

# The Fall and Rise of Jewish Historicism: The Evolution of the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (1919-1934)

DAVID N. MYERS  
*University of California, Los Angeles*

This article studies an intriguing, and largely unexplored, institution of Jewish research in Berlin whose development spans the brief history — and mirrors the initial optimism and ultimate tragedy — of the Weimar Republic. A central point of historical interest is the dissonance between the Akademie's original impetus, provided by Franz Rosenzweig, and its subsequent evolution under the stewardship of Eugen Täubler and Julius Guttmann. Whereas Rosenzweig envisaged the *Akademie* as an institution in which *Wissenschaft* would be actively mobilized to the task of communal self-definition, Täubler and Guttmann both insisted that the *Akademie* be a house of pure science. Moreover, while Rosenzweig first advanced his proposals for the *Akademie* as a reaction against a dry and dispassionate historicism, Täubler and Guttmann tended to affirm the virtues of esoteric scholarly inquiry.

In analyzing the shift from the Rosenzweig initiative to the Täubler/Guttmann model, this article relates the intellectual and institutional course of the *Akademie* from its inception in 1919 to its closing in 1934. In concluding, the article surveys the range of cultural and institutional expressions among Weimar Jewry by comparing the *Akademie's* development to that of two contemporaneous institutions: the *Freies Jüdisches Lehrhaus* in Frankfurt and the *Institut für Sozialforschung* also in Frankfurt.

Near the end of the first World War, a young German-Jewish soldier carried on a prolific correspondence with family and friends from the Balkan front. He sought in his letters a measure of intimacy, normality, and intellectual stimulation — qualities alien to the disorienting conditions of the front. Yet, beyond this psychological motive common to his fellow soldiers lay a grander task for the letter writer: in an atmosphere of death and despair, he boldly undertook to revitalize Jewish religion and culture.

The soldier was Franz Rosenzweig (1886–1929), and his war-time literacy legacy, inscribed on army post cards, endures as one of the most original, innovative, and substantial contributions to Jewish thought in

modern times.<sup>1</sup> Even his most notable philosophic achievement, *Der Stern der Erlösung*, which sought to provide a theological anchor for the modern individual cast adrift by Idealism and historicism, was begun while Rosenzweig served on the front. Yet it is not this philosophic masterpiece which concerns us here; *Der Stern der Erlösung* has been amply and ably commented upon.<sup>2</sup> Rather, our interest lies in Rosenzweig's reconsideration of the sources and methods of Jewish learning, and, specifically, in his role as propagator of the idea of an *Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* (Academy for the Science of Judaism).<sup>3</sup>

In March 1917, Rosenzweig proposed a series of far-reaching reforms for Jewish education in epistolary form to the eminent philosopher Hermann Cohen.<sup>4</sup> The proposals, which were entitled and later published as *Zeit ists*, aimed to recreate a holistic "Jewish world," animated by the classical sources of Jewish tradition.<sup>5</sup> To achieve this and

(1) Nahum Glatzer, Rosenzweig's erstwhile acquaintance from the *Freies Jüdisches Lehrhaus* in Frankfurt, has performed an extremely valuable service by editing and anthologizing Rosenzweig's war-time correspondence (and adding biographical notes) in *Franz Rosenzweig: His Life and Thought* (New York, 1953), 32-85.

(2) See, for instance, Glatzer's brief introduction to the English version of *The Star of Redemption*, translated by William Hallo and reprinted by the University of Notre Dame Press, (Notre Dame, IN, 1985), ix-xviii. Other noteworthy commentators include S.H. Bergmann, *Faith and Reason*, trans. Alfred Jospe (Washington, 1961), 51-80, Julius Guttman, *Philosophies of Judaism* (New York, 1973), paperback reprint, 416-451, and the various contributors to a volume edited by Paul Mendes-Flohr entitled *The Philosophy of Franz Rosenzweig* (Hanover, NH and London, 1988).

(3) In general, the origins and development of this fascinating institution have not been adequately studied. Among the contributions which discuss the *Akademie* are Nahum Glatzer's introduction to Franz Rosenzweig, *On Jewish Learning* (New York, 1955), 9-24, Werner Schochow, *Deutsch-jüdische Geschichtswissenschaft. Eine Geschichte ihrer Organisationsformen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Fachbibliographie* (Berlin, 1969), 38-42. Selma Stern-Taeubler, "Eugen Taeubler and the 'Wissenschaft des Judentums'," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 3(1958)40-59, Kurt Wilhelm (ed.), *Wissenschaft des Judentums im deutschen Sprachbereich. Ein Querschnitt* (Tübingen, 1967), 46-50, and David Nathan Myers, "From Zion Will Go Forth Torah: Jewish Scholarship and the Zionist Return to History" (Ph.D. Diss., Columbia University 1991), 19-23. The most authoritative primary source is the *Akademie's* yearly *Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins zur Gründung und Erhaltung einer Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* (hereafter *Korrespondenzblatt*), which appeared from 1919-1930. A potential cause for confusion is the fact that the opening issue of 1919 and that of 1920 both bear the number 1. Yet it is in the 1920 issue that the format for subsequent volumes was set. All told, the *Korrespondenzblatt* appeared, from 1920, ten times (though in eleven numbers since 4 and 5 were issued together). Regarding the early stages of the *Akademie*, see the *Korrespondenzblatt* 1(1919)1-5, and *Korrespondenzblatt* 1(1920)35-37.

(4) For a brief discussion of Cohen's intellectual biography, see Hans Liebeschütz, "Hermann Cohen and his Historical Background," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 13(1968)3-33.

(5) *Zeit ists* (Berlin and Munich, 1918). The title derives from Psalm 119:126: "It is time to work for the Lord; they made void Thy teachings." According to Rosenzweig's

thereby propel Jews at the periphery of their heritage to its center, Rosenzweig counseled a thorough restructuring of primary and secondary education in Germany. He called for the development of an elite cadre of teachers and scholars (approximately 150 in number) which would guide the spiritual and pedagogic agenda for the Jewish community.<sup>6</sup> While receiving the same theological training as German rabbis, these new "teacher-scholars" would also be adepts in the methods of critical scholarship. Yet their home would not be a rabbinical seminary nor, for the time being, a theological faculty attached to a German university.<sup>7</sup> Rather it would be an "Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," a community-sponsored institution where "teacher-scholars" could study and conduct research unencumbered by material demands, though very much occupied with contemporary Jewish affairs.<sup>8</sup> Through this mélange of functions, Rosenzweig imagined that the new scholars would be able to foster a spiritually vibrant public — a learned laity as once existed in Jewish communal life.<sup>9</sup>

In advancing his proposals, Rosenzweig was criticizing both the method and bearers of previous Jewish education in Germany. His letter to Cohen and subsequent writings insistently advocated a "new learning," a fully participatory engagement by Jews with core texts which avoided a rigid teacher-student dichotomy. Rosenzweig was mindful of the dis-

friend and disciple, Ernst Simon, this essay placed "the previously unknown author all at once at the center of attention of German Jewish culture." Simon, "Franz Rosenzweig und das jüdische Bildungsproblem," *Korrespondenzblatt* 11 (1930) 2. All German translations in this essay are my own.

(6) *Zeit* 15, 23. Rosenzweig was quite cognizant of the need to provide a stable financial foundation for the scholars involved in such an undertaking, something which had rarely been assured German-Jewish scholars. Accordingly, he proposed that a one-time educational tax be levied (over a three-year period) on German Jewish communities to raise the necessary capital from which fixed stipends could be drawn and distributed. This plan was never realized, and as we shall see, the *Akademie* never succeeded in achieving fiscal stability.

(7) *Ibid.*, 21. By this time, there were three major rabbinical seminaries in Germany reflecting the various branches of organized Judaism: the positive-historical or conservative *Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar* in Breslau (established in 1854); the liberal *Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* (1872); and the orthodox *Rabbinerseminar* in Berlin (1873). Rosenzweig himself studied at the *Hochschule* in 1913-14, where he first encountered Hermann Cohen. See also n. 31.

(8) Rosenzweig proposed that the teacher-scholars of the *Akademie* work half-time as teachers in the Jewish community, thereby allowing them to be engaged in its affairs and concerns. *Zeit* 15, 23-24.

(9) For Rosenzweig, the *Akademie's* "purpose is not only the organization of scientific research," but also "the intellectual and material consolidation" of an elite teaching corps; *Zeit* 15, 23. The intended effect of this consolidation was to permit the dissemination of Jewish knowledge throughout the Jewish community.

appearance of traditional Torah study as the common activity of the Jewish community. This process was accelerated in the era of critical scholarly analysis since non-specialists were effectively disenfranchised from the study of Jewish texts. Rosenzweig lamented that "the specifically Jewish (interest) has become, instead of the concern of all, the specialty of a few."<sup>10</sup> Moreover, since the advent of *Wissenschaft des Judentum*, the aim of attaining "scientific" virtuosity through appeal to an external standard of validation had replaced the quest for spiritual enrichment. Rosenzweig felt it necessary to redress this transformation. The latter-day proprietors of Jewish learning had to be weaned away from the cultural imperative of Emancipation — that is, from the demand to rehabilitate Judaism in order to win social and legal acceptance. More particularly, they had to be liberated from the single-minded obsession of having their discipline join the family of "European sister-disciplines" (*europäische Schwesterwissenschaften*).<sup>11</sup>

Rosenzweig's efforts to overcome the centripetal and elitist thrust of Jewish scholarship made him, in the eyes of a disciple, a leading "Jewish *Bildungspolitiker*" of his day.<sup>12</sup> His "political" stance was infused by the belief that the "curse of historicity" which afflicted Jewish intellectual life must be lifted.<sup>13</sup> It is interesting and paradoxical that this one-time student of history — a man who was offered a university position in history by his renowned teacher at Freiburg, Friedrich Meinecke — would become such a trenchant critic of historical method and thinking as applied to the Jewish past.<sup>14</sup> Yet, following his studies at Freiburg, and his vertiginous flirtations with Christianity, Rosenzweig became increasingly convinced that historical analysis contributed little to his new-found life task of revitalizing Jewish theology. In a 1914 essay, he sharply criticized modern Christian theology, and modern scholarship in general, for its historicist turn.<sup>15</sup> The notion that history was objective and scientific was but an "illusion." Moreover, historical research was better equipped to study the fossilized past than to impart significant meaning

(10) *Ibid.*, 18.

(11) Simon, "Franz Rosenzweig und das jüdische Bildungsproblem," 5.

(12) Simon, *ibid.*, 2.

(13) See his essay, "Atheistische Theologie," reprinted in *Kleinere Schriften* (Berlin, 1937), 289.

(14) In August 1920, Rosenzweig wrote a letter to Meinecke explaining why he turned down the offer to accept a lectureship in history. See *Franz Rosenzweig: His Life and Thought*, 94–98. Paul Mendes-Flohr offers an illuminating discussion of Rosenzweig's attitude to history and historical study in "Franz Rosenzweig and the Crisis of Historicism," *The Philosophy of Franz Rosenzweig*, 138–161.

(15) "Atheistische Theologie," 278–290.

to life. Several years later, Rosenzweig wrote in a letter that if historical study had any value, it lay, dialectically, in "free(ing) beliefs from their dependence on history" — that is, as a lever to propel ideas from the realm of the relative and ephemeral to that of the essential and timeless, from history to theology.<sup>16</sup>

In the coming years, Rosenzweig applied the conclusions of his methodological critique to the refinement of a theological world-view distinctive for its a-historicity. Thus, in a 1919 lecture, he declared: "The Jewish spirit breaks through the shackles of (historical) epochs. Because it is itself eternal and subservient to the Eternal, it defies the omnipotence of time."<sup>17</sup> It is important to note that Rosenzweig also channeled his criticism of historical study into the plan for a rejuvenation of Jewish learning outlined in *Zeit ists* of 1917. That this proposal was directed at Hermann Cohen should not be surprising. Though Cohen and Rosenzweig differed in background and philosophical perspective, the two shared a commitment to fusing Jewish scholarly and spiritual interests, as well as a confirmed disdain for pedantic and antiquarian historical research. Already at the beginning of the century, Cohen had observed, and criticized, the gap between the aims of Jewish scholarship and the spiritual needs of the Jewish public. In the opening article of the revived *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* in 1904, Cohen articulated the fear that the philosophical exploration of Judaism had followed the historicist turn of the nineteenth century — that is, the philosophy of religion had yielded to the *history* of the philosophy of religion. While not renouncing altogether the value of historical study, Cohen insisted that a revived emphasis on philosophy and ethics could tighten the bond between critical scholarship and Judaism, and as a consequence, between the labors of the few and the interests of the many (i.e., the community).<sup>18</sup> What was required for this task, Cohen later elaborated, was a fusion of scholarly and existential concerns. In a 1907 essay, he proclaimed that:

A believer of another faith cannot conduct scholarly research of a living religion, of our religion. A living religion can only be treated scientifically by one who belongs to it with inner piety.<sup>19</sup>

(16) See Rosenzweig's letter to Hans Ehrenberg of December 26, 1917, in his *Briefe* (Berlin, 1935), 273; quoted in Mendes-Flohr, *op. cit.*, 151.

(17) See "Geist und Epochen der jüdischen Geschichte," *Kleinere Schriften*, 25.

(18) See "Die Errichtung von Lehrstühlen für Ethik und Religions-philosophie an den jüdisch-theologischen Lehranstalten," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 48(1904)2–21.

(19) In this essay, Cohen revealed a good deal of concern for the material conditions

Cohen's critique of a detached scholarly ethos was not limited to the provinces of Jewish historical research. Indeed, he was among a group of prominent German academics who initiated, at the turn of the century, an overarching re-evaluation of the methodological and epistemological assumptions underlying German historiography in general. Along with Wilhelm Dilthey, Heinrich Rickert, Wilhelm Windelband, and others, Cohen sought to clarify and refine the modes of cognition and methods obtaining in the historical sciences as against the natural sciences.<sup>20</sup> In his own neo-Kantian formulation, that which distinguished the latter was reliance not only on logic, as with the natural sciences, but on ethical norms as well.<sup>21</sup> A dry, eviscerated historicism which resisted the ethical imperative thereby spurned its own methodological imperative.

Cohen's criticism helped induce what has been called a "crisis of historicism" in German intellectual life — a sober moment of reflection on the method and utility of historical study. Parallel to this criticism, Cohen called attention to the increasing insularity and detachment of Jewish historical scholarship in his essay in the opening number of the new *Monatsschrift*. Cohen's perception was confirmed by the observation of Ismar Elbogen, a ubiquitous presence in German-Jewish scholarly circles, that Jewish scholarship had become *Kleinarbeit* — a sort of scholarly dissection of minutiae.<sup>22</sup> Indeed, a glance at the history of German-Jewish scholarship does suggest that over the course of a century, the holistic scholarly endeavor of the formative generations (e.g., Zunz and Jost, and later, Geiger and Graetz) gave way to fragmentation in research. Jewish scholars bit off smaller and more esoteric topics for study

---

and employment prospects of young Jewish scholars. See Cohen's proposals for the revival of Jewish education in Germany in "Zwei Vorschläge zur Sicherung unseres Fortbestands," *Bericht der Grossloge für Deutschland U.O.B.B.: Festgabe (1882-1907)*, No. 2 (März 1907), 12. According to a short pamphlet describing the *Akademie's* activities, it was Cohen's 1907 proposals which laid the foundation for the *Akademie*. See *Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* (n.p., 1927), a copy of which is located in the holdings of the Klau Library of Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati.

(20) See Georg Iggers, *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (Middletown, CT, 1968), 133-173. It should be noted that the attack on historicism was not limited to philosophers. The historian Karl Lamprecht appeared to undercut the very core of historical method — indeed, the very credo of historicism — when he inveighed against "a descriptive method which distinguished phenomena merely in terms of distinctive, individual characteristics." Quoted in *ibid.*, 197.

(21) See Cohen's essay "Die Geisteswissenschaften und die Philosophie" in his posthumously published *Schriften zur Philosophie und Zeitgeschichte*, hrsg. von Albert Görland und Ernst Cassirer (Berlin, 1928), 520-526. See also Iggers, *op. cit.*, 144-147.

(22) I. Elbogen, *Ein Jahrhundert Wissenschaft des Judentums* (Berlin, 1922), 17.



without always possessing a clear view of the entire field. While this may well have been the result of the natural advance of a new academic discipline from its programmatic to its operative phase, it nonetheless came at a price: the loss of a grand vision or purpose, and concomitantly, a more diluted sense of communal responsibility (as against the demands of pure scholarship).<sup>23</sup> Responding to this apparent crisis, Hermann Cohen maintained that if *Wissenschaft des Judentums* were to be rendered vital, it would have to regain intellectual coherence, as well as a stronger sense of communal engagement.

Cohen supported his prescriptions with concrete acts. Following his retirement from the faculty of Marburg University, he began to devote himself to Jewish education by offering a series of lectures on philosophy and ethics at the *Hochschule/Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* in Berlin.<sup>24</sup> It was through Cohen's lectures in 1913-14 that Franz Rosenzweig first encountered, and fell under the sway of the renowned philosopher. In recounting his impression of Cohen's lectures, Rosenzweig observed that:

... here was no trace of that desperate lack of content or indifference to content from which almost all contemporary philosophizing seems to suffer — an indifference that always makes one wonder why on earth this particular man should be philosophizing and not doing something else ... The thing that ... I had long searched for only in the writings of the great dead — the strict scholarly spirit hovering over the deep of an inchoate, chaotically teeming reality — I now saw face to face in the living flesh.<sup>25</sup>

Rosenzweig's admiration for Cohen's philosophic seriousness, and his awareness of their shared concern for the state of Jewish learning, made the older philosopher a natural partner in the attempt to resuscitate Jewish scholarship. Another source of attraction may well have been Rosenzweig's intuition that both he and Cohen were, each in his own distinct way, returners to Judaism following intense encounters with a thoroughly non-Jewish intellectual world. This biographical commonality explains, at least in part, Cohen's enthusiastic endorsement of Rosenzweig's proposals for a Jewish *Akademie*, which he offered in a 1918 article in the *Neue Jüdische Monatshefte*. In "On the Founding of

(23) See D.N. Myers, "From Zion Will Go Forth Torah," 2-18.

(24) Cohen first lectured at the *Hochschule/Lehranstalt* in 1906, though he began a more regular program of teaching there in 1913, that is, after retiring from Marburg.

(25) Excerpted from a notebook of Rosenzweig in Glatzer, *Franz Rosenzweig: His Life and Thought*, 29.

an Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," Cohen analyzed the emergence of the modern rabbinate and the concomitant disappearance of a learned laity. To his mind, the time had come to reconnect the severed link between intense intellectual study and general education, and thereby encourage the dissemination of knowledge in the broader community. The rabbinical seminaries which had been founded in Germany in the last sixty years could not meet the demand. Only an open academy, drawing together scholars of varying interests and personal beliefs, and devoted to critical inquiry, could.<sup>26</sup>

Cohen's supporting glosses to Rosenzweig's initial proposal appeared at a most portentous moment in German, and German Jewish, history.<sup>27</sup> The war's end had laid open the prospect for a new liberal order predicated upon equality, tolerance, and freedom of expression. It also coincided with the opening of a tumultuous period in the German academic world. The radically new circumstances in which Germany found itself in 1917 mandated not only a redefinition of the national self-image, but more particularly a revived debate over the role and relevance of scholarship to present-day life. Perhaps the most renowned contributor to this debate was the sociologist Max Weber. In his famous speech, "Wissenschaft als Beruf," Weber sought to resurrect the rational man of science — distinct from a prophet, theologian, or demagogue — as one who consciously eschewed bias by resorting to rigorous and value-free scholarly method.<sup>28</sup> Shortly before this lecture, Franz Rosenzweig had first communicated to Hermann Cohen his own thoughts regarding the proper relationship of *Wissenschaft* to life. Quite

(26) "Zur Begründung einer Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," *Neue Jüdische Monatshefte* 2(10. März 1918)254-259, reprinted in Cohen's *Jüdische Schriften*, ed. Bruno Strauß, (Berlin, 1924), II:210-217.

(27) The ambience of Weimar Germany was an arena for a wide range of new cultural expressions. In commenting on the role of Jews in this arena, one observer noted: "The overflowing plenty of stimuli, of artistic, scientific, commercial improvisations which placed the Berlin of 1918 to 1933 in the class of Paris, stemmed from the most part from the talents of this sector of the population . . ." Quoted in Peter Gay, *The Berlin-Jewish Spirit: A Dogma in Search of Some Doubts* (15th Leo Baeck Memorial Lecture) (New York, 1972), 3-4. See also the inventory of Jewish cultural achievement in Hans Tramer, "Der Beitrag der Juden zu Geist und Kultur," *Deutsches Judentum in Krieg und Revolution* (1916-1923), ed. Werner E. Mosse (Tübingen, 1971), 317-385.

(28) For a general discussion of the post-war mood in the German academy, see Fritz Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933* (Cambridge, MA, 1969), 252. Max Weber's speech, a version of which was delivered in November 1917, is translated as "Science as a Vocation" in *From Max Weber*, ed. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York, 1946), 129-156. On the dating of Weber's speech, see Guenther Roth and Wolfgang Schluchter, *Max Weber's Vision of History* (Berkeley, 1979), 5.



unlike Weber's lecture, Rosenzweig's letter did not have as its primary goal the salvation of *wissenschaftlich* method or, more generally, of the scholarly profession. Rather, it was singularly occupied with mobilizing *Wissenschaft* to the task of reviving an authentic Jewish world. To do so, Rosenzweig — and Cohen in his response — believed it necessary to overturn completely the aspirations and scholarly methods which German Jews had inherited from the era of political emancipation and social integration.<sup>29</sup> Interestingly, neither man was prepared to embark upon this task beyond the bounds of the *Vaterland*. The locus of their aspirations for Jewish fulfillment was not Palestine or America, as it had been for many other Jewish contemporaries. It was Germany.

This geographic and existential choice forced Cohen and Rosenzweig to confront the inherent limitations of German Jewish life which Emancipation had promised, but failed, to overcome. Both persisted in the century-old dream of garnering official recognition for Jewish studies within the hierarchical establishment of the German university system. Invoking the legacy of Leopold Zunz, Cohen emphasized in 1907 the nexus between the emancipation of Jewish studies and broader social acceptance: "The emancipation of our *Wissenschaft* is the indispensable precondition of our genuine and invigorating social emancipation."<sup>30</sup> Rosenzweig, too, insisted in *Zeit ists* that "a theological faculty in the framework of a German university remains a great goal, perhaps the greatest, which we can attain from the state at present" — a goal similar to that which the Reform scholar, Abraham Geiger, had earlier advanced.<sup>31</sup>

Inevitably, Cohen and Rosenzweig recognized that their desires were obstructed by official restrictions and informal discrimination. They temporarily abandoned the effort to find a place for Jewish studies in the German university system. Instead, they focused their attention on the *Akademie* as the necessary cure for the methodological and concep-

(29) See Rosenzweig's critical comments on emancipatory aims and scholarly norms among "Enlightened" Jews in the 19th century in "Bildung und keine Ende," *Kleinere Schriften*, 79-93.

(30) Cohen, "Zwei Vorschläge zur Sicherung unseres Fortbestands," 11. Almost a half century earlier, in 1861, Zunz had made clear his conviction that "the emancipation of Jews in life will result from the emancipation of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*." See his *Gesammelte Schriften* (Berlin, 1875), 1:59.

(31) *Zeit ists*, 21. Rosenzweig's dream was fulfilled in 1922 when the University of Frankfurt established an academic position in Jewish theology to which Rosenzweig was invited. Because of illness, Rosenzweig declined, and Martin Buber assumed the post. Abraham Geiger's proposal for such a faculty is found in "Die Gründung einer jüdisch-theologischen Facultät, ein dringendes Berdürfniss unserer Zeit," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie* 2(1836)1-22.

tual malaise which afflicted *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. In the process, they hoped to extend the boundaries of Jewish scholarship to include all who possessed the will, if not always the expertise, to engage the classical sources of Judaism.

## II

Following Hermann Cohen's call for a new-style *Akademie* in March 1918, a group of Berlin Jews began to meet with the explicit aim of laying its conceptual and institutional foundation. Shortly thereafter, in April 1918, the octogenarian Cohen passed away. The force of his personality, however, did not fade. The original Berlin circle grew into a wider group — the *Verein zur Gründung und Erhaltung einer Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* — which brought together leading German Jewish communal leaders such as Gustav Bradt, Leopold Landau, and Paul Nathan with academics such as Leo Baeck, Ernst Cassirer, Albert Einstein, Ismar Elbogen, Eugen Täubler, and Otto Warburg.<sup>32</sup> The group receive funds from a variety of sources in order to proceed with the establishment of the *Akademie* — most significantly, from the Berlin Jewish community, the Bnai Brith organization in Germany, and several large donors (including Franz Rosenzweig's family), in addition to smaller contributors. With this financial base, the *Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, which had not yet found a permanent residence, was formally constituted in May 1919; scholarly work conducted under its auspices began in July of the same year.<sup>33</sup>

Ironically, in the first meetings of the *Verein*, a conception of the *Akademie's* function emerged which differed quite dramatically from that of Rosenzweig and of the recently-deceased Cohen. No firm evidence exists to explain the success of this competing conception in gaining adherents among the *Verein's* members. One can surmise that the radically egalitarian thrust of the Cohen-Rosenzweig initiative may have veered too far from the institutional and conceptual norms familiar to Jewish scholarly circles in Berlin. In any event, a somewhat narrower course of action for the *Akademie* was proposed in a February 1919 meeting of the *Verein* by Eugen Täubler, who at the time was lecturing in Greek and Roman history at the University of Berlin.<sup>34</sup> With this plan,

(32) Following Cohen's death, Gustav Bradt assumed leadership of the circle of supporters. He was followed by Leopold Landau, under whose leadership the *Verein* was formally established.

(33) A report on the initial funding for the *Akademie* is found in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 1(1920)39-40.

(34) Täubler presented the plan at a meeting of the *Verein* on February 23, 1919.

the *Akademie* took on an institutional form and direction which neither Cohen nor Rosenzweig had anticipated.

The man who set the *Akademie* on this new course was one of the most enigmatic and influential Jewish scholars of this century, and yet one who has received lamentably sparse biographical attention.<sup>35</sup> In terms of background, temperament, and mission, Täubler represented a different breed of German Jews than his contemporary, Franz Rosenzweig. Like Rosenzweig, his life and work reflected the erratic, at times tortuous, path of a Jewish intellectual grappling with a fragmented cultural identity. Unlike Rosenzweig, however, Täubler was raised in a traditional Jewish home in Gostyn in the eastern province of Posen. Following intensive Torah and Talmud study as a child there, Täubler went to Berlin to study at the Orthodox rabbinical seminary of Esriel Hildesheimer, as well as at the *Hochschule/Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*. Whereas Rosenzweig moved from the world of German academe to a more particular Jewish world, Täubler embarked on the reverse path. From the institutions of Jewish learning in Berlin, he moved on to the University of Berlin where he encountered some of the intellectual giants of the German academy (e.g., Theodor Mommsen, Ulrich Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, and Wilhelm Dilthey).<sup>36</sup> As Mommsen's research assistant, Täubler received a strong training in classics and history which he put to use, with great linguistic and contextual sensitivity, in his explorations of both Jewish and non-Jewish historical matters. Reflecting this topical dichotomy (and perhaps a manic personality), Täubler's professional life moved back and forth between Jewish and non-Jewish institutions, from the Berlin *Lehranstalt* to Berlin University, from the *Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* to the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences. A childhood friend, Leo Baeck, took note of this tendency when he eulogized Täubler as a perpetual "wanderer between two worlds."<sup>37</sup> Täubler's ideological commitments also swung between two distinct poles: deep pride and belief in the cause of German nationalism and a prescient endorsement of Zionism.<sup>38</sup> In the midst of all this vocational and psychic movement, one constant re-

(35) For the few biographical treatments of Täubler, see the literature mentioned in Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg's introduction to Täubler's *Der römische Staat* (Stuttgart, 1985), vi, n. 3. To this list, one may add Christhard Hoffmann, *Juden und Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Leiden, 1988), 200–219, and Herbert Strauss, "Das Ende der Wissenschaft des Judentums in Deutschland: Ismar Elbogen und Eugen Taeubler," *Bibliographie und Berichte: Festschrift für Werner Schochow*, ed. Hartmut Walravens (Munich, 1990), 280–298.

(36) See Hoffmann, 202.

(37) Baeck, "Wanderer zwischen zwei Welten. In Memoriam Eugen Taeubler," *Der Aufbau*, August 28, 1953.

(38) See H. Strauss, "Das Ende der Wissenschaft des Judentums in Deutschland," 293.

mained: an unswerving allegiance to the realm of *Wissenschaft*, which, it should be recalled, Rosenzweig (and Cohen) had willfully forsaken.

The most important feature of the *wissenschaftlich* perspective, according to Täubler, was the criterion of conceptual coherence and unity. As applied to his major field of research, the social and political history of the ancient Roman state, Täubler had "learned to perceive it in the unity of its economic, social, political and ideological elements and forces: not as a system of institutions but, in some respects, as an organic being."<sup>39</sup> A similar impulse to encompass the manifold dimensions and interconnections of the Jewish past left a deep imprint on Täubler's early research in ancient Jewish history.<sup>40</sup> It also inspired his prolific labors as an organizer of research projects in the field of Jewish history, commencing with his tenure as founding director of the *Gesamtarchiv der deutschen Juden*.<sup>41</sup> Täubler hoped that from the communal records assembled and preserved in the *Gesamtarchiv*, a comprehensive picture of German Jewish life could emerge. Success in fulfilling this mission depended on an appreciation of the intersecting forces of Jewish and general German history, not by considering Jewish history in an historical vacuum or in monodimensional (i.e., religious or literary) terms, In-

(39) This methodological self-description, in which Täubler acknowledged the debt of the nineteenth-century Prussian historian Otto Hintze, was contained in an application which Täubler made to the University of Chicago after emigrating to the United States. Drawing from the Täubler *Nachlaß* in Basel, Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg quotes this statement in his introduction to *Der römische Staat*, xii.

(40) See, for instance, his "Die weltpolitische Stellung des jüdischen Staates in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit," contained in the 30th *Bericht* of the *Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* in Berlin. This study is reprinted in Täubler, *Ausgewählte Schriften zur Alten Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1987), 173-192. Täubler repeatedly emphasized the need to elevate *Wissenschaft des Judentums* to the level of professional legitimacy of other historical and cultural disciplines. See, for instance, his inaugural lecture as the Ludwig Philippson professor of Jewish history at the *Lehranstalt* in 1912. The lecture was published in the 31st *Bericht* of the *Lehranstalt*, and reprinted in Täubler's *Aufsätze zur Problematik jüdischer Geschichtsschreibung 1908-1950*, ed. Selma Stern-Taeubler (Tübingen, 1977), 21-27. And in a 1918 precursor of his *Akademie* proposal, Täubler connected this aim to the aspirations of his nineteenth-century scholarly predecessors. That is, he evoked Zunz's renowned promise that the emancipation of the Jews will emerge from the emancipation of Jewish scholarship. See his lecture, "Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. Ein Aufruf und ein Programm," published in *ibid.*, 31.

(41) In two programmatic speeches as director of the *Gesamtarchiv*, Täubler emphasized the importance of treating Jewish history not in a contextual vacuum, but rather as part of general German history. See *Mitteilungen des Gesamtarchivs der deutschen Juden* (MGdJ) 1(1909)2, and MGdJ 3(1911)64-84. An acquaintance of Täubler's, Georg Herlitz, has judiciously noted that Täubler rarely missed an opportunity to stress the theme of integrating Jewish and non-Jewish history. See "Three Jewish Historians: Isaak Markus Jost — Heinrich Graetz — Eugen Taeubler: A Comparative Study," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 9(1964)88.

deed, it was essential to overcome the limited perspective of previous Jewish scholars who had treated "politics, the economy, and general culture not as primary conditions, but as accessories."<sup>42</sup>

Motivating Täubler's labors was a mix of sensibilities which typified the ambiguous status and perspective of German Jewish scholars devoted to the study of the Jewish past. As noted, Täubler was the beneficiary of an academic training which endowed him with great familiarity with the literature and tools of modern historical study. His own method bore strong traces of a 19th century Romanticist historicism which, as Friedrich Meinecke has shown, highlighted the multi-layered development of an individual (often national) organism. In seeking to introduce this perspective into Jewish scholarship, Täubler had to fight a number of simultaneous, and often enervating, battles. With respect to previous generations of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, he inveighed against the preponderant and unidimensional focus on *Literaturgeschichte*, arguing for a more serious consideration of the material existence and social interactions of the Jewish people. One effect of this corrective, as embodied in his early work on Jewish history (more so than in his purely programmatic utterances), was to draw attention away from intellectual and religious achievements to the political structure of the ancient Jewish state. However, the force of this corrective swing positioned Täubler at an extreme. His angle of observation was an "externalist" one, attuned to the shaping of Jewish history by non-Jewish forces. Ironically, the historicist principle of capturing the immanent development of an historical object — in spiritual as well as political terms — was at least partially sacrificed.

The price which Täubler paid in order to overcome the excessively "internalist" perspective of previous Jewish scholars was hardly compensated for in a second line of battle which he waged. Like many of his predecessors, Täubler regularly spoke of the need to raise Jewish scholarship to the level of general European historical research, and by so doing, to hasten the acceptance of Jewish scholars as equals by the German academy.<sup>43</sup> And yet, a good deal of the considerable energy he expended in organizing Jewish historical research was directed to establishing discrete institutions which *paralleled* academic institutions in the broader German society. Thus, the work of the *Gesamtarchiv* was expected to produce a picture of German Jewish history like that which emerged of German history from documents in the *Geheime Staatsarchiv*

(42) *MGdJ* 1(1909)3.

(43) See the *Korrespondenzblatt* 1(1919)23.

in Berlin.<sup>44</sup> While this conception reveals Täubler's belief that German Jews, in fact, possessed a distinct historical existence worthy of recounting, it also underscores the paradox of his attempt to elevate Jewish scholarship to a new level, albeit within the framework of exclusively Jewish institutions. Täubler's expectations, and his internalization of the limits of Jewish integration, suggest the persistence of a separate German-Jewish sub-culture which developed adjacent to the non-Jewish German society from the time of the *Aufklärung*.<sup>45</sup>

It was the aim of Franz Rosenzweig and Hermann Cohen not simply to acknowledge a distinct Jewish culture, but to infuse it with new vitality through a cadre of committed teacher-scholars. Eugen Täubler too was occupied with the task of revitalization, although of a more limited sort, as we see in his plans for the *Akademie's* Research Institute. In a series of proposals from 1918 to 1919, Täubler called for the creation of an institute in which Jewish history could be studied in its historical, literary, religious, philosophical, and linguistic manifestations — all of which he believed to be conditioned not merely by internal forces, but by constant interaction with general historical currents.<sup>46</sup> To carry out this vast project, Täubler suggested the creation of nine sections to be staffed by permanent Institute members. Each of these sections must avoid becoming an insular disciplinary island. Rather, as Täubler declared, "the particular work of each section runs parallel to the other, and becomes, through a thousand-fold intertwining of substance, problems, and methods, a unity."<sup>47</sup> Hence, Täubler imagined the construction of a methodological edifice which could house the entire organic unity of Jewish history, while sharing a foundation and walls of support with general history.

(44) Selma Stern-Täubler, "Eugen Täubler and the 'Wissenschaft des Judentums,'" 42.

(45) See David Sorkin's masterful analysis of the phenomenon of a German-Jewish "subculture" in *The Transformation of German Jewry, 1780-1840* (New York, 1987). Täubler appeared to acknowledge the consignment of Jewish scholars to a separate sphere when he declared that the *Akademie's* Research Institute must undertake "to transplant the more developed methods of other fields to the Jewish field and to encourage an independent development corresponding to its particular quality." See "Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. Ein Aufruf und ein Programm," *Aufsätze zur Problematik jüdischer Geschichtsschreibung*, 30.

(46) In a 1919 proposal, Täubler noted: "The Research Institute will be the organ of implementation of the Academy, and simultaneously the creator and maintainer of its scientific tradition. Its realm is the whole field of Jewish *Wissenschaft*, its task to explore this field systematically." *Korrespondenzblatt* 1(1919)9.

(47) The nine sections were Biblical, Hellenistic-Roman, Talmudic, Historical, Literary (medieval and modern), Islamic, Linguistic, Religious, and Philosophical. *Korrespondenzblatt* 1(1919)11,22.



Even while affirming the collaborative nature of the enterprise, and the goal of scholarly unity, Täubler shifted the focus and perspective of the *Akademie* away from the Cohen-Rosenzweig model. That model emanated from a philosophic critique of a detached and inaccessible scholarship, epitomized by contemporary historical research. By contrast, Täubler's vision was unmistakably that of an historian trained in the methods of archival research, and wedded to the meticulous and contextualized study of the past. From his vantage point, the primary task of Jewish historians was to illuminate the sum of the Jewish past through its various interlocking parts. The result would yield not an ethereal theological or philosophical entity, but rather a collective existence firmly rooted in material conditions. In proposing this ambitious aim as the *Akademie's* task, Täubler appeared to abandon the erstwhile objective of producing teachers for the community — in fact, *Akademie* researchers were to be exempted from teaching — or of fortifying the bond between *Wissenschaft* and general Jewish education. Täubler did acknowledge that the rejuvenation of Jewish scholarship and the rejuvenation of Judaism were, in some way, interrelated.<sup>48</sup> Yet, he was far more attentive to the former mission.

Clearly, Täubler's plans did not match Franz Rosenzweig's conception of the *Akademie*.<sup>49</sup> Nonetheless, Rosenzweig chose not to fight to gain control of the *Akademie's* course. Instead, he turned his energy and attention to another project whose impetus was the same as that which impelled him to write *Zeit ists*: the desire to educate alienated Jews into the classical texts and religious experience of Judaism. The result of this second initiative was a remarkable institution in its own right which, unfortunately, cannot be discussed in any detail here: the *Freies Jüdisches Lehrhaus* which opened in Frankfurt in October 1920.<sup>50</sup>

(48) See, for instance, Täubler's comments in "Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. Ein Aufruf und ein Programm," 31, or his report in the "Bericht des wissenschaftlichen Vorstandes" in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 2(1921)32.

(49) One *Akademie* researcher, Fritz Baer, has noted that Rosenzweig's goals were "the absolute opposite of Täubler's intentions." See his eulogy of Täubler in *Zion* 19(1954)72. Another *Akademie* researcher, Selma Stern, offers an interesting and somewhat contradictory piece of evidence: a 1919 letter from Franz Rosenzweig in which he commends Täubler for a plan "excellent and astonishing in the completeness of the picture it presents." See "Eugen Taeubler and the 'Wissenschaft des Judentums'," 52. Recent archival discoveries, however, shed new and more definitive light on the matter. Dr. Christhard Hoffman of the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung of the *Technische Universität* in Berlin has discovered a letter in the Täubler *Nachlaß* in Basel which Franz Rosenzweig wrote to Leopold Landau on February 3-4, 1920. In this letter, Rosenzweig suggests that the differences between him and Täubler are so deep that he doubts that a reconciliation is possible. I thank Dr. Hoffmann of Berlin for kindly sending me a copy of this letter, which he plans to publish with commentary in the near future.

(50) Nahum Glatzer notes that "the turn to the purely historical which the Academy

Absent Rosenzweig's influence, the *Akademie* in Berlin became the home of an elite Research Institute devoted exclusively to scholarly investigations. As founding director, Eugen Täubler drew upon his past work in organizing Jewish scholarly organizations. The *Akademie* afforded him the opportunity to re-emphasize the significance of archival sources in the study of the Jewish past, a principle which animated his earlier work at the *Gesamtarchiv*. Moreover, the *Akademie* provided him with the institutional support to foster a new professionally-trained class of Jewish researchers which could expand the methodological range of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* beyond its 19th-century foundation.<sup>51</sup> Fritz Baer, the first permanent researcher (*Mitarbeiter*) hired by the *Akademie*, recalled that Täubler's forceful, even mesmerizing personality created an ambience of monastic insularity and intensity. Indeed, Baer and his fellow "monk-disciples" were convinced that "this teacher (i.e., Täubler) could liberate us from the apologetics and idealistic approach of Jewish scholarship which had prevailed until that time in Western Europe."<sup>52</sup>

The sense of embarking on a new scholarly mission in an atmosphere of close collegiality permeated the first years of the *Akademie*. We hear further testimony to this effect from Selma Stern, another *Akademie Mitarbeiter*, who married Eugen Täubler in 1927. In a letter to Fritz Baer in 1968, she recalled nostalgically "the meeting with you and the other members of the *Akademie*, and the years of common striving and labor which have decisively influenced my life."<sup>53</sup> Notwithstanding her fond memories, it was not always easy to meld the skills and interests of individual researchers into a seamless collaboration. One structural obstacle to the goal of unified research seemed to inhere in the division of the Research Institute into disciplinary sub-units. And yet, Täubler insisted, with a familiar resort to the language of organic development,

---

had taken, prompted Rosenzweig, its initiator, to look to other ways of realizing his idea of a renaissance of Jewish learning." See his article, "The Frankfort Lehrhaus," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 1(1956)107.

(51) For Täubler, this meant moving beyond the limited horizons of *Literaturgeschichte*: "What the philosopher muses upon, or the poet shapes, is only one side. It is necessary to take account of what the whole, as a whole and in its parts, had done and gone through: the political, economic, social phenomena and problems, the cultural changes, the development of sects, assimilation, the national movement, and many others . . ." See "Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. Ein Aufruf und ein Programm," 29.

(52) See Baer's eulogy, "Eugen Täubler," *Zion* 19(1954)72. Baer, who had completed his doctoral dissertation at Freiburg under Heinrich Finke, was hired by the *Akademie* in July 1919. He remained a *Mitarbeiter* there until his immigration to Palestine in 1930, where he became the first professor of Jewish history at the Hebrew University.

(53) This letter of September 17, 1968 is found in Baer's papers in the Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People (Jerusalem), P163.

that the "arrangement (into sub-units) should not separate, but should rather make possible a close bond within the unity of the whole."<sup>54</sup>

The principle of integrated disciplines leading to a scholarly unity received its clearest expression in the *Bibliotheca Judaica* project, proposed by Täubler in his earliest plans for an *Akademie*.<sup>55</sup> He envisaged a collection of critical editions of the most important Jewish texts up to the 18th century, divided according to twelve categories.<sup>56</sup> Each of the Akademie's sections would play a role in identifying, editing, and annotating the texts to be included. As a result, the *Bibliotheca Judaica* was an undertaking which required the full participation of *Akademie* researchers, not to mention considerable financial support from the Jewish community. If successfully executed, it would serve as a paradigm for the kind of collaborative scholarly labor essential to a vital and holistic *Wissenschaft des Judentums*.

In the first three years of the *Akademie*'s operation, Täubler focused the staff's energies on one specific component of the *Bibliotheca Judaica* series. Along with Fritz Baer, David Hartwig Baneth, and Arthur Spanier, he endeavored to produce a complete literary record of the Hebrew Crusade chronicles, replete with historical analysis. The potential value of this work went beyond the normal recognition which comes from an important scholarly achievement. Täubler also saw a palpable therapeutic value for the *Akademie* researchers:

Commonly-pursued works (of this kind) are of particular importance for the inner progress of the (Research) Institute. The talents which dwell in each *Mitarbeiter* and which are naturally developed according to the different directions of each one, join together in a singular task, and enhance it, as well as serving to fructify and mature the researchers. At the same time, they promote, to a great extent, the inner unification of the entire field of Jewish scholarship which consists of various disciplines.<sup>57</sup>

(54) See the *Korrespondenzblatt* 2(1921)32.

(55) *Ibid.*, 30. See also the proposal in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 1(1919)12. The scope of the *Bibliotheca Judaica* project recalls a number of vast projects of compilation undertaken by the *Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums*: a *Corpus Tannaiticum*, to include critical editions of Tannaitic texts; and the *Germania Judaica*, which was to assemble all archival fragments relating to Jewish life in Germany throughout the ages.

(56) These categories were Biblical, Greek writings, Talmudic, historical, dogmatic, philosophical, grammatical, mathematical, responsa, Biblical commentary, poetic, popular writing, and miscellanea.

(57) *Korrespondenzblatt* 2(1921)34. Following completion of this project, Täubler hoped to proceed to an *Index Talmudicus* as the next step in the *Bibliotheca Judaica*.

The vast scope of the *Bibliotheca Judaica* series virtually assured its non-completion, especially given the limited financial resources, and attendant constraints on hiring, of the *Akademie*. In fact, the project on the Crusade chronicles never reached fruition, thereby frustrating Täubler's expectations for a mutually fulfilling relationship between individual and group. What the permanent researchers of the *Akademie* were able to complete under Täubler's guidance were individual monographic studies or critical editions, many of which were published by the *Akademie* as part of a regular series. In the Talmudic Section, Chanoch Albeck and Arthur Spanier published studies on the redaction of the Mishnah and the Tosefta period in Tannaitic literature respectively.<sup>58</sup> David Baneth, who was a member of the Philological Section, worked on a German translation and introduction to the *Kuzari* of the medieval Spanish poet and philosopher, Yehudah Ha-Levi. This work was scheduled to be published by the *Akademie*, though Baneth's emigration to Palestine in 1924 delayed its completion. Yet, perhaps the most significant and enduring work — not surprising given Täubler's own training and priorities — was conducted by the researchers of the Historical Section, Fritz Baer and Selma Stern. Following Täubler's advice, Baer began his term of employment at the *Akademie* by investigating the protocols of the Jewish council of the principality of Cleve (spanning the years 1690-1807) — a document which had been preserved in the *Gesamtarchiv der deutschen Juden*. He followed this study with an analysis of the sources and composition of the sixteenth-century Hebrew chronicle, *Shevet Yehudah*.<sup>59</sup> It was also as an *Akademie* researcher that Baer was first sent to Spanish (and other) archives in order to compile what would become his monumental documentary history of the Jews in Christian Spain: the two volume *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien* (Berlin, 1929-36).

Like Baer, Selma Stern began to explore paths of research in her first years at the *Akademie* which she continued to follow throughout her subsequent career. She combed various German archives in search of material for a study of the Prussian State and the Jews in the time of the Great Elector, Friedrich Wilhelm (ruled 1640-88) and Friedrich

(58) See Ch. Albeck, *Untersuchungen über die Redaktion der Mischna* (Berlin, 1923), and A. Spanier, *Die Toseftaperiode in der tannaitischen Literatur* (Berlin, 1922). Subsequently, both also published another round of monographs for the *Akademie-Verlag*. See Albeck, *Untersuchungen über die halakischen Midraschim* (Berlin, 1927), and Spanier, *Die massoretischen Akzente* (Berlin, 1927).

(59) See Baer's *Untersuchungen über Quellen und Komposition des Schebet Jehuda* (Berlin, 1923) and the earlier *Das Protokollbuch der Landjudenschaft des Herzogtums Kleve* (Berlin, 1922). On the latter work, see D.N. Myers, "From Zion Will Go Forth Torah," 224-226.

I (1701-13). The results, published over a forty-year period in eight volumes, were intended to revise current notions of the causes and course of Jewish emancipation.<sup>60</sup> The early stages of this work led Stern, under the *Akademie's* aegis, to a more detailed examination of the role of Court Jews (*Hoffaktoren*) as agents (and symptoms) of change in the pre-Emancipation period. Out of this research came a biography of a renowned *Hoffaktor*, Joseph Süss Oppenheimer of Württemberg (*Jud Süss*, 1929), as well as a more general study of the phenomenon of Court Jews.<sup>61</sup>

Both Selma Stern and Fritz Baer were exemplars of the kind of researcher whom Eugen Täubler saw as essential to the elevation of Jewish scholarship to a level of parity with general historical studies in Germany. Unlike earlier practitioners of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, the two were trained historians whose labors heavily relied upon archival research. Both also shared Täubler's programmatic commitment to shift the focus of scholarly attention away from *Literaturgeschichte* to a wider array of considerations, especially social and economic, in evaluating the Jewish past. And yet, in absorbing these important Täublerian motifs, the two did little to advance the goal of collaborative research. Their respective scholarly contributions while at the *Akademie* fell under the rubric of *Einzelforschungen*, single works of research, which were intended to complement, not supplant, the large joint projects such as the *Bibliotheca Judaica*.

It should be reiterated that the vision of collaborative research which informed Hermann Cohen's and Franz Rosenzweig's original idea of the *Akademie* was shared by Eugen Täubler. More broadly, this principle was an important stimulus in the creation of other contemporaneous institutions of Jewish research such as the Institute of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem (1924) and YIVO in Berlin and Vilna (1925).<sup>62</sup> The impulse to undertake collaborative work in these institutions reflected a pervasive sense that Jewish scholarship demanded an accounting of its past

(60) Stern saw her work as revising the one-dimensional view of Jewish emancipation, fostered by nineteenth century liberal and Romantic historiography — namely, as "a necessary result of the ideals of freedom and equality of the French Revolution, and of the humanitarian *Aufklärung* philosophy of Lessing and Kant, Mendelssohn and Dohm." To her mind, this perspective must be expanded to take note of the significant structural changes in the political order of Germany which reshaped Jewish communal life. See "Der Staat des Grossen Kurfürsten und die Juden," *Korrespondenzblatt* 3(1922)4. See also the introduction to *Der Preussische Staat und die Juden*, (Berlin, 1925), xi.

(61) A précis of her biographical work on Jud Süss is contained in *Korrespondenzblatt* 7(1926)23-40. See also *The Court Jew: A Contribution to the History of the Period of Absolutism in Central Europe* (Philadelphia, 1950).

(62) On the Institute of Jewish Studies, see D.N. Myers, *op. cit.*, 52-101.

achievements, as well as a remedy to the fragmentation and overspecialization which accompanied the ongoing professionalization of the field. In the case of the *Akademie*, the task of achieving a systematic, collaborative enterprise was made difficult by a number of major obstacles: a dearth of financial resources and personnel, along with the strong research interests of individual researchers. An even more sizeable impediment, however, was the departure of Eugen Täubler, the guiding force behind the Research Institute, to an academic position at the University of Zurich in 1922.

### III

Täubler's resignation from the directorship of the *Akademie* was symptomatic of his restless, and cyclical, "wander(ing) between two worlds." Ever in quest of the personal contentment which so sadly eluded him, Täubler sought to escape the administrative demands and exclusively Jewish focus of the *Akademie*. He moved to Zurich to become a professor of Greek and Roman history, before assuming a professorship in ancient history at Heidelberg in 1925.<sup>63</sup>

If his tenure at the *Akademie* was marked by a host of bureaucratic strains, his last year there was full of even more ponderous pressures. For that year was one of staggering economic misfortune. The post-war inflationary rates of Weimar Germany reached unimaginable levels: at the beginning of 1919, 4.2 German marks purchased an American dollar. By November of 1923, the rate had soared incredibly to 4200 billion marks to the dollar!<sup>64</sup> An equally dizzying climb is revealed in the financial statements of the *Akademie*. Its operating budget in 1919 was approximately 70,000 marks. Two years later, in 1921, income and expenditures stood at 234, 618 marks. In 1922, the year Täubler left Berlin, the figure had jumped more than ten-fold to 2,897,795.50. And in the first half of 1923 alone, expenditures reached 53.4 million marks (equivalent to \$1442), whereas income totalled 6.7 million (or \$246).<sup>65</sup>

These conditions, which may have hastened Täubler's departure,

(63) In the wake of the Nazi ascent to power, Täubler resigned his professorship at Heidelberg, as well as his membership in the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences. In 1938, he returned to a German Jewish scholarly institution as professor at the *Hochschule/Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* in Berlin.

(64) See Fritz Ringer, *supra*, n. 28, 62.

(65) See the financial records of the *Akademie* in the administrative reports of the *Korrespondenzblatt* 1(1920)40, 3(1922)3, and 4-5(1923-24)55. By 1924, after the stabilization of the currency, the *Akademie's* budget had fallen to the 1919 level of approximately 70,000 marks.



hardly facilitated the entrance of his successor, the historian of Jewish philosophy, Julius Guttman. The normal difficulties of raising sufficient funds to meet the operating budget were overshadowed by the paralyzing inflation. Augmenting the staff of permanent researchers during this period was unthinkable. Moreover, the most reliable (and often exclusive) source attesting to the *Akademie's* development, the yearly *Korrespondenzblatt*, failed to appear in 1923. A report of the Administrative Board in the next number of the *Korrespondenzblatt* (describing the Research Institute's activities during 1923) reveals that "(financial) requirements for salaries and subvention (of existing projects) alone are absolutely extraordinary due to the progressive decline of the Mark."<sup>66</sup> What was necessary, the report concluded, was a new campaign to raise money outside of Germany, particularly in North America.<sup>67</sup>

Writing just as the first waves of the inflationary crisis hit, Julius Guttman indicated his desire to continue the agenda of Eugen Täubler by concentrating resources on large collaborative projects. He stressed in his first report as director that the value of research lay not in the individual monograph. Rather, the individual monograph paved the way for a unity of methods and perspectives, which, in turn, enabled "a unified scholarly undertaking of a corporate character."<sup>68</sup> In a later essay, Guttman noted that this "corporate" undertaking should yield a tight-knit *Arbeitsgemeinschaft* whose chief function was to systematize the vast and often inchoate mass of Jewish literary and historical knowledge.<sup>69</sup>

Implicit in this evocation of Täubler's vision of collaborative research was a critique of previous *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. Such a critique was quite natural for the peripatetic Täubler, who alternated between the fringes and the center of the Jewish scholarly establishment in Germany. It was less expected from Guttman who, in relative terms, was a "blue blood" in the brief history of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*.<sup>70</sup> His father, Jakob, was an eminent scholar who taught at the *Jüdisch-Theologisches*

(66) *Korrespondenzblatt* 4-5(1923-24)58. See also the reference to the "catastrophic inflation," *ibid.*, 57. A note at the beginning of Guttman's report on the scientific work of the *Akademie* relates that this number of the *Korrespondenzblatt* had been ready for publication in the fall of 1923, but was postponed "on other grounds" (i.e., other than lack of readiness), *ibid.*, 46.

(67) This idea was mentioned in the reports of the Administrative Board for the fiscal years 1922 and 1923. Both reports appear in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 4-5(1923-24)52-58.

(68) *Korrespondenzblatt* 3(1922)32; see also the *Korrespondenzblatt* 6(1925)43.

(69) See his essay "Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," *Festgabe zum zehnjährigen Bestehen der Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1919-1929* (Berlin, n.d.), 8.

(70) See the essay of the former *Akademie Mitarbeiter*, Fritz Bamberger, "Julius Guttman — Philosopher of Judaism," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 5(1960)3-34.

*Seminar* in Breslau. Guttmann *fils* studied and received rabbinic ordination at the seminary in Breslau, while also studying for a doctorate in philosophy at the local university. Like his father, Julius Guttmann's primary concern as a Jewish scholar was the history of philosophy, particularly among its most distinguished medieval Jewish expositors.<sup>71</sup> It was this subject which he taught at the Berlin *Hochschule*, and for which he achieved his greatest eminence as a researcher.

This interest in medieval Jewish thought reflected a long-standing fascination of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* with the absorption and reformulation of non-Jewish philosophical currents into Jewish molds, especially in the celebrated milieu of Muslim Spain. It also reflected a long-standing emphasis on the development of Judaism in intellectual-spiritual terms. Eugen Täubler frequently lamented this emphasis, claiming that it captured only one dimension of a multi-faceted historical existence. Interestingly, Guttmann echoed Täubler's reproachful tone in a popular programmatic essay written several years after he assumed the *Akademie's* directorship. In summarizing the state of research, he noted:

*Literaturgeschichte* remains prevalent in diverse areas of scholarship, though it has hardly penetrated the intellectual content of literary creations or the idealistic or psychic motives operating within them. Neither the development of popular Jewish piety nor the structure of Jewish communal life has been systematically studied. Indeed, a new set of questions, which has yielded a change of direction in general scholarship as well as a new sphere of cultural interest, has not yet been posed (in Jewish scholarship).<sup>72</sup>

Guttmann himself supplemented his principal research on Jewish philosophy with occasional forays into the origins and foundations of Jewish communal life in pre-modern times. He was especially intrigued by the application of sociological and economic modes of analysis to the Jewish past.<sup>73</sup> It was under his leadership that the *Akademie* added a

(71) Guttmann's discussion of Jewish philosophy in the Middle Ages occupies almost two-thirds of his authoritative study, *Die Philosophie des Judentums* (Munich, 1933), translated into English as *Philosophies of Judaism*.

(72) See Guttmann's report, "Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," *Der Jude* 7(1923)491.

(73) See, for instance, his reviews of the work of Werner Sombart and Max Weber respectively in *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 36(1913)149-212, and *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 69(1925)195-223. See also his later essay, "Die Idee der religiösen Gemeinschaft im Judentum," *Zum sechzigjährigen Bestehen der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin* (Berlin, 1932).

section for statistics and economics in 1927. This expansion of the *Akademie's* scholarly boundaries was motivated by a pair of interrelated goals similar to Täubler's: the rejuvenation of Jewish scholarship, and the cultivation of a new generation of professional researchers whose individual talents could be channeled to the larger aim of systematization.<sup>74</sup>

Guttmann was even more explicit than Täubler in admitting to the attenuated utility of *Akademie* research for Jewish life. While not seeking to sever the link between them, he averred that "only if *Wissenschaft* is guided entirely by its own law can it fulfill the function of contributing to the whole of Jewish life." This assertion of the autonomous and insular development of scholarship was followed by an even clearer statement of the relationship between present-day concerns and the direction of research:

The connection with the interests of Jewish life naturally cannot always be immediate and close. All manifestations of Jewish life, all periods of Jewish history, all areas of Jewish literature have their legitimate place within *Wissenschaft des Judentums* irrespective of whether their connection to present-day Jewish concerns is close or distant.<sup>75</sup>

Notwithstanding this affirmation of the legitimacy of "all manifestations of Jewish life." The *Akademie* under Guttmann's leadership followed his own scholarly strengths. Whereas the focal points of research under Eugen Täubler had been the historical, philological, and Talmudic sections, Guttmann emphasized the need to cultivate work in the study of the Jewish religion through the creation of a section for *Religionswissenschaft*. This section would not only gauge the inner development of Jewish religious thought, but also would trace its pervasive impact upon Jewish law, philosophy, and communal life.<sup>76</sup> As under Täubler, *Akademie* scholarship was concentrated on the medieval period, with its vast range of Jewish religious and cultural expressions. Guttmann called for critical editions and German translations of the most important works of medieval Jewish philosophy, considering them essential to an understanding of Jewish intellectual history. David

(74) See "Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," *Der Jude* 7(1923)491. Elsewhere, Guttmann argued that "a vibrant *Wissenschaft* differs from moribund learning in that its individual work (*Einzelarbeit*) is determined by general and fundamental points of view, and it achieves a unified methodological end." *Korrespondenzblatt* 4-5(1923-24)46.

(75) *Ibid.*; see Bamberger, "Julius Guttmann," 14-15.

(76) *Korrespondenzblatt* 3(1922)35.

Baneth's work on the *Kuzari* belonged to this enterprise. So too did a projected translation of the overtly philosophical sections of Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah* (undertaken by Julius Obermann, who had left for New York by 1923) and a translation of Hasdai Crescas' *'Or Adonai*.<sup>77</sup>

In addition to philosophy, Guttmann placed priority on other facets of medieval Jewish culture. The component of the *Bibliotheca Judaica* series which he hoped to develop most rapidly was the "Scriptores Grammatici," whose aim was the critical edition of prominent works of medieval Hebrew grammar and Biblical exegesis. The first project undertaken was Jonah ibn Janah's *Sefer ha-Rikmah*, edited by the Ukrainian-born philologist Michael Wilensky.<sup>78</sup> Though it was the only project completed in the "Scriptores Grammatici" series, the Akademie's support reflected a deep institutional commitment to examining the cultural interchange between Jews and Muslims in the Middle Ages. This commitment was clearly exhibited, for instance, in the Akademie's subvention of Heinrich Speyer, a part-time researcher, who studied Biblical narratives in the Koran.<sup>79</sup>

As noted above, the nexus between Jewish and non-Jewish cultures, especially in medieval Spain, was a persistent source of fascination for German Jewish scholars and intellectuals from the nineteenth century and extending well into the twentieth. Manifesting this curiosity, Julius Guttmann noted in his definitive history of Jewish philosophy that the confluence of Jewish and Arab cultures in Spain "produced important and brilliant achievements, and counts among the most fruitful and influential phenomena in the history of Judaism."<sup>80</sup> From a different perspective, Fritz Baer underscored, and in the process explained, this curiosity by observing that no Jewry was as finely balanced between the Jewish Occident and Orient as the Spanish. The sphere of its activity was that in which "all forces of medieval Christian and Islamic culture converge."<sup>81</sup>

(77) *Korrespondenzblatt* 4-5(1923-24)49. An essay by Baneth intended to supplement his translation of the *Kuzari*, "Jehuda Hallewi und Gazali," also appeared in this number of the *Korrespondenzblatt*.

(78) *Korrespondenzblatt* 6(1925)45. Wilensky's two-volume annotated edition of *Sefer Ha-Rikmah* was published in Berlin (1929-31).

(79) See H. Speyer, "Von den biblischen Erzählungen im Koran," *Korrespondenzblatt* 4-5(1923-24)7. Later projects which the Akademie supported as part of its "Corpus scriptorum grammaticorum et exegetarum" were Isaac Dov Ber Markon's edition of Daniel al-Kumisi's commentary to the minor projects, and Heinrich (Hayim) Brody's edition of the *Diwan* of Moses ibn Ezra. *Korrespondenzblatt* 8(1927)33-34.

(80) J. Guttmann, *Philosophies of Judaism*, 55.

(81) See F. Baer, "Probleme der jüdisch-spanischen Geschichte," *Korrespondenzblatt*

Baer's explanation warrants further comment. He expressly distanced himself from his scholarly predecessors by moving beyond the prevalent focus upon Jewish life in Muslim Spain, and the resultant denigration of Jewish life in Christian Spain. In introducing the first of two large volumes of documents compiled under the *Akademie's* auspices, Baer castigated earlier Jewish historians, especially Heinrich Graetz, for depicting the Christian period as one of "growing misery and decline." Baer asserted that "the obsolete spirit of Enlightenment" dominated the intellectual world-view of the earlier scholars — a critique which applied to their celebration of Jewish culture in Muslim Spain.<sup>82</sup> To his mind, this spirit manifested itself in the drive of nineteenth-century "Enlightened" German Jews for cultural and spiritual ecumenism — an impetus which drew upon the historical precedent of the "Golden Age" of Spanish Jewry.

Such a vision appealed to Baer on neither methodological nor substantive grounds. In the wake of Täubler's charge to historicize the Jewish past, Baer held that "in order to evaluate the sources correctly," the recorder of history must make every effort to understand historical events and currents on their own terms.<sup>83</sup> It was inappropriate to stand at a distance, projecting a current sensibility onto the past as a means of validating that present sensibility. Eschewing "the obsolete spirit of the Enlightenment," Baer saw no need to advance the image of a glorious confluence of Jewish and non-Jewish cultures in the "Golden Age" of Spain. Rather, he chose to explore a later period of Spanish-Jewish history beset, in his view, by a number of revealing socio-economic and religious struggles within the Jewish community.<sup>84</sup>

Baer's work simultaneously reflected the pervasive interest of Jewish scholars in the Jewish Middle Ages (and in Spain in particular), and proposed a corrective to that emphasis. It is noteworthy that this attempt to reshape Jewish scholarly norms was carried out at, and generously supported by, the *Akademie*. For this institution was inspired, from Eugen Täubler's first days, by the goals of nineteenth-century Jewish scholars, especially of elevating Jewish scholarship to a level commensurate with general historical and philological studies in Germany.

6(1925)5.

(82) F. Baer, *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien II/1, Aragonien und Navarra* (Berlin, 1929), xxiv.

(83) *Ibid.*

(84) See *Toldot ha-Yehudim bi-Sefarad ha-Notsrit*, revised second edition (Tel-Aviv, 1959). For a general discussion of Baer's historiographical perspective, see D.N. Myers, "From Zion Will Go Forth Torah," 211-258.

Moreover, in Julius Guttman, the *Akademie* had a director whose training and field of expertise evoked the formative generations of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. At the same time, Guttman — and the *Akademie* — were more than sponsors of Emancipation-era expectations. In institutional terms, the very existence of the *Akademie* attested to the continuing neglect of Jewish scholarship by the German university system, and to the attendant need to create a framework for it within the Jewish community.

This structural phenomenon was accompanied by a conceptual turn away from nineteenth-century scholarly paradigms. Under the guidance of Täubler and Guttman, *Akademie* researchers were explicitly encouraged to adopt methods and follow lines of research which were at odds with their predecessors. Baer's study of Christian Spain, and his previous study of early modern communal history, are perhaps the most salient examples. Another intriguing case was the *Akademie's* support of the young German scholar, Gershom Scholem, who had moved from Berlin to Jerusalem in 1923 to become the Judaica bibliographer at the Jewish National Library. Scholem's research focused on a subject which had drawn the neglect or outright enmity of nineteenth-century Jewish scholars: Jewish mysticism, and specifically, the esoteric tradition of Kabbalah. At the end of 1925, Scholem was commissioned by the *Akademie* to undertake a critical edition of the writings of the thirteenth-century Spanish Jewish mystic, Moses de Leon. In reporting on this endeavor, Julius Guttman wrote in the *Korrespondenzblatt* that it was a matter of utmost importance to explore de Leon's connection to the *Zohar*, the core text of the Kabbalah. For "the darkness in which the development of late medieval Kabbalah is still cloaked can only be lifted if his (i.e., de Leon's) writings are made completely accessible for research."<sup>85</sup> Much of Scholem's labors in the next decade were devoted to studying the link between Moses de Leon and the *Zohar*, though he never completed a critical edition of de Leon's writings for the *Akademie*.<sup>86</sup>

What is noteworthy here is not so much Scholem's final conclusion in the matter of the *Zohar*, but the fact that his novel research was sup-

(85) *Korrespondenzblatt* 6(1925)46.

(86) In November 1926, Scholem delivered his inaugural lecture at the Hebrew University in which he called into question Moses de Leon's authorship of the *Zohar*. See "Ha-'im hiber R. Moshe de Leon 'et Sefer Ha-Zohar," *Mada'e Ha-Yahadut* 1(1926)16-29. Two years later, he published a report of his research, "Zur Frage der Entstehung der Kabbala," in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 9(1928)4-26. It was only in a series of lectures in New York in 1938 that Scholem arrived at the position that Moses de Leon was, in fact, the author of the *Zohar*. See *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York, 1941), 193ff.



ported by the *Akademie*. Though it had hitherto escaped close and systematic analysis, Kabbalah was now recognized as a vital constituent of medieval Jewish life. Its exploration did not yield the same image of a rational and enlightened Judaism which had emerged from nineteenth-century Jewish scholarship (and apologetics). In this regard, Scholem's work conformed to the guiding ethos of the *Akademie*, which mandated that a holistic account of Jewish past, including expressions previously deemed unflattering or unworthy of scholarly attention, be given.

Scholem is relevant in another regard. Based in Jerusalem, he was not, and could not be, a permanent *Mitarbeiter*. Rather, he was part of a pool of part-time researchers who received subsidies to carry out work which fit the *Akademie's* own goals.<sup>87</sup> The need to contract out to scholars on a part-time basis was a function of the *Akademie's* perennial dearth of resources. Even after the great inflationary crisis of 1922-23, and despite a steady increase in the number of patrons, the *Akademie* was never able to secure solid financial footing.<sup>88</sup> As a result, new, or even replacement, *Mitarbeiter* were rarely hired. By 1925, the *Akademie* supported a total of twelve scholars, of whom half were permanent staff. By the end of its first (and last) decade of existence, the *Akademie* had employed double the 1925 total of scholars, though never more than six or seven *Mitarbeiter*. Julius Guttmann saw it as a mark of the *Akademie's* high standards, though no less of its own inability to provide steady support, that Research Institute alumni often left the institution for other leading centers of Jewish scholarship throughout the world — to the *Hochschule/Lehranstalt* in Berlin, to the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, to the Oriental Division of the Prussian *Staatsbibliothek*, and to the Hebrew University and National Library in Jerusalem.<sup>89</sup>

The presence of a cadre of highly-qualified, part-time researchers was also necessitated by two special projects supported by the *Akademie* outside the framework of the Research Institute staff. In December

(87) Even in this regard, Scholem was somewhat unusual. Most of the part-time researchers resided in Berlin, or at least, in Germany. However, Scholem and his colleague, J.N. Epstein, received *Akademie* money while living in Jerusalem.

(88) For figures on the increase in the number of donors, see *Korrespondenzblatt* 3(1922)55. The general paucity of resources is attested to in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 7(1926)41-42; 9(1928)40; 10(1929)39; 11(1930)33.

(89) See J. Guttmann, "Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," *Festgabe zum zehnjährigen Bestehen der Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 12. A report from the 1927 meeting of the *Akademie's* friends' association enumerates 25 scholars working under its roof. See the new series of the *Zeitschrift für Demographie und Statistik der Juden* 4(1927).

1922, the *Hermann Cohen-Stiftung* (Foundation) was established by the *Akademie* with the principal aim of collecting and publishing the late philosopher's Jewish writings. The task of editing these writings originally fell to Rabbi Benzion Kellermann, a former student of Cohen's and a member of the *Akademie's* advisory commission on philosophy. His death in 1923 pushed the editorial mantle into the hands of Dr. Bruno Strauss, a secondary school teacher in Berlin. Interestingly, the introduction which Kellermann intended to preface Cohen's writings was now to be undertaken by one of the philosopher's most distinguished disciples — none other than Franz Rosenzweig.<sup>90</sup> Through the joint labors of Strauss and Rosenzweig, three volumes of Hermann Cohen's *Jüdische Schriften* appeared in 1924. It was hoped that their publication would not only draw attention to Cohen as a Jewish thinker, but also stimulate interest in the activities of the *Akademie* (of which Cohen was a founding father).<sup>91</sup> It was also hoped that the *Hermann Cohen-Stiftung* could increase revenues. Indeed, soon after its creation, the Foundation became a fiscal and organizational entity distinct from the Research Institute in the expectation that it could attract its own contributors.

The value of the *Cohen-Stiftung* as a revenue producer for the *Akademie* was tempered by an extremely ambitious publication schedule. Following the publication of Cohen's *Jüdische Schriften*, two volumes of his general philosophical writings appeared in 1928 under the joint editorship of Albert Görland and Ernst Cassirer, the latter of whom had been a supporter of the *Akademie* from its inception. Around that time, the *Stiftung* also began to sponsor monographs which examined various aspects of Cohen's philosophical *oeuvre*.<sup>92</sup> In addition, plans were announced for a Hebrew translation of his major Jewish writings, the work for which was undertaken by Leo Rosenzweig with the assistance of two part-time researchers.

Excepting Cohen's *Jüdische Schriften*, all of these writings appeared, or were to appear, under the auspices of the *Akademie-Verlag*, the *Akademie's* publishing concern which was established in 1926.<sup>93</sup> The

(90) *Korrespondenzblatt* 4-5(1923-24)51.

(91) *Ibid.*, 52.

(92) The smaller philosophical writings are contained in *Hermann Cohens Schriften zur Philosophie und Zeitgeschichte*, hrsg. von A. Görland und E. Cassirer (Berlin, 1928). Monographs included Jakob Gordon, *Der Ichbegriff bei Hegel, bei Cohen und in der Westdeutschen Schule* (Berlin, 1927); and Jakob Gordin, *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des unendlichen Urteils* (Berlin, 1929). The *Cohen-Stiftung's* financial difficulties are mentioned in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 7(1926)43 and 9(1928)43.

(93) *Korrespondenzblatt* 8(1927)35. Prior to the creation of the *Akademie-Verlag*, the *Akademie's* monographs were published by C.A. Schwetschke & Sohn in Berlin. With the

was established by the publishing the late philosophical writings originally identified by Hermann Cohen's and a new philosophy. His death of Dr. Bruno Strauss, originally, the introduction of his writings was now to be distinguished disciples — through the joint labors of Hermann Cohen's *Jüdische Schriften* their publication would be undertaken, but also stimulate Hermann Cohen was a founding member of the *Cohen-Stiftung* could in the Foundation became the Research Institute and its contributors.

He was the main producer for the publication schedule. In 1928, two volumes of *Schriften*, two volumes of 1928 under the joint editorship of the latter of whom had died. Around that time, which examined various additions, plans were announced for new Jewish writings, the work with the assistance of two

These writings appeared, the *Akademie-Verlag*, the published in 1926.<sup>93</sup> The

<sup>93</sup> Hermann Cohens *Schriften zur Philosophie* (Berlin, 1928). *Monismus bei Hermann Cohen und in der Westdeutschen Philosophie* (Theorie des unendlichen Urteils) are mentioned in the

of the *Akademie-Verlag*, the publisher was Hermann Cohen & Sohn in Berlin. With the

*Verlag* was also the publisher of one of the *Akademie's* most significant collaborative projects, an edition of the writings of the father of the Jewish Enlightenment, Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786). Inspired by the impending bicentennial of his birthday in 1929, the Mendelssohn family offered initial financial support for the project in 1926, and entrusted its execution to two German-Jewish organizations: the *Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums* and the *Akademie*. The two groups created a guiding committee which included their representatives, as well as the Mendelssohn family. Editorial leadership was provided by Julius Guttman, Eugen Mittwoch, director of the *Seminar für orientalische Sprachen* in Berlin, and Ismar Elbogen, then professor at the Berlin *Hochschule/Lehranstalt*. The three scholars oversaw a team of *Akademie* scholars which included Fritz Bamberger, Haim Borodianski, Simon Rawidowicz, Bruno Strauss, and Leo Strauss.<sup>94</sup> The original plan called for sixteen volumes of Mendelssohn's writings to be published at the rate of three a year. Over the course of a decade, only seven of the sixteen volumes appeared. However, in 1971, the work of editing Mendelssohn's voluminous writings was resumed by the eminent scholar of Jewish philosophy, Alexander Altmann.<sup>95</sup>

The *Akademie's* willingness to embark on the large Mendelssohn project is attributable not merely to its proclivity for collaborative work. It also stemmed from the fact that Mendelssohn and his thought stood at the crossroads of the medieval and modern in Jewish intellectual history, as well as of the Hebrew, Yiddish, and German languages. Although *Akademie* research focused, for the most part, on the Jewish Middle Ages, neither Eugen Tübler nor Julius Guttman was averse to work which explored the intellectual and social processes that demarcated modernity. Indicative of this was the subvention of Leo Strauss' investigation of Spinoza's Biblical criticism, as developed in the *Theologico-political Treatise*. As Strauss later observed, his work rested on the premise that, in Spinoza, "a return to pre-modern philosophy is impossible" — that is, the rupture between ancient or medieval thought

*Akademie's* closing in 1934, its publication series was taken over by the renowned Schocken house in Berlin.

(94) The editorial board divided its labors in the following fashion: Guttman was to be responsible for Mendelssohn's philosophical writings, Elbogen for the non-Hebrew Jewish writings, and Mittwoch for the Hebrew writings on Jewish matters. The task of supervising work on Mendelssohn's correspondence and other writings fell to Bruno Strauss (who edited Hermann Cohen's Jewish writings). *Korrespondenzblatt* 7(1926)42.

(95) Altmann's editorial work has not only filled in the gaps of the earlier undertaking, but expanded its scope. See his introduction to Mendelssohn's *Gesammelte Schriften Jubiläumsausgabe* (Stuttgart, 1971), i:v-viii.

*Verlag* was also the publisher of one of the *Akademie's* most significant collaborative projects, an edition of the writings of the father of the Jewish Enlightenment, Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786). Inspired by the impending bicentennial of his birthday in 1929, the Mendelssohn family offered initial financial support for the project in 1926, and entrusted its execution to two German-Jewish organizations: the *Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums* and the *Akademie*. The two groups created a guiding committee which included their representatives, as well as the Mendelssohn family. Editorial leadership was provided by Julius Guttman, Eugen Mittwoch, director of the *Seminar für orientalische Sprachen* in Berlin, and Ismar Elbogen, then professor at the Berlin *Hochschule/Lehranstalt*. The three scholars oversaw a team of *Akademie* scholars which included Fritz Bamberger, Haim Borodianski, Simon Rawidowicz, Bruno Strauss, and Leo Strauss.<sup>94</sup> The original plan called for sixteen volumes of Mendelssohn's writings to be published at the rate of three a year. Over the course of a decade, only seven of the sixteen volumes appeared. However, in 1971, the work of editing Mendelssohn's voluminous writings was resumed by the eminent scholar of Jewish philosophy, Alexander Altmann.<sup>95</sup>

The *Akademie's* willingness to embark on the large Mendelssohn project is attributable not merely to its proclivity for collaborative work. It also stemmed from the fact that Mendelssohn and his thought stood at the crossroads of the medieval and modern in Jewish intellectual history, as well as of the Hebrew, Yiddish, and German languages. Although *Akademie* research focused, for the most part, on the Jewish Middle Ages, neither Eugen Täubler nor Julius Guttman was averse to work which explored the intellectual and social processes that demarcated modernity. Indicative of this was the subvention of Leo Strauss' investigation of Spinoza's Biblical criticism, as developed in the *Theologico-political Treatise*. As Strauss later observed, his work rested on the premise that, in Spinoza, "a return to pre-modern philosophy is impossible" — that is, the rupture between ancient or medieval thought

*Akademie's* closing in 1934, its publication series was taken over by the renowned Schocken house in Berlin.

(94) The editorial board divided its labors in the following fashion: Guttman was to be responsible for Mendelssohn's philosophical writings, Elbogen for the non-Hebrew Jewish writings, and Mittwoch for the Hebrew writings on Jewish matters. The task of supervising work on Mendelssohn's correspondence and other writings fell to Bruno Strauss (who edited Hermann Cohen's Jewish writings). *Korrespondenzblatt* 7(1926)42.

(95) Altmann's editorial work has not only filled in the gaps of the earlier undertaking, but expanded its scope. See his introduction to Mendelssohn's *Gesammelte Schriften Jubiläumsausgabe* (Stuttgart, 1971), i:v-viii.

and modern had become irreconcilable. Indeed, Strauss followed Hermann Cohen in understanding Spinoza's views as a radical critique of the fundamental belief in Revelation which undergirded traditional Jewish religion.<sup>96</sup>

Even more central to the *Akademie's* research agenda for the modern period than Strauss' work was that of Selma Stern on the Prussian state and the Jews. Stern was motivated by a desire to expand the terms of debate over the inception of modern Jewish history beyond a discussion of the influence of Enlightenment philosophy or the French Revolution. In her research, she sought to capture the large-scale structural changes in political order, and social and economic relations between Jews and non-Jews, which preceded the events of 1789. Evoking Täubler's ideal of an integrated historical portrait, she recognized that intellectual developments could not be understood in isolation from political or sociological phenomena, or the latter two from one another. "Political change conditions the formation of society, the intellectual structure is dependent upon the economic situation, external politics influence internal politics, and vice versa."<sup>97</sup>

According to Täubler, Selma Stern's work on the Prussian state and the Jews, by throwing light on the structural roots of modernity, helped pave the way for research of more contemporary interest. He believed that the depth of an historical perspective was necessary and prerequisite to the formation of a sociological section. It was with the aim of forging such a perspective that the Research Institute hired Selma Stern in 1920. Her research was "to create, through far-sighted archival/historical work in the field of modern Jewish history, a broad foundation for sociological work."<sup>98</sup>

Täubler's hope of establishing a sociological section was not realized during his tenure as Research Institute director. However, in 1927, Julius Guttmann entered into an agreement with the *Bureau für Statistik der Juden* whereby the latter institution would become the section for statistics and economics of the *Akademie*. Unlike the other section of the *Akademie*, the *Bureau* staff was an autonomous entity with its own director, Heinrich Silbergleit, and commission of overseers. Its focus of re-

(96) See the fascinating preface to *Spinoza's Critique of Religion* (New York, 1982), 31. This is the revised English version of *Die Religionskritik Spinozas als Grundlage seiner Bibelwissenschaft. Untersuchungen zu Spinozas Theologisch-Politischen Traktat* (Berlin, 1930). Strauss points to Cohen as the starting point for his analysis of Spinoza in "Zur Bibelwissenschaft Spinozas und seiner Vorläufer," *Korrespondenzblatt* 7(1926)2.

(97) S. Stern, *Der Preussische Staat und die Juden*, I:xii.

(98) *Korrespondenzblatt* 2(1921)33.

search was not to be the historical or theoretical dimensions of the sociological discipline, as Täubler had once imagined. It would instead "be confined in its investigation of contemporary Jewry to those problems that allowed a stringently exacting treatment free of all subjectivity."<sup>99</sup> This referred to the kind of demographic, ethnographic, and anthropological study of modern Jewry to which Jewish scholars had been devoting themselves from the beginning of the century, and whose most renowned representative was the German-born Zionist, Arthur Ruppin. The underlying aim of this "scientific" work was to study the physical and material qualities of diverse concentrations of Jews. Heinrich Silbergleit set as the section's first task a sweeping statistical analysis of German Jewry (e.g., population, religious affiliation, occupational and wealth distribution, birth and death rates), based upon the data from a general German census of 1925. This research played an important role in expanding the horizons of the Research Institute beyond purely historical inquiry. At the same time, it attracted new sources of financial support. The Prussian *Landesverband jüdischer Gemeinden* (Association of Jewish Communities), as well as large single communities, provided means to undertake this work, and thereby assured the *Akademie* of more regular funding for its operation.<sup>100</sup>

A related project undertaken with *Akademie* support, though not under the aegis of its section on economics, was Jacob Lestchinsky's study of the occupational structure of Prussian Jewry between 1812 and 1861. Julius Guttmann defined this work as lying between the disciplines of statistics and history, and saw it as an essential complement to Selma Stern's work on the Prussian state and the Jews.<sup>101</sup> Interestingly, the Ukrainian-born Lestchinsky headed the section on statistics and economics for another important contemporaneous institution of Jewish research, YIVO. The home of this section was Berlin, where Lestchinsky and a good number of other European scholars and writers had moved in the wake of the First World War. In fact, Berlin in this period was not simply the nucleus of German Jewish culture, but a major center for historical research and *belles lettres* in both Yiddish and Hebrew. Driven westward by physical threat and limited opportunities for professional advancement, Eastern European Jewish intellectuals were at-

(99) See Guttmann's comments on the new union between the *Akademie* and the *Bureau* in the *Zeitschrift für Demographie und Statistik der Juden* 4(1927)2; and his report in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 8(1927)31.

(100) See Silbergleit's plans for the section on statistics and economics in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 8(1927)1-6. See also the report in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 9(1928)42.

(101) *Korrespondenzblatt* 9(1928)42.



tracted to Berlin by the relative abundance of academic institutions (both universities and rabbinical seminaries), learned societies, and publishing prospects.

Though the *Akademie* was an institution created for and by German Jews, it nonetheless drew upon this pool of Eastern European scholars during the course of the 1920's. In the case of Lestschinsky, the connection was restricted to subvention of a specific project, and agreement to have it published by the *Akademie-Verlag*.<sup>102</sup> Other researchers had established more enduring links as *Mitarbeiter*, including Chanoch Albeck, Michael Wilensky, Haim Tykocinski, and Ephraim Porath. As a general rule, these scholars were endowed, from their formative educational experience, with an intimate familiarity with classical Jewish sources and the Hebrew language. Though there was never any formal campaign to lure Eastern Europeans to the permanent staff, it was nonetheless quite logical for the *Akademie* to avail itself of these highly-qualified researchers — born in Russia and trained in the West — who resided in Berlin. Their contribution lay not so much in introducing new methods or directions of research, but rather in providing skilled labor within the existing framework of study at the *Akademie*.

Periodically, both Eugen Täubler and Julius Guttmann expressed the view that the Research Institute could benefit by seeking out a wider, non-German audience. Already in his programmatic charge of 1919, Täubler maintained that imparting solid scholarly methods to Jewish researchers in the East (as well as in the West) was of great importance to the development of Jewish scholarship. He urged the translation of *Akademie* publications into Hebrew, a call which Guttmann echoed several years later.<sup>103</sup> The potential benefit of such work would be twofold. First, translation could make important scholarly work in German accessible to a growing audience of Hebrew readers. Second, in certain cases (e.g., Hermann Cohen's Jewish writings), the very act of translation into Hebrew assisted in the creation of a new scholarly idiom which the ancient language did not yet possess.<sup>104</sup>

To the extent that Guttmann was willing to mobilize the *Akademie's*

(102) Lestschinsky's study, provisionally entitled *Die Berufsverhältnisse der Juden in Preußen von 1812–1861*, was never published. He did, however, publish *Das wirtschaftliche Schicksal des deutschen Judentums* (Berlin, 1932), with the support of the *Zentralwohlfahrtsstelle der deutschen Juden*.

(103) See Täubler's comments in the *Korrespondenzblatt* 1(1919)20; and Guttmann, "Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums," *Der Jude* 7(1923)493.

(104) See the *Korrespondenzblatt* 6(1925)46 and 8(1927)33. Guttmann noted the great difficulty of translating Cohen's style into Hebrew, but was hopeful that the translation work "will benefit the development of a philosophical style in Hebrew."

resources to the task of Hebrew translations, he would appear to be lending support to the process of linguistic revival which figured prominently in the Zionist national movement. The fact that he, along with David Baneth, Fritz Baer, and Chanoch Albeck, later migrated to Jerusalem, and wrote and taught in *Hebrew*, fortifies this impression. Yet, the *Akademie* was less an institution with an avowedly nationalist agenda than a product of the forces of "dissimilation" which marked a new sensitivity to, and interest in, the cultural legacy of Eastern European Jews.<sup>105</sup> In broad terms, dissimilation was the result of a simmering, and largely inchoate, frustration which German Jews felt over the need to choose between national (German) and religious-communal (Jewish) identities. A more immediate catalyst was the contact between German-Jewish soldiers and Eastern European Jews during the First World War. This contact resulted in the creation of a new cultural image of the *Ostjuden* among German Jews — not as uncivilized primitives, but as venerable bearers of an authentic Jewish identity. It is not unreasonable to assume that the overtures made by Täubler and Guttmann to the Hebrew reading audience — perhaps stimulated by the presence of Hebrew scholars and authors in Berlin — reflected their absorption of the new positive valuation of Eastern European Jewish culture.<sup>106</sup>

Beyond the Eastern European connection, the effect of dissimilation on the *Akademie* was felt in a more profound way. The very genesis of the *Akademie* can be seen as a dialectical reaction to the struggle for political emancipation and social integration waged by Jews from the late eighteenth century. On one hand, its progenitor, Franz Rosenzweig, abandoned the quest for intellectual and spiritual universalism on which he had once embarked, and passionately devoted himself to the revival of a decidedly Jewish intellectual and spiritual experience. This movement led Ernst Simon, one of his leading disciples, to label Rosenzweig the paradigmatic "post-emancipatory Jew."<sup>107</sup> On the other hand, one

(105) The term "dissimilation" is explicated in Shulamit Volkov's important essay, "The Dynamics of Dissimilation: *Ostjuden* and German Jews," *The Jewish Response to German Culture: From the Enlightenment to the Second World War*, ed. Jehuda Reinharz and Walter Schatzberg (Hanover and London, 1985), 195–211.

(106) It must be noted that Täubler, as a Posen Jew, was raised in an environment located, geographically and otherwise, on the frontier between German and Polish (and their respective Jewish) cultures. See his comments in the autobiographical "Heimat/Land. Stadt. Gemeinde," originally published in a 1953 *Festschrift* for Leo Baeck, and reprinted in *Der römische Staat*, xxii. More generally, for an insightful study of the changing image of Eastern European Jews by German Jews, see Steven E. Aschheim, *Brothers and Strangers: The East European Jew in German and German Jewish Consciousness, 1800–1923* (Madison, WI, 1982).

(107) E. Simon, "Franz Rosenzweig und das jüdische Bildungsproblem,"

of the chief goals of the *Akademie* — the desire to revitalize *Wissenschaft des Judentums* within a Jewish institution — was not merely an affirmation of an inner Jewish quest, but a consequence of the exclusion of Jewish studies (and scholars) from the German academy. The co-existence of this inner Jewish thrust and the externally-imposed obstacle shaped the distinctly German-Jewish milieu in which the *Akademie* took form.

Ironically, the “dissimilated” sensibility which gave rise to the *Akademie* did not preclude the persistent articulation of Emancipation-era objectives by its leaders, especially of the century-old aim of elevating *Wissenschaft des Judentums* to a position of equality with other *Geisteswissenschaften*. Nor did it appear to prevent Emancipation-era sensibilities from coloring the topical priorities of the *Akademie*. It hardly seems coincidental that the experience of Jewish communities in Spain and Prussia — both marked by a high degree of cultural interaction with the non-Jewish society and the unusual intellectual achievement — received the most sustained, and arguably skillful, scholarly attention. In acknowledging the repercussive influence of the earlier community, Guttmann observed that “the development of the Jewish spirit throughout the centuries was decisively influenced by Spanish Judaism, and it is of utmost importance to know the social conditions in which the rich intellectual life of Spanish Jewry unfolded.”<sup>108</sup> Just as Guttmann imagined that Fritz Baer’s work on Christian Spain could illuminate the subsequent course of Jewish history, so he believed that Selma Stern’s work on Prussian Jewry could open the way to a better understanding of the Jewish experience in modern times.

In both cases, the impetus for research in these areas stemmed at least as much from the interests of the scholars themselves as from other stimuli. Nonetheless, the combined emphasis on Spain and Prussia recalls an historical axiom often applied to modern German Jewry, namely, that because of perceived parallels in cultural milieus, it has been singularly infatuated with the Jewish experience in the “Golden Age” of Spain. As has already been noted, this infatuation did not arise first in the twentieth century. It was a hallmark of a nineteenth-century Jewish *Weltanschauung* sustained by the desire for external social validation, and reliant on an historical example worthy of emulation.<sup>109</sup>

*Korrespondenzblatt* 11(1930)12.

(108) *Korrespondenzblatt* 4–5 (1923–24)49. See also Guttmann’s summary of Stern’s and Baer’s work (*supra*. n. 69) in “Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums,” *Festgabe zum zehnjährigen Bestehen der Akademie*, 13–14.

(109) Ismar Schorsch provides an important preliminary analysis of the infatuation of modern German Jewry with the Spanish Jewish past (focusing on four cultural spheres,

The danger of this observation, as it relates to the *Akademie*, lies in its reductionism. Much *Akademie* research avoided the Spanish-German axis of cultural development. In line with Täubler's announced priorities, the Research Institute supported a good deal of research in Midrashic, Talmudic, and Geonic literature — fields which do not fit as easily into the conceptual mold of the Emancipatory influence.<sup>110</sup> Further, in direct defiance of the infatuation with Spanish Jewry was Fritz Baer's research on the Jews in Christian Spain, begun at the *Akademie* and culminating in a remarkably tendentious Hebrew narrative published after his immigration to Palestine. In this later work, the privileged elite of Spanish Jewry were cast not as models of dignity and decorum, but as avaricious and morally bankrupt. When juxtaposed to Baer's glorification of Ashkenazic piety, this portrayal hardly amounts to a ringing endorsement of the Spanish model, or of the Emancipatory terms of discourse.<sup>111</sup> In fact, it is quite clear that Baer's critique of this model represented a response to, and rejection of, the "obsolete spirit of Enlightenment" which he saw as dominating Jewish scholarship prior to his time.

#### IV

The claim and counter-claim regarding the persistence of nineteenth-century aspirations in shaping the *Akademie für die Wissenschaft de Judentums* are not, surprisingly, mutually exclusive. Founded in the early years of Weimar Germany, the *Akademie* arose in an atmosphere charged with excitement and apprehension. The paradoxes and ironies of that milieu — the cohabitation of utopian expectations in the unprecedented progressivism of the new regime and bitter memories of the recently-concluded war — were surely not lacking in Jewish intellectual circles in Berlin. A mood which oscillated "between utter pessimism and contemplative withdrawal on the one hand, and impatient and inchoate bursts of radical activism on the other" characterized these circles —

including scholarship). See "The Myth of Sephardic Supremacy," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 34(1989)47–66.

(110) It should be noted that at the beginning of the 1930's, the *Akademie*, under the guidance of Harry Torczyner, ventured into the largely uncharted terrain of critical analysis of the Bible. Guttman believed that only an institution such as the *Akademie* — devoted not to subjective exegesis of the Bible, but to critical evaluation — could undertake such work. *Korrespondenzblatt* 11(1930)31.

(111) Nor, for that matter, does Baer's immigration to Palestine, where he established the department of Jewish history at the Hebrew University.

among whom was found Franz Rosenzweig, the founding father of the *Akademie*.<sup>112</sup>

Rosenzweig's plan for the *Akademie* was marked simultaneously by a withdrawal from traditional German-Jewish aspirations and by grand and energetic visions of cultural renaissance. The starting point for the process of rejuvenation was not a Jewish theological faculty in a German university, as Rosenzweig had periodically imagined. It was an institution whose *raison d'être* would not be defined by the surrounding Gentile society, nor, for that matter, by professional Jewish scholars. Rather, the *Akademie* of Rosenzweig's vision was to be the site of the "conquest of historicism" — that is, the overturning of the arcane and atomizing mode of analysis which dominated German historical studies throughout the 19th century.<sup>113</sup> The intended result of this reversal would be a more engaged and therapeutic function for scholarship.

The *Akademie* never completed this original task. Ten years after it was founded, in 1929, Julius Guttmann voiced sympathy with Franz Rosenzweig's original dream in a eulogy for the late philosopher. The *Akademie* had tried, he recalled, to fulfill Rosenzweig's goal "of making scholarship the centerpiece of a Jewish *Bildungswelt*, with his faith in giving clear and sure direction to the life forces of Judaism through scientific reflection." And yet, it could not attain the lofty objectives which Rosenzweig had envisaged. In fact, it made no attempt, under Täubler's or Guttmann's leadership, to assume a "religious-pedagogic" function. On the contrary, the *Akademie* had developed, over the course of its brief history, into "a purely scientific institution (*reinwissenschaftliche Anstalt*)."<sup>114</sup>

This explicit acknowledgement of the movement away from the Rosenzweig model of an *engagé* teacher-scholar was reinforced by the scholarly products which rolled off the *Akademie's* presses. Unlike the Schocken *Bücherei* series of the mid 1930's, the *Akademie's* publications did not present a distillation of popular topics in Jewish thought to a wide audience.<sup>115</sup> Rather, they were studies or critical editions in neglected and often esoteric fields of research. In some cases, they were

(112) See Anson Rabinbach's introduction to *The Correspondence of Walter Benjamin and Gershom Scholem, 1932-1940*, edited by Scholem and translated by Gary Smith and Andre Lefevere (New York, 1989), xv-xvi.

(113) E. Simon, "Franz Rosensweig und das jüdische Bildungsproblem," 7.

(114) J. Guttmann, "Franz Rosensweig," *Korrespondenzblatt* 11(1930)3.

(115) On the Schocken *Bücherei*, see Steven M. Poppel, "Salmon Schocken and the Schocken Verlag: A Jewish Publisher in Weimar and Nazi Germany," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 21(January 1973)30-31. In addition to the *Bücherei*, the Schocken house assumed publication of the *Akademie's* monographs in the 1930's.

works solicited by the *Akademie* as part of its design to achieve a holistic view of the Jewish past. Without exception, these works were distinguished by the kind of careful textual or empirical analysis which Franz Rosenzweig labelled — and reviled — as “historicism.” Accordingly, what had begun, with the birth of the *Akademie* idea, as a crisis of historicism seemed to end up as an affirmation of historicism.

As the *Akademie* entered its second decade of existence, Julius Guttmann remained sanguine that it could realize, if not Franz Rosenzweig’s original vision, then its own potential as an exemplary institution of pure Jewish research. Recalling the luminaries of Jewish scholarship who passed through its modest quarters on Berlin’s Lützowstrasse, Guttmann foresaw that “a lucky star will hover over the future of the *Akademie*.”<sup>116</sup> This optimistic claim revealed Guttmann to be less a clairvoyant than a scholar. His own departure in 1930 for a sabbatical at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati left a gap in leadership and direction which proved difficult to overcome. In that same year, the last number of the *Korrespondenzblatt* appeared, thereby precluding detailed reports of the *Akademie*’s activities. The subsequent silence portended the dissolution of the *Akademie*, whose doors closed officially in 1934. More ominously, this silence presaged the decimation of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* on German soil.

Finally, in situating this fascinating institution on the landscape of Weimar Jewry, it is intriguing to compare it to two other remarkable institutions of the same period. The first is the *Freies Jüdisches Lehrhaus* in Frankfurt, where Franz Rosenzweig transplanted his dreams for a new mode of Jewish learning. The *Lehrhaus* sought to enfranchise Jews who had become increasingly alienated from Judaism and its classical sources. Its faculty was comprised of intellectuals like Rosenzweig who had themselves made the requisite return to Judaism following deep immersion in the world of German culture. The students who registered for the *Lehrhaus*’ courses, numbering more than one thousand in a single year, were embarking upon the inward spiritual course — from the periphery to the center of Judaism — which Rosenzweig had prescribed.

The second institution is the *Institut für Sozialforschung*, also located in Frankfurt, from which the “Frankfurt School” of critical theory takes its name. The *Institut* itself had no avowedly Jewish agenda, though most of its members were of Jewish descent.<sup>117</sup> The overarching goal of the

(116) “Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums,” *Festgabe zum zehnjährigen Bestehen der Akademie*, 1.

(117) See Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950* (Boston, 1973), 31–35.



*Institut* was to nurture inquiry, based on an unabashed Marxist slant, into social and economic theory, and seek the application of its results to practical policies and deeds. What makes the assembly of intellectuals at the *Institut* a worthwhile subject of comparison was the quality of alienation — both from the Jewish faith of their grandparents, and from the bourgeois Enlightenment world in which that faith had been so radically transmuted. It was this same quality of alienation which Franz Rosenzweig sought to eradicate by encouraging a return to an inner Jewish world in his first proposal for an *Akademie*. And it was this quality which he sought to overturn in the Frankfurt *Lehrhaus*, with which several members of the *Institut für Sozialforschung* (e.g., Erich Fromm and Leo Lowenthal) were affiliated.<sup>118</sup>

All three of the institutions mentioned — the *Akademie*, the *Lehrhaus*, and the *Institut* — inhabited the same spectrum of alienation that identified, and served as creative inspiration for, intellectuals in Weimar Germany. All three relied on the collaborative and interdisciplinary labors of distinguished minds in order to forge a new world. And yet, their respective agendas could not be more varied. The mission of the *Institut für Sozialforschung* had little to do with specifically Jewish concerns. Rather, it rested on the demand for radical social change through a vigorous, even unrelenting, critique of prevailing social scientific research. For the Frankfurt *Lehrhaus*, the aim was to reconstruct a shattered Jewish world by escaping the myopia of professional Jewish scholars and the misguided course of assimilation. The *Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums* began its short life with the same aspiration as that of the later *Lehrhaus*. Soon after its opening, however, the *Akademie* assumed a far more restricted mission: the revitalization of professional Jewish scholarship within a “pure scientific” institution. To a great extent, this paradoxical shift in function resulted from the shift in leadership from Franz Rosenzweig, the philosopher and theologian, to Eugen Täubler and Julius Guttman, the critical scholars. At the same time, it reflected the *Akademie*’s embodiment of a set of competing impulses which streaked through Jewish cultural and institutional life in Weimar Germany: the novel impulse towards “dissimilation,” on the one hand, and the unrequited desire to realize the promise of Emancipation and, at last, attain broader social validation, on the other.\*

(118) See M. Jay, *ibid.*, 21.

\* I would like to thank Michael Brenner, Lois Dubin, John Efron, Alan Levenson, and, as always, Nomi Maya Stolzenberg for their insightful comments on various drafts of this paper.