EDITED BY DAVID N. MYERS
AND DAVID B. RUDERMAN

The Jewish Past Revisited: Reflections on Modern Jewish Historians

Yale University Press/New Haven & London

FOUR

Between Diaspora and Zion: History, Memory, and the Jerusalem Scholars

DAVID N. MYERS

In introducing the monumental and justly famous historical project *Les lieux de mémoire,* Pierre Nora wrote of the "acceleration of history" that characterized the modern age, the rapid disintegration of and distantiation from the historical past.[1] Characteristic of this process was the shifting function of historical memory. Nora observed that with respect to French history, "we no longer celebrate the nation. Instead, we study its celebrations."[2] This move from commemoration of past events to study of the commemorative acts (not even the events themselves) signalled the eclipse of the active participant in collective memory by the detached recorder of history. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, whose seminal book *Zakhor* inaugurated a new discourse on the function of history in modern Jewish existence, formulated the problem in even more stark and poignant terms. "Memory and modern historiography," Yerushalmi wrote, "stand . . . in radically different relations to the past." The former reflects "the shared faith, cohesiveness, and will" of the Jewish community in pre-modern times. Meanwhile, historiography in its modern incarnation chronicles, or perhaps presides over the "unraveling of that common network of belief and praxis through whose mechanisms . . . the past was once made present."[3]

The nature of the relationship between history and memory has inspired a huge proliferation of scholarship for well over a decade. Scores of articles have been devoted to historical and theoretical explications of this relationship; so too is the fittingly titled journal *History and Memory.* Moreover, there is now a scholarly monograph, Patrick Hutton's *History as an Art of Memory,* that traces the historical roots and evolution of this new intellectual discourse.[4] And of course, the central theme of the present volume attests to the ongoing interest in the question of history and memory, especially among Jewish scholars.

In discussing this intense curiosity, I cannot offer an extended analysis of the complex social and historical forces that produced either the rapid "acceleration of history" of which Nora spoke or the question of history and memory as a salient topic of scholarly inquiry; that task has been performed by Hutton and others. Rather, I would like to suggest that the categories of history and memory, often cast as irreparably detached from one another, may indeed be closer to one another than we often tend to think, that they may inhabit a continuum of attitudes toward this past.[5] Further, I would suggest that the very genre of modern historiography which Prof. Yerushalmi and others have seen as the antithesis or bane of collective memory, can be and has been the bearer of group memories. Of course, this proposition is not itself novel. Pierre Nora has noted that historians writing in 19th-century Europe continued to draw inspiration from a set of collective memories which they now subjected to critical analysis.[6] More generally, historiography inspired by 19th-century nationalism became the site of a dynamic struggle between the historian's need to impart group identity, on one hand, and fealty to the newly acquired methods of the professional historical discipline, on the other. Consequently, the nationalist historian came to serve as mediator between collective memory and critical history.

A particularly illuminating and germane case in point is the assembly of scholars known as the "Jerusalem School."[7] The earliest reference I have found for this term dates from 1926 when the Galician-born scholar, L. A.

Mayer, expressed the hope that a "Jerusalem School" would arise and establish a new level of "scientific" standards for Jewish scholarship.[8] For subsequent critics, the "Jerusalem School" failed in this mission, but did succeed in imposing upon its member-scholars a high degree of ideological conformity.[9] Even those who regard the emergence of a "Jerusalem School" in affirmative terms herald the crystallization of a new *national* perspective on the Jewish past.[10] What unites the assorted critics and supporters are the shared beliefs that the "Jerusalem School" is, first, a unified entity, and second, an extension of the much broader effort to create a new and coherent Zionist historical consciousness.

I would propose that the time is propitious to revisit this image and the term behind it. My own deliberations on the founding generation of historical researchers at the Hebrew University, the founding generation of the so-called "Jerusalem School," take place in an age in which the state of Israel has achieved a degree of institutional solidity, physical security, and economic well-being unsurpassed in its history. After nearly fifty years of difficult struggle and of considerable consensus regarding external threats, Israel is entering a new era of introspection and self-reflection regarding its origins and purpose. This seems to be an altogether natural process in the history of nascent states or political movements, even or especially revolutionary ones. In the Israeli case, a half-century of bitter struggle has yielded to a new, perhaps fleeting, moment of respite from armed conflict. This respite has prompted some to announce the end of ideology, and particularly that ideology, Zionism, which inspired the creation of the state. Concomitantly, a growing number of Israeli intellectuals have begun to raise the specter of a post-Zionist epoch, leading to an impassioned and at times vituperative reaction.[11] Before dismissing this claim as puerile cynicism or as a sign of slavish devotion to postmodernist fashion, it seems useful to recall that the dominant strain of Zionist ideology, the Herzlian strain, was largely realized in 1948 with the creation of the state. To the extent that Herzl's vision was not realized, it was because Israel had not become, at its inception, a nation like other nations, that it remained somewhat anomalous among its fellow states. But one must ask: are not the current conditions ripe for consummating the process of normalization to which Herzl aspired, in other words, for creating a bourgeois liberal state? Conversely, if normalization is not the true aim of Zionism, what is? To serve as the catalyst for the messianic age, as some religious Zionists believe? Or perhaps as the spiritual center of Ahad Ha-'am's dreams?

Unfortunately, I have neither the space nor the prophetic capacity to answer these questions now. I have raised them in order to suggest that discussion of the end of ideology need not mean the end of ideology. In fact, the animated recent debates among Israeli academics and intellectuals indicate that ideological passions are still quite alive.[12] Moreover, these questions have served as a prod to new scrutiny of guiding assumptions, ideological sources, and foundation myths of earlier generations in the *Yishuv* and State of Israel. One sees this critical spirit in the work of the so-called "New Historians" whose research on the formative years of the State of Israel, particularly Jewish-Arab relations, has produced intense controversy within the Israeli academic establishment.[13] It does not seem far-fetched to assert that traces of this critical spirit can also be seen in the work of scholars writing on subjects far removed from contemporary political concerns. For example, the appearance of Moshe Idel's *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*—first in English in 1988 and then in Hebrew in 1993—generated heated controversy in the pages of leading Israeli newspapers, in large measure because it challenged the near-canonical schema of Jewish mysticism set in place by a founding father of Jewish scholarship in Jerusalem, Gershom Scholem.[14] In related fashion, the historian Yisrael Yuval became the target of vehement attack after the publication of his 1993 article asserting the existence of powerful anti-Christian impulses in Jewish martyrologies following the Crusades.[15] Yuval's article made a provocative case for recontextualizing medieval Ashkenazic Jewish life by positing a subtle and unarticulated exchange of cultural and religious values between Jewish and Christian communities in the Middle Ages. Among other effects, Yuval's work dilutes the claims of his predecessors to the primacy of immanent forces in shaping Jewish history. In both cases, it was the seeming irreverence of Idel and Yuval toward conventional understandings of Jewish history, as well as toward previous generations of scholars, that transformed their rather arcane scholarship into *causes célèbres*. Undeniably, both scholars were possessed of an iconoclastic spirit that subverted accepted scholarly truths and flew in the face of the Israeli academic establishment.

The work of Idel and Yuval takes shape at a moment in Israeli history notable for its unprecedented receptivity to a critical reckoning with the past. Not coincidentally, it is at this moment that the iconoclasm of younger scholars, intent on revisiting the assumptions of their forebears, intersects with the complex relationship between history and memory; for the new critical spirit in Israeli historiography has led and will continue to lead to a refashioning of popular historical consciousness—and, by extension, collective memory.[16]

To understand fully the impact of the new historiographical directions in Israel, it is imperative to arrive at a more refined understanding of the early generations of Jewish historical researchers in Mandatory Palestine and Israel. Succeeding in this task requires resisting well-established and uninformed stereotypes about those scholars who came to be known widely and a bit deceptively as the "Jerusalem School."[17] Conversely, it is necessary to balance a number of disparate historical factors: the cultural and educational background of these scholars, their programmatic aspirations and their actual scholarly labors.

When the institutional home of these scholars opened in late December 1924, expectations for a revolutionary transformation of Jewish scholarship abounded. Surprisingly, the language used to capture the moment was permeated with religious imagery, although the new Institute for Jewish Studies was widely envisaged as a secular academy. Thus, Judah L. Magnes, a leading supporter of the Institute who would become the first chancellor of the Hebrew 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."[18] This theme was echoed by Max Margolis, an American scholar serving as the first visiting professor in Bible, who declared that "this place on which we stand—Mt. Scopus, from which we can see the (remnants of the) Temple—is a sanctuary for us. This edifice and the others that will rise in the not too distant future will become for us a holy place."[19] What was at work was an intriguing conflation of traditional religious values and modern scholarly norms; *Wissenschaft,* the scientific spirit, was to become the new and sacred Torah. Hence, Judah Magnes joyously proclaimed at the opening of the Institute for Jewish Studies that "we exult in the ideal of *pure science;* and there is no place in the

world with a location (*genius loci*) as suitable for *Torah* as Jerusalem." The equation, perhaps unconscious, of science and Torah reflected the dual aspirations of those gathered in Jerusalem: on one hand, to forge a new bond with an ancestral national tradition and homeland, and on the other, to assure the highest standards of objective research. The fusion of old motifs and new aspirations was reflected in the fact that speaker after speaker intoned the classic Jewish liturgical refrain to proclaim that "from Zion will go forth Torah."[20]

The resulting goal of laying the foundation for a new national scholarly edifice was seen as an antidote to the previously dominant model of modern Jewish scholarship, *Wissenschaft des Judentums.* For many critics in Jerusalem, German-Jewish scholarship provided little more than an apologia for German-Jewish assimilation. Its practitioners fundamentally distorted the Jewish past by focusing on the religious and literary evolution of Judaism rather than on the social and economic path of the Jewish nation. The new edifice of Jewish scholarship would arise then out of a paradigm shift, from faith to *Volk* as the lens through which to record Jewish history.

And yet, complicating the rise of such a new paradigm in Jerusalem was the fact that its initiators were born and trained in Europe. There were, with only a few exceptions, no Palestine-born Jewish scholars considered for an academic appointment in Jerusalem. Not only did the first generation of Jerusalem scholars emigrate (in the 1920s and 1930s) primarily from Central and Eastern Europe; most had either studied or taught in the modern rabbinical seminaries of Germany, Austria and Hungary that served as the institutional home of *Wissenschaft des Judentums.* It was there that the scholars were imbued with the spirit of *Wissenschaft* itself, of scientific rigor and objectivity. It was also there that their disciplinary priorities and expertise were acquired, a factor that inhibited the implementation of an altogether new scholarly paradigm in Jerusalem.

One instructive example should make this point clearly. In popular Zionist consciousness, the Bible was invested with great meaning, as the historical deed to the land of Israel, and more generally, as the symbol and source of national glory in that land. Conversely, the Talmud and rabbinic literature represented Jewish existence in exile, a rigid devotion to religious laws whose rationale was no longer self-evident. Given this unequivocal

hierarchical ordering, it is nothing short of astonishing that no permanent professor of Bible was appointed at the Institute of Jewish Studies for some fourteen years, whereas two appointments in Talmud and rabbinic literature, Jacob Nahum Epstein and Simha Assaf, were made in the first two years of the Institute's existence. And over the next three years, the Institute attempted to lure several more European-born scholars of rabbinics to Jerusalem, among them Victor Aptowitzer and Chanoch Albeck.[21]

The reasons for this apparent inversion of priorities are complicated, at times involving very personal criteria and choices. However, to the extent that we can generalize, it seems clear that Talmud and rabbinics won quick recognition in Jerusalem precisely because these fields were well-established realms of study not only within the traditional yeshivah but also within the modern rabbinical seminary; consequently, there was a relatively large pool of qualified scholars on which to draw. By contrast, academic study of the Bible had not attracted a similarly large pool, in no small part due to the reticence of Jewish scholars in the 19th century to engage in higher biblical criticism (which Solomon Schechter equated, in a memorable turn of phrase, with "higher antisemitism"). As a result, Talmud and rabbinics fared well in the first decades of the Institute's history, while biblical studies limped along.[22]

It was not simply the quality or quantity of scholars that determined these institutional developments. Nor was it the will of scholars and administrators on the ground in Jerusalem that always carried the day. For the Institute's affairs were supervised, at times dictated, by a Governing Council comprised largely of Jewish leaders from the Diaspora, not of all of whom were Zionists. Among the most prominent figures on this Governing Council were the chief rabbis of England and France, Joseph Hertz and Israel Lévi, who, during the long search for a professor of Bible, consistently resisted attempts to hire a scholar committed to higher critical methods. Because of the chief rabbis' involvement, some feared that the Institute of Jewish Studies was destined to become a European-style rabbinical seminary, a "proper 'Golus' institution," as one critic put it, relegated to the private sphere of religion and unable to realize its potential as a Jewish *national* institution.[23]

Yet another layer of authority and complexity emanated from the World Zionist Organization in London, whose president, Chaim Weizmann, insisted on the Organization's right to regulate the affairs of the Hebrew University, of which the Institute for Jewish Studies was part. This kind of assertion and intervention created resentment in Jerusalem, and recalls a similar pattern of quasi-colonialist relations that existed between foreign patrons and local students and faculty at the neighboring American University of Beirut.[24]

Nonetheless, with all these overlapping circles of authority—and the frustration and organizational structure that issued from them—there was a fair degree of consensus between Diaspora overseers and European-born scholars in Jerusalem on the need to create a new bastion of scientific scholarship in Palestine. Scholars and patrons alike were embarked on a veritable *mission civilisatrice* in a land at once exotic and familiar to the European—and European Jewish—mind. Here one cannot help but notice the rhetorical continuum between the Jerusalem scholars and their scorned 19th-century predecessors in Germany. Though each generation possessed its own distinct ideological orientation, both pledged unfailing allegiance to the standard of science, a commitment reflected in the nearly identical choice of terminology for Jewish studies in the respective contexts: *Wissenschaft des Judentums* in German and *mada'e ha-Yahadut* in Hebrew.[25]

To point to the rhetorical and methodological continuity between Europe and Palestine seems rather unremarkable in light of the European origins and training of the Jerusalem scholars. Still, we must bear in mind that this continuity cuts against the grain of the programmatic declarations proclaiming that a new Torah will go out from Zion. Moreover, it defies the widespread perception among contemporary scholars that a discrete "Jerusalem School" of historiography ever took rise. And yet, it is undeniable that the first generation of scholars in Jerusalem unquestionably devised conceptual models which differed from those of their German-Jewish forebears. Perhaps most importantly, the field of history—as distinct from philology, the favored discipline of 19th-century scholars—emerged as a central intellectual and institutional priority in Jerusalem.[26] It is significant not merely that history was accorded a new degree of professional respect in Jerusalem, a good deal more than it received in the rabbinical seminaries in Europe. It is also the fact that history was understood by the Jerusalem

scholars as it had been by non-Jewish researchers in 19th-century Europe—as the story of the nation. The equation of history and nation entailed a shift in emphasis from the literary and religious treasures of Judaism to the social and communal existence of the Jewish people. This shift was part of a broader process by which the Jewish past came to be understood and analyzed in material terms. Interestingly, this process, which commenced in the last third of the 19th century, was advanced by a cadre of Jewish proto-nationalists in Eastern Europe, who were the first agents of imagination of a new Jewish national community. From Peretz Smolenskin's call to investigate "darkhe ha-'am" (the ways of the people) to Simon Dubnow's proposed "sociological corrective" to previous Jewish historiography, this materializing impulse emphasized the corporate and corporeal qualities of Jewish life.[27] Scholars in Jerusalem provided new coherence and institutional weight to the "materialization" of the Jewish past. Among the salient Jerusalem variations of this theme were: first, an intense interest in the mechanism and functioning of the pre-modern Jewish community, a tendency reflected in the work of the historians Ben-Zion Dinur and Yitzhak F. Baer (but shared by Diaspora historians such as Dubnow and Salo Baron);[28] and second, an even more intense and distinctive interest in the land of Israel as the primary locus of Jewish national activity, even after the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE. The most obvious figure in this regard is Ben-Zion Dinur, about whom more will be said later. For now, I'd like to mention the Hungarian-Jewish scholar, Samuel Klein, who oversaw the introduction of the field of Palestine studies into the curriculum at the Institute of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem.[29] For Klein and others in Jerusalem, *Erets Yisra'el* was neither an other-worldly abstraction nor merely a source of liturgical inspiration. It was the site of this-worldly national activity whose history modern researchers were called upon to uncover.

I must hasten to add that *Erets Yisra'el* did not only signify a geographic or spatial realm for scholars in Jerusalem. It also represented the end of a temporal process—the *telos* of the Jewish people's long trek through dispersion and exile. Having demarcated this terminal point, scholars now succumbed to what Isaiah Berlin once called the "retrodictive" impulse, by which he meant the attempt to scour the past for themes or subjects that form a coherent, linear chain of historical development.[30] A few examples

will suffice. For Yitzhak Baer, the modern return to Zion had a complex retrodictive effect. It did not only offer the prospect of ending exile, it also inspired his search for the roots of Jewish communal governance. Baer's classic 1950 article on the origins of the Jewish community, which identified an immanent, ascetic, democratic thread running from Second Temple Palestine to medieval Ashkenaz, was published two years after the creation of the state of Israel.[31] Given Baer's proclivity for identifying typological models in Jewish history, it hardly seems unreasonable to suggest that he imagined the medieval community, informed by its uniquely Jewish democratic spirit, as an idealized proto-state.[32] He himself affirmed the nexus between past and present when he declared already in 1936 that Zionism was deeply rooted in "the ancient national consciousness of the Jews."[33]

A similar tendency to project into the historical past can be noticed in the writings of Yosef Klausner, who taught modern Hebrew literature at the Hebrew University. Though Klausner's professed first love was Second Temple history, he was denied a position in this field because Diaspora patrons (and even colleagues in Jerusalem) believed him to be both a popularizer and a chauvinistic ideologue. As consolation, he was awarded a professorship in modern Hebrew literature, which tells us something about the esteem in which that field was held in 1925.[34] In any event, in the six-volume series of course lectures on modern Hebrew literature that Klausner published from 1930 to 1950, he offered a curious scheme of periodization for his field of study. Modern Hebrew literature commenced in the late 18th century with the appearance of Naphtali Herz Weisel's *Divre Shalom ve-'Emet;* meanwhile, the last author whom Klausner dealt with in his six-volume study was the late 19th-century bilingual writer, Mendele Mokher Seforim.[35] The chronological boundaries which Klausner established for modern Hebrew literature were virtually identical to those of the *Haskalah,* the Jewish Enlightenment movement. In other words, modern Hebrew literature did not commence in the late 19th century with the revival of spoken Hebrew; nor was it a product of the birth of Zionism. Rather, it emerged in the midst of a literary and historical movement which many Zionists regarded with contempt. In a surprising gesture, Klausner asserted that his own Zionism disqualified him to pass judgment on literature produced under the influence of the nationalist movement. However, he felt

very much at liberty to assess the pre-Zionist period, and even to suggest an intimate connection between that period and its successor. Possessed of a certain triumphalist conviction, Klausner looked back on the literary past with magnanimity, and determined that whoever wrote in Hebrew necessarily affirmed the Jewish national will to survive.[36]

This triumphalist spirit, empowering the Zionist historian to regard the Jewish past in affirmative terms, is most pronounced in Ben-Zion Dinur. Renowned as the leading exponent of the Palestinocentric view of Jewish history—according to which all Jewish history revolves around the geographic and spiritual axis of Palestine—Dinur did indeed maintain that Jews in the Diaspora held to an undying faith in the need and benefit of the return to Zion. At the same time, Dinur identified what he called the sociopsychological factor in Diaspora Jewish history—the rituals, customs, social norms and collective memories—that preserved an ongoing sense of national coherence. Rather than discard these instruments, Dinur reclaimed them for a new Zionist version of Jewish history, much as he salvaged figures such as Baruch Spinoza and Moses Mendelssohn for his pantheon of proto-Zionist luminaries. At work was a fundamental historical principle: "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."[37]

At this point, we encounter a final twist to our story. In popular Zionist political rhetoric and historical consciousness, the Diaspora past was to be excised, expunged from memory. As the old Jew yielded to the new Hebrew, so too the Diaspora past was to surrender to the glories of pre-Exilic antiquity and the promise of a post-Exilic future. The symbol, or perhaps caricature, of this perspective is Yudke, the usually taciturn hero of Haim Hazaz's short story, "Ha-Derashah," who one day blurts out to his fellow kibbutz members that he is opposed to Jewish history, a history of passive suffering and indignity.[38] And yet, it turns out that Yudke's inclination to negate Jewish history, particularly Diaspora Jewish history, was not shared unequivocally by the first generation of professional scholars at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. While scholars such as Klausner and Dinur did in fact adhere to a "negationist" position in their politics, their scholarship reflected a more ambivalent stance. The Diaspora was presented as the

repository of inspired national values; it was seen in instrumental terms, as occupying an important place in the historical current conducting the Jewish people to the land of Israel.

The effect of this observation is to complicate the very notion of a Jerusalem school of historiography by pointing to the dissonance between popular Zionist views of the Jewish past and elite scholarly attitudes. I have not even discussed the most famous Jerusalem scholar of all, Gershom Scholem; Scholem's magisterial reconstruction of the history of Jewish mysticism bears virtually no trace of the instrumental Zionist impulses found in Baer, Dinur and Klausner, though it does bear other traces of Scholem's idiosyncratic Zionism.[39] What is important to note is that Scholem and his colleagues, the first Jerusalem scholars, were a generation in transition, suspended, as it were, between Europe and Palestine, between fealty to *Wissenschaft* and loyalty to Zionism, and consequently between the instinct to uphold the standards of critical historical scholarship and the desire to forge new boundaries of collective memory.

The ceaseless mediation between critical history and collective memory, I might add, has been the lot not merely of scholars in Jerusalem; it has been the predicament of the modern Jewish scholar whether writing in 19th-century Germany, early 20th-century Russia, or even late 20th-century America. What is distinctive about the case of Jerusalem is both the critical mass—the sheer numbers of scholars and students—and the degree of institutional solidity reflected in the Hebrew University. Yet, even these qualities did not yield an historiographical monolith. Each first-generation Jerusalem scholar balanced scholarly/professional and ideological/existential impulses in his own way (gender bias intended here). The resulting range of perspectives makes it much easier to speak of a group of *Jerusalem scholars* than it does of a single *Jerusalem school*. United by certain traits, these scholars nonetheless proceeded about their work with single-minded intensity, and oftentimes in monastic solitude.

The task of refining our understanding of the idea of a Jerusalem school beyond epithet or polemical tool is worthwhile, I would hope, in its own right. But it is the connection between this task and the broader reconsideration of Zionism that moves us even further. Like the Jerusalem scholars, Zionism was a movement forever negotiating between its birthplace in

Europe and its testing ground in Palestine, between West and East. The hybrid quality that resulted from this negotiation makes the Jerusalem scholars and the entire Zionist movement more complex historical phenomena than previously imagined. Now, as Israel reaches a seminal juncture, as it redefines its relation to its surrounding environment as well as to its own past, a critical re-examination of political and intellectual origins is in order. It is in the spirit of the time that this meditation is offered. In shedding new light on the Jerusalem scholars, it seeks to serve as antidote to historical ignorance and misperception—and perhaps as stimulus to further thinking about Zionism, on the one hand, and the bond between history and memory, on the other.

NOTES

1. Pierre Nora, *Les lieux de mémoire* (Paris, 1984), 1:xvii

2. Ibid., xxv.

3. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle, 1982), 94.

4. See Patrick H. Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory* (Hanover, NH, 1993), 9.

5. See the glosses to Yerushalmi's *Zakhor* in Amos Funkenstein, "Collective Memory and Historical Consciousness," *History and Memory* 1 (Spring/Summer 1992), 123–140; and David N. Myers, "Remembering *Zakhor:* A Supercommentary," *History and Memory* 4 (Fall/Winter 1992), 129–146.

6. See Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory,* 8.

7. See David N. Myers, "Was there a Jerusalem School?: An Inquiry into the First Generation of Historical Researchers at the Hebrew University," *Studies in Contemporary Jewry* 10 (1994), 66–92. I have dealt more extensively with this group of scholars in *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past: European Jewish Intellectuals and the Zionist Return to History* (New York, 1995).

8. "Was There a Jerusalem School?" 68.

9. It has been a commonplace assumption in Jewish historiography that a cohesive "Jerusalem school" came into existence with the establishment of a new scholarly center in Jerusalem. Perhaps the most renowned opponent was the Israeli literary critic, Barukh Kurzweil. Kurzweil not only regarded the "Jerusalem School" as a monolith; he portrayed its member-scholars, particularly Gershom Scholem, in demonic terms. See, for example, Kurzweil's essays in *Be-ma'avak 'al 'Erkhe ha-Yahadut* (Tel Aviv, 1969), 99–240.

10. See, for instance, the enthusiastic appropriation of the term "Jerusalem school" by Don Patinkin and Shmuel Ettinger in *Meḥqarim be-Mada'e ha-Yahadut,* ed. M. Bar-Asher (Jerusalem, 1986).

11. A recent symposium in the Israeli newspaper *Ha-'Arets,* "On Zionism, Post-Zionism and Anti-Zionism," reveals the depth of passion and disagreement among Israeli intellectuals over the historical legacy of Zionism. See *Ha-'Arets,* October 15, 1995, 4b–5b.

12. An interesting illustration of this intense passion is the controversy generated among Israeli academics by Zev Sternhell's recent book, *Binyan 'Umah 'o Tiqun Ḥevrah?* (Tel Aviv, 1995). Sternhell questioned a fundamental truism of Israeli historical consciousness—namely, that the dominant Labor-Zionist movement, and particularly its "founding fathers," successfully balanced commitments to an egalitarian social order and to a Jewish national revival. On Sternhell's reading, the "founding fathers" succeeded far more in the latter than in the former commitment. Sternhell's challenge to traditional historiographical assumptions provoked heated controversy almost immediately after the appearance of his book.

13. An important starting point for the new critical orientation in Israeli historiography is Benny Morris' *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem* (Cambridge, 1988). For other expressions of this new orientation, see *New Perspectives on Israeli History: The Early Years of the State,* ed. Laurence J. Silberstein (New York, 1991). See also the recent volume of *History and Memory* 7 (Spring/Summer 1995) devoted to "Israeli Historiography Revisited."

14. The publication of Idel's book in English in 1988 provoked the eminent scholar Isaiah Tishby, among others, to respond with biting criticism in "Hafikhah be-Ḥeqer ha-Qabalah," *Zion* 54 (1989), 209–222. Meanwhile, the Hebrew translation of Idel's book produced another storm in the pages of leading Israeli newspapers. See, for example, Michael Sassar, "Mi-'Oz—ulay—Yeṣe' Matoq," *Davar,* November 29, 1993.

15. See Yuval's article, "Ha-Naqam veha-Qelalah, ha-Dat veha-'Alilah (mi-'Alilot Qedoshim le'Alilot Dam)," *Zion* 58 (1993), 33–90, and the responses of Ezra Fleischer and Avraham Grossman and others in the succeeding volume of *Zion*.

16. Particular attention should be paid in this regard to the interesting work of Idit Zartal and Yael Zerubavel, among others, in re-examining the legend of Tel-Hai and its function within Israeli collective memory.

17. I have expressed my reservations about the term in "Was there a Jerusalem

School," *passim*, and in *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, 9. For an exemplary case of a stereotypical view of the Jerusalem scholars, see Baruch Kimmerling, "Academic History Caught in the Cross-Fire: The Case of Israeli-Jewish Historiography," *History and Memory* 7 (Spring/Summer 1995), 41–65. Kimmerling's conclusions about Israeli historiography suffer from a lack of accurate biographical information, and a near total lack of engagement with actual works of historiography.

18. See Magnes' address in *Yedi'ot ha-Makhon le-Mada'e ha-Yahadut* 1 (1925), 4–5.

19. Ibid., 20.

20. This refrain is taken from Isaiah 2:3, and is chanted before the Torah is taken from the ark during the Jewish prayer service.

21. See Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, 83–89.

22. Ibid., 102–108.

23. The term appears in a letter from the German Zionist Robert Weltsch to Martin Buber from June 23, 1924. See Martin Buber, *Briefwechsel aus sieben Jahrzehnten* (Heidelberg, 1973), 2:195.

24. I have emphasized the parallel to the American University of Beirut, as well as the quasi-colonial nature of relations between Diaspora patrons and administrators and faculty in Jerusalem, in "A New Scholarly Colony in Jerusalem: Notes on the Early History of the Institute of Jewish Studies," *Judaism* (Spring 1996), 142–59.

25. The only difference is that the Hebrew term is literally translated as the "sciences of Judaism," whereas the German phrase connotes the "science of Judaism."

26. The roots of the transition from philology to history can be traced back to Europe, in one particularly influential instance to the German-Jewish historian Eugen Täubler, who was the revered mentor of the first two Jewish historians hired by the Hebrew University, Yitzhak Baer and Ben-Zion Dinur. See my discussion of this important figure in "Eugen Täubler: The Personification of Judaism as Tragic Existence," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 39 (1994), 131–150.

27. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, 31–32.

28. Ibid., 125–126, 145.

29. Along with Dinur, Klein played a key role in editing the multi-volume *Sefer ha-Yishuv*, an anthology of historical references to the Land of Israel. See Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, 89–93, 140–141.

30. Isaiah Berlin, "History and Theory: The Concept of Scientific History," *History and Theory* 1 (1960), 7. Berlin noted that this impulse is a defining feature of the historiographical enterprise, particularly when the historian faces a dearth of direct testimony or evidence.

31. Y. F. Baer, "Ha-Yesodot veha-Hathalot shel 'Irgun ha-Qehilah ha-Yehudit bi-Yeme ha-Benayim," *Zion* 15 (1950), 1–41.

32. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, 124–128.

33. The original version of Baer's small book *Galut* was published in Berlin in 1936. I have consulted here the English *Galut*, trans. Robert Warshow (New York, 1947), 119.

34. *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, 94–95.

35. Ibid., 95–96.

36. Klausner, *Historyah shel ha-Sifrut ha-'Ivrit ha-Hadashah* (Jerusalem, 1949–50), 4:515. I might add that this positive evaluation of Diaspora authors stands in tension with the general thrust of Klausner's earlier history of the Second Temple period; there, it is not authors, and surely not Diaspora authors, but rather political and military leaders in Jewish Palestine who are the heros of the tale.

37. Ben-Zion Dinaburg, *Yisra'el ba-Golah*, Book 1 (Tel Aviv, 1926), 1:23–24.

38. See Haim Hazaz, "Ha-Derashah," in *Sipurim Nivharim* (Tel Aviv, 1951–52), especially 148–150.

39. For a further discussion of Scholem, see Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, 151–176.