

**THE CONCEPT OF UNIQUENESS IN EAST EUROPEAN
JEWISH HISTORICAL METHODOLOGY**

**Lila P. Everett
December, 1979
Max Weinreich Center for Advanced
Jewish Studies , YIVO**

The purpose of this paper is to evaluate various historical models for their effectiveness in interpreting East European Jewish life in the context of non-Jewish society. Our focus is on the major contributions of modern nineteenth-century and twentieth-century historians, of both the so-called "historical-materialist" and of the "idealist" schools, as well as ^{on} more recent attempts to re-evaluate Jewish history in light of the developments of the post-WWII era.

It is our belief that such an examination is of particular value and relevance now, as a new group of modern Jewish historians is commencing to write Jewish history for this generation. The temptation is strong, in face of wide research gaps and disruptions, as well as the loss of a whole generation of scholars in Eastern Europe, to "get on" with the business of gathering materials and to concentrate on "facts", on the assumption that all will fall into place when more materials have been examined and history, to paraphrase Ranke's famous dictum, will write itself "wie es eigentlich gewesen ist".

These factors may account for the reverence for extracted data and for the reluctance to examine the theoretical preconceptions guiding such efforts. Yet there can be no question that no historical work, whether conceived as a scientific or belle-lettristic effort, can be created without a theory or guiding notion. What is disturbing about recent developments in modern Jewish history is not that biases and hunches are present, since, in the positive sense, theories are an invaluable aid in dealing with the burgeoning world of materials, but that major assumptions are implicitly accepted

without a scholarly critique and without attempts at self-knowledge. An understanding of the subjective forces which motivate the writer of Jewish history is imperative, since Jewish historians are now emerging for the first time in an entirely secular context.

In the realm of East European Jewish history, in particular, the natural reaction to the decimation of a generation of historians has been to close ranks around the few survivors and to nurture a new generation who have had to acquire laboriously the linguistic and cultural tools easily within reach of the pre-war generation.(1)

Ironically, one immediate and radical effect of the demise of the East European Jewish community on historical thinking has been the tendency to diminish the importance of the East European Diaspora. It is in that context that Salo Baron's statement about the need to overcome the Europocentricity of Jewish history can perhaps be best understood:

In short, a mere glance at the histories written by Graetz, Jawitz, Dubnow or Margolis and Marx suffices to show how relatively "parochial" Jewish historiography had been even during the interwar period. Such history writing is simply no longer feasible today. Just as world history can no longer be written, as it used to be, principally in terms of the western evolution, so has Jewish historiography begun gradually to abandon its exclusive concentration on the traditionally narrow geographic areas in Europe and the adjoining Mediterranean lands. (2)

While it is perhaps only the natural impulse for survival which has sent historians to other Diasporas after the loss of the last and most important one, another psychological by-product has been the resurgence of the conviction that Jewish history represents the unique and incomparable experiences and sufferings of a people chosen if not by divine plan

then by the sardonic play of historical forces.

Furthermore, the current experiences of the Jewish communities in which Jewish history is now being written tend to support the consciousness of multiple Diasporas and uprootedness. Inadvertantly, East European Jewish history is now being studied in new immigrant societies, whether Israeli or American, where the experience of the twentieth century tends to obscure the deep roots of the East European community in local soil and to reinforce the credibility of the image of the Jews as a spiritual wanderer outside particular local forces. East European history viewed as a prelude to immigration or as a comparative experience to modern migrations further accentuates the schematic and remote treatment of the subject.

As the writers of modern Jewish history have become increasingly removed from the realities of East European life, the political, geographical and social environment in which Jewish life once transpired has become rather abstract. The links between East European Jewish life and medieval Spain or even ancient Alexandria may appear more tangible when stripped of the confusing particularities of the local context than the relationships between Jews and non-Jews of a given society.⁽³⁾ Such are the implications of the Jewish history curriculum at major universities in the United States and Israel at the present.

This methodological approach is founded, however, on the conviction which precedes the Holocaust experience, namely, that Jewish history is in a significant sense unique and does not lend itself to comparative study.

The sentiment may best be summarized by the following statement by S. Baron which simultaneously dismisses the economic and comparative explanation for Jewish history:

We feel, however, no less strongly that among the histories of the different human groups, that of the Jews will most stubbornly resist any full explanation which may be advanced for it exclusively on the basis of the progressive changes in the means of production or of any other economic transformations. (4)

There may be good reason to believe that total reliance on economic factors in Jewish history would eliminate an important, perhaps the most important, dimension, but assigning to Jewish history the unique quality of having the religious and intellectual factors predominate adds a metaphysical dimension which is simply beyond scholarship.

A particular problem for East European Jewish historians is the double loss of Russian and Polish historians (and the linguistic inaccessibility of the works of the latter), which have placed the current generation of historians in the curious position of learning from and reacting to the teachers of the interwar generation. We thus appear to have come full circle, from a critique of "idealist" Jewish history to the "materialist" reaction and now, once more, to the universalist elements transcending the particularities of the local experience.

The conviction that the history of the Jews was in some sense the history of a unique people precedes the Holocaust and appears to be a central theme in the writings of Jewish historians of every school. The contrast between metaphysical and practical history is evident most strikingly in the difference between the work of many Jewish historians in miniature and on a grand scale. Many small studies show a balance between the local context and internal Jewish developments which is lost once the historian is transferred to the larger canvass.

These discrepancies cannot be written off as the result of necessary dilution which will inevitably occur when the historian deals with larger historical periods and with more material. On the contrary, in Jewish history the larger work,

such as Mahler's Divrei Yemei Yisroel, Baron's The Jewish Community, and A Social and Religious History is still far from outmoded and continues to be considered the life achievement of the mature scholar rather than a textbook superficiality which might merely skim the surface of large chronological periods. Works which span the entirety of Jewish history seem to hold a special place and are with a halo which is yet more testimony that Jewish history in modern times has continued to represent a secularized version

of the faith in the chosen people.

Modern Jewish historians are almost without exception adherents of the theory of Jewish uniqueness in their interpretation of history for all periods of the Jewish past. It is a concept which is not a model in the sense that models are derived from empirical evidence, nor is it commonly tested against empirical data and refined. It is, however, a theory of great mythical and emotional power which informs the conscious and unconscious collection of data and its evaluation by historians engaged both in the study of pre-modern and modern Jewish history. This theory can actively inhibit the utilization of information which pertains to the non-Jewish environment or of data which would provide comparative experiences of other ethnic groups or nations. While such attempts to analyze parallel cases of historical experience have been made by sociologists and anthropologists and some American Jewish historians very recently, they are largely avoided by general Jewish historians as shallow and superficial. The main reason for the rejection of such comparisons, even when examples are available within the context of the same legal and political structure as that inhabited by the Jews, is the underlying conviction that the Jewish experience simply cannot be compared with that of other national groups.

Unlike sociology and anthropology, Jewish history is still primarily written for the in-group, for "us", the Jewish reader, and by the Jewish scholar. It is a known fact that from the beginning of modern Jewish history writing, with very few exceptions, there have been no Gentile practitioners of the art, and one can probably safely assume that there have been very few non-Jewish readers.⁽⁵⁾ More importantly, the writers of Jewish history have commonly made the assumption that they were writing either for the Jewish reader or, with regard to the whole Jewish community, as its apologists or defenders.

There are objective reasons why being a Jewish historian has, in effect, meant membership in a private club. Until the present generation of historians, there have simply been no Jewish scholars involved in secular historical studies of Jewry who could function outside parochial Jewish institutions. In the nineteenth century, in both Eastern and Western Europe prejudice prevented the establishment of Jewish studies at the universities. Jewish scholars in Germany, for example, were confined to the closed environment of the Jewish seminaries, while East European scholars found employment as teachers in secondary Jewish schools. In this century, in the United States, similar biases have prevented the establishment of Jewish studies in the broader university environment until after WWII. (6)

These developments have had serious consequences, for they ensured that Jewish scholars would not only write primarily for the Jewish public, but that they would also work in the Jewish and often non-secular setting. The religious connotations of Jewish history which was developed by the "idealist" school of Jewish historians was nurtured by the institutional environment in which Jewish academics functioned.

The main tenets of this school of thought are so well known and have been discussed so extensively that we need only refer here to some major points which are of importance for our study of East European Jewish historians. (7) Despite the fact that the Wissenschaft des Judenthums school of historical thought was already severely criticised in the nineteenth century for its excessive emphasis on the development of ideas and for its neglect of social and economic developments, the impact of its ideas has remained imprinted deeply in modern Jewish historiography.

Under the influence of Hegelian notions of the unfolding of divine Reason through history, Wissenschaft des Judenthums developed a missionary view of the importance of Judaism deeply influenced by nineteenth century theories of historical progress and of the unique role of nations in the gradual development of all mankind. Krochmal, Graetz, Zunz, Geiger all believed in the mission of the Jews to spread monotheism and higher morality among the nations. The persistence of the Jews as a people through the ages was understood as the result of this purpose and of making the mission the life task of the people. Certain

secondary explanations followed from these premises, such as the conviction that Jews, as bearers of the civilizing mission among mankind, had manifested higher morality and, through the ages, had achieved higher levels of scholarship. It is not surprising that movements which did not seem to fit the Judeo-Christian Western ethic, such as the Kabbala and Hassidism, were dismissed as aberrations from Judaism's lofty purpose. Even for Graetz, who had a much stronger sense of Jews as a nation and a propensity for cataloguing Jewish suffering, Jewish history did not need by definition to be considered in a peculiar historical context, since the ideas had primacy in determining the historical nature of the nation.

This concept of the unique qualities of the Jewish people was secularized and developed by Dubnow with a much stronger emphasis on the national elements in the history of the Jews. Writing as a critic of German Jewish historians, he called his theory of Jewish history "national-realistic" or "scientific-evolutionary" in order to distinguish it from the "idealistic" approach of *Wissenschaft des Judenthums*. Unlike the "idealistic" historians who had identified Jewish history with the evolution of Judaism, Dubnow wished to include economic, social and political details of Jewish life. (3)

In practical application he succeeded in his historical works dealing with the Jews in Poland and Russia both by his own and by popular standards. These works remain influential both through direct translation into English and by means of Greenberg's History of Jews in Russia, which is in effect an

updated rendering of Dubnow in English. (9) Dubnow made another important contribution by writing a history of Hassidism, thus admitting this hitherto neglected and disdained movement into the ranks of Jewish intellectual history. Although subsequently his "rationalist" bias in the treatment of Hassidism was strongly criticised, his division of the movement into rational and irrational aspects and even branches permitted the implicit recognition of some aspects of the Hassidic movement as a part of the mainstream of Judaism. (10)

Dubnow believed that one of the main tasks of the Jewish historian was to explain the unique fact of the preservation of the Jewish identity through the ages. In formulating the problem in this way, he was of course immediately suggesting a solution, namely that such a preservation was indeed exceptional and presupposed unique qualities on the part of the Jews. Jewish identity, accordingly, owed its persistence to a superior sense of nationality which, tautologically, was an expression of a strong will for survival and self-preservation as a group or nation. In this formulation, Judaism, the religious development of the Jewish people, was merely secondary to the desire to preserve national identity and to the desire for cultural insulation. The development of Jewish autonomy was the tangible expression of these national impulses through the ages and a self-willed substitute for the state.

The spiritual and idealistic aspects implicit in Dubnow's positivist rhetoric have long been recognized. Dubnow has been criticised by many historians, most justifiably and influentially

by Marxian Jewish historians such as Mahler for underplaying internal divisions in Jewish society and by Baron for a "lacrymose" view of Jewish history. (11)

Dubnow's historical perception of the Jewish people was a reflection of his ideological conviction that Jewish history was the history of a state (without an army, to be sure) within a state. Many of the methodological flaws which have been analyzed in his writings stem from this fundamental assumption rather than from the causes usually criticized. For instance, Dubnow's excessive reliance on internal Jewish sources is a direct result of his conviction of the existence of Jewish national independence through the ages. As a result, Dubnow's approach is close to the traditional martyrologies, which are even a factual source for some of his historical material. (12) Because of a deep sense of responsibility for the current preservation of the Jewish people, he did not discuss Jews outside the Jewish community, nor could he account for the rapid loss of the Jewish culture in modern times. Economic rivalry and class conflict were equally neglected due to an emphasis on unity, a desire to show Jewish solidarity. As a result of the bias of his sources, Jewish history appeared to reflect the noble ideals of scholarship and high morality and to be devoid of family conflicts, desertions, criminality or illiteracy.

Dubnow's treatment of Russian and Polish Jewish history in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was essentially a tale of anti-Jewish decrees and excesses unmitigated by any accounts of positive legislation or of developments which diverged from this chronicle of poverty and persecution.

While we now recognize that Dubnow exaggerated the importance of Jews in Russian history to the point that it would appear that the Russian monarchs in the nineteenth century were preoccupied with the Jewish problem and obsessed by Jews, the persistence of this distorted perception in current writings on this subject is less well known. (13) There is such a discrepancy between Russian Jewish history and Russian history, including the Soviet period, that the two are at times mutually unrecognizable. No doubt the ethnocentricity of both people has a role to play in this, but for Jewish historians the exaggeration of Jewish importance has at time achieved pathological proportions.

There is another aspect to Dubnow's interpretation of Jewish history which has continued to be influential despite its mythological and irrational aspects. We are referring to the anticipation of Jewish annihilation and to a holocaust mentality which were expressed on the occasion of such martyrological events as the Chmelnicki massacres, the Uman' massacre of 1764, and the pogroms in the Ukraine in the 1880's and in 1919. (14) There appears to be a kind of technology of mourning in Jewish thought which is vividly expressed by Dubnow on occasions of minor and major losses. An important aspect of this thinking is linkage between destruction throughout Jewish history with the more recent events and evocation and commemoration of past persecutions as part of a long-ranging attitude toward Jews. This martyrological syndrome has deep roots in traditional Jewish religious practice of commemorating victims of persecutions,

so that Dubnow's practice of listing persecutions in lieu of history becomes understandable. However, in this context we must question whether Dubnow's history has not been considered secular prematurely.

As a corrective to Dubnow and out of a shifting focus onto the masses, the inter-wars period, and particularly the 1930's, saw a veritable flood of Jewish studies pertaining to economics, statistics, demography, occupational distribution, and population growth. The desire to show that Jews could become subject to normalization and had, in fact, exhibited historically many "normal" tendencies was a major motivation for the work of such historians as Weinryb, Mahler, Ringelblum, and Szacki. (15) Jewish criminals became a favorite topic for investigation out of the impulse to show parallels between Jewish and non-Jewish historical developments. Many historians realized that the phenomenon of Jewish autonomy could be explained more satisfactorily through the policies of the medieval corporate state which made similar compacts with many groups in society, than by recourse to the internal "will" of the Jews.

Yet when we examine the writings of Mahler which represent in some aspects an attempt to apply Marxian interpretation to Jewish history, we find the persistence of the major assumption encountered in Dubnow's work--that the Jews formed a state within a state. For example, as applied to internal Jewish economy, Mahler's interpretation devolves upon the attempt to find the class identification of the Hassidim and to correlate the economic motivations of a certain class of Jewry with the espousal of

Haskala causes. (16) In addition to being reductive and simplistic, such an approach is also bad Marxism, for Mahler rejects analogies between Jews and non-Jews in his treatment of modern Jewish economics. In fact the attempt to show "normal" economic development among Jews by means of analyzing class structure in Jewish society is undermined from the very beginning by the assumption that the Jewish economic situation itself within the larger framework of Eastern Europe was abnormal.

Mahler's discussion of anti-Semitism in Poland is an example of the persistence of the insider's view on Jewish history. Most of his work, typical of other twentieth-century Jewish history, represents in fact the grafting of contradictory systems, of nationalistic and Marxian explanations, onto the assumption that the Jewish experience is unique. A fundamental and recurring theme of economic and statistical studies of modern Jewish life in Eastern Europe has been the abnormality of the Jewish occupational structure. Further refinements upon the same theme have been made in studies of the labor movement in which the peculiarities of the Jewish proletariat are viewed as unique or abnormal. The tendency to ignore the complementarity of Jews and non-Jews in the economic structure of East European society is but another expression of the conviction that Jewish history and economics should be treated separately from the local environment. (17) The theory of the abnormal development of Jewish economics is but a secularized version of the concept of Jewish uniqueness.

Salo Baron's remarkable contributions to general Jewish history and to East European Jewish history represent an effort

to close the gap between the idealist and materialist schools of Jewish historiography. His studies of the Jewish community through the ages and the monumental Social and Religious History of the Jews were designed as correctives both to the baal quf view of Jewish history and to the history of Jewish religious thought divorced from the historical context which Wissenschaft des Judenthums substituted for Jewish history. The methodology is evident in the choice of the title of the multi-volume universal Jewish history still in progress. The use of "social" and "religious" were intended to demonstrate the interdependence of Jews and Judaism, of the religious and national factors through the ages: "The unity of Jews and Judaism or, in other words, the interplay of the social and religious forces throughout Jewish history appears to be of controlling significance." (18)

According to Prof. Baron, the Jewish religion without the "chosen" people is unthinkable, while the Jews as a racial and religious cultural heritage could not survive long without Judaism. The major assumptions which underlie Baron's interpretation of Jewish history are that the Jewish religion was different and perhaps unique in that it was a historical religion and that because of the absence of the state experience (except for a short period), Jewish history became in effect the combination of national (without territory) and world history.

In practical application Baron's work often offers impressive research on the local context of a given Jewish community.

In this treatment Jewish history is always the concrete history of a particular Jewish community, its social-political non-Jewish

environment, and their interaction. Simultaneously, Jewish history is the interplay of the total cultural religious tradition with the particular historical moment. Volume XVI of the Social and Religious History of the Jews (Poland-Lithuania) is a particularly successful example of this method, which at its best is able to present three-dimensional history in full balance. Impressive research on Polish society provides the legislative, social, and political norms within which the Jewish community had to function. [¶] The problem inherent in such methodology is that the relationship between "Jewishness" and the local environment is vague and not clearly defined. The delicate balance between the religious-universal factors and the historical reality rests on the historian's intuition and is arbitrary rather than determined by the theoretical model. This balance can be easily upset in favor of the 5,000-year-old Jewish cultural tradition which is still Baron's overriding concern.

[¶] The attempt to combine national and world history into a meaningful whole can lead to shallowness, as the other practitioners of this method, and occasionally Baron himself, demonstrate. Ultimately this approach demands either thorough familiarization with all ages and societies, the scrutiny of records in all languages of societies in which there were Jewish communities, or it results in a superficial trek through world history highlighting the presence of Jews here and there. The limitations of time and memory serve, in effect, to redefine this method so that in practical application even the most studious and best-intentioned will stress national Jewish history at the expense of the local context. Inevitably, as knowledge is spread too

thin, the scholar falls into the trap of attributing causality to mysterious "Jewish" qualities, when an explanation is readily available from the history of local conditions, but about which he simply has no adequate information.

The problems of writing East European Jewish history in the universal Jewish framework are demonstrated abundantly in the works of Israeli historians, such as S. Ettinger and Ben-Sasson. One of the universals of Jewish history dwelled on here is the persistence of anti-Jewish sentiment through the ages. This is the affirmation of the Jewish uniqueness and national existence by persecution and suffering, and it represents in effect an updating of the lacrymose view of Jewish history, vindicated by the creation of the state of Israel, which is viewed as the apotheosis of Jewish development. This view is exemplified by Ettinger's studies of anti-Semitism from Hellenic times through the Middle Ages and once again in modern times in the Russian Tsarist Empire and in the Soviet Union. (19)

Faith in the continuity of Jewish history over various periods and locations imposes a continuity on anti-Semitism which is difficult to justify in terms of non-Jewish history and which dilutes the meaning of the term to the point where it loses any conceptual value.

A number of recent textbooks co-authored by Israeli historians illustrate the pitfalls of universal Jewish history in an exaggerated fashion. A work such as A History of the Jewish People, edited by Ben Sasson and others, is valuable in that it consolidates the findings of many new studies in condensed and

unified from, particularly new research on statistics, demography, and economics. (20) However, the usefulness of such a collective study is undermined by the superimposition of unique Jewish characteristics onto general historical explanations. As an example let us consider the discussion of demographic changes in this work as depicted by Ettinger. He notes the growth of the Jewish population in the nineteenth century and mentions an increase in individual life span and a decline of infant mortality as a result of general European social and cultural progress. At the same time, however, we are told of the importance of special Jewish home and child care. But no explanation is offered why European Jews in the 18th century and Asian and African Jews in the 19th century did not experience lower mortality while presumably following similar religious injunctions. Another example is migration to the cities, seen as part of a European trend toward urbanization, in which Jews, however, are viewed as more successful participants because of a peculiar "Jewish" trait for adaptability to alien surroundings. (21) There appear to have existed a number of special Jewish traits which also made Jews particularly apt journalists ("a rapid grasp of facts, agility, extensive contacts"), scientists, and musicians. (22) Leading Jewish entrepreneurs and prominent figures are listed even though their relationship to the Jewish community may be questionable, and then their traits are abstracted as "typical" Jewish qualities. If such reasoning were applied to other ethnic groups in the United States, we might say that the Irish and Italians had unique gifts for city politics

because the Irish are gregarious and the Italians have a tradition of city states!

Perhaps such analysis might be excused as poor textbook historianship, but it is our belief that these generalizations are deeply rooted in the methodology of modern Jewish history. The assumption that Jewish history can best be understood as a single thread running through many Diasporas demands the integration of Asian, African, Western European, and Eastern European history into a single whole. From the application of this theory--as in, for example, Ben Sasson's Trial and Achievement--it appears that this is done at the expense of the concrete historical context. Thus we are taken through the centuries, viewing in one paragraph Luther as a precursor of Auschwitz, while in the next we are in Amsterdam and must consider Sabbatai Zvi. The scope simply does not permit a detailed examination of the historical context.(23)

Aside from the practical problems inherent in the realization of universal Jewish history, we must question the methodological validity of detailed economic, social, and political knowledge of all Jewish communities through the ages even if it were practically feasible. The motivation for such efforts is not really secular, for unlike universal history which seeks to know all ages of man for their own sake, Jewish history assumes that somehow a continuous thread was woven so that all generations of Jews have come to bear upon the present one. This is the theory of the divine plan for the Jewish people without the deity, for ultimately there can be no justification for assuming

uninterrupted continuity in Jewish history unless one believes that the religious factors predominated. But if that were so then Wissenschaft des Judentums was more justified in its approach than its secular modern version, for the intellectual streams in Judaism have had more continuity and transferrability than the social experiences of isolated local communities.

To summarize our argument, we believe that modern East European and general Jewish history is written by means of recourse to mythical explanations, when natural causes might be completely adequate. Even when natural explanation are cited, a special "Jewish" dimension is added. This is most apparent in studies of anti-Semitism, where political, economic, and social explanations are accepted, but supplemented frequently by a mysterious and quintessential factor, an irrational and total rejection of aliens reserved only for Jews. The belief in unique Jewish traits (adaptability, genius), a unique historical path (national survival), and unique suffering are complementary components of the concept uniqueness.

11. Mahler, R., "Teorje żydowskiej historiografji o rozwoju dziejowym kultury żydowskiej", Miesięcznik żydowski, III, tom II 1933, pp. 208-226.
12. On the role of martyrology in Jewish history, see Tcherikower, E., "Jewish Martyrology and Jewish Historiography", YIVO Annual, Vol. I, 1946, pp. 9-23.
13. See for example, Ettinger, "The Jews in Russia at the Outbreak of the Revolution", in Kochan ed., The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917, (Oxford, 1972); see also Greenberg, op.cit.
14. Dubnow, "Der tsveyter khurbn fun ukraine (1768): di' folks-khronik 'mayse gdoyle min uman ve-min ukraine' ", Historishe shriftn, I, 1929, pp.27-54. The same approach is also dominant in the History of Jews in Russia and Poland.
15. Weinryb, B. Neueste Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Juden in Russland und History of Jews in Poland (Philadelphia, 1972); on Mahler, Polen see Festschrift for Raphael Mahler ; on Szacki, see Robert Shapiro, Working Papers in Yiddish and East European Jewish Studies, No. See also Friedman, op.cit.; M, Balaban, Bibliografija historii Zydow w Polsce i w krajach osciennych (Warsaw, 1936).
16. Mahler, Der kamf tsvishn haskole un khsides in Galitsye, (New Yo 1942).
17. See the many works by Jacob Leszczyński on Jewish economic history; see also Mahler, "Anti-Semitism in Poland," in Essays on Anti-Semitism, pp. 111-142, 1942.
18. Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews,
19. Ettinger, "The Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism", Dispersion and Unity, Vol.9, 1969; idem, "The Beginnings of the Change in the Attitude of European Society Towards the Jews", Scripta Hirosolymitana, Vol.VII, 1961; idem, "The Jews in Russia".
20. ed. H.H. Ben Sasson, (Cambridge, Mass., 1976).
21. ibid., p. 856.
22. ibid., 828, 829.
23. Jerusalem, 1974.

FOOTNOTES

1. Friedman, Philip, "Polish Jewish Historiography Between the Two Wars (1918-1939)", Jewish Social Studies, Vol. XI, No. 4(1949), 373-408.
2. Baron, Salo, "Newer Emphases in Jewish History", in History and Jewish Historians, (Philadelphia, 1964,)pp. 93-94.
3. Compare, for example, the treatment of East European Jewish communal history in S. Baron's The Jewish Community and Levitats' The Jewish Community in Russia (1943). While the former stresses parallels and historical continuity with the earliest Diaspora communities, the second work brings out parallels to peasant and other autonomous institutions in the local context, as well as changes within the period discussed.
4. Baron, "Emphases in Jewish History", History and Jewish Historians, p.75.
5. The most important exception was Bershadskii, a nineteenth century historian of Russian Jewry. See also Friedman, op.cit., pp. 400-402, on non-Jewish historians in inter-war Poland. His description elucidates further the hostile and non-interactive nature of the relationship between Jewish and non-Jewish historians in this field.
6. Neusner, Jack, "Two Settings for Jewish Studies", YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, 1974. An exception was Majer Balaban who occupied the chair of Jewish history at the University of Warsaw. See Friedman, op.cit.; Biderman, I.M., Mayer Balaban: Historian of Polish Jewry (New York, 1976), pp. 59-83. YIVO and the Instytut Nauk Judaistycznych in Warsaw were secular institutes for Jewish studies, but isolated from their non-Jewish environment.
7. Baron, Emphases.
8. Dubnow, S., Nationalism and History. Essays on Old and New Nationalism, ed. by K. Pinson; (Philadelphia, 1958).
9. Dubnow, S. , History of Jews in Russia and Poland, 1-III, (Philadelphia, 1920 or New York, 1975).
10. Ettinger, S., "The Hassidic Movement -Reality and Ideals", Jewish Society Through the Ages, ed. H. Ben-Sasson and S. Ettinger, pp. 251-266; Scholem, G. Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, (New York, 1973), pp. 325-350. Although Scholem is critical of the "rationalistic" bias against Hassidism, his own interpretation ultimately views all of Jewish intellectual history including mysticism as a continuous, rational evolution, regardless of geographical and chronological discontinuities.