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TO OUR READERS...

The iconoclastic and sardonic English novelist, Samuel Butler (1835–1902), is credited with having coined the phrase, “God cannot alter the past, though historians can.”1 Butler may have been writing facetiously, but there is truth in his observation. Historians rightfully take great pride when they can lay claim to being the first to reconstruct some aspect of our collective past. As time goes on, additional historical research inevitably leads to the discovery of new information that clarifies, sharpens, or enhances our knowledge of past events. There are even instances when new historical methodologies or new sources of information surface, and then historians strive to revise the historical writings of their predecessors or, to borrow Butler’s words, they “alter the past” in light of new data. This particular edition of our journal will serve to illustrate these interesting phenomena and, in so doing, our reader will again have the opportunity to experience the historical enterprise as a stimulating and dynamic process.

Students of the American Jewish experience who studied with our institution’s founder, Jacob Rader Marcus (1896–1995), are familiar with his many historiographical and methodological “principles” that “The Doctor” called (with tongue in cheek) “Marcusian Laws.” Some of Marcus’s rules were sobering. He insisted, for example, that Jewish indestructibility was directly attributable to a law he dubbed “Omniterritoriality”—the enduring necessity of maintaining numerous centers of Jewish life all over the globe. Many of these Marcusian laws were intentionally humorous: “The mind can absorb only as much as the derrière can endure” or his famous and oft-repeated paraphrase of the Scottish writer John Wilson’s immortal sentence about the sun forever shining on “His Majesty’s dominions.” According to Professor Marcus’s rendering, “the sun never sets on a graduate of the Hebrew Union College.”2

Marcus frequently admonished his students to eschew declaring that “so and so” was the first Jew to live in a particular place or to do a particular thing. The minute that sentence was uttered, he would solemnly warn, someone would inevitably prove that there was another Jew who merited that historical distinction! The first article in this issue of our journal serves as a colorful illustration of this intriguing phenomenon.

American Jewish historians have noted that the first women to function in a cantorial capacity were the “chazantes” who sprang up during the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s. The story of the “chazantes” is fascinating. In 1918, the famous impresario of Yiddish theater, Boris Thomashevsky (1868–1939), produced a full-scale musical comedy based on the story of a cantor’s wife called “Di Chazante.” The wife of a cantor may have been a likely foil for the Yiddish stage, but a half dozen years later thousands of American Jews would be enthralled by the appearance of an American original: women who sang cantorial music.
These women were Jewish trailblazers because, according to the ancient rabbis, the sound of a woman’s voice evoked a seductive aura that fostered immoral thoughts that led a man’s mind astray. Traditional Jewish custom therefore frowned on the idea of having women chant the traditional Jewish prayers when men were in the audience. That a woman would be permitted to chant the prayers during a formal worship service was unthinkable to traditionalists. Yet the coalescence of Jewish and American cultures during the 1920s gave rise to a remarkable new phenomenon: the “chazantes.”

In Yiddish, “chazante” literally means “the cantor’s wife.” Yet beginning in the 1920s, a startlingly large number of women artists began to call themselves “chazantes,” meaning “women who sang cantorial music” or even “female cantors.” Among the best-known “chazantes” were Sophie Kurtzer (1896–1974), Bernice Kanefsky, a.k.a. Bas Sheva (1925–1960), Jean Gornish, a.k.a. “Sheindele di Khazante” (1915–1981), Perele Feig (1910–1987), Goldie Malavsky (1923–1995), and Fraydele Oysher (1913–2003). It has been noted that the most famous of these “chazantes” shared a number of characteristics. They were all dynamic, modern-thinking women with extraordinary vocal talent; each was a woman who had been steeped in Jewish tradition from childhood; and they all possessed a genuine love for *chazzanut* (i.e., Jewish liturgical music). Significantly, the professional careers of these pioneering “chazantes” coincided with the rise of recording, radio, and broadcasting technologies in the United States.

Many have suggested that these “chazantes” marked the beginning of women in the cantorate. Gornish has frequently been called the “first” woman cantor because, in contrast to her peers, “Sheindele” always performed in the satin robes of a cleric with the distinctive cantorial mitre on her head. Although she never led prayers inside of a synagogue, Sheindele “approached the stage as if it were a pulpit and her audience as if it were a congregation.”

The first article in this edition of our journal compels us to revise the history of women in the American cantorate. As a result of Judith S. Pinnolis’s meticulous research, we now know that Sheindele—despite her many noteworthy achievements—was definitely not the first woman cantor. That honor apparently belongs to a talented female opera star named Julie Rosewald, who actually led services at Congregation Emanu-El of San Francisco. Why has Clio, the muse of history, been seemingly blind to Rosewald’s fascinating cantorial career until now? Perhaps because, in contrast to the twentieth century “chazantes,” whose liturgical interpretations were “broadcast, recorded, and preserved for future generations,” Rosewald’s cantorial endeavors occurred long before the age of recording and broadcast technology.

Pinnolis has meticulously reconstructed the entirety of Rosewald’s fascinating and far-reaching musical career. She documents how, as a result of the sudden death of Emanu-El’s beloved cantor, Max Wolff, in August of 1884,
the congregation elected to invite Rosewald to fill the gap. As the child of a cantor and a talented musical artist in her own right, Rosewald possessed all of the qualifications to step in and assist the congregation bereft of its cantor. She succeeded impressively, and the fact that she was a woman cantor did not seem to concern this religiously liberal Jewish congregation. For nearly a decade Rosewald served as Emanu-El’s “Cantor Soprano,” and Pinnolis proves that this capable prima donna actually led the congregation in worship.

Another one of Dr. Marcus’s historical principles was an admonition that “the fact scrubbed clean is more eternal than perfumed or rouged words.” A willingness to expose facts and concomitantly to “interpret them properly” was one of Marcus’s cardinal values as a historian of American Jewry. The second article in this issue of the journal illustrates how the revelation of historical facts enhance our ability to analyze and interpret the past.6

In his study of the early history of Yeshiva College’s student newspaper, The Commentator, Zev Eleff examines how the Orthodox seminary’s pioneering student journalists struggled to negotiate two frequently conflicting instincts. On the one hand, these young Orthodox correspondents wanted to assert their constitutionally guaranteed right to freedom of the press—even the student press at Yeshiva College. This instinct spurred them to engage periodically in testy battles with the school’s administration. It is difficult for young people of any background to challenge those who are in authority—particularly when those authorities are capable of wreaking havoc on their youthful futures. Eleff points out that this was intensely true in the case of the young journalists of Yeshiva College. These concerns were compounded in the lives of the young Orthodox correspondents, who were reared in “a culture that preached obedience to wiser and more experienced elders.”

This article also examines how The Commentator involved itself in campus politics. Most readers will be fascinated by Eleff’s reconstruction of the political intrigue that engulfed Yeshiva College in the aftermath of founding president Rabbi Bernard Revel’s death in 1940. Many may be surprised to read about the heated battle that involved none other than “The Rav”—Rabbi Joseph Dov Soloveitchik (1883–1993), a towering scholar and one of the most venerable and esteemed figures in the history of twentieth century American Orthodoxy. Eleff presents our readers with the “facts scrubbed clean,” and we learn that students associated with The Commentator as well as the student council vehemently opposed those who wanted Soloveitchik to become Revel’s successor as president of Yeshiva. Eleff’s documents provide us with a sophisticated understanding of the religious and political struggles that swept through this academy in the aftermath of Rabbi Revel’s death.

Marcus frequently referred to himself as “primarily a fact man,” and the significance of facts was one of the foundational ideals in his historical methodology. The powerful impetus that drove him to create a major archival center
in Cincinnati, Ohio, was fueled by his conviction that an assemblage of facts was indispensable to the historical enterprise. “I believe,” Marcus asserted, “that in every discipline, every area, every subject there has to be at least one work which supplies the Stoff, the raw material, if only for others to summarize, to reevaluate, and even to reject.”

Future historians will be grateful to Robert Tabak for his efforts to create a foundational reconstruction of the history of Jewish health-care chaplaincy in America. His essay begins by noting that although many histories strive to document the evolution of Jewish military chaplaincy, little has been published on the historical development of Jewish health-care chaplaincy. According to Tabak, the true professionalization of Jewish health-care chaplaincy begins in the aftermath of World War II. Interestingly, the unprecedented surge in the number of Jewish military chaplains during World War II may have actually spurred rabbinical interest in a venue of religious service that was based on “interreligious cooperation,” “a shared sense of mission,” and pluralistic values. Tabak proceeds to document the steady development of health-care chaplaincies in various cities during the last third of the twentieth century, culminating in the founding of the National Association of Jewish Chaplains (NAJC) in 1990. This article constitutes a pioneering effort to preserve the basic data relating to the professionalization of Jewish health-care chaplaincy. In due time, others will no doubt come forward to enlarge and reevaluate Tabak’s groundbreaking effort.

The leading military historian, Michael Howard (b. 1922), once posited that “historians have a responsibility to make some sense of the past and not just to repeat it.” Each author of the major articles in this edition of our journal strives to make sense of the past by analyzing and reinterpreting the primary source documents that have been put at their disposal. The American Jewish Archives takes pride in preserving historical documentation and making it readily accessible to those who, as Mr. Butler noted, must inevitably alter history in order to make better sense of it.

G.P.Z.
Cincinnati, Ohio

Notes

Butler’s quote in full is, “It has been said that although God cannot alter the past, historians can; it is perhaps because they can be useful to Him in this respect that He tolerates their existence.” Cf. Samuel Butler, Erewhon Revisited Twenty Years Later, Both by the Original Discoverer of the Country and by his Son (London: Grant Richards, 1902), 169.
Wilson first coined this famous phrase while writing under his nom de plume, Christopher North, in *Blackwood's Magazine* (April 1829). Wilson wrote, “His Majesty’s dominions, on which the sun never sets.” This sentence was later transformed into the more familiar phrase, “The sun never sets on the British Empire.” Cf. Fred R. Shapiro (comp.), *The Yale Book of Quotations* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006), 555.


The website of the Jewish Women’s Archive (JWA) notes that Jean Gornish “was believed to be the first woman to perform Jewish liturgical music.” See “Jean Gornish” on the JWA’s website, http://jwa.org/archive/jsp/perInfo.jsp?personID=147 (accessed 4 January 2011).


Portrait of Julie Rosewald. Popular Entertainment (Opera Cards #620).
(Courtesy Harvard Theatre Collection. Houghton Library, Harvard University)
Between 1884 and 1893, despite the Jewish tradition of kol isha prohibiting women from singing the lead in synagogue services, a woman soprano soloist served as cantor at Temple Emanu-El in San Francisco. Affectionately called “Cantor Soprano” by her congregation, Julie Eichberg Rosewald (1847–1906) sang the solo parts in all services and directed the music of the synagogue. Rosewald’s role was unique in America until 1955, when Betty Robbins began officiating as cantor at Temple Avodah in Oceanside, New York.2

This paper will lay out a description of the musical career of Rosewald and offer the evidence of her extraordinary role at Temple Emanu-El. Although she was not “invested” as a cantor, she led the services for her congregation, chose the music, served as choir director, and collaborated with the organist. In these capacities, she served the functions of a cantor.3

This role was but one aspect of an illustrious career spanning the worlds of opera and concert stage, to composer, author, teacher, and full professor of music. Rosewald’s life and career, and particularly her singing career culminating as America’s first woman cantor, contribute to our understanding of cultural activities of Jewish women in America. In light of changing nineteenth-century American attitudes concerning the limited sphere of women in music, her accomplishments are all the more outstanding.

In late-nineteenth-century America, new ideologies were beginning to take shape among American women that generally redefined their attitudes toward their roles in society. The ideal of “real womanhood” that had predominated earlier in the century and the nature of women’s proper sphere of work were part of these changes.4 Women became active outside the home in various social and reform movements, including the abolition, settlement house, temperance, and labor movements. Women writers emphasized the role of women as moral guardians of society and nurturers of American democracy.5 Women gained access to higher education, which helped young women “find their way to an independent identity and to help them prepare for achievement.”6 By participating in these various reforms, women began to question the philosophies that relegated them solely to the domestic sphere. Educated women “insisted on greater freedom in the way they dressed, in their choice of friends, and in their selection of lifetime work.”7 Women had gained new insights into their capabilities from their successes.
The concept of the “New Woman,” seen today as a sort of proto-feminist movement, was already widespread among American women by the 1880s. This New Woman was very different from the traditional ideals of womanhood, which defined women’s roles at home and in society. “The New Woman’s primary distinguishing characteristics included both an independent spirit and commitment to a lifetime career,”8 two traits that will be recognized in the biography of Julie Rosewald. The New Woman believed that each individual had the right to fulfill her potential through work, which in turn would improve the moral fiber of society.

Even before the Civil War, American Jewish women were heavily influenced by the general societal ideals of religious roles for women. Women were encouraged to be active in synagogue life, as many Protestant women were in their churches. The 1850s through 1870s witnessed an extraordinary expansion of reforms in Jewish worship that included movements for mixed choirs and mixed seating in family pews.9

Some women were creatively or artistically active in their Jewish and secular world. For example, Penina Moïse (1797–1880), whose poetry appeared in general publications such as The Charleston Courier, The Boston Daily Times, Heriot’s Magazine, and The Godey’s Lady’s Book, also published in Jewish journals such as The Occident.10 In 1842, Moïse published sixty of her religious poems in Hymns Written for the Use of Hebrew Congregations. The revised 1856 edition contained more than 190 of Moïse’s hymns. Many of these works were later adopted as part of the 1897 Union Hymnal published by the Reform movement.11 Her contributions to Jewish life were a precursor to more active involvement by women in synagogues.

The spirit of the late nineteenth century opened new opportunities for women in the Western states. In San Francisco, Emma Wolf (1865–1932) was writing short stories that appeared in local and national magazines. Her 1892 novel, Other Things Being Equal, which concentrated on the struggles of a Jewish woman, was widely read. Another Jewish woman in California, Rachel Frank (1861–1948), was crossing boundaries of traditional Jewish roles for women. Starting in the 1890s, Frank gave sermons in synagogues and published speeches throughout California and in other Western states. The so-called “Maiden in the Temple” caused a sensation, and interested readers of the Jewish press followed her activities. Her admission to Hebrew Union College (HUC) in Cincinnati in 1893 was widely reported.12 Speculation abounded whether a woman might really become a rabbi, as the Reform movement avowed acceptance of more rights for women within the synagogue. Since 1875, when Julia Ettlinger had studied at HUC in the college’s first class, some women had committed to serious Jewish study: “From the 1890s forward, in almost every decade, there were one or more women studying for the rabbinate.”13
It is not surprising that some of the most progressive attitudes came from California, as California was a place “that more than any other appeared from the outset to project—as seen from a Jewish perspective—a sense of America at its most promising, open, and refreshing.” By the 1870s, San Francisco’s openness allowed “Jews of all origins and persuasions … to enjoy the freedom to pursue varied opportunities and lead vibrant lives, to assimilate the best of modern America and the modern world, and to satisfy their special needs as Jews.” San Francisco’s Jews were proud of their large and impressive Reform Temple Emanu-El. “Like no other building in the nation, the region’s cathedral synagogue dramatically came to symbolize the freedom, equality, openness and fraternity of America and of the West for Jews and others.” With this vital atmosphere in mind, it is not hard to believe that in the 1880s, nearly a decade earlier than Wolf’s novel or Frank’s rabbinical studies, progressive and open-minded individuals at Temple Emanu-El could invite a woman vocalist to their temple and permit her to accept a role as a cantor.

How did it occur that Julie Rosewald was chosen as soloist in the temple and became “Cantor Soprano”? After all, San Francisco’s Jewish population by 1870 was the second largest in the United States. The Jews were 8 percent of the overall city population. San Francisco was a booming town with a sophisticated and elaborate opera culture. There were ten opera houses and twenty-seven opera companies with dozens of top-notch singers; between 1880 and 1890 there were more than 1,100 performances reported, and in the next decade there were more than 2,200. Consequently, the city was home to many Jewish people and many fine singers, male and female.

Temple Emanu-El’s request was not proffered to just any singer, for Rosewald was an international singing star with an enormous repertoire that included music used in Reform synagogues. She had a distinguished musical and Jewish background, including the study of Hebrew, through her family of cantors. She sang with her husband, Jacob H. Rosewald, in the Baltimore community, participated in Jewish musical events and charity work, and embarked on a brilliantly successful opera career. The offer for her to serve the synagogue in the capacity of cantor, seen in this light, seems almost a completely natural outcome of her talents, special abilities, and life story, rather than the bold or revolutionary decision it may seem today.

Rosewald’s qualifications alone would not have been enough to enable her to act as a cantor, however, if they had not come to light at a unique time and place. Changes in how American women viewed themselves, combined with societal openness made possible by the New Woman movement and California’s Western spirit, opened the door for “Cantor Soprano.” American women were stretching the boundaries in many areas of society, and Rosewald was able to take advantage of these changes and enter a leadership role in her Jewish world. Indeed, her career may be an exemplar of a Jewish woman who
integrates herself into American values and lifestyle in the nineteenth century while maintaining a strong Jewish identity. Given this societal context, perhaps other Jewish women were similarly enabled, but the record has been glossed over. Therefore, additional examination of the historical record may prove fruitful in identifying other cases of Jewish women’s accomplishments in the arts and elsewhere during this period.

Rosewald’s step onto the pulpit was the culmination of a combination of important factors in her education, training, accomplishments, and Jewish family background. Understanding these factors is important in explaining who she was and provides the context in which her contemporaries viewed her. This context occurred during the era of post-emancipation in Germany and the rise of the New Woman in America. Her background and social milieu help explain circumstances driving her story and triumphal accomplishments. First, this paper examines the musical and family background that brought a young German-Jewish artist to the United States; then her musical training and early singing career; and finally her role as an international opera star, culminating with her extraordinary California career as cantor and pedagogue. In addition, we will briefly look at individuals supporting Rosewald and the Reform Jewish community’s desire for high-level musical performance during worship as timely factors in her success story.

Rosewald’s Background; German-Jewish Women Singers

Growing up in Germany, Rosewald was familiar with the expected roles of German Jewish women. Despite the emergence of Reform Judaism early in the nineteenth century, Jewish women musicians in Europe found themselves relegated to the sidelines within Jewish worship. Attitudes derived from Jewish tradition that the voice of a woman leading men in worship distracted from prayer lingered in many temples. Neither were women allowed to lead services or serve as shaliach tzibbur, the “messenger of the people” or cantor. While some Reform synagogues began to include soprano, alto, tenor, and bass (SATB) choirs in place of all-men and -boys choirs, there were no leadership roles for women musicians. Cantors in European synagogues were all men. For the most part, Jewish women musicians found venues for their creative talents outside the synagogue and Jewish community, in art music and West European culture. There they flourished as musicians, especially vocalists.

Women of the emancipated generation in Germany were often not free to perform in public, however. Fanny Mendelssohn (1805–1847) belonged to that group of middle- and upper-class Jewish women and those newly converted to Christianity who stayed in their salons and homes. Despite the significant recognition Mendelssohn received through her own musical salon and the social status she gained from her family’s conversion to Christianity, she was never able to perform in “public,” as it was considered unseemly. Her brother Felix
Mendelssohn’s seeming opposition to Fanny’s performing in public or publishing music likely stemmed from concerns about public criticism of her work or her social status. She was hesitant herself; so despite encouragement from her husband, Wilhelm Hensel, only in the last year of her life did she publish some of her music. After she died suddenly from a stroke in 1847, Felix published more of it posthumously.21

In the Victorian age, many people differentiated between a female vocalist and a female instrumentalist in evoking sexual undertones in performance. The public was split between those who felt the female voice evoked “the presence of God” and those who felt the female voice was a “siren song” of dangerous temptation.22 Nevertheless, female vocalists in Europe were some of the most highly paid women of the era. They often received expensive gifts. Their portraits might be placed in storefronts alongside those of politicians. They were extremely popular, and “diva reception” was a lure akin to today’s rock idols.

Many emancipated German-Jewish families followed the path set by non-Jews and had their talented daughters musically educated as a socially acceptable “woman’s accomplishment.”23 “German bourgeois women were expected to play the piano and to entertain their husbands and children… . The Jewish bourgeoisie was quick to emulate its counterpart.”24 Occasionally, serious talent was developed in some families, and members would play for each other at home. In terms of public performance, however, Jewish women were in a different position than their counterparts. Because they could not achieve complete social status without converting to Christianity, it is possible that they did not face as great a stigma or loss of social standing as their non-Jewish counterparts by appearing on the musical stage.

Additionally, many middle- and upper-class families made even finer distinctions between their daughters’ giving concerts of vocal art music and performing on the operatic stage, where there was a line that could be crossed to becoming an “actress,” which at that time had tremendous negative connotations. The opera was associated with intense passions. While German families did not have the same deep belief as the English that “constant admiration was an influence likely to degrade the character of the female performing artist,”25 there was still some question of the woman singer being welcomed into respectable society as a diva.

Nevertheless, many of these talented German-Jewish women made their way to the opera and concert stages, including five Heinefetter sisters, three of whom—Sabina Heinefetter (1809–1872),26 Maria, known under the name Stöckl-Heinefetter (1816–1857), and Kathinka (1820–1858)—were renowned in European opera. Others included Jenny Meyer (1834–1894);27 Pauline Lucca (1840–1908); Marie Heilbron (1849–1886);30 Charlotte Sophia von Wertheimer (1795–1877); and Karoline Stern (1800–1850?), to whom Heinrich Heine dedicated a poem.29 Of special note were Marie Sulzer (1828–1892), Henriette
Sulzer (1832–1907), and Sophie Sulzer (1840–1885), daughters of the famous Vienna Obercantor Salomon Sulzer (1804–1890). Some musicians, along with many other Jewish young people of mid-nineteenth-century Germany, immigrated to America.

The Eichberg Family of Stuttgart

Obercantor Moritz Eichberg and Eleanor Seligsberg Eichberg of Stuttgart were the heads of a musically talented family, including three daughters—Pauline, Julia, and Bertha—who went on to performance careers. Moritz was born 18 December 1806 in Bad Mergentheim, Germany, and his wife, Eleanor, was born 14 June 1811 in Bamberg, Germany. The couple was married 23 May 1837. Moritz was the youngest of eight children of Samuel Jonas Eichberg (born 23 August 1757 and died 29 July 1831 in Bechhofen, Germany) and Pauline Beile Low (born 1765 in Affaltrach, Germany). Samuel Jonas was the cantor and kosher butcher in Mergentheim. Moritz followed his footsteps to the cantorate and studied Talmud in Fürth, and then he returned home and joined his father in his duties. In 1832, he sat for the required examinations of Württemberg, Germany, as a school teacher and precentor (cantor) and passed with a grade of “well qualified.” Moritz was invited to Stuttgart to apply for the newly created position of Vorsänger and led the first service there, which included choral music on the Shabbat of Hanukkah in 1833.

The Stuttgart Jewish community, while quite old, had been newly reorganized in 1832, and it became the local rabbinical center. Eichberg was found to be naturally gifted and musically sophisticated, a man of good humor and quick wit. He had fully mastered the southern German chazzanut (Jewish liturgical music) and had a beautiful tenor voice. He was officially hired as cantor in Stuttgart in 1834.

In April 1837 the community purchased a lot, and by October of that year a synagogue stood at 16 Langen Strasse. The building had a women’s gallery and two courtyard staircases, with the Holy Ark, lectern, and bimah (raised platform) on the east side of the prayer room. “Vorsänger Eichberg,” along with members of the royal court band, were deployed for the musical presentations at the inaugural ceremonies. For nearly thirty years the community grew steadily, so that by 1862 a modern, Moorish style building was erected, containing an organ and reflecting the influences of both Reform and high rates of assimilation to German cultural tastes.

The Eichberg family lived opposite the Conservatory of Music in Stuttgart. Their five children were Pauline, born 22 April 1839; Emilie, born 25 November 1840; Bertha, born 5 April 1844; Julia (or Julie), born 7 March 1847, and Antonie, born 26 October 1850. Four of the five children—all but Emilie—were recognized as musically talented.
Julie Eichberg’s Early Education

Julie’s parents recognized her musical talent when she was quite young and “early intended her for the lyric stage,”44 a socially acceptable path for young singers. She was sent at age ten to gain a general music education at the Stuttgart Conservatorium. Around age twelve she won a high honor by being accepted to studies at the Royal Theatre School in Stuttgart. At that time, the king annually selected only two students with “promising voices” from the conservatory to attend the theater school.45 Along with her powerful soprano voice, Julie made an appealing figure. She was 5 feet 1 inch in height, with hazel eyes, dark brown hair, a small oval face with a high forehead, and an aquiline nose.46 She remained at the school for four years.

Unfortunately, the death from typhus of her sister Bertha, an accomplished harpist, just shy of her twentieth birthday on 10 February 1864, caused the Eichberg parents to reevaluate their plans for Julie, and instead they wished her to quit her musical ventures. However, those years at the conservatory and Royal Theatre School had set Julie’s ambitions toward opera and the stage rather than the concert hall or a home parlor.

America

According to one reporter’s interview with Julie Eichberg Rosewald years later, her mother decided to send Julie to America to “break her connection to the German stage.”47 Julie had nearly completed her conservatory studies by the time she left Germany. After traveling through Liverpool, she arrived in New York at age eighteen in May 1865. She was to live with her married sister, Mrs. Pauline Eichberg Weiller, a former concert pianist but by 1865, a piano teacher with two small children in Baltimore.48

Julie and her sister enjoyed a number of years together where they participated in the musical events of Baltimore. For example, they both performed as soloists in the Peabody Institute’s American concert series during the 1867–1868 season and were named as “the chief attractions for the general public.” Pauline Weiller49 and Julie were among the solo performers specifically named by the board of trustees report of 1868 concerning this landmark event. On 24 October 1867 Pauline, Julie, and Jacob Rosewald appeared together at a benefit concert for The Home of the Friendless at the Concordia Opera House in Baltimore.50

Julie had met Jacob Rosewald, a violinist, conductor and composer, around 1865. She married him on 7 October 1866, in Baltimore, with Cantor J. Leucht from Baltimore Hebrew Congregation as officiant.51 The Rosewalds took up residence in a boarding house in Ward 10 of the city.52 Later, in 1880, when Julie and Jacob were touring, they used the home of her sister Antonie and David Oppenheimer, a wholesale jeweler, as their address of record, at 431 West Fayette Street.53
Jacob Rosewald, a native of Baltimore, earned a living as a musician, at various times conducting, composing, playing violin and occasionally organ or keyboard, and teaching music. As violinist at the Peabody Conservatory, he was an important musician in the community. He was also well known as choral conductor of the Liederkranz, a type of Männerchöre, a men’s singing society, which was a common feature in German-American communities. Rosewald composed and published music and taught music in the public schools. He was described as a sweet man who wore glasses and sported a moustache. He had black hair, light brown eyes, and stood 5 feet 6 inches.

Jacob and Julie participated together in the musical life of Baltimore in both the general and Jewish communities. In 1871, he led the Liederkranz and directed the program at the two-day Beethoven commemorations that were held at the Concordia Opera House in Baltimore. Julie sang the solos for selections from the Oratorio “Christ on Mount Olive.” In April 1873, both Julie and her husband participated as musicians in the consecration ceremonies for Bishop Gross. On 18 May 1873, Jacob composed music for the dedication of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum on Calverton Heights. Both he and his wife participated as performers:

About half-past two o’clock, the choir, consisting of about sixty-five voices, comprising the combined choirs of the synagogues of the city, opened the services with the singing of an introductory hymn, Prof. Rosewald, the leader, presiding at the organ. A fervent prayer was then offered by Rev. Dr. Szold. A dedicatory ode composed by Roy A. Hoffman, and put to music by Prof. Rosewald, was then sung by the entire choir with striking effect. A trio in this piece was handsomely sung by Mrs. Rosewald, Miss K. Benner, and Miss Jennie Putzel.

The public performance of women and men in mixed choral groups demonstrates the Jewish community’s coming together for important events with full participation for all. The community made distinctions between what took place in synagogue worship and in the public sphere. Mixed choirs were often used for public dedication ceremonies for Jewish institutions, including synagogue consecration ceremonies. During most of the nineteenth century, even Orthodox congregations in New York, Philadelphia, and elsewhere “saw
no problem in organizing choirs of men and women for their consecration celebrations,” as these ceremonies were not “subject to the usual restraints of Jewish public workshop.”

While Jacob’s father was a stalwart in an Orthodox synagogue in Baltimore, Jacob and Julie shifted toward the newer style of Jewish worship, possibly due to their interest in excellent western European music. By Rosh Hashanah 1873, Jacob was reported as the organist and the leader of the choir for Har Sinai Temple, a synagogue with Reform tendencies that included mixed choral singing. Julie was named among the “lady members” of the choir.

These experiences in the 1860s and 1870s in Baltimore laid a solid foundation for Julie and Jacob Rosewald. They both performed in Jewish synagogue and community events. Jacob served as musical director of Jewish and other choirs, utilizing his familiarity with Jewish synagogue music by playing organ for many holidays and special occasions at synagogues and other Jewish venues. Julie frequently sang in congregational and Jewish community events. These experiences gave them both a solid foundation in mid-nineteenth-century Jewish synagogue music. This accumulated knowledge, in conjunction with their families’ traditional backgrounds—Jacob’s family’s Baltimore Orthodox synagogue and Julie’s familiarity with southern German chazzanut from the home of her father—would lay the groundwork for important developments for Julie Rosewald in future decades.

Julie Rosewald’s Early Singing Career

In the late 1860s, Julie Rosewald began to appear in concerts in Baltimore with great success. Julie “earnestly requested” to study music further in Europe. In 1870, her husband finally agreed. She started her year of studies with Amalie Marongelli in Stuttgart. She then worked with Maria von Marra (1822–1878) in Frankfurt and Pauline Viardot-Garcia (1821–1910) in Paris. Julie was invited to tour Bonn, Salzburg and elsewhere in Europe, but she “declined at the request of her husband and family.” Franz Abt (1819–1885), the German composer of hundreds of the most popular songs of the day, including “When the Swallows Homeward Fly,” asked Julie to accompany him to interpret his songs in his concert tour to the United States in 1872. Abt was greeted at New York’s harbor with a hero’s welcome by Americans, many of whom literally competed to meet him at the boat. The excitement of being on the receiving end of seas of people cheering and greeting Abt must have been highly impressive on the young Julie. Abt was received by huge rallies of the German singing societies, banquets, and torchlight parades in New York, Boston, Washington, Baltimore, Chicago, St. Louis, and other cities. So great an event was Julie’s returning to America with Abt that it was mentioned as part of her achievements in her brief six-line entry in the 1927 edition of Grove’s Dictionary of Music and Musicians.
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On 20 June 1872, Julie represented Baltimore in a large event called World’s Peace Jubilee and International Musical Festival, held in Boston. She sang as part of a large chorus. The listing was given the flowery designation on the program “bouquet of artists.” The program consisted of popular works such as the Anvil Chorus from Verdi’s Il Trovatore; Gloria, from Twelfth Mass by Mozart; and the hymn, “Watchman, Tell Us of the Night,” by Lowell Mason, in which the audience was invited to join along in singing. These types of large-scale, public musical events, often threaded with some elements of American nationalism, were common in post-Civil-War America, but this event was considered monumental and created a national stir. Abt conducted his own music at the World Peace Jubilee. During his tour of the United States, he dedicated some of his songs to Julie Rosewald.

Julie returned home to Baltimore, but she continued to think about the offers in Europe that she had declined. She was not happy about all of the missed opportunities. The various offers only gave her further grounds to believe that she had the skills to do great work on the stage.

Julie’s Opera Career

From then on, Julie Rosewald wanted to sing on the stage and embark on an opera career. The successes and trials of this career would become integral to her American Jewish story. The story reveals not only a ready acceptance by American audiences to a talented Jewish musician in the nineteenth century; it also shows how an American Jewess was able to integrate her American values and modern attitudes with her own identity forged by a strong Jewish family.

In the spring of 1875, unbeknownst to her husband and “on her own responsibility,” Julie arranged for C.D. Hess (1838–1909), an important opera impresario, to hear her sing a concert in Baltimore. Despite her husband’s and family’s objections, Hess then “insisted upon her adopting the operatic stage” and “promised her a permanent engagement provided her debut was a successful one.” Since she was a married woman with a good social standing, her husband and relatives protested strongly against her return to the stage.
Nevertheless, Julie had her way, and she made her debut in Toronto in May 1875 as Marguerite in *Faust* with the Kellogg Opera Company under the direction of Max Strakosch. Julie’s success in Toronto changed her husband’s mind about a career for her in opera. He consented to have her tour.

Clara Louise Kellogg and Hess had already started up a music business relationship in 1873, in which Kellogg managed the “artistic details,” including the music. She planned productions, arranged scores, translated librettos, as well as performed the lead roles in her company. Hess served as “director” and later, between 1877 and 1890, assumed a management role with the Kellogg Opera Company. He persuaded Julie to join this touring English opera company. Prior to this, Julie had only sung in “French, Italian and German,” but in America in the 1870s, opera in English translation was still a norm for many of these traveling troupes.

Hess first engaged Julie for a season in California. Her career skyrocketed as an opera star. She performed in California with Hess’s company at a salary of one hundred fifty dollars a week starting in June 1875 and extending for three months. This high salary mirrors those of other in-demand female opera stars of the era. She gave her first San Francisco performance on 5 July 1875 at Maguire’s New Theatre as Filina in Thomas’s *Mignon*. She followed that with performances on 29 July as Zerlina in Mozart’s *Don Giovanni*, on 30 July as Arline in Balfe’s *The Bohemian Girl*, on 3 August as Lucia in Donizetti’s *Lucia di Lammermoor*, and on 18 August as Catarina in Auber’s *Crown Diamonds*. A reviewer stated, “Miss Rosewald sang the part of ‘Lucia’ effectively, and barring a few faulty intonations, correctly. The mad scene was a grand triumph, and ensured a hearty recall.”

From these roles, we understand that Rosewald sang primarily as a lyric coloratura soprano.
Upon the end of her season in California, Julie was given an extravagant farewell ball on 21 August 1875. She returned in triumph to Baltimore. Kellogg’s troupe gave several performances there in February 1876. On 23 February 1876, Hess received a petition signed by more than two hundred “pupils and personal friends” of Julie Rosewald, to have an additional performance where they could hear her sing. The next day Hess printed the petition as part of his front-page ad in The Baltimore Sun, which stated:

Dear Sir: We, the undersigned pupils and personal friends of Mme. J. H. Rosewald, fearing that some time will elapse before the return of the Kellogg Troupe to this city, and desirous of offering a true token of our appreciation for Mme. Rosewald, both as a lady and as an artist, would respectfully request you, if compatible with your arrangements, to give us an opportunity of hearing Mme. Rosewald a second time in opera before the close of your present season. Respectfully,...

Hess printed many petitioner’s names with the ad. Hess also announced an extra matinee on Saturday. Julie would sing Susanna in Mozart’s Marriage of Figaro, no doubt delighting large numbers of people in Baltimore.

In 1876, Kellogg’s company was reorganized, and Julie became one of the chief prima donnas. “The Kellogg Company as now constituted is, no doubt, one of the best musical combinations in the world,” gushed one report in 1876. Julie performed for the first time in Philadelphia with Kellogg’s company on 21 April 1876, appearing as Prascovina and Natalie in Meyerbeer’s The Star of the North. The next day, The Philadelphia Inquirer gave this review: “The first appearance of Mme. Juila [sic] Rosewald in opera here was one of the items of interest connected with this performance. The lady is evidently not a novice, and sang her part with ease and good taste. Her voice, too, is good, and her method a very fair one.” Julie appeared four times that week in the same opera. An additional review on 25 April 1876 indicated that the Philadelphia audiences were enthralled, showing “their delight at various points with hearty applause.” In addition to appearing with the company, she also concertized around the city with her husband and other soloists outside the opera, as shown through an advertisement for “Doctor Gustave Satter’s Second Grand Concert at Musical Fund Hall” for an appearance on 4 April 1876.

Julie sang with Kellogg for about two years, although not always in featured roles. She sang in eastern American venues such as Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Newark in early 1876, and later that same year in Detroit, Chicago, and further west. Her November appearances in Meyerbeer’s Star of the North in English gained her a fan with a reviewer at the Chicago newspaper The Inter Ocean. Today, these very favorable reviews serve as the best descriptions of her voice and qualities as a singer:
A new prima donna, at least to the Western public, made her debut before a Chicago audience last night. We refer to Mme. Julie Rosewald, a lady who for some reason has not gained the prominence in this troupe to which her talents entitle her. Talent she has, and plenty of it. Her voice for a high soprano has an unusual compass, and it is very seldom that a voice of this character is heard with such beautiful full and clear tones in the upper register. The chest tones are round and rich, and possess strong dramatic quality. The volume is large and the timbre fine, and add to these great agility, flexibility, a fine method, and thorough cultivation, and we have in the ensemble one of the best operatic voices that has been heard in Chicago for a long time. Her delivery is good and so is her phrasing. She has slight imperfections in her style, but compared with her excellencies, these are trivial, and not being traceable to natural defects, will be remedied in time. Furthermore, she acts well. In her score the staccato notes, echoes, and florid passages were brilliantly executed.

The following week the reviewer was even happier with Julie’s role as Filina in *Mignon*, in which she “had better opportunity to display her voice,” and went on in exquisite detail explaining she had “many chances to exhibit the thorough cultivation of her voice.” The reporter pointed out that “Mme. Rosewald’s execution of the entire polonaise and the florid close were very fine, and she was compelled to repeat it, so hearty was the applause of the audience.” The writer then took the opportunity to give the prima donna this message: “It would augment the effect of her vocalization if she could more thoroughly master the vowels and consonants of our language. Very likely this will follow as the result of service on the operatic stage.” The reviewer concluded that she should ease up in the force of emission, which resulted in “an unevenness in the registers and a slight huskiness in the lower tones,” adding that, “With these exceptions we have nothing to say of Mme. Rosewald’s singing save high praise. It is a voice with body and range and feeling in it, and in a role where dramatic quality is a prime requisite we can imagine just how effective it would be.”

After Julie appeared in *L’Étoile du Nord* (Star of the North) as Prascovia, the impressed reviewer conducted a long interview with her and again described her capabilities:

Her voice is one possessing unusual strength and volume. It is finely adapted to the requirements of dramatic music. Its range is over two octaves, with equal strength and roundness in all the registers, from low C to E Flat above the line, an exceptionally high soprano voice. In her singing we have all the pleasure that is derived from a strong and flexible chest soprano voice with dramatic quality, combined with excellent cultivation; especially in the upper register, where the tones are clear and full. The timbre is fine and her method thorough. A severe critic might find some fault with her enunciation of the vowels in the different pitches, on the ground that they are not firm and distinct enough. In some long tones, too, there is a slight want of clearness, probably the result of

---
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a little too much force being used in the emission of the voice. Otherwise it is a splendid voice, and these are small discrepancies when compared with her fine talents. Besides, they are faults which can be remedied with proper care. The cultivation of her voice and its dramatic quality adapt it to both florid and dramatic styles of music. She has a petite figure, makes a pleasing stage appearance, and is a good actress. An earnest and aspiring artist, her future is destined to be a very successful one.100

These types of rave reviews engendered some jealousies within the company, or so the gossip columns suggested. A few days after Chicago, Julie received raves in Detroit, where the press stated: “Miss Kellogg was not feeling very happy that morning. In fact they say that she was more than chagrined at the unequivocal success of Mme. Rosewald on the preceding evening, and the compliments which that lady received in the newspapers of that morning.”102 In general, Julie’s early experiences singing with Kellogg were an excellent start to her career, as the “Clara Louise Kellogg Opera Company is the Crème de la Crème of all our musical gems.”103 Clara Kellogg was a major star in both high-brow and popular circles, and one effusive reviewer described her as “the brightest and sweetest of our musical songstresses. There is a charm in her name, her song and her womanly loveliness combined with exquisite beauty, elegance of style and dress that place her in the front rank of all our American prima donnas.”104 Julie would learn much from Kellogg;105 she toured with her all around the United States, Canada, and possibly in Mexico.106 They “performed about everything popular in the line of grand and light opera.”107 Julie was able to capitalize on her growing reputation and fame in traveling with the Kellogg troupe.

Julie had started off with a repertoire of fifteen operas, which was an extraordinary feat for anyone to master for a three-month engagement. Yet within two years with Kellogg, she had added repertoire from *Crispino e la Comare* (Ricci); *Dinorah* (Meyerbeer); *Ernani* (Verdi); *La Fille du Régiment* (Donizetti); *Fra Diavolo* (Auber); *Der Freischütz*, both leading roles Agathe and Annetta, (Weber); *The Lily of Killarney* (Benedict); *Maritana* (Wallace); *Postillon de Longjumeau* (Adam); *Rigoletto* (Verdi); *Rose of Castile* (Balfe); and *La Sonnambula*
Julie’s powerful technique allowed her to participate in many roles. In the spring of 1877, she toured the West with Hess’s Grand English Opera Company, appearing as Senta in Wagner’s *The Flying Dutchman*. This was “the first representative of the part seen upon the Pacific Coast.”

The company also performed the usual repertoire of *Mignon*, *The Bohemian Girl*, *Faust*, and *Lucia de Lammermoor*. Julie continued to gain in reputation as a prodigious talent. Within a few years, she was an American opera star, and Meyer Kayserling in his book *Die jüdischen Frauen in der Geschichte, Literatur und Kunst* (Jewish Women in History, Literature and Art), published in Leipzig in 1879, wrote that “Julie Eichberg, welche im Stande ist, in vier Sprachen zu singen, gehört heute zu den beliebtesten Opernsängerinnen der Neuen Welt.” (Julie Eichberg, who is capable of singing in four languages, today belongs among the most beloved opera singers in the New World).

For the 1877–1878 opera season, Julie decided on another European tour. On 2 May 1878, Jacob sailed for Europe to join her. On his last evening in Baltimore before sailing, Jacob got together with his friends from the Liederkranz Society for an evening of singing and receiving wishes for a bon voyage. He left the next afternoon on the steamship *America*.

Julie’s European debut took place in Nuremberg, Germany, singing in *Les Huguenots*. In Berlin, she succeeded Hungarian coloratura soprano Etelka Gerster (1857–1922) at Kroll’s theater. She also sang in Amsterdam, Basle, Prague, Frankfurt, Mayence, Stuttgart, Cologne, and Dresden. The American press kept track of her progress, summarizing European reviews. The *Frankfurter Zeitung* was reported to write of her as “an artist by the grace of God, though there is no lack of cultivation either, and musical critics in Germany foretell for her the most brilliant success possible in an artistic career.”

From her European tour, Julie’s reputation gained further international stature when she was lauded by Eduard Hanslick (1825–1904), one of the most influential music critics at the time. His review appeared in the *Neue Freie Presse* in 24 June 1880, and an English translation was published in the *Rocky Mountain News* in Denver, Colorado:
Last week brought us a very interesting star engagement of Madame Julie Rosewald, who appeared as Isabella in “Robert,” and as Gilda in “Rigoletto.” We learned to appreciate in Madame Rosewald, who in the last two years achieved a great reputation in southern Germany, a highly gifted artiste of fine musical culture, possessed of a rich and musical voice of remarkable compass. She stands, in our opinion, in the foremost ranks of our dramatic singers. The engagement of Madame Rosewald at our Royal Opera would have been the more valued because she has an unusually large repertoire. She goes to America, where our best wishes accompany her, but we hope she will soon return to Germany where such singers as she is are not numerous.116

It was with the Dresden Royal Opera that Julie achieved many of her greatest successes. She was offered a three-year contract with the company,117 but her husband wanted to return to the United States, so she turned it down. She returned to Baltimore with him at the end of the season, in August 1880. In all, she had sung in fifty-three operas, appearing with the greats in Europe, such as tenor Theodor Wachtel (1823–1893). Her work in Europe and as a prima donna in Mayence, and especially her time with the Dresden Royal Opera, gave her an ever-increasing caché back home with American audiences.

On 12 October 1880 the Rosewalds participated in a gala marking the 150th anniversary of the settlement of Baltimore. Jacob conducted the orchestra and led members of the Baltimore Liederkranz in a lengthy afternoon program.118

Emma Abbott Company Years

Following Julie’s successes in Europe, the Emma Abbott Company engaged her as a prima donna and her husband as violinist and later as conductor. The Emma Abbott Grand English Opera Company, which Emma Abbott ran both as a prima donna and impresario, was all about popular culture, accessibility, and, according to Emma, morals. Abbott, a native of Chicago, was encouraged by Kellogg to study in Europe, but she did not like it there.119 In 1878 Abbott
married Eugene Wetherell, and together they embarked on forming an opera company, expanding into Grand Opera. Wetherell worked with financial partners, but Abbott made all the musical and artistic decisions.120 Abbott’s productions were in English, with small orchestras and lavish costumes, and were produced in small venues, often dedicating or opening new opera houses.121 Her repertoire consisted of the most popular, established operas. The company “appeared six or seven times a week. She insisted that singers could sing that often without impairing their voices.”122 Abbott was considered “a singer of the people” and her opera company “strictly American.”

Julie Rosewald joined this famous company in fall 1880 and began the season on 6 September 1880 singing the role of Mrs. Ford in Nicolai’s Merry Wives of Windsor.123 Julie became friends with Emma, exchanging techniques and training, although there were also the expected professional jealousies and ups and downs.124 By fall 1881, she sang in New York and elsewhere throughout America as top of the billing in “grand English opera” next to the now-famous Emma Abbott.

Abbott traveled as far west as the Dakotas. She appeared in cities such as Denver and Salt Lake City.125 In Philadelphia, Rosewald’s reviewers warmed to her: “Miss Rosewald was somewhat out of voice at the beginning when she began the ‘Tacea del notte’ [in Il Trovatore]; but her voice developed unexpected power and purity in all of the succeeding scenes. She has certainly never sung any other so well here, and her acting was appropriate, intelligent, and, at times, forcible.”126 Jacob Rosewald worked for the Abbott troupe as violinist and, by 1883, he was billed as director of the chorus and orchestra.127

One of the features of Abbott’s company, and many other traveling opera troupes of that era in America, was the practice of interpolating songs into the operas—that is, having the characters sing local or popular songs as well as the composed arias. The Abbott Company appeared throughout the South and always accommodated requests for popular songs, such as “Home Sweet Home,” as well as popular hymns and other patriotic and sentimental favorites.128

“Emma Abbott Grand Opera Company” (advertisement), The Atlanta Constitution (30 December 1883): 6A.
The Rosewalds appeared with Abbott’s company at DeGive’s Opera House in Atlanta in 1882 and again in 1884.

Julie sang with Abbott’s company as “favorite prima donna” at the National Theatre in Washington in April 1884 and throughout the country during that year.

**Concertizing Artist**

As early as 1880, Julie—although living the hectic life of a traveling virtuoso with the troupe—was also a concert soloist. She participated in fundraising events for the Jewish community using her status as prima donna. For example, she sang at the B’nai Sholom synagogue in Chicago in 1880, which was reported in the *American Hebrew*:

There was quite an assemblage present at the Michigan Ave Temple on Friday evening last; they came not to listen to the *Lacho Dodee*, but to hear the prima donna from the Royal Opera of Dresden, Madam Julie Rosewald. She is a member of the Emma Abbott Opera Troupe, and sang at the personal solicitation of Mr. Marks (the reader of the congregation), who is, I believe, a personal friend. Her choice selections were well rendered and deserved the hearty applause they received. The bird song from ‘Paul and Virginia’ was sung in a particularly happy strain, and was well adapted to exhibit her powers as a concert singer. The singing was interspersed with piano solo and selected recitations by the Misses Bertha Burge, Sadie Gatzert, and Blancha Peck, all of whom received their share of well-merited approval. The amount realized from the entertainment will be a welcome addition to the treasury of the Temple.

The in-demand soprano maintained quite the busy schedule. For example, on 3 February 1881, Rosewald sang with the veteran Signor Pasquilino Brignoli (1824–1884) in *Il Trovatore* at the Chestnut Street Opera House in Philadelphia. She received good reviews, including this one from the *The North American*:

Madame Rosewald has improved very much during the years that she has spent in Europe, and has gained in breadth of style and strength of voice, although at the cost of the purity and clearness of the upper notes. The tones in the middle register are, however, very fine and satisfying. Her acting in the last scenes was forcible and impressive.

By 24 February 1881, the press reported her being in Washington, DC, and two days later, on 26 February, she performed in New York in the first American performance of Handel’s *L'allergo, Il penseroso ed Il Moderato*, with the Oratorio Society and Symphony Society. Dr. L. Damrosch was the conductor, and his son, Walter Damrosch, was organist. Other than being a “first,” the event was apparently not successful.
The New York Times reviewer stated Rosewald “acquitted herself creditably in the lovely aria ‘Sweet bird, that shun’st the noise of folly’” but felt her enunciation was off—a complaint expressed often enough to give the impression Rosewald still sang English with a German accent. She and the others clearly had an off night. The reviewer went on to claim “her voice [was] . . not always of musical quality,” and the other soloists were “disappointing.” She received a very poor review of this concert from The Independent: “Mme. Rosewald, however, did not do at all well, singing not seldom out of time and tune, while her uncertain attack and phrasing made the nervous listener about as uncomfortable as he could well be. The audiences at both rehearsal and concert were for the most part cold and unresponsive.” One wonders whether some anti-Jewish bias was at play here as Dr. Damrosch was also unusually maligned in the same Independent article, while all other performers were given an outstanding accolade. Other reviews had been harshly critical to many that evening, possibly because Handel’s music was clearly unfamiliar to many participants. Nevertheless, it is hard to believe that Julie would have been out of sync rhythmically, even if she had lacked sufficient rehearsal and the society had a bad evening.

For the most part, Julie received rave reviews around the country. The critical Boston audience loved her performances when the Abbott troupe opened there with La Sonnambula and The Bohemian Girl on 26 April 1882.

Mme. Julia Rosewald, an artiste who has enjoyed a long career of successes in her own land, and who, as one of the prima donnas of the Abbott troupe in America, seems to have been received with general favor, made her Boston debut this season at the Globe Theatre yesterday afternoon. The opera was ‘La Sonnambula,’ and it was given of course, in English. There was a good-sized audience in attendance, considering the fact that it was a Wednesday matinee, and its verdict could not but have been gratifying to the prima donna and the company generally. Mme. Rosewald found in the role of Amina excellent opportunity for the display of her finely trained and skillfully managed voice. Her style is so thoroughly finished and her method so excellent that in many respects her performance may well serve as a model. Vocally, of course, Mme.
Rosewald cannot compare with the great prima donnas who have sung of late years, the part of Amina; but her voice is clear and strong, amply sufficient for the interpretation not only of the difficult floriture assigned the role, and adding greatly to the effect of much of the concerted music. Her singing was frequently applauded.

Julie continued traveling extensively, including to Milwaukee (where the press called her “remarkably pretty,”) Denver, Chicago, Little Rock, and New York, where in 1883 she appeared in Strauss’s *The Merry War* at the Cosmopolitan Theater.

**Life on the Road with a Traveling Opera Troupe**

Railroads made extensive travel possible for the touring opera troupes, and they played as many towns as possible when they were on the road. Life on tour was difficult. Meals were often eaten on railroad platforms. Accommodations could be crowded, and the reviews were often filled with gossip. The Rosewalds, as highly respected artists and part of an esteemed touring troupe, did not experience discrimination in the ways many Jews later did. It was reported, for example, in a February 1881 *Washington Post* society column, “City Talk and Chatter,” that the Rosewalds visited “the Willards.” That same week the column reported that judges, representatives, army officers, a senator-elect, and a count from Paris, France, stayed at the same lodgings. There apparently was no ban against a Jewish couple at this exclusive venue, although some places by 1880 had started to bar Jews. No evidence was found that the Abbott company arranged separate accommodations for the Rosewalds during any of their tours.

Tensions, professional jealousies, and the pressures of stardom were another reality of life in an opera troupe, and the press happily joined in the fray. Towns advertised upcoming shows and touted their stars, usually the women singers who led the troupe. Opera-goers frequently bought tickets based on who was performing rather than what opera was being performed. One incident began when two Colorado newspapers started sparring over favored divas. *The Daily Register-Call*, from Central City, Colorado, ran a line on 12 September 1881: “Miss Rosewald is a far superior artiste to Miss Abbott. Everybody acknowledges this fact but the Denver press.” Two days later, on 14 September, *The Daily Register-Call* ran an article accusing the *Denver Tribune* of playing “probably the acurist [sic] and diretiest [sic] trick and most unjournalistic, that has been perpetrated by the *Tribune* on that worthy artiste, Miss Julie Rosewald, since the opening of the opera season in Denver.” The dirty trick was created, the story went, by Eugene Wetherell, Emma Abbott’s husband, who blamed Julie for a poor box office showing for a performance in Denver. According to the article, Wetherell spread a rumor in the *Tribune* that Rosewald had purposely “leaked” that Abbott would not sing on a particular evening. Rosewald had not done that, but Wetherell was covering for the poor turnout for his wife and
trying to blame ticket office refunds on Rosewald. From this story, it seems that Wetherell wanted to insulate his wife from suggestions that Rosewald was the bigger draw or better artist. All the tensions were unnecessary; the house was filled nearly every night. Abbott’s engagement inaugurating Tabor’s Grand Opera House in Denver was lucrative all around. In two weeks the company mounted eight full-length operas. Rosewald sang only on 8 and 14 September in night performances and the remainder in matinees.

A few months later, Julie had a scare in Kansas City, when “she either took or thought she took by mistake cyanide of potassium” instead of a cold medication. A doctor gave her an emetic, and she was soon out of danger. However, given the kinds of jealousies that were portrayed about the two singers, the incident caused a sensation and “extravagant rumors” were spread for some time afterward. One story reported that Rosewald thought a mysterious man was following her “from city to city bent either on marrying her or murdering her, she is not certain which.” It is hard to determine whether this was excessive fan worship—or whether it was even real—due to scurrilous reporting from some of the newspapers.

Another tour story, variations of which were reported widely, was of an oversensitive artist taking out his anger with Jacob Rosewald. According to the report, Jacob had supposedly been prone to whispering condescending remarks about a new member of the crew, a bass named John Gilbert. Jacob, the director of the production, indicated that Gilbert was singing too loudly and drowning out the soprano (Emma Abbott or, on her off nights, his wife Julie). When word got back to Gilbert, he was furious. On 5 December, 1882, Gilbert apparently challenged Jacob about the innuendos in the offices of the National Hotel and

struck Rosewald in the face, knocking him down and crushing his nose. As Rosewald rose Gilbert struck him a second time…. Mrs Rosewald was so overcome that she fainted…. Miss Abbott, who was also present, did not lose the opportunity to put herself in a central position in the tableau and it is vouched for in print by several veracious Philadelphia journalists that she availed herself of the occasion to sing “Nearer My God To Thee” in four flats. One amused reporter concluded that “It is not the conductor who beats the bass but the basso who beats the conductor and puts not a head but a nose on him.”

Despite these types of incidents, the Rosewalds continued for another year and a half until spring 1884 with the Abbott Company.

Opera Star

Just as any other artist, Julie Rosewald promoted herself by granting interviews with reporters in various cities. Some of this publicity created a picture of her as a true and loving wife—the “normal” role for women. In 1881, while
her husband was touring separately, she stated to one columnist, “I do not wish to be separated from my husband again. Just think, 2000 miles separates us. Oh, I wonder if I have letters tonight.” The columnist concluded that “love and wifely affection are feminine characteristics of Madame Rosewald.” Julie’s personal charm and warmth were on display. She knew how to chat and be sociable with anyone. “I would have you forget my profession. I would talk of other things and other people” she told the reporter, endearing herself as one “whom you may well feel proud to call friend.” Her star status, along with her down-to-earth personal charm, were a winning combination. This interview gives insight into the tightrope that a performer needed to walk in pleasing an audience of both traditional and progressive women. On the one hand, Julie convinces the reporter that she shares the ideals of her audience as someone “wifely” and “feminine” who is focused on traditional roles and, in a romantic flourish, pines for letters from her distant husband. Yet in reality, her life as an independent, married, and working woman traveling “alone” was much more in keeping with the character of the “New Woman” in America. Rosewald’s interest in maintaining her own career outweighed any desire to follow along with her husband to his musical jobs. Her public comments paid lip service so she could declare herself an “ordinary” person with whom the audience could identify.

Another aspect of life on the road was touring with large trunks of costumes. Rosewald’s elegant opera gowns—of which she had many, for her large number of roles—were also social news, as many women were interested in the dresses of a singing star:

In her toilettes Madame Rosewald displays great taste…. She was attired in a black satin street costume, with an overdress of silk grenadine, richly trimmed with Spanish lace and jet passementerie. The dress was cut square in the neck and filled in with soft creamy lace, held in place by a butterfly of garnets. In her ears were exquisite cameo earrings and on her wrists she wore jet bands with pearls. In her wardrobe are many very rich, costly and elegant costumes…. A black velvet princesse toilet has a front of solid embroidery in jet. This is a very handsome toilet and is also very becoming. It was made by the court tailor at Vienne, from whom Madame Rosewald purchases many of her costumes…. Another beautiful dress is a white satin damaesse bridal toilet, richly trimmed with pearl passementerie.
with sides of pearl embroidery. The whole dress is beautifully trimmed with lace. Still another noticeably elegant toilet is of cream colored watered silk of heaviest texture, with embroidered bands of morning glories, in exquisite needle work, and lace trimmings.147

Such details added to the mystique of the diva and no doubt increased box office sales.

At the peak of her career, Julie is reputed to have sung in thirty operas in one seven-week period.148 This is not surprising, given the intensive scheduling and philosophy of Abbott’s company. For example, Rosewald appeared at least four times during Thanksgiving week in Baltimore in November 1882,149 and Abbott herself sang twelve times in two weeks in San Francisco in January 1884.150 By 1883, Julie was known to have mastered seventy-five operas, prompting one reporter to claim that “Miss Abbott values her beyond limit.”151 Julie is reported to have had such a prodigious memory that she knew the roles for 125 different operas,152 even memorizing one leading role in a single night before a performance.

The grueling tour schedule began, however, to take a toll. By 1883, a New York critic started complaining about the quality of her voice:

Mme. Rosewald’s appearance lifted the curtain from by-gone days of English opera, and carried her auditors back in memory to brilliant triumphs now almost forgotten. There was a time when Mme. Rosewald had a beautiful voice, which she used with exquisite judgment, but—Troja fuit. She was kindly received last night, and sang the polonaise from ‘Mignon’ with an occasional flash of her former excellence. In her second selection, Abt’s ‘Birdie at the casement,’ she was less successful, but after each song she received the customary recall.153

In 1883, Julie dabbled in publishing some popular music. One song, “My Little Girl,” which was translated from the German, was published by J.N. Pattison in New York.154 While it was still unusual for a woman to compose, by late nineteenth century there was some acceptance, provided the composition was of “cultivated ballads that display the ‘vocal culture’ of the female seminary and a genteel Victorian sensibility.”155 Of course, conventions did not hinder the “New Woman” anyway, and she tried many new activities.

Songsheet frontispiece, Julie Rosewald, My Little Girl, Song from the German (New York: J.N. Pattison, 1883).
(Courtesy Library of Congress)
Julie’s popular song was received well, with the melody declared “exquisite” and written “from the soul of a true artist.” The song “possesses the elements of one of the most taking songs of the day” wrote a Duluth, Minnesota, reviewer, clearly showing a preference for this sort of cultivated ballad elevated as art.

Julie also dabbled in a bit of light poetry. She either wrote or sent in a poem, “Ingredients of a Woman,” to be published in the Kansas City Times; the San Francisco Daily Evening Bulletin reprinted it:

Of vanity and weakness take equal measured parts,
Then, piety and meekness plus charms and wily arts,
Of whims then, and caprices, a handful try procure;
Of wit, quite sharp and stinging, a good supply make sure;
In cauldron then—of envy and temper each a slice—
‘Twill make compact the mixture, and boil quite in a trice;
A pinch of curiosity then in the cauldron throw,
Mixed with love and jealousy, to give the mass a glow;
To make, however, all complete, one thing do not forget;
Without a tongue, there never was a mortal woman yet.

San Francisco

Julie toured with Emma Abbott’s troupe for four years. In 1884, the Rosewalds decided to move to San Francisco, primarily due to Jacob’s health. The doctors ordered him to take it easy and move to a mild climate. As Julie told it, the Rosewalds and Abbott departed on good terms. Abbott was “ever pleased to testify to the rare ability, culture and mastery of music that distinguish Mme. Rosewald from the Atlantic to the Pacific seaboard.”

The decision to move to San Francisco gave the Rosewalds an opportunity to live in a pleasant climate and recover from life on the road and the attendant public scrutiny. Julie announced plans to open a conservatory and to work primarily as a singing teacher and concert artist, rather than tour with an opera company. She and her husband traveled west with her niece, Florence Hecht. Due to her star status, the Rosewalds were of interest to the press, and their trip across the country to California was reported in many local papers as they stopped along the way. The Kansas City Star ran a front-page article on her intended engagements for the next several months in Kansas City and Chicago, and The Denver Rocky Mountain News noted when they “passed through the city.” The Rosewalds arrived in San Francisco 10 August 1884. On 11 August, the papers announced that Jacob Rosewald would assume direction of the Pappenheim Opera Company, with Julie as a member. Other articles reported that Julie would be primarily spending her time teaching. Indeed, once she moved to San Francisco, Julie for the most part had left the opera stage, although she continued to give concerts, participate in charitable events, and travel for engagements out of town. She is not listed as a participant on the opera stage in San Francisco.
By mid-August, the Rosewalds were settled at 1018 Van Ness Avenue, where Julie set up a music studio, expecting to open it by the first of September 1884. A parlor grand Knabe piano made expressly for Jacob arrived by 16 August.\(^{165}\) However, despite all these preparations, shortly after their announced arrival in the city, Julie’s career would take an unexpected turn.

**Cantor Julie Rosewald**

Within a few weeks of her arrival in San Francisco, the Jewish community called on the Rosewalds for help in a musical emergency: Cantor Max Wolff (1839–1884)\(^{166}\) had succumbed to illness. Wolff had served Temple Emanu-El, the largest synagogue in San Francisco, for ten years, from 24 May 1874 until his death on 30 August 1884. At the time, the congregation was well established, generally flourishing, and wealthy.\(^{167}\) However, it was recovering from a period called by some members of the congregation the “seven years of famine” from the heavy burden of paying for the mortgage of the magnificent, stately building on Sutter Street. The building—the “new sacred edifice and its grounds”\(^{168}\)—had taken fifteen years to complete, nearly twenty years earlier.\(^{169}\)

In addition, the health of the beloved Rabbi Dr. Elkan Cohn (1820–1889) was failing. When Cantor Wolff died in August, less than a month before the High Holidays, it then

...threw the entire burden of the service upon the aged Rabbi. In this emergency the Congregation was able to engage the services of Madame Julie Rosewald, wife of the musician and composer, Jacob Rosewald, and herself a singer of note and remarkable gifts; and it must be stated, to the honor and credit
of that gifted woman that her fine appreciation of the needs of the service
greatly delighted the Congregation and gave her an honorable place amongst
those who served Emanu-El well and faithfully.170

Upon Wolff’s death, Julie must have been contacted nearly immediately to sing
in the worship services, because she started her work with the congregation as
soloist on that Rosh Hashanah. By 26 September 1884, The Jewish Progress
reported that, “The services of the various synagogues on Rosh Hashanah
were thoroughly in accord with the solemnity of the occasion…. The singing
was a feature of the service, Mrs. Rosewald at the Temple Emanu-El filling her
arduous position with great credit.”171

Remarkably, Julie’s role as cantor of Emanu-El has been—somehow—
largely forgotten or lost. Her name is not mentioned in the modern histories
of either the congregation or of Reform cantorial music. Yet the role was well
documented in its time. An article by Henrietta Szold (1860–1945)172 in volume
10 of the Jewish Encyclopedia, originally published sometime between 1901 and
1906, includes the following in the entry about Julie Rosewald:

For ten years, while living in San Francisco, she was a member of the choir
of Temple Emanu-El, singing and reciting, in place of a cantor, the parts of
the service usually sung and recited by that functionary—the only instance
known in which a woman has led the services in a synagogue. [italics and
emphasis added].173

Szold also wrote Rosewald’s biographical entry in the 1904–1905 American
Jewish Year Book, which states that Julie was “for ten years solo soprano at Temple
Emanu-El, San Francisco, during that time singing and reciting the parts of
the service usually sung and recited by a Cantor, in place of that functionary.”174

The American Jewess, a journal aimed at a female Jewish audience,
published an 1896 article “The Jewess in San Francisco” further corroborating
Rosewald’s role:

The name of Mme. Rosewald is synonymous with music. As the mention
of a flower recalls its perfume, so her name suggests a world of melody. For
years she was the principal singer in the choir of the Temple Emanuel and
is at present a teacher of voice culture at Mills Seminary. In every musical
venture she is interested, and her influence has done much toward sustaining
a high ideal in matters musical.175

This article, written while Julie was still actively engaged in her career, provides
an additional independent report that describes her in her long-term capacity
as a “principal singer” at Temple Emanu-El.

The length of Julie’s service as a cantor argues that she served as more than
an “emergency substitute” for the cantor.176 Her lengthy service may have been
due to fiscal restraints, or possibly the reasons were more about the “delight
of the Congregation.” In any case, she was retained for more than nine years in the singing role of the cantor and, as reported, led the services and directed the organist.\textsuperscript{177}

Further evidence that Rosewald’s role was more than a mere substitute for the missing male cantor comes through an extended tribute article written after her passing. In \textit{The Emanu-El}, the congregation’s weekly publication, Rabbi Jacob Voorsanger (1852–1908) answered some of the questions about the nature of her work and attitudes toward her as premier soprano of the Temple:

Her position in that respect was exceedingly unique. She came to her duties almost immediately after the death of Cantor Wolff and for a number of years, in collaboration with the late organist Schmidt, she controlled and directed the music of the services until her retirement shortly after the advent of Cantor Stark. During all these years Madam Rosewald, often lovingly called the “Cantor Soprano,” made her services a source of the greatest delight to all of her hearers. She combined the highest degree of musical ability with a pious disposition and a fair understanding of Hebrew, having been trained in the school of her late father who was Cantor at Stuttgart, Germany. It was this remarkable combination that made the services of the Temple in her time attractive in the highest degree and gave pleasure as well as edification to the numerous attendants. In this work she was also assisted by her late husband, the late J.H. Rosewald, a master of music of the highest order, and the services rendered by the Rosewalds to the Temple Emanu-El constitute a piece of history that will not easily be forgotten.\textsuperscript{178}

In an earlier article in \textit{The Emanu-El}, Voorsanger referred to Julie as “the distinguished singer in Israel,”\textsuperscript{179} a term (along with “sweet singer in Israel”) often associated with cantors.

“Cantor,” which means “singer” in German, began to supplant use of the Hebrew \textit{hazzan} following the lead of Salomon Sulzer, chief cantor in Vienna. The term initially was associated with Reform understandings of the cantorate. Many American Reform synagogues of this period got along without a \textit{hazzan}, as the organist or choral director often had musical authority. Strong musical leaders “could put their stamp on a synagogue.”\textsuperscript{180} Referencing Julie Rosewald as “Cantor Soprano” and recognizing her leadership in choosing music and directing the choir was yet another indicator of the acceptance she had as a leader.
who helped shape the musical direction of the temple.

To further understand how Julie came to the position as cantor, it is essential to remember that she was potentially the perfect candidate based, in part, on her knowledge of the cantor’s art. As a German Obercantor’s daughter who studied in her father’s school, she knew the liturgy intimately. She also knew a considerable amount of Hebrew. While not entirely rare, a woman with Hebrew skills was still unusual in nineteenth century America. Rosewald benefited from her early education under her father’s tutelage. Jewish education for women in 1850s and 1860s Germany had grown beyond a time when “women’s religious education was minimal, consisting of a mixture of morals, religion, reading, and writing,” usually in German or Yiddish. In many parts of Europe, rabbis in Reform settings were teaching girls in schools and women played an ever increasing role in congregations. Still, her skills exceeded that of most of her female contemporaries.

Additionally, she was part of a highly involved Jewish family with extensive experience in performing Jewish music publicly. She had frequently sung as a soloist with her husband at the organ at various Jewish occasions. It was also not uncommon in San Francisco at that time to engage women as musical soloists in churches. The Jews of Temple Emanu-El would have felt comfortable emulating their Christian neighbors in having a female musical soloist lead the congregation.

In addition to her unique qualifications Jewishly, Julie had sophisticated musical taste, a wonderful voice, a prodigious memory, and was a quick study at any music. She was also a highly respected, world-class, nationally renowned singer, a star of the operatic stage. Opera crossed the boundaries of popular and elite entertainment, and her reputation was widely known. She had just spent the previous decade experiencing a nineteenth-century version of today’s Hollywood celebrity. In San Francisco, her singing continued to be in demand outside of Jewish circles, as well—she participated from time to time in the choir of the local Catholic Church (and later sang at ecumenical events, such as the Thanksgiving Day services at the Central Presbyterian Church on 26
November 1884).\textsuperscript{185} Given Julie’s accomplishments and the open spirit in California, one can easily imagine how the board or the overburdened Rabbi Cohn would have raised her name to ask her to fill in until a “real” (that is, male) cantor could be secured.

The timing of the Rosewalds’ arrival in San Francisco had been a fortuitous coincidence for the congregation’s emergency need. Yet, even after Dr. Jacob Voorsanger was elected “junior rabbi” of the congregation on 14 June 1886 to replace Abraham Illch (1858–1885)\textsuperscript{186} and relieve the pressure from Cohn, Julie continued in her role for another seven years. During that time, Jacob Voorsanger became senior rabbi in 1889. Having started his own career as an Orthodox cantor, Voorsanger had transformed himself into an eminent Reform rabbi, writing widely in the American Jewish press, and culminating his career with the position at Temple Emanu-El.\textsuperscript{187} As a self-educated man,\textsuperscript{188} he may have been more open to people who gained expertise on their own. Not only cantors, but “many American rabbis of the nineteenth century had little rabbinic or academic training,”\textsuperscript{189} so a lack of “credentials” was not a barrier to placement in synagogues at that time. Furthermore, Voorsanger was publicly a “militant Americanist, ever embattled and unsparing in his denunciation of virtually all Jewish custom and traditions that might make Jews appear oriental and unwestern.”\textsuperscript{190} No doubt he would have viewed a woman singer as a perfectly acceptable part of Western tradition and the exclusion of women as part of an illogical cultural past. Voorsanger’s influence would, without doubt, have been instrumental in keeping Julie in the position of “Cantor Soprano.” If he had opposed her in that role, it is unlikely her tenure would have lasted as it did.

Julie’s roles as soloist and cantor at Temple Emanu-El were reported openly to the greater San Francisco community; her status was well known throughout the city. The local newspaper,\textit{The San Francisco Daily Evening Bulletin}, ran an announcement in 1888 confirming that Julie had selected the music for the upcoming High Holiday services. “During the approaching Jewish holidays a large number of new compositions will be heard here for the first time, having been recently imported by Mme. Julie Rosewald, the cantor soprano of Temple Emanu-El.”\textsuperscript{191}

It is important to note that the reference to Julie as “cantor soprano of Temple Emanu-El” was in conjunction with public promotion of her to the general community as the arbiter of new, quality, and tasteful music. That year, she introduced Felix Mendelssohn’s “Hymn of Praise,” (from his Lobgesang) written for Queen Victoria’s Jubilee, and a new soprano solo by Saint-Saëns. She also brought to temple services for the first time “standard choruses” of Haydn, Mozart, Gounod, and Hiller, as well as compositions by the local temple organist, Louis Schmidt, an in-demand church organist who also started a symphony club and founded an early San Francisco conservatory. Additionally, Julie added “Hear ye Israel,” from\textit{Elijah}, as well as selections from Beethoven
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and Mendelssohn. It is very likely that the “standard choruses” were those that later found their way into the 1897 edition of the *Union Hymnal*. These would be, “O Worship the King (Psalm 104),” set to music by Haydn; “Not Alone for Mighty Empire,” set to music of Mozart; “O Lord of Hosts (Out of the Deep),” set to Gounod’s music; and “Praise O Jerusalem” from “A Song of Victory,” by Ferdinand Hiller (1811–1885). The Hiller song is taken from a larger work, *Israels Siegesgesang* (*Israel’s Victory Song*) for soprano solo, chorus and orchestra: *op. 151* (1871), with the English adaptation by J. Troutbeck (1832–1899). The piece had received an enthusiastic London debut in 1880 and had been widely adopted in the Jewish community, so that by 1897 it was included in the listing of one hundred published anthems appropriate for synagogue use in the *Union Hymnal*. These anthems were primarily musically patterned after Protestant hymns or adapted from well-known classical music selections, just as the ones Julie introduced to Temple Emanu-El.

Bringing new music to the congregation was a major feature of Julie’s role as a cantor. Many nineteenth-century Jewish congregations relied on their (often Christian) organists for music and choir direction. There was little published liturgical music in the United States at that time that was specifically Jewish. For the most part, each congregation had to rely on local resources, and the repertoire was “based on contemporary European classical favorites, above all the music of the bourgeoisie, tastefully performed by the cantorial soloist while the worshippers sang hymns directly inspired by four-square, four-part Protestant standards.”

It is also likely that the musical selections Julie brought to San Francisco emulated the pattern established by Cantor Alois Kaiser (1842–1908), who worked in Baltimore’s Oheb Shalom congregation starting in 1866. During the years the Rosewalds lived and worked there, Kaiser started writing new synagogue compositions, using a prayer book by Rabbi Szold as liturgy. “Cantor Kaiser transposed operatic arias and classical composition to be used as melodies for the synagogue.”

The texts were mostly...
in English. The Rosewalds undoubtedly knew Kaiser through the Szold family and musical connections, and Julie would have been familiar with his work.

At the memorial services for Rabbi Elkan Cohn on 7 April 1889, Julie sang the solo selections, including “Oh, Stay Thy Tears,” from Beethoven, and the solo parts of “Lord, What is Man?” by Bach. The service for this beloved figure was well attended by Jews and non-Jews from the San Francisco area.

It cannot be verified whether Julie’s role as “Cantor Soprano” was a paid position. Most Temple Emanu-El records were destroyed in the great earthquake and fire of 18 April 1906, with only the brick structure of the building surviving.

Both Jacob and Julie Rosewald had backgrounds that qualified them to serve in various capacities for temple worship. Jacob often was ba’al k’ria, a Torah reader. It is well documented that singers in San Francisco’s synagogue choirs of that period were trained professionals, and many vocalists vied for these positions.

To the credit of the synagogues, it should be said that they pay … the largest salaries. With a cultivated taste for the best music and with a love for the majestic chanting and reverent choral responses, the Jewish people have always contributed liberally for the choirs…. They have always sought the best singers and the fact of employment in one of the synagogues was a certificate of excellence.

Professional musicians were hired to handle the difficult music that amateurs could not master. Originally, many Reform choirs in the United States were voluntary, but after the 1840s, “good music” was especially valued and incorporated into the services.

While Reform congregations throughout America in this era hired professional musicians, these mixed choirs of men and women were the subjects of continuous debate in the national Jewish press. These debates touched on the legitimacy of Reform Judaism and the appearance of Judaism to the non-Jewish world. Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise had advocated including women in choirs, but the debates continued over four decades. Wise had argued not only against the Talmudic prohibition of women singing but that such an attitude to exclude women was not part of a general Western musical world view. By the 1880s, mixed choirs were part of the Reform landscape. For example, in 1885 The Temple in Atlanta had the best-trained voices they could afford. “In many other Reform congregations of that time the emphasis was on good music and technically-trained singers, which meant, for most of them, Christian music and Christian musicians.” Organs were introduced after 1838, with the first organ in Charleston, South Carolina. By the 1880s, the use of organ accompaniment during Jewish worship was widespread in cities with Reform congregations.
The regular Sabbath music Julie used in services over the course of her tenure is somewhat conjecture, but it likely continued as adaptations of classical repertoire requiring trained musicians. Music at Temple Emanu-El strived to be sophisticated and elaborate. Julie introduced compositions from temple organist Louis Schmidt. Judging from this, one can surmise that the majority of compositions came from high-level standard classical composers and local contemporaries such as Schmidt.203

San Francisco’s Temple Emanu-El did not seem to have been infected by the new “cantorial craze in America which raged throughout the 1880s and 1890s” with the influx of eastern European Jews.204 The temple leaders believed that a cantor should be someone who could raise the level of musical performance and provide decorum to the services, not necessarily someone to give extended improvisatory chazzanut. The temple board took their time to replace their professional full-time cantor until they found the right person, which indeed they did in Edward Stark, the cantor who succeeded Julie Rosewald in late October 1893.

Stark eventually became known as a leading American cantor and synagogue composer. The years between Wolff and Stark are precisely the years that Julie was called upon to step up and serve until a new official cantor could be found.

Early records of the Sabbath services under Cantor Stark also give clues as to the musical nature of the services during Julie’s tenure. One such record describes the complexities and functioning of cantor, choral, and organ roles. The cantor soloist stood below on the pulpit to sing, while the choir and organist, and occasionally orchestral instruments, performed in the balcony, including during the High Holidays.205 The distance between the choir loft and the bimah was described as some thirty feet below the choir. The director, facing the congregation, was able to signal the organist and the choir by means of an electric buzzer. 206

Cantor Stark initially worked with the same organist as Julie, Louis Schmidt. Schmidt’s continuity as organist probably led to a similar continuation of musical style in the services, until Cantor Stark started composing his own works and bringing in his newer, eclectic style.207 Later, Julie was a fellow faculty member with Schmidt at the Mills Conservatory of Music.
In addition to their musical ventures, Jacob Rosewald was involved in business, and he and Julie amassed considerable wealth. Jacob was on the board of directors for the Enterprise Mutual Building & Loan Association and is recorded as dabbling in real estate speculation and “flipping” properties for quick profits. The Rosewalds lived in an expensive neighborhood and were listed in the directory of San Francisco’s Jewish elite. Their names appeared in the local newspapers at society dinner parties and socials, and they enjoyed all the status of the wealthy in the San Francisco Jewish and general community. They gave generously to local community and Jewish charities and often performed at charitable fundraisers and fashionable musical evenings. They must have owned some impressive riches—for example, an article in the local newspaper described the loss of Julie’s expensive jewelry, some of which were “investments.”

As a member of the wealthy class, Julie could travel. On 26 May 1888, for example, she sailed on the Umbria to England and then went to France. She spent a few months during the summer in Paris, staying at 11 Rue Volney, just a few short blocks from the Paris opera house. She also used the time and traveled to Switzerland and elsewhere in Europe.

Julie Rosewald is noted to have enjoyed lifelong work, a commitment typical of the New Woman. Toward the end of her tenure with the temple, she was approached to start the vocal department at Mills College. She did so, fulfilling her original, albeit delayed, vision in settling in San Francisco. All of this activity presents a solid résumé of continuous employment, from the stage, to the bimah, to the lecturn.
Voice Pedagogue in San Francisco

As a teacher in San Francisco, Julie was highly regarded and widely recognized: “Her success as a vocal teacher, has been that of a material genius, and beyond all question she is recognized as incomparably the Marchesi of the Pacific Coast.”213 She became a private vocal coach and principal music teacher in the singing department at the Conservatory of Music of Mills College in 1894, after her retirement from Temple Emanu-El.

Between 1870 and 1900, women were quickly added to rolls at American colleges. In 1870, “less than one-third of all American colleges admitted women, by 1900 almost three-fourths did so.”214 The addition of a female vocal coach would have been part of the explosion in higher education for women, especially in the arts, which was part of the general trend for the New Woman.

Julie served as professor of vocal music at Mills College from 1894 to 1897, although the Jewish Encyclopedia placed her as professor there through 1902, the year when she retired from “professional activities.” The discrepancy may be due to an emerita status.

Julie was forward-thinking in many respects. In 1891, previous to her employment at Mills College, she published an important volume, How Shall I Practice? Practical Suggestions to Students of Vocal Music, which outlines in detail her vocal technique and methods of pursuing good tones. This volume tries to help women singers liberate themselves physically (at least somewhat) from the confining dress of the day. As part of this method, she taught practical breathing exercises for women vocalists.

She recommended: “Breathe naturally, like a man or an infant whose ribs have never been compressed by stays.” She went on to say: “Divested of your stays, and with loose clothing, assume a recumbent position, without a pillow, so that the shoulder blades strike a flat surface.” After explaining the breathing technique, she continues: “In a few days you will be able to go through this breathing exercise when fully dressed and wearing your stays, remembering, however, that the latter should be worn at all times as loosely as possible, and fastened merely with an elastic cord.”215

This approval of women wearing more sensible clothing became one of the characteristics of the New Woman,216 and Julie’s advice and the attitudes

it conveyed were widely read. Her book received favorable reviews; according to one, “she brings efficient aid to the learner by a clear and simple method of practice based upon scientific knowledge and rational exercise of the vocal organs.” Julie’s recommendations on breathing and wearing loose clothing made a favorable impression outside the music world as well. Her breathing techniques were quoted in medical journals, and her instructions about loosening stays became part of wider discussions on the negative impact of this confining clothing style for all women. Her advice also emphasized the importance of deep breathing.

Julie’s music teaching method was considered on a par with the best of the Italian school of vocal technique at the time. A number of her pupils went on to stage and concert careers, including Marie Bernard (1865–1945), who sang with the Mendelssohn Quintet Club of Boston and, as Marie Barna, with the Damrosch-Ellis Opera; Carrie Millzner Hamilton (1868–1946), of the Bostonians opera company; Rita Newman Fornia (1878–1922), who sang with the Metropolitan Opera and the Kaltenborn String Quartet; Sybil Sanderson (1865–1903), who went on to sing with the Opera Comique in Paris; Anna Miller Wood, a mezzo contralto of Boston, who sang with the Kneisel Quartet and the Boston Symphony Orchestra and also enjoyed success on the stage and as a singing teacher; Jennie Winston, a soprano who became head of the vocal department of the Marlborough and Girl’s Collegiate School and was a soloist at Immanuel Presbyterian Church; Mrs. M.E. Blanchard, who became head of the department of vocal music of Mills College and solo contralto of St. Joseph’s Roman Catholic Church and the Geary-Street Synagogue; and Mabelle Gilman, who became a comic opera singer.

Julie was so well known as a top musician that businesses wanted to use her name for prestige. In 1900, ads for a local music company, Heine Piano, appeared with her name, promoting a product that claimed to be endorsed by “all prominent musicians.”

In April 1887, the pianist Samuel Fabian returned from a successful European tour and connected musically with the Rosewalds. His first concert was with full orchestra, and Julie sang for part of the event. Later that year, on 20 October 1887, Jacob Rosewald initiated a chronological series of four educational reviews that presented the musical pieces from each time period. Fabian performed, as did Julie and two of her pupils, Marie Bernard and Carrie Millzner. The works started with a concert of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and showed “evidence of the interest taken in the study of music on the Pacific coast.” “Mr. Rosewald prefaced each number with brief remarks concerning the composer and the period in which he lived and worked.” Julie also performed in the second concert, which took place on 4 November 1887. The evenings continued and were so successful that they were considered one
Jacob Rosewald was active in myriad pursuits in San Francisco, including conducting, lecturing, and writing. One of his happiest pastimes was writing sketches for the High Jinks, a series of outdoor entertainments of the Bohemian Club. In early October 1895, Jacob was unanimously elected as conductor of the Philharmonic Society of San Francisco. He was never able to really serve in that post, however. On 24 October, Jacob was visiting friends at the Bohemian Club when, around 8:00 PM, he experienced pain in his side. He went home to rest, and by midnight he was experiencing extreme pain. His fatal heart attack came at around 3:00 AM Friday, 25 October 1895, and he died almost immediately. As he was one of America’s most famous conductors at the time, Jacob Rosewald’s sudden death was reported around the country.

Julie Rosewald’s Later Years

After her husband’s death, Julie Rosewald took a trip east to Baltimore and presumably visited with family there. She had returned to San Francisco by 31 December 1895. For several years, Julie taught and engaged in an independent lifestyle in San Francisco. She had always exhibited an unconventional streak—continuing on the musical stage after marriage, serving as a cantor—and now, she followed other new trends. One such trend was the New Woman’s participation in sports or “sweaty athleticism,” as society’s view of exercise as detrimental was rapidly changing. An interview in the Philadelphia Inquirer discussed Julie’s interest in bicycling, a new and fashionable sport that she engaged in for the health aspects. San Francisco had a new biclorama, located at Market, Tenth, and Stevenson streets, where citizens could ride without braving the hills or testing their brakes in the city. Women could ride separately to retain a level of modesty. Julie, however, used her bicycle everywhere:

Even with the closest inspection I have failed to find the tiniest symptoms of spinal meningitis or any other threatening horror. On the contrary, where before I was afflicted with all the small torments that most women suffer from, I am now a perfectly healthy woman, with sound nerves. Three years ago I had rheumatism, neuralgia and all the aggravations a sedentary life can give one. I went East, described all my ailments, and then waited for my course of treatment, my European trip and array of medicine bottles. But instead of what I expected the doctor said: ‘Buy a wheel, and ride every day of your life.’ So I did, and scandalized all San Francisco, while my friends stood by and said: ‘How perfectly shocking! How can you do such a thing.’ But I persisted, and now they have discovered the wisdom of my ways. Wherever I went I took my wheel. My ailments all disappeared, my weight was reduced twenty or twenty-five pounds, and I was strong and well in every particular.

Around 1898, Rosewald decided to leave San Francisco to “travel the world,” and she remained away for about four years. During this time, she began to have
up-and-down episodes of ill health. She went to Baltimore in the winter of 1901 and sang some solos at a benefit concert sponsored by the Baltimore chapter of the National Council of Jewish Women at its fourth annual entertainment.²³⁶

In April 1901, a notice announced that her friends “will be glad to learn of her complete restoration to health and of her intent to return to California during the summer.”²³⁷ Rosewald did return to San Francisco in August 1901, where she took up teaching again. Her arrival in the city was announced in the papers on 1 September 1901.²³⁸ Within a few months, she had reestablished her teaching practice, and on 7 March 1902 her pupils gave a substantial public recital at the Sherman & Clay Hall.²³⁹ Despite all her attempts to stay healthy, Julie suffered from ill health and was forced to try another cure in Europe. She retired from teaching only six months after her return and planned to leave for Marienbad, Germany, in early April 1902.²⁴⁰ This is most likely the reason that she did not participate at any Bohemian Club operatic performance that year.²⁴¹ Sometime between spring 1902 and spring 1906, Julie became a partial invalid.

When she retired from teaching in 1902, Julie Rosewald was one of the most beloved opera singers of her generation. In the article, “Early Opera in America” C.D. Hess included Julie as one of America’s greatest operatic stars²⁴²—high praise indeed, considering how many prima donnas were active...
in the United States at that time.

When San Francisco experienced the terrible earthquake and fire of 18 April 1906, Julie Rosewald’s home at 922 Geary Street and income properties were in ruins. Julie was still away at the health springs in Wildebad, Germany. When she learned of the destruction, she apparently panicked or was in shock, thinking she had been ruined financially. She read accounts of the disaster and had seen a map in the San Francisco quarterly *Argonaut* of the area with burned houses. By May, she decided to leave Germany. She thought she should have to take up teaching again and planned to do so upon her return in the fall to Baltimore, where her sister Antonie still lived. As she wrote in a letter dated 4 June 1906 to the editor of the *Argonaut*:

> Your chart of the burned district showed me that the houses from which I derived my only income had not escaped, and that I, like many other thousands, must take up work again in order to earn enough to live on. What I regret most deeply is that this task must be accomplished elsewhere. I shall have to labor away from San Francisco where I toiled so many years, because that city will for a long time have more pressing needs than for singing teachers.

Originally, when Julie made out her then-current will, she had assets in excess of thirty thousand dollars and had intended to leave large sums of money to charities and relatives. This will specified donations to University of California for a “Rosewald Memorial Fund”; Mills College; Children’s Hospital; and many other charitable organizations helping children. Upon hearing of the great destruction in San Francisco and mistakenly believing she no longer had any substantial holdings through her real estate incomes, she changed her will and sent notification to lawyers in Baltimore, where she planned to live upon returning to the United States. This second will was dated 31 May 1906 and superseded the San Francisco will.

Less than two months later, Julie suffered a sudden paralysis. She was dead within three days, on 16 July 1906, although no one close-by had thought the situation was life-threatening. She died believing that her fortune had been wiped out, as her San Francisco lawyers and financial consultants did not know of her concerns and did not contact her to inform her that her estates were reasonably intact. Her law firm, located at 1817 Jackson Street in San Francisco (the same offices as Buckingham & Hecht, her sister’s family shoe manufactory), did not know of the existence of a second will and sent the first will to probate on 28 July 1906. The considerable and generous charitable gifts were widely announced in the press the next day.

Unfortunately, by early August, the executors of her estate, Bert R. Hecht and Irvin J. Weil, learned of the second will and had the sad duty to inform the various charities that they would not be receiving those substantial gifts, as
“Madam Rosewald, being in Europe, and not fully acquainted with the state of her affairs, believed that her property had so greatly diminished in value that it would not suffice, even approximately to cover the bequests made in her will.” Their hands were tied, and, as they explained to the Board of Regents of the University of California: “While the University will not therefore, receive the legacy which Madam Rosewald much desired to leave it, this is one of the consequences of the calamitous events of last April, and is not due to any diminution of Madam Rosewald’s benevolent intentions, or her respect for and appreciation of the work of the University of California.” The rescission of these gifts was not widely known, and that year, the *American Jewish Year Book* published a report about Julie Rosewald’s gifts based on the originally announced bequests.

Her unexpected passing was mourned by the entire San Francisco community. As one writer stated:

Madame Rosewald leaves a host of mourning friends and disciples behind her. She was an excellent woman and an excellent musician, and her place will not be filled. To have known her was a privilege and a benefit; and her influence will long be felt among California women to whose musical training she devoted her great talent and her best years.

Julie Rosewald requested that her remains be cremated in Germany. Apparently her ashes were brought back to San Francisco shortly thereafter, and interred by her sister Antonie next to her husband’s grave at Home of Peace, a cemetery affiliated with Temple Emanu-El in Colma, California. The name of this sweet singer of Israel was inscribed on the same monument with her husband.

**Conclusions**

Julie Rosewald’s life and career reflect that of an independent, successful Jewish woman and musician. It is sobering to realize, however, that while she was clearly well known and respected during her lifetime, her story has largely been lost both in the musical and Jewish historical record. If such a prominent Jewish woman’s life story has been glossed over within the last century, how many other Jewish women were participating in similar...
progressive and creative ways that have not yet been uncovered?

Here was a woman who was able to achieve fame and stature in America without denying her religion. She performed music as part of the Jewish community and Jewish worship. As a highly appreciated performer, she was free to travel and stay at fine hotels, and she was integrated into her musical troupes, even after marriage. Julie was able to hold a position on the faculty of a college as a full professor and department head. She was a published author and respected musical pedagogue. She did all this while remaining openly Jewish and an active member of a temple, performing as a religious functionary in a large, prestigious synagogue that was influential on a national level—all before 1902. She had a musical career on the concert stage and in the choir loft of her synagogue. She partnered with her husband, a gifted conductor, violinist and educator. Jacob Rosewald’s energies were focused on playing, conducting music and building institutions of good-quality music in the communities in which they lived. They both contributed widely to the local arts scenes, even while being nationally renowned in their respective fields.

Importantly, Julie Rosewald’s career sets the historical record of when a woman first served as a cantor in an American synagogue to 1884. This reflects a Jewish identity fluid with contemporary American beliefs and trends, especially concerning her role as a woman dedicated to an artistic career. Julie’s nine years of singing as “Cantor Soprano” was known in her day both in the Jewish and general communities. Her role was recorded in a widely read Jewish woman’s journal and in the premier Jewish Encyclopedia.

Julie’s view of herself fit snugly with the contemporaneous American movement that came to be called the “New Woman.” This view suited her taste for independence and a lifelong commitment to creative work outside the confines of a domestic sphere. While she did marry, she also lived the life of a career woman and international opera star. She operated in an increasingly open society that experimented and stretched the boundaries of women’s activities, and she stretched that openness into her Jewish world. She was clearly faithful to Judaism as she understood it in the context of the nineteenth-century American Reform movement. Despite traditional Jewish prohibitions against women leading synagogue singing she found her niche in the Reform movement, which not only accepted her as a member of a mixed choir, but allowed her to lead services as a soloist. While her activities as a cantor were not formally ‘sanctioned’ by the fledging institutions of Reform in America, neither was she condemned for her actions. Her congregation and rabbi accepted her role leading the singing as cantor in synagogue. Her “Cantor Soprano” years became a precursor for future American Jewish female cantors.

Julie’s story demonstrates a certain level of success for Jews in the arts in late-nineteenth-century America. True, many Jewish elite in San Francisco and other cities at that time experienced a “parallel society” to the Christian elite.
In the musical world, there were some overt prejudices against Jews, such as exclusion from the then-existing San Francisco Musical Society, which barred the Rosewalds. However, another non-Jewish organization, the Pacific Musical Society, admitted Jews, and Julie was an active member there. For Julie, these proved to be minor issues. In general, as an independent woman, she blended into and was active in both worlds. She achieved relatively high status in both musical society and general society not only by virtue of her fame, money, family connections, and German lineage, but because of her talents, which were needed and appreciated. Her success is merely one of many indicators that America would achieve greatness as a cultural center by welcoming all and providing opportunity to those with talent and ambition. In the United States, a more meritocratic system was forming—and ultimately would prevail—in which being a Jew would not be a decisive barrier to success in the arts. Julie’s life story is one excellent early example of this trend.
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(Courtesy Yeshiva University Archives)

Joseph B. Soloveitchik, rosh yeshiva of RIETS and professor of Talmud
(Courtesy American Jewish Archives)
In a speech delivered before the Alpha of Massachusetts, at Harvard University, Dr. Woodrow Wilson, then-president of Princeton University, spoke about the state of the American college. The future United States president lamented that “the college has lost its definiteness of aim” and has “for so long a time affected to be too modest to assert its authority over its pupils.” Wilson therefore called for universities to reestablish themselves as communities of teachers and pupils and for administrators to cease from devoting too much energy to the business of running colleges. Further, in urging teachers to reacquaint students to the “spiritual side” of books and intellectualism, Wilson noted that it is the sense of community that students required most:

The real intellectual life of a body of undergraduates, if there be any, manifests itself, not in the class-room, but in what they do and talk of and set before themselves as their favorite objects between classes and lectures. You will see the true life of a college in the evenings, at the dinner-table or beside the fire in the groups that gather and the men that go off eagerly to their work, where youths get together and let themselves go upon their favorite themes,—in the effect their studies have upon them when no compulsion of any kind is on them and they are not thinking to be called to a reckoning of what they know.1

President Wilson’s words rang just as true for the 1930s and in today’s time as they did when they were spoken on 1 July 1909. It is difficult—if not impossible—to gauge the progress of a group of young adults by the courses in which they enrolled. For that reason, when Paula S. Fass in 1977 wrote her path-breaking study on American youth in the twenties, she relied heavily on meticulous research of hundreds of articles and editorials published in more than a dozen campus newspapers to inform her work.2

Certainly, if we need close analysis of the college press to evaluate campus culture at the secular university, then it is most certainly essential to examine the unique student experience at Yeshiva College. Founded in 1928, Yeshiva College was the third component of a Yeshiva community that included the Talmudical Academy high school; Yeshiva College; and the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS). (For the purpose of this article, the term “Yeshiva” will refer to the institution in its entirety, while “Yeshiva College” refers to the undergraduate college only.)
Yeshiva was the vehicle driving Dr. Bernard Revel’s vision to modernize Orthodox education in America. The effort began in 1915, when he was elected president of RIETS, the earliest Orthodox rabbinical seminary founded in the United States. Plagued by severe financial constraints since its founding in 1896, RIETS had become more or less fiscally solvent when it merged with Yeshivat Etz Chaim, a school for younger Orthodox students, three years before Revel’s appointment. Upon arrival, Revel made courses in Jewish history and philology available to his rabbinical students and introduced homiletics and other practical training classes to better prepare future Orthodox clergy for life in the contemporary rabbinical frontier. Still, the lion’s share of RIETS’s schedule appeared as something like the old school European yeshivot.

Revel’s second step in modernizing Orthodox education was to establish the Talmudical Academy in 1916, with the thought that he might dissuade Orthodox families from enrolling their children in public high schools. As it was described in the school’s register, the Talmudical Academy was first and foremost a school “in which the regular high school studies as prescribed by the Board of Education of the City of New York” would be taught.³

Yet, while the theological seminary and the high school were certainly billed as modern institutions that perpetuated American ideals and democratic mores, it was singularly Yeshiva College that Revel established to synthesize religious and secular studies. Revel’s hope was that his college could “bridge the chasm between intellectualism and faith.” With this as its primary purpose, Yeshiva College was to serve as a theological laboratory whose most important contribution to American Orthodox life was “develop[ing] a complete Jewish personality.” Furthermore, Revel’s goal—the “blending of the Jewish approach to life with that pointed by modern culture,” of cohesion and conflict between religion and science—would not stand in the way of students’ simultaneously receiving a thorough education in “Talmud and Codes” and an undergraduate education on par with other institutions of higher learning.⁴

It is difficult to evaluate whether Revel’s vision for Yeshiva College was realized. With the exception of a few offerings in Jewish history and philosophy, nothing in the college’s course catalogues suggest that its science and liberal arts classes were any different from the ones at other colleges. However, life outside the classroom, particularly extracurricular life, reveals the ideological struggle of a new generation of American Orthodox Jews determined to wrestle with the European traditionalism of their parents and grandparents and the American culture steeped in modernism. Placed into these terms, we find a group of students determined to test the limits of Orthodox Judaism’s engagement with modernity, long before Jewish sociologists were writing on so-called modern Orthodoxy. That challenge, to create a culture synthesized from traditional Judaism and liberal American life, was the daunting struggle of the first genera-
Yeshiva College students undoubtedly found it difficult to be freewheeling journalists in a small, close-knit Orthodox Jewish community. Except for a few years at the start of the fifties, virtually all Commentator editors-in-chief, from its beginning in 1935 until 1958, were enrolled in RIETS. These students were poring over talmudic tracts and rabbinic texts while they were simultaneously taking courses at Yeshiva College. In all likelihood, they had to brace themselves before stepping out of their dormitory rooms the day after going to press, as they would invariably face the scrutiny of suspicious classmates, deans, and roshei yeshiva (rabbinic heads of school). Indeed, these same journalists who valued freedom of the press were still, to borrow from Irving Howe, “in some deep sense, part of Europe.” They faced numerous situations when they were torn between reporting the news and censoring information that could fall under the halakhic strictures of lashon hara, slanderous speech. Over the years, The Commentator took firm stands on various issues. Yet, the editors did so while cognizant that their role within their college was unlike that at City College, Columbia, or any of the other secular colleges along the East Coast that their siblings, cousins, and friends attended.5

The newspaper’s content reflected this difference. Over the course of its first decade of publication, Zionism was far and away the most talked-about issue facing American Jews, as well as the most recurrent theme in the student newspaper. Stories chronicled the events leading to the establishment of Israel and editorials encouraged greater support from American Jewry. Discussions on the situation in Palestine began with the newspaper’s first issue. There, the inaugural governing board ran an editorial titled, “How Long Will Orthodoxy Slumber,” blasting Orthodox organizations for being less involved in fundraising for the Histadrut than their Conservative and Reform counterparts. “It is a fact,” the piece claimed, “that there are in Palestine today organized groups which, while insisting on the establishment of an enlightened social order on which our friends in the Reform and Conservative Camps place so much
emphasis, draw their inspiration from and remain steadfast to the principles of Orthodox Judaism.\textsuperscript{6}

By the spring semester of 1943, coverage of Zionism and Palestine had appeared on The Commentator’s front page twenty-one times and in fifteen of its editorials. However, beginning on 4 March 1943, with a six-page special issue on the Nazi attempt to exterminate European Jewry, the editors turned their attention toward Europe and the Holocaust. The front page of the edition featured a drawing of a grotesque, blackened hand reaching out of a pool of blood. The only text on page one was a caption below the disturbing image. Quoting from Psalms, the caption read: “Out of the Depths Have I Cried Unto Thee, O Lord!” The edition, described as an “initial attempt” to spread the word, included stories about Jews being loaded into freight cars and referred to several Nazi officers, such as Heinrich Himmler.\textsuperscript{7}

Before the 1943 issue, little was mentioned of European Jewry’s dismal situation. In fact, before Kristallnacht, which occurred on 9–10 November 1938, The Commentator printed just one editorial alerting readers of the Nazis’ imminent terror. The journalists were so ignorant of the Nazi brutality overseas that the annual spoof edition, published at Purim, in March 1942, contained the headline: “Adolph Hitler Was Once Teacher Here.” Regrettably, the fictitious article reported that, “Proud of the distinction of having had this great historical figure as an inhabitant within its portals, Yeshiva will erect a monument to commemorate the occasion.”\textsuperscript{8}

News stories such as these went unchallenged by Yeshiva College administrators, students, and alumni. In all probability, members of the Yeshiva community either agreed with the opinions in The Commentator, were just as ignorant as its writers, or were not disturbed by them to the point that they submitted letters to the editor. Yet, there were occasions, especially in the newspaper’s earliest years, when the journalists clashed with their heads of school. The Commentator editors sometimes felt obligated to report the news despite the tensions that would come to bear. After all, the editors reasoned, their fearless style of journalism was “in line with the powerful undergraduate movement spreading throughout the colleges in America today.” We might conclude that the student journalists preferred to associate themselves with other campus papers rather than the Jewish press.\textsuperscript{9}

Over time, many of the tensions that the Yeshiva College journalists encountered would become front-page headlines and the subject of dozens of editorials. Sometimes, either explicitly or implicitly, deans bordered on censorship when they communicated to the editors their expectations of what they felt was appropriate and newsworthy. The journalists held steadfastly to their positions often, committed to the belief that democratic notions of free speech and freedom of the press were fundamental to developing a modern Jewish college in America. Thus, The Commentator began to assume the role of defender
of Yeshiva College’s core principles. The editors refused to concede that their Orthodox brand of Judaism and the free college press, a hallmark of collegiate culture, could not be somehow harmonized. This, then—the struggle for freedom of the press mixed with the responsibility to keep within the patriarchal standards of a traditional world—is the story we seek to explore.

A Small-Time Newspaper with Big-Time Dreams

The first Yeshiva College graduates made up a small yet diverse group of young men. In the college’s first dozen years, nearly half of its some five hundred students were alumni of the Talmudical Academy. Another 20 percent of the students were drawn to Washington Heights from other yeshivot in the United States and Europe, while the remaining one-third received their secondary education in public schools. Yeshiva College catered to various profiles and interests despite the fact that by the mid-thirties, about two out of five students hailed from Brooklyn’s Jewish community. Students were attracted to the new school for a variety of reasons. Some were committed to the curriculum, which stressed the importance of merging Jewish and secular studies into one synthesized educational model, while another, more pragmatic, group acknowledged the need to obtain a college degree to eventually earn a living. Yeshiva College, this latter cluster of students thought, was the culturally safest place to pursue that goal. Another significant cohort with Zionist leanings enrolled in Yeshiva’s Teachers Institute, a program started in 1917 by Mizrachi leaders where students studied modern Hebrew literature. Still others who fancied themselves iconoclasts sought for the first time to engage in an advanced secular education, despite the harsh warnings from their outspoken European rabbis.10

Certainly, during the Great Depression, academic opportunities were limited for Yeshiva College students. America’s economic collapse was so devastating that in 1930, just two years after opening its doors, administrators considered not introducing a junior year of study. Notwithstanding these hardships, dedicated faculty and students did their best to create a college campus atmosphere, replete with voluntary lecture series and extracurricular programs.11

The long-lasting Masmid yearbook, established in 1929, was the first supplementary school activity at Yeshiva College. Next was the formation of a student government. For many years RIETS had boasted an active student council, the Student Organization of Yeshiva, and in 1930 the college formed its own student board, the Yeshiva College Executive Council, which was reorganized two years later as the Yeshiva College Student Council. In 1934, the student activities committee, under the aegis of student council, started a basketball team, chess club, glee club, and debating society. Another group that got off the ground with immediate success was the international relations club. Established in December 1933, the club met bimonthly to discuss domestic and foreign political issues. After its first year of operation, the political group grew from fifteen founding participants to thirty-three student members.12
The early momentum to develop campus life reached its peak in 1935, when a very active student leadership formed nearly a dozen athletic teams and clubs. The list of new student groups included the Mizrachi Youth, Ibn Ezra Math Club, and Maimonides Health Club, as well as a student cooperative store and tennis and softball teams. In addition, the student loan fund and the employment bureau were set up to help students with their expenses and to find part-time jobs, respectively. Yet, the most impressive addition to the growing number of extracurricular activities at Yeshiva College that year was the establishment of its student newspaper, *The Commentator*.13

Although *The Commentator* was the first and longest-running Yeshiva student newspaper, its origins lie sometime before its first issue was published on 1 March 1935. By the thirties, the Talmudical Academy, founded in 1916, was already an established high school with many extracurricular activities monitored by the General Organization, the school’s student board. Among these early programs were several modest attempts to start a news publication. In 1920, the General Organization printed the *Yeshiva News*, a news bulletin that also contained editorial content. The *Yeshiva News* was given a certain degree of editorial freedom, but the publication quickly collapsed for lack of student support. In 1934, Talmudical Academy students established the *Academy News*, but like its predecessor, it too suffered from lack of student involvement.

Although journalistic activities in the high school certainly contributed to Yeshiva College students’ interest in starting their own newspaper, *The Commentator*’s beginnings were mostly inspired by two factors: the ambitions of a student who would become a longtime Yeshiva College professor, Eli Levine, and another student publication, *Hedenu*, a student-run magazine.14

Levine, who emigrated from Pesotzna, Russia, in 1923, was one of the more motivated members of Yeshiva College’s first graduating class of twenty students, in 1932. Although a chemistry major, Levine displayed his keen literary abilities by involving himself in several publications during the earliest years of the college. As an upperclassman, he was an editor of the *Masmid* and served on the literary staff of the ninth volume of *Hedenu*, the latter activity absorbing the lion’s share of his extracurricular hours.15

For nearly two decades, undergraduates and rabbinical students at RIETS wrote and edited the pages of *Hedenu*. The publication was a modest journal that ran at inconsistent intervals and included a hodgepodge of Hebrew and English Torah-related articles as well as book reviews, editorials, and news briefs. Among its notable news stories, it published articles in 1928 on Rabbi Shimon Shkop’s twice-weekly lectures, and in 1929 it devoted space to the development of RIETS’s Student Organization of Yeshiva. More dedicated to providing Yeshiva news than ever before, Levine’s 1932 volume of *Hedenu* carried an official news section that reported on several Yeshiva news items, including the appointment of Rabbi Joseph Lookstein to the RIETS homiletics
staff. Indeed, _Hedenu_ under Levine’s leadership endeavored to become a true Yeshiva news journal.¹⁶

Levine and the other forerunners of Yeshiva College journalism were in sync with the general collegiate spirit of their time. By the 1930s, if a Yeshiva College student picked up a nearby Manhattan undergraduate newspaper, he might read headlines in City College’s _Campus_ or Columbia’s _Spectator_ calling for an end to administrative oversight and faculty censors. Collegians across the country had heard about how frustrated students had raised funds to start news publications, such as the _Saturday Evening Post_ at Yale and _Tempest_ at Michigan, to avoid the faculty censors imposed on the already-established campus newspapers. The first students at Yeshiva College understood that, due to the strictures of their religious observance, their social climate differed from the kind felt on secular campuses. Nevertheless, the Yeshiva College students were well acquainted with rebellious college life from stories their older brothers and sisters relayed—and, quite possibly, they were envious.¹⁷

Following rigorous Talmud study and college courses, Levine and his small band of editors dedicated what was left of their college day to serving as Yeshiva’s resident “rebels.” Despite a considerable dearth of manpower, the 1932 _Hedenu_ was sharper than previous volumes, as it repeatedly sought to challenge the administration by printing editorials on the weaknesses of the Yeshiva College curriculum and the poor upkeep of the school building. However, after Levine and his first Yeshiva College class had graduated, _Hedenu_ struggled for a mission statement and, in fact, for its very existence. The publication unsuccessfully scrounged to find interesting news items and failed to print many issues. Sensing a need for an about-face, _Hedenu_’s 1934 editorial board tried to reclaim its journal’s identity through a bold editorial. Titled, “_Hedenu_—A New Policy,” the editorial declared:

> It is our belief that now, for the first time, _Hedenu_ sees the light of the day in its true garb, no longer clad in the unbecoming clothes of a student gossip paper given to petty quibbles and foolish dilly-dallyings.¹⁸

All news reporting, it vowed, would be stripped from _Hedenu_’s pages. In its place, the editorial board filled its 1934 issues with Judaica, headlined by reprints of articles by Dr. Albert Einstein and Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, a recent immigrant to Boston.

_Hedenu_’s new editorial direction, which would last until the magazine ceased publication at the beginning of the 1940s, could not have sat well with Eli Levine or the journal’s sophomore business manager, Moses I. Feuerstein. A Boston boy born into one of the most affluent Orthodox families in the United States, Feuerstein came to Yeshiva College with the brains and the connections to change the campus culture. And, after completing a graduate degree in chemistry at Columbia University, Levine returned to Yeshiva College as an
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assistant lab instructor, anxious to help the college increase its student body and resources so that it might support a newspaper. Therefore, it must have been somewhere in the corridors of Yeshiva’s main school building where Levine put the bug into Feuerstein’s head to use his strong connections to Yeshiva’s central administration and petition for a student-run newspaper.19

For Feuerstein, who was destined for a distinguished career in Jewish politics as president of the Orthodox Union and chairman of Torah Umesorah (National Society for Hebrew Day Schools), the dream of forming a student newspaper began in the spring semester of 1934. At the time, “for fear of laughter,” he only mentioned the idea to his closest friends. The following semester David Petegorsky, student council president, appointed Feuerstein, a junior at that time, to head a publication committee “to investigate and to report on the possibility of financing the publication and on plans for its establishment.” Feuerstein’s group reported its progress to student council at every one of its fall 1934 meetings. Plans were soon put into place for a biweekly publication of a four-page Yeshiva College student newspaper. Not surprising, student council quickly appointed Feuerstein to serve as The Commentator’s editor-in-chief. Yet, despite the frenzied pace, plans for a late fall launch were briefly postponed so that Feuerstein could piece together his governing board and secure advertisement.20

Monitoring his apprentice’s work with great pride, Levine saw his vision for a more “newsy” Hedenu transplanted in Feuerstein’s budding success. Here is a letter to the editor written by Levine in the first edition of The Commentator, published 1 March 1935:

In our days of the beginnings of Yeshiva College we, too, had fond hopes of making ours a true College, with a fine variety of extra-curricular activities, clubs and societies to relieve the monotony of mere academic existence. Yet these dreams remained but pious wishes; we were too busy being “pioneers” in a great educational endeavor. We left to you the task of going “collegiate” in real style. And you have done well!21

Certainly, the first governing board took great satisfaction in its efforts. Feuerstein would later write that “the feeling of awe with which the first governing board and then the school received the first Commentator will never be forgotten.” Still, it could not have been easy for the young journalists. Criticism came quickly as Feuerstein found himself constantly dodging patronizing offers “to help the newspapermen with their English.” In truth, however, the copy was for the most part sparkling clean, thanks to news editor Mordecai Gabriel’s dedication to the technical angles of the paper. In fact, Gabriel’s fingerprints were on so much of the newspaper that Feuerstein often had to listen sheepishly when fellow students would ask, “What do you do on the Commie, Moe?”22

Once started, the next obstacle for The Commentator journalists was that none of them owned typewriters. As a result, Feuerstein’s gang managed to
“borrow” typewriters from every part of the school building. It was not until the end of the spring semester when the problem was allayed and the newspaper had its own office, equipped with typographical implements.23

As for the initial content of the paper, Feuerstein was committed to presenting his readers with professional-looking copy—as professional as an amateur collegiate newspaper could look, at least. The inaugural four-column edition reported on student activities and proposed changes to strengthen the quality of the Hebrew curriculum. It did not, however, make a single mention that this was, in fact, the editors’ first issue. In later editions that spring, the student journalists continued in stride, advocating for more Jewish studies and literature courses and petitioning for the postponement of a rumored “School of Business Administration.” The first governing board also penned editorials on broader issues, such as the Zionist efforts of the Conservative movement’s Rabbinical Assembly of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and it levied criticism against Orthodox Jewry’s inactivity on that matter.24

In addition to reporting and editorializing on serious news, the paper also contained a number of humor columns, which often poked fun at the editors themselves. William Kaufman, the newspaper’s first sports editor, many years later commented on the publication’s first editorial squad:

Our dilemma, as expressed so frequently by Moe Feuerstein, was to control a diarrhea of words in the face of a constipation of ideas. But like Pavlov’s dogs once the pen touched the fingers the ink flowed like borscht in the streets of Moscow…. At that, however, it was probably a coefficient of the times. We were the kids of a Depression who couldn’t really take ourselves seriously. There were few of the luxuries around so laughter became a necessity. Of course, there weren’t too many of the necessities around either.25

However, in an editorial titled “Looking Backward,” in the year’s final issue printed on 20 May 1935, members of Feuerstein’s governing board permitted themselves some youthful reflection on their project. Observing how taken the students were with the newspaper’s first semester, the board made sure to end the year with well-deserved self-adulation: “As this issue goes to press,” the editorial began,

the first term of the life of The Commentator draws to a close. The very appearance of The Commentator at the scheduled bi-weekly intervals was already a record breaking phenomenon in the history of the College and student activities. That a tradition so deeply rooted in the atmosphere of Yeshiva could be violated by an immature and struggling young newspaper was merely another omen that even greater surprises were yet in store for the institution.26

Student council’s Petegorsky, who quietly handled the so-called political end of the newspaper, made similar remarks about the paper in that year’s issue
of Masmid. “Raising and crystallizing issues fundamental in their nature, The Commentator led the fight for reform and innovation in a manner hitherto impossible,” the student council president wrote. “It stands forth as the tower in the imposing edifice that will remain as a monument to the work of the 1935 student council.”

The Students Versus the First Dean of Yeshiva College

Thanks to a string of all-nighters at Bergen Press Corporation at 18 South Dean Street in Englewood, New Jersey, which produced the first five editions during the spring of 1935, Feuerstein’s Commentator solidified its place on the Yeshiva campus. The next semester Feuerstein, now a senior, returned, accompanied by most of his original governing board to lead The Commentator the following year. Yet, as it commenced its first full year of publication, its news and editorial content carried on with a predominantly mild tone. Most front-page articles reported on campus clubs and lectures. On page two, Feuerstein’s editorials remained upbeat and at times self-promoting. When students returned to campus in the fall of 1935 to hear of the formal establishment of a Hebrew department—one of the cardinal planks of The Commentator during the previous semester—Feuerstein made sure his readers acknowledged the newspaper’s victory, no matter how small. Several articles in the fall reported on Feuerstein’s speeches before the student body, his unanimous election to chair the Yeshiva College chapter of the American Student Union, and his trip to Washington, DC, where he and two other student leaders represented Yeshiva College at the American Institute for Public Affairs’ annual convention.

However self-aggrandizing these stories were, they apparently were what the readership wanted. One banner headline in the front-page columns that fall told the Yeshiva community of the strong endorsements the newspaper had received from alumni leaders. An editorial printed later in the semester relayed the comments printed by Boston’s Jewish Advocate, which reviewed The Commentator as a newspaper as “full of pep, dash and gossip as any collegiate publication.” The reviewer commented on the lively headlines and editorials as well as the professionalism of the sports editor, who “has apparently mastered sports language.”

The governing board took some issue with the Yeshiva College policies, but it appears that its overwhelmingly benign attitude toward the institution kept the newspaper in the good graces of the Revel administration. In fact, one reader wrote to the paper during that first semester complaining that the total of all the governing board’s editorials “has been some mild and evasive opinions on general questions.” Despite this, the journalists’ generally complimentary pieces on the school’s administration did not cease that year under Feuerstein, whose family maintained a close relationship with President Revel.
Another explanation for the newspaper’s timidity is that Feuerstein and his fellow editors could not be sure how the Yeshiva community would react to saber-rattling college journalists. Although the previous generations of Yeshiva students published newsheets, they were sporadic and functioned more as bulletins to inform students of prayer times and special lectures. Certainly, in an institution modeled after the yeshivot of Eastern Europe, many rabbis and teachers spoke up in opposition when Feuerstein petitioned the administration to start a college newspaper in 1934. And to the consternation of the young journalists, the faculty did not desist from protesting once the publication was underway. Mindful of how hard it was to call in favors and ultimately convince Revel to permit publication, Feuerstein was careful in his first months to straddle the thin line between editing a liberal arts college newspaper and behaving as a respectful yeshiva student.

Yet, it would not be long before The Commentator started to develop a reputation for irreverent editorial columns. Just more than a year after printing its first edition, The Commentator aimed its crosshairs at Dr. Shelley R. Safir, the first dean of Yeshiva College, appointed in 1931. Safir was a “close associate” of Revel and served for many years as principal of the Talmudical Academy. When, in the late 1920s, Revel set about assembling a college faculty, Safir was one of the few men Revel trusted for counsel. It was mostly due to his relationship with Revel that Safir received the deanship.31

However, while he had the backing of the school’s higher administration, Safir’s relationship with the student body was fraught with animosities, which surfaced from the time he assumed the deanship. As time progressed, Safir removed himself from student activities, including the newspaper. In Feuerstein’s three semesters of running the paper, we do not find a single quote attributed to Safir or inclusion of his name in any news story. Instead, campus reporters retrieved Yeshiva College news from Registrar Jacob I. Hartstein. Yet, in the publication’s first year, despite student-organized opposition to Safir, The Commentator omitted any mention of the conflict. This omission is especially noteworthy after considering that, on several occasions that year, editors were called into Safir’s office under threat of censorship and disbandment.32

After two semesters of placating administrators, The Commentator in the spring of 1936 finally devoted significant space to sharp criticism of Safir. Perhaps Feuerstein was aware of the faculty’s growing displeasure with Safir’s handling of the college’s finances in the thick of the Great Depression. Also, with his father’s strong ties to Revel and with knowledge of the president’s deteriorating health and preoccupation with fundraising, Feuerstein must have known that resistance to any attack in the paper would not be forthcoming from Safir’s superiors.33

Teaming up with student government, the newspaper’s front-page headline of the 19 March 1936 issue read:
Reportedly, three days prior to publication, student council held an hour-long session in which members accused the dean of “total disregard” for Yeshiva’s religious ideals, incompetence in fulfilling his role as dean, alienation of students, and behaving immorally in a way unbecoming his office. After hearing the charges, student council established a committee to investigate and report back their findings. In an accompanying editorial, Feuerstein’s board supported student council’s decision to probe the students’ case against Dean Safir but cautioned representatives to engage only in “fair play.” Despite their strategically reserved tenor, the editors could not resist emphasizing that “the charges against Dr. Safir are of such a serious nature that, if substantiated, they would definitely disqualify a man from the deanship of any college, much less Yeshiva.”

The newspaper’s deliberate vagueness in addressing the exact details of student council’s accusations reflects a certain hesitation on the journalists’ part. The serious charges levied against Safir would have made for the kind of controversy that journalists at other colleges craved. Yet, at least in the earliest days, the editors of The Commentator viewed themselves not as a fourth estate, but as a part of student leadership meant to work toward bettering the college. They were both wary of projecting flippancy unbefitting rabbinical students and were, at the same time, college students raring to get involved in the politics of their beloved school.

In a three-page resolution, student council outlined much more grievous indictments than the ones to which the paper alluded. Student council claimed to have in its possession copies of letters from Revel to Safir that proved that the dean mishandled funds for both the college and the Talmudical Academy. In listing Safir’s “acts against Jewish law,” the council reported the following:

Students were sent by the Dean to a non Kosher restaurant for the purchase of meat sandwiches.

Dr. Safir was seen on several occasions driving to and from the Yeshiva in his car on the Sabbath. On one occasion in tennis clothes and with tennis equipment.

Student council also cited the dean’s use of “loud and intemperate language.” However, most astounding of all was the council’s claim that “Dr. Safir has appeared to be unduly intimate with his former secretary.” As a result of Safir’s alleged affair and the newspaper’s very public reporting of the charges, Revel appointed a committee of five Yeshiva College professors to do
whatever you may deem necessary in order to ascertain all the facts in this connection. This includes the calling of witnesses and the examination of all pertinent evidence.

Upon completion of your investigation you will kindly present to me your findings together with your recommendations.36

In a letter from the committee members to Safir, dated 11 May 1936, they informed the dean that they were “happy to state that a great many of these [charges] could be rejected as irrelevant without further investigation. There remain, however, certain others which require examination.” While we cannot know which accusations resulted in Safir’s eventual removal from the deanship, we can be sure that the students were the ones primarily responsible for the dismissal. Further, it is without doubt that Feuerstein and his fellow editors were aware of the details of student council’s charges. Nevertheless, despite enough ammunition to involve the school’s trustees, The Commentator’s self-censored news and editorial treatment of the affair reflects a level of timidity as well as respect for the graveness of the situation. Whether the governing board’s decision was based on respect for Safir’s personal privacy, for the integrity of the college, or in keeping with the strict halakhic guidelines against slanderous speech is also unknowable. What can be said, though, is that to this point, the Yeshiva College journalists were not prepared to conduct their newspaper in the no-holds-barred fashion of most other campus newspapers.

After the March edition and for the remainder of the semester, The Commentator chose to refrain from further direct discussion of the Safir affair. However, with an irreverent punch, it did opt to reprint a letter to the editor from Safir that was originally published in the paper’s inaugural issue that described the newspaper as a “source of gratification” and expressed the dean’s hope that it would “serve as a link to the students and the faculty.” The only other reference to Safir came in The Commentator’s final issue of the year. On the front page, an article released the results of a poll taken of the Yeshiva College senior class. The typical graduating senior of 1936, the article reported, would resign if he were the dean of Yeshiva College. The same news piece acknowledged Feuerstein, who was voted the most popular student, the most likely to succeed, and the school’s “biggest politician”; it also stated that he had done the most for Yeshiva College. In the end, it was the young Feuerstein, very mindful of the boundaries of his political environment, who had his way.37

In the aftermath of the episode, Safir remained an instructor of biology in the college and principal of the Talmudical Academy until he retired in 1963. However, he was forced to resign from his more prestigious post as Yeshiva College dean in June 1936. As one of the principal elements in Safir’s undoing, Feuerstein’s Commentator came out of its first contentious bout of politics victorious. In total, Feuerstein produced fourteen issues in his second
year as editor-in-chief and made sure *The Commentator* located advertising to compensate for the meager fifteen dollars it received from student council. Feuerstein passed the editorial reins to Mordecai Gabriel and headed for Harvard Business School. Yet, it would not be long before he once again figured into more *Commentator* politics.38

**Agitations and Curriculums: Editorializing a Mission**

Student journalism at Yeshiva College began during a time of transition for the college press. At the onset of the 1930s, American collegiate journalism was known for its “unhesitant pandering” to the administration and “devout catering to the institutions made sacred by trustees, alumni and their subordinates.” However, at Columbia University in 1932, Reed Harris, editor of *The Spectator*, broke the mold when he condemned the scandalous operations of the school’s dining halls. The unprecedented editorial, printed in March of that year, was enough for administrators to expel Harris. Although he was eventually reinstated, the dean capitulated only after four thousand students staged a one-day rally at Columbia. Receiving national media attention, the event did more than arouse an entire Ivy League student body; it set off a chain of editorial reaction in campus newspapers across the country.39

In fact, so significant was the Harris episode that one observer stated: “Teachers and others familiar with American student life agreed that the Columbia strike was the most militant student demonstration of recent years.” It was further noted “far and wide that at last American college students were becoming excited over something more important than football and crew.” In fact, the culture of collegiate newspaper writing had changed so drastically that, by the time another student journalist arrived on campus later in the decade, Columbia’s newspaper carried a very different reputation. “*The Spectator*,” the student recalled, “was always starting some kind of a fight and calling for mass-meetings and strikes and demonstrations.” Just a few miles up Broadway in Washington Heights, Feuerstein took great interest in these matters. He and his friends yearned to create that kind of rebellious social climate at Yeshiva College.40

After serving as the newspaper’s first news editor and then as Feuerstein’s second-in-command the following term, Mordecai Gabriel was well prepared to handle all sides of the newspaper—editorial, technical, and political. In an article announcing his promotion in the spring of 1936, the ambitious Gabriel promised disbelieving readers that his dedicated board would produce a six-page weekly publication.41

Upon returning to campus at the start of the fall semester, *The Commentator* editors organized themselves to address several pertinent issues on campus. These included advocating for support for the students’ dramatic society and support for the Jewish settlements in Palestine. Also in 1936, Gabriel’s governing board
would seek to point out the second-class treatment the Yeshiva College student council received as compared with the administration’s treatment of RIETS’s student council, the Student Organization of Yeshiva, whose constituents were perceived as more observant and mature than the Yeshiva College students.

Important as those matters were, they received second billing once Gabriel’s board got word of the faculty’s decision to increase the required time for a Yeshiva College baccalaureate degree to five years, beginning with that year’s incoming class of freshmen. Registrar Jacob I. Hartstein announced the “Five Year Plan” in an article on the front page of the semester’s first issue. “The purpose of the plan,” according to the article, was “to allow for concentration on academic work and at the same time provide a greater amount of leisure for college men taking full programs in the Department of Jewish studies.” Although the journalists were certain that the plan would be met with student frustration, “reliable sources” informed them that, in fact, the previous year’s student council’s alleged strong push for the policy change was the deciding factor. Yet, despite plenty of campus commotion from faculty and students, Gabriel believed the plan had little chance for success with a deanless college, and therefore he did not permit the newspaper to voice its opinion on the issue.

Two months after the plan’s introduction, considerable signs of student frustration manifested themselves, as they had over the Safir affair. If there was any validity to the previous student council’s encouragement of the new policy, the current council reversed its predecessor’s stance to align better with student consensus. Impelled to action by news of the Yeshiva College Alumni Association’s resolution supporting the added year of study, student council issued its own resolution denouncing the application of the Five Year Plan to the current freshmen class.

Also in that issue, the editors, realizing that administrators were willing to make policy changes with or without a permanent dean in place, dropped their editorial silence on the matter with sharp criticism in its editorial pages. Gabriel and his governing board decried the faculty for instituting the Five Year Plan “without any program or design whatsoever.” In addition, although the journalists acknowledged that the policy, in theory, was “a scheme revolutionary in effect,” The Commentator, with “the future of Yeshiva College” at stake, declared:

In attempting to carry out the plan, the administration has already bungled things. Instead of first attempting to enlist the support of the students for its policy, the administration just imposed it upon them, expecting a silence betokening acquiescence. Actually, this manner of procedure has only served to incense student opinion. Under these circumstances, no co-operation can be expected from the students.
Forced by vociferous student outcry, the faculty regrouped to revise its policy. In the new version of the Five Year Plan, students averaging a “B” or higher would be exempted from spending an extra year at Yeshiva College. Those students who failed to maintain at least a “B” would be required to fulfill a limited number of courses during a supplementary fifth year. Efforts to placate the student body failed, however. In a “special meeting” held 30 December 1936, student council voted unanimously against the adoption of the revised Five Year Plan. The newspaper reiterated its opinions about the “absurd” plan, claiming that “instead of intensifying the present course of study, it is simplifying it for those who cannot keep up with it.”45

After two weeks of negotiations with faculty, student council finally agreed to deploy a committee to investigate student opinion of the Five Year Plan and report its findings. If the faculty had any doubt which student group was leading the crusade against the plan, proof came with the announcement of the committee members: Three of four were also key members of The Commentator—Gabriel, Managing Editor Eleazer Goldman, and A. Leo Levin, who would serve as editor-in-chief the following year. Also noteworthy, at the same meeting, student council approved a formalized constitution for the newspaper that provided the editors with autonomous control of its content to its governing board, thereby limiting student council’s involvement to finances, exclusively. The newspaper’s strong influence over student sentiment, it appears, reached all the way to the student body’s elected leadership.46

The Commentator fanned student hostility, which continued throughout the following spring semester. The final story on the Five Year Plan ran in Gabriel’s last issue as editor. The newspaper and student council threatened “extreme action” as their members prepared to rally students against the Five Year Plan. Yet, whatever actions they had in mind were never employed; Yeshiva College policy makers dropped their Five Year Plan that summer. For a second straight year, The Commentator adopted a strong stand against the administration—and won. The newspaper’s reporting of the Five Year Plan far exceeded that of any news coverage in its first two years. Indeed, in their coverage of the charges brought against Safir, Commentator journalists were aided by the editor-in-chief’s significant pull with Revel and prior knowledge that Safir’s job security was already precarious. With regard to the Five Year Plan, on the other hand, the only allies the governing board could count on were its fellow students.47

In contrast to their handling of the Safir controversy, believing that the basic rights of the student body were at stake, the journalists did not struggle with being at the same time a college newspaper—undaunted and daring—and a yeshiva publication—always expected to remain subordinate to the will of the teachers. To the chagrin of its opponents, The Commentator was emerging, at least in the eyes of its editors, as a synthesis of traditionally Jewish and modern sentiments. Accordingly, the newspaper did not hold back, utilizing strident
and oftentimes very cutting language to advance students’ causes. Reflecting on a year of name-calling and sharp accusations, the 1937 student council president lamented that faculty-student relations are “not close enough to assure a mutual understanding and combined effort at improvement of the students’ lot.” Consequently, Yeshiva College students banded together, in spite of faculty and alumni opposition.48

From the faculty’s standpoint, they were without strong leadership to quell student unrest. In addition to operating without a dean, Yeshiva College faculty was mostly without its president. Revel was far too busy searching for funds to keep the school running than to be involved with the day-to-day chores affecting Yeshiva College and RIETS. Already after the first wave of articles on the Five Year Plan, the faculty sensed that the newspaper under Gabriel’s editorship would be more critical of the college than it had been under Feuerstein. For a brief period, a committee to quietly monitor The Commentator was formed under Dr. Moses L. Isaacs, head of the department of physical sciences and secretary of Yeshiva College. Yet, when the committee asked Revel to intervene over the paper’s truculent opposition to the Five Year Plan, he rebuffed, recommending instead “to let the matter rest.”49

Consequently, the battle over the Five Year Plan was, all things considered, the first significant issue about which the undergraduates of Yeshiva College confronted the faculty head-on. In this matter, with The Commentator leading the way, the students demonstrated that they held the upper hand in the early history of the school.50

Be that as it may, students saw a vital need for congenial discussion with administrators. Cognizant of their difficulty to negotiate on policies with a disorganized faculty, they pushed the administration to appoint a dean. Since Safir’s resignation at the beginning of the summer of 1936, The Commentator, perhaps mirroring its own self-appointed role on campus, supported the selection of a dean who represented “the highest synthesis of Torah Judaism with modern secular culture.” Although they were at odds regarding the Five Year Plan, the newspaper received support from the very active members of the Yeshiva College Alumni Association, who were oftentimes more informed about Yeshiva politics than was the newspaper. In various articles throughout Gabriel’s tenure as editor, The Commentator, as well as the Alumni Quarterly, discussed the importance of a dean as the “one person in the position to handle the various aspects of the college program with an eye to their co-ordination.” In the following year, under the leadership of Editor-in-Chief A. Leo Levin, the newspaper increased its coverage of the search for a dean. Again encouraged by vocal alumni leaders, the governing board printed editorials demanding a speedy appointment of second dean for Yeshiva College.51

After a good deal of commotion, an alumni committee recommended Moses Isaacs—one of the original members of the faculty, a college secretary, and the
faculty member who had been appointed to chair the committee to oversee *The Commentator* the previous year—for the deanship. “We are in full agreement with the unanimous contention of the Alumni,” the student newsmen wrote in an editorial, “that Professor Isaacs fulfills the rigid qualifications demanded of the dean of Yeshiva College most admirably.” Within a week, Revel announced Isaacs’s appointment. More than just dean, Isaacs was charged with jurisdiction over curricula, finances, and faculty appointments, and therefore elevated to the title of assistant to the president of the college. Alumni, faculty, and students hailed the move as a positive change for the college’s various programs.52

“Change” was also the word to describe *The Commentator*’s new outlook on Yeshiva College and its new administration. Unlike the situation under Safir, Isaacs granted interviews to the collegiate reporters and access into his proposals to the faculty. The newspaper ran an editorial expressing its conviction that Isaacs would spare no effort to avail himself to students. This belief proved correct and, at least over the next several years, *The Commentator* was upbeat about Isaacs’s various initiatives. Moreover, by way of feeding the paper with stories—the dean would often post news items on a bulletin board outside his office—Isaacs made sure that his superiors, students, alumni, and benefactors read the kinds of stories he preferred them to read. In this way, *The Commentator* became a useful mouthpiece for the young dean looking to hire faculty and add to enrollment numbers. After a few seasons of trial and error, Yeshiva College and its sometimes-contentious, sometimes-obedient student newspaper were finally on the same page.53

However, calamity soon befell Yeshiva with the untimely deaths of President Revel and Rabbi Moses Soloveitchik, RIETS’s senior rabbinic faculty member. Once again, with the young institution facing impending disarray, the undergraduates began to lose faith in Yeshiva’s leadership. Student leaders and editors hastily, and without consulting college officials, prepared themselves for another battle to take place in the pages of their *Commentator*.

**The Rabbi Soloveitchik Affair**

Bernard Revel was explicitly uninvolved with *The Commentator*; there is not a single quotation in its pages attributed to him. Yet, the young journalists—who, along with the entire student body, saw Revel as a true role model—made sure the front page included all news of their president’s many speaking engagements and honors, whenever possible. Students’ adoration and keen interest in Yeshiva’s president even extended to mundane activities, including an article at the top of the 16 February 1938 edition’s front page, with the headline: “Dr. Revel Leaves for Vacation in Florida.” According to the article, a “much needed rest from his strenuous duties at the Yeshiva” was reportedly the impetus for the six-week holiday.54
At that time, the journalists were probably unaware that Revel’s health was fading. As Revel’s biographer notes, many within the Yeshiva community were aware that Revel was severely drained from the anxieties of overseeing Yeshiva’s bleak financial situation. Few, however, were cognizant of the toll the job had taken on his physical fitness. Therefore, when news broke that Revel suffered a cerebral hemorrhage while lecturing to a class of rabbinic students on 19 November 1940, the community was seized with apprehension; the thought of Yeshiva without Revel, for his supporters and detractors alike, was inconceivable. Despite the sobering realization that he most likely would never step into the school again, The Commentator published a passionate editorial praying for the welfare of Yeshiva’s leader. “We are confident,” the paper asserted, “that the wages of such selfless devotion as that of Dr. Revel—long life and health—will be his recompense, and in this spirit we wish him a speedy refuah shlemah,” a full recovery.55

That prayer, along with the prayers of thousands more, went unanswered. Dr. Bernard Revel, Yeshiva’s first president, died almost two weeks later, on 2 December 1940, at the age of fifty-five.

With the institution now in a state of turmoil, several groups—both within and without the school—competed for control of Yeshiva. One group very forthcoming about its attempt to take over was the Agudath ha-Rabbonim. Established in 1902 by European-trained rabbis, the Agudath ha-Rabbonim was a highly influential fraternity dedicated to resisting all kinds of modernization of the American Orthodox synagogue and rabbinate. Consequently, much of its energies were focused on competing against the modern-leaning Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and its brother organization, the Rabbinical Council of America (RCA). Although the Agudath ha-Rabbonim, generally speaking, disapproved of Yeshiva College’s academic interests, its organization was fastened tightly to Yeshiva’s operations. The Agudath ha-Rabbonim appointed the members of the school’s rabbinic advisory board and, until 1936, when the two institutions started to drift apart, RIETS ordination was conferred jointly by Yeshiva and the Agudath ha-Rabbonim. Despite its affiliations, however, and due to the Agudath ha-Rabbonim’s strong opposition to secular studies, there was a widening disconnect between Yeshiva and the rabbinic organization from the time Revel opened Yeshiva College in 1928.56

Only one day after Revel’s demise, leaders of the Agudath ha-Rabbonim sent a telegraph to Samuel Levy, chair of Yeshiva’s board of directors, dated 3 December 1940, informing him of the rabbis’ intent “to supervise and conduct the affairs of the Yeshiva until such time that a worthy successor to the late Doctor Revel is chosen with the approval of the Agudath ha-Rabbonim.” The next day, Levy wrote back to the rabbinic group to let them know he intended to keep all matters of Yeshiva to the discretion of its trustees until a new president would be named. Through a series of letters, a dialogue continued,
basically consisting of the Agudath ha-Rabbonim’s claims to Yeshiva and Levy’s continuous rebuffs.57

After Levy appointed Samuel Belkin, Moses L. Isaacs, and Samuel Sar on 8 December 1940 to serve as the executive committee to temporarily handle Yeshiva’s affairs, the Agudath ha-Rabbonim issued a forceful letter instructing Levy to step aside. In place of Levy and his executive committee, five members of the Agudath ha-Rabbonim were prepared to begin their purported role as the “Directorate of the Yeshiva.” Among the five rabbis were the prominent Eliezer Silver, the head of the Agudath ha-Rabbonim, and Joseph B. Soloveitchik, the brilliant, young leader who served unofficially as chief rabbi of Boston.

The disagreement soon reached the public. Very quickly, it became well known that there were two frontrunner candidates for Yeshiva’s presidency: Rabbi Soloveitchik and Rabbi Leo Jung, spiritual leader of The Jewish Center in Manhattan’s Upper West Side and professor of ethics at Yeshiva College. Reflecting on these events many years later, Joseph H. Lookstein, rabbi of the prominent Congregation Kehilath Jeshurun and Yeshiva insider, recalled that the student body became unprecedentedly involved in the affairs of the board of directors. “Even the students, unbecoming activistic,” remembered Lookstein, “campaigned for or against certain candidates. Such student involvement was happily unknown in those days and at Yeshiva it should have remained unknown.” Thus, with rumors and debates raging through the campus, Student Council President Hyman Chanover penned the following letter to Levy, on 20 December:

We, however, cannot view but with apprehension the activity of groups outside the walls of the Yeshiva who we wish to believe, are motivated by a sincere interest in Yeshiva and in American Jewry. The ideal of Yeshiva and Yeshiva College, which places its emphasis first and foremost upon Yeshiva, on Torah, and then upon the harmonious blending with the secular training, as envisaged by Dr. Revel, has at times been severely criticized by these very same groups. That ideal must be our guiding force. We must recognize the fact that Yeshiva and Yeshiva College are one integrated unit and not two independent ones where the interests of one conflict with the purpose of the other.58

For their part, The Commentator editors teamed with Chanover, who served as editor-in-chief of the paper the year before, to bellow the flames as long as possible. In fact, themes and language from Chanover’s letter to Levy resonated in an impassioned editorial in the 8 January 1941 issue of the paper:

As conceived by Dr. Revel and accepted by those who could understand and appreciate the contribution of the Yeshiva concept, the aim of Yeshiva is the proper integration into an organic unity of our Jewish religious heritage with modern secular culture. The raison d’être thus conceived demands an institution which is to be more than the mere collation of several, distinct
departments. Rather does it regard Yeshiva as a body the members of which function as an organized whole, this whole being in reality greater than the sum of its parts. In these momentous days when decisive measures are being contemplated, students are justified in feeling that this historic aim for which so much has been sacrificed must remain the guiding star of Yeshiva—to maximize its potentialities as a dynamo of spiritual and cultural energy.

They have, moreover, the right to expect that historic aim to be represented in the personality of the man, whoever he be, designated as the successor of our deceased pathfinder.

Yeshiva and Yeshiva College are one, and only one unit. Jewry, then, is looking forward to a continuation of that unity in the appointment of our Rosh Yeshiva and president of the College faculty. He must personify the principles, philosophy and spirit which are the very life breath of our great institution.59

If the political flames had any chance to simmer, it was only for a short while. Just two months after Revel’s passing, Rabbi Moses Soloveitchik, RIETS’s senior rosh yeshiva and father of Joseph Soloveitchik, passed away at age sixty-two. In her memoir, Shulamith Soloveitchik Meiselman, Moses’s daughter, contends that “false and vicious gossip concerning” Joseph’s character weighed heavily on the elder Soloveitchik. “My father,” Meiselman asserts, “was tormented by these reports and finally became debilitated, developing a high fever.”60 Although certainly not meant to be taken at face value, Meiselman’s comments bring into focus the level of political tension stirring at Yeshiva at this time.

At any rate, in a headline that draped the top of its front page, The Commentator announced:

THOUSANDS PAY LAST TRIBUTE TO RABBI MOSES SOLOVEITCHIK

The article detailed the funeral service held in Yeshiva’s Lamport Auditorium. One eulogist, a member of the Agudath ha-Rabbonim, said before an audience of four thousand that Yeshiva’s students “are now left as orphans with both their father and mother, Dr. Revel and Rabbi Soloveitchik, gone.” Yet, according to the article, “by far the most touching words of the afternoon came from the lips of Rabbi Soloveitchik’s oldest son, Rabbi Dr. Joseph B. Soloveitchik, chief rabbi of Boston. He portrayed to the weeping audience how he and his father had continually exchanged profound and intricate matters of Jewish Law.”61

Soon after Moses Soloveitchik’s death, the Agudath ha-Rabbonim again wrote to Samuel Levy. This time, the rabbis reported to the Yeshiva chairman that its members unanimously voted that Joseph B. Soloveitchik should be selected to fill the void left by his father’s passing. The letter affirmed unequivocally that “in accordance with Jewish law and tradition Rabbi Dr. J.D. Soloveitchik
is to succeed his great father as Rosh Yeshiva.” It was also around this time that Levy received a memorandum signed by fifty-eight students requesting that Soloveitchik be appointed to succeed his father. After Levy responded to the Agudath ha-Rabbonim that he would take the suggestion under advisement, the Agudath ha-Rabbonim wrote another telegram to clarify Levy’s “misunderstanding” that its prior communication was merely a “suggestion.” As “the only authority on Torah Judaism in this country,” the group demanded that Soloveitchik assume the post of senior rosh yeshiva, as he “is the lawful heir to his father’s position.”

Meanwhile, on the front page of the following edition of The Commentator, the feature article recapped a special address delivered by Alumni President Moses I. Feuerstein. With more than five hundred in attendance, Feuerstein, The Commentator’s founding editor and one of Yeshiva College’s top graduates, took the opportunity to audibly editorialize about Yeshiva’s current predicament. Ominous politics within the Jewish community in his hometown, Brookline, Massachusetts, motivated the urgent tones in Feuerstein’s speech. Soloveitchik, due to several changes implemented in Boston’s Orthodox community at his behest, had become increasingly unpopular among the rabbinic members of the city’s Vaad ha-Rabbonim. This rift, which eventually turned into scandal and a legal suit filed against him, was exacerbated further when the community’s laity sought to get involved.

While Feuerstein, whose affluent family sided with the Vaad, let others carry on the fight in Boston—much of it in the pages of the city’s Jewish Advocate—he believed he would be most effective on Yeshiva’s political stage, where, despite his youth, he was already something of a celebrity. By this time, Yeshiva administrators and contributors had taken sides in the search for Yeshiva’s next president. The politics surrounding this debate were so loud and complex that many rumors circulated, quite a few with contradicting stories. One report that went uncontested, however, was the Feuerstein family’s position in this drama. Moses Feuerstein’s father, Samuel, maintained close ties with Rabbi Jung and the well-heeled members of The Jewish Center, who contributed toward many of the same Jewish organizations that Feuerstein supported. As for the son, Moses Feuerstein was just beginning to develop lifelong relationships with Jung and his son-in-law, Leonard Rosenfeld. These factors, along with the Feuerstein family’s opposition to Soloveitchik in Boston matters, led the young politician to advocate for Jung’s candidacy. “Yeshiva will stand or fall on the type of leadership rendered by the men who are put into key positions,” Feuerstein predicted in his fiery speech before students and alumni at Yeshiva’s campus. Feuerstein, known as the “golden boy” to the Yeshiva community, warned of precipitous choices and cautioned that “grave danger” stood in the way of Yeshiva’s reaching its grand potential.
To complement the newspaper’s coverage of Feuerstein’s speech, editor-in-chief Ephraim F. Mandelcorn—described as “one man who fears no battles on the Yeshiva front”—appended an editorial that repeated many of Feuerstein’s comments:

Yeshiva must be a smoothly functioning organization consisting of leaders temperamentally capable of working in harmony for the best interests of the institution. It can no longer tolerate internal strife, tending to slacken the bonds of cooperative fellowship.

The realization of the possibilities of such an appreciative leadership is a challenge to the greatest men of traditional Judaism of our age. It is self-evident that there will be many aspirants. It remains the responsibility of those vitally interested in Yeshiva to judge each aspirant on the basis of his qualifications rather than the intensity of his desire for the position or the ends to which he will go to attain it.

Finally, reminding readers of the paper’s earliest bouts, Mandelcorn’s governing board concluded the column affirming that, just as Yeshiva’s student body averted crises in the past, so, too, the “present study body shall ourselves not be found wanting.”

If readers inferred from the editorial that the journalists were sending a warning shot or holding back information on this heated gossip, their presumptions were confirmed in the next issue. Before Feuerstein departed the Washington Heights campus, he informed the editors and student council of all the intimate details regarding Soloveitchik’s candidacy for rosh yeshiva. Most assuredly, as an alumnus of great repute and a former Commentator editor, Feuerstein’s elaborate report went unquestioned.

About a month earlier, the collegiate journalists had praised Soloveitchik for his eloquence in eulogizing his famed father. Yet, they were now convinced that the erudite speaker described in that article was nothing but a façade. For them, all apprehension in releasing the story centered around The Commentator’s role in RIETS. In its earliest years, the newspaper rarely went on record with controversial matters. When it did, as we have seen, the stories were generally muted to some degree and always focused squarely on Yeshiva College politics. Any report on the Agudath ha-Rabbonim’s attempt to install Soloveitchik as the head of RIETS as well as Yeshiva College would broaden the paper’s coverage to concerns beyond the scope of the college proper.

With Feuerstein’s stirring speech reverberating in their minds, the governing board launched its 19 March 1941 issue with an intention to make heads turn. The major headline of that edition, which banded across the front page, read:
AGUDATH HORABONIM ATTEMPTING ‘SMEAR’ CAMPAIGN AGAINST YESHIVA

The article was written anonymously. However, when Yeshiva students still spoke of the piece around campus a decade later, it was well known that Chanover, Mandelcorn, and Rabbi Jung’s son-in-law, Leonard Rosenfeld, were the students most responsible for the copy. Sensing the gravity of this report, not only was the byline of the article given an untraceable pseudonym, the article itself was prefaced with the following disclaimer:

The article which follows has been carefully checked as to reliability and its authenticity is unimpeachable. Because of unscrupulous use of intimidation against those bearing damaging evidence regarding Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik’s record and character, the Commentator is compelled to hold its sources confidential and is permitted to release them only to the Board of Directors upon a formal request.67

Correctly informed of the unrelenting letters sent to Levy, the article revealed that the Agudath ha-Rabbonim had been making “every effort to force the appointment of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik” to the position of rosh yeshiva. The subsequent claims made in the story, however, came from Feuerstein, directly. The young reporters charged that the Agudath ha-Rabbonim vowed to contact all “world-renowned” rabbis, cautioning them “against having any connection with Yeshiva until the appointment of Rabbi Soloveitchik is forced through.” Soloveitchik, they said, would also be contacting those rabbis with the same message. Moreover, the article stated that Soloveitchik allegedly sought an unreasonably high salary from the school, and it charged that he wanted more than just his father’s position:

Rabbi Soloveitchik has let it be known that, if appointed to his father’s position, he would not recognize any existing superior authority in the Yeshiva proper. It is intimated in certain quarters that for Rabbi Soloveitchik the position of Rosh Yeshiva would merely be a stepping-stone to the presidency of Yeshiva and Yeshiva College.68

In what would become their modus operandi when reporting on major stories, the editors appended an editorial meant to defend the school so that the student body should not “stand by idly in the rape of an institution.” The editors accused the Agudath ha-Rabbonim of employing a “tactic of presenting the candidate superficially-admirably suited for the position and yet possessed of that basic character defect which makes him a willing tool or an active partner to its plans.” Finally, in an attempt to win over Yeshiva board members who were presumably doing their best to sidestep “powerful propaganda,” the newspaper concluded:
AGUDAH HORABONIM ATTEMPTING 'SMEAR' CAMPAIGN AGAINST YESHIVA

Author Jan Voltis Is Ex-Yeshiva Inmate

---
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---

Abraham D. Duker
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---

The Commentator's front page assault on the Agudath ha-Rabbonim and Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik (19 March 1941).
Yeshiva is not, nor shall it ever be, the personal property of one single family or clique. It is the common domain of Orthodox Jewry, to which no private interest can ever lay claim. And not all the guns of the Agudath Ha-Rabonim or of its misguided “Hassidim” shall make us a party to turning the Yeshiva into a hopeless jungle of political intrigue.69

Reactions on campus to the article came swiftly. A few hours after the edition hit the stands, school administrators sent a telegram to Levy, recommending the conditional hiring of Soloveitchik. Prior to that, administrators “had studiously avoided taking any position regarding” the appointment of Soloveitchik “on the ground that it is a problem affecting the internal organization of one of the departments of our institution, and not the entire institution.” However, after the newspaper exposed the controversy, the administrators suggested to Levy that “it is apparent, even to the most casual observer that the question has gotten out of hand and is threatening to involve our Yeshiva in bitter controversies which will do no one any good.” Administrators pointed out that Moses Soloveitchik, despite his title as senior rosh yeshiva, was in reality just like all other members of RIETS’s Talmud faculty. “Although he was its outstanding member by virtue of prestige, scholarship and age,” Moses Soloveitchik’s position was “no different than that of any professor.” Similarly, it was suggested that his son, Joseph, “be offered the position on the Talmud faculty occupied by his father for the past eleven years … and that his activities and duties and obligations are not to extend beyond this prescribed limit.”70

To acknowledge their defeat in this matter, The Commentator’s governing board dropped all coverage of politics surrounding Soloveitchik. The lone exception was a brief, muted blurb announcing the board of directors’ invitation to two rabbis, Moses Rosen and Soloveitchik, to lecture as full-time roshei yeshiva at RIETS. Soloveitchik delivered his first lecture at Yeshiva in front of a packed lecture hall on 13 May 1941. Finally, after another two years of search committees and internal politics, Dr. Samuel Belkin, the dean of RIETS and Yeshiva College professor of Greek, was elected Yeshiva’s second president. His commitment to empowering the modern-thinking, English-speaking rabbis of the Rabbinical Council of America severely weakened the Agudath ha-Rabbonim. Ironically, Belkin’s agenda to elevate the RCA as American Orthodoxy’s premier rabbinical group would have been impossible to actuate without Soloveitchik, who would mentor more than four decades of RIETS rabbis. In 1952, Soloveitchik accepted the chair of the RCA’s Halakhah Commission, thereby irrevocably ending his political relationship with the Agudath ha-Rabbonim.71

While many were content to put the entire matter behind them, other students remained indignant over the events surrounding Soloveitchik’s appointment. As head of the executive committee, Moses Isaacs published a response to The Commentator’s opposition to the impending appointment in the following edition. Isaacs’s letter scolded the editors and went a long way to silence them,
but discussions carried on in the dormitory hallways. This is more than evident from Student Council President Chanover’s entry in the yearbook. Without making overt reference to the whole matter, Chanover, one of the most vocal students on this issue, praised the paper for keeping readers informed of turns of events and keeping up its noble fight. “Through its elected representatives and its organ, The Commentator,” he wrote, “a guard of vigilance was maintained by the student body against the ever-increasing pressure of alien groups bent upon penetrating the Yeshiva organism.”

All told, the episode served as a major setback for the newspaper’s relationship with Yeshiva’s administration, specifically with Isaacs. Officials no longer had faith that the paper would stay, with some room for sophomoric ranting, in tune with “what was best for the institution.” What is more, the journalists had demonstrated, through their handling of the Soloveitchik affair, that despite the fact that the periodical was the official undergraduate newspaper of Yeshiva College only, they were willing to cover beats beyond the journalists’ domain. And with a new era beginning under President Belkin, with more at stake for an expanding institution, the undergraduate journalists would soon find their freedom of the press further challenged.

Despite what Feuerstein and the other Yeshiva College journalists wrote in the 1936 yearbook, that “the underlying spirit of The Commentator consisted in a fundamental denial of the right of the administration to assume dictatorial power” over the student body, they nevertheless felt beholden to a culture that preached obedience to wiser and more experienced elders. Although the young journalists were wont to claim that the newspaper’s goal was to promote “democracy inside as well as outside” Yeshiva College, the editors mostly accepted—however grudgingly—their responsibility to promote their institution, even if that meant sacrificing certain freedoms. In the ensuing years, however, editors grew incrementally more comfortable with their role as reporters and defenders of Yeshiva College students. Despite their recurrent indignation, Commentator editors reveled in this encounter and thrived because of it. This, then, as we trace American Judaism back to this time of radical adjustment, may well be the “real intellectual lives” of the first Yeshiva College undergraduates, the seedlings of modern Orthodoxy in America.
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The Emergence of Jewish Health-Care Chaplaincy: The Professionalization of Spiritual Care

Robert Tabak

Until recently, our only means of training new chaplains was by ‘apprenticing’ them to older chaplains for a number of weeks. However, the need for scientific training of chaplains has long been felt by us. …

—New York Board of Rabbis, ca. 1950

This article examines the development of civilian Jewish chaplaincy in the United States—service in hospitals, geriatric care centers, mental-health facilities, prisons, and other settings including Jewish community chaplaincy. The discussion below does not include Jewish military chaplains, whose numbers today are much smaller but about whom much more has been written.

The development of a professional field is sometimes only recognized in hindsight. In general terms, professionalization can serve a number of purposes, including fellowship with others in the field, raising the image of the profession, providing continuing education, excluding those deemed incompetent or poorly trained, and seeking recognition from governmental or other official bodies. Usually people have been involved in a field for some time prior to the landmark development of professional organizations, training, and certification. In the United States, for example, fields such as law and medicine existed prior to the formation of the American Medical Association in 1847 or the American Bar Association in 1878. In the 1880s, historians, economists, political scientists, modern language instructors, and folklorists all formed professional groups in the United States. Similarly, the development of professional training and organization in social work or nursing (for example, the American Nurses Association founded in 1896) marked transitions towards a recognized professional status. Other fields have developed very recently, such as bioethics, which reached professional status in the 1990s.

In Jewish life, there is a long-term trend toward professionalization in a number of areas that were originally avocational. The mohel (ritual circumciser) is a specialization centuries old, as most fathers did not feel qualified to carry out this task personally. A paid rabbinate goes back to at least the Middle Ages, with justification for paying people for this role the source of considerable debate. While parents (traditionally fathers) are obligated to educate their children, village teachers gradually took on this role in Europe, and in the last century Jewish education became a profession. An example parallel to chaplaincy was
the development of professional training and organization for cantors. For centuries this field was usually entered by informal apprenticeship. Between 1947 and 1952 all three major Jewish religious movements in the United States opened cantorial training programs at their seminaries and established affiliated professional organizations.7

These changes over time—even over just a few decades—signal the emergence of a professional field. Jewish chaplaincy builds on older traditions of bikur holim, visiting the sick, which continue today as a volunteer activity. This tradition is traced back in rabbinic literature to God, who visited Abraham: “The Holy One, blessed be he, visited the sick as it is written, ‘The Lord appeared to him by the terebinths of Mamre (Gen.18:1)’—and so you must visit the sick.” It was viewed as part of deeds of loving-kindness—gemilut hasadim. This is an obligation, or mitzvah, for Jews.8 While the Talmud seems to prohibit payment for visiting the sick, medieval sources find exceptions to this rule based on local custom and the length of time the visitor spends with the sick.9 Rabbi Meyer Strassfeld wrote in The Third Jewish Catalog (1980): “Until we as a community can reclaim this mitzvah as our own, we ought to make sure that at least we have professionals who represent our care and concern when one of our ‘family’ is ill. Local Jewish federations should be encouraged to make the creation of chaplaincy programs an important priority.”10

The Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling defines pastoral care and those who provide it thus: “Chaplain refers to a clergyperson or layperson who has been commissioned by a faith group or an organization to provide pastoral services in an institution, organization, or governmental entity. Chaplaincy refers to the general activity performed by a chaplain, which may include crisis ministry, counseling, sacraments, worship, help in ethical decision making, staff support, clergy contact, and community or church coordination.”11 Underlying both Jewish chaplaincy and the choice to become a Jewish chaplain is a very significant thread of pluralism or commitment to klal yisrael (the entire Jewish community).

While most professional Jewish chaplains in the United States are rabbis, a significant number are not, including cantors and professionally trained Jewish lay people. Jewish chaplaincy programs often include both professional and volunteer components. However, this paper focuses on the development of full- and part-time professional Jewish health-care chaplaincy, particularly since the middle of the twentieth century. This is now a large, visible field composed of hundreds of Jewish professionals, marked by the formation of the National Association of Jewish Chaplains (NAJC) in 1990, a point to which I will return. (In the interest of self-disclosure, I will note that I was a board member of the NAJC. I served as vice-president from 1994 to 1998, as a board member at large from 2004 to 2006, and as secretary from 2006 to 2010).
This article looks at two elements that influenced this development of a professional field (1) social and organizational trends affecting chaplaincy—i.e., the organization of the field; and (2) trends affecting rabbis and other chaplains—i.e., the individuals—in terms of careers and identity.

In historical research, one typically presents a review of the literature. In the case of Jewish military chaplaincy, a number of volumes exist, including memoirs. It is well documented that Abraham Lincoln appointed the first American Jewish military chaplain in 1862; and during World War II, the Jewish military chaplaincy expanded greatly. In the case of Jewish civilian chaplaincy, however, any review of the literature will be brief. In the first edition of the Encyclopedia Judaica (1971), the only references to chaplains or chaplaincy are to the military. Similarly, in the two-volume centennial history of the Jewish Theological Seminary, the only references to chaplains are to military chaplains. The Jewish Encyclopedia (1901–1905) contains a handful of references to Jewish nonmilitary chaplains. It mentions Dr. A.M. Radin, visiting chaplain for New York state prisons, and reports that Isaac Samuel “is the only Jewish minister in England who has received a stipendiary appointment as Jewish chaplain in a non-sectarian institution.” These were clearly exceptional appointments in their period.

One of the few postwar publications to discuss Jewish civilian chaplaincy was a volume in a popular career choice series. Rabbi Alfred Gottschalk, then-dean of the California school of the Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR), wrote Your Future as a Rabbi, published in 1967. It included a few pages on nonmilitary chaplaincy, mentioning rabbis serving as community chaplains as well as in “hospitals, mental institutions, homes for the aged, and orphanages.” It also offered brief profiles of several chaplains. Murray Polner’s Rabbi: The American Experience (1977) includes a page or two on Hillel rabbis and two paragraphs on a rabbi who served Jewish prisoners in a correctional institution.

David Zucker’s American Rabbis: Facts and Fiction (1998) reviews both fiction and research on rabbis and the rabbinate. Zucker includes a few sentences on civilian chaplains in a longer chapter titled, “Non-Congregational Rabbis.” Unlike the longer treatments of military chaplains and Hillel rabbis, Zucker’s reference to health-care chaplains is not based on previously published sources. This is especially surprising since Zucker is himself a chaplain at a Jewish long-term care facility near Denver and served as an officer of the NAJC. The few books on general chaplaincy or pastoral care with a historic element rarely mention Jewish chaplains. In short, there is very little secondary literature.

The Early Stages

A history of the New York Board of Rabbis published in 1977 identifies the first hospital chaplain as Rabbi Samuel Isaacs, who served at Jews’ Hospital,
later Mt. Sinai, from 1852 to 1878. However, since he was a full-time congregational rabbi, this was at most a part-time position, if he indeed held the title of chaplain. The New York Board of Jewish Ministers established a visiting chaplaincy for prisoners in 1891. A significant milestone occurred in 1896, when the state legislature funded a Jewish chaplain, parallel to Christian chaplains, for Sing Sing and other prisons. According to the historian of the New York Board of Rabbis, continuing problems were lack of money and supervision—issues continuing to the present. Also, having chaplaincy appointments in the hands of the state or facility was problematic, as Jewish representatives wanted to monitor who was appointed to serve Jewish prisoners.

There were other early appointments of rabbis in health-care roles. The Jewish Hospital in Philadelphia had a rabbi from the 1890s to the 1950s who led services for the elderly residents of the adjacent Home for the Jewish Aged. One Jewish geriatric facility in New York (on the Lower East Side, and after 1910 on the Grand Concourse in the Bronx) had a rabbi and rav hamachshir (kashrut supervisor) as early as 1902. In general, in these early examples, a ritual role was key. No professional standards or credentials for Jewish chaplains existed. There was little vision of pastoral care or counseling as a field, and, outside of some state institutions, patient and family visiting were not always a key responsibility.

From the 1920s through World War II, professional training for ministry (and later for chaplaincy) began to develop in the Protestant community. This program, which was based on case studies, fieldwork, and clinical supervision, came to be called Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE). While CPE programs had grown by World War II, they were still loosely organized and more or less limited to Protestant ministers and seminary students, virtually all of whom were white males.

In the same period, Hillel, B’nai B’rith’s Jewish campus program, began to create an alternative model of noncongregational rabbinic service. Rabbi Benjamin Frankel, the first Hillel rabbi, served the University of Illinois from 1923 to 1927. Despite the Depression, the program grew to twenty-five campuses with full-time directors by 1938. According to historian Deborah Dash Moore, “In sum, Hillel established the secular synagogue on campus, founding in this way a new calling for the rabbinate.” The Hillel program was not tied to a congregation or to one particular Jewish denomination, a model also followed in chaplaincy.

In the late nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century, most Jewish patients in large and medium-sized American cities were treated in Jewish facilities with a Jewish atmosphere and strong ties to local rabbis and congregations. More than sixty of these hospitals were established, not only in large cities such as New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, but also in medium-sized communities such as St. Louis, San Francisco, Louisville, and Milwaukee. Historian Alan
Kraut notes that Jewish hospitals became “powerful cultural mediators for the Jewish community.” Many made provision for kosher food and were havens from antisemitism, which affected patients and physicians. However, few, if any, had a Jewish chaplain.22

**The Post-World-War-II Era**

Moore has noted the widespread impact of Jewish military chaplains during World War II. Some three hundred rabbis served in the U.S. military, and their roles received widespread attention. Furthermore, while chaplaincy was based on interreligious cooperation, Jewish chaplaincy was based even more on a shared sense of mission and pluralism overcoming Jewish denominationalism. Abraham Duker wrote that military chaplaincy “furnished a laboratory for the blending of the [Jewish] religious groupings.” More than half a million American Jews served in the armed forces during the war. While not all of them had contact with Jewish chaplains, many did. These influences continued after the war.23

It is not coincidental that it was in 1945 that the Jewish Federation of New York responded to the New York Board of Rabbis’ request to establish a chaplaincy program, including a coordinator. The rabbi hired, Rabbi Harold Gordon (ordained by both the Jewish Theological Seminary and by Chief Rabbi Avraham Kook of Palestine), was known as the “Flying Chaplain” in World War II. By 1950, New York State required the New York Board of Rabbis’ approval for all Jewish chaplaincy appointments to their facilities. By 1951 the program was extensive, with a full-time coordinator, four full-time and seven part-time chaplains, plus support staff.24

In Chicago, the Board of Rabbis and the federation established a central chaplaincy service in 1946. In addition to the full-time community chaplain, others were employed by Illinois penal and mental-health facilities. In 1951 in Los Angeles, the federation’s Jewish Committee for Personal Service employed two half-time Jewish chaplains, after failing to find one person for the role, plus a number of part-time chaplains.

In Philadelphia, the Jewish Family Service in 1942 established a small one-rabbi chaplaincy program to state facilities and prisons. Beginning in 1951, the Philadelphia Board of Rabbis worked with the Allied Jewish Appeal and the Federation of Jewish Charities to establish a Jewish chaplaincy program, soliciting information on chaplaincy programs in other cities to bolster their case. In addition, they surveyed local Jewish hospitals and institutions. The survey did not include Christian and nonsectarian hospitals; apparently the surveyors assumed that almost all Jewish patients sought general medical care at Jewish facilities.25 When an independent Jewish Chaplaincy Service was established in 1955 in Philadelphia, the first full-time director was Rabbi Joseph Rothstein, an Orthodox rabbi with family counseling training and a background as a military chaplain.26
Other programs were also created during this period. In Baltimore, Sinai Hospital hired its first chaplain in 1952. Newark started a chaplaincy program in 1958. Milwaukee began a community chaplaincy program, especially to serve Jewish hospital and mental-health patients, in 1962. Miami established a community chaplaincy program in 1966. Often these services initially were limited to Jewish, county, and state facilities and did not even attempt to reach patients in facilities under nondenominational or Christian sponsorship.

Despite the increasing numbers of Jewish chaplaincies, formal training or standards had not yet been developed. Around the country, numerous Jewish facilities serving geriatric and other clients had a rabbi, but few of them participated in CPE programs. One of the early participants, Israel J. Gerber, wrote of his remarkable chaplaincy training experience in Boston in 1948, exclaiming in his first paragraph, “I am so impressed with their value that I have decided to write out my experiences so that they may stir other rabbis to undergo similar post-graduate training.”

In New York in 1948, the Board of Rabbis established a Chaplaincy Institute based at Mt. Sinai Hospital and its Institute for Pastoral Psychology. Also in the early 1950s, Rabbi Fred Hollander, an Orthodox rabbi at Bellevue Hospital in New York, was another one of the few rabbis in the country to have experience in CPE. In 1958, he was approved as a CPE supervisor by the predecessor of the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education (ACPE). Hollander was almost certainly the first Jew to hold such a certification. He ran summer training sessions that attracted many rabbis, including those from other movements, most of whom became pulpit rabbis. The cross-denominational nature of the sponsorship and participation is noteworthy and a continuing theme. In general, however, rabbis seeking greater human relation skills were more likely to get an additional degree in social work.

Non-Jewish chaplaincy experienced wide expansion in the period following World War II. In 1940 only “a handful” of Protestant hospitals had a chaplain, and there was no organized chaplaincy in the Veterans Administration (VA) or in state mental health facilities. By 1950, there were “almost 500” full-time chaplains in general hospitals and 241 employed by the VA. Christian groups were also organizing professionally. The Chaplains Section of the American Protestant Hospital Association was founded in 1946 (again, note the post-war date) and became the College of Chaplains in 1968, still affiliated with the Protestant hospital organization. The National Association of Catholic Chaplains was founded in 1968. The ACPE was formed out of several smaller groups in 1967. However, there was little organization of Jewish civilian chaplains before the 1980s (except for a group of Jewish correctional chaplains centered in New York).
The Recent Era

When Rabbi Jeffery Silberman participated in an intensive CPE program in 1981, he was one of the few rabbis to do so. He was also one of the first rabbis with this training to enter chaplaincy professionally. Silberman wrote of his experiences in a 1986 article that dealt with both the learning he gained from case experience and the challenges of working in a program whose content and supervisor were infused with Christian assumptions. In particular, an assignment to reflect on the experience of “grace” did not fit with his Jewish beliefs. Silberman not only went on in chaplaincy but also became a certified Jewish supervisor in the field in 1988, authorized to train other students in a formal program. At the time, he was the only Jew in the United States to hold this status.33

While its history is outside the scope of this paper, it should be noted that the makeup of CPE, and its professional group, the ACPE, was changing by the 1980s. Established and led by white Protestant males, the field significantly shifted, as many women, Catholics, African Americans, other minorities, and eventually non-Christians entered CPE programs and some became CPE supervisors.

Jewish chaplaincy was also undergoing change by the 1980s. New people were entering the field, including many women in the rabbinate. Other more senior people found their way to the field after serving in congregations and other posts. Still, Jewish chaplaincy had an image problem. Silberman, the first president of the recently founded NAJC, wrote an editorial in an interfaith journal in 1992, explaining the new organization to Christian colleagues: “Unfortunately, Jewish chaplaincy is still saddled with an old stereotype about rabbis ‘who cannot cut it in congregations.’ While this image has changed in recent years, many hospital administrators believe that Jewish chaplains are good only for determining whether or not the hospital kitchen is kosher.”34 Silberman implied something that many Jewish chaplains felt: that many rabbis did not consider nonmilitary chaplaincy to be a “real job,” let alone one that a competent rabbi would choose.

In 1990 the College of Pastoral Supervision and Psychotherapy (CPSP) was formed. This alternative professional and educational group, sometimes in competition with ACPE, has a number of Jewish chaplains who are now active in this group.35

While the number of Jewish hospitals significantly declined through mergers and closures from the 1980s onward, the number of Jewish facilities serving the elderly grew. A 2003 report found more than 160 Jewish nursing homes (mostly federation-sponsored) and 396 federation-affiliated senior housing or assisted living apartment projects in North America.36 These figures do not include the many privately owned facilities or those with significant Jewish populations.
under independent nonprofit sponsorship. Many of these facilities do not have a Jewish chaplain, but a large number do.

By the late 1980s a significant number of men and women were seeking ways to serve the Jewish community through health-care chaplaincy. Non-Orthodox seminaries by the 1990s were offering or encouraging clinical education, particularly CPE. Women in particular seemed to find the emphasis on building relationships in chaplaincy to be meaningful. They also found the time demands more flexible than congregational work, particularly for mothers of young children. For example, Amy Eilberg, the first Conservative woman rabbi, entered hospice chaplaincy after a short time in a large congregation. For many new rabbis who did not aspire to lead large congregations, chaplaincy seemed a natural fit. As in the field of Jewish education, chaplaincy was becoming a field entered by choice rather than by accident.37

The publication of professional literature—including theological perspectives as well as practical experience and guidance—also signaled an increasing professionalization of the field. The most significant single work to date was edited by Rabbi Dayle Friedman, a faculty member at the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College and a former geriatric chaplain. *Jewish Pastoral Care: A Practical Handbook from Traditional and Contemporary Sources* was initially published in 2001, with a revised edition appearing in 2005.38

Many Jewish chaplains are part of interreligious teams and serve patients of all religious backgrounds. Of those who serve in primarily Jewish facilities, many do arrange for services and holiday celebrations. However, their main roles are in counseling and supporting patients/residents, staff members, and families. They also contribute to creating a Jewish atmosphere, particularly in residential and long-term care settings with many Jewish residents. A large number—in many cities, most—of Jewish patients or residents are unaffiliated with a congregation, yet they still may value their Jewish heritage, particularly at a time of crisis. Jewish chaplains can fill a role that congregational rabbis often cannot, due to limited time to visit multiple institutions and, sometimes, a lack of training that enables them to be comfortable in these settings.

Since the 1980s, two wider trends have occurred that have affected the field of Jewish chaplaincy. One is the greater societal emphasis on spirituality as well as on ritual aspects of religious life in health care; the other is that the emphasis on spiritual care is also reflected in regulations by accrediting agencies.

The first trend—an increasing emphasis on spirituality in health care—has manifested itself in various ways. For example, the selective medical periodical index Medline listed 91 articles dealing with religion, spirituality, or pastoral care in 1999; 203 articles published in 2003; and more than 1,600 (of which 420 appear in an annotated bibliography) in 2007.39 There has been a significant growth of research on spirituality and health in pastoral care, medical, and academic settings.40 In the Jewish community, too, recent decades have seen a
large increase in the number of publications, conferences, and gatherings dealing with spirituality. This includes the many publications by Rabbi Lawrence Kushner, the growth of the Jewish Lights publishing house, retreat center programs at Elat Chayyim, the development of the Jewish Renewal movement, and numerous publications and events relating to Hasidism and kabbalah from both traditional and innovative perspectives. The formation of the Institute for Jewish Spirituality is another example, as is the Kalsman Institute on Judaism and Health at the Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion in Los Angeles. The HealthCare Chaplaincy, a multifaith nonprofit in New York, had long included Jewish chaplaincy students and supervisors; and in the 1990s it opened a specific Jewish program, today the Department of Studies in Jewish Pastoral Care. In addition, the growth of dozens of community-based Jewish healing centers deserves its own study. This growing awareness of the spiritual dimensions of life within health care, in both the general and Jewish society, does not lead directly to professional chaplaincy staffing, but it raises awareness of the concerns that chaplains address.

Some local Jewish communities set up training programs to advance the field of Jewish chaplaincy. A program in Detroit organized by the Jewish Hospice and Chaplaincy Network trained eight rabbis in CPE from 2000 to 2004. In the last decade, the New York Board of Rabbis also sponsored CPE programs to improve the skills of rabbis serving as chaplains, along side of programs based in hospitals and other health care centers.

The second trend mentioned—that is, changes in accreditation regulations that reflect an increased emphasis in spiritual care—has been formalized since the 1990s. Hospice programs, for example, are required to provide pastoral care. U.S. hospitals and geriatric centers accredited by the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Health Care Organizations (JCAHO, now known simply as the Joint Commission) now are required to address spiritual care. The 2007 hospital standards include under Standard RI.2.10 (“The hospital respects the rights of patients”): “Element of Performance #2: Each patient has the right to have his or her cultural, psychosocial, spiritual, and personal values, beliefs, and preferences respected. . . . Element of Performance #4: The hospital accommodates the right to pastoral and other spiritual services for patients” (p. RI-10; emphasis added). At the end of life, “Interventions address patient and family comfort, dignity, and psychosocial, emotional, and spiritual needs, as appropriate, about death and grief” (p. PC-25; emphasis added).

While these and other standards for accreditation (necessary for health-care institutions to receive Medicare and other government funding) do not require hiring staff chaplains or those of particular religions, they put the issue on the agenda of secular and denominational facilities. Chaplains in these health-care facilities often are required to be endorsed by a recognized pastoral care organization, although so far that is not a formal Joint Commission requirement.
A New Organization

In the early 1980s, the Council of Jewish Federations General Assembly held sessions that included discussions about Jewish chaplaincy. By the mid-1980s, a core of Jewish chaplains serving health-care and geriatric populations had begun seeking recognition and fellowship, which they did not find in either Christian chaplaincy groups or in denominational rabbinic organizations. Several Jewish chaplains began consultations on establishing a new national organization. They approached the major rabbinic groups, including the Reform Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Conservative Rabbinical Assembly, for assistance. However, these groups focused on the congregational rabbinate; supporting civilian chaplains was not a priority. Between 1986 and 1987 they did receive support from the New York Board of Rabbis, the Miami Rabbinical Association, the Board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia, and the Chicago Board of Rabbis, following a meeting of executives of those groups. Significantly, the preliminary financial support for professional chaplaincy—five hundred dollars from each board of rabbis—came from local groups working across denominational lines, which often had an interest in chaplaincy service.

In 1988 a major interfaith pastoral care seminar, “Dialogue 88,” was held in Minneapolis. By pre-arrangement, twenty or so Jewish chaplains met and established a framework for a new organization. Early in 1990, the National Association of Jewish Chaplains (NAJC) held its founding convention in Atlantic City.

Since its formation, the NAJC has experienced three organizational milestones. First, in 1993, it voted as to whether only rabbis would be eligible for full membership. There were some concerns about “quality control” should nonordained people be admitted. However, the proposal to include non-rabbis passed overwhelmingly. The open policy was similar to those of Catholic and Protestant chaplaincy groups, yet the clinching argument for the Jewish community had more to do with the role of women. Since Orthodox women, no matter how highly educated, could not be ordained, they would not be eligible for full NAJC membership otherwise. Today, some 80 percent to 90 percent of the professional members are rabbis. Most of the non-rabbis are women from various denominational backgrounds who have pursued Jewish education and chaplaincy training but have not been ordained.

A second milestone was the institution of certification in 1995. Rabbi Yaakov Frank of Chicago, an Orthodox rabbi who had previously served as certification chair for the Association of Mental Health Chaplains (AMHC), encouraged this effort. All professional membership in NAJC requires advanced Jewish and chaplaincy education, but NAJC certification demands go beyond that, requiring more advanced education and recognition by a peer panel. Currently, both chaplains working in the field as well as new chaplains are pursuing this education and seeking professional status and peer recognition comparable to
that which most non-Jewish chaplains have. Today there are more than one hundred certified Jewish chaplains.\textsuperscript{48}

Jewish chaplains also sought to find their place in the wider community. The NAJC in the late 1990s was briefly a member of the Conference on Jewish Communal Service, an umbrella group of organizations representing other Jewish communal workers, but that affiliation ended in 1999. By 2000, the NAJC was putting an emphasis on relationships with other Christian and non-denominational pastoral care and education organizations. It also was involved in coalitions concerned with disaster relief and was in regular contact with the Association of Jewish Aging Services, representing Jewish geriatric venues.\textsuperscript{49}

A third milestone, in 2003, was the designation of CPE as the only recognized clinical path for becoming a Jewish chaplain. In that year, the NAJC and five other North American pastoral care organizations approved joint outlines for procedures for certification, education, and ethics. At the same time, the NAJC became more specific in the training requirements to become a professional member, a stage prior to certification. In earlier years of Jewish chaplaincy and the NAJC, various formats (often social work, but sometimes another area of psychology or marriage and family therapy) were recognized; but beginning in 2003, new chaplains would need at least two units (total eight hundred hours) of CPE as well as rabbinic or other graduate-level Jewish study, to become full voting members of the NAJC, the initial step for professionals.\textsuperscript{50}

Recent years have also seen Jewish chaplains become increasingly involved in training other future chaplains, caregivers, and clergy of all backgrounds. In earlier years, while there were few Jewish chaplains, those involved in professional pastoral care education had even fewer Jewish peers. In 2007, led by Conservative Rabbi Naomi Kalish, a Jewish Supervisors Network was formed within the ACPE. Ten Jews who are full supervisors (certified as CPE educators), and an additional five candidates currently in ACPE training to become qualified to teach in this field, are members of this ACPE network. The members are from all Jewish religious movements; about two-thirds are women. In the CPSP, a smaller professional group, there are two Jewish supervisors and several more in training.\textsuperscript{51}

Chaplains achieving certified chaplain status meet additional standards. Although many NAJC chaplains were initially “grandfathered” into certified status based on training and experience, they now must have four units (1,600 hours or a full-time calendar year) of CPE or an equivalent, in addition to rabbinic or advanced Jewish education, plus self-assessments, recommendations from peers, and a demanding interview. These standards for certification are comparable to those of cognate non-Jewish professional chaplaincy organizations. Certified chaplains must complete a minimum of fifty hours a year of continuing education and a peer review meeting with a committee of chaplains every three years.
Since 1990, the NAJC has grown to some 300 professional members, full- and part-time chaplains (plus an additional 300 students, retired members, and affiliates, including a number in Israel). As of 2009 the NAJC included chaplains from all Jewish movements, including several from the haredi (“ultra-Orthodox”) communities. More than 150 attended the 2002 conference in Philadelphia; more than 125 attended the 2006 conference in Los Angeles. Its board, membership, and past presidents include chaplains from all four major Jewish religious movements.52

At the 2005 NAJC national convention in Philadelphia, the national executives of the Reform, Conservative, Reconstructionist, and Orthodox rabbinical groups were invited guests. During one lunch session, participants were broken into groups by denomination (as well as a group of lay and unaffiliated chaplains), and the executives met with rabbis and rabbinical students from their own denominations. What is remarkable is that this lunchtime discussion was the only breakout by denomination, except for worship services, at a four-day conference of 150 Jewish chaplains, the large majority of whom were rabbis.

The NAJC faces challenges, including providing ongoing services to members with a largely volunteer effort, in addition to producing publications and holding the annual national conference. Its print and web publications are not widely distributed outside of the membership. After almost twenty years of existence, its staff consists of a half-time executive director and a part-time administrative assistant, housed at the Jewish Federation of Metrowest, New Jersey. At the June 2009 board meeting, that group set a goal of employing a full-time executive director by 2012. Its website, www.najc.org, is relatively modest. Regional efforts, begun in earnest in 2007, have had only limited success. There have been a number of regional study sessions and meetings, but Jewish chaplains, whether or not NAJC members, meet regularly in only a few locales (e.g. Chicago and Denver).53

For various reasons, not all Jewish chaplains are members of the NAJC. At least some may be unaware of the organization’s existence. Others, while Jewish, see themselves as more “generic” chaplains rather than “Jewish” chaplains. Some have been certified by the APC and maintain it as their primary professional affiliation, and others are uncomfortable with the degree of pluralism in the NAJC. And still others lack either the clinical or the advanced Jewish education required for NAJC professional membership (although affiliate status would still be open to these individuals).

The ability of the NAJC to cross denominational lines and promote cooperation and learning on caring for the sick, the aging, and their families is noteworthy. For example, The NAJC has collaborated with other groups to sponsor special CPE chaplaincy training sessions in Brooklyn for members of the haredi communities. At a 2009 conference dinner honoring CPE educator Rabbi Bonita Taylor, who has guided many Jewish and non-Jewish students,
one of the speakers praising her work as a teacher was a rabbi from the Satmar Hasidic group, a former student.54

The NAJC represents Jewish chaplains and the Jewish community in health care and other wider audiences. It provides a Jewish organization that is a peer with other North American professional pastoral care groups. In 2001 the NAJC joined with four other pastoral care groups to issue a “white paper,” Professional Chaplaincy: Its Role and Importance in Healthcare, explaining and documenting the value of chaplaincy in the field for hospital administrators and others.55 In February 2003, the NAJC for the first time held a joint convention with three other chaplaincy organizations—Catholic, nondenominational, and Canadian—in Toronto. In 2003 to 2004, the NAJC and five other American and Canadian pastoral care, education, and counseling counterpart organizations formed a loose Council on Collaboration (since renamed the Spiritual Care Collaborative), which developed “universal” standards for pastoral care education, certification, and ethics. Another joint membership conference, Summit ’09, was held in Orlando in February 2009. Although the NAJC was the smallest of the six sponsoring groups, it had an equal role in leadership and planning. A number of NAJC members led workshops and spoke at plenums, including Ben Corn, a physician from Israel interested in spiritual care, who was one of four plenum speakers. There were approximately 120 Jewish chaplains out of 1,800 participants, including at least nine visitors from Israel.56

The chaplaincy field has not experienced uniform growth. Changing demographics and a concern with financial issues have led to the reduction or elimination of chaplaincy positions, with some hospitals and other facilities questioning the value of nonrevenue-producing programs. The Milwaukee Jewish community chaplaincy program, for example, eliminated its full-time staff as of June 2009. Other institutions and agencies have reduced chaplaincy hours or funding.57 Some facilities, however, are showing an awareness of the efficacy of these programs—chaplains increasingly cite clinical studies that show increased patient satisfaction and shorter hospital stays as part of a rationale for their positions—and new Jewish community chaplaincy programs have opened in the last several years in San Diego; Phoenix; Columbus, Ohio; Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; and Princeton-Trenton, New Jersey.

American Chaplains and Israeli Spiritual Care

Unlike other Jewish professions, such as rabbi, teacher, cantor, or mohel, there was no accepted term for “chaplain” in either classical or modern Hebrew. Rabbi Dayle Friedman, in her book Jewish Pastoral Care, proposed the term livui ruchani (a revision of her earlier suggestion of hitlavut ruchanit, “spiritual accompanying” [her translation], with a pastoral caregiver called melaveh ruchani (masc.)/melavah ruchanit (fem.). Some Israeli caregivers have adopted Friedman’s terminology, but another phrase, emerging in Israel since 2005, is temicha ruchanit (“spiritual support”), with a spiritual caregiver called a
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tomech ruchani (masc.) or tomechet ruchanit (fem). These terms focus on the interpersonal relationships rather than the employer (as in rav tzeva’i [literally, “military rabbi”], the contemporary Israeli term for a military chaplain, whose role in Israel is largely ritual).

In Israel, where the field and even the concept of civilian pastoral care was little known, there is a growing interest in spiritual care. Ten Israelis attended the NAJC conference in Philadelphia in January 2005; and “dialogues” between American chaplains and sixty to seventy Israelis from various health-care, social service, and religious organizations were held (largely in Hebrew) in Jerusalem in March and December 2005. Since then, an Israeli steering committee on spiritual care has taken the initiative, with encouragement from the NAJC and the UJA-Federation of New York, to hold conferences annually. Several American Jewish chaplains have attended each conference, often as presenters, and delegations of Israeli spiritual caregivers attend the NAJC conferences in North America.

The May 2008 conference near Jerusalem had more than 180 Israeli attendees from a wide variety of professional fields and religious and secular backgrounds. The fifth annual Israeli spiritual care conference in May 2009 had about 200 participants, and the planners were able to select presentations as more speakers applied than could fit in the two-day schedule. Many of the participants, from fields such as social work, nursing, medicine, psychology, and geriatrics, have an interest in the emerging field of spiritual care whether or not they are employed in it. In addition, CPE programs were held in Jerusalem for the first time in 2006 (continued in subsequent years), led by a visiting American supervisor, Rabbi Zahara Davidowitz-Farkas. Three such groups were conducted in 2008 and two in the summer of 2009.

Other training programs for spiritual caregivers in Israel are expanding. In 2008, sixteen agencies and hospitals interested in strengthening the field founded the Israel Spiritual Care Forum, which now has a representative serving on the board of the NAJC. Currently, several Israeli candidates are studying in the United States to become CPE supervisors and train spiritual caregivers on their return to Israel. Unlike in the United States, where the large majority of Jewish chaplains are rabbis, in Israel most come from other backgrounds, including nursing, counseling, social work, or education.58

Jewish health-care chaplaincy in civilian communities, hardly visible on the communal stage a few decades ago, now has grown to a critical mass. It includes an organized network for professional support and a framework for professional certification and continuing education. The field of chaplaincy—hospital, geriatric, hospice, community—represents (along with its Hillel and military cousins) an important and virtually unique area of American Jewish religious cooperation and service across denominational lines, modeling possibilities for Israel as well.
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Notes

1There is no standard nomenclature for nonmilitary chaplaincy. Earlier drafts of this article suggested “civilian Jewish chaplaincy,” which is not a term in general use but one created to contrast with military chaplaincy. Several readers suggested “health-care chaplaincy.” While the large majority of civilian chaplains work in health-care-related fields such as hospitals, geriatric service, hospices, and mental health facilities, this heading is not sufficiently inclusive. The field also includes prison, police and fire, airport, disaster relief, and community chaplaincy, among other areas, as well as administration and training for chaplaincy. The term “nonmilitary chaplains” does not focus on what those in this field actually do. This article does not include campus chaplaincy (e.g., Hillel), which can be viewed as a related field. Earlier versions of this article were presented at the American Jewish Historical Society Scholars Conference in Albany, New York, in June 2002 and at the Spirituality, Religion, and Health Interest Group of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia in March 2003. The author wishes to thank participants in these programs for their questions and comments, as well as the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions. See also Robert Tabak, “Hospitals: Chaplaincy” in Encyclopedia Judaica (EJ) 9, 2nd ed., ed. Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik (New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007), 564–565. Also available at http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/judaica/efud_0002_0009_0_09261.html (accessed 8 November 2010).

2“Structure of Chaplaincy Activities of the New York Board of Rabbis,” [ca. 1951], copy in the Jewish Federation Collection, box 11, folder 18, Philadelphia Jewish Archives Center (PJAC), Philadelphia. PJAC has merged, as of early 2009, with Temple University’s Urban Archives. I have used the location numbers and citations in use at the time research was conducted.

3The terms “chaplaincy,” “pastoral care,” and “spiritual care” are used interchangeably in this article.

4Prior to the Iraq war in 2003, fewer than three dozen active duty Jewish military chaplains were in the U.S. armed forces. A larger number served in reserve units. In 2007 sixty-six Jewish chaplains were on either active duty or in actively drilling (i.e., activated) reserve units (figure from Chaplain Maurice Kaprow, U.S. Navy, June 2007).

5Information on bioethics from Paul Root Wolpe, Ph.D., formerly of University of Pennsylvania Center for Bioethics, now at Emory University. On critical time periods, see Burton J. Bledstein’s data on the rapid expansion of medical and scientific professional associations in the United States from 1864 to 1889. Bledstein, The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1976), 85–86.

6I am indebted to Dr. Jonathan Sarna of Brandeis University for this insight.

7There are at least two book-length studies of the cantorate as a field: Leo Landman, The Cantor: An Historic Perspective (New York: Yeshiva University, 1972); and Mark Slobin, Chosen Voices: The Story of the American Cantorate (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989). Of course, in religious terms the development of specialists assists but does not change individual obligations (mitzvot) such as circumcising sons, educating children, studying Torah, or visiting the sick.

8BT Sotah 14a; also Rambam (Mishneh Torah, Laws of Mourning 14:1), who sees visiting the sick as a rabbinic ordinance, in contrast to some other early sources that see it as biblical.
Comments of Tosafot, the Rosh, Shitah Mekubetzet, and Ran on this Talmud page and the preceding one are summarized in “Visiting the Sick” in the Encyclopedia of Jewish Medical Ethics, vol. 3, ed. Avraham Steinberg (Jerusalem and New York: Feldheim Publishers, 2003), 1119–1125. Thanks to Chaplain Elanah Naftali for this source.


Index of the Encyclopedia Judaica. (As noted, the revised EJ includes an article on nonmilitary chaplaincy as a section of the “Hospitals” article, although it covers other areas of chaplaincy as well.) Jack Wertheimer, ed., Tradition Renewed: A History of the Jewish Theological Seminary (New York: JTS Press, 1997).


Isaacs, born in the Netherlands, was rabbi of Shaarey Tefilla congregation in New York and a vice-president and founder of Jews’ Hospital. Prior to arrival in New York around 1839, he had served as “principal” of a Jewish hospital and orphan’s home in London. See Cyrus Adler, “Samuel Myer Isaacs” in Jewish Encyclopedia 6, p. 635.
The Emergence of Jewish Health-Care Chaplaincy: The Professionalization of Spiritual Care


25 “Chaplaincy Service,” Philadelphia Allied Jewish Appeal memo and report from Mr. E. Pearlman to Mr. E.R. Gomberg, 3 April 1952, Allied Jewish Appeal, Executive Director’s files, Jewish Chaplaincy Service, Federation record group 93, Box 26, folder 40, PJAC. This was a brief review of community-funded chaplaincy programs in other major cities. It included an estimated census of Philadelphia Jewish patients/residents in local mental health, psychiatric, and Jewish hospitals, as well as Jewish homes for the aged (total between 1008 and 1168), excluding an additional number deemed “inaccessible” in institutions or in private hospital rooms. This did not include another seventy-five to eighty in prisons and deliberately excluded nonsectarian and Christian-affiliated hospitals. It was followed by a list of questions to be considered in planning a local chaplaincy service, including sponsorship and funding.

26 For example, Philadelphia Board of Rabbis Executive Committee meeting, 14 September 1951, on both chaplaincy and training in pastoral skills for rabbis (Board of Rabbis papers, PJAC); Chaplaincy Service (Committee) meeting, which included rabbis, professional staff, and lay leaders, minutes of 21 May 1952 (Allied Jewish Appeal, Executive Director’s files, Jewish Chaplaincy Service, Federation record group 93, box 26, folder 40, PJAC). Note the argument of the (locally oriented) Federation of Jewish Charities leaders that “the Federation cannot enter into a religious program” and that it is a “health and welfare agency.” Press release, “Rabbi Joseph Rothstein Added to Jewish Chaplaincy Service,” 21 July 1955, Federation records, Jewish Community Chaplaincy Service, box 11, folder 7. The press release does not mention Rothstein’s military chaplaincy service, but the committee minutes and papers do.

27 Personal communications and telephone interviews by author with several individuals, Winter–Spring 2002: Rabbi Mitchell Ackerson, chaplain, Sinai Hospital (now part of Lifebridge Health System), Baltimore; Cecille Asekoff, chaplaincy coordinator for Joint Chaplaincy Commission of Metrowest, Whippany, NJ, and executive director of the NAJC; Rabbi Len Lewy, community chaplain, Milwaukee; Rabbi Sol Schiff, former director of the Greater Miami Rabbinical Association and coordinator of chaplaincy.

28 A 1979 nonexhaustive survey of chaplaincy programs at Jewish hospitals by Beth Israel Hospital (Boston) found full-time Jewish chaplains at Mt. Zion Hospital in San Francisco, Cedars Sinai Medical Center in Los Angeles, Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York, Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago, and Beth Israel Hospital in Boston. The local Jewish federations funded each entirely or in large part. Albert Einstein Medical Center in Philadelphia hired its first full-time chaplain...
in 1982. The Philadelphia Geriatric Center (now named the Abramson Center) hired its first full-time chaplain (for pastoral care, not kashrut supervision) in 1985. Copy in Albert Einstein Medical Center papers, record group 2302, box 17, folder 2, PJAC.


*Spirituality & Health: A Select Bibliography of Medline Published Articles*, ed. John Ehman, has appeared annually since 1999; available at http://www.uphs.upenn.edu/pastoral/resed/bibindex.html (accessed 8 November 2010). Medline does not index every publication, but it includes (in English) dozens of journals such as the *New England Journal of Medicine, Journal of Health Psychology, Family Medicine, Journal of Clinical Oncology, Holistic Nursing Practice, Lancet, and Southern Medical Journal*. Ehman’s annotated bibliography includes publications in English from around the world, although the large majority is American.


This brief list does not include activities at the local level.

Although it is already dated, see David Hirsh and Rabbi Simkha Weintraub, “Jewish Healing and the Jewish Family Service Field,” *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* 73, no. 2/3 (Winter–Spring 1996/1997): 188–191. More recently, Susan Sered has written an important article, “Healing as Resistance: Reflections upon New Forms of American Jewish Healing,” in *Religion and Healing in America*, ed. L. Barnes and S. Sered (Oxford and New York, 2005), 231–252. While not dealing specifically with chaplains, Sered notes the key roles for women and gay men in the emergence of the Jewish healing movement from the 1980s onward. She also notes the use of Jewish religious language in these programs, although they often are in contrast to traditional Jewish religious roles.

---
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Interviews with Rabbi Jeffery Silberman, New York (May 2002) and Rabbi Sol Schiff, Miami (June 2002), both founding members and past presidents of the NAJC. The late Rabbi Mel Glatt of Cherry Hill, New Jersey, also played a key role in early stages of professionalization. I also thank Cecille Asekoff, Father Joseph Driscoll, and Rabbis Dayle Friedman, Yaacov Rone, and Israel Kestenbaum for their insights. (Personal communications in 2002, with follow-up personal communications with Dayle Friedman, Yaacov Rone, and Cecille Asekoff in 2008 and 2009.)

A partial list of chaplains with key roles at this early stage includes Rabbis Jeffery Silberman and Charles Spirn of New York, Mel Glatt of Cherry Hill, New Jersey, and Amy Eilberg of Philadelphia.

This decision had a positive secondary effect: Right-wing Orthodox rabbis, who would not join a rabbinic group with other denominations, felt welcome to join a non-rabbinic body.

The AMHC later merged and became part of the Association of Professional Chaplains. Personal communication, August 2009 from Cecille Asekoff, executive director of the NAJC, who reported 106 current certified members, compared with 81 in 1995 and 84 in 2000. The total number of chaplains certified by the NAJC since 1995 is higher than the current number, as some certified chaplains have since retired and dropped their certified status; left the field of chaplaincy; switched primary affiliation to another professional group; or died. Informal data indicate that all these categories would total several dozen people.

“JCSA: Results of the 1999 Membership Survey,” The Journal of Jewish Communal Service (Fall/Winter 1999): 11–22. Page 14 notes that “NAJC was affiliated with the JCSA at the time of the survey [1998]. They have since ended their affiliation.” The reasons for disaffiliation are not clear, but the predominance of federation-based social service agencies in the JCSA may not have been a good fit for the largely rabbinic NAJC, many of whose members did not work for Jewish federations. This change was also around the time when the NAJC made a priority of establishing more significant ties with cognate pastoral care organizations.

Personal communications from past NAJC presidents Rabbis Stephen Roberts and Shira Stern, February 2009. People who had already joined NAJC under earlier, more flexible standards were “grandparented” and could continue in that status.

Personal communications from Rabbi Naomi Kalish about ACPE, February 2009 and July 2009. Personal communication from Rabbi James Michaels about CPSP, September 2009. In each case it is possible that there are a few Jewish chaplaincy educators or candidates who have not contacted their colleagues. The large majority of the Jewish supervisors and candidates are also members of the NAJC.

The 2009 NAJC board of twenty-one members included eleven women. Of the twenty-one, including the past president, all but two were rabbis. The vice-president was a lay chaplain, Sheila Segal, as was a CPE supervisor-in-training, Allison Kestenbaum, a member-at-large. As of October 2009 the NAJC had had eight presidents since its founding in 1990. These came
from all four major Jewish denominations; three were women. At the time of their elections, three presidents were in chaplaincy agency work, two were hospital chaplains, one a hospice chaplain, one a Veterans Affairs chaplain, and one a pastoral counselor. This list under-represents chaplains serving geriatric populations.

53 Minutes, NAJC board meeting, June 2009. Copy in author’s possession. The economic recession led to a freeze in NAJC dues from 2008 to 2010, which made the goal of increased staffing more distant. NAJC dues notice, mailed July 2010, in author’s possession.

54 Rabbi Jonas Gruenzweig was one of four speakers honoring Rabbi Bonita Taylor, a graduate of the Academy of Jewish Religion. Taylor is employed by the Healthcare Chaplaincy in New York, a multifaith organization. The NAJC dinner in her honor took place in Orlando, Florida, as part of the larger Summit ’09 conference on 2 February 2009.


56 The standards are found at http://www.spiritualcarecollaborative.org/standards.asp (accessed 26 June 2008).


58 The NAJC’s Israel activities were supported by a grant to increase spiritual care in Israel from the UJA-Federation of New York. Some Israeli spiritual care programs can be found through links on the English-language website of Life’s Door-Tishkofet, a program in Jerusalem: www.lifesdoor.org (accessed 8 November 2010). For a discussion on a number of such Israeli programs in the general press, see Tabel Frosh, “Preparing to Meet the Maker,” Haaretz (15 January 2009), http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1055925.html (accessed 8 November 2010). Another article discusses the program at Shaare Zedek hospital in Jerusalem; see “A Vital Approach” by Peggy Cidor in the Jerusalem Post (5 November 2010), http://www.jpost.com/LocalIsrael/InJerusalem/Article.aspx?id=194016 (accessed 8 November 2010). Additional information from unpublished conference presentation, “The Evolution of Spiritual Care in Israel: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach Developed to Address a Diverse Multi-Cultural Society,” presenters included Rabbi Zahara Davidowitz-Farkas, Elisehva Flamm-Oren, Dr. Ephraim Yakir, and Dvora Corn. Spiritual Care Summit, Orlando, Florida, 3 February 2009. Make-up of the spiritual care field in Israel is based on the author’s participation and conversations at Israel Spiritual Care Conference at Maaleh Hahamishama, May 2009.
The Marcus Center is pleased to announce the creation of two new endowed fellowships: **The Bertha V. Corets Fellowship** and **The Herbert R. Bloch, Jr. Fellowship**. Established by the Corets Family in loving memory of their mother, grandmother and great-grandmother, the Bertha V. Corets Fellowship will enable students and scholars to spend one-month intensively researching the courageous actions of Mrs. Corets and the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to Champion Human Rights in their efforts to boycott American businesses that continued the importation and sale of goods from Nazi Germany before World War II. Mrs. Jean F. Bloch and Mr. Peter Bloch, the wife and son of the late Herbert R. Bloch Jr., a department store executive for Federated, Inc., communal leader, and former Vice Chair of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion’s board of governors, have created a fellowship in his honor, which will allow The Marcus Center to award a one-month research stipend to a promising graduate student or an established scholar in the field of American Jewish history.

The Fellowship Program of The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives was established in 1977 by our institution’s founder, the late Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus. Since its inception, more than 350 scholars from over 20 countries have been named Marcus Center Fellows.

Applicants for the Marcus Center Fellowship program must be conducting serious research in some area relating to the history of North American Jewry. Fellows receive a generous stipend to conduct research and study at the American Jewish Archives for one month.

Applications are available online at [www.americanjewisharchives.org](http://www.americanjewisharchives.org)

**Deadline for application is March 17, 2011.**

For more information, contact Mr. Kevin Proffitt at kproffitt@huc.edu

“Every night I pray for the Blacks because if there were no Blacks, they would be picking on Jews,” Metz Kahn’s grandfather used to say. (157) A resident of Baton Rouge, Kahn is a descendant of one of the Jewish families who fled the Rhine Valley in the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century to escape poverty and marginalization, finding their promised land on the banks of the Mississippi. Through interviews she conducted with their descendants, Anny Bloch-Raymond documents the acculturation of these immigrants from the east of France and the south of Germany over four generations. Ambitious and pragmatic, they adapted themselves to an environment that often proved hospitable to their faith, and they eagerly became “southern religious,” a particular brand of American Judaism. (72)

Mostly young, single men, these immigrants entered the United States through the port of New Orleans, second in importance to New York. From there, they typically first led the itinerant life of riverboat peddlers or junk dealers. They eventually settled in small towns along the bayous of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, where they owned and operated stores, selling hardware, dry goods, lumber, clothing, or dishes. Key figures of the local economy, they acted as intermediaries between the great merchants of New Orleans and the rural population of the Deep South. The most successful became planters, slaveowners, or industrialists, and some even gave their name to southern towns. A portion of them received their education in Catholic schools, entered mixed marriages, or converted to Protestantism. The majority, however, retained their Jewish heritage.

Dispersed along the Mississippi, the immigrants from the Rhine Valley took some time to organize their communities, build synagogues, and establish charitable associations. By then, they were already well engaged in a process of Americanization, eager to learn English and to affirm their patriotism and their loyalty to their new land. They served under the Confederate flag during the Civil War, rejected the early Zionist movement, and joined Masonic Lodges and women’s benevolent associations. Becoming Americans also meant reformulating their religion to embrace Reform Judaism. Surrounded by the culinary culture of the South, they took great liberties with dietary laws. Yet they were respectful of the commandments of *tzedakah* (charity) and were active community builders and charitable supporters of their coreligionists.

Strongly involved in their synagogues, the older generation interviewed by Bloch-Raymond understands Judaism primarily as an ethic and a culture.
In contrast, the younger generation—influenced by the recent immigration of thousands of Jews from the American Northeast—seems more Orthodox in their religious practice. In spite of great social, political, and economic achievements, concludes Bloch-Raymond, the Jewish population that settled along the Mississippi more than a century ago is still not firmly rooted in the South; the integration remains unfinished. Within the racial structure of the region, the place of the descendants of these Rhine Valley immigrants is more ambiguous than ever, as revealed by the current antisemitism of African-American leaders and white supremacists.

A contribution to the history of immigration, *Des berges du Rhin aux rives du Mississippi* leaves plenty of room for the voices of the immigrants and their descendants. Throughout the seven chapters, these individual narratives—drawn from memoirs, letters, and interviews—constitute the most interesting aspect of the study and will hopefully be made accessible to future researchers. Then again, if at the onset of the book the project appears promising, the end product turns out to be unfocused and fragmentary.

Working from the stance of the sociologist, most of Bloch-Raymond’s discussion of the past is informed by the present. The New Orleans she describes is the one she visited, not the one that her subjects encountered a century ago. Perhaps too close to her informants, she accepts their testimonies at face value and scarcely confronts them with the historiography. Life on a sugar plantation, for instance, is portrayed here through the nostalgic eyes of the memorialist, not the brutal reality of slavery and industrial agriculture. Obviously charmed by the culture of the South, the author often digresses from her topic, discussing in much detail the current status of French in Louisiana or the origins of Creole cuisine. The book also suffers from poor editing. Spelling mistakes, typographical errors, and problematic uses of punctuation are countless throughout, most conspicuously on the back cover, picture captions, and even a chapter title. The subtitle “*L’invention de la cuisine casher créole*” is used twice in the same chapter. Several endnotes do not coincide with the information they are supposed to reference.

All these lacunas are symptomatic of a book that was not quite ready for publication. We must nonetheless credit Bloch-Raymond for giving a voice to several generations of Southern men and women too often excluded from the history of the region. In itself, this is a valuable contribution.

Marise Bachand is a doctoral candidate at the University of Western Ontario, Canada. A specialist of the cultural history of the South in the nineteenth century, she teaches American history in universities across Quebec.
Bad synagogue or church history—and there is plenty of it out there—has the unmistakable quality of home movies. Scenes that might induce warm, fuzzy feelings or incessant embarrassment among family members often elicit an involuntary yawn (or worse) from everyone else. As the title of the recently published history of Temple Israel in Boston suggests, its authors aspired to write a book that transcends the parochial interests of a single congregation. Here they have succeeded marvelously.

Conceived to mark the congregation’s sesquicentennial in 2004, *Becoming American Jews: Temple Israel of Boston* might be forgiven for celebrating the achievements of Boston’s second-oldest synagogue, the largest Jewish congregation in New England. It certainly does not lose an opportunity to trumpet the congregation’s leading role in social justice causes or its commitment to outreach and liturgical innovation. Likewise, a nostalgic current runs through the scores of photographs and documents in the volume. But from the outset, the book makes the case that the story of temple members’ efforts to “maintain the equilibrium between their desire to practice their faith and their determination to be accepted as Americans . . . is, in many ways, the narrative of American Reform Judaism in microcosm.” (xii) Time and again, this case is made convincingly, whether the subject is the German congregants’ nineteenth-century utilitarian embrace of ritual innovation and liturgical reform or the impact of interwar antisemitism on its rapprochement with Zionism.

*Becoming American Jews* is not the first history of Temple Israel that aspires to be more than a commemorative volume. In 1954, Arthur Mann published *Growth and Achievement: Temple Israel, 1854–1954*, which included contextual essays by noted scholars Bertram Korn and Moses Rischin, as well as by former American Jewish Historical Society president Lee Friedman. Mann himself wrote the four chapters at the heart of the volume, focusing on the careers of the temple’s senior rabbis.

The authors of *Becoming American Jews* are very conscious of Mann’s contribution. Indeed, they aspired to write a book that was as much the “anti-Mann,” as it was a sequel. While Mann’s volume placed the rabbis at the center of its inquiry, *Becoming American Jews* claims to be a social history that puts the congregants themselves in the spotlight. As such, the reader learns about the “ambitious entrepreneurs” in the 1880s whose exodus from the working-class South End to the stately brownstones of Back Bay and Roxbury coincided with a desire to replace their modest wooden *shul* with a magisterial “church like edifice.” That building, on Columbus Avenue, blended the Romanesque revival architecture of Bavarian synagogues with Bostonian architectural flourishes like steeple towers. Likewise, the reader hears about efforts in the 1990s to keep a
large and increasingly diverse membership from becoming balkanized, even at the risk of alienating old timers, whose yearning for late Friday evening services and utilizing the mostly English *Union Prayer Book* ultimately went unrequited. Instead, the temple moved to a family-friendly, heavily Hebrew early-evening service, replacing the choir and organ with congregational singing to the tunes of the cantor’s guitar.

Still, the new volume maintains a focus on the congregation’s clergy, particularly its senior rabbis. The spotlight is inevitable, since the clergy team’s imprint was, and is, felt in virtually every aspect of congregational life. Temple Israel’s rabbis have generally been strong leaders, firm managers, and adroit politicians. This is not to say that the will of the lay leadership has not prevailed at critical junctures. Nevertheless, congregants have historically recognized that the prestige of their congregation was considerably enhanced by the reputations of its religious leaders. They actively sought rabbis whose visionary leadership and scholarship were matched by healthy egos, and they generally granted them freedom of the pulpit and a fairly wide latitude in ritual, liturgical, and educational policies and procedures. The reader will be thankful that *Becoming American Jews* provides compelling portraits of charismatic leaders such as Solomon Schindler and Joshua Loth Liebman, who seemed to embody the zeitgeist. Likewise, its extended treatment of the past half-century, most notably the juxtaposition of Rabbis Roland Gittelsohn and Bernard Mehlman, provides a useful case study of the evolving nature of the contemporary rabbinate.

One of the more interesting aspects of the book is its attention to synagogue architecture. In the authors’ view, the procession of buildings that the congregation erected and inhabited over the course of its 150-year history were reflections of congregants’ and clergy’s evolving aspirations and self-perceptions. Sometimes, later generations found themselves hostage to the conceptions of earlier generations. As the authors skillfully explain, Gittelsohn’s personal style—the moral crusader who was, nevertheless, a transcendent and remote presence on the pulpit—was transposed into the architectural and aesthetic style of the temple’s sanctuary in its current location on Longwood Avenue. Mehlman, the “institutional humanizer” and “teaching rabbi,” spent the next twenty-two years spiritually at war with his physical surroundings. The authors also offer a laudably in-depth portrait of the synagogue’s religious school and social action programs. Sadly, they afford only cursory attention to synagogue music in general, and the creative genius of longtime musical director and composer Herbert Fromm, in particular.

Dwyer-Ryan, Porter, and Davis deftly utilize gender and class as analytical lenses, although the reader sometimes wishes that they dug a little deeper. For example, they explore the profound impact of the synagogue’s first female rabbi, Elaine Zecher, whose rabbinate has largely been devoted to spiritual engagement. Yet they neglect the fact that the most successful female rabbis at
Temple Israel have held pastoral and social action portfolios that might, fairly or unfairly, be pigeonholed as feminine. Likewise, when the senior rabbi retired in the late 1990s, the search committee did not include any women among its finalists. Coincidence? Perhaps. But consigning female rabbis to supporting roles is hardly anomalous within the Reform and Conservative movements and is thus a topic that is worthy of attention. The authors would have pushed the scholarly envelope had they at least raised the issue.

On the other hand, the book does not sugarcoat the temple’s leadership controversies, including the rejection of Judaism for nonsectarian humanism by its freethinking, turn-of-the-century rabbi, Charles Fleischer. Indeed, the authors are to be commended for their forthright treatment of more recent challenges and minor scandals.

_Becoming American Jews_ shines because its authors exude an affection and enthusiasm for their subject but seldom allow these feelings to overwhelm their narrative. They admirably balance the desire to celebrate a storied congregation with the goal of finding larger meaning in its history. This book sets the standard for future synagogue histories and should be required reading for all who embark on such an endeavor.

Jonathan Krasner is assistant professor of the American Jewish experience at Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion in New York.


_The Women Who Reconstructed American Jewish Education, 1910–1965_ is an important contribution to scholarship on Jewish education. This volume offers a fuller understanding of the leadership in the early- to mid-twentieth century by illuminating the work of leading women in a period that is traditionally understood to be shaped primarily by men such as Samson Benderly and Mordecai Kaplan. This volume details the life histories and contributions of eleven women who provided institutional and inspirational leadership in the arts, literature, community organizing, and schools.

In Ingall’s illuminating introduction, she offers a helpful framework for understanding the contributions of these exemplary women. She argues that their commitment to Hebrew and their love of Israel and the richness of Jewish culture reflects the story of the Americanization of the Jews in the United States during this period. Some of the women, such as Ethel Feineman and Grace Weiner, sought to integrate the Jews in the United States through their social progressivism, as evident in the settlement houses they created. Others, like Jesse Sampter, worked to “Judaize” American Jews through building organizations
such as Hadassah, which would enhance members’ Jewish identity and sense of community. Jonathan Krasner’s chapter on Sadie Rose Wallerstein (author of the famous *K’tonton* children’s books) is perhaps the strongest chapter in the volume in demonstrating Ingall’s introductory thesis. In his chapter, he compellingly traces Wallerstein’s evolution of *K’tonton* to reflect the changing position, views, and values of Jews in American society.

While progressive education, Jewish culturalism, and Hebraism were common philosophies among many of the women in this volume, they were also linked by key institutions such as the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. These physical places were laboratories for deepening their educational aspirations and building of community that would nurture the women’s creativity. This notion of “place” as core is amply illustrated in Ingall’s own chapters on Anna Sherman and her role in the Teachers Institute, and Tzipora Jochsberger, founder of the Hebrew Arts School.

This volume offers a substantial contribution to the scholarship of Jewish education by illustrating the ways in which these notable women changed the nature of Jewish education. As Ingall argues, “these women made a case for *Jewish education*, not merely *Jewish schooling*” (italics in original, p. 20). They took their understanding of progressive education and experiential learning and broke down the barriers between education in the classroom and the neighborhood, between academics and the arts, and between Hebrew instruction in isolation and Hebrew as a living language. The scholarship on progressive education in secular schooling during this period recognizes and highlights important women such as Caroline Pratt, Harriet Johnson, Elizabeth Irwin, and Lucy Sprague Mitchell, who took students into the streets of New York City to study geography, social studies, and ecology. Their vision of education created landmark progressive schools in New York that still thrive today. This volume helps the field of Jewish education similarly recognize the women who integrated theory and practice and who launched innovative educational models upon which we continue to build.

As a feminist qualitative researcher, I paid close attention to the methodologies the writers of these chapters employed, and this is the one area of the volume that falls a bit short. In general, the methodologies are not fully spelled out, and some chapters are constructed more like encyclopedia entries than analytic essays. In two cases, the authors describe using “portraiture,” a methodology developed by Sara Lawrence-Lightfoot, an eminent sociologist at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. As a result, I was hopeful that these chapters would demonstrate a creative analysis of the data the authors collected, but they did not quite meet the criteria of portraiture Lawrence-Lightfoot set out. Missing was the “thick description” that would yield a new vantage point through which we can understand the women more deeply. Interestingly, each chapter in this volume begins with an actual photographic portrait of the women, helping the
reader “see” the protagonists more fully. It would have been more compelling to have equally vibrant narrative portraits across the board.

Despite some methodological shortcomings, the book stands as an important contribution to the history of Jewish education in the United States. In particular, the biographies help to render a fuller picture of Jewish education as a field by examining the major contributions of significant women who were teachers, artists, writers, community activists, and organizational leaders. To understand this vital period in American Jewish history—about which so many volumes have been devoted to the Benderly boys and their disciples—it is essential we hear the voices of the creative and productive women of these decades. Ingall’s volume has amplified those voices for all to hear.

Miriam B. Raider-Roth is an associate professor of Educational Studies and Urban Educational Leadership and the director of the Center for Studies in Jewish Education and Culture at the University of Cincinnati. She is currently studying how teachers’ engagement with collaborative text study shapes their understanding of learning and teaching.


*Zionism and the Roads Not Taken*, based on the author’s dissertation at Yale University (2004), is a timely and ambitious attempt to unearth approaches to Zionism that sought to embrace the concept of Jewish nationhood outside of the purely statist model. While Pianko engages a number of thinkers throughout the work, he devotes particular attention to three figures—Simon Rawidowicz, Mordecai Kaplan, and Hans Kohn—with overlapping yet different ideas about Jewish nationhood in an age that was increasingly defining national life and legitimacy through national sovereignty. The study’s “narrative arc,” Pianko informs us, “bridges time and space to trace the ways in which Rawidowicz, Kaplan and Kohn joined Jewish and non-Jewish thinkers committed to reimagining the fundamental categories of nationality between World War I and the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948.” (4)

Pianko emphasizes that while these thinkers who conceived of “nation beyond state” became marginalized in the dominant narrative of Jewish nationalism, they were by no means marginal figures in their own time. (8) They were actively involved in Jewish institutions and published their work in mainstream Jewish periodicals such as the *Menorah Journal*. This is a testament to the fluidity of interwar conceptions of national identity, both Jewish and non-Jewish. The second chapter (“Sovereignty Is International Anarchy”) is devoted to the further development of this context. Pianko explores the varying approaches
of Horace Kallen, Simon Dubnow, Alfred Zimmern, and Israel Friedlaender toward the question of Jewish national existence to demonstrate the diversity of opinion that accompanied debates about sovereignty, the widespread concern about joining national identity to Palestine, and (especially in the case of Kallen) the need to negotiate Jewish national identity in an American Progressive Era context that increasingly privileged the melting-pot model.

Pianko is at his best when offering highly interesting, contextual analyses of Rawidowicz’s, Kaplan’s, and Kohn’s struggles with Jewish national identity. In analyzing Rawidowicz’s “Global Hebraism,” Pianko begins with a fascinating excerpt from Rawidowicz’s correspondence with David Ben Gurion, in which he protests that naming the new Jewish state “Israel” threatened to reduce the term to “a geographical-political term, devoid of Jewish identity.” (61) This episode reflects the concerns that led Rawidowicz to develop his theory of Jewish nationalism presented in his tome Babylon and Jerusalem. Pianko emphasizes that in contrast to both Ahad ha’am’s “center-periphery model,” and Simon Dubnow’s “Diasporism,” Rawidowicz did not seek to affirm either the Diaspora (Babylon) or the land of Israel (Jerusalem) at the expense of the other (71–73). Also of great interest is Rawidowicz’s appropriation of the laws of Eruvin. By interpreting the concept of eruv as a way to assimilate outside ideas into the Jewish context while avoiding fatal levels of cultural absorption, Jews (and presumably other minority groups) could affirm the “right to difference” while remaining loyal and engaged members of American society at large (78–80). Rawidowicz also used his advocacy of minority rights within the nation state to challenge Israel’s marginalization of Arabs. The fact that this chapter went unpublished is a sign, in Pianko’s view, that by the 1950s such criticism was already a “communal taboo.” (181)

While most readers will already be familiar with Mordecai Kaplan as the author of Judaism as Civilization and the father of the Reconstructionist movement, Pianko reveals a less-known side of Kaplan. Kaplan’s primary task, according to Pianko, was not to make Judaism compatible with America, but to make “U.S. democracy safe for minority groups in general and for Jews in particular.” (105) Like Rawidowicz, Kaplan had grave concerns that, in the America of the 1930s, the “melting pot” ideal would result in the smelting of national and religious minorities into a single national-religious identity. Pianko emphasizes Kaplan’s belief that, “without halting this excessive trend in American nationalism . . . no religious reform or theological innovation would be able to rescue Judaism.” (107) This concern with rescuing Judaism led Kaplan to a surprising array of solutions—not the least among them his suggestion of reviving the premodern corporatist model within the context of a transformed multicultural American society. (123) Like Rawidowicz, Kaplan, who, especially in his public declarations, was an ardent Zionist, felt a deep
sense of conflict over the treatment of Arab minorities in Palestine. This is due, in part, to Kaplan’s conviction that Zionism was to serve as an exemplar of national civilization defined outside of the sovereign model. (129) Pianko shows that as developments in the Yishuv and the State of Israel moved steadily away from this ideal, Kaplan held similar concerns regarding the Jewish state to those he had about American society.

Unlike Rawidowicz and Kaplan, Hans Kohn’s legacy is based more on his role as a scholar of comparative nationalism than on his Jewish contributions. Though Pianko may overstate, in his final chapter, the continued centrality of specifically Jewish concerns in Kohn’s later thought, he rightly emphasizes the importance of Kohn’s early writings on Zionism. Further, he presents a compelling case for continuity between his idealization of Zionism and his later belief in the promise of America. According to Pianko, “Kohn would resurrect a generalized version of his understanding of Zionism’s political mission as the idea of nationalism, with American Nationalism embodying the former role of Zionism.” (158) While Kohn upheld the desirability of the “melting pot” against Horace Kallen’s critique, the author argues convincingly that Kohn’s vision of American nationalism as “unity through multiplicity” was far closer to Kallen’s ideal than Kohn wanted to admit—or could admit, in the immediate aftermath of the McCarthy era (169–170). Finally, Pianko does a fine job of challenging the characterization of Kohn’s theory of nationalism as a “dichotomy” between Western “civic” and Eastern “ethnic” orientations. Rather, he asserts, “if Kohn’s legacy is connected to a dichotomy, it should be one that differentiates between counterstate and statist conceptions.” (176)

Pianko’s final chapter diverges from the focus on intellectual history that characterizes the rest of the book. Here he presents an essay that relates these primarily interwar debates to contemporary concerns. It is likely that many of these theorists will remain the concern of Jewish academics and, as Pianko anticipates, those interested in ethnic and Diaspora studies. Yet Pianko’s final chapter, and the book as a whole, is highly successful in both historicizing these theorists and using their thought to challenge and contextualize the contemporary disjunction between Jews as “nation” in the sovereign state and as “religion” in the Diaspora.

Brian Smollett is a doctoral candidate in Jewish history at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. He teaches Jewish and European history at Queens College, CUNY.

The books under review provide two models for the writing of state Jewish histories.1 Leonard Rogoff provides a comprehensive, analytically nuanced account of Jewish life in North Carolina. Bryan Edward Stone concentrates on the frontier framework to tease out the uses and transformations of diverse identities among Jews in selected episodes of Texas history. Jonathan D. Sarna does not exaggerate when he notes in a book cover blurb, “Down Home is the best and most comprehensive history of Jews in any one of the fifty states.” For its part, *The Chosen Folks* stands with Stephen J. Whitfield’s pivotal essay and two previous works by Rogoff2 as one of the most in-depth and outstanding studies concerning regional identity. Similarities and differences between Rogoff’s and Stone’s volumes abound.

Two illustrated chronicles and a more analytic anthology, besides a plethora of other studies, have previously appeared on Texas history.3 In his publication, Stone, an associate professor at Del Mar College in Corpus Christi, Texas, has dramatically revised his dissertation from the University of Texas at Austin. Rogoff is historian of the Jewish Heritage Foundation of North Carolina. His book is part of a larger project documenting and disseminating information on North Carolina Jewish history through a traveling exhibit, video, and school curriculum. As such, it joins Theodore Rosengarten and Dale Rosengarten’s *A Portion of a People*4 as exemplars of what state historical associations are capable of producing.5 Solid historical accounts of North Carolina Jewry are sparse and only one article—also by Rogoff—is statewide in scope.6

Both authors succeed as iconoclasts. Stone questions converso and crypto-Jewish settlement in the colonial origins of the Lone Star State and argues against the Jewish connections of nineteenth-century pioneers that previous historians have claimed. Yet his more sweeping challenge is to those historians who place New York City as the model and only truly legitimate center of the American Jewish experience. His frontier approach suggests instead the legitimacy and significance of Jewish life in all forms and environs as well as the necessity of studying these for the lessons they offer beyond New York’s hegemony. Stone adds depth to our knowledge and understanding of the roles of Jews during the Civil Rights era, which are reinforced in Rogoff’s book.

Rogoff also attacks myths of early Jewish settlement as a prelude, in his case, to opposing the distinctiveness school of Southern Jewish historiography. Cosmopolitanism rather than provincialism characterized even those North Carolina Jews who resided in small towns. These Jews, although living in a rural state, are urban in their perceptions, contacts, and experiences. Rather than conforming and “not calling attention to themselves,” (188) they actively
challenge prevailing norms and institutions. Although he pays homage to Jewish roots in *passim*, Rogoff’s North Carolina Jewish history reflects constant and repeated incoming and outgoing migrations. Jews start businesses in small towns to accumulate capital to move to cities with larger Jewish communities and to educate their children to become professionals and move away. Their roots are to family, business, and religion rather than to region. New Jewish migrants rejuvenate and replenish Jewish communities and institutions regularly. Some Jewish communities die out, while others are reborn or born anew. In each of these themes, Rogoff replaces the nostalgic view with messages of vibrancy and realism. Finally, following the wave of research of the last fifteen years to which he has contributed—along with Wendy Besmann, Deborah R. Weiner, and Lee Shai Weissbach, among others—Rogoff brings the history of East European Jews to the forefront of Southern Jewish history. (Stone provides evidence of Zionism and vibrant East European Jewish communities, institutions, and culture as well but not as a primary theme.)

Although the authors do not always draw the same conclusions, the histories of North Carolina and Texas Jewry are remarkably—although not surprisingly—similar. Rogoff clearly could have used Stone’s frontier framework to guide his work. Individual Jews could claim pioneer status in each, but substantial congregation- and institution-building did not thrive until the post-Civil-War era. Both states attracted Jews from the German states and other parts of Europe who had first lived elsewhere in the United States. Jews were few and far between, although Texas had more urban enclaves. Following the familiar patterns of nineteenth-century chain migrations, movement from town to town along transportation corridors, and from peddler to dry goods storekeeper to department store owner, these Jews adapted and compromised their Jewish practices.

Stone touches upon other themes upon which Rogoff elaborates. In both locations, Jewish acceptance was predicated on Jews’ behavior and contributions to society. Yet Stone draws a picture almost devoid of antisemitism until after World War I, while Rogoff’s North Carolinian Jews are more tolerated than accepted. Jews in Texas and North Carolina strive for urban, middle-class respectability and generally align with business-progressive politics and politicians. Challenging prevailing historiography, apparently few Jews in either place owned slaves. In hub-and-spoke or center-and-periphery fashion, Jews in both states maintained close ties with major Jewish centers—Baltimore, Charleston, New Orleans, and Richmond—outside of their states. This served as one of many mechanisms in which these Jews retained ties to national and international Jewry and overcame their relative physical isolation. Isaac Leeser and Isaac M. Wise sparked the formation of congregations, but the actions of a key local leader proved essential. The small Jewish population also led to other survival mechanisms. Reform scions of earlier immigrants and traditional
East European Jews tended to cooperate and compromise out of necessity. The North Carolina Association of Jewish Women, which fostered men’s, youth, and rabbinic counterparts, and the Kallah of Texas Rabbis represented the need for statewide organizations that would have been established in cities with larger Jewish populations. Bringing the parallels forward, World War II and, more recently, the Sunbelt phenomenon brought tremendous growth and change to both.

My qualms with *Down Home* are minor. Although the case can and should be made for Southern Jewish distinctiveness in several areas, the celebration of Christmas by Classical Reform Jews (143–144), Americanizing names (141), and holding social events and using organizations beyond local communities to bring Jewish youth together (272–273) were national phenomena and not manifestations of “southern blending.” (272–273) Compromises between East European Orthodox and “German” Reform Jews and lesser division between the two was not the result of “a blended southern Jewish ethnicity” (271) but rather behaviors that typified intragroup relations in small towns everywhere, as Rogoff acknowledges on the following page. But these are isolated statements. Most of this book attacks exaggerated claims of regional distinctiveness.

I will note a few of the difficulties with Stone’s volume that are more extensive and substantive. First, although his use of the frontier framework is appealing on many levels, the definition and application of it become somewhat nebulous and problematic. Drawing on the theories of Sander Gilman, Kerwin Lee Klein, and Gloria Anzaldúa, among others, Stone’s “frontier” appears as “an imagined space of cultural interaction where differences collide, groups encounter one another, and cultural boundaries must be devised and continually revised.” (237) Since Jews interact with others and are defined by and define themselves in relation to those others (including Jews elsewhere), Jews throughout the world and throughout history can thus all be categorized as frontier people. (14–15) Yet Texas Jews also defined themselves as frontier people with their imagery of participation in the beginnings of Texas history, when it was a frontier in the more traditional sense. Sometimes “frontier” seems to equate with living in isolation in relation to larger Jewish communities. Defining Jews in contemporary Sunbelt cities as frontier people further strains the credibility of the term. (234) Stone does the latter by juxtaposing Sunbelt Texas with Los Angeles and Miami as the appropriate comparisons and continuing the imagery of the Texas Jewish frontier by asking why more Jews have not been attracted to the state. Yet the comparison to North Carolina, where Rogoff draws a more complete picture of Sunbelt effect, and other Sunbelt states may be equally appropriate; and the issue may not be the negatives Stone associates with the Lone Star State but rather the unique attractions of Los Angeles and Miami. Further questions arise over interpretation. Stone views the rise of the modern Ku Klux Klan as a turning point where Texas Jews confront bigotry
and outsider status seemingly for the first time. (136–146) Was there virtually no antisemitism earlier, especially during the late nineteenth century? Stone notes only briefly exclusion from country clubs, and he puts it during a much later era. (203) For a final example, Stone discusses the relatively small number of East European Orthodox Jews in Texas and implies the population dominance of the “German” Reform element until the 1920s at the earliest. Yet the approximately 3,300 Jews in Texas in 1880 had multiplied to 16,000 by 1905, and the numbers double between 1910 and 1920. (64, 95, 154) It would be unusual and unlikely if these increases were not largely the result of a major East European influx relative to the earlier settlers. Indeed, Stone provides evidence of vibrant East European Jewish communities dating from the 1880s. This goes beyond demographic quibbling. Earlier demographic dominance of East European traditionalists raises questions concerning some of the broader generalizations relating to late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century identity. Were the newcomers accepted as Anglos, and did they accept their position as such so quickly and easily? Last, Rogoff emphasizes nineteenth-century ties with Germany, German culture, and Lutheran Germans in North Carolina. (89, 142) One wonders why the study of Jewish, Texas, Southern, Western, and American identities failed to extend to German identity and interaction with the large and important gentile German population in Texas as well.

Regardless of these issues, Stone and especially Rogoff are to be commended for outstanding, thought-provoking books based on extensive archival research. They take historiography to the next level of debate, and their interpretive insights lay the groundwork for future studies. The illustrations in both enhance the stories as do, in *Down Home*, insightful sidebars. Anyone interested in regional and national history should read these books.

Mark K. Bauman retired as professor of history at Atlanta Metropolitan College. He is the editor of Southern Jewish History and *Dixie Diaspora: An Anthology of Southern Jewish History*; co-editor of *Quiet Voices: Southern Rabbis and Black Civil Rights*; and author of *Harry H. Epstein and the Rabbinate as Conduit for Change and the forthcoming* American Jewish Chronology.

**Notes**

1For the sake of transparency, I served as a press peer reviewer for *The Chosen Folks* and have worked as editor with both authors in other publications.


This book is a ghost story, told about a structure that never existed. Susan G. Solomon argues that Louis I. Kahn’s designs for Philadelphia’s Congregation Mikveh Israel (1961–1972) represented a zenith in postwar synagogue architecture. Regrettably, however, none of Kahn’s six schemes for a complex of structures facing Independence Mall was ever built, so their quality and influence cannot be properly measured. Although the book’s subject is Kahn’s “Jewish architecture,” the author says almost nothing about his design of Temple Beth-El (1966–1972) in Chappaqua, New York, which was erected.

As one of America’s most distinguished postwar architects, Kahn (1901–1974) has enjoyed enduring renown for masterworks such as the Yale University Art Gallery (1951–1953), the Salk Institute for Biological Sciences (1959–1965) in La Jolla, the Indian Institute of Management (1962–1974) in Ahmedabad, and the Kimbell Art Museum (1966–1972) in Fort Worth. Solomon’s previous studies include an insightful monograph on his bathhouse for a Jewish Community Center (1954–1959) near Trenton, which, she claims, was a turning point in his later career.

As the author indicates, Kahn’s Unitarian Church (1959–1969) in Rochester, New York, was highly evocative, but many of his best secular buildings also achieved a spiritual depth and majesty. The book leaves some lingering questions about its subject. Kahn was nearly a lifelong resident of Philadelphia who had only a meager knowledge of Judaism and did not affiliate with Jewish institutions (though he did visit Israel on many occasions). Thus, it is extremely difficult to understand what Judaism may have meant to Kahn. Additionally, Solomon too easily dismisses the fact that, while married, he fathered two children with two other women.

As a seeker of architectural truth, Kahn continually searched for essential meanings of space, form, light, materials, and sequential movement. Ironically, his lengthy struggles with Mikveh Israel’s insensitive and ineffective leadership produced a succession of challenging (and misinformed) interpretations of Jewish
prayer and celebration. Ultimately, Kahn was dismissed from the commission; the mundane structure completed in 1976 gave equal importance to a sanctuary and a museum of American Jewish history, but it did justice to neither. Alas, the new National Museum of American Jewish History, dedicated in November 2010, has partially arisen from the ashes of Kahn’s defeat. But he will surely be lionized within it!

Solomon has much to say about Jewish and gentile synagogue architects of the postwar decades, particularly those active in the Northeast, but her devotion to Kahn obscures an important point. Frank Lloyd Wright’s design of Beth Sholom synagogue, erected in suburban Philadelphia in 1959, was probably modernism’s most astonishing Jewish house of worship. Although Wright worked on a monumental scale and Kahn on a more intimate one, both architects sought an archetypal sense of drama and transcendence for their synagogues. Despite their clients’ requests, neither architect had much interest in glorifying patriotic themes or employing traditional Jewish symbols.

It was unnecessary for Solomon to try to magnify Kahn’s brilliance by diminishing some of his American contemporaries. Minoru Yamasaki, perhaps best known today for his demolished World Trade Center in Manhattan, created an allusive yet enthralling sanctuary for North Shore Temple Israel in Glencoe, Illinois, which was built in 1964. Percival Goodman was the most prolific synagogue designer in Jewish history. He was a much more successful businessman and technician than Kahn, and he too earned the respect and loyalty of many clients. Although Kahn was the far greater architect, Goodman was also an idealist and seldom repeated himself. Goodman, moreover, was in some sense aware of his own limitations, for he offered numerous commissions for sculptures, paintings, and textiles to leading avant-garde artists who could balance representation and abstraction. The Jewish Museum’s recent exhibition of art by Adolph Gottlieb, Herbert Ferber, and Richard Diebenkorn, commissioned in 1951 for Congregation Beth El in Millburn, New Jersey, demonstrates the daring and fruitfulness of Goodman’s vision.

Solomon’s book ends on a false note of despair. American synagogue architecture and congregational life have not suffered an irreversible decline following Kahn’s calamitous experience with Mikveh Israel. By their very nature, most buildings of any genre, style, or era are utterly forgettable. But Samuel Gruber’s recent book on twentieth-century American synagogue architecture suggests that several fine examples have been constructed throughout the country since Kahn’s death. Norman Jaffe’s stunning Gates of the Grove Synagogue (1989), in East Hampton, New York, is one of my favorites.

George M. Goodwin, the editor of Rhode Island Jewish Historical Notes, has written about many American synagogues and other facets of American Jewish culture.

This impressive study of nearly a thousand pages is the capstone of Urofsky’s engrossment with the life of Louis D. Brandeis (1856–1941). It is a remarkable undertaking that builds upon his earlier studies. The task required considering the vast body of work published during the long interim. Urofsky successfully covers Brandeis’s career as a lawyer and public advocate and his long and influential tenure as Supreme Court Justice; he is, however, somewhat less convincing in dealing with Brandeis the Zionist. (Most of the chapters that discuss Zionism are titled “Extra-Judicial Activities, I, II, and III.”) The otherwise impressive list of primary sources misses, e.g., the deposit of the Combined Jewish Philanthropists of Boston, the archives of Brandeis’s law firm (now Nutter, McClennen & Fish), as well as some relevant Yishuv and Israeli archives. Also, perhaps because of the time that has lapsed, oral history is scant.

By the end of the nineteenth century, Brandeis’s Boston was a major immigrant-absorbing city characterized by a web of ethnic neighborhoods and institutions. For Brandeis, this resulted in his increasing awareness and response to Boston’s Jews and the Jewish communal institutions nationwide, a development Urofsky fails to deal with in any depth. Urofsky, moreover, neglects the philosemitism (old and new) that characterized influential Yankee circles. While Urofsky discusses antisemitism extensively (though without illuminating the subtle nature of social antisemitism), his overlooking philosemitism and the changing sociopolitical character of the Jewish community prevents him from fully explaining Brandeis’s gravitation to Zionism. Indeed, in essence, Brandeis was attracted rather than pushed to Zionism. The works of an array of scholars—Barbara Solomon, Oscar Handlin, Arthur Goren, James Connolly, Lawrence H. Fuchs, Stephen J. Whitfield, as well as scholars in the excellent *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*—who have produced major studies discussing ethnic identity, American nationality, cultural diversity, and other pertinent themes are not productively utilized in the new volume; and see my “The Enigma of Louis Brandeis’s ‘Zionization,’” in *American Public Life and the Historical Imagination*, edited by W. Gamber et al.

In this pluralistic milieu, the brilliant, broad-minded, intellectual, conscientious Brandeis—a “non-Jewish Jew” (until 1905)—developed a sensitivity to personal and public issues of identity. Yet Urofsky does not meaningfully benefit from pertinent works of Jonathan D. Sarna and the late Ben Halpern, in which the historians sensitively trace Brandeis’s roots back to a Jewish Messianic sect in Europe and illuminate the innerconnection between his evolving Jewishness—permeated by *tikkun olam* (repairing the world)—and the kind of Zionism he later developed. Halpern further analyzes the influence of the Palestinian murderous attacks of 1929 and again of 1936–1939, of the rise of
antisemitism and Nazism in the 1920s and early 1930s, and of Britain’s betrayal of the Mandate on Brandeis’s Zionism, leading it to become more assertive and nationalist. Indeed, Brandeis’s initial view of a universal, mission-oriented Zionism gradually came to conceive the very existence of the Yishuv as a vital, sublime goal unto itself.

Urofsky, inattentive to Brandeis’s deepening commitment to Zionism, consequently does not discuss the meaningful and mutually respecting relations that developed between him and David Ben-Gurion, a theme covered in some historically perceptive publications. Nor does he delve into the Britain-oriented compromising policy of Chaim Weizmann that, among other factors, nourished the understanding between Brandeis and Ben-Gurion.

Brandeis’s extended family in Europe included Reform Jews; Urofsky should have discussed the possible impact that background had on Brandeis’s mind and on his openness to the Reform movement of his own time, which emphasized social values. Brandeis’s first comprehensive Zionist lecture—“The Jewish Problem: How to Solve It”—was given at the Eastern Council of Reform Rabbis; instructively, Brandeis’s inner circle prominently included Stephen S. Wise, an eminent Reform rabbi and pursuer of social justice.

Furthermore, Urofsky’s conclusion that Brandeis’s success in making Zionism a force to be politically reckoned with is mainly the result of his secular leadership (755) is quite rigid. It seems that other contributions Brandeis made, which Urofsky aptly detailed (chapter seventeen), were more important—especially the synthesis of Zionism and Americanism and the emphasis on the philanthropic, Eretz-Israel-oriented function of American Zionism. Brandeis’s secularism was never set as a pattern for American Zionism to follow. And not only were religious personalities such as Wise and Julian Mack at the heart of the “Brandeis group,” but he also forged a grand alliance with Hadassah and Henrietta Szold, an esteemed religious personality. Solomon Goldman, a Conservative rabbi and president of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) (1938–1940), was an admirer of Brandeis (and Ben-Gurion) and energetically disseminated Brandeis’s Zionist writings. In general, Brandeis’s Zionist course and legacy have been cherished by religious (less so the small Orthodox movement) and non-religious alike.

Urofsky indicates that Zionism was closer to Brandeis’s heart than any of his other causes (409). This observation ties into my broader explanation of his Zionism as a response, in part, to an identity issue. This is, by the way, also why Brandeis did not distinguish between Judaism and Zionism and employed the terms interchangeably.

Urofsky’s important book is rather comprehensive. However, it is missing a subtle analysis of American pluralism and of Brandeis’s Zionist heritage that developed in this context.

In 1802, Thomas Jefferson established the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York (site of the Revolutionary-Era fort that Benedict Arnold offered to betray to the British) with a mandate to train military officers who would be faithful to republican ideals. Over the next century, West Point became the pre-eminent institution for educating Americans who aspired to serve as officers in a democratic society. For some American Jews, West Point occupies a special place in their affections, for Jews have been intimately associated with it since its founding. Indeed, at least one American Jew was in the inaugural class.

Lewis Zickel was one of those American Jews whose life is entwined with what West Point alumni call “the Long Grey Line”—a reference to the traditional uniforms of the cadets. Zickel, West Point class of 1949, channeled his passion for his alma mater into an account about the relationship of American Jews with West Point, and in the course of his study he provides numerous digressions into the meaning of military service to American Jewry. Since the French and American revolutions, military service has been the ultimate test of citizenship, and Zickel wanted to demonstrate that since the founding of the American Republic, American Jews have participated in the service of arms.

The book is divided into three parts: Part one is a history of Jews and the academy; part two is Zickel’s autobiographical account with an emphasis on his motivations to serve and his military career; and part three contains short sketches of other Jewish graduates and their relationship with the academy.

While Zickel’s recounting of the history of American Jewry and West Point begins strongly by integrating the history of the institution with the American Jewish experience—pointing out, for example, that there never was a religious test required for entry—the story quickly gets bogged down. Zickel’s priority seems to be to remind his readers of the Jewish contribution to military affairs, reflecting perhaps a need to defend Jews against charges that they were not fully American. In addition, Zickel’s narration passes much too quickly through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in order to incorporate his own story into the chapter. The final result is disappointing, as the author does not provide any new information on the Jewish experience at West Point; meanwhile, his
analysis of the antisemitic accusations about Jews shirking military service, and the Jewish response, also does not cover any new ground.

The autobiographical section will interest historians whose focus is the integration of immigrants and their children into mainstream American life via military service. As with every generation and immigrant group, the path to acculturation into American society can be found in endeavors such as sports, business, or the military. One has only to look at class photos and the names of the cadets of West Point in the last hundred years to see which immigrant group, and their descendants, are becoming fully American. Zickel’s story is an exemplar of that journey and, as such, provides some useful insight for the reader. As with the previous chapter, Zickel attempts to confront the question of anti-Jewish bigotry at the academy and in the military. The major issue in this section, as with the previous, is that he seems to argue simultaneously for its being present and its insignificance.

Part three is based on a questionnaire Zickel sent to every Jewish alumnus of the Long Grey Line that he could identify. The results of this survey contain the kind of material that is bane and boon to the historian. As published, the information contains anecdotal evidence that can be mined usefully for a variety of attitudes toward the academy, the military, and America. The chapter does not, however, provide any systematic evidence from which the historian can draw general conclusions. While Zickel did include a sample copy of a finished questionnaire, he does not adequately explain what methodology he used to extract information for inclusion.

Sadly, Lewis Zickel died before publication, and while the professional historian will have quibbles with his text, methodology, and format, it does provide insight into the experiences of a man who was always proud to be an alumnus of America’s oldest, and arguably most prestigious, military academy.

Frederic Krome, assistant professor of history at the University of Cincinnati Clermont College, is co-author of The Jews of Cincinnati (2007), along with articles on modern Jewish and military history. His book, Fighting the Future War: An Anthology of Science Fiction War Stories, 1914–1945, is scheduled to be published by Routledge in spring 2011.
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Dr. Pamela S. Nadell holds the Patrick Clendenen Chair in Women's and Gender History and is Professor of History and Jewish Studies at American University. Dr. Jonathan D. Sarna is the Joseph H. & Belle R. Braun Professor of American Jewish History and Director of the Hornstein Jewish Professional Leadership Program at Brandeis University. Dr. Gary P. Zola is Executive Director of The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives and Professor of the American Jewish Experience at the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

Tour prices
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Accommodations
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Here is a select listing of new accessions added to the collection of The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives in 2010.

**American Conference of Cantors**
Oral history interviews with ACC members Sheldon Chandler, Hans Cohn, Lawrence Avery, and Israel Goldstein.

*Received from the American Conference of Cantors, Schaumburg, IL*

**Anshe Chesed Congregation (Vicksburg, MS)**
Board of Trustees minutes, 1944–1960.

*Received from Iuliu Herscovici, Vicksburg, MS*

**Association of Reform Zionists of America**
ARZA concert honoring Rabbis Elyse Frishman and Daniel Freelander, 10 June 2010.

*Received from Elliott Kleinman, New York, NY*

**Bernd, Addie**
“Addie Bernd in His Own Words: An Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times,” a memoir of Holocaust survivor Addie Bernd, compiled by his daughter, Janet Bernd Isenberg.

*Received from Janet B. Isenberg, Glen Rock, NJ*

**Boise, Idaho**

*Received from Elliott Kleinman, New York, NY*

**Bronstein, Herbert**
Recording of a sermon given by Rabbi Bronstein at Temple Brith Kodesh (Rochester, NY), following the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. 1968.

*Received from Herbert Bronstein, Glencoe, IL*

**Cantors**
The Art of the Cantor: In Memory of Barry Serota, 1948–2009, a history of the cantorate, produced by Beth Schenker in cooperation with the WFMT radio network and hosted by Hazzan Alberto Mizrahi, focusing on great cantors of the 20th century, including operatic cantors, cantors in America, cantors in concert, and the western European tradition in the cantorate.

*Received from Beth Schenker, Chicago, IL*
Carin, Reuven

The Un-Silence of a Canadian: 25 Years of Protesting the Surrender to Injustice by Canada’s Leadership, a memoir by Carin.

Received from Leigh Lerner, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Central Conference of American Rabbis

Correspondence and other records of the CCAR Committee on Church and State, compiled by Rabbi Fred Reiner during his tenure as chair of the committee. 1987–1996.

Received from Fred Reiner, Washington, DC

Central Conference of American Rabbis

Records of a CCAR Rabbinical Placement Commission meeting, 6 May 2010; together with a handbook on procedures for the placement of newly ordained rabbis.

Received from Samuel Joseph, Cincinnati, OH

Cheyenne, Wyoming

Lest We Forget: Remembrances of Cheyenne’s Jews, a collection of memoirs and interviews with residents of Cheyenne, Wyoming, co-authored by Mark Elliott and Marie Still. 1990.

Received from Sherry Levy-Reiner, Washington, DC

Chyet, Stanley F.

Personal papers focusing on Chyet’s career as a scholar and professor at Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion together with his work in Hebrew literature and poetry.

Received from Yaffa Weisman, Los Angeles, CA

Cohn, Edward Paul

Papers, writings and clippings of Rabbi Cohn, detailing his work at Temple Sinai (New Orleans) and in assisting the New Orleans community in the recovery from Hurricane Katrina.

Received from Edward Paul Cohn, New Orleans, LA

Cohon, Samuel S.

Drafts, correspondence, and papers concerning the revision of the Union Prayer Book (1931–1939) under the auspices of the Central Conference of American Rabbis’ Liturgy Committee; together with papers on other matters concerning Reform Jewish liturgy. 1931–1960.

Received from Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, NY

Congregation B’nai Israel (Baton Rouge, LA)

Video history of the congregation, created as part its 150th anniversary celebration. 2010.

Received from Congregation B’nai Israel, Baton Rouge, LA
Congregation B’nai Jehoshua Beth Elohim (Deerfield, IL)
Plans, reports, and documents concerning the relocation and building project of Congregation B’nai Jehoshua Beth Elohim, 2004–2010, along with a synagogue documentary and history. Together with recordings of sermons and music delivered at the congregation, given and performed by Cantor Jennifer Frost, Rabbi Karyn Kedar, Rabbi John Linder, Rabbi Mark S. Shapiro, and Cantor Cory B. Winter.

Received from Marvin J. Dickman, Highland Park, IL

Congregation Shir Ami (Newtown, PA)
History of the congregation together with miscellaneous items pertaining to its work and activities.

Received from Sharon K. Benoff, Newtown, PA

Dworkin, Harold
Papers of Cantor Dworkin, including clippings, correspondence, a vita, and miscellaneous items. 1947–1981.

Received from Jean Becker, Casselberry, FL

Eisendrath, Maurice N.
Correspondence on various matters during Eisendrath’s tenure as rabbi at Holy Blossom Temple. Includes correspondence on synagogue activities, with rabbinic colleagues, and other matters. 1932–1943.

Received from Holy Blossom Temple, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Filmstrips
Collection of filmstrips on Jewish life, culture, and history, produced by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Bureau of Jewish Education, the Jewish Education Committee of New York, and others.

Received from Liz Rolle, Norwalk, CT

Garfein, Stanley J.
Personal and rabbinic papers concerning Garfein’s work at Temple Israel (Tallahassee).

Received from Stanley J. Garfein, Tallahassee, FL

Gold, Rosalind
News clippings concerning Gold’s career in the rabbinate since her ordination in 1978.

Received from Rosalind Gold, Reston, VA

Goldstein, Harold K.
Miscellany, a memoir of Goldstein’s activity in the social justice movement as well his relations with various Reform rabbis, including Arthur Lelyveld and Abraham Cronbach. 1980.

Received from Sherry Levy-Reiner, Washington, DC
Goldstein, Morris
Music, photographs, and other items of Goldstein, cantor at Congregation B’nai Israel (Cincinnati); together with a section of a stained glass window from the Rockdale Avenue Temple in Cincinnati that was designed by Goldstein.

Received from Emmy Lou Cholak, Traverse City, MI

Golf Manor Synagogue (Cincinnati, OH)
Questionnaire sent to congregants concerning the synagogue and its services to members in an effort to increase membership, together with a final report based on the gathered data. 2005.

Received from R.M. Selya, Cincinnati, OH

Golinkin, Scott
Collection of articles, compiled by Golinkin, on the inclusion and use of Yiddish phrases and words in legal and court documents.

Received from Scott Golinkin, Chicago, IL

Gottschalk, Alfred

Received from Joyce Kamen, Cincinnati, OH

Grafman, Milton L.
Audio recording of a Rosh Hashanah sermon concerning stores in Birmingham, Alabama, owned by Jewish merchants that remained open on the High Holidays, 1966; together with a diary of a trip to Europe, including visits to Nazi Germany and Russia, taken under the auspices of the international YMCA. 1938.

Received from Stephen W. Grafman, Potomac, MD

Harkavy, Franklyn
Papers and writings, including poetry and a memoir by Alexander Harkavy.

Received from Rosalind Harkavy, Cincinnati, OH

Herzl, Theodor

Received from Mary Davidson Cohen, Overland Park, KS

Hochman, Daniel
Memoir of Hochman’s childhood in Poland before and during World War II, together with the story of his life in the United States, including his work as an engineer in developing the modern fax machine.

Received from June Dilevsky, Jerusalem, Israel
International Association of Jewish Vocational Services
Records documenting the career management, skills training, rehabilitation programs, and history of the International Association of Jewish Vocational Services (formerly Jewish Occupational Service). Records include administrative records, minutes, reports, conference programs, project files, and photographs. 1939–2009.

Received from Genie Cohen, Philadelphia, PA

Janowski, Max
Original recording of musician Janowski performing at a 1979 seder hosted by Richard Olin.

Received from Richard Olin, Longboat Key, FL

Jewish Chautauqua Society
Minutes and records of the JCS. 1905–1950.

Received from the Union for Reform Judaism, New York, NY

Jewish Federation of Cincinnati (Cincinnati, OH)
Records, brochures, clippings, and other items concerning the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati. 2000–2010.

Received from the Jewish Federation of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH

Jonas, Selda
Papers, photographs, and miscellaneous items concerning Jonas of Brooklyn, NY, founder of the Brooklyn (NY) Ethical Culture Society, compiled by David J. Bardin; together with a diary kept by Jonas from 1902 to 1903, with a transcription of the entries.

Received from David J. Bardin, Washington, DC

Kamrass, Lewis
Commemorative video honoring Rabbi Kamrass’s twenty-five years as senior rabbi at Isaac M. Wise Temple in Cincinnati. 5 June 2010.

Received from Isaac M. Wise Temple, Cincinnati, OH

Kaye, William G.

Received from William G. Kaye, Naples, FL

Knobel, Peter
Personal papers concerning Knobel’s work in the rabbinate and in liturgical revision.

Received from Peter Knobel, Evanston, IL

Lee, Barton G.

Received from Barton G. Lee, Tucson, AZ
Lefkowitz, David, Jr.
Motion picture produced by the U.S. government concerning relief and rescue efforts in post-World War II Europe featuring Rabbi Lefkowitz, then a chaplain in Bavaria, leading a service for U.S. soldiers.

Received from Helen Horowitz, Northampton, MA

Levitt, Norma U.
Personal papers, including Levitt’s writings and other materials, pertaining to her work in the Women for Reform Judaism, the United Nations, and in issues pertaining to women’s and children’s rights.

Received from Norma U. Levitt, Monroe Township, NJ

Levy, Helen Solomon
Helen Solomon Levy booklet of contributions, 1937–1955; together with other personal papers and related items found on her writing desk at the time of her death in 1955.

Received from Philip Angel, Charleston, WV

Lichtenauer, Irma
Two letters (in German, with English translation) written by Lichtenauer from Germany to Flora Stargardt in Cincinnati, recounting her experience during the Holocaust and requesting assistance. 1945 and 1947.

Received from David Stargardt, Lawrenceburg, IN

Liss, Yitzak Jacov
*Diary of a Young Soldier: A Jewish Legionnaire in World War I Palestine*, consisting of a copy of an original Yiddish diary (with English translation) kept by Liss from May to December 1919 while serving in the British Jewish Legion (38th Battalion Royal Fusiliers) during World War I. Together with an essay on Jewish legions in World War I, written by Shlomit and Michael Keren. (Original items located at the Schusterman Center for Jewish Studies at the University of Texas, Austin.)
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