perfect tool used to separate Jewish daily life from its neighbourhood, implemented to untie and detach at some point Jews from non-Jews. Unfortunately, the limits of this review do not permit doing justice to all that a reader will discover in this fascinating book. To sum up, Elisheva Carlebach’s *Palaces of Time* is a splendid achievement in every respect: elegantly written, concise in its contents, enhanced with sumptuous illustrations, masterly analysed. Yet, in my opinion, one of its major feats consists in illuminating the openness and diversity of the cultures of the Jews during the early modern period.

Conceptualizations of time and lived temporality extended far beyond the confines of religion and religiosity. They involved also the new challenges Jews were facing, when identity and citizenship were discussed and questioned in the early modern period, just before or at the start of the emancipation process. New cultural vehicles, new approaches to others, and a new relationship to history are all made visible and clearly understandable by Elisheva Carlebach’s study of Jewish calendars. They are probably one of the best and most paradigmatic expressions of the non-insularity of Jews throughout their history.

**Sylvie-Anne Goldberg Ehess, Paris**


Those of us who were privileged to study under teachers who came directly from the great pre-War centres of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* in central Europe – and were at times seriously challenged by this privilege – now often fondly recall the various characteristics of these giants of learning and of method. Many of them enjoyed a tendency to be iconoclastic, had little patience with religious establishments, were generally more excited by footnotes than by music, art or sport, and regarded it as essential to the dignity of the scholar to maintain a total privacy about their private lives and personal preferences. They did not naturally take to joint projects and they were fearless about expressing their criticism of colleagues, regardless of the degree to which this might lead to breakdowns in personal relations. One of their heroes was undoubtedly Moritz Steinschneider (‘Ramshash’) and there can be few serious students of Hebraica and Judaica who have not found themselves at some stage of their researches, if not all stages, greatly in debt to this inspiring proponent and champion of scientific Jewish learning. Our mentors needed only to mention in respectful tones his name in connection with some historical or literary problem for us to be thoroughly convinced that the relevant data or conclusions had to be considered with the utmost seriousness. But it is now less fashionable to defer to such nineteenth-century scholars and they have in recent decades been accused (among other things) of putting liberalism before Jewish survival, of unjustifiably downgrading subjects that did not appeal to them, and of viewing the world through lenses that were Euro-centred but never Eastern-Euro-centred.
Now that over a century has passed since Steinschneider’s death (1907), and almost two centuries since his birth (1816), the time has come for a re-appraisal of the man and his work. The volume here being reviewed, which is essentially a reflection of the conference held on the topic in Berlin in 2007, sets about precisely such a task.

The task is accomplished with considerable aplomb. Some twenty-six contributions, prefaced by a helpful editorial introduction, tackle a host of topics relating to the figure of Steinschneider under five headings. In the first of these, which deals with the man and how he slots into the intellectual ideas of his day, Ismar Schorsch describes the vision beyond the books, Michael I. Miller the family inspiration, and Céline Trautmann-Waller the affinity with Zunz and his ideas. Steinschneider’s notions about encyclopedias, his work as an orientalist, his concept of the history of Jewish literature, and his noble dream of objectivity have attracted the close attentions of, respectively, Arndt Engelhardt, Irene E. Zwiep, Reimund Leicht and Nils Roemer. The aim and structure of his magisterial Die Hebraeischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters are discussed by Gad Freudenthal, while Giulio Busi and Giuseppe Veltri demonstrate that he was not wholly dismissive of mysticism and kabbalah. The second section is devoted to ‘Ramshash’ as a bibliographer. Various aspects of his methods in working with manuscripts, his work as a cataloguer of major Hebrew holdings, and the history and fate of his personal collection are covered by Judith Olszowy-Schlanger, Jan Just Witkam, Steven Harvey and Resianne Fontaine, and Benjamin Richler. Rachel Heuberger has offered a close study of what he and Aron Freimann contributed to Jewish bibliography while Avriel Bar-Levav discusses him as ‘a living citizen in a world of dead letters’. The manner in which modern knowledge and understanding of medieval literature, philosophy and science derived great benefit from Steinschneider’s efforts is the subject of the third part of the volume. Here Daniel J. Lasker, Paul B. Fenton and Diana Matut explain his work on Karaism, Judaeo-Arabic and Yiddish (yes, even the Yiddish he referred to as a ‘repulsive (widerlicher) jargon’). His connections with Italy are charted by Asher Salah, while Tony Lévy writes in French on his studies of Jewish mathematicians, and Norman Golb on how he functioned as a historian. In the fourth section, a most interesting survey of the genesis of Die Hebraischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters comes from the pen of Charles H. Manekin, and Elisabeth Hollender and Andreas Lehnardt provide details of how the bindings of books in German libraries and archives have revealed folios of medieval Hebrew manuscripts. The volume concludes with Petra Figeac’s summary of the Steinschneideriana in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek and with a reproduction of the master’s Der Aberglaube published in Berlin in 1900.

So what do we learn from this hefty volume? We cannot but admire Steinschneider’s amazing industry. Despite working as an educator and administrator of a girls’ school, he managed to author almost 1,400 publications. The quality of his work, as well as its range, are truly astonishing and he laid the foundations for so much later scholarship. He taught his successors ( alas, a lesson no longer being learned by
many contemporary ‘experts’ in Jewish studies) that without the consultation and analysis of manuscripts (even if he surely underestimated the importance of Genizah material), and without extensive bibliographical knowledge, research is doomed to be third-rate, and he demonstrated how one must approach serious historical study with a minimum of tendenz. He was undoubtedly one of the great academic figures of all time and no simple bibliographer. But acknowledging all this as we do, and as we are encouraged to do by this impressive collection of essays (but less than impressive index), and by the overlapping studies in Pe’amim 129 (2011), we may also stand back from Steinschneider and his time and recognize that he and his colleagues were not necessarily so admirable in all their notions. Scholarship can never be totally objective. Jews should not need to give up their Jewishness, their ‘jargons’, their superstitions, and their national aspirations in order to be accepted as cultured human beings in the modern world. And the private character of scholars, as well as their relationships, their preferences and, at times, their narrow concerns, are all an important (and even at times productive) part of academic and educational history, and ultimately need to be revealed as such.

Stefan C. Reif
St John’s College, Cambridge


There is much to commend this study. Emily Greble capitalizes on a recent historiographical trend which prioritizes the local to observe the national and international. Histories of cities, conceived as biographical portraits, are enjoying popularity too. They offer the opportunity to capture various aspects of social life and explore their meaning in their native context. This, in turn, feeds into the writing of national and international histories adding more detail and local nuance, and a turn away from the desire to find overarching narratives explaining large-scale historical developments and subsuming the complexity of these historical developments as they were negotiated on the ground.

Sarajevo appears to offer the researcher an opportunity to further complicate the history of the Holocaust, the Second World War and the position of Nazi satellite states. Greble’s choice to focus on the years of Nazi occupation and the subsequent NDH during the war years, provides a concise window through which to explore the relationship of the various populations of the city to the new circumstances. She makes the maintenance of religious identifications central to her inquiry and is able to observe the religious, confessional, ethnic and national fault-lines that run through Sarajevo’s complex society. She does so by focusing on social and religious leaders through available archival materials. That Greble focuses inwards on the city means that she largely ignores the connections of the city to the rural areas surrounding and supporting it. The time frame of her inquiry has the consequence that the