Between Universalism and Particularism: The Origins of the Philosophy Department at Hebrew University and the Zionist Project

Neve Gordon and Gabriel Motzkin

> And when the history of modern Palestine and the University is written, it may well be the use of the Hebrew language which will stand out as one of the great spiritual sources of whatever we may contribute to human culture.
>
> —Leon Roth, 1945[1]

In 1946, the Vaad Leumi (Jewish National Council) declared a general strike to protest the Mandatory restrictions denying access to Nazi victims who sought refuge in Palestine. Philosophy professor Leon Roth decided not to comply with the Vaad's call, thus infuriating the striking students who began banging on his class door in order to interrupt his lecture. Roth cried out to them: "Gentlemen . . . let me just ask you what you think is more likely to bring about the end to British rule in this country—your noisy door-banging or my philosophy? Surely no reasonable man can doubt that it is my philosophy that will achieve those ends!"[2]

This remark is revealing: it underscores some of the tensions underlying the relationship between the Zionist project of nation-building and the establishment of the first philosophy department in Palestine.[3] It points to opposing conceptions concerning the central mission of Zionism and, more specifically, to a disagreement regarding the appropriate framework within which the struggle for independence should take place. Moreover, it suggests that philosophy in general, and the department in particular, could and perhaps should play a role in the nation-building project. But to gain better insight into the meaning of Roth's claim, we must first examine how he and his sole colleague, Samuel Hugo Bergman, conceived the department's task and its relation to the political scene.

The Department's Founders

Leon Roth, who headed the philosophy department during its first 23 years, was born in London in 1896 to an observant Jewish family. In college he studied classic philosophy, first at the City of London School, and later at Exeter College, Oxford. During World War I, Roth was drafted to the Jewish Battalion of the allied forces, where his sergeant was David Ben-Gurion. Following the war, he returned to Exeter to finish his degree and was awarded the John Locke Scholarship in Mental Philosophy (1920) as well as the James Mew Scholarship in Rabbinical Hebrew (1921). In 1923, after completing his doctorate, which examined ethical question in the writings of Spinoza, Descartes, and Maimonides, and receiving the supernumerary Green Prize in Moral Philosophy, he obtained a position in the department of philosophy at Manchester University.[4]

Roth's association with the Hebrew University appears to have begun in 1925, when he was sent as Manchester University's representative to the opening ceremony on Mount Scopus.[5] During the following three years, Roth and Judah Magnes corresponded about the possibility of the former moving to Palestine and establishing a philosophy department.[6] Roth, as is clear from his letters, was interested in the position.[7] Following the death of Ahad Ha-am in 1927, an endowed chair was created in his name and offered to Roth, who by that time had already published several articles and two books (*Spinoza, Descartes and Maimonides* and *The Correspondence of Descartes and Constantyn Huygens, 1635–1647*) and had been elected a fellow of the British Academy.[8]

In a letter addressed to Magnes, Roth expresses his willingness to join the university's staff and to head the philosophy department, adding that

> the needs of the university could best be met if the duties of the department were to be broadly formulated as twofold: (1) the exposition and development in the Hebrew language of the general problems of thought with reference to the general history of philosophy; and (2) the broad discussion of the history and character of the Jewish contribution.[9]

Experience, Roth continues, "would show how far, if at all, the two could run together."

It is important to note that, already at this early stage, Roth refrained from using the term Jewish philosophy. He did not think there could be such a thing, claiming rather that there was a need to underscore the "Jewish contribution" to philosophy. Also, he sensed that a tension might arise between the "general problems of thought" and the specific Jewish contribution, and that reconciling the two would be no simple undertaking.

Ironically, the university's Board of Governors was deliberating at this stage whether to hire Roth as a philosophy lecturer in the Institute of Jewish Studies instead of opening an autonomous philosophy department. There were two major reservations about employing Roth in that capacity: he was not an expert in medieval Jewish philosophy, and he did not know Arabic and therefore could not read the medieval philosophers in their original tongue.[10] Roth himself, however, refused to be considered for this position. Roth thought that to isolate philosophy in an Institute for Jewish Studies was to "imprison Judaism" as well as to revert to the undesirable model of a diaspora rabbinical seminary.[11]

In the aforementioned letter to Magnes, Roth adds, though, that a "fully developed department of Philosophy has a foothold in many different subjects," thus suggesting that he disagreed with the emerging tendency toward compartmentalization.[12] His unease appears to have been informed by a premonition that emphasizing the Jewish contribution to philosophy could enhance a form of separatist particularism. Roth was, in a sense, echoing an existing dispute about the model that should be adopted when establishing the first institution for higher learning in Palestine. The initiators of the university project had already rejected the idea of emulating the diasporic seminary, but there were tensions among them regarding the institution's role: whether it should focus on scientific research or whether it had a more concrete national Jewish role.[13] But we will return to this below.

Roth and his family left England in mid-October and reached Palestine in time for the 1928–29 academic year.[14] A few months earlier, he had begun corresponding with Samuel Hugo Bergman, who was slated to be his sole colleague in the new department.[15] "I have the greatest

admiration both for him [Bergman] and for his work and could wish for no better colleague," Roth wrote to Magnes before he left.[16]

Bergman, at the time, was director of the National and University Library in Jerusalem, and he had held this position since his emigration from Czechoslovakia in 1920. Born in 1883, Bergman was a student of Anton Marty and had received his doctorate at the German University in Prague in 1905.[17] As a young scholar he was already interested in a variety of issues, ranging from epistemology—not only the relation between the knowing subject and object but also issues relating to the foundations of mathematics and physics—to the relation between reason and faith. Prague philosopher Bernhard Bolzano, a key forerunner of the modern analytic school, as well as Franz Brentano and Martin Buber influenced his work during this period.[18]

From 1907 until his arrival in Palestine, Bergman worked as a librarian in the University Library in Prague, and during this period he wrote two books (*Das philosophische Werk Bernhard Bolzanos* [1909] and *Worte Moisis* [1913]) as well as hundreds of essays.[19] He spent many hours reading Immanuel Kant and the neo-Kantian philosophers, particularly Hermann Cohen. Years later Bergman would introduce German philosophy to Palestine and would help revive the interest in Cohen, who had been somewhat forgotten. Around this time he also became interested in Zionist thinkers like Theodor Herzl and Ahad Ha-am, and was an active member in the Zionist organization Bar-Kokhva.[20]

In 1915, Bergman was drafted into the military and spent a year at the front. Four years later, he was invited to London to take part in planning the establishment of what was to become the Hebrew University and was urged to direct the planning committee's education department.[21] In 1920, he was asked by the World Zionist Organization to head the National Library, which consisted at the time of 18,000 volumes; the books were mostly in Judaica, packed in a small "unsuitable building."[22] Fifteen years later, Bergman resigned from this position to become Hebrew University's first rector (1935–38); the library he left behind had become the "greatest in the Near East, serving the whole of Palestine, and having a treasure of over 300,000 volumes in all branches of Science, with regular catalogues and a trained staff."[23] During his tenure as the library's director, Bergman also helped found the Hebrew bibliographic quarterly *Kiryat Sepher* and was active in the Jewish Labor Federation's cultural department.

Although Bergman was a full member of the philosophy department from its foundation in 1928, for the first 10 years he was engaged in two other momentous tasks (National Library director and rector) and could not dedicate all of his time to departmental matters or to

philosophy itself. After being elected rector, he wrote a friend: "It was not easy for me to accept this appointment despite the honor it entails because it will deprive me of a whole year's work at a time in which I enjoy working so much."[24] Little did he know that he would stay in office for three years. Bergman, however, was not one to stop reading and writing philosophy, or, in his parlance, "working." During this period he wrote such books as *Immanuel Kant's Philosophy* (1927, Hebrew), *Der Kampf um d. Kausalgesetz in d. jüngsten Physik* (1929), *Solomon Maimon's Philosophy* (1932, Hebrew), and *This Generation's Thinkers* (1935, Hebrew). Bergman was a "Renaissance Man"; his bibliography, which was compiled in 1967, includes a total of 1,786 entries, and he continued writing for eight more years.[25]

The Department's Structure and Objectives

In June 1928, the university's Board of Governors met for the fourth time. In the meeting's protocols, one reads that the board members were prepared to "establish a [philosophy] department as soon as the staff of the philosophical section submits a recommendation." During the same meeting, they also decided to establish the Ahad Ha-am chair in philosophy.[26]

Over the previous two years, the university had offered five courses in philosophy, beginning in 1926 with a class on "The Philosophy of Islam." In the 1927–28 academic year, courses on "Neo-Platonic Philosophy and Its Sources," "The Philosophy of the Kabbalah" in two parts, and "Aristides's Letter" were proffered. Philosophy, however, was not taught in a systematic fashion, and the existence of any philosophy courses at all was because Gershom Scholem and Moshe Schwabe, who were already teaching at the time, had an interest in certain philosophical issues.[27]

The importance of establishing a philosophy department that would provide methodical access to the field was, nonetheless, recognized early on. Immediately following the university's foundation, discussion began concerning the appropriate "home" for a philosophy department—in the Institute of Jewish Studies or in a College of Arts and Letters that was to be set up—and not whether it should be established. In a meeting of the Preparation Committee of the Department of Arts and Letters, held in 1925, Professor Joseph Klausner suggested that such a college should be fashioned like a faculty of arts found in universities in England; he thus implied that a philosophy department should be founded inside such a college.[28] Yet up until mid-1927, it was

still unclear whether the philosophy department would be part of a new College of Humanities or of the existing Institute of Jewish Studies. Only in May 1927 did the institute's faculty members decide to submit a proposal for the establishment of a College of Arts and Letters that would include a philosophy department. This department would deal with philosophy in general, whereas Jewish philosophy would be taught in the institute.[29] One month later the University Council decided to hire five new lecturers who would teach in the new college; among the names mentioned was Bergman.[30]

In March 1928, Magnes obtained a contribution of $5,000 for the purpose of establishing the new philosophy department.[31] The same month the University Council decided to offer the position of department chair to Roth, which he accepted.[32] Everything had been well prepared in advance so that by June, when the Board of Governors convened, only a formal approval was necessary. Within a short period the department's doors opened.

Ninety-two students signed up for courses in philosophy during the first year of studies, which was a significant number considering that, in 1928, only 250 students were enrolled in the university.[33] A wide range of courses were offered, particularly if one takes into account that for the next 20 years or so the philosophy department consisted of only two faculty members. On average, each lecturer taught four classes per year, two general courses and two seminars. The lecturers took turns giving the introductory course, which was taught each year to new students.[34] In addition, Roth taught such courses as "The History of Ancient Philosophy," "Introduction to Philosophy and Logic," and "Introduction to Ethics"; his seminars ranged from "Plato's Republic" and "Aristotle's Metaphysics" to "Problems in Russell's Philosophy." Bergman taught courses like "The History of Modern Philosophy" and "General Problems in Epistemology"; his seminars included "Solomon Maimon's Logic," "Locke's *Essay*," and "Leibniz." In 1939, Roth introduced a course on political philosophy, and two years later Bergman began to teach analytic philosophy, offering courses on "Logic," "The Problem of Induction," and "Mathematical Logic."[35]

The courses were taught in such a way that different issues and figures were selected for treatment each year, so that, by the time a student graduated from the program, he or she would have covered considerable ground.[36] Students were also able to attend a wide panoply of courses offered by lecturers from other departments. These included Avraham Frankel's "Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy" (1929–30), Martin Buber's "Problems Pertaining to Human Essence, Past and Present" (1940–41), and Ernst Simon's classes on Rousseau

and on the concept of freedom (1941–42).[37] Students could also take philosophy courses taught at the Institute for Jewish Studies. These included courses by Zevi Diesendruck, who taught "The History of Medieval Jewish Philosophy," "Philosophical Questions after Maimonides," and "Aristotle's Ethics" (1929–30). As of 1934, Julius Guttmann taught a variety of courses, ranging from "Medieval Jewish Philosophy" and "Maimonides' Philosophy" to "Spinoza's Ethics," and Gershom Scholem taught courses on the Kabbalah.

Thus, Roth and Bergman were responsible for the core philosophy courses, with Roth focusing on ethics and on ancient and political philosophy, and Bergman concentrating on epistemology and modern philosophy. Although Roth had come from England, he was not engaged with the Anglo-Saxon analytical school—which was on the rise during those years due to Bertrand Russell's and Ludwig Wittgenstein's work—but rather belonged to the "old school," which dealt with the history of philosophy and of ideas. He was interested primarily in pre-Kantian early modern thought and tried to draw the connection between it and Judaism. Ironically, it was the European, Bergman, who introduced the Anglo-Saxon analytical school to Hebrew University students while propagating German philosophy and, more generally, continental thought. Bergman was, in this sense, unique; he was one of those rare scholars who strove to bridge the gap between these two different directions in twentieth-century philosophy.[38] In his thought, the rupture between them did not exist.

In the 1934 *Report of the Survey Committee of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem*, also known as the Hartog Committee report, the philosophy department was criticized for running "parallel courses" instead of offering a wider range of classes. The Hartog Committee claimed that both faculty members specialized in modern philosophy, and it recommended that Roth be asked to "devote his chief attention to the field of ancient philosophy."[39] Roth rejected this assessment in his reply and provided a detailed list of the courses taught, demonstrating that parallel courses were actually not offered. He also dismissed the committee's suggestion that he should devote all his time to ancient philosophy.[40]

During this early period, there was no bachelor's program; studies lasted three to four years, at the end of which one received a master's degree. From the mid-1930s until the early 1950s, when a bachelor's program was finally introduced and the university grew dramatically, the department had on average 30–50 students. These students could choose to take philosophy as a "minor" or as a "major," which had been set up in 1929, one year following the department's foundation. Studies for those who were majoring in philosophy comprised 10

hours per week for a period of three years.[41] Students attended lectures during the whole period and attended seminars during their second and third years. Third-year majors could take a seminar that was conducted according to the Oxford tutorial system.[42] These students were also required to take a comprehensive exam toward the end of their studies that included five topics: the general history of philosophy, one period within the history of philosophy, logic and the theory of knowledge, ethics and political philosophy, and general questions.[43] Students who took philosophy as a minor participated in lectures for two years and in a one-year seminar. The exam they took included only three subfields.

In light of the limited teaching resources, it is quite astonishing that by the late 1930s students were writing master's theses on such diverse topics as "The Mutual Influence Between the Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Philosophy in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," "Butler's Analogy and Hume's Dialogues," "Ideal Ethics and the Renewed Utilitarianism in Nineteenth-Century England," and "Antinomies in Logic."[44] Only four students, however, wrote dissertations and received doctorate degrees during the department's first 25 years: Nathan Rotenstreich, Mordechai Roshwald, Yehoshua Bar-Hillel, and Tzvi Yehuda Adar (Rabinovich), the first three under Bergman's supervision and the fourth under Roth's.[45] Roshwald died when he was still very young; Adar became a lecturer in the education department at Hebrew University; and Rotenstreich and Bar-Hillel eventually became faculty members in the department and the mentors of third-generation students, some of whom are still teaching at Hebrew University. It is this second generation, particularly Bar-Hillel, who began to deemphasize the history of philosophy and to highlight instead the importance of the analytic school.

Because Bergman was busy with the National Library until 1935 and then was rector for three years, Roth, who was chair, was the one responsible for determining the department's character.[46] Before assuming office, Roth spent some time contemplating how he would like the future department to look, and the courses offered reflect, in many respects, his view of the way in which a philosophy department should be constituted. In the "Memorandum on the Teaching of Philosophy at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem," which was presented to the Board of Governors, he suggests that the best way to approach the subject of philosophy is through the history of its problems. There are, he writes,

> two ways of acquiring a knowledge of this history. It can be learned either at second hand from books or lectures about it, or from direct study of the

> classical treatise themselves. From the educational point of view there is little doubt which of these two ways is to be preferred. The task of the teacher is rather to guide the student in his personal struggles with the classical treatises than to transmit to him by dictation generalized accounts of their doctrines.[47]

The courses offered by the department reflected the latter approach. Courses that examined the basic elements of philosophy preceded both the classes that discussed particular philosophers and those that analyzed the most recent philosophical speculations. At one point, though, Roth's statement in the memorandum becomes somewhat ambiguous. He stresses that a department at Hebrew University should try to utilize the classical Jewish writers. The reason to pursue this direction is not only because their works are available in Hebrew but also because it is "essential that a national University should seek to understand and further the specific thought of the nation itself." However, he immediately adds that, because there is a "sub-department of Philosophy at the Institute of Jewish Studies, it would be best to make a beginning at the outset with the classical *non-Jewish* philosophers, the most important being those of ancient Greece and Modern Europe."[48]

Once again we witness Roth's hesitancy about accentuating Jewish philosophy. If one seriously reflects on the second clause, where he qualifies his initial statement about the need to emphasize Jewish thinkers, it appears as if the first clause were actually written to please the board. Such an assumption gains credence when one takes into account Roth's essay "Is There a Jewish Philosophy?" in which he argues that there is no such thing as a Jewish philosophy just as there is no Jewish physics or Jewish mathematics. Rather, there is a philosophical interpretation of Judaism or a philosophy of Judaism—that is, a discussion of the answers offered by Judaism to some general problems of life and thought.[49] In those early years, Roth was apparently still afraid that the university would transform into some kind of theological college. "Here is no rabbinical seminary or theological college, although Jewish learning in all its branches finds with us supreme recognition," he wrote years later in an essay describing the university, claiming also that

> It is a University in the normal sense, an institution of higher learning in which the sciences and the arts are handed on to the coming generations; where the spirit of disinterested inquiry is furthered; where the primary tools of thought are given by precept and example, and where youthful enthusiasms, disciplined by knowledge, are forged into permanent tastes.[50]

The relation between Judaism and philosophy occupied Roth during the entire course of his life and, as we show below, was intimately related to the way he conceived the nature of the nation-building project.

It is important, though, first to stress that, when Roth says he espouses a historical approach, he does not mean the study of "influences" and "developments" but rather an "enquiry into the nature and ground of the typical ideas (and they are not too many) which have shown a habit of recurring in the course of human thought. This somewhat unhistorical history would go to Plato's *Gorgias* (for example) for the discussion of hedonism and power politics, and to *Theaetetus* for an introduction to epistemology."[51] When one reads Bergman's introductory books on epistemology or logic as well as his excellent three-volume *A History of Philosophy*, which scores of Israeli students continue to peruse each year, one notices that he too endorsed this approach.[52] Both teachers questioned the tradition of philosophical thinking and wanted to endow their students with a skeptical frame of mind; suspicion was considered essential for intellectual progress and a requisite for constructive work.

This is also the central claim made in the introduction to the first volume of the Hebrew philosophical journal *Iyun*, which was founded in 1945 and published by the philosophy department.[53] The journal's principal aim was to create a Hebrew podium for contemporaneous philosophical research. Its founders—Bergman, Buber, and Guttmann—chose the name *Iyun*, which means in Hebrew "investigation" or "contemplation"; their introduction claimed that the essence of philosophy is self-criticism: "Philosophy fulfills its function of encouraging thought when it exposes knowledge—each time anew—to its fundamental problems."[54] Of the nine articles that appeared in the journal's first volume, four were written by scholars—Ernst Cassirer, Fritz Heinemann, David Baumgardt, and Felix Weltsch—from abroad, and three of these had to be translated into Hebrew. *Iyun*'s skeptical approach as well as its endeavor to translate "foreign" ideas and to introduce them, as it were, to philosophy students in Palestine was a reflection of some of the philosophy department's central goals.

The skeptical approach highlighted by the department's founders was, in their view, as Roth later observed in his essay "Philosophy at the University and the Jewish Mind," at odds with some aspects that characterized certain ideological trends within Zionism. "The 'return to Zion,'" he writes, "means (so we are told) a return to 'normalcy,' a healing of the duality implied in the 'dispersion.' The Jewish consciousness is said to be 'split,' and its sundered parts must be brought together again. . . . Now at last he has found—or re-found—a home. He has

come to his rest, and may revert to the ordinary." Although Roth conceded that these phrases might contain some truth, he argued that they are extremely dangerous because "home" and the "ordinary" can also come to mean mediocrity, "the dull sameness of the untravelled."[55]

Instead, Roth emphasized the need to "cultivate the spirit which welcomes ideas from abroad" and rejected the desire for self-sufficiency. "Parochialism," he concluded, "will not do. Let us temper our village-pump patriotism; and if modern authority be wanting for the justified ambition to irradiate the world, let us not be ashamed of the antique sentences of Isaiah."[56] So Roth, not unlike Bergman, was wary of certain elements within the nationalist project, particularly those that engendered complacency. He therefore eschewed separatist tendencies and stressed the importance of absorbing ideas from abroad. Both scholars, as we will see, believed that philosophy linked to a specific understanding of Jewish thought could mitigate the shortcomings inherent in the national project. It is in this sense that, for the founders of the department, the study of philosophical classics became a political enterprise worth pursuing.

Translating the Classics

> We are all fond of talking of Greece and Israel as the roots of what is good in modern life. Could that be expressed more clearly than by the teaching in our University of Plato in the tongue of Isaiah?
>
> —Leon Roth, 1945[57]

Even before arriving in Palestine, Roth recognized the practical problem of bringing students into direct contact with the great philosophers. With the exception of Spinoza, hardly any of the Greek, modern, or contemporary philosophers had been translated into Hebrew, and therefore Roth considered translation of classics to be one of the department's chief roles.[58]

We should keep in mind that the revival of Hebrew as a spoken language had begun only 50 years before and that in the late 1920s and early 1930s the Jewish population in Palestine consisted of fewer than 200,000 people. Many Jews were new immigrants who were struggling to make ends meet in an undeveloped country, and a large percentage could not even read Hebrew. How many Jews living in Palestine at the time could have been interested in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, and how

many of these would have chosen to read it in Hebrew? So while Roth needed to find a practical solution for his students, surely the motives underlying the project were also Zionist in the sense that a basic part of nation-building is the translation of classic texts into the local vernacular. Indeed, the revival of the "holy language," alongside the attempt to secularize and transform it into a modern language, was part and parcel of the Zionist venture.[59]

But considering the university's scant resources, how was this project to be accomplished? In his "Memorandum on the Teaching of Philosophy," Roth suggests that "this work could be arranged on the seminar system, that is to say, it could be apportioned out systematically to various members of a select class and the results could be coordinated at meetings held at regular intervals."[60] These words marked the beginning of a massive translation project.

The difficulty was that Hebrew philosophic terminology had stopped developing in the medieval period, after the translation of Aristotle, Maimonides, Aquinas, and Averroes. Kant's contemporary, Solomon Maimon, wrote a Hebrew commentary on Maimonides' *Guide to the Perplexed*, but even it, according to Roth, "was in the language of the 13th century translators."[61] So, though philosophy needed to be translated into Hebrew, Hebrew had to be taught modern philosophy. It had to be put through the same stages of philosophical development that other modern languages had undergone.

The way to achieve this goal was, in Roth's view, obvious: "start with the first modern expressions of philosophical thought, make Hebrew assimilate them, and then pass on to the more recent" philosophical works.[62] Accordingly, the project began with Descartes' *Discourse on Method*, which the French philosopher had written in his mother tongue, thus breaking the long tradition of writing philosophy in Latin. The result of these activities was that in 1930, after less than a year and a half's work, a number of Hebrew texts in a cheap and easily accessible form were available. These texts were "sufficient to constitute reading for a full course in the history of development of modern ideas, including complete versions of some of the smaller works of Descartes, Leibniz, Rousseau, Kant, Fichte, Mill and Brentano, and substantial portions of Locke, Berkeley and Hume."[63] They were first hectographed, read, corrected, and reread in classes and seminars until it was felt that they passed muster. Only then were they printed and sold as unbound textbooks at the low price of 75–100 mils (30–40 cents) each.[64] "I well remember," Roth wrote, "going through Descartes' *Meditations* in this way, supervising translations one week and lecturing on them the next."[65] In this manner, Roth helped establish

what later became Magnes Press, where he was an editor for a certain period as well as chair of its executive committee. The Magnes series of philosophical classics is the product of his initiative and diligence.[66]

Bergman also played a central role in this project, particularly after 1938 when he could commit all of his time to the department. Even earlier, though, he had edited the Hebrew edition of Johann Fichte's *The Vocation of Man* and Kant's *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics That Can Qualify as a Science*. After completing his tenure as rector, he immersed himself in translation, working together with his student Rotenstreich. In over two decades of scrupulous labor, they produced excellent Hebrew editions of Maimon's *Essay on Transcendental Philosophy* and *Givat ha-moreh* and Kant's three *Critiques*.[67] Rotenstreich describes their work as an attempt to fulfill two goals: they endeavored "as much as we could to be faithful to the German text while striving to endow the text with a Hebrew tune, drawing from the terminology of Hebrew philosophy."[68]

The translation project, however, was not limited to the moderns. Leon Simon and professors Klausner and Diesendruck helped translate parts of Plato and Aristotle, and contemporaneous works like Russell's *Problems of Philosophy* were also translated into Hebrew.[69] At a certain point, Joseph Ur, one of the department's students, became the philosophical series' principal translator. Roth himself translated four short volumes of Aristotle's writings and edited twelve books in the series.[70] In his 1934 reply to the Hartog Committee, he wrote that he considered translations to be a principal part of his duty as the department's chair: "Beginning with the second week of residence in this country I have spent most of my leisure in supervising, revising, and editing . . . translations."[71] Considering the political events taking place, the fact that about 30 philosophical works were translated during the university's first 20 years is truly remarkable.

To understand the translation project simply as a solution to pedagogical needs is, however, to misunderstand both Roth and Bergman and how they conceived their mission as the founders of the first philosophy department. Reviving the Hebrew language was considered central to the Zionist venture because it helped to unify and galvanize the immigrant population. "Hebrew is not only the *lingua franca* of Jewry, the only language on the use of which all Jews can agree," Roth claimed. "It is in itself an inspiration, a call to better things. It is the linguistic side of the cry for a New Jerusalem."[72]

In retrospect, Roth even maintained that the State of Israel was created by modern Hebrew and not vice versa, thus confirming that the translation of classics was informed by their Zionist beliefs.[73] Yet it

seems to us that, though Zionism inspired the translation project, Roth and Bergman also hoped that the texts, in their turn, would help spur some form of self-reflection and critique of Zionism.

It is in this context that their membership in Brit Shalom becomes relevant. Neither ardent nationalists nor conventional Zionists, both Roth and Bergman believed in the establishment of a binational democratic state that would be universalist at least in the sense of guaranteeing equal rights to Jews and Palestinian Arabs. This worldview correlates in many ways with certain aspects of ancient and modern philosophy, which stressed the significance of creating an ethical community. In this light, their endeavor to make philosophical texts accessible to Jewish students in Palestine begins to gain new meaning; one may even begin to appreciate Roth's response to the striking students who banged on his classroom door.

Between Universalism and Particularism

To gain better insight into the ideological underpinnings of the translation project, one needs to examine Roth's and Bergman's political views, which were, in turn, informed by their philosophical convictions. Bergman spent years writing about the relationship between philosophy and religion, underscoring the limits of reason and the important role faith plays in human existence.[74] Although we cannot do justice to his philosophy in this context, it is important to note that he accepted the Kantian claim that one can never access or know the thing in itself. Because humans only have access to phenomena that appear in their consciousness, the objects we comprehend do not reflect the world; rather, consciousness takes part in the world's very constitution. The world, then, is a product of the cognitive organization and interpretation of human beings, and the objects one comes across are at least partially contingent upon the theory one employs.[75] This is true not merely from a philosophical point of view but also from a political one.

The inability to access a reality that is beyond phenomena led Bergman to faith. But, as opposed to Kant, Fichte, Friedrich Schelling, Hegel, and Cohen, Bergman did not think that faith and religion were mere epiphenomena of philosophy but claimed that they enjoyed an autonomous existence. Echoing Hume, Bergman argued that "without faith in the unmediated access to the 'known [world],' we could not live or philosophize."[76] He even quoted Augustine's famous statement: "I believe in order to understand and to know."[77] Whereas reason, according to Bergman, is intersubjective and belongs to the public realm, faith

is subjective and belongs to the private sphere. Yet the phenomenon of religious experience, as William James called it, was, in Bergman's opinion, also informed by a universal component.[78] Bergman's description of this form of universalism was super-larded with Buberian overtones, and it is therefore not surprising that he referred to the moment of faith as the "meeting."[79] A person's "meeting" with the almighty is, to be sure, subjective, yet the structure of the relationship, the "meeting" itself, is the basis of all authentic religious experience and as such universal.

What interests us here, though, is not so much the philosophical details or ramifications of Bergman's claims but rather his view regarding the limits of reason and his assertion that faith, which among other things informs our judgment, is not merely a subjectivist or particularist endeavor. Indeed, Bergman criticized the dogmatism characterizing many religions, pointing out that religious establishments feed the dogmatic worldview by emphasizing the particular at the expense of the shared experience. Bergman wrote about the relation between reason and faith mostly in abstract terms, but his thoughts on the matter gain concreteness in his political writings.

In his essay "On the Question of Israeli Nationalism," Bergman revealed his wariness of the worldview that emphasizes the particular, cautioning his readers that both Judaism and Zionism have a tendency to do just that.[80] After showing that, in the Diaspora, Judaism assumed a pseudo-national role of galvanizing the community and caring for its needs, he suggested that Judaism should now give up this function and pass it on to the national institutions. The national authorities, in turn, should permit the creation of a new Judaism, one that focuses on spirituality rather than on finding solutions for practical needs. A Judaism that assumes nationalist functions is likely to promote a particularist worldview, which is antithetical to the universalism underlying faith.

Thus, Bergman advocated a separation between religion and state, at least in the political sense. These are perilous times, he warned his readers in "On the Question of Israeli Nationalism," maintaining that the nationalist project appeared to be turning once again to religion, using it, as it were, as an instrument to homogenize the immigrant population and to advance its goals. He characterized this move as reactionary, claiming that it would also corrupt religion because it would undermine the development of spiritual activity. Yet he also cautioned his readers against abandoning Judaism altogether for the sake of a secular Zionism devoid of spirituality. If this were to occur, he said, the nationalist project would no longer recognize that it is merely a means that contains only part of the people's independence, and it would

eventually succumb to all the dangers making up all nationalisms: the danger of chauvinism and hatred of the other.[81]

Bergman, to be sure, did not advocate a cosmopolitan worldview as an alternative to Zionism, nor did he adopt an uncritical approach to the Enlightenment and to its universalistic message. Yet he sensed the danger of a particularist propensity that was emerging within Zionist ideology and the problems it entailed. Philosophy that emphasizes the universal and at the same time is aware of its limits could perhaps influence the way people think and thus help divert the danger. This idea informed not only his writings but also, as we will argue below, the translation project.

Roth approached the issue in a slightly different way, spending less time writing on the relation between reason and faith in general and more on Judaism and its role in the Zionist project. In an essay on Spinoza, Roth criticized the great philosopher for perceiving Judaism as a "tribal habit of life, isolationist and misanthropic, a device for group survival."[82] Spinoza was describing a form of Judaism that rejects the "stranger" and is intolerant toward difference. Roth denounced this form of Judaism, pointing out that "according to the rabbis the command to be kind to strangers is given in the Pentateuch no less than thirty-six times!"[83] He accordingly did not abandon Judaism for the sake of the Enlightenment as many secular Jews did but, rather, maintained that an isolationist Judaism is based on a misguided reading of the religious texts and a misunderstanding of the message proffered by the great Jewish prophets.[84] "When the prophet wishes to lay down our duty in this life, he says: 'God hath told thee, O man, what is good.' He does not say: O Englishman, O Frenchman, even O Jew; but O *man*."[85]

In a memoir dedicated to Roth, Raphael Loewe tries to explain Roth's decision to leave Israel and return to England three years after the declaration of independence—and after having served as the university's rector (1940–43) and dean of humanities (1949–51)—suggesting that it was the result of a deep disappointment with the Jewish state:

> He had gone out to Palestine in the hope that it was to constitute a truly Jewish contribution to the polity of man. It being his experience that Jewish ethics and notions of justice were not given any marked enunciation in the national life of Israel . . . he saw no reason to remain in the country any longer.[86]

Loewe cogently describes Roth's vision as one of establishing "*Jewish* ethics and notions of justice" in Israel's national life, but one must differentiate between Roth's understanding of Judaism and the conception of Judaism used to create Israel's national identity.

As Bergman noted (speaking about his colleague but perhaps also about himself), Roth distinguished between two opposing and contradictory strains of Jewish thought. Whereas the first is humanistic, enlarging and universalistic, the second is reductive, narrow, and has a separatist character.[87] This approach manifested itself clearly in Roth's book *The Guide for the Perplexed: Moses Maimonides*. There Roth suggested that we do not find in Maimonides

> the conception of an exclusive connection between religion and the Jewish people, or between religion and Palestine, or between such religious phenomena as prophecy and the geographical condition of Palestine. Judaism for him is not a product of "race" or an inheritance of "blood," nor is it bound up exclusively with any one people or any one soil.[88]

Both Bergman and Roth appear to have sensed that the Zionist project invoked what scholars like Deniz Kandiyoti, following Tom Nairn, have more recently called the Janus-faced quality of nationalist discourse. This discourse "presents itself both as a modern project that melts and transforms traditional attachments in favor of new identities and as a reaffirmation of authentic cultural values culled from the depth of a presumed communal past."[89] The problem with this discourse, as Roth and Bergman suggested in their writings, is that both the universalism it invokes in the name of modernity and the traditional past to which it appeals not only contradict each other but, in different ways, can engender intolerance toward the *other*. The importance of reconciling the tension between universalism and particularism, and of respecting the dignity of the other, are pressing issues that continue to haunt us to this day. Roth's and Bergman's attempts to articulate an alternative approach by uncovering this tension and revealing some of the difficulties and dangers it entails within the Israeli context is surely part of their legacy. On the one hand, they were against a universalism that breaks off from traditional attachments; they did not simply adopt the modern project and its conception of universalism, because they were constantly interested in the traditional and particular—that is, Jewish life and thought. On the other hand, they rejected an atavistic conception of Judaism and stressed that it is the universal feature within the particular that needs to be accentuated; a Judaism true to its origins is universalistic, one that emphasizes the past but has meaning for the future, one that makes room for the other.

It is in light of Roth's and Bergman's worldviews that we should understand both their endeavor to make classic philosophy available to future generations and, perhaps more important, the incredible translation enterprise they launched. The classes and translations were part

of an effort to instill an alternative moral content into the national project and in this way to help cultivate an ethical community in Palestine. In other words, their concern was primarily with the good and just life at a historical moment in which most people were concerned with mere life. Accordingly, teaching philosophy and translating classics was much more than a job for them, it was a life calling.

Although Bergman and Roth were the philosophy department's founders, it is important to stress that their contribution exceeded the department's frontiers. Following the 1935 decision to separate the university's administrative and academic units, Bergman and Roth were among a small group of faculty members who assumed the academic leadership; Bergman as the university's first rector, and Roth as its third. Both scholars believed that responsibility for academic decisions should be handed over to the faculty, and they recognized the importance of allowing the university's academic division to function as an autonomous unit. The fact that they were chosen for this distinguished position is a sign of the high esteem in which they were held, and it also points to the elevated status that philosophy enjoyed during those years.

In the final passage of *Government of the People by the People: Fundamentals of Democracy*, which was published right after Israel's establishment, Roth claimed:

> We are all currently asking, what can we do in order to help the state? The answer is simple: we must give of ourselves, but be ourselves and give ourselves, and demand also from others that they be and give themselves. We must purge the monkey ideal, whereby every person trains to be the mirror of the other. Each one must learn to be oneself. Only if we cultivate this diversity will we be able both to create a worthy unity and to constitute a true democratic state, for (in the words of J. S. Mill) the value of a state is nothing but the values of the individuals who compose it.[90]

Both Roth and Bergman tried to achieve this goal, each in his own way. Although Bergman is still remembered and revered in Israel, at least in some intellectual circles, Roth has been forgotten. To be sure, his decision to leave Israel in the early 1950s can partly explain the present failure to recognize and appreciate his many contributions, as is the fact that it was Bergman's students and not Roth's who became the department's second-generation faculty members. But the total obliviousness surrounding Roth's name also involves the cosmopolitan tradition that he represented, which did not play well in Israel of the 1950s because it could not be integrated into the national self-understanding. Roth was forgotten because his vision could not suit the hegemonic discourse of

the time. By way of conclusion, we would like to leave the reader with a question: What does it mean for us to remember alternative discourses that were indeed present at the creation of our cultural institutions?

Notes

For their comments and suggestions, we would like to thank Hagit Lavsky, Danny Yackoby, Yehoyada Amir, and the anonymous reviewers. For financial assistance, we are grateful to the Cherrick Center for the Study of Zionism, the Yishuv, and the State of Israel at Hebrew University.

1 Leon Roth, *The Hebrew University and Its Place in the Modern World* (London, 1945), 7.

2 Edward Ullendorff, "Foreword," in Leon Roth, *Is There a Jewish Philosophy?* (London, 1999), xiv. In the Hebrew University Archives (hereafter HUA) is an official complaint against Roth submitted by the Vaad Leumi's student organization. The students complained to the university administration that Roth continued teaching despite the strike. HUA, Leon Roth file, Feb. 21, 1947.

3 For the relationship between the establishment of Hebrew University and the Zionist project of nation-building, see Shaul Katz and Michael Heyd, eds., *Toldot ha-universitah ha-ivrit bi-Yerushalaim, shorashim ve-hathalot* (Jerusalem, 1997); David N. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past: European Jewish Intellectuals and the Zionist Return to History* (Oxford, 1995); and Betzalel Brshai, "Ha-universitah ha-ivrit bi-Yerushalaim, 1925–1935," *Katedra* 53 (1990): 107–22.

4 HUA, Leon Roth files, "Leon Roth, Short Biography" (undated) and letter from Roth (May 23, 1926). Edward Ullendorff, *The Two Zions* (Oxford, 1988), 62–63; Raphael Loewe, *Rationalism, Judaism, Universalism: In Memory of Leon Roth* (New York, 1966), 1–13; Ullendorff, "Foreword," x–xi. Roth's older brother, Cecil, became an accomplished historian and reader in Jewish Studies at Oxford. In the early 1930s, he was offered a position in the Institute of Jewish Studies but declined the offer. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, 139, 235.

5 Ullendorff, "Foreword," x. A few months later he is already mentioned in a letter to Judah Magnes as a possible candidate to be a lecturer in Jewish Religious Philosophy (HUA, Leon Roth file, letter dated Aug. 24, 1925, in German). For a description of the ceremony, see "Helek gimel: Hagigat haptihah, aviv tarpah (1925)," in Katz and Heyd, eds., *Toldot ha-universitah*, 311–59. Also perti-

nent is Hagit Lavsky's essay in the same book, 120–59.

6 In a letter from Harvard University to Harry Wolfson, who had previously declined an offer to become the philosophy department's chair (HUA file 183, letter from Wolfson to Magnes, Jan. 28, 1927), Magnes inquires whether Wolfson regards Roth "a suitable person to be chosen lecturer in Philosophy in the Institute of Jewish Studies." He also notes in the letter that "Professor Julius Guttmann has a very high opinion of Dr. Roth" (HUA file 183, letter from Magnes to Wolfson, July 1, 1927). Two other people are mentioned as candidates for the position in the same letter—Dr. Joseph Plotzkin from Berlin, and Mr. Effros from Baltimore—but Magnes notes that Guttmann did not think highly of them. Guttmann was to become professor of Jewish philosophy in the Institute of Jewish Studies in 1935, and his opinion of Roth informed the relationship between the two.

7 HUA, Leon Roth files, letters to Magnes dated May 23, 1926 (English); July 8, 1927 (Hebrew); Sept. 20, 1927 (English); Mar. 21, 1928 (English); Sept. 2, 1928 (English); and Dec. 25, 1928 (Hebrew).

8 A bibliography of Roth's writings appears in Roth, *Is There a Jewish Philosophy?*, 180–89. The decision to create an endowed chair in Ahad Ha-am's name is mentioned in the Protocols of the Board of Governors, 1925–45 (HUA). See the fourth Board of Governors meeting, June 3–5, 1928, pp. 48–52.

9 HUA, Leon Roth files, letter dated Sept. 20, 1927 (English).

10 HUA, Leon Roth files, letter from Magnes to Roth dated July 8, 1927 (Hebrew).

11 Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past*, 100, 221. The philosophy slot in the Institute of Jewish Studies was eventually offered to Julius Guttmann.

12 HUA, Leon Roth files, letter dated Sept. 20, 1927 (English).

13 See Arthur Aryeh Goren, "Mabat me-har ha-tsofim: Y. L. Magnes veha-shanim ha-rishonot shel ha-universitah ha-ivrit," and Ze'ev Rosenkranz, "'Merkaz ruhani naaleh' o 'Bayt shorets makakim'? Meoravuto shel Albert Einstein be-inyanei ha-universitah ha-ivrit, 1919–1935," both in Katz and Heyd, eds., *Toldot ha-universitah*, 363–85, 386–96.

14 HUA, Leon Roth files, letter dated Sept. 2, 1928 (English).

15 HUA, Leon Roth files, letters dated Mar. 21, 1928 (English); Sept. 2, 1928 (English).

16 HUA, Leon Roth files, letter dated Mar. 21, 1928 (English).

17 HUA, Samuel Hugo Bergman files from 1937 (undated biographies in English and Hebrew).

18 See Nathan Rotenstreich, "Hafilosofyah shel ha-meah ha-esrim ba-aspaklryah shel kitvei Bergman," in *Kitvei Shmuel Hugo Bergman, bibliografyah, 1903–1967*, Baruch Shohetman and Shlomo Shunami, eds. (Jerusalem, 1968), 9–12. See also the special issue of *Iyun* 26 (1975), "In Memory of Samuel Hugo

Bergman," particularly the articles by Yirmiyahu Yovel, "Hogeh u-maamin," 7–29, and A. Tzvi Baron, "Darko shel S. H. Bergman ba-filosofyah: Shlavim," 30–50, and William Kluback, *Courageous Universality: The Work of Schmuel Hugo Bergman* (Atlanta, 1992).

19 See Shohetman and Shunami, eds., *Kitvei Shmuel Hugo Bergman*.

20 See Yovel, "Hogeh u-maamin"; Kluback, *Courageous Universality*; and Robert Weltch, "Zikhronot al S. H. Bergman," *Iyun* 26 (1975): 67–71.

21 See Hagit Lavsky, "Ben ha-nahat even ha-pinah la-ptihah: Yisud ha-universitah ha-ivrit," in Katz and Heyd, eds., *Toldot ha-universitah*, esp. 126–31.

22 HUA, Bergman files, May 21, 1935 (English).

23 Ibid.

24 HUA, Bergman files, letter to Y. Poznansky, Nov. 14, 1935 (Hebrew, our translation).

25 See Shohetman and Shunami, eds., *Kitvei Shmuel Hugo Bergman*.

26 HUA, the Protocols of the Board of Governors, 1925–45. The fourth Board of Governors meeting, June 3–5, 1928, pp. 48–52.

27 HUA, Hebrew University Year Books, 1926, 1927.

28 The Meeting of the Preparation Committee of the Department of Arts and Letters, 1925, HUA, file 183.

29 Meeting of the faculty members of Institute of Jewish Studies, May 20, 1927 (HUA, file 183).

30 Resolution of the University Council, June 29, 1927 (HUA, file 183).

31 Letter from Magnes, thanking Mrs. Cecilia Rosenbloom for her contribution. The letter was sent to a Mr. S. Buckstein, March 12, 1928 (HUA, file 14/6).

32 See the Magnes-Roth letters, *cited in n. 7 above*.

33 HUA, J. L. Magnes, "End of the School Year Speech, 1929," in *Speeches of the Chancellor of Hebrew University* (Jerusalem, 1936). One should note that this was not the actual number of students who majored in philosophy but only students who took courses in philosophy. See also HUA, *Hebrew University in Jerusalem: Its Formation and Current State* (Jerusalem, 1939), 86.

34 HUA, Leon Roth, "Appendix B." In J. L. Magnes, for the Members of the Board of Governors and the University Council, *Reply to the Report of the Survey Committee of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem*, July 1934, pp. 174–76; HUA, Hebrew University Year Books, 1929–48.

35 HUA, Hebrew University Year Books, 1929–48.

36 HUA, "Memorandum on the Teaching of Philosophy at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem," file 2270, 1928. On the memo the name of the author is not indicated, but in Roth's response to the Hartog Committee he states that he authored it (Magnes, *Reply to the Report of the Survey Committee*, 175).

37 HUA, Hebrew University Year Books, 1929–30, 1936–37, 1940–41, 1941–42.

38 Bergman's interest in both schools of thought can be traced back to his work on Prague philosopher Bolzano, who was

among the precursors of the analytic school, and to his attraction to Brentano, who influenced Edmund Husserl and several existentialist philosophers.

39 HUA, *Report of the Survey Committee of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem* (Jerusalem, 1934), 22–23.

40 HUA, Roth, "Appendix B."

41 For the Board of Governor's approval of a "major" program in philosophy, see the protocols from the August 18–19 meeting in 1929 (HUA, Protocols of the Board of Governors, 1925–45).

42 HUA, Roth, "Appendix B." HUA, Board of Governors Annals, Fifth Session, Aug. 18–19, 1929, pp. 56–57.

43 HUA, file 2270, 1937, "Tokhnit behinah be-filosofyah." Also Proposal and Program for General Philosophy (undated document in Hebrew), HUA, file 183.

44 HUA, file 2270, 1937.

45 The Authority for Research Student Archives, Hebrew University, files 72, 251, 142, 121.

46 The division of labor is also reflected in their salaries. Whereas Roth received 573.3 Palestinian pounds per year, Bergman received 190.8 as a lecturer and an additional 402 as the library's director. HUA, *Report of the Survey Committee of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.*

47 HUA, file 2270, 1928 (English).

48 Ibid. (italics added). It is interesting to compare Roth's thought on the matter with the controversy that took place about the structure of the (Jewish) history department. See Ariel Rein, "Historyah klalit vehistoryah yehudit: Bi-meshutaf o be-nifrad? Li-sheelat hagdarat limudei ha-historyah ba-universitah ha-ivrit ba-asor ha-rishon," in Katz and Heyd, eds., *Toldot ha-universitah*, 516–40.

49 Roth, *Is There a Jewish Philosophy?*, 1–14.

50 Roth, *The Hebrew University*, 3.

51 Leon Roth, "Philosophy at the University and the Jewish Mind," in *Hebrew University Garland*, Norman Bentwich, ed. (London, 1952), 65–72.

52 Samuel Hugo Bergman, *Mavo letorat ha-hakarah* (Jerusalem, 1940), *Mavo le-torat ha-higayon* (Jerusalem, 1954), and *Toldot ha-filosofyah ha-hadashah*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem, 1970–75).

53 *Iyun* 1 (Oct. 1945): 3–4.

54 Ibid., 3.

55 Roth, "Philosophy at the University," 69.

56 Ibid., 71.

57 Roth, *The Hebrew University*, 7.

58 HUA, Roth, "Appendix B," 176.

59 For a close examination of the ideological underpinnings of this translation project, see Neve Gordon, "Zionism, Translation and the Politics of Erasure," *Political Studies* 50, no. 4 (2002): 809–26.

60 HUA, file 2270, 1928. In the memo, Roth also writes: "A course should take three hours a week, one hour being devoted to preliminary survey, one to the coordination of translations, one to detailed exposition."

61 Leon Roth, "Building a Language," *Commentary* 2 (1946): 298–300.

62 Ibid., 299.

63 Ibid., 298.

64 HUA, file 5045, Roth letter to Mr. Sherman, Nov. 28, 1945.

65 Leon Roth, "The Jerusalem University: Some Personal Notes," *Universities Review* 2, no. 2 (1930): 111–15.
66 Since its inception, 41 titles have appeared in the Philosophical Classics series published by Magnes University Press, Jerusalem (all in Hebrew).
67 Shohetman and Shunami, eds., *Kitvei Shmuel Hugo Bergman.*
68 Nathan Rotenstreich, "In Memory of Samuel Hugo Bergman," *Iyun* (special issue) 26 (1975): 65 (translation ours).
69 Leon Simon was Ahad Ha-am's student and in the late 1940s became the chairperson of Hebrew University's executive committee. Joseph Klausner was the founder of the Hebrew literature department at the university; for an interesting account of his work and legacy, see Shmuel Werses, "Yoseph Klausner ve-reshit ha-horaah vehamehkar shel ha-sifrut ha-ivrit ha-hadashah ba-universitah ha-ivrit," in Katz and Heyd, eds., *Toldot ha-universitah.*
70 See the bibliography in Roth, *Is There a Jewish Philosophy?*, 180–89.
71 HUA, Roth, "Appendix B," 176.
72 Roth, *The Hebrew University*, 7.
73 Leon Roth, "The Resurgence of Hebrew," *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 2 (1959): 177–86.
74 See, e.g., Bergman's essays in his *Hogim u-maaminim: Masot* (Tel Aviv, 1959), and his *Anashim u-drakhim: Masot filosofiyot* (Jerusalem, 1967). Regarding Bergman's view about the limits of reason and his relation to Judaism, see also Yovel, "Thinker and Believer," and Baron, "S. H. Bergman's Way."
75 Bergman, "Filosofyah ve-dat," in *Hogim u-maaminim*, 7–13.
76 Ibid., 15.
77 Ibid., 27.
78 Ibid. Bergman criticizes James's term "religious experience," but it is beyond the scope of this article to discuss this issue.
79 Ibid.
80 "Al sheelat ha-leumiyut ha-isreelit" as well as "Hearot al ha-sheelah ha-aravit," essays written by Bergman and published as part of a compilation, *Ba-mishol*, Nathan Rotenstreich, ed. (Tel Aviv, 1976).
81 Bergman, "Al sheelat ha-leumiyut ha-isreelit," 51.
82 Roth, *Is There a Jewish Philosophy?*, 100.
83 Ibid., 66.
84 See his essays "The Significance of Biblical Prophecy" and "Moralization and Demoralization in Jewish Ethics," both of which appear in Roth, *Is There a Jewish Philosophy?*
85 Ibid., 78.
86 Loewe, *Rationalism, Judaism, Universalism*, 8–9. In 1948, after the Dir Yassin massacre when 250 of the village's 400 Palestinian Arab residents were murdered and the rest expelled by Etsel and Lehi forces, Roth, Buber, D. Sentor, and Ernst Simon wrote to Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, asking him not to allow Jews to settle on the village's ruins. Notwithstanding their appeal, the Jewish, mostly Orthodox, neighborhood of Givat Shaul was eventually built on the ruins of Dir Yassin. See

Tom Segev, *1949, ha-isreelim ha-rishonim* (Jerusalem, 1984), 101.

87 Samuel Hugo Bergman, Moshe Sternberg, and Nathan Rotenstreich, eds., *Al profesor Haim Yehuda Roth za"l* (Jerusalem, 1963), 5.

88 Leon Roth, *The Guide for the Perplexed: Moses Maimonides* (London, 1955), 123. In 1947, Roth traveled to the United States and gave a few public lectures. Following a lecture in Los Angeles in which he criticized some of the policies of the Jewish establishment in Palestine, the Zionist Organization in Los Angeles sent an angry telegram to Hebrew University, asking its authorities to reprimand Roth for engaging in "anti-Zionist propaganda." In the university's archives, one finds a heated exchange between Roth and Leon Simon, who was then the chair of the university's executive board. Leon Roth, HUA files (June 15, 1947; July 15, 1947; Oct. 23, 1947); see also "Prof. L. Roth Stirs Wrath of Zionists," *Los Angeles Times*, June 6, 1947.

89 Deniz Kandiyoti, "Identity and Its Discontent: Women and the Nation," *Millennium: A Journal of International Studies* 20, no. 3 (1991): 429–43. According to Baruch Kimmerling, the Zionist secular *avant-garde*, which constantly stressed the values of the Enlightenment, invoked the traditional Jewish experience for two major reasons: first, to substantiate a historic right to a specific territory (and thus also to distance themselves from the global colonial context by representing the Zionist movement as a "return to Zion"); and, second, to homogenize Israel's diverse immigrant population. Kimmerling even argues that "Zionism adopted the Bible, redefined it as a national-historical text, and tried to transform it into a primary mythical infrastructure for a new historiography of Judaism as nationality" (Kimmerling, "Religion, Nationalism and Democracy in Israel," *Constellations* 16, no. 3 [1999]: 339–63).

90 Leon Roth, *Shilton ha-am al yedei ha-am: Raayonot yesod be-demokratyah* (Tel Aviv, 1949), 74 (translation ours).