

Journal *of*  
JEWISH  
STUDIES

VOL. LXV | NO. 1 | SPRING 2014

OXFORD CENTRE FOR HEBREW AND JEWISH STUDIES

# Contributors

YEHUDIT HENSHKE

University of Haifa, Israel

ATAR LIVNEH

Ben-Gurion University, Israel

YARON Z. ELIAV

University of Michigan, USA

MICHAEL SHENKAR

Collège de France, Paris, France

AVRAHAM RAMI REINER

Ben-Gurion University, Israel

JONATHAN S. MILGRAM

Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, USA

JONATHAN JACOBS

Bar-Ilan University, Israel

YOSEF OFER

Bar-Ilan University, Israel

CHAVIVA LEVIN

Yeshiva University, New York, USA

C. PHILIPP E. NOTHAFT

Warburg Institute, University of London, UK

TAMAR WOLF-MONZON

Bar Ilan University, Israel

# Contents

The Byzantine Hebrew tradition as reflected in MS Cambridge of the Mishnah YEHUDIT HENSHKE	I
'United we stand': Israelite solidarity in two Jubilean clan rosters ATAR LIVNEH	26
Samuel Krauss and the early study of the physical world of the rabbis in Roman Palestine YARON Z. ELIAV	38
Yosef bar El'asa Artaka and the elusive Jewish Diaspora of pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia MICHAEL SHENKAR	58
From France to Provence: the assimilation of the Tosafists' innovations in the Provençal Talmudic tradition AVRAHAM RAMI REINER	77
The Talmudic hermeneutics of medieval Halakhic decision-making: 'compound ambiguities' and the reading practices of the <i>rishonim</i> JONATHAN S. MILGRAM	88
Nahmanides' addenda to his <i>Commentary on the Pentateuch</i> in light of MS Cambridge 525 JONATHAN JACOBS AND YOSEF OFER	113
Portrayal of Christians in Ephraim of Bonn's <i>Sefer Zekhira</i> : an alternate Ashkenazic voice CHAVIVA LEVIN	129
A tool for many purposes: Hermann Zoest and the medieval Christian appropriation of the Jewish calendar C. PHILIPP E. NOTHAFT	148
'Time for the Orient has come': The Orient as a spiritual-cultural domain in the work of Uri Zvi Grinberg TAMAR WOLF-MONZON	169

# Samuel Krauss and the early study of the physical world of the rabbis in Roman Palestine

YARON Z. ELIAV

**ABSTRACT** Samuel Krauss and his early-twentieth-century work *Talmudische Archäologie* gradually became the cornerstone of any research into the relationship between rabbinic texts and archaeology. Today, many consider him the founding father of the new field known as the Material Culture of Ancient Judaism. The current study investigates the development of Krauss's scholarly life, clarifying the various factors that prompted his interest in bringing rabbinic texts into conversation with physical remains, as well as reconstructing the intellectual milieu that shaped his research and methodology. In the process it also aims to dispel some of the inaccuracies that have become associated with Krauss over the years.

**S**AMUEL KRAUSS was born in 1866 in Ukk, a small village in Western Hungary. The sixth child of a simple yet typical Jewish family, he attended various traditional Jewish schools, before moving to Budapest at the age of 16 and embarking on the scholarly path known as *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. Krauss's academic career took him to Germany and back to Hungary, before he settled in Vienna in 1906, receiving a teaching position at the local rabbinical seminary, the Israelitisch-Theologische Lehranstalt. Twenty-six years later, Krauss became the head of the seminary and eventually its rector. There he witnessed the horrors of the Nazi rise to power, and shortly after the Kristallnacht in November 1938, he managed to escape to England, where he spent the last ten years of his life in Cambridge,

---

An expanded version of a lecture presented at Princeton University in November 2008, as part of a colloquium on rabbinic material culture organized by Peter Schäfer, Zeev Weiss, Catherine Hezser, and the author. My thanks to the participants of that conference and to the two anonymous readers of the journal for their judicious comments. All translations and mistakes are mine.

engaging with the university and the scholars there, although not in any formal capacity.<sup>1</sup>

Just over one hundred years ago, in 1910, Krauss published the first volume of what would become a three-volume work, *Talmudische Archäologie* (*TA*).<sup>2</sup> For the first time, a scholar attempted to document and reconstruct the entire physical landscape of ancient Jews living in Roman Palestine, as depicted in rabbinic literature – that is, during the first few centuries of the Common Era. Moving systematically, *TA* covers numerous aspects of human life, including dwellings, furniture, clothing, jewelry, cosmetics, food and utensils, as well as means of transportation, agricultural methods, medicine and death – to name some, but not all, of the most prominent topics. In this work, Krauss accomplished three impressive feats: first, he meticulously presented the various rabbinic sources on each subject, making a special effort to clarify the technical terms for and the taxonomy of the different physical items, largely unfamiliar to the twentieth-century ear; second, he strove to illustrate, or bring to life, the topics of his investigation with whatever archaeological remains were known in his time; and third, he wove all the details into a synthesized, rich and comprehensive picture. Occasionally, the author extended beyond the narrow confines of the physical realm to matters we would label today as social history. The long chapter on family life (*TA* II, pp. 1–54) provides a good example of such a digression, where the author discussed issues such as education and the discipline of children (*TA* II, pp. 18–22) or the status of women (*TA* II, pp. 43–50). But here, too, Krauss's methodology remained consistent, particularly in clarifying the vocabulary within the semantic field of the topic in rabbinic literature and then synthesizing the data into a fuller and coherent picture.

Soon after the completion of this monumental work in German, Krauss began working on a second edition, this time in Modern Hebrew, which he called *Qadmoniyot ha-Talmud* (*Qad*).<sup>3</sup> He envisioned this undertaking to be a complete revision of the German original, wider in scope, content and organization.<sup>4</sup> Many obstacles, however, delayed the conclusion of the second

1. The various Jewish encyclopedias normally devote short entries to summarize Krauss's life; see, e.g., *Encyclopedia Judaica* 10, cols 1248–50. For more elaborate details, see my discussions of his life below and the notes there (esp. n. 7).

2. S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie* (3 vols.; Leipzig: G. Fock, 1910–12) [*TA*].

3. Idem, *Qadmoniyot ha-Talmud* (2 vols, 4 parts; Odessa/Berlin/Vienna/Tel-Aviv, 1914–45) [*Qad*].

4. Krauss articulated his vision for this second edition in a short introduction, hidden in the

project: The first part of volume I appeared in Odessa in 1914, but then the turbulent years of World War I suspended the work, and the second part of volume II came out only ten years later in Berlin. Another few years passed before Devir, a Jewish publishing house in British Mandate Palestine, in the newly founded city of Tel Aviv, picked up the project and printed part one of volume II in 1929. But once again history thwarted Krauss's plans, and the second part of volume II was not published until 1945. By then the project came to a final halt and no further material from the Hebrew edition ever saw light. The Hebrew edition mostly corresponds to the first two-thirds of volume I of *TA* (up to p. 207), with one chapter on travel (*Qad.* I.1, pp. 114ff.) taken from volume II (*TA* II, pp. 317–49). It also adds a new opening section on the different forms of settlements as well as a section eulogizing Jerusalem (*Qad.* I.1, pp. 3–113), both missing from *TA*. The Hebrew edition, though smaller in size, is more comprehensive in its treatment of the various topics.<sup>5</sup>

Although praise was slow to come at first, the academic world eventually acknowledged that Krauss had achieved a breakthrough, recognizing his scholarship as an innovation worth pursuing; more recent scholars have even cherished him as the founding father of the ambitious new field called Jewish Material Culture (or תרבות חומרית in Hebrew).<sup>6</sup> His works, in both German and Hebrew, are now widely accepted and utilized.

But, at the same time, Krauss has also been misunderstood. Certain misconceptions and inaccuracies have prevented us from fully appreciating who Krauss was, what led him to initiate his pioneering scholarly projects, and finally why and in what ways he is still relevant to us. The following study wishes to place Krauss and his work in their immediate intellectual and scholarly contexts and to investigate the nature of his endeavour from

---

opening pages of volume II.1.

5. For example, the first chapter in *TA* dealing with caves is six pages long, roughly two pages of text and another four pages of notes (*TA* I, pp. 2–4, and notes on pp. 268–72), whereas the equivalent chapter in *Qad.* runs to ten pages.

6. For example, Daniel Sperber calls him 'the grand master of Talmudic realia'; see D. Sperber, *Nautica Talmudica* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1986), p. 10. See also idem, *Material Culture in Eretz-Israel during the Talmudic Period* (in Hebrew; 2 vols; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi and Bar Ilan, 1993–2006), pp. 1–4; P. Schäfer, *The Talmud Yerushalmi and Graeco-Roman Culture I* (Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 71; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), pp. 4–6. It should come as no surprise that in the most recent contribution to this field – C. Hezser (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) – the first sentence of the Introduction (p. 1) places the volume as a continuation of endeavours launched by Krauss.

within, based on who he was, what he produced, and what the factors were that shaped his interests and projects.

## Biographical and intellectual background

When he published the first volume of *TA*, at the age of 44, Krauss had only just landed his first real academic position four years earlier, at the rabbinical seminary in Vienna (in 1906). His life story up to this point, as well as his intellectual scope and research interests, mirrors the strides of a typical *Wissenschaft des Judentums* scholar.<sup>7</sup> Krauss's education was standard for an Orthodox boy in Hungary; he attended *Talmudei torah* and *yeshivot*, first in Jánosháza and then, starting at the age of 13, in Papaa, a town in north-west Hungary (the latter *yeshiva* was led at the time by the German rabbi Solomon Breuer, the son-in-law and successor of Samson Raphael Hirsch, a leader of German Orthodox Jews). With some variations, these institutions modelled their curriculum on a Lithuanian-style study of *gemara* – that is, Talmud – built on the exegesis of Solomon ben Isaac (Rashi, c. 1040–1105) and other medieval rabbinic commentators known as the *Rishonim*. In addition to this textually oriented study of the Talmud, the curriculum included *Poskim*, the medieval and early modern legal codes that provided talmudically based detailed manuals for Jewish life, by scholars such as Maimonides, the North African Isaac of Fez (the Rif), Jacob b. Asher, author of the compilation of laws known as the *Four Columns* (*Arba'a turim*), and the sixteenth-century scholar Joseph Caro, who produced the most widely accepted Jewish legal code, the *Shulhan arukh*.<sup>8</sup>

7. See J. Klausner, 'Professor Shmuel Krauss umifal hayav', *Sefer ha-yovel leprofessor Shmuel Krauss* (Jerusalem: Reuven Mass, 1937), p. ix. The biographical details that follow are taken from this piece and a few other sketches of Krauss that were produced mainly by his students; see A.R. Malakhi, 'Samuel Krauss', in S. Krauss, *Qorot battey ha-tefillah be-yisra'el* (New York: Ogen, 1955), pp. vii–xiv; R. Loewe, 'Foreword', in S. Krauss, *The Jewish–Christian Controversy* (ed. and rev. W. Horbury; Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), pp. vii–x. More work on the intricacies of Krauss's life could and should be carried out based on the vast archival information available at various libraries – including the National Library in Jerusalem, the Library of the University of Southampton, the New York Public Library, and elsewhere. Catherine Hezser's recent study on Krauss arrived after this article was accepted for publication; see C. Hezser, 'Samuel Krauss' Contribution to the Study of Ancient Judaism, Christianity, and Graeco-Roman Culture Within the Context of *Wissenschaft* Scholarship', *Modern Judaism* 33 (2013), pp. 301–31.

8. For a short summary and further bibliography, see Y.Z. Moskovits, 'The Yeshivot in Hungary in the 19th and 20th Centuries', in Anna Szalai (ed.), *In the Land of Hagar: The Jews of Hungary – History, Society, and Culture* (Tel Aviv: Beit Hatefutsoth, 2002), pp. 67–74; S. Stamper, *Lithuanian Yeshivas of*

Like many Jews of his generation, this kind of traditional learning failed to captivate Krauss's mind or aspirations. Upon reaching the impetuous age of 16, he moved to Budapest, enrolled in a gymnasium to fulfil the minimum requirements for a secular high-school diploma, and then after two years joined the local rabbinical seminary. By this time the Budapest seminary was already a respectable academic institution, far removed from the strictures of traditional Orthodox yeshivot. Krauss studied there with prominent Jewish scholars such as David Kaufmann (known for the Mishnah manuscript that carries his name, which he acquired in Italy in 1896 and then published in 1929),<sup>9</sup> and Wilhelm (Vilmos; in Hebrew Binyamin-Zeev) Bacher. Under their tutelage, Krauss trained in the classical methods of the *Wissenschaft* movement. He continued to focus on Jewish literature from the biblical to the medieval, with special emphasis on rabbinics, but now, unlike with his earlier, more traditional training, he engaged the ancient texts utilizing historical and philological tools.<sup>10</sup> Simultaneously, Kraus also attended classes on general history and theology (that is, Christian literature) at the local Budapest University. Here he also deepened his knowledge of classical languages, both Greek and Latin, which in Hungary, following the German model, he must have started while studying for the high-school diploma.<sup>11</sup>

After spending five years in these two institutions in Budapest, Krauss moved to Berlin and continued his studies; the curriculum he created combined Jewish scholarly disciplines at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums with general studies at the local university, and later at the university in Gießen as well. In 1893, he submitted his dissertation to that university. Nine years after taking the first step on the academic path, Krauss, now 27, received a doctorate. His dissertation, which five years later would become his first book – *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud*,

---

*the Nineteenth Century: Creating a Tradition of Learning* (trans. L. Taylor–Guthartz; Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2012), pp. 42–3.

9. See I. Ormos, 'David Kaufmann and His Collection', in É. Apor (ed.), *David Kaufmann Memorial Volume* (Kelteri Tanulmányok Oriental Studies 10; Budapest: MTKA, 2002), pp. 141–3.

10. A good account of the academic curriculum in the seminar is found in M. Carmilly-Weinberger (ed.), *The Rabbinical Seminary in Budapest 1877–1977* (New York: Sepher Hermon, 1986). Daniel Schwartz highlighted the historical–philological tradition of the Budapest seminary and explored its intellectual roots in his review of Carmilly-Weinberger's book; see *Zion* 53 (1988), pp. 447–9 (in Hebrew).

11. For classical education offered at Budapest University during Krauss's time, see T. Erdey-Grúz and K. Kulcsár (eds), *Science and Scholarship in Hungary* (2nd edn; Budapest: Corvina, 1975), pp. 346–9.

*Midrasch und Targum* – explored the Greek and Latin words embedded in rabbinic literature.<sup>12</sup>

Nowhere during these years did Krauss obtain any significant knowledge of archaeology. Nor, in fact, did he evince any interest in the subject. Berlin, where he studied from 1889 to 1893, was a celebrated centre of archaeological studies, a highly regarded and developed field of scholarship in Germany at that time; it was considered a ‘major academic discipline’ (*Großwissenschaft*), with museums, research institutions and, above all, university courses on the highest level.<sup>13</sup> Despite these rich offerings and plentiful opportunities, Krauss eschewed engagement with archaeology during those years – not because of a negative attitude towards the field, but simply because his interests lay elsewhere. By contrast, a quarter of a century later Eliezer Lipah Sukenik, who would eventually become a renowned Jewish archaeologist, travelled to the same Berlin to enhance his expertise in this very field.<sup>14</sup> The dissimilarity between Krauss and Sukenik reflects their different scholarly trajectories – the latter was an archaeologist, Krauss was not.

## Career

Krauss’s research in the first twelve years after the completion of his dissertation showed no sign of his future involvement with the physical realm of the ancients. Instead, like a typical member of the *Wissenschaft* scholarly community, his writing and teaching expanded over many topics. In particular, he seemed captivated by the relationships between Jews and Christians in antiquity: starting in 1892, Krauss published a series of articles in the journal *Jewish Quarterly Review* on Jews in the works of the Church Fathers, followed by individual studies on various authors such as Jerome; and then in 1902 a monograph on the life of Jesus, based on Jewish sources (like the

12. 2 vols; Berlin: Calvary, 1898–99; reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1987.

13. On archaeology in Germany during those years, see in detail S.L. Marchand, *Down from the Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996). Krauss also ignored archaeology while studying in Budapest, despite many possibilities for archaeological training, though fewer than in Berlin; see Erdey-Grúz and Kulcsár, *Science and Scholarship in Hungary*, pp. 369–70.

14. For Sukenik’s career and scholarship, see the various articles, both Hebrew and English, in his memorial volume: N. Avigad et al. (eds), *E.L. Sukenik Memorial Volume* (Eretz-Israel 8; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1967). See also N.A. Silberman, *A Prophet from Amongst You: The Life of Yigael Yadin – Soldier, Scholar, and Mythmaker of Modern Israel* (Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, 1993), pp. 7–27.

דברי ישר and others). But nowhere did he show the slightest interest in matters archaeological or physical.<sup>15</sup>

While his interests grew, numerous obstacles hindered Krauss's career. For 13 years he worked without a proper academic position, several times passed over when suitable posts opened. In 1903, to mention one example, the faculty of the Hochschule in Berlin offered Ismar Elbogen, eight years younger than Krauss, a position that Krauss had coveted.<sup>16</sup> Krauss spent this time teaching at the non-academic Teachers Seminary that functioned as an adjacent, but academically inferior, institution to the Rabbinic Seminary of Budapest.<sup>17</sup> He blamed this lengthy stay at a lesser institution on a combination of unfavourable reviews of his *Lehnwörter* and a lack of the right connections.

Only in 1906, at the age of 40, after Adolph Büchler left the Vienna seminary and moved to Jews' College in London, was Krauss invited to assume his friend's post – a position he then kept for the next three decades.<sup>18</sup> Many other hardships and disappointments clouded these years – stretches of poverty and despair during and after World War I; the stinging denial of more respectable, and more physically and financially secure, jobs in Jerusalem and then New York, which never quite materialized; and, finally, witnessing first-hand the burning of the Vienna seminary's great library during the Kristallnacht.<sup>19</sup>

Despite the vicissitudes of his career, Krauss's scholarly productivity was steady and impressive. By one count his publications number over a thousand pieces.<sup>20</sup> Throughout his forty-five years of essays, lectures, articles and books, he clung to lexicographical–linguistic tools and philological considerations.

15. A full list of Krauss's scholarly output during those years can be found in the bibliography prepared by his student at the Vienna seminar, Eliyahu Ashtor; see E. Strauss, *Bibliographie der Schriften Prof. Dr. Samuel Krauss' 1887–1937* (Vienna: Holzner, 1937).

16. See E. Ullendorff, 'The Berlin Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums: Marginalia, Personalities, Reminiscences', in G. Abramson and T. Parfitt (eds), *Jewish Education and Learning* (Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1995), pp. 198–9.

17. But one should also recognize that waiting many years for a position was not uncommon in those days, when Jewish Studies was only rarely taught at regular universities, and Jewish institutions were scarce. The Islamist Ignaz Goldziher, for example, one of the giants of nineteenth-century Jewish scholarship, waited 23 years until he got his position at the Budapest seminar; see Carmilly-Weinberger, 'One Hundred Years of Seminary in Retrospect', in idem, *The Rabbinical Seminary*, pp. 20–23.

18. The relation between the two, Büchler's departure to England and Krauss's arrival in Vienna, was already suggested by Daniel Schwartz (as in n. 10), p. 447 (in Hebrew).

19. Malakhi, 'Samuel Krauss', p. ix.

20. Strauss, *Bibliographie*.

Like other *Wissenschaft* scholars of his day, he saw his role primarily to detect, to philologically verify, and then to interpret, ancient terms and phrases, whether in Aramaic, Hebrew, Arabic, Greek or Latin (and, to a lesser degree, in other ancient languages as well). He also attempted to synthesize the data in order to shed useful light on ancient Jewish life. At times, Krauss also ventured into historical studies, whether to clarify the context of the terms he was studying or to elucidate figures and institutions of the Jewish past. His greatest scholarly achievement – the study of the physical world of the rabbis – which received its full expression in *TA* (although accompanied by numerous smaller studies), is best understood if seen within this spectrum of his broader career.

### *Talmudische Archäologie* – terminology and methodology

*TA* embodies the full scope of Krauss's scholarly priorities and displays both the apex of his work and its limitations. Despite the title's use of the term 'archaeology', this massive work only briefly and superficially touches upon actual physical remains. To Krauss, the term 'archaeology' did not mean the study of physical remains in and of itself, but rather stood for the totality of the real, daily world of the ancients, whether tangible or not. As mentioned above, the book covers areas that have no immediate connection to the physical realm, such as family life, and it includes discussions of many non-material aspects of human experience such as naming, age and lifespan, and the position of women in society.<sup>21</sup> Krauss considered all these to be 'archaeology'. It seems, therefore, that Krauss used this term in its Ancient Greek sense to designate antiquity (*Altertümer*), as, for example, in Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* (*Ioudaïkēs archaiologias*), and not in the disciplinary sense in which we use it today, as referring to tactile remains of the past. What may look to us like an anachronistic use of the term reverberated widely in the scholarly jargon of Krauss's time, and is also reflected in the word he chose for the title of the Hebrew version – *Qadmoniyot ha-Talmud* (Antiquities of the Talmud).<sup>22</sup>

21. *TA* II, pp. 12–8 (naming); 22–3 (age and life span); 43–50 (the position of women); etc.

22. Prof. Peter Schäfer first pointed out this possibility to me. It is hard to determine whether this is indeed the case for Krauss, as he was surely aware of both the chronological and the disciplinary registers of the word. When he discusses archaeology in the introduction to *TA* he seems to refer to the discipline, as for example when he lists it among the numerous branches of learning that

Regardless of its somewhat misleading terminology, Krauss's three-volume project explores the tangible, material world as it is depicted in rabbinic texts, with some attention, although much less exhaustive, to the Hebrew Bible.<sup>23</sup> Krauss rigorously studied these texts in the old-fashioned philological way, detecting variants and alternative versions in textual witnesses and comparing and analysing parallels. Reference to actual physical remains he restricted only to brief illustrations. To us, his conception of archaeology may seem overly simplistic, but we must be careful not to project our own wishes onto him; he was not, contrary to one recent study, an 'artifact-based scholar'.<sup>24</sup> Rather, he was mostly a text-based scholar, a Talmudist aiming to organize and explain all known information about the real world – the daily life of Jews – as registered in rabbinic literature. In itself, this project amounts to an important and innovative achievement. But while acknowledging Krauss's importance and contributions, let us not make him into something that he was not.

A close examination of *TA*'s part one – the first of the work's twelve parts – devoted to 'Habitation/Housing and Household Appliances' (*Wohnung und Hausgerät*; *TA* I, pp. 1–77), demonstrates the limited ways in which actual physical findings function in Krauss's work. The author divided this part into five subsections – non-permanent dwellings (caves, tents, huts), building materials, construction, surrounding areas and household appliances. He then further broke these five parts into 49 smaller chapters, systematically moving from the most rudimentary living places, the caves and tents, to actual houses. Dealing with the latter, which take up the bulk of the chapter, he began with materials – stones, bricks, wood and others – moved to the construction and foundations of buildings, and then meticulously discussed their various parts,

---

were required for his book (and apologizes that no one can expect him to master them all): 'Der Verfasser gibt sich bezüglich der Kenntnis so verschiedenartiger Realien keiner Täuschung hin, zumal im vorliegenden Falle, wo sie uns in einem fremden Idiom und nur in gelegentlichen Notizen überliefert werden. Man kann nicht zugleich Theologe, Philologe, Archäologe und auch Maurer, Schneider, Landwirt, Schmied, Musiker usw. sein' (*TA* I, p. ix). On the other hand, the various biblical archaeology books that Krauss consulted (which I discuss in detail below) explicitly assigned the *Altertümer* meaning to the word 'archaeology' in their title.

23. See *TA* I, p. vii, where Krauss succumbs to the romantic views of his time about the 'stability' of the Orient, which leads him to tie the biblical (First Temple) and even the pre-biblical ([sic!] 'vorbiblichen') to his own project about the Talmud.

24. See S. Fine, *Art and Judaism in the Greco-Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archaeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 34.

from the outside walls and roofs to the inside floors, ceilings and kitchens. The chapter concludes with utensils and furniture.

Such an organization of topics and titles may seem at first very similar to a modern archaeological discussion of buildings; the similarities, however, are quite deceptive. Take, for example, the first section of the chapter dealing with caves (*Höhle*; *TA* I, pp. 2–4). After a very general statement about the use of natural caves by human beings, Krauss opened the discussion by exploring the Hebrew and Aramaic terms for caves – מערה and מערתא – with reference to their equivalents in Syriac, Greek and Arabic. He then moved briefly to the physical landscape and mentioned in a few short sentences various caves that have served as dwellings, including the Hauran and the caves at Mar Saba in the Kidron valley (*TA* I, p. 3). In the Hebrew edition he added the caves of Marisa (Mareshah) and Petra (*Qad.* II.2., p. 216), as well as references to caves outside the region, in Armenia, Cappadocia and Africa (*Qad.* II.2., p. 216 n. 7). The entire discussion of the physical realm amounts to five lines and is limited to the introductory survey of the section. Having covered these preliminary topics – the etymological and the physical – Krauss devoted the bulk of the section to an examination of rabbinic references to caves. Here, too, he organized the discussion around terms the rabbis use to designate the parts of the cave – כהלים, דפנות, מכתשה, בור, שקיפים, גחרים and more – which Krauss, the expert lexicographer, laboured with great precision to define. To reach these lexicographical goals, he employed his vast knowledge of rabbinics, with constant reference to medieval commentators, textual variants and parallel sources. He also utilized classical sources in Greek and Latin, as well as Semitic material other than Hebrew and Aramaic, in order to shed further light on the meaning of these terms.

Krauss organized all twelve parts of *TA* in a similar vein. The core of the discussion relies on the terms and phrases gathered from rabbinic texts. Data from the physical landscape serves as a rather meagre illustration for the topic, usually in the introductory portion of each discussion. So, for instance, when he wrote about roofs and ceilings and came across rabbinic references to arches and domes, he offered parallel references from Greek and Latin literature as well as drawings of such elements from the Hauran (*TA* I, pp. 27–30). But he neither engaged in any serious investigation of chronological or typological developments of available archaeological material, nor seriously consider its relevance to his discussions. In the chapter on caves, similarly,

he showed no awareness of the chronological disparity between the burial caves from Marisa, mainly from the Hellenistic period, and those from Mar Saba, which are Byzantine, thus 500 years apart. He also, not surprisingly, neglected the functional difference between them – burial in Marisa, and residence for reclusive monks in Mar Saba.

### Scholarly contexts – models and influence

In many ways, *TA* serves as something of a thematic dictionary, a handbook. Though organized topically and not alphabetically like most dictionaries, it nevertheless seeks, above all else, to clarify and organize the *terminology* employed in rabbinic depictions of the physical world. As we have seen, regard to actual archaeological findings was minimal, sporadic and mainly illustrative. Detecting the lexicographical commitment, as well as the philological methodology, that defines Krauss's scholarship in *TA* places him in direct succession to another Hungarian scholar, a generation older, who overlapped with him for three years in Budapest before departing for New York: Alexander Kohut (1842–1894). The compiler and author of the first modern rabbinic dictionary, *'Arukh ha-shalem*, Kohut based his work on the same principles that would later guide Krauss's efforts in *TA*, especially the insistence that semantics, the meaning of words that people of a certain era used, held the key to the reconstruction of their world.<sup>25</sup> Krauss's dissertation and first published book, the *Lehnwörter*, can be seen as an extension of *'Arukh ha-shalem*, as it sets out to deepen our knowledge of one central strand of rabbinic vocabulary – the Greek and Latin loanwords. Later in his career Krauss also produced a supplement to the *'Arukh ha-shalem*, entitled *Tosfot he-Aruch*.<sup>26</sup> But in other projects too, *TA* included, one can detect the same intellectual proclivities and methodological foundations. Like Kohut, Krauss concentrated on words and their meanings, and then wove his historical reconstructions around them. Rather than physical artefacts, which stand at

25. Not much has been written about this pioneering figure of Jewish Studies. For a summary and bibliography, see the entry about him penned by Jack Riemer and Menahem Zevi Kaddari in *Encyclopedia Judaica* 10, cols 1149–52. Many interesting details are added by his second wife in the biography she wrote of her stepson, Kohut's son George; see R. Kohut, *His Father's House: The Story of George Alexander Kohut* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1938).

26. S. Krauss, *Sefer tosfot he-'aruch ha-shalem (Additamenta ad librum aruch completum; Alexanderi Kohut; Vienna: Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1937)*.

the core of recent material culture scholarship, the building blocks of Krauss's project were language and philology.

Despite his resolute attention to words, Krauss's decision to apply the lexicographical and philological model to matters related to physical objects required immersion in the realm of the tangible. He had no choice but to pursue material objects, documenting their appearance in rabbinic literature, navigating archaeological encyclopedias and guidebooks, finding comparable examples to illustrate the rabbinic material. This endeavour departed from the common grounds trotted by most Jewish scholars of his time. And so, the question remains – why did he do it?

Kohut's influence as manifested in Krauss's steadfast commitment to lexicography and philology cannot be overstated. But, in addition, in selecting this topic for his research, Krauss may very well have been inspired by one of his primary teachers in Budapest, David Kaufmann.<sup>27</sup> In 1901, only a couple of years after Kaufmann died at the age of 47, and more or less at the time that Krauss had begun to contemplate the project that would become *TA*, he produced a 60-page biography of Kaufmann.<sup>28</sup> The fifth

27. This source of influence on Krauss was already suggested by Steven Fine, although without the evidence I provide here; see Fine, *Art and Judaism*, pp. 17, 34. Other than the point about Kaufmann's inspiration of Krauss, I find myself disagreeing with Fine's reconstructions, which see the rabbinical seminar in Budapest in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as the 'focal point' for the process of 'integrat[ing] archaeological remains into its understanding of ancient Judaism' (p. 17), as well as his portrayal of Krauss (and Ludwig Blau) as 'artifact-based scholars' (p. 34). Kaufmann developed an interest in Jewish art that intensified through the many illustrated manuscripts he purchased (with the funds of his wife's wealthy family), eventually becoming the renowned 'Kaufmann Collection' donated by his mother-in-law to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He also published a few studies on this topic, most notably refuting, for the first time, the common opinion that Jews produced no art because of the Second Commandment, and thus he was labelled by some as 'the first Jewish art historian'. So far as I know, Krauss was the first to highlight the novelty in Kaufmann's approach to Jewish art; see S. Krauss, *David Kaufmann: Eine Biographie* (Berlin: Calvary, 1901), p. 45. This assessment was later adopted by others; see Carmilly-Weinberger, *The Rabbinical Seminary*, p. 20; M. Olin, *The Nation without Art: Examining Modern Discourse on Jewish Art* (Lincoln NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), pp. 73–98. But these were rather peripheral interests to Kaufmann, whose expansive scholarly efforts and vast labours were applied elsewhere. It is worth noting, for example, that in all his classes at the rabbinical seminary in Budapest he never taught a topic even remotely close to either art or archaeology. In the same vein, of the many dissertations produced by students at the Budapest seminary, only a handful dealt with archaeological topics, and only one (!) concerns a topic remotely associated with archaeology and the Talmud (hygiene, in 1893); see Carmilly-Weinberger, *The Rabbinical Seminary*, pp. 322–3. These modest numbers are in stark contrast to numerous dissertations on archaeological topics produced in other institutions (to be discussed later), thus refuting the notion that Budapest led the trend of incorporating archaeology into Jewish Studies. For a thorough, updated survey of Kaufmann's personal story and a well-balanced assessment of his academic work, see Ormos, 'David Kaufmann', pp. 125–96; for the list of classes and topics that Kaufmann taught at the seminary, see *ibid.*, pp. 128–30.

28. Krauss, *David Kaufmann*.

section of that short monograph (pp. 45–9) is quite revealing. In it, Krauss began by surveying Kaufmann's interests in art, his purchasing of illuminated manuscripts and other artistic artefacts, as well as his important contribution in refuting the perception (widely held at the time) that Judaism condemned artistic production. But then he went on to state that hand in hand with Kaufmann's interest in art was his research in archaeology (p. 45). Krauss tied this preoccupation with archaeology to the recent discovery of Jewish catacombs in the town of Venosa, in southern Italy, and the publication of its Hebrew (and other) inscriptions by Kaufmann's friend, the notable Jewish Italian linguist Graziadio Isaia Ascoli (who, we learn from Krauss, notified Kaufmann about the inscriptions and consulted with him regarding their content). 'As a result', Krauss wrote, 'his studies took on a definite direction and he was and remained the sole archaeologist of the past century'.<sup>29</sup> Krauss continued by detailing Kaufmann's travels to North Africa in the 1880s to observe the newly discovered mosaic floor in Hammam Lif (present-day Tunisia), belonging to the first ancient synagogue ever to be unearthed, and the controversy that ensued about its Jewish identity (p. 46).<sup>30</sup> Krauss also described Kaufmann's instrumental role in the establishment of the first Jewish Museum in Vienna (pp. 46–7), and concluded with what he saw as his teacher's legacy: 'There was no doubt in Kaufmann's mind that enough material for a Jewish archaeology is available in Jewish hands' (p. 48; *Kaufmann zweifelte nicht daran, daß in jüdischen Händen das Material für eine jüdische Archäologie vorhanden ist*).

Praise aside, it seems that Krauss exaggerated the role of archaeology in Kaufmann's overall *oeuvre*. After all, in the nearly 30 books and over 500 essays that he produced in his short life, Kaufmann devoted only a tiny fraction to matters related to the physical world of the Jews.<sup>31</sup> Regardless of Krauss's assessment, by no stretch of the imagination can Kaufmann be regarded as an archaeologist as we currently understand the term, or even as it was understood at the turn of the century. But the disparity between what

29. *Ibid.*, p. 45: 'Seine Studien nahmen demgemäß eine bestimmte Richtung, und er war und blieb der einzige Archäologe des vergangenen Jahrhunderts.'

30. On this discovery and on Kaufmann's role in the debate that followed, see E. Bleiberg, *Tree of Paradise: Jewish Mosaics from the Roman Empire* (Brooklyn NY: Brooklyn Museum, 2005), pp. 9–14.

31. See Ormos, 'David Kaufmann'. For a full bibliography of Kauffmann's scholarly output, see M. Brann, 'Verzeichnis der Schriften und Abhandlungen David Kaufmanns', in M. Brann and F. Rosenthal (eds.), *Gedenkbuch zur Erinnerung an David Kaufmann* (Breslau: Schottleander, 1900), pp. lvii–lxxxvii.

Kaufmann really was and how Krauss portrayed him tells us much about Krauss – about how he perceived his teacher and about the role Kaufmann played in shaping his own scholarly profile. Just a few years after setting down these thoughts, Krauss decided to carry out what he regarded as his teacher's legacy. Lacking further evidence, we will never know how much of the idea behind *TA* developed while Krauss studied with Kaufmann in Budapest, and how much came to be in the ensuing years as he was contemplating new projects that could lend him the academic prestige and job that he still lacked. Krauss's perception of Kaufmann, however, as paving the path for the study of archaeology by Jewish scholars is indubitable.

In addition to the immediate impact of Kohut and Kaufmann, three other strands, each prevalent in nineteenth-century scholarship, contributed to the shape and substance of Krauss's *TA*. First and foremost we must recognize the broader intellectual and academic contexts that both stimulated and inspired projects such as Krauss's. Throughout the nineteenth century publishing houses all over Europe – in France, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Germany – inundated the public with reference works on almost any given subject, a process that had begun in earlier centuries but reached an unprecedented peak in this era.<sup>32</sup> Whether alphabetically organized encyclopedias or thematically arranged handbooks, these publications transformed both the landscape of knowledge and its accessibility. Germany in the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth century (and by extension the Austro-Hungarian empire as well) witnessed the flourishing of studies on the classical Greek and Roman past in general and its archaeological remains in particular.<sup>33</sup> Heinrich Schliemann's excavations and claims about Troy ignited the public imagination (and fierce academic debate) in the 1870s and 1880s, precisely when the young Krauss took his first steps in the scholarly world.<sup>34</sup> The extensively revised edition of what came to be known as the Pauly-Wissowa *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* – probably the best single resource for the study of the ancient world and its remains

32. On the roots of this process, see, for example, F.M. Eyby et al. (eds), *Enzyklopädien der frühen Neuzeit: Beiträge zu ihrer Erforschung* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1995).

33. For a good summary, discussion and vast bibliography, see Marchand, *Down from the Olympus*.

34. From the vast literature on Schliemann, see in particular H. Döhl, *Heinrich Schliemann: Mythos und Ärgernis* (Munich: Bucher, 1981); W.M. Calder III and D.A. Traill (eds), *Myth, Scandal, and History: The Heinrich Schliemann Controversy and a First Edition of the Mycenaean Diary* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1986).

ever to be produced – took shape in precisely the same years: the first of its 84 volumes appeared in 1893, Krauss's final year in Berlin.<sup>35</sup> These were only the tip of the iceberg, as numerous publications summarized all available information about the Greek and Roman worlds. The growing field of Jewish Studies followed suit with a variety of encyclopedias and reference works published in this same period.<sup>36</sup>

Krauss himself participated in this burgeoning knowledge production. At the turn of the century, when he still lacked an academic job and before he began planning *TA*, Krauss contributed over 200 entries to *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, the most ambitious project of this sort in Jewish circles, carried out in the United States by an Austrian Jew – Isidore Singer – who crossed the Atlantic for this sole purpose.<sup>37</sup> *TA* emanated from this broad process of encyclopedic documentation and should be seen as one of its products – a thematic handbook presenting the physical world of the Talmud. It offered Krauss, who up until that point worked on isolated and relatively restricted encyclopedia entries in projects belonging to others, the opportunity to launch a large-scale endeavour of the same nature, one that would be totally his own.

A second source of inspiration for Krauss came from the proliferation of books devoted to what their authors called 'biblical archaeology'. Here, too, the word may mislead the modern reader. To take one example: in 1894, a year after Krauss completed his dissertation and still a decade before he began working on *TA*, Wilhelm Nowack, an established German biblical scholar at the University of Strasbourg (at the time, following the agreements resulting from the Prussian-Franco war of 1870–71, part of the Deutsches Reich), published the two-volume *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie*.<sup>38</sup> In his Introduction (pp. 1–2), Nowack provided a detailed discussion of the term 'archaeology' and made it perfectly clear that he assigned it a broad meaning designed to cover the entire 'representation of life conditions of

35. H. Cancik, *Antik – Modern: Beiträge zur römischen und deutschen Kulturgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1998), pp. 7–22.

36. See S. Brisman, *A History and Guide to Judaic Encyclopedias and Lexicons* (vol. 2 of idem, *Jewish Research Literature*; Bibliographica Judaica 11; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1987).

37. *Ibid.*, pp. 27–34. For a list of Krauss's contributions, see Strauss, *Bibliographie*, pp. 7–9. Decades later, in the 1920s, Krauss also wrote numerous entries for the German project, G. Herlitz and B. Kirschner (eds), *Jüdisches Lexikon* (5 vols; Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1927–30), and the German *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, as well as its Hebrew twin, known as the *Eshkol*. For these projects, see Brisman, *A History*, pp. 48–57; and for Krauss's contributions, see Strauss, *Bibliographie*, pp. 9–10.

38. W. Nowack, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie* (2 vols; Freiburg: Mohr, 1894).

Israel' (*Darstellung der gesammten Lebensverhältnisse Israels*), not at all limited to the physical environment per se. He also explained that he chose the term 'archaeology' to signal his departure from the customary focus of his scholarly peers on the political and religious history of the Old Testament.

The first volume of Nowack's book set out to re-create the manifold dimensions of human experience in the days of the Israelites. It covered a wide range of topics, from the surrounding natural setting, with detailed chapters about geography, geology and fauna, to the man-made aspects of life, such as food, clothing (*Kleidung*; pp. 120–28) and jewellery (*Schmuck*; pp. 128–32), as well as other activities and structures that define human existence – taking care of one's body (*Körperpflege*; pp. 132–5), houses and their installations, furniture and utensils (*Wohnungen*; pp. 135–48), all the way to measurements, weights, and monetary denominations (pp. 198–220). Similar to what we find later in Krauss, Nowack too ranged far beyond the physical, tangible realm, with detailed sections exploring the multifaceted aspects of family affairs (pp. 152–98), occupations and professions (*Beschäftigungen und Berufsarten*; pp. 221–51), the arts (pp. 251–79) and writing (pp. 279–99).

Striking similarities in structure, method and content connect the projects of Nowack and Krauss. Their chronological foci, however, differ; whereas Nowack centred on the so-called First Temple period, Krauss concentrated on the post-Second Temple era, the period that saw the production of rabbinic literature.<sup>39</sup> The books also do not coincide in scope – Nowack endeavoured to cover more ground than Krauss's *TA*, with his second volume addressing the realities of Israelite religious life, a subject Krauss left out completely. Even in the first volume Nowack included topics such as the military or the natural setting of the country, which Krauss ignored.<sup>40</sup> But other than the differences in chronology and scope, the two books are conspicuously alike, as if Krauss intended *Talmudische Archäologie* as the chronological sequel to Nowack's *Hebräische Archäologie*.

39. But cf. Krauss's opening statements in the introduction to *TA* (I, p. vii), claiming that Talmudic archaeology is connected to the biblical (*Die Talmudische Archäologie schließt sich unmittelbar an die biblische an*) and that Jews preserved the core of their life in continuation of their old heritage.

40. But note that Krauss too recognized the relevance of these topics for his own project. He added a long section on the natural, geographical settings to the Hebrew second edition of *TA* (*Qad.* I.1, pp. 3–113). Also, although it was not part of the *TA/Qad.* project, he devoted an entire separate monograph to gathering and organizing all the data in rabbinic literature relating to armies and military topics; see S. Krauss, *Paras ve-Romi ba-Talmud uvamidrashim* (Jerusalem: Mosad harav kook, 1948).

Compare, for example, Krauss's first part on housing and furniture (*TA*, pp. 1–77) to Nowack's discussion of the same topics (pp. 135–8): the internal organization of these two units – starting with temporary dwellings of caves and huts and moving to permanent structures, followed by discussion of building materials and techniques, and concluding with the various furniture and utensils inside – is practically identical.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, not only do most of the topics and the organization of the book overlap; the two authors also shared a common method and writing style. They organized each chapter around the terms that the ancient texts use – the Hebrew Bible in Nowack's case and rabbinic literature in Krauss's. When referring to a certain subject, be it housing, agriculture, family life, hygiene, jewellery or clothing, both scholars collected the relevant terms from the far corners of their respective texts, were careful to include the original language wherever possible, and, in addition to explaining the meaning and providing a translation, also wove the terms into a coherent, holistic picture. For Nowack and Krauss alike, the terms that survived in ancient texts were the building blocks for re-creating the lost universe of the ancients. Both scholars also peppered their books with illustrations, mostly line drawings of various objects and structures that they borrowed from archaeological publications. Even the illustrations in both books closely resemble each other, and at times the same ones are used.<sup>42</sup>

Neither Nowack nor Krauss conducted their research in a vacuum. They were preceded by a whole line of similar books by well-known scholars. In 1855–56, on the other side of Europe, in the eastern Prussian city of Königsberg, the rabbi and scholar Joseph Lewin Saalschütz published his *Archäologie der Hebräer*, with chapters devoted to the dress, science, food and customs of the ancient Israelites.<sup>43</sup> If anyone is entitled to the designation 'the first Jewish archaeologist' it is Saalschütz, who taught at the local university as an instructor of biblical archaeology, and published on topics related to the physical world of the Jews half a century before David Kaufmann, Ludwig Blau and Krauss.<sup>44</sup> The programme, methodology and content of Saalschütz's

41. The larger number of pages in *TA* results from (a) Krauss's inclusion of biblical material (see above, notes 23 and 39), and (b) the more elaborate nature of the rabbinic corpus in comparison to the Bible, which gave Krauss much more ground to cover.

42. Compare, for example, the old threshing device (*Alter Dreschwagen*) in *TA* II, p. 190, with Nowack, *Lehrbuch* I, p. 233.

43. J.L. Saalschütz, *Archäologie der Hebräer* (Königsberg: Bornträger, 1855).

44. Only minimal attention has been given to this groundbreaking figure; see the entry devoted to him in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 30 (1890), pp. 103–6.

book bear a strong resemblance to those of Nowack and Krauss, save the pictorial illustrations, which it lacks.

This same kind of work, partially lexicographical, partially reconstructive of the antiquities of the Israelites, stretched even further back to Christian Hebraists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>45</sup> Krauss knew them all – Nowack, Saalschütz and these Christian Hebraist predecessors – and he frequently relied on their work, as reflected in his bibliographies and even more so in the substance of his scholarship. He extended the chronological scope of these pioneering endeavours from the reconstruction of Israelite life, habits and environment to the realm of the Jews in the later Roman world, and by doing so applied their model, which had been focused on the Hebrew Bible, to the corpus of rabbinic literature.

Finally, a third contributing factor that influenced Krauss's work came from the increasing number of books and dissertations related to the material world of ancient Jews that were published during the nineteenth century, by both established and budding scholars. Among the recognized figures devoted to these issues was the Hungarian Jewish scholar and Reform rabbi Immanuel Löw, who published extensively on the realm of plants and vegetation, with a clear, although not exclusive, focus on the period of the Talmud.<sup>46</sup> Krauss shared Löw's commitment to lexicography, he admired his erudition, and he solicited his comments for all the major books he produced. He even dedicated *TA* to Löw.<sup>47</sup> Other pioneering works that anticipated Krauss's include a book by Adolf Brüll on clothing from 1873 and a series of monographs on medicine in the Talmud, culminating in the studies of Julius Preuss in the early 1900s.<sup>48</sup> In addition, the growing circles of students who

45. E.g. Conrad(us) Iken(ius), *Antiquitates Hebraicae* (Bremen: Gerhardi Wilhelmi Rumpii, 1741) – Krauss used an edition from 1764; Heinrich Ehrenfried Warnekros, *Entwurf der hebräischen Alterthümer* (Weimar: Hoffmann, 1832) – Krauss used an earlier edition from 1794.

46. The main publications by Löw available to Krauss while he was working on *TA* were Löw's 1879 dissertation, published as a monograph two years later – see I. Löw, *Aramäische Pflanzennamen* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1881) – as well as a substantial series of articles on specific topics. For the latter, see the bibliography of Löw's writing incorporated into his *Festschrift*-turned-memorial volume – A. Scheiber (ed.), *Semitic Studies in Memory of Immanuel Löw* (Budapest: Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1947), pp. 6–11. Löw published his four-volume magnum opus *Die Flora der Juden*, a magisterial resource still used today, only later in the twentieth century, between 1924 and 1934, when he was jailed on accusations of disloyalty to the Horthy government of Hungary.

47. For example, in the subtitle of the *Lehnwörter* Krauss mentions that the book includes comments (*Bemerkungen*) from Immanuel Löw. See also his elaboration on Löw's contribution in the introduction, p. vii.

48. A. Brüll, *Trachten der Juden im nachbiblischen Alterthume: Ein Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kostümkunde*

attended the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* institutions across Europe at the turn of the century also contributed. The proliferation of these establishments in the second half of the nineteenth century led to numerous dissertations on a wide array of topics associated with rabbinic literature.<sup>49</sup> The subject matter of more than a few of these works, some contemporary with Krauss and others preceding him, coincides with the themes of *TA*. To mention just one example, while he was working on the 'Housing and Household Appliances' (*Wohnung und Hausgerät*) section of *TA*, Krauss benefited not only from the aforementioned chapters in Nowack's book on the biblical world, but also from two dissertations dealing with the rabbinic side of these topics. In 1898, seven years before Krauss launched his *TA* project, Johann Krengel, a student at the Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar in Breslau, submitted a doctoral dissertation on furniture and household appliances in the Mishnah to the local university.<sup>50</sup> About a decade later, during the years in which Krauss was toiling on *TA* but before its actual publication, Arthur Rosenzweig, a student at the University of Berlin and the Hochschule (or the Lehranstalt, as it was called at the time) für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, submitted another dissertation, devoted to houses in the Mishnah.<sup>51</sup>

Krauss must have known Rosenzweig well. Fifteen years earlier, while in Berlin as a student, Arthur's father, Adolf Rosenzweig – himself a scholar with strong interest in archaeology and of Hungarian descent like Krauss – served as the chief rabbi of the Neue Synagoge, the central institution of Berlin's Jewish community.<sup>52</sup> It is hard to imagine that two Hungarian Jews, sharing both a religious and a scholarly background as well as topical

---

(Frankfurt am Main: Goar, 1873). Preuss started publishing on this topic in 1894, and he also benefited from much earlier books by other authors on the same topic. His final contribution came out a year after Krauss's, in 1911; see J. Preuss, *Biblisch-Talmudische Medizin: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Heilkunde und der Kultur überhaupt* (Berlin: Karger, 1911).

49. Much has been written about these schools of higher education and from different perspectives – memoirs, history and analytical studies; for a sample, see G. Kisch (ed.), *Das Breslauer Seminar: Jüdisch-Theologisches Seminar (Fraenckelscher Stiftung) in Breslau 1854–1938* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1963); H.H. Völker, 'Die Gründung und Entwicklung der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums 1869–1900', *Trumah* 2 (1990), pp. 24–46; idem, 'Die Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin, 1900–1942', in H. Walravens (ed.), *Bibliographie und Berichte: Festschrift für Werner Schochow* (Munich: Saur, 1990), pp. 196–230; Ullendorff, 'The Berlin Hochschule', pp. 195–202.

50. J. Krengel, *Das Hausgerät in der Mišnah* (Breslau: Schatzky, 1898).

51. A. Rosenzweig, *Das Wohnhaus in der Mišnah* (Berlin: Lamm, 1907).

52. Not much has been written about the Rosenzweigs; on Adolf Rosenzweig, see the short entry in J.J. Herzog and P. Schaff (eds), *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (13 vols; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1908–14), vol. 10, p. 96.

interests, and living for years in a foreign city, would not be well acquainted. As with the works of Krenzel and Rosenzweig, Krauss used numerous other dissertations and short publications as bibliographical resources for almost every one of the topics covered in *TA*. From this point of view, Krauss did not initiate interest in the physical world of the rabbis but rather synthesized a very broad wave of interest and engagement in this subject matter as it was sweeping through Jewish scholarly institutions in turn-of-the-century Europe. Krauss himself never claimed such honour and acknowledged the work of those preceding him, both in the Introduction to *TA*, where he admitted that one scholar alone does not have the needed expertise to research such a broad array of subjects, and in the bibliographies to each chapter, where he painstakingly listed all the works that he used, many of which have long been forgotten and lost.<sup>53</sup>

To conclude, the immediate, concrete reasons that led Krauss to embark on *Talmudische Archäologie* remain unknown. He began the actual preparations for it as early as 1905, when he travelled on his own initiative and budget to Ottoman Palestine and then to Egypt and Italy, in order to see at first hand the physical remains he was about to investigate.<sup>54</sup> Even if we never know for sure, it seems clear that a variety of factors, stemming from and operating within different contexts, both instigated and informed his work. Like the projects of many before him, Krauss's *TA* remains a product of its time as much as the fruit of one man's work.

---

53. Krauss, *TA* I, p. ix.

54. *Ibid.* Towards the end of his life, Krauss testified that he visited Palestine only three times; see Krauss, *Qorot battey ha-tefillah*, p. 5.