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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. The Rabbinate in Central Europe during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

B. Changes in the Function and Education of the German Rabbi during the Nineteenth Century

C. Early Attempts to Organize Modern Rabbinical Schools in Germany

D. Conclusions
The rabbinical schools that were established in Germany during the second half of the nineteenth century were the first successful large-scale attempts to meet the educational needs of the modern rabbi. These needs resulted from the effects on the traditional rabbinate that were brought about by the political, intellectual and religious transformation of the Jewish community during the generations immediately preceding that period. A brief survey of the traditional status, function and education of the rabbi, and their subsequent change as related to conditions in Germany, presents a background to the subject proper of this dissertation.

A. The Rabbinate in Central Europe during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

The date of origin of the rabbinate in Central Europe is a controversial question among historians. It is apparent from all opinions on the subject that the rise of the rabbinate to a role of major importance was a gradual process. As the young, sparsely populated Jewish communities of medieval Europe grew in size and number, the need for recognized religious officials increased. The organization of communal life demanded leadership qualified to determine modes
of conduct and to perform a number of functions: to define the communities' relationship to government and to one another; to codify religious practices and customs; and to re-interpret Jewish law in the light of new conditions. Such leadership was facilitated by the development of rabbinic scholarship in Northern France beginning with the turn of the eleventh century. An early example of a rabbinic scholar who assumed a position of major influence was Rabbi Gershom of Mayence (960-1028), whose Takkanot or ordinances are regarded as having been the first significant application of the law-making function of the rabbi in Central Europe. By the latter half of the twelfth century, the scholar enjoyed equal authority with the lay communal official. This was evidenced by a Takkanah which prohibited laymen from pronouncing the Herem, or excommunication ban, without the approval of the rabbi. At that time, the term Rabbi came into use as the designation of the rabbinic scholar in Central Europe. Successive generations witnessed the increasing growth of the rabbinate's authority and influence.

The extension of rabbinical authority throughout the Middle Ages and until the dawn of the nineteenth century was made possible by the special political status of the Jewish community. At that
time, the community functioned within the confines of a ghetto, physically separated from the Christian world. It generally enjoyed internal autonomy. Jewish law was recognized by government as binding on the Jew. It regulated his social and religious life, and determined communal relationships. The rabbi, as the guardian and interpreter of the law, was, therefore, recognized as the highest religious and judicial official in the community.

The qualifications of the rabbi were confirmed by his Semikhah, the traditional rabbinical ordination in use since early Tanaitic times. The Semikhah, containing the talmudic terms Moreh Yoreh Yodin Yodin, implied permission to expound and teach Jewish law and to judge civil cases. It was conferred orally by teacher upon student without bestowing special ecclesiastical powers. Toward the end of the fourteenth century, a change in the method of ordination became necessary owing to Jewish migrations which created difficulties in verifying the authenticity of conferment. It was then that Rabbi Meir Halevi of Vienna instituted the method of conferring Semikhah by means of a written diploma, and established the Morenu as a rabbinical designation. In the course of time, Semikhah became accepted as the certification of the rabbi. In Germany during the nineteenth century, Semikhah, Morenu and Hattarat Hora-ah, all conferred
by certification, were used interchangeably to signify the same thing.

During the period beginning with the end of the sixteenth century, the Central European rabbi had a definite status and function. He was a politically elected official as distinct from an ecclesiastical, or church-appointed, functionary. His authority rested on his knowledge of the law, uprightness of character and religious piety, and not on the claim to divine ordination. His intellectual reputation and ability to attract students were matters of prime consideration in his appointment to office. In some municipalities, the election of a rabbi required governmental approval but the right of government alone to decide on a candidate was everywhere strongly resisted.

The rabbi enjoyed a high degree of power, but he was by no means independent of communal officialdom. Life tenure was uncommon. Contracts between rabbis and communities were drawn up for a specified term, usually three years, at the end of which the agreements could be renewed or terminated. The existence of an educated laity, intellectually competent to question the rabbi's opinion, also served to check any arbitrary assertion of authority on his part. In purely religious matters, the rabbi's
decisions were virtually unchallenged. However, in matters impinging on civil law, protection of tenancy and other communal regulations, lay officials passed final judgment.

The rabbi was usually a salaried official, the amount of his remuneration varying according to the size and wealth of his community. In addition, he was entitled to special fees for the execution of certain functions; namely, the adjudication of court cases; the registration of weddings, births and deaths; the administration of oaths; the performance of marriages; the supervision of divorces and levirate marriages; and, the authorization of religious functionaries in the preparation of ritual foods and the like. He also received a fee for public lectures, and gifts in kind from members of his flock. In many cases these extra incomes exceeded his actual salary. Along with these material benefits, he also enjoyed certain social privileges and honors, such as occupying the seat of highest dignity in communal councils and at private ceremonies. Jewish law prescribed no special vestments for the rabbi but he was expected to dress in a manner reflecting the dignity of his office. During the period under discussion, his usual attire consisted of a silk frock and a fur cap.
THE FUNCTIONS OF THE RABBI

The functions of the rabbi came under three general headings:

(1) Educational—As a spiritual and intellectual leader, the rabbi was duty-bound to devote his major efforts to all educational endeavors in general and to the Yeshibah, or talmudical academy, in particular, the maintenance of which was the traditional practice of every community. In the academy, he lectured daily throughout the school year. Some rabbis also lectured weekly on the Bible. The rabbi attended to the material welfare of the students and the school, a task in which he was assisted by lay officials. He was in charge of distributing stipends to students and arranging for their room and board in local households. He examined students weekly and at the end of semesters, and watched over their moral and intellectual development as well as over the efficiency of the teaching staff wherever such was employed. He also shared with lay officials in the supervision of elementary schools and their teachers.

In large academies, which had a regular teaching staff, the rabbi decided on the talmudic tractate that was to be studied during the term, and period-
ically delivered his own lectures as well. In smaller communities, unable to maintain academies, he gathered about him several pupils for private instruction. His public lectures, usually delivered on the Sabbaths preceding Pesah and Yom Kippur, were vehicles for adult education.

(2) Judicial—The rabbi presided over the Bet Din, or Jewish court. Adjudication of civil cases and deciding on questions of Kashrut, or religious dietary questions, were his most important judicial duties. In the writing of responsa in answer to inquiries on legal problems, the rabbi’s judicial function extended far beyond the limits of his community. This function was also a form of educational activity, in that it stimulated student interest in Jewish learning. Once responsa of recognized rabbinical authorities were issued in print, they became texts for study. Other matters of a legal character requiring the rabbi’s attention were mentioned previously in connection with the services for which he received special fees.

(3) Communal—The rabbi was charged with general supervision over the moral and religious conduct of the community. Occupying the seat of honor in communal councils, he was in a position to advise their members and to initiate regulations of benefit to the community. Together with lay officials, he represented the com-
munity before government. In certain cases he exer-
cized a government function as the registrar of wed-
dings, birth and deaths, and as the official responsi-
ble for the payment of communal taxes. Occasionally
the function of the Shtadlan, or pleader in behalf of
his people, and that of the rabbi were combined in
the same person.

The rabbi served as an example of piety, scholar-
ship and integrity to his people. He was not a syn-
agogue official or religious minister in the sense of
a Christian pastor. He officiated at the Musaf wor-
ship on Pesah and Shemini Azerat and at the Ne-illah
worship on Yom Kippur, but these services were in the
nature of courtesies extended to him. He was neither
a preacher in terms of modern day usage, nor did he
officiate at funerals, although he did at times
eulogize an outstanding scholar or pious personage
at his demise. His occasional public addresses
were in the nature of talmudic discourses on ap-
propriate themes. For preaching purposes, communities
engaged special practitioners, or were serviced by
itinerant preachers or Maggidim. To quote Professor
Louis Ginsberg on the subject: "The rabbi of the
centuries gone-by called himself neither disciple
of the prophet, nor successor to the priests, nor
ought resembling these epithets...Still less may we
consider the rabbi of yore as the preacher. Every Jew considered himself at home in the synagogue, and there was no need to delegate the privilege of speaking to one particular person."

**THE EDUCATION OF THE RABBI**

Rabbinical education during the period under discussion was influenced by the same conditions that governed general Jewish education. All learning was overwhelmingly religious in content and character. Secular studies were virtually ignored, if not forbidden. Municipal schools, where general knowledge could be pursued, were closed to the Jew. The Ghetto walls surrounding the Jewish community served as a physical and psychological barrier against intellectual intercourse with the outside world. Within these walls there prevailed a self-contained educational curriculum centered around the study of Torah. Only few rabbis enjoyed a secular education, and this was generally meagre in extent. About the middle of the eighteenth century interest in general learning increased, but this was an early symptom of the coming of a new cultural age in Jewish history.

The major school of higher Jewish education was the Yeshibah, or talmudical academy. In Germany, however, unstable political conditions coupled with economic insecurity militated against a widespread develop-
ment of these academies. German Jewry during this period could boast of few prominent Yeshibot—namely, in Metz, Frankfort a. Main, Fuerth and Altona.

German-Jewish students in search of scholarship usually travelled to Poland and Hungary. Many rabbinical aspirants studied privately or at the community Klaus, or "house of study." Most of Germany's rabbis immigrated from the east or studied there. In any event, there were no essential differences between the education received in one locality or another, or between the objectives and content of private instruction and the program of the Yeshibah, which alone presents any semblance of institutional organization.

The Yeshibah was not a professional institution in the modern sense of the term. It had no specified entrance requirements; nor did it impose a definite number of years of study; nor any systematic graduation of students by age, subject-matter, or years of attendance. Every student was expected to have had an elementary knowledge of Talmud and to continue his education for as many years as he was able. Some communities even prescribed periodic returns to the academy for students who had graduated into family and communal life.

The school year at the Yeshibah generally con-
sisted of two semesters, from Heshvan 1 to Shebat 15 and from Iyyar 1 to Ab 15 (from about the beginning of October to about the middle of January, and from the beginning of May to about the middle of August). Between semesters many students dispersed to smaller communities to study under public support, but some remained at the Yeshibah to pursue unprescribed courses. The daily study period was a long one, from early morning to late evening, with all-night sessions encouraged and diligent study enforced by frequent examinations.

Talmud, rabbinic commentaries and Codes comprised the curriculum. Little if any attention was devoted to theology, Hebrew grammar, biblical exegesis and other non-talmudic subject-matter. Haggadah, or the non-legal areas of rabbinic learning, were not emphasized, and in most cases moralistic studies were extra-curricular.

The prevailing method of study was Pilpul, a kind of dialectic which critically dissected the text and drew out its implications. Pilpul was originally applied as a means of harmonizing contradictory passages and statements in order to establish underlying principles. In the sixteenth century, this technique was developed by Polish rabbis into an extreme form of hair-splitting analyses, called Hillukim, which often led to sophistical argumentation and illogical
conclusions. Ephraim Lenschitz (died 1619) called these extreme forms of *Pilpul* "empty discussions and mental gymnastics." The language of instruction was Yiddish, the Judeo-German dialect spoken by almost all Central and East European Jews.

Yeshibah students could qualify for one of two degrees, Haber and Morenu. The title Haber, used in Talmud to designate a scholar, was in early modern times conferred without bestowing rabbinical authority. It was an honorary degree, entitling its bearer to membership in communal councils, and to serve in a quasi-religious capacity. In general, the Haber degree required only a candidate's familiarity with Talmud. The Morenu title, authorized its holder to occupy rabbinical positions. It required, in addition to proficiency in talmudic literature, knowledge of all four branches of codes, the *Turim* of Jacob ben Asher (ca 1300), or the *Shulhan Arukh* of Joseph Caro (1488-1515).

B. Changes in the Function and Education of the German Rabbi during the Nineteenth Century

During the nineteenth century, the rabbinate in Germany underwent a throughgoing transformation. There were two major forces supplementing each other which exercised an important influence on the train-
ing of the rabbi. One was internal and intellectual, the other external and political.

**INTELLECTUAL INFLUENCES**

The impact of the French Enlightenment on European civilization was strongly felt in Germany and began to affect Jewish life at the end of the eighteenth century. In certain Jewish centers, the movement toward Haskalah, or cultural enlightenment, initiated a general reaction against age-old beliefs and practices. Maskilim, or "enlightened" Jews, rebelled against the restrictiveness of Ghetto life, cultivated general learning and the refinement of letters, rejected the strict discipline of religion, and substituted reason for faith. They denounced traditional rabbis as Kauscherwaechter, or supervisors of ritual foods, a term which implied the unfitness of the old rabbi to lead his community in the new age.

The Haskalah movement led to a radical change in traditional rabbinical education. It opposed the confinement of Jewish learning to Talmud and its pil-pilistic distoration. On the one hand, it promoted a return to a more intensive study of Bible, Hebrew and Jewish history. The translation of the Pentateuch by Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786), the most prominent figure of the movement, and the publication under his auspices of a grammatical Hebrew
commentary thereon, the Biur, was instrumental in stimulating greater interest in biblical and Hebrew literature. On the other hand, the Haskalah movement popularized Jewish cultivation of secular knowledge. In his epistles to the Austrian Jews, the Dibrei Shalom V'Emet, Naphtali Hartwig Wessely (1725-1805), Mendelssohn's colleague, appealed for the inclusion of biblical, historical and general subjects into the curriculum of the Jewish school. In the "enlightened" Jewish schools which were established in many larger communities, secular studies gradually encroached upon the time of Jewish studies, eventuating ultimately in the elimination of Talmud from the curriculum.

As a result of the spreading influence of the Haskalah movement, the old Yeshibah was virtually undermined, finally passing out of existence during the third decade of the nineteenth century. The Yiddish-speaking student of East-European talmudical academies fell into disrepute. Jewish communities began to emphasize the secular qualifications of rabbinical candidates. The demand arose for a German-speaking, worldly cultured religious authority.

Another intellectual movement which had a pronounced effect on rabbinical education was that of the Wissenschaft des Judenthum, or Science of Judaism,
launched in 1819 by Leopold Zunz (1794-1886) and others under the influence of the growing interest in historical sciences at that time. In the broadest sense, the Wissenschaft movement sought to arrive at an exact knowledge of Judaism and of the relations of the Jew with all cultures and peoples with which he had come into contact. It promoted a secularized Jewish scholarship and attempted to elevate Jewish learning to a position of equality with other sciences. It inaugurated modern Jewish historiography, philosophy, scientific Halakhah and cognate studies. It promoted the opinion that familiarity with traditional and secular subjects was insufficient for the proper education of the modern rabbi. Many Jewish intellectuals felt that the modern rabbinical curriculum must extend to all areas of Jewish learning, and that this learning must be pursued with the objective methods of science.

POLITICAL INFLUENCES

The political transformation of the Jewish community during the nineteenth century was in harmony with the new intellectual developments. In the train of the rise of modern nationalism in Central Europe and of the policy of separation between state and church came the disappearance of the old order of Jewish communal organization. The
new policy of government was to integrate minority populations into the general body politic. Jewish political autonomy was abolished and Jewish law was subjected to the regulation of state law. The new Jewish community that took the place of the old was organized along denominational lines similar to Christian church organizations. The rabbi thus lost his authority as a communal official having legislative civil powers.

The changes in the function and education of the rabbi that resulted from the new political policy toward the Jewish community were in many instances enforced by direct government decree. In Prussia, the Edict of 1812 forbade the appointment of non-Germans to rabbinical posts, and limited the rabbi's legislative authority to purely religious matters. In Bavaria, the law of 1813 required of rabbis to meet the following conditions: "naturalization and national allegiance; proof of moral conduct; restriction of rabbinical jurisdiction to religious questions of law; and knowledge of the German language and of general subjects." In accordance with church organization in that kingdom, rabbinical salaries, incomes, appointments and other Jewish congregational matters were placed under state supervision. The Jewish community was transformed
The three attempts that were made in this direction represented the theories of the three religious parties that came into being in Germany during the early nineteenth century. Each of these parties had a definite approach to the question of the modern rabbinate, and each found ideological expression in the three rabbinical schools which were established in Germany during the second half of the century.

Reform---The Reform movement attempted to reconcile Jewish life with the existing environment by revising Jewish law and religious practices. It had no definite philosophy or program. Some Reform rabbis, like Samuel Helden (1806-1860) and David Einhorn (1809-1879), went as far as to deny the validity of certain biblical laws, while others merely protested against the observance of outmoded customs. Three major Reform principles are evident from the decisions of the rabbinical conferences held during the forties. First, Jewish law and ethnic concepts are not binding upon the Jew. Second, religious beliefs and practices may be changed in accordance with the dictates of science, reason or necessity. Third, only the prophetic, universal verities of Judaism are authoritative, and the dissemination of these truths is the primary mission of the Jewish faith.

In accordance with these principles, Reform rabbis eliminated many religious observances and
traditions; recognized national law as governing Jewish civil relationships; deleted Hebrew and references to the restoration of Zion from the liturgy; and introduced such synagogue innovations as the shortened service in German, organ music, choral singing, and the sermon in the vernacular.

The Reform movement brought into bold relief, and gave official sanction to, the new concept of the rabbinate that germinated in the minds of the Maskilim and government authorities. Under its patronage, a new type of rabbi came into vogue—a Prediger, or preacher, a Religionslehrer, or religious teacher, and a Seesorger, or curator of the soul.

The chief function of the new rabbi was preaching. The contract entered into in 1835 by Leopold Zunz and the Prague Temple listed the following duties: preaching on Sabbath and holidays, addressing bride and groom at wedding ceremonies, conducting confirmation exercises, blessing newborn children and their mothers, "naming" newborn children, praying for the sick, eulogizing the dead, and conducting special memorial services in the synagogue.

The sermons of the Prediger differed vastly from the sophisticated lectures of the old rabbi. They were usually lengthy perorations on general ethical themes,
and, in the words of Isaac Hirsch Weiss (1815-1905), "modelled on Christian sermons, in content and style." 59

As a Religionslehrer the rabbi was obligated to "give daily religious instruction to older boys and girls...and to supervise the education of children in the elementary schools." Unlike the rabbi of old, he did not teach Talmud to advanced students.

The new rabbi resembled the Christian pastor in his ministerial duties and outer appearance. He was a Seelsorger. He ministered at rituals and attended to the spiritual needs of his flock. He wore special vestments resembling the garb of a Christian minister only when officiating at religious services. "I shave, and I wear a cap only when I am cold; I am not a Rab," wrote Isaac Noah Mannheimer, the preacher of the Vienna Temple, in 1835. 62

The new rabbinical functions which were brought into vogue by the Reform movement led to the disappearance of the high standards of traditional rabbinical learning. The Prediger and Religionslehrer had no special need for extensive knowledge of Talmud and Codes. The reduced program of religious practices that was adopted by Reform Jews did not require authorities on questions of Jewish law. In Reform congregations, rabbis were judged on the merits of their sermons rather than their Jewish scholarship. 63
The Semikhah or Hattarat Hora-ah was not strictly demanded of rabbinical candidates for Reform positions. It became stylish to appoint rabbis who had received doctorate degrees from oriental or theological departments of the university. The insistence on a rabbi's university education was in agreement with government policy on this subject and with the educational philosophy of Abraham Geiger (1810-1874), the most prominent Reform rabbi at that time. As will be noted in the following section of this chapter, Geiger held that rabbinical learning is inseparable from general science and must be, therefore, integrated with university studies.

**Neo-Orthodoxy**—The two most important principles by means of which traditional Judaism was harmonized with the demands of the modern age were enunciated by Samson Raphael Hirsch (1808-1888) the recognized founder of Neo-Orthodoxy. In his *Nineteen Letters of Ben Uziel*, Hirsch laid down the principal of *Torah Im Derek Eretz*. By the term *Torah* he meant all the laws, practices, and traditions of Judaism as contained in the Bible, Talmud and rabbinic literature. All these, he held, are expressions of the revealed Word of God which cannot be changed by conditions of life. The *Torah* is eternal, but social and political changes are temporal. "If
Jewish people, he held, are unique because of their acceptance of the Torah and their living in accordance with its precepts. Whoever observes the Torah is a member of the Jewish "peoplehood," a Yisroel-Mensch. All the liturgical passages referring to the restoration of Zion must, however, be preserved, since the restoration of Zion signifies the consummating act of the universal acceptance of the Torah. Integration into the general national body politic of Germany should be accepted by all Jews, but not to the point of religious assimilation, lest the unique consciousness of a peoplehood dedicated to Torah-true living is lost.

Hirsch's philosophy was reflected in his attitude to the function and education of the modern rabbi. He agreed that "the rabbi must be a Prediger and Religionslehrer." He felt, however, that the traditional judicial functions must be preserved in theory and wherever possible exercised in practice. The rabbi must therefore receive an intensive education in Talmud and Codes. In addition to these studies, he must acquire a comprehensive knowledge of Bible, Hebrew and Jewish history. Hirsch thus accepted the educational ideas promoted by the Haskalah movement. In his Realschule in Frankfort a. Main, considerable emphasis was placed on the study of
biblical and historical subjects. He was, however, opposed to the pursuit of Jewish Wissenschaft on the grounds that it foreboded danger to traditional interpretations.

A clear statement of Neo-Orthodoxy's position on the question of the training of the modern rabbi was offered by one of Hirsch's disciples. To quote:

The modern rabbi should to every extent achieve a high standard of secular knowledge, but he should in no way pursue this knowledge at the expense of Jewish learning. He should meet the needs of the age, but in no way at the expense of the religious principles of Judaism... He should study, understand and respect the Talmud and Shulhan Arukh... He should be a rabbi in the traditional sense of the word, and still be characterized by modernism. In one ward, the modern rabbi has a two-fold task: externally, to adjust to the spirit of the age; internally, to exemplify the rabbinic sage of old.

Positive-Historic Judaism—-The third religious party in Germany Jewry was the Positive-Historic, or Conservative, which was founded by Zachariah Frankel (1801-1873) following the Frankford Rabbinical conference of 1845. The philosophy of this party was contained in Frankel's attitude to religious reforms and to the question of the validity of Jewish law.

Frankel admitted the necessity of moderate reforms, but opposed eliminating from the Jewish religion its historical elements. On the one hand, he maintained that certain customs and practices which were outmoded and irrelevant to Jewish life
should be abolished. He called the practices Werkheiligkeiten, or mechanical religious acts. He referred to Neo-Orthodox leaders who insisted on the observance of every jot and tittle of the law as Siddur-Lomdim, or prayer book scholars. On the other hand, he opposed the deletion of Hebrew and references to the restoration of Zion from the liturgy on the grounds that these usages have been continuously present in the historic consciousness of the Jewish people. Although he did not impute sanctity to rabbinic ordinances and denied the revelational character of even such laws which were considered by the Talmud as being Sinaitic in origin [Halakhah LeMoshe MiSinai], he insisted that they be observed lest Judaism suffer permanent impairment. To quote the late Professor Ginsberg: "For an adherent of this school [the Positive-Historic] the sanctity of the Sabbath reposes not upon the fact that it was proclaimed on Sinai, but on the fact that the Sabbath idea found for thousands of years expression in Jewish souls."

In accordance with these views, Positive-Historic Judaism reorganized the traditional rabbinical curriculum. It believed with Neo-Orthodoxy that talmudic studies are basic elements in rabbinical education, but it placed less emphasis on an intensive
knowledge of these studies. The scope of halakhic learning in the Positive-Historic school was limited to those areas of Jewish law which were considered inseparable from the historical consciousness of Judaism. On the other hand, Positive-Historic Judaism stressed the study of Jewish scientific subjects. As will be noted later, Frankel's program of rabbinical education consisted of a trivium of traditional, secular, and scientific courses of study.

C. Early Attempts to Organize Modern Rabbinical Schools in Germany

The new concepts concerning the rabbinate and Jewish learning that became popular in Germany during the early part of the nineteenth century, the disappearance in that country of the old Yeshibah, and the prevailing prejudices against rabbinical students of East European talmudical academies, gave rise to the necessity of creating institutions for the education of modern native rabbis. These institutions were to be novel by virtue of their professional objective, modern form of organization, inclusion of non-talmudic subjects in the curriculum, and use of German as the language of instruction.

Developments in Christian theological education
set a precedent for the professional schooling of the rabbi. In the sixteenth century, the Council of Trent decided on the formal training of Catholic priests. The Protestant Reformation, critical of the old clergy, called attention to the need for special clerical education. Subsequent growth of distinctive Protestant denominations further promoted this need. By the middle of the eighteenth century, theological seminaries came into vogue partly as a result of the secularization of hitherto church-controlled universities and of the rationalistic spirit of the age which considered the pursuit of the practical as proper educational procedure.

In Germany during the nineteenth century, theological education was organized along two lines: university-affiliated faculties under ultimate state control, and church-owned seminaries. While the chief function of the faculties was to educate religious ministers, their program was not officially aimed at professional training. They were university departments offering instruction in theological subjects. The seminaries, on the other hand, were chiefly professional institutions. The term "seminary" derived from the Latin "seminarium", which defines a school or class organized for the purpose of pursuing a specific course of study. This term
had also come to denote a convent type of school where student life and intellectual engagement conform to a prescribed discipline. Both of these forms of contemporary theological school organization were reflected in the attempts to establish modern rabbinical schools in Germany during the early part of the century.

It is alleged that during the last decade of the preceding century, Berlin Maskilim unsuccessfully tried to induce Chief Rabbi Herschel Levin (1721-1800), to organize a rabbinical seminary. A similar movement was afoot at that time in Austria. In 1810, Israel Jacobsohn (1768-1828), the pioneer reformer, persuaded the civil authorities in the Kingdom of Westphalia to open a seminary in Cassel, but the fall of that kingdom in 1815 prevented this from taking place.

The first formulated proposal to establish a seminary is attributed to an Orthodox rabbi, Meyer Simon Weyl (1744-1826), Hirschel Levin's successor in the rabbinate of Berlin. Rabbi Weyl, aware of the intention on the part of dissident Jewish laymen to organize such a school, and fearful that under their influence the school would be anti-traditional in spirit, independently petitioned the Prussian Ministry of Education in November of 1824 for permission
to open an Israelitisch theologische-paedagogische Seminarium. "It is necessary," wrote Weyl, "to depart from the narrow tendencies of the old school and to expand the educational program in accordance with the demands of the age. For this purpose an institution should be established wherein consideration would be given to all subject-matter necessary for the training of the modern rabbi and teacher." To achieve this objective, Weyl proposed to transform the local Talmud Torah, a communal elementary school, into a seminary. At first a Vorbereitungsklasse, or preparatory class, was to be organized. From this class students would graduate either to a theologischen Klasse or paedagogischen Klasse. The Vorbereitungsklasse was to have a four year course of study in the following subjects:

Religion and Moral Studies: Maimonides' Sefer HaMada; Bahia's Hobat HaLebabot; selections from the Sefer HaHinuk, alleged to have been written by Aaron Halevi (died 1293); and other ethical works—Two hours weekly.

Hebrew: Bible and commentaries; Hebrew composition; Elementary Aramaic based on the Targumin; Translations from Hebrew into German and from German into Hebrew—Four hours weekly.

Rabbinics: Mishnah; Talmud with commentaries; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim; and the first volume of Maimonides' Yad HaHazakkah—Fourteen hours weekly.

German Language and Literature—Two hours weekly.

French and Latin—Two hours weekly.

Geography; History; Physics, Mathematics; Natural Science; and Art—Thirteen hours weekly.
Available sources do not record the exact curriculum of the proposed theological department. From the curriculum of the *Vorbereitungsklasse* it would appear that emphasis was to be placed on traditional studies. A comparison with the available course of study of the pedagogical class suggested a three year, thirty-hours-per-week program for the theological course.

Rabbi Weyl's project failed to materialize. His independent action created resentment among the lay leaders of the community, and necessary funds for the creation of the advanced classes were not forthcoming. He died shortly after the organization of the *Vorbereitungsklasse*. Subsequently the school degenerated, in the words of the Provincial School Superintendent, "into an elementary school where only Talmud studies are of an advanced nature." While similar projects were launched during the forties by Samson Raphael Hirsch in Nikolsburg, Moravia, and by Esriel Hildesheimer (1820-1899), another pillar of Neo-Orthodoxy, in 1851 in Eisenstadt, Hungary, no Orthodox movement in this direction was afoot in Germany until 1870.

The greatest effort in behalf of establishing a modern rabbinical school was made during the period under discussion by Reform rabbis. Abraham Geiger
(1810-1874) was the first Reform rabbi to write on the subject. In 1832, he remarked: "We have no inspiring patterns, no masters whom we could follow. If only a Jewish Seminar should be erected at a university where exegesis, homiletics, Talmud and Jewish history should be taught in a true religious spirit, it would be the most fertile and most instructive institution." The term Seminar was four years later changed by Geiger to Facultate. Writing in 1836 on "The Formation of a Theological Faculty, in Imperative Need of Our Time," Geiger disapproved of a seminary form of schooling. A seminary, he felt, is a one-sided and exclusive institution where biased religious viewpoints and a shallow professional education are promoted. He criticized the practice of dividing a rabbi's education between two schools, one for rabbinical studies and the other for secular studies. He argued that it is false to separate arbitrarily Jewish theological learning from other sciences. "The innermost truth, the profoundest essence of all spiritual activity," he wrote, "is Wissenschaft." To arrive at a genuine appreciation of Jewish subject-matter, it is necessary to pursue all courses of study, religious and secular, in an integrated fashion and with critical methods of investigation. This is only possible in a university, where
Jewish and general scholarship can be cultivated to­gether under the guidance of scientific research.

The Geiger the need of creating an agency for rabbinical education was secondary to that of re­vitalizing Jewish learning and of advancing Wissens­schaft. He maintained that there could not be a learned rabbinate without first reconstructing the entire rabbinical curriculum on modern scientific grounds whereby the traditional education of the rabbi would be integrated with other branches of science. To facilitate this integration, it was desirable, he held, to erect a Jewish theological Facultaet at a university modelled after its Christian counterpart. This Facultaet would be devoted chiefly to the pursuit of Jewish Wissenschaft, but it would also, include such special courses necessary for the rabbinical profession as homiletics, pedagogy, and the practical art of "pastoral ministrations."

As a means of promoting his plan, Geiger proposed to organize a Maimonides Society to which all German Jews would make financial contributions. The growth of the Society, he hoped, would in time in­fluence one of the German states to establish the Facultaet at its university.

In 1838, Geiger wrote a pamphlet "On the Erection of a Jewish Theological Faculty" in which he reiterated
the idea that the development of Jewish men of science was more important than training professional rabbis. What was needed was not a seminary, but an impartial scientifically minded theological faculty. Any other form of rabbinical school organization would isolate the Jewish curriculum and tend to encourage one-sided religious views.

Geiger's plan was generally supported by other Reform rabbis. Ludwig Philippson (1811-1899), one of the leading figures in the Reform movement, published on October 24, 1837 "a Call to All German Jews to Subscribe to a Jewish Faculty" in the famous periodical which he founded, Die Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums. Through this periodical, he conducted an unsuccessful campaign to raise 100,000 Thaler for the Facultaet project. At the conference of Reform rabbis held in Frankfort in 1845, the Geiger-Philipsson proposal was adopted as the official plan of the Reform movement for organizing a rabbinical school.

Despite the efforts of Geiger and other Reform adherents, the Facultaet project failed to materialize. The historian, Isaac M. Jost (1793-1860), an eye-witness to these events, attributed this failure to the refusal of German rulers to establish such a school at a university, and to the inner conflicts of the German-Jewish community. A survey of the
period under discussion suggested that advocates of the project could not have aroused general interest. The masses were generally conservative in their religious beliefs. They viewed with disfavor the efforts of such staunch reformers as Geiger and Philipppson. The lay partisans of Reform, on the other hand, were for the most part indifferent to Jewish cultural activity.

At the third conference of Reform rabbis held in Breslau in 1846, the Facultaet project was abandoned. Shortly thereto, public announcement was made of the testament of the deceased Jewish philanthropist, Jonas Fraenckel (1773-1846), which designated a large sum of money for the establishment of a seminary. It was known then that Geiger was chiefly responsible for Fraenckel's bequest. Many felt that Geiger would be elected to direct the new school and that Reform's wishes with regard to rabbinical education would thus be satisfied. The conference decided, therefore, to suspend independent action in favor of cooperating with the custodians of the Fraenckel legacy. As a result, Reform agitation in behalf of a Facultaet came to an end, not to be renewed until twenty years later.

Adherents of the Conservative party were likewise active in attempting to solve the existing problem of rabbinical schooling. During the forties, Michael
Sachs (1808-1864), rabbi of Berlin, and Leopold Zunz, who by this time had disassociated himself from Reform, are reputed to have taken steps in this direction. It is evident from some sources that the teachers seminary of Berlin, founded in the early forties under Zunz's direction, was originally intended for rabbis as well.

The most important discussion of the problem came in 1845 from the pen of Zachariah Frankel. To quote:

The question of the rabbinate is today moreover a question of the survival of Jewish learning; for the more the study of Torah is abandoned by the masses, the more does its future depend on the rabbinate. Our generation must be, therefore, vitally concerned with the practice of selecting spiritual leaders from among those who have acquired scholarship in secular schools. We must admit that a student who spends most of his time at the university can hardly be adequately prepared for the rabbinate. Unlike Catholic and Protestant theological students, who remain under the guidance of their spiritual teachers throughout their university careers, the Jewish university student is isolated and accessible to anti-religious influences. He has no opportunity to develop under the direction of Jewish scholars, and can find no spiritual warmth in the society of his Jewish colleagues. Nor will the establishment of a Jewish theological faculty, as some advocate, solve the problem. There is a vast difference between preparation for the rabbinate and preparation for the Christian ministry. Jewish scholarship cannot be attained unless one devotes himself to it from youth onward. It is therefore necessary to design rabbinical education parallel with gymnasium schooling. For this purpose a Collegium should be founded, where religious as well as the general subjects of the gymnasium would be taught by the same teachers.

Frankel discussed this question again in 1852. Deploring but accepting the fact that Jewish scholarship had come to be solely the possession of the rabbi,
he asked, "But where are the institutions which train for the rabbinate?" In response he exclaimed, "Founding a seminary! So demand the urgency and hopelessness of the day!" This school, he added, should place "religious education as the first and foremost goal of its program, in which general science would find its rightful position." It should offer instruction in the general subjects of the German gymnasium, thus making available more time for Jewish studies during the period when students prepare for entrance into the university. This statement by Frankel came to the attention of the custodians of the Jonas Fraenckel legacy, and was partially responsible for the appointment of its author as the director of the first modern rabbinical school in Germany, the Jewish Theological Seminary of Breslau, opened in 1854.

It is significant to note that although German Jewry was the first Jewry to feel the full impact of new age, modern rabbinical seminaries were originally established in non-German Jewish communities—namely, in Warsaw (1818), Padua (1829), Metz (1830), Amsterdam (1836), and Vilna and Zhitomir (1844). All of those institutions came into being more or less as a result of direct government action, and all of them except the one in Padua were at that time organized on the level of the gymnasium. With the exception
of the schools in Metz and Amsterdam, none of them continued in existence beyond the third quarter of the nineteenth century. They had no major influence on the course of Jewish scholarship during the period under discussion.

The failure to establish rabbinical institutions in Germany during the early part of the century was the result of several conditions. First, German state governments, unlike the governments of neighboring countries, were not inclined to participate in the creation of such schools, leaving activity in this direction to Jewish enterprise. Second, Germany was divided among many independent principalities, making the organization of a national rabbinical school difficult. Third, the Jewish community was in the throes of a struggle for political emancipation which diverted Jewish interest from educational and cultural issues. Fourth, the community was beset with inner religious conflicts, each party to which was too weak to undertake by itself the founding of a school. Fifth, except for Jonas Franckel most of the wealthy Jews were generally indifferent to the problems of rabbinical education and did not make available the necessary material resources for such purposes. Hence, the rabbinical institutions other than that founded by Fraenckel made their appearance during the last
third of the century when Jewish life in Germany became more or less stabilized.

D. Conclusion

The need for a novel type of rabbinical school became evident in Germany during the early part of the nineteenth century. As a result of the influence of the Haskalah movement and the development of scientific Jewish scholarship, the Talmud-centered curriculum of the old Yeshibah and pilpulsitic, or sophistical, methods of study became unpopular. The new intellectual trends emphasized secular learning, intensive study of Bible, classical Hebrew and Jewish history, and the pursuit of the science of Judaism.

The political reorganization of the Jewish community, attended by the disappearance of communal autonomy, divested the rabbi of his traditional judicial functions and authority. In many instances, government laws transformed the rabbi into a congregational functionary with duties limited chiefly to preaching and religious ministrations, and demanded his education preparation in secular subject-matter. These changes necessitated the establishment of modern professional rabbinical institutions where learning was to agree with the new concept of the rabbinate.
Religious ideological differentiation promoted the need for different types of rabbinical schools. Each of the three religious groups, Reform, Neo-Orthodoxy and Positive-Historic Judaism, had a definite approach to the training of the rabbi. Each sought to implement its educational ideas through the several attempts that were then made to organize modern rabbinical institutions. Although these attempts were abortive, they initiated activity which was eventually fruitful.
CHAPTER II

DAS JUEDISCH-THEOLOGISCHE SEMINAR ZU BRESLAU
(The Jewish Theological Seminary of Breslau)
ORIGIN AND FORMATION

The Jewish Theological Seminary of Breslau, the first school of its kind in Germany, owes its origin to the philanthropy of Jonas Fraenckel (1773-1846), a wealthy Breslau merchant and grandson of Moses Mendelssohn's teacher, Chief-Rabbi David Fraenckel of Berlin. In his last will and testament, Jonas Fraenckel bequeathed a considerable portion of his amassed fortune for the erection and maintenance of "a seminary to educate rabbis and teachers."¹

There is reasonable evidence indicating that Jonas Fraenckel was influenced by Abraham Geiger. Fraenckel was a member of Geiger's congregation and his supporter in the latter's controversy with the Orthodox forces of the community.² The words of the rabbi, who had been agitating for many years in behalf of a modern rabbinical institution, probably impressed the congregant. It is therefore credible that Fraenckel intended to designate Geiger as the director of the projected school, a fact alleged by several writers.³ That the founder envisaged the institution in the spirit and ideology of his spiritual mentor was testified by his desire to combine it with the Breslau Wilhelms-Schule, a notoriously anti-talmudic "enlightenment" school which was identified with the Reform movement in Breslau, and which closed shortly after Fraenckel's death.⁴

The changing sentiment in Germany during the middle
of the century was chiefly accountable for the failure of Geiger and the philosophy which he represented to become associated with the Breslau Seminary. The unsuccessful political revolutions of 1848 brought in their wake a general reaction to liberalism. Public opinion was moving away from progressive activity and toward docile conservatism. Reflective of this change was the upsurge of an anti-Reform trend in Jewish life. The rabbinical conferences of 1844-1846 failed to unite the modern German rabbinate, and some of their radical decisions alienated many earnest thinking Jews from the Reform movement. When, therefore, the curators of the Jonas Franckel Foundation, among whom there were members of Geiger's congregation, set out in 1850 to search for a director, they were inclined for reasons of expediency to listen to the advice of their chief consultant, Joseph Lehmann (1801-1873), editor of the Magazin fuer die Literatur des Auslands, who expressed himself on the candidacy of Geiger thus:

The recent rabbinical conferences have exhibited the unfitness of their participants to contribute to the preservation of our faith and to lead us in creating such an institution... Nor can we find such a man in Breslau. The considered one Geiger, who is a scholar of uncommon repute, has pursued a course which disqualifies him to confer rabbinical dignity on others. 6

About two years after these words were written, Zachariah Frankel published his famous article in the Monatschrift in which he appealed for Schopfung eines
Seminar, or the creation of a seminary. This article, cited in the previous chapter, attracted the attention of Lehmann, who forwarded it to the curators and urged the election of its author to the directorship. Frankel, the leader of the Conservative party was, besides his personal qualifications, the most appropriate candidate at a time when Reform popularity declined. In consideration of this fact as well as of his person, and upon the urging of Lehmann, the curators voted in February 1853 to elect him.

Zachariah Frankel was born in Prague in 1801, descending from distinguished rabbis and scholars. He enrolled at an early age in the Yeshibah of Rabbi Ezekiel Landau of Prague, in which he displayed unusual scholarly abilities. At the age of twenty-four he removed to Budapest to complete his secular education at the local university, from which he received a doctorate degree in 1831. In the same year he was ordained and appointed as the rabbi of the Leitmeritz region in Bohemia. He was the first university-educated rabbi to have received such an appointment in the Austrian Empire.

In 1836, Frankel was elected chief-rabbi of Saxony, with headquarters in Dresden. In this office he attained renown as a scholar and Jewish leader. Shortly after his arrival in Dresden he published Die Eidesleistung der Juden, a scholarly treatment of the Jewish law regarding
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The recent rabbinical conferences have exhibited the unfitness of their participants to contribute to the preservation of our faith and to lead us in creating such an institution... Nor can we find such a man in Breslau. The considered one [Geiger], who is a scholar of uncommon repute, has pursued a course which disqualifies him to confer rabbinical dignity on others.

About two years after these words were written, Zachariah Frankel published his famous article in the Monatschrift in which he appealed for Schopfung eines
Seminar, or the creation of a seminary. This article, cited in the previous chapter, attracted the attention of Lehmann, who forwarded it to the curators and urged the election of its author to the directorship. Frankel, the leader of the Conservative party was, besides his personal qualifications, the most appropriate candidate at a time when Reform popularity declined. In consideration of this fact as well as of his person, and upon the urging of Lehmann, the curators voted in February 1853 to elect him.

Zachariah Frankel was born in Prague in 1801, descending from distinguished rabbis and scholars. He enrolled at an early age in the Yeshibah of Rabbi Ezekiel Landau of Prague, in which he displayed unusual scholarly abilities. At the age of twenty-four he removed to Budapest to complete his secular education at the local university, from which he received a doctorate degree in 1831. In the same year he was ordained and appointed as the rabbi of the Leitmeritz region in Bohemia. He was the first university-educated rabbi to have received such an appointment in the Austrian Empire.

In 1836, Frankel was elected chief-rabbi of Saxony, with headquarters in Dresden. In this office he attained renown as a scholar and Jewish leader. Shortly after his arrival in Dresden he published Die Eidesleistung der Juden, a scholarly treatment of the Jewish law regarding
oaths, which disproved the accusations against Jewish integrity implied in the current practice of imposing on Jews the offensive More Judaica. This work was followed by a study on the Septuagint (Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta), and by a critical responsa against the revised prayer-book of the Hamburg Temple. By 1843, Frankel's fame had reached such a high mark that he was offered the post of chief-rabbi of Berlin. However, he remained in Dresden. The last ten years of his residence in that city witnessed his emergence as the leader of the Conservative party, and as one of the leading figures in Jewish Wissenschaft.

Frankel's most important scholarly contributions were in the field of the history of Halakhah. His major work on this subject was his Darkhei HaMishnah, which was supplemented by several monographs in the journal which he founded, the Monatschrift fuer die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthum. He also wrote on biblical and historical themes. His last important work was the Mabo HaYerushalmi, the first of a series of books devoted to the systematic redaction of the Palestinian Talmud. This venture was cut short by his death on February 13, 1874.

Frankel possessed a strong character, limitless energy, a keen understanding of the issues of the day, and a deep love for his students, all of which qualified
him for effective leadership of the Seminary. To quote one of his early pupils, Moritz Guedemann: "He[Frankel] was able to detect the wrongs that prevailed in the relationship between rabbi and community, and to steer rabbinical education in the right path. As a friend, yes, as the father of his students, this childless man guided his children to greater rabbinical dignity."

Frankel's appointment was the most decisive initial factor influencing the ideological and educational course of the Seminary. "The new institution must be organized according to my spirit and thinking," he wrote to Lehmann before accepting the post. His personality and viewpoint was felt in all phases of the school's work, even influencing the teachers and students for many years after his death. His educational program remained in essence the blueprint of the institution and served as a model for subsequent schemes of rabbinical schooling. Any consideration of the Seminary must, therefore, take into earnest account his person, philosophy and program.

A month after Frankel's election, the curators, Lehmann, Heinrich Graetz, who was chosen to teach at the new school, and Rabbi Michael Sachs of Berlin, met with the new director in Dresden to adopt plans of organization. Shortly thereafter a suitable building was purchased and a government charter was obtained. On
August 10, 1854, the Breslau Seminary was formally opened with an enrollment of eighteen students.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

The Seminary was housed in a four story building located at Wallstrasse 1b, which contained several suitable lecture rooms, a small synagogue, residence quarters for the director and permanent instructors, a library and two utility rooms.

Technically, the Seminary embraced two combined schools, one for the rabbis and one for the teachers. This combination was opposed by Leopold Zunz and others who had been consulted by the curators. Jonas Fraenckel's testament, however, that the Seminary should educate teachers as well. Hence, a Lehrerseminar was organized in 1857, continuing in existence for ten years.

The history and educational program of the Lehrerseminar is not within the purview of this dissertation. Suffice it to note here that it offered a three year course of study in Bible and biblical subjects, Palestinian topography, history, ethics and observances, Pflichtenlehre, pedagogy, catechism, elementary Hebrew and Mishnah.

Frankel's organizational plan divided the rabbinical school into two departments. The lower department offered a four year course of study in Judaic and general
subjects, beginning with the Sekuda class, or fifth year, of the gymnasium. The higher department was confined to theological subjects, its students attending the local university for secular knowledge. Accordingly, entrance requirements were minimal, namely: fourteen years of age, admittance into the Sekunda class and an elementary background in Bible and Talmud.

The partial organization of the Seminary on the level of the gymnasium, reflective of the organizational character of the forerunning rabbinical seminaries in Europe (except Padua), was necessitated by prevailing conditions. The absence of an efficient Jewish secondary school system and the general indifference to higher Jewish education precluded normal development of advanced academic institutions. Furthermore, the current trend toward secular learning steered interest away from the rabbinate. Once a Jewish student matriculated at the university, he sought achievement at other than Jewish academic or professional fields. Frankel keenly sensed this condition when in 1845, as was noted in the previous chapter, he wrote an article advocating the establishment of a seminary on a parallel structural level with the gymnasium. However, the Breslau school went a step further than its forerunners in Metz, Amsterdam and Russia, by extending the course of study through the university period.
The division of the Seminary into two departments remained technically in effect until 1885. Much before this time, however, it became apparent that strict adherence to this organizational order could not be maintained, since the student body was heterogeneous. Native German students normally enrolled in the Seminary after having graduated from the gymnasium, but with insufficient Hebrew background for entrance into the higher department. On the other hand, the average foreign student was usually well advanced in Jewish studies but had not completed the gymnasium. Consequently, the departments could not function exclusive of each other in graduation. At the end of the sixties, the number of students who had not matriculated at the university declined, resulting in the gradual abandonment of the departmental system. In 1885, a one department system was introduced having a six year course of study restricted to Judaic subject-matter. Admission was then limited to students who were qualified to enter the university.

The Seminary had no dormitory facilities. No tuition or entrance fees were charged, but students had to provide for their own physical needs. The poor received stipends and other forms of material assistance. During the eighties, it became the practice to extend stipendiary aid to all students. To quote Bernard Drachman, an American student during this period:
The Curatorium, or board of governors, in the true spirit of Jewish ethics, insisted that all students, whether well-to-do or poor, should accept stipendiary assistance. This was done in order not to humiliate those who were in real need of financial aid.

A government charter, issued on April 10, 1854, placed the Seminary under official state supervision. However, it imposed no other obligation besides that of conforming to the general regulations of the Prussian Ministry of Education which applied to private educational institutions. Full jurisdictional power remained invested in the hands of Seminary authorities, namely, the curatorium, the director and the faculty.

The curatorium consisted of the three custodians designated by Jonas Fraenckel and their successors. It was the governing body, exercising power of review over all institutional matters. Its work was, however, chiefly confined to the administration of the budget and the adoption of policy. Educational and student matters were under the jurisdiction of the director and, subsequently, of the faculty.

The director was the spiritual and official head of the school. His duties were as follows: to execute general policy, to preside over the faculty, to plan the curriculum, to give instruction in advanced halakhic subjects, to determine the fitness of candidates for the rabbinical degree, to confer the Hattarat Horaḥ, to guide the students spiritually and academically,
and to preach in the Seminary synagogue on festivals and special occasions. The requirements for appointment to the directorship were as follows: "a deep and thorough knowledge of Jewish theology and general science, a distinguished rabbinical career, piety and moral exemplification, ... and the recommendation and approval of the candidate by the faculty and three reputable German rabbis."

Under Frankel, the directorship assumed wide, almost dictatorial powers. By virtue of his prestige and forcefulness, Frankel was able to arrogate to himself authority over the curatorium and the faculty. He personally exercised supervision over all school matters, demanding conformity to his views. Adolph Kohut, a student during the sixties, described him as the "dictatorial father of a Jesuiten-Anstalt."

Frankel was succeeded in September 1874 by Rabbi Leyser Lazarus (1820-1879), a disciple of Rabbi Akiba Elger of Posen and a talmudist of considerable repute. Lazarus had graduated from the University of Berlin and served as the rabbi of Prenzlau for twenty-five years before coming to Breslau. His former pupil, the late Professor Gotthard Deutsch, described him as a skilled dialectician who stressed the method of Pilpul. Except for a monograph on "The Ethics of the Talmud", issued in 1874 together with the annual report of the Seminary,
he is not known to have written on Jewish scientific themes. His tenure of office was beset with personal illness, ending with his death on April 16, 1879.

The directorship was abolished after the death of Lazarus. The circumstances leading to this were connected with the person of Heinrich Graetz (1817-1891), the great Jewish historian. During his younger years, Graetz had been an ardent follower and friend of Samson Raphael Hirsch, the founder of Neo-Orthodoxy, but later became identified with the Conservative party. As a teacher in a Breslau Jewish school during 1850-1851, he joined the anti-Geiger forces. It was then that he wrote several critical articles against the Reform movement which brought him to the attention of Frankel, with whom he soon consummated a binding friendship. When Frankel was chosen for the directorship, he insisted on the appointment of Graetz to the faculty of the Seminary. Graetz, therefore, considered himself the rightful successor to Frankel. However, the conditions governing appointment to the directorship militated against his candidacy. According to the statutes, a candidate had to have considerable professional rabbinical experience and had to be a recognized scholar in Talmud and Halakhah. Graetz could lay claim to none of these qualifications. His single attempt at a rabbinical career ended in failure.
Although he taught Talmud in the lower department of the Seminary, his knowledge of this field was limited. His main forte was history and, to a lesser degree, exegesis. Consequently, his candidacy was rejected, creating on his part bitter resentment toward Lazarus, his rival for the post. It is told that he never referred to the latter as Herr Direktor. Upon Lazarus' death, Graetz's name was again placed in nomination. In order to avoid further embarrassment to Graetz, the curatorium decided to abolish the office of director, replacing it with that of Seminar-Rabbiner.

The Seminar-Rabbiner performed the functions of the erstwhile director, but he was not exclusively in charge of administrating the educational program. The first incumbent of this office, David Joel, shared administrative duties with Graetz. Later these duties were placed in charge of the faculty as a whole.

David Joel (1815-1882) was a distinguished rabbi and talmudist of the Lazarus type. He had also studied under Rabbi Akiba Eiger in Posen and at the University of Berlin, but he was not as skilled a pilpulist as the second director and was more predisposed to the study of philosophy. During his rabbinical service in Schwersenz and Krotoschin (1842-1880), he published several philosophical treatises, the best known of which is the Midrash HaZohar. Two of his
monographs on Superstition and the Jewish Attitude Thereto were issued by the Seminary after his death, which occurred on September 7, 1882.

Joel was succeeded by Israel Lewy (1841-1917), a former student of Frankel, by whom he was stimulated to a critical investigation of the Talmud. Combining a profound and extensive knowledge of Talmud with an inclination for scientific thoroughness, Lewy gained fame as the greatest scientific talmudist of his day in Germany. In recognition of this, he was appointed lecturer in halakhic subjects at the Hochschule fuer die Wissenschaft des Judenthums when that school was opened in 1872. From this time until his death he published several textual reconstructions and analyses which are considered to be fundamental to the study of Talmud and Midrash. His most important contributions in this area were the following works: Fragments from the Mishnah of Abba Saul (1876), On the Mehillta of Rabbi Simon ben Yo- ha-i (1889), and Introduction to and Interpretation of the Palestinian Talmud, Tractate Nezikin (1895-1914). Attesting to his scholarly influence were such of his outstanding pupils as Adolph Buechler (1867-1939), Solomon Schechter (1847-1915), Saul Horovitz (1859-1921) and Immanuel Loew (1854-1939). Another pupil, Max Gruenwald, described him thus:
He was an exacting teacher, making demands on his students which were often impossible to meet. Sometimes when we thought that we had achieved some understanding of the problem, he would apply his critical acumen and destroy the whole premise of our thinking. In his presence we soon felt the limits of our own abilities, realizing that it was difficult to follow his depth and sharpness of mind...The harmonious combination of uncompromising critique with strict adherence to tradition in the personality of Lewy served as a model and guidepost to us throughout our lives. 28

An interesting commentary on Lewy is the enmity that existed between him and Graetz, ostensibly caused by the latter's exegetical studies which frequently denied the authenticity of the Massoretic text. Even Graetz's sympathetic biographer admits that "he [Graetz] grew more and more unrestrained in his effort to restore approximately the text of the Bible by means of audacious conjecture..." Graetz's anti-traditional viewpoint irritated the pious Lewy. There were, however, personal differences that promoted the dispute, namely, Graetz's indignation at not having been elected titular head of the school and Lewy's self-assertion as the successor to Frankel. Gruenwald related that: "It came to an open conflict, in which students were involved, many of them gathering petitions in favor of Graetz [sic]. Shortly thereafter, Graetz died, and many students who were not attuned to Lewy's disciplinary efforts transferred to the Hochschule in Berlin." 30

The faculty was composed of the director or
Seminar-Rabbiner and several full-time instructors, the total number of which never exceeded five at any given time. There were also several part-time assistant instructors, usually selected from among senior students. A full-time teacher enjoyed permanent tenancy and received a salary comparable to that paid to university lecturers as well as residential quarters in the Seminary building.

The character of the faculty was modern and scholarly. Each instructor was a university-trained student and a recognized authority in his field of endeavor. Members of the faculty were required "to uphold the principles of Positive-Historic Judaism." They were, in the words of one writer, "as remote from each other in their religious attitudes and educational methods as is East from West."

Besides the previously mentioned instructors, the faculty consisted of the following members: Jacob Bernays (1824-1881), Marcus Brann (1849-1921), Jacob Freudenthal (1839-1907), Saul Horovitz (1859-1921), Manuel Joel (1826-1890), David Rosen (1823-1894), and Benedict Zuckerman (1818-1891). Thumbnail sketches of the character and teaching activity of these men are included in the Appendix to this study.

The composite student body during the period 1854-1904 consisted of four hundred and ten students, of which ninety-one were Austrians (including Galicians, Bohemians
and Moravians), forty-seven Hugarians, twenty-one Polish and Russians, six Americans and eleven from other European countries. Of the remaining two-hundred and thirty-four Germans, approximately one hundred hailed from eastern border districts where the standard of talmudic learning was relatively high.

The character of enrollment is indicated by the following figures disclosed by Brann for the period under discussion: students admitted into the lower department with the minimal entrance requirements, one hundred and four; gymnasium graduates who attended the lower department, sixty-eight; gymnasium graduates in the higher department, one hundred and sixteen; advanced rabbinical students pursuing general courses in the lower department, forty-four. The remaining eighty were special students, some of which matriculated after a period of preparation.

It should be noted that not all of the enrolled students completed the entire course of study. During its first fifty years, the Seminary conferred only one hundred and twenty-six rabbinical degrees, indicating that less than one-third of the total enrollment graduated.

A distinguishing characteristic of the Seminary during the period under discussion was its sound financial status. Interest from a capital fund of
300,000 Mark and a stipendary fund of 15,000 Mark set aside by Jonas Frashoke. 35

provided most of the budgetary needs. There were also incomes accruing from over one-hundred private legacies and contributions, illustrating the wide popularity that the institution achieved. Foreign communities such as Vienna and Prague, and the Russian Society for the Diffusion of Culture among Jews —Hebrah Marbizei Haskalah —, allocated special scholarship monies to assist native students studying in Breslau. A student mutual-aid society, the Liwyath Hein Verein, organized by Frankel in 1855, received substantial support from alumni and friends. With such financial means at its disposal, the Seminary was able to carry forth its educational program without undue hindrances.

CURRICULUM

Aim and Philosophy—the curriculum had a two-fold objective: professional and academic. It aimed to educate rabbis "on the grounds of Positive-Historic Judaism," and to "achieve a thorough knowledge of all branches of Jewish learning and a devotion to its furtherance." The graduating rabbi was not just to be a competent religious functionary, but also an "able exponent of the Jewish faith and its Wissenschaft."

Underlying these objectives was the religious and
educational philosophy of Frankel. In accordance with Frankel's viewpoint, referred to in the preceding chapter, all essential factors of historic Jewish life—traditions, customs, laws and all practices that have through the ages remained part and parcel of the Jewish living—must be preserved in the content of Judaism. The curriculum of the Jewish school embodying the sum-total of Jewish experience, must embrace all elements of the Jewish heritage. It must remain true to tradition and communal sentiment. Since, however, modern life and education demand the acquisition of worldly culture, and have demonstrated the universal truth of science, the Jewish curriculum must be expanded to include general academic subjects and scientific methods of research.

The expansion of the curriculum, Frankel believed, must accord with three educational principles, namely: "appropriate methods, material completeness and inseparable association with general science." These principles were not conceived as integrated parts of a whole system, but as a distinct trivium, each part thereof supplementing the other. By "appropriate methods" Frankel meant the application of critical research to undeveloped areas of Jewish scholarship which lend themselves to scientific investigation.
without imperiling fundamental traditional beliefs and practices. Frankel opposed the complete subjection of Jewish learning to the test of science. Textual studies in Bible, Talmud and Halakhah, he felt, should be pursued in the traditional spirit, but their historical and philological aspects should receive critical, systematic treatment. Hence, the division of the Seminary curriculum into areas of traditional, textual studies and areas of scientific research.

The second principle, "material completeness," aimed at extending the curriculum to its rightful limits. Accordingly, the talmud-centered program of the old Yeshibah was to be broadened to include more extensive study of Bible, history, philosophy, philology, and other branches of Jewish learning. These subjects were to be supplemented, in keeping with the third principle, with secular education. To quote Frankel:

The rabbinical seminary should rest on the foundations of the old school, but, lest it suffer the same fate, it should open new educational vistas... The distinct character and goal of Jewish education must not be forsaken. It should, however, be enhanced through the application of scientific methods... and be supplemented with general secular studies, thus wedding science to religion.

A basic understanding according to the spirit of the age and to modern principles of education is most important. This applied to theology as well as to other studies. A thorough fundamental knowledge (Gründlichkeit) protects theology from misleading
superficiality. Jewish learning must be, therefore, scientifically developed so that it remain not confined to the outline alone, but so that it will be able to arrive at the full expression of its inner destiny. This is the chief reason for combining science with religion...The latter thus becomes protected against one-sidedness, and can progress to its rightful goal.

The Course of Study—To implement his program, Frankel instituted the following seven year course of study which remained for the most part in effect until 1885:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area of Instruction</th>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bible, Exegesis, Hebrew, Methodology of the Mishnah, Mishnah, Talmud (Intensive), Sekunda (Secular subjects)</td>
<td>9, 1, 4, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bible, Exegesis, Aramaic, Palestinian Geography, Mishnah and Older Baraithot, Talmud (intensive), Religion and Observances, Sekunda</td>
<td>8, 4, 4, 2, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bible, Exegesis, History of Exegesis, Targumim and Septuagint, Hebrew Composition, Advanced Introduction to the Mishnah and Older Baraithot, Talmud (Intensive), Talmud (Extensive), Midrash, History of the Jews and their Literature, Prima (Secular subjects)</td>
<td>5, 2, 4, 4, 1, 2, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advanced Introduction to the Talmud, Talmud (Intensive), Talmud (Extensive), Talmudic Practices (Codes), Midrash (Textual and Scientific), History of the Jews and their Literature, Pedagogy and Catechism, Prima</td>
<td>2, 4, 3, 2, 3, 2, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Area of Instruction</td>
<td>Hours Per Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Advanced Biblical Exegesis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talmud (Intensive)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talmud (Extensive)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talmudic Practices (Codes)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Philosophy and Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Talmud (Intensive)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talmud (Extensive)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palestinian Talmud</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsa Literature</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Philosophy and Ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homiletics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Talmud (Intensive)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talmud (Extensive)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palestinian Talmud</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsa Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homiletical Exercises</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mosaic-Talmudic Criminal, Civil, and Marriage Laws</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of the courses listed in the annual reports of the Seminary revealed that this course of study was by no means fixed or static. New courses were introduced from time to time. A good example was Zuckerman's course in chronology and calendar sciences, begun in 1861. The reports also list classes in liturgical music.

Upon the reorganization of the Seminary in 1885, a new six-year course of study was put into effect. The areas of instruction and their time distribution under the new program were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Instruction</th>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
<th>Number of Semesters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bible Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Interpretation of Pentateuch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas of Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
<th>Number of Semesters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Interpretation of the Later Prophets and Hagiographa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Introduction to the Bible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Biblical Archeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Exegetical-Historical Exercises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Exegetical Literature</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) History of Exegetical Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Hebrew Grammar</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Talmud Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Intensive Talmud</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Extensive Talmud</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Codes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Scientific Talmudic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Introduction to the Mishnah and Borsithoth, Introduction to Babylonian and Palestinian Talmudic Literature, History of Halakhah, Talmudic Jurisprudence)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Jewish History</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Religious Philosophy and Hellenistics</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Homiletics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Theory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Midrash</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Homiletical Exercises</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Pedagogy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Educational Theory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Instructional Methods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Calendar Sciences</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both courses of study had a prescribed schedule of work. The first required eighteen hours per week of Judaic study in the lower department and fifteen hours per week in the upper department. The second required sixteen hours per week. In addition, students had to attend the university. Classroom attendance at the Seminary was not obligatory on the part of university students.
The school year coincided with that of the secular school system, beginning in October and ending in June. The daily schedule of instruction was arranged to allow students to attend university classes.

Besides completion of the prescribed course of study, qualification for graduation required an additional period of a year or more devoted to preparation for final examinations. These examinations were given in two separate areas, theological-scientific and talmudic-ritual, illustrative of the dichotomous character of the curriculum. Both examinations were styled after similar tests held in the university. They consisted of a written dissertation and an oral interrogation. The dissertation dealt with a topic assigned by the major instructor of each area, and the oral test covered the whole field of related subject matter. The oral examination in Talmud and Codes required a general knowledge of the following texts: Shabbat, Pesahim, Gittin, Kedushin, Kethubot and Hulin; Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'ah, Chapters 1-111, dealing with dietary laws; Orah Hayyim, Chapters 440-467, dealing with Passover laws; and Eben Ezer, Chapters 119-176, dealing with divorce laws.

In addition to the successful completion of the final examinations, a candidate for the rabbinical degree was required to deliver a talmudic discourse.
and a sermon in the Seminary synagogue on the Sabbath preceding his ordination.

The rabbinical degree was officially conferred upon the qualifying candidate at the annual convocation held on January twenty-seventh, the anniversary of the death of Jonas Fraenckel.

**Analysis of Instruction**—Both the original and the revised course of study reserved more than one-half of the time of instruction for the study of textual Talmud and Codes, and about one-fifth for biblical and philological subjects. During Frankel's administration, about ten percent of the learning program was devoted to scientific Halakhah, and about five percent to philosophy. These percentages were reversed by the revised course introduced in 1885. The remaining time was distributed among the other areas of instruction in the following order of importance: history and literature, Midrash and homiletics, pedagogy, and calendar sciences.

In accordance with the educational principles elucidated by Frankel, instruction in Judaic subjects was divided, as was noted previously, into textual, or content courses and "methodological" or scientific courses. The latter were conducted by means of Einleitungen, or introductory lectures, which purposed to survey the whole range of the field of study.
Textual courses were usually organized in special classes or seminars, with the instructor guiding student work. Both of these forms of instruction were adaptations of those in use at the German university during that time, Vorlesungen \( \underline{\text{lectures}} \) and \( \underline{\text{Ubungen \text{\textit{exercises}}}} \).

The specific method and scope of instruction in each subject-matter area, wherever indicated by the sources, are treated separately in the following order:

(1) Talmud:---Frankel attempted to solve the problem of providing a means of achieving essential proficiency in Talmud in the shortened learning period of the Seminary in two ways. First, he instituted two types of talmudic courses: \( \underline{\text{staterisch, or intensive,}} \) and \( \underline{\text{cursorisch, or extensive.}} \) "Staterisch" courses were analytical in character, embracing the study of commentaries, legal opinions and, to some degree, dialectics. "Cursorisch" were limited to general interpretative readings of the text with the Rashi commentary. The former aimed at deriving the full meaning and implication of the textual theme, and the latter at affording to the student a wide-range appreciation of talmudic literature. Second, he directed talmudic instruction towards achieving a
knowledge of the practical Halakhah rather than to acquiring dialectical skill and textual erudition. Such tractates as Shabbat, Kedushin, Gittin, Hullin, all of which deal with applicable laws, were usually chosen for study. Textual selections were restricted to halakhic discussions, irrelevant passages being omitted. Accordingly, tractates were not studied in entirety. To implement efficient learning of Halakhah, Frankel integrated the study of Talmud with that of Codes.

With regard to method, Frankel related that:

Each tractate is begun with an introductory survey of its content and organization... The individual lesson is introduced with a discussion of the theme. Students are urged to take notice of each phase of the textual debate, its implications and relevancy to the established Halakhah.

In addition to regular talmudic classes, special exercises were held. To quote Frankel:

The exercises consist of either textual reviews or written discussions. Reviews are based on Maimonides' Yad HaHazakkah, each law thereof being investigated for its talmudic origin and compared with the opinions of other commentators. Written discussions are in the form of student responsa on assigned questions related to the lesson.

With regard to the range of talmudic instruction, the writer has found that during the first seven year period, that is from 1854 to 1862, only selected portions of eleven tractates were covered. This range was gradually narrowed toward the end of the century. The study of commentaries included the works of Rashi,
Tosafot, Maimonides, and Asher Ben Yehiel. It is significant to note that Frankel introduced the study of the Palestinian Talmud into the curriculum, a subject that was neglected by the traditional Yeshibah.

(2) Codes:—The approach to this subject was traditional, as can be gauged from the following questions of the final examinations held in 1862:

a) A quarter measure of fat of a properly slaughtered chicken was mixed with twenty quarter-measures of fat of another fowl, and a Zayit measure of meat of the first was mixed with twenty Zaitim of the second. The twenty-one quarter measures of fat were later mixed with one-hundred similar measures, and the twenty-one Zaitim with one-hundred other meat Zaitim. The second fowl was later found to be Treifah. What is the law concerning the fat and the meat in each case?

b) A lean lung was attached to the wall of the animal by a Sirkhah/membrane/ which protruded from one of its lobes. This lung was then broiled or cooked with a kosher fat lung. What is the law concerning both lungs?

c) A salted fish from which the blood had been extracted was placed next to a fowl that was in the process of being salted. Both articles were in contact with each other a long period of time. What is the law concerning the fowl?

d) A divorce contract in which the husband was referred to as "Reuben who is known as Abraham" was disputed by two witnesses, who said that the husband's correct name is "Abraham, also known as Reuben". What is the law, if the divorce had already been validated and the woman married another man?

e) Is it permissible to include a "condition" in a Get? When can a "repeated condition" be included?
Bible: Biblical studies ranged from simple interpretative reading in the text with the Rashi commentary to advanced research in exegetical literature. The method of study was philological and historical. Although the general tendency in the Seminary was to respect higher biblical criticism, the anti-traditional theories of the Graf-Wellhausen school were not accepted. To David Rosin, the major instructor in biblical subjects, "the question of Bible or Talmud criticism did not matter, his chief emphasis being on a thorough knowledge of the text." Graetz, on the other hand, treated the Bible, as was noted earlier, without regard for the Massoretic canonical order.

Hebrew: Until 1885, the study of Hebrew was an integral part of the Bible course with emphasis on biblical grammar. The separate listing of Hebrew in the revised course of study suggests that this subject was given increased attention toward the end of the century. This change was probably influenced by the growing interest in Zionism at that time. It is reported that during the late eighties a group of older students met regularly in the home of David Rosin to discuss Zionist questions and to promote conversational Hebrew. However, the extent of Hebrew study in the Seminary was meagre. One reporter declared: "I am yet to find a Seminary graduate who can write or converse
in our holy tongue with comparative ease."

(5) History:---History was taught in correlation with the history of Jewish literature, with emphasis on Kulturgeschichte rather than on the political, social, and economic aspects of Jewish life. This approach was followed by Graetz in his monumental History of the Jews and reflected the Kulturgeschichte trend in historiography current in Germany at that time.

(6) Homiletics:---This subject was taught by means of exercises. These exercises were conducted in connection with the activities of the Homiletische Verein, a student society which met each week to assign students to preach in the Seminary synagogue on Sabbaths and to examine selected sermons. Available sources offer inadequate information on the range and procedure of instruction in philosophical, pedagogical and other subject-matter.

Instructional Aids and Incentives:---There is no record of the use of special instructional materials. Standard editions of the Bible, Talmud and other rabbinic works served as text-books for most of the content courses. In the study of historical and "methodological" subjects, the individual instructor's personal notes were employed. Both Frankel and Graetz made extensive use in their teaching of materials which they incorporated in their published works. The large Seminary library, consisting of the collections of
Leon Vita Saraval (1771-1851), an Italian-Jewish bibliophile, and of private bequests, provided tools for scholarly research. In 1876, the library was reputed to have been the largest of its kind in Germany, containing over 32,000 volumes and 600 manuscripts.

In order to stimulate creative student achievement, the Seminary instituted special scholarships and contests, modelled on similar incentives in use in secular schools. The most important scholarship awards were the Joseph Lehmann Preisstiftung, inaugurated in 1854; the Zachariah Frankel Scholarship, established in 1872 in celebration of the director's seventieth birthday; and the David Rosin Prize, initiated in 1895.

Religious Discipline and Student Activities---During Frankel's time, strict conformity to tradition was demanded. Students were required to attend daily services in the Seminary synagogue and to observe all traditional laws and customs. Subsequently, however, the spirit of discipline became more moderate. Gotthard Deutsch, a student during the late seventies, reported that Rosin and Freudenthal wore caps only in the classroom, and that an American student publicly opened letters on the Sabbath but "even he took his meals at a kosher restaurant!" Dancing with females was tacitly permitted, "but in all other respects, however," added Deutsch, "our conduct was strictly orthodox." Although
instruction and student activities were regulated according to the Positive-Historic viewpoint, graduates were permitted to accept posts in Reform congregations.

Student activities were not confined to study alone. Students were often invited to the homes of faculty and curatorium members where they enjoyed a hospitable environment. They took part in holiday celebrations and special school events, such as annual convocations and birthday anniversaries of instructors. Several student organizations provided them with opportunities of collegiate association and extra-curricular activity. Of these, the Liwyath Hein Verein and Homiletisch Verein have already been mentioned. In 1889, a Gesangverein was founded to "cultivate an appreciation of liturgical music."

A social club, Amicitia, was organized in 1871, and a Literarische Verein juedischer Theologen in 1888. The Amicitia was described by Drachman in the following words:

This society was modeled on the great student organizations of German universities, but modified to suit Jewish conditions. It met on Thursday evening when the proceedings were almost an exact replica of those in the regular university student Verbindungen. There was the same student lingo, the same drinking of beer and beer duels, and the same spirit of youthful merriment and hilarity. In several ways the Amicitia differed from the Verbindungen. Its members did not wear uniforms, did not promenade the streets...leading huge dogs, did not fight duels, and were consequently not distinguished by proudly borne Schmisse, or scarred countenances. But as regards the manner of conducting the meetings, there was almost exact similarity.
I enjoyed these meetings immensely. The spirit was carefree and jovial, the singing excellent, and the entire proceedings so novel that I found them intensely interesting...I remember particularly one Purim celebration at which, in accordance with the nature of the festival, several exquisitely humorous compositions were read. Among these was one of good-natured persiflage, satirizing the strictly conscientious religious observance of Seminar-Rabbiner Dr. Lewy, which threw the audience into paroxysms of laughter...

THE EDUCATIONAL PRODUCT

The following conclusions concerning the educational product of the Seminary are based on available records and on the writer's familiarity with the subject.

1. The Seminary succeeded considerably in producing professional rabbis capable of executing the new functions of the modern rabbinate. These rabbis were all secularly educated and were able preachers in the German language. They occupied the largest number of rabbinical positions in Germany, and a considerable number served communities in other countries, particularly Hungary. The writer has traced the professional activities of the graduates listed by Brann for the period 1854-1904, and has found that over seventy percent of those who practiced the rabbinate were prominent in their spheres of endeavor.

2. The Seminary graduate was not a proficient talmudic student in the traditional sense. "There are
no Lamdnim (Talmudic scholars) in Breslau," exclaimed one critic. "Those students who are well versed in Talmud are the Hugarians, who studied in Hungarian Yeshiboth before coming to Breslau; and even they do not compare with their colleagues whom they have left behind." The halakhic knowledge of the graduate was limited to simple questions of mourning, festival laws and the like. "How can they know more?" asked Isaac Hirsch Weiss, "when they learn only the first portion of Yoreh De-ah and study Talmud by the shallow 'cursorisch' method?"

Admission of its failure to develop students adequately educated in traditional Halakhah was made by the Seminary at the end of the century when it introduced the practice of issuing modified ordination degrees to candidates of insufficient talmudic knowledge. These degrees, a copy of which is included in the Appendix to this study, omitted the technical terms Yoreh Yoreh and Yodin Yodin, which, according to traditional usage, testify to a rabbi's authority in religious and civil questions of law. Dr. Adolf Kober, a former student of the Seminary, has told the writer that few German-born graduates received the traditional Hattarat Hora-ah in its complete form.

(3) Not all graduates adhered to the Positive-Historic philosophy according to which they were
educated. Many occupied posts in Reform congregations and several in Orthodox congregations. "They are reformers among the reformers and orthodox among the orthodox," remarked one critic who accused them of hypocrisy.

(4) Although he was inadequately familiar with talmudic literature, the Seminary student was well-rounded in other branches of Jewish learning. The writer has found that two-thirds of the graduates made smaller or larger contributions to the field of Jewish scholarship. Among these graduates were several outstanding scholars — namely, Wilhelm Bacher (1876), Pinhas F. Frankl (1873), Moritz Guedemann (1862), Moses Gaster (1881), Alexander Kohut (1867), David Kaufmann (1877), Samuel H. Margulius (1881), and Adolf Schwartz (1873). Eighteen graduates served as teachers in higher institutions of Jewish learning and a few, like the Neo-Kantian philosopher, Hermann Cohen, occupied professorial positions in German universities. It should be noted that most of the prominent graduates were students of Frankel. In general, the calibre of students during the post-Frankel period was poor.

Besides student education, the Seminary played a significant role in promoting higher Jewish learning. As the first successful modern rabbinical school, it served as a model for similar institutions. It
influenced the organization of "sister academies" in Budapest and Vienna \[^79\] the Landesrabbinerschule and the Israelitische-Theologische Lehranstalt, where some of its foremost graduates taught. The literary works of its instructors stimulated Jewish scholarship. Above all, the Seminary demonstrated the practicability of combining secular knowledge, scientific Jewish studies and traditional rabbinical learning in the curriculum of the modern rabbi.
CHAPTER III

DIE HOCHSCHULE (LEHRANSTALT) FUER DIE WISSENSCHAFT DES JUDENTHUMS

(The High School (Institute) for the Science of Judaism)
ORIGIN AND FORMATION

The creation of the Hochschule in 1872 was chiefly the result of revived interest in the Geiger-Philippsohn Facultät project. Increased Reform activity during the sixties of the nineteenth century was accompanied by renewed agitation for the establishment of a Jewish theological faculty. After his removal to Frankfort a. Main from Breslau in 1864, Abraham Geiger once again turned his efforts to the realization of his long cherished dream to found a school of this type. The synod of Reform rabbis held in Leipzig in 1869 adopted a resolution calling for the implementation of Geiger's plan. It was, however, the movement initiated in this direction by a vigorous group of Jewish laymen in Berlin that eventuated in success.

The leader of the Berlin group was Moritz Lazarus (1824-1903), the younger brother of Leyser Lazarus, Zachariah Frankel's successor in Breslau. Moritz Lazarus was a disciple of John Frederick Herbart (1776-1841), the noted philosopher and educator. He was recognized as the foremost student of psychology in Germany during his time. Together with his brother-in-law, Heinrich Steinthal (1823-1899), he enunciated the theory of Voelkerpsychologie or ethno-psychology. He was popularly acclaimed as
a philosopher and Prussian patriot. As the president of the Leipzig and Augsburg synods during 1869-1871 and as the most prominent figure in the Jewish community of Berlin, he held a position of influence in German-Jewish life.

In 1867, a meeting was convened by Lazarus in the home of Moritz Meyer (died 1869), a wealthy Berlin merchant, to plan the "erection of a Lehranstalt for the promotion of Jewish Wissenschaft." Shortly thereafter, Lazarus and his friends began to campaign for the election of Abraham Geiger to the Berlin rabbinate in the hope that he would organize a school for the training of modern rabbis. Their repeated attempts to elect Geiger were blocked by Orthodox and Conservative communal officials. Success finally came as a result of developments connected with the reorganization of the local Beth Hamidrash, a traditional "house of study" founded during the middle of the preceding century.

The background to these developments was the existence in Berlin of a large group of Jewish university students who aspired to become rabbis. These students pursued talmudic studies at the Beth Hamidrash. To provide them with a knowledge of other Jewish subjects, the community instituted
informal courses in Bible, Jewish history and related fields. It soon became evident that this type of instruction was inadequate. Many people felt that the Beth Hamidrash should be transformed into a modern rabbinical school. But all efforts in this direction were stalemated by conflicting religious factions vying with each other for control of the institution. The issue came to a head at the end of 1869 when Eariel Hildesheimer (1820-1899), the prominent Neo-Orthodox leader, was appointed as the educational head of the Beth Hamidrash. The courses indicate that Hildesheimer's appointment weakened Conservative opposition to Geiger, whose election in December 1869 could not have taken place without the approval of the Conservative majority of communal officials.

In January 1870, one month after Geiger's election to the Berlin rabbinate, a public meeting, "attended by many Conservatives," announced the formation of a Verein zur Erhaltung und Verwaltung des Hochschule, or Society for the Maintenance and Administration of the Hochschule. Immediate steps were then taken to organize the new school, but the outbreak of war between France and Prussia shortly thereafter delayed its formal opening until May 6, 1872.
ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

The Hochschule was organized as an independent institution, unaffiliated with a university. In this respect it differed from the organizational form of a theological faculty such as was advocated by Geiger and Philippsohn. German theological faculties were, as was noted in the first chapter, university departments under government control. The expressed wish of the founders of the Hochschule was that the institution remain free from interference by "state, community or synagogue authorities." In other respects the Hochschule approximated a Faculté. Its program was not limited to the professional education of rabbis alone, but it also provided opportunities of advanced Jewish learning to other interested students.

A significant change took place in 1883 when financial stringency compelled the school to obtain a government charter, which permitted it to solicit funds from philanthropic agencies incorporated under state law. It was then that the institution was placed under the jurisdiction of the Prussian Ministry of Education and that its official name was changed to Lehranstalt, a colorless designation of non-accredited schools. The government, unwilling to recognize a Jewish school as a Hochschule on an
equal level with the various secular Hochschulen which existed in Germany at that time, demanded the change in name. The original designation, by which it continued to be popularly known, was put back into official usage after World War I by the liberal Weimar Republic.

The school was directed and administered by a lay executive board, or curatorium, consisting of nine members. To prevent the influence of religious partisanship, rabbis and synagogue functionaries were excluded from the curatorium. Even Abraham Geiger, with whom the origin and formation of the Hochschule was closely connected, did not hold any official position except that of instructor. It was thus hoped to give the impression that the institution was non-denominational in character. Actually, however, Reform adherents and philosophy played the major role of influence. The chairmen of the curatorium, Moritz Lazarus and Salomon Neumann (1819-1905), and most of its members, were identified with the Reform movement.

A self-governing faculty was in charge of instruction and related matters. Candidates for appointment to the faculty had to meet the same requirements as were demanded of university teachers. The following instructors taught at the Hochschule
during the nineteenth century: Eduard Baneth (1863-1926), David Cassel (1818-1893), Pinhas Friedrich Frankl (1848-1887), Abraham Geiger (1810-1874), Israel Lewy (1841-1917), Sigmund Maybaum (1844-1899), Joel Mueller (1827-1895), Martin Schreiner (1863-1899), and Heinrich Steinthal (1823-1899). Thumbnail sketches of these men are included in the Appendix to this study.

Applicants for admission into the Hochschule were required to matriculate at the university. No other conditions governed entrance. Tuition was free of charge and Christians and women were admitted. Unqualified students were permitted to enroll as Hospitanten, or "listeners." To help these students matriculate, special preparatory courses in the general subjects of the gymnasium were instituted in 1875. Similar courses were offered after 1891 in Hebrew and talmudic subjects for the benefit of German-born students who, in the opinion of one of their East European colleagues, "knew less about Jewish learning than do the pupils of the fourth or fifth grade in the Heder."

The total number of matriculated students attending during the period 1872-1902 was one hundred and sixty-eight, of which fifty-eight came from German-speaking countries, thirty-two from Hungary.
and Bohemia, thirty-eight from Galicia, twenty from Russia and Poland, eleven from America, and nine from other countries. Only seventy-five completed the prescribed rabbinical course of study, and fifty-two of these became practicing rabbis.

In contrast to the Breslau Seminary, the Hochschule was continuously beset with financial difficulties. Its lack of material resources precluded the engagement of an adequate number of instructors and the acquisition of suitable quarters. The first locale of the school was a shabby third-floor room at Spandauer Bruecke 8, from which it removed in 1875 to Unter den Linden 4a and in 1892 to Lindenstrasse 48-52. Shemaryahu Levin, a student during the nineties, described the Lindenstrasse building as "a three story house, concealed in darkness, unbecoming even the lowliest of elementary schools."

The stipendiary fund, established in 1873 to assist poor foreign students, was always short of monies. These conditions prompted Ludwig Philippsohn to remark in 1882, "There has never been such a poverty-stricken institution in German Jewry."

THE CURRICULUM

Aim and Philosophy—The ultimate aim of the Hochschule curriculum was the "preservation, advancement and dissemination of the Science of
The immediate objectives were "to supplement university studies with courses in all branches of Jewish learning and to provide educational opportunities to those who have dedicated themselves to the calling of rabbi and Prediger."

The philosophy of the curriculum was essentially that which had been outlined by Abraham Geiger in his Facultaet plan. Three major theories were enunciated by the founders of the Hochschule.

First, the primary element of the rabbinical curriculum is the study of "total Jewish Wissenschaft." Textual studies in Bible, Talmud and related subjects are secondary. The scope of "total Jewish Wissenschaft" extends beyond the application of scientific methods to traditional subject-matter and the systematic investigation of Jewish theology, history and literature. It encompasses all areas of life in which Jewish endeavor finds expression and by which it is influenced. To quote from the Hochschule program:

"The total Wissenschaft of Judaism is not just the science of its theology and literature...All products of the Jewish soul, its destiny and development, its contact and permeation with the spirit of other peoples, its participation in the theoretical and practical growth of the intellect, its position in the history of mankind—all these are encompassed by the total Wissenschaft of Judaism, which develops under its own as well as foreign influences and is explored through various disciplines of study."
Second, Jewish Wissenschaft is inseparable from general science; hence, rabbincial education must be integrated with university studies. In discussing the curriculum of the Hochschule, Steinitz said, "Whoever desires to understand intelligently ethics and religious philosophy must first study history of philosophy, logic and metaphysics; whoever wishes to appreciate the Bible scientifically must be familiar with the theory of interpretation and higher criticism; whoever desires to grasp the fullness of Jewish history and literature must know the history of the world, its peoples and cultures; and finally, whoever wants to impart religious instruction must be versed in the theory of pedagogics."

Third, rabbinical education, like all objective sciences, is governed by the principle of Lehr-und Lernfreiheit, or the freedom of teaching and learning. This principle was adopted by the Hochschule from the German university. It illustrated the unity of Jewish and secular learning as conceived by the program of the school, and was in accordance with the philosophy of the Reform movement.

These theories are readily distinguished from the moderate philosophy of Zachariah Frankel. While Frankel admitted the need of pursing Jewish Wissenschaft, he conferred upon it no exclusive primacy.
His program of rabbinical education emphasized a traditional curriculum expanded to include related scientific subject-matter. It made a definite differentiation between theological and secular education, restricted scientific courses to historical and literary areas of instruction, and aimed to educate the rabbi along definite ideological lines. In contrast, the Hochschule stressed the all-inclusiveness and supremacy of Jewish Wissenschaft, its integration with secular education and the free pursuit of study.

Course of Study—The implementation of the Hochschule program was from the outset beset with inherent difficulties. The attempt to combine rabbinical education with a purely academic curriculum led to a conflict between theory and practical necessity. The founders of the institution envisioned a school dedicated to pure science, but most of the matriculated students were interested chiefly in preparing for rabbinical careers. The absence of adequate material means precluded the development of an expanded curriculum capable of satisfying the needs of Wissenschaft as well as of the professional student. As a result, the course of study gradually developed into a professional program of education.

Available sources disclose three stages in the development of the curriculum. During the period
1872-1874, there was no definite course of study. Courses were organized each year without adherence to a prescribed plan. A list of these courses is included in the Appendix. Student attendance at lectures was not obligatory. Only with regard to the required triennium adopted from the university was any definite regulation enforced.

An attempt to formulate a definite course of study was made in 1875, when the following Lehrplan, covering an eight semester period, was introduced:

Lectures

1) Introduction to the Science of Judaism (Encyclopedic and Methodological)
2) Introduction to the Biblical Books
3) Biblical Exegesis (especially the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the Psalms)
4) History of Jewish Interpretations of the Bible (Translations, Commentaries, Grammar and Lexicography, the Development of Vocalization and Accentuation, the Massorah)
5) Evolution of Religious Ideas in the Scriptures
6) Hebrew and Aramaic in the Post-biblical Literature of the Jews
7) Introduction to the Talmud
8) History of Halakhah and Aggadah
9) History of Jewish Dissident Sects (Samaritans, Saducesses, Boethusites, Karaites)
10) History of Jews and Jewish Literature
11) History of Jewish Religious Teachings and Philosophy
12) Attitude, Content and Task of Modern Judaism
13) Comparative Religious History
14) Ethics and Religious Philosophy

Seminars

1) Each semester one biblical book, in connection with Lecture #3
2) Grammatical and Massoretic works, in connection with Lecture #4
3) Textual studies in Mishnah, Boraitah, Babylonian and Palestinian Talmud
4) Midrash and Homiletics
5) Selective readings in medieval philosophical and poetical works, in connection with Lectures #10 and #11.

An examination of the courses listed in the annual reports after 1875 revealed that this Lehrplan was not put into effect. Lectures on the "Introduction to the Science of Judaism" were discontinued after Geiger's death in 1874 and other prescribed courses were conducted very irregularly.

The final stage in the development of the course of study took place in 1891. The program adopted in that year extended the required period of study to ten semesters, made attendance at lectures mandatory, and divided the school into three departments. The first department comprised the first four semesters, each having a twelve hour-per-week schedule of work devoted chiefly to basic textual subjects. The second covered the next four semesters, and had a sixteen hour-per-week required period of study in advanced wissenschaftliche disziplinen, or scientific subjects. The third covered the last two semesters, with an eighteen hour-per-week schedule devoted to professional studies.

The courses and distribution of time as prescribed by the 1891 course of study are indicated
as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Department</th>
<th>Number of Semesters</th>
<th>Hours per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Languages:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hebrew Grammar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aramaic Grammar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Bible:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exegesis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commentaries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Talmud:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Talmudic Texts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Codes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Introduction to the Mishnah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Midrash:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Religious Philosophy</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. History and History of Literature</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII. System and History of Liturgy</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second and Third Departments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Biblical Exegesis:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lectures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exercises</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Talmud:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Babylonian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Palestinian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Codes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Midrash:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Holiletics</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Method and Didactics of Religious Instruction</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. Philosophy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Systematic with Exercises</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Texts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII. History and History of Literature</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The successful completion of the course of study was confirmed through final examinations which consisted of an oral test and two written dissertations.

A regulation passed in 1886 required all candidates
for the Hattarath Hora-ah to choose for one of their dissertations a talmudic or halakhic theme. Those students who failed to do so could only receive the title Prediger and Religionsleher.

Analysis of Instruction—About two-thirds of the instruction was divided equally between biblical and halakhic subjects. About one-fifth was devoted to history and philosophy. The remaining time of instruction was distributed among the other subjects in the following order of importance: homiletics, pedagogy, liturgy, comparative religion, and calendar sciences.

The two forms of instruction, which were to some degree adopted by the Breslau Seminary from the university, namely, Vorlesungen [lectures] and Uebungen [exercises], were exclusively employed at the Hochschule. The purpose of the lecture was "to give the hearer seeking an introduction into a subject a living survey of the whole field, through a living
personality, in a series of connected discussions."

The exercises aimed to help the student "assimilate
the material presented in the lecture and to acquaint
him with the tools of research."

There is limited information available with re-
gard to specific methods of instruction. The statutes
of the school required all instruction to be "purely
in the interest of the science of Judaism." Israel
Lewy introduced the Breslau method of teaching Talmud
in two courses, "Statarisch" and "Cursorisch." Cassel,
Baneth and Lewy maintained a cautious respect for tra-
ditional interpretation. Steinthal and Geiger followed
the radical theories of higher biblical criticism in
vogue at the time. Steinthal was described by one
of his students as a free-thinker who "taught in a
manner uninhibited by precedent and dogma." Geiger's
method of teaching was empirical. On his portrait
which hung in the main lobby of the Hochschule, he
had the following words inscribed: "From study of
the particular to knowledge of the general, from
knowledge of the past to an understanding of the
present, from comprehension to faith."

The areas of study were generally similar to
those at the Breslau Seminary, but they were less
intensively pursued. On the other hand, more time
was devoted to philosophic subjects. Textual tal-
mudic courses were limited in scope and elementary in character. The final oral examination in Talmud required "ability to interpret a talmudic passage with the Rashi commentary." No mention is made in the sources of extensive study of Responsa and other halakhic works. The impression is that the instruction was not primarily aimed at achieving a basic knowledge of source material but at a general knowledge of the historical sequences of Jewish religious and intellectual development. One of the students remarked, "I must admit that I have learned more about the Science of Judaism from Christian professors at the university than from my teachers at the Hochschule."

An interesting incident related by Shemaryahu Levin indicates the attitude that prevailed in the Hochschule toward modern Hebrew:

We were invited to the house of Dr. Maybaum for Passover evening. The interpretations which were offered by this modern rabbi concerning the customs of the Seder and its laws were like the far-fetched, esoteric sermons of the old Maggidim in the small towns of Russia. All of his explanations were aimed at proving that national concepts never played a role in the historical development of the Jew. Even the dramatic tale of the Exodus was, according to him, only a symbol. I deliberately turned the course of conversation to the new spirit that had arisen in Eastern Europe and spoke about modern Hebrew literature that was beginning to sprout in Russia. Dr. Maybaum wanted, thereupon, to strike a fatal blow, so he arose and said with a proud and victorious tone, "It is one of my principles not to write Hebrew." When I asked
him why, he answered, "Because I am a German." I did not say more but later on in the evening I remarked, "It is one of my principles not to write English." Dr. Maybaum looked at me in amazement and asked, "Why?" I answered, "Because I do not know that language." Since that day I have never been invited to the home of Dr. Maybaum.

Instructional Aids and Incentives---Standard works were used in all biblical, talmudic and other textual courses. An innovation of the Hochschule was the use of specially prepared text-books, written by Cassel and Maybaum, for the study of history, homiletics and pedagogy. A major instructional aid was the large library which consisted of 12,000 volumes in 1897. Four special scholarships served to motivate individual student research.

Religious Discipline and Student Life---In accordance with the philosophy and program of the institution, no religious discipline was enforced. The atmosphere was, however, definitely non-traditional. The most influential instructors were such staunch Reform advocates as Geiger, Steinthal and Maybaum. The general attitude of students to traditional religious practices may be gauged from the following incident described by a reporter in 1875:
Several days ago, when Dr. Lewy began his lecture in Talmud at the Hochschule, he noticed that all of his students were seated with bare heads. The lecturer then called the attention of his audience to their improper conduct. Thereupon an American student arose and inquired whether the Doctor's remarks were prompted by personal conviction or by the wishes of institutional authorities. The Doctor replied that he had not received any instructions from his superiors on questions of religious practice. "In that case," retorted the student, "we will continue to attend your lectures with uncovered heads." The lecturer continued to read without returning a remark. Since that day he has been the only one in his class who wears a cap.

Extra-curricular student activities were carried on for the most part outside of the Hochschule, either in connection with university studies or with political affiliations. East-European students usually belonged to the Society of Russian-Jewish Students in Berlin. Such students as Shemaryahu Levin (1867-1935), Henry Malter (1864-1925), Joshua Thon (1870-1936), and Marcus Ehrenpreis (1869-1949) were actively engaged in Zionist efforts, which often incurred the wrath of their anti-Zionist colleagues and instructors. A Verein der Hoerer des Lehranstalt fuer die Wissenschaft des Judenthaus / Society of Students of the Lehranstalt was founded by Cassel in 1888 but there is only fragmentary evidence of its activity.

THE EDUCATIONAL PRODUCT

During the period under discussion, the Hochschule produced few outstanding Jewish scholars.
Several of its graduates were engaged in scholarly and literary work, but only the following are known to have made noteworthy contributions to one or more fields of Jewish learning: Samuel Poznanski (1864-1921), Henry Malter (1864-1925), Simon Bernfeld (1860-1940), David Neurnark (1866-1924), Immanuel Loew (1854-1924), Leo Baeck (1873-----), and Hermann Vogelstein (1870-1942). It is significant to note that with the exception of the last two, all of these personages were of East-European origin and received an intensive rabbinical education in their native countries before enrolling in the Hochschule. Baeck and Vogelstein also studied several years at the Breslau Seminary prior to their coming to Berlin.

The number of eminent rabbis who had graduated from the Hochschule was also small. Of the fifty-two students who completed the rabbinical course during 1872-1902, only twenty-one are mentioned in the *Juedisches Lexikon* and *Encyclopedia Judaica* as having played a prominent role in their profession, and only three received the traditional *Hattarat Hora-ah*. Two American students who pursued distinguished but different religious careers were Felix Adler (1851-1933), the founder of the Ethical Culture Society, and Emil G. Hirsch (1851-1923), the late rabbi of the Reform Temple Sinai in Chicago.
It is evident from the investigation undertaken by this study that the Hochschule did not play a major role of importance as an institution for rabbinical education during the nineteenth century. In succeeding years, however, it made greater strides in this direction. At that time, it began to take on the character of a seminary. In 1901, Ismar Elbogen (1874–1943), the noted Jewish historian, was appointed "chief consultant on administrative and instructional problems." Actually, he became the virtual director of the school. Although the original objectives of the founders remained in force, the curriculum became more and more geared to the professional needs of the rabbinical student. A definite course of study covering a period of six years was instituted and the number of rabbinical graduates increased considerably. Several students during the post-World War I period, among them Professor Abraham J. Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, have told the writer that a high level of scholarship existed in the school during their student years. These achievements were to a great extent the result of improved financial conditions which made possible the erection of a suitable building at Artillierstrasse 14 in 1907 and the engagement of an adequate number of instructors.
CHAPTER IV

DAS RABBINER-SEMINAR FUER DAS
ORTHODOXE JUDENTHUME

(The Rabbinical Seminary for
Orthodox Judaism)
ORIGIN AND FORMATION

The Rabbinical Seminary for Orthodox Judaism, the last of the three modern rabbinical schools established in Germany during the nineteenth century, was founded in 1873 in Berlin by Esriel Hildesheimer (1820-1899), the eminent Neo-Orthodox rabbi and leader. 1

Esriel Hildesheimer was a disciple of Jacob Ettlinger of Altona (1798-1871), one of the first secularly educated traditional rabbis in Germany. After completing his rabbinical education he attended the universities of Berlin and Halle, from which he received a doctorate degree in 1845. He then served for six years as the secretary of the Jewish community of his native city, Halberstadt. During that period he published a philological study on the Septuagint, Materialien zur Beurtheilung der Septuaginta, and several anti-Reform articles which brought him to the forefront of the Neo-Orthodox movement.

Hildesheimer's rise to prominence as a rabbi and educator began with his appointment in 1851 to the rabbinate of Eisenstadt, Hungary. Shortly after arriving in that city he founded the Rabbinats-Kandidaten Schule, wherein, in keeping with the Neo-Orthodox principle of Torah Im Derekh Eretz, referred to in Chapter I, general subjects of the
gymnasium were taught along with the traditional Jewish studies. The establishment of this school aroused the opposition of both Reform and Orthodox rabbis. The former criticized the school's emphasis of Talmud and religious discipline, and the latter objected to the teaching of secular subjects. Orthodox indignation was especially strong. Zealous Orthodox partisans denounced the institution in 1858 before the civil authorities, resulting in its temporary shutdown, and a fanatical Hassidic rabbi ex-communicated its founder in 1860 for his "unbelieving" views. These adverse pressures failed, however, to daunt Hildesheimer. He succeeded in obtaining permission to re-open the school, which thereafter grew in student enrollment and influence.

By the late sixties, Hildesheimer's position in Hungary became untenable. The tense struggle raging between Reform and Orthodoxy for many years was at this time focused on the proposal to establish a national rabbinical seminary. Reform and "enlightened" Jews had influenced the government to favor such an institution. The necessary funds for implementing this plan were to be provided for by the one-million Gulden tax that the government had exacted from the Jewish community for its support of the Hungarian political revolutions of 1848-9 but which was later
placed in reserve for Jewish educational purposes. Orthodoxy, seeing in the projected seminary a threat to traditional rabbinical education, vehemently opposed the proposal. In this controversy, Hildesheimer occupied an isolated position. At the Hungarian Jewish Congress of 1868, convened by the government to resolve the seminary issue, among other things, he took a positive but critical stand. He favored the creation of a seminary but opposed its control by Reform adherents. Consequently, he was bitterly condemned by both religious camps.

Hildesheimer’s stand at the Hungarian Jewish Congress illustrated Neo-Orthodoxy’s attitude towards the seminary education of the rabbi. Although he was an uncompromising advocate of traditional practices, he felt that a seminary type of schooling was not contradictory to Orthodox principles. A seminary under the direction of loyal traditional leaders, he maintained, is best suited for educating Orthodox rabbis in modern times. Writing in defense of his views, he said:

My approach to the issue differs from that of the Geonim /ultra-Orthodox scholars/, although we strive to achieve the same purpose. I feel that there is no future for rabbinical education in modern times without a seminary. It is wrong to argue against such a school by using existing seminaries and their irreligious graduates as examples; for we have thus far examined only the schools that are guided by dissenters and heretics. A seminary directed by faithful and devout men would be a Kiddush Hashem.
sanctification of God. Our own school is the best proof. From it have gone forth hundreds of students who are versed in Torah and Hokhmah and imbued with an awe of Heaven.

The opportunity to put his views on rabbinical education into effect amid more favorable surroundings came to Hildesheimer in 1869, when he was called to Berlin. Efforts to bring him to that city had been begun two years earlier by the Special Commission of the Berlin Beth Hamidrash, referred to in the preceding chapter. On February 12, 1867, the Special Commission, consisting largely of Orthodox adherents, invited him to become administrator and faculty chairman of the institution. These efforts were blocked by influential Conservative members of the General Versammlung, the parent body of the Beth Hamidrash, who viewed Hildesheimer's appointment with apprehension, especially because of his demand for unlimited authority.

However, a vacancy on the teaching staff precipitated his election in May 1869. Meanwhile, the appointment of Abraham Geiger to the rabbinate of Berlin caused loyal Orthodox Jews, led by several members of the Special Commission, to secede from the organized Jewish community. They organized an independent congregation, Adas Yisroel, and appointed Hildesheimer as its rabbi. Thus Hildesheimer, followed by thirty of his students in Eisenstadt, arrived in Berlin in
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The opportunity to put his view on rabbinical education into effect amid more favorable surroundings came to Hildesheimer in 1869, when he was called to Berlin. Efforts to bring him to that city had been begun two years earlier by the Special Commission of the Berlin Beth Hamidrash, referred to in the preceding chapter. On February 12, 1867, the Special Commission, consisting largely of Orthodox adherents, invited him to become administrator and faculty chairman of the institution. These efforts were blocked by influential Conservative members of the General Versammlung, the parent body of the Beth Hamidrash, who viewed Hildesheimer's appointment with apprehension, especially because of his demand for unlimited authority. However, a vacancy on the teaching staff precipitated his election in May 1869. Meanwhile, the appointment of Abraham Geiger to the rabbinate of Berlin caused loyal Orthodox Jews, led by several members of the Special Commission, to secede from the organized Jewish community. They organized an independent congregation, Adas Yisroel, and appointed Hildesheimer as its rabbi. Thus Hildesheimer, followed by thirty of his students in Eisenstadt, arrived in Berlin in
September 1869 to serve in the dual capacity of rabbi and teacher.

Hildesheimer's first attempt to organize a seminary in Berlin was unsuccessful. In 1870, he undertook to transfer the Beth Hamidrash into a professional rabbinical school. However, since the Beth Hamidrash was under the control of the general community, he could not carry out his plans without the approval of communal officials, who were generally Conservative and Reform partisans. These officials favored the reorganization of the Beth Hamidrash into a non-professional Facultät under lay leadership. It was alleged that this type of school organization was strongly advocated by the "followers of Frankel" who opposed the creation of a seminary that might compete with the Breslau institution. Hildesheimer stood firm against this proposal. "I desire a Seminar," he exclaimed, "and not a Facultät...

My students will attend only if I am in full charge." The ensuing dispute between the interested parties ended in a stalemate. Conservative partisans, fearful of Hildesheimer's efforts, began to support the Hochschule project of Moritz Lazarus, as was indicated in the preceding chapter. Hildesheimer, unable to overcome the opposition of communal officials, turned his energies to the creation of an independent seminary under Orthodox auspices.
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The first public announcement of the proposed organization of the Rabbinner-Seminar was made on September 4, 1872. On that day, Hildesheimer published a "Prospectus of the Rabbinal Seminary for Orthodox Judaism" in the Juedische Presse, the official organ of the Adas Yisroel. In this announcement he outlined the importance and general program of the projected school, and appealed to Orthodox adherents for support. Subsequently, a Seminar Verein was created, headed by a Centrale Comitee in Berlin and consisting of local branches in many larger German-Jewish communities. Within the course of a year, the Verein raised a capital fund of over sixty thousand Mark, making possible the immediate opening of the school. On October 12, 1873, the Rabbinner-Seminar was formally opened in Berlin at Gyps-Strasse 12a.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

The Rabbinner-Seminar was established under statutory law as a permanent institution based on "the viewpoint of Orthodox Judaism." It could be dissolved only in cases of extreme financial stringency, and then only if "suitable German universities engage Orthodox Jewish teachers to instruct students in the study of Talmud free of charge." This provision aimed at insuring opportunities for
the traditional education of German-Jewish rabbinical
aspirants.

The school was organized into two departments
having a combined six year course of study. The
lower department comprised the first four semesters
and the upper, the remaining eight. Studies in
both departments were confined exclusively to Judaic
subject-matter.

The entrance requirements were as follows:
qualification for admission into the Prima class,
or final year of the gymnasium, and ability to "read
comprehensively a talmudic text of average difficulty
with the commentaries of Rashi, Tosafot and MaHarsha
[Samuel Edeles]." The secular educational re-
quirements were subsequently increased. A regulation
of 1877 demanded completion of the German gymnasium
as a pre-requisite for matriculation, but it permitted
the admission of special, unqualified students.
This regulation was replaced in 1891 by a rule which
forbade the acceptance of non-matriculated students.
In addition to the educational requirements, great
stress was placed on the "moral-religious" character
of an applicant. Applicants who were suspected of
lacking in sympathy for traditional practices were
rejected.
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As was the case in the Breslau Seminary and the Hochschule, instruction was free of charge, and indigent students were granted financial assistance in the form of stipends. However, the Rabbiner-Seminar's stipendiary allotments were conspicuously few in number. This was probably due to the relatively small number of students from Poland and Russia, as will be indicated later, who were usually the majority of the recipient of aid in the other schools.

The administrative organization of the Rabbiner-Seminar was generally similar to that of the forerunning rabbinical schools. A government charter placed the school under the ultimate supervision of the Prussian Ministry of Education, which in turn delegated authority over school matters to a curatorium consisting of seven members. The chief administrative official was, however, the rector. He served as the chairman of the curatorium, the spiritual and educational head of the institution, and the major instructor in Talmud.

Esriel Hildesheimer, the founder and first rector of the institution, contributed to the prominence of the school. As the rabbi of the Adas Yisroel, he organized the Orthodox Jewry of Berlin under a bold leadership. His strengthening of communal regulations regarding religious practices helped regain much of
the sentiment that Orthodoxy had previously lost among the local Jewish population. His patriotic services during the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1 was rewarded publicly by imperial commendation and raised his prestige even among his assimilationist adversaries. He earned world-wide Jewish acclaim for his efforts in behalf of oppressed Jews in foreign lands. He was the most prominent German rabbi of his day active in the support of Jewish colonization in Palestine.

As a result of these achievements, he became recognized as the practical leader of the Neo-Orthodox movement, complementing the philosophical leadership of Samson Raphael Hirsch.

Hildesheimer's personality and ideas played an important role in shaping the course of the school. He brought to bear upon the institution many years of rich pedagogical experience which he had gained in Eisenstadt. The extent of his literary creativeness was limited in comparison with that of the high ranking Jewish scholars of his day. His chief scholarly work was the redaction in 1888 of the Geonic treatise, Halakhot Gedolot. But he possessed a great knowledge of Talmud, to which he devoted most of his instructional efforts. His piety, simplicity and personal devotion had a pronounced influence on his students, who looked to him for guidance even after
they left the school. To quote one of his disciples:

Works were created by others, but no man created an institution to form students in his own likeness as he [Hildesheimer] did. He was a deep-thinking man and a genuine Yerei Shomayim, living in strict accordance with his beliefs. His piety rather than articles and studies expressed his greatness. His interest in small things, in the joy and trials of his students, was one of his great personal attributes. He was the reaper and faithful friend of his pupils, their guiding light throughout their lives...22

Hildesheimer was succeeded after his death in 1899 by his disciple and colleague, David Hoffmann (1843-1921). Hoffmann had studied at the famous Yeshibah of Pressburg before enrolling in Hildesheimer's school in Eisenstadt. Afterwards he attended the universities of Berlin, Vienna and Tuebungen, where he took his doctorate in 1871. He was appointed instructor in Talmud, Codes and Pentateuch at the Rabbiner-Seminar immediately following its organization and after a two-year period of teaching at the Samson Raphael Hirsch's Realschule in Frankfort a. Main.

Hoffmann possessed a saintly soul and a gigantic intellect. He combined critical mastery over biblical and talmudic literature with unshakeable adherence to tradition. He was the chief defender of Orthodox interpretations against the attacks of nineteenth century "higher criticism." His Principle Arguments Against the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis (1904-1916) were a major contribution to the apologetic literature directed
against the Wellhausen construction of ancient Jewish history. His *Commentary on Leviticus* (1905), one of his best known works, initiated the method of demonstrating the authenticity of the Massoreh through the use of halakhic sources. The *First Mishnah* (1882) and *Contributions towards an Introduction to the Halakhic Midrashim* (1912) described the developmental growth of Halakhah in accordance with the belief in the Sinaitic origin of the Oral Law. These and other of his numerous works were considered by Professor Louis Ginzberg as being indispensable to the scientific study of biblical and Tanaitic literature.

The faculty of the Rabbiner-Seminar was a homogeneously organized body; the members of which were all academically educated in traditional and secular subject-matter and were all strictly Orthodox in their views and conduct. The two highest ranking faculty members next to Hildesheimer and Hoffmann were Abraham Berliner (1833-1915) and Jacob Barth (1851-1914).

Berliner became associated with Hildesheimer in 1871 after having served as rabbi in several communities of the Posen region. Although he never received a formal academic education, he achieved great scholarly success. His researches in Jewish history and medieval Jewish literature, the subjects which he taught at the Rabbiner-Seminar, have remained valuable contributions.
to their fields. His works include *The Inner Life of the German Jews in the Middle Ages* (1866), *The Commentary Rashi* (1866) and a three-volume *History of the Jews in Rome* (1893). He co-edited with Hoffmann the *Magazin fuer die Wissenschaft des Judenthum* (1876-1893) and was one of the organizers of the *Mekizei Nirdamim*, a society dedicated to the publication of Hebrew books and manuscripts. His travels to large European libraries resulted in the discovery of many notable Jewish documents. Hildesheimer called him "a rock of Traditional Judaism."

Barth was regarded at the turn of the century as one of the leading orientalists of his day. He was a product of Hildesheimer's school in Eisenstadt, later becoming his teacher's son-in-law. He received his secular education at the University of Berlin, where he was later appointed as professor of Semitic languages. He joined the faculty of the Rabbiner-Seminar in 1874 as instructor in Bible and philology. His works include *Comparative Studies* (1897), *The Nominal Construction in Semitic Languages* (1891), two monographs on Job and Isaiah, and several Arabic studies. He was acclaimed for his scholarly refutation in 1901 of the thesis of Friedrich Delitzsch, the noted German Assyriologist, which described the Bible as an old Babylonian code. In so doing, Barth emulated the
efforts of Hoffmann to defend the authenticity of the Bible against its scientific critics.

The other instructors during the period under discussion were Solomon Cohn (1822-1902), Hirsch Hildesheimer (1845-1910) and Joseph Wohlgemuth (1867-1939). Cohn was a Neo-Orthodox rabbi in Berlin. He taught homiletics from 1878 to 1894. Hirsch Hildesheimer, was the founder's eldest son, and he lectured on the Tanaitic period of Jewish history and on Palestinian geography. Wohlgemuth was a former student of the Rabbiner-Seminar, who joined the faculty in 1895 as instructor in Talmud, religious philosophy and homiletics.

The total number of student enrollments during the period 1873-1903 was two hundred and ten. This number is divided according to the following countries of student origin: one hundred and forty-six from Germany; thirty-seven from Austria-Hungary, excluding the Galician province; twenty-four from Russia, Poland and Galicia; and three from other countries. Of these, one hundred and forty-four completed the full course and received the Hattarat Hora-ah. All but eighteen of the graduates made the rabbinate their career.

The attendance of proportionately few East-European students during the period under discussion
was not coincidental but the result of a deliberate policy. To quote an anonymous writer in 1895:

Hildesheimer, the German rabbi, who is looked upon even by Russian Jews as a Zaddik and "upholder of the Law" will not accept into his school a student from Russia...There are numerous young men who have received letters from Hildesheimer informing them that he cannot admit them because etc...etc...they are Russians.

That Hildesheimer who was generally sympathetic towards Ost Juden [Eastern Jews], as was evidenced by his charitable efforts in their behalf, should have adapted such a discriminating attitude to East-European students is understandable in light of his concept of the Rabbiner-Seminar. As will be noted later, he felt that the institution's purpose was to educate German rabbis in traditional subject-matter. The primary desire of the immigrant student in Germany was, however, acquisition of general knowledge, the opportunity of which was unavailable to him in his native land. Hildesheimer, sensing this difference of interest, was not inclined, therefore, to accept foreign students. Moreover, he suspected Russian-born applicants of irreligious tendencies. He often complained that "the young men who come from Russia to Berlin throw off from themselves the yoke of Torah." He appealed to Russian rabbis to discourage the emigration of students to that city, where "they are subject to the dangers of heresy."
The impression is that the enforcement in 1891 of a rule excluding non-matriculated students from the school was directed against East-European applicants.

Of the three schools investigated by this study, the Rabbiner-Seminar was the best equipped financially. This fact was due chiefly to its close association with the Adas Yisroel congregation, which provided the necessary physical facilities as well as a considerable portion of budgetary needs. It also had the support, with the exception of Samson Raphael Hirsch's zealous followers, of an identifiable, organized Orthodox movement. Major sources of income were the fund-raising campaigns of the Seminar-Verein, subscriptions, bequests and donations.

CURRICULUM

Aim and Philosophy---The aim of the curriculum was "to teach the Written and Oral Teachings as manifested in the Bible, Talmud, rabbinic literature and codes...and to influence the moral religious education of the student." The chief objective, therefore, was transmission of the traditional Jewish heritage. Secular studies, although desirable, were "excluded from the program."

The educational philosophy of Neo-Orthodoxy as interpreted by Hildesheimer underlay this objective.
Several basic principles are evident from Hildesheimer's fragmentary writings and from the course of study which he introduced at the Rabbiner-Seminar:

(1) The primary element of the rabbinical curriculum is the study of Talmud and Codes. "Learning Shass and Poskim [Talmud and Codes], and again Shass and Poskim," exclaimed Hildesheimer, "is the major obligation of every student." However, in contrast to the program of the old Yeshevah, the curriculum of the modern rabbi should include intensive courses in Bible, Jewish history and literature.

(2) Secular education is desirable for its practical utility. Its importance in the training of the rabbi, according to Hildesheimer, derived from environmental considerations rather than from an inherent educational philosophy. The principle of Torah Im Derekh Eretz, whereby Neo-Orthodoxy reconciled the pursuit of general knowledge with tradition, was defined by Hildesheimer as aiming at "the harmonization of Jewish tradition with modern surroundings to the avoidance of assimilation." The major objective of general learning, he felt, was functional. It furnished the German rabbi with the means of teaching the religion of old to a worldly cultured Jewish society, thus enabling him to combat the current tendencies leading to disaffection from Judaism.
(3) Jewish *Wissenschaft*, or scientific studies, are unessential but useful elements of the curriculum. Hildesheimer agreed in principle with one of his Neo-Orthodox critics who remarked:

The scientific training of modern religious rabbis is both useful and desirable and there is no doubt that it can be more easily achieved in an institution than by the rambling methods of an autodidact. But so great is the danger lest excessive time and energy be spent on the scientificent side to the detriment of the core itself that we feel obliged to draw attention to it. The most essential requirement in the eyes of modern Orthodoxy must still be that an institution of this type, unlike that in Breslau, should turn out, not scholars, but rabbis. These rabbis must have a complete mastery over what is after all their own field of scholarship. 37

Hildesheimer felt, however, that although Wissenschaft for its own sake was unimportant when compared with traditional studies, and foreboded danger to traditional learning, its inclusion into the rabbinical curriculum was necessary, since science enables the Orthodox rabbi to meet the threats of modern scholarship on equal grounds. Applied by the traditionalist, *Wissenschaft* serves to defend Orthodox interpretations with the same implements of research employed by his academic adversaries. Its pursuit is, therefore, in keeping with the rabbinic instruction "Know thee what to answer an unbeliever." 38 This attitude to Wissenschaft was reflected in the objectives of the several scientific courses taught at the Rabbiner-Seminar during the period under discussion. To quote a former student
of the institution:

The critical theories concerning the Bible and the Oral Law which attack the internal and historical truth as well as the traditional interpretation of Holy Scripture received in these lectures scrutinizing examinations, as a result of which their baselessness and incorrectness were revealingly exposed. 39

(4) The education of the rabbi must be education in and for religion. It must not be confined to abstract knowledge or textual proficiency. Using the words of the prayer book, Hildesheimer remarked, "Our aim is not only to 'learn and teach' but to 'keep, do and observe the whole Torah'." 40 On another occasion, he said, "Thorough knowledge cannot be separated from faithful performance of religious duties." 41 These remarks had two implications. First, the rabbinical student must be indoctrinated with religious loyalty. Hence, his student life must conform to a prescribed discipline. Second, he must be trained in the performance of practical skills of religious ritual. The Rabbiner-Seminar inaugurated, therefore, courses in Shehitah and Bedikkah, or the ritual slaughter of cattle and its examination, and in the rite of Milah, or circumcision. 42

Course of Study---The course of study included formal classroom instruction and informal, private study. The formal course was distributed over a
period of six years in the following manner:

**Lower Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Instruction</th>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First and Second Semesters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmud</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentateuch</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Exegesis and Hebrew</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midrash</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third and Fourth Semesters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmud</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentateuch</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Exegesis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midrash</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upper Department**

| **Fifth and Sixth Semesters**              |               |
| Talmud                                     | 5             |
| Codes                                      | 2 and 3 (in two classes) |
| Bible                                      | 2             |
| History                                    | 2             |
| Palestinian Geography                      | 2             |
|                                            | **13-14**     |

| **Seventh and Eighth Semesters**           |               |
| Talmud                                     | 5             |
| Codes                                      | 2 and 3 (in two classes) |
| Exegesis                                   | 2             |
| History and Literature                     | 2             |
|                                            | **11-12**     |

| **Ninth to Twelfth Semesters**             |               |
| Talmud                                     | 5             |
| Codes                                      | 3             |
| Advanced Bible Exegesis                    | 4             |
| History and Literature                     | 2             |
|                                            | **14**        |
An examination of the annual reports issued by the Rabbiner-Seminar revealed that in addition to these subjects other courses were offered. Homiletics and religious philosophy were taught regularly for one hour per week during the last four semesters, and special classes in *Einleitungswissenschaften*, or scientific introductory lectures, were conducted from time to time by Hoffmann for selected groups of advanced students.

Besides the formal course, students were required to engage in an extensive program of self-study. To qualify for promotion from the lower to the upper department, a student had to have mastered by himself one hundred pages of Talmud in addition to what he learned in class. At the end of the first eight semesters, he was required to have achieved self-taught knowledge in prescribed portions of the following tractates: *Abodah Zarah*, *Sukkah*, *Pessahim*, *Mishnahot*, *Shabbat* and *Rosh Hashanah*. These requirements considerably increased the study load. In an interview between the writer and the late Professor Alexander Marx, a student and son-in-law of David Hoffmann, it was borne out that the average number of hours-per-week of formal and informal learning was twenty-five.

The school year coincided with that of the secular school. Classroom attendance was compulsory, and a rigid system of supervision was maintained. Each
student had to submit to monthly and end-of-semester examinations. University studies were encouraged but not considered mandatory. The impression is that the time schedule of the formal course was shortened during the last eight semesters in order to allow students to attend the university.

Successful completion of two sets of final examinations, similar in form to those held at the Breslau school and the Hochschule, were required for graduation. These examinations were, however, confined to Talmud and Codes. Unlike the other schools, the Rabbiner-Seminar conferred upon its graduates only the traditional Hattarat Hora-ah containing the talmudic terms Yoreh Yoreh Yodin Yodin, which testified to the bearer's qualifications to decide civil and ritual questions of Jewish law.

Analysis of Instruction—The absence of accurate records precludes an exact evaluation of the weight of instruction. It appears from available sources that about three-fourths of the combined formal and informal course of study was devoted to Talmud and related subjects. Biblical and historical studies constituted in each case about one-tenth of the learning program, and the remaining time was distributed among the other areas of instruction in the following order of importance: Midrash and homiletics, philos-
ophy, and scientific lectures.

The sources also contain fragmentary information regarding methods of instruction. Advanced Talmud was taught by manner of Suggyoth, whereby a given theme was pursued through all of its references in different talmudic texts and commentaries. Biographers of Hildesheimer related that his style of teaching was pilpulistic. Hoffmann's method was, to quote Alexander Marx, "Pshat, the plain meaning of the text, while giving constant attention to the application of this meaning to practical legal decisions." His advanced courses were of a higher order. "Here," Marx recorded, "the Tosafot were studied more intensively and he drew on all parallel passages to clarify the subject to the last degree. He frequently added remarks showing the students the true way to a critical understanding of Talmud and to research in the field." Under both Hildesheimer and Hoffmann, students were required to make extensive reviews of the daily lesson. A student play held in 1899 portrayed Hazarah or review sessions, as a "never ending plague.""}

In non-talmudic courses, the employed methods of instruction were similar in form to those used at the Breslau Seminary and the Hochschule. Their application, however, was in strict accordance with the Orthodox beliefs. No criticism of the traditional
for study, such as prizes and scholarship. The traditional feeling that learning is a religious obligation needed no other motivation.

Religious Discipline and Student Life—A rigid religious discipline was enforced. Students were required to observe all the laws and customs prescribed by the Shulhan Arukh. This disciplinary policy was also applied to graduates. A "Faithful Testament" /Hoda-ah Ne-emanah/ attached to the ordination degree, enjoined its holder to remain loyal to Orthodoxy. It gave notice to the graduate that upon his acceptance of an appointment to the rabbinate of a non-traditional congregation "all license and authority, the Semikhah and Hattarat Hora-ah...are therewith revoked and nullified."

Extra-curricular activities were for the most part confined to the celebrations of religious holidays and of such occasions as the completion of a talmudic tractate /Siyyum/. A student society called Dibbuk Haberim, or Union of Colleagues, was organized in 1879. It held semi-monthly meetings at which "philosophical and Zionist questions" were discussed. Under its auspices, a banquet was held each year, featuring dramatic presentations by the students. All of its activities were, however, supervised by the rector and the faculty.
THE EDUCATIONAL PRODUCT

Several general conclusions regarding the character of the Rabbiner-Seminar's graduate have been reached by the writer on the basis of available information. (1) He was an effectively educated person, having a broad and well-balanced knowledge of Jewish and secular learning. (2) His knowledge of talmudic and rabbinic literature was extensive rather than intensive. It was superior to that of the Breslau and Hochschule student, but fell short of the Yeshibah Bahur's vast and sharp erudition. An impression gained from an examination of a select number of halakhic treatises written by Rabbiner-Seminar graduates failed to reveal an inclination on the part of the authors to discover basic principles, to harmonizing texts and opinions and to engage in dialectic disputations, all of which generally characterized the products of the old Yeshibah. (3) Although his education was of a high order, he was not distinguished by great literary achievements. (4) His chief characteristics were his piety, loyalty to tradition and crusading efforts in behalf of Orthodox Judaism.

These general conclusions, evaluated in terms of the aim and philosophy of the curriculum, and in the light of conditions prevailing in German Jewry, point to the efficiency and success of the school.
Both critic and friend attested to this fact. Simon Bernfeld (1860-1940), the noted Bible scholar and former Hochschule student, concluded his criticism of the German rabbinical schools with the following remarks:

Whether we agree with the viewpoints of German Orthodoxy or not, we must admit that its Judaism is not sterile. The practices of German Orthodox rabbis are in harmony with their preachments. Although we are disturbed by their emphasis of trivial religious observances, we must concede that they alone offer hope for the preservation of Judaism in Germany. In this respect, Hildesheimer's school achieved its greatest success; for it produced over one hundred and twenty rabbis qualified to lead their communities in the right path.64

Joseph Wohlgemuth, the historian of the Rabbiner-Seminar, wrote in summation:

However much opinion amongst Jews might differ as to the justification and necessity of rabbinical colleges and whatever might be one's attitude in the question of the old Rab versus the modern Rabbi, one thing must be clear to all but fools and fanatics. When we consider what was the position of Orthodox Judaism in Western Europe, we must admit that the founding of the Rabbiner-Seminar constituted one of the chief measures towards the preservation of traditional teachings amongst the Jews once the ghetto walls had fallen. And one thing is to be regretted: that in founding this institution Orthodox Jewry was the last to enter the field.65
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY
SUMMARY

From the eleventh century onward, the rabbinate in Central Europe developed gradually toward an increasing authority due to the autonomic character of Jewish community life in the Middle Ages and the ever-greater responsibilities devolving upon the rabbi for interpreting, expounding, and molding Jewish law. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the status, function and education of the rabbi differed greatly from those of today. The rabbi was a communal official of major importance. His appointment to office depended to a large degree on his intellectual reputation and ability to attract students. His authority, along with the cognate social and religious prestige and honors, derived from his learning, uprightness of character, and piety, rather than from his title.

The rabbi had several functions. As educator, he headed the Yeshibah, or talmudical academy, where he lectured to advanced students. He supervised and examined students and instructors, and oversaw the work of elementary schools. As jurist, he presided over the civil court, rendered decisions on a wide variety of religious and ethical problems, and attended to all matters requiring legal opinion. As
communal leader, he guided the community's moral and religious conduct, acted as its representative vis-à-vis the government, and was its exemplar of piety, scholarship, and integrity.

Rabbinical education, at that time, ignored secular studies. The predominating school of higher Jewish education was the Yeshibah, which was non-professional in aim and character. The Yeshibah imposed no specific entrance requirements or systematic student grouping. Its curriculum paid little or no attention to non-talmudic and non-legal subject matter. The prevailing method of study was the dialectic textual analysis known as Pilpul, conducted in the Yiddish language. Students could qualify either for the honorary Haber degree, requiring general familiarity with talmudic literature, or for the Morenu degree, requiring mastery of Talmud and Codes and authorizing appointment to rabbinical position.

Since the Yeshibah did not flourish in Germany because of unsettled political conditions and economic insecurity, German rabbis were usually recruited from among students of East-European academies.

In the course of the nineteenth century, the rabbinate in Germany was radically transformed in status, function and educational preparation. New intellectual and political trends in Jewish life,
supplementing each other and influenced by the impact of the French Enlightenment on the culture of the community and by the rise of the modern national state, were responsible for this change. The movement toward Haskalah, or cultural enlightenment, promoted the cultivation of general learning and the study of classical Hebrew literature. The movement known as Wissenschaft, or the Science of Judaism, expounded the treatment of Judaism and related subjects as areas of scientific research. As a result of the growing influence of these intellectual movements, the Yeshibah lost ground and its students became unpopular. Talmudic and halakhic studies gradually declined in importance. Their place in the curriculum was taken by secular education, intensive study of Bible, Hebrew and Jewish history, and scientific pursuit of all branches of Jewish scholarship. The political reorganization of the community along denominational lines, attended by the disappearance of Jewish communal autonomy, precluded rabbinical jurisdiction over questions of civil law. Governmental efforts to subordinate the rabbi to civil authorities and to divest him of his traditional judicial powers led in many instances even to dictating his educational requirements and religious
duties. The rabbi now became a congregational functionary, his role chiefly limited to preaching and ritual ministrations.

Reacting to these trends, each of the three ideologies of Reform, Neo-Orthodoxy, and Positive-Historic Judaism developed its own approach to the rabbinate and its requisite education. Reform helped bring into vogue an entirely new concept of the rabbinate, the chief duties of which were preaching on ethical themes, supervising the religious education of children, and performing pastoral tasks. The chief qualification of the new rabbi was the ability to deliver excellent sermons in good German rather than rabbinic scholarship. In accordance with the philosophy of Abraham Geiger, Reform emphasized the importance of Wissenschaft and the integration of rabbinical education with general learning. Neo-Orthodoxy accepted the new function of the rabbi, but retained traditional rabbinical authority on questions of Jewish law. It viewed secular education as permissible and even desirable but always supplementary to Jewish learning, the religious character of Judaism being stressed. Hebrew, Bible and Jewish history also held an important position in its curriculum, but scientific studies were deprecated. Positive-Historic Judaism theoretically approved of the changes brought about in the rabbinate, but
insisted on the preservation of those elements of the rabbinical function and education which have played an important role in the historic consciousness of the Jewish people. It maintained that the rabbi must be versed in traditional, secular and scientific Jewish studies, all of which it considered equal in value.

Early in the nineteenth century, a need became evident for the establishment of institutions to train modern and native rabbis embodying the new concepts of the rabbinate and Jewish learning and replacing the diminishing and unpopular products of the old Yeshibah. Several attempts were then made to put various theories on the subject into practice by establishing organized rabbinical schools with professional objectives and provision for study of secular and non-talmudic subjects. These attempts reflected both of the prevailing types of institutions then existing for Christian theological education, which were organized either as university-affiliated faculties under ultimate state control, or as church-controlled seminaries.

Pioneer efforts along these lines occurred in all three ideological groups, but were in all cases abortive, seldom progressing beyond the planning stage. Actually, the first modern rabbinical schools were established in non-German communities. German Jewry was at the time in a state of upheaval and inner
religious struggle, with the various parties each too weak to found its own school, and with both wealthy Jews and the masses generally indifferent to educational needs and issues. Nevertheless, the various plans, proposals, and campaigns for theological institutions laid the groundwork for eventual establishment of successful schools.

The first such school, which also was the largest and most influential, was the Jewish Theological Seminary of Breslau, established in 1854, and growing out of the bequest of the philanthropist, Jonas Fraenckel. This Seminary was imbued with the personality and philosophy of its first director, Zachariah Frankel, the founder of Positive-Historic Judaism.

The Breslau Seminary combined two schools, one for rabbis and one for teachers. It was organized to offer instruction in Jewish subjects and the secular subjects of the gymnasium in a lower department, and theological subjects only in a higher department, in an effort to counteract the absence of a secondary Jewish school system. In time, heterogeneity and changes in the student body made it impossible to maintain a two-department system of organization. In 1885, a single department was set up, with its course of study restricted to Jewish subjects and its students limited to those qualified to enter a university.
The faculty included both full and part-time instructors, all of whom were modern, scholarly, university-trained, and recognized authorities in their respective fields. The instructors were required theoretically to uphold the principles of Positive-Historic Judaism, but in actuality they differed considerably from one another and sometimes even came into conflict with one another in their attitudes toward traditional Judaism.

The total enrollment during the fifty-year period between 1854 and 1904 was four hundred and ten, over half of which were German Jews. The remaining students came from Austria, Hungary, Poland and Russia, America and other lands. In this period, the Seminary conferred in all only one hundred and twenty-six rabbinical degrees, less than one-third of the total enrollment.

The Seminary enjoyed a sound financial status, based on its original bequest and many later legacies and endowments. Instructors received good salaries, tenure, and quarters. The Seminary was well-housed, charged no fees of any kind, and provided generous stipends for needy students, as well as numerous prizes and incentives.

To carry out its dual aims of professional and academic education, the curriculum was divided into
the three areas of traditional subjects, secular studies, and scientific Jewish research. The six-seven year course of study required fifteen-eighteen hours per week, plus attendance at the university. Final examinations covered two separate areas, theological-scientific and talmudic-ritual, and graduates were required to deliver a talmudic discourse and a sermon before receiving an official rabbinical degree.

Over half the instructional time went to textual study of Talmud and Codes, and about a fifth to biblical and philological subjects, the remaining time being devoted to philosophy, scientific Halakhah, history and literature, Midrash and homiletics, pedagogy, and calendar sciences. Instruction in Jewish subjects was divided into textual or content courses in seminar classes and methodological or scientific courses by means of survey lectures. Talmud courses were treated both extensively and intensively. Codes were taught in the traditional approach, and Bible in a philological and historical approach. Hebrew received increasing attention through the years, but few students were able to use it in writing or conversation. History, presented with a cultural emphasis, was taught in correlation with the history of Jewish literature. Homiletics were taught by
means of practical exercises. Texts used were standard editions of Bible, Talmud, and rabbinical works, and for other subjects instructors used their personal notes. The Seminary's excellent library, at one time the largest of its kind in Germany, was an important instructional aid.

At first, strict conformity in observances was demanded of students, but later discipline became more moderate. Students enjoyed many informal activities, such as gatherings at homes of instructors, holiday celebrations, and student clubs and organizations.

The Breslau Seminary succeeded in producing capable rabbis, secularly well educated and able preachers in German, who occupied most of the posts in Germany and a good many in other lands. Over seventy per cent of its rabbinical graduates during its first half-century, could be classified as prominent in their profession. Two-thirds of its graduates made contributions to the field of Jewish scholarship, and some became teachers in higher Jewish institutions and German universities. Most of these distinguished graduates had studied under Frankel. After Frankel's death, the calibre of students was generally poor. The typical graduate was not proficient in Talmud, and had only a limited
halakhic knowledge. He received a modified rabbinical ordination degree omitting the tradition terms which authorize the holder to render legal decisions. The Seminary was also not effective in actually instilling its Positive-Historic approach to Judaism in its students, as was evidenced by the fact that many of its graduates accepted Reform and Orthodox posts.

As an institution, the Seminary promoted higher Jewish learning and influenced the organization of institutions of learning where some of its former students taught. Literary productions of its faculty stimulated Jewish scholarship. Because it demonstrated the practicability of combining secular knowledge, scientific Jewish studies, and traditional rabbinic learning in the education of a modern rabbi, it served as a model for later institutions.

The second rabbinical school established in Germany, in 1872, was the Hochschule, or High School for the Science of Judaism, which grew out of the early efforts of Abraham Geiger and Ludwig Philippsohn to establish a Jewish theological faculty at a German university. Its actual creation was achieved by a vigorous layman's group in Berlin. This school was originally organized as an independent institution unaffiliated with a university, offering a program of study for the professional education of rabbis.
as well as for non-rabbinic students interested in advanced studies. Though theoretically non-denominational in character, Reform actually exerted the major influence on this school.

Financial stringency compelled The Hochschule, in 1883, to obtain a government charter permitting it to solicit funds and placing it under government control. It was then that its name was changed to Lehranstalt. The original designation, by which it was commonly known, came back into use after World War I. Members of the faculty, which was self-governing, had to meet the same requirements as university instructors, and students had to matriculate at the university. Tuition was free, and admission was open to Christians and women. Between 1872 and 1902, a thirty year period, the total enrollment was one hundred and sixty-eight, of which about one-third came from German speaking countries and the remainder from Hungary and Bohemia, Galicia, Russia and Poland, America, and elsewhere. Only seventy-five students, however, completed the full course, and only fifty-two became practicing rabbis. Continuing financial straits made it difficult for the institution to engage an adequate number of teachers or provide suitable quarters.

The Hochschule aimed to preserve, advance, and disseminate the Science of Judaism, to supplement uni-
versity studies with courses in all branches of Jewish learning, and to provide education for rabbinical candidates. It considered the "total Science of Judaism" as primal in rabbinical education, and textual studies in Bible, Talmud, and religious subjects as secondary. Since Jewish Wissenschaft was held inseparable from general science, rabbinical education was always combined with university studies. Whereas at the Breslau Seminary the Science of Judaism had no primacy and all subjects proceeded along definite ideological lines, this institution stressed the all-inclusiveness and the supremacy of Wissenschaft and its integration with secular learning, and the principle of freedom of teaching and study.

After some years of unplanned courses and abortive plans, a curriculum was finally formulated on a five year basis. Oral and written final examinations were eventually extended to include talmudic or halakhic content. Two-thirds of the institution's teaching time was equally divided between biblical and halakhic subjects, about one-fifth was devoted to history and philosophy, and the remainder to homiletics, pedagogy, liturgy, comparative religion, and calendar sciences.

Both lectures and exercises were employed in the instruction. Areas of study were similar to those in
the Breslau Seminary, but were pursued less intensively, with more time being devoted to philosophical subjects. Textual Talmudic courses were limited and elementary, since general and not basic knowledge was the primary aim of this instruction. Bible and related subjects were taught in accordance with the theories of higher biblical criticism in vogue among Christian scholars at that time. The attitude toward modern Hebrew was negative. In addition to standard texts, students were provided with especially prepared texts for history, homiletics, and pedagogy. This institution also boasted a large and excellent library.

No religious discipline was enforced here, but a non-traditional atmosphere prevailed, as the most influential instructors were Reform adherents. Extra-curricular activities were usually carried on outside of the school itself, through university or political club connections.

In the period under consideration, the Hochschule produced few outstanding scholars or eminent rabbis. Only three of its graduates received the traditional Hattarat Hora-ah. Later, after 1901, improved finances and new dynamic leadership led to greater success.

Third and last of the German rabbinic schools established during the last half of the nineteenth
century was the Rabbiner-Seminar, or Rabbinical Seminary for Orthodox Judaism, founded in Berlin in 1873 by the outstanding Neo-Orthodox leader, Esriel Hildesheimer. His personality and ideas played an important part in setting the character of the school. Its two departments, lower and higher, were both confined exclusively to Jewish subject-matter. Entrance requirements, limited at first to knowledge of the Talmud, were later extended to include secular learning. This institution stressed moral and religious character in its applicants, and rejected those suspected of anti-traditionalist tendencies.

The administration of the Rabbiner-Seminar, much as that of the other two institutions, devolved about a government charter, with ultimate supervision resting in the Prussian Ministry of Education, which delegated authority over scholastic matters to the school itself. The faculty was homogeneous, all highly educated in both traditional and secular subjects, and personally strictly Orthodox in views and conduct. Tuition was free of charge. The Rabbiner-Seminar was financially the most sound of the three schools discussed in this study. It was sponsored and supported by a well-to-do congregation and by a large well-organized Orthodox movement.

Total enrollment in the thirty year period
from 1873 to 1903 amounted to two-hundred and ten, mostly German students, with only small representation from other lands. Of this figure, hardly half completed the full course and became rabbis. East European students were deliberately kept few in number, as the main purpose of the institution was to train German rabbis, and also immigrant students were thought to be interested only in a general education unobtainable in their native lands, and were suspected of irreligion besides.

The primary aim here was the transmission of the traditional Jewish heritage without excluding secular studies. Study of Talmud and Codes held first place, supplemented by intensive courses in Bible, history, and literature. Secular education and Wissenschaft were accepted rather than espoused, and for environmental reasons rather than for their inherent value. They enabled the Orthodox rabbi to teach religion to modern Jews and to meet the threats of modern scholarship on equal grounds, thus combating disaffectionary trends. Rabbinic education here was wholly religious in character, indoctrinating the student with religious loyalty, requiring him to conform to a prescribed discipline, and training him in the expert performance of ritual skills.

The six-year course of study was presented through
both formal classroom instruction and private study, and extensive self-study was required. Classroom attendance was compulsory, and supervision of the student body was rigid. Students faced monthly and end-of-semester examinations. The two sets of final examinations were similar to those of the other two schools, except that they were confined to Talmud and Codes. This institution conferred only the full rabbinic degree, with authority to decide ritual and civil questions.

Three-fourths of instructional time was devoted to Talmud and related subjects, and about a tenth to Bible and history, the remainder going for Midrash and homiletics, philosophy, and scientific lectures. Talmud was taught by the pursuit of a single theme through all references and commentaries, with extensive daily reviews. Non-talmudic courses followed lines similar to those of the other two seminaries, but according to a strictly Orthodox point of view on traditional interpretation of Bible and Jewish history.

The range of talmudic and halakhic studies here was more extensive than in the other institutions. Textual proficiency, including ability to quote verbatim, was emphasized in the study of Bible. The school favored Zionism though unofficially, and offered courses in modern Hebrew composition and
literature. Standard texts were employed in the main, and a large library served both students and teachers.

Unlike the other two schools, the Rabbiner-Seminar did not offer any special prizes or incentives for scholastic effort, adopting the traditional attitude toward learning as a religious obligation that was its own reward. Religious discipline was rigid, requiring students to observe all traditional laws and customs, and requiring graduates to accept only Orthodox posts under penalty of losing their degrees. Extra-curricular activities were confined mostly to celebrating religious holidays and holding the talmudic Siyum on completion of the study of a tractate. A student society, Debbuk Haberim, had all its activities supervised by the faculty.

Graduates of this institution were educated persons, with broad, well-balanced knowledge of both Jewish and secular learning. Their knowledge of Talmud and rabbinical literature, though it was extensive rather than intensive, and inferior to that of the old Yeshibah student, was nevertheless superior to that of the graduates of the Breslau Seminary and the Hochschule. Neither faculty nor graduates were distinguished by any great literary achievements, but they were pious men, loyal to tradition, and crusading spirits in behalf of Orthodox Judaism. Within the terms of its own
aims. The Rabbiner-Seminar was the most efficient and successful of the three schools considered in this study.

All three institutions differed from the old Yeshibah in being highly organized and wholly or partly dedicated to the professional training of the rabbi. The influence and example of German secular schools, in administrative and curricular organization, and in methods of teaching, was very strong. With the exception of the early period of the Breslau Seminary, all three institutions produced few outstanding Jewish scholars, and the number of graduates who were proficient in traditional talmudic areas of learning was still smaller. The time available to the study of Jewish subject-matter was limited by the needs of general education. Pressed for time and urged by new educational philosophies, these institutions neglected the vast field of traditional rabbinic scholarship. However, they served well the existing needs of German Jewry, adapting well to the varying and serious conditions of religious and cultural Jewish life in that country.

The German rabbinical schools were also the forerunners of three great American rabbinical institutions, each of which follows or followed more or less one of their three patterns. The Breslau Seminary has its counterpart in the Jewish
Theological Seminary of America, the Rabbiner-Seminar in the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, and the program of the Hochschule was reflected in that of the Jewish Institute of Religion prior to its merger with the Hebrew Union College. The many similarities and difference between these pairs, and the extent to which the newer school imitated or inherited the pattern of the older, merits the investigation by other students in the field of the history of rabbinical education.
# Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZdJ</td>
<td>Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAR Yearbook</td>
<td>Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGJ</td>
<td>Jahrbuch fuer die Geschechte der Juden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJGL</td>
<td>Jahrbuch fuer Juedische Geschichte und Literatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JQR</td>
<td>Jewish Quarterly Review. New Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGWJ</td>
<td>Monatschrift fuer die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAJHS</td>
<td>Proceedings of the American Jewish Historical Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZJT</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Zeitung fuer Juedische Theologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZGJD</td>
<td>Zeitschrift fuer die Geschechte der Juden in Deutschland (ed. Ludwig Geiger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRIJ</td>
<td>Zeitschrift fuer die Religioesen Interessen des Judenthunm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AKTENSTUECKE*

Juedisch-theologisches Seminar
(Fraenckel'sche Stiftung)

Der hierselbst verstorbene Kommerzienrath Jonas Fraenckel hat letzwillig die Errichtung eines Seminar zur Heranbildung von Rabbinern und Lehrern angeordnet.

In Wuerdigung der grossen Bedeutung einer solchen Anstalt fuer Glauben und Wissenschaft hat das unterzeichnet Kuratorium dahin gestrebt, dem Willen des Testators eine dem hohen Zwecke entsprechende Verwirklichung zu verschaffen.

Nachdem nun durch Allerhoechste Kabinets-Ordre d. d. Potsdam. den 31 August 1847, die Errichtung des Seminars genehmigt und die Bestaetigung der betreffenden Statuten durch hohes Regierungs-Rescript vom 31 Januar c. ausgesprochen worden ist wird zu Berslau im August d. J.

DAS JUEDISCH-THEOLOGISCHE SEMINAR

unter der Leitung des unterzeichneten Dr. Frankel eroffnet werden.

Nachst ihm werden als Hauptlehrer die Herren DD. J. Bernays und H. Graetz fungiren.

Der Unterricht wird alle zur juedischen Theologie gehoerenden Disciplinen, und in Verbindung damit auch die klassischen Sprachen und Realien von der Secunda ab umfassen.

Er ist durchweg unentgeltlich.

Fuer Breslauer Schueler des Seminars sind vier alljaehrlich zu vergebende Fraenckel'sche ae 50 Reichsthaler ausgesetzt; doch stehen auch fuer auswaertige Schueler, welche durch Fleiss und gute Fuehrung sich auszeichnen, Stipendien zur Verfuegung.

Jueglinge, welche fuer den Beruf eines Rabbiners sich ausbilden wollen, und den zum Eintritt in das

*Copied from MGWJ,III (Leipzig 1854), p. 125.

Das die Lehrer-Abtheilung des Seminars Betreffende wird spater oeffentlich bekannt gemacht werden.

Naeheren Ausschluss ertheilt das Programm, welches von dem unterzeichneten Kuratorium auf Begehren gern mitgetheilt wird.

Breslau, im Maerz 1854

Dr. Z Frankel
Oberrabiner zu Dresden

Das Kuratorium der
Kommerziennath Fraenckel'sche Stiftungen
Das Programm


Nur bei methodischer Auffassung kann es gelingen, den massenhaft angehaeften Stoff-jüdischen Wissens zu bewältigen und zugleich die, dem Studium jüdischer Theologie einwohrende dialektische Richtung, auf welche nicht verzichtet werden soll, in wissenschaftlicher Strenge zu regeln.

*Copied from "Das Juedesch-Theologische Seminar": MGWJ, III (1854), pp. 126-130.
Die Forderung materialer Vollständigkeit zieht zunächst in den Bereich des Seminarunterrichts:
Bibelstudium und hebraische Sprachkunde, Mischna, Talmud, Midraschim, Religionsphilosophie. Neben diesen Disziplinen, welche schon in früheren Jahrhunderten mit staunenswertem Scharfsinn und Ehrfurcht gebietendem Tief Sinn bearbeitet worden, haben neuere Forschungen noch andere Wissenszweige hervorgetrieben, denen die gebührende Beachtung nicht versagt werden darf.


Hiermit sind als Lehrgegenstände des Seminars folgende zu verzeichnen:

- Heilige Schrift und deren Exegese, mit Einschluss der Targumim; hebraische und aramaische Sprache; Geographie von Palaestina.
- Historische und methodologische Einleitung in Mischna und Talmud.
- Babyloniischer und palaestinischer Talmud.
- Klassische Sprachen und Realien.
- Geschichte der Juden verbunden mit Geschichte der jüdischen Litteratur.
Midraschim.
Religionsphilosophie und Ethik nach jüdischen Quellen.
Rituelle (talmudische) Praxis.
Geist des mosaisch-talmudischen Kriminal- und Civilrechts mit besonderer Hervorhebung des mosaisch-talmudischen Eherechts.
Paedagogik und Katechetik
Homiletik.

In dieses Verzeichniss sind die Universitätsstudien nicht aufgenommen, weil die Zurücklegung derselben an der Universität auch für den Seminaristen am angemessensten erscheint. Verlangt die Rücksicht auf die herbeizuführende innere Verbindung der jüdischen mit der allgemeinen Wissenschaft, sowie das Mass der Zeit, welche das jüdisch-theologische Studium erfordert, dass der Gymnasialunterricht am Seminar selbst erteilt werde: so ist dagegen der für die Universität reifgewordene Zoegling durch den vorangegangenen Seminarunterricht bereits mit einer solchen Kenntniss der jüdischen Theologie ausgerüstet, dass sein gleichzeitiger Besuch ge-sonderter Anstalten kein Bedenken erregen kann und der Vorteil benutzt werden darf, welchen die Universität in ihren gegen Einseitigkeit gerichteten Einflüssen darbietet.— Auch während der Universitätsjahre soll der Seminarbesuch forgesetzt werden; in dieser Zeit wird der Unterricht, zu den höheren Gegenständen aufsteigend, eine den philosophischen Studien entsprechende Tätigkeit auf theologischem Gebiete entwickeln und, der Bestimmung des Seminars gemaess, den Zoegling bis an das Ziel seiner Be- fähigung zum Rabbiner leiten.

In Betreff der Erfordernisse zum Eintritt in das Rabbinerseminar ist noch zu bemerken, dass unter talmudischem Wissen, welches die öffentliche Bekanntmachung erwähnt, eine fertige Auffassung des Talmud-Textes mit Raschi und wenigstens den leichteren Stellen des Tosafot-Commentars zu verstehen ist.— Der Eintretende muss das vierzehnte Lebensjahr zurückgelegt haben; die Zeit des Verweilens im Seminar ist durchschnittlich auf sechs Jahre, mit Einschluss der Universitätsjahre, festgesetzt.

Bei der Große der Aufgabe konnte für jetzt nur das Rabbiner-seminar eröffnet werden; man darf jedoch der Hoffnung Raum geben, in nicht ferner Zeit auch das Lehrerseminar ins Leben treten zu sehen.
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Im Namen Gottes, zur Erhaltung und Hebung des Glaubens und der Wissenschaft, wird das Unternehmen begonnen; vor diesem begeisternden Gedanken schwinden alle Schwierigkeiten, und es befestigt sich die Zuversicht, das so Unternommene werde nicht erfolglos bleiben.

Im Februar 1854

Dr. Z. Frankel, Oberrabbiner.
Thumbnail Sketches of the Instructors at the Jewish Theological Seminary of Breslau during the Nineteenth Century
(excluding the directors, Seminar-Rabbiner, and Heinrich Graetz)

1. **Jacob Bernays (1824-1881)**—The son of Hakham Isaac Bernays of Hamburg, he was educated by his father and at the University of Bonn, where he excelled in classical philology. He was appointed by Frankel in 1854 to teach the classical subjects of the gymnasium in the lower department and Jewish philosophy to advanced students. During his Breslau tenure, he gained fame as an outstanding authority on Aristotelian literature, having discovered and edited several treatises of that ancient philosopher. He left the Seminary in 1866 to become Professor of Classical Literature and the Librarian at the University of Bonn.

2. **Benedict Zuckerman (1818-1891)**—A native of Breslau, he was educated in the local Jewish schools and university. His main field of scholarly endeavor was mathematics and astronomy. He was appointed to the faculty in 1854 to teach general mathematical subjects in the lower departments and calendar sciences in the upper department. He also gave instruction in elementary Codes and served as the Librarian and the administrator of the Stipendiary fund. He was a pious, strictly Orthodox individual.

3. **Manuel Joel (1826-1890)**—The brother of Seminar-Rabbiner David Joel, with whom he studied at the University of Berlin. His forte was medieval Jewish philosophy and homiletics. His *Contributions to the History of Philosophy*, published in 1893, contain monographs on Maimonides, Gersonides, Ibn Gabirol and other medieval Jewish thinkers. Two volumes of his sermons became very popular in Germany at the end of the century. He came to Breslau in 1858 to serve as the principal instructor in the Lehrer-Seminar, but also taught homiletics in the rabbinical school. He left the Seminary in 1864 to succeed Geiger in the rabbinate of Breslau, returning in 1888 as lecturer in philosophy.
4. **Jacob Freudenthal (1839-1907)**—A student of the Seminary from 1854 to 1859, and of the University of Breslau, he succeeded Manuel Joel in 1866 as instructor in the Lehrer-Seminar, and also taught philosophy and Hellenistic literature to rabbinical students. He is chiefly known for his *Hellenistic Studies* published between 1875 and 1879. He left the Seminary in 1888 to become Prof. of Hellenistica at the Breslau University.

5. **David Rosin (1823-1894)**—A student of Michael Sachs and Solomon Rappaport and at the University of Halle, he was the principal of the Berlin Religionsschule from 1854 until his coming to the Seminary twelve years later. He was well grounded in biblical exegesis and Jewish philosophy, somewhat pedantic, but with a passion for detail. David Kaufmann, his biographer, called him the most beloved teacher at the Seminary.* He taught Bible, homiletics, philosophy, pedagogy and Talmud. Several of his scholarly monographs on biblical and pedagogical themes were published together with the annual reports of the Seminary.

6. **Marcus Brann (1849-1921)**—A graduate of the Seminary and the Breslau University in 1875 and rabbi in several Silesian communities, he was known as an accomplished historian with a bent for local history and popular historical writing. He edited Graetz's *History of the Jews* to which he added important information and succeeded the latter as editor of the Monatschrift and Seminary teacher in 1891. Besides history, he taught the courses of Rosin and Zuckermann after their deaths. He also succeeded Zuckermann as Librarian and administrator of the Stipendiary fund.

7. **Saul Horovitz (1859-1921)**—A graduate of the Seminary and the Breslau University in 1891, he became, in 1896, instructor in Talmud, Midrash, philosophy and homiletics. He was a recognized critical talmudist, the author of critical editions of the Sifrei to Numbers and Deuteronomy and the restorer of the lost Midrash Sifrei Zuta (1910). He also wrote a scholarly work on the *Psychology of Jewish Religious Philosophy in the Middle Ages with Critical Investigations of the Arabic and Greek Sources*. He succeeded Lewy as Seminar-Rabbiner in 1917.

* See David Kaufman, biography of Rosin, AZdJ, LXIII (1899), p. 517.
חתור חורין, כְּבָּן הָאָוָן

לב ולפניהו

וְהֵשֵׁב שְׁעַרְךָ לִיהוָה לְעָה, לְתֵן עַל בְּךָ וְלֶחֱטְבֵךָ. כִּי יְהוָה אָחַז אֲשֶׁר

הֲיִהְיֶה לְךָ אֲשֶׁר יָדָה כְּיִשְׁרֵי יְהוָה וְיֹבֵל בְּךָ כְּיִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה שָנִיף, בְּךָ שָנִיף.

שַׁלֹּל עֲלֵךְ שֵׁם להוֹר אַלְּמָה נָאָר אַלְּמָה שֵׁם הַעֹלֶם נָאָר שֵׁם הַעֹלֶם נָאָר
THE PROGRAM OF THE HOCHSCHULE*


Anderseits aber wird auf unserer Anstalt manches nicht gelehrt werden, was eine selbstständige Fakultät nicht von sich ausschliessen konnte. Denn nicht bloss auf der Höhenstufe der Universität soll unsere Hochschule stehen, sondern in der innigsten Verbindung mit jener die Ausbildung ihrer Studenten bewirken. Unsere Anstalt ist kein Seminar zur abgesonderten Ausbildung von Theologen; die gesamte Wissenschaft des Judentums, aber nur diese soll auf ihr vorgetragen werden; alle anderen Wissenschaften dagegen sollen unsere Studenten auf der Universität betreiben.

Dies ist neben vielen anderen der hauptsächlichste Grund, weshalb unsere Hochschule an der Seite der durch Weite des Umkreises der Disziplinen ausgezeichneten Universität zu Berlin errichtet wird.

* Copied from the Bericht der Lehranstalt fuer die Wissenschaft des Judenthum in Berlin, XXVI (Berlin 1908), pp. 5-7.
Die Hochschule sorgt auch drittens überhaupt nicht ausschließlich für den Studenten der Theologie, auch die Studierenden der Medizin, der Jurisprudenz und der Philosophie, denen das Interesse für die Schätze und Schicksale des jüdischen Geistes nicht fehlt, sollen hier Gelegenheit finden, sich auf wissenschaftliche Weise darüber zu unterrichten.

Uns schwebt als eine nicht zu fernes Ideal vor, dass einesseits manche Vorlesungen an unserer Hochschule—ebenso wie die öffentlichen Vorlesungen an der Universität—auch von jüdischen Laien als eine Quelle der Belehrung aufgesucht; anderseits auch nicht jüdische Studierende, welche für diesen speziellen Teil allgemeinen menschlichen Wissens ein Interesse haben, in denjenigen Zweigen, welche tatsächlich auf den Universitäten einer genügenden Beachtung entbehren, auf unserer Hochschule belehrt suchen und finden werden.

Dann wird es, indem namentlich auch die literarische Tätigkeit auf ihr einen festen Boden gewinnt, der glückliche Erfolg dieser Hochschule sein, über den Inhalt des Judentums, sein Wesen, seine Leistungen und seine Geschichte unter Juden und Nichtjuden Licht zu verbreiten. Und wie sehr bedarf es dessen bei beiden!

Nicht um eine Abschliessung also irgend einer Art, nach irgend einer Richtung handelt es sich, wenn wir eine eigene Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judentums errichten. Nur der Gegenstand, der hier betrieben wird, ist ein besonderer; nicht bloss bis jetzt tatsächlich ganz vernachlässigt, sondern wahrscheinlich noch lange (und vielleicht nach der natürlichen Abstufung der Interessen fürein immer) von den Universitäten in beschränkten Massen beachtet, erheischt er eine eigene Stätte, wo er mit dem innigsten Interesse gepflanzt und gepflegt wird. Deshalb wurde auch die Errichtung eines oder zweier Lehrstühle für Wissenschaft des Judentums an einer Universität, wenn sie auf die eine oder andere Art hәtte bewirkt werden können, nicht genügen. Ausgeschlossen aber ist für die Zukunft keineswegs, dass unsere Stiftung unmittelbar mit einer staatlichen Universität dann verbunden werden kann, wenn die Sicherheit gegeben ist, dass die Wissenschaft gleichberechtigt und unabhängig gepflegt wird."
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STATUT*

DER HOCHSCHULE FUR DIE WISSENSCHAFT DES JUDENTHUMS

Name und Zweck.

Unter dem Namen; "Hochshule fur die Wissenschaft des Judenthums" wird zu Berlin eine selbständige, von den Staats-, Gemeinde- und Synagogen-Behörden unabhängige Lehranstalt begründet.

Zweck derselben ist die Erhaltung, Fortbildung und Verbreitung der Wissenschaft des Judenthums.

Zu diesem Behufe werden zunächst Vorlesungen gehalten, welche die gesamte Wissenschaft des Judenthums umfassen; mit denselben können Übungen, Disputatorien, verbunden werden. Beides wird durch den Lehrplan näher festgestellt.

Begründung und Erhaltung.

Begründet wird die Hochschule mit Hilfe derjenigen Capitalien und Beiträge, welche die ersten Mitglieder des Vereins diesem Zwecke gewidmet haben.

Erhalten wird die Hochschule

1) durch die Zinsen,
a) der Stiftungscapitalien,  
b) der Künftig zufallenden Capitalien im Betrage von 100 Thlr. und darüber.

2) durch einmalige Zuwendungen von weiger als 100 Thlr.

3) durch die regelmässigen Beiträge der Vereinsmitglieder.

*Copied from Bericht der Hochschule fuer die Wissenschaft des Judenthum, I, (Berlin 1874), pp. 8-11.
Stiftungen, auch mit besonderen Bestimmungen seitens der Geber können an der Hochschule gegründet oder mit ihr verbunden werden, sobald sie dazu dienen, den Hauptzweck derselben unmittelbar oder mittelbar zu fördern. (ef. Fundatoren #33).

Verwaltung.

Die Verwaltung der Hochschule geschieht durch ein Curatorium von Neun Mitgliedern.

Die Pflichten und Befugnisse des Curatoriums bestehen in der Verwaltung des Vermögens der Hochschule, in der Verwendung der Zinsen und sonstigen Einnahmen derselben, und der Bestimmung über Ausgabe oder Kapitalisierung der letzteren; in der Anstellung und Besoldung der Lehrer; in der Feststellung des jeweiligen Lehrplans; in der Bestimmung und Beschaffung der Räumlichkeiten; in der Anordnung zur Schöpfung und Fortführung von Attributen (Bibliothek, Sammlungen); in der Vertheilung von Stipendien an Schüler.

Die Beschlüsse des Curatoriums, welches sich nach einer von ihm selbst zu bestimmenden Geschäftsordnung constituirt, werden mit zwei Drittel Majorschaft gefasst; dasselbe ist beschlussfähig, wenn ausser dem Vorsitzenden oder dessen Stellvertreter noch fünf Mitglieder anwesend sind.

Als das erste Curatorium sind von den ersten Mitgliedern des Vereins gewählt die Herren:

Banquier Hermann B.H. Goldschmidt,
Dr. phil. S. Gumbinner,
Professor Dr. M. Lazarus,
Comm. Rath B. Liebermann,
Dr. med. M. J. Meyer,
Dr. jur. Paul Meyer,
Dr. med. S. Neumann,
William Schoenlank,
Rabbiner Dr. Ludwig Philippson in Bon.

saemmtlich zu Berlin.
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Ausser diesen neun Mitgliedern des Curatoriums, sind noch drei Stellvertreter in den Herren:

Fabrikbesitzer: Alexander Wolff, Banquier Carl Berthold Simon, Banquier Meyer Cohn, gewählt, welche in dieser Reihe eintreten wenn wahren der ersten Amtsperiode ein Mitglied ausscheidet.

Die Amtsdauer des ersten Curatoriums ist auf funf Jahre festgestellt.

Von den Mitgliedern des Curatoriums müssen mindestens sieben in Berlin ansässig sein. Ausgeschlossen von der Mitgliedschaft des Curatoriums sind
1) die Lehrer dieser Hochschule, 2) in Function stehende Rabbiner und sonstige Cultusbeamte.


In jedem folgenden Jahre scheiden, so lange bis eine Reihenfolge festgestellt ist, drei durch das Loos bestimmte Mitglieder aus, welche jedoch wieder wählbar sind. Die regelmässige Amtsdauer der Curatoren ist im Uebrigen eine dreijährige.

Stimmreich ist jedes Mitglied des Vereins. Das Stimmrecht kann nur personlich und nicht durch Stellvertretung ausübekt werden.

Die Lehrer.

Die anzustellenden Lehrer müssen denjenigen wissenschaftlichen Grad besitzen, der zur Anstellung an einer Universitaet berechtigt.
Dieselben koennen sowohl auf Lebenszeit, als auf eine Reihe von Jahren angestellt werden, und sind verpflichtet, in jedem Semester über diejenige Disziplin, fürer welche sie berufen sind, Vorlesungen zu halten, resp. die Uebungen und Disputatorien zu leiten, während es ihnen freisteht, zugleich über andere Disziplinen, welche in das Gebiet der Hochschule gehören, Vorlesungen zu halten.


Das Lehrercollegium ist verpflichtet, alljaehrlich und rechtzeitig das Lections-Verzeichniss zu entwerfen, dem beirath (#23) zur Begutachtung resp. dem Curatorium zur Bestaetigung zu unterbreiten den abgehenden Studirenden der Hochschule Zeugnisse resp. Diplome unentgeltlich auszufertigen, das Curatorium auf dessen Wenscho in allen persoenlichen und sachlichen Fragen mit Gutachten zu versehen; eine gemessene der Wuerde der Anstalt entsprechende Disziplin unter den Studirenden aufrecht zu erhalten; endlich fuer die ordnungsmassige Erhaltung und Benutzung der Attribute der Hochschule (Bibliothek, Sammlungen u. dgl.) Sorge zu tragen.
Dem Lehrerkollegium bleibt es vorbehalten, wird aber als der Würde und dem Dienste der Wissenschaft des Judenthums entsprechend empfohlen, sich als ein akademische Koerperschaft zu constituiren, zu diesem Behufe in regelmässigen Versammlungen Vorträge zur gegenseitigen Belehrung zu halten, und zur Foerderung der Wissenschaft zur veroeffentlichen, hiesige und auswaertige Gelehrte als Mitglieder zu ernennen, alle diese akademischen Angelegenheiten nach einer von ihm selbt zu entwerfenden und von dem Curatorium festzustellenden Geschäftsordnung zu vollziehen.

Das Curatorium hat die Lehrer zu verpflichten, dass die Vorträge lediglich im reinem Interesse der Wissenschaft des Judenthums, ihrer Erhaltung, Fortbildung und Verbreitung gehalten werden.

Dem Curatorium steht ein Beirath zur Seite, dessen Gutachten einzuholenist:

a) über den Lehrplan,
b) über die Personen der anzustellenden Lehrer,
c) über alle wissenschaftlichen Fragen, welche die Hochschule betreffen.

Der Beirath besteht

a) aus dem Collegium der angestellten Lehrer,
b) aus 3 bis 6 anderen gelehrten, oder wissenschaftlich gebildeten, hiesigen oder auswärtigen Männern, welche sich zu diesem Behufe mit dem Lehrercollege verbinden.

Die Mitglieder des Beirates werden von dem Curatorium der Generalversammlung vorgeschlagen und von dieser gewählt.

Auch steht es dem Vereinsmitgliedern frei, in der Generalversammlung Vorschläge zu machen.

Der Lehrplan.

Die Vorlesungen, welche an der Hochschule
gehalten werden, sollen sich über alle Zweige der Wissenschaft des Judenthums verbreiten.

Dieselben sollen die Universitäts-Studien ergänzen, insbesondere dergestalt, dass diejenigen, welche sich dem Rabinats und Predigt-Amte widmen, Gelegenheit zu ihrer vollständigen Ausbildung finden.

Ein diesem Zweck entsprechender, auf einen Cursus von einer bestimmten Anzahl Semester anzulegender Plan der Vorlesungen wird vom Lehrcollegium entworfen, vom Beirath begutachtet und vom Curatorium genehmigt oder abgeändert.

Die Schüler.

Die Studirenden müssen durch ihre wissenschaftliche Vorbildung zu den Universitäts-Studien berechtigt sein.

In besonderen Fällen kann das Curatorium nach Anhörung des Lehrer-Collegium eine Ausnahme gestatten.

Über die Studirenden wird eine Martrikel geführt.

Zur Anhörung einzelner Vorlesungen werden Hospitanten zugelassen; über dieselben wird eine zweite Matrikel geführt.

Alle Vorlesungen und Übungen sind unentgeltlich.

Diejenigen Studirenden, welche den vollen Cursus an der Hochschule durchgemacht haben, sind berechtigt, ihre Prüfung zu verlangen, nach deren Ausfall ihnen die entsprechenden Zeugnisse resp. Diplome ausgefertigt werden; ebenso diejenigen, welche nach vorherigen Studien auf einer anderen entsprechenden Lehranstalt zur Vollendung in 3 oder mehreren Semestern ausdrücklich zugelassen werden.
Zeugnisse über einzelne Vorlesungen können auch an Hospitanten ertheilt werden.

Prufungen aber und Ertheilungen von Diplomen sind durchaus nur auf diejenigen zu beschränken, welche den Cursus auf der Hochschule durchgemacht haben oder ihn mit ausdrücklicher Erlaubniss des Curatorium in 3 oder mehr Semestern vollendet haben.

Die Studirenden, welche sich dem Rabbinitats- oder Predigt-Amte widmen, erhalten bei ihrer Aufnahme einen Lehrplan, der ihnen zur ingefaehren Richtschnur und Wahl der Vorlesungen dienen soll.

Der Verein zur Erhaltung und Verwaltung der Hochschule.

Mitglieder des Vereins sind diejenigen, welche einen jaehrlichen Beitrag von mindestens 5 Thlr. zahlen.

Immerwaehrende Mitglieder sind diejenigen, welche einen Beitrag von mindestens 200 Thlr. auf einmal oder innerhalb 5 aufeinanderfolgender Jahre zahlen.


Die Mitgliedschaft für ein jaehrlich beiträsendes Mitglied erlischt, sobald es den Beitrag wahrhend eines Jahres nicht gezahlt hat.
Das Curatorium der Hochschule bildet zugleich den Vorstand des Vereins.

Dasselbe ist Namens des Vereins zu allen gerichtlichen und aussergerichtlichen Angelegenheiten bevollmachtigt und alle Rechtshandlungen vorzunehmen verpflegt, zu denen nach den Gesetzen eine Special-Vollmacht gehoert. Es vertritt den Verein sowie die Hochschule in allen Prozessen, bei Vertragern, Vergleichen und Rechtsgeschaeften aller Art, und ist auch dazu berechtigt, sich jederzeit und zu jeglichem Geschaeft durch eins seiner Mitglieder vertreten zu lassen.

Das Curatorium als Vorstand des Vereins hat all-jaehrlich eine Generalversammlung durch Bekanntmachung in drei Berliner Zeitungen, und wenigstens in einer die Interessen des Judenthums vertretenden Zeitschrift, oder durch schriftliche Einladung zu berufen, ueber die Verwaltung des Vereins resp. der Hochschule Rechnung abzulegen, und die erforderlichen Wahlen vollziehen zu lassen.

Zweigvereine fuer die Erhaltung und Verwaltung der Hochschule koennen ueberall gebildet werden.

Die Zweigvereine geben sich ihre Statuten nach Massgabe des gegenwaertigen selbst, unerlaesslich ist die Aufnahme des #32; sie sind verpflichtet, ihre Einnahmen dem Curatorium nach Ablauf eines jeden Kalenderjahres zur Verfuegung zu stellen.

Die Mitglieder der Zweigvereine haben das Recht, an der in Berlin stattfindenden Generalversammlung mit Sitz und Stimme Theil zu nehmen. Die Einladung geschieht an den Vorstand der Zweigvereine und durch diesen an seine Mitglieder.

Die Legitimation der Mitglieder der Zweigvereine ist von den Vorstaenden derselben auszufertigen, von dem Curatorium zu pruefen.
Abaenderungen dieses Statuts sind mit Ausschluss
der unabaenderlichen ## 2,3, und 21 nur dann vorzuneh-
men, wenn sie von dem Curatorium oder der Vereins-
Mitglieder beantragt, und dann

So lange der Verein besteht, drei Monate vor der
Generalversammlung zur Kenntniss der Vereinsmitglieder
gebracht, und in der General-Versammlung mit drei
Viertel Majoritaet der Anwesenden

Beschlossen werden.

1. **Abraham Geiger** (1810-1874)—The most controversial figure of the Reform movement, he combined a conviction of the necessity to revise Jewish religious concepts and practices with a critical knowledge of Jewish learning, basing the former on the latter. His reputation as a rabbi and religious leader was equaled by his achievements in Jewish scholarship. He was an excellent student of Hebrew philology, history and biblical literature. He founded two important scholarly journals and wrote larger and smaller studies in all major areas of Jewish scientific learning. His *magnum opus* is the *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel* (1857), in which he demonstrated that the ancient Aramaic and Greek translations of the Scriptures were not based on a single fixed text, but reflected the inner developments of the inner Jewish spirit and community. He lectured at the Hochschule from its inception until his death on the broad, historical survey of Jewish Wissenschaft and on the *Pirkei Abot*.

2. **Heinrich Steinschneider** (1823-1899)—The co-founder with Moritz Lazarus of the theory of *Voelkerpsychologie*, this professor of philosophy and philology at the Berlin University was one of the organizers of the Hochschule and its most influential instructor during the nineteenth century. He taught philosophy, ethics, comparative religion, and courses in the development of religious concepts in the Bible. He was not a scientific, systematic Bible critic, but was attracted to the Bible by its ethical content. He was an extreme anti-traditionalist in his religious behavior, often being called a free-thinker.

3. **Israel Lewy** (1841-1917)—He taught Talmud and rabbinical literature from the inception of the school until his appointment as the Seminar-Rabbiner of the Breslau Seminary in 1882. A description of this great scientific-talmudist and strict traditionalist is included in Chapter II of this study.
4. David Cassel (1818-1893)--A second rate historian, he is best known for his text book on teaching Jewish history and literature Lehrbuch fuer die juedische Geschichte und Literatur, (1868), and a two-volume Geschichte der Juedeschen Literatur dealing with the Bible (1872-1873). He was ordained in the forties by Zachariah Frankel and graduated from the Berlin University. He served as instructor in Berlin Jewish secondary schools and at the Beth Hamidrash before coming to the Hochschule in 1872. He was a moderate traditionalist, but refrained from participating in religious controversies. He taught historical and literary subjects as well as elementary courses in the Preparaendie.

5. Pinhas Friedrich Frankl (1848-1887)--A student of the Pressburg Yeshibah and a graduate from the Breslau Seminary and University, he attained fame as an outstanding Arabic scholar and authority on Karism. His chief works are Studien ueber die Septuaginta und Peschita zu Jeremiah (1872), Karaeische Studien (1876), and Beitrage zur Literaturgeschichte der Karaeer (1877). He succeeded Geiger in the rabbinate of Berlin and at the Hochschule in 1877, and taught in the latter school Midrash, homiletics and medieval Jewish philosophy.

6. Joel Mueller (1827-1895)--A student of Hungarian Yeshibot and the University of Vienna, he served in several rabbinates in Hungary and taught in the Vienna Realschule before succeeding Lewy in 1884. He was a talmudist of considerable repute, but not an original thinker. He is chiefly known for his redaction of medieval rabbinic responsa literature, such as Teshubat Hakhmei Zarfat Velutaret, Teshubat Geonei Mizrah U-Ma-eriv, and the Halakhot Psukkot. One of his students at the Hochschule described him as an "emancipated-talmudist who became progressively liberal with old age."* He taught Talmudic subjects.

7. Sigmund Maybaum (1844-1899)--A pupil of Eariel Hildesheimer in Eisenstdat and a graduate from the Breslau Seminary and University, he was a rabbi in several Bohemian communities before succeeding Pinhas F. Frankl in 1888. He was a reformer and a second rate scholar. His chief literary contributions were related to the areas which he taught at the Hochschule, namely, Jueduschen Homiletik (1890) and Methodik der juedischen Religionsunterricht (1895).

8. Martin Schreiner (1863-1926)—A graduate of the Budapest Landesrabinerschule and an authority on Jewish history under Islam, he succeeded Cassel in 1893, teaching medieval Jewish history and philosophy. His major scholarly contributions were: Der Kallam in der jüdischen Literatur, Zu Geschichte den Polemik zwischen Juden und Mohammedaner, and Geschichte des Aschatitenthums. Mental illness compelled him to cease teaching in 1902.

9. Eduard Baneth (1863-1926)—A disciple of Esriel Hildesheimer and graduate from the Orthodox Rabbiner-Seminar of Berlin and the local university, he was recognized as a talmudic scholar and a moderate traditionalist. He wrote Ursprung der Sadokaer and Boethosaeer and redacted several halakhic works. He succeeded Mueller in 1896 as instructor in Talmud and Codes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Abraham Geiger</th>
<th>Israel Lewy</th>
<th>David Cassel</th>
<th>Heinrich Steinschal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872-3</td>
<td>Introduction to the Science of Judaism (1)</td>
<td>Mishnah (2)</td>
<td>Jewish History (4)</td>
<td>Interpretation of Deuteronomy (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Biblical Literature (2)</td>
<td>Talmud (3)</td>
<td>Psalms (3)</td>
<td>Development of Religious Ideas in the Bible (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Codes (2)</td>
<td>Aramaic Literature (2)</td>
<td>Religious Philosophy (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-4</td>
<td>General Introduction to the Science of Judaism (1)</td>
<td>Talmud (6)</td>
<td>Same as above, plus</td>
<td>Same as above, plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genesis (2)</td>
<td>Mishnah (2)</td>
<td>Introduction to the Liturgy of the Synagogue (3)</td>
<td>Jewish Ethics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua (1)</td>
<td>Codes (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pirkei Abot (1)</td>
<td>Palestinian Talmud (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Old Biblical Texts (2)</td>
<td>Introduction to the Mishnah (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874-5</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Aramaic Literature (3)</td>
<td>Jewish Ethics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaiah (3)</td>
<td>Religious Ideas in the Bible (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liturgy (3)</td>
<td>History of Religion (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cabbalistic Literature (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calendar Science (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Parenthetic numbers mean hours per week
EINLEITUNG.

Das unterzeichnete Curatorium des RABBINER-SEMINARS überweist hiermit den angesammelten Capital-Fonds von ca Rthler. 22,000, wie die später zum Fond eingehenden Capitalien, desgleichen die gegenwärtigen wie die zukünftigen Jahresbeiträge zur GRÜNDUNG DES SEMINARS FUER DAS ORTHODOXE JUDENTHUM,

und erklärt, dass aus diesen Mitteln zuerst das Grundstück Gyps-Strasse 12a. erworben werden soll.

ZWECK.

Der Zweck des Seminars ist: die mundliche und schriftliche Lehre, wie solche in der Bibel, im Talmud, dessen Commentatoren und jüdischen Codicis niedergelegt ist, sowie die damit im Zusammenhang stehenden religioes-wissenschaftlichen und profanen Disziplinen, Rabbinats-Aspiranten und jüdischen Juenglingen überhaupt im wissenschaftlichen Organismus zu lehren und auf die sittlich-religioese Bildung der Hörer zu wirken.

SITZ UND GERICHTSSTAND.

Der Sitz und Gerichtsstand des Seminars ist Berlin.

*Copied from Statut für das Rabbiner-Seminar und den Seminar-Verein zu Berlin (Berlin 1874).
STANDPUNKT DER ANSTALT, DOCENTEN UND HOERER.


LEHRGEGENSTAENDE.

Die Lehrgegenstaende sind:

a) Bibel, Exegese, Targumim, hebraeische und aramaische Gramatik, sowie eventuell semitische Sprachen ueberhaupt;

b) Babilonischer Talmud und zwar bei grundlicher Behandlung der eigentlichen discursaiven Seite (?), stete Hinzunahme der abschliessenden (?).

c) Gesetzes-Codices (?).

d) Jerusalemitischer Talmud.

e) Midrasch.

f) Practische Bekanntschaft mit (Beschneidung) (Schaechter-function).

g) Juedische Religionsphilosophie und Ethik.

h) Geschichte der Juden und der Juedischen Literatur.

i) Homiletik.

k) Paedagogik.

Gymnasialgegenstaende stehen zunaehest ausserhalb des Programms, koennen jedoch nach Beschluss
des Curatoriums aufgenommen werden. Bis dahin wird zur Aufnahme in das Seminar von den schuelern:

im profanen Wissen der Nachweiss der Reife fuer Prima der preussischen Gymnasien, im talmudischen der Nachweiss der Befaehigung zum selbststaendigen Erfassen eines mittelschwierigen talmudischen Textes und der Commentatoren Raschi, Tosefot und Bemerkung des Edeles ( ) verlangt. -- Hospitanten koennen vom Rector zugelassen werden. -- Der Gesammt-Cursus ist 6 Jahre, die Vertheilung des Lehrstoffes nach den Jahrgaengen ordnet der generelle Lehrplan.

#5

LEITUNG.

Die aeußere Leitung des Seminars liegt dem Curatorium ob, die innere dem Rector, der die Gesammtverantwortung fuer die Anstalt traegt, den Semestrationsplan in Gemeinschaft mit den Docenten entwirft, und mit denselben Conferenzen haelt (#7), die er beruft, und denen er praesidirt, jaehrlich einen Bericht ueber die inneren Angelegenheiten des Seminars dem Curatorium erstattet, die Vermittelung des Verkehrs zwischen dem letzteren und den Docenten in der Regel bildet, und die die inneren Angelegenheiten des Seminar betreffenden Beschluesse des Curatoriums ausfuehrt.

#6

DOCENTEN.

Die ordentlichen Docenten werden auf Vorschlag des Rectors vom Curatorium ernannt, die ausserordentlichen vom Rector in Uebereinstimmung mit dem Docenten-Collegium.

#7

CONFERENZEN.

#8

CLASSIFICATION.

Die Classification der Eintretenden wird durch eine Prüfung des Rectors und seiner Docenten bestimmt, das Aufsteigen in den Conferenzen festgestellt.

#9

AUSTRITT.

Jeder Höerer der Anstalt hat beim seinem Abgange das Recht auf ein Zeugniss über seine intellectuelle Capacitaet, sein erworbenes Wissen und seine moralische Fuehrung. Die Hatharah (Ordination), welche vom Rector ertheilt wird, kann nur nach absolvirter Pruefung erlangt werden. Über die Zulassung zur Pruefung entscheidet der Rector.

#10

BIBLIOTHEK.


#11

MITTEL.

Die Mittel zur Erhaltung des Seminars bestehen:

a) in Ertraegnissen der Fonds;

b) den Miethsertraegen des zu vermietenden Hauses;

c) den Einnahmen, welche dem Seminar zu dessen Erhaltung freiwillig zufließen.
CLASSIFICATION.

Die Classification der Eintretenden wird durch eine Prüfung des Rectors und seiner Docenten bestimmt, das Aufsteigen in den Conferenzen festgestellt.

AUSTRITT.

Jeder Höerer der Anstalt hat beim seinem Abgange das Recht auf ein Zeugniss über seine intellectuelle Capacität, sein erworbenes Wissen und seine moralische Führungs. Die Hatharah (Ordination), welche vom Rector ertheilt wird, kann nur nach absolviert der Prüfung erlangt werden. Über die Zulassung zur Prüfung entscheidet der Rector.

BIBLIOTHEK.


MITTEL.

Die Mittel zur Erhaltung des Seminars bestehen:

a) in Erträgnissen der Fonds;

b) den Miethserträgen des zu vermiethenden Hauses;

c) den Einnahmen, welche dem Seminar zu dessen Erhaltung freiwillig zufließen.
#12

FONDS-ANLAGE.

Die Capitalien des Seminars muessen stets in despositalmaessigen Effecten oder Hypotheken angelegt sein.

#13

GESCHENKE, LEGATE, STIPENDIEN.

Das Institut nimmt Geschenke und Legate sowohl fuer den Fond als auch fuer laufende Ausgaben, sowie Stipendien und Stiftungen fuer die Hoerer dankbar entgegen. Die Zuweisung dieser Stipendien an den Empfaenger erfolgt, insoweit der Spender nicht anders bestimmt, durch den Rector.

#14

CURATORIUM.

Das Curatorium fuehrt die Verwaltung des Seminars und vertritt dasselbe nach Aussen sowohl bei den Behoerden und Gerichten, als auch Privatpersonen gegenueber, und zwar auch in denjenigen Angelegenheiten, welche nach dem Gesetze eine Special-Vollmacht erfordern. Dasselbe hat insbesondere den folgenden Geschaeftskreis:

a) die Anstellung der Docenten auf Vorschlag des Rectors und die Vereinbarung des Gehalts und der Bedingungen mit denselben;

b) die Genehmigung des Lectionsplanes, soweit damit eine Erhoehung des Ausgaben-Etats verbunden;

c) die Verwaltung der Cassen und der Fonds des Seminars, sowie die Stipendien, Stiftungen und Empfangnahme aller dem Seminar gewidmeten Gelder.

Das Curatorium hat den von dem Rector alljahrlich zu erstattenden Bericht, sowie die Ergebnisse der Finanz-Verwaltung alljahrlich zu veroffentlichen. Dasselbe ist zur Einholung von Gutachten des Rectors und der Conferenz der Docenten berechtigt. Das Curatorium fuehrt seine Legitimation durch ein Attest
der Aufsichtsbehörde. Die Ausstellung von Urkunden seitens desselben erfolgt durch die Unterschrift des Vorsitzenden und zweier Mitglieder des Curatoriums.

#15


#16

Das Curatorium besteht aus seiben Mitgliedern, wovon mindestens zwei ihren Wohnsitz in Berlin haben, hat aber die Befugniss, diese Anzahl zu vermehren, sowie Ehrenmitglieder für das Curatorium zu ernennen, welche berechtigt sind an den Berathungen des Curatoriums, jedoch ohne entscheidende Stimme, Theil zu nehmen. --Das erste Curatorium besteht zur Zeit aus den Herren

Rabbiner Dr. J. Hildesheimer, Berlin,
do. Dr. S. Cohn, Schwerin (Mecklenburg),
do. Dr. S. Auerbach, Halberstadt,
Oberrabbiner Dr. Loeb, Altona,
Kaufmann Gustav Hirsch, Berlin,
do Sally Lewisohn, Hamburg,
do. Emanuel Schwarzschild, Frankfurt a.M.
und aus dem Ehrenmitgliede
Kaufmann A. H. Heymann, Berlin.
Das Curatorium ernennt eines seiner Mitglieder zum Rector des Seminars, der zugleich Vorsitzender des Curatoriums ist. Gegenwärtig ist der Rabbiner Dr. Hildesheimer zum Rector, und zwar auf Lebenszeit, ernannt; dessen dereinstige Nachfolger werden nach einem Provisorium von drei Jahren, wenn nicht vier­teljährrige Kuendigung des Curatoriums geschehen, ebenfalls Lebenslaenglich angestellt.

Von den uebrigen Mitgliedern des Curatoriums treten alljaehrlich zwei und zwar, entweder die Dienstaeltzen, oder bei gleichem Dienstalter die durch das Loos bezeichneten aus, und werden durch Cooptation aus der Zahl derjenigen Personen, welche nach Inhalt des #11 c. zur Erhaltung des Seminars jaehrliche Beitraege leisten, ersetzt. Die Austretenden sind sofort wieder waehlbar.

HONORAR.

Die Hoerer des Seminars erhalten den Unterricht unentgeltlich; jedoch steht den Einzelnen frei, Colleigengelder zu zahlen, welche in die Seminar­Casse fliessen.

AUFLOESUNG DES SEMINARS.

Das Seminar ist unaufloesbar. Die Mittel des Seminars duerfen nur zu den oben angegebenen Zwecken verwendet werden, Sollte eine Verringerung der Einnahmen eine Einschraenkung der Wirksamkeit des Seminars nothwendig machen, so kann dieselbe nur in dem Sinne erfolgen, dass an geeigneten deutschen Universitaeten orthodoxe juedische Lehrer angestellt werden, um juedischen Junglingen, welche an diesen Universitaeten studiren, unentgeltlichen Unterricht in den talmudischen Faechern zu ertheilen.

AENDERUNG DER STATUTEN.

Die #s 1 und 3 der Statuten sind unabanderlich, die uebrigen Paragraphen koennen nur vom Curatorium

#21

Die Bestimmungen des Statuts, welche sich auf den Zweck, den sitz und die Vertretung der Anstalt beziehen, duerfen nur mit landesherrlicher Genehmigung, die uebrigen Bestimmungen nur mit Genehmigung des k. Oberpraesidenten der Provinz abgeaendert werden.

Obiges Statut Wurde durch folgendes Rescript d. d. 27. Januar 1874 vom k. Oberpraesidium der Provinz Brandenburg bestaetigt:


DER OBERPRAESIDENT DER PROVINZ BRANDENBURG.

Wirkliche Geheime Rath

V. JAGOW.
Hattarat Hora-ah
(Rabbi Esriel Hildesheimer)
מרעה עמנוא

אלברט בורנשטיין

מאמר עווי והなし מחזור של"ת"}

במהלך בין שניים לאפס

עדים קורימים המקימים את הערך המגלה עם אאות המסורה

וכות א瑪רה

186 ברכ Yosemite 78 כנפיים

187 ברכ Yosemite 78 כנפיים
לא הותירה אותם כל כך חסרים בעייתיים.

כל זה הוחלט לפני כן כךtimestampsר והיה הוא המutivo גם הוא. הוא חזר את על המחשהーズיות והיה הוא המutivo גם הוא.

לכתוב הותירה אותם כל כך חסרים בעייתיים.

告诉他, וירג', וואז

ויתמר להב נייר, והודע

וכך проч儿科 לוחים פנים חלשים, ולא הוחלט לפני כן כךtimestampsר והיה הוא המaddafiיוס והיה הוא המ.btnCloseו גם הוא.