberated from the biases and
inhibitions of the diaspora, was not instantly achieved. This point becomes even
 clearer when juxtaposed to the fate of Talmud studies and rabinics in Jerusalem. In
popular Zionist consciousness, the Bible and the Talmud occupied diametrically
opposed positions: the Talmud symbolized a way of life associated with Jewish
existence in exile, a rigid devotion to religious laws whose rationale was no longer
self-evident; the Bible, by contrast, embodied the authenticity of a vital and healthy
existence in the Jewish national homeland.

This hierarchy, however, was not translated into concrete institutional norms in
the early years of the IJS. The fields of Talmud and rabinics were represented in
the institute's opening semester by Michael Guttmann, a visiting professor from the
Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar in Breslau. By the second semester, a permanent
faculty position was offered to and accepted by Jacob Nahum Epstein, Ismar El-
bogen's collaborator in Berlin. Epstein was not alone. In the summer of 1925, he
was joined by Simha Assaf, a Russian-born rabbi already in Palestine, as instructor
in geonic literature. Over the next three years, the IJS faculty made unsuccessful
attempts to recruit a number of other scholars of rabinics who taught in European
seminaries such as Victor (Avigdor) Aptowitz and Chanoch Albeck.

The strong institutional emphasis on Talmud and rabinics requires further com-
ment. On first glance, it would seem that Jacob Nahum Epstein, celebrated by
Gershom Scholem as "the most eminent member of the institute's faculty," ade-
quately represented the field in Jerusalem. At the same time, the extent of student
interest in the field of Talmud outpaced Epstein's capacities. This interest may
well have been a function of the fact that Talmud studies and rabinics were central
features of the existing model of Jewish scholarship. After all, they consumed a
major portion of the traditional yeshivah curriculum. But they were also important,
even dominant, curricular priorities in the modern rabbinal seminaries in Ger-
many, Austria and Hungary. Moreover, critical research in these areas, at least from
the time of Zacharias Frankel in the mid-nineteenth century, was well developed.
One consequence was that talmudic and rabinic literature, unlike critical Bible
studies, had no shortage of qualified professional scholars.

The desire to make use of this pool of scholars and to perpetuate a major priority
of Wissenschaft des Judentums were important objectives of the institute's diaspora
overseers. Leading members of the IJS's governing council, such as its chairman,
Chief Rabbi Joseph Hertz, proved far more interested in providing a solid institu-
tional base for extant scholarly traditions than in overturning them. The emphasis on
continuity, surprisingly, also informed the work of some scholars in Jerusalem. In
his opening lecture at the IJS, Jacob Nahum Epstein maintained that the most
immediate effect of Zionism on his field of research was to invite an inventory of previous scholarly emphases. The main task that he outlined in this lecture was thus a critical edition of the Mishnah. Yet Epstein had first undertaken this task in 1915 in Berlin, and he had devoted himself to it both prior to and following his immigration to Palestine.

Were one to chart Epstein’s career, it would be difficult to identify a significant transformation in his research, that is, one initiated by a shift in geography or political consciousness. His work manifests a high degree of institutional and intellectual continuity between diaspora and Zion that is rarely recognized in discussions of modern Jewish historiography. This said, it would be misleading either to take Epstein as representative or to deny any innovation to the Jerusalem scholars. In the first five years of the IJS, a number of fields of study were incorporated that clearly reflected the influence of Zionism.

The first of these was Palestinology, or Palestine studies, which embraced the history, geography and topography of the land of Israel. There may have been no other field of study that had as much appeal to the Zionist public in Palestine. A recent observer, Meron Benvenisti, has written of the cult-like obsession guiding exploration of the land; it was impelled by a “search for rootedness, the need to turn the *geographica sacra* of the Diaspora into tangible reality, to make Eretz Israel a natural, not only a spiritual, homeland . . . to possess it through the senses by bodily contact with its soil, mountains, deserts, and streams.” The sensuous craving to know the ancient homeland converged with the political objective of claiming historical rights to it. The latter objective, in particular, had real urgency in the British Mandatory period, when the question of territorial sovereignty over Palestine hung in the balance. At this critical juncture, scholarship was mobilized to the task of fusing nation to land. Beyond the walls of the Hebrew University, this objective stood behind the activities of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society, as well as other projects such as the multivolume *Sefer hayishuv*, which aimed to anthologize all historical references to Jewish settlement in the land of Israel.

Within the Institute of Jewish Studies, Palestine studies assumed an important place. A permanent professorship was established at the institute’s opening, and was held from 1924 to 1940 by Samuel Klein (excepting a three-year absence). Klein was a Hungarian rabbi and scholar whose religious observance and training made him acceptable to the more traditional members of the IJS governing council. In addition to his university education in Berlin and Heidelberg, Klein had also studied at the Budapest Rabbinical Seminary and at the Orthodox Rabbnerseminar in Berlin. In fact, it was at the Rabbnerseminar that Klein first developed an interest in the historical geography of Palestine through courses with Hirsch Hildesheimer.

It is curious to note that even Palestine studies, like most of the disciplines in the institute, had originated as a field of Jewish scholarship in Europe. It is also interesting that some of Samuel Klein’s most overtly political writings were Hebrew pamphlets asserting the Jewish right to Palestine prior to his emigration from Europe. Still, there can be little doubt that the field of Palestine studies received a prominence and institutional support in Jerusalem that it never enjoyed in Berlin or Vienna. In Klein’s first semester of teaching, student demand was so great that he decided to offer three large lecture courses rather than one. Moreover, the scope of Klein’s research sh work on highly det phlets for high-sch ment to the land of settlement in Pale three-volume gener ing the latter, Samu research: “one large we never surrender justice of our dema land.”

In this context, identifying criteria (often vaguely) un might hold that or scholarly assertion Samuel Klein’s cot both on the centrali present, and *exclus*

Another field of effort was Hebrew l constructing a myt as repositories of a revival of Hebrew emblem of the retu logical that a nation of Hebrew literature

One of the first (Palestine studies) w While this appoint literature, it actual; bent of the position Ph.D summa cum l distinguished Germ; charge that he was nationalist ends. position that he des professionally train intervention of his convince the diaspo Temple post. As Klausner in modern diaspora opponents “dangerous” in his

Having been rele less set out to esta
invite an inventory of
in this lecture was thus
taken this task in 1915
following his immigra-

declare a significant
shift in geography or institutional and intel-
ligence in discussions
eading either to take

Klein’s research shifted considerably following the move to Palestine. Rather than
work on highly detailed monographic studies in German or on short Hebrew pam-
phlets for high-school students, Klein now attempted to present the Jewish attach-
ment to the land of Israel in its widest historical sweep. He wrote a history of Jewish
settlement in Palestine from the fifth to the nineteenth centuries, and he planned a
three-volume general history of Palestine (only two of which appeared). In introduc-
ing the latter, Samuel Klein made explicit what it was that he hoped to provide in his
research: “one large testimony to ourselves, and before the nations of the world, that
we never surrendered the right of existence in our land, and also testimony to the
justice of our demand to build an eternal home in it like any people residing in its
land.”

In this context, it is worthwhile to recall Boyd Shafer’s point that the first
identifying criterion of a nationalist movement is the claim to “a certain defined
(often vaguely) unit of territory (whether possessed or coveted).” A corollary
might hold that one of the primary tasks of a nationalist historiography is the
scholarly assertion of a group’s historical claim to a particular territory. Under
Samuel Klein’s control, Palestine studies at the IJS filled that function, focusing
both on the centrality of the land of Israel in Jewish history as well as on the past,
present, and exclusive right of Jews to its possession.

Another field of study that was integrally and explicitly related to the Zionist
effort was Hebrew literature, especially in its modern incarnation. In the process of
constructing a mythic national identity, both language and literature are often seen
as repositories of a collective consciousness and creativity. In the Jewish case, the
revival of Hebrew as a spoken tongue and literary language was important as an
emblem of the return of a vital Jewish nation to history. Thus, it would seem quite
logical that a nationalist scholarly enterprise devote considerable effort to the study
of Hebrew literature and language.

One of the first three permanent professorships at the IJS (along with Talmud and
Palestine studies) was the modern Hebrew literature position established in 1925.
While this appointment would seem to confirm the importance of the national
literature, it actually masked a rather ambiguous institutional posture. The incum-
bent of the position, Joseph Klausner, was a Russian-born scholar who received his
Ph.D summa cum laude in Semitics from Heidelberg. Despite the imprimatur of a
distinguished German university, Klausner was plagued throughout his career by the
charge that he was a base popularizer willing to subordinate scholarly standards to
nationalist ends. It was because of this reputation that Klausner was denied a
position that he desperately coveted in the field for which he believed himself to be
professionally trained: the history of the Second Temple period. Not even the
intervention of his unlikely friend and political rival, Judah L. Magnes, could
convince the diaspora overseers of the IJS that Klausner was worthy of the Second
Temple post. As a concession, Magnes was able to arrange a professorship for
Klausner in modern Hebrew literature; this topic, according to one of Klausner’s
diaspora opponents, Adolph Büchler, was “almost nonexistent,” and hence less
“dangerous” in his hands than Second Temple history.

Having been relegated to his second love, as he described it, Klausner nonethe-
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ture.59 His lectures marked the first time that a regular course of study had ever been offered in this field. They were also, by far, the most popular given at the institute. Students were drawn by the clarity of Klausner’s bio-bibliographical account of Hebrew authors—an approach short on aesthetic evaluation and long on historical contextualization. The cycle of lectures given by Klausner formed the basis of his six-volume history of modern Hebrew literature.60 Interestingly, the periodization underlying this work (and thus Klausner’s lectures) does not comport to what might be regarded today as modern Hebrew literature. For while Klausner commenced his study with Naftali Herz Wessely’s Divrei shalom veemet of 1782, he concluded with Mendele Mokher Seforim (1835–1917), the great Yiddish and Hebrew author. These temporal contours actually demarcate the literature of the pre-Zionist Haskalah movement more than the literature of the Zionist period. In fact, referees who read the first volume of Klausner’s history suggested that its name be changed either to The History of the Haskalah and Modern Literature or to The History of Modern Literature and Haskalah.61

Klausner’s equation of Haskalah and modern Hebrew literature was not accidental. Rather, it was informed by an important principle: the Haskalah was not merely penultimate to the Zionist era in time; it was an integral part of the historical current conducting the Jewish people back to the land of Israel. This principle effectively blurred the boundaries between Haskalah and Zionism and, consequently, between the diaspora and Palestine. Through his scholarly work, Klausner advanced an instrumental scheme in which pre-Zionist Hebrew writers were heralded for their preservation and affirmation of the national will to live. At its most reductionist, this appreciation took the form of the maxim that whoever wrote Hebrew necessarily affirmed Jewish national consciousness.62

In casting the Haskalah as a station on the teleological path to Zion, Klausner was undermining, perhaps unwittingly, the claim that the diaspora must be “negated.” Moreover, in arguing that any and all Hebrew writing bore a kernel of national spirit, Klausner was depicting a Jewish national culture that was far more expansive, in temporal or spatial terms, than might have been imagined. To be sure, it was far more expansive than Klausner’s own political ideology, a staunch Revisionist Zionism, would have allowed.63

This observation calls into question the notion of a neat correspondence between an individual’s political and scholarly persona. In Klausner’s case, neither his scholarship nor his politics won him a legion of admirers in Jerusalem. He attributed his low regard to an “anti-nationalist” cabal, comprised of German Jewish professors, that allegedly conspired within the university to control its affairs and deny him his proper place.64 One of the leading members of the German group, by all accounts, was Gershom Scholem. Though there is no evidence that Scholem possessed or exerted the power to harm Klausner, it is clear that his own background and politics were quite different from that of the Russian-born professor. Scholem was the product of a highly assimilated German Jewish heritage against which he rebelled in assuming the course of Zionism. Whereas Klausner moved from East to West to acquire professional academic training, the direction of Scholem’s cultural journey ran from West to East, from Berlin to Jerusalem.65 And whereas Klausner espoused a “maximalist” territorial agenda for Zionism (Jewish control over both
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Despite their many differences, both scholars recognized the salutary effect of Zionism in legitimizing their respective areas of study. For Klausner, it was Zionism that heightened sensitivity to the germination of modern Hebrew letters in the Haskalah period. For Scholed, it was Zionism that liberated Jewish scholars from the inhibitions of their predecessors. Specifically, Scholed maintained that Jewish mysticism was regarded as an unworthy topic of investigation by nineteenth-century Wissenschaft des Judentums, for it embodied a nonrational side of Judaism whose exploration might prove detrimental to the objectives of political emancipation and social integration. However, the passage of time and emigration from Europe had rendered these objectives irrelevant. Shorn of the desire to assimilate, scholars in Jerusalem could overcome the fear and bias of their predecessors and pursue a subject such as mysticism without concern for gentile approval.

Given this belief, it is not surprising that Scholed set out in his opening lecture to challenge prevailing scholarly views about Jewish mysticism—in particular, about the genesis of the Kabbalah and its core text, the Zohar. Scholed challenged the opinion of the eminent nineteenth-century historian, Heinrich Graetz, that the Zohar was a failed attempt by the thirteenth-century Moses de Leon to pass off his own writing as that of the second-century Shimon bar Yohai. While Scholed could not determine with certainty the authorship of the Zohar, he was convinced that “large sections [of the book] were in the hands of R. Moses before he began to write books in his own name.”

A decade later, Scholed reconsidered his position. In a lecture of 1938, he announced that “I have come to accept in substance the contention of Graetz . . . that the Spanish Kabbalist Moses de Leon must be regarded as the author of the Zohar.” The earlier Scholed was clearly intent on setting Kabbalah studies on a new institutional and conceptual course, an impulse inspired by both personal and ideological motives. The later and more mature Scholed not only had the benefit of a decade’s careful study to reevaluate the material in question; he had also lost the rash urge to undercut Graetz—one of the founding fathers of modern Jewish scholarship.

This shift should in no way diminish Scholed’s monumental and dramatic ordering of the field of Jewish mysticism. After all, Scholed remained throughout his career a fierce opponent of received wisdoms, both scholarly and popular, about Judaism. His opposition was not only to a singular, halakhic definition of Judaism. It was also to the dogmatism of nineteenth-century German scholars who cast Judaism as a static, unchanging religious essence. Judaism, in Scholed’s eyes, was a dynamic, sometimes explosive mélange of different religious and social currents. His primary scholarly mission was to uncover the centrality of one of the most dynamic currents in that mélange: mysticism. Not coincidentally, this mission
was closely related to the ideological inspiration that Scholem received from Zionism. Both mysticism and Zionism were, for him, dynamic agents of change in Jewish history. He once recalled in an interview that, as a young man, “I wanted to enter the world of kabbalah out of my belief in Zionism as a living thing.”

Scholem and his most bitter critics would agree that Zionism empowered him to study the largely unexplored terrains of Jewish mysticism and messianism (including their convergence in the Sabbatian movement). But this recognition of the influence of Zionism in charting new territory should not be mistaken for a classically nationalist rendering of the past. In one important regard, Scholem defied the nationalist mode through and through: he did not place the Jewish nation at the core of his academic research. His interest remained, as for his predecessors of Wissensc
des Judentums, the evolution of Jewish religious and spiritual expression. To be sure, Scholem focused on aspects of that development that had not been highlighted in previous research, especially on the enormous psychic and social force expended on messianic expectations and activism. But his vast scholarly efforts hardly yielded a picture of a glorious or unified Jewish Volk.

The most important disciplinary branch yet to be mentioned, and one that did place the Jewish nation at the center of its inquiry, was Jewish history. With the exception of Bible, all of the fields described so far—Talmud, Palestine studies, modern Hebrew literature and Jewish mysticism—were incorporated into the Institute of Jewish Studies within the first two years of its creation. By the end of 1926, appointments in Jewish law (Asher Gulak) and medieval Hebrew literature had also been made. In the next year, a bitter conflict broke out in Jerusalem over a proposed chair in Yiddish, which pitted Joseph Klausner and other East Europeans against Gershom Scholem and a group of German academics and intellectuals. One of the arguments that ultimately decided the case against accepting the Yiddish chair in 1927 was that a number of more important fields had yet to be established in Jerusalem. Most significant among them was the field of Jewish history.

Although it was recognized as a central component of Jewish studies in Jerusalem, there was no full-time professor or regular courses of instruction in Jewish history until 1930. Until that year, no suitable or willing candidate could be found, a fact that attests to the relative paucity of professionally trained Jewish historians. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Jewish studies had a strong orientation toward philology, the painstaking literary and linguistic analysis of texts. Only at the beginning of this century were other methods (social and economic history) and sources (archives) associated with the field of history systematically applied to the Jewish past. A critical figure in effecting the transition between the philological and historical foundations of Jewish studies was Eugen Täuber, who was the founding director of both the Gesamthist der deutschen Juden (1905) and the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (1919) in Germany. More important for present purposes, Täuber was the revered mentor of the first two members of the Jewish history department at the Hebrew University: Yitzhak Baer and Ben-Zion Dinur (né Dinaburg).

Under Täuber's guidance, Baer began his professional career at the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin. The German-born Baer was employed at this institution from 1919 until 1930, at which point he immigrated to Palestine and assumed a professorship at the Hebrew University. The region has remained his life's work. Here, he would seem to have made frequent referrer to the development and the nineteenth century, to which the reassessment of the Jewish state. Baer argued that our people that first most advanced state that he identified was a uniquely egalitarian, undying faith of the German people.
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assumed a professorship in Jewish and general history at the IJS. Six years after Baer arrived in Jerusalem, a position in modern Jewish history was offered to the Russian-born Dinur, who was first introduced to the critical historical method by Täuber at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin in 1911. Both Baer and Dinur shared Täuber’s commitment to broadening the methodological horizons of Jewish scholarship, to moving beyond the predominant emphasis on Literaturgeschichte to a more expansive analysis of social, economic, cultural and political forces. In one of their earliest collaborative ventures, Baer and Dinur announced in the first issue of the historical journal Zion that they aimed to overturn the monodimensional “literary-theological character” of nineteenth-century scholarship. And each man followed this methodological principle in his own work. Baer integrated social and economic historical approaches into a discussion of competing religious and intellectual trends in his pioneering study of the Jews in Christian Spain. Dinur, meanwhile, sought to include as wide an array of aspects (social, economic, political, religious, intellectual) as possible in his multivolume anthology on Jewish life in the diaspora, Yisrael bagolah.

The methodological expansion that Baer and Dinur preached and practiced rested on a new concept in Jewish scholarship. It was no longer the Jewish religion that stood at the center of their study. Rather, as they proclaimed in Zion, Jewish history was to be equated with “the history of the Israelite nation (haumah hayisreilit).” Here, it would seem, was the Jewish version of the multifaceted Volk that anchored the development and professionalization of national historiography in Europe during the nineteenth century. Consistent with this classical model, both Baer and Dinur made frequent reference to the organic unity and continuity of the Jewish nation, qualities that obtained throughout the long and difficult trek in dispersion. As Dinur observed in the introduction to Yisrael bagolah: “Even after the [ancient Jewish] commonwealth was destroyed and the Jews dispersed and absorbed among the nations, the complete unity of the Hebrew nation did not cease.” Baer also identified a continuous development in the nation’s history even after the fall of the ancient Jewish state. In his seminal study of the medieval kehilla (community), Baer argued that the communal form was “an immanent creation in the history of our people” that first surfaced in the Second Temple period, and that reached its most advanced state in Christian Europe during the Middle Ages. The continuity that he identified was not merely formal. The communal form was suffused by a uniquely egalitarian, democratic spirit that drew strength from the humble piety and undying faith of the Jewish people.

Baer’s and Dinur’s belief in the continuity and immanence of Jewish history stands somewhat at odds with their professional charge to contextualize the past. Curiously, that same tension lies at the very heart of historicism as understood in its traditional incarnation. Historicism, in Friedrich Meinecke’s classic account, is the exploration of an individual historical organism that can be understood only according to its own laws of development. The incomparability of such an organism poses problems for one who seeks to comprehend it in comparative terms, or in its interaction with other historical organisms. For instance, one who places great stress on the continuity and immanence of Jewish history risks minimizing the impact of the “external” forces that shape the lives of Jews in a specific time or place. This
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was a risk incurred not only by Baer and Dinur, but by modern Jewish scholars in
general—from Leopold Zunz and Immanuel Wolf to the present. Affirmation of the
continuity of Jewish history—of the very notion that it is a coherent subject of
study—has been an a priori and instinctive act for Jewish historians devoted to the
subject; as such, it has not only preceded, but often grated against, the trained
impulse to contextualize.

The fact that Baer and Dinur shared in this affirmation of Jewish historical
continuity meant that they did not attempt to excise the diaspora past from historical
memory. Nor did they depict that past in uniformly negative terms (as characterized
by powerlessness, for example). Even in the sphere of the political, the two Jerusa-
lem historians observed the functioning of quasi-state diaspora communities that
preserved the national culture and Geist under trying conditions. From his first
major research project in Berlin to his later studies in Jerusalem, Baer investigated
the kehillah as the manifestation of a well-developed political consciousness (shaped
by a strong egalitarian orientation).84 Dinur, for his part, identified two forces that
sustained a Jewish national identity in diaspora communities: the static sociopsyc-
ological force that relied on the collective memories, rituals, habits and language
of the Jews; and the more dynamic sociopolitical force that expressed “the living
and conscious link with the land [of Israel].”85 It was this latter force that stimulated
the desire to “return to Zion,” an impulse that Dinur saw as ever-present in diaspora
Jewish life.

Those individuals or small groups who acted upon the desire to return to Zion,
previously considered marginal in Jewish historiography, were thrust to the fore-
front in Dinur’s historical scheme. Indeed, they were heralded as precursors of the
national redemption and guaranteed a place in the pantheon of Zionist luminaries.
And yet even this Zionist triumphalism did not require the obliteration of the
diaspora past. Rather, as with Klausner’s understanding of the Haskalah, Dinur
treated diaspora communities instrumentally, as repositories of the national will that
served their function until the correct balance of forces was in place for redemption
in Zion. Far from denying a political existence to the Jewish people in exile, Dinur
(and Baer) uncovered an instinct for preservation and organization, as well as a
certain political sagacity in surviving. Rarely have these qualities been attributed to
Zionist historiography in its depiction of diaspora Jewry.86

In Dinur’s case, this scholarly perspective did not coincide with his declared
ideological position that “rebellion against the diaspora is the fundament.”87 Nor did
this perspective conform to the anti-diaspora sentiment of popular Hebrew authors
from M. J. Berdychewski and Yosef Hayim Brenner to Yonatan Ratosh to A. B.
Yehoshua. The narrative line of these authors often juxtaposed the vigor of the new
Hebrew to the physical and spiritual decrepitude of the diaspora dweller, devoted to
texts rather than territory, religion rather than nation.88

There can be little doubt that such a mythology has helped to shape the historical,
cultural and political identity of Jews in Palestine and, later, Israel. It is also clear
that some Jerusalem scholars contributed to the propagation of this mythology
through their work: for example, Samuel Klein in his studies of the Jewish presence
in Palestine throughout the ages; Ben-Zion Dinur in his emphasis on the eternal link
of Jews to Palestine; or Joseph Klausner in his volumes on the Second Temple
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neans. But it also seems clear that radical negation of the diaspora experience was not an obsessive concern of the Jerusalem scholars. Nor, for that matter, did a master narrative define a singularly coherent "Jerusalem school." There was a multitude of disciplinary and topical interests, methodologies and approaches that comprised Jewish historical scholarship in the first decades of the Institute of Jewish Studies. To reduce this multitude to a single "essence" is to ignore the idiosyncrasies and divergent directions of the Jerusalem scholars. It is also to violate one of the most instructive principles guiding Gershom Scholem's monumental scholarly la
; for Scholem, it was imperative to focus on the dynamic clash of ideas and movements, on the dialectical interplay of tradition and innovation, in the creation of a new cultural and intellectual moment.

After pointing out the diversity of the Jerusalem scholars, one must invariably ask: what can be said affirmatively of the first-generation researchers at the Institute of Jewish Studies? What thematic or biographical commonalities existed among them to merit consideration as a collective?

It can be noted that most of the first-generation scholars of the IJS were immi
gants from Europe who believed that Zionism could effect a revolution in Jewish scholarship. Through a return to the locus of Jewish national vitality, they believed that "a new attitude to the past," as Gershom Scholem put it, could be achieved. In adopting this belief, the Jerusalem scholars expressed disappointment with, and even scorn for, their predecessors of nineteenth-century Wissenschaft des Juden
tums. Whether it be an overly spiritualized account of the Jewish past, or a clozing apologetic tendency, the earlier scholars were perceived as limited in their historical purview. The move to Palestine would open new vistas to the historical researcher. In echoing an age-old historiographical truism, Ben-Zion Dinur wrote that the mere passage of a generation "direct[ed] the vision of historians to areas of historical reality that earlier were overlooked." How much more could be expected through the force of Zionism, which Dinur and other colleagues considered not merely as an ideology among competing ideologies, but as a force capable of altering the historical reality of the Jewish people.

In fact, the geographic and generational shift did bring a number of important innovations. Soon after Yitzhak Baer's appointment to the IJS, the field of history became a major component, if not the centerpiece, of Jewish studies in Jerusalem. The significance of this development lay in the close association between history and nation. Unlike earlier philologically inclined scholars, Baer, Dinur and their prominent second-generation students (G. Alon, H. H. Ben-Sasson and S. Ettinger, for example) undertook to study the Jewish nation in broad terms—as possessing an economic, social, political, as well as intellectual, existence.

The result was, if not a master narrative, then a more dynamic and multidimen
tional portrait of the Jewish past. The intense interest in Jewish communal life in the diaspora reflected a desire to regard Jews as more than cloistered scholars unconcerned with the ways of the world. They were also to be seen as creative historical agents who skillfully adapted to the exigencies of Exile. This is not to suggest that scholars in Jerusalem altogether freed themselves from a "lachrymose" conception
of the Jewish past; Yitzhak Baer, for example, gave explicit support to this conception in 1938 in a review of Salo Baron’s *A Social and Religious History of the Jews.*91 Likewise, Baer’s picture of diaspora life in *Galut* and, to a certain extent, in *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain* was lugubrious.92 Nevertheless, his work identified an indomitable spirit that nourished communal institutions, cultural mores and social habits as well as religious texts. It was this spirit that rescued Jews from the rigors and trials of exile and provided them with a sense of communality that transcended time and space.93 And it was this unique communal sense that defined the *national* identity of the Jewish people.94

The new emphasis on a vital and multidimensional Jewish nation was not restricted to the field of history. It was also expressed in the institutionalization of, and prominent place accorded to, related fields such as Palestine studies, modern Hebrew literature and later Bible and archaeology.95 Scholars in these fields explored different aspects of the Jewish past that had been only cursorily examined, if at all, by previous scholars. Uniting the diverse work of these scholars was the fundamental conviction that Jewish history exhibited a basic continuity, be it manifested in the persistence of Hebrew language in the diaspora or in the bond between Jews and *erey yisrael.* Indeed, it was organic growth rather than dramatic rupture, continuity rather than discontinuity, affirmation rather than negation of the diaspora experience, that characterized the Jerusalem scholars’ view of the past.

This characteristic did not distinguish the Jerusalem scholars from their predecessors. After all, Heinrich Graetz, the great narrative historian of the nineteenth century, underscored the continuity of Jewish history and the Jewish nation in his historiographical and theoretical writings.96 His ideological nemesis, Abraham Geiger, a fierce critic of rabbinic Judaism, understood Jewish history as constantly evolving in form, but with an inner essence at its core. The announced aim of Jerusalem scholars to distance themselves from their predecessors, which might be seen today as a necessary act of self-individuation, was not entirely realized. Neither the Wissenschaft nor the Jerusalem generation blotted out the diaspora from its historical line of vision. Both envisaged a continuous, if meandering, current of Jewish historical development.

It is imperative to add that neither generation forswore its sacred claim to scientific validation. Modern Jewish scholars have exhibited a great willingness to exorcise their predecessors for succumbing to bias. But very rarely have they acknowledged the presence in their own work of what Hans-Georg Gadamer has deemed a vital and affirmative element of historical interpretation—namely, prejudice.97 For Gadamer, acknowledging one’s own prejudices helps identify the interpretive accretions that stand between subject and historical object, and hence condition one’s historical understanding. Actually, the Jerusalem scholars did aspire, in Gadamer’s terms, to a fusion of interpretive horizons through their return to Palestine. That is, they hoped to blur the boundary between critical observation of, and active participation in, Jewish history—between subject and object. But they bore the unmistakable imprint of their predecessors and mentors in Europe. As with the older generation, they feared that to renounce their own objectivity was to admit to a subjective foray into identity formation. And such an admission required an unacceptable surrender of scholarly legitimacy.98
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This unwillingness to question one’s own prejudices is not unique to Jewish scholars. Historians in general have often regarded the acknowledgement of partisanship or prejudice as subversive of both their scholarly and political or theological missions. The particular failure of Jewish scholars to pose an “objectivity question” in their work may stem, one might speculate, from a sense of insecurity about the Jewish condition. Mirroring the broader population of Jews, Jewish scholars repeatedly confront the difficulty of fitting their concept of Jewish identity into conventional norms of group definition. Neither the celebration of Judaism as a sublime ethical religion (faith) nor the celebration of the Jewish nation (Volk) has obviated the need of Jewish scholars to appeal externally—to “science” (Wissenschaft or mada’)—for validation.

This appeal is an important part of the legacy that the first-generation scholars at the Institute of Jewish Studies inherited from previous Jewish scholarship. There can be little doubt that the transplantation of academics from Europe to Palestine effected considerable change in the institutional and intellectual history of Jewish scholarship. The institute provided a new material base for professional historical research, as well as inspiration for methodological and thematic innovation.

Yet the carry-over of personnel virtually assured the residual presence of organizational models, concepts and expectations transferred from the continent. John Pocock gave fair and sage warning when he noted that “to trace the history of a revolution is almost of necessity to start with a strawman.” In other realms of historical inquiry, scholars have urged caution in accepting at face value assertions of revolutionary innovation (in the cases of Renaissance humanism, the French Revolution, and modern historicism, to mention only a few disparate examples). Similarly, in considering the claims to innovation of the Jerusalem scholars, a note of caution seems advisable.

Fortunately, this note has already been sounded by a first-generation Jerusalem scholar. In 1944, on the twentieth anniversary of the institute’s founding, Gershom Scholem called attention to the fact that certain defects of Wissenschaft scholarship had reproduced themselves in Jerusalem. In a state of bitter despair (due in large part to the ongoing genocide of European Jews), Scholem memorably lamented his own European-born colleagues who had immigrated to Palestine. He announced simply: “We came to rebel, and ended up continuing.” While this terse judgment need not be seen as the conclusive epitaph for the Jerusalem scholars, it should serve to encourage a more careful and refined understanding of them.
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92. In describing his motivations for writing Galut, Baer admitted that he intended the small book as “a word of comfort and emotional encouragement to my brethren, who saw before their eyes a terrifying death”—that is, to German Jews suffering under the Nazi reign. Baer’s comments are found in a letter of January 18, 1948 in the Baer papers, Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People, P163.
93. Baer concluded Galut with the enigmatic speculation that there is "a power which lifts the Jewish people out of the realm of all causal history." And in the epilogue to the English version, he claimed that "our history follows its own laws, maintains its innermost tendencies in the face of the outward dangers of dispersal, disintegration, secularization, and moral and religious petrification" (pp. 120, 122).

94. Baer here revealed a strong neo-Romanticist orientation. Consistent with that orientation, he emphasized that Jewish history could not be adequately comprehended without a good understanding of the Middle Ages. He further insisted that it was in this period that Jewish history became "the history of religion insofar as religion is the most exalted expression of the nation's life force" (Ikarim behukrat toledot yisrael, 7, 11, 14). The link between religion and nation—with a particular focus on the Middle Ages—anchors a classically Romantic view of the past.

95. Scholem's field of Jewish mysticism did focus on a vital and complex historical process, though the object of investigation was not explicitly the Jewish nation, but rather the religious traditions of Judaism.


97. The importance of acknowledging prejudices is a central tenet of Hans-Georg Gadamer's hermeneutical system. Rather than flee from them, Gadamer insists that "we must raise to a conscious level the prejudices which govern understanding." See Gadamer, "The Problem of Historical Consciousness," in Interpretive Social Science: A Reader, ed. Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan (Berkeley: 1979), 156.

98. When Joseph Klausner was at last permitted to lecture on the Second Temple period in 1944, he warned that "the historical researcher, the true man of science, must examine himself many times over to determine if perhaps he is interpreting historical events so that they suit his private desires or party line." Here, the imperative was to absolve oneself of prejudice, not acknowledge its ineluctability. Joseph Klausner, Historyah shel habayit hasheni, 4th ed. vol. 1, (Jerusalem: 1953/1954), 11.

