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3 A Renaissance of Jewish Readers in Victorian Philadelphia

How does one write a cultural history of Jewish reading activities? I will ask in a preliminary way several questions related to such an undertaking: namely, what did Jews read; what reading materials did Jews lack that they tried to acquire or produce themselves; where did Jews read; and what functions did their reading activities serve? Scattered through this discussion of sources, sites, and reading activities, I also hope to point to some of the deeper challenges and at times counterintuitive questions scholars of the history of reading have posed about this subject. Roger Chartier, the most distinguished contemporary historian of reading practices, has formulated the task as follows: first, to recognize that “reading is not always inscribed in the text; that it is not true that there is no imaginable gap between the meaning assigned to it [the text] by the author of the text or its editor, by criticism, tradition, etc.) and the use or interpretation that readers may make of it” and second, to understand that “a text exists only because a reader gives it meaning.” In shifting the interpretive focus from traditional conceptions of authorship to material texts and historically contextualized audiences, Chartier follows the arguments of Michel Foucault, who redirected cultural historians’ attention to the processes governing the reception of texts. At the same time, Chartier, building on the work of Donald McKenzie, has demonstrated how the forms in which messages are delivered and the manner in which texts are performed shape, constrain, and otherwise affect the meanings conveyed. Consequently, the physicality of reading materials and the historicity of reading activities are critical for understanding not only the ways that individuals read but also for analyzing how audiences generate meaning.

Such an approach, if it is to be comprehensive, requires us to treat not only the words on the page as symbolic carriers of meaning and to know
something about the life stories of the readers themselves. It also demands that we explore the complex processes by which words, sounds, and images as texts are received and read. Recognizing the historicity of texts and the contexts in which texts and readers are located helps us to appreciate the distinctive communities to which readers belonged, the skill levels and competencies of these readers, and the manner and environment in which they read or were read to. Unfortunately, owing to insufficient empirical research, the important and underlying question of literacy levels attained by readers who can be identified as Jewish in mid-nineteenth-century Philadelphia will not be addressed. Instead, I will focus here on a limited group of producers and consumers of reading materials who were highly literate, multilingual, and instrumental in building the institutional and cultural foundations for new kinds of sociability through reading. Even as they resemble in some respects their non-Jewish counterparts, these Victorian Jewish writers, editors, compilers, and readers also show distinctive characteristics that set them apart. These differences are especially evident when contrasted with models of secularization often advanced to characterize non-Jewish reading patterns during this time period.

For the sake of studying cultural histories of Victorian Jewish reading activities, it may be useful to recall that while there is some definitional overlap between the analytical categories “Jewish” (e.g., readers) and “Judaic” (e.g., what was read), they are not identical. The fact that someone was born Jewish does not necessarily make that person a Jewish reader, and the fact that someone of Jewish parentage authored a particular work does not mean the work counts as a work of Judaica. Indeed, part of what is fascinating about this Victorian moment in vernacular cultural exchanges between Jews and non-Jews is precisely this new and rapidly expanding availability of and accessibility to a wide variety of works in multiple languages. In this context, the English vernacular helped to produce a new kind of Jewish reader, indeed, one might even argue, a new kind of non-Jewish Judaic reader.

All people who identified themselves as Jews obviously did not exclusively read “Jewish” books and serialized publications. The bibliographic concept of “Judaica,” notably, can refer to publications issued by Jews or non-Jews, but whose content is preponderantly concerned with Jews and Judaism. As Robert Singerman put it in the introduction to his authoritative bibliography of pre-twentieth-century “Judaica Americana”: “Judaic subject matter, and not the author’s ancestry, is the determining factor in judging the appropriateness of a work for inclusion.” He includes, for example, mission-
in 1907, the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, the first academic institution of higher Jewish learning in the world accredited to confer PhDs in Judaic studies, was chartered in Philadelphia.\textsuperscript{19} Jewish Philadelphians also established multiple Jewish benevolent and relief associations during this era, and in particular created some of the first Jewish literary societies, which will be discussed in detail below.\textsuperscript{20} One scholar of this pre-mass migration era, Lance Sussman, has described an antebellum “Philadelphia Pattern” of Jewish communal life with national repercussions. As new Jewish communities grew roots, for example, in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis, we find parallel literary, social, relief, and other extra-synagogal institutions sprouting up there as well.\textsuperscript{21}

Philadelphia’s Jewish cultural organizations were led by a close-knit group of people who are sometimes referred to as the “Philadelphia Group.” The moniker was coined by Solomon Solis-Cohen in his “Founder’s Day Address” delivered at Dropsie College on March 9, 1924. His idea was to link together a historical chain of Jewish educators and educational institutions dating from the beginnings of the Hebrew Sunday School movement in the 1830s to Dropsie College in his own time.\textsuperscript{22} Solis-Cohen, a prominent physician, lay scholar, and translator of medieval Hebrew poetry, argued that “these men and women of vision and various phases of their activity must be studied as an organic whole. They founded synagogues as a matter of course . . . and maintained charitable associations. But their chief endeavors were directed in two lines—school and publications.”\textsuperscript{23} In so doing, Solis-Cohen lumped into one, not entirely consistent pot a multigenerational mix of rabbis, educators, teachers, scholars, legal professionals, administrators, and businessmen: Isaac Leeser, Sabato Morais, Mayer Sulzberger, Cyrus Adler, as well as Rebecca Gratz, Hyman Gratz, Solomon Solis, Moses Aaron Dropsie, Marcus Jastrow, and one non-Philadelphian—Solomon Schechter, who came to New York from Cambridge University in 1902 to head the reorganized Jewish Theological Seminary of America. With the exception of Jastrow and Schechter, all these leaders had for some period of time been affiliated with the city’s historic first synagogue, the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation Mikveh Israel, and Sephardic history and culture informed their sense of history and manner of worship.

Not mentioned by Solis-Cohen but closely associated with the same Sephardic congregation was the Cohen family.\textsuperscript{24} Henry Cohen, a prosperous merchant, originally from London, and his American-born son Charles J. Cohen, who owned a stationery company, served as presidents of Mikveh Israel during the second half of the nineteenth century. Henry and his wife Matilda, from Liverpool, had five children, all born and raised in Philadelphia. One of them, Mary M. Cohen, became a prominent literary figure and contributor to a number of Jewish newspapers including the short-lived (Philadelphia) \textit{Jewish Index}, the (Philadelphia) \textit{Jewish Record}, and the (Philadelphia) \textit{Jewish Exponent}. She served as the superintendent of Philadelphia’s Hebrew Sunday School and notably was among the founders of the Browning Literary Society in the 1880s. Cohen, whose career is the subject of a recent study by Dianne Ashton,\textsuperscript{26} also served as president of the Mikveh Israel Association, a kind of congregational literary society, during the 1890s. She shared a close friendship with Nina Morais, another literary figure of note, translator, and champion of women’s suffrage. Nina was the daughter of the Sephardic hazan (prayer service leader) of Mikveh Israel, Sabato Morais, and his wife Esther Clara Weil, who died tragically in 1872 when Nina was seventeen.\textsuperscript{27}

The concept of a “Philadelphia Group” was enlarged in 1983 in a collection of essays titled \textit{Jewish Life in Philadelphia, 1830–1840}, edited by Murray Friedman.\textsuperscript{28} The leadership pattern was taken beyond the framework of Philadelphia Jewish educators and publishers to encompass relief workers and other communal services associated with the period of mass migration (especially from Eastern Europe to the Atlantic shores during the 1880s and 1890s through 1924, after which time the U.S. government severely restricted the arrival of new immigrants). Two such members added to this expanded conception of the Philadelphia group were Louis Edward Levy, the cofounder in 1884 of the Association for the Protection of Jewish Immigrants,\textsuperscript{3} and Charles Spivak, a physician and community leader. In 1993, following a conference in Philadelphia on the Philadelphia group, Friedman penned a “Collective Portrait” of them to introduce \textit{When Philadelphia Was the Capital of Jewish America}. This was the second in a multivolume series he edited on Philadelphia Jewish history.\textsuperscript{29}

Despite the coherence and heuristic value the concept of a “Philadelphia Group” of Jews offers, it is important to understand that this conceptualization of these individual Jewish leaders as a collective is something that postdates their communal activities and conceals more than it reveals. This Philadelphia “group” of Jews active and visible in communal affairs spanned several generations. Its different “members” did not always see eye to eye politically, had different life experiences in terms of gender, family origins, and levels of wealth, and did not always share the same religious orientation.
Perhaps the deepest social fissure that divided the first “generation” of these communal leaders active during the antebellum period can be traced to the dismissal of the Westphalia-born Isaac Leeser as the hazzan of Mikveh Israel in 1850. Leeser had aroused the wrath of his congregation by demanding more autonomy, more money, and more respect. In response, the congregation that had hired him dismissed him for insolence. The furor that erupted also created the job opening that brought Sabato Morais, an Italian Sephardic Jew, to Philadelphia from London. Ultimately, Morais was elected the congregation’s next minister under these difficult circumstances (many of Leeser’s supporters left Mikveh Israel and started a new congregation, Beth El Emeth). 

Leeser and Morais did not get along, differed as much in their temperaments as in their politics (the former was combative and voted Democrat, the latter self-abnegating and voted Republican), and about critical issues such as the slavery question (Leeser argued that it was not appropriate to speak out about political issues like this one, and at one point was suspected of being a Southern sympathizer; by contrast Morais adamantly opposed the institution of slavery and in 1864 was given a three-month “gag” order against preaching by his congregational board). In later years Solis-Cohen, and his teacher Morais, fiercely opposed political Zionism, while other figures such as Bernard Levinthal, an early-twentieth-century leader of modern Orthodox Judaism and a kind of “chief rabbi” of immigrant Jewish Philadelphia, became ardent advocates of the cause. Marcus Jastrow, who served as rabbi of Rodelph Shalom from 1866 to 1892, today is associated with the beginnings of the Conservative movement of Judaism. During his ministry in Philadelphia, he instituted several controversial reforms in the content and character of the prayer service, including mixed seating and organ music. Joseph Krauskopf, among the first graduates of Hebrew Union College, the Reform rabbinical seminary started in 1875 in Cincinnati, became the leader of Philadelphia’s Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel in 1887. Taken together, they reflect a wide diversity of viewpoints about religion and politics that existed within the framework of Philadelphia’s intergenerational Jewish leadership patterns.

What these generations of individuals did share was a commitment to Jewish communal service and a noblesse oblige sense of responsibility for their brethren in Philadelphia and abroad. All were committed to some form of a ritualistically observant Jewish religious culture, albeit some in highly modified and voluntary forms. All learned to read in the original languages and also to translate into the English vernacular classical works of Jewish culture. To take just one example, Solomon Solis-Cohen, under Morais’ tutelage, rendered into highly stylized Victorian English the medieval Hebrew poetry of Moses Ibn Ezra and Yehudah ha-Levi. He was not alone in this kind of literary activity. On the day that Morais suffered a fatal stroke in November of 1897, he and two of his students, Isaac Husik and Gershon Levi, had been reading and translating the Hebrew poetry of Yehuda ha-Levi.

Figures like Morais and many of the young people he nurtured as a spiritual leader and teacher sought to rediscover and/or translate into English classics of Jewish learning. These included some of the most dazzling and difficult texts of medieval Sephardic philosophy and poetry, such as the works of Sabbatai Donnolo, Moses Maimonides, Hasdai Crescas, Immanuel of Rome, Joseph Albo, and Isaac Abravanel. Through study in the original and through translation these works were made newly accessible as part of a Judaized classical curriculum. As will be discussed below, the educational and literary associations these Jewish Philadelphians created were self-consciously intended to serve the purpose of cultivating a new kind of Jewish reader—one trained to read traditional Jewish sources, to worship in Hebrew, to speak, read, and write proper English—and to ensure that these new readers’ Jewish reading activities were isomorphic with the Victorian culture in which they lived.

The Production of Reading Materials

Perhaps one of the most striking features of Jewish reading activities in Victorian Philadelphia was the labor-intensive effort to print, publish, or acquire Jewish reading materials. Thanks to Robert Singerman and his bibliographical labors we learn that between 1840 and 1900 there were at least 170 monograph titles and 70 distinct periodicals of a Judaic nature published in Philadelphia. The types of printed works included a variety of religious works such as prayer books and catechisms. The multiplication and diversity of these versions of Jewish liturgy offer bibliographical evidence as well as visual and textual illustrations of communal fractures in the manner of worship and character of religious reading. We also find distinctively Americanized forms of Jewish publications, all reflecting a diversity of purposes and forms of reading materials: constitutions, by-laws, and minutes of synagogues, fraternal orders, and relief organizations; communal histories; books of poetry, travel books, and dramas; apologetic literature; philo-Semitic and antisemitic works; conversionist, millenarian, and internal Jewish polemical tracts.
Printing and publishing not only were cultural activities but also, notably, generated business opportunities. Newspapers, books, pamphlets as well as commercial advertising and want ads were critical sources of revenue, especially for Leeser, who supplemented his ministerial salary with sales of the various publications he authored or edited. Advertising also provided a practical means of communication by which distant communities were able to circulate news about job opportunities and hopeful candidates might learn about and apply to fill them. Similarly, the business of printing broadsides, circulars, invitations, and occasional works such as birthday, bar mitzvah, anniversary, and funeral addresses formed a significant part of this growing public sphere of commercial reading materials.

The Jewish periodical press and printed books themselves were ready outlets for advertisements promoting the latest Judaica publications. The most important antebellum Jewish newspaper, the Occident and American Jewish Advocate, was published in Philadelphia and edited by Isaac Leeser. The Occident circulated news about Jews from all over the world to the scattered Jewish communities of the Western Hemisphere and beyond. At the same time, it frequently was quoted overseas, particularly in the Anglo-Jewish press, as a reliable source of information about happenings in North America and the Caribbean. The first issue of the Occident came out in April of 1843, and it subsequently appeared every month (not including a brief stint as a weekly from 1859 to 1861) until 1869. In the Occident, its founder and editor editorialized on the burning issues of the day such as Saturday closing laws, the role of religion in the public schools, the need to build up Jewish education, establish a rabbinical seminary, support charities, and otherwise strengthen Jewish communal ties.

Subscription lists demonstrate that the Occident circulated to the farthest reaches of the pioneer West, from Canada to the Caribbean islands, and across the Atlantic to England and Western Europe. Both Jews and non-Jews subscribed to and read the Occident. Letters from Christian ministers, for example, posing questions about Jewish doctrines and practices can be found among Leeser’s personal correspondence and in print on the pages of the Occident. As a news source, the Occident also found its way into the non-Jewish press through reprinting of its content. In short, the Occident provided a (semi-) neutral meeting place for Jews and non-Jewish readers as well as for Jews themselves.

Philadelphia was among the most important publishing centers in the United States in the Victorian era, and this also held true for Jewish publishing.

The city’s Jewish leaders maintained an almost unbroken chain of Jewish journalism, dating from Leeser’s Occident in 1843 and continuing into the twenty-first century:

1843–1869: The Occident and American Jewish Advocate, edited by Isaac Leeser (Mayer Sulzberger served as editor for the final year of publication [1868–1869] after Leeser’s death in fulfillment of a pledge to his mentor.)

1872–1873: The Jewish Index, edited by Samuel Mendelsohn and Maurice Lam under the supervision of Sabato Morais, who ultimately wound up writing most of the content

1875–1886: The Philadelphia Jewish Record, edited by Alfred T. Jones

1887–present: The Philadelphia Jewish Exponent, edited by Charles Hoffman and Henry S. Morais, inter alia

As a publisher of Victorian Jewish religious works in antebellum America, Leeser was peerless. Between 1837 and 1838, he produced an English translation, in six volumes, of the Sephardic prayer book Sifte tsadikim (Lips of the Righteous) bound in tooled, gold-embossed leather. Leeser’s text, in turn, relied upon the first English translation, produced by David Levi, one of the leading figures of enlightened Jewish London, in the late eighteenth century. In 1839, Leeser published the first American Jewish catechism, and in 1848, he published an English translation of the Ashkenazic prayer book Dibre tsadikim (Words of the Righteous), bound in red Moroccan leather and also embossed in gold. Both his Sephardic and Ashkenazic liturgies moved in their pagination from right to left like a traditional Jewish text, yet were accompanied by a vernacular translation on the facing page. His Jewish Bible translations, first of the Pentateuch in 1845 and later of the entire Hebrew Bible, the famous “Leeser Bible,” published in Philadelphia in 1853, became the standard Bible editions in English read by Jews in the second half of the nineteenth century.

The first American Jewish Publication Society (AJPS) was established in Philadelphia by Leeser in 1845. In the AJPS’s constitution, Leeser declared the purpose of this enterprise as twofold: “to obtain a knowledge of the faith and proper weapons to defend it [Judaism] against the assaults of proselytizers on the one side and of infidels [Reformers] on the other.” To launch the society, Leeser introduced a serialized publication that he titled the Jew-
ish Miscellany, of which seven numbers appeared between 1845 and 1848. In this series, Leeser selected for publication and/or reprinting works by notable Anglo-Jewish authors including Grace Aguilar, Charlotte Elizabeth, Marion Moss Hartog, Hyman Hurwitz, and Moses Samuels.55

Thus, among the key ingredients supporting the reading activities of Jews living in Victorian Philadelphia were their own entrepreneurial efforts. They printed religious and educational materials, published newspapers and monographs, purchased additional books from abroad, and established schools, libraries, and literary associations as sites for meeting, reading, and discussing what was being read.54

A Renaissance of Jewish Reading

Beginning with Rebecca Gratz55 and Isaac Leeser in the 1830s, the first generation of this Philadelphia group created the educational institutional infrastructures of Philadelphia’s organized Jewish community. Sabato Morais, Leeser’s successor at Mikveh Israel, later infused these forms with his own Sephardic rabbinic humanist content and played a critical role in the shaping of Jewish reading activities in the second half of the nineteenth century. Where Gratz and Leeser built institutions, Morais raised disciples. To do so, Morais drew upon his own background and training in classical rabbinic, Sephardic, and Italian religious humanist sources to implement a new program of Jewish cultural regeneration.

Morais was born in the port city of Livorno on the western coast of Tuscany in 1823. After receiving his rabbinical certification, he found work in London as a teacher at the Sephardic congregation’s Orphan Home from 1846 to 1851. Over the course of his six years there he became fluent in English and began delivering well-received public addresses in his adopted language. In March of 1851, he came to Philadelphia to apply for what had been Leeser’s position at Mikveh Israel. Morais remained employed there, despite some periods of controversy (during the Civil War, for example, he was silenced for preaching in support of Lincoln and the Union cause), until his death in 1897 at the age of seventy-four. Morais’ near half-century tenure, as Pamela Nadell has observed, was the longest continuous ministry sustained by any American rabbi during that time.56

Over time, Morais emerged as the mentor, teacher, guiding force, and religious leader of a group of young activists who took up the call to produce what he called a “regenerated” version of observant Judaism planted in American soil. From the first year of his arrival in 1851 until his death in November of 1897, Morais programmatically advanced his Italian Sephardic heritage as a basis for this version of Jewish religious Americanization. In particular, he turned to literary associations to cultivate this new generation of young people and instruct them how to be ritually observant and culturally refined, how to be pious and enlightened, in essence how to be a modern citizen and preserve Jewish tradition.

But why would young Jews trying to be modern and American want to imitate a medieval European model? And what did this group mean by the seemingly oxymoronic phrase “enlightened orthodoxy” eventually adopted to characterize its outlook? Superficially, one might think anyone living under the sway of the Enlightenment by definition would always reject revealed religion as irrational, as superstitious, and as a threat to freethinking, and would regard oneself as unbound by the traditions of the past. By contrast, is not a religiously observant Jew committed to a belief in divine revelation and historically obligated to practice mitzvot (that is, God’s commandments, as transmitted to Moses on Sinai and as interpreted by Jewish sages across the millennia) and not to freely choose his or her own lifestyle?

Here we find a set of tensions that goes to the heart of the meaning of “renaissance” in this Victorian Jewish context of reading. For our purposes, I would like to suggest that the term “renaissance” refers to a specific kind of appeal to the past and a specific set of activities—teaching, reading, translating, printing, publishing, preaching, and otherwise publicly communicating classic works of Judaism and Jewish thought. In Philadelphia, beginning in the 1850s, we find Morais programmatically transmitting traditional forms of Jewish religious learning in a new setting outside the synagogue and beit midrash (house of study): the literary association. It would be a mistake to characterize the literary association as a secularized form of the beit midrash. Sephardic culture did not require such a dichotomy between the synagogue and the world outside it, and such a harmonization had deep roots, both historically and intellectually, in Morais’ thinking. Indeed, there is clear and consistent evidence that Sephardic history, religion, and culture occupied a paradigmatic place in Morais’ neorabbinic humanist curriculum as a basis for religious Americanization. And significantly, some of the most important non-Jewish sources informing Morais’ thinking hark back to the intellectual heritage of the Italian renaissance in which he was raised—a legacy marked by the attempt to synthesize religious and humanist currents. Above all, this renaissance heritage, Jewish and non-Jewish, was intensely preoccupied with...
activities of reading, including the recovery of classical literary sources for study and publication and the critical preparation of manuscripts for printing. In speaking about the early Hebrew printers in Venice, for example, Morais once referred to the “critical minds” that revised the Masoretic Bible and its traditional commentaries, “freed them from the blunders of copyists,” and “disclosed in the Jews of Italy abilities of the highest order.” In these sentiments we find the pride he felt for his native Italian Jewish heritage as well as evidence of his early education in Livorno, where he was infused with this religious-humanist sensibility. The educational program Morais advanced in Philadelphia reflected his Sephardic-Italian upbringing. In his teachings, he rejected the more radical philosophies of secular Enlightenment otherwise pervasive in Continental Europe and America, which preached the autonomy of reason unbound by the demands of traditional religious authority. At the same time, he affirmed the critical role reason and historical criticism should play in shaping Jewish religious culture in America.

Common to the early Jewish leaders of the “Philadelphia Group” and their young pupils was precisely this embrace of classical learning—Jewish and non-Jewish—undergirded by a belief in reason in harmony with God’s revelation. They shared a belief in a forward-looking, progressive, messianic view of history but also believed in the binding character of the distinctive historical practices of Judaism and the obligation to preserve a separate Jewish national identity, charged with a special divine mission. Taken together, their programmatic efforts sought to give rebirth to observant Judaism in the open, democratic, voluntary environment of the United States. The term Morais introduced in 1851 to capture the spirit of this proposed rebirth was “regeneration.” He spoke of the “virgin soil” of America “in which the ritual system governing Judaism would be regenerated.” And he turned to the voluntary, social form of literary associations to help achieve this ambitious goal.

Historically, the concept of “regeneration” had already become widespread by the late eighteenth century. In relation to Jews, it referred especially to calls for their occupational diversification and social rehabilitation as a precondition or at minimum a preliminary step toward their political integration into European society. The term itself can be found in writings of a variety of different Enlightenment writers, including religious philosophers such as the Abbe Gregoire, who championed Jewish political emancipation. In Philadelphia, beyond the walls of the synagogue, literary societies would become a new site for promoting regeneration as a cultural and religious undertaking. Reading, it must be emphasized, was an extension of their religious identities, not a rejection or a secularization of them. Reading activities would be one of the most important means envisioned to help attain this fusion of the sacred and the putatively secular. In short, reading, as well as the production and/or importation of suitable reading materials, was crucial to the Philadelphia group’s pedagogic efforts to realize this internal harmonization of the classical and the contemporary, the particular and the universal, the revealed and the rational, the Jewish and the American.

Victorian Jewish Readers and Their Literary Associations

One distinctive feature of Victorian culture in general was a particular style of reading. Mary Kelley, in her study of reading habits among antebellum American women, has examined some of the characteristic features of their experiences. Kelley discovered, through a close study of diaries, letters, autograph albums, and journals, the hidden world of what she calls “reading women.” She has shown how women made the activity of reading into “a vehicle for what the Renaissance scholar Stephen Greenblatt has called ‘self-fashioning,’ namely the achievement of a distinctive personality, a particular address to the world, a way of acting and thinking.” Reading, Kelley explains, could be serious or playful, inward or political, private or public. In particular, Kelley writes, “sometimes books confirmed an already familiar identity. Sometimes, [books] became catalysts in the fashioning of alternative selves.”

To get a sense of what was read, Kelley surveyed the variety of reading materials women reported selecting (in their diaries, letters, and other sources) and argued for discontinuity between the revolutionary and Victorian reading eras: “in contrast to their seventeenth- and early-eighteenth century counterparts who devoted themselves primarily to religious literature, women readers active after the revolution began to immerse themselves in secular literature. The traditional ‘steady sellers,’ the Bibles, psalm books, and devotional works to which colonial Americans had devoted themselves still constituted an important share of their reading. Simultaneously, however, they read widely in history, biography, and travel literature.”

In a master’s thesis titled “Better and Wiser Daughters in Israel”: The Diaries of Fannie and Amelia J. Allen,” completed at the University of Pennsylvania in 1997, Idana Goldberg studied the phenomenon of reading as “self-fashioning” in the diaries of two Jewish sisters, Fannie and Amelia Allen. These sisters, living in mid-nineteenth-century Philadelphia, were committed to observing Jewish traditions and maintaining a distinctive Jew-
ish identity even as they acculturated into the American middle classes. According to Goldberg, we find the Allen sisters reading precisely in order to fashion their own identities as Jews, as women, and as Americans. In contrast to the processes of secularization and individualization implied by Kelley’s interpretation, the Allen sisters used reading to advance their social commitments, both to their religious/ethnic particularism and to the project of acculturation and refinement.

In Dianne Ashton’s pioneering study of Mary M. Cohen, based in part on a scrapbook Cohen kept, we find another example of a highly educated Victorian Jewish woman engaged in performative reading activities. The act of scrapbooking, like diary keeping, both of which were so much in vogue during the Victorian period, preserved material traces that document aspects of her reading practices. Unlike diaries, which contain handwritten, intensely personal reflections, scrapbooking was a visual medium, a compilation of acquired sources such as newspaper clippings, keepsakes, greeting cards, holiday memorabilia, broadsides, invitations, as well as more intimate, handwritten letters. In scrapbooks, in other words, we find not only excerpts and references to the bound, commercially available forms of what people read (i.e., books and serialized publications) but also the ephemeral contents of everyday life. These acts of reading, clipping, annotating, reordering through compilation and arrangement, pasting, and patterning generated new meanings as well as entirely unforeseen associations. By illustration, consider what can be gleaned from a handful of pages from Mary M. Cohen’s scrapbooks: on one sheet we find pasted a handwritten letter, dated June 1877, to her from Cyrus L. Sulzberger praising her for her “excellent article on ‘Jane Austen and her works.’” In a second scrapbook volume she kept, we learn that Mary published this piece about Austen under the pseudonym “Coralie” in the [North American] “Review.” On the reverse side of the first scrapbook page where she pasted Cyrus Sulzberger’s letter, we find a program for the “Sixth Entertainment” of the Young Men’s Hebrew Association in Philadelphia held two months earlier on March 20, 1877, publicizing a duo performance by “Miss Mary M. Cohen and Mr. William Stoll, Jr. on piano and violin, performing Osborne and de Beriot’s ‘I Puritani.’”65 And on another page, we find “Coralie” publishing her own rendering of Psalm 65 into English.66 In just a few juxtaposed pages we learn that “Miss Mary Cohen,” who was single, received flattering letters from her male admirers, that she played the piano (or violin), and that she did so well enough to perform contemporary “high culture” non-Jewish musical compositions at public entertainments for like-minded Jews. We learn that she was capable of reading and translating biblical verse from the original Hebrew, and that she not only read Jane Austen but published essays about her novels in nationally circulating non-Jewish newspapers. Perhaps most significant for our purposes is the discovery that, as an author, Cohen frequently published under a pseudonym.

Mary Cohen’s teacher, Sabato Morais, also acquired the Victorian habit of clipping and pasting. Thanks to his scrapbook, we now know of hundreds of articles he anonymously published in a variety of Jewish and non-Jewish newspapers and which he carefully annotated by hand and commented on in a ledger-size volume he kept. We also know, exclusively from marginal annotations he inscribed in his scrapbook, of the episode during the Civil War when he was forced to stop preaching and of the details of his plan for a uniform Jewish liturgy that he propounded in the 1870s. Common to both writers was the habit of publishing pseudonymously or anonymously. Though intensely public in their activities, they concealed their literary authorship. This self-abnegating habit, ironically, argues against the individualist notion that reading and writing activities were private and self-fashioning and suggests rather that the outward-directed selfless act of educating, rather than fame, was regarded as the most important virtue.

Recognizing the social dimensions and functions of Victorian Jewish reading activities is crucial to understanding the lived experiences of Jews in Philadelphia during this time. Though not quantifiable, it seems reasonable to assume that many American Jews, as an aspect of their acculturation, were engaged in practices similar to those of the Allen sisters, Mary M. Cohen, and Sabato Morais. At the immigrant level, reading offered an entrée into the unfamiliar world into which newcomers arrived as they adjusted to a new language and new surroundings. For native-born, English-speaking American Jews, the habit of reading (and the flood of discussions and debates that reading provoked) furthered the absorption of the mores, the morals and manners, and the expectations of the surrounding society. It also deepened the connections between these Jews and their non-Jewish neighbors. Through books and broadsides, through newspapers and literature, through translations and catechisms, and by clipping and pasting Jewish readers learned about themselves, tried to figure out who they wanted to be collectively and how they wanted to be seen. In short, reading provided Jews with a mode of “self-fashioning” both as individuals and as a community. Reading activities could be instructive or adaptive, purposeful or entertaining, silent or out loud, private or social. Reading activities ultimately served as social glue that
bound together the Jewish community, with all its internal fractures and differences, as each individual groped to make sense of his or her local environment and, consequently, what it meant to be Jewish collectively in America.

To do so, people of all kinds, both Jews and non-Jews, regularly sought out new forms of literary association outside traditional, especially religious, settings. Perhaps it should be recalled that the Victorian period in American history predates Andrew Carnegie and the building of the great system of public libraries at the end of the nineteenth century. Before then, it is not self-evident when and where people met to talk and read outside the marketplace, churches, and synagogues. And yet, as Alexis de Tocqueville was famous for observing in his Democracy in America, whose first edition appeared in 1835, Americans exhibited an unbelievable passion for associating and creating voluntary organizations of all kinds. Tocqueville defined the American penchant to “join” and to form voluntary associations of all kinds—“political, industrial, commercial, or even literary or scientific”—as one of the unique features of American democracy. “Americans,” he wrote, “of all ages, all stations in life, and all types of dispositions,” “are forever forming associations. . . . In every case, at the head of any undertaking, where in France you would find the government or in England some territorial magnate, in the United States you are sure to find an association.” In Tocqueville’s liberal understanding of American democracy, Jurgen Habermas explains, these “educated and powerful citizens were supposed to form an elite public (in view of the lack of aristocracy by birth) whose critical debate determined public opinion.”

The cultural life of Jews outside the American synagogue emerged in this public sphere under unprecedented conditions: Constitutional guarantees separating church from state; mass migration; opportunities for social mobility and voluntary affiliation; pluralism and lay-driven leadership patterns. Precisely because Jews in the United States historically enjoyed legal protections to associate voluntarily without interference from the state, new kinds of questions arose about the imperative to join Jewish organizations. As the level of affiliation with the chosen people in America became a matter of individual choice for Jews, a rationale was needed to explain and otherwise justify the meaning of that choice. The greater the openness of the American milieu to individual Jews (in terms of opportunities for social integration and material betterment), the greater became the perception by Jewish leaders of a threat to Jewish communal cohesion and survival. A new kind of question began to haunt Jews in America: “why be Jewish?” The answer was no longer a simple matter of birth and belief nor a consequence of being excluded from the majority culture. Even while many Jews believed in America as a land of freedom, in fact, America’s freedoms threatened the cohesion and the very existence of these Jews as an organized community.

In his 1835 circular announcing the American Jewish Publication Society, Leeser sought to remedy the problem through the medium of publishing as a form of association: “as associationalism has been found to produce a remarkable degree of success where individual efforts have failed, it was deemed highly probable that if Israelites were to unite for the encouragement of their own literature, they might speedily witness many beneficial effects of their union.” In contrast to Leeser’s relatively impersonal publishing efforts, Morais’ preferred solution—literary associations themselves—provided intimate, direct physical sites of sociability and orality beyond the printed page and unburdened by the demands of congregational affiliation to think about these questions.

The first (non-Jewish) reading society in Philadelphia, the “Junto,” was organized by Benjamin Franklin in 1727. In the colonial period leading up to the American Revolution (declared of course in Philadelphia in 1776), reading societies served a subversive, political function. In the case of the Junto, the names of its members and the subject matter discussed were often kept secret or just secret enough to attract the attention of potential members. As Scharf and Westcott record in their three-volume encyclopedic History of Philadelphia, published in 1884: “The artful founders knew the value of secrecy; and this was made on its elements, yet only to appear to stimulate interest among those who were admitted and lead outsiders to conjecture that it was of much importance. It existed until the war of the Revolution. . . . Morals, politics and natural philosophy were its themes.” There was more to it than that, as we now know. The Junto’s members played substantial roles in the rebellion against British rule. After the Revolution, the Junto was transformed into a more open institution, the subscription library.

While Jews had joined non-Jewish associations such as the Freemasons and learned institutions such as the American Philosophical Society in the eighteenth century, Jewish-identified voluntary associations beyond the walls of the synagogue only began to flourish later, in the setting of Victorian Philadelphia under the impact of population growth and cultural change. There were three generations of Victorian Jewish literary gatherings, with some overlap in their orientations: antebellum literary associations for mutual improvement; postbellum literary associations for educational uplift and social enter-
tainment; and thirdly, in the 1880s amidst the rising tide of mass migration, elite literary societies (as they then began calling themselves, shedding the earlier, more egalitarian language of association) named after cultural icons, as well as congregational literary societies, and the beginnings of immigrant literary societies.

The first generation appeared during the 1840s, and we have very little information about these societies, except to observe that they were coterminous with the rise of the other, non-Jewish literary societies during the same time. In the antebellum period, reading societies ceased to function as subversive instruments of revolution. In fact, a strange inversion and inward turn occurred as the stated aims of reading societies were domesticated to serve the social needs of individuals and their self-improvement. Nonetheless, reading itself at times could function as a vehicle for social protest, if not revolution. Sam Warner, in his *Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of Its Growth*, shows how books and newspapers sensitized people to social inequities and injustices afflicting the working poor (e.g., working conditions in the needle trades) by "shaping the sentimental consciences of readers" and spurring them to take action (e.g., the growth of unions during this time, ca. 1830s–1850).77

The earliest Jewish literary societies in Philadelphia were less political and more internally focused than the kinds of societies that existed in the eighteenth century. According to Henry Morais in his history of the Jews of Philadelphia, published in 1894, the city’s first Jewish literary association, a “Young Men’s [Literary] Society[,] was started in 1841 . . . [and another] society, bearing the Hebrew name of Ohabe Lemudah [Lovers of Religious learning], whose object was the ‘mutual improvement of its members’ was formed in May [of] 1844.” Morais also mentions a “Hebrew Literature Association,” started in 1850, and another called the Young Men’s Hebrew Literary Association, organized in 1855.78 As noted earlier, it was Henry Morais’ father who first turned to this generation of literary societies to cultivate a vanguard of young Jewish leaders.

What then did this teacher and regular speaker at literary societies read and impart? Part of the answer is easily traced from secondary works he drew upon in his published and unpublished writings, as well as from his correspondence, in which he cites or otherwise alludes to a wide-ranging variety of works of a Jewish and general nature. Another source is Morais’ personal library, albeit keeping in mind that not every book in one’s library has been read, and not everything one reads is found in one’s library.79 One of the few extant sources documenting the actual contents of Morais’ library collection, at least as it stood in the 1860s, is a pocket notebook he kept listing book purchases.80 Though limited to a few pages of brief entries, his notes reveal a thorough awareness of the most important works and currents that circulated in English-speaking Jewish intellectual circles. The notebook is inscribed “Catalogue of Religious Works (more particularly in the Jewish Religion),” but the fragmentary information shows that Morais possessed a large variety of volumes of a Jewish and a general nature. According to the list (which does not identify the specific editions),81 Morais purchased, inter alia, the seventeenth-century Dutch Sephardic printer Menasseh ben Israel’s famous biblical commentary *Conciliator*, the English translation of the *Phaedoon*, a dialogue on the immortality of the soul by Moses Mendelssohn, the eighteenth-century icon of Jewish enlightenment; the English translation of “Letters of [Certain Jews to Monseur] Voltaire” (an apologetic response to Voltaire’s attack on the Jews); David Levi’s “Dissertations” and “Letter to Joseph Priestly,” on the limits of deism and in defense of religious liberty; Robert Lowth’s “Isaiah” and “Hebrew Poetry”; Johann Herder’s “Spirit of Hebrew Poetry” (in English translation), treating the aesthetic dimensions of sacred scripture; Bernard Picart’s “Religious Ceremonies of All Nations” (in English translation); the “Political and Literary History of the Jews in Spain,” by Don Joseph Amador de Los Rios (in English translation); Georges-Bernard Depping’s “History of the Jews in the Middle Ages” (in English or French translation), with his notable sections on the economic history of the Jews; and various types of belles lettres, such as the Victorian Jewish poet and novelist Grace Aguilar’s “Women of Israel,” as well as a work by the famous American orator Edward Everett. Morais subscribed to various Jewish periodicals published in England and America (the *Voice of Jacob*, the *Hebrew Review*, the *Occident*, and the *Asmonean*). According to the notebook, he sought and may have acquired a copy of Julius Euer’s *Bibliothecaria*,82 one of the most important bibliographies of Hebrew printed books available in the nineteenth century. His notebook shows that he purchased many of these works from booksellers abroad in London, Paris, and Italy, as well as in the United States.83

There also appear entries for works concerning biblical philology, archaeology, and geology, including a clipping of an advertisement for “An Answer to Hugh Miller and Theoretic Geologists,” by Thomas Davies, and other works, mostly on the Bible, such as Sir Edward Stachiwy’s “Hebrew Politics in the Times of Sargon” and Isidore Kalisch’s “Historical Critical Commen-
Analyzing a purchase note for "One Thousand and One Arabian Nights" in the original Arabic published in four volumes, along with an Arabic grammar by Faris El Shidlac, which suggests that Morais had some facility with Arabic. Morais also kept abreast of Christian missionary and polemical tracts, such as Joseph Frey's "Letters and Articles on Judaism." Frey was a Jewish-born convert to Christianity and founder in April 1820 of the American Society for Meliorating the Condition of the Jews, a Christian missionary group.67 These kinds of reading materials formed the core of his personal library; he also made them available to visitors to his home, which served as a kind of informal literary salon where he tutored students.68 His daughter Nina continued this practice after moving to Minneapolis, where she hosted a weekly Sabbath study group at her home.67

A leather-bound notebook containing the loan entries made for the Hebrew Education Society “Maimonides College Library” during the 1880s discloses additional information about what Morais was reading and teaching.69 In August of 1880, for example, Morais borrowed a copy of “Mishnah Nezikin” (which contains, notably, the beloved ethical tractate called “Pirke Abot”), presumably for study and teaching. The latter purpose appears to be confirmed by his student Solomon Solis-Cohen’s renewing the same title in November of 1880. Additional entries show Morais having in his possession French and Hebrew editions of the travels of Benjamin of Tudela as well as the French translation of volume one of Maimonides’ Moreh Nebukhim (Guide of the Perplexed), with Salomon Munk’s notes. More surprising, perhaps, are notations during 1883 showing Morais borrowing a copy of Spinoza’s Ethics, providing evidence that he knew his work firsthand.70 To the right of the entry appears the number “546,” which was Morais’ home address on Fifth Street, suggesting he took the book home with him and did not merely consult it as a day loan in the Hebrew Education Society building. On August 28, 1884, we find on loan to Miss Gertrude Hahn, a member of Congregation Mikveh Israel, an unspecified work about the Inquisition, and in June of 1885, Cyrus Adler, a Morais disciple, borrowed the poetry of Dryden, and the works of Locke and Milton on education. This highly abbreviated list of reading materials speaks not only to what presumably was being read but also what was being discussed through direct instruction, public address, publications, and indirectly by allusion to the various sources and via informal conversation.

In the years following the Civil War, a second generation of Jewish literary associations formed in Philadelphia, and with them came a broader mission. In this period, the emphasis shifted from small-scale mutual improvement to strengthening Jewish community ties in general, both through opportunities for young, single Jews to meet and socialize with their coreligionists and through the acquisition of a more advanced, sophisticated understanding of Jewish history, culture, and learning. The establishment and development of these youth-oriented cultural and educational institutions, however, remained central to Morais’ implementation of his programmatic Sephardic vision of Jewish regeneration. There is clear historical evidence for his continuous efforts in this regard after the Civil War.

The first postbellum Jewish literary society in Philadelphia, named the “Hebrew Association,” appeared in 1873 and received Morais’ approbation and “active assistance.” Reportedly, Morais served as its president “for a while”71 and addressed the association’s members at all its meetings.72 On the broadside promoting the Hebrew Association, printed in Philadelphia in a variety of bold and italicized fonts of different sizes and dated December 15, 1873, we learn that its stated purpose was to “gain an insight into the Jewish learning of the past” through the study of all subjects that “may expand the range of human thought and impart a knowledge of what is good and useful.”73 The rallying cry at the end of the broadside summed up the spirit, if not the reality, of the association: “Fellow Israelites: Let us endeavor to rekindle the love of letters among those who have inherited a rich and varied literature.”74

The social composition of the membership, which “gradually increased until it numbered about fifty or more,” is not exactly known, but from the association’s published list of officers, we know that women did not hold leadership positions. Membership was not based exclusively on class, though clearly the association appealed to the wealthier members of Philadelphia Jewish society. Most telling perhaps was the relatively high subscription fee charged to help maintain the Hebrew Association’s library of “Standard works and Journals”; an “initiation fee of one dollar [caps in original] and a yearly subscription of three dollars payable by instalments [sic!] the first week of every month.”75

Nathan Weissenstein, the association’s founder, first president, and a student of Morais from the city’s Jewish Foster Home, was an exception to the social profile. The majority of the officers included the sons of prominent Jewish leaders. These young men, such as Lewis W. Steinbach, Hyman P. Binswanger, Harry B. Sommer, and David Solis-Cohen, also happened to be
Morais’ students from Congregation Mikveh Israel. Another officer, Jacob Voorsanger, would later become a prominent rabbi in San Francisco. Marcus E. Lam, a student of Morais from Maimonides College, served as secretary.56 Members met at different locations every two weeks, where they regularly heard lectures with a “Jewish tinge” and attended a variety of musical performances and recitals. Formal debates and informal, sometimes fiery arguments were also part of the social experience: “On a certain occasion, a Mr. Pearsall delivered a lecture,”6 in which he gave a clever expose—by means of stories—of Spiritualism. The address was exceedingly entertaining but it aroused the wrath of a certain Professor Rehn [Isaac Rehn was the president of the “Harmonial Society of Philadelphia”],67 a Spiritualist, who was at that time giving a series of séances at Handel and Haydn Hall. He [Rehn] argued against the speaker, and said that he had long been convinced of the truth of Spiritualism. This led to his engagement to speak at a subsequent meeting of the Association.68

A more famous and direct outgrowth of the Hebrew Association was the Young Men’s Hebrew Association (YMHA), established two years later in May of 1875. Many of the YMHA programs, according to its founders, were patterned on the activities of the Hebrew Association.69 The YMHA also drew its inspiration from the establishment of a YMHA in New York the previous year. In Philadelphia, most though not all (some Hebrew Association members did not embrace the new institution)100 of its founders previously belonged to the Hebrew Association. In the “Preamble to the Constitution and By-Laws” of the YMHA we learn that membership was by subscription and that the purpose of the society was “to promote a higher culture among the young men and to unite them in a liberal organization which shall tend to their moral, intellectual, and social improvement, hereby agree to form the Young Men’s Hebrew Association.” Women were not offered formal membership as “Active members,” a category reserved for “male Israelites” over the age of twenty. Still, women were quite active in its programming, both as planners and as speakers. Morais’ daughter Nina Morais, for example, received a prize for an essay she wrote and publicly delivered.101 Other women known to have been involved include the aforementioned Mary M. Cohen, her sister Katherine Cohen, Ida Casseres, Bessie Davidson, Freda Jonas, Clara Kaufman, Esther Solis, Ida Sternsteine, and Julia Weiler. The YMHA regularly presented lectures “on Jewish and current topics,” held “entertainments of a social, musical, dramatic, and literary character,” and had an “Associate Organization or branch, composed of junior members between the ages of 16 and 21 years”—a group that included young women. The YMHA, thus, was a meeting place outside the synagogue where Jewish teenagers and young men and women in their twenties could socialize, read, perform, debate, and promote their distinctive cultural and religious identities.

Reading in these public settings was often out loud or performed, especially in the form of public addresses and musical entertainments, in which sheet music reading played a critical role.122 In Mary M. Cohen’s scrapbook, we find a program for the “Young Men’s Hebrew Association. Season 1877-78,” whose opening entertainment on “Tuesday Ev’n October 2d, 1877 at Musical Fund Hall” featured Franz von Suppe’s comic opera Fantanitza arranged by H. Hahn, with accompanying orchestra; an address by Mayer Sulzberger, followed by Miss C. Long singing “Bliss Forever Past”; then a performance of the French composer Daniel Francois Auber’s overture Le Cheval de Bronze (The Bronze Horse); A. Roggenburger performed a violin solo composed by the Belgian composer Charles August De Beriot, and Julius Kaufman gave a recitation of “The Ghost” by Gaetano Donizetti, another famous composer, from Bergamo, near Milan. Between Auber’s overture and De Beriot’s “6th Air” violin solo, Emanuel Cohen, the future husband of Nina Morais, read his first-prize essay, “The Philosophy of Carlyle,” to the audience. By 1877, two years after its founding, the association already was hosting such extravagant programs and publishing its own monthly literary review. Beginning in 1881, the YMHA began publishing a bimonthly called the Association Bulletin, but it only survived two years.131

As the title of the “Young” Men’s Hebrew Association explicitly states, and as its constitution and by-laws confirm, these Jewish literary societies clearly represented a youth-driven push for new forms of sociability. Note, however, that the early officer and membership lists of the YMHA demonstrate that the preponderance of the young men and women active in the Philadelphia YMHA were affiliated with Congregation Mikveh Israel, or otherwise knew Morais from his involvement with them at the Hebrew Association, as a teacher at the Hebrew Sunday School, at the Hebrew Education Society, at the Jewish Foster Home, and/or at Maimonides College.141 The YMHA librarians, for example—first Jacob Voorsanger, followed by Lewis Steinbach, on the recommendation of Ellen Philips, the superintendent of the Hebrew Sunday School Society—were both former Hebrew Association members. The leading spirit of this generation’s keeper of the books was Nathan Weissenstein, “an alumnus of the Jewish Foster Home, intensely religious, full of Hebraic zeal, but of frail physique.” (He died three years later in 1878.) Weis-
senstein also had served as the first librarian of the Hebrew Sunday School Society when it launched its library.\textsuperscript{105}

Weissenstein, a Morais’ Foster Home pupil, reportedly was credited by the majority of his peers as being the chief founder of the Ymha. Nonetheless, Mayer Sulzberger, the first president of the Ymha, a disciple of Isaac Leeser, and witness to the controversies of the 1850s that divided Leeser and Morais loyalists, is generally recognized to have been the most important intellectual and administrative figure in the growth of the Philadelphia Ymha. At the same time, Morais remained a behind-the-scenes mentor and supporter of the Ymha and also delivered innumerable public lectures before its members.

By the end of the 1870s, the literary associations had taken on a new role as the locus for planning public events. During this time, organized missionary activities and anti-Jewish discrimination was growing. The evangelical preaching of Moody and Sankey, for example, at mass outdoor events that attracted thousands, was the most visible face of these Protestant revival movements.\textsuperscript{106} These revivals did not leave Philadelphia’s Jewish community unaffected, and the young people involved with the Ymha launched a counteroffensive for what they called a “revived Judaism.”\textsuperscript{107} Speaking out from their literary societies, they pledged to defend Jews and Judaism against the newly intensifying threats of conversion and other forms of anti-Jewish hostility.\textsuperscript{108}

According to documents discovered by Jonathan Sarna, a select group of members of the Ymhas of Philadelphia and New York joined together in October of 1879 to form a secret society called Keyam Dishmaya (from the Aramaic, meaning roughly “rise up for the sake of Heaven”)\textsuperscript{109} with the aim of promoting Sabbath observance, reviving Jewish ritual observances, and resisting these new threats to Jewish life. These young activists called for a “Grand Revival of the Jewish National Holiday of Chanukah” to be held at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia on December 16, 1879.\textsuperscript{110} In subsequent years, Sarna points out, Cyrus Adler (a Morais disciple) would refer to their “revival of Jewish learning” as an American Jewish “renaissance” that pointed back to the events of 1879.\textsuperscript{111}

This revival of Jewish learning, I would like to suggest, did not stem only from resistance to imminent threats and forces. In Philadelphia, at least, it also harked back to and reflected the decades of religious and cultural education Morais self-consciously nurtured in the young activists. The program Morais launched in the 1850s to cultivate a new generation of young Jewish leaders, to inculcate in them a sense of duty toward Jewish traditions, and to regenerate through them ritual observances in America preceded and condi-
tioned the forms of resistance we find at the end of the 1870s. This is not to argue for a “great man” version of Victorian Jewish acculturation in Philadelphia, however charismatic and beloved Morais may have been; rather, it reinforces the argument for the isomorphic appeal of his teachings with the cultural situation of the time.

During the 1880s, a third generation of Jewish literary societies came to the fore in Philadelphia. These societies often were named after famous literary and political figures that were becoming canonical during the last two decades of the century. Acculturated Victorian Jews exhibited a clear desire to identify themselves with these non-Jewish icons. Among the names of this generation’s Jewish literary societies were the “Irving,” named after the author Washington Irving, whose presidents, David Solis-Cohen and Harry B. Sommers, formerly served as officers at the original Hebrew Association; the “Whittier Society,” after the poet James Greenleaf Whittier; the “Longfellow,” after Henry Wadsworth Longfellow; the “Tennyson,” after Lord Alfred Tennyson; and the “Robert Browning Society.” There were also Jewish literary societies and social clubs named explicitly after Jews, suggesting that already in the 1880s the formation of a kind of parallel Jewish cultural canon was under way. These included a “Leeser Society” (it would seem that Leeser was already becoming a canonical figure for American Jews within twenty years of his death); and nearby, in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, we find a Moses Mendelssohn literary society. Among the Jewish social clubs that existed in Philadelphia during the 1880s, we find the “Montefiore Social” and the “D’Israeli Society,” named, respectively, after nineteenth-century England’s most famous Jew and Jewish convert (who nonetheless was claimed as “Jewish” for the political successes and heights he attained). In addition to these extra-synagogal literary associations, there were also a number of associations connected with Philadelphia’s synagogues. Among them were the Auxiliary Association of Rodeph Shalom, which then became the Jewish Culture Association; the Mikveh Israel Association; Adath Jeshurun’s “Our Students of Jewish History”; and the “Knowledge Seekers,” attached to the Reform congregation Keneseth Israel (under the leadership of Rabbi Joseph Krauskopf, the first American-born ordained Reform rabbi) and which later was called the Lyceum.\textsuperscript{112} Perhaps the most innovative change within the Victorian Jewish cultural model was the founding of an immigrant “Hebrew Literature Society” in 1888, which itself was an outgrowth of a library established by garment workers and cigar makers in 1887.\textsuperscript{113}

As part of their stated mission, all these literary societies began building
libraries to supply their reading rooms. Perhaps the single most important private collection of books and pamphlets of Judaica Americana assembled in the nineteenth century belonged to the aforementioned editor of the *Occident*, Isaac Leeser. His personal collection grew over the years as he became a well-known personality to whom various works were sent for publication or review. After Leeser’s death in February of 1868, the lifetime bachelor bequeathed his collection to Maimonides College, one of his most cherished achievements as an institution builder. For Leeser, the building up of the college’s library was of prime importance. Leeser’s personal library came to form the core collection of the college’s holdings, supplemented by new acquisitions. When Maimonides College closed in 1873, five years after Leeser’s death, the Maimonides College Library, also known as the “Leeser library,” was transferred to the Hebrew Education Society, another of Leeser’s pioneer institutions. The Hebrew Education Society/Leeser Library continued to grow until 1912, when, in a public ceremony, it was formally transferred to the newly established Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, with Cyrus Adler, the college’s first operating president, presiding. The Leeser Library today forms the core of the Dropsie collection of Judaica Americana, which now belongs to the library at the Herbert D. Katz Center for Advanced Judaic Studies at the University of Pennsylvania.

Today, the two most important private collections of nineteenth-century Judaica Americana—those of Leeser and Joshua I. Cohen—are held under one roof at the Library at the Katz Center at the University of Pennsylvania. Together with the collections at Gratz College, the Philadelphia Jewish Archives Center at Temple University, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Library Company, the Rosenbach Museum and Library, the American Philosophical Society, the Free Library of Philadelphia, and in conjunction with many of the historic synagogue archives in the city, Philadelphia is home to the incunabula of Victorian Jewish cultural production. In short, what was read and what was printed in Philadelphia forms the basis for any serious inquiry into the history of reading and Jewish readers in the Victorian world.

**Postscript**

The Leeser Library and personal papers collection are how I came to know Leah Levitz Fishbane. Early on in her graduate career Leah came to Philadelphia to research the Philadelphia group and the renaissance and revival of Jewish learning associated with them. In 2006, the Penn Libraries hired her to work on our newly formed “American Genizah Project,” whose pilot archival collection for cataloging, transcription, and digitization was that of Isaac Leeser. Leah made significant contributions to the development of our cataloging template and was the first to provide transcriptions in Hebrew font of original material. Her participation in our project will not be forgotten, and her memory will remain for a blessing.

**NOTES**

1. I would like to express my deep appreciation to Eitan Fishbane, Adam Mendelsohn, and Jonathan Sarna for their insightful criticisms and great encouragement in helping me to complete this essay.

2. This time period is often designated by the adjective “Victorian,” roughly corresponding to the reign of Queen Victoria (1837–1901). Scholars such as Carl Degler and Michel Foucault have enlarged the term’s scope to encompass social life in America and France during the same time period. See Carl Degler, “What Ought to Be and What Was: Women’s Sexuality in the Nineteenth Century,” *American Historical Review*, vol. 79, no. 5 (December 1974), pp. 146–90; Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977; 2nd edition, Vintage Books, 1995); idem, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978; 2nd edition, Vintage Books, 1990). In a broader sense, the term has come to refer to a geographical and cultural space, what has been called an “Atlantic community, a transatlantic culture that tells us more about Victorian attitudes and institutions than we could learn from a single nation.” See the introduction to *Victorian Women: A Documentary Account of Women’s Lives in Nineteenth-Century England, France and the United States*, ed. Eran Olalston Hellerstein, Leslie Parker Hume, and Karen M. Oppen (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1981). In speaking about a Victorian period in American history during the mid-nineteenth century, scholars like Daniel Ward Howe point to the emergence of American middle-class occupational patterns, such as entrance into the liberal professions (law, medicine, ministry and teaching); cultural phenomena such as fraternalism, voluntary and literary associations; and a variety of reform movements aimed at moral improvement and social control (e.g., the creation of asylums for the insane and the orphaned; penitentiaries and penal reform; the abolition of slavery, corporal punishment, and the death penalty; and the temperance movement). See the special issue on “Victorian Culture in America” edited by Daniel Walker Howe, *American Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 5 (December 1975), and especially Howe’s essay, “American Victorianism as a Culture,” pp. 507–32, reprinted with some modifications and additions as *Victorian America*, edited with an introductory essay by Daniel Walker Howe (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1976).


4. Chartier, introduction to A History of Reading in the West, pp. 3–5.


7. I refer here to literacy levels for Hebrew and/or English, both of which were assigned the status of literary languages during this time, unlike Yiddish, for example, which was treated by many in the accumulating classes as an unrefined “jargon.”


9. On the Dobson Bible, see most recently Yosef Goldman, Hebrew Printing in America, 1725–1966: A History and Annotated Bibliography, research and editing by Ari Kinsberg, 2 vols. (Brooklyn, NY: Yosef Goldman, 2006), vol. 1, p. 1, and entry four, p. 6. Goldman writes in his introduction to his first subject section (on Bibles), “We have not seen any copies of Dobson’s Bibles that contain evidence of Jewish ownership” (Goldman, Hebrew Printing, vol. 1, p. 1). For the copies at the University of Pennsylvania previously owned by Jews (call number: B875 1814), see the Penn Libraries Catalog (www.library.upenn.edu);

TITLE: Biblia Hebraica Torah, nevi'im kevim; secundum ultimam editionem Jos. Athææ, a Johanne Leusden denuo recognitam, recensita varisque notis latinis illustrata ab Everardo van der Hoogh, V. D. M.

PUBLISHER: Philadelphïæ: cura et impensis Thomæ Dobson edita ex Ædibus lapideïs. Typis Gulielmi Fry, MDCCXXIV.

RENAISSANCE OF JEWISH READERS / 99

DESCRIPTION: Book 2 v. 22 cm.

NOTES: First Hebrew Bible printed in America. v. 1–2 are from the collection of David Sulzberger, v. 1–2, c. 2 are from the collection of Robert Bearden, c. 2 is a gift of Cyrus Adler.

LOCAL NOTE(S): v. 1–2 (c. 1–2) is a gift of Cyrus Adler.

Similarly, among Judaica bibliographers, a distinction is sometimes made between Judaica and Hebraica. A modern Israeli publication written in Hebrew that is not preponderantly concerned with Jews or Judaism, therefore, would not fall into the category of "Judaica."


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PHILADELPHIA</th>
<th>UNITED STATES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF U.S. POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>5–6,000</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


12. For a discussion of some of these institutions, see Jewish Life in Philadelphia, 1810–1940, ed. Friedman. On the history of the Jewish Publication Society, including its forerunner, the American Jewish Publication Society, see Jonathan D. Sarna, JPS: The Americanization of Jewish Culture (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1989).

14. There have been a number of studies of Leerzer and the contents of the Occident. See Lance J. Sussman, Isaac Leerzer and the Making of American Judaism (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1995), passim, for the most authoritative study, and see further below.


24. For information about the Cohen family, see H. S. Morais, Jews of Philadelphia, pp. 64-69, and the Charles J. and Mary M. Cohen Collection at the CAJSL, MS 3, and the finding aid to the collection, Box 1, FF 1.

25. Letter from Samuel Mendelssohn (editor of the Jewish Index) to Mary Cohen, Philadelphia, November 22, 1872, written on the letterhead of the “Office of the Jewish Index, 413 Chestnut Street.” See Mary M. Cohen scrapbook, Charles and Mary M. Cohen Collection, CAJSL, Box 4.
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4 Preserving the Past to Fashion the Future

The Editorial Board of the Jewish Encyclopedia

American Jews in the twenty-first century take for granted the richness of Jewish cultural life. Institutions dedicated to Jewish life abound: those dedicated to Judaism, to Israel, to promoting justice, to defending Jewish interests, to Jewish learning, and to the arts. Some organizations promote specific religious denominations while others focus on serving the needs of subcommunities of Jews—Syrians, Russians, Israelis, intermarrieds, elderly, singles, gays and lesbians. In the early twenty-first century, this evolution continues with Jewish groups that coalesce around organic farming, meditation, and alternative music, to name just a few of the organizing venues for contemporary Jewish culture. The proliferation of Jewish film and arts festivals and the expansion of gourmet kosher food products are other ways in which contemporary Jews experience the breadth of Jewish cultural life.

As “People of the Book,” Jews have always been especially attuned to the literary riches of Jewish culture and to the power of the written word to disseminate it. Not surprisingly, the explosion of resources at the turn of the twenty-first century in this arena is astounding. The translation of sacred texts into English1 has rendered accessible so much of Jewish learning, and the publication of analytical works in Jewish history, thought, Bible studies, mysticism, literature, rabbinics, and more has made it possible for readers of all backgrounds and levels to gain access to Jewish knowledge. Scholarly works consider popular as well as high culture, with books on Jewish food, film, humor, comics, and theater found in bookstores alongside those on biblical wisdom literature or medieval liturgical poetry. Novels and short stories also abound, and Jewish children’s literature has come into its own. Whereas eighty years ago parents were hard-pressed to find picture books or English-language Jewish stories to tell their children, nowadays one can choose from hundreds of es-