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Abstract

This article will analyze a selection of Anglophone and Romanian scholarship on Moses Gaster. Gaster (1856–1939) was an intellectual, bibliophile, rabbi, educator, and activist for Jewish emancipation and a national home in the geographical area of Palestine. The article is complemented by a thematically organized bibliography which brings together Anglophone and Romanian scholarship, and other material, such as newspaper articles. This work thus hopes to contribute to the closing of the gap between Anglophone and Romanian writing on Gaster. Whereas in Anglophone contexts Gaster is better remembered as an Anglo-Jewish leader and an outspoken advocate of Zionism than for his literary scholarship, in Romania it seems to be the other way around. Gaster has, until recently, been remembered especially as a Romanian philologist and folklorist. This overview of the state of research also aims to contextualize my contribution, which focusses on Gaster’s scholarship and collection. I will argue that in order to evaluate Gaster’s significance, it is important to consider not only his wide-ranging scholarly work and his political and communal involvements, but also his passion for collecting.
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I. Introduction

This article is part of my larger research project, “Moses Gaster: eclectic collector”. The title was chosen to emphasize that Gaster (1856–1939) was a collector in more than one sense of the word. First of course in the literal sense: he was a bibliophile who assembled an enormous collection
of printed books, manuscripts, pamphlets and amulets. Progress in
documenting and analyzing his collection, now distributed over various
institutions, has been made especially during the academic year of 2011–
2012. The focus then was on the Gaster Collection at the John Rylands
Library in Manchester. The project as a whole is not only concerned with
Gaster’s collection, but especially with evaluating his place in the history
of scholarship in the fields to which he contributed. It may be suggested
that there could be a link between the two aspects. Taking seriously the fact
that Gaster was a collector may help in understanding and contextualizing
his scholarship. Secondly, as a scholar he was in a sense also a collector:
several of his main publications are collections – collections of stories,
which he brought together from different manuscripts, and from books
published by various scholars. In existing research on Gaster, the
significance of his collecting has received scant attention. This article will
compare and contrast Anglophone and Romanian scholarship on Gaster.
It seems that in the Anglophone contexts Gaster is better remembered
as an Anglo-Jewish leader and as an outspoken advocate of Zionism
than for his literary scholarship. In Romania it is the other way around,
at least for approximately the first fifty years after his death, he has been
remembered almost exclusively as a Romanian philologist and folklorist.
Gaster as an actor in history, which will be referred to in this article as his
“political” side, understood in the wide sense of the word, is a relatively
recent rediscovery. The argument will be made that in order to evaluate
Gaster’s contribution, it is important to consider not only his wide-ranging
scholarly work and his political and communal involvements, but also
his passion for collecting.

Moses Gaster was an intellectual, bibliophile, rabbi, and activist for
Jewish emancipation and the establishment of a national home in the
geographic area of Palestine. He was born in Romania and studied in
Germany. After his studies he returned to Bucharest where he became a
lecturer at the university. He also officiated as an inspector of secondary
schools (appointed in 1883) and an examiner of teachers (since 1884).²
Besides this he was active in various Jewish Societies, such as the Jewish
Colonization Society and the Council of the Society for the publication
of Jewish school books. Due to his involvement on behalf of the Jewish
population he was expelled from Romania in 1885, together with other
vocal Jewish intellectuals. He spent the rest of his life in England, where
he became the Haham, the leader (roughly the equivalent of chief rabbi),
of the Sephardic Congregation (Jews from Spanish and Portuguese
backgrounds) of the British Empire. The relations between Gaster and the Sephardic establishment were problematic, and in 1918 he was made to resign.

As a scholar Gaster was engaged in diverse fields of study, including Romanian and Roma language and literature, folklore, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, magic and mysticism, and Samaritan studies. He also published on other religious groups such as Hasidim and Karaites. Many of his interests can thus be understood as “marginal”, outside of the established canon of mainstream scholarly interests. In spite of his deteriorating eyesight, Gaster continued to publish and give talks throughout his life. Many of his scholarly publications were editions and studies of texts, especially in the area of Jewish and Christian literature from antiquity to the Middle Ages, and folklore. Some examples include *Literatura Populară Română* (1883), *Ilchester Lectures on Greco-Slavonic Literature* (1887), *Chrestomatie Română* (1891), *Hebrew Visions of Hell and Paradise* (1893), *Two Unknown Hebrew Versions of the Tobit Legend* (1896), *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (1899), *Exempla of the Rabbis* (1924), *Asatir, the Samaritan Book of the Secrets of Moses* (1927) and *Maaseh Book of Jewish Tales and Legends* (1934). He also was a sharp commentator on “current affairs” and contributed numerous articles to newspapers and magazines.

Besides the legacy of his written output, another of his major achievements shows him in yet a different role, that of bibliophile and collector. Gaster assembled an enormous library of printed books and manuscripts (scrolls, fragments and codices) reflecting his wide ranging interests. This collection has now been distributed over several different institutions. Two sales were made when Gaster was still alive: in 1925 the British Library in London bought circa 1000 manuscripts. Most of these are Hebrew manuscripts (that is, various languages in Hebrew script), but they also obtained some Samaritan manuscripts. The Romanian Academy Library in Bucharest acquired most of Gaster’s Romanian manuscripts in 1936. The remainder of Gaster’s library was sold and donated after his death, especially in the 1950s. The most important holdings are at the John Rylands Library in Manchester, at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, London and the Special Collections of University College London. Smaller collections are at the Brotherton Library in Leeds, and the YIVO Institute in New York. Many of Gaster’s printed books in the area of Judaica were acquired by the University of California in Los
Angeles when they bought up the stock of the booksellers Bamberger & Wahrman.

It is not surprising that Gaster as an intellectual, rabbi, talented orator, and one who was passionate about politics and Jewish causes, was strongly committed to education, in the wider sense of the word. He continuously emphasized the importance of study and learning for the Jewish community. Before, during and after his time as Haham, he wrote several books for children. In Romania he had already produced a short account of biblical history, which was reprinted three times.\(^9\) Starting in 1928, he published a series of booklets on the Jewish festivals.\(^10\) He was also responsible for a new edition of the prayer book.\(^11\) It was one of the major disappointments of his life that his dream of turning the Lady Judith Memorial College at Ramsgate into a leading European Rabbinic seminary failed.\(^12\) The college was founded by Sir Moses Montefiore as a memorial for his wife in 1867. Twenty years later, at the time Gaster started his post as Haham, it was used as a kind of retirement home for learned Jewish gentlemen. Gaster concluded that this was not in accordance with the original intention of the founder. He presented his ideas for reorganizing the college in writing to the Sephardic leadership.\(^13\) He wanted to transform this memorial college into a Rabbinic seminary, obviously inspired by his own experience of having studied at Breslau. The leadership approved of his plan, and appointed him as principal in 1888. The college opened for Rabbinic students in 1890. In the second of his annual reports he proudly states: “The reputation of the College has now spread over the Continent, and its importance and scientific character have been recognized near and far”.\(^14\) However, behind the scenes things were not as glorious as they appeared from Gaster’s published reports. Around 1895 the relationships between Gaster and members of the Sephardic establishment, which were already tense, started to deteriorate. Deep interpersonal conflicts were at the core of this so-called ‘Ramsgate affair’, or ‘Montefiore scandal’. Differences in opinion about the correct interpretation of the statutes of the founding of the College as drawn up by Sir Moses Montefiore also played a major role. The accusations that the two students whom Gaster had ordained had engaged in immoral conduct may have been made up, and were certainly secondary.\(^15\)

Gaster was a fervent correspondent who kept in touch with a great number of people. His contemporaries knew him as a talented orator, a fact which is mentioned in most of the articles which were written around the time of his eightieth birthday, in obituaries and in memorial
addresses. Those writings also on the whole place equal emphasis on Gaster’s significance as a scholar and as an actor in history. The Romanian chief-rabbi and Zionist, I. Niemirower, stated in an obituary that “Moses Gaster was not just a great scholar and writer, but also a man of action. Thanks to his talent as an orator in different languages, he was often invited to speak, most notably at the Zionist conferences”. Another obituary by the same author was entirely dedicated to the topic of Gaster as an important Zionist. His conclusion was that “Moses Gaster cannot be forgotten as a figure in our history, or as a Zionist”. However, this is exactly what happened. Gaster, with his interest in marginal literature, became himself marginalized, even in the history of Zionism to which he had dedicated so much of his energy. In her monograph The Unknown Gaster, Măriuca Stanciu refers to him as a “forgotten Zionist leader”. This may be the case especially in Romania, but it is not completely different in the Anglophone contexts. Philip Alexander has explained that “Moses Gaster is in many ways a controversial figure whose place in contemporary Jewish history, though assured, is by no means well-defined”. James Renton has persuasively argued that it was in the context of the development of a “Weizmann-centric” history of the Zionist movement that “Moses Gaster was transformed from a widely respected, influential and politically aware Zionist leader into a petty and peripheral individual”.

II. Anglophone representations

A. Gaster’s difficult personality and troubled relationships

Although this is somewhat of a simplification, it seems that in Anglophone scholarship Gaster is most often dealt with in the context of Anglo-Jewish history. His involvement in Jewish causes, particularly Zionism, is well known, although not always positively regarded. Cecil Roth predicted in his memorial address delivered a month after Gaster’s death at a meeting of the Jewish Historical Society of England, that his shortcomings will soon be forgotten. It seems fair to state that his prediction did not come true. Eugene Black stated that Moses Gaster “complained about everything and quarreled with almost everyone. From an institutional perspective, he proved at best a nuisance and at worst a major hazard to those causes into which he flung himself with such
abandon. Yet Gaster was English Zionist leadership writ large: substantial talent, excessive ego, and a predilection for quarrelsomeness”. This characterization may be at the extreme end in terms of unflattering portraits of Gaster. Nevertheless, drawing attention to his difficult personality is a frequent component of Anglophone writing on Gaster, as will be illustrated with several examples in this section.

First, the entry by Geoffrey Alderman in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* starts as one would expect with a brief biographical introduction. This is followed by a comparatively short section on Gaster’s scholarly achievements. The emphasis of the article is on Gaster’s personality and conflicts, especially in his position as Haham. Alderman stated: “If the Spanish and Portuguese leadership hoped that Gaster would put the Sephardim back on the map of Anglo-Jewry, they were certainly not disappointed. But Gaster fell out with this leadership, just as he fell out with most other people with whom he came into contact”. Gaster’s Zionism was one of the major sources of conflict with the Anglo-Jewish establishment, which was on the whole anti-Zionist. They perceived Gaster’s Zionist activities as “compromising, undermining, and perverting his ecclesiastical position – and also their status as British citizens”. That they had elected him as a Haham in the first place, in spite of his political convictions, is best explained by the plight of the Sephardic community. They were struggling to maintain their independence from the Askenazi majority. In this context they elected Gaster, an eminent and learned figure, as Haham. He thus became the counterpart of the Askenazi chief rabbis, father and son Nathan (1845–1890) and Herman (1891–1911) Adler. Alderman observed that Gaster “relished and exulted in the role of underdog, which might have been made for him, and used the majesty of his office (an image which in a sense he created) to make the voice of Sephardi distinctiveness heard in every corridor of power to which he could gain access. He had no hesitation in turning personal prejudices into religious principles, a task made easier by Hermann Adler’s comparative ignorance of Talmudic matters”.

Second, the recollections by two of his sons, Vivian and Theodor Gaster, also draw attention to Gaster’s difficult personality. Theodor’s well rounded portrait of his father dealt with most aspects of Gaster’s life and career. He evaluated Gaster’s contributions and pointed out weaknesses in his scholarship and in his attitudes to his social context. Theodor Gaster stated that his father’s
innate temperament took toll not only scholastically, but also psychologically. Usually ahead of his contemporaries, he was, alike in his work and in his life, always restless and frustrated. ... He was *difficile* in committees and team work, because he had almost invariably seen the wider ramifications and implications of an issue before his colleagues had got to them ... A constant impatience tended at times to beget intolerance and to foster a conviction of infallibility. I never heard my father admit that he was wrong... His Zionist colleagues found him obstinate and intractable. The fact is, however, that he usually turned out to be more far sighted than they.26

The unpublished six page typescript on Moses Gaster by his eldest son Vivian Gaster can be found among the UCL Gaster papers. It is undated, but from after the Second World War, and it seems to have been written as a speech at a family reunion. About half of it relates to Gaster’s strained relationships and conflicts. Vivian Gaster explained that

generally speaking his relations with the congregation, especially the richer ones ... were unhappy. Not that he did not have many close friends, but he did have enemies or at least men who were unfriendly, men who were, as he said, narrow in their conceptions ... and resentful of his broader ideas. He was a fine preacher, a powerful teacher of Judaism and a leader in any Jewish cause, but he was not a ‘spiritual’ leader. He had not the essential humility of spirit.27

On the next three pages of the typescript he described various examples of conflicts. He characterized Gaster’s attitude as unyieldingly combative, fighting for what he thought ought to be done. In his conclusion Vivian Gaster observed that his father’s attitude

led to much unhappiness and many estrangements. It was in fact his inability to compromise and his unwillingness to tie himself down even to meet a not unreasonable request, that resulted in his resignation of the post of Haham in 1918.28

This “resignation” has also been described as a dismissal.29 Taylor opens his chapter on Gaster by stating that he was the only one of twenty-one chief rabbis and hahamim to get fired. He pointed out that although considered by some as “the most formidable figure” in the history
of leaders of the British Jewish communities, Gaster was also perceived as “a difficult egomaniac, an impossible colleague and a vicious opponent”.30

B. Gaster and Folklore

Whereas in Romanian literature on Gaster he is most frequently discussed within the study of folklore, there are only a handful of articles in English which discuss him in this context. Compared with portrayals of Gaster within the context of Anglo-Jewish history, in English articles on Gaster in the context of folklore his difficult personality and problematic social relations do not feature prominently, or are not referred to at all. Four studies will be discussed in this section. The first is a short obituary by Allen Gomme in the journal of the Folklore Society, of which Gaster had been a member for over fifty years, serving as its president in 1908 and 1909. Gomme stressed that Gaster has always played an “active and leading part” in the development of the “science” of folklore, and in the “day to day business of the Society”.31 Gaster’s other activities, including his political side, have been mentioned towards the end of the obituary:

it is right to remind ourselves in these days that Dr. Gaster commenced his activities on behalf of persecuted Jews as early as 1880 and helped at that time to found the first refugee colonies in Palestine, and that it was his connection with that movement that led to his being exiled from his native land, though happily without finality or rancor on either side.32

Although the accuracy of this presentation of history might be questioned, it is noteworthy that Gomme drew attention to the political context in a short study primarily dedicated to Gaster’s scholarly achievements, particularly in the area of folklore. This contrasts with most of the Romanian portraits of Gaster within folklore studies and Romanian philology, where Gaster’s political dimension received scant attention. Gomme concluded by stating that Gaster’s life “adds luster to the name of Romania as it has enriched the country of his adoption and the whole world”.33 Not a word had been devoted to Gaster’s difficult personality or the less than successful aspects of his life.

Whereas it could be argued that it is part of the genre of the obituary to focus exclusively on the positive aspects of the life of the deceased, the same does not apply to a portrait such as that published by Venetia Newall in 1975, which is the second study to be discussed here.34 That
article has been based especially on testimonies from people who knew him, some correspondence, and newspaper articles, and concluded with nothing but praise:

Moses Gaster possessed all the qualities of an outstanding folklorist: love of tradition, his people and his nation, boundless enthusiasm and gifted scholarship, his private library overflowing with richness of books and incunabula. But he was much more than all this: he was a truly noble spirit.\(^{35}\)

Unlike the studies within the context of Anglo-Jewish history where emphasis is placed on Gaster’s difficult personality, Newall illustrated with several examples that “Gaster’s relations with other folklorists were friendly and cordial.”\(^{36}\) She also stressed that Gaster “was always ready to encourage the work of younger scholars”.\(^{37}\) Like Gomme’s obituary, she devoted considerable attention to Gaster’s political side, in her presentation of him as “a great Jewish nationalist.”\(^{38}\) A large section at the beginning of the article has been dedicated to Gaster’s dismantling of the “blood libel accusation”, particularly in the form of letters to the editor of *The Times*. She thus illustrated Gaster’s readiness “to tackle the superstition of anti-semitism in any shape or form”.\(^{39}\) In this portrait, one looks in vain for a critical assessment of Gaster’s work. It seems to have been written to defend Gaster’s reputation. In this light it is worth mentioning that Newell thanked several of Gaster’s children for their support and assistance in the writing of the article.

The third study, a few pages devoted to Gaster in a monograph on the history of the study of folklore in Britain, did more to place Gaster’s scholarship within context, although still without a critical evaluation of specific studies by Gaster. Dorson placed Gaster within his chapter “the Society Folklorists”. Like Gomme and Newell he thus demonstrated the significance of the connection between Gaster and the Folklore Society. He grouped Gaster among “three newcomers” who “joined in a formidable assault on the prevalent theory of survivalism. Joseph Jacobs, the Judaic scholar from Australia, Francis Hindes Groome, the gypsy expert, and Moses Gaster, the Romanian rabbi, found in spite of their divergent backgrounds a common sympathy for the migration hypothesis.”\(^{40}\) Attention to Gaster’s political involvements has been limited to a brief reference to his expulsion. According to Dorson, Gaster was “exiled from his native land for his part in helping settle Sephardic Jews in Palestine”.\(^{41}\)
Dorson’s focused on how this “unpredictable figure... the learned Moses Gaster” developed his arguments in favor of the migration theory in several of his publications. He hinted at Gaster’s personality without explicitly criticizing it by using phrases such as his “lumping together” of several theories he disagreed with, “immediately leaping into the battle front”, and arguing his case with a “confidently challenging voice”. In conclusion he stressed Gaster’s achievements:

This learned rabbi, writing with equal fluency in Romanian, English, German and Hebrew, serving as officer of the Royal Asiatic Society, the Jewish Historical Society, and the Folk-Lore Society, contributed a Balkan tang to the golden period of the English folklore movement.

The fourth and last study to be discussed in this section also deals with Jacobs and Gaster together. After sketching the context of the expanding field of English folklore studies, Rabinovitch explained: “that two Jewish newcomers to the country, Joseph Jacobs (1854–1916) and Moses Gaster (1856–1939), could gain acceptance in English society through contributions in this field is evidence that being a Victorian gentleman was not limited to Englishmen only.” He observed that these two “elite Jews” via their “very different approaches to folklore and anthropology” strove to be both English and Jewish, and aimed to show the general public that Jews had made significant contributions to civilization throughout history. The differences between them have been reflected in the headings of the two subsections: “Joseph Jacobs: an English folklorist in late-Victorian England” and “Moses Gaster: a Jewish folklorist in Edwardian England”. Rabinovitch, much more than earlier Anglophone writing on Gaster and folklore and in contrast with Romanian writing on the subject, explicitly connected Gaster’s folklore scholarship with his communal and political involvements. This has been made clear for example in his statement that Gaster’s affectionate descriptions of the fantasy world of tales, and the equilibrium established in them between all inhabitants of the earth, human and non-human, are likely a reflection of his own struggles at the time for the Zionist cause as well as for the improvement of living conditions for the Jews in Romania and tsarist Russia... It is worth pointing out that Gaster’s presidency of the English Folk-Lore society also coincided with the most intensive period of Zionist activism in his life.
Another aspect of Rabinovitch’ article relates to the debate of nationalism versus universalism within the study of folklore. Whereas some present Gaster as a Jewish nationalist,\(^48\) and others as a Romanian patriot,\(^49\) Rabinovitch seems to have come to a more accurate understanding of Gaster’s work as he points out that Gaster emphasized the “universal human quality of folklore”.\(^50\) But like the other contributions discussed in his section, he does not provide a thorough examination of Gaster’s publications. He draws upon Gaster’s work to obtain insights into his views, rather than to evaluate the quality of his scholarship. Although he did not analyze Gaster’s scholarship, he stated that compared with Jacobs, Gaster’s “studies were more scholarly”.\(^51\) Such a positive approach to Gaster’s work seems to be reserved in the English speaking world for studies which deal with Gaster as a folklorist. As the next section will show, his scholarship is generally not as positively regarded within Jewish studies.

C. Gaster’s “sloppy scholarship”

In addition to drawing attention to Gaster’s limited social skills, another common ingredient of Anglophone writing on Gaster is highlighting the flaws in his scholarship, especially, as Tova Rosen and Eli Yassif have put it, his “lamentable habit of dating the texts he discovered and published to impossibly early periods – perhaps in order to magnify the importance of his discoveries”.\(^52\) Theodor Gaster also addressed this point:

As his critics were not slow to point out, he bedeviled much of his work by an obstinate proclivity towards predating by centuries (in one case by a millennium!) almost every text that he discovered, in the romantic belief that mere antiquity automatically enhances intrinsic value.\(^53\)

Another example of this has been provided by Renate Smithuis, who started her introduction to the Genizah Collection in the John Rylands Library with an epigraph. She selected the following statement by Gaster: “It is well known that the smaller the leaves are the older they are”.\(^54\) Drawing attention to such a problematic claim as the first thing the reader sees vividly illustrates the point that Gaster’s paleographic skills might not be what one would wish for.

Philip Alexander has provided an insightful re-evaluation of one of Gaster’s books, a collection of stories published in 1924 under the title *Exempla of the Rabbis*. Alexander expressed the opinion that the neglect
of Gaster’s scholarship “is not wholly justified”. He particularly praises Gaster’s “pioneering spirit, which led him into many fields which were unfashionable in his day”. In his introduction he observed that Gaster’s reputation and influence began to decline around 1920. He referred to Gaster’s difficult personality and his lack of ability to adjust himself to his social context as the main reason for this decline: “Strong-minded, independent and combative, he seems to have had little time for the arts of diplomacy. He tended to alienate people, and he found himself in his later years increasingly marginalized and isolated”. Alexander next observed that Gaster’s scholarly reputation “also suffered something of an eclipse. The inadequacies of his scholarship – perceived already by discerning critics during his lifetime – became glaringly obvious after his death. His work is now generally seen as over-hasty, inexact and unreliable, and few today would pay it much regard”. The body of the article has been dedicated to a careful analysis of Gaster’s edition of a collection of Rabbinic stories which he called the *Exempla of the Rabbis*. Alexander’s assessment of this work shows that he fully recognizes Gaster’s shortcomings. He confirms many of the usual points of criticism: the Hebrew text contains many mistakes, Gaster’s English summaries “frequently miss the point, and sometimes contain outright mistranslations.” The long list of cross-references provided by Gaster which link the stories he presents to other stories in Jewish and world folklore “testify to his formidable command of folk literature, but the references are often inaccurate or imprecise, and the parallelism is of very different kinds.” Alexander observed that, engaging with Gaster’s text, “it is very difficult for the reader to decide … just what lies before him”. He contextualized Gaster’s work, stating that Gaster produced his edition “as an old-fashioned folklorist … primarily concerned with recording parallelism in content between individual folktales”. Unlike scholars of texts and literature today, such as Alexander and Smithuis, Gaster “was uninterested in questions of literary form” and “paid scant attention to the literary integrity of the compilations which he used”. Alexander provided a useful list in which he has traced most of the sections of the text back to their source manuscripts, which still leaves him with a few sections of diverse or unidentified sources. It turned out that the most important manuscript is Gaster Cod. 82 from the Rylands Gaster collection. The remainder of the article has been dedicated to an evaluation of this manuscript. In conclusion Alexander stated that this manuscript “may have a more central role to play [in the history of the development of Hebrew
prose] than has commonly been supposed". Gaster’s work thus seems to be perceived as worthy of reassessment because of the importance of the texts and manuscripts which he brought to light, rather than for the quality of his scholarship.

III. Romanian representations

A. Gaster the “Great Scholar”

The common somewhat negative perception of Gaster’s scholarship as pointed out by Alexander, seems to apply particularly to the Anglophone context. Gaster’s scholarly reputation does not seem to have suffered the same “eclipse” in Romania. An entry on Gaster can be found in nearly every encyclopedia of Romanian literature, writers, folklorists, ethnographers and even the Romanian Encyclopedia and the Encyclopedic Dictionary. The heading of the entry in the Dictionary of Romanian Literature provides a typical illustration of how Gaster has been identified: “philologist, historian of literature and folklorist”. The brief entry in the Encyclopaedic Dictionary identifies Gaster as “Romanian philologist of Jewish origin”. In addition, several well respected Romanian scholars wrote articles on Gaster’s contribution to various areas of Romanian culture. Most of these scholars were experts in the areas of Romanian language, literature or folklore. The emphasis of these studies can be illustrated for example by the first sentence of Chiţimia’s study on Gaster’s contribution to Romanian folklore:

M. Gaster was active in different areas of scholarship, but made his significant contributions especially in the context of the study of folklore and ancient literature, closely connected, using with success and competence the comparative method.

The idea of “comparative” research can be perceived as a way to make sense of Gaster’s interest in different fields of scholarship. Although this idea does not seem to feature in English writings on Gaster, it can be found throughout the Romanian literature. Virgiliu Florea explained that “Gaster developed his true vocation as a comparativist as far back as his Breslau studies …”. That the phrase has been applied not only in writings on Gaster in the context of Romanian philology, but also, more recently, in
studies which dealt with Gaster within Jewish Studies, is illustrated by the title of one of Stanciu’s articles: “The Comparative Approach – a Ticket to Integration: A New Perspective on Moses Gaster’s Comparative Studies on Jewish Popular Literature”. In it she placed Gaster firmly within the context of the Wissenschaft des Judentums, the intellectual movement which established Jewish Studies as an academic discipline. She thus expressed a view which differs from that of Alexander, who has argued that Gaster, with his “unfashionable” and marginal areas of research, “marks the transition from the concerns of the nineteenth century Wissenschaft des Judentums to the broader and more general phenomenological approach to Judaism which prevails in our own days”. Alexander thus recognized, more than Stanciu, the “marginal” nature of many of Gaster’s interests. A last example to be mentioned here of reference in Romanian scholarship to Gaster as a “comparativist” is the title Studies in Comparative Folklore. Petre Florea chose this title for a collection of articles by Gaster, which he brought together for reprint in order to “commemorate the activities of the great scholar”.

The recognition of Gaster as a “great scholar” is another important ingredient of Romanian scholarship, particularly in the articles which approach him within the context of Romanian philology. Gaster’s younger contemporary, folklorist Arthur Gorovei begins his article of 1945 with the statement: “On 11 March 1939 the great scholar who contributed prominently to the study of our folklore passed away, at the age of 83 years.” Gorovei continued by listing Gaster’s achievements, drawing particular attention to his contributions to important Romanian journals. The last section of his article consists of twelve letters which Gaster had sent to him over a period of 44 years, between 16 November 1893 and 30 November 1937.

That a substantial portion of Gaster’s correspondence, particularly with Romanian intellectuals, has been made available in published books is due to the efforts of Virgiliu Florea over the past 30 years. Florea is professor (emeritus) at the Folklore Institute at Cluj-Napoca and spent considerable time researching the UCL Gaster Papers, on which his publications are based. In his first book, M. Gaster in Correspondence: Literary Documents, he published the correspondence, both ways, of Gaster with N. Cartojan, L. Ţăineanu, and Caterina and Nicolae Titulescu. Each of the three sections has been preceded by a short study on the relationship of Gaster and his correspondents, based mainly on information obtained from the correspondence. In the preface Florea
referred to Gaster as “the great scholar, originally from Romania, author of the valued *Literatura Populară Română* and *Chrestomatie Română*, his best known works”. More than a decade later Florea published *Romanian Friends of M. Gaster*. It consists of short studies, most of which are followed by an appendix with documents such as letters (not always between Gaster and the figure to whom the chapter is dedicated). This work dealt with Gaster’s relations with figures from the “Junimea” literary circle in Bucharest: Titu Maiorescu, Iacob Negruzzi, Vasile Alecsandri, Mihai Eminescu, Ion Creangă, I.L. Caragiale, and Ion Slavici. It thus has a tighter focus than the later work in two volumes *Romanian Writers in the Gaster Archive in London*, which has been organized by location of the correspondent. The first volume and the first section of the second (with two correspondents) dealt with people from Bucharest: Al. Odobescu, B.P. Hasdeu, Petre Ispirescu, Constantin Esarcu, Carmen Sylva, Ioan Bianu, Take Ionescu, Moses Schwarzheld, Nicolae Iorga and Octavian Goga. The second volume then continued with five correspondents from Basarabia (currently the Republic of Moldova) and Bucovina (P.A. Sîrcu, I.G. Sbiera, Artur Gorovei, Vasile Grecu and Leca Morariu), one correspondent from Cluj (Constantin I. Marinescu), two from the USA (Oakland and New York, Samuel Ghinsberg and Leon Feraru), and a short section with one letter from Petre P. Carp.

Another work, which deserves to be better known in Anglophone contexts, is dedicated to the correspondence between Gaster and Agnes Murgoci (née Kelly), Australian-born folklorist of Romanian culture who lived in England and like Gaster was a member of the Folklore Society. The introductory study has been published both in Romanian and in English. The 111 documents which follow contain letters from Agnes Murgoci, Moses Gaster, Agnes’ daughter Helen Murgoci (all in English), and ten letters in Romanian by Agnes’ husband George Munteanu Murgoci. The work as a whole sheds light on folklore studies, on the collegial relations between these two folklorists (a reoccurring theme is Gaster giving Murgoci access to the resources in his library), but also on the historical and political contexts. Two examples are the visit to Romania which Gaster made along with other specially invited English participants in 1921, and attempts at improving the reputation of Romania in the English media. After introducing Agnes Murgoci, the “unknown Romanian folklorist”, Florea referred to Gaster as “the great Romanian-born scholar, whose renown speaks for itself”.
A similarly laudatory expression is “Moses Gaster: a great scholar”, as title of the first chapter in his monograph *Moses Gaster, the Person and his Work*. In it, Florea praised Gaster’s *Literatura Populară Română* as “a fundamental work”. *Chrestomatie Română* deserved credit as Gaster’s “most important work”. Although this monograph has been structured by titles of Gaster’s publications, Florea did not provide a thorough critical evaluation of their content. Instead his focus was on the contexts of these publications, based again on his research of the correspondence and other documents from among the UCL Gaster Papers.

One of Florea’s predecessors at the folklore archive in Cluj, Ion Muşlea, gave a paper on Gaster’s contribution to Romanian Folklore in 1959, which was published posthumously in a collection of essays. It consists mainly of basic biographical information and an overview of selected publications in the area of Romanian literature. He thus placed Gaster’s scholarship in the context of his time. The overview starts with Gaster’s contribution to the journal *Columna lui Traian* in 1878. Muşlea evaluated it as “a serious scholarly contribution of an erudite scholar who mastered the method of composing an article worthy of being published in any serious journal.” Dealing with *Literatura Populară Română*, the work to which he has devoted most attention, Muşlea credited Gaster with “having provided us with a beginning of the synthesis of our folklore”. Gaster’s productivity has also been underlined, as Muşlea pointed out that between 1877 and 1937 not a year passed without a contribution by Gaster to the study of universal folklore. He observed that Gaster’s interest in Romanian folklore “did not decline with old age”, pointing particularly to Gaster’s re-edition of Anton Pann’s *Povestea Vorbii*, written at the age of 78. He appreciated this work, particularly for Gaster’s “interesting and valuable” study of the development of proverbs. About Gaster’s biography of Pann, Muşlea observed that in spite of the fact that some information is missing (which Gaster would have been able to obtain only in Romania), it is still the “most complete and most interesting” biography until the appearance of the work of Ion Manole. Having mentioned Gaster’s last publications, and the fact that he died on the way to a lecture he was going to give on Romanian folklore, Muşlea observed “during his entire life, until the moment of his death, folklore was his preferred pursuit ... Gaster loved folklore as very few scholars did”. Muşlea did not seem to intend it as a point of criticism when he characterized Gaster as an armchair folklorist. What he meant is that Gaster was interested particularly in written popular literature. With a few exceptions, he did not go out
into villages collecting tales from “the people”, but instead drew upon collections of stories published by his fellow-scholars. Muşlea pointed out that in spite of this, Gaster still contributed to the collection of folk tales, because he supported the collecting activities others. In conclusion he characterized Gaster as passionate about folklore and considered his comparative studies and his editions of popular literature as his most important contributions.

Although Gaster is thus on the whole positively portrayed in Romanian scholarship, some points of criticism have been raised. Ovidiu Bârlea dedicated a short section to Gaster in his history of Romanian folklore studies. He started out by characterizing Gaster, “the learned Rabbi”, as “a sound connoisseur of ancient literature preserved in manuscripts”. He pointed out that Gaster approached folklore as an appendix to the “book” of popular written literature. Gaster was not alone in doing so; Bârlea perceived him as part of a movement which regarded written literature (whether Hebrew, Indian, Arabic or Persian) as the foundation of European folklore. A large portion of the study consists of Bârlea’s evaluation of Gaster’s Literatura Populară Română (1883). He recognized Gaster’s “unmeasured generalizing” as one of the major shortcomings of the work. He also criticized Gaster for arguing that fairytales are more recent than other scholars at the time thought, without presenting any evidence in support of his claims.

Whereas in Anglophone writing Gaster’s knowledge of languages has usually been praised as remarkable, in some Romanian publications this aspect has been seen as underdeveloped. The short entry in the Romanian Encyclopedia of 1900, which identified Gaster as an “erudite person of Jewish origin”, states that Gaster’s works have been well received, but “regarding the language they are very imperfect, especially those written in Romanian”. The author of one of the reports evaluating unfavorably Literatura Populară Română for the Romanian Academy is of the opinion that “Gaster did not have sufficient knowledge of the language in which he wrote, the work is full of grammatical and linguistic errors.”

According to Ilie Bărbulescu, Gaster did not know any Slavonic language. Bărbulescu was a member of the Romanian Academy and a Professor of Slavonic Studies at the University of Iaşi. He shared the nationalistic views of the intellectuals active there at the time. He wrote an article about Gaster’s “scholarly personality” on the occasion of Gaster’s 80th birthday, which was abundantly celebrated. Bărbulescu responded to the “articles of praise” which had appeared in the Romanian press at
In his view the praise was “partly deserved”. He recognized Gaster as an important scholar, because he opened new roads in the study of Romanian folklore and philology. The professor from Iași appreciated the value of both *Literatura populară română* and *Chrestomatie română* as pioneering works. But he soon added that they are valuable only because of their novelty, only because that kind of work had not been done before. On a closer examination there are many shortcomings. He provided a long list of grammatical and orthographic mistakes. But more importantly he pointed to what he called “the narrow horizon” of the works as their major flaw. He considered it a serious problem that in his work on Romanian literature Gaster has not made thorough comparisons with Slavonic and Hungarian literature. That would have been required for a proper understanding of the Romanian literature.

After those scholarly points of criticism, Bărbulescu’s article suddenly takes a completely different turn. He claimed that Gaster won his good name not just because of his scholarly contributions, but because of the “noise” that was made by the “national and international socialist movement.” He boldly stated that Gaster was expelled, because he was a socialist. It was also the socialist movement that made sure that he obtained the position of Chief Rabbi so soon after his arrival in London. Bărbulescu even went a step further, suggesting that Gaster was helped in his success, not only by being a part of the socialist movement, but also of Freemasonry. According to him this was the only explanation for the fact that the Romanian Academy, “among which there are many Freemasons”, decided in 1929 to make Gaster an honorary member, even though this honor was not bestowed on other scholars “whose work was by no means inferior to that of Gaster”. It may be perceived as a confirmation of Gaster’s confrontational personality, so often commented upon in Anglophone scholarship, that he responded to these accusations. He sent Bărbulescu a letter, plus a bibliography of his work. Gaster was not alone in defending himself. His close friend Moses Schwarzfeld responded in his paper *Egalitatea*. He corrected Bărbulescu’s statement that Gaster did not know any Slavonic languages, by asserting that Gaster “already in his youth knew old Slavonic and some of the Slavonic languages, such as Russian”. Furthermore, Schwarzfeld reduced to the realm of phantasy Bărbulescu’s views regarding the reasons for Gaster’s expulsion and for his honorary membership of the Romanian Academy (in other words, the membership of Freemasonry and of the Socialist Movement). Having pointed out these and other mistakes, he urged Bărbulescu to publish a rectification...
Bărbulescu responded, not by rectifying anything, but by defending himself and restating his point of view in even stronger terms in a second article.\textsuperscript{100}

Those ideas of the professor (Bărbulescu), writing in the 1930s, can be compared and contrasted with the discourse, several decades later, of a professor (Macrea) who complied with the official communist ideology of that time. Both of these contributions show how the ideology of the time influenced the way Gaster has been presented, at least in some publications. Linguist Dimitrie Macrea has a chapter on Moses Gaster in his 1978 book on the history of Romanian linguists and philologists. He began it by observing that “the linguistic and philological activities of Moses Gaster, whose contribution is in general little known to the general public, was not correctly understood and appreciated, among us, in his time.”\textsuperscript{101} Although he recognized Gaster’s main fields of activity as “folklore, literary history and Semitics”, he was of the opinion that his work in the areas of linguistics and Romanian philology was of special importance, because it had formed his academic foundation (it was the main focus of his studies). Still on the first page of his study, he explained that Gaster’s philological studies “originated from his love, manifest on all occasions, for the Romanian language and our ancient literary and popular creations”. In sharp contrast to Bărbulescu, Macrea enthusiastically praised Gaster’s \textit{Chrestomatie Română}. He regarded this “impressive”\textsuperscript{102} publication as “a work which has become classic”, establishing “Gaster’s name as a philologist and editor of ancient texts”.\textsuperscript{103} It is noteworthy that Macrea does not refer to Gaster’s Jewishness. Instead, he leaves no opportunity unused to present Gaster as a passionate Romanian patriot. He even perceived Gaster’s “passionate love for Romania’s soil” to be a fundamental aspect of his scholarship.\textsuperscript{104} Gaster’s expulsion has been attributed entirely to the fact that “the liberal politician Dimitrie Sturdza had the most hostile attitude towards Gaster”.\textsuperscript{105} The situation between them had escalated when Gaster had ridiculed Sturdza’s explanations for the origin of two Romanian place names in a public lecture, offering “sound scholarly arguments” to support his view. According to Macrea, an embittered Sturdza responded by expelling Gaster from the country. This was possible, because “Gaster, although born and raised in Romania, did not have Romanian citizenship due to the laws of the time”.\textsuperscript{106} His explanation completely fails to account for the other vocal Jewish intellectuals who were expelled. Surely not all of them had insulted Dimitrie Sturdza.
Similar veiled language regarding Gaster’s expulsion can also be found in some other articles. In the entry on Gaster in the *Dictionary of Romanian Literature* Berdan stated: “In 1885, following a chauvinistic campaign against him, Gaster was expelled from the country”.107 Datcu, in his *Dictionary of Romanian Ethnologists*, shared Macrea’s view, explaining that Gaster was expelled, “following a political conflict with D.A. Sturdza”.108 A notable exception is the way in which already in 1968 Chițimia criticized the view that the expulsion was due to a conflict with Sturdza. He referred instead to Gaster’s activities on behalf of the Jewish population, particularly his newspaper article which had exposed violence directed at Jews during a conflict in a rural community in Romanian Moldova.109

**B. Gaster as a political figure – recently rediscovered**

In spite of the exception in Chițimia’s contribution, the majority of Romanian publications prior to the 1990s dealt almost exclusively with Gaster as a Romanian philologist. In those articles Gaster’s role as an actor in history, in other words his political side, has been overlooked.

Ambrus Miskolczy tried to remedy this situation in a Romanian-Hungarian work (with a summary in English) published in Budapest in 1993. In his preface he stated that Gaster is a figure who needs to be rediscovered in the history of scholarship.110 Miskolczy’s contribution consists of a selection of Gaster’s articles and correspondence, “previously unknown documents which shed light on his psychology and spirituality”. He suggested that “the undercurrent of his creativity and attitudes was nonconformity”.111 His substantial introductory study is entitled “From the cultivation of traditions to modern nationalism: the rebellion (or revolt) of Moses Gaster.”112 Although he mentioned Gaster’s published work, he does so in passing within a study which places Gaster in the political and social developments of his historical context. He stressed Gaster’s conflicts with the Romanian antisemitic political elite. The study consists of four sections and combines a chronological with a thematic organization. The first section “The world of Gaster’s Bucharest and Romanian antisemitism” dealt with Gaster’s childhood and youth within the context of the situation of Jews at the time. Miskolczy made use of Gaster’s personal reminiscences, but not in an uncritical fashion.113 An example is his view that Gaster may have exaggerated things in his section on his childhood memories, for example when claiming that the Transylvanians brought antisemitism to
Bucharest. A corrective to the widespread assumption in Anglophone scholarship that Gaster was an outsider to the Sephardic community is the information that Gaster was Sephardic from his father’s side of the family and Ashkenazy from his mother’s. The second section carries the title “Rebellion against his parents?” Miskolczy stated that besides his conflict with the antisemitism of the time, Gaster had two further confrontations as a student in Breslau: with himself, and with his father. The section focused particularly on Gaster’s correspondence with his father from 1879. The next section, “rebellion against the powers”, dealt with the political situation in Romania and Gaster’s part in the struggle for Jewish emancipation after his return from Breslau. Miskolczy mentioned Gaster’s failed attempt to obtain Romanian citizenship and provided probably the most detailed account of Gaster’s expulsion and the various circumstances which led up to it. At the beginning of the section Miskolczy explained that by 1885 Gaster had developed his activities in three related areas: he tried to renew Jewish religious life, he thoroughly researched the history of old Romanian literature and Romanian popular culture, and he had started the work of organizing the emancipation of Jews in Romania.

This portrayal of Gaster’s activities in Bucharest between his student days and his expulsion differs significantly from those in the studies discussed earlier. Here much more emphasis is placed on Gaster’s communal and political involvement. Another point is that Miskolczy, like Newell mentioned earlier, stressed Gaster’s modern outlook in relation to Jewish communal life and in his scholarship. The last section is dedicated to Gaster’s identity as a Zionist, under the heading “the evolution of Moses Gaster from traditionalism to modern nationalism: Gaster’s Zionism”. Miskolczy correctly observed that Gaster occupied a somewhat unusual (he used the term “isolated”) position within the Zionist moment. He does not express it in terms of locating Gaster within political and cultural Zionism, but argued that Gaster’s originality consisted of the way in which he tried “to combine western enlightenment with eastern traditionalism”.

Miskolczy’s study is followed by a selection of Gaster’s publications and some correspondence (including with his father, Romanian politicians, and Hungarian scholars). The publications by Gaster are a book review (in German) in which he challenged some of the then commonly held
views on Romanian history, a study on the Hungarian Jewish sect the Sabbatarians (in Romanian, and translated into Hungarian), an edition of some Székely tales, and an article “The Spread of Judaism through the Ages”, in which Gaster stressed the role of the Hungarian Sabbatarians. This choice of material illustrates what Miskolczy stated in his English summary:

Gaster’s activities are related to Hungarian history... Moses Gaster is a scholar who understood the secret of the development of multinational life in Transylvania: respect of otherness.\(^{119}\)

That is certainly an idea worth exploring, whether Gaster’s interest in the literature, history and language of marginal groups (besides Sabbatarians also Samaritans, Karaites and Roma) was the result of such convictions. In conclusion Miskolczy expressed the hope that his book “draws attention not only to the life and work of a great scholar and humanist, but it also makes one understand that his life must be examined as a totality because it has a profound message for our world”.\(^{120}\) This focus on Gaster’s life as a whole, and the suggestion that it holds relevance for today, seems far removed from earlier Romanian publications and their more narrow focus on Gaster’s contribution to Romanian language and literature.

It seems that Miskolczy’s work has not received as much attention as might have been expected. Five years later, Eskenasy still mentioned that in Romania Gaster is much better known as a scholar than as an actor in modern history.\(^{121}\) He made that statement in his introduction to his edition of Gaster’s memoirs, some correspondence and other documents that shed more light on Gaster’s political involvements. What is called “memoirs” is better described as fragmentary and rather messy reminiscences, which Gaster dictated between 1930 and 1938 to “two secretaries who were both refugees from Nazi Germany, and whose command of English was not at that time as excellent as it afterwards became”.\(^{122}\) Gaster himself was by that time completely blind and thus unable to check his facts when referring to events from half a century earlier. There is much repetition, and some inconsistency. Nevertheless, Eskenasy’s Romanian translation of “Gaster’s memoirs” is now frequently cited in Romanian scholarship, particularly within Jewish Studies.

Stanciu’s 2006 monograph, to which reference has already been made, made frequent use of Eskenasy’s edition of Gaster’s personal reminiscences. As the title of the work indicates, she aimed to (re)discover
“the unknown Gaster”, namely his political side, his standing up for Jewish emancipation and for the right to a Jewish national home. The introductory chapter of the monograph presents an overview, particularly of Gaster’s early career in its context, under the title “landmarks on an intellectual journey”. The second chapter focussed on Gaster’s scholarship in the area of Romanian philology and culture. This is followed by a chapter which stresses the significance of the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* as Gaster’s foundation. The fourth chapter addresses Gaster’s publications in the field of Jewish Studies, and the fifth deals with his writings which show him as an actor in modern history. Publications by Gaster have been mentioned throughout the monograph, but there could have been more detailed analysis of Gaster’s work. The conclusion rightly stressed the polyvalent nature of Gaster’s contributions. The study is followed by nearly one hundred pages of reprints of work by Gaster in the areas under consideration in the monograph: Romanian culture, Jewish studies, and politically engaged articles from newspapers and magazines. It also contains some photograph, a feature which it has in common with the publications of Virgiliu Florea.

**Conclusion: Gaster as “encyclopedist” and collector**

In Romanian scholarship Gaster has been perceived, and on the whole admired, as a scholar in the areas of Romanian language, literature and folklore. Only in the last twenty years has his “political side” been rediscovered. The edition in Romanian translation of his personal reminiscences has played a central role in this rediscovery. It is not surprising that the focus on the flaws in Gaster’s character, especially his limited interpersonal skills, so prominent in Anglophone portraits, are virtually absent from Romanian representations, because they rely to a much larger extent on Gaster’s own words, and on how Gaster himself wished to be remembered.

Virgiliu Florea pointed out that “among specialists exists the opinion that Gaster’s work can only be studied in separate parts”. I am inclined to suggest a different approach, namely to consider as much as possible the breadth of Gaster’s scholarly and communal activities when trying to assess his contribution and significance. Mircea Eliade was a historian of religion and one of the most well-known Romanian scholars and at
that time part of the extreme right establishment. He praised Gaster in an obituary as

one of the most learned people of this century. He was part of that class of intellectuals, today quite rare, who do not limit their curiosity to the development of only a few areas of scholarship. He was an encyclopedist in the true sense of the word ... Few scholars will be able to cover the wide range of subjects which Dr. Gaster fruitfully cultivated in 60 years of uninterrupted scholarly work.125

Theodor Gaster also commented on the diversity of his father’s achievements, and hinted at what in Romanian writings has often been referred to as the comparative method. He stated that Moses Gaster’s distinctive contribution to learning and letters lies, however, not so much in the propounding of particular theories about particular texts (many of which were, in fact, wrong) as in a unique gift for correlating and cross fertilizing areas of study previously kept apart. He was forever opening windows and revealing new and exciting vistas. Few have done so much to put so many old things in so many new perspectives.126

It may be suggested that Gaster’s nature as an “encyclopedist” relates to his passion for collecting. As a collector, Gaster brought together an enormously diverse range of manuscripts, printed books, amulets, and other items, in many languages, from different historical periods and geographical areas. As a scholar, in some of his works (such as Romanian Bird and Beast Stories, 1915) he brought together various stories, found by him in the printed works of his contemporaries and predecessors. In others, (such as Chrestomatie Română, 1891), he collected texts from many different manuscripts. In my current and future research I aim to analyze further the possible connection between Moses Gaster’s scholarship and his collecting activities. It may be suggested that in order to attempt to understand his scholarship, one has to take notice of his activities and mindset as a collector.
NOTES

1. This research will be continued from September 2013 until August 2017 as a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship at the University of Manchester.

2. Information gathered from a CV, written probably at the very end of the nineteenth century, UCL Gaster papers, item 1/E/3.

3. The bibliography compiled by his friend and assistant Bruno Schindler ("List of Publications of Dr. M. Gaster", in B. Schindler (ed), Gaster Centenary Publication, Lund, Humphries and Co., London, 1958, 23–40) contains 281 items but is not complete. It is particularly selective in book reviews, articles for newspapers and magazines and Gaster’s earlier work published in Romania. Some of the missing publications can be found in the bibliography of Stanciu, M., Necunoscutul Gaster: Publicistica Culturală, Ideologică și Politică, Editura Universității, Bucharest, 2006, 231–35.

4. For an overview, see Simonescu, D., “Colectia de manuscrisete M. Gaster din Biblioteca Academiei Române”, in Viața Românească 32.5, 1940, 6–32. The manuscripts were accompanied by a typed handlist, My Collection of Old Romanian Manuscripts (reference number A2517) in which Gaster briefly describes the 206 manuscripts (most of which contain multiple compositions). They have also been described in the Romanian manuscript catalogue: Ștrempel, G., Catalogul Manuscriselor Românești, I, B.A.R. 1–1600, Bucharest, Editura științifică și enciclopedică, 1978, 213–61 and 296–98.

5. The Rylands Gaster collection is the most diverse in types of material and languages. It consists of manuscripts (divided over the Hebrew, Samaritan and Miscellaneous (nearly twenty languages) sequences), c. 15,000 manuscript fragments from the Cairo Genizah (recently digitised and catalogued, see http://rylandsgenizah.org, last accessed 14 October 2013), Gaster’s own copies of his published work, and the Rylands Gaster archive. This archive consists of 1) correspondence between Gaster and members of the Samaritan community in Nablus (c. 500 letters), 2) Gaster’s lists of his books (“Library Catalogues”), and 3) the Rylands Gaster Papers, which are working documents: notes, studies, drafts, proofs of Gaster’s published work, unpublished articles and notes, and copies of original manuscripts. For a preliminary catalogue of the third section, see Haralambakis, M., Box list of Moses Gaster’s working papers at the John Rylands Library, Manchester, Centre for Jewish Studies, 2012.


For an overview of the Rylands Gaster collection as a whole, an inventory of the miscellaneous manuscript sequence and a catalogue of the German Manuscripts, see Haralambakis, M. “A Survey of the Gaster Collection in the
This is a collection of printed books from Gaster’s library, particularly in the areas (broadly defined) of Romanian and other European languages (including dictionaries and textbooks), literature, folklore, history and politics. An overview, which focusses especially on Romanian early printed books, has been provided by Deletant, D., “A Survey of the Gaster Books in the School of Slavonic and East European Studies Library”, in Solanus, 10, 1975, 14–23.

Known as the UCL Gaster Papers, it is the largest Gaster archival collection. It includes correspondence, notes, diaries, sermons, accounts, invitations, photo albums etc. At present the collection is temporarily housed at the National Archives, in Kew. It consists of more than 170,000 items, in 337 boxes (plus 22 volumes and 9 rolls). See Levi, T., The Gaster Papers: A Collection of Letters, Documents, of the Late Haham Dr Moses Gaster (1856–1939), University College Library, London, 1976.

This last mentioned collection is probably the smallest and most focussed, consisting of one archival box containing several hundreds of items such as postcards, wall-calendars, and letters of appeal which Gaster received from charitable institutions in Palestine between 1900 and the early 1920s. See Hill, B.S., “The YIVO Collection of ‘Moses Gaster Papers’”, in YIVO News, 2006, 16–17.


Titles include The Story of Chanucah (1928), The Story of Passover (1929), The Story of Purim (1929), The Story of Shevuot (1930) and The Story of the High Festivals and the Feast of Tabernacles (1931). Typescript drafts of The Story of Shabbat and The Story of the Fast Days can be found in the Rylands Gaster Papers 11/6, see Haralambakis, Box list, 61.


Twenty-eight years later, after explaining why it took him so long to finish the publication of the Exempla of the Rabbis, of which he had already published a section in his last report of the Montefiore College in 1896, he stated: “I prefer not to dwell here on the events which followed and prevented the completion of the work at the time; the memory alone is sufficient to deepen the bitterness which has grown from year to year”. Gaster, M. The Exempla of the Rabbis, Being a Collection of Exempla, Apologies and Tales
Gaster, M., “Scheme for the Reorganization of the Judith College” (typescript, undated, but a Report by the Elders of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation, dated 18 Nov 1887 responds to it; both documents are at UCL Gaster Papers 4/A/1(3)).


This interpretation is based on a study of the abundance of correspondence, reports, investigations, newspaper cuttings and other materials related to the Montefiore College at the UCL Gaster Papers 4/A/1–4/B/8.

Niemirower, I., “Dr. Moses Gaster”, in Curierul Israelit, 12 March 1939, 1. Throughout this article, English paraphrases from Romanian contributions have been made by the author.

Niemirower, I., “Moses Gaster ca mare Zionist”, in Știri din Lumea Evreescă, 9 March 1939, 1–2. Schwarzfeld put it even stronger: “the future will realise more fully how much the Zionist movement owes to his [Gaster’s] untiring energy, his fiery speeches and to his unflagging hope at a time when others were given over to despondency”. Schwarzfeld, M., “Biographical Sketch of Dr. Gaster’s Early Days”, in B. Schindler and A. Marmorstein (eds.), Occident and Orient, being Studies in Semitic Philology and Literature, Jewish History and Philosophy and Folklore in the widest sense ... Gaster Anniversary Volume, London, 1936, 6.

“Un lider sionist uitat” is the title of one of the subsections in her chapter which deals with Gaster as an actor in history, based mainly on his publications which reveal his political involvement (particularly Jewish emancipation and Zionism) Stanciu, Necunoscutul Gaster, 105–20.
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It is not entirely clear why he makes this distinction in the subheadings, particularly as he in the concluding sentence described Gaster as “not only an English folklorist who was Jewish … but also an English folklorist of the Jews”. Rabinovitch, “Jews, Englishmen, and Folklorists”, 126.

Rabinovitch, “Jews, Englishmen, and Folklorists”, 123.
E.g., Newall, mentioned earlier in this section.
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“Short Introduction to the Genizah Collection in the John Rylands Library”, in Alexander, P.S. and Smithuis, R. (eds), 16–17 and the other examples mentioned there.

Gaster, T. “Moses Gaster 1856–1939,” 103. It needs to be mentioned that Theodor continued by pointing out that “it is easy to snide about such weakness. The fact is, however, that Gaster’s mistakes are such as can be readily corrected, whereas his merits are virtually unique. … In range of knowledge, combinative imagination, and intuitive empathy with the climates and patterns of ancient thought and with what actually moves and informs the ‘common folk’, Gaster surely ranks among the giants of his time”.


Alexander, “Gaster’s Exempla of the Rabbis”, 793. Gaster’s pioneering role has also been stressed by Yassif, E., “Moses Gaster: Pioneer in Folklore and Jewish Studies”, in Pe’amim 100 (2003–2004), 113–24 [Hebrew].


Alexander, “Gaster’s Exempla of the Rabbis”, 797.


It seems fair to say that this is the most substantial chapter. It is accompanied by 24 letters exchanged between Gaster and Maiorescu between 1876 and 1892. They provide insight into Gaster’s work and the political context. Most letters are in German, and one in French. Florea has provided Romanian translations.


The pen name of Queen Elisabeth of Romania, to whom Gaster had sent a copy of his 1915 publication *Romanian Bird and Beast Stories*. Florea presented the German letter (signed “Elizabeth” and dated Bucharest, 28 January 1916) and a Romanian translation.
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Florea, *Omul și Opera*, 99. In the title of the monograph which traced the history of this work, a term is used which can be translated as magnum opus and as masterpiece. The bulk of that monograph consists of 118 letters from the publisher, F.A. Brockhaus, to Gaster (German letters accompanied by Romanian translations). Florea, V. and Cernea, E., *Din Istoria unei capodopere, Chrestomatie Română de M. Gaster, cu 132 de documente inedite*, Editura Fundației pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2010.

Besides the two works already mentioned, Florea also dealt with the *Ilchester Lectures on Greaco‑Slavonic Literature* (1887), *Romanian Bird and Beast Stories* (1915), *Children’s Stories from Romanian Legends and Fairy Tales* (1922), Gaster’s work on the Gospel of Radu from Mănicești of 1574 (published mistakenly as *Tetra Evanghelul Dianocului Coresi din 1561*; 1929), and Gaster’s re‑edition of Anton Pann’s *Povestea Vorbii* (1936).

Mușlea, I., “Dr. M. Gaster folklorist”, in *Cercetări etnografice și folclor*, vol I, Editura Minerva, Bucharest, 1971, 201–13. The paper, commemorating the century since Gaster’s birth (in 1856), was presented at a session of the Romanian Academy in Cluj on 1 February 1957.
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To give just one example, Bensusan stated in his portrait of Gaster in the volume published on the occasion of Gaster’s 80th birthday: “His capacity for assimilating foreign languages is extraordinary, the number in which he can converse runs into double figures.” S.L. Bensusan, “Moses Gaster”, in *Occident and Orient: Gaster Anniversary Volume*, 9.


The reviewer was bishop Melchisedec. His report has been published as “Raportul P.S.S. Episcopul Melchisedec asupra operei D-lui Gaster”, in *Analele Academiei Române*, Seria II, Tomul V, Ședințele ordine din 1882-83 și sesiunea generală a anului 1883. Secțiunea I. Partea administrativă și dezbaterile, Tipografia Academiei Române, București, 1884, 163–70. The citation is from a short summary of the bishop’s report in the general report of the process of reviewing the works which had been summited to the academy to be considered for recognition as the best publication of the year: Ștefănescu, G., “Premierea de opere. Raportul general,” 149 (in the same volume of the annals of the Romanian academy). Bishop Melchisedec states in his report that “the work has its merits, because it is the first work of Romanian literature produced by a son of Israel working in Romania, and it provides evidence of Romanian sentiments”, 168–69. However, that statement is followed by a long list of examples of mistakes in Gaster’s use of the Romanian language.


An example which illustrates the extent of the celebrations is the large anonymous article (four columns) “Sărăbătorirea Dr. M. Gaster”, in *Egalitatea*, 26 November 1936, 96, which described different celebratory activities which took place in London and in Bucharest. See also the different contributions, brought together as “Sărăbătorirea Dr. M. Gaster: Mesajul întrunirii de sârbătorire către Dr. M. Gaster”, in *Egalitatea* 10 December 1936, 100–101. It included contributions of Iacob Bacalu, D. Wertenstein, and a short summary (unsigned) of the English press on this occasion.
He explicitly mentioned the article by Barbu Lăzăreanu in *Adevărul* of 27 August 1936.


The first version of the bibliography compiled by his friend and assistant Bruno Schindler, which had then just been published, in Schindler, B. and A. Marmorstein (eds), *Occident and Orient, being Studies in Semitic Philology and Literature, Jewish History and Philosophy and Folklore in the widest sense ... Gaster Anniversary Volume*, London, 1936. The bibliography as referred to earlier in this article is an improved version which was published in 1958.
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