

Chapter 1 : Early Yiddish Texts With Introduction and Commentary - PDF Free Download

From Nokhem Shtif in Kiev to Yoysef Opatoshu in New York, 6 February , expressing his delight that Opatoshu is a reader of Di yidishe shprakh, unlike other Yiddish writers who, he claims, scorn all attempts to improve the Yiddish language and have fallen under the sway of the Yiddish of the masses and the popular press.

Cherikover , was a Russian-born Jewish historian of Judaism or the Jewish people. Biography Tcherikower was born and raised in Poltava Ukraine , in the Russian Empire, where his father was a pioneer of the Hovevei Zion movement. He attended gymnasium in Odessa, and went on to university in Saint Petersburg. His participation in the Russian revolutionary movement led to his arrest at a Menshevik meeting during the revolution, after which he spent a year in prison. For the next ten years he wrote mainly in Russian; after most of his work was in Yiddish. Tcherikower contributed biographies and a variety of other articles to the Russian-language Jewish encyclopedia Evreiskaia entsiklopedia. He returned to Russia sometime after the outbreak of the revolution in , and then in late moved to Kiev, in the newly independent state of Ukraine. In the spring of a wave of anti-Jewish violence spread through the Ukraine, including Kiev, and Tcherikower turned his attention to gathering documentation of the events in the Jewish communities, leading the "Editorial Board for Collecting and Investigating Material Pertaining to the Pogroms in the Ukraine. The archive assembled by these scholars eventually served as the basis of several historical works in Yiddish about the events. When the Soviets gained control in the Ukraine in , Tcherikower and other Yiddish activists in Kiev fled the city; he and his wife Riva Rebecca , taking the archive with them, went first to Moscow and then to Berlin. A significant contingent of Russian Jewish artists and scholars similarly took up residence in Berlin in the early s, including the scholars with whom Tcherikower had worked in Kiev, as well as the esteemed Jewish historian Simon Dubnow, whom Tcherikower regarded as a mentor. During this period several Yiddish and Hebrew publishing houses were established in Berlin, providing Tcherikower and his colleagues opportunities to publish scholarly works in Yiddish. Although the institute initially had its central office in Berlin, much of its activities were centered in Vilna Vilnius, Lithuania , which became its official headquarters within the following year. In this work Tcherikower, assisted by his wife, brought to bear materials in the pogrom-related archive he and his colleagues had assembled. Tcherikower is also often remembered for his research on the notorious Protocols of the Elders of Zion in the context of the Berne Trial of He headed a group of historians, including Vladimir Burtsev and Sergei Svatikov, who gathered evidence and gave testimony for the prosecution concerning the fraudulent nature of the Protocols. In Tcherikower, then living in France, co-edited, with Yisroel Israel Efroykin , the new Yiddish-language journal Oyfn sheydveg At the crossroads , with Zelig Kalmanovitch as a major contributor. The three colleagues, who had all advocated for diaspora nationalism and Yiddishism, aimed to reevaluate their cultural and political views on the future of the Jewish people. When the Germans invaded France in June , Tcherikower and his wife fled their Paris apartment, and headed for the south of France. He died in New York City in She died in New York on July 7, Yidisher literarisher farlag, Di Ukrainer pogromen in yor [The Ukrainian pogroms in].

Chapter 2 : yidishkeyt | In geveb

In Nokhem Shtif's lifetime, Yiddish was the vernacular of the vast majority of Ashkenazic Jews. In addition to traditional cheders, secular Yiddish schools flourished after World War I, as did competing modern Hebrew-language schools.

How do Jewish students fit in? All of these questions deserve to be answered, but they cannot be answered by linking them to the long and complex history of communism, the Jews, and anti-Semitism. Nor can they be addressed by assuming that all criticisms of Israel, including devastatingly harsh ones that question the basis for a Jewish state, are anti-Semitic. Overall, Stephen Norwood has not produced a worthwhile piece of history—neither of the Left which he never defines nor of anti-Semitism. Nor has he done much to advance our understanding of the contemporary scene in which condemnation of Israel and Israeli policies has begun to spread beyond the towers of academe. Scholar-ship for the Yiddish Nation. Cambridge University Press, The two competing master plans usually banked on recognition of different languages as national ones: Hebrew by Zionists or Yiddish by anti- and non-Zionists. Pure Yiddishism, which was first and foremost about building a modern Yiddish-speaking nation, never became the ideology of a mass movement, though it inspired the creation of organizational structures at some historical moments. The Kultur-Lige, or Yiddish Culture League, established in Kiev in , with offshoots and replications in many corners of the world, played an exceptionally important and consequential role in the history of Yiddishism. True, nowadays it operates in a completely different academic climate: Indeed, Shtif moved rather than fled to Kiev in , then to Kovno and, finally in , to Berlin. During that period of time he belonged to the Folkspartey, whose Dubnowian ide-ology was close to Pure Yiddishism. In August of the following year, nine people, including Shtif who soon returned to Kiev , gath-ered in Berlin to take part in a preliminary conference, and this meeting later came to be referred to as the act of the founding of YIVO. The institute was designed as a conglomerate of several sections based in Berlin, Warsaw, and Vilna. In Vilna, too, Weinreich and his colleagues could only dream of turning the institute into a financially secure institution, though its economic base somewhat stabilized by the end of the s. His dissertation saw light posthumously only in Still, his academic status was solid compared to that of the autodidact Simon Dubnow and to those of Elias Tsher-ikower and Jacob Lestschinsky, heads of the Historical and Social-Economic Sec-tions, respectively the latter two only attended universities. Weinreich, who combined in himself excellent qualities of a scholar, adminis-trator, and journalist, had to solve numerous problems in order to keep the institute Book Reviews afloat. It was an important if arduous task for an academic institution, endeavoring to survive in the pugnacious ideological atmosphere of interwar Jewish Poland. Lack of money, its extra-academic status and linguistic insularity, as well as the exceeding attention paid to hair-splitting topics certainly weakened the posi-tion of YIVO. To those who did not share the assumptions of Diaspora Nationalism YIVO was a modest institution in a provincial Polish city, perpetually on the verge of bankruptcy and serving a narrow circle of scholars, students, and intellec-tuals. For its activists and supporters YIVO represented the pinnacle of modern Jewish culture, an organization that gave dignity to the lives of 11 million Yiddish-speaking Jews throughout the world. Even the Yiddish socialist daily Forverts, which had, since the early s, employed Weinreich as a journalist, reported his arrival less prominently than that of Rabbi Schneerson. Still, Weinreich breathed new life into the American Section of the Yiddish Scientific Institute, established in New York in October , and essentially rebuilt and reinvented the institute on the new ground. After They Closed the Gates: Jewish Illegal Immigration to the United States, â€” University of Chicago Press,

Chapter 3 : Elias Tcherikower - Wikipedia

Nokhem Shtif Translation by Maurice Wolfthal Best known for his call to found a university-level institution devoted to Ashkenazic culture, which helped to lead to the founding of YIVO, Nokhem Shtif develops his arguments for Yiddishism in these excerpts from his work, "Yiddish and the Jews."

First I owe an unending gratitude to my committee for all of their many efforts on my behalf. To Chana Kronfeld, the most devoted teacher, who commented on every word of the manuscript, and ceaselessly pushed me further and further to better understand the fascinating project of modern Yiddish culture. To Naomi Seidman, an advisor and a friend, who has always believed in me, supported my work, encouraged me, and engaged with me in an on-going intellectual dialogue. Without them both my efforts would have amounted to much less. To Robert Uri Alter for his support, generosity, and for enabling me to teach a memorable class on Yiddish film which made its way into this dissertation. And last but not least I owe thanks to Tony Kaes, who allowed me to benefit from his profound understanding of the cinematic art and of modernist trends. I would also like to thank my M. My Yiddish teacher Yitskhok Niborski infected me with his commitment to the Yiddish language and culture, and I shall be ever thankful to him for his warmth and intellectual generosity. My father, whose childhood stories made Eastern Europe sound like a wonderland, and whose Yiddish songs were my first encounter with Yiddish folk performance, never understood why I had chosen to study this dead language. Still, without him I would have never delved so happily into Eastern European Jewish culture. My mother has always encouraged me to study "with such brains, you could have become a Rabbi! My work benefitted from the dialogue with colleagues on both sides of the Atlantic, and I especially cherish the intellectual friendship of Maya Barzilai and Diego Rotman. Zachary Baker, the knowledgeable librarian for the Judaica collections at Stanford University, assisted me with his good advice and kind words. Arnon helped me more than once at crucial stages of this work, and Sandy Richmond, forever known as Jewish Studies most benevolent despot, offered her help throughout my studies at UC Berkeley. Lastly, our son Michael, who brought so much joy into my life, and whose openness to strangers, good temper, healthy appetite, and innate happiness keyneynore allowed me to complete this project. And, of course, I owe the utmost gratitude to Riki for her endless devotion, reliable advice and rare insights. She was always there for me. Hoping to fulfill what he envisioned as the new commercial and aesthetic potential of this carnivalesque tradition, Green stages a cinematic reproduction of a purim-shpil, in which he combines, perhaps unwittingly, nostalgia with social critique. Suddenly, the purim-shpiler and other characters such as the klezmer and the badkhn rhymester, jester and master of ceremonies in the traditional Jewish wedding have an immense appeal for Yiddish film and literature. What is the nature of the relation that modern and modernist works establish towards their re-imagined subject, folk performance? What is the attitude towards the past, but also towards the present and the future, that the appropriation or re-imagination of folk performance seeks to establish? In a departure from recent studies that attempt to document the actual nature of Jewish folk performance, whether in pre-modern times or in the interwar era, this dissertation focuses on the discourse that evolved around and the artistic re-imagination of folk performance between the two World Wars. See Itsik Manger, *Megile-lider Warsaw: Selected Poetry and Prose*, trans. Yale University Press, , Studies in Polish Jewry 16 Social, Historical, and Musical Observations. Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, , , ; see also the translation and re1 iii performance are reclaimed and usedâ€™as tropes, cultural symbols and models for alternative poeticsâ€™in modernist Yiddish poetry and drama on the one hand, and in popular film on the other. In this project I investigate such varied fields as literature, theater, film, and even historiography, thus revealing a joint endeavor to construct folk-performance as an origin of and a model for modern Jewish culture. My research project explores a radically modern turn to the past which aims to construct a genealogy, an alleged lineage that reclaims Jewish folk performance as its heritage. Eastern European Jewish culture is no exception to this rule. In fact, as early as the Haskala Jewish Enlightenment , Jewish artists projected various fantasies, concerns and aspirations onto traditional Jewish performance. This imagined folk performance became an arena where anxieties regarding the value of Jewish art and its cultural heritage were expressed, and where tensions between cultural continuity

and break were enacted and negotiated. In the fervent interwar period, on which the dissertation focuses, with its modernist aesthetics and vibrant popular culture, this process became further intensified and politicized. Nostalgic or ironic, lowbrow or sophisticated, the re-invention of folk performance in the interwar period engaged some of the major concerns of the modern Jewish revolution. Socialist scholars and artists turned to folk performance to prove the alleged folkish nature of Yiddish culture and contrast it with decadent bourgeois culture. The Collections and Writings of Moshe Beregovski, eds. Mark Slobin, Robert A. Syracuse University Press, See the series of articles on folk performers in the first volume of Tsaytshrift: As Robert Adler-Peckerar writes: Finally, traditional performance was re-imagined by modernist artists of the interwar period as an alternative aesthetic sphere, where human experience once resided in its living immediacy, before it became inaccessible due to processes of modernization, as Walter Benjamin has argued about the performative practice of the storyteller. However, while the maskilim promoters of the Haskala distanced themselves from the supposed inferiority of performative culture which they viewed as representative of a backwards traditional world, their writing, I argue, discloses deep ambivalence towards traditional folk performance, and especially towards the much despised figure of the badkhn. Moreover, while looking down with contempt on the badkhn, they also drew parallels between him and themselves, troubled but also intrigued by the apparent similarities between the badkhn and the maskilic poet. The maskilim were also envious of the badkhn for his popularity among the folk, for having the flexible Yiddish language at his disposal rather than their stiff Hebrew, and for benefitting from the advantages of live performance. Furthermore, in judging the badkhn according to European aesthetic standards, the maskilim unwittingly shifted the badkhn from the realm of folklore to the sphere of art. Thus, notwithstanding the bitter irony in the maskilic references to folk performance, the Haskala constitutes the first phase in the modern project of reclaiming traditional performance as the imagined roots of modern Jewish art. Following generations of Hebrew and Yiddish writers broadened the range and tenor of the responses to traditional folk performance. Frug, himself a master of rhyme, reiterates the maskilic complaint that the badkhn has corrupted the taste of the people, and adds a Zionist edge to the argument. Unlike the badkhn who provides mere entertainment, the true poet, proclaims Frug, should express the hardships of his people, and sing the holy song of Zion. Schocken Books, , Der Fraynd, , 1: Shimin, , Peretz, turn towards a more favorable view of folk performance both in their Yiddish and in their Hebrew auto-translation. Significantly, this transformation takes place in the realm of Yiddish culture rather than Hebrew. The salient poets of this modernist movement, Nathan Alterman and Avraham Shlonsky, use figures of jesters, street musicians and their instruments as universal symbols, detached from the concrete Jewish diasporic realia, even when they incorporate direct citation from Yiddish folk texts in Hebrew calque translations. Hebrew Publishing Company, , 4: Norich explores the three artist figures as analogical to the writer, but overlooks their being performing artists. Abramovitch, Sholem Aleichem, and Peretz Albany: State University of New York Press, , Folksfond edition, , 9: Schocken, , I thank Robert Alter for the reference to this poem. The rise of traditional performance as a national and social ist symbol occurs only in the realm of Yiddish culture, in a burst of creative energy shared by scholars, artists and other cultural activists. This national endeavor, I argue, was common to scholars and artists alike, who, inspired by the rehabilitation of this old traditional form, appropriated it according to their own aesthetic and political agenda. Through an investigation of the interconnections between historians, artists and historical conditions, the chapter lays down the ideological foundations for the rediscovery of and fascination with folk performance in Yiddish culture of the interwar era. The chapter examines two pioneering historiographies of Yiddish theater: From the Oldest Times until the year ; and their critical reception among Yiddishists and Zionists alike. The figure of Zigmunt Turkow, a salient actor, theater director and producer in interwar Poland, serves to demonstrate the complex relationships between historians and artists, who together constructed the myth of the origins of Yiddish and Jewish theater. The work of the poet, playwright and theater director Moyshe Broderzon, discussed in the third chapter, constitutes a prominent expression of the interwar wave of interest in folk performance. Broderzon, I argue, appropriated folk performance not only as a theme but also as a model for an alternative, radical poetics. While his modernist rhetoric typically exalted novelty, it constantly strove to find precursors and ancestors. It also, however, expressed his identification with an image of Yiddish

culture as oral, folkish and dialogical in nature, a culture that possesses the potential to disrupt hegemonic power. The new medium showcased a variety of Jewish performances, exploiting them for a melodramatic enactment of contemporary Jewish hopes and anxieties. Folk performers thus allowed for a spectacular transformation of tradition to modernity, using melodramatic plots in which the crisis of modernization could be conceived in personal terms. University of California Press, Presses universitaires de Vincennes, Unity in Multiplicity Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, , I thank Avraham Novershtern for this insight. Waszy"ski and even, I would argue, to ironic distance, as in *Der purim-shplier*, interpreted perhaps against the grain. Usually examined separately and perceived as oppositions, modernist high-art and popular mass culture of the twenties and thirties are discussed in this study together, as interlinked arenas of cultural production that addressed the same modern challenges. Modern Yiddish mass culture was often conservative and nostalgic in nature, and appropriated folk performance in its struggle against rapid assimilation, or simply in order to evoke a sense of national pride. Modernist culture often also distrusted modernization processes—albeit in a different way. Folk creativity constituted a potential aesthetic alternative for modernist artists, Yiddish and international, who allied themselves with it in reaction to the emerging mass culture, which for them denoted dangerous aesthetic degeneration, commodification and blunt politicization. Other modernist artists, on the other hand, drew on diverse sources of inspiration and materials, of which mass culture was one. Harvard University Press, []. *Decentering Literary Dynamics* Berkeley: I thank Anton Kaes for this observation. Modernist author Yisroel Rabon serves as an example for participation in canonized and low-brow cultural production: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, On shund literature see Khone Shmeruk, "Le-toldot sifrut ha-shund be-yidish," *Tarbits* 52, no. It also served to display entertainment, music and dance-qualities which had an appeal for both high- and low-brow artists and audiences. Moyshe Broderzon, discussed in the third chapter, constitutes a salient example for this complex dialogue between high and low. In this sense, Broderzon was like Manger, a modernist poet and a notorious bohemian, who drew largely on folk songs and ballads, employing simple rhymes and humor. Manger wrote the dialogue and lyrics for the *Der purim-shplier*, and Broderzon wrote the screenplay for *Freylekhe kabtsonim Jolly Paupers*, Poland , dir. Leon Jeannot and Zigmunt Turkow. Finally, I argue, alongside low and high culture a third factor should be taken into account, that of the scholarly discourse. Through well-read and influential artists such as Turkow, Manger or Broderzon, the academic studies of people like Schiper and Max Erik reached wider circles, together creating a wave of interest in folk performance, and a *Zeitgeist* ready to embrace it, and especially the *purim-shpil*, as the origins of modern Yiddish culture.

5 Nokhem Shtif A Contrarian's Yiddishism He either wandered as if in a world of chaos, or else was imprisoned as if in a cage. ©Shmuel Niger1 N.

Biblical references are to the Revised Standard Version. Introduction Several years ago when I found out that the published by the Argentine YIVO was still in print as a complete set, I immediately bought the hundred volumes. When I happened to mention the purchase to a colleague, whose field is modern Jewish intellectual history, she casually asked me if that was everything. It took a moment for me to realize that she was asking whether those hundred slender octavo volumes comprised the entire corpus of Yiddish literature. My brief explanation clarified the issue and embarrassed both of us. While I was quite aware of the contempt with which most Jewish intellectuals have in the past regarded the Yiddish language and its literature I had already written a book on the subject, I had until then never imagined the depth of misinformation concerning Yiddish literature on the part of intelligent, well-intentioned, but "uninformed" scholars in Jewish studies. If our non-Yiddishist colleagues imagine that all of Yiddish literature can be had in a hundred volumes, what might they imagine about Old and Middle Yiddish literature? In general they have heard of Glikl bas Leyb Pinkerle Glikl Hamil; usually Germanized to Gluckel von Hameln, perhaps the only four pre-modern titles included in the Buenos Aires reprints and in some cases perhaps also the, but almost certainly nothing else. When I mention that from the period before, there exist more than manuscripts most of which include multiple, sometimes dozens of texts each and several hundred printed books, the eyes of my colleagues betray their scepticism. When I mention that I have been editing an anthology of Old and Middle Yiddish, and have included some texts either excerpted or as integral texts, they are therefore sceptical that such things exist, that they exist in such numbers, and that they could be anything other than dull morality guides for traditional Jewish grandmothers. Instead of imagining that Morris Lutzki lists more than 1, items in his catalogue of Yiddish printed books from the Bodleian Library in Oxford and from the British Library alone: There are not 1, different titles, however, for reprint editions are also included and numbered. Perhaps we could view Yiddish, as Chone Shmeruk suggests, as a literature of the interstices: Instead, one will see that Jews of the fifteenth through eighteenth centuries created 2. Pergamon, here, p. It is likewise a serious error to imagine that Jewish intellectual needs of that time were satisfied by [biblical paraphrase] and [ethical treatises] alone. It is a baseless misconception that up to the time of the Emancipation, Jews led exclusively religious lives and thought of nothing but Torah and the commandments. Thank heavens that Jewish unworldliness has always been much less dominant than we have been told. Indeed in its reflection of the daily life of Jews, Yiddish literature provides the most compelling evidence that love and life and the love of life were quite well known in the ghetto. While the authors of religious books themselves generally tended toward asceticism, ordinary Jews had a normal approach to life, and even within the ghetto Jewish children took delight in the spare sunlight that managed to reach them. It would be unreasonable to imagine that the present volume could altogether change this rather astonishing situation. And while the primary purposes of a volume of several hundred pages of Yiddish texts necessarily have to do with scholarship in the field, I also hope that the breadth and depth of early Yiddish literature, as represented in this collection, will attract the attention of some readers beyond the academy who are unaware of the scope, historical importance, and literary and cultural value of this vast corpus of texts. The body of literature in Old and Middle Yiddish has been the focus of a great deal of attention in the last three-quarters of a century in numerous fields of scholarship. To illustrate with a personal anecdote: Without any diminution of our respect for the immense erudition of the scholar-authors of these well-bound and often-reprinted tomes, brimming over with lists and charts and paradigms of rules and densely packed footnotes detailing exceptions to those rules and exceptions to the exceptions, we could and did make gentle fun of what seemed to us their positivistic excesses. That amusement at their expense was possible for the simple reason that those volumes existed and still exist. For the reader of early Yiddish, there are practically no basic reference works. The scholarly implications of the previous sentence are, in this small corner of the scholarly world, quite simply staggering. If the word derives

from the Germanic component of Yiddish, one can pretend momentarily that the word is German, transform its specifically Yiddish orthography into a more or less corresponding medieval or early modern German form, and then look it up in a dictionary of an appropriate period of German—which will provide a variety of German senses of the German reflex of the word, which may or may not have some relation to the meaning of the early Yiddish word in its cultural context. Or, if the word stems from the Slavic component of Yiddish, then one can momentarily pretend that it is early modern Slavic and look it up in the relevant dictionary of Czech or Russian or Polish. Or, if the word derives from the Semitic component of Yiddish, one can pretend that it is rabbinical Hebrew and look it up in a variety of Hebrew dictionaries. But not one of them is a Yiddish dictionary, and the fact is, Yiddish is a language in its own right and has been for quite a number of centuries, and the definitions one finds in the excellent and, not surprisingly, Neogrammarian dictionaries by Lexer, Miklosich, and Jastrow, for instance, are not definitions of Yiddish words. There are the magnificent older standards in literary history, generally intended for an educated lay audience: Joffe and Yudel Mark, does take early Yiddish into account, but has thus far in its four volumes progressed only to the end of the letter N, the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet. Cerf, ; English translation: Introduction to Old Yiddish Literature, trans. Oxford University Press, forthcoming. Even in modern Yiddish studies, the basic tools of languagebased scholarship literature, linguistics, intellectual history, theater, etc. There are also the language textbook grammars of modern xviii Introduction Among the desiderata in early Yiddish studies noted above is a text anthology. Thus ideally a historical anthology of literary texts should be able to refer to the standard lexica and grammars of the language, as well as to the standard histories of the literature of the period. In the field of Yiddish we are not yet quite so far advanced. In his brief anthology of texts that surveyed the entire history of Yiddish, Solomon Birnbaum reflects on why there has been no comprehensive anthology: The following short texts aim at providing no more than a very cursory glance at several periods and regions in the life of the Yiddish language. This material is not sufficient to illustrate its development. Not only would a whole long book of texts and discussion of these be needed for that, but research has not yet advanced to a stage when such a work can be successfully attempted. Many more years, or even decades, will have to pass before then. One of the reasons, of course, is that the amount of material at our disposal is scanty in relation to the expanse in space and time taken up by Yiddish. Quantitatively it is, however, not too small and it is virtually untouched by the philologist and linguist. The collection and editing of the texts and the attendant research—all this is still waiting to be done. Hartlebens, ; 4th rev. Grammatik der jiddischen Sprache, mit einem Worterbuch und Lesestiicken Hamburg: Buske, ; and Yiddish: A Survey and a Grammar Toronto: A Survey and a Grammar, A second reason for the lack of any published anthology of Old Yiddish is that such collective anthologies have until recently long been out of style. Furthermore, since any selection of a few hundred pages of excerpted texts forcibly excises the texts from their cultural contexts and juxtaposes them with radically different types of texts from a vast geographical and chronological expanse, it has been widely suggested that such a selection cannot but misrepresent both the culture and the corpus itself. Robert von Hallberg Chicago: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies, 9 , ; rpt. Jewish Women and Jewish Writing Detroit: Wayne State University Press, , 52, here p. Niemeyer, ; 3rd edn. Clarendon, , 9th revised edn. Cassidy and Richard N. Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, ; Wilhelm Braune, ed. Niemeyer, ; August Leskien, ed. Hermann Bohlau, ; 10th edn. Winter, ; Karl Pomeroy Harrington, ed. In any case, the usefulness of this particular brand of anthology has not only not died out but, amid complaints, they have continued to be reprinted even up to the present, some new ones are still added to the list from time to time, and in recent decades a trend toward rehabilitating the idea of compiling and publishing anthologies of medieval literature seems to be emerging. For as Yiddish studies began to come into its own in the decades before the Second World War, early Yiddish was without question its most active and productive subfield, and was, not surprisingly, concentrated in Warsaw, Kiev, Prague, Vienna, and Vilnius. When the Nazis and their willing helpers in various western, central, and eastern European countries murdered six million Jews, among the victims were many of the established experts in the field of early Yiddish studies, and many of their students. If, for a moment, we try to turn our attention from the incomprehensible human catastrophe of the Holocaust, and focus only on this single tiny corner of its devastation, then we must note that while all fields of Jewish scholarship suffered

from the Holocaustâ€”Jewish scholars and professionals in all fields were murdered by the Nazis without discriminationâ€”Yiddish studies is a special case. For while there were academic scholars of the Bible, the Talmud, medieval Jewish philosophy, Sephardic poetry, the Haskalah, and so on living on six continents, Yiddish scholarship, and in particular scholarship focusing on early Yiddish, was concentrated in eastern Europe, where in the two decades before the beginning of the Second World War it flourished at an academic and even institutional level. As a result of the Holocaust, however, Old Yiddish studies seemed almost to die on the vine, and the field has never recovered from that devastation. Allyn and Bacon, ; 2nd edn. University of Chicago Press, Handbook of Church Slavonic, Part 1: Athlone, ; Part II: Texts and Glossary, ed. Among recent titles of particular relevance to the present project is a Ladino anthology: Sefarad in my Heart: A Ladino Reader, ed. Moshe Lazar Lancaster, California: Introduction li The overt and profound linguistic antagonism of the state of Israel toward Yiddish did nothing to revive the field in the immediate post-war years, and Zionist anti-Yiddish propaganda is still dominant in quarters where other kinds of bigotry are not tolerated. In more recent decades the field has nonetheless begun to re-establish itself particularly in England, France, Germany, Israel, and the United States and return to some of the basic scholarly tasks interrupted by the devastation of the Holocaust. Chone Shmeruk built Yiddish studies in Jerusalem from the ashes of his own Holocaust experiences. Two generations of scholars and scholarship had disappeared into the ovens, and with them also all continuity within the field. Where does one go now to study Old Yiddish? Now it seems that the only academic programmes in which early Yiddish figures significantly are in Dusseldorf Marion Aptroot , and in a very restricted sense in Trier Simon Neuberg, following the recent retirements of Erika Timm and Walter Roll. Even so, judging by the growing number of publications in the field, interest in early Yiddish seems to be growing year by year and decade by decade, with outposts now in France and in a variety of central European universities, in addition to some scholars in North America. Thus the basic premise of the present volume is that the wealth of early Yiddish literature is still all but inaccessible to all but dedicated experts in the field: And even those who are acquainted with the field have no convenient access to its broad range of texts. This gap in the scholarship is all the more disturbing, because in the last several decades the canon of early Yiddish has been so significantly expanded through discoveries of important manuscripts and unique exemplars of early printed texts that the field itself has been transformed in scope and significance. As already noted, there are in fact a few important published collections that include some Old Yiddish texts: All texts are, however, transcribed into a Germanized, Roman-alphabet form that masks their cultural identity. This remarkable and still important volume is in fact more of a cultural history with illustrative text excerpts than it is a text anthology per se. Like Grinbaum, these editors also present the texts only in Germanized, Romanalphabet transcription. Ein kurzer Uberblick und Texte aus acht Jahrhunderten includes still fewer texts, which he transcribed into a very unusual ad hoc Roman-alphabet system designed to illustrate and propagate his idiosyncratic interpretation of Yiddish pronunciation. At the same time, however, we need not fault these pioneering editors for not providing a comprehensive anthology of Old and Middle Yiddish literature, since that was not by any means their purpose. Any conception of a contemporary audience for early Y i d d i s h is problematical, of course, as a comparison with any of its sister disciplines clearly demonstrates.

Chapter 5 : Bibliophile Bookbase Search Result Page

"At the beginning of the twentieth century, Yiddish was widely viewed, even by many of its speakers, as a corrupt form of German that Jews had to abandon if they hoped to engage in serious intellectual, cultural, or political work.

Harrison in December Description is in English. The first attempt to arrange the Zhitlowsky papers was made in by B. Another early listing of the papers was made by Eva Zhitlowsky Ch. At that time, the papers were in folders or packets, but not arranged in a meaningful manner with exception of the correspondence processed previously by B. The unarranged part of the collection was in poor physical condition and was completely disorganized. Many items, especially among the manuscripts, have been only partially identified, but even these were included in the description of the papers, sometimes with a substitute title provided by the original processors. Only those fragments which could not be identified at all were placed in specially designated folders at the end of each series. The miscellaneous series includes materials which are too small in quantity to form a separate series, the photographs and certain historical documents. The collection was arranged in a Yiddish alphabet mode and the description was originally written in Yiddish. An exception was made for the manuscripts and typescripts in languages other than Yiddish and for the correspondence of those institutions that did not use Yiddish. These materials are arranged in Latin alphabetical order, including Russian manuscripts and correspondence, the titles and names of which have been transliterated and translated, and German materials, which have been translated. The inventory lists for correspondence with individuals has been rearranged according to the Latin alphabet, although the folder organization has not been changed. Personal names have been transliterated, journal titles and organization names have been transliterated and translated, and the titles of speeches and writings have been transliterated and translated. Yiddish names have been transliterated according to YIVO standards except when the individual is known in English by another spelling. Additionally, if the name appeared in Latin letters anywhere within the folder, that spelling was used rather than a standard transliteration. The languages of correspondence that is not in Yiddish are in parentheses following the listing of the material. All manuscripts and typescripts have been arranged alphabetically by title rather than by author. While there are only a few Yiddish manuscripts without a known author, among the non-Yiddish materials there is a large number of unidentified items. The collection has been microfilmed and so any misfiling has been maintained to correspond with the microfilm. Microfilm reel and frame numbers follow the folder titles. The dates are exact on the folders but the folder list has condensed the dates. The page numbers sometimes refer to the number of sheets and sometimes, for double-sided documents, to the number of sides. The collection has been divided into 11 series, some of which have been further divided into subseries. Yiddish , Russian , German , English , French , Latin , Hebrew , Dutch;Flemish Abstract This collection contains correspondence between Chaim Zhitlowsky and many important political figures and organizations, as well as manuscripts and other writings, some written by Zhitlowsky and some written by others. Scope and Contents of the Materials The Papers of Chaim Zhitlowsky consist of correspondence, manuscripts and typescripts, notes, newspaper clippings, some official documents such as residence cards, a passport, and diplomas, photographs, and financial records. The materials have been divided according to type of records. There are over identified or partly identified items in these two series, and about of these were written by Zhitlowsky. There are approximately 60 manuscripts written by others and manuscripts of no known authorship. It is likely that a substantial number of these unattributed writings are also by Zhitlowsky. Yiddish language, Yiddish culture, the future of Yiddish, the Czernowitz Conference of August and modern Yiddish, Jewish autonomy, Territorialism, Eretz Israel, Biro-Bidjan, political radicalism, Marxism, Socialist thought, Communism and anti-Communism, a history of world philosophy, philosophical systems, Hegel, Kant, and ethics and religion. Notwithstanding his scholarly works on philosophy, Zhitlowsky was first and foremost interested in contemporary social and political developments. Therefore many of his writings were created in response to actual events and are stamped with the urgency of a political commentary, a program of action or a resolution. A predominant theme is the gap between the national aspirations of the Jewish people and their actual situation. Another topic which greatly preoccupied Zhitlowsky was how to apply his populist

ideas to socialist ideology and to the programs of Russian and Jewish Socialist parties. His changing attitudes towards the Communist movement can also be found in his writings. There is a small group of miscellaneous materials other than writings and correspondence which topically complement the other series. These include photographs, leaflets, programs, minutes, and reports pertaining to the following subjects: Historical Note

Chaim Zhitlowsky was a Jewish philosopher and writer, literary critic, a leading theoretician of the Socialist movement in Russia, a chief exponent of Yiddishism, Diaspora Nationalism and Territorialism, and a social and political thinker. He was a co-founder of the Russian Socialist-Revolutionary Party and was later connected with various Jewish Socialist organizations, including Poale Zion and the Bund. Zhitlowsky was also a vice-president of the conference on Yiddish language held in Chernivtsi, Romania in . According to several sources, including a police card and a British passport folder 1 , Chaim Zhitlowsky was born in in Horodok, Vitebsk province, Belarus. However, his autobiography folder 2 says that he was born on April 19, in Ushachy, also in Vitebsk province, and this information has been reprinted in Encyclopedia Judaica and the Lexicon, among other sources. When he was five years old, his parents moved to Vitebsk, the capital of the province. Joseph Zhitlowsky made sure to give his son a good education at cheder and with private tutors and then at the Vitebsk Gymnasium. Under the influence of the Russian revolutionary movement, Zhitlowsky began to move away from Jewish life and Jewish concerns. He began to think about the question of nationalism, particularly Jewish nationalism. He advocated Jewish assimilation in several articles before the anti-Jewish pogroms of made him reevaluate his position and his sympathy for the Jewish people and their national aspirations. These pogroms started in April in Elisavetgrad Kirovgrad , Ukraine and swept through dozens of towns and villages in Ukraine and Russian Poland all the way to Warsaw. Zhitlowsky ultimately rejected assimilation and demanded Jewish national equality and social and political rights, thereby combining Jewish national aspirations with Socialist ideology into what became known as Diaspora Nationalism. This theory was focused on Jewish nationalism in the Diaspora, in opposition to the ideology of Hovevei Zion Lovers of Zion and political Zionism, which advocated Jewish settlement in Israel. He disliked the religious character of political Zionism. During his lifelong search for a practical political party that would fit his theory of Diaspora Nationalism, Zhitlowsky embraced many different ideologies and movements. As a young man, he was an ardent populist, working for the Narodnaya Volya in Tula , in Vitebsk and in St. Petersburg , where he went to study Jewish history. The liberal Russian press enthusiastically greeted and responded warmly to his ideas, but the treatise met with scant favor among Jewish critics, because it contained no solution for the problems it discussed. In he left Russia for Berlin where he resumed his study of Jewish history, Marxism and philosophy. He was expelled from Germany under the anti-Socialist law and went to Zurich, and there he founded the Verein fuer Wissenschaft und Leben des Judischen Volkes Association for Science and Life of the Jewish People , in order to spread Nationalism and Socialism among the Jewish masses. He then traveled to Bern, where he received his doctorate in from the University of Bern. Rosenbaum and several other Russian radicals, co-founded the Union of Russian Socialist Revolutionaries Abroad, which was reconfigured as the Russian Socialist-Revolutionary Party in , which Zhitlowsky later represented in the Socialist International in Stuttgart in . Zhitlowsky contributed articles on Marxism and philosophy to several well-known Russian magazines, such as Russkoye Bogastvo, the Jewish "Russian Voskhod, Sozialistische Monatshefte, and Deutsche Worte, among others. When the first Yiddish daily in Russia, the St. Petersburg Frajnd, was founded, Dr. Zhitlowsky, under the pen name N. In he organized the Group of Jewish Socialists Abroad. Their purpose was to prepare revolutionary propaganda literature in Yiddish, beginning with the Communist Manifesto. Zhitlowsky was present at the First Zionist Congress in Basel in , although he did not support political Zionism and even wrote an article in the New York Jewish Daily Forward against it. A day after the Congress, Dr. Zhitlowsky addressed the delegates and guests on Yiddish and the purposes of the Yiddish publishing house Zeit Geist, which had been founded by a group of Jewish intellectuals and revolutionaries. In this speech were first laid the foundations of Yiddishism, which subsequently became deeply rooted in Eastern Europe and America. He became a member of the Jewish Socialist Bund. In , partially in response to the Kishinev pogrom, Zhitlowsky revised his Jewish program and became a Territorialist, which was a movement to establish an autonomous settlement of Jews in a sufficiently large territory, of which Palestine was

considered as just one of the possibilities. In the following years he made many efforts to reconcile theoretically the principles of Territorialism and Socialism. He was also instrumental in founding several political organizations that would incorporate the ideas of Territorialism and Socialism in their political platform. In Zhitlowsky left Europe for North America, having been sent there by the Socialist-Revolutionary Party as its emissary and fund-raiser. Zhitlowsky returned to Europe in . Unable to enter Russia for fear of being arrested, he stayed in Lwow Lemberg. He was nominated by the Socialist-Revolutionary Party to run for a seat in the second Duma folder and was elected in the Vitebsk district. However, the police authorities annulled his election. In Zhitlowsky left Europe again for the U. Under the editorship of Zhitlowsky, this journal exercised great influence on Yiddish culture, literature and the development of free Socialist thought. After a brief stay in America, Zhitlowsky returned to Europe, where he participated in the conference for the Yiddish language which was held in Chernivtsi Czernowitz , Bukovina, August September 4, . This conference, of which Zhitlowsky was both the initiator and chairman, along with I. Peretz and Nathan Birnbaum, and which hosted leading Yiddish authors of the day, proclaimed Yiddish as a national language of the Jews. After the conference, Zhitlowsky returned to the U. In the United States, Zhitlowsky distinguished himself in work to promote and strengthen the Yiddish language and culture. He became the standard-bearer of Yiddish, which he considered a prerequisite for the survival of the Jewish people. While many thought that his attitude towards Yiddish was dogmatic and irrational, he persevered nevertheless in lending his unqualified support to any and all efforts on behalf of Yiddish. In *Dos Naye Lebn* in , Zhitlowsky raised the question of founding Yiddish secular schools in America and in , at the Convention of the Poale Zion Party in Montreal, Canada, he helped to usher in the inauguration of this type of school. Zhitlowsky took an active part in the growth of this school. At first he joined the Socialist Territorialists. Then, in he initiated the merger of the Socialist Territorialists, the Sejmists and Labor Zionists, but the unified group did not last long. In subsequent years he moved closer to the Labor Zionists. He supported the movement for an American Jewish Congress, which held its first session in . Until then, he had been a contributor to the *Warheit*, edited by L. He now joined the staff of the newly-organized *Tog*. At the same time, he continued his tracts on philosophy and sociology in the Yiddish magazine *Zukunft* and, from , *Die Zeit*, a Poale-Zion daily. In , when the magazine was discontinued, Dr. Similar celebrations were held in other American and European cities visited by Dr.

Chapter 6 : UC Berkeley - eScholarship - PDF Free Download

Get this from a library! The revolutionary roots of modern Yiddish, [Barry Trachtenberg] -- "The Revolutionary Roots of Modern Yiddish, investigates the evolution in status of the Yiddish language and three major figures responsible for its transformation."

Biographical Note Chaim Zhitlowsky was a Jewish philosopher and writer, literary critic, a leading theoretician of the Socialist movement in Russia, a chief exponent of Yiddishism, Diaspora Nationalism and Territorialism, and a social and political thinker. He was a co-founder of the Russian Socialist-Revolutionary Party and was later connected with various Jewish Socialist organizations, including Poale Zion and the Bund. Zhitlowsky was also a vice-president of the conference on Yiddish language held in Chernivtsi, Romania in 1905. According to several sources, including a police card and a British passport folder 1, Chaim Zhitlowsky was born in Horodok, Vitebsk province, Belarus. However, his autobiography folder 2 says that he was born on April 19, in Ushachy, also in Vitebsk province, and this information has been reprinted in Encyclopedia Judaica and the Lexicon, among other sources. When he was five years old, his parents moved to Vitebsk, the capital of the province. Joseph Zhitlowsky made sure to give his son a good education at cheder and with private tutors and then at the Vitebsk Gymnasium. Under the influence of the Russian revolutionary movement, Zhitlowsky began to move away from Jewish life and Jewish concerns. He began to think about the question of nationalism, particularly Jewish nationalism. He advocated Jewish assimilation in several articles before the anti-Jewish pogroms of 1903-1904 made him reevaluate his position and his sympathy for the Jewish people and their national aspirations. These pogroms started in April in Elisavetgrad Kirovgrad, Ukraine and swept through dozens of towns and villages in Ukraine and Russian Poland all the way to Warsaw. Zhitlowsky ultimately rejected assimilation and demanded Jewish national equality and social and political rights, thereby combining Jewish national aspirations with Socialist ideology into what became known as Diaspora Nationalism. This theory was focused on Jewish nationalism in the Diaspora, in opposition to the ideology of Hovevei Zion Lovers of Zion and political Zionism, which advocated Jewish settlement in Israel. He disliked the religious character of political Zionism. During his lifelong search for a practical political party that would fit his theory of Diaspora Nationalism, Zhitlowsky embraced many different ideologies and movements. As a young man, he was an ardent populist, working for the Narodnaya Volya in Tula, in Vitebsk and in St. Petersburg, where he went to study Jewish history. The liberal Russian press enthusiastically greeted and responded warmly to his ideas, but the treatise met with scant favor among Jewish critics, because it contained no solution for the problems it discussed. In 1905 he left Russia for Berlin where he resumed his study of Jewish history, Marxism and philosophy. He was expelled from Germany under the anti-Socialist law and went to Zurich, and there he founded the Verein fuer Wissenschaft und Leben des Judischen Volkes Association for Science and Life of the Jewish People, in order to spread Nationalism and Socialism among the Jewish masses. He then traveled to Bern, where he received his doctorate in 1907 from the University of Bern. Rosenbaum and several other Russian radicals, co-founded the Union of Russian Socialist Revolutionaries Abroad, which was reconfigured as the Russian Socialist-Revolutionary Party in 1908, which Zhitlowsky later represented in the Socialist International in Stuttgart in 1910. Zhitlowsky contributed articles on Marxism and philosophy to several well-known Russian magazines, such as Russkoye Bogastvo, the Jewish "Russian Voskhod, Sozialistische Monatshefte, and Deutsche Worte, among others. When the first Yiddish daily in Russia, the St. Petersburg Frajnd, was founded, Dr. Zhitlowsky, under the pen name N. In he organized the Group of Jewish Socialists Abroad. Their purpose was to prepare revolutionary propaganda literature in Yiddish, beginning with the Communist Manifesto. Zhitlowsky was present at the First Zionist Congress in Basel in 1906, although he did not support political Zionism and even wrote an article in the New York Jewish Daily Forward against it. A day after the Congress, Dr. Zhitlowsky addressed the delegates and guests on Yiddish and the purposes of the Yiddish publishing house Zeit Geist, which had been founded by a group of Jewish intellectuals and revolutionaries. In this speech were first laid the foundations of Yiddishism, which subsequently became deeply rooted in Eastern Europe and America. He became a member of the Jewish Socialist Bund. In 1908,

partially in response to the Kishinev pogrom, Zhitlowsky revised his Jewish program and became a Territorialist, which was a movement to establish an autonomous settlement of Jews in a sufficiently large territory, of which Palestine was considered as just one of the possibilities. In the following years he made many efforts to reconcile theoretically the principles of Territorialism and Socialism. He was also instrumental in founding several political organizations that would incorporate the ideas of Territorialism and Socialism in their political platform. In Zhitlowsky left Europe for North America, having been sent there by the Socialist-Revolutionary Party as its emissary and fund-raiser. Zhitlowsky returned to Europe in Unable to enter Russia for fear of being arrested, he stayed in Lwow Lemberg. He was nominated by the Socialist-Revolutionary Party to run for a seat in the second Duma folder and was elected in the Vitebsk district. However, the police authorities annulled his election. In Zhitlowsky left Europe again for the U. Under the editorship of Zhitlowsky, this journal exercised great influence on Yiddish culture, literature and the development of free Socialist thought. After a brief stay in America, Zhitlowsky returned to Europe, where he participated in the conference for the Yiddish language which was held in Chernivtsi Czernowitz , Bukovina, August September 4, This conference, of which Zhitlowsky was both the initiator and chairman, along with I. Peretz and Nathan Birnbaum, and which hosted leading Yiddish authors of the day, proclaimed Yiddish as a national language of the Jews. After the conference, Zhitlowsky returned to the U. In the United States, Zhitlowsky distinguished himself in work to promote and strengthen the Yiddish language and culture. He became the standard-bearer of Yiddish, which he considered a prerequisite for the survival of the Jewish people. While many thought that his attitude towards Yiddish was dogmatic and irrational, he persevered nevertheless in lending his unqualified support to any and all efforts on behalf of Yiddish. In *Dos Naye Lebn* in , Zhitlowsky raised the question of founding Yiddish secular schools in America and in , at the Convention of the Poale Zion Party in Montreal, Canada, he helped to usher in the inauguration of this type of school. Zhitlowsky took an active part in the growth of this school. At first he joined the Socialist Territorialists. Then, in he initiated the merger of the Socialist Territorialists, the Sejmists and Labor Zionists, but the unified group did not last long. In subsequent years he moved closer to the Labor Zionists. He supported the movement for an American Jewish Congress, which held its first session in Until then, he had been a contributor to the *Warheit*, edited by L. He now joined the staff of the newly-organized *Tog*. At the same time, he continued his tracts on philosophy and sociology in the Yiddish magazine *Zukunft* and, from , *Die Zeit*, a Poale-Zion daily. In , when the magazine was discontinued, Dr. Similar celebrations were held in other American and European cities visited by Dr. A Zhitlowsky Memorial Volume was published in Berlin. It contained articles and reminiscences of his intimate friends and disciples. Through the initiative of Dr. Zhitlowsky, and his lifelong friend, Dr. Ellsberg, the Yiddish Culture Society was founded in September The purpose of the organization was to unite all adherents of Yiddish to enable them to work in common for the development of Yiddish, Yiddish schools and Yiddish culture in general. He was also one of the editors of the weekly Yiddish, issued by the Yiddish Culture Society. Zhitlowsky was a bitter foe of dogmatic Marxism. He began the dispute back in in Zurich where his lecture on Plekhanov stirred a debate lasting 72 evenings it was called afterwards the "72 Zurich Nights". He later pursued his arguments against Communist ideology and against the Bolshevik regime in post Russia. He broke with the pro-Soviet camp over the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, but later returned in the wake of the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union. From until his death he moved closer to the radical, pro-Soviet groups active in the Jewish community in the U. During this last period of his life he came to the conclusion that Communist ideology incorporated many of the ideals for which he had always fought. He was convinced that the creation of the Jewish autonomous province in Biro-Bidjan was a true realization of his Territorialist dream. He believed that the Communist claim about promoting cultures which are "Socialist in content and national in form" spelled a brighter future for Yiddish as well. Zhitlowsky was more of a theoretician than an organizer. He exerted great authority and influence among the Socialist groups and in the Jewish community, chiefly through writings, debates and lectures. His collected works were published twice during his lifetime in New York, , 10 volumes; in Warsaw, , 15 volumes. *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Volume Zhitlowsky lived and worked in the times which saw the formation of modern Socialist ideologies and the creation of radical mass movements. He himself was very much an

inspirational force in this process, attaining a position of leadership in international, Russian and Jewish Socialist groups. He witnessed and often subscribed to the birth of the many factions of populist, Socialist, Territorialist and Communist persuasions and at various times he was involved as theoretician and political activist with such major political parties as the Narodnaya Volya, the Russian Socialist-Revolutionary Party, the Jewish Labor Bund, and the Poale Zion, among others. He was the founder of the theory of Jewish national self-determination in the Diaspora, to which he remained rigidly faithful until the end of his life and which in fact prompted him to wander from movement to movement, in his search for a political solution to the theory. Zhitlowsky was a forceful orator, a formidable polemicist, a prolific writer and talented popularizer of knowledge. A philosopher by training, he had to his credit as many theoretical works as popular essays, articles and lectures on philosophy, psychology, religion, ethics, literature, and history. Chaim Zhitlowsky was married twice. His first wife was Vera Lokhova whom he met in Vitebsk and married in Berlin. Vera Lokhova was a populist they both worked in the Narodnaya Volya organization in Vitebsk and an author in her own right. They separated in but were formally divorced until In Zhitlowsky married Nora Van Leuven.

Scope and Content Note The Papers of Chaim Zhitlowsky consist of correspondence, manuscripts and typescripts, notes, newspaper clippings, some official documents such as residence cards, a passport, and diplomas, photographs, and financial records. The materials have been divided according to type of records. There are over identified or partly identified items in these two series, and about of these were written by Zhitlowsky. There are approximately 60 manuscripts written by others and manuscripts of no known authorship. It is likely that a substantial number of these unattributed writings are also by Zhitlowsky. Yiddish language, Yiddish culture, the future of Yiddish, the Czernowitz Conference of August and modern Yiddish, Jewish autonomy, Territorialism, Eretz Israel, Biro-Bidjan, political radicalism, Marxism, Socialist thought, Communism and anti-Communism, a history of world philosophy, philosophical systems, Hegel, Kant, and ethics and religion. Notwithstanding his scholarly works on philosophy, Zhitlowsky was first and foremost interested in contemporary social and political developments. Therefore many of his writings were created in response to actual events and are stamped with the urgency of a political commentary, a program of action or a resolution.

Elias Tcherikower, Eliahu Tcherikower, Elias Tscherikower, I. M. Cherkover (), was a Russian-born Jewish historian of Judaism or the Jewish people.. Biography.

Author " , linguist, literary historian, and political activist. Born in Rovno mod. Rivne to a prosperous family, Nokhem Shtif received both a Jewish and a secular education. Even as a student at a Russian secondary school and, later, at Kiev Polytechnic University where he was enrolled between and , he continued studying religious and modern Hebrew literature. From Nokem Shtif in Kiev to Yoysef Opatoshu in New York, 6 February , expressing his delight that Opatoshu is a reader of *Di yidishe shprakh*, unlike other Yiddish writers who, he claims, scorn all attempts to improve the Yiddish language and have fallen under the sway of the Yiddish of the masses and the popular press. He asks if Opatoshu will have a look at some folk expressions from the town of Siedlce that were recently published in the journal; could he contribute additions or corrections? Russian and Yiddish letterhead: *Di yidishe shprakh*, Kultur lige cooperative press, Kiev, Red Army In autumn , he cofounded the Vozrozhdenie Renaissance Jewish socialist group in Kiev. Shortly thereafter, Shtif was arrested for his political activities and was expelled from the university. From late until early , he lived in Bern, where he organized a local Vozrozhdenie group and agitated against the Bund. Its members, also known as Seimists, sought Jewish national autonomy in Russia and became committed Yiddishists. Inspired by Simon Dubnow , the party had been first formed in , but remained dormant throughout the following decade. In , Shtif moved to Kiev, where he devoted himself to journalism. He left Kiev in , spending a short time in Minsk, where he and Zelig Kalmanovitch lectured for Yiddish teachers. Subsequently, Shtif moved to Kovno Kaunas , then a stronghold of the Folkspartey, but eventually settled in Berlin in March In Kiev and Berlin, he returned to philological studies, particularly of old Yiddish literature. A propagandist"pro-Yiddishist and anti-Hebraist"quality characterized all of his studies, such as his pamphlet *Humanizm in der elterer yidisher literatur Humanism in Old Yiddish Literature* , published in Kiev in and reprinted in Berlin in Shtif, however"lured by the unprecedented scale of state-sponsored Jewish cultural development in the Soviet Union , particularly in Ukraine"left for Kiev in Even while still in Berlin, he, along with Bal-Makhshoves and Dovid Bergelson , had argued that Ukraine was the real cradle of Yiddish literary talent and apparently believed that Kiev could become the cultural and academic capital of the Yiddishist movement. Shtif became the central figure in the Kiev Institute of Jewish Proletarian Culture , as it was called in previously known as the Chair for Jewish Culture at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, from Concurrently, a professional philological journal, *Di yidishe shprakh The Yiddish Language*; from called *Afn shprakhfront [On the Language Front]* , edited by Shtif, was also launched. For a short time, he directed the Kiev Institute, but later headed only its philological section; Yoysef Liberberg , a Communist Party member, replaced Shtif as director. In , both men were severely criticized for attempting to bring Simon Dubnow to Kiev as a guest of honor to a ceremonial opening. They are of the same generation, which has achieved so many things, including Zionism and socialism and "war and revolution. YIVO Although Shtif continued publishing articles on the history of Yiddish literature and language, he and the entire Kiev center concentrated primarily on practical questions, most notably on language planning. Although his aim was not to outlaw all words and forms derived from Hebrew and Aramaic, he argued that a substantial number of them were redundant in Soviet"secular and denationalized"surroundings and, therefore, could be discarded and, to the greatest extent possible, excluded from the process of lexical innovation. In fact, although the frequency of Hebraisms declined in newspapers and textbooks, poets and prose writers, particularly of the older generation, paid little attention to the recommendations of Shtif and other language planners. He also wrote *Yidishe stilistik Yiddish Stylistics*; , based on his articles in *Di yidishe shprakh*. Shtif died working in his office on 7 April

Chapter 8 : YIVO | Shtif, Nokhem

(Tal Hever-Chybowski is the director of the Paris Yiddish Center "Medem Library (Maison de la culture yiddish "Bibliothèque Medem), founder and editor of the diasporic-Hebrew journal Mikan ve'eylakh in Berlin, and Ph.D. candidate at the History Department of Humboldt University, Berlin.

Illustrations follow page Note on Transliteration and Translation Because most of the sources for this study are in Hebrew, Russian, Yiddish, and in a very few cases Ukrainian, I have had to transliterate extensively. Note that the transliterations remain true to the spelling in the Yiddish originals, however, which often deviates from YIVO standards, because this is relevant historical information for those interested in the development of the language and its culture. I have transliterated Hebrew in accordance with contemporary standards of pronunciation rather than seeking to approximate the Ashkenazi pronunciation that most of the historical actors would have used, except where that approximation provides relevant historical information; thus, I refer to the Jewish Enlightenment as the *haskalah* rather than the *haskole*. By the same token, transliterating Yiddish according to the YIVO standard means that I do not seek to approximate the diverse regional dialects of the historical actors themselves. For all languages, I have sometimes deviated from these transliteration rules when dealing with personal names relatively familiar to English-language readers for example, Sholem Aleichem rather than Sholem Aleykhem. Some of the history related in this book took place at sites characterized by extensive ethnolinguistic mixing. When discussing towns and regions that substantial numbers of Jews called by a particular name, I have used that name rather than the Ukrainian, Polish, Lithuanian, Belorussian, or Russian equivalent, except in cases where the location has a familiar name in English for example, Warsaw instead of Varshe. Given that there is no linguistically or politically neutral choice in such matters when one is writing the history of this once-multiethnic region, and given that this book is mostly about people who understood themselves as Jews in linguistic terms above all, this seemed the fairest choice. All translations are mine, and all italics in quotations are from the original works, unless otherwise noted.

Introduction To create among Jews a broad, comprehensive modern culture with all of its colors and nuances, with all of its achievements and searching—that is [our] great task. It also unleashed numerous wildly ambitious visions of societal transformation, many of which proved wholly irreconcilable. Over the course of , these conflicting visions, coupled with a welter of social crises, dragged the fragile revolutionary society toward open conflict. In the wake of what came to be known as the July Days, the veteran Russian-Jewish newspaperman Ben-Tsion Katz abandoned his work in Hebrew publishing to take part, as he put it, in the political fight against Bolshevism. Highly literate, disproportionately urban, and deeply politicized by years of state abuse, popular violence, and a fraught debate over their place in Russian and Polish, and Ukrainian society, the 3. Most Jews in Russia and Ukraine no doubt spent the years of the Revolution and Civil War merely struggling to survive, like most of their countrymen. Most famously, many played important roles across the spectrum of Russian radical and liberal politics. They created hundreds of Jewish schools with curricula framed by their conceptions of Jewish culture, and recruited the finest Hebrew and Yiddish writers to create, virtually overnight, rich Hebrew and Yiddish literatures for children. In Moscow and Kiev, competing camps of Hebraists and Yiddishists forged overarching cultural organizations of unprecedented scale and resources, the Hebrew Tarbut Culture and the Yiddish Kultur-Lige, which founded hundreds of branches in even the smallest Jewish towns despite the chaos of the era, and planned Jewish museums for ethnography and art, traveling theaters, and mobile exhibitions to bring the new culture to the provinces. Three striking aspects of this endeavor frame my investigation. First, these culturists were in no way insensible to the fraught nature of the moment they were living through; most were politically active. Second, Jewish culturists were by no means deaf to the claims of historical rupture and new beginnings that the Revolution promised or threatened. Many of them were themselves revolutionaries. Some shared the modernist convictions of the pan-European avant-garde, which saw wholesale cultural and psychic reinvention as essential to the creation of a new world. Yet they did not conceive or create their culture in accordance with the instrumental, identitarian, and collectivist terms that such a stance would seem

to dictate. Translator of Finnish, Babylonian, and ancient Greek epics, and himself a seductive, vitalistic Romantic poet, he mixed a deep Jewish nationalism with a dizzying cultural universalism: In , at age thirty-three, Bergelson was already a leading author in a Yiddish literary sphere that had begun to develop among Russian and Polish Jews in the late s. He was also committed to a radical politics that synthesized revolutionary socialism and Jewish diaspora nationalism. The party to which he adhered, the United Jewish Socialist Labor Party Fareynikte , preached maximal political autonomy for a supposedly secular Yiddish-speaking Jewish nation within the framework of a revolution that would sweep away class distinctions. As a writer, he refused to bend his own literary work to either Jewish national or revolutionary socialist ends. Bergelson played a central role in the Yiddish cultural institutions that sprang up in Kiev in in the context of promises of unprecedented formal cultural autonomy by short-lived Ukrainian nationalist governments. As a literary editor in several publishing houses, literary adviser to an experimental drama troupe, and leading voice in the Yiddish Kultur-Lige organization, Bergelson hewed a path away from the model of culture-as-politics-by-othermeans that is generally deemed the hallmark of all East European nationalist and socialist intelligentsias. Thus it was not his socialism but his Yiddishismâ€”his belief that all other forms of Jewish cultural life should give way to a new, monolingually Yiddish secular cultureâ€”that most consistently structured his cultural practice. He even reached out to literary figures identified with Zionist politics and with Hebraism, a vision of Jewish cultural formation that accorded the birthright to classical Hebrew rather than vernacular Yiddishâ€”that is, to figures in the Jewish political and cultural camps with whom he should have been locked in bitter conflict. Bergelson and his compatriots had longstanding personal ties with Bialik, but tellingly, although their solicitation appealed to these personal ties, it also acknowledged their political differences and posited a realm of culture beyond politics: Yet the sensibilities he represented did not merely appear here and there, a deviation from some mainstream practice of Jewish culture-as-politics. The study that follows might be said to spring from the question: In seeking to answer that question, this book is on one level a history of the fate of this ideal in the years that followed In mid, Jewish socialists invested with the power of the new regime destroyed everything he had helped build. By , Grinblat found himself in a small Jewish town in Ukraine just as the region descended into civil war and a bewildering array of armies unleashed a wave of atrocities against Jewish communities. Father to an infant son, the former literary critic put aside dreams of culture to organize local defenses and was badly wounded while repelling would-be pogromists. Quite the contrary, one of the most fascinating aspects of this cultural endeavorâ€”as with so many programmatic endeavors undertaken in the midst of revolutionary upheavalâ€”was the coexistence of extremes of violence and deprivation with extremes of ambition and creativity. The history of Jewish culturist efforts at the juncture is one of actors, texts, and institutions of pivotal importance in modern Jewish history yet largely unknown even to scholars of East European Jewry. The story of how Jewish culturists negotiated the relationship between their endeavor and the institutions that bounded itâ€”the market, political parties, the state, other ethnolinguistic culturesâ€”speaks to central questions of Russian history yet is largely invisible to historians of Russia for linguistic reasons. In part, this is also a history of how one group of participants in the Russian Revolution understood the Revolution in relation to an ideal of Jewish cultureâ€”and what the Revolution and its executors, the Bolshevik party, ultimately meant for the Jewish cultural project. The Bolshevik regime assumed no meaningful presence in the Jewish cultural life of Moscow and Petrograd until mid, and did not take and hold Kiev and Odessa until In , the incorporation of the Jewish cultural project into the Bolshevik order began in earnest. As several historical studies have recently reminded us, this incorporation was not simply a matter of suppression. The endeavor of Jewish culture taken up in actually continued in its original form outside Soviet space: Indeed, in its secular Israeli incarnation, the East European Jewish cultural project has outlived the Soviet experiment itself. Furthermore, the efforts to create a new Jewish culture in were not inventions of the revolutionary era but in all essentials represented the unfettering, culmination, and fullest expression of an ideological program born long before the Revolution. Beginning in the late s, Jewish literati in the imperial capital Petersburg and in urban centers of East European Jewish life such as Warsaw, Odessa, Vilna, and Kiev began to posit the need for Jewish creativity in all the arts. The venture of Jewish culture began to attract ever-widening circles beyond the still-narrow stratum of

Jewish creative intelligentsia. The new centers that sprang up in Moscow and Kiev cities partially closed to Jews before were direct outgrowths of prewar efforts in Warsaw, Vilna, and Odessa, organized by veterans of those earlier ventures. Even the new conditions ushered in by February's freedom to organize on a mass scale, the enhanced openness of the Jewish population as a whole to the new culture, and the glittering possibility of state support in a federal Russia or an independent Ukraine initially served not to alter but to reinforce prewar cultural visions. Despite the terrible chaos of the era, then, the watershed offers the historian of Jewish culture a twofold clarity. The events of 1917-1918 comprise a history in miniature of how the cultural project was violently altered by the most extreme forms of twentieth-century sociopolitics and revolutionary socialism. But the brief interlude of 1917-1918 offers historians something more interesting still. Because the conditions of that moment both allowed and compelled the champions of Jewish culture to articulate and enact their long-developing conceptions of culture as they never had before and would not do again until the formation of Israel, 1917-1918 provides the ideal framework within which to address questions of larger scope and import concerning the Jewish search for a modern culture, the nature of Jewish nationalism, and the relationship between ideals of culture and ideals of nationhood in the modern world. Nation and Culture The bid for Jewish culture at the 1917-1918 juncture, especially the seemingly orphaned moment of 1917-1918, offers, first, an especially suitable context in which to think about Jewish culture as an idea and undertaking from its beginnings long before and its development beyond Soviet borders long after. This issue is in itself decisive for the study of Jewish history as a whole. The idea of a full-fledged, separate Jewish version of the pan-European institution of culture was peculiar to East European Jewish modernity. In Western and Central Europe, Jews were offered an emancipatory contract that they essentially fulfilled: Under the twin conditions of the radical unsettling of traditional norms and the reinforcement of Jewish identification and collectivity, it was logical that some East European Jews rejected—or simply never considered—the notion that the price of modernity was the erasure of their Jewishness, and sought instead a modernity of their own making. It also offers a prism through which to advance our understanding of the tangled relationships among culture as a general ideal of modernity; modern conceptions of language, art, and selfhood; and two of the ideologies that have so decisively shaped the modern world, nationalism and socialism. The concept—in some views a mere discourse—was born out of parallel quests by early nineteenth-century German and English Romantic intellectuals for a new form of creativity and experience that could realize two exalted and crucial ends. Early champions of culture, who were witnesses to the bloody birth of modern politics in the French Revolution and the rise of market society with all its attendant material and psychic woes, hoped to chart a third realm that might somehow rise above these fallen ones while helping to resolve their constituent problems. Heirs to the Enlightenment who accepted however reluctantly the dictates of secularity and of individual autonomy, these intellectuals also hoped to find a means to cultivate a creative, psychically whole individuality in a disenchanting age. They staked their hopes above all on art and aesthetic experience. Through the lens of a critical history of ideas, the concept of culture can seem inherently self-defeating because it posits an impossible union of the ideal of individual autonomy through reason with an irrationalist faith in the trans- 12 Introduction formative power of aesthetic creativity and experience. Historically, under certain circumstances, these claims have achieved real social purchase and generated real and profound effects in human society. This recognition suggests the value of what we might call a neoinstitutionalist approach to culture, one that takes culture as a real activity performed by real individuals who related to its claims with a mix of critical distance and true belief, who valued it both instrumentally and for its own sake, and who sought to obey its dictates even as they sought to use culture to suit their other ends. Attention to the generative power of culture as concept and institution, however, tends to fade as scholars look east, beyond the cultural spheres of Western and Central Europe. Multiple scholarly literatures laden with a variety of assumptions have bequeathed us an enduring image of the profound differences between culture West and East, metropolitan and non-metropolitan, pivoting around such oppositions as cosmopolitan versus parochial or authentic, universal versus particular, individual versus collective, and culture as end versus culture as instrument. The sociologist Zygmunt Bauman puts it particularly baldly: The separation between intellectual work and professionalized politics, the retreat of intellectuals into distinctly cultural institutions, the growing preoccupation of

intellectuals with the autonomy of culture. In some respects, the search for a modern Jewish culture in Eastern Europe was unusual. It was atypical in its multilinguality, counterposing to the languages of the metropolises German, Russian, Polish not one but two ethnic languages, high Hebrew and vernacular Yiddish. Most importantly, it was bound to a typical sort of East European nationalism. Granted, this nationalism was inflected by the strange territorial and sociological features of Jewish life; its political forms ranged from Zionism to various diaspora-nationalist visions of a separate Jewish national life in a reconstructed, federal Russia, both crosscut by socialism. During the late nineteenth century, an ever-widening flow of hundreds of thousands of Russian Jews streamed into metropolitan centers as a concomitant flow of new ideas, values, texts, and commodities made its way into even the most remote Jewish shtetlekh towns ; many of these towns even sported makeshift movie theaters by World War I. At the same time, changing economic needs and cultural opportunities stimulated rapid assimilation. The champions of Jewish culture sought more than the overthrow of tradition. Themselves steeped in Russian, Polish, or German literary culture, they sought to carve out a Jewish culture that could hold its own. At the same time, these culturists were true believers in the virtues of high culture, and loathed the emerging Yiddish popular culture of Eastern Europe and New York as shameful and debilitating. From Jewish cultural producers, should have elicited the most unabashed, confident, and assertive efforts to date to use secular cultural means to shape a new Jewish collective identity and mythic consciousness. For those who sought to organize Jewish culture institutionally, the goal should have been to yoke the cultural sphere to political mobilization as closely as possible. And there certainly seems little reason to expect much discursive and institutional space for such selfishly individualist and old-fashioned notions of culture as a sphere of self-cultivation and self-expression. These expectations and this sort of approach might seem especially well-suited to the era of the Russian Revolution, moreover. February propelled culturists into a bitter open struggle for hegemony over the terms of Jewish culture itself. Competing Hebraist and Yiddishist camps moved to remake the complex polyglot reality of the new Jewish culture in accordance with radical, uncompromising monolingualisms. Jewish culturists also seized as the moment to project their culture to the whole of Jewish society, not least with the power of the state. But in key respects, the Jewish cultural project taken up in differed profoundly from such a picture. Although all of the tendencies sketched earlier were to be found, they were by no means triumphant or even dominant. Rather, as this study demonstrates, they stood in tension with surprisingly powerful countervailing imperatives of cultural experimentalism and anti-essentialism, a paradoxical will to cultural egalitarianism and self-abnegation on the part of culturist intelligentsia, a widespread resistance to the instrumentalization of culture, and obdurate defenses of the distinct prerogatives of art and self-cultivation—all within the framework of Jewish cultural nationalism. Both the Hebrew and Yiddish cultural milieus of the era resounded with calls for an outright revolt against the idea that a modern Jewish culture had to be based on indigenous national traditions. Locked in an increasingly zero-sum battle with these Hebraists over the language and politics of the new Jewish culture, Yiddishists in this period nevertheless paralleled their will to cultural de-Judaization, and even boasted of their superior achievements on this score. Similar complexities abound when we turn our gaze from the content of culture to plans for its dissemination to the larger Jewish population. Like Bergelson, leading individual and organizational voices of the Jewish cultural milieu actually explicitly rejected such a strategy.

This is an archive of past discussions. Do not edit the contents of this page. If you wish to start a new discussion or revive an old one, please do so on the current talk page.

Indian market touched fresh record highs week-after-week helped by strong cues from global markets and domestic liquidity which continues to dominate in the year. The next big question in front of investors is "to buy stocks now or wait for declines?" The general theory says that it is very tough to time the market but if investors keep a disciplined approach to investing, heavy losses could be avoided. Instead of looking at the Index, investors should focus more on stock specific opportunities and if you look for them, there are plenty available. Sectors which are related to Indian economy should do well, suggest experts. Hence, sectors like consumption, GST-related, as well as rural focussed themes, are likely to do well in the coming years. Some of the themes that we believe should do well in are Cyclical like Cement, Infra, capital goods benefit from the higher government spending, GST beneficiaries like jewelry retail, footwear, building material value migration from unorganised to organised layers, rural recovery sectors like Auto, FMCG, vehicle financing, etc. We have collated a list of top 10 stocks from different brokerage firms which could give multibagger returns in the next years: With experience and expertise, it has established a presence across all auto category from two-wheelers to Farm Equipment. The company is expected to achieve revenues of Rs. Low leverage, higher promoter stake and lower than industry average valuations are factors imperative for investment in the company. Ujaas Energy Limited has completed projects totalling MW of solar power plants for corporates and retail clients. The company can double its EPS over the next couple of years on capacity augmentation. Nitin has an installed capacity of, spindles. Strong promoter pedigree - NSL is promoted by R. Nolkha who has spent around 25 years in the Industry before setting up NSL. Over the last 25 years, the Nolkha family has grown the business very efficiently and have successfully navigated the challenges and threats. Trading at an attractive valuation of 9x FY Indian food retail market is the sixth-largest in the world and estimated to grow to Rs. QSR segment contributes WDL enjoys certain competitive advantages like long-term rent agreements with a longer tenure for acceleration on a relative basis which leads to faster store breakeven periods. The Company continued with the strategic and consistent expansion of its store base by setting up 22 stores in FY. In a span of just five years, PEL has evolved to become one of the largest real estate financiers in India. NBFC business - largely catering to real estate developers financing is expected to remain on a robust growth path. With these investments, PEL has also diversified into retail financing. PEL is the third-largest player after Abbott and Baxter in the global inhalation anesthesia space. It has a good portfolio of high-ranked brands. Nachos is a nascent but fast growing segment in India and Agro Tech has become the No. The company plans to launch different flavours and spin-offs of peanut butter combination with jelly or chocolate. Peanut butter is expected to clock sales of Rs. and we expect it to touch Rs.1bn by FY. The company has five plants currently and the sixth one is under construction at Chittoor. Rajoo Engineers supplies machinery for packaging products and is bound to gain with strong consumption demand and an uptick in FMCG sales. Currently trading at higher multiples with respect to trailing multiples we are confident of strong sales and higher profitability due to positioning in the industry. Rajoo has maintained strong return ratios and will continue to do so. Greaves Cotton drive a significant portion of its revenue from agri-equipment and construction equipment. This makes Company uniquely positioned to gain from all quarters of government policies. Flex Foods is an associate company of Uflex and a leader in flexible packaging technology. Flex Foods cultivates and processes food products and supplies vacuum freeze-dried, air-dried, frozen and an individually quick frozen IQF product range. It sources its raw materials through contract farming through a dedicated network of farmers. Strong pedigree, good product range, and low forward earning multiples make us confident of a better outlook for the stock. The company is planning to ramp up production capacity, raise capital for inorganic growth and acquire additional acreage.