

# JUDAISM

*The Origins of Modern Jewish Studies  
and the Founding of the Hebrew University*

*William M. Brinner, George L. Mosse,  
David N. Myers, Martin Jay, Jacob M. Landau,  
Menahem Milson, Anita Shapira, Arthur A. Goren*

*The Recovered Self: Auschwitz & Autobiography*

*D. Mesher*

*Teaching Judaism in the Secular University*

*William Nicholls*

*Pat Buchanan and the Jews*

*Edward Shapiro*

*Divorce: Tel Aviv Style 1973*

*Victor Geller*

*Poetry*

*Leora B. Smith and Hilda Raz*

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF JEWISH LIFE & THOUGHT  
PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS



Issue No. 178 / Volume 45 /

Number 2 / \$6.00 /

**Spring 1996**

in cosmopolitanism, liberalism, and compromise. They repeated A. D. Gordon's phrase "a human people" in order to describe their Jewish vision. They advocated a German tradition and, with the exception of the university's structure, maintained its enlightened aspect while refusing to follow its descent into aggression and into the arms of a narrow parochial culture.

As these Central European intellectuals lived on into the post-war world they were haunted by their failure as far as the Zionist movement itself was concerned, even though their dream of a Hebrew University had been realized beyond all expectation and was a source of continual pride. Perhaps we should remember what they themselves often forgot, namely that *Bildung* like the Zionism they advocated should be open-ended, and therefore provide hope for the future.

### *A New Scholarly Colony in Jerusalem: The Early History of Jewish Studies at the Hebrew University*

DAVID N. MYERS

MORE THAN SEVENTY YEARS AGO, IN ONE OF THE GRAND capitals of the Middle East, a new university was inaugurated. Bearing the name of a great civilization, this university stood as testimony to the efforts of dedicated and earnest men from the Occident (and here the gender-specific language is intended), individuals possessed of a missionary zeal to bring enlightenment, culture, and new standards of academic excellence to the barren shores of the Orient. Their stated aim was not the imposition of Western values but rather a more harmonious convergence of diverse traditions and peoples. The words of the institution's American president attest to this noble ideal: "the University does not have the negative aim of tearing her students from the formal affiliations and ceremonies of the ancient East, but rather the positive aim of sharing with them the spiritual experience of the growing West. The institution forms a link between East and West; a channel for the exchange of ideas between the two."<sup>1</sup>

---

DAVID N. MYERS teaches Jewish history at the University of California, Los Angeles. He is the author of *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past* (1995) and numerous articles and reviews in modern Jewish intellectual and cultural history. He is currently at work on a book on anti-historicism in modern Jewish thought.

And yet, beyond this rhetoric of spiritual and cultural ecumenism lay layers of tension, conflict, and resentment which accompanied and threatened the development of the nascent university. The most important of the overlapping circles of conflict revolved around two axes: first, the question of whether the university would be a religious or secular institution, a question which implicated the very method of scholarly analysis permitted within its walls; and second, the paramount issue of whether the university would be governed by foreign norms, values, and overseers, or whether it would reflect, culturally and administratively, its native environment.

It would be most interesting to follow the history of these conflicts from conception to resolution. To do so, however, would be a luxury, since they involved an institution which is not the main subject of this essay. With a certain mischievous delight I must confess that the story I have been relating is not that of the *Hebrew University of Jerusalem*, but rather that of the *American University of Beirut* (AUB). The president whose words were quoted above was not the San Francisco native Judah L. Magnes, but rather Bayard Dodge. And the religious sensibilities that checked the unfettered pursuit of academic scholarship were not orthodox Jewish but rather fundamentalist Protestant.<sup>2</sup>

The parallel between these two Middle Eastern institutions—the Hebrew and American Universities—is especially striking in their incipient stages of development. One chronicler of the AUB, John Munro, inadvertently happened onto this truth when he accused the first American missionaries who conceived of an outpost of higher learning in Beirut of embodying the spirit of “Hebraism.” Borrowing consciously from Matthew Arnold’s (and, unwittingly, from numerous eighteenth-century European thinkers’) distinction between Hellenism and Hebraism, Munro depicted the latter as the epitome of single-minded and zealous devotion, lacking all trace of spontaneity or malleability. According to Munro, the spirit of Hebraism “was hardly conducive to the establishment of a university in the full humanistic sense of the word.”<sup>3</sup>

Quite apart from the semantic similarity between the so-called “Hebraism” of the AUB’s founders and the national activism of the Hebrew University’s supporters, there is a shared historical context in which to understand the evolution of the two institutions. Both arose in the midst of persistent debate and disagreement over organizational structure and institutional function. Both were forged through a complex and confusing network of relations among foreign patrons, their administrative and religious allies on the ground, imported faculty, and local students. In this respect, I believe it is fair to say that both universities were mired in a tangled web of relations symptomatic of colonialism.

To speak of such a colonial web summons up images of foreign domination, marked by inevitable and often brutal repression of the native. It is precisely this kind of sharp, politically charged, dichotomy which I hope to avoid when using the term “colonialism.” In the first instance, I use the term to describe not the machinations of imperial powers, but the complex network of relations between Diaspora patrons and Palestine-based administrators and faculty of the

Hebrew University. These relations produced the usual assortment of frustrations and failed expectations, as well as charges of paternalism, typical of state-sponsored colonialism. But there is another connotation for colonialism employed here, one that emerges out of contemporary post-colonial studies. This rendering refers to the cultural practices, identities, and implications emanating from colonial relations. In this vein, it is the effects of colonialism in confounding, not reinforcing, starkly delineated cultural categories—for instance, between foreign and native cultures—that are most interesting. Admittedly, my concern here is not the nature of relations between Jewish settlers and Arab inhabitants in Mandatory Palestine. Instead, it is the way in which European and, to a lesser extent, American sensibilities alternately melded, co-existed, and clashed with the desires and demands of Palestine-based Jews in shaping the Hebrew University and its Institute of Jewish Studies.

To illuminate this interaction, I will describe the contest among competing conceptions of a Jewish national university in Palestine, most of which were hatched first in Europe. The transfer of these ideas from the European laboratory to the testing grounds of Palestine was itself beset with tensions and conflict, as was the very Zionist ideology that undergirded them. Consequently, there were pendulous swings in the early institutional history of the Hebrew University. While following these various turns in institutional organization, I also aim to convey the story of the first generation of scholars, almost all European-born, who immigrated to Palestine and laid the foundation for Jewish studies at the Hebrew University.<sup>4</sup> It is these figures who best exemplify the complex cultural effects of colonialism—at least in the sense of the term I intend. Raised in Gentile milieux which required a greater or lesser submersion of Jewish cultural and national identity, the future scholars of Jerusalem lived an existence akin to that of colonized peoples. They were acutely aware of their diminished capacity to shape their own Jewish world in Europe, and strove to attain a measure of cultural and, specifically scholarly, self-empowerment—quite literally, to write themselves back into history.<sup>5</sup>

The route to legitimation, both national and professional, necessitated the creation of a new bastion of critical scholarship in the distant land of Israel. There, it was hoped, scholarship could be pursued without apologetic tendencies. This goal could be accomplished by arming the new fortress of Jewish research with quintessentially European notions of objectivity, scholarly probity, and disciplinary organization.

It is here that we encounter a curious set of paradoxes. The first generation of researchers at the Hebrew University attempted to upend their own “colonial” experience in the Diaspora by becoming scholarly colonizers, not so much of other peoples as of a cultural territory—namely, the new *Yishuv*. With solemn pride, they planted the flag of *Wissenschaft* into the soil of Palestine. In doing so, they were intent not only on validating themselves as professional scholars, but on assuring that a secure, even sacred, space for “science” be created in Palestine.<sup>6</sup> To a certain extent, they succeeded in

carving out a niche for themselves in the *Yishuv*—as arbiters of scholarly virtue. That this task was at odds with the pioneering ethos of the dominant labor Zionist movement in Palestine at the time is an important theme, but one which can not detain us now. What is germane and intriguing is a point hinted at above: the Jerusalem scholars never fully succeeded in remaking themselves. They never fully exorcised European values and sensibilities after moving to *Erets Yisra'el*. Paradoxically, at times they also found themselves in conflict with the wealthy Diaspora patrons who supported the Institute of Jewish Studies of the Hebrew University. Straddling the poles of colonizer and colonized, the Jerusalem scholars thereby embodied the dynamic social status, as well as the cultural hybridity, that often results from the colonial experience.

The notion of cultural hybridity, of a status that stubbornly resists the fixed identities of foreigner and native, surfaces frequently in the writings of contemporary scholars and critics.<sup>7</sup> Not surprisingly, the emergence of this idea has come at the end of the age of classic European colonialism.<sup>8</sup> With the benefit of historical perspective, we now recognize that the encounter of the colonizer and the colonized involved not merely political repression, but also an ongoing exchange and reformulation of social, cultural, and linguistic norms. The philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah has perhaps best captured the dynamic and somewhat subversive quality of this exchange in speaking of his native Africa. There, Appiah notes, "European languages and European disciplines have been 'turned,' like double agents, from the projects of the metropole to the intellectual work of the post colonial cultural life."<sup>9</sup> Appiah's image of the double agent subverts the conventional assumption of colonialism as a hegemonic and monolithic force. This image also seems strikingly applicable to the first-generation Jerusalem scholars, who came to Palestine as bearers of European academic standards and yet hoped to rid themselves of ignoble vestiges of Diaspora life. Curiously, their own divided sense of cultural identities in Palestine mirrored that which they had hoped to leave behind in Europe. Indeed, for the Jerusalem scholars, the return to Zion purged neither ambivalence nor ambiguity from the Jewish condition. This last observation has special salience in light of the highly charged debate in Israeli and Jewish circles over Zionism.<sup>10</sup> Serious questions have been raised of late regarding the historical character and future relevance of Zionism. Without addressing these questions directly, I would suggest that their mere posing by Israeli intellectuals, coming at a distinct moment in Israeli history, offers the possibility for a constructive re-evaluation of the past.<sup>11</sup> And so, in this spirit of constructive re-evaluation I now turn to the fledgling development of Jewish studies at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

2. Similar to the American University of Beirut, the Hebrew University was imagined by a group of people far removed from its proposed site. European Jews had been dreaming of a specifically Jewish university at least as far back as the sixteenth century when the Italian rabbi, David Provenzali, offered up

an ambitious plan for an academy of higher learning for Jews.<sup>12</sup> However, a far more concentrated focus on the idea of a Jewish university emerged in the late nineteenth century, set in motion by the programmatic initiatives of one Hermann Zvi Schapira. Schapira was a Lithuanian rabbi who underwent an unlikely mid-life career shift: after a time as a *rosh yeshivah*, he became interested in secular studies, decided to concentrate on mathematics, and eventually became an *extraordinarius* professor at the University of Heidelberg. In a series of articles appearing in the Hebrew periodical *Ha-Melits* in 1882, Schapira proposed the creation of a Jewish institution of higher learning to be based in Palestine.<sup>13</sup> This institution would have three faculties—theoretical-scientific, practical-scientific, and rabbinical (the last of which recalls the early efforts of American missionaries on behalf of a religious college in Beirut); and, though based in Palestine, the Jewish institution's language of instruction would be German, since Schapira did not yet deem Hebrew a suitable language of academic instruction. (We might again note the parallel to the American University of Beirut, where supporters of English insisted that *it*, not Arabic, be the language of instruction.) At this stage in time, there was little financial or popular support for Schapira's idea. Nonetheless, Schapira was given the opportunity to present his ideas on a Jewish institution in Palestine to the First Zionist Congress in Basel, Switzerland, in 1897. Despite the limited time allotted to him, he was greeted, according to the Congress protocols, with thunderous applause.<sup>14</sup>

Shortly thereafter, the elderly Schapira passed away, bringing to a close the brief first phase in the modern history of the Jewish university idea.<sup>15</sup> From this point forward, the history of the university idea became inextricably linked to the unfolding tale of the nascent Zionist movement. Particularly noteworthy was the keen interest of young Zionist intellectuals in the university cause. In 1902, three of the more prominent of these intellectuals, Martin Buber, Berthold Feiwel, and Chaim Weizmann co-authored a German pamphlet, *Eine Jüdische Hochschule*, which outlined the formation of a Jewish institution of higher learning comprising technical, natural-scientific, and humanities faculties. Curiously, the pamphlet's authors suggested that the institution could be established, at least provisionally, in Europe. The three Zionists were concerned by the troubled lot of Jewish students in Eastern Europe, where political unrest, economic hardship, and quotas on university attendance threatened their physical and emotional well-being. The joint proposal was a good deal more responsive to the concrete social conditions of the day than Hermann Zvi Schapira's call for a college in Palestine. However, it too failed to galvanize the support of the broader Zionist movement which had not yet—and, for that matter, never wholly—embraced the university idea.

It was not until the second decade of the twentieth century that the university idea commanded more serious attention among Zionists. By that time, the territorial question that plagued the movement in the "Uganda" controversy had been resolved. The locus of Zionist aspirations was unques-



tionably Palestine; so too it would be the site of a Jewish national university. Indeed, the Eleventh Zionist Congress in Vienna in 1913 authorized the formation of a committee charged with drawing up detailed plans for the university, including the purchase of land in Jerusalem.<sup>16</sup> But beyond the shared assumption that the university would be in Palestine, there was little consensus among supporters of the university idea. To begin with, there were many Zionists who opposed the idea altogether, believing such a recondite project to be a waste of precious resources. The prospect of creating a new generation of *Luftmenschen*—an overflowing “intellectual proletariat,” as one opponent put it—violated the emerging Zionist ethic of physical labor, self-help, and ascetic sacrifice.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, it seemed to perpetuate the very patterns of Diaspora life—passive study rather than active building—that Zionism aimed to overturn. Still, there were more than a few Zionists who supported the idea of a university. Some believed that it would serve as a place of refuge for Jewish scholars and students denied a place in European institutions. Others believed that a university, as the training ground for a new generation of Palestine-based Jews, filled an indispensable function in the work of nation-building. Yet others envisaged an elite center of pure research in which the world’s leading Jewish scholars would be gathered.

It is imperative to note that just as there were Zionists who opposed the university idea, so there were non-Zionists who supported it. As a matter of fact, the most prominent supporters of the university idea in the 1910s included a number of distinguished European Jews who were agnostic over the larger Zionist enterprise. In particular, the French financier, Baron Edmond de Rothschild, and the German scientist and Nobel Laureate, Paul Ehrlich, surfaced as leading advocates of the university idea. In order to obtain the financial backing of Rothschild and the approbation of Ehrlich, Chaim Weizmann, who was the great champion of the university idea in Zionist circles of the day, was forced to adopt their preference for a center of pure research that housed a small group of distinguished scholars.<sup>18</sup> This idea was to be a central, if not dominant, one until the founding of the Hebrew University in 1925. Even after its formal opening, various supporters of the university continued to subscribe to the model of a small research center, in part out of fear that a more open and popular institution would quickly degenerate to the level of a third-rate teaching faculty.

To be sure, it was not merely this fear which impelled the idea of a research center. It was partly a matter of creating an institution on a scale commensurate with available resources.<sup>19</sup> It was also a function of the powerful research ethic which held sway over Jewish intellectuals in Europe from the mid-nineteenth century.<sup>20</sup> This ethic was imparted to Jewish scholars in the historical and philological seminars of German universities; concomitantly, it provided content to *Wissenschaft*, the magically resonant term which defined academic excellence and, to a certain extent, cultural identity among Jewish intellectuals in Europe.<sup>21</sup> From the mid-nineteenth century onward, both

practitioners and patrons of Jewish scholarship insisted that any serious institution of higher learning be based on the foundation of *Wissenschaft*, as measured by established rules of objective methodology.

Apart from these considerations, there may well have been another motive present. The idea of a small research center as the core, if not totality, of a Jewish university in Palestine was largely the province of non-Zionist supporters. When encountering figures such as Rothschild and Ehrlich or later, Cyrus Adler, Adolph Büchler, Israel Lévy, and Felix Warburg, one gets the distinct impression that their involvement in the university project was, in part, a gambit to control potential Zionist excesses.<sup>22</sup>

Interestingly, these figures did not object to the idea of a major research center *in Palestine*. The momentum of Zionist support for the project had effectively rendered the question of location a moot one. But there would be no compromise on the model of an elite research center. The non-Zionists sought to insure that European standards of scholarship prevail in Jerusalem. Their demands were not mere bluster either. Rothschild in the 1910s and Warburg in the 1920s provided major subvention for the university project. Indeed, it was Warburg's gift of \$500,000 which allowed the Institute of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem to open in December 1924, some three months before the inauguration of the Hebrew University of which it became part.

Warburg diverged from other non-Zionists in one important regard: he was not interested in maintaining ultimate administrative control from abroad. Warburg was coaxed into university affairs by the enterprising American-born Reform rabbi, Judah L. Magnes, who left Jewish communal life in New York in 1922 to move to Palestine. Magnes, a passionate advocate of the Hebrew University for nearly a decade, acted as Warburg's proxy in Jerusalem. Warburg, in turn, insisted that Magnes and other local supporters be entrusted with administrative control of the university. Indeed, by the early 1920s, some of the most important Zionist supporters of the Hebrew University had moved to Palestine. In 1922, a committee on behalf of a Hebrew college in Jerusalem was established which included such long-time proponents of the university idea as Magnes, Menachem Ussishkin, Yosef Klausner, and Ahad Ha-'am.<sup>23</sup> This committee supported the regnant idea of a small-scale institution, at least at the outset. At the same time, it sought to satisfy an audience whose existence was barely considered by non-Zionist supporters hitherto: Jewish students, both local and foreign, for whom opportunities of university study, especially in Jewish studies, were severely limited.<sup>24</sup>

The emergence of a local lobby for the university introduced a new force in the balance of power of university politics. Emblematic of this development was Felix Warburg's abdication of authority to Judah Magnes. But this did not reflect, by any means, a complete surrender of authority by Diaspora supporters. Leading non-Zionists remained committed to preserving control over academic affairs through supervisory bodies such as the Governing Council of the Institute of Jewish Studies and the Board of Governors of the Hebrew University. Perhaps



even more surprising was the fact that the World Zionist Organization and its president, Chaim Weizmann, insisted on organizational control over the university from London, not Jerusalem. In explaining the rationale, Weizmann's assistant, M. D. Eder, declared in 1925 that "there does not yet exist in Palestine that intellectual atmosphere which is essential for the evolution of a university in general and particularly one that is intended to represent the intellectual traditions and give scope to the foremost intellectual workers of world Jewry."<sup>25</sup>

Upon reflection, there would seem to be a deep incongruity in the fact that Weizmann and the official Zionist movement discouraged local Palestine control over the Hebrew University. Was this not the very objective of Zionism? As is so often the case in Jewish organizational life, one can explain such an unlikely position as the result of antagonism between leading personalities—as I shall presently. But the generally confused state of jurisdictional control and institutional conception was the product of a larger phenomenon: namely, the difficult enterprise of projecting an institutional model conceived in Europe onto the *terra incognita* of Palestine. The resilient demands of Diaspora Jews, Zionist and non-Zionist alike, to conduct the business of a university located in Palestine rested on a paternalistic skepticism in the ability of the locals to guide their own affairs. Such a description hints, and not so subtly, at a colonialist relationship in which the foreigner dictates to the local. And yet, there was one curious feature to this relationship that requires mention: both sides, the subjects and objects of the colonialist arrangement, were in their origins the same people. There were virtually no Jews born in Palestine involved in the creation of the Hebrew University, with the notable exception of the scholar David Yellin, scion of a distinguished Sephardi family from the old *Yishuv*. All of Yellin's comrades in the struggle to establish a university were Europeans or, to a lesser extent, Americans. Not surprisingly, those Diaspora Jews who made their way to Palestine lived an entirely different existence than those who remained in the Diaspora. They faced new life conditions which significantly altered their priorities and expectations, and created resentment and hostility toward European kin.

Notwithstanding these sentiments, it was in the spirit of harmony that the Institute of Jewish Studies was inaugurated on Jerusalem's barren Mt. Scopus on December 22, 1924. This event marked the culmination of several years of intense negotiations among diverse parties from Europe, America, and Palestine. It also marked the apparent victory of the concept of a small-scale center whose main function was to carry out research. Optimism was in the air, as speaker after speaker heralded the occasion as an historic one in the annals of Jewish learning, often punctuating their remarks with the traditional liturgical refrain: "From Zion will go forth Torah."

Behind the soaring oratory lay a far grimmer reality. Chaim Weizmann was seething in London, wedded to the mistaken belief that he, president of the World Zionist Organization, had not been invited to the opening of the Institute of Jewish Studies. The fact that the letter inviting Weizmann arrived

after the inauguration was sufficient cause for ire.<sup>26</sup> Even more disturbing to Weizmann was the fear that he might be losing control of university affairs.<sup>27</sup>

Chaim Weizmann's anger was not based merely on institutional considerations. His antipathy for Judah Magnes, a one-time friend and collaborator, was increasing daily. Weizmann doubted Magnes' ability to lead, distrusted his progressive politics, and, above all, feared his widening influence. The growing antipathy would be an important factor in the early history of the Hebrew University. It increased in 1925-26 as a result of a new arrangement by which the World Zionist Organization at last ceded formal claim to the University; however, as part of the bargain, Chaim Weizmann became chairman of the Hebrew University's Board of Governors with a mandate to conduct University affairs abroad. One need not be expert in organizational management to see the potential for administrative discord between Magnes in Jerusalem and Weizmann in London. The structural tension was exacerbated by personal distaste, leading to a climax in the 1930s when Weizmann sought to supplant Magnes altogether as chief administrative officer of the Hebrew University.

But that is getting ahead of our story. Around the opening of the Institute of Jewish Studies in 1924, Weizmann's voice of discontent was not a solitary one. Such voices were even heard in Palestine. For example, the Jerusalem-based scholar Joseph Klausner, whom Judah Magnes counted as one of his few friends, lambasted the new Institute as the creation of "non-nationalist religious men."<sup>28</sup> Klausner deeply resented the interference of Diaspora Jewry, particularly non-Zionists, in what he regarded as an essential national mission (one aspect of which was getting him an appointment at the Hebrew University). He would have certainly agreed with the assessment of a fellow Zionist based in London, Robert Weltsch, who called the Institute a "proper 'Golus' institution."<sup>29</sup> Weltsch had uppermost in mind the list of candidates being considered to serve as the Institute's faculty; most were older scholars who taught in the modern rabbinical seminaries which were established in the mid-nineteenth century in Germany, Austria, and Hungary. In fact, rabbinical seminaries *were* the training grounds for modern Jewish scholars. Ironically, the university professorate was not yet open to Jews in those countries where Jewish scholarship had reached its most developed state. As a result, it was in rabbinical seminaries that serious students were trained and that serious scholars were employed.<sup>30</sup> And it was from these seminaries that the largest pool of qualified candidates for the faculty of the Institute of Jewish Studies was drawn.

The demography of Jewish scholarship thus assured a strong Diaspora presence in Jerusalem. Invariably, the new scholars in Jerusalem carried with them disciplinary priorities, organizational schemes, and a strong commitment to the research ethic they had absorbed in European universities. But they were quickly immersed in a world in which they were valued not as research scholars, but as popular national pedagogues. For some, particularly the Eastern Europeans, the shift in locale was not particularly jarring. Figures such as Ben-Zion Dinur, Joseph Klausner, and Simha Assaf easily fell into the role

of teacher. For others, such as the German historian Fritz Baer, there was a great deal of dissonance between their old and new functions.

Baer had spent the previous decade of his life employed in an institution of pure Jewish research in Berlin where he had no pedagogic responsibilities. In Jerusalem, he was not only engaged to *teach* Jewish history; he became, upon arrival in 1930, the entire department of Jewish history at the Hebrew University.<sup>31</sup> This obviously entailed a major change in function for Baer. But it also reflected a broader institutional shift. By this time, the original model of a small-scale research center was no longer deemed tenable. In fact, from the opening of the Institute of the Jewish Studies, student interest surpassed any previous expectation.<sup>32</sup> The result was a renewed debate in 1925–26 over the function of the Institute. A committee of inquiry headed by the English-Jewish scientist, Selig Brodetsky, was created with the explicit charge to navigate between the competing poles of teaching and research. Leading Diaspora members of the Institute's Governing Council, particularly the chief rabbis of France and England (Israel Lévy and Joseph Hertz), feared that the introduction of a full curriculum of instruction would create a "degree factory."<sup>33</sup> By contrast, advocates of an institution geared to the needs of local Jewish youth in Palestine inveighed against the prevailing model of a "research monastery."<sup>34</sup> After considerable discussion, the Brodetsky committee decided on a course of action which acknowledged the wisdom of an institution responsive to local needs. Ever cautious not to alienate Diaspora supporters, the Brodetsky committee recommended the *gradual* introduction of regular instruction, commencing with study at the master's level in a new Faculty of the Humanities.<sup>35</sup> The implementation of this decision signified an important first step in the localization of the Institute of Jewish Studies and the Hebrew University. Indeed, the new attention to local Jewish demands indicated that the University was sinking roots in the soil of Palestine.<sup>36</sup>

Were this process a linear one, our story might well conclude here. It would be a tale of liberation, the liberation of Jewish scholarship not only from its oppressive European environment, but from colonialist Diaspora control. In fact, the unique example of Zionism—"the last, least typical of European nationalisms," in Trevor-Roper's words—complicates any such prospect.<sup>37</sup> In one important respect, Zionism was indeed typical of European nationalist movements. It was the paradigmatic case of the invention or imagination of a national community, in the sense conveyed by Anderson, Gellner, Hobsbawm and other adepts of the new discourse of nationalism.<sup>38</sup> Perhaps in no other case were a national language and land such abstract constructs to the masses upon whom a cultural elite sought to leave its imprint. Perhaps in no other case then was the task of imagining a national community so imaginative.

But it is precisely in the linguistic and territorial void that the uniqueness of Zionism lies. Reviving Hebrew and transporting the Jewish people to its ancient homeland required an immense outlay of psychic and material resources. Until these processes were consummated, Zionism would remain an

anomaly among nationalisms. For its constituency was not national in conventional territorial terms; it was global in its widespread dispersion.<sup>39</sup> Without question, this basic anomaly became part of the very foundation on which the Hebrew University stood.

Recall, for instance, that supporters of the University expressed concern not only over the welfare of Jewish youth in Palestine, but periodically of European Jewish students and scholars as well. This concern became a matter of official university policy in 1933 with Adolf Hitler's rise to power in Germany. At that point, the University's Board of Governors established a special committee to plan the rescue of displaced Jewish scholars from Europe.<sup>40</sup> But this committee was charged with another function which also attested to the international scope of the University: a systematic review of the University's administration. What, one might ask, was international about that? In the first place, a major impetus behind this charge came from Chaim Weizmann, now in the second act of his long-distance drama with Judah Magnes.<sup>41</sup> Weizmann's dissatisfaction with Magnes had grown exponentially over the course of a decade, and he now had as an ally one of the University's most important supporters, Albert Einstein, who had been interested in the University's cause since the early 1920s. Everyone, including Magnes, wanted to retain the world-renowned scientist as a friend of the University. In fact, when Magnes heard that Einstein had questioned his competence in running the University, he offered to give him any position he desired in the Jerusalem institution.<sup>42</sup> He was less generous with Weizmann, who had been his persistent adversary in the struggle to control the University.

Beyond the deep personal animosity of two men, discontent with Magnes' management of the University began to catch the attention of the University's trustees. The early 1930s were a difficult time for the new institution; the recent global depression, political unrest in Palestine, and difficulties in attracting distinguished faculty contributed to a sense of malaise. Magnes, at once earnest and guileful as chief administrator, was an obvious target. In search of solutions to overcome the current torpor, the Board of Governors created the Survey Committee in 1933. The Committee's members included Prof. Louis Ginzberg, Dr. Redcliffe Salaman, and its chair, Sir Philip Hartog. I hasten to comment here that committees of review are hardly unknown in the history of universities; along with boards of trustees, they often inspire dark fears of usurpation of authority and paternalistic intervention. Indeed, this was the case with the Survey Committee. The composition of the committee underscored the quasi-colonial relations which still obtained between the University's supporters abroad and in Palestine. To begin with, the chairman of the committee, Philip Hartog, was a British scientist with considerable administrative experience in university affairs, particularly in colonial India. Hartog had, for instance, chaired a major review commission for the Calcutta University, and later served as first vice-chancellor of the University of Dacca.<sup>43</sup>

If Judah Magnes had not been fearful of Hartog's colonial credentials prior to his arrival, it did not take long. The Survey Committee quickly set out to interview long lists of what were formally called "witnesses." Magnes himself was subjected to lengthy interviews with the committee members, the transcripts of which hint more at an interrogation into a crime than a friendly review. Magnes was caught in webs of inconsistencies as he tried to respond to questions concerning his style of management. Though appreciative of Magnes' "single-minded devotion to the cause of the University," the committee members were sharply critical of his administration.<sup>44</sup> The objections ranged from the seemingly trivial claim that the University "possesses no common rooms or refectories" of the kind found in Western universities to the larger charge that Magnes had "a fundamental misconception . . . of what a University should be."<sup>45</sup> No longer could the university tolerate Magnes' merging of the functions of "Chancellor and Dictator," to borrow the language of the report.<sup>46</sup> To remedy the situation, the Survey Committee recommended the abolition of the position of Chancellor, and the creation of the new position of provost to be filled by a professional administrator.

The Hartog committee thus set in motion a substantial overhaul of the Hebrew University, which included stripping Judah Magnes of control over the University in Palestine. The initiators and implementers of this strategy came, in the main, from abroad. And their work signaled the ongoing importance of Diaspora Jewry to the Hebrew University. What also reinforced this message was the other main task of the Survey Committee: helping to facilitate the absorption of displaced Jewish scholars from Europe.<sup>47</sup> By overseeing the integration of new scholars from Europe, the Committee was assuring a continuing Diaspora presence in the University. In this respect, the committee's work in 1933-34 marked a certain reversal in the trend toward localization that the University followed from 1926. In fact, the swing toward a more international mission and audience continued to compete with the localizing trend for years to come—throughout the Nazi genocidal campaign against European Jewry, though less so in the immediate aftermath of the creation of the State of Israel.

3. It was the web of relations between foreigners and locals that initially impelled the analogy between the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the American University of Beirut. As in the latter case, it is too facile to explain the development of the Hebrew University in the stark terms of colonial domination over local natives. In both instances, the leading faculty and administrators on the ground were themselves of foreign birth or nationality. Moreover, in both cases, the founding faculty and administrators saw themselves as embarked on a *mission civilisatrice*, specifically to introduce Western standards of academic excellence to the Middle East. Virtually all of the first-generation Jerusalem scholars, those from both East and Central Europe, had studied in Germany where they were exposed to the methods and standards of validation of

*Wissenschaft*. Many expressed the desire to make Jewish scholarship comparable in quality to the work of scholars of German or French history—to create, in the words of Ernst Simon, a “European sister-science.”<sup>48</sup> This aspiration persisted, even intensified, despite the fact that professional Jewish scholars and their subject matter were effectively excluded from the German university system.

The resulting mix of intellectual emulation and institutional disenfranchisement created interesting consequences. In collective psychological terms, the movement of Jewish scholars from Europe to Palestine represented a response to the failure to gain access to the academic workplace. But this response, I emphasize, hardly meant that European sensibilities were effaced. The Jerusalem neighborhood of Rehavia where many of the transplanted scholars made their new home had a distinctly *mitteleuropäische* air to it. It became a kind of “little Berlin,” replete with cafés, salons, and reading circles.<sup>49</sup> Similarly, the new Jerusalem university which employed the European scholars reflected the principles of academic and administrative order which they brought with them from European seminaries.

A few brief examples will suffice to support this claim. First, the new scholarly center in Jerusalem was intended to provide new vitality and direction to the field of Jewish studies. As part of this new impetus, the Bible—the favored classical source of Zionists—was to be accorded a central place in the curriculum of the Hebrew University. On the surface, it would seem that such a priority entailed diminished attention to the Talmud, the normative textual authority for Diaspora Jewry. As a matter of fact, the early history of the Institute of Jewish Studies demonstrates precisely the opposite. Talmudic and rabbinic literature won ample faculty representation, while no permanent professor in Bible was appointed for almost a decade and a half. The reasons are more complex than I can explicate at this point.<sup>50</sup> One of the primary reasons was surely the influence of Diaspora overseers of the Institute such as Joseph Hertz and Israel Lévy, who not only were committed to the study of Talmud, but resisted modern critical approaches in Biblical scholarship. But another major contributing factor was the relative abundance of professional scholars of the Talmud and the relative dearth of professional scholars of the Bible. Here, the recurrent claim heard in the early years that the Institute replicated the Diaspora rabbinical seminary seems to have real merit. For the Institute not only continued the disciplinary emphasis of the German seminaries. It did so with scholars drawn from the seminaries themselves, who perpetuated the curricular and research emphases of their former institutional base in Europe.

There was another important way in which the first-generation Jerusalem scholars revealed their European origins. One might have expected that as a group devoted to a new scholarly center in Zion, they would have followed the political Zionist tenet of “negation of the Diaspora.” After all, denigration of the Diaspora’s historical significance would seem to issue naturally from the new-found centrality of *Erets Yisra’el* in Jewish history among Jerusalem scholars. But even those committed to a baldly “Palestinocentric” perspective, most

notably, Ben-Zion Dinur, were loath to discard the Diaspora past from the historical memory of the Jewish nation. Rather, for Dinur and others, the Diaspora witnessed the preservation of Jewish national identity and culture, and thus was an inextricable, though also instrumental, component of Jewish history.<sup>51</sup> Instead of erasing Diaspora communal existence from the historical record, the first-generation Jerusalem scholars investigated the social, economic, and cultural dimensions of that existence, hoping in part to find historical precursors for contemporary political experiments.<sup>52</sup> That they were themselves born and bred in the Diaspora hardly seems unrelated to their appreciative perspective on its history. Notwithstanding this point, discussions of the "Jerusalem school" all too often neglect the complex attitudes and positions of Jerusalem scholars to the (and their own) Diaspora past.<sup>53</sup> The most renowned of all Jerusalem scholars, Gershom Scholem, gave poignant expression to this complexity in a bitter requiem for Jewish scholarship in 1944. Beset with deep anguish over the ongoing genocide of Europe's Jews, Scholem took stock of the purported advances of his Jerusalem colleagues over their Diaspora teachers and predecessors. Rather than introduce radical change, they had replicated many qualities of their scorned forebears. This realization prompted Scholem to conclude, in a sweeping indictment of his own generation: "We came to rebel, and ended up continuing."<sup>54</sup>

It may well be the case that as the Institute of Jewish Studies become more acclimated to Palestine, and as a native cohort of Jewish scholars arose, the unwitting tendency of the first generation to continue waned. To a great extent, the study of Jewish history in Jerusalem in succeeding generations became a more local affair—that is, more the study of a nation in a conventional territorial sense.<sup>55</sup> But this development should not obscure the fascinating tensions of the founding generation of Jerusalem scholars. They were exemplary cultural hybrids, never fully at home either in Europe or Palestine, and perhaps secretly reveling in their marginality. Their scholarship swayed between the poles of Zionism and *jüdische Wissenschaft*, as they sought to re-invent the Jewish past while using organizational models and the guiding ethos of their predecessors in Germany. And yet, in one significant regard, the Jerusalem scholars provided definitive resolution to a Diaspora dilemma. They and their teachers were shunted to the periphery of academic life in Europe. In Jerusalem, they became the masters, intent on imposing European standards of scholarship and objectivity. Indeed, it was there, in the midst of an intricate web of relations between Diaspora and "local" Jews, that the Jerusalem scholars created a new scholarly colony some seventy years ago.

#### ENDNOTES

1. The words of Bayard Dodge from his Inaugural Address of 1923 are quoted in John M. Munro, *A Mutual Concern: The Story of the American University of Beirut* (Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1977), pp. 75–76.



2. A curious episode in the early history of the American University of Beirut, or more accurately, its precursor—the Syrian Protestant College—occurred in 1882 when a young lecturer, Edwin Lewis, was forced to resign after delivering a commencement address which referred admiringly to the work of Darwin. This recourse to Darwin transgressed the fundamentalist attitudes towards Biblical accounts of creation held by the College's Board of Trustees and administration. See Munro, *A Mutual Concern*, pp. 26–30.
3. Munro, *A Mutual Concern*, p. 2. Later Munro records, it was the "Hebraists" who took the day when Darwinism was suppressed at the AUB's precursor, the Syrian Protestant College, in the late nineteenth century. *Ibid.*, 35.
4. For a fuller analysis of the Jerusalem scholars and their role in creating the Hebrew University's Institute of Jewish Studies, see David N. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past: European Jewish Intellectuals and the Zionist Return to History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
5. In this respect, they bear some resemblance to the anti-colonial nationalists whom Partha Chatterjee has identified in the rather different context of Bengal. Chatterjee calls attention to a non-political form of nationalist activity centered around the spiritual, as distinct from material, domain. This model, though originating in opposition to Western models of nationalism, can perhaps be of value in analyzing a range of Jewish cultural activists in the early twentieth century including Zionists, autonomists, and Bundists. Chatterjee, *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. 6.
6. Various speakers at the opening of the Institute of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem on December 22, 1924 emphasized the *sacred* mission of the Institute, specifically by equating modern scholarship and Torah. See, for example, the speeches of Judah L. Magnes and Max Margolis in *Yedi'ot ha-Makhon le-mada'e ha-Yahadut* 1 (1925).
7. See, for instance, Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), Stuart Hall, "Cultural Identity and Diaspora," in *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*, edited by Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), and Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993).
8. The idea of cultural hybridity, of a dynamic cultural identity formed at the borders of contiguous or overlapping group identities, is not a new one. For an interesting adumbration, see Randolph S. Bourne, "The Jew and Trans-National America," *The Menorah Journal* 2 (December 1916): 280.
9. Kwame Anthony Appiah, *In My Father's House: Africa in the Philosophy of Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 56.
10. For a sampling of views in the ongoing debate over "post-Zionism," see the special volume on "Israeli Historiography Revisited" in *History and Memory* 7 (Spring/Summer 1995). See also the divergent viewpoints represented in a symposium on post-Zionism, "Al Tsiyonut, post-Tsiyonut ve-anti-Tsiyonut" in *Ha-aretz*, November 15, 1995: 4B.
11. In this respect, it is interesting to compare the new "post-Zionist" critiques of Zionism to post-colonial revisitations of colonialism. In suggesting this comparison, I do not mean to equate Zionism and colonialism, though this is a hotly contested issue in the current Israeli debates. Rather, I mean to emphasize that the culmination of an historical epoch—of European colonialism, on one hand, and of a certain stage of Israeli history (i.e., the phase of unrelenting conflict with the Arab world), on the other—brings with it the opportunity to explore the foundation myths underlying guiding ideologies.
12. In 1566, Provenzali and his son Abraham produced a plan for such an academy that would include Talmud and Hebrew studies along with subjects from the canon of Renaissance humanism: Latin, logic, rhetoric, mathematics, and medicine. See Cecil Roth, *The Jews in the Renaissance* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1959), p. 42. For a brief, helpful survey of the university idea, see David Biale, "The Idea of a Jewish University," in *Like All the Nations? The Life and Legacy of Judah L. Magnes*, edited by William M. Brinner and Moses Rischin (Albany: SUNY Press, 1987), pp. 127–137.
13. Schapira's initial suggestions appeared in *Ha-Melits* 22 (1882): 437–438. Subsequent discussions can be found in *Ha-Melits* 26 (1882): 528, 723, and *Ha-Melits* 29 (1884): 85.

14. See the *Officielles Protocoll. Zionisten-Congress in Basel, 29. 30. und 31 August 1897* (Vienna, 1898), p. 189.
15. On Schapira and subsequent plans for a Jewish university, see Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, pp. 42–43.
16. For a more detailed analysis of the university project in this period, see Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, pp. 46–47.
17. The Belgian Zionist, Jean Fisher, articulated the concern about such a proletariat arising in Palestine. See Jehuda Reinharz, *Chaim Weizmann: The Making of a Zionist Leader* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 380.
18. On Weizmann's efforts to gain the support of Rothschild and Ehrlich, see Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, p. 47.
19. This view was contained in a report published by the Keren Ha-Yesod based on the Annual Zionist Conference of July 1920 as *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem* (London, 1921), p. 8.
20. On the important role of the research ethic in the German university system, see Charles M. McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany, 1700–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp. 151–189.
21. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, p. 19. The central place of *Wissenschaft* in German-Jewish society suggests that this notion served either as complement or successor to the idea of *Bildung*, as expertly analyzed by George Mosse, in *German Jews beyond Judaism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), and his essay in this issue, "Central European Intellectuals in Palestine."
22. Reflective of this perspective was Cyrus Adler's damning judgment of Joseph Klausner's book, *Yeshu ha-Notzri*. Adler denounced this book as "one of the first unfortunate products of that scientific and cultural revival" that Zionism sought to engender. Adler's remark is contained in a letter from 1924 to Louis Marshall, and published in Ira Robinson, *Cyrus Adler: Selected Letters*, Vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1985), pp. 93–94.
23. The committee advanced a proposal for a "mikhlah 'ivrit birushalayim (Hebrew college in Jerusalem)." See Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, p. 51.
24. While responsive to these students, the Jerusalem committee was also prompted to action by reports that various groups—British Mandatory authorities, as well as local Muslims and Christians—were developing plans to establish universities in Jerusalem. Three years earlier, in 1919, the Syrian Protestant College was formally renamed the American University of Beirut, heralding a new era for higher education in the Levant. All of this activity apparently produced a new local impetus, even urgency, to establish a Jewish institution of higher learning in Palestine.
25. Eder offered the assessment in a letter of 24 July 1925 to Felix Warburg. The letter is contained in the Felix Warburg Papers of the American Jewish Archives, box 222. See Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, p. 60.
26. In a letter to Magnes of December 25, 1924, Weizmann expressed his surprise at having read of the Institute's opening in the previous day's *London Times*. He received a letter of invitation for the opening on December 27. See Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, p. 204, n. 100.
27. In particular, Weizmann felt that the opening of the Institute would overshadow the inauguration of the broader Hebrew University some months later. Magnes attempted to assuage Weizmann on this particular point in a letter from January 12, 1925 which is contained in the Magnes Papers, American Jewish Archives, box 154.
28. Klausner, "Lifetihah ha-Makhon la-mada'e ha-Yahadut," *Ha-Universitah ha-'Ivrit birushalayim* (Jerusalem, 1925): 34.
29. Weltsch's comment came in a letter to Martin Buber from June 23, 1924 in Buber's *Briefwechsel aus sieben Jahrzehnten*, vol. 2 (Heidelberg: L. Schneider, 1973), p. 195.
30. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, pp. 21–22.
31. On Baer's transition from Berlin to Jerusalem, see Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, pp. 109–128.

32. Student enthusiasm is reflected in the report contained in *Yedi'ot ha-Makhon le-mada'e ha-Yahadut* 1 (1925): 76-77.
33. See the report of the Brodetsky Committee, "Report on Teaching and Research in and Publications by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem," page 10. A copy of this report can be found in the Central Archives for the Hebrew University, file 178/II.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
35. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, p. 63.
36. For some of the recent scholarly transplants from Europe, this development must have been somewhat chastening. And yet, the experience on the ground necessitated a quick realignment of perspective. Gershom Scholem, the young German scholar of Jewish mysticism, apprehended that the new University did not possess the financial or even human resources to become a major research center in an instant. Scholem's letter of 4 Tevet 5687 (December 9, 1926) is found in the Central Archives for the Hebrew University, file 178/II (1926).
37. See Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Jewish and Other Nationalisms* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1962), p. 23.
38. See, for example, Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), and Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). For a recent attempt to apply the insights of the new critical discourse on nationalism to the Jewish case, see Uri Ram, "Zionist Historiography and the Invention of Modern Jewish Nationhood: The Case of Ben Zion Dinur," *History and Memory* 7 (Spring/Summer 1995), pp. 91-124.
39. This observation was evident already to those first agitating toward a nationalist definition for Jewish culture in the nineteenth century. See, for instance, Peretz Smolenskin's comments in *Ha-Shahar* 1 (5) (1869): 4. This idea also animated Simon Dubnow in his monumental *Weltgeschichte des jüdischen Geschichts* (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1925). See Dubnow's introductory remarks, excerpted in *Ideas of Jewish History*, edited by Michael A. Meyer (New York: Behrman House, 1974), p. 259.
40. See Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, pp. 68-72, and Yoav Gelber, *Moledet hadashah: 'aliyat Yehude merkaz Eropah ve-kelitatam, 1933-1948* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 1990), pp. 455-462.
41. See, for instance, Weizmann's letter to Magnes from September 16, 1933 in *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, edited by Gabriel Sheffer, vol. 16 (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1978), p. 49.
42. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, p. 60.
43. *Report of the Survey Committee*, p. 139. Like Chaim Weizmann, Hartog was a Manchester-trained chemist, an affinity which makes Hartog's participation in the Survey Committee quite logical. For a summary of Hartog's work in academic administration, see Mabel Hartog, *P.J. Hartog: A Memoir* (London: Constable, 1949).
44. *Report of the Survey Committee*, p. 104.
45. *Report of the Survey Committee*, p. 102.
46. *Report of the Survey Committee*, p. 104. According to the report, if the Hebrew University were to achieve its unrealized potential as a great institution, it would be necessary to remove "the canker in some of the departments and in the administration itself which . . . at the present moment threatens the University in its very being." *Report of the Survey Committee*, p. 120.
47. *Report of the Survey Committee*, p. 1.
48. Ernst Simon, "Franz Rosenzweig und das jüdische Bildungsproblem," *Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins zur Gründung und Erhaltung einer Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* (11) 1930: 5.
49. See David Biale, *Gershom Scholem: Kabbalah and Counter-History*, revised edition (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).
50. See Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, pp. 102-108.

51. Indeed, it is curious and even counter-intuitive that Jewish nationalist historians, and not merely Zionists (I have in mind Simon Dubnow, as well as Dinur and his Jerusalem colleague, Yitzhak Baer), developed a deep interest in the medieval and early-modern Jewish community as a prototypical nation or state. See Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, pp. 114–115.

52. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, p. 149.

53. See, for example, Baruch Kimmerling, "Academic History Caught in the Cross-Fire: The Case of Israeli-Jewish Historiography," *History and Memory* 7 (Spring/Summer 1995): 41–65.

54. Scholem, "Mi-tokh hirhurim 'al Hokhmat Yisra'el," in *Hokhmat Yisra'el: hebetim historiyim u-filosofiyim*, edited by Paul Mendes-Flohr (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar, 1979), p. 167.

55. See Shmuel Ettinger, "Heker Toldot Yisra'el ba-dorot ha-aharonim," in *idem, Historyah ve-historiyonim* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1992): 44.

## *Response to George Mosse & David Myers*

MARTIN JAY

JOHN MUNRO, THE HISTORIAN OF THE AMERICAN University of Beirut cited by David Myers in his fascinating essay, accused the American missionaries who were its progenitors of succumbing to the dreaded spirit of "Hebraism," which in a footnote he defines as a zealous inflexibility that "was hardly conducive to the establishment of a university in the full humanistic sense of the word." Although there may be little overt irony in the recoil from an alleged Hebraic narrowness in the foundation of a Christian university in Lebanon, it is hard not to feel its far stronger presence in the narratives we have just heard of the origins of a Hebrew University in Jerusalem. For many of its founding fathers, those scholarly colonists from Central Europe who are the heroes of both these essays, were running headlong away from what has for centuries, if not millennia, been stigmatized as the Hebraic alternative to Hellenic culture. True, the language of their new university was to be Hebrew and, as Professor Myers notes, Talmudic and rabbinic literature did find an honored place in the curriculum, which allows him to say that "in the early years . . . the Institute replicated the diaspora rabbinical seminary." But it seems that the center of gravity of their existence ultimately lay elsewhere, in that powerful tradition of *Bildung* and *Wissenschaft*

---

MARTIN JAY is Professor of European Intellectual History at the University of California, Berkeley. His most recent books include *Force Fields* (1993), *Downcast Eyes* (1994), *The Weimar Republic Sourcebook*, edited with Anton Kaes and Edward Dimendberg (1994), and *Vision in Context*, edited with Teresa Brennan (1996).