Judaica Librarianship

Volume 12 31-48

12-31-2006

The First Deinard Collection of the Library of Congress

Myron M. Weinstein

The First Deinard Collection of the Library of Congress

MYRON M. WEINSTEIN

ABSTRACT

The extensive Hebraica holdings of the Library of Congress are based on a core collection of nearly 10,000 books and pamphlets that was acquired circa 1912. The "nation's library" purchased that collection—which included 19 incunabula—from the prolific Hebrew author and bibliographer Ephraim Deinard, with financial support from the businessman and philanthropist Jacob Schiff. It was the first of three Deinard collections acquired by the Library of Congress. This article outlines the negotiations and vividly describes the personalities who made that signal acquisition possible.

INTRODUCTION

The origins of the Hebraic collections of the Library of Congress are not to be sought in the extraordinary personal library of Thomas Jefferson that Congress bought in 1815 to replace the books consumed in the fire at the Capitol, torched by the British the previous summer. As was said, no other library in the country at that time was "so admirably calculated for the substratum of a great national library."[1] Though Jefferson expressed some interest, among a myriad of other interests, in matters Hebraic[2]—even in Hebrew manuscripts![3]—Hebrew was not one of his languages and it would be stretching a point to maintain that the volumes of his that were selected for exhibit in "From the Ends of the Earth" (which was held in 1991) could constitute a suitable or adequate nucleus for a collection of Hebraica, *sensu stricto*.

To understand how the Hebraic collections of the Library of Congress came into being, we must skip rather to the close of the nineteenth century and introduce four protagonists: Ephraim Deinard, Cyrus Adler, Herbert Putnam, and Jacob Schiff. It will be easy to agree that Deinard's role was crucial and we shall meet him first. As for the others, no ranking of the importance of their parts is intended; we introduce them simply in convenient order.

THE WANDERINGS OF EPHRAIM DEINARD

Traveler, dealer—primarily—in antiquarian Jewish books and manuscripts, ancient coins[4] and sundry art objects, prolific Hebrew author, editor, bibliographer, early Zionist activist, advocate of agricultural settlement of Russian Jews, developer, controversialist and past master of Hebrew invective, Deinard was born in the Baltic region of the Tsarist Empire toward the middle of the nineteenth century. He spent his formative years in Lithuania, moved to White Russia where he married in the mid-1860s, and went on to the Crimea where he briefly became the amanuensis and factotum of the Karaite champion Abraham Firkovitch. The early 1880s find him established in Odessa as proprietor of a bookstore. "Established" is, perhaps, precisely what he was not. There were trips—to mention only two—to the Holy Land in 1880 on a reconnaissance mission for prospective settlement, and after the pogroms began in 1881 in the wake of the assassination of Tsar Alexander II, Deinard led a large party of Russian-Jewish refugees to Constantinople (in May of 1882) seeking the requisite permission to settle in Palestine.[5]

On October 6, 1888, Ephraim Deinard arrived in the United States from Liverpool, accompanied by a wife, four young daughters, and a niece—and 11 pieces of luggage.[6] If you have guessed that these contained the ladies' wardrobes, you cannot be aware that Deinard, quoting Heine, is on record as disapproving of the latest Paris fashion.[7] What the luggage contained, in the main, was Mr. Deinard's stock in trade, to wit, Hebrew printed books and manuscripts. It was a rather lengthy trip from Odessa—the family had set out in January but he spent the first eight months zigzagging through various Russian cities, plying his trade,[8] replenishing his purse, observing the state of the incipient Zionist movement, and awaiting exit documents. (He parked the family in Vilnius.) By my count, Ephraim Deinard was to disembark in the port of New York after successful acquisitions trips six more times in his final 42 years.

His early years in America were also years of frenetic activity. He applied for naturalization not two months after he landed.[9] He began to publish a Hebrew "nationalist"[10] weekly (it expired after 23 issues) on a press he set up in his home on Orchard Street. He soon moved the press to Newark (Kearny/Arlington)—where he was to live for some three decades—on which he produced a parody, a satire, essays mingling musings on the future of the Jews with bitter memories, and polemics—always polemics. He started a Yiddish weekly.[11] He worked on a catalog of the stocks of two New York Hebrew bookdealers.[12] He precipitated a fiasco in attempting to found an agricultural colony in California.[13] And he planned other projects which died aborning: another Hebrew periodical,[14] a catalog of the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary,[15] trip around the world to exotic Jewish communities,[16] to name just a few.

Now, in the first half of his life, back in Europe, Deinard had been purveyor of manuscripts and rare books to some of the great libraries—and particularly to the national libraries, viz. the British Museum, the Bibliothèque Nationale,

the Preussische Staatsbibliothek. It obviously occurred to him—I cannot say when but certainly quite early, perhaps even well before he got here—that the United States also had a national library and it was terra incognita. To lobby for his agenda, Deinard joined the American Oriental Society in 1894[17] and attended the Congress of Philologists held at the University of Pennsylvania during the last week of that year where seven American learned societies convened to honor the memory of William Dwight Whitney, the recently-deceased Sanskritist and English lexicographer, and conduct their learned affairs.

At a meeting of the AOS, Deinard delivered a paper on the Subbotniki and spoke a second time, as well. The subject of the second talk I have not found reported in the press,[18] but he relates in two of his books[19] that he proposed the establishment of a large collection of Hebrew works at the Library of Congress that would serve the needs of the American scholar, for he found it appalling that scholars in the United States wanting old Hebrew books would have to travel to the British Museum or the Bodleian Library to consult them. "Is it not a disgrace," he writes, "for our rich country, in general, and for its Jewish citizens, in particular?"[20] According to Deinard, his proposal was supported by Daniel Coit Gilman, President of Johns Hopkins University, who by chance happened to be the president of the American Oriental Society that year. Gilman supported the idea but Cyrus Adler, then Librarian of the Smithsonian Institution, opposed it. Deinard does not tell us why, but there is a suggestion in his turn of phrase that Adler believed that the time was not yet ripe.[21]

THE SMITHSONIAN CONNECTION

Cyrus Adler was born in the early 1860s in a small frontier town in Arkansas, lost his father when he was only three, and was raised by his mother and maternal uncle in Philadelphia. His schooling was a harmonious blending of traditional Jewish learning and humanities. Adler gave up law to study Assyriology with Paul Haupt at Johns Hopkins University and in 1887 was the first person to take his Ph.D. degree in Semitics at an American university. His association with the Smithsonian Institution was wholly fortuitous, having blundered into visiting the U.S. National Museum after a photographic exhibit of cuneiform inscriptions that he wished to see had been taken down. He was invited in, impressed his interlocutors and in short order became, early in 1888, Honorary Assistant Curator of the collection of Oriental Antiquities[22]—a collection that did not exist! This was not as unusual as it sounds, for in those days at the Museum "there was virtually no paid staff; whenever a volunteer appeared, a special niche was carved out for him as an honorary curator or some such title."[23] But Adler was unusual. With a great capacity for work—in several places, on various projects, concurrently—meticulous attention to details, a gift for administration, easy contact with his peers and superiors, and an ability to formulate a convincing argument and conceptualize a clear path, he became increasingly indispensable to Secretary Samuel Pierpont Langley—the noted astronomer

and the man who almost invented the airplane.[24] From 1889, Adler exerted himself to collect an outstanding group of Jewish ceremonial and art objects for display in the Ethnology Department.

In 1892, Secretary Langley appointed Adler as the Librarian of the Smithsonian Institution. Now in a certain sense, this, too, was a rather anomalous position for by act of Congress in 1866 the Smithsonian Library had been transferred to the Library of Congress.[25] In fact, from the very acceptance of Smithson's gift by the United States, there had been squabbling in the Institution as to whether the Smithsonian was to *have* a library or to *be* a library.[26] The transfer was duly accomplished and subsequent accessions were sent on to the Capitol—where the Library of Congress was still housed, of course—until the late 1880s, when the system broke down due to overcrowding. Upon Adler's appointment, parts of the Smithsonian book collections were at the Institution, a great portion was at the Capitol, and as Librarian he was, ex-officio, Custodian of the Smithsonian Deposit at the Library of Congress with special emolument from LC funds. His office was in the Castle but some of his duties detained him on the Hill.

Some three years after completion of the LC building, at the turn of the century, a Smithsonian Division was established there to attend to the deposit[27] and Adler occasionally occupied a desk in the Jefferson building. All this is to say that when, in 1892, he drafted a letter to the editors of *The American Hebrew,* arguing against the establishment of a national Jewish university in the United States or provision of endowed chairs in Hebrew at leading colleges, the two Washington institutions with which he was associated were jostling in his mind when he stated that an alternative might be the underwriting of a library on Jewish science run by the Library of Congress or the Smithsonian.[28] (Perhaps I should mention, parenthetically, that by "Jewish science" he meant neither the work of Jewish physicists or biomedical researchers, nor yet again a Jewish analogue of the movement founded by Mary Baker Eddy. "Jewish science" was the short and misleading translation that was in vogue for *Wissenschaft des Judentums,* the science of Judaism. Adler said that he strongly disliked the term but I have noticed that he used it, nonetheless. Nowadays, it has been redubbed "Jewish studies.")

Could he then have supposed that the Smithsonian might really house a Judaic/Hebraic book collection, when its authority to run a library of its own was merely based upon a tacit understanding between the Secretary of the Smithsonian and the Librarian of Congress for the retention by the Institution of books in various departmental and operational collections on its premises? More likely, what brought Adler to an either/or formulation at this early date, rather than to an outright recognition that the Library of Congress was the logical choice, was the fact that he was an official at the Smithsonian but he had no opposite number to assume the burden at LC.[29] We must note, incidentally, that Adler's 1892 proposal antedates Deinard's intervention at the AOS by more than two years and that already in the summer of 1892—even before he became Librarian—Adler had gone up to Newark to visit Deinard and see what he had for sale. He did not find him in.[30]

As Librarian of the Smithsonian from 1892 and elevated, as well, to Assistant Secretary in charge of libraries and international exchanges from 1905 to 1908, Adler was in close touch with three Librarians of Congress and maintained friendly relations with each. His contacts with Herbert Putnam, who occupied the LC post for forty years (1899–1939), are best documented. Scion of the founder of the publishing house, Putnam was born in New York at the start of the 1860s, graduated from Harvard, prepared for the legal profession but wavered between law and librarianship in positions in Minneapolis and Boston in the 1880s and 1890s. He was called to be Librarian of Congress in 1899 after President McKinley's previous nominee failed to muster the needed Senate support, his own nomination being enthusiastically endorsed by Melvil Dewey. A case could readily be made for Herbert Putnam being the most successful Librarian of Congress of all to the present date—outshining even the redoubtable Ainsworth Rand Spofford, who in the years 1864 to 1897 in fact transformed the "congressional library" into the national library of the United States. When Putnam appeared on the scene, however, the collections were still narrowly focused, provincial, and defective. Putnam was a man of broad culture and creative vision; he soon began to collect world literature with vigor and discernment. In 1904, he bought the library of a prominent deceased Indologist, Albrecht Weber. He followed this in 1907 by acquiring an 80,000-item Russian library, the Yudin Collection. Major Japanese and Chinese collections were accessioned in 1907–1908.

OVERTURES TO THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The evidence is at hand that virtually from the start of Putnam's tenure he and Adler were discussing LC needs. Adler's letter to Putnam of March 23, 1900, begins: "Quite some time ago I spoke to you of the great lack in the Library of books relating to the Bible and all oriental subjects. This is so marked as to practically render any real work on these subjects in Washington impossible."[31]

Quite some time ago? The man had assumed his post in a recess appointment only the previous spring; he was confirmed only at the end of the year! We do know, however, that Adler had also been working on Putnam's predecessor, John Russell Young,[32] who had a very brief career at LC, dying in office.

On March 26, 1905, Adler transmitted an offer from the widow of Abraham M. Bank of her late husband's second book collection of 2,500 volumes. Adler wrote Putnam:

> If the Library of Congress is desirous of having a Hebrew Department, the Collection described in the accompanying letter would, as far as I have been able to learn, make an excellent nucleus. I bring it to your attention, therefore, in the hope that it may bring up for consideration, at least, the entire subject of a collection devoted to Hebrew Scholarship. That the need for one is urgent at the National Capital at the present time, I cannot claim, on the other hand, no great library, known to me, is without such a collection. . . .[33]

Putnam expressed interest and said he would go and inspect it, but it came to nought.[34]

Later that year, Adler forwarded to Putnam a short listing of Judeo-Arabic and Judeo-Persian publications from the Cairo dealer J. B. Yahuda, and stated in his covering letter: ". . . You have spoken to me once or twice in the past about getting a collection of Jewish literature, but I do not know what, if any, steps you have taken in this direction. . . ."[35]

Putnam bought the 146 titles involved.

This is where matters remained until 1909, when Deinard again comes into the picture. You will recall that when, in 1894, Deinard proposed the establishment of a Hebraic collection at LC, Adler—we have it on Deinard's authority—opposed it. Now if I were a psychohistorian I would lay bare the true root of Adler's distrust of Deinard. The best I can do is to say that it was there, it can be traced in Adler's correspondence,[36] and it was, no doubt, nurtured by Adler's cousin, Judge Mayer Sulzberger, who was, in effect, Deinard's patron.[37] So what had *changed* from the 15 years in which Adler stood athwart Deinard's ambition? What had changed was Adler's address. In 1908, Adler was prevailed upon to give up the Assistant Secretaryship at the Smithsonian and move to Philadelphia to found the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning. This was a "very considerable wrench,"[38] for not only was Adler much at home at the Smithsonian, but with friends at the very pinnacle of the Federal Government[39] he might soberly have aspired to the highest office of the institution.

In any case, by October 5, 1909, Deinard thought the road was clear and he had a letter composed to the Librarian of Congress, which stated in part:

> I would like to call your attention to the fact that for a number of years past, I have been collecting Hebrew books . . . This collection consists of the oldest and rarest books which are to be found only in the British Museum, and some of them are not to be found even there. The entire library contains about 10,000 or perhaps more volumes. As I am compelled to leave this country, I would like to sell my entire library . . . Every official library in civilized Europe contains a Hebrew department . . . and I think it would be very advantageous to the Congress Library . . .[40]

The letter mentions Hebrew incunabula and about 150 old manuscripts, among other things. There followed a flurry of letters in the next month or so between Putnam and Deinard, Putnam and Adler, and Adler and Marx.[41] Putnam sought to learn what he could about Deinard, about Deinard's collection, and about other such collections that were on the market or in institutions. On Adler's advice, he went to see Dr. Alexander Marx, Librarian of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and he visited Arlington, New Jersey, to at least inspect the physical state of Deinard's books and gain some conception of the vendor. As for an evaluation of Deinard and his collection, Adler ducked, passing on the opinions of his cousin, Judge Mayer Sulzberger, who had had frequent dealings

with him. The learned jurist, I'm afraid, rendered a profoundly ambiguous judgment ("a great collector . . . substantially an honest man with a highly imaginative turn of mind and places great values upon manuscripts which have not been examined"[42]).

SEMITICS OR HEBRAICA—A QUESTION OF SEMANTICS

In the course of the exchange between Putnam and Adler, however, a distracting side issue arose, one that was to come up again. Putnam's initial letter to Adler on this matter mentioned "Semitica" and "Semitics." Now, Deinard's library was essentially a collection of Hebraica. Of course, Hebraica could be subsumed under Judaica, and Judaica under Semitica. So, in his reply of November 7, 1909, Adler, confining himself to Semitics, *sensu lato* (and we need to recall that his was the first Ph.D. degree in this discipline in the country and he was then President of Dropsie College, a school devoted to Semitics), stated that Putnam ought first to decide whether he wished to buy the kind of library Deinard offered, and then consider whether he might not rather invest those funds over a number of years in purchasing "the great standard works in all the [Semitic] languages and literatures."

Here we are in need of a brief linguistic excursus on the term "Semitic." That term in the sense "of or pertaining to the Semites, their languages, religions, and cultures" was not in general use until the first quarter of the nineteenth century,[43] but by the start of the twentieth century the editors of the first edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary* were able to document: ". . . (In recent use often *spec.* = Jewish)."[44] That is to say, it had become a euphemism (probably under the influence of "anti-Semitic").[45] Hence, we can appreciate Adler's pause in his second reply of five days later to inquire what it was that Putnam had in mind. This time, though, he assumed that it was a body of Judaica and he came out strongly for purchase of the Deinard books if they could be gotten at a moderate price. And to Putnam's query as to the future prospects for cultivation of Judaic studies outside of New York and Philadelphia, i.e., in Washington, he answered sagely that in acquiring the Deinard Collection the Librarian of Congress "would certainly be making a notable addition to the Library and one which in the course of time, would come to be reasonably used."[46] Putnam thanked Adler and assured him that he had not overlooked the Judaica/Semitica distinction.

But Putnam did not employ appropriated funds to buy Deinard's books in 1909; in essence, he left the matter dangling. This emboldened Deinard to broach the subject again after a hiatus of more than two years during which time nothing much happened, though Deinard did, apparently, sell some of the manuscripts and printed books he had offered LC in the interval.[47] Now, shortly after New Year's Day in 1912, with his collection moved to new and more accessible quarters and, with most of his listing ready, Deinard girded up his loins and wrote Putnam asking for an appointment.[48] This gambit received only mild

encouragement,[49] for some vital element which had been missing in the earlier overture was still wanting. Could it have been the support of a Maecenas—and which Maecenas was more in the public eye in those days than Jacob Schiff? One would have had to be totally somnolent to be unaware of his philanthropic benefactions, but by happy occurrence—whether by design or chance, I cannot say—an editorial appeared in the *New York Times* in early February about him![50]

A POTENTIAL BENEFACTOR EMERGES

Jacob Henry Schiff was born in the Forties in Frankfurt am Main, a city well known for nurturing a spirit of commercial enterprise among the denizens of its Judengasse. He arrived in the United States at 18 and achieved a rapid rise in the financial world. His charities included many educational and civic institutions and Jewish causes. It would prove too fatiguing to recount all of Schiff's good works.[51] Suffice it to say that among the recipients of his largesse were the Jewish Theological Seminary, the Hebrew Union College, the forerunner of Yeshiva University, Columbia and Harvard, and the Tuskeege Institute and other Negro institutions. And he had been very generous to the Jewish Division of the New York Public Library.[52]

How to approach him? At the urging of Simon Wolf, a Jewish presence in the Capital for half a century and a friend of Adler's, Putnam decided to ask Adler to intervene with Schiff—who greatly admired Adler—on LC's behalf.[53] Adler declined, stating, respectfully, but in effect—I fear I must put it this way—that Putnam was a big boy and he could do it himself.[54] If you suppose that the concept of LC as the National Library of the United States is the invention of latter-day Librarians of Congress, listen to Putnam warming to this theme in 1912. On April 1st, he took his courage in his hand and wrote:

> My dear Mr. Schiff:
>
> We librarians, as well as the general public know that among your various generous gifts in the public interest, you have included a considerable sum towards the purchase of Hebrew books for the New York Public Library. For some time past I have wished to establish here in the National Library a department of Hebraica. . . .
>
> And from time to time it has occurred to me how fortunate it might be if the foundation of such a department could be some collection of note already formed by a competent hand, and *presented* to the nation: for the service of such a gift . . . goes far beyond the actual material which it conveys—I mean in attracting public attention, awakening public interest and inducing auxiliary gifts from others.
>
> Now there happens to be just now available a collection which would seem to answer the above description . . . I rest upon the judgment as to its value of experts whom I have consulted. From what they tell me, it would form an admirable basis upon which to develop here a collection that would really signify not merely in its direct service to scholars, but as a recognition of the part which Hebrew

> history, literature and tradition, as well as the Hebrew race, play and will play in the affairs of this country. . . .
>
> . . . Feeling, however, that not merely the reputation, but the utility of the collection here would be so greatly enhanced if it could come to us by gift, and recalling the interest that you had shown in the case of the New York Public Library—which I could not believe to be less where the Library is the National Library and the gift would be to the entire country . . .
>
> Please let me add, however, that . . . [if] your response is that you are already committed to all the projects of this nature that you can feasibly undertake, I shall completely understand the situation;—and only regret that we are not to have the privilege of associating your name in so gratifying a way with the larger expansion of this, the National Library.
>
> *I beg to be,*
> *Faithfully yours,*
> *Herbert Putnam*
> *Librarian of Congress*[55]

Schiff responded promptly that he would seek the advice of friends whose counsel he valued and get back in touch.[56] He then wrote to Adler propounding two questions: (1) Was Deinard's collection suitable for the Library of Congress? (2) Was the Library of Congress suitable for Deinard's collection? Adler, who rarely acted in these matters without consulting his cousin, the Judge, whose opinion he presumed to be more judicious and mature, wrote up a memo with talking points for Judge Sulzberger. I quote from it:

> . . . The Library of Congress was originally founded as a Library for Congress . . . it has changed in theory and is now becoming a National Library. It is entirely proper with this idea in view that the great Hebrew literature should be represented. I know that this is an old view of Mr. Putnam's and he has discussed it with me from time to time during my stay in Washington and since.
>
> Now with regard to Mr. Schiff's letter. He asks the question as to whether Deinard's Library would form a proper and dignified nucleus for forming around it a collection that would do honor both to the national library and to the literature and civilization of our race . . . As far as I know, Professor Marx is the only person who is sufficiently acquainted with Deinard's collection to give the answer . . . I would recommend Mr. Schiff to ask . . . Marx . . .

The next question that Mr. Schiff puts is whether the Library of Congress is the proper place for building up an active collection, as he is not sure that in Washington such a collection would have as much purpose as in the New York Public Library and the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary:

> Mr. Schiff is undoubtedly right about hesitating on this point and yet there is another view which I would like to present.

> There is but a very small Jewish community in Washington and, of course, no group of Jewish scholars that would justify the making of a large Jewish collection . . . from the point of view simply of the Jewish community. On the other hand, Washington is the national capitol [sic] a fact the importance of which has already been recognized by other people. The Roman Catholic Church is represented there by two Universities . . . The Methodists are slowly building up a great Institution of learning there . . . The Baptists built . . . George Washington . . . I confess that I always felt that the time ought to come when for the honor of the Jews of this country, Jewish learning should be in some way represented in Washington and as there . . . could not be any place for a teaching institution there, and there is probably no likelihood of a research institution, the nearest to such a representation would be a department in the National Library.[57]

And in his reply to Schiff of April 7th, Adler elaborated on this point:

> . . . Feeling that such an ideal was far off, I made efforts to place in the National Capitol [sic] a collection that would represent in a beautiful and dignified way Jewish ceremonial and art objects and with such funds as the National Museum had at its disposal, I collected a nucleus which has been greatly enhanced in recent years . . . These cases in the National Museum are at present the only representation of anything distinctively Jewish in the National Collections which meets the eye[s] of [visitors] from all over the country.
>
> Of course a Library does not make the same form of appeal to the eye. Nevertheless, since the Library of Congress has now its great Chinese and Japanese collections, its great Russian Collection, since they are of such size as to be represented in the Catalogues and stand out prominently we think that in lieu of any separate dignified representation of our history and literature, a strong department in the National Library would do much credit to our people.[58]

He concluded by dashing cold water on Schiff's suggestion that a condition might be attached that the development of such a department would be supervised by a special committee, suggesting instead that Schiff stipulate that it be staffed by a competent person to make it known and useful to scholars.

TYING THE KNOT

On April 15th 1912, Schiff wrote Putnam:

> I am now prepared to say to you that I shall be willing to have you buy Mr. Deinard's Library. . . .
>
> I am informed that, while some sections are fairly complete, others need supplementing, and that to make it a really representative collection would need care and search for several years by a competent librarian acquainted with Jewish literature and bibliography. . . .

> . . . I would like to stipulate . . . that . . . Such a person ought not to be a mere cataloger, but a real Hebrew scholar and bibliographer, who would in his person as well as through the collection worthily represent Jewish scholarship.
>
> I take it that the gift which I am ready to make to the National Library, ought to be viewed as a beginning, and that there will be set aside annually, from the Library budget, a definite sum in order that the Collection might be a growing and living one. If this be done, I might hereafter be willing, when special opportunities offer, to supplement the regular annual appropriations by further contributions in order to help make the collection such as I am sure you and I want to see it become.[59]

Adler, who had found himself in the delicate position of attorney for two sides in a three-sided negotiation, relayed to Schiff the unconfirmed tidbit of information that Putnam thought he could scrape together half the funds needed from the LC budget if the other half could be procured as a gift. He justified this action in a closing remark to Schiff: "This statement, of course, comes to me entirely from Mr. Deinard, but I thought you were entitled to have it."[60] Schiff proceeded without regard to such considerations.

Deinard's asking price in 1909[61] and opening price in 1912[62] was $15,000, but this was whittled down $500 by the date of the Librarian's letter of solicitation to the philanthropist,[63] and the nearly 10,000 books and pamphlets were finally had for $13,000. To this Schiff added $2,000 for ancillary services, e.g., administration, cataloging, and expert counsel.[64]

The First Deinard Collection emanated from Hebrew presses in no fewer than 300 localities and covered a time span of four-and-a-half centuries. Nineteen incunabula are recorded. It was strong in Bible editions and commentaries and the ancillary grammars, dictionaries, and concordances. Talmud and Midrash editions along with commentarial literature occupied a large place in it, as did responsa, codes, liturgical works, and kabbalistic texts. Medieval Jewish philosophy was well represented, as were the literary products of the Spanish Golden Age. History and geography were not overlooked. It embraced the Haskalah period writing, as well, with incomplete runs of the nineteenth-century periodicals.[65]

I confess myself baffled at times as to whether the First Deinard Collection included even a single manuscript. The evidence is quite contradictory: On the one side, there are no manuscripts in the present collection with indicia that decisively point to 1912 as the accession year. Further, Immanuel M. Casanowicz's report to the Librarian of Congress on the contents of the First Collection (based upon Deinard's handwritten inventory) fails to mention manuscripts.[66] What is more, in the surviving portion of the original inventory itself no manuscripts are enumerated. Arrayed against these testimonies on the other side are a memo from 1912, which states that the "material designated by Mr. Deinard as including incunabula and manuscripts" has been placed in a locked enclosure[67] and a journalistic account from 1913 of this collection which mentions "many manuscripts."[68] The evidence from every one of these sources may be

impeached for one reason or another, so I prefer to take my stand with the great Hebrew bibliographer and manuscript authority Alexander Marx, who wrote to Schiff on January 14, 1914: ". . . But as the Library of Congress has no Hebrew manuscripts whatever . . ."[69] I should mention that it may be possible to reconcile the seemingly irreconcilable by assuming that some manuscripts were forwarded by Deinard for independent consideration by LC but that they were sent back due to Sulzberger's adverse comment, which I have quoted earlier.

There were still some matters to be clarified: Putnam explained to Schiff that the Library's inability as a U.S. Government institution to contract beyond the appropriations of the current fiscal year, and his incapacity to bind his successors in office regarding the expenditure of funds meant, in fact, that he could not accept the stipulations regarding staffing and annual budget.[70] Schiff graciously agreed, instead, to a statement by Putnam as to the reasonableness of the stipulations and his intention to carry them out to the best of his abilities.[71]

But the Librarian was unsure of the extent and open-endedness of the financier's commitment—and I think it is fair to say that he was still unsure as late as March 12, 1920, when he wrote him for the last time, six months before Schiff's death.[72] Would Schiff, for example, countenance the participation of others in contributing toward the contemplated Department of Semitic Literature, and if so under what terms?[73] An extremely sensitive subject! Schiff's reply was not long in coming:

> I shall have no objection to have [sic] any one else, of respectable standing, participate in this, provided he will make a contribution of at least the same amount that I am giving. But it would not be fair to me, if any other person became associated in this foundation by the contribution of any smaller amount, and if such be proposed, I would not consent . . .[74]

It is not to be wondered at that no other givers were found on these stiff terms.

THE SEMITIC DIVISION IS ESTABLISHED

As regards the staffing of the new division, there were, in fact, three applicants for the position (and four other names were mentioned): the Assyriologist William Muss-Arnolt, whom Adler spoke against; Harry Austryn Wolfson (who was to achieve renown at Harvard as interpreter of philosophical texts in several languages), whom Adler praised; and Israel Schapiro, a Hebraist, thirty-something, with a Semitics background who became the incumbent with Adler's blessing.[75] Deinard put forward the name of the veteran St. Petersburg Hebrew bibliographer, Samuel Wiener.[76] Putnam's first choice, Israel Davidson (who went on to a distinguished career at the Jewish Theological Seminary in the field of medieval Hebrew literature), was never invited as Schiff declined to make funds available to supplement the Library salary.[77] Putnam also considered Ephraim Deinard's son-in-law, Samuel N. Deinard, and Professor Josef Horovitz.[78] I believe it the workings of Divine Providence that neither Wolfson

nor Davidson got the job, else instead of their massive published tomes we might have had to be satisfied with variorum editions of their collected memos!

There were some false starts as regards the naming and scope of the new division. The first page of the *[Annual] Report of the Librarian of Congress for . . . 1912* indicates the likely intention of calling the unit the Division of Judaica, but by and by it became the Semitic Division. I may add parenthetically—for it is certainly of interest if not of immediate relevance—that the name and identity of the Division came to trouble Putnam's successor, Archibald MacLeish. It is common knowledge that Felix Frankfurter's endorsement of MacLeish won the poet Franklin Roosevelt's nomination as Librarian of Congress. It is unknown that MacLeish returned the favor, in a manner of speaking, by soliciting Frankfurter's opinion on a proposed reorganization involving the Semitic Division. In mid-1943, the poet-Librarian wrote the Justice as follows:

> . . . The move will, I am convinced increase the rather limited (at present) usefulness of our Semetic [sic] collection, which is largely concentrated as you know, upon ancient religious literature, and which should be developed in other fields and times. However, the move could be made, by unsympathetic persons—and there will be some—to look like a lessening of interest in Semetic [sic] studies. This would particularly be true if the name of the new division touched the sensibilities of Jewish intellectuals and scholars.[79]

As for the alleged sensibilities of Jewish intellectuals, one would be hard-pressed to come up with a better-intentioned utterance from a worse-informed source!

So, returning to 1912, Putnam was elated and went back to plotting other coups as Librarian of Congress. Adler was gratified and went back to running things as President of Dropsie College and seeking other outlets for his "unutilized capacities."[80] Deinard was galvanized and went back to Europe and Palestine to assemble other collections to purvey to the Library of Congress (and the Smithsonian Institution). And Jacob Schiff went back to being Jacob Schiff, i.e., making loads of money and giving lots of it away.

There were three other Deinard Collections that were still to be acquired by LC, one of them again through the munificence of Schiff. But they may constitute fitting subjects for harangues on other occasions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasant duty to thank Michael Grunberger for sharing several items that I had not previously seen, Peggy Pearlstein for spotting a significant reference, and John Knowlton, Herman Dicker, Roger Kohn, Aviva Astrinsky, and Arthur Kiron for facilitating access to needed materials. Acknowledgments for use of archival documents are made to the Annenberg Research Institute [now the Center for Advanced Judaic Studies at the University of Pennsylvania], Essex County Clerk's Office, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America Archives, the

Library of Congress, the National Archives and Records Administration, New York County Clerk, and the Smithsonian Institution Archives.

NOTES*

1. *Annals of Congress,* 13th Cong., 3rd sess., H. R., 17 Oct. 1814 (= *Debates and Proceedings* [Washington, 1854], 3: 398).
2. *The Adams-Jefferson Letters,* ed. Lester Jesse Cappon, 2 vols. (Chapel Hill, 1959), 2: 383–386.
3. *Alistair Cooke's America* (New York, 1974), 151. I have not to date identified the note to which Cooke refers. It seems likely, however, that Jefferson was copying something he read in one of his books, perhaps in Claudius Buchanan's *Two Discourses . . . to which are added Christian Researches in Asia* (Boston, 1811), 223–228. This book is inventoried J. 186 in the *Catalogue of the Library of Thomas Jefferson,* comp. Emily Millicent Sowerby, 5 vols. (Charlottesville, 1983), 2: 189.
4. In a moment of vainglory, Deinard writes from Palestine in 1913 to Immanuel Moses Casanowicz of the Smithsonian Institution, that already in his youth in Russia he had become known as just about the greatest connoisseur in numismatics, with museum directors constantly soliciting his opinion! Cyrus Adler was decidedly suspicious of this alleged expertise and the completeness of the collection of ancient Jewish coinage he was offering. Nonetheless, about a dozen of his coins did eventually arrive at the Smithsonian; cf. *Koheleth America,* 2: 152, for what he says became of the balance of the collection. Deinard (Hebrew letter) to Casanowicz, 25 Feb. 1913; Adler to Casanowicz, 30 Jan. 1913; Adler to Geare, 27 May 1913: Accession 41107 [now incorporated into 207992], Box 1048, Record Unit 305, Smithsonian Institution Archives. Before returning to the United States that year, Deinard published at his own expense the first work in Hebrew on ancient Jewish numismatics, Samuel Raffaeli's *Matbe'ot ha-Yehudim; Coins of the Jews: History of Jewish Coinage* (Jerusalem, 1913). There is no repetition of the claim to expertise in Deinard's preface.
5. Ephraim Deinard, *Divre ha-yamim le-Tsiyon be-Rusyah,* 2 vols. (Kearny, N.J., 1904), 1: 44–62.
6. This corrects the faulty date given in Deinard's *Koheleth America: Catalogue of Hebrew Books Printed in America from 1735–1925,* 2 vols. in 1 (St. Louis, 1926), 1: 6. Entries for the Deinard Family, SS City of Chicago Passenger Manifest, 6 Oct. 1888, list no. 1369, passengers nos. 203–204, 342–346; Passenger Lists of Vessels Arriving at New York, 1820–1897; (National Archives Microfilm Publication M 237, roll 525); Records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Record Group 85, National Archives. Ephraim Deinard's occupation is recorded there as "tailor." The eleven pieces of luggage listed for Mrs. Deinard—Mr. Deinard is shown as lugging nothing!—would have been crammed with the large collection of printed books and 200 manuscripts that he states he brought with him (*Koheleth America,* 6). It is these books that are advertised on the back pages of *ha-Le'umi* from the first issue (14 Dec. 1888).
7. "Jewish Colonization in California: Deinard Describes its Prospects," *The Jewish Exponent* (Baltimore and Philadelphia), 12 Feb. 1897, 1.

*Editor's note: Rather than attempt to recast these extensive notes according to the strictures of *Judaica Librarianship* style, they have been reproduced here (with minor adjustments) as they appeared in the author's typescript. As indicated in the Acknowledgments, the Annenberg Research Institute is now the Center for Advanced Judaic Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

8. Deinard, *Divre ha-yamim,* 2: 59; Simcha Berkowitz, "Ephraim Deinard (1846–1930): A Transitional Figure" (M.A. thesis, Columbia University, 1964), 8, n. 30.
9. He applied for his first papers at the Court of Common Pleas for the City and County of New York on 5 Dec. 1888 and was admitted to citizenship on 1 Nov. 1893 at the Court of Common Pleas of Essex County, New Jersey. For a statement of his intentions see *Divre ha-yamim,* 2: 58.
10. *Ha-Le'umi.* It is fairly described as "Zionist" in orientation. But when he announced its impending publication in *ha-Tsevi,* 5: 8 (23 Nov. 1888), suppl. p. (2), he signaled a "Territorialist" position by calling the periodical "Ameriḳa vi-Yerushalayim" and stating as its aim the encouragement of agriculture among Jews in America and Palestine, and the formation of an organization similar to the Alliance Israélite Universelle for that sole purpose. Cf. the wish of Eliezer Ben-Yehuda in *ha-Tsevi* four issues later, 5: 12 (17 Jan. 1889), p. 47.
11. *Der Patriot* (Newark, 1891 or 1892). Not a single issue of this weekly is known to survive. See Jacob Kabakoff, *Shoḥarim ve-ne'emanim* (Jerusalem, 1978), 29 and Robert Singerman, *Judaica Americana,* 2 vols. (New York, Westport, Conn., London, 1990), 2: 1057, no. S553. But his Yiddish journalism appeared earlier in the London weekly *Tsukunft* and that is preserved. See Ephraim Deinard, *'Atidot Yisra'el: Masa' Tsiyon,* 2 vols. (Newark, 1891), 1: 67. (He is also reputed to have published in Yiddish in the Pittsburgh publication *Der Blumengarten.*)
12. Ephraim Deinard, *Or Mayer* (New York, 1896), 6.
13. See Jacob Voorsanger in *Emanu-El* (San Francisco): 15 Jan. 1897, 6–7; 21 May1897, 6–9; 15 Oct. 1897, 6–7. Cf. *The Jewish Exponent* (Baltimore and Philadelphia): 12 Feb. 1897, 1–2; 7 May 1897, 7; 14 May 1897, 6; 29 Oct. 1897, 4; and cf. the broadside by Deinard, "The Colonization Question of Russian Jews in America" (Kearny, 1897), *American Jewish Ephemera,* lecture: Oscar Handlin, catalogue: Charles Berlin (Cambridge, Mass., 1977), 54.
14. *Tsiyon;* See Jacob Kabakoff, *Shoḥarim ve-ne'emanim,* 27–29.
15. *Selected Letters / Cyrus Adler,* ed. Ira Robinson, 2 vols. (Philadelphia / New York, 1985), 1: 64.
16. *Judaica Jerusalem:* Auction 12 June 1991, 92. The "c. 1900" date given in the auction catalog for the broadside is too late: the date is circa 1893–1895.
17. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 16 (1894): cclxxvii (where Deinard is dubbed "Rev.," as also in the press account!); cf. Simcha Berkowitz, "Ephraim Deinard: Bibliophile and Bookman," *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 9 (Spring 1971): 151, n. 77.
18. *The North American* (Philadelphia), 29 Dec. 1894, 4.
19. *Koheleth America,* 1: 6 and *Le-Ḳorot ha-Yehudim be-Ameriḳa; History of the Jewish Settlement at Kearny-Arlington. N.J.* (New Orleans, 1925), 18–19.
20. *Le-Ḳorot,* 18.
21. *Koheleth America,* 1: 6.
22. Cyrus Adler, *I Have Considered the Days* (Philadelphia, 1941), 66–68.
23. Ellis Leon Yochelson, *The National Museum of Natural History: 75 Years in the Natural History Building,* ed. Mary Jarrett (Washington, 1985), 18.
24. Adler, who was the person on the Smithsonian staff closest to Secretary Langley, delivered a lecture in memoriam before the Philosophical Society of Washington on Langley's life and career: *Annual Report of the Board of Reagents of the Smithsonian Institution for . . . 1906* (Washington, 1907), 515–533. Cf. also Adler, *I Have Considered the Days,* 283–284, 249–259. Langley, Manly (the solo test pilot), Adler, and three helpers—along with the flying machine invented by the Secretary—are shown before takeoff over the Potomac in a 1903 photo, reproduced *ibid.,* facing p. 256, and elsewhere. Cf. *New York Times,* 8 Oct. 1903, 1.
25. *U.S. Statutes at Large,* 14: 13.
26. *Annual Report . . . Smithsonian Institution . . . for . . . 1866,* 15.

27. *[Annual] Report of the Librarian of Congress for . . . 1901* (Washington, 1901), 270–275.
28. Arch 1, Box 8, Adler 10, pp. 3, 7, Adler Papers, Jewish Theological Seminary of America Archives. Cf. Naomi Wiener Cohen, *Encounter with Emancipation* (Philadelphia, 1984), 208, 368, n. 79. (Cohen gives the date as 1892, but the document is undated and should be earlier.)
29. Adler's brother-in-law to be, Herbert Friedenwald, became the first chief of the Manuscript Division at LC in 1897 (to 1900), but he was not situated to influence such matters.
30. Adler to Deinard, 11 Dec. 1893, Accession 207992, Box 1048, Record Unit 305, Smithsonian Institution Archives.
31. Adler to Putnam, 23 Mar. 1900, Smithsonian, Putnam-MacLeish, Central File, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
32. Adler to Young, 29 Sept. 1898, John Russell Young, Central File, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
33. Adler to Putnam, 26 Mar. 1905 (with enclosure, Bank to Adler, 20 Mar. 1905), Smithsonian, Putnam-MacLeish, Central File, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
34. Putnam to Adler, 28 Mar. 1905; Adler to Putnam, 2 Apr. 1905 (with enclosure, Ginzberg to Adler, 31 Mar. 1905); Putnam to Adler, 4 Apr. 1905, Smithsonian, Putnam-MacLeish, Central File, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress. Bank to Putnam, 11 May 1905; Putnam to Bank, 15 May 1905; Bank to Putnam, 10 June 1905; Secr. to Bank, 12 June 1905, Order Division, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
35. Adler to Putnam, 19 Dec. 1905, Smithsonian, Putnam-MacLeish, Central File, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
36. In his letter of 30 Jan. 1913 to Casanowicz (see n. 4 above), Adler—who normally kept enmity out of his correspondence—writes: ". . . You speak of Deinard's bringing the collection to this country for examination. I understood that Deinard had gone to settle in Palestine. Of course, I never believed that he would settle there but I think it a very good thing to let him settle there. . . ." (Adler was, of course, a non-Zionist!) And in his letter to Geare of 27 May 1913 (cf. n. 4 above), he writes: ". . . I am not at all favorable to purchasing Deinard's collection without having some expert see it . . . While . . . I am very anxious to see the collections grow, we ought not buy a pig in a poke . . ."
37. His feelings towards Deinard may now be read in *The Mayer Sulzberger-Alexander Marx Correspondence, 1904—1923,* ed. Herman Dicker (New York, 1990), 4 (S-6), 7 (S-9), 27 (S-42), 29 (S-44), 37 (S-61), 43 (S-75, 76a), 45 (S-78, 80), 47 (S-84), 48 (S-86), 53 (S-97), passim. The Judge's letter of 22 July 1896, authorizing Deinard to publish a catalog of his collection (*Or Mayer*), is preserved in the Smithsonian Institution Archives (Accession 207992, Box 1048, Record Unit 305).
38. *Selected Letters / Cyrus Adler,* 1: 141.
39. Adler was on friendly terms with Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, and had once had his amateur legal opinion appropriated by Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller in a Smithsonian Regents controversy! See *I Have Considered the Days,* 50, 190–192, 264–266, 271–273, 275–276, 302–216. Cf. *ibid.* 270.
40. Deinard to Librarian of Congress Library, 5 Oct. 1909, Order Division, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
41. Putnam to Deinard, 29 October 1909; Deinard to Putnam, 2 Nov. 1909; Putnam to Adler, 3 Nov. 1909; Putnam to Deinard, 4 Nov. 1909; Adler to Putnam, 7 Nov. 1909; Adler to Marx, 7 Nov. 1909; Deinard to Putnam, 8 Nov. 1909; Putnam to Adler, 11 Nov. 1909; Adler to Marx, 12 Nov. 1909; Adler to Putnam, 12 Nov. 1909; Putnam to Adler, 12 Nov. 1909; Putnam to Deinard, 12 Nov. 1909: All are in Putnam-MacLeish, Central File, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, except the two letters from Adler to Marx, which are in the Marx files at the Jewish Theological Seminary Archives.
42. Adler to Putnam, 7 Nov. 1909. (See n. 41 above.)

43. *The Century Dictionary,* ed. William Dwight Whitney, 6 vols. (New York, 1889–1891), 5: 5487.
44. *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles,* ed. James Augustus Henry Murray, 10 vols. in 13 (Oxford, 1888–1928), 8/4 (ed. Henry Bradley) (1912): 445.
45. On the term "anti-Semitic," however, cf. what Adler writes Kohler as late as 1909: *Selected Letters / Cyrus Adler,* 1: 166.
46. Adler to Putnam, 12 Nov. 1909. (See n. 41 above.)
47. *Sulzberger-Marx Correspondence,* 47 (S-84), 48 (S-85, 86), 51 (S-92, 93), 52 (S-95, 96), 53 (S-97), 55 (S-102).
48. Deinard to "Dear Sir," 4 Jan. 1912, Order Division, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
49. Putnam to Deinard, 10 Jan. 1912. See also Secr. to Deinard, 23 Feb. 1912: *ibid.*
50. *New York Times,* 9 Feb. 1912, 8.
51. Cyrus Adler has summarized them in his authorized biography *Jacob H. Schiff; His Life and Letters,* 2 vols. (New York, 1928). Cf. *I Have Considered the Days,* 347–354 for his account of its composition.
52. Putnam mentions this to Adler in his letter to him of 6 Mar. 1912, and elicits in the latter's reply of 21 Mar. 1912 the figure of $40,000 as Adler's appraisal of Schiff's total gift to date for the purchase of books for the "Hebrew Department" of the New York Public Library. Adler Papers, Annenberg Research Institute [Center for Advanced Judaic Studies, University of Pennsylvania]. Cf. also *Jewish Book Annual* 23 (5726, 1965–66): 42–43 and Deinard, *Koheleth America,* 1: 7.
53. Putnam to Adler, 6 Mar. 1912. (See n. 52 above.)
54. Adler to Putnam, 21 Mar. 1912. (See n. 52 above.)
55. Putnam to Schiff, 1 Apr. 1912. Folder—LC Gift Funds: Jewish Studies 5: Schiff, Jacob H., Central Files Unit, Office Systems Services, Library of Congress.
56. Schiff to Putnam, 3 Apr. 1912, *ibid.*
57. Adler to Sulzberger, 5 Apr. 1912, Adler Papers, Annenberg Research Institute.
58. Adler to Schiff, 7 Apr. 1912, *Selected Letters / Cyrus Adler,* 1: 210–211.
59. Schiff to Putnam, 15 Apr. 1912, Folder—LC Gift Funds: Jewish Studies 5: Schiff, Jacob H., Central Files Unit, Office Systems Services, Library of Congress. This letter is published by Adler in his biography, *Jacob H. Schiff,* 2: 35–36, with the financial detail omitted.
60. *Selected Letters / Cyrus Adler,* 1: 212.
61. Deinard to Putnam, 2 Nov. 1909; Putnam to Adler, 3 Nov. 1909; Adler to Putnam, 7 Nov. 1909. (See n. 41 above.)
62. Putnam to Adler, 6 Mar. 1912, Adler Papers, Annenberg Research Institute.
63. Putnam to Schiff, 1 Apr. 1912. (See n. 55 above.)
64. Putnam to Schiff, 25 Apr. 1912; Schiff to Putnam, 29 Apr. 1912; Putnam to Schiff, 5 May 1912; Schiff to Putnam, 7 May 1912; Putnam to Schiff, 9 May 1912, Folder—LC Gift Funds: Jewish Studies 5: Schiff, Jacob H., Central Files Unit, Office Systems Services, Library of Congress.
65. For this overview of the First Deinard Collection, I rely in the main on Immanuel M. Casanowicz's analysis published in *[Annual] Report of the Librarian of Congress for . . . 1912,* 23–25, which is based, however, upon Deinard's handwritten inventory (Hebraic Section, Library of Congress), and not upon an examination of the books received. I diverge in reporting the number of incunabula, which according to Casanowicz was "some 30." This cannot be right even if the First Deinard Collection included (as did the Fourth Deinard Collection) several non-Hebrew incunables—an assumption for which I have found no evidence. The earliest post-accession listing I have encountered is the 12 June 1914 memo by Israel Schapiro (Hebraic Section, Library of Congress), "List of the Hebrew Incunabula in the First Deinard Collection," which records 19 distinct editions and tallies in number with Deinard's

handwritten inventory. Schapiro stated the total number of LC's Hebrew incunabula after the arrival of the Second Deinard Collection, with its four additions, as "more than one-fourth of all the imprints known to Jacobs (see *JE,* s.v.)," *[Annual] Report . . . for . . . 1914,* 28–29. This should yield a figure for 1914 somewhat over 25, inclusive of the incunables not acquired from Deinard which were held in or out of the Semitic Division.

66. *[Annual] . . . Report for . . . 1912,* 23–25.
67. Memo, Chief Order Division to Librarian of Congress, 18 June 1912, Order Division, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
68. *The American Hebrew and Jewish Messenger* (New York) 94:9 (26 Dec. 1913), 250.
69. Marx's missive to Schiff with this information was forwarded by the latter to Putnam, with his authorization to purchase the Second Deinard Collection on 14 Jan. 1914. Folder—LC Gift Funds: Jewish Studies 5: Schiff, Jacob H., Central Files Unit, Office Systems Services, Library of Congress. Marx had been down to Washington (with Adler) in the summer of 1913 and had inspected the First Deinard Collection. Of course, he was writing only of the material acquired from Deinard. He was not cognizant of the fact that the *[Annual] Report . . . for . . . 1904,* for example, records the accession of a Hebrew manuscript prayer book on parchment (p. 56) and a portion of a Torah on sheepskin (pp. 37, 41).
70. Putnam to Schiff, 25 Apr. 1912, Folder—LC Gift Funds: Jewish Studies 5: Schiff, Jacob H., Central Files Unit, office Systems Services, Library of Congress.
71. *Ibid.*
72. Putnam to Schiff, 12 Mar. 1920; Schiff to Putnam, 16 Mar. 1920, *ibid.*
73. Putnam to Schiff, 25 Apr. 1912. (See n. 70 above.)
74. Schiff to Putnam, 29 Apr. 1912, *ibid.*
75. Adler to Putnam, 15 June 1913, Adler Papers, Annenberg Research Institute.
76. Deinard to Sulzberger, Hebrew letter of 8 Apr. 1912, Marx-Sulzberger file, Deinard Papers, Jewish Theological Seminary of America Archives.
77. Putnam to Schiff, 17 Sept. 1913; Schiff to Putnam, 19 Sept. 1913; Putnam to Schiff, 22 Sept. 1913, Folder—LC Gift Funds: Jewish Studies 5: Schiff, Jacob H., Central Files Unit, Office Systems Services, Library of Congress.
78. Putnam to Adler, 24 Feb. 1914; Adler to Putnam, 26. Feb., 1914; Putnam to Adler, 27 Feb. 1914; Adler to Putnam, 6 Apr. 1914, Adler Papers, Annenberg Research Institute.
79. MacLeish to Frankfurter, 12 July 1943; Frankfurter to MacLeish, 17 July 1943, Librarian's Letterbook, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.
80. Adler to Putnam, 9 Oct. 1899, Smithsonian, Putnam-MacLeish, Central File, LC Archives, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress.

Myron M. Weinstein (1927–1998), a long-time research librarian in the Hebraic Section of The Library of Congress, served as Head of that Section from 1980 until he retired in 1984.