

An Exchange of Letters between Gershom Scholem and Judah Goldin

YAACOB DWECK

"Goldin may be said, indeed, to have been the first American scholar to approach rabbinic literature, midrash in particular, as literature."¹

Judah Goldin approached his scholarly correspondence with the same literary cast of mind that he brought to rabbinics, as David Stern so memorably wrote. A series of letters that Goldin and Gershom Scholem exchanged during the summer of 1980 demonstrates how both scholars used their written communication as a medium of rebuke as well as clarification. Thus, the letters, which reveal two of the twentieth century's leading scholars of Jewish Studies discussing a third scholar of great stature—Harry Wolfson—are of both literary and historiographic interest. Both Goldin and Scholem thought long and hard about what they wrote to one another. Their exchanges support the conclusion that the Hebrew letter, a crucial means of scholarly debate since the Haskalah, if not earlier, continued to serve that purpose well into the modern era.

Over the course of a long career, Gershom Scholem wrote in many genres. His book reviews, however, were relatively few. After a flurry of largely scathing reviews in his early years, Scholem tended to write in seemingly every other genre—the article, the monograph, the catalogue, the survey, the encyclopedia entry, the published letter—except the book review. Moreover, he repeatedly turned down requests to review books in

I owe my knowledge of these letters to the generosity of Professor David Stern. I am grateful to Professor Daniel Abrams for his many kindnesses, and I am grateful to Professor Carolyn Yerkes for reading what I thought was a final draft; the usual caveats apply. The letters are preserved in Jerusalem, National Library of Israel, Gershom Scholem Papers, ARC 4* 1599 01 926. Folder, Goldin, Jehuda.

1. David Stern, "In Memoriam: Judah Goldin, 1914–1998," *JQR* 89.1–2 (1998): 1–2, here 2.

academic and nonacademic venues. Thus, it was somewhat out of the ordinary when in 1979 he published a review in the *Times Literary Supplement* of Leo Schwarz's *Wolfson of Harvard: Portrait of a Scholar*.² When the book appeared in print, both the book's author and its subject, Harry Austryn Wolfson, had already died.³ Scholem's review was sharp. He chastised Wolfson as someone who "hankered after gentile praise," and criticized Schwarz for failing to mention, much less engage with, the work of Wolfson's (and Scholem's) contemporary Leo Strauss. The matter would have likely ended there. An uncharitable review by a scholar in the pages of a magazine—except Judah Goldin would have none of it.

Scholem was at the height of his scholarly fame when he wrote the review. He held court in Jerusalem, where he regularly received American visitors, some of whom were scholars and others who were writers and intellectuals. Nevertheless, Goldin took Scholem to task. With the exception of a carefully phrased dissent by Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi in his study of Isaac Cardoso and a trenchant footnote in an article by Leon Wieseltier on Leopold Zunz, Goldin was the only American who dared criticize Scholem in public and in English.⁴

The matter of language was not trivial. Nearly twenty years earlier, in the late 1950s, at least four of Scholem's colleagues had had the temerity to criticize him: Barukh Kurzweil, R. J. Z. Werblowsky, Isaiah Tishby, and Isaiah Sonne. Some, like Kurzweil, had done so in a newspaper, while others like Werblowsky and Tishby, had done so in the pages of periodicals, and still others like Sonne, had reserved his rebuke for the chapters of an annual.⁵ These debates—about the theological foundations of Scholem's work and about his interpretation of Jewish messianism as it

2. Gershom Scholem, "The Sleuth from Slobodka," *Times Literary Supplement*, November 23, 1979, 16.

3. "Publisher's Note," in Leo W. Schwarz, *Wolfson of Harvard: Portrait of a Scholar* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1978), iii.

4. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *From Spanish Court to Italian Ghetto: Isaac Cardoso, a Study in Seventeenth-Century Marranism and Jewish Apologetics*, Columbia University Studies in Jewish History, Culture and Institutions 1 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 302, 312–31; Leon Wieseltier, "Etwas über die Jüdische Historik: Leopold Zunz and the Inception of Modern Jewish Historiography," *History and Theory* 20 (1981): 135–49, here 140 n. 14. Cf. Ismar Schorsch, "Scholem on Zunz: An Egregious Misreading," *Prooftexts* 38 (2020): 278–99. On Scholem and America, see Boaz Huss and Jonatan Meir, "'The Light Is Burning Pretty Low': The 1948 Correspondence between Samuel Lewis and Gershom Scholem," *Correspondences* 8 (2020): 45–72, and the literature cited there.

5. On the Scholem–Kurzweil debate, see Noam Zadoff, "The Debate between Baruch Kurzweil and Gershom Scholem on the Study of Sabbatianism" [Hebrew], *Kabbalah* 16 (2007): 299–360; for Werblowsky, see R. J. Zwi Werblowsky "Reflections on 'Sabbatai Sevi' by G. Scholem" [Hebrew], *Molad* 112 (1957): 539–46; for Tishby, see Isaiah Tishby, "On Gershom Scholem's Approach to the Study of Sabbatianism" [Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 28 (1958): 101–33; for Sonne, see Isaiah Sonne, "New Material on Sabbetai Sevi from a Notebook of R. Abraham Rovigo" [Hebrew], *Sefunot* 3–4 (1960): 62–67.

manifested itself in Sabbatianism and Hasidism—are part and parcel of the study of Jewish mysticism. They have attracted a substantial amount of commentary in their own right and repay repeated reading. The crucial point is that these debates took place in Hebrew and were largely unknown beyond the confines of the academy or the Hebrew reading public.

The version of Scholem available to English readers—both in his own writings and in those by others about him—differed markedly from the Hebrew works. Rather than cast himself as a scholar who worked alongside and among many other scholars, Scholem presented himself as a solitary heretic who wrote against the grain.⁶ Moreover, he actively encouraged a whole array of intellectuals and scholars to fashion their portraits of him in a similar manner. In their reviews, profiles, and interviews, American intellectuals such as Harold Bloom, George Steiner, and Cynthia Ozick wrote admiringly and uncritically about Scholem.⁷ The very same month that Scholem and Goldin engaged in their exchange about Harry Wolfson, Cynthia Ozick had written to Scholem after a visit in Jerusalem: “The pinnacle of our time abroad was the supernal hours spent with you and Mrs. Scholem.... Having been appointed Ambassador by you, I have now fulfilled my tasks.” She then went on to detail the various errands she had performed as his publicist in New York upon her return from Jerusalem.⁸

At the time Scholem was in his early eighties. A version of his autobiography, *Von Berlin nach Jerusalem*, was about to appear in English, and the first book-length study about him, David Biale’s *Gershom Scholem: Kabbalah and Counter-History*, had just appeared. In a review of the English translation of the autobiography, *From Berlin to Jerusalem*, Arnaldo Momigliano described *Gershom Scholem: Kabbalah and Counter-History* as only a confirmation “of how remote most American Jews now are from nineteenth-century trends of German thought.”⁹ When Biale objected, Momigliano responded: “Professor Biale should really not confuse me with Herodotus nor himself with Scholem.”¹⁰

6. On Scholem and the Institute for the Study of Kabbalah, see Yonatan Meir and Shiniichi Yamamoto, “The Open Book: Gershom Scholem and Research on Sabbatianism” [Hebrew], in Gershom Scholem, *History of the Sabbatian Movement: Lectures Given at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1939–1940* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Schocken, 2018), 9–43.

7. George Steiner, “Inner Lights,” *New Yorker*, October 22, 1973, 152–74; Cynthia Ozick, “Slouching toward Smyrna,” *New York Times Book Review*, February 24, 1974, 27–28; Harold Bloom, ed., *Gershom Scholem* (New York: Chelsea House, 1987).

8. Letter from Cynthia Ozick to Gershom Scholem, dated July 22, 1980, which appeared in Gershom Scholem, *Briefe III (1971–1982)*, ed. Itta Shedletzky (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1999), 432.

9. Arnaldo Momigliano, “The Master of Mysticism,” *New York Review of Books*, December, 18, 1980.

10. Momigliano, *New York Review of Books*, April 30, 1981.

This was the milieu that Judah Goldin entered when he published his own review of Schwarz's biography in *The American Scholar*.¹¹ From their extant correspondence, it appears that Goldin and Scholem enjoyed a friendly if not particularly close relationship in the decades prior to this exchange.¹² Scholem was nearly two decades older than Goldin, and they studied adjacent but different periods. Both men, however, had an abiding interest in literature. And, as was the case with few other scholars of Jewish studies over the course of the past century, their scholarship had a literary quality to it.

Goldin's review, whose title "On the Sleuth of Slobodka and the Cortez of Kabbalah," made it clear that it was an explicit response to the review in the *Times Literary Supplement*, took Scholem to task on several counts. Goldin took umbrage at the fact that Scholem had singled out Wolfson for chasing after the accolades of gentiles. Goldin, who had lived and worked in the American university system for almost all of his adult life, spoke about the subject with frightening honesty. He made clear that it was hardly only Wolfson who hankered after gentile praise but every Jewish scholar of a Jewish subject who worked in an American university. Nor were Scholem and Goldin themselves, by implication, immune from this longing. Goldin wrote that, as a young man, Wolfson had fallen in love with American English, with philological rigor, and with Harvard University. And he had dedicated his entire life to scholarship, the results of which were nothing short of astonishing.

Scholem quipped about Wolfson that "there was always about him something of the air of an unfinished individual, a personality who had paid for his ambitions by sacrificing the fullness of life."¹³ Goldin roared back:

Nor is it particularly instructive to be informed "of the air of an unfinished individual" of paying "for his ambitions by sacrificing the fullness of life," (is there another form of payment?), every word of which is true. Who is a finished individual? The man who never marries but devotes his whole long life to creative study and teaching is doubtless unfinished. How about the man who marries a madwoman and in humiliation scurries to collect a hundred rabbinical signatures to be granted release to remarry, yet all the time produces important papers? Or the man who has no children? Or the scientist who can no longer satisfy even his mistress? Or the lady classicist who has never married because she has been too busy classifying artifacts from excavations? Everyone is unfinished,

11. Judah Goldin, "On the Sleuth of Slobodka and the Cortez of Kabbalah," *The American Scholar* 49 (1980): 391–404.

12. Gershom Scholem Papers, National Library of Israel, Jerusalem Arc. 4* 1599 01 926, Goldin, Jehuda.

13. Scholem, "Sleuth from Slobodka," 16.

and very likely everyone is saved from insanity or meaingless existence by being fragmentary, being consumed by the work he gives himself over to—which is to our profit also.¹⁴

Scholem concluded his review with a story about Wolfson delivering a talk at the Harvard Chapel. After showing him the short printed text, Wolfson asked Scholem, “What do you think I like best about this piece?” I [Scholem] must have looked helpless. He [Wolfson] said triumphantly: ‘You see, nobody will ever know whether I believe anything or not.’¹⁵ To this Goldin had responded in a somewhat jocular tone, “the tableau and comment with which Scholem ends his review are virtually a confrontation between the Litvak and the Yekke: both failed to understand one another, since the one was being witty and the other did not have a sense of humor.”¹⁶ As it emerges in the exchange of letters, Scholem was less than thrilled about being called a Yekke without a sense of humor in public. In his response Goldin took great pains to assure Scholem that he had not used the word Yekke as a slur.

Perhaps more than the substance and severity of Goldin’s response, perhaps even more than being called a Yekke in front of the gentiles in the pages of *The American Scholar*, Scholem took great offense at the title of Goldin’s article. In one sense, it is possible to read Scholem’s letter to Goldin as simply a demand along the lines of: *how dare you compare me to Cortés? He was a conquistador, and I am a scholar*. Even in 1980, only two years after the publication of *Orientalism* and well before the subaltern studies collective had transformed the historical study of empire, the name Cortés amounted to an epithet. But Goldin was not cowed, either by a phone conversation that he had had with Scholem before he published the review in *The American Scholar* or by Scholem’s letter. He answered Scholem in one of the most effective ways a scholar can respond in the heat of controversy: *Are you telling me you didn’t get the reference?* He then proceeded to use the most brutal weapon a scholar can deploy—condescension—and gave Scholem a basic lesson in the history of English literature and explained that the name Cortés was nothing other than a reference to a line in a poem by John Keats, “On First Looking into Chapman’s Homer.”

9 ביולי 1980

חבר יקר

אתמול קיבלתי את החוברת של *The American Scholar* בה נדפסה תשובתך למה שכתבתי ב TLS. לצערי אינני מסכים לאף אחת מהערותיך ושיפוטיך המכוונים נגדי.

14. Goldin, “On the Sleuth of Slobodka and the Cortez of Kabbalah,” 402.

15. Scholem, “Sleuth from Slobodka,” 16.

16. Goldin, “On the Sleuth of Slobodka and the Cortez of Kabbalah,” 403.

ולדעתי הסניגורים שלמדת על ליאו שווארץ שכתב ספר בינוני מאד שבבקורת נסיתי לדון איתו, עד כמה שיכולתי, לכף זכות. שנינו מנוגדים בהחלט בדעתנו על ספר זה, ובמדה רבה גם על גבורו של הספר. אתה חופשי לחשוב עלי מה שאתה רוצה – לקרוא אותי בכינוי Cortez של הקבלה, ודווקא Cortez על כל מה שכולל בשם זה! – אתה חופשי לא להתייחס בכובד ראש למשפט שכתבתי מתוך כובד ראש גמור ומתוך ידיעה מדויקת. כל זה מצער אותי (בלי ספק) אבל איננו משנה החבה. למדתי ממך שאני Yekke בלי a sense of humor ובשיפוט זה יש לך ודאי זכות ראשונים. אני (ולא אני בלבד!!) שמעתי פעמים אחדות מפי וולפסון את קטרונו המר לא על עיסוקו בקלאם Vietnam שלו אלא האוניברסיטה של הרווארד, והדברים חקוקים על לוח לבי, ומנעתי עצמי מלהביא אותם. ולא היה בכך כל הצלחה כשם שלא היתה הצלחה במה שאמר לי על הדרשה שלו. אבל מה יש להתווכח כאן? בברכה ושלוש גרשום שלום

יום ד' 30 ליולי 80

פרופ' שלום היקר

בחדשי הקיץ אין אני מבקר באוניברסיטא אלא לעתים רחוקות מאד, ואף אז למשל בספריה לבדוק משהו. ברם כאשר אני באתר אני פונה גם למשרד של המחלקה, בו תיבות הדואר. וכבר לפני שלוש מציאתי את מכתבך מ9 יולי בתוך תל של מכתבים. את מכתבך קראתי מיד, לכשחזרתי הביתה פניתי אל המכתבים האחרים ראשונה, ואח"כ שניתי ושלשתי בדברייך שהם מאליו ממין היותר חשובים לי. מובטחני ששנינו לא נשנה את השקפותינו לא על ספרו של שוורץ ולא על וולפסון מפני שגישותינו שונות בהחלט. על ספרו של שוורץ דנת ביחס למאמרים של ת"ח שהכרתים, ואותם המאמרים אינם "בינוניים" אלא לדעתי זיבורית, הן בלשונם, הן בסגנוניהם, והן בהשקפותיהם, ועל הספר כוונה אמרת (מה שאמת) שהוא gracious, intelligent, clean ולא שהוא מן הביוגרפיות המצוינות בעולם הספרות וכדומה. ובכן אני מחזיק בהערות של "ניקי" וכו' ולא באתי כעת לערער את הערכתך. גם משיחה הטלפונית כשאמרתי לי, אל תכתב בbitterness, אמרתי לך שלא השבתי ברוח זו אלא שאני חולק על השקפתך, ואמנם לידי אין נקודה זו העיקרית ברגע זה. ולא זו בלבד, אף לגבי וולפסון אין לי ידיעות המביאות אותי לשנות את דעתי עליו. מה שידעתי והרגשתי בעצמי אמרתי בפה מלא שלא הייתי מתלמידו או ממקורביו (אח"כ שמשך חייו כתב לי שנים-שלשה מכתבים קצרים ששמתחי לקבלם). אבל תהא זאת גוזמא שבגזומות לומר שקרוב הייתי אליו או לאלה שקרב לעצמו. מעולם לא שמעתי מפיו קטגוריא על הרוורד, להיפך! ובזאת איני נצב לסתור מה שאתה כותב על דבריו המרים אליך. (ואפשר שלפעמים היתה דעתו נוחה מהרוורד ולפעמים לא. תופעה זו שכיתה שקשה עם מוסדות ופרופסורים שאני מכיר – בקורת בחוץ והלל בפנים. וגם איפכא!) תגובה מכוונת לשני פרטים (1) כשכתבתי על שלום שהוא יעקב בלי הומור נתכוונתי ל-tableau שאתה יצרת, לא אני, במשפט האחרון בבקורת שלך. בכה בקעה ועלתה [2] התמונה לפני, על ידי הסיום. האם דברים אלה בגדר דברים אחרונים על וולפסון? הרושם שאני מקבל ממכתבך הלא שלא רק "בלי הומור" אלא המלה יעקב היא מעין זלוזל. צלצלתי לשנים מחברי שמוצאם מגרמניה ומדי פעם ופעם אני קורא הם יעקב בפניהם, ושאלתי אותם פשוט, האם מלה יעקב פגיעה בכבוד אדם. ענתה הראשונה בצחוק Judah, don't be silly: והשני אמר, לאו דווקא, הכל תלוי It all depends on the tone of voice. ומכיון שידעת וידוע אני שאיני מיקל

בכבודך (to put it mildly!) ולא מתוך קלות ראש כתבתי מה שכתבתי עליך, צר לי שהכאבתיך. אך בוודאי ובוודאי לא הייתה מטרתי לגרום עלבון או צער, כשם שמעולם לא הייתי סתם ופתאום אומר על וולפסון Litvak (האם במצפוני הגיתי ש"אם לא למעלה מזה" – זה עתה עולה על דעתי), כן לא היה עולה על דעתי פתאום וללא סיבה יעקע בלי הומור על שלום. ברי שכוונה לחדד וטיבו של אקט לחדד, ולכן עיינתי במילון Yiddish-English etc. של אוריאל ווינרייך, ואני מעתיק בדיוק את הגדרתו: יעקע, דאר – German Jew (hum.). לדין גם האינסטינקט שלי לא התעני. אף על אבק של הכלמה לא הרהרתי.

(2 Cortez – דווקא שם זה בכותרת למאמרי, בחרתי כדי להודיע מראש את הערצתי לאדם גדול שעלי לחלוק עליו. האם אינך מכיר מאין לקחתי את השם הזה? תמיהני. על John Keats שמעת. ועל הסוניטה שלו On First Looking into Chapman's Homer אני כמעט בטוח גם כן שמעת. – אני מפסיק כתיבה ביד זה להדפיס את השו"ר רות ש"פרצו" לתוך מאי בבואי לקרא שם למאמרי (שגיאתה של קיטס הם מן המפורר-סמות)

... Till I heard Chapman speak out loud and bold
Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
When a new planet swims into his ken;
Or like stout Cortez when with eagle eyes
He stared at the Pacific—and all his men
Look'd at each other with a wild surmise—
Silent, upon a peak in Darien.

כינאי של לעג כאן? אי כבוד? שחוק על לשון הזולת? "חפשי לחשוב עליך מה שאני רוצה? דוקא שורות אלה גרמו להחליף במקום
Sleuth of, sleuth from
לשם הקבלה כביכול של חצאי המשפט.

המכתב הזה ארוך כגלות. תחילה לא ידעתי (ואף עתה איני יודע) אם אתה מצפה לתשובה, או תהיה מרוצה בזה. אמרתי (והלואי שלא טעיתי) אולי יחשוב פרופ' שלום שאיני שם לב לדבריו. לא התחלתי מגילה זה עד שעברתי ולא פעם על מאמרך ב
TLS

ועל דברי ב

American Scholar

ועל מכתבך. הקדשתי זמן להתחשב עם האשמותיך. מעולם לא חשבתי שלא כתבתי בכובד ראש והוגן לי שמידה זכות תפשתי גם אני.
במיטב ברכות בכל רצון שלך, יהודה גולדין

9 July 1980

Dear Friend,

Yesterday I received the issue of *The American Scholar*, in which appeared your response to what I wrote in the TLS. Unfortunately I cannot agree to a single one of your criticisms and judgements directed at me, or to your defense of Leo Schwarz, who wrote a very mediocre book, which, in my review, I tried to treat charitably. The two of us clearly differ in our assessment of this book, and, to a certain degree as well, in our assess-

ment of its subject. You are free to think what you like about—but to call me the Cortez of Kabbalah, and specifically Cortez with all that is implied in that name!—you are also free not to take seriously a sentence I wrote in all seriousness and with great precision; all of this pains me (without a doubt) but doesn't change my affection. I learned from you that I am a Yekke with *no sense of humor*, and this judgment is certainly yours to make.

I (and I am not alone in this!!) heard several times from Wolfson the bitter complaints about his dealings not with the Kalam, his Vietnam, but with Harvard University, and his words are etched in my mind, but I restrained myself from quoting them. But this was no quip, just as what I had said about his sermon was not a quip. But what is there to argue about here?

With all good wishes,
Gershom Scholem

Wednesday, July 30, 1980

Dear Professor Scholem,

In the summer months, I only come to the university on rare occasions, and even then only to check something in the library. But when I happen to be there I stop by the departmental office, where the mailboxes are located. And two days ago I discovered your letter from the 9th of July amongst a pile of correspondence. I read your letter immediately, and when I returned home, I first turned to the other letters before reading yours a second, and then a third time, because your words are of the utmost importance to me.

I have no doubt that the two of us will not change our opinions, either about Schwarz's book or about Wolfson because our approaches are so decidedly different. You judged Schwarz's book in the context of articles by several scholars I knew, and those articles are not mediocre but weak, in my opinion, in their language, their style and their philosophy; and about the book you intentionally said (which is true) that it is "gracious, intelligent, clean," and that it is not one of the great biographies in the world of literature, and so on. I agree with the evaluation "clean" and so on, and I have not come to question your evaluation. Even in our telephone conversation when you said to me don't write with "bitterness," I said to you that I had not responded in that spirit, but that I disagreed with your worldview. But I don't think this is the crucial issue right now, and moreover, even with regard to Wolfson, I don't have any information that would lead me to change my mind about him. What I knew and felt myself, I said explicitly since I was not one of his students or in his inner circle. (Later on, in old age, he wrote me two or three short letters which I was happy to receive.) But it would be a great exaggeration to say that I was close to him or to those that he drew near to himself. I never heard him complain about Harvard, to the contrary! But this doesn't contradict what you write about the bitter complaints he shared with you.

(Perhaps, sometimes he was happy at Harvard, and at other times, not. This is a common phenomenon with institutions among many Professors I know—criticism outside, praise inside. And also the opposite!)

Let me respond specifically to two points. 1) When I wrote that Scholem was a Yekke without a sense of humor, I was responding to the “tableau” that you, not me, had evoked in the last line of your review. With this in mind, an image occurred to me at the conclusion. Is this really the last word on Wolfson? The impression I got from your letter is that it was not only “without a sense of humor” but also that the word Yekke contained a hint of mockery. I telephoned two friends of mine who are of German origin and who I openly call Yekke, and I simply asked them is the word Yekke a slur. The first answered laughingly, “Judah, don’t be silly.” The second said, not necessarily, “it all depends on the tone of voice.”

And since you know full well and I know that I do not take your honor lightly (to put it mildly!), and I wrote what I wrote about you not out of any frivolity, nonetheless it aggrieves me that I have caused you pain. But in no way, shape, or form was my goal to cause humiliation or suffering, the same way I never would simply and suddenly call Wolfson a Litvak (did I subconsciously think something “even more extreme”—this I consider only now) so too I would never have suddenly said without any reason “a Yekke without a sense of humor” about Scholem. Obviously, intention is one thing and the nature of the act another, and so I looked in Uriel Weinrich’s *Yiddish-English Dictionary*, and I copy his definition precisely: *Yekke*, der – German Jew (hum.). For the record, my instinct did not mislead me. There was not even a trace of an affront in what I had thought.

2) Cortez—I specifically chose this name for the title of my article so as to indicate from the outset my admiration for the great man with whom I intended to argue. Do you not recognize the source of the name? I am surprised. You have heard of John Keats. And I am also certain that you have heard about his sonnet “On First Looking into Chapman’s Homer.” I am going to cease writing by hand in order to type up the lines that leapt into my head when it came time for me to give a title to my article (Keats’ mistake is one of the most celebrated).

... Till I heard Chapman speak out loud and bold
Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
When a new planet swims into his ken;
Or like stout Cortez when with eagle eyes
He stared at the Pacific—and all his men
Look’d at each other with a wild surmise—
Silent, upon a peak in Darien.

Like exile, this letter is long. At first I did not know (and even now I do not know) if you are expecting an answer, or if you will be pleased with this. I said (and I hope I am not mistaken) maybe Professor Scholem will think I am not paying attention to what he said. I did not begin this let-

ter without reviewing your article in the *TLS* and mine in *The American Scholar* and your letter. I have devoted time to your accusations. I never thought that I had written disrespectfully, and it seems that I too deserve the benefit of the doubt.

With all the best blessings for your every wish,
Judah Goldin

Bibliography

- Bloom, Harold, ed. *Gershom Scholem*. New York: Chelsea House, 1987.
- Huss, Boaz, and Jonatan Meir. "'The Light Is Burning Pretty Low': The 1948 Correspondence between Samuel Lewis and Gershom Scholem." *Correspondences* 8 (2020): 45–72.
- Goldin, Judah. "On the Sleuth of Slobodka and the Cortez of Kabbalah." *The American Scholar* 49 (1980): 391–404.
- Meir, Jonatan, and Shinichi Yamamoto. "The Open Book: Gershom Scholem and Research on Sabbatianism" [Hebrew]. In Gershom Scholem, *History of the Sabbatian Movement: Lectures Given at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1939–1940* [Hebrew], 9–43. Jerusalem: Schocken, 2018.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. "The Master of Mysticism." *New York Review of Books*, December 18, 1980.
- Ozick, Cynthia. "Slouching toward Smyrna." *New York Times Book Review*, February 24, 1974. 27–28.
- Scholem, Gershom. "The Sleuth from Slobodka." *Times Literary Supplement*, November 23, 1979, 16.
- . *Briefe III (1971–1982)*. Edited by Itta Shedletzky. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1999.
- Schorsch, Ismar. "Scholem on Zunz: An Egregious Misreading." *Prooftexts* 38 (2020): 278–99.
- Schwarz, Leo W. *Wolfson of Harvard: Portrait of a Scholar*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1978.
- Sonne, Isaiah. "New Material on Sabbetai Sevi from a Notebook of R. Abraham Rovigo" [Hebrew]. *Sefunot* 3–4 (1960): 41–69.
- Stern, David. "In Memoriam: Judah Goldin, 1914–1998." *JQR* 89.1–2 (1998): 1–2.
- Steiner, George. "Inner Lights." *New Yorker*, October 22, 1973, 152–74.
- Tishby, Isaiah. "On Gershom Scholem's Approach to the Study of Sabbatianism" [Hebrew]. *Tarbiz* 28 (1958): 101–33.
- Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. *From Spanish Court to Italian Ghetto: Isaac Cardoso, a Study in Seventeenth-Century Marranism and Jewish Apologetics*. Columbia University Studies in Jewish History, Culture and Institutions 1. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

- Werblowsky, R. J. Zwi. "Reflections on 'Sabbetai Sevi' by G. Scholem" [Hebrew]. *Molad* 112 (1957): 539–46.
- Wieseltier, Leon. "Etwas über die Judische Historik: Leopold Zunz and the Inception of Modern Jewish Historiography." *History and Theory* 20 (1981): 135–49.
- Zadoff, Noam. "The Debate between Baruch Kurzweil and Gershom Scholem on the Study of Sabbatianism" [Hebrew]. *Kabbalah* 16 (2007): 299–360.

