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Dear Colleagues,

It seems there’s no better time for Jewish Studies to tackle the patriarchy. Against the background of the #MeToo movement and a brighter spotlight on oppressive societal systems and structures, we’re becoming more aware than ever of the power dynamics that privilege certain voices, bodies, and scholarly work over others. We’re becoming more aware of how patriarchal habits seep into our classrooms and conferences. And we’re becoming more aware of what we can do to address these tendencies.

This Perspectives issue—the Patriarchy Issue—is, in part, a response to a call to action. The pieces that follow seek to unmask, elucidate, question, or reconceive patriarchal structures in Jewish Studies. They are a necessarily small sample of research essays, fiction, and personal narratives that expose the anxieties underlying patriarchal dominance, that center voices and experiences often considered marginal, and that rethink conventional assumptions about how the patriarchy operates.

Under the heading “Expanding the Canon,” we also highlight several shorter essays that expose the exclusion of women’s creative and intellectual work from a variety of Jewish Studies subfields. As the new editors of AJS Perspectives, we would also like to draw your attention to two special sections in the issue we intend as permanent features: a section on the profession, and a section on pedagogy. As we encourage scholars to tackle particular research themes we also hope to turn these same lenses on ourselves as academics and teachers. How do these themes play out in our classroom? Where do these dynamics manifest in our professional lives?

For this Patriarchy Issue, the section on the profession carries particular salience. We would like to highlight four personal essays, by Keren McGinity, Karla Goldman, Mika Ahuvia, and one anonymous author, that detail painful and harrowing journeys of defying or negotiating patriarchal structures in our field. Two of the essays discuss the conformism expected of women scholars in order to succeed: Goldman narrates the process of her termination when she could not fit into the boys’ club; Ahuvia details the sacrifices she made when she adapted to patriarchal expectations—and her desire to undo the damage. The other two essays reveal the support our field has bestowed on harassers and assailants for far too long. McGinity describes how a #MeToo moment led to what is hopefully a reckoning and course correction; the other (anonymous) author relates her experience of secondary, institutional harassment after filing a complaint. In the case of the essay published anonymously, legal counsel pointed us in the direction of removing the author’s own byline against her wishes. Perhaps this too is an expression of the patriarchy that sometimes exerts a type of paternalism when what the author is craving is full-throated agency. The experience of publishing these four essays reminds us of how far we have yet to go in dismantling the patriarchy’s work of suppression and silencing.

From the Editors
We’d like to thank Karin Kugel for her outstanding work in shepherding the Patriarchy Issue to production. Finally, we’d like to dedicate this issue to the memory of Jonathan M. Hess, whose fine leadership, along with that of Laura S. Lieber, helped inspire us to continue to identify pressing themes worth examining as a field, and to listen attentively to diverse voices.

Chaya Halberstam
King’s University College

Mira Sucharov
Carleton University

“Who lives, who dies, who tells your story?” These words repeat in the closing song of the smash hit Hamilton. The title character laments that “every other founding father’s story gets told”—but Hamilton’s? Who will tell his story? After all, “you have no control,” he frets.

Thanks to Eliza, the wife who survives him by fifty years, Hamilton’s story is told. Eliza organizes his papers and letters and, overcoming many obstacles, publishes his biography.

This issue of AJS Perspectives is filled with stories. There are first-person stories that give voice to searing pain and the unbidden knowing that is born of it. There are third-person accounts of lost voices and lost stories whose owners never deemed them worthy of the telling. There are familiar, never-lost stories from classic texts that, when read with new eyes, become fragile, crumble, and then vanish, only to re-emerge as something new.

There are stories about those empowered to silence texts by refusing to acknowledge what they say and show; stories about those empowered to silence texts by refusing to acknowledge what they say and show; stories about those empowered to silence texts by refusing to acknowledge who they are.

If so, then Hamilton was wrong. Perhaps you can control the story. After all, the play ends with Eliza, who steps forward to sing, “I put myself back in the narrative.” Standing center stage, she tells us her story, the story of a founding mother. She tells us her story, the story of a founding mother. She tells us her story, the story of a founding mother. She tells us her story, the story of a founding mother. She tells us her story, the story of a founding mother. She tells us her story, the story of a founding mother.

Perhaps most important, there are stories about changing the story: prescriptions for better practices in teaching, publishing, translating, editing, conferencing, with the hope that the story that will one day be told about us will be different.

Perhaps most important, there are stories about changing the story: prescriptions for better practices in teaching, publishing, translating, editing, conferencing, with the hope that the story that will one day be told about us will be different.

From the President
association’s story—taking a hard look at the ways our own processes and structures are implicated in power dynamics that negatively affect the experience of our members. And we have worked to change that story. A major step in that direction occurred in December 2018, when the AJS board approved a set of painstakingly developed informal and formal procedures for handling complaints of sexual misconduct relating to AJS-sponsored programs or activities.

We must now put these procedures into practice, and to that end we have established two main goals that will be accomplished before the 2019 annual conference: to develop and implement the program of intensive training required by the ombudspersons and other Sexual Misconduct Committee members responsible for operationalizing our new procedures; and to develop a variety of online resources and educational materials to support and guide our members around matters of sexual misconduct. This is how we change the story.

One reads the pieces in this issue and it is clear: we must do a better job shaping a better story through the daily labor of better practices, better procedures, better listening, better thinking. We must make the AJS, and the field of Jewish Studies as a whole, more fair, more inclusive, and more diverse.

The AJS’s next fifty years must be a story worthy of the telling. Let us not be left fretting that we haven’t done enough.

“And when you’re gone, who remembers your name?
Who keeps your flame?
Who tells your story?”

Christine Hayes
Yale University

i From the musical Hamilton, by Lin-Manuel Miranda (PhD h.c., Yeshiva University, 2009), © 5000 Broadway Music.
Complicating Patriarchy

When I was a child, we had a medium-sized ceramic figurine of a rabbi in our house. Old and wizened, sporting a long grey beard and dark robes, he looked appropriately pious. And as a young boy who was still learning about Judaism via synagogue services, Sunday school, and rudimentary Hebrew classes, in my mind the figurine was, despite clear prohibitions against idolatry, my concept of what God looked like. God as father. God as judge. God as powerful. God as man. While I knew intellectually that God wasn’t really an old man in the sky, the fact that biblical and other narratives typically gender and reinforce God as male (George Burns in the movie Oh, God! Anyone? Anyone?) led to this conclusion for me. Judaism—and it is clearly not unique among religions in this regard—is a rather androcentric and yes, patriarchal religion.

And yet, while patriarchy is often conceived of and discussed as a binary system of oppressor and oppressed, male and female, father and mother, husband and wife, as some of the articles in this issue of Perspectives reveal and indeed as work by emerging scholars such as those in the AJS’s newly formed Gender and Sexuality Studies Group uncovers, gender, sexuality, and power are often multiple, nonbinary, and, I would argue, contextual categories.

Take, for example, the histories of Jewish masculinity by AJS members Sarah Imhoff, Beth Wenger, and Daniel Boyarin, which have examined the ways in which the gender of Jewish men reads differently depending on the time period, country, or culture in which those individuals lived. Such men might still be patriarchs and women might still play a subservient role to them, but in a larger hierarchy, depending on the context, Jewish men may read as less powerful, even weak, compared to their non-Jewish counterparts. That observation isn’t meant to invalidate Jewish patriarchy or condone men’s inappropriate behavior toward women, but it does complicate the binary.

Along those lines, many recent theorists remind us that identities are intersectional. Consequently, how do we understand the role of patriarchy vis-à-vis gay men or transmen? Such individuals arguably occupy other strata of maleness and masculinity, which further challenges how we conceive of patriarchy. Some of these individuals might even find themselves to be the oppressed and oppressor at the same time.

All this is not to negate the notion that patriarchy has and continues to have detrimental, violent, and painful effects on many members of our community, as a number of the articles in this issue reveal. From unfair job discrimination to unwanted comments about appearance to sexual assault, patriarchy has a very real, very deeply felt impact on women. And for those of us who identify as “men,” and I put this category in scare quotes because it, like “women,” is a more fluid category than we often think, there is still work to be done to address inequality. Even those of us who identify as allies and feel we may be doing the “right thing” vis-à-vis gender equality may not realize the ways in which
we may still be blind or even unconsciously supportive of institutionalized patriarchy, those systems that place and keep women on a lower rung than men. These are issues that the AJS’s leadership are thinking very seriously about and working to address. Is there gender diversity at the conference in panel makeup? In board composition? In committee makeup? While perfect equity has not always been achievable, it’s a goal to strive for.

Hopefully no matter what your gender or sexuality is, the articles in this issue will be thought provoking. You might identify with some of them as a victim, being reminded of something that happened to you; as a knowing (or unknowing) perpetrator; or as a bystander, watching on the sidelines, who has not yet spoken up to help change the system. The articles here are meant to stir reflection and awaken us to the ways in which the complicated and uneven systems of gender, sexuality, and power operate in this world. We have to make sure that AJS members are treated equally and fairly, with decency and respect, able to perform their work as scholars, teachers, and researchers without fear, anxiety, or threat, and until all that is fully achieved, we have work to do.

Warren Hoffman  
Association for Jewish Studies

———

ii  https://jewishstudies.wisc.edu/kutler-masculinities/
Thank you to our donors

The AJS is grateful to the following supporters who contributed to the AJS@50 Annual Fund since January 2018. Donors to the fund are updated monthly at associationforjewishstudies.org.

Please support AJS, your intellectual home. Your contributions sustain a rich array of AJS programs, resources, and publications and help keep membership dues and conference fees affordable.

For further information, please go to associationforjewishstudies.org or contact Warren Hoffman at whoffman@associationforjewishstudies.org or (212) 294-8301 ext. 6249.
AJS Dissertation Completion Fellowships

The Association for Jewish Studies congratulates the recipients of the 2019-2020 AJS Dissertation Completion Fellowships.

MATTHEW BRITTINGHAM
Department of Religion, Emory University
“‘Our Jewish Workingmen May be Proud of Our Torah and of Our Religion’: Jewish Immigrants, Judaism, and the Yiddish Mass-Market (1900-1930)”

PRATIMA GOPALAKRISHNAN
Department of Religious Studies, Yale University
“Domestic Labor and Marital Obligations in the Ancient Jewish Household”

SARA HALPERN
Department of History, The Ohio State University
“These Unfortunate People’: The International Humanitarian Response to European Jewish Refugees in Shanghai, 1945-1951”

CHEN MANDEL-EDREI
Department of Comparative Literature, University of Maryland
“Planned Encounters: The Aesthetics and Ethics of Modern Hasidic Narratives–A Historical and Literary Perspective”

ADI NESTER
Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Colorado, Boulder
“People of the Book: Biblical Music Dramas and the Hermeneutic Formation of Collectivity”

NOAM SIENNA
Department of History, University of Minnesota
“Making and Reading Jewish Books in North Africa, 1700-1900”

DANIELLE WILLARD-KYLE
Department of History, Rutgers University
“Living in Liminal Spaces: Refugees in Italian Displaced Persons Camps, 1945-1951”

MEIRA WOLKENFELD
Department of Talmud, Yeshiva University
“Scent and Self: The Sense of Smell in the Cultural World of the Babylonian Talmud”

The AJS also recognizes the following finalist:

C. TOVA MARKENSON
Departments of Theatre and Drama, Northwestern University
“Performing Jewish Femininity: Prostitution and Protest on the Latin American Yiddish Stage (1900-1939)”

Recipients of the AJS Dissertation Completion Fellowships receive a $20,000 stipend, as well as professional development opportunities and ongoing contact with mentors during the fellowship year. Particular attention will be dedicated to training the fellows to speak publicly, in an accessible fashion, about their work.

Information about the 2020-2021 AJS Dissertation Completion Fellowship competition will be available on the AJS website in the fall of 2019.
The Association for Jewish Studies is pleased to recognize the following Institutional Members:

### FULL INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

- Boston University, Elie Wiesel Center for Jewish Studies
- Brandeis University
- Columbia University, Institute for Israel and Jewish Studies
- Cornell University, Jewish Studies Program
- Duke University, Center for Jewish Studies
- Graduate Theological Union, Richard S. Dinner Center for Jewish Studies*
- Harvard University, Center for Jewish Studies
- Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institute of Religion
- Indiana University, Robert A. and Sandra S. Borns Jewish Studies Program
- The Jewish Theological Seminary, The Gershon Kekst Graduate School
- Johns Hopkins University, Leonard and Helen R. Stulman Jewish Studies Program
- Lehigh University, Philip and Muriel Berman Center for Jewish Studies
- McGill University, Department of Jewish Studies
- New York University, Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies
- The Ohio State University, Melton Center for Jewish Studies
- Rutgers University, Department of Jewish Studies and The Allen and Joan Bildner Center for the Study of Jewish Life
- Spertus Institute for Jewish Learning and Leadership
- Stanford University, Taube Center for Jewish Studies
- Touro College, Graduate School of Jewish Studies
- University of Arizona, the Arizona Center for Judaic Studies
- University of California, Los Angeles, Alan D. Leve Center for Jewish Studies
- University of California, San Diego, Jewish Studies Program
- University of Florida, Center for Jewish Studies
- University of Maryland, the Joseph and Rebecca Meyerhoff Center for Jewish Studies
- University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Judaic and Near Eastern Studies Department
- University of Michigan, Jean & Samuel Frankel Center for Judaic Studies
- University of North Carolina at Asheville, Center for Jewish Studies*
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Carolina Center for Jewish Studies
- University of Toronto, Anne Tanenbaum Centre for Jewish Studies
- Vanderbilt University, Jewish Studies Program
- Washington University in St. Louis, Department of Jewish, Islamic, and Near Eastern Languages and Cultures
- Yale University, Program in Judaic Studies
- York University, Israel and Golda Koschitzky Centre for Jewish Studies

### ASSOCIATE INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

- Academy for Jewish Religion
- American University, Center for Israel Studies and Jewish Studies Program
- Appalachian State University, Center for Judaic, Holocaust, and Peace Studies
- Arizona State University, Center for Jewish Studies
- Barnard College, Program in Jewish Studies
- Brown University, Program in Judaic Studies
- California State University, Fresno, Jewish Studies Program
- Chapman University, The Rodgers Center for Holocaust Education
- Colby College, Center for Small Town Jewish Life and Jewish Studies Program
- Concordia University, Institute for Canadian Jewish Studies, Judaic Studies Program, Department of Religion and Cultures, and Department of History*
- Fordham University, Jewish Studies
- The George Washington University, Judaic Studies Program
- Hebrew College
- Loyola Marymount University, Jewish Studies Program
- Michigan State University, Jewish Studies Program
- Northeastern University, Jewish Studies Program
- Old Dominion University, Institute for Jewish Studies & Interfaith Understanding
- Portland State University, Harold Schnitzer Family Program in Judaic Studies
- Princeton University, Program in Judaic Studies, Ronald O. Perelman Institute for Judaic Studies
- Purdue University, Jewish Studies Program
- Reconstructionist Rabbinical College
- Rice University, Program in Jewish Studies
- Temple University, Feinstein Center for American Jewish History
- University of California, Berkeley, Center for Jewish Studies
- University of California, Davis, Jewish Studies Program*
- University of California, Santa Cruz, Center for Jewish Studies
- University of Colorado, Boulder, Program in Jewish Studies
- University of Connecticut, Center for Judaic Studies and Contemporary Jewish Life
- University of Denver, Center for Judaic Studies
- University of Kentucky, Jewish Studies
- University of Minnesota, Center for Jewish Studies
University of Oklahoma, Schusterman Center for Judaic and Israeli Studies
University of Pennsylvania, Herbert D. Katz Center for Advanced Judaic Studies and the Jewish Studies Program
University of Pittsburgh, Jewish Studies Program
University of Tennessee – Knoxville, Fern and Manfred Steinfeld Program in Judaic Studies
University of Texas at Austin, Schusterman Center for Jewish Studies
University of Virginia, Jewish Studies Program
University of Washington, Stroum Center for Jewish Studies
University of Wisconsin – Madison, George L. Mosse/Laurence A. Weinstein Center for Jewish Studies
University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, the Sam and Helen Stahl Center for Jewish Studies
Yiddish Book Center
Zionism University*

More information about AJS Institutional Membership, including a list of benefits, can be found at www.associationforjewishstudies.org/membership/institutional-membership

AFI LiATE INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS
Association of Jewish Libraries
Association for Canadian Jewish Studies*
Association for Israel Studies
Council of American Jewish Museums
Latin American Jewish Studies Association*
World Union of Jewish Studies
*We are pleased to recognize our new 2019 members!*

More information about AJS Institutional Membership, including a list of benefits, can be found at www.associationforjewishstudies.org/membership/institutional-membership

If your program, department, foundation or institution is interested in becoming an AJS Institutional Member, please contact Michelle Katz at mkatz@associationforjewishstudies.org or (917) 606-8249.

51ST ANNUAL CONFERENCE
December 15–17, 2019   |   Hilton San Diego Bayfront   |   San Diego, CA

Join the AJS for more than 190 sessions devoted to the latest research in Jewish Studies.

• Major exhibit of leading publishers of Jewish Studies scholarship
• Evening film screenings and performances
• 51st Anniversary Party and Plenary Lecture on Sunday, December 17
• Evening receptions sponsored by Jewish Studies programs and research institutions
• Jewish Studies and Digital Humanities workshop (featuring the latest digital research projects and teaching tools)
• Professional development sessions, mentoring opportunities, and more!

Special reduced room rates at the Hilton San Diego Bayfront ($149 single and double occupancy; $129 student rate) available through November 15, 2019. Call 1-800-HILTONS for reservations. Be sure to ask for the AJS rate.

For best rates register before August 31, 2019. See the AJS website for registration information.

For information on exhibiting, advertising, or sponsoring at the 51st Annual Conference, please contact Heather Turk, Director of Events and Operations, at advertise@associationforjewishstudies.org.
The Patriarchy Issue

Twelve Theses on the Patriarchy Issue

Martin Kavka

1. This is the Patriarchy Issue of *AJS Perspectives*. It provides an opportunity to think about patriarchy’s issue—about what issues from patriarchy.

2. What does patriarchy issue? To what does patriarchy give birth? Nothing but more patriarchy.

3. All birth sees the arrival of something new in the world ... except for patriarchal issue. Patriarchy is nothing new. Sure, it claims to be like birth. Patriarchy in the academy gives birth to new PhD holders, new books, and new institutions. But none of these are new, because they are beholden to the patriarchy that grants PhDs, recommends publishing contracts, and funds institutions.

4. Because patriarchy is nothing new, the circulation of patriarchy happens through vessels that are ersatz and monstrous versions of uteruses.

5. Usually, monsters in cultures signify the uncanny anxieties of a dominant culture. But patriarchal issue is the monster about which not enough people are anxious. It is the monster that walks around every day, passing as just. It has no “tell” that signifies its difference. That is what makes it the most monstrous.

6. Sometimes monsters can do good, maximizing the flourishing of those in a community who are relatively powerless. Anyone who knows Isaac Bashevis Singer’s version of the golem story, in which the golem demonstrates that a rabbi has been framed for murder, knows this. That story is edifying because we readers know the difference between the monster and the human. It is not edifying for the monster: when the golem learns that humans know that he is not human, he wreaks havoc in Prague.

7. Not all humans have realized that the birth that results from patriarchal issue is neither human nor humane. It stops people from flourishing in seminar rooms, at conferences, in edited volumes, and in recommendation letters. It prevents others from being born; it prevents life while it hoards life for the patriarchy.

8. The monster of patriarchal issue should not be seen as a disease. If it were a disease, one could immunize oneself against it by just taking in a little patriarchy. But this fails, as countless numbers of well-meaning yet clueless men can testify (including this clueless gay man, who has coedited three volumes with fifty-two essays between them, only nine of which were authored by women).
9. How does one kill something that so many people fail to see as inhuman? There is not much else to do except to signal to others that a certain kind of monster is here, now, impeding human flourishing.

10. Sometimes this signaling occurs through a patient discourse that delineates a taxonomy of monsters, and persuasively classifies this monster as the kind that does not make for flourishing. At other times, it occurs through screaming. It is difficult to say that the discursive signal is more effective than the emotive and wordless one. Screams awaken sleepers and get them to see, even if we might think that screams have little argumentative power.

11. The inhumane monster, when shown that it is not human, will wreak havoc in a community. No one, frankly, should expect patriarchy to respond differently to this issue of AJS Perspectives. AJS members with longer memories will be able to tell persuasive stories of the greater havoc that would have resulted had this issue appeared two decades ago or more.

12. Given that patriarchy issues and reissues itself so well, the proper language to describe the appearance of the AJS Perspectives patriarchy issue is theological—that of miracle. That is hopefully enough to sustain a community’s efforts to kill the monster of patriarchal issue.

MARTIN KAVKA is professor of Religion at Florida State University. He is the author of Jewish Messianism and the History of Philosophy (Cambridge, 2004), which was awarded the Jordan Schnitzer Book Award in Philosophy and Jewish Thought by AJS in 2008. He is also the coeditor of the Journal of Religious Ethics.
“A fascinating read that portrays life in Telz, the vibrant Jewish shtetl or market town that was also a famous Yeshiva center.”

—Robert Shapiro, Brooklyn College, CUNY

Paper $24.95s 978-0-8156-3644-1  ebook 978-0-8156-5472-8

“A much-needed and most valuable study on the research of Holocaust awareness and of Holocaust cinematic representations.”

—Nurith Gertz, The Open University of Israel

Paper $34.95s 978-0-8156-3650-2  ebook 978-0-8156-5478-0

“For those already interested in Celan who don’t know Romanian, this book offers a perspective that is thoughtful and even intimate at times.”

—Maria Bucur, author of Heroes and Victims: Remembering War in Twentieth-Century Romania

Paper $29.95s 978-0-8156-3602-1  ebook 978-0-8156-5450-6

“Provides a relevant lens for thinking about issues related to American pluralism and Jewish identity today.”

—Noam Pianko, University of Washington

Paper $34.95s 978-0-8156-3641-0  ebook 978-0-8156-5469-8
How the rabbis of the Talmud transformed everything into a legal question—and Jewish law into a way of thinking and talking about everything

“How Chaim Saiman has written a genuinely enthralling book about a concept central to rabbinic Judaism: the study of Jewish law, not only as a guide to life but as ongoing encounter with the divine. A superb, much-needed, and enlightening work.”
—Rabbi Lord Jonathan Sacks

“Halakhah not only succeeds wonderfully as an introductory text but brims with ideas, formulations, interpretations, and perspectives that will stimulate, enrich, and catalyze scholars as well. Saiman’s smart, comprehensive, and regularly brilliant book will stand as a significant contribution for some while to come.”
—Yehudah Mirsky, Brandeis University

Cloth $29.95
Cosponsored by the Tikvah Fund
Why It Was So Hard to Say #MeToo and What I Learned When I Finally Did

Keren R. McGinity

I thought “me too” from the moment I first read the words in October 2017. But I did not say them or post them on social media. I wanted to, but I could not give myself permission to add my voice to the growing numbers. I thought about my experiences of being touched without my consent, searching for clues. I went over each incident in chronological order. All were evidence of the patriarchy that made men think they had an inalienable right to women’s bodies. When I got to the most recent incident, however, I stopped in my mental tracks. It was someone many people knew, someone whose research and writing had shaped a tenacious narrative, and that made it different from the rest.

As I wrote in a June 2018 op-ed for the Jewish Week,

It happened at a conference of a prestigious Jewish organization several years ago. An older, married man used his seniority to lure me to dinner with the promise of professional guidance. I suggested we go someplace nearby the venue and invite other people to join us. He vetoed both of those ideas....

He took me to a candle-lit Italian restaurant that was entirely unsuitable for an ostensibly professional meeting. He peppered me with personal questions about my love life. He reached across the table and took my hand in his. I could not get out of that restaurant and back to the conference hotel fast enough. But despite my obvious discomfort, he persisted in accompanying me into the elevator and up to my floor. I should have insisted on parting ways in the hotel lobby. But he is a leader in his field and I was afraid to offend him.

I firmly said “good night,” told him that he did not have to walk me back to my room, and turned to walk away when he suddenly wrapped his arms around me, pressed his body against mine, and forcefully kissed my neck in a way that only lovers should. I broke free and ran to my room, reeling from what had just happened. I felt violated and betrayed. Adding to my wound, he texted me the next day as if he had not done anything wrong.

(citation: https://jewishweek.timesofisrael.com/american-jewrys-metoo-problem-a-first-person-encounter/)
(Editors’ note: An investigative reporting piece in the Jewish Week that was published a month later revealed that the man in question was Steven M. Cohen, a prominent sociologist and leader in the Jewish communal world. https://jewishweek.timesofisrael.com/harassment-allegations-mount-against-leading-jewish-sociologist/)

I knew what he did was not kosher, that I had been mistreated, but women are socialized to not make waves and I was a product of that patriarchal brainwashing.

Multiple factors contributed to my initial silence. He was older, tenured, and significantly more powerful. The interconnectivity of Jewish academia and community combined with the perpetrator’s status meant that saying #MeToo would draw attention to an abuse of power in the Jewish community in general and Jewish Studies in particular. If I spoke out, I thought I would bring shame to the community in which I worked, a community that I loved. The ideas that the Jewish people are one big family, that we are responsible for one another, and that we should not speak ill of each other kept a muzzle on me. It did not occur to me then that speaking out is consistent with Jewish values and academic integrity.

As I read more #MeToo articles, a sense of urgency began to well up inside me, compelling me to do something. Six years after the incident with Cohen, I read an article in the Jerusalem Post that opened a door I had not known existed. It was as if the question in the title, “When Will US Jews Confront Sexual Harassment and Other Abuses of Power?” was directed to me. Author Rafael Medoff, a Holocaust historian, argued that Jews should strongly encourage people to step forward about their experiences and contact his Committee on Ethics in Jewish Leadership “to discuss what can be done.” It felt like a clarion call to end my silence and to disallow someone who had acted so unethically from continuing to lead Jewish Studies and the community. It took six more months and many baby steps before my words became public.

What I learned when I finally spoke truth to power fills me with amazement and hope for all who have suffered, for Jewish Studies, and for the Jewish community. The academic leaders in whom I confided that I had written a soon-to-be-published #MeToo piece took immediate action to protect other women by disinviting Cohen from speaking on campus and writing a #WeToo blog.
expressing solidarity. Within hours after my story went live I was inundated with an overwhelming deluge of kindness, support, and gratitude. I received emails and texts from individuals who had been harassed by Cohen and by other perpetrators, and also from bystanders who wished they had been upstanders. Their experiences ranged from recent to decades old, triggered by learning about my story. In some cases, they had not told anyone before. I became a keeper of dark secrets, a human vault.

The voluminous response made me realize how significantly the #MeToo movement was in changing attitudes that could influence the trajectory of Jewish Studies. The days when people brushed off inappropriate behavior as “Steve just being Steve” were coming to an end. Women who complained about him years earlier had been told: he has a family, and dragging his name through the proverbial mud would ruin his career. Fortunately, in 2018, not a single person indicated anything similar to me. Once I used my voice, Cohen’s near-daily postings on the Association for the Social Scientific Study of Jewry listserv ceased. Two months after I went public, and four weeks after a journalist’s exposé, the Title IX investigation ended with his resignation from Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion.

By saying #MeToo, I learned that genuine feminists—of all gender identities—support each other because they can see and handle the truth. Traveling in Israel over the summer gave me the opportunity to meet Shulamit Magnus, a professor emerita of Jewish history from Jerusalem who serves on the Committee on Ethics in Jewish Leadership. She shared her shock and anger; Cohen had been a longtime friend. But there was zero hesitation on her part to condemn his behavior and support me for coming forward. We walked through the Old City. I had never visited the Kotel at night. Shulamit spotted an opening in the crowd and generously steered me into it. I placed my hands and forehead on the ancient stones, welcoming their coolness. I surprised myself and wept for what seemed like a long time. Exhaustion, fear, and relief flowed out of my eyes and down my cheeks. The throng of female worshippers felt comforting. I was not alone.

The most important lesson I learned is that I am resilient and pliable, as are Jewish Studies and the community. Although gatekeepers like Cohen have influenced my career, I persisted; I kept researching, publishing, teaching, and serving. When someone betrays us or betrays our values, such as ethical conduct and mutual respect, we can choose to evolve rather than enable patriarchy. In the process, individuals will unburden their hearts and minds, organizations and institutions will rid themselves of the unrighteous and their toxic behavior, growing stronger as a result. Jewish Studies and the many communities scholars serve will be enriched by a greater diversity of perspectives that generate new research questions and intellectually nuanced findings that inform communal priorities.

Sexual misconduct and abuses of power are part of patriarchy’s legacy that reinforces structural inequalities and inequities. Let us prevent them from happening in the first place by redistributing power, creating checks and balances, encouraging transparency, and holding all accountable.

___
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For the last ten years, as Sol Drachler Professor of Social Work and Professor of Judaic Studies at the University of Michigan, I have had the privilege of deepening my students’ understanding of Jewish history and identity while preparing them to address the challenges of contemporary Jewish life. Given how similar this project is to where I started, twenty-seven years ago, teaching student rabbis at Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC) in Cincinnati, I may appear to have traveled a smooth path to my current position. I did not.

Arriving in Cincinnati in 1991, I became the first woman to hold a tenure-track position on that HUC campus. I hardly felt like a pioneer. At that point, it seemed late in the game for this kind of advance—after all, Sally Priesand, who had studied in Cincinnati, had been ordained as the first American woman rabbi twenty years before I got there, and both the New York and Los Angeles campuses of HUC each already had one woman on their faculties. So, people were less impressed than shocked to learn that I was to be the campus’s first woman faculty member. Cincinnati faculty explained that theirs was a small cohort and there were few women in the text-focused academic fields that dominated their ranks. Meanwhile, many of the school’s women students felt frustrated that people considered them “women rabbis” as opposed to just “rabbis.”

I quickly fell in love with the school’s history and curious cast of characters, the pride that local folks took in the college, and the library’s large bound volumes of nineteenth-century periodicals. I felt honored to join this historic campus and to teach its students.

It seemed fitting that I was completing a dissertation focused on how eighteenth- and nineteenth-century American Jews adapted Judaism to address changing expectations for women, with much of my research focused on the nascent Reform Movement and its organizational home in Cincinnati. It did not escape me that my own presence was pushing present-day HUC to adjust in ways both large and small (a lock on the faculty’s...
bathroom door!). More than anyone, I was aware of how often the Reform Movement’s historic rhetoric of gender equality had repeatedly failed to match reality for women within its reach. Still, I hoped I could become a small but positive footnote in the history of this venerable institution.

I felt confident in my ability to navigate these waters. I had long dwelt in institutions marked by male academic privilege. My undergrad school, Yale, had gone coed only ten years before my arrival, and I was coming from an American History graduate program at Harvard dominated by male faculty and students. As the youngest, only unmarried, only gay (though not comfortable or out in that setting), and only woman faculty member, I knew there were myriad ways in which I didn’t belong, but I never had trouble finding my place in male worlds. My expectations, moreover, were shaped by the example of my academic parents. Starting out in the 1950s, my mother, a true pioneer, had rarely seemed ruffled as she raised four children and became a leading scholar of modern Chinese history. My parents never focused on traditional femininity as the way to success, and I understood from them that academics were judged according to the merits of their contributions. Hence, I wasn’t worried about appearing too forthright or questioning. I understood those traits as among my strengths, as they had been before my time at HUC and would prove to be again after.

Accordingly, I fully embraced the opportunities offered by Cincinnati and HUC. I spent days, weeks, and months in the American Jewish Archives, completing my dissertation and then my book manuscript, while enjoying the added benefit of being able to welcome, host, and learn from visiting scholars from around the world. The archives also became a home for further research and publishing on the history of the Cincinnati Jewish community, American Jewish liturgies, and the history of the relationship between HUC and the Jewish Theological Seminary. I developed courses that brought students beyond the institution’s walls—on one notable occasion, for instance, bringing my students from a course on blacks and Jews into a remarkable dialogue with the adult education community of one of the city’s African-American churches that dwelt in a former synagogue building. Indeed, studying the experience of Cincinnati’s black churches whose homes were in former synagogue buildings yielded both precious relationships and a published article.

I developed relationships throughout the community and with colleagues at the University of Cincinnati. Among many other communal endeavors, I joined the effort to build a museum dedicated to the history of the Underground Railroad in Cincinnati, cochairing its history advisory committee. HUC’s particular and unique community was especially precious to me, and I regularly attended worship services and community events. I took a leading role in working with students to deepen communal engagement through service projects, community conversations, and inviting outside speakers on current vital subjects that were missing in the standard curriculum. Opportunities to create and participate in this rare sort of engaged community were what made me prize the Cincinnati campus of HUC as a special learning environment, beautifully suited to immersing students in both meaningful community and critical thought. I also participated fully in faculty discussions, service roles, and in publicly representing the school, always with an eye to seeing us fulfill the potential of our singular history and current possibilities.

In 1998, when I organized the third biennial Scholars Conference on American Jewish History, I relished the opportunity to introduce my colleagues to a special school and community. The conference is still fondly remembered by those who were there for its challenging program, its deep immersion in the rich history and texture of HUC and Cincinnati, and for a remarkable
keynote by playwright Tony Kushner, who had struggled through a cross-country odyssey, buffeted by fierce rain storms, to get to us.

So, in 2000, when I was denied reappointment after nine years at HUC, I was deeply stunned and bereft at the seeming erasure of all I’d done there. Indeed, it has taken a long time for me to recognize that I could be valued for the very skills—teaching, administration, public speaking, collegiality—that those who determined my fate at HUC decided I lacked. Although the committee, when asked directly about my research and writing, acknowledged that my scholarship met their expectations, I was still left feeling, for years afterward, that I needed to prove myself on that score as well.

Why revisit all this now? As the fractures that emerge when women enter settings once reserved for men come increasingly into clear view, it becomes easier to see how women who run into trouble in these environments are blamed for their inability to fit in. HUC’s leaders were outraged when, in the face of my dismissal, people questioned their commitment to gender equality. Given that, very soon before, the first woman faculty member at HUC’s New York campus had been denied tenure and New York’s first female dean had been dismissed, it seemed a fair question. Yet, rather than acknowledge the possibility of legitimate concern, they questioned the loyalty of those who objected. They absolved themselves of responsibility, while disempowering those who suggested the school could do better. As faculty at HUC or rabbis in the Reform Movement, women who talked (even with each other) about being treated badly or inappropriately could risk current or subsequent jobs. In relatively closed systems like the Reform Movement or Jewish Studies, few could afford to disrupt upbeat institutional narratives.

In 2004, I accepted a settlement in a lawsuit I had brought against HUC for wrongful dismissal. I refused, however, to accept a provision that would have prevented me from writing about my experiences there. Today, as I watch courageous women stepping forward to call the Jewish community to account for overlooking the transgressions of powerful men, it seems like high time to set the record straight about my own experience.

My early years as the only woman faculty member on campus yielded many strange experiences. Others would occasionally call attention to my awkward position, as in my second year, when one professor beseeched his colleagues to cease what he called the “puerile practice” of addressing each other as “gentlemen” at faculty meetings. The practice shifted after that, but not without someone first responding, “oh, I’m sure Karla doesn’t mind.”

I quickly became aware that many faculty members, most of whom were HUC graduates, simply could not recognize the vulnerability of those who did not experience themselves as insiders. I would often see faculty dismiss the efforts of students who questioned the campus culture. When I highlighted the courage it took for a student to, for instance, facilitate a conversation about gender inequality at HUC, they would respond, “Courage? Why would that take courage?” Still, I felt bemused when a group of students asked me if I was going to “get in trouble” for working with them to deepen campus conversations on difficult subjects. They understood the culture better than I did.

In 1998, I grew concerned about how the Committee on Faculty’s new leadership appeared to be assessing my contributions. I knew I taught more interactively and less frontally than many of my colleagues, but was surprised to see the committee advise me to do more “teaching per se.” I was likewise nonplussed when they passed on to me a colleague’s suggestion that my academic work was too narrowly focused on women. They did not, as I would have hoped, indicate that in fact I had published well beyond that subject or note that, in any case, no one had ever suggested a “narrowness” to work focused only on men. When I wrote a long letter to share what I found unsettling in their coded language of privilege and discrimination, they questioned why I refused to acknowledge their support and continued to present myself as
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an outsider. One professor let me know that as he read my letter eight times, he asked himself why I was being such a “baby.” Also, that I was a good writer. Also, that there was something irritating about my smile.

Despite these difficulties, the committee never advised me to delay my tenure process (as they did with other faculty members for whom they had concerns). My book was about to be published by Harvard University Press, and I was deeply engaged with students and community. I persisted in believing that input from the rest of the faculty would protect me. Moreover, no man had been denied tenure on the Cincinnati campus in almost fifty years.

In January 2000, I was invited to the home of an older faculty member whom I really didn’t know very well. He was so disturbed by the unprecedented proceedings at a recent meeting of the full professors to discuss my reappointment, he felt he needed to alert me. He likened the oral report he heard to a grand jury presentation where only the prosecution is allowed to present its case. He described a forty-five-minute “minority report” (accompanying a 3-1 committee vote *in my favor*) that offered an unrelenting litany of my failings.

That negative report then made its way to the College-Institute provost and president, both of whom were rabbinical school classmates of the committee chair. When the report reached the school’s Board of Governors, member Sally Priesand questioned how this extreme portrayal could conflict so profoundly with her experience of hearing me speak and seeing me interact with students. Her questions were dismissed, and the board was assured that the whole process had been “impeccable.”

When the administration announced my nonreappointment to the community at the end of the term, I joined my female colleague in New York as the only people denied reappointment or tenure in recent decades across HUC’s three American campuses. There was no system for appeal.

Offering no meaningful oversight, HUC allowed a few men to conduct a closed process that succeeded in disposing of someone, with the wrong kind of smile, who did not fit their idea of what their first woman faculty member should be. Unlike many in my situation, I was fortunate to have good health; strong support from family, community, friends, and a caring partner; as well as financial resources. Moreover, I was not forced to abandon my academic expertise. Moving back home to Boston to serve as historian in residence at the Jewish Women’s Archive, I was able to begin reassembling the pieces of my personal and professional identities.

It is nineteen years later; I know things have changed. For one thing, after my departure, review procedures were introduced into HUC’s tenure process. While there are still only two women with academic appointments in Cincinnati, there are many women throughout the system, including some with significant administrative positions. Still, as the news illustrates every day, we are not yet a society that trusts women and their truths. Most institutions still have work to do, and I believe the best way to support a school that I still care about is to hold it accountable for both its past and its present.

As this #MeToo moment continues to reveal the cracks in our “postfeminist” social order, we need to scrutinize our narratives of gender progress. We may see institutions evolving and women increasingly moving into positions of authority and leadership. We should not, however, assume all those journeys have been smooth. Nor should we trust that the gatekeepers of institutions long dominated by men will know how to relinquish some share of their power and control, even when it has come time for them to do so.
A Patriarchal Miseducation

Growing up, I learned how to be silent in the face of sexual violence. As a professor, I must do better.

Mika Ahuvia

One in four girls and one in six boys will be sexually abused before they turn eighteen.

• Fourteen years old: I am reading a chapter of the Bible with my two younger sisters, my mother, and my grandfather. The Torah portion is Genesis 19, the angels’ visitation to Sodom. The townsmen at the door. Lot offering his virgin daughters instead of his guests. I object: Lot is a terrible father. My grandfather responds: That is not the point of the story. The story is about proper hospitality.

• Sixteen years old: My father has a guest. The guest comments on what he’d like to do to my teenage body. My father overhears and laughs. Is this a story about proper hospitality? I remember that this is not my story and I am silent. I start avoiding home.

• In college, I choose Classical Studies because it takes me as far away from myself and the present as possible, and lets me linger with the minds of great men who never worry about being sexually assaulted, who ruminate on the pursuit of the good life and self-actualization. I read Aristophanes and Plato and am inspired by their occasionally sympathetic statements about womankind.

• Over the next eight years, I pursue Judaic Studies in five academic institutions between the United States and Israel. Moving repeatedly is isolating.

• I am on a date with an observant Jewish law student. He tells me that it is the open sexualization of women in our culture that leads men to desire what is forbidden: children. I cannot respond because I am choking back tears and I cannot even name why.
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• I audit a “Bible as Literature” class with a popular professor. Genesis 19 comes around again. This professor teaches with compassion and kindness, but he does not call out Lot. I follow him out after class, wait in a line of students, and ask him what this story means, why it seems so cruel. He says, and I write this down a few moments later, that the Bible includes hard stories; it does not smooth out its rough edges for us. It would be doing us a disservice if it did. He does not indict Lot, but I am gratified he admits the terrain is rocky.

• I read the texts of the rabbis. I am drawn to their imaginative realms: under Roman occupation, the rabbis are victims of oppression, focused on self-definition and living according to their own values. I’ve identified with men’s perspectives for so long, I do not even mind their casual misogyny. I do not take the patriarchy personally. I am a star student.

• One of my favorite professors invites me to join him at a bar for a drink. I’ve heard whispers about him, so I ask a male colleague to join me. When my friend leaves the table to go the bathroom, my teacher begins to tell me about his troubled sex life. I nod sympathetically and am grateful that my friend will return eventually. I can handle this like a guy, I tell myself. It is only years later, when I am about to marry, that I can see what was wrong with that exchange. Oversharing like that is a way of establishing intimacy where none should exist; it is a way of breaking down a door that ought to remain closed. Within a year two friends and two mentors will tell me their own experiences with him: propositions, physical intimidation, and sexual harassment. Each swears me to secrecy while at the same time minimizing what happened to her. I am heartbroken to lose my trust in him, but after I graduate, I never speak to him again. He remained a professor and I remained silent. Only now do I wonder how many others are still carrying his secrets for him. And I wonder if I did enough to protect the next isolated student or vulnerable assistant professor or random stranger from him.

• At one of my university programs, I’m the only woman in my cohort in my department. I hang out with my male colleagues and I am proud of myself because I can be one of the guys. I don’t mind their jokes about women, sex, and rape because I’ve been disconnected from my body for so long, I barely feel it.

• I’m preparing for an exam on Hebrew Bible and Ancient Judaism. I decide to read the entire Bible with commentaries of my choosing. Over the course of my studies of Judaism and ancient religion, I have never been assigned scholarship with a feminist perspective. Men in my field tend to discuss feminist scholarship only in tones of derision. I stumble across Comparative Literature scholar Mieke Bal discussing the most violent book of the Bible, the book of Judges, in her book Death & Dissymmetry. She notes that one of the most ancient biblical interpreters, Ben Sira, called the judges pious heroes: “May their bones flower again from the tomb, and may the names of those illustrious men live again in their sons.” Following Ben Sira, the book of Judges has been understood to be about the establishment of Israelites in the Promised Land. The judges are deserving of blessed memory: memorial tombs, names, and sons.

• But, Bal points out, there are almost no sons in the book of Judges, and there are many slaughtered daughters without names and memorial. Ben Sira denied the facts of the book of Judges. He ignored the descriptions of violence against women. And most modern scholars, following him, do too.

• I exhaled a breath I did not realize I’d been holding for half my life. I acknowledged a truth that I’d been repressing for years: texts that contain sexual violence are about sexual violence. And scholars collude in that violence against women and the silencing of women when they ignore that dimension of the text and the reality of sexual violence in the world around them.
I write an encyclopedia entry about sexual violence in early Jewish sources and share it with a workshop of my peers. A prospective student shows up late, has not read my essay fully, but offers a lot of feedback. The fact that in a long list of forbidden incestual relations, Leviticus 18 seems to omit a prohibition of father and daughter incest? Irrelevant, he tells me, it is obvious fathers would be prohibited from abusing their daughters. According to a global metaanalysis of self-reported child sexual abuse, an average of 12.7 percent of children experienced sexual abuse by a parent or caregiver. For women alone, that figure rises to 18 percent. American society has an incest problem that it assiduously avoids.

My main point was that in rabbinic texts, sexual violence was discussed primarily in terms of the resultant economic damage to the father or in terms of contractual marriage negotiations, not as a prohibited violation in and of itself.

But this overconfident student tells me that the rabbis might not articulate rape as a crime per se, but disciples listen to their rabbis and rape is unheard of in rabbinic communities. The men in the classroom all nod to each other. The professor is silent. I declare the workshop over forty-five minutes early and leave.

No community is immune from rape and sexual assault. Perpetrators rape victims in Jewish communities at the same rates as perpetrators rape victims in the general population.

Let me state clearly what no male teacher of mine has ever stated out loud: when a text describes sexual violence, it is about sexual violence. And sexual violence happens in families, with friends and acquaintances, and in all communities. It has happened to at least a quarter of your students and to your colleagues and mentors. It is traumatic and it is wrong. Now, then, and always. And if we do not possess the moral clarity to call that out, we are teaching men and women to be numb to sexual violence and to not call it out when it affects them, their peers, and others. We must do better.

If you choose to say nothing about violence in an ancient text or the world around you, you are choosing to collude in the silencing of victims.

In my classes, students practice talking about the construction of power in ancient texts. We talk about how their generation has popularized the concept of consent. It is not that women and boys in the past did not suffer sexual violence. It was just that their experience was irrelevant to the authors whose texts do survive. I include statistics about sexual violence on campus and I encourage students to look out for each other. I am not only teaching students to think, I am also always giving them permission to feel, and to imagine a different reality.

MIKA AHUVIA is the Marsha and Jay Glazer Endowed Chair in Jewish Studies and assistant professor of Classical Judaism in the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies at the University of Washington, Seattle. Her article “The Daughters of Israel: An Analysis of the Term in Late Ancient Jewish Sources” (co-written with Sarit Kattan Gribetz) can be found in the Jewish Quarterly Review 108.1 (2018): 1-27. Her reflection on reading and teaching rabbinic literature in the Age of #MeToo can be found on the Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion’s blog (www.fsrinc.org/reading-rabbis-metoo/).

---


Harassment: An Unfinished Story

In June 2006, a distinguished professor planted his open mouth on mine. Ever since I lodged a complaint about this incident with the university in April 2013, it’s become a large part of my professional identity. But, as damaging as that instance of sexual harassment/assault was to my psyche and my career, that isolated personal violation was far less devastating to me than the more systemic damage I have sustained from patriarchal structures in academic Jewish and Biblical Studies. I am facing the likely prospect of having to leave academia, and to find some other means for financial survival. I see this new development as an indirect outcome of my struggles with a powerful institution. This abuse is the most prolonged of my #MeToo experiences.

What follows is not a report or analysis. Abuses of power rely so heavily on hints below the surface, unspoken or barely spoken sophistries, and plausible deniability. So often, they cannot be described in familiar logical forms of narrative, even to insiders who are familiar with the cultural norms, structure, institutions, and even personalities involved. And so, I present here two snapshots out of my thick scrapbook: one partially annotated memory of the beginning of the process of “speaking out,” and one follow-up email that I leave to speak for itself. (I trust that it also bespeaks the silences and silencing that it reflects, reveals, and conceals.)

1. Lodging a complaint: April, 2013.

The harassment officer was immediately responsive. What relief! Policies have been established; there is a process and people care! I can lay my burden down, and the fixers will do whatever they do to repair this kind of thing.

Our first phone call, and the officer suggests a meeting of the three of us: her, me, and him.

Oh. This is not what I expected.

She says I can bring somebody along for support. But whom can I even confide in? Who can help me with something so personal, and so professionally significant, and therefore even more existentially personal, especially when concerned friends all advise me not to pursue something so potentially dangerous? But she’s the “expert.” If this is how things are done …
The officer arranges a preliminary meeting with him, just the two of them. She calls me immediately afterward. I am again relieved, feel heard, cared for. She begins by assuring me, “It’s ok. He made it back to the office ok.” Huh? “You know, he’s old, and this was hard for him to hear, and I was worried, but I checked, and he’s alright.” Huh? (Later, a couple of senior scholars—women—express their opinions that I should leave the poor man alone. They express this publicly. But I must stay focused.)

When I meet the harassment officer for the first time, she begins, “What do you think we can do anyway? He’s retired, so we don’t really have a way to punish him.” Why would I care about punishing him? Isn’t she the expert—what is usually done to care for victims of sexual harassers/assailants? I think. I remember cocking my head to the side and looking upwards, thinking, seeking inspiration, but also adopting a subservient nonthreatening posture and voice: “Umm…. Maybe he shouldn’t be teaching?” She thinks about that—that could be a good idea; he’s scheduled to teach next semester and maybe that should be reconsidered.

Even when the intentions are good, the entire complaint process involves conflict of interest—harassment officers work for the university. And often the intentions of institutional representatives are far from being good or compassionate, and they do not assume responsibility for victims, past, present, or future.

I try to consult with colleagues about what I might want as the outcome of this complaint. One colleague asks me, “Do you want him to go to jail?” Before I can even think about this, they say, “Well, he should go to jail. I know of at least two women whose lives he completely ruined.” Later in the conversation, this confidante says, “You know, it’s probably best to just let this pass. He’s old. Younger scholars don’t do this kind of thing anymore.”

Eventually, I come up with a list of objectives and needs. The list still focuses on the individuals, but begins to recognize the much broader systemic problem. I realized that I would most like to see the process move toward repair and healing.

**Even when the intentions are good, the entire complaint process involves conflict of interest—harassment officers work for the university.**

---

a. I want an acknowledgment of wrongdoing. I want recognition of an ongoing problem. I want a statement that he will get help and that he will stop his well-known pattern of harassing women.

b. I want the department to host a workshop on sexual harassment. What I don’t want is for the department to shrug off his behavior as “just him being him.”

c. For the sake of other victims, I want him to issue a public apology. I want to help right a wrong that has been tolerated for too long.

**Update:** My requests were ignored. Other complainants came forward. The institution submitted two other complaints, but omitted mine, falsely giving an impression that my complaint came after the statute of limitations. The emeritus professor was issued a warning, but continued to be honored by the institution. In contrast, I was subject to humiliations and erasure. He subsequently misused his position yet again and committed further assaults. He was barred from campus, and subjected to other punitive measures. My requests for a process of restorative justice were not implemented.

2. Six years after my complaint, thirteen years after I was assaulted, in the era of #MeToo, can we as an academic community move beyond the gossip and voyeurism?

Now that it is thankfully no longer politically correct to blame victims, can we move beyond the blaming of victimizers and focus on reconciliation?

With these questions in mind, I write and send an email to the institution that mistreated me and mishandled my complaint:

**7 October 2018. From <Author> to <Institution>**

Subject: Secondary victimization, post-Kavanaugh confirmation
Dear <M.> and <L.>,

I understand that from your perspective, this might not yet be a propitious time for me to reiterate my pleas to collaborate in a process of restorative justice and healing. In light of current events, both personal and political, it feels like an appropriate time for me to try asking again. And even to have some small hope that this time, there might be some ability for people to hear and reply to my requests with compassion and understanding.

I am writing to ask you to please acknowledge and apologize for the personal hurt and professional damage that I incurred due to secondary harassment by <your institution> in the context of a primary complaint of sexual harassment that I lodged at the university in 2013. I recall that when I first used the term secondary harassment, common responses included dismissing, denying, and even mocking not only my own experience but even the phenomenon. Thanks to the Kavanaugh travesty, humanity has been treated to a powerful demonstration—by the president who nominated him—of one form that secondary harassment can take, as he mocked Blasey Ford during a rally.

I am writing to offer you the opportunity to distinguish yourselves from the despicable behavior we’ve seen in the last week. It is hard to be put in the position of suffering sexual harassment at work and not knowing whom to turn to or how to protect yourself. It is worse when afterward you are quietly ignored, shunted towards the idea that it is your responsibility alone to create healing and to “move past” the sexual harassment that was suffered in the first place. It is that much harder when people who are meant to be allies and protectors humiliate, misrepresent, silence, and malign the victim in order to minimize institutional and their own personal responsibilities.

The callous indifference, deception, and character assassination that I was subjected to by <your institution> in the course of the processing of my complaints were far more hurtful, damaging, and violating to me than the original incident of <the perpetrator> placing his open mouth on mine. Moreover, the original incident itself was the product of a culture in which such behavior was tolerated, and therefore enabled; although his systematic harassment of women was well known for decades, and even after he had been formally disciplined, the university and <the perpetrator’s> colleagues and specifically <your prominent research center> continued to heap honors upon him. I understand that some of <the perpetrator’s> numerous victims felt gratified when he was eventually barred from campus. I felt partly validated but mostly frustrated because my own stated needs had been ignored yet again.

With thanks in advance in the hopes that you will reply in a genuine and genuinely compassionate manner, etc.

UPDATE: None. This e-mail received no response.

I am no longer awaiting an answer. In 2006, I cried silently to myself, feeling that I must somehow be so horribly flawed to have fallen victim to a predator. In 2013, I cried out as though in “a field” (cf. Deuteronomy 22:27), with almost none (willing) to hear. In 2018, my voice is becoming audible as part of a growing chorus. Will the response repair the damage that has been done?
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Vista del fondo omitid de la Sala del Gran Sanhedrin (43983) cropped
Gender Inclusivity: A Preliminary Guide for Jewish Studies Scholars

Susannah Heschel and Sarah Imhoff

Jewish Studies needs to do better when it comes to gender inclusivity. Here, as a complement to critiques of gender imbalance in Jewish Studies, we offer a brief list of constructive moves for scholars seeking to make Jewish Studies a more inclusive field. Our list includes several interlocking dimensions: the presence of women and nonbinary scholars; the study of topics related to women, gender, and sexuality; and analytical and theoretical tools that help us ask new questions about old topics. Although gender inclusivity does not get to all of the roots of patriarchal norms in our field, we see it as one basic goal that complements other methodological and epistemological goals. We hope that it will foster conversation about common problems incubated by patriarchy and potential strategies for change.

Practice inclusion in your own scholarly spaces and research

In writing about a Jewish group or Jews in a historical moment, ask yourself about the presence of women and gender nonconforming people in that community. If it seems they do not play a prominent role, ask yourself why they are submerged and what that accomplishes for the members of the group, its ideology, its relationships, and its reputations.

In writing about a thinker, text, or movement of thought that is entirely male, ask yourself if feminist theory might illuminate the structures, power, and relationships present. Are certain terms or ideas implicitly gendered or eroticized through metaphors? How do gender and sexual arrangements function in the larger framework?

Seek out scholarship by women and nonbinary authors and read it.

Read feminist and queer theory and think about its applicability to Jewish Studies.

Cite women and nonbinary people. Look at how you cite them too: Is it only in footnotes, or do you engage their ideas substantively within the text?

Never organize an all-male panel, conference, lecture series, editorial board, or edited volume. If you find you don’t know enough nonmale scholars who work on the topic, ask your colleagues, use social media, and consult websites like https://womenalsoknowhistory.com/ (History focused) and https://womenalsoknowstuff.com/ (Political Science focused).

Put women and nonbinary authors on every syllabus. Ask your students to consider how historical or cultural or intellectual developments might have affected women or gender nonconforming people differently. Have them pay attention to what is missing in the readings you assign and how the readings might be different if, for example, a woman had authored the text or if the author had thought about people of other genders. Ask them to think about what this exclusion accomplishes.
In your classroom, foster an atmosphere of respect and encouragement so that voices that have been marginalized or even silenced will feel empowered. Be careful not to foster, in any way, a culture of harassment or marginalization. Have students and colleagues identify their pronouns, never make sexual jokes, never comment on students’ bodies or clothing, and never use gender identity or sexual orientation as an excuse to disparage. Such principles are rules at most colleges and universities; let Jewish Studies stand at the forefront of respecting those rules.

**Encourage inclusion for colleagues and within your organizations**

When you work as a peer reviewer or an editor, look at each bibliography. If it is overwhelmingly male, ask the author to consider women and nonbinary scholars.

The *Journal of the American Philosophical Association* instructs authors to seek out “all the literature, relevant to their topic, that may have been published by women or other individuals from underrepresented groups.” Jewish Studies journals can do likewise. If you serve as an editor or on an editorial board, consider adopting similar policies or instructions.

University presses can also create formal structures for inclusion. For example, Princeton University Press, responding to our critique of *Hasidism*, a book written by eight male authors, has now put into place regulations for gender inclusivity for authors, contents, outside reviewers, and writers of blurbs. If you are a series editor or have another close relationship with a press, encourage your press to follow suit.

**Have students and colleagues identify their preferred pronouns, never make sexual jokes, never comment on students’ bodies or clothing, and never use gender identity or sexual orientation as an excuse to disparage.**

When you discover you’ve been invited to something that is not gender inclusive, say something. What you say and how you say it can depend on your own position. Graduate students and non-tenure-track faculty may say something like, “I learned a lot on this panel, but I do wish there were more women’s voices,” while a tenured professor might write to the organizers as soon as they notice the imbalance. A message like this might say, “I noticed that this conference has mostly male speakers, and I wanted to suggest that we include women. I admire the work of Dr. So-and-So and Prof. So-and-So, and they could add important perspectives on X and Y,” or, if the organizers express lack of interest in changing the lineup, “I now see that this is an all-male conference, and so I will have to withdraw.” One of us, invited as the only woman to speak at a three-day conference, said she would deliver her paper from behind a screen unless additional women were invited to speak. Other women were immediately invited.

**Activate conversations**

Include female and nonbinary colleagues in discussions and meetings, informal and formal.

At conferences or lectures, try not to call on a man first. Studies show that when a woman asks the first question, the subsequent conversation is far more balanced with respect to gender. Encourage your female students to raise their hands. Call on women when you lecture and respond to them with encouragement.

**Change the structure of the field**

Actively mentor women and nonbinary junior colleagues and graduate students. Introduce yourself at a conference, send an email when you read a piece you like, and promote good work on social media. It’s hard for women to enter a field dominated by men; reach out and encourage women to join the field.
If you serve on a tenure or promotion committee or write a letter for a colleague’s tenure, remind colleagues of the ways in which student evaluations of teaching reinforce racism and sexism. At the institutional level, advocate for tenure and promotion to “count” diverse modes of knowledge production, such as reflexive or narrative writing and public scholarship.

Encourage your institution to prioritize gender inclusivity. The online version of this article provides links to scientific studies showing the value of gender inclusivity; you may find these helpful in convincing administrators and colleagues.

---


NEW FROM ACADEMIC STUDIES PRESS

The Believer and the Modern Study of the Bible
Edited by TOVA GANZEL, YEHUDAH BRANDES, & CHAYUTA DEUTSCH
2019 | 9781618119513 | 582 pp. | Cloth | $139.00
This volume is the first attempt to create a dialogue among scholars and rabbis around the question of how religious belief in the divine revelation at Sinai can be combined with critical Bible study. The volume contains twenty-one essays by contemporary Jewish academics and thinkers on the relationship between faith and the source-critical study of the Bible.

Sin•a•gogue
Sin and Failure in Jewish Thought
DAVID BASHEVKN
Cherry Orchard Books
2019 | 9781618117977 | 216 pp. | Paper | $23.95
By its very nature, the ideals of religion entail sin and failure. Judaism has its own language and framework for sin that expresses themselves both legally and philosophically. This book presents the concepts of sin and failure in Jewish thought, weaving together biblical and rabbinic studies to reveal a holistic portrait of the notion of sin and failure within Jewish thought.

China and Israel
Chinese, Jews; Beijing, Jerusalem (1890-2018)
ARON SHAI
Jewish Identities in Post-Modern Society
2019 | 9781618118950 | 270 pp. | Paper | $29.95
In the fascinating story of Israel-China relations, unique history and culture intertwine with complex diplomacy and global business ventures—some of which have reached impressive success. This book paints a broad picture of China-Israel relations from an historical and political perspective and from the Jewish and Israeli angle.

Palestine to Israel
Mandate to State, 1945-1948, Volumes I & II
MONTY NOAM PENKOWER
Touro University Press
Seventy years after the creation of the State of Israel, Palestine to Israel offers the definitive narrative of the achievement of Jewish sovereignty in the beleaguered Promised Land. The two volumes offer a riveting conclusion to Penkower’s Palestine in Turmoil and Decision on Palestine Deferred.

Kashrut and Jewish Food Ethics
Edited by SHMULY YANKLOWITZ
Jewish Thought, Jewish History: New Studies
2019 | 9781618119049 | 292 pp. | Paper | $32.95
This volume of collected essays brings forth new paradigms in the exploration between the intersection of Judaism’s concern with eating, dignity, food ethics, and animal welfare. Contained here are rabbinic reflections on the nature of Judaism’s timeless concern with upholding the moral and spiritual integrity of kosher laws in theory and practice.

Piety and Rebellion
Essays in Hasidism
SHAUL MAGID
New Perspectives in Post-Rabbinic Judaism
2019 | 9781618117519 | 362 pp. | Cloth | $109.00
Piety and Rebellion examines the span of the Hasidic textual tradition from its earliest phases to the 20th century. The essays collected in this volume focus on the tension between Hasidic fidelity to tradition and its rebellious attempt to push the devotional life beyond the borders of conventional religious practice.

Print to Fit
The New York Times, Zionism and Israel (1896-2016)
JEROLD S. AUERBACH
Antisemitism in America
2019 | 9781618118981 | 322 pp. | Paper | $29.95
Ever since Adolph Ochs purchased The New York Times in 1896, its enduring masthead motto—“All The News That’s Fit To Print”—has become news that fits the Times’ discomfort with the idea, and since 1948 the reality, of a thriving democratic Jewish state in the historic homeland of the Jewish people.

Journal of Contemporary Antisemitism
Editor-in-Chief LESLEY KLAFF (Sheffield-Hallam University, UK; University of Haifa, Israel)
ISSN 2472-9914 (Print) / ISSN 2472-9906 (Online)
Overseen by an international team of editors, this rigorously peer-reviewed journal aims to provide a forum in which scholars from diverse political and intellectual backgrounds can analyze, debate, and formulate effective responses to the ever-evolving and insidious threat of antisemitism.

www.academicstudiespress.com
Dynamics of the Patriarchy in Jewish Communal Life: An Infographic

MEN DOMINATE
PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

**ONLY TWO WOMEN** head one of the 16 major Jewish federations

- Fewer than 17% of top execs of Jewish non-profits are women
- Men hold more top rabbinc positions than women, across denominations

MEN MAKE MORE MONEY THAN WOMEN

- Jewish women execs make 60.74% compared to men
- Women rabbis make on average $43,000 less annually than male rabbis
- Male execs of Jewish non-profits received an average pay increase of more than 15 TIMES what women received (3.84% for men, and 0.22% for women over two years)

MEN DOMINATE JEWISH LAY LEADERSHIP

- Less than **ONE-THIRD** of board members of Jewish non-profits are women
- Jewish women’s philanthropy is largely ignored by the mainstream communal leadership.

MEN DOMINATE OPINION-MAKING

- Men dominate Jewish panels of EXPERTS and OP-EDS
- Men dominate in publishing and even book reviews
- Writing under a man’s name makes you more than **8 TIMES MORE LIKELY** to get published
- In some academic fields, men are published 7 TIMES AS OFTEN as women

SOURCES:
The Forward Salary Surveys and analysis: “How much are Jewish federation leaders making?”
MEN IN POWER OFTEN PROTECT OTHER MEN

Alleged SEXUAL PREDATORS who received high-profile support include: Marc Gafni, Motti Elon, Jonathan Rosenblatt, Ari Shavit…

THE SEXUAL OBJECTIFICATION OF WOMEN IS OFTEN NORMALIZED

#MeToo reports of EVERYDAY SEXISM and gender abuse in the Jewish community continue to emerge.

MEN DOMINATE IN FORMING COMMUNAL AGENDAS

Since men dominate lay leadership, professional leadership, opinion-making, money, and philanthropy, men’s NEEDS AND PERSPECTIVES dominate communal agendas

ELANA MARYLES SZTOKMAN is an award-winning author and anthropologist specializing in gender and religion. Two of her four books won the National Jewish Book Council award. She is the founder of Lioness Books that publishes works by women who roar, and also serves as the Vice Chair for Media and Policy for Democrats Abroad in Israel. In her day job she works for the New Israel Fund.
FELLOWSHIP OPPORTUNITY

The Herbert D. Katz Center at the University of Pennsylvania is now accepting applications for the 2020–2021 academic year on the theme of America’s Jewish Questions

Over the past four decades, the methods, questions, and sources guiding the study of Jews in the United States have changed vastly even as the central narrative of American Jewish history has shifted only gradually. In particular, the story that “America is different”—that American Jewish experience has been marked by success and progress in contrast to the narrative sweep of European Jewish history—has remained entrenched in scholarship about American Jews.

New attention to the diversity of Jewish practices, politics, and peoples, at home and abroad, compels us to reconsider many of the basic assumptions and concepts that have shaped the study of American Jews. This fellowship year promises multiple entry points into some of the most pressing debates within U.S. history and Jewish history, and intersects with vital questions shaping Jewish cultural studies, literary theory, and social scientific inquiry. Even as the recent rise of anti-Semitism and the emerging challenges to Zionism in the United States have been sources for contemporary Jewish debate, broader trends in Jewish scholarship over the last two decades also suggest the need for critical reinterpretations of American Jewish culture and community.

In an effort to make the most of this moment, the Katz Center invites applications from scholars pursuing research that revises, reframes, or expands our understanding of American Jews, their history, religious life, politics, culture, and experience. Possible topics may include but are not limited to: nationalism and sovereignty in globalizing contexts; religious experimentation and innovation; civil society and the state; constructions of gender, sexuality, and race; systems of jurisprudence and economics; aesthetic and cultural expression; linguistics; mobility, migrations, urbanism, and Jewish life in unexpected places. The fellowship year aims to be in conversation with developments beyond Jewish studies, and applications are welcome from scholars whose work crosses national or religious boundaries and who explore the complex connections that American Jews created throughout Europe, Latin America, Palestine/Israel, and other parts of the world. The Center also welcomes projects that engage in public scholarship or that seek to communicate to new audiences in new ways.

The Katz Center’s goal is to support individual projects, but it aims as well to encourage intellectual community, which means the ideal applicant will be one willing to learn from and work with scholars from other disciplines or focused on other periods, or animated by different approaches.

Application Deadline: September 23, 2019

For more information about the Katz Center’s fellowship program and to access the application portal, visit us online.

katz.sas.upenn.edu
CONGRATULATIONS
Salo Baron Prize Winner

The American Academy for Jewish Research is pleased to announce the winner of its annual Salo Baron Prize for the best first book in Jewish studies published in 2018. The prize, including a $5,000 award presented at the annual luncheon at the AJS Conference, will honor:


Situated at the intersection of Jewish Studies, Comparative Literature, and the Medical Humanities, *Tubercular Capital* explores the writing of Hebrew and Yiddish writers for whom the diagnosis of tuberculosis proved an artistic and material spark. It argues that Jewish literature might productively be re-examined through the lens of this disease, which paradoxically hampered and inspired afflicted writers. Whether they wrote in Eastern Europe, Central Europe, the Middle East, or the American West, Yiddish and Hebrew writers mobilized their diagnoses, translating them into creative writing, monetary gain, and engagement with a long tradition of European, American, and Russian writing about TB. At times, the results reverberated globally, as in the galvanizing of a trans-hemispheric campaign to help Sholem Aleichem recuperate after his tuberculosis diagnosis in 1908. *Tubercular Capital* is a book of great elegance, sophistication, and creativity. In crossing an unexpected range of texts, geographies, literary traditions, and methodological schools, it contributes to a broad array of fields. With spell-binding writing and literary élan, Yudkoff puts an unexpected disease at the very center of the modern Jewish and literary worlds, permitting us to see both as never before.

American Academy for Jewish Research (www.aajr.org) is the oldest professional organization of Judaica scholars in North America. Its membership represents the most senior figures in the field.

The Baron Prize honors the memory of the distinguished historian Salo W. Baron, a long-time president of the AAJR, who taught at Columbia University for many decades. It is one of the signal honors that can be bestowed on a young scholar in Jewish Studies and a sign of the excellence, vitality, and creativity of the field.
The American Academy for Jewish Research is pleased to announce the winners of its Special Initiatives Grants.

AAJR provides grants of up to $5,000 to faculty at North American universities to 1) encourage academic collaboration between Jewish studies programs (or faculty) at multiple institutions, either in the same city or in close geographical proximity, or 2) enable collaborative scholarly endeavors that would not otherwise receive funding.

Natalia Aleksiun, Touro College, Graduate School of Jewish Studies; Elissa Bemporad, Queens College and CUNY Graduate Center; Dina Danon, Binghamton University, SUNY; Federica Francesconi, University at Albany, SUNY; In collaboration with the Center for Jewish History / The New York State Working Group on Jewish Women and Gender in Global Perspective

Francesca Bregoli, CUNY-Queens College and the Graduate Center; Elisheva Carlebach, Columbia University; Joshua Teplitsky, Stony Brook University; Magda Teter, Fordham University / The Early Modern Workshop

Michelle Chesner, Columbia University; Marjorie Lehman, Jewish Theological Seminary; Adam Shear, University of Pittsburgh; Joshua Teplitsky, Stony Brook University

Reading Hebrew Handwriting in the Margins: Owner’s Signatures, Annotations and other MS Material in Early Hebrew Printed Books

Samuel Heilman, The Graduate Center CUNY

A Working Group Exploring the Convergence and Divergence of the Similar Paths taken by Muslims and Jews in America

Jessica Marglin, University of Southern California

California Working Group on Jews in the Maghrib and the Middle East (Cal JeMM)

William Miles, Northeastern University; Alan Verskin, University of Rhode Island

Jews in Muslim and Shared Diasporic Lands

Jonathan D.Sarna, Brandeis University; Yael Zerubavel, Rutgers University

The Formation of New Jewish Communities: The Fourth Biennial Graduate Student Workshop

The American Academy for Jewish Research (www.aajr.org) is the oldest professional organization of Judaica scholars in North America. Composed of the field’s most eminent and senior scholars, it is committed to professional service through this initiative and others, including the Salo Baron Prize for the best first book in Jewish Studies, support for doctoral dissertation research, and workshops for graduate students and early career scholars.
AMERICAN ACADEMY FOR JEWISH RESEARCH

Congratulates Its

GRADUATE STUDENT SUMMER FUNDING RECIPIENTS

The American Academy for Jewish Research is pleased to announce the winners of its grants for graduate student summer research funding.

AAJR provides stipends for up to $4,000 to promising graduate students in any field of Jewish Studies at a North American university who have submitted their prospectus and have a demonstrated need to travel to archival, library, or manuscript collections or for ethnographic research.

Ariel Paige Cohen, University of Virginia
Displaying Art and Exhibiting Philanthropy: Jews, Gender, and Museums in the United States, 1888 - 1958

Andrew Fogel, Purdue University
Comics and the Politics of Jewish Identity in America, 1938-1955

Maxwell Ezra Greenberg, University of California, Los Angeles
The Borderlands of Jewishness in Tijuana, Mexico (20th Century)

Max Lazar, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Jerusalem on the Main: Jewish Integration in Frankfurt, 1914-1938

Tamar Menashe, Columbia University
Jews in Cross-Confessional Legal Cultures in Germany, 1495-1700

Chaya R. Nove, Graduate Center at City University of New York
Phonetic Contrast in Hasidic Yiddish Peripheral Vowels

Benjamin Steiner, Brandeis University
The Ketubah Rendered in English: Jewish Women and Jewish Acculturation in Anglo-American Society

The American Academy for Jewish Research (www.aajr.org) is the oldest professional organization of Judaica scholars in North America. Composed of the field’s most eminent and senior scholars, it is committed to professional service through this initiative and others, including the Salo Baron Prize for the best first book in Jewish Studies, funding for collaborative special initiatives, and workshops for graduate students and early career scholars.
The Frankel Institute for Advanced Judaic Studies at the University of Michigan provides residential fellowships for scholars to conduct research around an annual theme. We are currently accepting applications for the 2020-2021 theme, “Translating Jewish Cultures”

Applications are encouraged from scholars of all ranks (Ph.D. required) working on topics that fit under the increasingly broad rubric of translation studies. This Institute year seeks to advance the study of translation writ large by inviting projects that critically engage with the interdisciplinary field of translation studies and explore how recent theoretical developments, informed by postcolonial theory, gender studies, transnationalism, and world literature studies, might stand in dialogue with the study of Jewish translation histories and practices.

The major goal of the Frankel Institute is to provide an intellectually stimulating environment, promote an atmosphere of openness, and encourage constructive criticism. It seeks to advance Jewish Studies globally and considers diversity and pluralism as fundamental characteristics of a public university and emphasizes such principles in all endeavors. Additionally, the Institute offers a broad range of events to the public, including lectures, symposia, art exhibitions, and musical performances.

Applications due October 8, 2019

For more information, and complete application materials go to www.lsa.umich.edu/judaic/institute judaicstudies@umich.edu • 734.763.9047
The Art of Bible Translation
Robert Alter
“Hugely entertaining and irreverent.”
—Adam Gopnik, New Yorker
“The Art of Bible Translation is an extraordinary intellectual adventure. Like Robert Alter’s translation of the Hebrew Bible itself, this book is a triumph.”
—Michael Wood, author of On Empson
Cloth $24.95

The Book of Exodus
A Biography
Joel S. Baden
“Baden’s book will be useful to anyone who wants a broader understanding of Exodus and its interpretation through the ages. There is nothing quite like it.”
—Marc Zvi Brettler, author of How to Read the Bible
Cloth $26.95

Spertus Institute
Graduate Jewish Studies
MA and Doctoral Programs Designed for You

- Nondenominational
- Distinguished faculty
- Seminar courses in Chicago and online options
- Opportunities to explore individual interests

spertus.edu/learn
Contact Anita Silvert at asilvert@spertus.edu or 312.322.1707

Spertus Institute is a partner with the Jewish United Fund in serving our community.

Spertus Institute for Jewish Learning and Leadership

Congratulations to Spertus Institute President Dr. Dean Phillip Bell on the publication of The Routledge Companion to Jewish History and Historiography.
Patriarchy: Undermined at Its Origin

Lori Hope Lefkovitz

Patriarchy, the grounding term of both conventional masculinity and male hegemony, has a distinctly biblical resonance in our culture writ large, but perhaps especially for those Jews for whom Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob populate our personal imaginations as if they were mythic figures from our own families, beloved and flawed heroes who live in the web of familiar and familial lore, in relationship with equally familiar mothers, wives, and siblings (mostly brothers). Endlessly reinterpreted, from children’s books to High Holy Day sermons, from Renaissance paintings to TV miniseries, and for some of us in midrashim and fiction, the bequest of the patriarchy from father to son until Jacob begets the sons and grandsons from whom the eponymous tribes and lands of Israel will forever be named, is an internalized, dynamic saga.

The biblical patriarchy presumes paternal authority, primogeniture, and subservience of wives and mothers to the driving principle of Genesis: to create the lineage of the people Israel through a male line privileged by birth order and God. In story after story, however, patterns of barren mothers who conceive through divine intervention (when human fathers prove inadequate) and their younger sons who subvert norms of inheritance (against the expectations of their fathers) reveal an unconscious cultural anxiety about the power of mothers and wives to thwart patriarchal prerogatives. The controlling violence of patriarchy proceeds less from confident male authority than from the insecurity and sense of vulnerability exposed in our familiar biblical origin stories.

The birth stories in Genesis subvert the norms that undergird the social fabric. And younger sons who are oedipal victors (boys who align with their mothers at the expense of their fathers) inherit the narrative future because God, in cahoots with the Matriarchy, together overwhelm the preferences of the human father and the patriarchal system that the father represents. Positioned as eavesdroppers, listening in at the tent flaps of power, women are divinely sanctioned agents of small, consequential rebellions against rules. In the manner of carnival, however, these challenges to norms actually work to reinforce norms by their clear exceptionality.

Although these stories conform to the punishments for eating from the tree of knowledge, with working fathers and childbearing mothers, and most of all, the subordination of wives and daughters to husbands and fathers, patriarchal reversal narratives reveal the anxiety that there is, in fact, nothing natural about either these arrangements, or the sexual binary, or heteronormativity. The unjust consequences of that anxiety are, I would argue, the building blocks of our civilization. At the heart of the original patriarchal narratives is evidence that women in kitchens and bedrooms conspire with God to compromise men’s supremacy. With threats to reproductive rights and commodification of female bodies in places of high authority, we stand again on the threshold of terrifying efforts to confine women in controlled domestic spaces, kitchens and bedrooms.

After the promises of numberless progeny early in Genesis, the reader imagines that for umpteen generations men will beget men, and firstborn sons will be privileged inheritors. Except, whenever a hero is distinguished with a birth story (Isaac; Jacob; Joseph; Samuel; Samson), his mother benefits from God’s intervention. Against the backdrop of fertile women, often cowives, the mother of a hero is either too old to have a child or barren (never mind that a “barren mother” is self-contradictory) such that God reasserts Himself as Creator, with a
The larger biblical context confirms this paradigm of preference for the younger, smaller, smarter son and the reversal of primogeniture: showy Joseph is hated by his older, outdoorsmen brothers, but Joseph’s dream visions are fulfilled when the brothers bow before his political authority; King David is conspicuously the youngest, smallest of his brothers, victor over a giant with his slingshot; and Solomon, too, is the son of the preferred wife Bathsheba, the wise son who inherits the kingdom because his mother works with the prophet to guarantee his pride of place, over David’s treacherous older sons. The masculinity and male authority of the patriarchy is thus undermined at its origins. But we should not be confused into believing that the pact between God and mothers and the manipulation of husbands by wives signals female power. Instead, it signals fear: fear that women—as mothers, wives, or seductresses—usurp male authority. This is the Hegelian master-slave dialectic: mothers, wives, and slaves are imaginatively invested with threatening sexual power to justify their containment.

The excluding conspiracy between matriarchs and God does not end with the interruption of her barrenness. Sarah’s decision to banish Hagar and Ishmael because she sees Ishmael and Isaac “playing” has God’s endorsement. Abraham’s preferences are irrelevant and unnoted. God says, simply: “Listen to Sarah.” Rebecca, like the matriarch mother-in-law before her, positions herself at the tent flaps to overhear the conversations between men in power. When Rebecca overhears her old, blind husband Isaac (blindness, a metaphor for impotence or curtailed male sexual power) tell Esau to hunt fresh game, she contrives to replace Esau with the younger, smoother son, famously, like Isaac himself, a man of the tent who loves his mother. It is Rebecca (ambitious for her favorite) who makes the stew and dresses Jacob up to mislead Isaac. Jacob expresses reluctance, a fear of being caught, but Rebecca speaks with the authority we later come to associate with Jewish mothers, promising that she will take the blame and assume the curse (Genesis 27:12–13). When her boys were in utero, God told the mother which son would be preferred, and Rebecca honors God’s intentions by manipulating Isaac. Because Jacob will go on to marry sisters who are her own nieces, Rebecca is the genetic winner of Genesis in tribal Israel.

The miraculous intervention that will make the impossible, and therefore heroic, baby possible. Superficially, this pattern suggests that as in Eden, God is again jealous of women’s procreative power and asserts Himself in history to authorize heroes. But more deeply, it is the human father who is the loser in the textual unconscious: mother and God work together to create Isaac, Jacob and Esau, Joseph, Samuel, Samson. God manages what the frustrated human husband/father could not accomplish, a frustration signaled by several of these patriarchal figures’ expressed distress that they are not enough for their beloved wives. Jacob angrily rejects Rachel’s blameful demand to give her children, asking whether he is in God’s place (Genesis 30:2), and Elkanah demands of Hannah: “Aren’t I as good as ten sons?” (1 Samuel 1:8). Elkanah’s question may be rhetorical, but the answer is, clearly, “no.”

Rebecca, like the matriarch mother-in-law before her, positions herself at the tent flaps to overhear the conversations between men in power.
Listening for the Father: A Personal Narrative

Julian Levinson

When I was five years old, my mother began an extramarital affair. We were living on a hilly street in San Francisco’s Haight-Ashbury district; it was the early seventies—a swinging era. My mother was born in Tel Aviv to industrious but insolvent German-born Jewish parents. My father had a typical American Jewish background; he came from the Overbrook section of Philadelphia. The man my mother took up with was seven years younger than she and, among other things, a Connecticut WASP. Faithless. Faithlessness. Infidelity. Disloyalty. Betrayal. These words have uses in both the marital and the religious realms. They show us something about our habits of mind, our blurring of boundaries, how quickly we draw comparisons between how we treat those we are intimate with and how we behave in the face of the divine. In the Bible the language of marital infidelity is used as a metaphor for Israel’s infidelity to God, its whoring after foreign gods. In my childhood home it was never clear what was a metaphor for what.

My father discovered that my mother was having an affair after about two years. At this point my father left the house and my mother continued with the man whom I now referred to as “my mother’s boyfriend.” My mother and he stayed together in rather turbulent fashion for another decade, at which point they got married and then promptly divorced a week later. There were endless discussions of the relationship, repetitive words that passed between them in the kitchen at night while upstairs my brother and I turned up the stereo, pretending we were the new rhythm section for Kiss.

Fixed in my mind is an image of my father leaving our house, walking down the stairs. Is this the moment he left for good? Notice his slow, deliberate gait, his eyes rising to find the car, his face turned away in silence.

One of the ways I reacted to my father’s absence was to teach myself about baseball. I’d lived long enough to know boys were supposed to know such things. I started reading the sports section in the San Francisco Chronicle. I learned to parse the box score, a series of numbers, abbreviations, names, and odd phrases that could summon into existence the previous evening’s game. How wondrous. Every day I wore a black Giants cap I’d found in the woods near a playground. It was a personal form of piety that I enacted to prove, I suppose, that I was now claimed by larger forces.

At night I listened to Giants games on the radio. The hum of the stadium told me there was a place where people were awake at night, paying attention. The announcer was named Lon Simmons. He was a WASP to be sure, with a deep, boozy voice, and all the time in the world to recount distant meetings with baseball greats in “the clubhouse.” I was lulled to sleep by tales that meandered through American towns. St. Petersburg, Shreveport, Bristol, Corpus Christi. I used his signature phrase for calling a home run—“way back, way back … tell it goodbye!”—when I batted around a tennis ball with my friend Pat McGee.

As for my mother’s boyfriend, he was afoot on another sort of odyssey. Having lived the first two decades of his life as Craig Van Collie, it was time for a change. One day in the early years of his affair with my mother he announced that henceforth he would be known to the world as Shimon. Nobody considered it a matter much worth pondering, certainly not around the “Dancer’s Workshop” on Divisadero and Haight, where he and my mother first met and where he performed defiant snake dances in the nude. Names were fungible in San Francisco circa 1975; identities were transmutable. (My much older half-sister later had a child with a man named Dire Wolf; my father’s third wife would change her name from...
One of the ways I reacted to my father’s absence was to teach myself about baseball. I’d lived long enough to know boys were supposed to know such things.

Linda Berger to Lila Esther.) And so my mother’s boyfriend became Shimon, a name redolent in his mind (so I’m guessing) with bronzed men on a kibbutz, soldiers praying at the Wall. Nobody was sure where to place the accent on his new name, but the “sh” was easy enough, and it sufficed to lend him an air of mystery.

His full name—and the name he used when publishing articles in Latitude 38, the Sausalito-based sailing and marine magazine where he worked—became Shimon-Craig Van Collie. A cacophony, but a good-faith attempt to keep track somehow of his Connecticut past. And for me the parts of Shimon that held the most promise were those that still cast the glow of Americana: his skills at batting, pitching, and catching, his ability to bait a hook.

One day around the time I was thirteen, Shimon took my older brother and me to Golden Gate Park to play baseball. I must have pitched the ball too close to my brother’s head because the next thing I knew he was charging at me, cursing wildly. After my brother threw me to the ground, Shimon leaned over to me, looking blankly into my face. It became clear that he was not going to stop the fight—fights being, I guess, part of the ways of men or simply not his to interfere with. In an embarrassed voice steadied by a sudden purpose, he instructed me to take my retainer from my newly de-braced mouth and give it to him for safekeeping while scores were settled. I don’t know how long I lay curled up with my hands protecting my face as my brother’s blows rained down.

It is important for me to know whether Shimon regretted my defeat on the ball field. Maybe he hoped I would kick like mad and prove the resourcefulness of the underdog. Maybe he hated my weakness and hoped to cast it out like his own younger, more vulnerable self.

In the lecture class on the Hebrew Bible I now teach at the University of Michigan, I spend a good deal of time on the story of Cain and Abel. There is a print by the nineteenth-century French artist Odilon Redon that is especially poignant to me. Cain is swinging a club, blinded by rage, his body electrified. Abel teeters backwards. Otherwise the scene is completely barren. I show the image to my students with the giddiness of a magician revealing the missing bunny. I am trying to teach them about violence and patriarchy and the failure of the fathers and the cascading betrayals that occur beneath the presumably watchful eyes of the strange God of the Bible. There is more than a little hostility in my voice, as if I’m waging a personal vendetta. But with the patriarchy so dispersed in my life, with the relations between fathers and sons, tradition and invention, power and vacuum, so hard to parse, I can’t be sure whom or what I’m aiming at.

JULIAN LEVINSON is the Samuel Shetzer Professor of American Jewish Studies at the University of Michigan. His publications include Exiles on Main Street: Jewish American Writers and American Literary Culture (Indiana University Press; winner of the National Jewish Book Award for American Jewish Studies, 2008) and articles about topics such as Yiddish modernism, Holocaust representation, and Jewish storytelling. He has translated several works of Yiddish literature and is currently translating a novel by Isaiah Spiegel about the Łódź Ghetto.
EXPANDING THE CANON: TRANSLATION

Where Are All the Women in Translation?

Aviya Kushner

I often find myself writing about international Jewish literature in translation, but wanting to write about sexism. I feel this urge most strongly after translating an Israeli poet and then looking for ways to frame her work for an editor. It is at these moments, writing an introduction or dashing off what I hope will be an appealing cover letter making the case for a talented-but-unknown woman writer whose late-blooming career reflects all the obstacles placed in her path, that I know that I am really up against a systemic problem.

I wonder if I should explain that the patriarchy is still alive in the seemingly liberal literary world.

One blazing sign of the patriarchy is the relative dearth of women writers in translation; according to the Translation Database maintained by the University of Rochester, over the past decade, 29 percent of books in translation were written by women.\(^1\)

The bias extends to women translators; the PEN/Ralph Manheim Translation Award, recognizing lifetime achievement, has been awarded to only three women translators out of the thirteen translators who were given this honor since 1982.\(^2\)

It’s important to spell out why this matters.

Without translation, women writers who don’t write in English are doomed to local careers. They have no hope of being considered for the Nobel Prize, the Man Booker, and other career-making awards—not to mention international press coverage. As language study declines and English becomes the lingua franca, not being translated often means not being read.

Of course, international literature itself is rare in English—only 3 percent of books in the United States were originally written in languages other than English; the figure is about 5.6 percent in the United Kingdom, and around 6 percent in Canada. While Elena Ferrante and Clarice Lispector are both best-selling Jewish female writers in translation, the truth is that women writers are chronically underrepresented on the global stage—and Jewish women writers have not escaped this fate.

In this environment, translation is a form of activism. And it is also a form of feminism.

Recently, I translated collections by two women poets who previously did not appear in English: Yudit Shahar and Rina Soffer. Both are Sephardic women who published a first book later in life—Shahar at fifty, and Soffer at ninety. I hope my translations will be met by scholarly interest, and I want to spell out how scholars can help.

Jewish Studies scholars can and should investigate the translation gap. Note how a gender imbalance persists whether it is a Jewish language, like Yiddish, or a world language like Russian. Jewish texts have always been multilingual and multinational, and scholars have the power to, at long last, open the doors for women—both writers and translators. With every citation, lecture, review, or research choice, consider the possibility of letting a woman in.

AVIYA KUSHNER is The Forward’s language columnist and the author of The Grammar of God (Spiegel & Grau, 2015), a finalist for the National Jewish Book Award and the Sami Rohr Prize. She is an associate professor at Columbia College Chicago.

---


\(^2\) [https://pen.org/penralph-manheim-medal-for-translation-winners/]
I am David Aroughetti, Turkish Jew.

Everyone knows that there are two types of people, those who are seen as the pasha, who are big and have a manner which tells the whole world that they are important, who are strong, who speak with authority, directly, saying what they want and of course expecting to receive it and that everyone will listen to them. It does not matter if they are—what is the word?—stout; it is better because no wind can blow them aside, and there is no one who can change their mind or ideas on something. Don’t be stupid. Yes, they can change their opinions or ideas, but from the beginning, from the first, this kind of person says something with vigor and force. And afterwards, no matter, with the same force, he says the opposite—with the same fierceness, with a clear eye, and he doesn’t have to explain to anyone why he changed his mind. It does not matter why. Now it is what it is and everyone must listen and do what he says.

It is interesting to know that religion is not important to this kind of person because … because? It is not important to speak of such things. Yes, a Jew of this kind is Jewish, what do you think he’s going to be? Christian? Turkish? Don’t be ridiculous. The important thing is to be strong and powerful and not take garbage from anyone.

In the Turkish world it was normal for men to be this way. Well, not everyone but many. The head of the family. And soon the women understand that they should present the same face to the world. The man knows how to speak like a dog, with a short bark so that no one can ask for...
anything. And soon the woman knows how to do exactly the same thing. It is something to see! It is a marvel! After some years of receiving this kind of speech, the wife like an acrobat high up in the circus tent, with her partner, can take the same steps—her chest high—on the high wire, her muscles strong and perfectly steady.

Religion doesn’t matter because it’s woman’s work, lighting the Shabbat candles, cooking kosher, two hours plucking the feathers from a chicken to make dinner, soaking the chicken in salt. There’s so much women have to know, the dishes for meat and for milk, all these things are the job of women, a lot of work, but it’s okay, it’s for the family.

In New York, of course, things are different. After many years, the woman says the same thing, that religion doesn’t matter, it is too much. Religion isn’t in style, it’s passé. But that is many years later.

Oh, I was going to speak of the other kind of people. You know, it doesn’t matter. We’re not going to speak of the other kind of people, who are small and humble and think they should serve people. When I think about them, my stomach contracts, my…. Let’s not speak of them. The world is not interested in this kind of person.

Don’t think that life doesn’t mean work. In the New World I worked very hard. From my work I was able to buy a mink coat for my wife. Con el mink coat—we went to weddings and parties in the catering halls del Bronx. Everyone knew we were important and that I take care of my wife and my family.

I want to explain something. I came to New York in 1910 and after two years of selling cigarettes on the street, and working in a skirt factory and doing everything, I wanted to marry. In New York, full of people, millions of people, the streets packed with people running in all directions, there was no wife for me. The coffee houses on Allen Street were full, and smoky, with men desperate for life, for money and hope. It was better to go back to my country, and get a wife there. And I did it, the same as I did everything in my life, with no problems! I liked this novia which my father said was for me because I was strong, strong of body and mind, and even more because I knew to go to America and make my way in the New World. My novia was strong, she wasn’t a skinny little thing, her hair flowed like a river from her head, and her heart was full of the riches of the Jewish Turkish life. Her brothers knew also that the world is big and that America was an open door for everyone who wasn’t afraid of crossing the sea . . .

I have to tell you what happened after the wedding, and I am going to tell you right away without leaving out anything. The truth was that there was no blood.

Do you know what that means? Everyone understands that. After the wedding, there should be blood, the blood of the new wife in the bed. And there wasn’t. I kept my silence, saying nothing in the bed. Am I the man or a chicken? I didn’t say anything for an hour. I felt like a man who had been robbed in the night. I had to think.

Get out! I said to her. No longer my wife! Get out of my bed, my house, my family. Go back to Turkey. You are not for me. I barked like a dog in a rage. It was simple, direct and incontrovertible. She yelled out from bed as if I had struck her with my hand, but my words were much worse. She was wearing her nightgown, the one from the trousseau rich and white like the stars in a dark night. But of what value is white clothing without the most important thing in the family, the whiteness of her purity.

I am the pasha. They tricked me. Never! Never! Never! will I forgive you. . . .

SHALACH MANOT’S short story excerpted here was published previously both in the original Ladino and in English translation. Manot’s most recent book is the novel, His Hundred Years, A Tale (Albion-Andalus Books, 2016). Shalach Manot is the pen name of Jane Mushabac, professor emerita at City University of New York, who has won fellowships from the Mellon Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities.
Aligning with the patriarchy has sometimes paid off for Jewish women, while, all too often, challenging it has had devastating consequences. This is a tale of two Jewish women anthropologists—Ellen Hellmann and Ruth Landes—whose different career paths reflect patriarchal and racial expectations.

Ellen Hellmann and Ruth Landes both received their doctoral degrees in the 1930s, in South Africa and the United States, but they experienced divergent career trajectories. Their marital status, the ethnicity/race, career, and political stances of their significant others, and their specific Jewish family backgrounds (including class and politics) shaped their professional paths.

Ellen Hellmann's alliances with elite white men in her philanthropic pursuits within the German Jewish community in South Africa were correlated with her financial and institutional stability. In contrast, Jewish women of eastern European descent, like Ruth Landes, who challenged patriarchal, assimilationist, and white middle-class norms (especially around marriage and same-race sexuality) often found stable institutional posts difficult to obtain and maintain. The content of their writing about black women mirrored their placement within patriarchal and racial systems. Hellmann adopted commonly held assimilationist and conformist stances regarding black women's sexuality and families. But Landes contested these assumptions and argued that sexuality was a source of financial and spiritual power. These two case studies illustrate how only analyzing Jewishness and gender is not enough to understand the patriarchal effects on Jewish women's career trajectories; in order to understand the differences, we must use an intersectional lens by looking at racialization in connection with class, politics, and gender-/sexuality-conformity and nonconformity.

Urban anthropologist Ellen Hellmann grew up in a wealthy, strict German Jewish household in Johannesburg, South Africa. In 1936, her father, Bernard Kaumheimer, hired a Swiss architect to build what Hellmann called the “parental mansion” in Houghton, an upper-class suburb. Ellen and her father fought...
constantly. Hellmann remarked in 1982 to historian Riva Krut, "I said argument was the spice of life. ... I was a very, very stubborn little girl, very difficult." Hellmann's experience with her father could explain her opposition to strict disciplinarian styles of parenting and displacement of this opposition onto the subjects of her research. In her 1940 dissertation, "Problems of Urban Bantu Youth," she argued that young people's disobedience stemmed from African parents' sternness.

Ellen felt like "the ugly duckling in this family of lovely girls," since her father favored her sister, Inez. Ellen suffered from long-term depression and self-doubts about her "standing in the scientific world." She remarked to Ruth Landes in 1968: "A diet of futile opposition isn't always v. heartening! ... I thrive selfishly and often with a sense of inevitable guilt on the compensations that our country offers those who have the right skin colour."

Ellen's first husband, a Lithuanian Jewish lawyer, Joseph Hellmann, committed suicide in 1941 during military service in North Africa. "One of the troubles, not the sole one, about my first marriage, was that he was an Eastern Jew, a Jew of Eastern Jewish descent"; this was "not good," Hellmann told Krut in 1982. Then Ellen married Bodo Koch, a German Jewish refugee surgeon, in 1948. With her father's earnings and her two husbands' employment, Ellen was a "privileged person" who felt she "owed" those with less privilege. Thus, she felt it would not be "right" to accept a salary, according to her daughter, Ruth Runciman. Hellmann served in philanthropic leadership capacities for Johannesburg organizations such as the Joint Council of Europeans and Africans (1940-48), lobbying city agencies for services for "Africans." She also worked for the Public Relations Committee of the Jewish Board of Deputies (1940-50) and the Zionist Socialists (1930s). The Jewish Board of Deputies, dominated by German Jews like Hellmann, viewed "Western Jews" as superior to, and more "civilized" than "Eastern Jews," whom Ellen Hellmann compared to [black] "non-Europeans," a commonly used association. As Riva Krut explains, middle-class Jewish men wished to establish Jewish assimilation into the whiteness of South African nationalism and "anglicize" the "oriental" traits of the "raw Russian Jew." Hellmann was a leader in the Progressive Party (1959-71), advocating for the qualified franchise, requiring proof of property ownership, financial stability, and verifiable "civilization" to vote. Ellen's professional networks were made up of white men from the South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR), where she served for forty years. Hellmann described the SAIRR in 1974 as a "middle of the road body" centered on the "pursuit of truth," and "objective fact-finding."

Her master's thesis on a Johannesburg slum yard, Rooiyard (researched 1933-34, published 1948) posited that European culture represented "higher civilization." She critiqued the effects of the colonial system on "native" Africans, including unsanitary living conditions, yet she wanted them to "adopt such elements of European culture as may enable them to an ordered and economically secure social life." She also adopted assimilationist standards of white middle-class gender and sexuality norms in her critique of black women who engaged in extramarital relationships in Johannesburg's "locations," townships, mine-quarters, and slums. The percentage of unmarried parents did not exceed 15
percent in Hellmann’s sample groups, yet she contended that these low statistical rates were not a “true reflection of the laxness of sexual morality in the urban Native community.”

While Hellmann reproduced the patriarchal critiques from her father in her work on South African cultures, American anthropologist Ruth Landes challenged her mother’s criticisms. Anna Schlossberg, a Russian Jew, was hypercritical of her daughter Ruth’s appearance, reminding her to wash her “greasy” face (1959); later, Landes theorized (1950) that Jewish mothers perceived their daughters as competition within a patriarchal family structure. In 1938–39, she sought out Candomblé priestesses in Brazil who “did not care about being dainty” and argued that Candomblé was a matriarchal religion “made up almost exclusively of women and in any case controlled by women.” In *City of Women* (1948), Landes theorized sexuality as power that Candomblé priestesses used to gain spiritual authority and financial independence.

These theories about women’s centrality within the Afro-Brazilian religion Candomblé were not popular in the academy, since patriarchy rather than matriarchy was posited to be foundational to Candomblé by male scholars who dominated Afro-Brazilian Studies at that time: Jewish American anthropologist Melville Herskovits and white Brazilian anthropologist Arthur Ramos. Her controversial theories in combination with her close working relationship with Edison Carneiro, an Afro-Brazilian scholar, triggered gossip about Ruth Landes’s interracial relationships and her status as an unmarried/divorced woman.

The academic scandal about her interracial relationships began with a letter from German anthropologist Rüdiger Bilden to Melville Herskovits on December 6, 1937:

“Landes is a damn fool and a disgrace to the Department of Anthrop. As far as I can see, she has done little or no Brazilian preparation here or anything else, except getting herself sexually involved with colored members of the faculty. Sex seems to be her forte, particularly in its practical aspects.”

At the time of Bilden’s letter, Landes was conducting research on race relations at Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee, in preparation for her fieldwork in northeastern Brazil the following year. Based on her fictionalized memoirs, she engaged in a romantic relationship with black physicist Elmer Imes during her time at Fisk.

Rumors also spread about Landes’s political orientations because of the men in her life. Landes was associated...
with communism because of her involvement with Edison Carneiro, her Afro-Brazilian research partner, and socialism because of her Russian Jewish father, Joseph Schlossberg (founder of the labor union Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America). He also wrote for Yiddish socialist papers.

Landes was unable to obtain a tenure-track position for thirty years after she received her PhD. She was itinerant and institutionally unstable.

Hellmann married Jewish men with economic and institutional prestige and assimilated to gendered and racialized norms for behavior, distancing herself from the subjects of her research, who were black. She enjoyed institutional stability. Ruth Landes, however, is an example of how disobedience to entrenched norms of “proper” white feminine sexual behavior can ruin careers in an age of racialized patriarchy.

For more information and to see the sources that I used for this article, you can download my full dissertation at: https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd/3575/.

ABBY GONDEK is currently an adjunct lecturer at Florida International University in the departments of Global and Socio-cultural Studies, History, African and African Diaspora Studies and Education. She serves as a clinical supervisor for the student teaching internship in Social Studies Education at FIU. She recently published “Ruth Landes / ‘she maverick’: A Jewish gendered late style” in History and Anthropology.
Stella Beck, an elderly Jewish woman, is typical of most of the women I’ve interviewed for my thesis exploring the lives and work of Jewish women and girls on the Canadian home front during the Second World War. Stella arrived in Canada with her family in August 1939 from Europe, not speaking a word of English. In her late teens, she settled in Montreal, entered the textile industry, learned the language, and eventually met the man she would marry after the war. Her story is a dramatic one—it is one of survival, of coming to grips with a new country and language, and of contending with the guilt many who were able to leave Europe experienced, knowing they had left so many behind.

But when I first went to set up an interview time with her, she demurred, saying, “I don’t really have anything to say that’s important.” I asked her to reconsider doing the interview and she again agreed to it, but when I called again to confirm, she questioned whether her story had any value. Luckily, Stella did consent to the interview, but her reluctance to talk, based on a belief that her story doesn’t count, is not unusual. In fact, of the nine interviews completed, seven have expressed some measure of surprise that I would want to talk to them because they believed their pasts weren’t important.

And who can fault them? On the whole, their contributions have been ignored. For example, preeminent historian of the Canadian Jewry, Gerald Tulchinsky, in a two-volume history of the Canadian Jewish community, acknowledges that Jewish women enlisted in World War II. However, though he includes many quotes from Jewish men who served, he includes exactly one from a Jewish woman—about a male Jewish soldier. Jewish women’s service is rendered completely invisible.

Thus, asking seemingly simple questions such as, “Where were women?” and “What were Jewish
When my Hebrew skills became good enough to understand what medieval Hebrew mystical poems said, I couldn’t stop connecting their themes with Sephardic Judeo-Spanish women’s songs. However, when, in the fall of 1999, I mentioned this to an eminent Israeli woman scholar, she immediately and categorically said it was impossible. Sephardic women were illiterate and didn’t go to synagogue. There was no way that they could be evoking Hebrew mystical poetry in their vernacular-language songs. End of discussion.

This older, established woman scholar couldn’t see through her patriarchal, hierarchy-trained scholarship. I felt it in my bones that what the academy had told her was actually contradicting what the texts were saying clearly before our eyes.

It’s no secret that the study of Sephardic music as a source of religious connection focuses exclusively on men’s liturgical output. Men’s outwardly religious repertoire has taken precedence over women’s private repertoire, which has been sung for centuries. To conclude that women’s songs are simply secular traces from the surrounding cultures is ignoring the manner in which Sephardic women interact with their own perceptions of religious expression. When one keeps in mind how people, families, and communities actually transmit information and beliefs, it is evident that men’s and women’s repertoires were most certainly in conversation.
It took ten years of in-depth fieldwork in Morocco’s Jewish community for me to untangle the inherent intertwining of the mystical essence of women’s Judeo-Spanish repertoire. Women’s songs, albeit never explicitly using their Jewishness as an identifying banner, are the linchpin of this whole community’s Jewish survival. They sing of God, of fertility, of the woman as the ‘ez ḥayim, and of the continuity of the Jewish people. The soul, the dove, the people of Israel are all present in the texts and most importantly in the way their listeners hear the veiled meanings behind what is explicitly said. When I asked ninety-two-year-old Henri B. of Tangier if his mother’s songs were more Spanish or more Jewish he looked at me aghast at the mere hint that his mother would have even entertained a non-Jewish thought. Her songs, these ancient songs, were absolutely and most certainly the most Jewish repertoire, our repertoire, lo nuestro.

The fact that Western and Eastern Sephardic women’s repertoire in the vernacular teaches morality through ancient royal characters from Spain has been repeatedly studied by Hispanists in the last century as exposing traces of Spanish literature frozen in time through the voices of women. The focus on the Spanish language and history of the texts did not even consider the possibility that women could be singing repertoire that expressed their religious beliefs or cultural belonging in their current communal situation in North Africa or the Ottoman Empire. My research has established this seamless function of camouflaged integration. Women’s repertoire ensures their group’s taharah, the ritual purity of their lineages. The songs ensure the continuity of local Judaism by celebrating sanctioned fertility and curtailing women’s uncontrolled sexuality.

The patriarchal structures that have shaped the study of music can be challenged by reassessing the internal function of repertoire in the vernacular. This assessment then becomes the starting point for an overdue reevaluation of musical repertoire performed by Jews and its full relationship to their negotiations of religious affiliation, gender, power, identity, and transmission.

**Vanessa Paloma Elbaz** is a research associate in the Faculty of Music at the University of Cambridge working on the ERC funded project “Past and Present Musical Encounters Across the Strait of Gibraltar,” as well as a research associate at Peterhouse and a member of the Center for the Study of Global Human Movement at the University of Cambridge. In 2012 she founded KHOYA: Jewish Morocco Sound Archive in Casablanca. She is also an international performing artist of Moroccan Jewish repertoires. Among other publications, she is the author of “Kol b’Isha Erva: the Silencing of Jewish Women’s Oral Traditions in Morocco,” in Women and Social Change in North Africa: What Counts as Revolutionary? ed. Doris Gray and Nadia Sonneveld (Cambridge University Press, 2017), 263-288.
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**Kugel and Frijoles**
Latino Jews in the United States
Laura Limonic
ISBN 978-0-8143-4576-4

“Full of rich and absorbing ethnographic material, *Kugel and Frijoles* provides important insights into the experiences of a fascinating immigrant group. Written in a highly readable style, the book enriches our understanding of how immigrants construct ethnic and racial identities in the U.S. today.”
—Nancy Foner

**Doctor Levitin**
A Novel by David Shrayer-Petrov
Translated by Arna B. Bronstein, Aleksandra I. Fleszar, and Maxim D. Shrayer

“A heartrending novel about a Soviet Jewish family with a dream of leaving for Israel. Often tragic, always vivid, *Doctor Levitin* is a startling fantasy of revenge and redemption.”
—Joshua Rubenstein

**The Superwoman and Other Writings by Miriam Michelson**
Edited with an Introduction by Lori Harrison-Kahan

“Michelson’s voice comes roaring back from the Progressive Era, full of rollicking stories about Amazons, girl thieves, and feminist radicals. Whether she was covering news or writing fiction, Michelson modeled the kind of public engagement our own era desperately needs. Harrison-Kahan has reintroduced a fierce, funny writer we should never have forgotten.”
—Jean M. Lutes

**Sing This at My Funeral**
A Memoir of Fathers and Sons
David Slucki
ISBN 978-0-8143-4486-6

“Slucki’s memoir is a gutsy reckoning with ghosts. Like the best stories, *Sing This at My Funeral* features complex characters and a curious narrator who is not afraid to keep digging. Slucki’s voice is compassionate, sharp, and relentless. A page-turning family narrative that is both highly personal and highly relatable.”
—Sofija Stefanovic

**Holocaust Memory and Racism in the Postwar World**
Edited by Shirli Gilbert and Avril Alba

“An inspiring and challenging book which compellingly links Holocaust memory and racism in the postwar world. Not afraid of tackling big and complex issues, the authors show how different understandings of Nazi genocide shaped responses to problems of ‘race’, not always in ways one might expect. Highly recommended.”
—Dan Stone

**The JDC at 100**
A Century of Humanitarianism
Edited by Avinoam Patt, Atina Grossmann, Linda G. Levi, and Maud S. Mandel

“Few organizations have histories as important and powerful as the JDC. Its century of service make it worthy of a book as excellent as this one, which we can hope, will inspire many more scholarly projects. The JDC truly deserves to be the focus of research and attention.”
—Hasia R. Diner
Mar ‘Ukba Had a Poor Man (B. Ketubbot 67b):Ⅰ
A Talmudic Patriarchal Narrative with a Metadialogue CommentaryⅡ
Dov Kahane

A.

Mar ‘Ukba had a poor man in his neighborhood
- “Had,” did he? I wonder if the poor man felt he “had” a rich man in Mar ‘Ukba, too?
- I doubt it. He did not know who his benefactor was. Read on, you’ll see.

into whose door-socket
- A “pivotal” place.
- LOL. “Liminal” is the word I would use—not quite in nor out.

he used to throw four zuz every day.
- Throw—as in “throw away” or “throw from a distance.” Seems like Mar ‘Ukba really did not want to get too close.
- No, he wanted to keep his distance. Preserve anonymity. Anonymous charity is the highest form of giving. It preserves a person’s dignity.Ⅲ
  - Whose anonymity?
  - What do you think?
- Well, the anonymous poor man of course.
- But Mar ‘Ukba knows to whom he is giving charity!
- Then to preserve his own anonymity. So the poor man won’t feel shamed or indebted every time he sees Mar ‘Ukba in the street.
  - But if he does not know who his benefactor is then won’t he feel shame in front of every person he meets, as everyone is potentially his benefactor?
  - You have a point there.

Once, the poor man said: “I will go and see who does me this kindness.”

- “Charity wounds” said Marcel Mauss, and even anonymously given charity wounds.
- What do you mean?
- Well maybe the poor man is thinking: “Who does me this kindness every day? How can I express my gratitude if I don’t know who bestows this gift on me?”
- Or maybe he is thinking: “Can I rely on the gift tomorrow? Next week? Next month?”
- No, the poor man does not “have” Mar ‘Ukba the way Mar ‘Ukba “has” a poor man. This asymmetry of the anonymous gifting creates an unrequitable debt and an intolerable hierarchy.Ⅳ
- No wonder he wanted to expose his benefactor.

On that day Mar ‘Ukba was late at the house of study
- So he was a scholar.
- Yes. And he was the Exilarch.Ⅴ
- What’s that?
- Like a Patriarch of the Jews of Babylonia in the third century.

and his wife
- Oh, so he was married.
- Yes.
- But what is her name?
- Not sure.
- So she is also anonymous!

was coming home with him.
- And where was she coming from?
- Not the study hall, I am sure.
- Perhaps the market?
- Where she took her homemade wares to sell.
- Yeah ... so that her learned, community-minded husband could continue learning with his buds in the study house.
- And throwing his coins into the door-sockets of the poor.

As soon as he saw them bending down at his door
- That liminal space again.
- But notice that they are not throwing the money,
- Now that she is there, they are bending down to place it carefully.
He went out after them, but they fled from him
- They really did not want the poor man to see them, did they?
- No, they were bent on preserving that semianonymous, disconnected relationship ... well at least Mar ‘Ukba was.
- I get it, “bent” ... but please elaborate.
- Let’s read on.

and ran into an oven
- A Babylonian mega-oven. Think: Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar or Abraham and Nimrod.

from which the fire had just been swept.
- You would sweep out the glowing coals to cook your food.

Mar ‘Ukba’s feet were burning
- Surely the rest of him was pretty hot, too.
- But it’s those fleeing feet that are getting singed.
- I am beginning to get a sense that the story is critical of his practice of fleeing.
- Indeed.

and his wife said to him: “Raise your feet and put them on mine.”
- It seems like she was not feeling the heat like he was.
- Again she supports him—quite literally now.

He became upset.
- Why was he upset? He should have been grateful to his miraculous wife.
- Maybe he was upset by her “undoing” his masculinity with her preternatural abilities to withstand the heat?
- Or did he just not like to admit that he relied on her support constantly.

She said to him: “I am usually at home and my benefactions are direct.”
- Is she saying that she can stand the heat because she is used to it, being at home in the hot kitchen all day?
- No, it’s because her benefactions are direct. She gives food directly to the poor.
- So what?
- So, maybe she is saying that she can stand the emotional heat while he cannot. Maybe she is telling him: “My charitable giving is direct and immediate. I am at home in the kitchen preparing food for the poor folk. They come in to my domain—past the liminal door-socket—and I know them by name and they know me. I know their troubles, their darkness, their desperate hopes and their unfulfilled dreams. I feel their pain directly and do no stay cool and detached from my beneficiaries.”
- Whoa!

- And note that the place of their temporary “refuge” is the oven, the central locus of the kitchen activity, the hearth, a place of warmth, of nurturing and—as she points out—sometimes a hot spot of real but difficult interpersonal connections.

- I am not sure if that is what Mar ‘Ukba wanted to hear.
- No, it might not resolve his emotional conflict, but it does throw into sharp contrast his anonymous charity with the personal, direct help that his wife practiced.

- Tying the end of the story back to the beginning.
- Right, that’s called chiastic closure.
- Good storytelling! Anything else?
- Yeah. Did you notice who were the silent actors and who had the speaking parts?
- Yes, I see: only the poor man and Mar ‘Ukba’s wife have spoken lines.
- Yes, the “anonymous” ones.
- Yes, so even though the story seems to be about him, Mar ‘Ukba is silent throughout.
- Much like his charity, which is without interpersonal connection.
- Cool!
- Exactly.

B.

- Now what?
- Now comes the Stammaitic (anonymous) redactional intervention.

And what was all that about?
- All what?
- All of Mar ‘Ukba’s fleeing and hiding.

As Mar Zutra bar Tobiah said in the name of Rav. Others state it was Rabbi Huna bar Bizna who said in the name of Rabbi Shimon Ḥasida; while others state it was Rabbi Yohanan who said in the name of Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai:
- Wow, that’s a lot of names.
- Yes, now there are a whole lot of voices heard.
- But I thought you called it a Stammaitic (anonymous) intervention? It seems like it is very much attributed.
- Well, yes, it’s the narrators who are anonymous here. But they are bringing in a lot of “firepower” with these multiple attributions.

**Better that a person throw himself into a fiery furnace than publicly put another person to shame.**

- I see where you got the idea of not shaming. It’s expressed here as a norm.

- Yes, but who in this story is being protected from shame?

- The poor man?

- I don’t think so. He wants to know the identity of his benefactor.

- Mar ‘Ukba?

- Exactly. And who might be shaming him?

- The poor man?

- Or maybe his wife is putting him to shame by forcing him out of his patriarchal “comfort zone.” Out of the liminal space of noninteraction. Out of the exclusively male, hierarchical society of the study hall. Into the hot hearth—the scalding and frightening (for him) domain of the female.

- Wait! That’s a whole lot of gendered assumptions that you are making.

- You may be right.

- And furthermore, the anonymous intervention is critical of that read. It valorizes Mar ‘Ukba’s hiding with its norm.

- Yes. I agree. It is an attempt to reappropriate a rather subversive story. And look how it ends:

**Whence do we derive this? From Tamar; for it is written, “When she was brought forth” (Genesis 38:25).**

- What does that mean?

- When she was about to be executed for suspected adultery, Tamar sent a message to her father-in-law, Judah, who was actually the father of her unborn child. She did this discreetly, says a midrash, so as not to embarrass him.

- So she was going to “take the bullet” for him.

- Actually, she was ready to allow herself to be burned at the stake rather than embarrass Judah.

- But in the end he ‘fesses up.

- Yes, in a sense Tamar taught Judah a lesson in responsibility. It’s not a simple story. But the editors of the Talmud employ this aspect of the biblical story as a proof text for the actions of Mar ‘Ukba and his wife.

- That a woman should sacrifice herself in order to protect the honor of a patriarch?

- Or might we conclude that our patriarch, Mar ‘Ukba, should learn that a little self-sacrifice is necessary himself?

- Which one is it?

- Hard to say.

- Cool!

- And hot.

**DOV KAHANE is a PhD candidate in Rabbinic Culture and Literature at the Jewish Theological Seminary. His research explores the humanistic aspects of rabbinic culture as depicted in and displayed by the narratives that appear in the Bavli.**

---

i The text is my translation of the Vilna edition using Michael Sokoloff's *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2002). Manuscripts were consulted for variants.

ii The term metadialogue implies a discussion about a discussion. If we think of Talmud essentially as conversations—real or fictionalized—that take place around a particular tradition, any commentary on the Talmud becomes a metaconversation. Here, I conjure a fictional metadialogue on this talmudic text both to elucidate some of its contours and depths as well as to interrogate the underlying methodology of unpacking a text, a central problem in the study of rabbinic literature that interests me. The bolded words are the translated text of the Talmud. The other material is the dialogue between two anonymous readers of the text. And, by extension, my footnotes constitute a meta-metadiscourse.

iii “When you give alms do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing” (Matthew 6:1–4); “Rabbi Elazar said: One who performs acts of charity in secret is greater than Moses, our teacher” (B. Bava Batra 9b); and see Maimonides, Mishneh Torah, Laws of Giving to the Poor 10:8–10. The idea of anonymous charity has also been viewed as an attempt to insure that charity never becomes the “dependency-generating” gift that characterizes both the modern and premodern world. See Seth Schwartz’s *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010).

iv The concept of charity as the unrequited free gift that acts, on some level, to “wound” its recipient has been articulated by many since Mauss first wrote about it in *Essai sur le Don* (1925). See Barry Schwartz’s “The Social Psychology of the Gift,” *American Journal of Sociology* 73 (1967): 2. Perhaps this is the crux of the issue at stake in this narrative as well.
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Did Soviet State Socialism Kill Patriarchy?

Karolina Krasuska

Did Soviet state socialism kill patriarchy? We automatically picture female tractor drivers or think of the Soviet Union as a state with a very high percentage of professionally active women (85 percent of working-age women in 1988, to be precise). We may also think so because of the large proportion of women writers within the new wave of Russian Jewish American literature—or what I call post-Soviet Jewish American writing—and the presence of unabashed women leaders, women-dominated family structures, and queered genealogies in this fiction. With their stories, Lara Vapnyar, Anya Ulinich, Sana Krasikov, Ellen Litman, and Nadia Kalman intervene in the underlying, often heteropatriarchal, narratives within the context of American Jewishness. Yet, at the same time, they, as well as some male writers of their cohort, demonstrate that patriarchy fares rather well, just under a post-Soviet guise that may not be hegemonic today.

Quite often we tend to think that we know what patriarchy looks like, that we know all its markers “here” and what its apparent features are “elsewhere,” which is usually the namesake for the global South. Within this simple division gender relations in North American Jewish post-Soviet fiction seem tricky. Its characters represent “the new immigrant whiteness,” as Claudia Sadowski-Smith has recently claimed, which may lead us to measure gender relations by what is familiar and dominant in the United States. Also, so many markings of the worlds created there seem progressive to left-loving critics. What fascinates me in this fiction are the details that at a second glance make us see the unfamiliar in the familiar; that show that gendered oppression may hide in the cracks of what may seem, at first glance, a sign of emancipation. I’d like to think about these traps, as it were, that this fiction sets up for its readers as good examples of unapparent patriarchy. Most often it hinges on two characters: the tough immigrant woman and her ailing husband.

In immigrant post-Soviet Jewish fiction the family patriarchs are suffering patriarchs. They suffer because they feel powerless. And the stress falls very often on how they “feel.” What mattered in the Soviet Union, we are told, seems not to be valued here. While it may be the case sometimes, I do wonder to what extent these characters simply say as much to justify the lack of the precise status they used to enjoy rather than a loss of privilege. As in Nadia Kalman’s The Cosmopolitans, in the United States, Osip’s resourcefulness is not pretentiously called “sublime pragmatism” anymore, but still it could be of use, and maybe even is.

It may be easier to feel sorry for—and not just sneer at—the suffering patriarchs who visibly struggle economically, as does Roman in David Bezmozgis’s Natasha and Other Stories. But even in this case his ailing is relative: it is not so much caused by the lack of place but rather a loss of a specific place, a specific career, a more-or-less sudden drop in his status. If Berman still feels he remains a former Soviet Olympic coach, a massage therapy business must feel like a failure in itself.

In other words, the patriarchal privilege as these patriarchs knew it in the Soviet Union does not seem to have traveled. This becomes additionally clear within inter-Jewish masculine hierarchies with established, nonimmigrant American Jews. In these confrontations, post-Soviet heads of the family lose big: their economic status becomes challenged; vis-à-vis religious traditions and practices, their Jewishness, which is secular, is also questioned. Again, Bezmozgis or Kalman are good examples.
How does, then, this brand of patriarchy function? The patriarchs do not seem to give up the status they used to enjoy, nor do they seem to accommodate. The family still revolves around the patriarch, but his feeble emotional state forces his wife to be a do-all robot. The women’s immigrant toughness seems to be quietly imposed on them. While their husbands suffer, they pull up their sleeves and work, taking care of husbands, children, and relatives, with little time left to reflect on how they feel. Stalina in The Cosmopolitans or Marina in Yelena Akhtiorskaya’s Panic in a Suitcase are especially cases in point.

Minus the suffering male and everything it entails, this arrangement dates back to the Soviet family model, where women were supposed to fulfill the primary duty of all Soviet citizens independent of gender, that is, work professionally, but be responsible for home life alone. The ailing husband has all the unspoken demands of the new Soviet patriarch, but under the condition of immigration—or post-Soviet transformation—is unable to fulfill his part of the bargain. The failure of Soviet secular patriarchal arrangements as they knew them is far from the demise of patriarchy. No wonder, then, that the daughters of the immigrant matriarchs see it for what it is, rebel against it, and consequently fail the test of domesticity, as Karen Ryan has noted.

There is more to this fiction than what I described above, more than this leftover from the Soviet system that does not even pretend to work when transplanted, but burdens middle-aged women. Alternative scenarios come mostly from other, less numerous works within this fiction, set in the Soviet Union itself. To name a few: Julia Alekseyeva’s narrative about a great-grandmother, Soviet Daughter, somewhat romanticizes the early twentieth-century Soviet sexual revolution; Lara Vapnyar’s “Lydia’s Grove” tells a story of a (failed) lesbian couple; good chunks of Vapnyar’s The Scent of Pine zero in on communal models that go beyond nuclear family gender order—the Soviet summer camp. Yet these seem to be the necessary margins that define the core of unapparent Soviet and then post-Soviet patriarchy on display in recent fiction in English written by Soviet and post-Soviet Jewish immigrants.

Karolina Krasuska is assistant professor at the American Studies Center, University of Warsaw, Poland. She is the author of Płeć i naród: Trans/lokacje [Gender and Nation: Trans/locations] (Warsaw: IBL PAN, 2012) and a co-editor (with Andrea Petö and Louise Hecht) of Women and the Holocaust: New Perspectives and Challenges (Warsaw: IBL PAN, 2015). Her article “Post-Soviet Migrant Memory of the Holocaust” in the Palgrave Handbook on Holocaust Literature and Culture is forthcoming.
The Poem and Its Frame: On the Transmission of the Arabic Poems by Qasmūna bint Ismā‘īl al-Yahūdī

Guadalupe González Diéguez

Two early modern anthologies of Arabic literature, both based on an earlier lost source (a section of Al-Mughrib fī ḥulā al-Maghrib by Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Sa‘īd al-Maghribī, 1213–86), preserve three brief poems by a twelfth-century woman poet named Qasmūna bint Ismā‘īl al-Yahūdī. An Andalusi Jewish woman composing poetry in Arabic, she does not belong to the field of the history of Hebrew literature and is just a very minor figure in the vast field of Arabic poetry. The manner of preservation and transmission of her poems, in Arabic biographical works composed by male authors within a patriarchal framework, is an example of how the transmission of the works by premodern women authors also set the stage for their interpretation, often in accordance with certain societal and traditional expectations.

The earliest of these anthologies, Nuzhat al-julasā‘ fī ash‘ār al-nisā‘ by Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 1505), is dedicated in full to women poets in the Arabic language. Al-Suyūṭī identifies Qasmūna, as was customary in the case of unmarried women, by giving the name of her father, Ismā‘īl ibn Naghrela, that is, Samuel “ha-Nagid,” the famous medieval Jewish poet and vizier. Chronologically it is dubious that she was the daughter of ha-Nagid, since according to Al-Suyūṭī she lived in the sixth century of the Islamic era (twelfth century), and ha-Nagid died in 1077. Through this identification, Qasmūna is presented to us as the daughter of an illustrious poet, a satellite and reflection of his talents. The debated identity of Qasmūna’s father looms large over her and has taken a great deal of the pages dedicated to her, in an implicit acknowledgement that she deserves interest in as much as she is related to a towering male figure, and not so much on her own.

The second anthology that preserves her poems, the Naḥf al-ṭīb min ghuṣn al-Andalus al-raṭīb by Al-Maqqarī (d. 1632), includes Qasmūna’s verses in a section dedicated to the literary merits of Andalusian non-Muslims, women, and children. He says, “A Jewish poetess, named Kasmunah, daughter of Ismail the Jew, is also counted among the bright geniuses of that nation. Her father, who was himself a man of considerable learning and a good poet, had bestowed the greatest care on her education, and imparted to her all the science which he himself possessed” (trans. Pascual de Gayangos). The literary brilliance of Qasmūna is directly attributed to her father here.

The case of Qasmūna shows how the writing of premodern women authors, of which very little has reached us, was often edited and presented according to an agenda that conforms to the conventions and expectations of a patriarchal system. The women poets of the Islamic world did not edit and publish themselves, and the ways in which their work has reached us must be critically accounted for, since they are far from neutral.

GUADALUPE GONZÁLEZ DIÉGUEZ is assistant professor at the Institut d’Etudes Religieuses, Université de Montréal. Her recent articles include “An Autobiographic Passage in Rhymed Prose in Isaac ibn Latif’s Form of the World,” Sefarad 78 (2018): 7-34.
Imaginary Letters by the Wives of Wilhelm Marr, Patriarch of Antisemitism

Lisa Silverman

Wilhelm Marr (1819–1904), the German journalist credited for introducing the word “antisemitism” into wide circulation, at one point referred to himself as its patriarch. Ironically, he was also so obsessed with Jewish women that he married three of them: Georgina Johanna Bertha Callenbach (daughter of an apostate Jew, whom he married in 1854 and divorced in 1873), Helene Sophia Emma Maria Behrend née Israel (a Jewish woman whom he married in February 1874 but who died in September that year, three days after the birth of their son, who also died), and Jenny Therese Kornick (a half-Jewish, divorced writer whom he married in 1875 and divorced in 1877).

Sources from which we can glean information about Marr’s relationships with these women are currently limited to Marr’s own publications and letters, some of which Moshe Zimmermann includes in his definitive biography, Wilhelm Marr, the Patriarch of Antisemitism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987). Zimmermann notes Marr’s “mysterious attraction” to Jewish women and briefly ponders what it meant for Marr to be married to them. But what did it mean for these women to be married to Marr, and what can these women’s choices tell us about antisemitism’s power and pliancy, as well as its relationship to misogyny? In what follows, I present imaginary letters Marr’s wives might have written.

To: Wilhelm Marr
From: Georgina Bertha Callenbach
Hamburg, 15 May 1872

Lieber Wilhelm,

I’m outraged. I could not believe my ears when mother told me that she found those love letters you wrote to that ugly, insipid Helene Israel. But then I saw one of her silly, simpering missives to you and I could no longer deny it. I should have known that you might be so cruel! Ever since we first met, you have never stopped talking about Jewish girls, like the ones who brought you cakes to eat in primary school, or those snooty ones you met on your boat journey to Costa Rica. What did you love about them so much? It seems to me that your enchantment with Jewish women matches the intensity of your scorn for Jewish men. So what was your problem with me —was I not Jewish enough for you? Were you only interested in my father’s fortune? I wish I could have stood up for myself and refused to marry you. I suspected that we were not going to get along. But I could not face father’s disappointment. He relished anything he thought might distance himself from his own Jewish past, so he loved that I married you. And if we had not wed, what would my other choices have been? At least we never had children. Adieu and bonne chance! Please tell Helene that I am much better off without you.

Georgina

----------

To: Helene Israel
From: Georgina Bertha Callenbach
Hamburg, 15 May 1872

Liebe Helene,

I deeply regret that Wilhelm and I began corresponding when you and he were still betrothed. And yet, perhaps you can understand that we did so only because we had found true love! Have you by any chance read the letters of Rahel Varnhagen? She is a much better writer than I am and can say what she means better than I ever could: it is simply a double curse to be both a woman and a Jew.
And yet, Willie truly loved me even though I had the misfortune to be Jewish, poor, and ugly. I was neither rich nor beautiful, like you—and he actually became less affluent when we married. You see, he is not a bad person. So I beseech that you neither condemn nor despise us!

Yours sincerely, Helene Israel

To: Wilhelm Marr
From: Jenny Kornick
Leipzig, 15 December 1874

Lieber Wilhelm,

I was profoundly moved to read “Too Happy,” the beautiful eulogy you wrote for your late wife in Gartenlaube. It exquisitely illuminated your true love for her, for which you have earned my deep admiration. I am also a writer and I believe we are kindred spirits. I would be honored by your reply.

Sincerely yours, Jenny Kornick

To: Wilhelm Marr
From: Jenny Kornick
Leipzig, 15 June 1878

Lieber Wilhelm,

Enough is enough. I cannot fathom why you wrote that your love for Helene exceeded your feelings for both Georgina and me because she was a “pure” Jewess and because “pure blood is always preferable to mixed blood” At least now I have more insight into your true character. Damn you for convincing that fool Fritsch to give my Ozzie an ultimatum. You know how much I have always desired to write as a journalist! If I could have been employed elsewhere, I would have. As you well know, I was never particularly keen to write about antisemitism. But I would have done so in this case. I would have considered myself lucky to even be able to use my real name! So, damn you for subverting my chances, and also for spreading loathsome falsehoods about my character. Nobody pays attention anymore to your lengthy rants about Jews or about anything else, for that matter. Well, so much for your ultimatum anyway: Ozzie has chosen me over the editorship and has agreed to raise Heinzi. Your son shall forget your name and will know another man as his father.

Yours, Jenny

To: Georgina Bertha Callenbach
From: Jenny Kornick
Leipzig, 15 December 1882

Liebe Georgina,

My name is Jenny Kornick. Like you, I was divorced from Wilhelm Marr after an unhappy marriage. I am thinking about writing an article about the women in Wilhelm’s life for Auf der Höhe, the journal edited by Leopold von Sacher-Masoch, although I fear he may not be particularly enthusiastic about the idea for reasons I would rather explain in person. Would you be willing to meet with me?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours, Jenny Kornick

LISA SILVERMAN is associate professor of History and Jewish Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and contributing editor of the Leo Baeck Institute Year Book. Her current book project is titled, The Postwar Antisemite: Culture and Complicity in Austria and Germany after 1945.

i  Rahel Varnhagen (1771–1833), writer and salon host, converted to Christianity in 1814. She is known for her letters, published in 1861, in which she discusses the limitations of being both a Jew and a woman.

ii  Marr was inconsolable when Helene Sophia Emma Maria Behrend née Israel died. He published a eulogy soon thereafter, to which many women responded with letters, including Jenny Therese Kornick, who was already divorced by that time.

iii  Kornick married Marr in 1875; their son Heinz was born in 1876. Their marriage was unhappy and they divorced in 1877. She then married Oswald Zimmermann, another antisemitic journalist. Marr became jealous that Zimmermann was appointed editor of the newspaper Antisemitische Correspondenz and that he planned to hire Jenny as a journalist. To retaliate, Marr convinced Fritsch, the newspaper’s owner, that Jenny was a promiscuous woman who did not dress appropriately and that Oswald should be fired if he allowed her to contribute.

iv  Kornick was at one time the lover of Leopold Sacher-Masoch (1836–95), who is best known for his erotic novels. Auf der Höhe (1881–85) featured articles on liberal topics including women’s emancipation. Kornick published at least one article in the journal, but it was unrelated to Marr or his wives. She and Zimmermann later denounced the journal as anti-German and philosemitic, leading to its demise.
LGBTQ Children of Holocaust Survivors

Jacob Evoy

In the summer of 2017, a member of an open Facebook group of children and grandchildren of Holocaust survivors asked the group, “What have you done in your lifetime that would redeem your parents’ memory and all the family members they lost?” While perhaps crudely stated, the question is a poignant one that received a variety of responses. One recurring theme among the children and grandchildren of survivors was the insistence on marrying another Jewish person in order to have as many children as possible and raise them to be Jewish. Having Jewish children and grandchildren is viewed as a means of denying Hitler and the Nazis a posthumous victory. Many of those commenting on the post agreed that having Jewish children and raising them in a Jewish family is one of the best ways to resist. While I am not by any means against these acts of resistance, I have come to question who is (un)able to participate in the rebuilding of the Jewish community in this way. For instance, LGBTQ children of Holocaust survivors were not always able to participate in the same way as their fellow heterosexual children of survivors. The experience of LGBTQ children of Jewish survivors remains remarkably understudied and acknowledged within the histories of Holocaust survivors and their descendants. I will be taking up these questions within my larger dissertation project entitled, “Queer(ing) Post-Holocaust Experience: An Oral History of LGBTQ Children of Holocaust Survivors.”

Academic fields such as History, Psychology, and Transitional Justice have largely ignored this group of individuals, even though they have been speaking and writing about their experiences as well as organizing themselves for decades. For instance, in the 1990s the International Association of Lesbian and Gay Children of Holocaust Survivors was created in New York. At its peak, the association had over 150 members from eleven different countries. There was clearly a need among LGBTQ children of survivors to find each other to discuss and work through issues that they specifically were facing, such as experiences of homophobia from within their families and/or communities. While the organization has since disbanded, their website remains active and provides a snapshot of some of the colliding histories of LGBTQ persecution by the Nazis, the Holocaust, the rise of the modern LGBTQ rights movement in the United States, and the experiences of children of survivors.

Along with groups such as the International Association of Lesbian and Gay Children of Holocaust Survivors, there exists a small collection of writings from LGBTQ children of Holocaust survivors. The genres of writing include theatre, fictional short stories, autobiographical short stories and memoirs, poetry, and some academic texts. The small collection of authors includes Lev Raphael, Lisa Kron, Rick Landman, and Susan Knabe.
All of these authors in some way discuss their experiences as LGBTQ children of Holocaust survivors, in ways that reveal how they are similar and different from those of heterosexual children of survivors. One issue in particular that has stood out is marriage. Marriage was often out of the question for LGBTQ children of survivors when in their 20s and 30s, as same-sex marriage was not legalized in Canada until 2005 and in all fifty states in the United States until 2015. Lev Raphael discusses his experiences and feelings surrounding his brother’s engagement in his autobiographical work Journeys and Arrivals: On Being Gay and Jewish (Faber and Faber, 1996).

When Raphael’s brother announced his engagement to a first-generation Polish Catholic immigrant woman, Raphael’s family had a difficult time accepting his choice of partner. For Raphael, the engagement also made him question his own emerging Jewish identity. “I wished my brother hadn’t taken something away from the family by marrying a non-Jew,” Raphael writes, “But the experience was odd for me. I was too uncertain in my own Jewish identity to condemn what my brother was doing—or to feel comfortable with it” (13-14). Raphael had been struggling to reconcile his Jewish faith and identity with his growing awareness of his own homosexuality. Struggling with finding his Jewish identity along heteronormative definitions, Raphael felt that his brother had undermined the same normative definers by marrying someone outside the Jewish faith.

In many ways, the experiences of LGBTQ children of Holocaust survivors are unique and demand further study and acknowledgement.

Alongside this feeling was the realization that even if his brother married a non-Jewish woman, his brother would still always be considered “normal” compared to Raphael because his brother had entered into a heterosexual relationship. “I also felt bested by him,” Raphael writes, “out-maneuvered in our unspoken rivalry. I couldn’t count on marrying even a Jewish woman, and so even though my brother had dropped out of college, he was normal, and had just proven it in the most obvious way” (13-14). His brother’s engagement and subsequent wedding forced Raphael to face the realization that he would never be considered “normal” within his family. His homosexuality dislodged him from the path expected of him and Raphael viewed this as a betrayal to his family, their history, and the Jewish community.

The engagement of his brother and Raphael’s feelings of this event highlight only a small aspect of how LGBTQ children of Holocaust survivors have different experiences from their straight counterparts. In many ways, the experiences of LGBTQ children of Holocaust survivors are unique and demand further study and acknowledgement. LGBTQ children of survivors have also contributed to the rebuilding of the worldwide Jewish community and have worked tirelessly to preserve their families’ histories and memories. These efforts need to be acknowledged and highlighted in academic studies of Holocaust survivors, and also within the larger Jewish and LGBTQ communities.

JACOB EVOY is a PhD candidate at the University of Western Ontario completing a collaborative degree in Women’s Studies and Feminist Research, and Transitional Justice and Post-Conflict Reconstruction. Their doctoral research’s working title is “Queering the Post-Holocaust Experience: An Oral History of LGBTQ Children of Holocaust Survivors.” Their research interests include: queer history, trauma studies, memory studies, and Holocaust and genocide studies. Jacob has a chapter, “Aren’t you afraid of what people might say? What people might do?: Lady Gaga and the ‘Heeling’ of queer Trauma,” being published in Brandon Arroyo and Thomas Waugh’s upcoming anthology I Confess! in 2019.
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Patriarchy Is Alive and Well in Pentateuch

Sarah Shectman

Pentateuchal Studies continues to be a male-dominated field—this is hardly a surprising statement given the overall gender imbalance in Biblical Studies. In my years on the Society of Biblical Literature Pentateuch Section steering committee, first as a member and then as cochair, I saw firsthand how its narrow focus—its synonymity with historical-critical method, especially composition history—has resulted in the same few handfuls of scholars being the primary participants; the majority of these scholars are men. Though the steering committee itself has achieved and maintained remarkable gender balance, it was often difficult to achieve the same balance in our sessions. Open calls for papers on topics like gender that seemed likely to attract women scholars elicited a total of two or three proposals—people working on feminism likely did not even look at our call for papers.

As a newly minted PhD, I was at first optimistic that the historical-critical tunnel vision of Pentateuchal Studies might change and that other methods, like feminism, might make some inroads. My book, *Women in the Pentateuch: A Feminist and Source-Critical Analysis* (2009), which sought to bridge the divide between historical-critical and feminist scholarship, was published by a well-respected academic press, and it was well reviewed. That it was only reviewed in two places (and notably, both reviews were by women), however, demonstrates the difficulty involved in effecting such change. One review of a volume on the Priestly (P) material that I coedited went through the various essays summarizing their major points in a few sentences. When the reviewer (a man) got to my essay on women in P, he simply gave the title and moved on to the next one—in the same sentence! My ideas, apparently, did not even merit a full sentence.

So why has my women-focused source-critical research not been engaged with by mainstream Pentateuch scholars, most of whom are more than happy to devote considerable room to the ideas of scholars they don’t agree with? Their lack of engagement suggests that most Pentateuch scholars simply haven’t read my book because they don’t think it’s relevant. Although this can feel personal, it is not a criticism of my otherwise well-received scholarship. Rather, it is a symptom of the culture of the field, which overvalues methods typically embraced by male scholars, deemed more “serious” and more “scientific.”

My experience is not an isolated incidence; women scholars continue to be marginalized. Nevertheless, I have seen a few signs of progress. More and more of my male colleagues are expressing solidarity with women and scholars of color who employ a wider range of methods. For Biblical Studies to move forward—to make sure that its output remains vital, innovative, and relevant, to attract new scholars and ensure that they are provided with a safe space in which to do their work, and to address its gender and racial gaps—will require more colleagues to recognize that diverse participants bring with them diverse methods and ideas, which in turn create better scholarship.

SARAH SHECTMAN is a scholar and editor living in San Francisco, California. She is the author of *Women in the Pentateuch: A Feminist and Source-Critical Analysis* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009) and coeditor of *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009). She is the cofounder of SB Allies (sballies.org).

---

i My thanks to Ilona Zsolnay for her comments on earlier drafts of this piece.
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Reconsidering Ancient Israelite “Patriarchy”

Carol Meyers

“Patriarchy” is a social-science construct, not a biblical term. Yet it appears often in Biblical Studies; scholars refer to biblical texts, and by extension ancient Israelite society, as patriarchal. But is that designation appropriate? To answer that question means first recognizing that patriarchy entered the discussion of Israelite society via developments in the social sciences in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Formed from the Greek words for “rule” and “father,” it was used by influential pioneers in the new field of Anthropology (e.g., Lewis Henry Morgan, Henry Sumner Maine, and Numas Denis Fustel de Coulanges) to describe ancient families. Drawing mainly from Greek and Roman legal texts, they reported that the all-powerful father had complete authority over everyone in his household. That view penetrated Biblical Studies when (in 1887–88) a German biblical scholar (Bernhard Stade) published a very influential history of ancient Israel and used patriarchy to describe Israelite families. Then, in the early twentieth century, the meaning of the term was expanded when, following the lead of sociologist Max Weber, scholars began to refer to society-wide male domination in ancient Israel.

Those views about ancient Israel have had a powerful impact on Biblical Studies. But recent developments in the study of ancient societies, including ancient Israel, challenge the validity of the patriarchy paradigm. Important work in Classical Studies, drawing not only on legal texts but also on a variety of other literary sources as well as archaeological and iconographic materials, has shown that traditional depictions of an all-powerful paterfamilias do not correspond to what is now known about the social realities of Greco-Roman household life and of classical society in general. Fathers did not have unlimited power over their families, nor did men dominate all communal institutions. Rather, women frequently were household managers, making decisions about the use of resources and dominating the organization of everyday life; and they held leadership positions in certain extrahousehold activities.

A similar picture emerges in the study of Israelite women by using archaeological materials in addition to relevant biblical texts. The excavations of households, which were the setting for the major economic, social, and religious activities of women and men in the agrarian communities in which most people lived in Iron Age Israel (ca. 1200–587 BCE), produces invaluable information about the processes and functions of everyday activities. To be sure, raw archaeological data themselves do not tell us about gendered aspects of household life nor about the interactions of its members. However, the methodologies of gender archaeology—in which information about premodern peoples helps us to identify features of gendered life among ancient peoples living in similar ecological niches—provide an important interpretive lens for viewing excavated Israelite structures and artifacts. That is, ethnographic analogies allow us to reconstruct the gendered roles and accompanying dynamics that would have played out in Israelite settlements.

One example is what we can learn about bread production from the grinding tools and ovens ubiquitous at Israelite sites. Biblical texts and ethnographic analogies together provide evidence that women were the ones who used these artifacts and installations to carry out the various steps necessary for converting raw grains into edible form. Grains were the nutritional mainstay of the Israelite diet, contributing nearly three-fourths of one’s daily caloric intake. They were so important that the biblical word for bread (leḥem) can designate food in general. Ethnographic analysis strongly suggests that when women each day prepare life-sustaining food that
Recent developments in the study of ancient societies, including ancient Israel, challenge the validity of the patriarchy paradigm. Though the patriarchy paradigm has long dominated scholarly discourse on ancient Israelite gender relations, it occludes other inequities—those related to social class (including debt servitude and slavery), political structure, ethnicity, race, or age. Moreover, it rests on an essentializing female-male binary that supports heteronormativity and precludes acknowledgment of gender fluidity. Just as important, it assumes that households were static and their gender dynamics were monolithic, thus ignoring many ways in which women can be social actors.

Reconsidering patriarchy shows it to be an inadequate and misleading descriptor of Israelite society. Removing it from scholarly discourse on Israelite gender relations does not mean suggesting gender equality. Rather, it acknowledges that patriarchy is a social-science construct of questionable validity and value for representing the lived experience of many ancient Israelites.

Teaching Against the Patriarchy

The Gender Gap in the Field of Medieval Jewish Intellectual History

Jennifer Seligman

Male scholarship has predominated in medieval Jewish intellectual history, the field in which I am pursuing a doctorate. Though women are gaining more positions in the field of Medieval Jewish Studies, and thus we can look forward to increasing women’s scholarship in this area, there is still a gap that needs closing. I believe this is due to the discrepancies in women’s and men’s Torah study still extant in Orthodox Judaism. Fluency in Talmud, Bible, Jewish law, and their medieval commentaries is required in order to study medieval Jewish intellectual history, and this fluency is usually obtained in the yeshiva system, where, despite much progress in women’s Torah education, this study remains a primarily male pursuit. There is a “rabbinic knowledge gender gap,” and I think it can be closed in academic Jewish Studies in the following manner:

Unlike Bible, Second Temple Judaism, Talmud, Jewish History, Holocaust, and Israel Studies, there is a lack of academic study of the talmudic and halakhic commentaries and law codes of the medieval and early modern eras. Our understanding of this critically important literature would be greatly enhanced by applying academic approaches to its study. In addition, teaching this literature in the academic realm would provide greater access to women as well as those who do not have either an Orthodox or yeshiva background, as well as non-Jews. Practical ways to achieve this could be:

1. For a survey course on Ashkenazic medieval Jewish history, include short yet indicative examples of medieval rabbinic thought, in English translation: Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Rashbam, and Nahmanides on the Bible; Rashi and Tosafot on a brief passage of Talmud; and possibly an excerpt from Maimonides’ *Mishneh Torah* for contrast. This
need not take more than a week or two of lecture, and Bible and Second Temple Judaism/Talmud could be prerequisite courses if desired by the instructor and/or the department.

2. A seminar on medieval Jewish talmudic commentary and law designed for upper-division undergraduate as well as graduate students. All primary sources would be in English translation.

3. A graduate seminar (yet open to upper-division undergraduate students with the requisite language skills) on medieval Jewish talmudic commentary and law, with primary sources studied in the original medieval Rabbinic Hebrew.

I look forward to medieval Jewish intellectual history becoming an integral part of the study of Judaism and Jewish history, either as its own independent field or as part of the study of medieval and early modern Judaism. Moreover, even for those seeking to study other aspects of Jewish history, medieval Jewish intellectual history plays an important role, such as the study of the status of Jewish women in Jewish law and the development of Jewish law and Jewish observance up until the present day; it also provides ample sources for comparative work with medieval Christian Studies. It’s a rich source of ore waiting to be mined.

JENNIFER SELIGMAN is a PhD student in Medieval Jewish History at the Bernard Revel Graduate School at Yeshiva University, where she received her MA in the same field in 2011.

Modern Jewish Thought and the Fratriarchy
Andrea Dara Cooper

In an issue devoted to patriarchy, I want to think about brotherhood. In The Politics of Friendship, Jacques Derrida examines the brotherly nature of friendship and political community, arguing that any society based on fraternity is exclusionary. If communities are structured through “the economic, genealogical, ethnocentric, androcentric features of fraternity,” then how can we begin to think beyond the fraternal? I propose that we examine the vertical problem of patriarchy through the horizontal sphere of fraternity in Modern Jewish Thought. Doing so will allow us to consider how the field has historically belonged to a “familial, fraternalist” configuration. More broadly, we will see that necessary critiques of patriarchy should be paying attention to the primary organizing principle of fraternity.

At the heart of Franz Rosenzweig’s major work, The Star of Redemption (1921), lies an evocative reading of the Song of Songs. I am intrigued by Rosenzweig’s compelling interpretation; while the Song of Songs is usually seen to focus on a hetero-erotic relationship between lovers, Rosenzweig homes in on the lovers’ wish to become like siblings. But his reading is marked by fraternal tropes and the subsequent effacement of gender difference. He transposes the erotic energy in the Song from a celebration of difference to a longing for sameness. This transposition involves a move from revelation to communal redemption, as the erotic sphere is surpassed by neighborly “brotherliness.” For Rosenzweig, the anthropocentric and theocentric are not separable, and the language of brotherhood is not exclusive to one sphere or another. In his reading, the Song’s lovers long to be united in societal fraternity. While this may suggest a neutrality of gender, it is only attained by eliding sibling difference. As the lover/beloved erotic plane is left behind, all become equal as brothers. Along the way to this shared kinship, the feminine is left behind and sexual difference becomes effaced. That all are united in the kingdom of brotherliness, the Reich der Brüderlichkeit, suggests that all are only equal insofar as all are masculine.

My reading is influenced by Elliot Wolfson’s explanation of a fundamental motif in kabbalistic literature, in which the feminine becomes masculine in a reconstituted male androgyne: “In the ideal state, gender differentiation is neutralized and the female is absorbed back into the male.” A similar transmutation takes place in Rosenzweig’s reading of the Song, as all are united in brotherliness and attain equality under the bearing of the masculine. As Zachary Braiterman and Mara Benjamin have observed, Rosenzweig’s version of fraternity becomes masculine. While this may suggest a fraternalist community, a homosocial community, a Männerbund. Here Jacques Derrida’s critique of fraternity becomes particularly relevant: “The fratriarchy may include cousins and sisters but, as we will see, including may also come to mean neutralizing.”

If we view patriarchy as a network of interconnected relationships, we can see how horizontal relationships make vertical power structures possible. In the classical politics of
friendship, brotherhood is crystallized in the communal bond. The ethical relation is figured as a friendship inseparable from fraternity—Platonic, free equals taking part in a homosocial bromance. Any relation of solidarity among nonbrothers is then only thinkable on the model of fraternization.

In my view, the model of brotherhood structures both the philosophy/theology of Rosenzweig and the ethics of Emmanuel Levinas. In the move from the familial to the social level, society is construed as a relationship of brothers, in which every self is commanded to ethical relations with others because of this shared kinship. As Levinas writes in Otherwise than Being: or, Beyond Essence (1974), “The other is from the first the brother of all the other men.” What happens when a celebration of difference is set aside in service of a unifying fraternal community? Brotherhood may appear to be an admirable ethical aim, but it requires dissolving the particularities of identity.

We should interrogate and make explicit the structural organizations that drive these philosophical approaches. In these works, fraternity functions on the level of both form and content—as a network of male thinkers who operate in relation to one another, and as a trope that shapes their methodologies. This coincidence is not accidental. How do these themes shore up ethical approaches that privilege the masculine? This is both a hermeneutical limitation and an ethical problem. What would the accepted canon of Modern Jewish Thought look like beyond, in Derrida’s words, “the homo-fraternal and phallogocentric schema” of the fratriarchy—beyond the old male thinkers’ club? What questions and interpretations are overlooked?

How does this extend to our pedagogy—to the homogenous names on our syllabi? One could maintain that a syllabus on Jewish Thought (or any area of Jewish Studies) should reflect the field; since this is how the field was historically constructed, this is how our syllabi should look. Instead, I suggest we critically examine our syllabi and the edited volumes from which we teach, exposing students to productive anachronistic and thematic frameworks that include overlooked methods. In a class on Spinoza, we might assign a contemporary essay on embodiment, or

alongside Levinas, an essay highlighting the blind spot of sexual difference.

Luce Irigaray and Derrida observe that Levinas’s work is novel, even radical, because it is explicitly sexed male—unlike Heidegger’s Dasein, or countless other works and concepts in the history of Western thought that presume to be unsexed and therefore underwrite a masculine norm. Taking a cue from Irigaray and Derrida, we can emphasize the positionality of the author rather than reflexively assigning them a normative neutrality. In doing so, we will reveal and disrupt power relations already at work in the texts we select. We can expand our notion of Jewish Thought to include alternate forms, affective networks, and nonsystematic, poetic, and epistolary sources: What other voices would be admitted if we accepted letter-writing, memoir, and testimony as accepted categories? A responsible and critical ethics of reading can lead to a more inclusive field of study. Once we start, we’ll realize that it’s not difficult to de-bro-ify our Jewish Thought syllabus/canon. But we have to start.

ANDREA DARA COOPER is assistant professor in the Department of Religious Studies and Leonard and Tobee Kaplan Fellow in Modern Jewish Thought and Culture at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her book, Reading Beyond the Fratriarchy in Modern Jewish Thought, is under contract with Indiana University Press.

“We Were Like Cancer Patients”: Ruth Klüger’s Still Alive and Patriarchal Silencing

Matthew Brittingham

For professors and graduate students who do not specialize in the Holocaust, but are often called on to teach it, getting students to confront issues related to gender and the Holocaust can be challenging. There’s a massive amount of material available to cover. And there’s the broader tendency to generalize Holocaust experiences, a tendency to which our students and ourselves can certainly fall prey. From the historical perspective, Marion Kaplan’s research on gender and German Jewry under the Nazi regime is standout work centered on women’s experiences and women’s voices in the midst of Nazi domination. But what about female survivors and the gendered silencing of their voices and their memories? The gendered politics of memory and vocalizing trauma is sometimes even harder for students to approach.

One way I bring the voices of female survivors to the classroom is through assigning Ruth Klüger’s memoir Still Alive: A Holocaust Girlhood Remembered (Feminist Press, 2001). In it, Klüger offers challenging perspectives on gender, patriarchy, and Holocaust memory. Klüger’s memoir focuses on her often-difficult relationship with her mother, who suffered from mental health issues that were exacerbated by Nazi terrors. Klüger charts their life together: post-Anschluss Vienna, various camp experiences, escape from a Nazi death march, hiding out and passing as non-Jews before the war’s end, postwar European displacement, immigration to the United States, and living in the shadow of the Holocaust. From the very beginning of the memoir, Klüger places her Holocaust memories in the context of war memories in general, which tend to be particularly dismissive of the female voice and even silence women’s trauma. For example, Klüger suggests that she is hardly ever asked about her experiences during the war, in part because “wars,” she writes, “and hence the memories of wars, are owned by the male of the species…. Besides women have no past, or aren’t supposed to have one. A man can have an interesting past, a woman only an indecent one. And my stories aren’t even sexy” (18). As Klüger suggests here, the patriarchally inflected association of war stories with masculinity tends toward silencing female experiences during the war, including the rape of female prisoners, sexual assaults, risky pregnancies, and even abortion. In light of this quote, the very existence of her memoir—populated centrally by herself and her mother—is itself a challenge to male-dominant wartime perspectives that historically omitted female Holocaust survivors and their traumas.

Throughout the memoir, Klüger not only tells her own story, but resurrects such so-called “indecent
pasts.” That is, beyond a Holocaust memoir, *Still Alive* is a broader challenge to World War II’s patriarchal point of view, not only chauvinist, masculine glorifications of the war, but also facile divisions between who did or did not experience violence and trauma during the war. A poignant example is Klüger’s resurrection of histories of rape at the hand of Soviet camp liberators. Far from being simply concentration camp liberators, Klüger “heard from Jewish women who were almost raped in their liberated camps.... Their stories strongly suggested that there were others who were unlucky, and who endured the trauma of rape as a kind of coda to their persecution by the Nazis” (159). The Soviet rape of Jewish women was certainly not the first instance of sexual violence committed against female Jewish prisoners, but it is indeed a story of traumas that complicate our often-simplistic notions of being “liberated.” Of course, before “liberation,” aside from the everyday terrors of camp life, laws and regulations related to *Rassenschande* (“race defilement,” i.e., sex between so-called “Aryans” and supposed racial “inferiors,” especially Jews) did not stop Nazis soldiers and guards from raping Jewish women under their control, and a total number of victims will never be known. After the war, it was difficult to talk about rape at the hands of the Soviets or the Nazis, as victims of rape still lived in a wider world of gender norms that elevated men’s narratives, might shame rape victims, and made conversations about sexual violence taboo.

Klüger also refers to the Soviet gang rape of German women, an act of revenge often understood by “the patriarchal point of view” as “not necessarily just” but certainly “understandable,” rather than as abhorrently traumatic sexual violence regardless of their being German (159). In postwar Germany, as Klüger notes, the trauma experienced by these victims of rape was hidden because of its associated dishonor and shame (much like the Korean “comfort women” who struggled with testifying about their experiences as sex slaves until only the last several decades, partly due to Korean cultural stigmas). She states this very powerfully: “An act of violence that dishonors its victim will not bring her attention, let alone sympathy. Language favors the male, by putting the shame of the victim into the service of the victimizer” (ibid.). My students often have to wrestle with this “chronicle of German women as victims” (ibid.).

One of the most complex and emotionally challenging passages for my students usually emerges from Klüger’s life in America. Klüger eventually marries a former American serviceman who served in the European theater and later became a teacher of European history. When her husband’s history course reached Hitler and the Nazi regime, Klüger offered to discuss the concentration camps with his class, only to have the proposition flatly
rejected. Wondering why, she suggests that her story probably appeared to him as “something improper that reflected poorly on his honor as a decorated veteran who had fought evil” (182–83). Instead, Holocaust survivors “were like cancer patients who remind the unafflicted that they too, are mortal” (183).

Klüger uses this episode to reflect on another instance of silencing, only this time one much more explicitly intersecting gender and war memories. While at a dinner party with her husband’s friends, Klüger listens to a former WWII pilot recount a war story where he hunted and pinned down a German soldier. After a considerable period of time without being quite able to finish him, the former pilot “admiring and laughing at his prey ... cheerfully waved to the man with the wings of his plane” (ibid.). Klüger speaks up: perhaps the German soldier did not realize in that moment that he was part of some war game, but rather he was experiencing “the terror of death” (ibid.). Thus, the act of having “cheerfully waved”—a signal to war “gamesmanship”—was probably meaningless to the German soldier. Klüger’s challenge is silenced: “In the end, my husband’s friend is irritated and taken aback by my words. He isn’t prepared for serious objections to his merry memories. I realize that women are tolerated in these circles only when they keep their mouths shut” (ibid.). Klüger’s memoir constantly subverts students’ expectations, most startlingly on the patriarchal silencing of female experiences in World War II, the Holocaust, and postwar life. Indeed, based on my students’ end-of-year course assessments, the most commonly uncomfortable aspects of Klüger’s memoir is her commentary on gender and violence that I highlight above. It is precisely this discomfort with female silencing in light of patriarchal narratives with which I want my students to wrestle.

MATTHEW BRITTINGHAM is a PhD candidate in the Graduate Division of Religion at Emory University. He is also a fellow at Emory’s Tam Institute for Jewish Studies and a translation fellow at the National Yiddish Book Center.

Disrupting Biblical Patriarchy in 280 Characters: Examining the Inherent Patriarchal Nature of 2 Samuel 11-12

Shayna Sheinfeld

The Hebrew Bible is patriarchal—predominantly produced and copied by and for men. One way that I disrupt the inherently patriarchal reading of the biblical narrative in my classroom is to focus on all the figures in the narrative, rather than just on the (male, privileged) protagonist. In this case study I explore how I disrupt the patriarchal narrative of 2 Samuel 11:1-12:25 using tweets.

Reading 2 Samuel 11-12

To review 2 Samuel 11-12 briefly, King David spies Batsheva bathing on a rooftop, has her brought to him, and has sex with her. Learning that she is pregnant with his child, David orders that her husband Uriah be brought back from the war so that he will have sex with her and Uriah will think the child is his. When Uriah refuses to have sex with his wife because his fellow countrymen are still at war, David sends him to the front lines, where he is killed, so that David can marry Batsheva (chapter 11). In chapter 12 Nathan confronts David on behalf of the Lord, David
accepts that he made a mistake and repents. For punishment from God, Batsheva and David’s firstborn son dies, but she soon becomes pregnant again and gives birth to Solomon, who becomes the heir to the throne.

While students understand that how David treats Batsheva—spying on her while she is bathing, having sex with a married woman, attempting to trick and then kill her husband—violates today’s standards, David’s violations are retroactively justified through his repentance and the death of his firstborn son. David and Batsheva then go on to produce the next king of Israel. The text clearly portrays God as approving of the union despite David’s actions. God’s eventual approval suggests that the ends justify the means in this case, and that David’s actions, while not condoned, are forgivable offenses. This reading supports a patriarchal lens and reinforces the misogynistic elements present throughout Tanakh.

The Assignment

The Twitter assignment attempts to disrupt this underlying misogynistic and overtly patriarchal reading of the text by having students examine the actions and reactions of figures through a careful reading of the text, translated into a tweet—280 characters of contemporary language. I prepare index cards with the names of each of the characters and one of the two chapters (e.g., David - 11, Batsheva - 11, Uriah - 11, Nathan - 12, etc.). I mix these up and hand them out randomly as students arrive to class. After some in-class analysis of the figure of David and the monarchy, we move to exploring 2 Samuel 11-12. I then explain the activity:

1. Together with their groupmates who have the matching index card, students are to read through the assigned chapter and discuss the main points of the narrative, focusing on the point of view of their character.

2. Students then create a (fake) Twitter handle for their character as a way to assign voice to their character.

3. Students create four tweets (each tweet can be a maximum of 280 characters) from the point of view of their assigned character. They are to use contemporary language and standard Twitter features (e.g., hashtags, @, images, quoting/commenting on other tweets, etc.). They may create a new tweet, develop it as part of a thread, or in response to a particular tweet.

4. Finished tweets are written on the board and discussed as a class. In addition, I also provide students with a sample tweet from 2 Samuel 6:12-23, from Michal’s perspective, as an example:

@KingDavid Stop that dancing & get dressed #embarrassed #nekkid #showGodsomerespect

The activity itself does not need to take long; limiting the number of tweets to four means that students have to focus on the main points of the narrative for their assigned figures. Students need twenty minutes to read, develop their tweets, and write them on the board, and I allow ten minutes for discussion of the tweets and the activity afterwards.

What This Activity Does

Using Twitter, students are able to engage in a (localized) social media discussion of the biblical narrative, which produces the potential for reading the narrative through a contemporary lens. Using contemporary language and Twitter also assists with removing the theological overtures that are often read into the narrative (e.g., “King David must be good because God chose David”) in
order to produce thinkers who can also recognize the potential for harm that the text does in different settings to women and to other populations. As contemporary readers of the text, we are not unlike the “lurkers” on Twitter, who may read tweets, may periodically comment, but often are removed from “what’s at stake” in a discussion by dint of a screen.

Students are able to examine the narrative situation from the additional perspectives of (1) the silenced woman who has no control over what happens to her/her body, (2) her husband who is killed, and (3) the prophet Nathan who knows the extent of David’s misconduct. This activity helps students shift from accepting the biblical narrative in which David is tacitly exonerated at face value to thinking about the consequences of David’s actions on the people around him. This activity gives these minor characters voice as their agency is analyzed; likewise, students contend with the idea that the text has a (pro-David, pro-monarchical) agenda and that agenda silences those who do not support it, women most of all. Students hone their ability to approach the narrative through a critical lens, and to offer resistant readings that recognize that the character presented as God’s chosen king is problematic.

Sample students’ tweets from handle @Baesheva:

• Who’s the #perv checking me out while I’m bathing?
• response to: @therealDavid Gonna get me some of that! #fullmoonrising #ispybatsheva
• @Uriah Please come home! #makelevenotwar
• Why did you kill my baby @God? #enoughdeath #ididntwantthis

Postactivity Discussion and Pedagogical Result

Following the chance for each group to read their tweets to the class, we discuss the activity as a class. Students are usually insightful about the purpose of the activity. They point out that slowing down their reading to do this activity helps them recognize the inherently patriarchal perspective in the text; one student wrote on their evaluation, “The twitter activity was both the most fun and the most engaging activity we did in class. I hadn’t thought about the story in this way, but even though Batsheva seemed complicit in the text, it wasn’t a consensual relationship.” Another student announced at the beginning of the activity that she took my class because a friend of hers told her about “the tweeting thing with David and Batsheva.”

The activity helps the students recognize that just because a woman is present, and even named, does not mean the text gives her voice or agency. Perhaps most importantly, through this activity students recognize that the patriarchal nature of the biblical narrative is not harmless, even today, and that the text and its audiences throughout history often encourage violence toward women and nonelites.

SHAYNA SHEinfeld is a visiting scholar at the University of Kentucky. Her article, “The Old Gods are Fighting Back: Mono- and Polytheistic Tensions in Battlestar Galactica and Jewish Biblical Interpretation” will be published in the Journal of Interdisciplinary Biblical Studies in 2019.
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i Note that I do not have the students tweet on the actual social media platform Twitter. Twitter is a valid pedagogy tool as well, although to use it productively it should be an all-semester investment. For more on using the platform Twitter during a semester-long course, see Megan P. Goodwin’s interview on Richard Newton's blog, “#SyrRelBodies: US Religions and the Regulation of Bodies of Color,” April 24, 2017, https://sowingtheseed.org/2017/04/24/syrrelbodies-us-religions-and-the-regulation-of-bodies-of-color/.

ii Note that “bae,” an acronym meaning “before anyone else,” is an American colloquialism that refers to someone’s boyfriend/girlfriend; this play on the name Batsheva with “Baesheva” was created intentionally by the students.
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