INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Howard Allen Berman

TITLE "His Majesty's Loyal Opponents: A Comparative Study of the Presidencies of Kaufmann Kohler and Solomon Schechter"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [XX]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [✓]) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) for Ph.D.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ✓ yes ___ no

May 29, 1974
Date

Howard A. Berman
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed 7/16/74
Date

Moira Steinberg
Signature of Library Staff Member

HIS MAJESTY'S LOYAL OPPONENTS

A Comparative Study of the Presidencies of

Kaufmann Kohler and Solomon Schechter

Howard Allen Berman

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the Degree of Master
of Arts in Hebrew Letters and Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

1974

Referee: Prof. Stanley F. Chyet

Dedicated to

my loving and deeply beloved

parents,

BERNARD AND ELAINE BERMAN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special expressions of appreciation are in order to those individuals whose help, and guidance were of great help to me in the preparation of this paper. A heartfelt to:

Dr. Stanley Chyet . . . a good friend and a sensitive teacher who served as faculty referee and advisor for this thesis, and whose thoughtful suggestions, perceptive observations, and above all, whose concern for students over policies, were all invaluable to me.

Dr. Jacob R. Marcus . . . whose influence on this work though indirect, is nevertheless profound--it was Dr. Marcus whose magnetic personality and whose warmth and concern originally sparked, and continues to nurture, my interest and commitment to the study and appreciation of the Jewish experience in America.

In addition, I want to thank Mrs. Fannie Zelcer, of the American Jewish Archives, for her always ready and enthusiastic helping hand . . . and Mrs. Moira Steiner, my typist, for her interest and cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DIGEST

As an outgrowth of a long-time interest in the historical development of the institutions of American Judaism in general, and of the Reform Movement in particular, this thesis is a comparative study of the presidential terms of Dr. Solomon Schechter at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (1902-1915), and Dr. Kaufmann Kohler at the Hebrew Union College (1903-1921).

At the turn of the century, when both men assumed office, the Hebrew Union College had already been established as the national center of American Reform Judaism, and the Jewish Theological Seminary was soon to emerge as the institutional exponent of the newly organized Conservative Movement. Schechter and Kohler, whose personal friendship paralleled the cooperative relationship between the two institutions during this period, shared many goals and ideals in common--the study and perpetuation of Torah, the advancement of scientific Jewish scholarship in America, and the training of a generation of American rabbis whose academic and spiritual preparation would provide strong leadership for the Jewish community in that crucial era of transition and growth. And yet, the difference in their respective interpretations and implementation of these goals provide valuable insights into the characteristics and the major issues confronting Reform and Conservative Judaism in that stage of their development. Schechter's underlying principle was the preservation of traditional Judaism in a contemporary context, and the development of an approach to Jewish life which would emphasize the ideals of

the "catholic" community of Israel, and bridge the extremes of strict Orthodoxy and radical Reform. Kohler, on the other hand, was uncompromisingly committed to the classical expression and interpretation of Reform Judaism--a progressive, universal religion which stressed the prophetic "mission of Israel," and bitterly opposed the antithesis to this mission, Jewish nationalism. These respective principles were underscored throughout Schechter's and Kohler's administrations--in their scholarly writings, their public speeches, and in the curricula and policies of their institutions.

This thesis is not a comprehensive history of the Seminary and the College during these years, nor is it a complete biographical study of either of the two individuals. Rather, it attempts to trace and analyze this significant chapter in the annals of both schools in terms of their presidents, and within the perspective of their relationship to each other during this period.

INTRODUCTION

The coming year marks the one-hundreth and ninetieth anniversaries, respectively, of the founding of the Hebrew Union College and the Jewish Theological Seminary. In the course of their history, these two institutions have become major centers of Jewish learning not only for America, but for the world as well. As the significant milestone observances approach, there is particular interest in reviewing the progress and accomplishments of the past. This study is an attempt to present and analyze a highly significant chapter--perhaps the most significant--in this history. The accession of Solomon Schechter and Kaufmann Kohler to the presidencies of the two schools within a year of each other marked the beginning of one of the most crucial periods of development for both institutions and their respective Movements.

I have not attempted a comprehensive history of the Seminary and the College during this era. In this sense, I am closer to Schechter than to Kohler--this paper treats only "Some Aspects" of the subject. Through the study and comparison of the correspondence, official documents and published writings of the two men during their terms in office, I have attempted to present an overall picture of the significant similarities and differences between them and their philosophies regarding their institutions.

With all the recent discussion of increasing similarities between the Reform and Conservative Movements in America, even to the point of speculations concerning merger, it is nevertheless ironic that formal and informal relationships between HUC and JTS appear to be less friendly

than ever before. The predictions of "jealousy and strife" which, Schechter observed, had been made by some in 1902, appear now to have been fulfilled. Perhaps it is the increasing similarity itself and the resulting delineation of competition which are the causes of this situation. And yet, 1972, like 1902, saw the beginnings of new eras of leadership for both the College and the Seminary. Perhaps the future will again witness what Schechter had once called "common battle for the cause of Judaism."

CHAPTER I

The inauguration of Solomon Schechter as President of the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1902, and that of Kaufmann Kohler as head of the Hebrew Union College a year later, were together the culmination of a long and complex chapter in American Jewish history. The last quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed the development of what would emerge as two of the leading expressions of American Judaism, the Reform and Conservative Movements. In both cases, the respective movements sought expression and organization through the establishment of rabbinical seminaries--institutions which would foster their particular ideologies and goals for Jewish life in America, and which would train rabbis and teachers committed to those principles.

The Hebrew Union College had been established in October of 1875 in Cincinnati, under the leadership and guidance of Isaac Mayer Wise. Initially, the College as well as its patron organization, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, had been conceived of as institutions which would encompass and serve the entire Jewish community in America, Orthodox and Reformers alike. However, while such may have indeed been the case in its infant years, the College within little more than a decade after its founding was clearly supported and therefore primarily influenced by the Reform Congregations of the Midwest, under the popular leadership of Wise. With the drafting of the "Pittsburgh Platform" in 1885, defining in no uncertain terms the radical theological program of American Reform, Wise made the following declaration in an effort to

maintain the support and participation of the traditionalists in the College:

> This College remains steadfast upon its traditional basis. The law which Moses commanded us is the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob, and no deviation from that divine spirit as it reveals itself in Israel's prophets and sacred history; as it re-echoes in the literary treasures of our great and immortal teachers of all centuries of history; as it proclaims itself loudly and emphatically in the reason and conscience of all good men. No evolution; development is the watchword. No deviation; continuation is the key-note. The spirit remains unchanged.[1]

Whatever Wise's reassuring intentions may have been in this statement, a distinct rationalist (i.e., "Reform") viewpoint is most evident. Regardless, the traditionalists from the Eastern states had long held Wise in suspicion and now withdrew their support and began to plan their own institution.

The ranks of traditional Judaism in America in 1885 had not yet been swelled or influenced by the mass immigration of Eastern European Jewry, which in a few years was to establish and define the Orthodox presence in the United States. The rabbis and community leaders who met in New York on January 31, 1886, to organize the Jewish Theological Seminary Association were primarily of native-Sephardic and German background. While for the most part fully orthodox in practice, ideologically they were loosely bound together in what has become known as the "Historical School." The School, from which later evolved the Conservative Movement, sought to maintain the traditional, "historical" laws and practices in what it hoped would develop into a distinctive "American Judaism"--native in <u>culture</u>, but bound by the <u>doctrines</u> and rituals of orthodoxy.[2] As had been the case with the Hebrew Union College, the Seminary allegedly sought to serve no one movement--and yet its particular principle was evident in the statement made by Alexander Kohut:

> Judaism is a consistent whole. The Mosaic, prophetic, talmudic-rabbinic Judaism is an organic totality. . . . The Judaism of history is a unity, an organic development. May Moses be its head, the prophets its heart, the Rabbis its links, one without the other is a halfness, a wanton mutilation. . . . Reform, Conservatism, and Orthodoxy- these are the watchwords under which the verbal battle is fought, and the result is that the pure faith cannot obtain its due acknowledgement. Therefore, we imperiously need a seminary, which will have no other ambition, no other title than that it be purely and truly Jewish. . . .[3]

On January 2, 1887, the Jewish Theological Seminary officially opened in New York. Its first President and guiding spirit was Sabato Morais, the Italian-born rabbi of Mikveh Israel Congregation in Philadelphia. Morais' view of what the new Seminary's philosophy would be was less neutral than Kohut's:

> I acknowledge that as far as it lies in my power, the proposed seminary shall be hallowed to one predominating purpose - to the upholding of the principles by which my ancestors lived and many have died . . . trained by preceptors loyal to Conservatism, real professors, making declaration of their fealty to Jewish doctrines - the scholars shall follow in the wake of their teachers, preaching the eternity of the revelation at Sinai; the venerableness of oral impartings, resuscitating the national language, commending books that have preserved it, widened its scope and beautified it.[4]

In the years that followed, the two institutions progressed, the College in Cincinnati rather rapidly, the Seminary in New York somewhat more modestly. With the previous tension between the traditional and liberal forces now alleviated at the Hebrew Union College, Wise and his Board of Governors began directing the institution by distinctly "Reform" principles. Greater emphasis than had been possible earlier began to be placed on a critical-scientific approach to the study of the Bible and other Jewish sources, though Wise maintained his strong disapproval of much of the current "Higher Criticism." The graduates of the College for the most part accepted positions in Reform congregations, and when

they went to more traditional synagogues, led them into the Reform Movement. A growing faculty and student body testified to the steady progress of the College during this period. At the time of Wise's death in 1900, the College was twenty-five years old. It was the nationally acknowledged center of the Reform Movement. It had its own building, a library which was "the largest and most important of its kind in the country," and most important, it had ordained sixty-one men as rabbis. Many were serving the leading congregations of the country, and some were already serving on the faculty of their Alma Mater.

In 1900, the future of the Jewish Theological Seminary was not as promising. The beginnings had been encouraging enough, and ten rabbis had been ordained. However, the power base of traditionalism had already shifted from the established Sephardim and Germans to the newer Orthodox immigrants from Eastern Europe. The Yiddish-speaking, strictly observant newcomers expressed little interest in the Seminary, and began laying the groundwork for their own yeshivot.[5] With the death of Kohut in 1894 and Morais in 1897, the Seminary lost its two most devoted leaders. Without such strong leadership, the student body dwindled, and there was great difficulty in engaging competent teachers, especially of the calibre of Morais. Moreover, funds were meagre, and the Seminary building on Lexington Avenue was mortgaged to help meet the basic expenses.[6]

In 1900, with the Hebrew Union College in transition and the Seminary on the verge of collapse, there was considerable talk of merging the two institutions under one new president. Henry Leipziger, a member of the HUC Board of Governors, wrote to Bernhard Bettmann, the board's president, in 1901:

> I would suggest . . . for your consideration, the advisability of a union with the Jewish Theological Seminary of

> New York. That institution is also looking for a President. Is this not a good time to consider the underlying principles of training for the ministry and to determine whether or not there is common ground in Judaism on which the two divisions in the Jewish community could stand? Certainly a curriculum could well be arranged which should form the equipment of a Jewish minister whether he determine to lead an orthodox or a reform congregation. Such a union college would arouse the enthusasm of American Israel by the very breadth of its purpose. . . .[7]

In New York, The American Hebrew sought a consensus of opinion on the subject of merging the two seminaries, and solicited the views of various prominent Jewish leaders. A number of responses, particularly those of the philantrophist Jacob Schiff and the lawyer, Louis Marshall, both Reform Jews, favored a united institution, preferably to be located in New York. There was even a proposal by Dr. I. Singer, editor of the Jewish Encyclopedia, to completely disband the two existing schools, and establish a new "Jewish University of Theology, History and Literature." However, it was clear from the views of those who had been most involved in the College and the Seminary, that institutional loyalties and interests precluded any real possibility of merger.[8] In the end, both schools took the more positive route of seeking new leadership to preserve and carry on what had already been accomplished. With Wise's death, the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College began their search for his successor. Moses Mielziner, the professor of Talmud, was appointed president pro-tem in March, 1900, and served in this capacity until his death in February, 1903. He was succeeded for the remainder of that academic year by Gotthard Deutsch, professor of History.

During this period, the Seminary's fortunes took an abrupt turn. In 1901, with the death of Joseph Blumenthal, the president of the Board of Trustees, all hope for the future of the institution seemed doomed. However, in one of those legendary incidents that change the course of

history, the young Cyrus Adler, speaking at a dinner party at the home of Isidor Straus in New York, challenged the wealthy Jews of New York to save the only institution of higher Jewish learning in the city. The outcome of this was that a number of leading New York Jews, led by Jacob H. Schiff and Louis Marshall, together re-organized the Seminary, and secured an endowment fund of $500,000. Schiff moreover announced that he was going to build a new home for the school. It has been observed that it was a "terefa banquet" in celebration of the first graduation of the Hebrew Union College in 1883, that led to the creation of the Jewish Theological Seminary in the first place, and now another dinner, at the home of a Reform Jew, probably also "terefa," was to save the Seminary from oblivion. On April 17, 1902, the old Jewish Theological Seminary Association formally merged with the new Jewish Theological Seminary of America, and plans were immediately put under way to engage a new president who would successfully guide the future of the renewed institution.

CHAPTER II

When the new Board of Trustees of the reorganized Jewish Theological Seminary began making arrangements to name a new president in 1901, there was little doubt that Solomon Schechter was their first choice for the position. Indeed, the new Board members, particularly Schiff and Marshall, made Schechter's invitation the precondition for all further action.[9]

Solomon Schechter, already world-famous as a rabbinic scholar and discoverer of the Cairo Genizah, was born in 1847 in Focsani, Rumania. His father Isaac had been a Habad Hassid, a follower of Rabbi Schneour Zalman of Liady, and served as the ritual slaughterer of the village (whence the family name was derived). As a child, Schechter was a prodigy, studying Bible and Talmud under his father at an early age. At ten, he was sent to the Yeshiva of Piatra, and at thirteen he went to Lemberg to study under the famous Talmudist, Rabbi Joseph Saul Nathanson. In 1875, Schechter enrolled as a student at the Vienna Beth Ha-Midrash, his first contact with a "modern" Jewish education. During his four years in Vienna, Schechter came under the influence of Adolph Jellinek, the city's famed preacher, and the scholars Isaac Hirsch Weiss and Meir Friedmann. In 1879, Schechter moved on to Berlin, where he studied at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums and at the University of Berlin. He also established contact with Israel Lewy and Moritz Steinschneider.

In 1882, a fellow Hochschule student, Claude G. Montefiore, persuaded

Schechter to return with him to England to serve as his tutor and preceptor in Rabbinics. In England, Schechter quickly became the center of a group of young Jewish intellectuals and students who met regularly to discuss the crucial issues of Jewish life. In 1890, he was appointed lecturer in Talmud at Cambridge, and two years later, was named reader in Rabbinics and was awarded the honorary degree of Master of Arts.

By this time, word of Schechter's prominence in Jewish scholarship had spread to America. In 1890, in his first formal contact with the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, he received an invitation from Sabato Morais to accept a position on the faculty. A year later, Schechter wrote to Alexander Kohut: "I should be willing to accept the position of teacher in your Seminary, provided the remuneration will permit me to live independently."[10] Nothing concrete came of this first proposal, but Schechter's interest in the Seminary was kindled. In November, 1893, he wrote again to Kohut:

> What is your College doing? America must be a place of Torah, because the future of Judaism is across the seas. You must make something great out of your Institution if the Torah and wisdom are to remain among us. Everything is at a standstill in Germany; England has too few Jews to exercise any real influence. What will happen to Jewish learning if America remains indifferent? [11]

When Kohut died in 1894, Morais again wrote to Schechter requesting that he consider filling Kohut's post as professor of Talmud.[12] While Schechter made no commitment at this time, in 1895 he was invited to deliver a series of lectures on "Jewish Thought," under the newly established Gratz Foundation in Philadelphia. Two of those who encouraged and arranged Schechter's visit at that time were later to play instrumental roles in his acceptance of the Seminary presidency, Dr. Solomon Solis-Cohen and Cyrus Adler. While in Philadelphia, Schechter met with

Sabato Morais and the two discussed further the possibility of Schechter taking a faculty position at the Seminary. In a letter to his wife from America, Schechter wrote:

> They would like to have a real seminary for rabbis. I believe that perhaps there may be a few people who would give a lot of money, especially Mr. [Moses] Dropsie who is quite in love with me. Ich verhalte mich ganz ruhig in der Sache, and I am listening. If the things come, they will come by themselves. . . . [13]

Schechter's month-long stay in America both strengthened his own interest in American life and institutions and won him a sizable following of admirers and friends. In July, 1894, in the course of negotiations for the Philadelphia lecture tour, he wrote to Dr. Gustav Gottheil in New York, "I believe that the future of Judaism is in America, and with God's help I am sure we could do much good there, not only for science but for the purpose of forming a school of young men who will unite enthusiasm with Jewish learning."[14]

For the next few years following his return to England in March, 1895, Schechter's life was devoted to the travel and study surrounding his work with the Cairo Genizah. In July, 1896, he announced the accidental discovery of the fragments of the original Hebrew text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, and in December, he left for Cairo where he unearthed the ancient manuscripts in the depository of the Cairo Synagogue. Following a short visit to Palestine, Schechter returned to England, where the next five years were spent studying and publishing his finds from the Genizah. It was during this period that Schechter's world-wide fame was established. The Genizah material proved as significant to Christian scholarship as it was for Jewish history, and Schechter's reports of his work were widely published.

With the death of Sabato Morais in 1897, an intense effort was initiated by Schechter's friends in New York and Philadelphia to bring him to America as the new president of the Seminary. However, this was still before the "Straus banquet," and the necessary funds were not yet available. In the summer of 1899, Dr. Solomon Solis-Cohen, of Philadelphia, one of the long-time supporters of the Seminary, met with Schechter in Amsterdam to officially convey the offer . Solis-Cohen obtained a promise from Schechter that he would indeed come if adequate financial means could be secured. Negotiations, formal and informal, continued through 1900, when Rabbi Stephen S. Wise and Leonard Lewisohn, of New York, again made proposals to Schechter.

Throughout these initial stages, Schechter corresponded with Mayer Sulzberger, the Philadelphia judge who had been one of the founders of the Seminary and a life-long supporter. The Schechter-Sulzberger letters offer valuable insights into the developments which eventually led to Schechter's coming to America. In December, 1899, Sulzberger wrote to Schechter:

> The Jewish newspapers are full of positive accounts of your coming. For once, however, they seem so far to have spoken favorably. Whether favorably or the reverse, their consistency cannot be relied on, nor do I esteem their praise nor dread their wrath. What concerns me much more is that a proper Contract should be drawn up before you irrevocably sever yourself from England. . . . From the way things look, you may be coming at the right psychological moment. Orthodoxy, reform, conservative, all have been found to be names, and it is no bad thing to be uncomprehended in or by any of them. He who has scholarship, talent and enthusiasm may be more appreciated for the first time in our history than he who leads a party. So I begin to feel that things may come out right after all, though these are hard times in the money market.15

In another letter a few months later, Sulzberger again wrote to Schechter concerning the difficulties with the old board of the Seminary,

then supervised by a rabbinical committee:

> I have intimated to Dr. Solis-Cohen that, unless the Board of Trustees is reorganized on the basis of secularity, I shall advise your declination. The Board may be properly orthodox in belief and expression, but they do not command the financial support of the only people to be relied upon to maintain the Institution in permanence. I have discussed the matter with [Jacob] Schiff, who is the Yehudi of New York, and we have agreed that to render the place assured, a friend of mine, Louis Marshall, should be the President. Marshall is the ideal man in every respect. He has united character, knowledge, natural ability, high repute and worldly means. With him at the head of us, I would feel that after a period of four years things would be perfectly safe. Without him, or one equally satisfactory--and I do not know the other--I should feel equally unsafe. [16]

The drawn out negotiations and lack of concrete progress appear to have discouraged Schechter. In 1900, he was offered the position of professor of Hebrew at the University of London, and he wrote to Sulzberger of his doubts and uncertainty:

> I could have wished that more definite American news would have reached me a little earlier. . . . Being in suspense for years and even now about the results of the negotiations in America, I was unable to prevent my friends from taking the steps which led to the results known to you by this time from the University Reporter [concerning the London appointment]. . . . I am not committed here in any way, but you can see that my position now is somewhat embarrassing and differing from what it was some months ago. [17]

After discussing questions of salary, Schechter then concluded his letter to Sulzberger with an eloquent statement of what he would hope to accomplish in America:

> The real question is whether you think it desirable, both for the Seminary and myself, that I would accept the offer; that is to say whether the Seminary can be rearranged in such a way as to become a centre of Jewish Wissenschaft pure and simple, and thus offering me a scope of activity worth while to give one's life to it, whilst on the other hand it will provide me with the material means placing me for the rest of my life above the question of מה נובל
> If you think so, I will come, though it will take some time as already indicated, before I shall be able to give notice here. In short, I wish to come, if you and your friends in America really want me. [18]

A few months later however, the reorganization had begun, and Sulzberger was able to write confidently to Schechter, "We are dealing with entirely different circumstances, and I am inclined to be more trustful and to assume all reasonable risks."[19] With the reorganization of the Seminary, the new board agreed that Cyrus Adler should be the president of the trustees, while Schechter should be named president of the faculty. This arrangement, it was felt, would relieve Schechter of the administrative burdens of the institution, allowing him more time for teaching, as well as for his own studies. Schechter enthusiastically welcomed this plan and wrote to Adler, "Be assured that I shall have you as a colleague in the whole work we are going to undertake."[20] One of the stipulations of the new board, probably due to its own heterogeneity, was that the Seminary not be subject to denominational commitments or party politics. Schechter himself had expressed similar views in his earliest correspondence, and in October, 1901, wrote to Adler:

> You know my conservative tendencies, both in life and thought, but I am thoroughly convinced that, if the Seminary is to become a real blessing, it must not be degraded as a battle-ground for parties. It must above all give direction to both Orthodox and Reform.[21]

It is of interest that the most influential of the new supporters and trustees of the Seminary were wealthy German Reform Jews. Schiff, Marshall, and Lewisohn were all active members of Temple Emanu-El of New York, and all continued to support the Hebrew Union College as well. However, their interest in the Seminary was motivated by two significant factors: their particular interest in Jewish life in their own city of New York, and even more important, their conviction that it would be the more traditionally oriented Seminary, rather than the Hebrew Union College, which would be instrumental in "Americanizing" the Eastern Euro-

pean immigrants who were coming to New York by the millions.

The negotiations now proceeded rapidly, and on November 24, 1901, Sulzberger was able to telegraph Adler in Washington, "Schechter Accepts Presidency!" Schechter, not usually credited with having been the most practical of men, nevertheless set a number of conditions to his acceptance, and these were approved by the board. He asked that he not be required to teach more than five hours a week. He explained to Sulzberger:

> There is no need to tell you that I do not mean to stop at five hours. With the help of heaven, I shall devote myself to the Institution, but it must be to the life of a scholar. The whole teaching must be of the highest quality, for which careful preparation is required.

Schechter also agreed on a salary of $5,000 and a house; "This item requires no special reason. I simply want a little עולם הזה when I get older as so many of us do." He also stipulated, with a characteristic mixture of humor and seriousness, that

> . . . The appointment must be for life, not 'for a number of years,' and some arrangement should also be made for a pension to my wife and children in the case I should die. . . It is too bad that even I should have to think--in spite of all my immortality--of death; but this is the lot of every married man before his children are provided for.[22]

Schechter and his family arrived in New York in April, 1902. While he was not formally scheduled to take up his new duties until the autumn, he immediately began drafting his own plans for the Seminary. His firm conviction that traditional Judaism was vibrant and ever-growing was given expression in one of his first official acts, selecting a new seal for the Seminary. He chose the symbol of the burning bush from the Bible, with the motto וסנה איננו אכל "And The Bush Was Not Consumed."

****

The choice of Isaac Mayer Wise's successor at the Hebrew Union College was not as clear-cut as the situation at the Seminary seemed to be. Upon Wise's death on March 26, 1900, the HUC Board of Governors decided that the presidency should be filled temporarily by the revered Moses Mielziner. A veteran faculty member, Mielziner had served as professor of Talmud at the College since 1879. A widely respected scholar who was a pioneer in modern methodology for Talmud study in America, he was seventy-two years old when he assumed the post. However, his advanced age and failing health prevented him from exercising strong leadership during this crucial period for the College. While Mielziner ordained three classes of rabbis, the student body began to dwindle, until by 1903 there were only half as many students as there had been five years earlier.[23]

During the three years of Mielziner's "temporary" presidency, the board carried on extensive negotiations to seek a permanent successor. There were apparently those who felt that the board was procrastinating. In April, 1902, Rabbi Joseph Stolz, of Chicago, an 1884 HUC alumnus, wrote to Bernhard Bettmann, president of the board, complaining that there had already been too much of a delay in finding a new man. Bettmann's reply, dated April 12, thanked Stolz for his letter, "as it so clearly shows your deep interest in the College."[24] Bettmann then proceeded to report on the progress, or lack of it, which had been made. He wrote that the board had been in communication for "more than 18 months" with the famous English scholar Israel Abrahams:

> . . . He was almost ready to accept the proffered presidency, he repeatedly asked for the time necessary to await

> the decision of the Cambridge authorities, and like ourselves you will be sorry to learn that after all this, and after we all felt sure that he would come, the enclosed letter [from Abrahams] shattered our hopes and destroyed at once all the work of so many months. He declines reluctantly, but he declines.[25]

The parallels between the HUC and JTS situations at this point are rather striking. Schechter and Abrahams were together the two leading Jewish scholars in England. At the time, Abrahams was senior tutor of Jews College in London. From late 1900 through 1902, both of these men were involved in negotiations with the respective American institutions. However, the "decision of the Cambridge authorities" which Abrahams was awaiting apparently concerned the very position that Schechter then occupied and was evidently going to give up. Indeed, with Schechter's formal acceptance of the Seminary position in November, 1901, Abrahams did in fact receive the appointment of reader in Rabbinic and Talmudic Literature as Schechter's successor! After discussing the disappointment with Abrahams, Bettmann, in the same April, 1902, letter to Stolz, asked for the rabbi's advice:

> Now do <u>you</u> know of anybody that can be secured and who is worthy to wear the mantle of our lamented Dr. Wise? So much has been achieved that the Board is unanimous in holding that the new President must not be in charge of a Congregation [as Wise had been] but devote his entire time to the College. If you think of any one, please let me hear from you as early as possible . . .[26]

Following the negotiations with the scholar Abrahams, the board now turned to seek a man who had broad experience as a congregational rabbi, one whose practical knowledge of administration would set the College on a solid foundation. In October, 1902, Bettmann officially contacted Rabbi J. Leonard Levy, of Pittsburgh, to offer him the position.[27] Levy, also English-born, was an 1885 graduate of Jews College and in America had become a leading Reform rabbi and community leader. However, he had just

accepted the pulpit of Rodeph Shalom Temple a few months earlier and declined the HUC offer, not willing to give up his new position immediately.

The board's final choice would seem to have been a natural one in the first place. The name of Dr. Kaufmann Kohler was submitted for consideration at a joint meeting of the Board of Governors and members of the HUC Alumni Association in St. Louis, in January, 1903.[28] Kohler combined the scholarly qualifications of Abrahams and the practical experience of Levy. A son-in-law of David Einhorn, Kohler had been rabbi of Temple Beth El in New York for twenty-four years and had long been one of the leading champions of Reform Judaism in America. Most important, Kaufmann Kohler was a widely respected scholar, on a par with Solomon Schechter.

In the first week of February, 1903, Abraham Bloom, a member of the HUC Board of Governors, visited Kohler in New York to inform him of the proposal. Kohler expressed deep interest, and on February 11, Bettmann wrote to him officially offering the position:

> . . . Your long and illustrious career as one of the foremost leaders in the reform movement of American Judaism makes us feel that you are in full accord with us upon the following two propositions, which, as the trustees of an institution supported by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, we deem it of the utmost importance at this time to establish and proclaim:
>
> First: That the Hebrew Union College, in addition to being a permanent seat of Jewish learning in all branches, shall forever continue to be the exponent of American Reform Judaism as taught and expounded by its immortal founder, Isaac M. Wise, and his illustrious co-workers.
>
> Second: That the independent and separate existence of the Hebrew Union College for the purpose of educating Rabbis and teachers, who shall expound the principles of American Reform Judaism, is imperative . . .[29]

This second condition is of particular interest. It must be remem-

bered that at this point, Schechter had just been inaugurated in New York, and the Seminary had become the recipient of a $500,000 endowment fund through the support of Jacob Schiff. There was apparently some renewed talk of merging the two institutions. The board evidently felt it necessary to make it clear that such was not their intention. In fact, in Bettmann's original draft of the February 11th letter to Kohler, the second proposition was stated quite differently:

> Second: That in accordance with the above declarations and in view of the recent liberal endowment of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, which institution openly proclaims its purpose to perpetuate in this country the old-time, rigid, unyielding orthodoxy, against which, without surrendering one iota of the underlying eternal truths of Judaism, we have successfully waged war during the last half-century, the separate and independent existence of the Hebrew Union College has become an absolute necessity, though we also wish to proclaim herewith our desire to maintain with the said institution the most friendly relations which will not involve the sacrifice of principle on either side.[30]

Apparently, the board felt that Bettmann's original statement was too vehement. Kohler received the amended letter, and replied on February 15:

> In reply I would state that I highly appreciate the great honor conferred upon me by your esteemed Board in extending to me a call to fill the position of President of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, made illustrious by the immortal founder and first President of the College, the sainted Dr. I. M. Wise.
>
> Deeply conscious of the confidence placed in me by this choice, I do not hesitate to say that the field of activity thereby opened to me would be most congenial to my taste and in harmony with my highest aims and aspirations; in fact, I would consider the opportunity given me to devote all my energies to the great task of educating and equipping young men for the sacred profession of rabbis and teachers in American Israel as the crowning work of my life.[31]

Kohler's response to the two propositions of the board must have convinced them that they had chosen the right man:

> I fully share your view regarding the need of an institution of Jewish learning which stands uncompromisingly and

> consistently for those principles of Reform and Progress, advocated by Drs. Geiger, Einhorn and Wise (זכרונם לברכה), which made American Judaism a power in this free country, and which offers to the American Jewish Congregations a certain guaranty that they will have, as exponents of our sacred heritage, men who have both the courage of their opinion and the equipment to proclaim and defend these liberal views in full accordance with the historical development of Judaism.[32]

The board's stipulations and Kohler's strong concurrence with regard to the religious position of the College offer a striking contrast to the neutral position agreed upon by Schechter and the JTS board during their negotiations.

Kohler made it clear that, despite his keen interest, he could make no definite commitment until he had consulted his congregation. In the meantime, arrangements were made for the candidate to come to Cincinnati to meet personally with the board and to inspect the College. Kohler arrived in the city on February 17, and met with the selection committee the following day. Afterwards, Bettmann made the following report:

> After an exhaustive and most friendly exchange of opinions and full discussion of all points concerned with the Rev. gentleman, your Committee has unanimously agreed to submit to you the following:
>
> We respectfully recommend that the Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College extend to Rev. Dr. Kaufmann Kohler of New York City a call to the Presidency of the College . . .[33]

On February 19, the board unanimously elected Kohler to the post, stipulating a salary of $6000 a year. On February 24, Kohler wrote to Solomon Sulzberger, president of Temple Beth El, officially informing him of his decision to accept. He submitted his resignation, much to the sorrow of the congregation, at a meeting on March 3, and on March 5, wrote to the Board of Governors, formally accepting the presidency.

Kaufmann Kohler had been born in Fürth, Bavaria, on May 10, 1843, to an old German rabbinical family. He began his own Jewish studies as

a child and undertook advanced work in his teenage years under various leading rabbis. From 1858 to 1862, he studied in Mainz and afterward at the yeshivah in Altona under Rabbi Jacob Ettlinger. In 1862, Kohler enrolled in the Gymnasium at Frankfurt to pursue his secular studies and continued his rabbinical preparation under Samson Raphael Hirsch, the famous champion of German Neo-Orthodoxy. From Frankfurt, Kohler went on to Berlin and Erlangen for his university training and received his doctorate in 1867. His university studies were a turning point in his life, drawing him away from the strict orthodoxy he had been raised in and had practiced under Hirsch. Kohler's doctoral thesis, "Der Segen Jacobs," reflected the strong influence of contemporary German biblical criticism and was denounced by his former teachers. In 1869, having been recommended by Abraham Geiger, Kohler accepted the pulpit of Congregation Beth El in Detroit and came to the United States. In 1871, he moved to Sinai Congregation in Chicago and, in 1879, succeeded his father-in-law David Einhorn as rabbi of Temple Beth El in New York.

Kohler had been one of the forceful leaders of "radical" Reform in America. It was he who convened the Pittsburgh rabbinical conference in 1885, and the adopted "platform," which had led immediately to the secession of the traditional rabbis and the birth of the Jewish Theological Seminary, was based largely on his original draft. Most significantly, Kohler had been a firm opponent of both Isaac Mayer Wise and the Hebrew Union College in its early years. Kohler felt that Wise's theological neutrality and relatively conservative approach to Reform was treason to the movement's cause. The hostility between the two men had been evident at the Cleveland rabbinical conference in 1855 and lasted for well over twenty-five years. In 1876, Kohler was among Wise's opponents who pro-

posed to open in New York another rabbinical seminary--which Wise mockingly called the Hebrew "Disunion College." However, as the Cincinnati institution progressed and Wise's leadership in the movement became more broadly established, the antipathy between the two cooled. In 1883, Kohler was invited by Wise to examine HUC's first ordination class. He was impressed with the accomplishments of Wise's first students and took part in the first ordination ceremony on June 20, 1883. Publicly addressing Wise, he practically apologized for his earlier opposition:

> . . . I hail the opportunity offered of expressing my deep and sincere recognition and admiration of what you have achieved. As I recall the many difficulties you had to cope with, the many drawbacks and obstacles you had to overcome, the fears and aprehensions you had to dispel, I can not but say: The Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valor! Behold, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, opposed from all sides, is an established fact, a power working for the good of Israel. The College, its bright jewel, at first looked at with sneers and skepticism, has stood the test. It has gone through its critical teething period. It stands there as an ornament of American Judaism, a foundation of hope for the future, a testimony of religious zeal and devotion, by its intrinsic value and usefulness outshining any other institution of liberal-hearted American Israel![34]

The taste of victory must have been sweet for Wise at this moment in view of his former opponent's praises, and yet there is historical irony in that twenty years later Kohler would be his successor.

Throughout his rabbinical career in America, and particularly during his presidency of the College, Kohler pursued his scholarly interests, publishing numerous articles and books, and serving on the editorial board of the Jewish Encyclopedia. He commanded the great respect of other leading scholars, including Schechter, and indeed, if the HUC Board of Governors had consciously sought an "equal" to the new Seminary head, they found one in Kohler.

The difficult task of finding a successor to the Founder of Hebrew Union College was now accomplished. Bernhard Bettmann was able to state at Kohler's inauguration in October, 1903, that "With Dr. Wise and Mielziner of blessed memory, the era of construction has passed, and now the period of development begins . . ."

****

The two men who had now become acknowledged leaders of American Jewry were not strangers to each other. Schechter and Kohler met for the first time in 1901 when Kohler, travelling in England, paid a special visit to Schechter in Cambridge. Schechter later recalled the meeting:

> . . . There is no scarcity in that ancient seat of learning, 'full of sages and scribes,' of learned conversation. But the day with Dr. Kohler was one of the most delightful I have ever experienced in that place. The day was spent in roaming over the contents of the Genizah and in conversation. Our thoughts were turned to Judaism and the subjects which occupied our minds were all of a theological or historical nature. We probably differed in a good many points, and please God we shall differ in many more--but this did not prevent our short acquaintance from ripening at once into what might approach friendship. I felt that I was in the presence of a scholar and a seeker after truth . . .[35]

Kohler for his part, eulogizing Schechter fifteen years later, also had fond memories of their first encounter:

> I was privileged to spend a glorious day with him at Cambridge, and we both found that, notwithstanding all our difference of opinion, we had so much in common, and that we felt especially deeply concerned in the imperative need of a positive Jewish theology for our time, the importance of which is so lamentably underrated by the average Jewish scholar. . . . He then looked eagerly forward to the larger field soon to be opened for him on American soil . . . and I, on my part, indulged in the dream of working side by side with him in New York like Hillel and Shammai with the maxim: 'Both views echo the voice of the living God.' Providence ordained it otherwise. Our spheres of activity led us far asunder.

> During the first year of his stay in New York our relations were of the friendliest nature, nay, I may say, intimate, sweetened by an almost daily intercourse and exchange of views on scientific and religious questions. Later on, our mutual friendship and esteem was never diminished nor interfered with by occasional public controversies carried on for the sake of the cause we both held dear and sacred, and prompted only by love of God and truth. . . .[36]

When Schechter accepted the presidency of the Seminary in 1901, he wrote to Kohler personally, telling him of his decision. Kohler, at the time one of the leading New York rabbis, was especially happy at the thought of Schechter coming to the city. He wrote to Jacob Schiff that he was "greatly heartened" by the development; "Schechter's coming is the beginning of a new epoch for American Jewry."[37] Kohler also took the opportunity of expressing his admiration of Schiff himself, for his recent service to New York Jewry in his generous support of the Seminary. A year later, when Kohler accepted the presidency of HUC, a banquet was given in his honor by the Judeans of New York, on March 26, 1903. The principal speaker was Schechter:

> We have to create a really living, great literature, and do the same for the subjects of theology and the Bible that Europe has done for Jewish history and philology. It is in view of this fact that I hail Dr. Kohler's election to the Presidency of the Hebrew Union College as a happy event in the annals of American Jewry; for under his guidance I am sure Cincinnati will, in good time, contribute its share to this great 'battle of duty.' Some amiable persons predict jealousy and strife between the two colleges, and are already to enjoy the fight as disinterested spectators. I am certain that they will prove false prophets, for the old dictum that the students of Torah increase peace in the world, holds good also in our day. . . .[38]

While Schechter admitted that there were substantial differences between himself and Kohler, as well as between the two institutions, they were both united in the cause of Judaism:

> . . . and Dr. Kohler, by his wide learning, contagious enthusiasm and noble character, is the right man in the

> right place to marshal a part of these forces, which may, by the blessing of God, help us to victory.[39]

When Jacob Schiff's new building for the Seminary was dedicated on April 26, 1903, Kohler was invited to deliver one of the principal addresses:

> I am not quite sure in my mind whether it is in my capacity as President-Elect of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, or as a personal friend of Professor Schechter, that I have been honored by the distinction of being selected as one of the speakers on this festive occasion. In either capacity, I am glad of the opportunity of extending my sincere congratulations, first of all to the Jewish community of this metropolis, upon this beautiful seat of Jewish learning which adds a new, bright gem to her crown. . . . Ever since I met Professor Schechter in Cambridge there has grown a feeling of friendship and mutual regard between us, based upon a conviction strong in us both; that we have a field of labor in common which has been sorely neglected by all who wrote on Jew and Judaism, and that is a systematic Jewish theology. . . .

Kohler concluded with an expression of what he hoped the new relationship between the College and the Seminary would be:

> . . . the two Jewish institutions of learning, the one here with its conservative tendency, and the other, in the West, with its outspoken Reform principle, will soon stand forth, well-equipped and well-supported, the pride and joy of every Jew in the land, the equals of any similar theological school of other creeds. So will the Torah be a "Tree of Life" to all that support it, and a fount of blessing to all whose names are linked with its modes of propagation. May then, God's full grace and blessing rest upon the Jewish Theological Seminary, and may He whose name is glorified in this house cause friendship and peace, harmony and fraternal feeling to dwell here and in every heart that seeks truth, so that East and West, Conservative and Reform, Jew and Gentile, may be made One by the knowledge of Him who is One. . . .[40]

On October 12, 1903, a week before Kohler's inauguration, Schechter wrote him a long letter. It is evident that by that time, the two had become fast friends:

> We are all delighted to hear that you feel so well in Cincinnati, and that your new sphere of activity brings

> you so much satisfaction. If I were a little more selfish I would of course wish that you would feel sometimes some homesickness for New York, so that we could meet more often.

Schechter continued, offering his apologies at being unable to attend the inauguration. Apparently, the HUC Board of Governors had not invited him, and Schechter felt that this was intentional. A personal invitation from Kohler himself arrived too late:

> I should have liked nothing better than to have been present at יום שמחת לבך. You know my regard for you and my attachement to you and your dear family, and that I was always anxious to show you all the honor which was in my power, and which such a real "Talmud חכם" and a genuine gentleman like you deserves. But I gave up all hope of receiving an invitation when I saw in the papers that those who are responsible for the arrangement of the exercises had no room for the President of the Faculty of the New York Institution. I tell you that I felt it very strongly. And thus giving up all hope of seeing you soon, I made various arrangements which cannot be any more postponed. . . . Of course I could have made different arrangements if your committee would have honored me, in due time, with their official invitation to take part in the exercises. I am unfortunately not a private man, and can only have gone as a representative of our Seminary and participating in the programme. . . .
>
> You see that I am quite frank with you, as I do not want that there should remain a טינא שבלב. And thus, my dear friend, accept herewith all my best wishes. May God give you long life, good health, and all the success in your Institution as you yourself desire. May your family be happy together with you and rejoice in your joy. With sincere regards to you, Mrs. Kohler, the Misses Kohler and Mr. Edgar, whom I wish a speedy recovery, I remain
>
> Your old friend,
> S. Schechter[41]

Schechter's disappointment over the inauguration invitation was to be compensated for a decade later, when the Board of Governors invited him to deliver one of the principal addresses at the dedication of HUC's new campus in 1913. The Schechter-Kohler friendship was to continue throughout the remainder of their lives. Indeed, the relationship between the Seminary and the College has never been as cordial or productive as it was during their terms of office.

CHAPTER III

Solomon Schechter was formally inaugurated as President of the Faculty of the Jewish Theological Seminary on Thursday evening, November 20, 1902. The ceremonies were held in the auditorium of the Young Men's Hebrew Association on 92nd street in New York and were attended by a broad cross-section of the city's massive Jewish community. Of special interest was the roster of guests of honor, who were selected to sit on the speaker's platform, "as complete a gathering of various shades of opinion and belief as could have been obtained even if the result had been premeditated."[42] The leaders of the Seminary, Bernard Drachman and Henry Pereira Mendes, both Orthodox rabbis, sat side by side with the prominent Reformers Gustav Gottheil, Emil G. Hirsch, Henry Berkowitz and Kohler, then still rabbi of Temple Beth-El. Moses Mielziner, then acting-president of HUC, had been invited to participate, but was unable to make the trip from Cincinnati. He sent the following message, which was read to the assemblage by Cyrus Adler:

> . . . It is my sincere wish that the Seminary may prosper and flourish under the leadership of so eminent a scholar who has been called to preside over it. The Hebrew Union College, which at present I have the honor to represent, will always view the prosperity of its younger sister institution without jealousy, for, though our ways and methods may differ in some respects, the aim and object of both institutions are the same--the maintenance of Judaism and the cultivation and propagation of Jewish learning.[43]

After an introductory address by Adler, the new president of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, Schechter was introduced and rose to speak. The inaugural address, entitled "The Charter of the Seminary,"

lasted over an hour and appears to have deeply impressed the audience:

> He read from manuscript, often finding it difficult to decipher his own handwriting. He leant upon the stand before him and turned away many times to drink water. He had no gestures except that of pointing his index finger at the audience and moving it up and down to emphasize his remarks. His accent was decidedly foreign, but one became accustomed to it. His rhetoric was excellent, his sentences being crisp, epigrammatic, definite and admirable in every respect. When he made a point he paused, he glanced at his hearers and noted its effect, especially on those who were seated on the platform. . . . The address was filled to the brim with sagacity and satire, humor and erudition, sincerity and hopefulness, dogmatism and liberality. . . . American Judaism was in need of such a message, and especially from such a man. . . .44

Schechter opened his address with the observation that the Jewish community of New York was like the first man, Adam, whose body the Rabbis said was composed of clay from the four corners of the earth. In a community which was as large and diverse as any Jewish center in the world, the Seminary was called upon to be "all things to all men, reconciling all parties and appealing to all sections of the community." Schechter declared from the outset that it was indeed his intention that the Seminary should never become "partisan ground or a hotbed of polemics." The purpose of the study of the Torah was to "anticipate the mission of Elijah" in bringing peace to the world.

The main body of the address was devoted to Schechter's interpretation or "Midrash" of the newly adopted Charter of the Seminary:

> The Jewish Theological Seminary of America was incorporated by a law of the State of New York, approved February 20, 1902, for the perpetuation of the tenets of the Jewish religion, the cultivation of Hebrew literature, the pursuit of Biblical and archaeological research, the advancement of Jewish scholarship, the establishment of a library and for the education and training of Jewish rabbis and teachers.45

Schechter maintained that "scholarship" at the Seminary would be

understood as a "thorough and accurate knowledge of Jewish literature, or at least of parts of it." He emphasized the need for accuracy and detail in study, which, while difficult and even tiresome, was the only true way to acquire knowledge. Schechter was clearly setting for his new students standards based on his own painstaking and demanding approach to study. These high academic standards however, had a very practical motivation:

> . . . I am sure that we will all agree that ignorance of the language of the sacred literature of Israel in persons undertaking to teach Judaism has by no means any claim on our forbearance as the vagary of genius, and has to be opposed as objectionable and pernicious.

The new president went on to define one important way in which the Seminary would differ from the traditional Orthodox yeshiva. He spoke of the danger of "artificial ignorance," the refusal to confront the philosophies and issues of the modern world. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had produced various movements and revolutions in thought and action, which could not be argued away by silence. While many of the intellectual trends of the day brought disaster and decay, particularly in Jewish life, none of them in the end would fail to have some beneficial effect on the development of Jewish Science. Schechter recalled the Karaite schism which, despite the violent breach it wrought in Judaism, nevertheless had proved to be the impetus for an unprecedented study of biblical grammar and exegesis. "Thus, these movements may all contain grains and germs of truth, or at least may provide the nidus for the further development of truth, and with all this, the student must be made acquainted."

Schechter further defined his concept of scholarship:

> The crown and climax of all learning is research. The object of this searching is truth--that truth which gives

> unity to history and harmony to the phenomena of nature, and brings order into a universe in which the naked eye perceives only strife and chance.

In pursuing this truth, the student must not only study the old sources, but must also be ever open to new ideas and fresh fields of exploration. It was in this development of new approaches to the ancient literature that each generation could make its distinctive contribution to Jewish learning. Indeed, Schechter paraphrased the Rabbinic maxim regarding the rebuilding of the Temple, stating that

> every age which has not made some essential contribution to the erection of the Temple of Truth and real Wissenschaft is bound to look upon itself as if it had been instrumental in its demolition. For it is these fresh contributions and the opening of new sources, with the new currents they create, that keep the intellectual and the spiritual atmosphere in motion and impart to it life and vigor.

Having discussed his philosophy of the Seminary as a place of learning, Schechter proceeded to define his view of what the goals of the institution should be as a training school for the Jewish ministry. The most important function of the rabbi is to teach Judaism;

> he should accordingly receive such a training as to enable him to say: 'I regard nothing Jewish as foreign to me.' He should know everything Jewish--Bible, Talmud, Midrash, Liturgy, Jewish ethics and Jewish philosophy; Jewish history and Jewish mysticism, and even Jewish folklore. None of these subjects, with its various ramifications, should be entirely strange to him.

Observing that most of the actions and even aspirations of men are primarily "nothing else but organized traditions; our thoughts nothing else but reminiscences, conscious and unconscious," the modern rabbi cannot neglect any part of our great intellectual bequest, "but at a serious risk of peril." It was with this caveat in mind that Schechter said he had drawn up the new curriculum for the Seminary. He emphasized, however, a point which has since become the basic philosophy of all modern

rabbinic education:

> We cannot, naturally, hope to carry the student through all these vast fields of learning at the cultivation of which humanity has now worked for nearly four thousand years. But this fact must not prevent us from making the attempt to bring the students on terms of acquaintance at least with all those manifestations of Jewish life and Jewish thought which may prove useful to them as future ministers, and suggestive and stimulating to them as prospective scholars.

Schechter then continued, moving on to what was certainly the most "delicate point" regarding his leadership of the Seminary--its religious approach. He admitted that it probably would have been more prudent to avoid this question altogether, but "life hardly would be worth living without occasional blundering." In firm and uncompromising terms, Schechter declared that

> . . . the religion in which the Jewish ministry should be trained must be specifically and purely Jewish, without any alloy or adulteration. Judaism must stand or fall by that which distinguishes it from other religions as well as by that which it has in common with them. Judaism is <u>not</u> a religion which does not oppose itself to anything in particular. Judaism is opposed to any number of things, and says distinctly 'thou shalt not.' It permeates the whole of your life. It demands control over all your actions, and interferes even with your menu. It sanctifies the seasons, and regulates your history, both in the past and in the future. Above all, it teaches that disobedience is the strength of sin. It insists upon the observance both of the spirit and of the letter. . . . In a word, Judaism is absolutely incompatible with the abandonment of the Torah.

In his views on the Seminary's approach to modern philosophy and research, Schechter delineated what its distinction from Orthodoxy would be. He now underscored his differences with contemporary Reform Judaism. Quoting his hero Lincoln, Schechter reminded his listeners that

> we cannot escape history . . . . The past, with its long chain of events, with its woes and joys, with its tragedies and romances, with its customs and usages, and above all, with its bequest of the Torah . . . , has become an

> integral and inalienable part of ourselves. . . . We must make an end to these constant amputations if we do not wish to see the body of Israel bleed to death before our very eyes. We must leave off talking about Occidentalizing our religion--as if the Occident has ever shown the least genius for religion--or freeing the conscience by abolishing various laws. . . . Those who are entrusted with carrying out the purpose of this institution, which, as you have seen, aims at the perpetuation of the tenets of the Jewish religion, both pupils and masters, must faithfully and manfully maintain their loyalty to the Torah. There is no other Jewish religion but that taught by the Torah and confirmed by history and tradition, and sunk into the conscience of Catholic Israel.

If however, the Seminary was to be committed to tradition, it would nevertheless welcome differing viewpoints and opinions. Schechter observed that Judaism had always been able to accommodate diversity and individuality, but warned that "any attempt to place the centre of gravity outside of the Torah must end in disaster."

Apart from the academic and spiritual preparation of the rabbinic student, Schechter also spoke of the importance of a rabbi's training in "the subject called Life." The Seminary's education of its students could not only be measured in terms of scholarship. While the modern rabbi should neither seek to appropriate nor be exclusively entrusted with the "deeds of lovingkindness" incumbent upon every Jew, he nevertheless had to have some expertise in the pastoral functions of congregational life. While there was a time when many of these functions were performed by the community as a whole, they had in modern times become largely the responsibility of the rabbi. Schechter did not approve of the trend toward a specialized "rabbihood," but felt that his students should still be prepared to fulfill this vital role effectively.

Schechter closed his address with a solemn charge to both the Seminary and American Jewry as a whole. He observed that as Jewish life in Eastern Europe continued to decline through persecution and hardship, the

West, particularly America, would become the new world center of Jewish life and learning. The responsibilities and challenges thus entailed were enormous--and only the future would determine if the Jews of America could fulfill their historic task. And yet, Schechter said, "The true Israelite is he who, in his discontent, thirsts always for the future, and the race is not yet ready to fail. By the help of God we shall not fail."

A week after the inauguration, Mayer Sulzberger wrote to Jacob Schiff, regarding the address:

> . . . It is not only a masterly production in the way of thought and diction, but it seems to me to be an event that may mark off a new epoch. Its firm convictions, wide outlook, broad tolerance, combined with unflinching war against error, signalize the rise of American Jewry to a higher plane. . . .46

****

Kaufmann Kohler's inauguration as the second president of the Hebrew Union College was held on Sunday afternoon, October 18, 1903. The ceremonies took place in Cincinnati's Mound Street Temple, in whose vestry rooms the College's first classes had been conducted twenty-eight years before. Nothing of the diversity which had marked the assembly at Schechter's installation was evident. The official participants were all leading Reform rabbis and officers of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The majority of the audience present were members of Cincinnati's Reform temples. Bernhard Bettmann spoke for the Board of Governors, and Samuel Woolner, president of the Union, brought the greetings of the patron organization. Other speakers were Kohler's brother-in-law, the Chicago rabbi Emil G. Hirsch; Joseph Stolz, representing the

College alumni; and Gotthard Deutsch, for the faculty. The ceremonies in general appear to have had more of a "liturgical" character than the Seminary's exercises a year earlier. Whereas Schechter had been inducted in the public hall of a secular Jewish organization, the Kohler ceremonies were conducted in a synagogue, with choral renditions of appropriate Hebrew prayers and hymns. It may very well be that the Seminary intentionally avoided using any of the local synagogues, which by inference would have connected the institution with a particular denominational viewpoint. At that stage, as Schechter had emphasized, the Seminary was not yet the exponent of any particular party line. The "Y" was the neutral, common meeting ground for the entire Jewish community. The Hebrew Union College however, had no such reservations about its affiliation. It was clearly a Reform institution--as the words of the president were to confirm unequivocally.

Kohler's address was entitled "What a Jewish Institution of Learning Should Be." He opened with a capsule statement of the underlying principle of his presidency:

> It is the diadem of the Torah, the crown of Jewish learning, that I long to see again placed upon the brow of modern Israel. 'The Torah is thy life and the length of thy days.' The Torah, the fount of light and joy, the comfort and mainstay of the Jew in darkest time and amid direst distress, must again occupy the central place in our hearts and homes and be rendered the life-center of the Jewish community.
>
> With the Torah as the rallying point of the race, the Jew is unconquerable and irresistible; without it he is bound to go down and be lost. . . . The Torah establishes his claim as the God-chosen servant of humanity. . . . To the promotion and propagation of the Torah, to the sending forth of the Testimony, the message of Israel's God sealed upon the lips of disciples, I shall, under God's guidance, consecrate my life and my labors for the rest of my days.

After declaring this commitment to the Torah as the foundation of

the College's work, Kohler proceeded to define what he meant by "Torah." In the modern age, with its revolutionary challenges to traditional faith, the younger generation of American Jews had religious needs very different from those of their parents. This new generation would not tolerate brilliant but empty oratory from the pulpit; they wanted and needed above all else power from their Judaism. The Torah as the source of power was a recurring theme throughout the address:

> Whence then, should come the power to the preacher unless he has drunk deeply at the fount of Jewish knowledge, unless the Beth ha Midrash, the institution of learning, represents, above all power. 'The Torah is nothing if not power, victory-boding strength.'

In the traditional Judaism of the past, every aspect of one's life was regulated by the Talmud and the Shulchan Aruch, which gave the Jew "the intellectual and moral fibre to brave life's struggles and temptations nobly." Today, however, the Talmud could no longer be the exclusive source of religious inspiration and guidance. And yet, most of the Jewish theological schools in the world still maintained

> all possible stress and value upon these barren Halakic subjects, the divine origin and character of which are believed in neither by teacher nor pupil, whereas the essentials of the Jewish faith, the great religious and philosophical questions of the age, Divine Revelation and Authority, Inspiration and Higher Criticism, the relation of science to faith, of comparative religion or of Christianity to Judaism, are timidly shunned as a 'Noli Me Tangere!'--'Touch me not.'

Consequently, the men who had been educated at these seminaries, while perhaps adept in some obscure scholarly subject, were not equipped to deal with the spiritual needs of their people: "They lack the power of a great, all-enrapturing, all-vivifying truth. There is nothing of the prophetic spirit in them to make Judaism a power for an age weakened by doubt and chilled by apathy." Kohler said that this shortcoming in

the Orthodox rabbinate was the cause of the "sad state" of religious life in Europe.

The new president then defined his view of how modern rabbinic education must meet the challenges of the day:

> The theological school must be the power-house to supply pulpit and people with the dynamic force of an all-ruling, all-electrifying religious truth. It is not enough that Bible and Talmud, Halakah and Haggadah, Hellenic and Arabic literature, Philosophy and Cabala, History and Literature, Liturgy and Homiletics be taught; they must all be turned into vitalizing sparks of truth. They must all be transformed into spiritual helps and lifts to unfold the inherent power of Judaism in its manifold stages and phases of growth. It is in this light that each teacher, by showing the organic connection, the inner relations between his branch of study and the others, can single out the potencies, the spiritual, moral and intellectual kernel beneath the shell, and so lay bare the deeper impulses and show the higher motives that gave lasting value and zest to each specific study and movement. In other words, the theological curriculum must mean not the registration, but the profound appreciation, of all the religious forces that were at work throughout the various ages and lands, while at the same time our own religious needs and our own religious consciousness should form the object of our foremost solicitude.

The conveying of the power and spiritual force of the Jewish tradition was clearly Kohler's idea of the primary purpose of the College. The entire rabbinic curriculum was to be designed with this goal in mind:

> There is a wealth of spiritual and ethical thought buried in the Midrash and Talmud which must be turned into power, whereas at present it is treated as dead matter. But in like manner, do most of the branches of Jewish learning wait for the creative mind that extracts from them the element of power. Let but the human side, the moral sentiment, the deeper life-problem in Jewish history or any of the Rabbinical, philosophical or mystic writings be touched, and the driest subjects become interesting, instructive and fascinating.

While the Jewish theological school was bound to search for the power within the traditional sources, it also had a major responsibility to confront the problems and issues of the contemporary world. Kohler

denied that Higher Biblical Criticism or Comparative Religion were detrimental to Judaism. However, these crucial questions indeed made a complete reevaluation of priorities necessary:

> The issue today is no longer between Reform and Orthodoxy, but between a world with God and a world without God. How, then, can the destinies of homes and communities, the guardianship of souls and the future of Humanity be entrusted to men who, in a time when the foundations of morality are shaken and the peace of the world quivers under the fierce contest of ideas, lack power and principle, wavering and oscillating between agnosticism and belief, between Judaism and Unitarianism and a dozen other isms, because, immature in judgement, they have eaten of the unripe fruit of the tree of knowledge only to expose their own nakedness of soul?

Kohler declared that Reform Judaism especially must be a source of power, "the faith of manhood." The courage and conviction of the early Reformers should provide an example of men of power, of principle, "who brooked no compromise and never yielded." Orthodoxy, on the other hand, could not fulfill this need:

> It is Romanticism that wants picturesqueness; that renders Judaism and Synagog a museum of antiquities, preserving the forms of the past fossilized while the spirit has fled long ago. Such conservatism fails to engender power, because it lacks conviction; it only creates hypocrites, men that halt between the two sides.

Reform alone could provide the power and strength of conviction necessary for the modern Jew. It rejected ceremonialism and legalism and declared Judaism to be "not a system of laws and statutes, but the law of truth and righteousness." Most important, the power of Reform Judaism would reclaim "the entire so-called Christian civilization" for its own. In a subtle attack on Zionism, Kohler asserted that Reform:

> . . . does not plan a retreat before the foe by way of East Africa or Asia. . . . Reform Judaism is hated and feared most by the anti-Semite, because it is aggressive. It refuses to simply take the defensive. It wants to assert its power; neither shall it rest, until the whole

> history of the world will have been reconstructed on the principle of evolution, which beholds in Christianity as well as in Islamism, offshoots of a world-conquering Judaism.

Kohler proceeded to develop this point in the next part of his address. He decried the neglect of Jewish learning by Jews, who excelled in almost every other area of scholarship. The result of this situation was a great scarcity of competent, scientific literature on Jewish life and thought outside the talmudic sphere. Whole crucial areas of study, such as Hellenistic literature and the Apocrypha, essential sources of the Jewish influence in western civilization, were unkown to most Jewish academicians. And even worse, non-Jews had taken the lead in the study and translation of Jewish literature. It was no wonder, then, that so little credit was given the Jewish contribution to world history and culture. It was now "high time to reclaim what is our own." The modern Jew had to move away from the narrow circle of Rabbinic literature and devote his studies to Judaism in all its phases and stages of development. Again, it was Reform which could restore to Judaism its true "cosmopolitanism," once again making the Jewish people "the banner-bearer of the light of a truth for all peoples." To accomplish this prophetic mission, the American Jew would have to broaden his horizons, both scholarly and religious.

Moving from the sublime to the practical, Kohler reminded his listeners that the Hebrew Union College could not accomplish these ends if it was denied the means of offering a thorough education to its students. He called for the endowment of chairs and lectureships in Bible, Assyriology, Old and New Testament research, Jewish literature and theology, and comparative religion, "to make our work here broad, comprehensive, world-uplifting, and world-enlightening." He apparently had it in mind

to persuade the wealthier Jews of Cincinnati to do for the College what Schiff and Marshall had recently done for the Seminary in New York. He made it a matter of self-interest; a properly supported College would be "an impregnable fortress of Judaism and a challenge to Anti-Semitism in high or low stations--a true laboratory of Jewish thought, and authoritative power to reconstruct the history of the world and reclaim for the Jew his rights and his titles as the factor of civilization."

Having discussed the scholarly training of the rabbi, Kohler turned to his religious preparation. The modern rabbi was called upon to deal with "the great issues, the stern realities of life." While Orthodoxy sanctified life with ritual and ceremony, Reform was "vocal in duty," perceiving God's holiness in life itself. A rabbinic student had to learn to unfold the "deeper powers of the soul," to enable him to minister effectively to his people. To accomplish this, the College would have to strive to inculcate firm religious values in its students; "The spirit of piety and reverence must pervade the whole mode of teaching." Kohler admitted that many young Reformers lacked spiritual sensitivity. In their cold, rational approach to religion, they had lost contact with the "finer tendrils of the soul."

> Over and against the cold intellectualism which tends to undermine reverence for authority, faith, and the longing for God in prayer, so natural to every child-like soul, we must institute regular religious exercises, devotional readings and other modes of spiritual uplifting. The future Jewish minister must learn how to wing the soul up to God in prayer . . . the Hebrew Union College should not only be a seat of learning but a schoolhouse for religious, social and civic virtue; it must give us not merely wise and intelligent leaders who understand the requirements of the time and supply the needs of the congregation, but men of unbending strength of character and truthfulness, God-fearing men who hate sin and show their inner calling by true self-denial, as well as by dignity and comity.

Kohler now addressed himself to two specific needs of the College curriculum and policy. He emphasized the necessity of training in sociology, philanthropy, pedagogy and psychology, modern disciplines which would enable the rabbi to be "an efficient worker for the common good in this complex life of ours." He also alluded to a major change he sought to make in the College's total program. Referring to the current general procedure of joint undergraduate study at both the College and the University of Cincinnati, Kohler asserted that under such an arrangement, "progress [at] the College is simply excluded. A thorough change of the system is peremptory." Indeed, the move toward making HUC a post-graduate institution would be one of Kohler's most pursued goals.

The inaugural address concluded on a highly significant note. While there was no formal representation of the Jewish Theological Seminary at the exercises, Kohler was apparently determined that the proper tone be set for the future relationship between the two schools:

> I rejoice to think that American Israel has two institutions of learning which hold forth the promise of imparting to Judaism new power, new light and new life: the Seminary in New York, new and full of promise, under the leadership of the powerful personality of Schechter and enjoying the support of princes in Israel, princes in philanthropy as well as in wealth and influence; and ours, a democratic and therefore truly American institution appealing to all Israelites of the land for aid and counting upon the active support and cooperation of all the rabbis and scholars who champion progress and reform as well as learning. It glories in its tradition and record, and I confidently rely upon the tried and tested services of my associates of the faculty to help me in bringing the Hebrew Union College up to the highest requirements and the highest standard of efficiency.
>
> Oh, that all the progressive Jews of this wide land may unite to make the sanctuary of the Torah, upheld by the shekalim contributed by each and every Israelite, a center from which life and light, warmth and power flow throughout the whole body of American Israel, uniting and fortifying Judaism, and illumining and conquering the world!

****

A comparison of the two inaugural addresses reveals significant similarities as well as characteristic differences. Both Schechter and Kohler intended their speeches to be manifestos of the goals and philosophies of their respective institutions. Indeed, their subsequent administrations can be seen as the implementation of the ideas and programs initially set forth at their installations. The two significant issues of their terms of office not specifically alluded to in the inaugurals, Kohler's fight against Zionism and Schechter's guidance of the emerging Conservative Movement, can both be viewed as subsequent developments.

In comparing the texts of the two speeches, it may be kept in mind that Kohler's was delivered almost a year later than Schechter's. Kohler had been present at the New York inauguration, and certainly had access to Schechter's printed text. While it may be inferred that in a number of points Kohler was consciously responding to the views of his colleague, and important correlations do exist with regard to subject matter and content, there was, nevertheless, no systematic effort on Kohler's part to pattern his speech after Schechter's. In terms of style, both addresses were rather long, though probably not inordinately so for their time. Kohler was a seasoned preacher, and his words reflect the organization and formality of a sermon. Schechter, on the other hand, had little experience at public speaking. While his talk was somewhat disorganized, it was distinguished by the famous Schechter wit and informality.

A common theme to both addresses was the emphasis on commitment to Torah, without which, there could be no authentic Judaism. And yet, the two men clearly had differing interpretations of the meaning of the term

"Torah." For Schechter, Torah was the totality of the distinctive Jewish tradition, embodied in law and ritual and in the historic experience of "Catholic Israel." Kohler's view of Torah, however, was the developing dynamic ideal of the prophetic teachings of Judaism. Schechter maintained that Judaism demanded compliance with "the letter as well as the spirit." The Seminary would uphold the traditional practices of Judaism as essential components of its message, and its president attacked their abolition as "amputations from the body of Israel." Kohler, conversely, set forth a classical expression of Reform theology. Ritual and legalism were to be rejected in favor of the "true" ethical mandate of Judaism, which called upon Israel to be a "light to the nations." While Schechter denounced the inroads of non-Jewish ideas in contemporary religious thought, Kohler welcomed "all truth, from whatever source." Despite these fundamental differences, which were, after all, the basic distinctions between the Reform and "conservative" ideologies of the time, both messages have important themes in common. Both stressed the need for Judaism to assert itself in the world. Interestingly enough, the universalist Kohler was even more aggressive in this respect than Schechter. The latter had said that Judaism must "stand or fall by that which distinguishes it from other religions." Kohler however, carrying Reform's "mission of Israel" concept to its strongest end, called for a "world-conquering" Judaism which would, in essence, undermine Christianity's influence by reasserting its own preeminent role in world civilization.

With respect to rabbinic education, both men spoke of the necessity of combining a thorough study of the traditional sources with a familiarity with modern issues and ideas. Schechter of course, was more cautious in his approach to such contemporary issues as Higher Biblical

Criticism, and yet admitted that the problems they created had to be confronted and dealt with positively. Schechter and Kohler were both sensitive to and perhaps even self-conscious about their institutions' primary functions as professional training schools, as opposed to the traditional Jewish school's broader purpose of תורה לשמה. The two men acknowledged the need to maintain the dual purpose of Jewish study: learning for its own sake as well as preparation for the ministry. In terms of curriculum, both men listed the same subjects as the core of rabbinic education: Bible, Talmud, Jewish history and literature, mysticism, liturgy and philosophy, and both stressed the need for the modern disciplines of social science, philanthropy, psychology and homiletics.

In their perceptions of their own positions, as well as the roles of their institutions, both Schechter and Kohler had almost prophetic insight, which at the time must have seemed presumptuous. Both men declared in their inaugural addresses that the future of Jewish life and learning would be in America. A generation before the Holocaust, both men viewed the deterioration of Europe's political and social situation, and the subsequent decline of Jewish stability in eastern Europe as the greatest challenge before them. The College and the Seminary, and the American Jewish community they guided, would become what Yavneh had been two thousand years before--the survivors and heirs of the Jewish heritage.

CHAPTER IV

Following the festivities of his inauguration in November, 1902, Solomon Schechter was immediately faced with the formidable task of reconstructing the faculty and program of the Seminary. When he was called to the presidency, the teaching staff consisted of four professors and six part-time preceptors. The student body for the academic year 1900-1901 numbered twenty-seven in four grades. Of the old faculty members, Schechter retained two; Bernard Drachman, as instructor in Bible and Hebrew grammar, and Simon Jacobson, as instructor in hazanut. Two younger scholars, who had already achieved eminence in the United States were also appointed in 1902--Louis Ginzberg, as professor of Talmud, and Schechter's former Cambridge pupil, Joseph Mayor Asher, as professor of Homiletics. Joshua Joffe was named instructor in Talmud, to assist Ginzberg in the highly text-oriented curriculum. For the two crucial disciplines of biblical exegesis and Jewish history, Schechter could find in America no candidates whose scholarly qualifications and loyalty to tradition met his high standards. In the summer of 1903, Schechter travelled to Europe to select new professors for these subjects. He chose Israel Friedlander of Strasbourg University to fill the newly endowed Sabato Morais Chair of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, and Alexander Marx, a recent graduate from Königsberg, as professor of history. In 1905, Schechter engaged Israel Davidson, a specialist in medieval literature, as an additional instructor in Hebrew and Rabbinics.

Having assembled the core of an eminent faculty, Schechter proceeded to completely redesign the Seminary's program and curriculum. One of the

preliminary changes that had been made by the new board at the time of the reorganization was the elimination of the old preparatory department and the stipulation that the Seminary become a post-graduate institution. Consequently, whereas under the old program the course of study covered a period of nine years, including combined undergraduate studies, the new course was designed on the basis of four years of graduate rabbinic study. Requirements for admission to the Seminary were drastically revised. Candidates were now required to hold a Bachelor of Arts degree or its equivalent, and were required to pass an entrance examination in the following subjects:

Grammar - Elementary Grammar of the Hebrew language and of Biblical Aramaic, including the paradigm of the verb and noun.

Bible - The whole of the Pentateuch; translation and interpretation at sight. The Book of Genesis with Targum Onkelos and the commentary of Rashi and Rashi characters.

The Book of Judges (with the exception of the Song of Deborah, Chapter 5).

Isaiah, Chapters 1-12.

Psalms, 1-22.

Daniel, Chapters 1-3.

Mishna - The Second Order of Seder Moed with the exception of the Tractates Erubin, Betzah and Hagigah.

Gemara - The first Perek of Tractate Berakoth, pages 1-13.

General acquaintance with the contents of the Prayer Book.

General acquaintance with Jewish history.[47]

Probably due to the influence of Jacob Schiff, special arrangements

were effected by Cyrus Adler between the Seminary and Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Pennsylvania and Chicago Universities under which those institutions offered a special Bachelor's degree program covering the subjects required for admission to the Seminary.

The new curriculum that Schechter designed was based on instruction in five general disciplines:

1. The Bible - Under this title are included a thorough grounding in the grammar of Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic, the study of the versions, especially the Septuagint and the Peshitta, a thorough acquaintance with the ancient and modern commentaries, the introductory literature to the Bible, and Biblical Archeology.

2. Talmud of Babylon and Jerusalem - These will be taught on philological and critical lines, proper attention being given to their linguistic criteria and their historical bearings. Under this title are included the ancient Rabbinical Homilies (Midrashim), as the Mechilta, Sifri and Sifra, the Midrash Rabbah to the Pentateuch and other Biblical books; also the study of the Codes of Moses ben Maimon, R. Jacob ben Asher, R. Joseph Caro, R. Abraham Danzig, and other convenient digests.

3. Jewish History and the History of Jewish Literature, with specimen readings.

4. Theology and Catechism - Under this title are included Jewish Philosophy and Ethics, the Jewish liturgies, their genesis and development, and their doctrinal significance.

5. Homiletics, including a proper training in Elocution

and Pastoral Work - This last comprehends the initiation of the students in the profession of teaching, by attaching them to a religious school; also visiting the poor, ministering to the sick and dying, familiarity with the Jewish charitable institutions in the city, and preparation for the practical part of the minister's vocation.[48]

In addition to courses in these areas, provision was made for optional training in hazanut. Following completion of the new four-year program, a student was required to undertake a series of final examinations, and to present an approved thesis. After this, providing that the student was "possessed of good moral character," he was entitled to the degree of Rabbi. Post-graduate courses leading to the degrees of Doctor of Divinity and Doctor of Hebrew Letters were also instituted. This basic course of study, initially adopted by Schechter in 1904, remained in effect throughout his presidency. The only later addition was a series of courses in English literature and rhetoric, which Schechter believed to be essential aspects of a modern rabbi's training.

One of Schechter's most significant initial innovations in the Seminary program was the establishment of the Teacher's School. In his first report to the board, in March, 1903, he suggested that a course for Jewish teachers be instituted as a regular but separate branch of the Seminary, stressing the crucial need for competent instructors in the congregational religious schools of New York City.[49] In his report the following January, Schechter was able to state with great satisfaction that the Teacher's Course had been inaugurated with an enrollment of over one-hundred students and was meeting each week on Monday and Wednesday evenings. The Teacher's Course was one of Schechter's many programs

designed to broaden the Seminary's influence and outreach in the New York metropolitan community. Another effort in this area was the beginning of the Seminary Series of Popular Lectures which Schechter inaugurated in December, 1903. The purpose of the series was to offer the public the benefit of hearing leading scholars discuss diverse themes of Jewish interest. The speakers for the first series included Louis Marshall, Judge Sulzberger, Cyrus Adler, Rabbi Samuel Schulman, and Joseph Jacobs. The lecture series proved to be a great success, and was instituted on an annual basis.

One of Schechter's greatest priorities in the initial stages of his presidency, and one which remained essential to him throughout his term of office, was the building of the Seminary library. His own broad scholarship as well as his past contacts with the great Hebrew libraries of Europe and England, compelled him to regard the development of a superior collection at the Seminary as of utmost importance. When he engaged Alexander Marx as professor of history, in 1903, it was stipulated that Marx, who had been a pupil of Moritz Steinschneider, also serve as chief librarian. At the time of his appointment, Marx was only twenty-five years old, and he was to devote the next fifty years of his life to making the Seminary library one of the greatest in the world. In 1902, the library had consisted of approximately 5,000 volumes, collected primarily through donation in the course of the twenty-year history of the institution. By the time of Schechter's death in 1915, the collection had grown to more than 50,000 volumes and almost 2,000 manuscripts. The first major development in the library after Schechter's inauguration, was the donation in January, 1904, of the magnificent collection of his friend, Judge Mayer Sulzberger. Sulzberger had carefully acquired over

7,500 Hebrew and Jewish printed books, and about 750 manuscripts and incunabula, "fairly representative of the various branches of Jewish learning." Together with these books, Sulzberger presented a collection of antique ceremonial objects, which became the basis for the Seminary's Jewish Museum. He expressed the hope

> . . . that the Seminary may become the centre for original work in the science of Judaism, to which end the acquisition of a great library is indispensable. We and our successors must labor many years to build up such a library, but I believe that a good foundation for it has now been laid.[50]

Another major development in the Seminary library during Schechter's presidency was the donation in 1907 of the collection of Moritz Steinschneider himself, purchased and presented by Jacob Schiff. The Steinschneider library consisted of 3,000 Judaica, 1,500 Hebrew books, and thirty manuscripts. In 1911, Schiff made another major contribution, that of the famous Kautzsch collection of 4,600 books and pamphlets. Finally, following Schechter's death in November, 1915, his family presented his library to the Seminary, including 1,475 books, thirteen manuscripts, and a number of Schechter's own rare Genizah fragments. Included in this collection was his famous autograph letter of Maimonides.

On March 20, 1904, Schechter delivered his first presidential report to the biennial meeting of the Seminary. After little more than a year as president, he had succeeded in establishing the renewed Seminary as a major force in American Judaism. His popularity and personal impact on the community as well as the eminence of his school became widespread. The future indeed seemed very bright for the institution which only three years before had seemed doomed. In his report, Schechter was able to state with justifiable pride and confidence:

> It is no exaggeration to say that no Jewish seminary, either in this country or abroad, can lay claim to be

> better equipped than we are. Our Seminary is located in a new building the most suitable for its purpose; it commands a staff of teachers, the majority of whom may be called thorough specialists in their subjects; it has a large number of pupils, counting together with its Teacher's Course over one hundred; it is in possession of a library, collected and donated by Judge Sulzberger with the best of judgment and with the greatest of sacrifices, such as no other seminary in the world could show.[51]

The president proceeded to describe the goals of his new curriculum, stressing the importance of its various subjects. With regard to the Bible, Schechter said that while it was being taught "in agreement with the best critical methods . . . we are not prepared to reconstruct the Bible in accordance with every whim of the latest commentator. If I have any hope for myself and for those who are to be trained in this institution, it is that the Bible will reconstruct us." The president also discussed the importance of the study of halacha, the legal portions of Jewish literature. He attacked those whose ignorance of traditional Jewish law blinded them to the integral role it had played in Jewish history and in the development of the Jewish ethical tradition.

Schechter reported the reasoning behind the new requirement of a Bachelor's degree prior to entrance into the Seminary. He observed that a good liberal education, exposing future rabbis to the classics of world literature and philosophy, would imbue them with a "better understanding of what humanity now owes to antiquity and to its past," and they would thus be "less confident in their powers of turning the wheel of history" with religious anarchism and skepticism. As he had in his inaugural, Schechter once again stressed the need for a complete and in-depth Jewish education for the modern American rabbi. Referring to the fashionable catch-phrases then popular in rabbinic circles, he said that

> Judaism cannot be dismissed with a few general meaningless phrases. Judaism is, as I have so often insisted

> upon, and shall insist again on every public occasion, a positive religion, with a Sacred Writ and a continuous tradition . . . knowledge of such a religion can only be acquired by a serious study and an elaborate training, which must necessarily last for years.

Schechter was apparently trying to resist the efforts of some who, impatient with the demands and length of the new course of study, desired to make "practical" use of the Seminary students in religious schools and congregations. He stressed that

> Study requires ripening, and the problems of Judaism are not such that a young man of twenty should master them, even if he were a genius . . . it is high time that a Synagogue should come to its rights, and be dealt with in the same careful and solemn manner as is accorded to all other higher interests in the community. It is only then that Judaism will be able to rediscover itself, and to accomplish those sacred duties for which our ancestors died, and for which we hope to live.

****

Due to the more stable situation at the Hebrew Union College in 1903, Kohler's accession to the presidency did not occasion the extensive changes that Schechter was required to initiate in New York. When Kohler took office, the College faculty consisted of four professors and five full-time instructors, all of whom were initially retained: Dr. Gotthard Deutsch, professor of history and Jewish philosophic literature; Dr. David Philipson, professor of homiletics; Dr. Louis Grossmann, professor of ethics and pedagogics; Sigmund Mannheimer, instructor in exegesis and Aramaic; Dr. Moses Buttenwieser, instructor in biblical exegesis, Ephraim Feldman, professor in Jewish philosophic literature and instructor in Talmud; Caspar Levias, instructor in exegesis and biblical Aramaic; Dr. Henry Malter, instructor in medieval philosophy and Arabic; and Dr. Judah Leon Magnes, instructor in biblical history and grammar,

and librarian. Kohler himself assumed the position of professor of theology and Hellenic literature, and he changed Malter's position to professor of Talmud. When Magnes resigned his post in 1904 to accept the pulpit of Temple Israel of Brooklyn, he was replaced by Dr. Max Schloessinger, who was also named chief librarian. In 1905, Max Margolis, who had taught at the College from 1893 to 1897, was reappointed as professor of biblical exegesis.

The only major innovation in the College program which Kohler strongly advocated was its conversion to a post-graduate course. He had alluded to the necessity of this move in his inaugural and was doubtless influenced by the similar change that Schechter had effected at the Seminary. Kohler stressed that the elimination of the part-time system of concurrent high school and university study was the only way to raise the academic standards of the College. In his first report to the board of governors, he stated that

> The College, so far as its higher development is concerned, must be rendered independent of the University and raised to the standing of a post graduate institution. This shall be my Catonian Carthaginem delendam esse, until the Union of American Hebrew Congregations will see fit to change our status, and accord to the Hebrew Union College the position it deserves and claims.[52]

However, such considerable overhauling of established policy proved to be too drastic, and the board rejected the proposal. The old program remained in effect, under which students attended local high schools and then the University of Cincinnati, concurrently with the College. The program thus covered eight years--a four-year preparatory department for high school students and a four-year collegiate course for university undergraduates, which culminated in graduation and ordination. Kohler did succeed in having an additional post-graduate year instituted in the

collegiate department, during which the student's full time could be devoted to the final year of his rabbinic studies. He also placed a greater emphasis on recruiting university graduates, who were eligible to enter the collegiate course in the second year, spending a minimum of three years in full-time theological study. Under the revised program, the degree of Bachelor of Hebrew Letters חבר לאגודת בני ישראל, was to be awarded upon the successful completion of the second collegiate year. While the preparatory department was gradually phased out in the course of Kohler's administration, it was not until 1945, under his successor, Julian Morgenstern, that the College was completely reconstructed on a post-graduate basis.

In Kohler's revised curriculum, submitted to the board of governors in October, 1903, the entrance requirements for the College were set as follows:

Preparatory Department-

In Hebraica: Fluent and correct Hebrew reading, with knowledge of grammar, at least of the regular verb; ability to translate at sight any passage from the historical parts of Genesis into English; and familiarity with biblical history from Abraham to Zerubabel.

In Secular Branches: Knowledge sufficient for admission to the B grade of the Cincinnati high schools.

Collegiate Department-

In Hebraica and Rabbinica: Thorough knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic grammar and ability to translate at sight any part of the Pentateuch, the Psalms, Proverbs and Daniel; passages from medieval Bible commentators and the Mishnah; also portions of

Maimonides' Sefer Ha-Madda; familiarity with biblical and Jewish history as far down as the times of the Tannaim, and with the essential doctrines of the Jewish religion.

In Secular Branches: Knowledge sufficient for admission into the Junior class of the University of Cincinnati, a certificate of admission to the same being indispensable, unless the applicant has graduated from a university of recognized standing.[53]

The subject matter of the curriculum remained much as it was; the preparatory department undertook introductory courses in Bible, liturgy, Mishnah, Hebrew grammar, biblical history, geography, and Midrash. The Collegiate department provided for more advanced study in biblical exegesis, commentaries, Mishnah, Talmud, Codes, philosophy, Midrash and Homiletics, and elocution. Kohler gradually offered new courses in his own specialty areas, systematic theology and apocryphal and Hellenistic literature. Additional instruction was also instituted in practical theology, ethics, pedagogy, and communal service. Only one area of study from the old curriculum was eliminated by the new president--modern Hebrew literature. In his opening address to the students of the College on September 14, 1903, Kohler stated:

> The College should have a thoroughly American character. The students should endeavor to be imbued with the American spirit, and this includes the mastery of English diction. Neo-Hebraic Literature may be a necessity for Russian Jews who have no genuine national literature from which to derive culture and idealism. For us the English literature is a source of culture and enlightenment; wherefore Neo-Hebraic Literature will be abolished here.[54]

Kohler's new program also added a three-year post-graduate course leading to the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Candidates, primarily College alumni, were offered three areas of study; Hebrew literature, Jewish

history and Semitic languages, from which a major and two minors could be selected. Work for the doctorate was to be done either in residence at the College, at another approved institution, or in absentia. Following the presentation of a thesis and completion of a faculty examination, the degree was conferred. This earned HUC doctorate became the most prominent graduate degree in the American Reform rabbinate.

Like Schechter, Kohler stressed the need of building his institution's library. When Max Schloessinger was appointed chief librarian in 1904, the collection numbered about 10,000 volumes. In 1905, Julius Rosenwald of Chicago presented the 4,000-volume library of Rabbi Meyer Kayserling of Budapest. Another significant gift came to the library in 1907, when the Alumni of the College, through their Rashi Memorial Fund, contributed a collection of 900 rare halachic works purchased in Constantinople and about 1,100 volumes of Hebraica acquired in Germany. In the course of Kohler's administration, the library continued to expand, acquiring hundreds of individual gifts as well as the notable collections of David Einhorn and Moses Mielziner. In 1906, Kohler appointed Adolph Oko the College's first full-time professional librarian. Under Oko's charge, the Hebrew Union College Library became one of the leading collections of Judaica and Hebraica in the world. In 1911, Oko began to assemble the nucleus of the College's famed Spinoza collection, and after World War I, he travelled to Europe and consummated one of the largest single purchases ever made for a Jewish institutional library, a number of unique collections totalling over 18,000 books and manuscripts. At Kohler's death in 1926, his own library was also given to HUC, which had by then developed a collection of over 55,000 volumes and manuscripts.

One of Kohler's greatest priorities during the early stages of his

presidency was the raising of funds for the College. The primary source of income for its operating budget was drawn from the dues of constituents of the UAHC. While numerous scholarship contributions were received often, from all parts of the country, they seldom amounted to more than $100. The Isaac M. Wise Memorial Fund, which had been established by the Union in 1901, was pledged to raise an adequate endowment fund for HUC. The fund, however, drew numerous small contributions rather than single large amounts and by 1905 had not yet reached a total of $80,000. While Kohler felt that there was great value in this broad based "democratic" support of the College, he continued to plead for the kind of funds that New York's wealthy Jews were lavishing on the Seminary. To the board of governors and to the general Jewish community, he spoke often of the crucial need for endowed chairs in basic disciplines, lectureships, scholarships, and most important, new physical facilities for the growing institution. As a significant part of his efforts at raising financial and popular support for the College, he took numerous trips throughout the country. Kohler spoke to congregations and individuals, spreading the message of the College's work--and its needs. In 1904, he went to New York on behalf of the Wise Memorial Fund and raised over $30,000. Upon his return, he reported to the board:

> . . . I feel richly compensated by the results of my trip to New York, which was successful not only from a material point of view . . . but still more so from the moral side, for I believe I have won the warm interest and good will of the leading Jews of the metropolis for the Cincinnati college, it being fully recognized by them that the Hebrew Union College responds to the needs of progressive American Judaism, while the Seminary stands for conservative Judaism. In view of this fact we should aim to maintain good and friendly relations between the two institutions, which should work hand in hand in as far as no principle is involved. . . .[55]

CHAPTER V

The raising of the academic standards of their institutions was not the only major priority for either Schechter or Kohler. Both men were particularly concerned with the quality of the religious life of their students. Despite the depth of their "Jüdische Wissenschaft," their "scientific" scholarship which so often produced religious skepticism, both men preserved a correspondingly deep religious faith. It was often said of Schechter that he had the religious fervor of Hasidism in his veins.[57] Kohler, for his part, often extolled the virtues of "childlike" faith and piety.[58] The centrality of prayer and religious observance for both men was reflected in the religious programs they fostered at their respective schools. Religious observance had, of course, been understood as a fundamental aspect of life at both the Seminary and the College since their founding. However, under the new presidents, the Seminary synagogue and the College chapel became increasingly the focal points of the rabbinic student's activity.

While at Cambridge, Schechter had often expressed the void he felt in his life due to the lack of an organized congregation and synagogue.[59] When he came to New York, he was apparently determined to fill this personal need through the religious community he hoped to build at the Seminary. In Schiff's new Seminary building, a permanent synagogue occupied a prominent place. For Schechter, this was to become his new "shul." Upon his accession to the presidency, he presented to the Seminary synagogue the magnificent Torah ark which he had discovered dismantled in

the Cairo Genizah. The ark, believed to be over 800 years old, became the pride and joy of the Seminary and was proudly described in its catalogues as "the oldest piece of ecclesiastical furniture in the country."[60] Most importantly, however, the ark symbolized the central place that the synagogue occupied in Schechter's own life. Under his direction, regular services were instituted for Sabbaths and festivals, and every student was expected to attend. The worship was conducted by the Seminary cantor, Simon Jacobson, with the assistance of the students. Seniors were required to preach at the services as part of their training. The Sabbath worship was a "mincha" service, held on Saturday afternoons. On Saturday morning, the students were expected to attend one of the local synagogues in order to benefit from the homiletical examples of New York's prominent rabbis. It is interesting to note that for a time the congregation most frequented by Seminary students was, of all places, Temple Emanu-El, the citadel of Reform. The Temple's assistant rabbi, Judah Leon Magnes, who had recently left the HUC faculty, was something of a hero to the Seminarians, who greatly admired his dynamic personality and his newfound commitment to Zionism.[61] While it is very possible that Schechter did not greatly approve of his students' attendance at the Reform services, he apparently did not discourage them. Emanu-El was, after all, also the temple where Jacob Schiff and Louis Marshall regularly attended services, and there was undoubted benefit in their frequent exposure to the students of the Seminary.

If Schechter was indeed uneasy at his students' use of the Union Prayer Book on Sabbath mornings, he compensated for the deficiency by establishing the traditional Ashkenazi rite as the authorized "minhag" of the Seminary synagogue. Men and women sat separately, and unlike

many of the Conservative synagogues of the time, no organ or mixed choir was permitted. Head coverings were required not only in the synagogue, but in all classes as well. Adherence to the dietary laws and the traditional observance of the Sabbath were prerequisites for admission to the Seminary, and all students were required to maintain these practices throughout their time at the institution as well as following it. One of Schechter's standard charges to the graduates each year was the exhortation to maintain the traditional lifestyle regardless of the liberal tendencies of the congregations they might serve.[62]

With regard to Zionism, Schechter had but recently joined the ranks of the movement. Before his move to America, Schechter had been highly critical of Jewish nationalism and had decried its secularist tendencies. "Zionism without religion," he said, "is a menace."[63] However, soon after his accession to the presidency, Schechter's sympathies to the cause grew deeper. His interpretation of Zionism, however, was primarily a cultural-religious one, as he expressed in the public statement he made in 1905 when he joined the Zionist Federation in New York:

> . . . The rebirth of Israel's national consciousness and the revival of Judaism are inseparable. When Israel found itself, it found its God. When Israel lost itself, or began to work at its self-effacement, it was sure to deny its God.
>
> The selection of Israel, the indestructibility of God's covenant with Israel, the immortality of Israel as a nation, and the final restoration of Israel to Palestine, where the nation will live a holy life, on holy ground, with all the wide-reaching consequences of the conversion of humanity, and the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth--all these are the common ideals and the common ideas that permeate the whole of Jewish literature extending over nearly four thousand years.[64]

Schechter's public endorsement of Zionism met with a strong negative reaction by the Reform directors of the Seminary. Schiff published a public repudiation, stressing the incompatibility of Zionism with American

patriotism and the Jewish "mission." As far as the Seminary's policy itself was concerned, the institution remained officially neutral, though the faculty and students joined their president in commitment to the movement.

****

In his opening address to the students of the Hebrew Union College on September 14, 1903, Kohler outlined the religious program he planned to institute:

> First of all, this is a Jewish institution--its Jewish character should always be prominently in view. The attitude of the professors and the conduct of the students should be thoroughly religious, manifested by regular attendance at divine service as well as in the religious spirit which is to prevail in the studies and the teaching. . . . The whole atmosphere should be a religious one and the daily lessons begun with religious exercises.[65]

Under Kohler's administration, religious worship indeed became a fundamental aspect of College life. Daily chapel exercises were instituted each afternoon, consisting of devotional readings with comments by Kohler himself. A Sabbath evening service was also established, in addition to the main Sabbath service which had been traditionally held on Saturday afternoons. The afternoon service had first been instituted by Wise, who required the students to attend morning worship in one of the local temples--the policy later adopted by Schechter in New York. Kohler decreed that the entire College community, both students and faculty, were required to attend all chapel services. He advised those professors who objected, that they were expected to set an example for the students.

As Kohler had made abundantly clear in his inaugural, HUC was a Reform institution. The religious observances of the school reflected

Kohler's uncompromising commitment to the "classic" expression of Reform Judaism. The traditional headcovering and prayer shawl were prohibited from the chapel, and the Union Prayer book rubric was strictly adhered to. Kohler also exercised strict control over the sermons which the upper-classmen were required to deliver at the Sabbath services, and only previously approved addresses were permitted. A student who expressed a dissenting interpretation of Judaism, whether advocating traditionalism or Zionism, was denied the opportunity to preach. Kohler, it will be remembered, had drafted the text of the "Pittsburgh Platform." He was deeply committed to the concept of the universalism of the Jewish religion, and the prophetic mission of Israel. "Outmoded" rituals and Jewish nationalism necessarily undermined this viewpoint, and he was uncompromisingly opposed to both.

As the president had stated in his opening address, both students and faculty were expected to conform to his religious standards. He often emphasized the need for the professors to stress the spiritual significance of their subjects, and not only teach them as scholarly disciplines:

> In as much as it is the chief aim and purpose of the College to train young men for the high and sacred task of spiritual leaders of American Israel, and render them efficient and zealous workers in the pulpit, the Religious School and the community at large, we do not lay all the stress upon so called Jewish Science which does not, as facts amply show, make its representatives immune from skepticism, agnosticism and religious indifference. As was the case under the genial and inspiring influence of the sainted Dr. Wise, so does the College training at present aim especially at inculcating and arousing in its students a truly religious spirit, that holy fervor and religious enthusiasm which cannot fail to exert a wholesome influence upon the Congregations they are to lead and to mould [them] in a manner which mere booklore never can. In taking full cognizance of the demands of our age and of our Western civilization, we look to sincerity and consistency which alone create whole souled

> and vigorous men of courage and conviction, not mere opportunists who are led, instead of being leaders. Yet at the same time the Hebrew Union College with its steadily growing library has grown to be a powerful source and stimulus of research also to its alumni and all those who apply for intellectual or scientific help and advice as devotees of the Torah.[66]

The influence that Kohler sought to exert over the faculty created hostilities which soon erupted into open conflict. In 1905, Kohler sought to have two professors, Caspar Levias and Ephraim Feldman, dismissed from the faculty; he alleged that they lacked the convictions required to instill the proper religious spirit in their students. Despite the support of the students and complaints from the alumni, Kohler did succeed in having Levias' contract terminated. The most famous cause célèbre in his administration however, was his confrontation in 1906 with three senior professors, Max Margolis, Henry Malter, and Max Schloessinger, over the issue of Zionism. Ironically enough, Margolis, who seems to have been the leader of the rebellion, had been engaged by Kohler in 1905, to replace Levias as professor of Biblical exegesis. In a letter to Margolis confirming his appointment in April, 1905, Kohler confided:

> . . . I feel that your heart is in the cause more than is the case with many of the professors now in the faculty, and I know that you would gladly and enthusiastically devote all the time at your disposal to the high task of training men for the Rabbinate imbued with the right religious spirit. And I am sure that I can count upon you to second me in every endeavor to inculcate the right spirit and understanding of Judaism in the students of the College.[67]

Margolis replied a few days later, assuring Kohler that he could indeed count on him. However, little more than a year later, his allegiance took an abrupt turn. Margolis, who in 1905 had called upon the Central Conference of American Rabbis to formulate a purely religious creed--based on the Pittsburgh Platform--for what he called the "Reformed

Jewish Church in America,"[68] had by 1907 completely reversed his commitment. He suddenly emerged as a strong Zionist and openly attacked Kohler's precious "mission of Israel" concept before his students. Malter, who had been Wise's last appointment in 1900, had never accepted the more radical Reform of Kohler; Schloessinger, whom Kohler had named to the faculty in 1904, also suddenly became an outspoken Zionist. These three professors together began isolating themselves from the other faculty members and expressed open resentment of what they felt to be Kohler's dogmatism and restriction of academic freedom. In 1906, the three brought a formal complaint before the Board of Governors in a public attempt to undermine Kohler's authority. The president, in turn, outraged by the tactic, condemned their "spirit of rancor and insubordination."[69] By the end of the academic year 1907, all three had resigned their positions.

The "affair" aroused attention and concern throughout the country. Opinion seems to have been divided. The East Coast Jewish press, especially the Zionist journals, denounced Kohler.[70] Emil Hirsch, in the Reform Advocate of Chicago, sided with his brother-in-law Kohler; academic freedom, he maintained, was not absolute, but entailed obligations:

> These ignored, the principle itself lacks legitimacy. . . were it the purpose of the Hebrew Union College to train mere scholars, its instruction might be coldly and indifferently academic. But as we understand it, its purpose . . . in the main, is to train preachers and Rabbis. . . . These should have scholarship, but they should have more, a personal enthusiasm, a personal viewpoint.[71]

David Philipson, Kohler's firm supporter, later wrote of the incident:

> The Zionists raised a great hue and cry to the effect that the three men had lost their places because of their advocacy of the Zionist position. This was not true. There was no question of Lehrfreiheit involved. The only matter at issue was the insubordination of these men, especially Margolis. The position became so in-

> tolerable that either the president or the professors had to go, and the president was sustained.[72]

Samuel S. Cohon, in his history of the College, published in 1950, agrees with Philipson.[73] Michael Meyer has also pointed out the other factors--dissatisfaction with their financial situation, for example--which led to the resignations of the three professors.[74] The entire matter, even in distant retrospect, still appears to be rather complex. In modern times it has become fashionable to condemn Kohler's "dictatorship" and intolerance. Certainly by present-day standards of academic freedom, especially at the Hebrew Union College, the president's strict control in 1907 seems incredible. And yet, understood in its contemporary setting, the incident and Kohler's handling of it become clearer. Whatever psychological or sociological factors were involved in the vehement anti-Zionism of Kohler and his generation of Reformers, it must be remembered that the Zionist movement at that time was overwhelmingly secularist, socialist, and even anti-religious. Reform (and Orthodox) opposition to Jewish nationalism was based on a positive Jewish religious commitment. Certainly the "world conquering" Judaism that Kohler so fervently looked forward to, was as proud and self-assertive an identity as Zionism was. It must also be considered that Kohler objected to Zionism primarily insofar as it undermined the religious dimension and responsibilities of the Jewish People. He had deep respect for the spiritual interpretation of Zionists like Schechter, who fought against the secularism of the movement.[75]

In 1907, Kohler appointed Dr. David Neumark to succeed Malter as professor of philosophy. Neumark was a prominent cultural Zionist, who had been associated with Ahad Ha-Am in the Hebrew journal Hashiloah. Neumark's Zionism was apparently perfectly acceptable to Kohler--it stres-

led the compatibility of cultural rebirth with a liberal religious approach to Judaism. Neumark was, incidentally, a strong advocate of modern Hebrew, and his History of Jewish Philosophy - תולדות הפילוסופיה בישראל was published by the College in Hebrew in 1922.

In the later years of his administration, Kohler's anti-Zionist policies at the College became less stringent. As Zionism continued to make headway in the Reform Movement, pressure from rabbis and lay leaders was brought to bear on the president. In 1915, a number of Zionist Reform rabbis, led by Max Heller and Stephen S. Wise, sponsored before the UAHC a resolution which was subsequently endorsed by the Board of Governors. It stipulated that, while the president could retain his general control over the chapel, Zionist addresses and activities would be permitted elsewhere on the campus.[76] Moreover, a student sermon could not be rejected solely on the grounds that it advocated Zionism, providing that it maintained a religious approach. While this resolution was accepted by Kohler, the College remained anti- or at least non-Zionist throughout his term of office. Apparently, the 1915 resolution was not enough to satisfy the Zionist members of the rabbinate. In 1920, during Kohler's last year as president, Stephen Wise formulated his plans for a new liberal rabbinical seminary which would encourage Zionism as an essential component of Judaism. A year later, Wise's Jewish Institute of Religion opened in New York.

****

Kohler was not alone in experiencing difficulties in faculty relationships. Schechter, too, even before his inauguration, became involved in a dispute over the ideological position of one of his profes-

sors. The incident centered around Bernard Drachman, the American-born Orthodox rabbi who had been among the founders of the Seminary and had served on the faculty from its inception. From 1889 to 1901, Drachman served as dean and, according to his autobiography, saw himself as "the logical candidate for the successorship of Dr. Morais; the least to which I was logically entitled was a professorship in some major subject. My just claims were apparently not even considered."[77] While Schechter initially retained him as instructor (not professor) in Hebrew grammar and reader in Codes, there was an effort on the part of a number of the Seminary's directors to dismiss him on the grounds of his "fanatic" Orthodoxy. In a letter to Sulzberger, dated June 1, 1902, Schechter explained his reasons for retaining Drachman:

> Our friends seem to be determined to get rid of him. But
>
> 1) Is it quite fair to dismiss a man from a post which he occupied 15 years without any more than valid reason such as having committed a crime?
>
> 2) He will be the only American graduate of the faculty and may do a good deal of good with his "kosher" English.
>
> 3) . . . he is the only link between us and the downtown people among whom he commands, I hear, a large following. <u>As to his fanaticism I am sure that I will be able to keep him to his proper place</u>. Of course I am a stranger and there may be very good reason for the action of the committee which is not clear to me. . . . What I mainly object to is to alienate the Orthodox whose only representative on the staff will be Drachman. . . .[78]

By 1908, however, the situation had changed. Apparently there was

"very good reason" for Drachman's dismissal. His relationship with Schechter became seriously strained when he published an edition of Divre ha-Rivoth, a collection with original commentary of the letters of controversy between the twelfth-century rabbis Abraham b. David of Posquières and Zerahia b. Isaac Ha-Levi on the question of Rabbi Abraham's opposition to Maimonides. According to Drachman, when he presented a copy of his work to Schechter, it was received "most ungraciously."[79] From that point on, Drachman wrote in his memoirs, he was "persona non grata" at the Seminary. Possibly, Drachman's scholarship did not meet Schechter's standards, but it is even more probable that the incident was only a symptom of Schechter's growing disaffection for the Orthodox, whom he was no longer afraid of alienating. By this time, Schechter's original neutrality had given way to a determined effort to establish the Seminary as the center of an organized Conservative movement. Whatever the factors, Drachman's contract was terminated by the Seminary in 1908, allegedly for reasons of economy.[80] Drachman later wrote that he knew of "no justification on ethical or scholarly grounds" for his dismissal and "that in so doing, the Seminary departed far from the views of its sainted founder and first president, Dr. Sabato Morais."[81] After his departure from the Seminary, Drachman continued to take an active role in the Orthodox Jewish Congregational Union of America, which he had helped organize in 1898.

CHAPTER VI

The crisis of 1907 left HUC's faculty depleted by a third. The staff-building which Kohler had been spared upon his accession to office now became an immediate necessity. In addition to the appointment of Neumark as professor of philosophy, Kohler now also engaged a new instructor in Bible to replace Margolis. His choice was Julian Morgenstern, a 1902 HUC alumnus who had just received his doctorate from the University of Heidelberg. The young Morgenstern was not only a promising scholar, but equally important to Kohler, he was educated in and fully committed to "mainline" American Reform Judaism. Another faculty change was necessitated in 1907 when David Philipson resigned his position as professor of homiletics to accept membership on the Board of Governors. Philipson retained his part-time status on the faculty, however, delivering lectures on the history of the Reform movement, and on the "activities of a rabbi." Kohler himself took over the position of professor of homiletics.

In 1909, Sigmund Mannheimer, the veteran instructor in Bible and Targum, died at the age of seventy-four, following twenty-five years of devoted service to the College. To replace him, Kohler named Henry Englander, also a graduate of HUC (1901). Englander had gone on to receive his Ph.D. from Brown University, where he taught Hebrew and Bible prior to being recalled by his alma mater. In addition to his teaching duties, Englander served as registrar for the remainder of the Kohler administration. In 1910, the faculty suffered another loss with the sudden death of Ephraim Feldman, the professor of Talmud. Feldman had been stricken

with a heart attack while on his way to a convocation at which he was to receive an honorary doctorate for his twenty-five years of service on the faculty. To fill the Talmud chair, Kohler appointed a distinguished scholar, Jacob Z. Lauterbach. Lauterbach, who had worked with Kohler on the staff of the Jewish Encyclopaedia, received an Orthodox rabbinical education in Berlin and, while fully committed to the Reform movement, remained the eloquent theorist for its traditionally oriented faction. The diversity in Kohler's reconstituted faculty would seem to undermine arguments of his intolerance of ideological diversity. HUC students would now be exposed to a philosophy professor committed to cultural Zionism and an emphasis on Jewish peoplehood. They would study Talmud with a scholar who taught that the traditional halacha and Reform Judaism were not incompatible. These two new professors, moreover, would provide a balance to the more classical Reformers on the faculty--Buttenwieser, Morgenstern, and Kohler himself. Kohler's new appointments would also seem to negate the argument that ideological differences alone had been responsible for Kohler's confrontations with Margolis, Malter, and Schloessinger; they lend credence to Philipson's and Cohon's view that, more than any other factor, the personal hostilities simply became intolerable within such a small institution. Most important, however, the faculty was now more or less united under its president, committed as a body to positive, if varying, interpretations of Reform Judaism.

Kohler was to make two further appointments in the course of his administration. In 1915, Solomon B. Freehof joined the faculty as assistant professor of Rabbinics, under his mentor Lauterbach. And finally, in 1920, Jacob R. Marcus was named instructor in Bible and Rabbinics. Marcus had just been ordained by the College. After going to Berlin in

1922 to earn his doctorate, he returned four years later to rejoin the faculty, specializing at first in general and later in American Jewish history.

With the internal crisis at the College resolved, Kohler's position became stronger. The distinguished new faculty added considerable eminence to the institution, which embarked on a period of steady development. In fact, the next few years were to witness growth and prosperity for both the College and the Seminary. Student enrollment at both schools continued to rise, and by 1915 HUC's student body had reached a high of ninety-three; the Seminary then numbered sixty-two in its rabbinic department. The financial situation at HUC also began to improve steadily in the later part of the Kohler years, with funds and endowments eventually comparing favorably to those of the Seminary.[82] In 1909, both institutions benefitted from the continued interest and generosity of Jacob Schiff, who that year created a $100,000 trust fund, providing that its annual income be shared by the College and the Seminary for the purpose of establishing affiliated teacher's colleges. In Cincinnati, the Teacher's Institute was established under the direction of Louis Grossmann, the professor of pedagogy at HUC. However, when it became apparent that Cincinnati's relatively small Jewish community could not provide either sufficient students or opportunities of employment for graduates, the Institute was reorganized. It ceased classes at the College and, instead, Schiff's fund was used to establish teacher's courses and conferences in various cities under HUC's sponsorship. In New York, the Teacher's Institute was organized as a separate branch of the Seminary, replacing Schechter's original teacher's course and conducting evening classes in two locations, uptown and downtown on the lower East Side.

Under the initial direction of Mordecai Kaplan, the Institute flourished, enrolling students and providing teachers for the city's hundreds of religious schools. In 1909, Kaplan was also appointed by Schechter professor of homiletics at the Seminary and remained on the faculty for over fifty years, subsequently teaching Midrash and philosophy. He later gained renown as the founder of the Reconstructionist movement and its Rabbinical College in Philadelphia.

The most notable development at the Hebrew Union College during Kohler's presidency was the move from its old downtown Cincinnati building to a new suburban campus in 1913. As early as 1903, in his first report to the Board of Governors, Kohler had emphasized the need for a new home for the College:

> . . . Especially must the wealthy Jews of Cincinnati be made to feel that they owe it to the Hebrew Union College, as the object of their just pride, to take the initiative step toward making it a national institution of learning for American Reform Judaism, worthy of the name, by rearing its edifice anew on the heights of the city . . . of a size commensurate with modern requirements, with a large lecture hall in the center, and with wings to expand outwardly and inwardly in all directions, and in the vicinity of the University. . . . An appeal to that effect emanating from your honorable body cannot fail, I am sure, to bear good fruit.[83]

In 1905, the Union purchased a tract of land in the hilltop area of Clifton, near the University of Cincinnati, and in 1910 construction was under way. The new campus initially consisted of two tudor-style edifices, the administration building and the library. The former, housing classrooms, offices and a chapel-auditorium, was designed exactly as Kohler had specified in 1903--the classroom wings emanating from the hall in the center of the building. The library, the gift of Isaac W. Bernheim of Louisville, was built to accommodate 50,000 volumes and was hailed as the first permanent Jewish library building in the world. The

new buildings were dedicated on January 22, 1913. The three main speakers were Rabbi Jonah B. Wise, the son of HUC's founder, President Kohler, and the specially invited guest, Schechter. In his address, Kohler welcomed his colleague:

> I am especially gratified to have my honored friend, the illustrious president of the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York, Dr. Schechter, with us to participate in our dedication ceremony and thus give evidence of the spirit of amity and fellowship that should ever exist among scholars who are to follow the maxim: Out of all dissent in views, mutual appreciation and friendship must emanate in the end, if truth be the common aim and object. And may I repeat here what I said when participating in the dedication of the New York Seminary: There is room and necessity for both schools, the Conservative and the Progressive, for as it was said of the Schools of Hillel and Shammai: 'The words of the living God are in both.' We may advance along different lines and under different standards, yet in front of Mount Sinai, in the great principles of Judaism, all Israel is one. 84

HUC's president spoke of the great future he foresaw for American Judaism and also took the opportunity of discussing the additional needs of the College before the prominent assembly of UAHC leaders from throughout the country:

> Great things then, have you done here--a real work of Kiddush ha Shem, of glorification of God's name. Yet these very grounds here speak louder than words can of what is yet to be done for the maintenance, the expansion and further development of this institution. You must hold up our hands. You must continue to bestow your great generosity upon our college and manifest your interest in its steady growth in numerical and spiritual power and influence. You must complete the chain of our buildings here by adding to the two proud buildings the dormitory so urgently needed for the physical and moral welfare of our students. You must aid us in enlarging the scope of our work by endowing chairs for the various branches of Jewish learning . . . and increasing the number of scholarships for the encouragement of our promising young men. Thus may we look forward with confidence and bright hope into the future and anticipate the triumph of our great cause.

Kohler concluded his address with the following hope:

> To Judaism then, to Progressive American Judaism with its lofty ideals, we dedicate this college building, to the

> promulgation and perpetuation of Israel's truths, to the elevation of human nature, to the promotion of justice and righteousness on earth, to the vindication of the name and faith of the Jew, to the glorification of the eternal God, the Father of mankind, we dedicate this house as a temple of divine knowledge and wisdom, and this chapel as its Holy of Holies. May the Shekinah ever rest here to fill the soul of each student and teacher with the fire of holy enthusiasm for truth and justice, and with the spirit of reverence and awe for whatever is holy and good. Let light stream forth from the treasure-house of Israel's literature to illumine the eyes and enoble the souls of all who enter. May we all be consecrated anew to the service of God and man as priests of the most high! Amen.

The address that Solomon Schechter delivered in Cincinnati on that occasion has become a classic. Entitled "His Majesty's Opposition," it was a notable example of Schechter's well-known eloquence and wit. The speech underscored the nature of the relationship between the College and the Seminary by drawing a parallel between them and the principal parties of the British Parliament:

> My pleasure is not spoiled by hearing and seeing so much here from which I, of necessity, differ. Indeed, if I were in agreement with you, I would have been deprived of the pleasure of being here today at least, in the capacity of President of another College pursuing, to a certain extent, different aims and endeavoring to realize them by largely different methods. . . . Probably you all know the way in which some English statesmen speak of their opponents in the Parliament, referring to them as His Majesty's opposition. This sounds like a paradox, yet it contains a deep truth, implying as it does, that both His Majesty's government as well as His Majesty's opposition form one large community, working for the welfare of the country and the prosperity of the nation. The same principle may also be applied to theology, there being, under Providence, room also for the opposition party, which has its purpose and its place assigned to it by history. . . . Of course, it will always be a question as to which is which; we Conservatives maintaining that we are His Majesty's Government and you His Majesty's Opposition. . . . But, thank God, there are still a great many things and aims for which both parties can work in perfect harmony and peace, and [which] unite us.[85]

Schechter outlined the common aims and principles of the two institutions, and concluded thus:

> These great principles of God's holiness, God's justice and God's governing the world, are to be especially taught now. And they must be taught for years and years to come. The whole of Jewish literature forms a commentary to it; the whole of Jewish history forms an illustration to it; the whole of Jewish life should bear evidence to it. And in this work we can all combine in teaching. But in order to teach, we must first learn and practice. And this is the purpose for which colleges are established. And thus may God's blessings be upon this College, among all other colleges of Catholic Israel כלל ישראל, in which these great truths of Judaism shall be taught and learned, and then proclaimed to the world, in all their purity and in all their application to the different and various departments of life and thought.

****

Schechter's address at the HUC dedication, with its prominent use of the words "we Conservatives," reflected a significant change in his philosophy with regard to the Seminary's religious position. In his inaugural and throughout the early years of his presidency, he had maintained that the Seminary was to be a "non-partisan" institution. At that stage, the term "conservative" denoted more an Americanized Orthodoxy than it did a distinct movement. However, within a decade after his accession, Schechter became increasingly committed to the concept of an organization which would serve as a religious alternative to the Reform Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Orthodox Jewish Congregational Union of America. The Drachman affair of 1908 clearly illustrates how far Schechter had come in disassociating the Seminary from Orthodoxy. On February 23, 1913, the United Synagogue of America was established at a meeting at the Seminary. Its purposes were defined in a preamble which Schechter had drafted:

> To assert and establish loyalty to the Torah and its historical exposition; to further the observance of the Sabbath and the Dietary Laws; to preserve in the service the reference to Israel's past and the hopes for Israel's

> restoration; to maintain the traditional character of the liturgy, with Hebrew as the language of prayer; to foster Jewish religious life in the home, as expressed in traditional observances; to encourage the establishment of Jewish religious schools, in the curricula of which the study of the Hebrew language and literature shall be given a prominent place. . . .[86]

If the above provisions delineated the new organization's distinction from Reform, its concurrent departure from Orthodoxy was underscored in the following statement:

> We do not ignore the importance of the instruments and methods of modern scholarship; at the same time, we maintain our faith in the inspiration of Scripture, re-affirm the authority of the Torah, and assert our firm conviction that the chain of Jewish History and Tradition need not and must not be broken. . . .[87]

Schechter was elected the first president of the United Synagogue and served in that capacity for a year, guiding the movement through its initial stage. In a letter to Louis Marshall, chairman of the Seminary's trustees, he asserted the necessity of the organization for the future support of the institution:

> . . . When I received the call in Cambridge to come over and take charge of the Seminary, I understood that the purpose of the Institution was a twofold one. First, to establish a training school for Rabbis which, adopting what is best in modern thought but at the same time teaching traditional Judaism in such a manner as to awaken fresh interest in our glorious past, should create a Conservative School removed alike from both extremes, Radical-Reform and Hyper-Orthodoxy. . . .
>
> Thus, the Seminary proved a factor for good in American Israel, though its work is not of the sensational kind. And what it has done it has accomplished in the teeth of many opposing forces which in former years were attacking it on all possible occasions. Indeed, whilst all the sections of the community, whether Orthodox or Reform, have their organs singing their praises of the Party to which they belong and making constantly proselytes for their cause, the Seminary was entirely dependent on its own work to reach the public. . . .[88]

It was Schechter's hope that the United Synagogue would eventually create a foundation for the kind of popular support of the Seminary that

the Reform and Orthodox congregational unions provided for their institutions.

CHAPTER VII

As the College and the Seminary continued to grow and develop, the personal prominence of both Kohler and Schechter was established throughout the American Jewish community. During their terms in office, both men published major works on related themes. When they first met at Cambridge in 1901, the two scholars had discussed the necessity of scientific research in the area of Jewish theology.[89] In 1909, Schechter completed his contribution on the subject, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. Nine years later, Kohler published his magnum opus, Jewish Theology: Systematically and Historically Considered. The two volumes became the standard works on the subject and remain classics in the field today. A more direct effort in cooperative scholarship, and one which has had a lasting influence on Jewish life in America, was the participation by Kohler and Schechter in the committee which produced the Jewish Publication Society's translation of The Holy Scriptures. The board of editors, which began its work in 1909, was under the chairmanship of Cyrus Adler and virtually represented a joint College-Seminary effort. In addition to the two presidents, the board included Joseph Jacobs, the Seminary's professor of English literature and rhetoric; David Philipson; Samuel Schulman, rabbi of New York's Temple Beth-El; and later, ironically, Max Margolis, at the time professor of Bible at Philadelphia's Dropsie College. Adler, in his memoirs, recalled the "rather strained atmosphere" in which the board initially met, but observed that in the course of the seven years that the committee worked together, the old animosities were forgotten, "clashes became less frequent, and it was in a spirit of thank-

fulness to God that we completed these labors."[90] The work on the Bible was completed in November, 1915, and the final text was first published two years later.

****

Schechter's last years as president of the Seminary were difficult and disillusioning for him. The administrative burdens of the institution weighed heavily upon him, and as he advanced in years, these pressures took an ever greater toll. Schechter's hypersensitivity to criticism was a well-known component of his personality, and the violent attacks levelled against him by the Orthodox press when the United Synagogue was established hurt him deeply.[91] Most significantly, he felt that in his later years the once generous support given the Seminary by its directors was beginning to decline. He resented the energy and funds which many of the institution's previous supporters were beginning to direct to the Kehillah, New York's newly organized Jewish community body, and he deplored the secular and social emphasis of that organization. Excerpts from letters to Cyrus Adler in 1913 reveal Schechter's growing despondence:

> At present, it seems that the Board [of the Seminary] are more interested in questions of civics than in rabbinical Jewish learning. Social work and sociological Judaism is what they expect from the rabbis. And this is not my province.[92]

And again:

> I will not allow this constant humiliation and neglect of the Seminary . . . I have always a feeling that we are the step-children of the community. It is absolutely impossible that the Institution should flourish and succeed in its ultimate aims on support coming from those who are not in complete sympathy with it. . . . 93

And then:

> If I were not at the head of an Institution for training rabbis, I should look with tranquillity upon all these things; but as matters stand, the Institute being neglected largely by the Directors, surrounded on all sides by hostile forces and ignored by the press, living constantly in a deficit, I am sensitive to all such agitations which mean mischief.[94]

Finally, in December, 1913, Schechter wrote a long letter to Louis Marshall, chairman of the Seminary trustees, setting forth his grievances with the board: "I must take it out of their minds that I came into this country for the purpose of converting the downtown Jew to a more refined species of religion. . . ."[95] He reviewed the considerable accomplishements of the Seminary over the years--its growth and its contributions to scholarship and Jewish religious life--but continued:

> . . . I cannot help thinking that the Seminary is given little credit for what it has accomplished. And instead of encouraging it to follow on the path it had set out, there is an unmistakable tendency to reproach us for our want of forming large constituencies and enlisting the support and the goodwill of what is described as the 'Orthodox public.' It is overlooked that an institution which is meant to pursue a middle course and to create new currents of thought and action could not possibly be popular with the crowd whose mind is, as a rule, given to extremes and to radical action, whether Orthodox or Reform. . . .
>
> I must frankly say that no consideration in the world would ever have induced me, in my comparatively advanced age, to leave the precincts of Cambridge, had I known that the Seminary was largely meant for a particular section of the community, forming a sort of higher Talmud Torah, having the purpose of reconciling the most unruly element in Jewry and giving it a little religious refinement. It is true that I have never heard such a sentiment expressed by the Board, but the growing indifference on the part of several of the Trustees of the Institution makes me believe that I am not quite wrong in my judgment. . . .
>
> I fully appreciate the magnanimity and sacrifice brought by some of our Trustees for the Institution. But I feel not less humiliated by the indifference of others. I am sorry to speak in such frank language. But my experience within the last four or five years was one continuous mortification to me, which was calculated to make the last few years of my life a period of constant care and anxiety. It is a terrible thing to see one's hopes and aspirations shattered to pieces. For I cannot help feeling that the Seminary is in a sadly struggling con-

> condition. . . . An appeal to the public at large is of little use and, as far as my experience goes, such appeals have only done us harm and injury. Relief, therefore, can only be expected from the Trustees, and it is their sympathy and interest which I endeavor to enlist anew in this memorandum.

The tone of desperation evident in these words is striking--all the more so for having come from the characteristically buoyant and optimistic Schechter. He was sixty-three at the time and perhaps had simply reached the end of his fighting strength. Strangely enough, there is no overwhelming evidence that the Seminary was in serious financial or organizational trouble at that time. Perhaps, more than deficiencies in the existing program, Schechter was disappointed that some of his plans for the institution had not yet been realized after ten years in office. In addition to the alleged financial problems, he was clearly upset over certain attitudes which he perceived among members of the Seminary's board. It has been the common consensus of historians that the support of the Seminary by New York's wealthy German Jews was not so much a matter of their personal commitment to traditional Judaism as it was their determination that the institution should have an "Americanizing" effect among the Orthodox immigrants. The notion is apparently well founded, since Schechter also perceived it--and deplored it. Perhaps more than anything, however, the president's unhappiness at this point in his life was due to the realization that his cherished scholar's ideals, which he had taken such pains to try to maintain when he accepted the position, had given way to the mundane concerns of administration. A biographer later observed:

> But--the great teacher turned administrator. He exchanged the task that was spiritual for one that was secular. The religious mystic shaped pragmatic policies. Incidental problems absorbed his interest. Learned controversies gave way to parochial contentions. Orthodoxy or Reform; Synod

> or Congregationalism; the compatibility of Zionism with Americanism--these were the burning questions. Solomon Schechter, willy nilly, became involved in what he hated most: 'red-tape and platform Judaism.' 96

Schechter's depression continued to deepen. An additional factor arose which added to his sense of hopelessness--the steady deterioration of the world situation. Europe, to which he still had close personal ties, was being engulfed in the beginnings of the first World War, and Schechter's sense of history gave him an almost prophetic concern over the sufferings he foresaw for his own people in the tumultuous times that lay ahead. In June, 1915, he spoke to the graduating class of the Seminary:

> We live in awful times. It is a world in conflagration. We cannot divert our eyes from it. We dare not remain indifferent. Any man, to whatever party he may belong, whatever his descent may be, who does not, when reading his morning or evening paper, feel sometimes as if his heart would break at this terrible suffering of humanity --in which Israel is the greatest sufferer among the nations--must, to say the least, be classed among those whom the late Mr. Gladstone described as having come into the world with a 'double dose of the original sin.' The situation can only be depicted in the words of the Prophet: 'Blood and fire and pillars of smoke,' preceding the great and terrible Day of the Lord. 97

The months following that address were to be a time of conclusions for Solomon Schechter. In October, 1915, he collected and published a volume of addresses and sermons which he had delivered in the course of his thirteen years as president of the Seminary; the volume was entitled Seminary Addresses. On November 3, the seven years of labor on the Bible translation came to an end. Finally, during the second week in November, he reportedly spoke to Adler for the first time of his intention of resigning from the presidency.[98] Nothing further was to come of this, however, for on November 19, 1915, Schechter was stricken with a heart attack while teaching a class at the Seminary and died at his home later that

afternoon.

Schechter's sudden death deeply shocked the entire Jewish community, and he was mourned throughout the country and in England and Europe as well. At the Seminary, his passing had a profound effect upon the students:

> When news of Dr. Schechter's death reached us, we were oppressed with the sudden calamity, as the newly created man who, when the first night came, supposed that day would never return. We saw nothing behind the heavy clouds of sorrow and we could not think that the darkness would be dispelled. How could our world continue without him; how could the sphere in which he moved, the Seminary of which he was the animating spirit, survive the shock of his departure. . . .99

A few months later, the Seminary published the third volume of its Student's Annual, which was devoted to a Schechter memorial. Tributes from all over the world were collected in the volume, including eulogies by Kohler and Philipson. At the Hebrew Union College, the students also dedicated an issue of their HUC Monthly as a Schechter memorial edition. A memorial service held in the College chapel on December 18, 1915, was attended by the HUC faculty, students, and board. Kohler spoke feelingly of his old colleague:

> When one of the world's great sages dies, all mourn the loss of one near and dear to them, says the Talmud. Solomon Schechter's death is an irreparable loss, not merely to our sister-institution, the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York, whose illustrious head and powerful reorganizer he was, but to the entire American Jewry and the whole learned world as well. And it is especially befitting that we . . . of the Hebrew Union College, should give public testimony to the high esteem in which the departed master was held by us . . . all the more so, as the impression which his genial personality and the beautiful words of wisdom he spoke on the occasion of this, our new College Building, made upon us, is still treasured in our hearts as a precious memento. . . .
>
> So let us thank God today for having given us in Solomon Schechter a banner-bearer of light, a man of the spirit, an interpreter of Israel's soul, a zealous champion of the Torah, even though he represented, as he said

> to us nearly three years ago from this pulpit, 'His Majesty's Opposition.' . . . God in his inscrutable wisdom has summoned the revered master to the Academy on high, and we, his co-workers, shall sadly miss the unique personality, the venerable man with the leonine head, who was so human with his healthy laughter, his sledge-hammer wit and his humorous stories, and again with his fierce outbursts of temper and his terrible scolding and condemning, and yet so true and loyal and full of zeal for God and His Law. . . . 100

Kaufmann Kohler remained in office at the Hebrew Union College for six more years. A good deal of his energy was devoted to the completion of his Jewish Theology, which appeared in 1918. By 1920, at the age of seventy-seven, Kohler was no longer able to carry the full burdens of his office. The College registrar, Henry Englander, assumed many of the administrative responsibilities in these later years, as the president became weaker and reportedly, even senile. The Board of Governors eventually decided to encourage Kohler to retire. While at first he resisted the idea, the president finally submitted his resignation on February 23, 1921.[101] Kohler remained in Cincinnati for another year, before deciding to return to New York to spend his final years. He was named president emeritus by the College, which chose Professor Julian Morgenstern as his successor. On May 22, 1922, Kohler delivered a farewell sermon in the College chapel. He reviewed the goals and accomplishments of his almost twenty years as president of HUC, and spoke of the three ideals to which he had devoted his career--"the solidarity of Israel . . . American Reform Judaism . . . and the Hebrew Union College."[102] His fighting spirit was still strong, and in the course of the address, two subjects came under his attack--his old enemy, Zionism, and a newer opponent, Stephen Wise's projected Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, "which would be just colorless and non-descript enough to suit certain classes of men in a Free Synagogue, or . . . which would be so broad and all-inclusive

in its character as to give equal place to all religious systems and shades of thought . . . however diametrically opposed to each other."

Of his own beloved College, the old rabbi spoke glowingly, with many allusions reminiscent of his inaugural address two decades earlier:

> Thus two hundred and twenty graduates went forth from here to turn progressive and enlightened Jewry throughout the length and breadth of the land into warm-hearted and zealous Jews, into a people of God; nay, to make Judaism a power and an influence everywhere and win a listening world for the truth of Israel's Only One God. It is no exaggeration to say that the Hebrew Union College transformed America into a land of promise for world-conquering Judaism with its bright outlook into the future. As the schoolhouse founded by Rab in Sura made Babylonia the Holy Land of the Torah for centuries, so does this grand plantation of Dr. [Isaac M.] Wise bid fair to make America the Holy Land of progressive, yet positive Judaism for future generations. . . .

Kohler remained in retirement in New York for the next four years, writing and occasionally preaching in his old pulpit at Temple Beth-El. He lived to see HUC celebrate its Jubilee in 1925, and while he was too infirm to attend the festivities in Cincinnati, he did contribute an article for the commemorative volume published in honor of the milestone.[103] A few months later, on January 26, 1926, Kaufmann Kohler passed away at the age of eighty-three.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

In evaluating the long-range influence of Kaufmann Kohler and Solomon Schechter on the subsequent development of the Hebrew Union College and the Jewish Theological Seminary, it becomes immediately evident that Schechter must be judged to have made the stronger, more lasting impact. The Jewish Theological Seminary of America has remained loyal to most of the principles and goals that Schechter set for it more than fifty years ago. It remains committed, at least in spirit, to the upholding of traditional Judaism in a contemporary context. It has long been a fountainhead of religious American Zionism. And most significantly, it has become the national center of the organized Conservative Movement which Schechter initiated. While Schechter, had he lived to see his movement grow so spectacularly, might not have fully approved of its inevitable preoccupation with organizational problems and procedures, he nevertheless would no doubt have been gratified to know that fully one-third of America's religiously affiliated Jews are active supporters of the Seminary through the United Synagogue.

In retrospect, the legacy of Kaufmann Kohler at the Hebrew Union College, is more difficult to define. The College, as well as the Reform Movement of 1974 is diametrically opposite in most significant respects to the institution he left a generation ago. The ritualism and tradition which Kohler denounced as "obsolete romanticism," have now been restored as essential components of Reform Jewish life, particularly at the College. His strict religious requirements have long been abolished in fa-

vor of a "free chapel" and optional attendance, and a significant proportion of those HUC students who do attend the chapel do so with covered heads and shoulders. The concept of academic freedom, which was so narrowly defined by Kohler, has become the distinctive feature of the College administration, and the religious interpretations and practices of both faculty and students are as diverse as the individuals themselves. The most significant contrast, however, between Kohler's HUC and the College of today, is in respect to the issue of Zionism. The Hebrew Union College has gone from anti-Zionism under Kohler to the non-Zionism and neutrality of the Morgenstern era, and finally the strong pro-Zionist commitment of the administrations of Nelson Glueck and now Alfred Gottschalk. HUC opened its Jerusalem branch and required its students to study there even before the Seminary established its presence in Israel. Today, anti-Zionism is an unthinkable heresy at the College, a remote chapter in its history that its administration and students would rather forget. Of course, it must be taken into consideration that Kohler did not live to see the single historical event that most brought about this abrupt change--the Holocaust. It is more or less an open question what his response would have been to the events which befell the Jewish people in the years following his death. Be that as it may, today "that little land," as Kohler so contemptuously referred to Palestine, has become probably the single most important concern for both the College and the entire Reform Movement as well.

And yet, in more subtle ways, many of Kohler's more practical goals for the College have been realized. The post-graduate rabbinic program which he envisioned has become a fact of life. More important, HUC has retained its scholarly eminence in the particular fields first emphasized

by Kohler in his revised curriculum--Bible exegesis, theology, and post-biblical literature. By the same token, the Seminary's faculty remains preeminent in Talmudic and Midrashic scholarship.

Perhaps, in a broad historical perspective, it is not entirely valid to equate the roles of Kaufmann Kohler and Solomon Schechter. Schechter was more to the Seminary what Isaac Mayer Wise had been for the College--and it is the memories of these two men which continue to be "revered" at the respective schools. However, in a strict historical context, the Kohler and Schechter eras coincided in time, and corresponded in philosophies and accomplishments. In the interests of the scientific study of the Jewish past which both men cherished, this thesis has attempted to trace, analyze and evaluate this significant chapter in the history of the Jewish experience in America.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

PERSONAL REMINISCENCES

In the course of my research, I came upon a number of recorded reminiscences of both Solomon Schechter and Kaufmann Kohler, preserved in the writings of their students and associates. While such information is unverifiable, it does offer valuable insights regarding the more "human" sides of these historical figures. Of particular interest is the light that these incidents shed on the relationships that Schechter and Kohler had with their students over the years, as well as the glimpses they offer into the more personal aspects of life at the Seminary and the College during their administrations.

I. "Dr. Solomon Schechter, As I Knew Him"

The following excerpts are taken from the memoirs of Rabbi Herman H. Rubenowitz (JTS '08), whose student days at the Seminary were spent during Schechter's incumbency:

> It was in the winter of that year [1905] that I, a student of the Seminary, doing graduate work at Columbia University, in cooperation with a number of other Jewish college students, organized the Inter-Collegiate Zionist Society, to my knowledge the first academic group of this kind in the country. We were looking about for a place to hold our first public meeting, and the thought occurred to me that the students' lounge at the Seminary might be an ideal place. I was delegated as emissary by my fellow members to approach Dr. Schechter for permission to use the Seminary students' room, which he readily granted. Little did I dream that this,

our modest request, would give rise to a veritable tempest in the Seminary Board of Trustees.

It so happened that I was designated to be student preacher in the Seminary Chapel that Sabbath, and, as was the custom, I was invited to have dinner at the Schechter home after the service. Everything went very pleasantly when suddenly Mr. Louis Marshall, chairman of the Seminary Board of Trustees, made his appearance, and immediately he and Dr. Schechter retired to an adjoining room. Shortly thereafter, while we were enjoying a cozy chat with Mrs. Schechter in the living room, we heard irate voices coming from the library where Dr. Schechter and Mr. Marshall were closeted. There followed a loud bang on the desk, the door flew open, and we heard Dr. Schechter, in a towering rage, shout at the greatly embarrassed Mr. Marshall, "The money bags are not going to rule the Seminary." Mrs. Schechter with her wonted tact immediately stepped into the breach, and with a pat on the shoulder of her angered husband, said to him, "Alter, (her favorite way of addressing him) do be calm." Then she turned to Mr. Marshall with a smile that appealed for forbearance. Mr. Marshall shook hands with her and took his leave.

I subsequently learned that the cause of this outburst of rage on Dr. Schechter's part was Mr. Marshall's request that he withdraw the permission given our little embryonic inter-collegiate Zionist group to meet at the Seminary, because, as Mr. Marshall put it, a Zionist meeting at the Seminary would be misunderstood, and put the Seminary in a class with the foreign Jews of the East Side. Whatever repercussions there may have been among the directors of the Seminary, the permission given us students was not withdrawn, and our little group did hold its meeting in the students' room as scheduled.

I can bear testimony from personal experience to his great kindness and generosity. I well remember one morning when he called me into his office at a time of great sorrow and distress for me because of the recent death of my father. He noticed that I was depressed and run-down, and insisted that I go away for a rest, and vacation to recover.

On another occasion, he asked me to go up to Lake Saranac, where one of our Seminary men, stricken with tuberculosis, was receiving treatment. When I returned and reported to him about the unhappy condition of the patient, he arranged to have him transferred to Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York City, where he would no longer suffer from loneliness and isolation. He stood by the unfortunate sufferer to the very end, and supplied him with every possible comfort, and also helped to bring over from Europe his mother and brother so that they could be with him during the closing days of his life.

****

In his biography of Schechter, Norman Bentwich recorded the following incidents:

Schechter sought to bring into their life something of that corporate spirit which he had learnt to appreciate at Cambridge. His aim, indeed, was to found, as it were, a Cambridge College for Jewish Studies. He instituted luncheons and dinners in the Seminary, which should correspond in some way with the dinners in college hall. At the same time he fostered the personal relationship between master and student as he had known it himself as a Hasidic disciple and in Vienna; and invited the students in turn to his home on Sabbaths and holy days. Students are called in rabbinic literature, "the sons of the Torah"; American Jewry thus far had treated them as stepsons. He wanted dormitories for them,

to make the work of the teachers effective and the life of the students comfortable. Passing the imposing pile of the Union Theological Seminary near his own Institution, he exclaimed: "One day I, too, shall write an Epistle to the Hebrews."

His concern for the students extended to the smallest detail. He writes to a friend who had a clothing business in town, to ask help for a student who was to preach a trial sermon: "It is desirable, as you can imagine, that he should present a dignified appearance in respectable clothes. He is a very poor fellow, and even if he were to get the position, he has such heavy responsibilities towards his family that it may be a year or more before he could pay for the suit of clothes he needs. My question to you is, would you be willing to share the risk with me by giving him a suit of clothes and trusting him on his honour to pay it to you as soon as he can? I need not tell you that, if you were to help a young man establish himself, you would be doing a good deed."

His tender care for the material problems of his students was concealed, and yet became known to them. A young student was called to his study for an audience. "You look", he said, "as if you had not eaten today." He found that the student had walked ten miles to the Seminary because he could not pay the fare. Straightway he gave him 200 dollars, saying that he had a fund at his disposal for helping such cases. Some time after Schechter's death the student, now a young rabbi, came to repay the loan, only to find that no such fund existed, and that no member of the staff knew of the matter.

He took infinite pains to obtain bursaries for poor students. When he was in the country on a holiday, he would approach some wealthy Jew and say: "Mr. A., you owe me five hundred dollars." If A expressed surprise and asked how the debt was incurred, he would reply: "Trust me. It is for a good cause", and would get the money for one of his students. The cheques which he signed on the day of his death were on account of bursaries of this kind.

While he stressed the need for rabbinical learning, he stressed equally the need for a knowledge of modern literature. To a canditate for admission into the Seminary, who was expecting to be asked about his qualifications in the Bible and Talmud, he turned straightway and asked: "Have you ever read Rousseau's Confessions?" The student had not. "Nobody is qualified to enter the ministry who has not read the Confessions. Take this book"--he handed him a copy which lay on the table--"and do not return until you have read it." When Rudyard Kipling's Kim was published, Schechter opened a lecture at the Seminary with the words: "Gentlemen, have you read Kim? Do so at once, for there you will find the portrait of a real Hasid."

++++++++++

II. "The Kohler Image"

Kohler too, was remembered fondly by his students. The following passages are taken from the collected anecdotes of Hebrew Union College history, Telling Tales Out Of School, and represent the memories of a number of Kohler's "boys."

As for Dr. Kohler (1903-1922), time had to lapse before Dr. Kohler could win appreciation. Tension would occasionally flare up between the new president and the students. There were even "strikes." But the passing years brought adjustment. The students began to approximate Dr. Kohler's conception of what students ought to be, while Dr. Kohler's accomplishments as a scholar and an administrator gradually awakened student loyalty.

(Abraham Cronbach, '06)

On June 10, 1920, nine long, weary but pleasant and happy years of study, privation and sacrifice were about to end in our ordination. All ten members of our class were on the pulpit, and between the venerable Kaufmann Kohler and the Honorable Alfred M. Cohen we were to be summarily transformed into Rabbis in Israel.

Among the now still living in our class were Solomon A. Fineberg, Leon Fram, Bernard Heller, Jacob R. Marcus, and Harvey E. Wessel (who never failed to have that E of his middle name registered as an important part of his designation).

The reverend Dr. Kaumann Kohler, President of the College, then seventy-seven years of age, seemed all of his years and weary as he pronounced the Semichah formula and Priestly Benediction over us. We heard him say, "Solomon A. Fineberg, no longer shall your name be known in Israel as Solomon A. Fineberg, but henceforth your name shall be known in Israel as Rabbi Solomon A. Fineberg." On he went down the line until I myself had been ordained and became a musmach under the new official title of Rabbi. Then, finally and last, came the turn of Harvey E. Wessel. By this time, poor old Dr. Kohler was very visibly tired. Turning thus to

his paper, from which he was reading out the names in order to insert of his own the title "Rabbi," he intoned: "Harvey Wessel, henceforth your name shall no longer be known in Israel as--" At this point, to the amazement of all of us, he glanced down at his paper and noted that he had forgotten to read out Wessel's middle initial. Thereupon, the distressed old gentleman became confused; flustered, he resumed as follows: "--But henceforth your name shall be known in Israel--(consulting his paper again) as Harvey E. Wessel" (quite forgetting to insert Wessel's hard-earned and newly-won title of Rabbi).

(Abraham Shinedling, '20)

The sainted Kaufmann Kohler had his own very special accent. When he was some seventy years of age, he generally confused his C's and G's. Greeks came from his lips as "creeks," and Catholics sounded like "Cadillacs." Dr. Kohler never knew when we asked him about the Creek Cadillacs that we were employing his own accent in framing the question. He would proceed to discourse on the Greek Catholics with all of his accustomed innocence and erudition.

He had a strange practice in the classroom, at least for the decade that I knew of, but he would call the roll for each of our sessions by means of the latest H.U.C. Catalogue--or what he referred to as the "gatalogue." He would keep the latest edition of this mighty work containing the list of students by classes in the large center drawer of his open desk.

One day some wag in our class got to the room ahead of time, temporarily removed the up-to-date catalogue, put in its place in the desk drawer a very old catalogue which he had managed to secure, and left the antique for the aging president to find. Dr. Kohler, upon entering the

classroom and seating himself at his desk, reached into the drawer, pulled out the ancient catalogue, and proceeded to call the roll of the II Collegiate Class which he knew us to be. Unsuspectingly, he called out the names of rabbis who had long since been ordained, some of them actually deceased by this time.

No one answering, he at once looked puzzled, but continued to call the roll, becoming more puzzled as some recollection of the earlier names occurred to his mind. Then he took a closer look at the catalogue, and noticed its date. "Boys," he said, "I must have gotten hold of the wrong gatalogue by mistake," and sent one of the students into the office for the latest edition.

This prank was played on Dr. Kohler a number of times, and so short was his memory when he was already near or in his mid-70's, that he never caught on to it as a piece of student mischief, but always blamed his own carelessness and inadvertence.

(Abraham I. Shinedling, '20)

Kaufmann Kohler's Bavarian upbringing was quite evident in the way he mixed his B's and P's, D's and T's, so when the class of 1914 finally attained the honor of having him as a Homiletics professor we quickly learned what a "dext" was, how the "Pottle for Judaism" should be fought and that "brebaration" was the sine qua non of "breaching."

Dr. Kohler was, in many ways, a saint. Gentle as a lamb at home, he could be a roaring lion in the pulpit. To illustrate the fact that, above all, preparation was the basic ingredient of a good sermon, this saintly man, from whose lips no vulgar or untoward word ever came, told us the following story, actually blushing and giggling in a bit of embarrassment as he related it.

"Gentlemen, as you know, before I became president of the College I lived in New York. Each year Mrs. Kohler and I had our season tickets to the opera which we enjoyed very much. Of all the composers we loved Wagner best, and of all Wagner's operas our favorite was Die Walküre. You remember the great dramatic act when the Walküre maidens ride onto the stage on white horses and sing the famous refrain. Well, gentlemen, it was the duty of a certain stage-hand to brebare the horses for this act. One night it happens that one of the horses had not been well brebared and in the middle of the great scene, right on the stage, in full view of the audience, the horse improvised! That, gentlemen, is what I think of poor brebaration."

(Elkan C. Voorsanger, '14)

We were both tall--looked and sounded somewhat alike--and both came from San Francisco. So it wasn't too strange that Dr. Kohler, who didn't know the names of his students anyway, should confuse us. Thus, over the years Magnin was Voorsanger and Voorsanger was Magnin.

We sweated out our years of Buttsy's Bible, Laudy's Talmud, Deutsch's History, Morgy's Grammar and Daniel, Neumark's philosophy, and Kohler's Theology and Homiletics. We went from the old building on Sixth near Cutter and attained the dignity of the new campus on the hill. Theses were finally approved and then the great day arrived--Ordination Day.

Our class had been betting for years that it would happen, and sure enough it did!

It was an impressive graduation service--a fine baccalaureate sermon, followed by Alfred Cohen's sonorous declaration to the class, and then the final act, the solemn moment of Dr. Kohler's charge to us and the individual "laying on of the hands."

I walked up to the venerable president with, I felt, the shechinah perching right on my shoulder, lowered my head and was then blessed and ordained as follows: "Elkan Voorsanger, to be known in Israel henceforth as Rabbi Edgar Magnin."

(Elkan C. Voorsanger, '14)

In the anti-Zionist days of the College, a favorite phrase of Kaufmann Kohler, the professor of Theology, was "dot little land." It was a term of contempt. Some of us discovered that the way to get a good grade was to employ that expression often enough in a term paper.

(Samuel H. Markowitz, '22)

The oldest College pun that I can remember was uttered in the days when Kaufmann Kohler was our president and Adolph Oko the librarian. Then it could be said that the College drink was "Oko-Kohler."

Oko was the best critic the Faculty had, but he loved Dr. Kohler. Who could help it! There was something almost touching in our prexy's utter simplicity. Every student in the class could mimic his easy and infectious laugh; so whenever we drew that laughter, each man would throw back his head and in unison set up such a universal cackle as to shake the walls.

Dr. Kohler was a great theologian, easily the greatest of his time, but alas, he was no disciplinarian and he was the classic instance of the absent-minded professor. We took advantage of his inability to identify us; and come to think of it, his nearsightedness may have been the chief reason why we could recite in place of someone who had cut class and still

not be discovered. When Dr. Kohler put his glasses high on his forehead and held the Midrash up before his face, the class could disintegrate without the least suspicion being aroused.

He was well along in years in our day, but his homiletical faculty was as keen as ever. The sermons we submitted to him were sometimes a bit on the comedy side, but he never flinched from a discussion of even our most fantastic notions. Of course, no one ever dared mention Zionism, and he even chided me for singing Al naharot bavel in chapel. But Dr. Kohler was never a conservative when it came to unconventional sermons. He spent a whole week with us on the subject of Billy Sunday when that intrepid evangelist was "raising hell" in Cincinnati. Each day the full newspaper report of Billy's sermon was our textbook. Our master-homiletician laughed over his rival's quite unintelligible reading of the Bible: "Then David up and beaned Goliath on the cocoa with his slappy." But he recognized genius and accorded his meed of praise to America's number-one devil-wrestler. If Billy Sunday could have heard Kohler, he probably would have been equally awed by the latter's dexterity with a page of Septuagint.

Dr. Kohler was not only a phenomenal scholar, but also a master of kavanah. At Mincha services on Shabbos he always gave the benediction in the College Chapel, and we were able to judge his reaction to the student sermon by the length of the closing prayer. If the sermon had failed to make its point, Dr. Kohler would start in where the young preacher left off. He could round out a disconnected oration with a few skillful sentences, or even offer the Lord some excellent refutations on controversial points upon which he held views opposite to the one expressed. I remember these prayerswith gratitude. They were long, but they were masterpieces of form and style, and sometimes they were thrilling in their ec-

static zeal. When some of the more gifted preachers among the students would inspire us all, Dr. Kohler could utter a prayer that certainly ascended to the very steps of the Mercy Seat.

To the denizens of Peebles Corner his was a well-known figure, for many a night the venerable rabbi would attend the movies. This diversion was almost sacred to him, but alas, it brought disaster in its wake. One night in coming out of the theatre Dr. Kohler fell across some wiring and broke his hip. From then on he was seriously disabled and had to ordain one class while lying in a hospital bed. Those who attended the ceremony said it was classic in its beauty, as the young men, standing in a circle, advanced to the bedside one by one to stand beneath the trembling hands of the stricken patriarch.

He revovered sufficiently to creep about the College on a cane, but he could no longer get to the movies. One of our students put Dr. Kohler rather heavily in his debt by carting a whole motion picture camera and films to the house for the private entertainment of the president of the College. Some students claimed there was an ulterior motive in this lovely attention, but I know differently. It was done out of the kindness of a heart that was truly devoted to Dr. Kohler.

Our own ordination was memorable by the fact that the master made no mistakes in our names when he gave the official declaration of our degrees. We deliberately planned in advance to whisper our names to him as each stepped up to receive his blessing.

I saw him angry only twice in all the years. Once was an historic riot-act read to the student-body on the subject of playing penny-ante poker. I think he had a hard time whipping up that rage, but I suppose it had to be done.

The other time I shared his anger. It was the Golden Jubilee of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in New York. As one of the banquet features, movies and views depicting the history of the College were thrown on a screen for the entertainment of over two thousand Jews from all over America. By some incredible oversight the picture of the man who had served for nineteen years as President of the institution was not shown. Dr. Kohler, who knew his movies, had a right to be irate. I always wondered who slipped up that time.

It was Dr. Kohler who began the Purim-shpiel tradition at the College. Every year we went in a body to his house on erev Purim, and a few of us presented a bit of a "stunt" as the main feature of the evening. These became more elaborate as the years passed, until I understand the annual Purim "show" came to be almost on a par with the never-to-be-forgotten "Quest of the Holy Dagesh" of 1913 vintage.

Dr. Kohler was a deeply lovable character. I long continued to read his old homiletics notes, written around the edge of my College Tanach, and always a nostalgic reverie came over me as I recalled him in all the different changes of my eight years under his tutelage. We took frightful advantage of his trusting nature, but we never failed to rise up in the presence of his hoary head. To have had his smichah was worth boasting about.

(From "There were Giants," H.U.C. Monthly, March, 1938, by Henry J. Berkowitz, '21)

****

And finally, the following memory of both men, recalled by Cyrus Adler in his autobiography, I Have Considered The Days. The incident occurred during one of the more tense meetings of the Bible Translation Committee (circa 1914), during which there apparently had been some scholarly

disagreements between Schechter and Kohler . . .

One story that stands out in my mind was a quip of Dr. Schechter's. Dr. Kohler was a native of Fürth in Bavaria. Kohler told us at luncheon one day that during the many years the Prince Regent was insane and in an asylum, prayers for his recovery were regularly said in every church and synagogue, only not in Fürth. "Well," said Dr. Schechter, "perhaps in Fürth insanity is not considered a disease."

APPENDIX IIA

THE COLLEGE AND SEMINARY

Address delivered by Kaufmann Kohler at the dedication of the new building of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, April 26, 1903.

I am not quite clear in my mind whether it is in my capacity as President-Elect of Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, or as personal friend of Prof. Schechter, that I have been honored by the distinction of being selected as one of the speakers on this festive occasion. In either capacity, I am glad of the opportunity of extending my sincere congratulations, first of all to the Jewish community of this metropolis, upon this beautiful seat of Jewish learning which adds a new, bright gem to her crown. Hitherto, New York, justly proud of her matchless monuments of philanthropy and benevolence, led other cities by her luminous example of munificence and liberality towards the destitute and suffering, the fatherless and helpless. In regard to the spiritual uplifting of the Jew--aside from the magnificent houses of worship--in regard to the promotion of Jewish learning, New York fell far below her standard as the leading community of the New World; to-day the beginning is made of rolling away this reproach by this monument which will at all times rank above all eleemosynary institutions because it stands for the highest idea of Judaism--the Torah which is the fountain and foundation of all great achievements in Israel.

Among the leaders of Judaism in the second century, a dispute arose whether the teaching or the doing is of greater value, and after due deliberation and debate they agreed that the teaching is of vaster importance, because it engenders and inspires the deed. Our practical go-

ahead age has lost sight of this truth and neglected the spring and motive power of our ethical, intellectual and social progress. The great majority of Jews still manifest that warm sentiment of compassionate love for suffering humanity which is the heritage of ancient Israel; they still betray a mind fond of enlightenment and culture and burn with a desire for truth which is so characteristically Jewish, and they resent with indignation every wrong and injustice done to a single Jew in firm allegiance to their race, but they fail to give due recognition to the source of all truth and righteousness and love that permeated them, and formed not only the character of the Jew, but shaped three-fourths of our civilization claimed to be Christian or Aryan. It is pre-eminently the theological school which gives the Jew a standing among the various religious denominations. Pulpit oratory evokes tears or smiles, assent or dissent; it is the seat of learning vested with authority which endows the man in the pulpit with the knowledge and skill to substantiate every righteous claim and to refute the assumptions and pretentions of other creeds and classes of journalsistic and professional literature.

Never before had Jewish scholarship such grand opportunities as today. The Jew is heard by the great world if he but speaks with the convincing power of truth, and with the authority erudition gives. The theological institution equips the leader of men, the soldier of God, with the proper weapons for the warfare of truth and justice and in defense of the eternal verities of Judaism. Nor is it merely the stored-up knowledge of the past, for which the seat of Jewish learning stands, though it may be safely said that the best of what European Christendom knew for the last eight centuries, is obtained through Jewish mediatorship. "The Babylonians are fools," says the Talmud, "who pay reverence

to the scroll of the law and not to the men of the spirit who breathe new life in the dead letter and change the law according to altered conditions." Judaism is progress, the evolution and blossoming forth of those prophetic ideas of truth and justice and liberty for which the Jew has been chosen the herald and champion and martyr-priest in history.

I congratulate you, the head and faculty of the Jewish Seminary as well as the students, upon this new home, which seems to say to each: "Enlarge your scope and the world's mental horizon"; which seems to invite each to a wider and severer atmosphere of thought, to a loftier view and a closer contact with the scientific world around, and to offer more light, more elbow-room for independent research.

In the old Beth Hamidrash God has only the four yard's circumference of the Halakah; in the modern theological school God enters the whole of man, the whole of humanity, as the King of Glory, and, behold, Bible criticism and mediaeval mysticism, Greek Midrash fragments and Geniza finds, Talmudical and Ritual codes become alike resonant with the Sinai message and lift all the disciples of the Lord upon the watch-tower of historic and prophetic vision; if but truth is made a fire that burns and threatens to consume unless spoken forth and justice a shield to crown each one engaged in the service of humanity with victory. Men we need with a holy conviction and ardent love for God and Judaism and humanity; men of principle, self-respecting Jews who serve God, not men, for whom religion is a living truth and a living hope, not imitators, such as look to the right to some High Church for models to emulate, or to the left to liberal Unitarians for pleasantry and flirtation. A more intensified Jewish thought and sentiment must emanate from the theological schools, if Judaism is to re-conquer the multitude.

With the patriarch Jacob we thank God to-day. American Israel which crossed the sea but two or three generations ago, has grown into two camps. Judaism was at all times divided into two different schools and systems, into conservative and liberal currents of thought, and this contrast kept it in a healthy state of mind and heart. American Judaism must needs have two factions, one with its face, its hopes and ideals, turned to the East, and the other with hope and heart centred in the West. But while there must be diversity of opinion in regard to dogma and ritual, in regard to belief and practice, in the essentials, Judaism is one.

On the march the people formed a manifold plurality when standing in front of Mount Sinai, there was but one Israel. Ever since I met Prof. Schechter in Cambridge there has grown a feeling of friendship and mutual regard between us, based upon a conviction strong in us both; that we have a field of labor in common which has been sorely neglected by all who wrote on Jew and Judaism, and that is a systematic Jewish theology. Non-Jewish writers tried to present it to the world, but misrepresented it, because they started with the foregone conclusion that Judaism is inferior to Christianity. Much of the inaccuracy and inconsistency prevailing in the Jewish pulpit and press is due to the lack of a system of Jewish belief and Jewish ethics. May this new home of learning, with a large library at its disposal, enable my friend Schechter to achieve great success so that his work may be an incentive and an inspiration also to me in my labors from another point of view.

This is a day of rejoicing with the Law for both the heads of this institution and the generous donors. With what better words can I, therefore, conclude my address than with the verse on Simhat Torah, which

contains the secret of Judaism's history through the ages: "Rejoice Zebulon, the man of material success, in thy going out, and Issachar, the man of learning, in thy tents of the law!" Every intellectual and spiritual progress made by the Jew was made possible only by the concerted action and co-operation of the men of wealth and the men of learning. Wherever the Torah formed a centre in Israel, the men of worldly means came to the rescue of the men of scholarship to make the promotion of Jewish literature and learning their common aim, thus blessing and immortalizing each other. What has been done here by a few generous-hearted magnates of wealth will, I feel confident, be an incentive to hundreds and thousands throughout the land, so that the two Jewish institutions of learning, the one here with its conservative tendency, and the other, in the West, with its outspoken Reform principle, will soon stand forth, well-equipped and well supported, the pride and joy of every Jew in the land, the equals of any similar theological school of other creeds. So will the Torah be "a Tree of Life" to all that support it, and a fount of blessing to all whose names are linked with its modes of propagation. May, then, God's full grace and blessing rest upon the Jewish Theological Seminary, and may He whose name is glorified in this house cause friendship and peace, harmony and fraternal feeling to dwell here and in every heart that seeks truth, so that East and West, Conservative and Reform, Jew and Gentile, may be made One by the knowledge of Him who is <u>One</u>. Amen.

APPENDIX IIB

HIS MAJESTY'S OPPOSITION

Address delivered by Solomon Schechter at the Dedication of the new Hebrew Union College Campus, Cincinnati, Ohio, January 22, 1913.

At the request of the Board of Directors of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, at the wish of my colleagues, as well as following my own inclination, I have come here to offer you our congratulations on this auspicious occasion, the dedication of the new buildings of the Hebrew Union College. It is a pleasure to me to have seen this great edifice with its commodious halls, its well-equipped library and its fine classrooms, erected to the glory of God, and at the same time forming a monument sacred to the memory of the late Dr. Isaac M. Wise, the founder of this Institution. I remember to have read once, in a book by an early American writer, who complained of the want of distinguished men in this country, and of the lack of reverence to the few great names we do possess. These buildings, bearing the name of one of the leaders of Reform Judaism in America, removes this reproach. It shows that we are now beginning to learn the meaning of reverence and authority, for even Reform Judaism cannot live without authority.

I here take the opportunity of putting on record my thanks to the family of the late Dr. Isaac M. Wise. I had not the honor of knowing the head of the family, who had already been taken from us before I removed to this country, but I had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of Mrs. Wise very soon after my arrival in America. And I acknowledge here with thanks that both she and her sons, as well as other members of the Wise family, always treated me with uniform kindness and attention.

And this in spite of all my heresies regarding Reform Judaism and other theological frailties symptomatic of my want of sympathy with reform tendencies, of which I have never made any secret.

My pleasure is not spoiled by hearing and seeing so much here from which I of necessity differ. Indeed, if I were in agreement with you, I would have been deprived of the pleasure of being here today; at least, in the capacity of President of another college pursuing, to a certain extent, different aims and endeavoring to realize them by largely different methods. Least of all would I, a mere student, without the least forensic ability, have a right to speak in this distinguished gathering consisting of so many great scholars and orators, as your illustrious President and other Rabbis here who have grown old in the service of the Synagogue and famous for their gifts of oratory and speech. But there is also another consideration. Probably you all know the way in which some English statesmen speak of their opponents in the Parliament, referring to them as His Majesty's Opposition. This sounds like a paradox, yet it contains a deep truth, implying as it does that both His Majesty's government as well as His Majesty's oppostion form one large community, working for the welfare of the country and the prosperity of the nation. The same principle may also be applied to theology, there being, under Providence, room also for the opposition party, which has its purpose and mission assigned to it by history. Of course, there are exceptions, but generally there is hardly any phenomenon in Judaism in the way of sect or movement which has not served a certain purpose in the divine economy of our history.

For the opposition there must be, owing to the difference of temper and temperament, the difference of training, the difference of surround-

ings which no process of schooling can entirely obliterate, and the difference of opportunity. Of course, it will always be a question as to which is which; we Conservatives maintaining that we are His Majesty's Government and you His Majesty's Opposition. But this is one of the differences. For reduce your differences as much as you want, and, indeed, I hope and pray that the difference of aims is not so deep as we sometimes think, the fact remains that we are unfortunately divided both in questions of doctrine--at least certain doctrines--and even more in practice. But, thank God, there are still a great many things and aims for which both parties can work in perfect harmony and peace, and unite us. To mention here only two: There is, first, the question of Jewish learning, which concerns us all. This, as has often been pointed out, can only be accomplished by the Jews and for the Jews. No outsider can do it for us even when representing the most liberal point of view, for there is such a thing as a Jewish liberalism and a non-Jewish liberalism, as my friend, the learned President of this College, knows as well as I. To this, any student keeping pace with the productions of theology, philosophy and history will bear evidence. We have thus to do our scholarship for ourselves. I had only lately an experience of this fact. In the course of my studies I found it necessary to read a certain book dealing with the geography of Eastern Europe in the tenth century. You would think that with such a book on such a neutral subject one might feel safe. But it was full of venom and hatred giving evidence to the anti-Semitic tendencies of the author. The most amusing thing was that the subject of his special attack in whom he discovered so much Rabbinical confusion and Talmudic aberrations, etc., was Paulus Cassell, who became converted to Christianity some fifty years ago. But there

is a practical side to this question, touching also the larger Jewish public. I am thinking especially of the problem of text-books for our teachers of religious schools and educated laymen. At present we recur to works written or compiled by Christian authors. This must not be allowed to continue. This class of books, which should have the purpose of imbuing our children with loyalty and devotion and attachment to Judaism, should be composed by ourselves. Christian works on the same line will not help us to bring up our children as Jews. We cannot have our love letters written for us. We must write them ourselves, even at the risk of bad grammar. And this is a work in which both parties, realizing the nature of the problem, can work together.

This is a specimen of work for the Jew and by the Jew. But there is also the great work which Judaism can do for humanity at large, in which both parties can combine. It is only sufficient to mention here the terrible atrocities perpetrated under the eyes of Europe in the Near East. Men, women and children, all non-combatants, are slaughtered by the thousands every day, their number amounting to half a million already, according to the estimate of the newspapers. And yet, no real moral indignation is seen anywhere. We simply put away our papers and enjoy our breakfast as if nothing had happened. We have become so infatuated with the doctrine of the survival of the fittest that we have lost all sensibility to the great moral catastrophes which are passing before our very eyes. And the more philosophy, the more heartless we become. The world is thus in need of new instruction, and this instruction, as history has taught at various epochs, as, for instance, in the Reformation, can only come from the Old Testament.

The Fatherhood of God has always been taught by Judaism, but this

is a time in which the aspect of the Holy King, and the King of Judgment, who not only reigns, but governs, should be emphasized. As my friend, Dr. Kohler, has expressed himself in his recent very interesting essay on the subject: Die Naechstenliebe im Judenthum:

"Nun, ich moechte als Theologie die Liebe nicht missen, aber ich verlange als Jude, erst Gerechtigkeit und dann Liebe."

("As theologian, I should not like to miss the principle of love, but as a Jew I expect first justice and afterwards love.")

These great principles of God's holiness, God's justice and God's governing the world, are to be especially taught now. And they must be taught for years and years to come. The whole of Jewish literature forms an illustration of it; the whole of Jewish life should bear evidence to it. And in this work we can all combine in teaching. But in order to teach, we must first learn and practice. And this is the purpose for which colleges are established. And thus may God's blessing be upon this College, among all other colleges of Catholic Israel in which these great truths of Judaism shall be taught and learned, and then proclaimed to the world, in all their purity and in all their application to the different and various departments of life and thought.

In conclusion, I wish also to thank Dr. Kohler, the President of this College, as well as all those gathered here, for the kind reception which has been accorded me. I was really touched by the honor you have shown me. May God reward you for this act of Gemillath Chasadim. "For my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, Peace be within thee. Because of the house of the Lord our God I will seek thy good."

To indicate the scope of the instruction in the Seminary there are given here the schedules for the past two years.

SCHEDULE OF STUDIES—1902-1903.

SENIOR CLASS.

HOURS.	MONDAY.	TUESDAY.	WEDNESDAY.	THURSDAY.	FRIDAY.
9 to 10 a. m.	Pesahim, Prof. GINZBERG.	Pesahim, Prof. GINZBERG.	Pesahim, Prof. GINZBERG.	Pesahim, Prof. GINZBERG.	Pesahim, Prof. GINZBERG.
10 to 11 a. m.	History of Jewish Literature, with Specimens, Prof. SCHECHTER.	Jewish History, Prof. GINZBERG.	Philosophical and Ethical Texts, Prof. ASHER.	Judæo-Aramaic Grammar, Prof. GINZBERG.	Yerushalmi Bikkurim, Prof. SCHECHTER.
11 a. m. to 12 m.	Shulhan Aruk, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Jewish Theology, Prof. SCHECHTER.	Hebrew Grammar and Composition, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Exodus, Prof. SCHECHTER.	Biblical Archæology, Dr. ADLER.
12 m. to 1 p. m.	Midrash Bereshit Rabbah, Prof. SCHECHTER.	Berakot, Mr. JOFFE.	Psalms, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Homiletics, Prof. ASHER.	Psalms, Dr. DRACHMAN.
1 to 2 p. m.	Joshua, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Isaiah with Targum, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Berakot, Mr. JOFFE.	Isaiah with Targum, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Ahot, Mr. JOFFE.

JUNIOR CLASS.

3 to 4 p. m.	Hebrew Grammar and Composition, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Mishnah, R.-Ha-Shanah Yoma and Sukkah, Mr. JOFFE.	Genesis with Rashi, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Berakot, Mr. JOFFE.	
4 to 5 p. m.	Judæo-Aramaic Grammar, Prof. GINZBERG.	Baba-Meziah, Mr. JOFFE.	Jeremiah, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Baba-Meziah, Mr. JOFFE.	

SCHEDULE OF STUDIES—1903-1904.

SENIOR CLASS.

HOURS.	MONDAY.	TUESDAY.	WEDNESDAY.	THURSDAY.	FRIDAY.
9 to 10 a. m.	Hullin, Prof. GINZBERG.	Hullin, Prof. GINZBERG.	Gittin, Mr. JOFFE.	Hullin, Prof. GINZBERG.	Hullin, Prof. GINZBERG.
10 to 11 a. m.	History of Jewish Literature, from the Completion of the Talmud to Maimonides, Prof. MARX.	Jewish History, from Herod the Great Until the Crusades, Prof. MARX.	Psalms, Prof. FRIEDLAENDER	Judæo-Aramaic Grammar, Prof. GINZBERG.	Yerushalmi Shekalim, Prof. SCHECHTER.
11 a. m. to 12 m.	Shulhan Aruk Yoreh Deah, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Jewish Theology, Prof. SCHECHTER.	Shabbat, Mr. JOFFE.	Shulhan Aruk Yoreh Deah, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Jewish History, from Herod the Great Until the Crusades, Prof. MARX.
12 m. to 1 p. m.	Mekilta and Pesikta, Prof. SCHECHTER.	Hebrew Grammar and Composition, Prof. FRIEDLAENDER	Homiletics, Prof. ASHER.	Leviticus with Selected Commentaries, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Jewish Philosophy Moreh Nebukim, Prof. FRIEDLAENDER
1 to 2 p. m.	Jeremiah, Prof. FRIEDLAENDER	Shulhan Aruk Orah Haim, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Shulhan Aruk Eben Ha-Ezer, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Jeremiah, Prof. FRIEDLAENDER	Jewish Calendar, First Term, Dr. ADLER. Jewish Liturgy, Second Term, Prof. SCHECHTER.

JUNIOR CLASS.

3 to 4 p. m.	Hebrew Grammar and Composition, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Mishnah-Pesahim and Bezah, Mr. JOFFE.	Exodus, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Sukkah, Mr. JOFFE.	
4 to 5 p. m.	Jewish History, Prof. GINZBERG.	Baba Meziah, Mr. JOFFE.	Proverbs, Dr. DRACHMAN.	Baba Meziah, Mr. JOFFE.	

PROGRAMME OF STUDIES.

Senior Department.

1. Bible.

Introductory Lecture: 1 hour.

First Year. Biblical History.
Second Year. Monuments and the Bible.
Third Year. Canon and Introduction.
Fourth Year. Biblical Archæology.

Texts: 2 hours.

First Year. Isaiah.
Second Year. Jeremiah.
Third Year. Ezekiel and Job.
Fourth Year. Minor Prophets.

2. Talmud.

Introductory Lectures: 1 hour.

First Year. Introduction to the Talmud.
Second Year. History of the Halacha.
Third Year. Outlines of Rabbinical Law and Literature.
Fourth Year. Religious Ceremonies and Institutions.

Texts. (*a*) Babylonian Talmud: 4 hours.

First Year. Pesahim.
Second Year. Hullin.
Third Year. Kiddushin.
Fourth Year. Sanhedrin.

(*b*) Palestinian Talmud: 1 hour.

First Year. Berakot.
Second Year. Pesahim.
Third Year. Sotah.
Fourth Year. Sanhedrin.
(Parallel Class: 1 hour. Babylonian Talmud.)

3. **History and Literature.**

(*a*) Post-Biblical History: 2 hours.

First Year. From Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba.

Second Year. From Bar Kochba to the end of the Gaonic period.

Third Year. From the Gaonic period to the middle of the 14th Century.

Fourth Year. From the 14th Century to Modern Times.

(*b*) Literature: 1 hour.

First Year. Hellenistic Literature.
Second Year. Tannaitic Literature.
Third Year. Midrashic Literature.
Fourth Year. History of Sects.

4. **Codes.** 2 hours.

Yore Deah and Eben Ha-Ezer (supplementary reading of Orah Hayyim with examinations at regular intervals.)

5. **Philosophy.** 1 hour.

First Year. From Saadya to Bahyah.
Second Year. Gabirol and Judah Halevi.
Third Year. Maimonides.
Fourth Year. Post-Maimonidian Philosophy.

6. **Theology.** 1 hour.

7. **Liturgy.** 1 hour.

8. **Midrash.** 1 hour.

Selections from the most important Midrashim.

9. **Homiletics.** 2 hours.

Lectures on the theory of preaching and practice in writing and delivering sermons.

Junior Department.

1. Hebrew Grammar. 1 hour.

Etymology of Verb and Noun.

2. Bible. 1 hour.

Proverbs; Liturgical Psalms; The Five Scrolls; Ezra; Daniel.

3. Biblical Commentaries. 1 hour.

Rashi, Ihn Ezra, and other commentaries on Genesis, chap. 1-3; Exodus, chap 17-25; Leviticus and Deuteronomy.

4. Talmud. 2 hours.

First Year.	שבת, פרק כל כתבי, ר' אליעזר דמילה	A
Second Year.	נסין, פרק השולח	A
Third Year.	כתובות, פרק אע"פי	A
First Year.	ברכות, פרק תפלת השחר	B
Second Year.	יומא, פרק יום הכפורים	B
Third Year.	בבא מציעא, פרק המפקיד	B
Selections from the Babylonian Talmud.		C

5. Codes. 2 hours.

First Year. *Orah Hayyim* §1-241.
Second Year. *Idem.* §242-428.
Third Year. *Idem.* §429-695.

6. Mediaeval Hebrew Literature. 1 hour.
First Year. Historic Texts.
Second Year. Poetic Texts.
Third Year. Ethical Texts.

7. Biblical and Post-Biblical History (Elementary Course). 1 hour.

8. Homiletics. 1 hour. Homiletic Exercises.

into English; and familiarity with biblical history from Abraham to Zerubabel.

In Secular Branches: Knowledge sufficient for admission to the B grade of the Cincinnati high-schools.

Standard of Admission to Collegiate Department.

In Hebraica and Rabbinica: Thorough knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic grammar and ability to translate *at sight* any part of the Pentateuch, the Psalms, Proverbs and Daniel; passages from medieval Bible commentators and the *Mishnah*; also portions of Maimonides' Sefer ha Madda; familiarity with Biblical and Jewish history as far down as the times of the Tannaim, and with the essential doctrines of the Jewish religion.

In Secular Branches: Knowledge sufficient for admission into the Junior class of the University of Cincinnati, a certificate of admission to the same being indispensable, unless the applicant has graduated from a university of recognized standing.

Course of Studies in the Preparatory Department.

1905

Grade D (14 hours a week):

1. Bible: (*a*) Genesis and Deuteronomy, 3 hours.
   (*b*) Selections of Psalms and Proverbs, 2 hours.
2. Prayerbook, 1 hour.
3. Mishnah: Abot, 2 hours.
4. Hebrew grammar, 2 hours.
5. History, Biblical, with texts, 2 hours.
6. Geography, 1 hour.
7. Religious instruction from Hebrew texts committed to memory, 1 hour.

GRADE C (14 hours a week):

1. Bible: (*a*) Exodus, Leviticus and Numeri, 3 hours.
   (*b*) Selections of Psalms and Proverbs, 2 hours.
2. Prayerbook, 1 hour.
3. Mishnah, Berakot and selections from Seder Moed, 2 hours.
4. Hebrew Grammar 2 hours.
5. History, Biblical and post-Biblical, 2 hours.
6. Geography, 1 hour.
7. Religious instruction from Hebrew texts, 1 hour.

GRADE B (15 hours a week):

1. Bible: Selections from prophetical and poetical portions, 2 hours.
2. Bible Commentators: Rashi, Rashbam or Kimhi.
3. Midrash or Selections from En Yaakob.
4. Mishnah: Historical portions in Seder Moed and Nashim, 2 hours.
5. Targum: Poetic portions of Pentateuch, 2 hours.
6. Aramaic grammar and Hebrew syntax, 2 hours.
7. Jewish history in outline to 70 C. E., 2 hours.
8. Prayerbook, 1 hour.
9. Religious instruction, Sabbath and holidays, 1 hour.

GRADE A (15 hours a week):

1. Bible: Selections from Isaiah and Minor Prophets, 2 hours.
2. Rashi and Rashbam, poetic portions of Pentateuch, 1 hour.
3. Mishnah: Selections from Seder Moed 2 hours.
4. Midrash: Selections from Wayikra and Shir ha Shirim Rabba, 2 hours.
5. Aramaic: Daniel and Targum to Pentateuch, 2 hours.
6. Biblical Canon, 1 hour.
7. Jewish history in outline, 2 hours.

8. Religious and ethical instruction from Sefer ha Madda and Talmudic portions, 2 hours.
9. Liturgy and Calendar, 1 hour.

This course leads to the degree of חבר לאצילי בני ישראל Bachelor of Hebrew Letters and entitles its recipient to enter the Collegiate department of the Hebrew Union College, provided he is a graduate also of the Cincinnati High School in its college course or of another institute of the same grade.

Course of Studies in the Collegiate Department.

FIRST COLLEGIATE CLASS (15 hours a week):

1. Bible Exegesis, critical-historical: Amos, Hosea and Micah, 2 hours.
2. Rashi and Ibn Ezra to Genesis, 1 hour.
3. Mishnah: Hullin and portions of Seder Nashim, 2 hours.
4. Talmud: Introduction with select passages, 1 hour.
5. Halakah: H. Shema, Tefillah, Berakot, historically developed, 1 hour.
6. Haggadah: Portions from En Yaacob and Debarim Rabba, 2 hours.
7. Religious Philosophy: Introduction, Onkelos, Philo, 1 hour.
8. Jewish History from Exile to Mishnaic time, 2 hours.
9. Apocryphical Literature, 1 hour.
10. History of Liturgy, 1 hour.
11. Sunday-school work, Bible teaching, 1 hour.
12. (Optional) Syriac, 1 hour; Arabic, 1 hour.

SECOND COLLEGIATE CLASS (15 hours a week):

1. Bible Exegesis: Isaiah, 2 hours.
2. Rashi and Ibn Ezra, Leviticus and Deuteronomy, 1 hour.
3. Mishnah: Seder Nezikin, 2 hours.
4. Talmud: Berakot and Shabbat, 1 hour.

5. Halakah: H. Zedakah and Peah, Talmud and Code, 1 hour.
6. Haggadah: Bereshit Rabba, 1 hour.
7. Religious Philosophy: Saadiah and Moreh, selections, 2 hours.
8. Jewish History from Mishnaic period to close of Gemarah, 2 hours.
9. Apocryphical and Apocalyptic Literature, 1 hour.
10. Liturgy, Festivals and Calendar, 1 hour.
11. Sunday-school Work: Religious and ethical teaching, 1 hour.
12. (Optional) Languages, as above, 3 hours.

THIRD COLLEGIATE CLASS (16 hours a week):

1. Biblical Exegesis: Jeremiah and Ezekiel, 2 hours.
2. Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Nahmanides to Exodus and Leviticus, 1 hour
3. Mishnah: Zeraim and part of Zebahim, 2 hours.
4. Halakah: Kiddushin and Gittin, Talmud and Code, 1 hour.
5. Haggadah: Tanhuma and Pesikta, 2 hours.
6. Code: Yad ha Hazakah and Shulhan Aruk Orah Hayyim, cursory reading, 1 hour.
7. Jewish History, Geonic and Spanish period, 2 hours.
8. Religious Philosophy: Kuzari and Moreh, 2 hours.
9. Ethical Literature: The eight chapters from Maimonides, 1 hour.
10. Hellenistic Literature, 1 hour.
11. Homiletic Literature, 1 hour.
12. (Optional) Languages, as above, 3 hours.

JUNIOR CLASS (18 hours a week):

1. Bible Exegesis: Psalms, 2 hours.
2. Introduction into Bible, 1 hour.
3. Mishnah: Seder Zebahim and Seder Toharot, 2 hours.
4. Halakah: Hullin and H. Maakalot Asurot, Codes, 2 hours.

5. Haggadah: Selections from Shir Hashirim and Kohelet Rabba, 2 hours.
6. Jewish History: From xii. to xviii. century, 2 hours.
7. Ethics with Literature, 2 hours.
8. History of Judaism and its sects, 1 hour.
9. Homiletics, theoretical and practical, 2 hours.
10. Systematic Theology, 1 hour.
11. Elocution, 1 hour.
12. (Optional) Languages, as above, 3 hours.

SENIOR CLASS (18 hours a week):

1. Bible Exegesis: Job and Kohelet, 2 hours.
2. History of Bible text and translations, 1 hour.
3. Halakah: H. Kiddushin and Gittin Code, 2 hours.
4. Haggadah, with introduction into the Midrashic literature, 1 hour.
5. Judaism and its currents of thought: Talmudism, Karaism and Kabbalah, 1 hour.
6. Systematic and Practical Theology, 2 hours.
7. Religious Philosophy: Crescas, Albo and modern philosophers, 2 hours.
8. Jewish History, modern times, 2 hours.
9. History of Liturgy, 1 hour.
10. Homiletics, theoretical and practical, 2 hours.
11. Ethics, 1 hour.
12. Elocution, 1 hour.

Students who did not take all the subjects of the class, or failed in any, may be granted the privilege to remain in the same class another year; if they failed in one or two subjects only, they may be promoted to the next higher class, on condition that they pass examination in those subjebts prior to February 1st of the next year.

COURSE OF STUDIES

As Arranged for 1920–21.

Capitals before a subject indicate name of professor teaching the subject: K—Kohler; D—Deutsch; G—Grossmann; N—Neumark; L—Lauterbach; B—Buttenwieser; M—Morgenstern; E—Englander; F—Freehof; Mr—Marcus.

An asterisk (*) after the number of hours for a subject indicates that the subject is taken in combination with the class above.

A double dagger (‡) indicates that the subject is taken in combination with the class below.

D Grade.

		HOURS
M —	1. Hebrew Grammar	4
M —	2. Joshua	1
E —	3. Bible: Genesis and Exodus	4
Mr —	4. Pirke Abot	2
F —	5. Liturgy	2
S —	6. Catechism	1

C Grade.

E —	1. Hebrew Grammar	1
M S —	2. Bible: (*a*) Numbers	1
M & Mr—	(*b*) Deuteronomy	4
E —	(*c*) Judges	1
Mr —	(*d*) I and II Kings with corresponding chapters in Chronicles	2
F —	3. Mishna: Berakot and Bikkurim	2
F —	4. Prayerbook	2
Mr —	5. Biblical History from the establishment of the Kingdom to the Exile	1

B Grade.

Mr —	1. Biblical History	2
Mr —	2. Bible: (*a*) Leviticus	1

		HOURS
E —	(*b*) Selected Readings in Commentaries of Rashi and Rashbam to the Pentateuch	2
M —	(*c*) Samuel and corresponding chapters in Chronicles; Ruth and Esther. This course will be given in 1920–21 and in alternate years thereafter.	2*
M —	(*d*) Aramaic Grammar; Daniel and Ezra. This course will be given in 1921–22 and in alternate years thereafter.	2*
B —	(*e*) Psalms. In 1921–22 and in alternate years.	2*
E —	(*f*) Proverbs. In 1920–21 and in alternate years.	2*
F —	3. Mishna: Selected Treatises of Moed	2
F —	4. Liturgy	2
Mr —	5. Catechism, Ceremonies and Doctrines	1

A Grade.

M —	1. Bible: (*a*) Samuel, etc (See B Grade 2c); in 1920–21.	2‡
M —	(*b*) Aramaic Grammar, etc (See B Grade 2d); in 1921–22.	2‡
B —	(*c*) Psalms (See B Grade 2e); in 1921–22.	2‡

			HOURS
E	—	(*d*) Proverbs	2‡
		(See B Grade 2f); in 1920–21.	
E	—	2. Midrash: Leviticus Rabba; Selected Portions	2
L	—	3. Mishnah: Selected Treatises of Seder Nezikin	2
N	—	4. Sefer Hamadda	2
D	—	5. General Survey of Jewish History	2
K	—	6. Judaism—its Doctrines and Ceremonies	1

FIRST COLLEGIATE CLASS.

B	—	1. Bible: (*a*) Beginnings of Prophecy. Amos and Hosea. Cursory readings from Isaiah and Jeremiah	3
E	—	(*b*) Genesis with Targum and Commentaries	2
D	—	2. Midrash Rabba to the Megilloth	1*
L	—	3. Haggadic Selections from the Talmud	1
F	—	4. Mishna: Tractates from Seder Nashim	2
N	—	5. Jewish Philosophy	2
D	—	6. Jewish History	2*
K	—	7. History of Judaism and its Sects	1*
G	—	8. Religious Pedagogy	1

SECOND COLLEGIATE CLASS.

B	—	1. Bible: (*a*) Isaiah 1-39	3*
		In 1921–22 and in alternate years thereafter.	
B	—	(*b*) Jeremiah	3*
		In 1920–21 and in alternate years thereafter.	

			HOURS
M	—	(*c*) Introduction to the Bible	3*
D	—	(*d*) Mediaeval Commentaries to the Bible	1*
D	—	2. Midrash: to Genesis and Numbers Rabba	1‡
L	—	3. Talmud: Introduction to; Development of Halakah with selected readings	3
N	—	4. Philosophy: (*a*) Introduction to Philosophy and Cabbala	1
N	—	(*b*) Philosophic Text	1
D	—	5. Jewish History	2‡
K	—	6. Apocryphal and Apocalyphic Literature	1‡

THIRD COLLEGIATE CLASS.

B	—	1. Bible (*a*) Isaiah, etc	3‡
		(Same as in II Collegiate).	
B	—	(*b*) Jeremiah, etc	3‡
		(Same as in II Collegiate).	
M	—	(*c*) Introduction to the Bible	3
D	—	(*d*) Medieval Hebrew commentaries to the Bible	1
L	—	2. Talmud: Pesahim, Taanit and Shabbat	2
K	—	3. Systematic Theology	1*
N	—	4. Jewish Philosophy	2
K	—	5. Homiletics	1
D	—	6. Jewish History	2*

JUNIOR CLASS.

B	—	1. Bible: Ezekiel, Job and Kohelet	3
L	—	2. Topics from Hullin and Codes	2
K	—	3. Midrash and Homiletics	2*
K	—	4. Systematic Theology	1‡
N	—	5. Jewish Philosophy	3

			HOURS
D	—	6. Jewish History	2‡
G	—	7. Ethics and Pedagogy	2*
		8. Jewish Sociology: Principles	2*

SENIOR CLASS.

B	—	1. Bible: Isaiah 40-66	2
K	—	2. Homiletics and Midrash	1‡
L	—	3. Topics from Kiddushin, Gittin, Yebamot and Code	2
N	—	4. Jewish Philosophy	2
K	—	5. Practical Theology	1
D	—	6. Jewish History	2
G	—	7. Ethics and Pedagogy	2‡
		8. Applied Sociology	2‡

NOTES

[1]Union of American Hebrew Congregations Proceedings UAHCP , III, 2005-2006, as cited in Cohon, "History of the Hebrew Union College," Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, No. XL, Part 1 (September, 1950), p. 35.

[2]The development of the Historical School and the birth of the Jewish Theological Seminary Association have been comprehensively treated by Moshe Davis in The Emergence of Conservative Judaism.

[3]American Hebrew [AH], XXV (Feb. 5, 1886), 194-5, as cited by Davis, p. 235.

[4]AH, XXVI, no. 2 (Feb. 19, 1886), 19-20, as cited by Cohon, pp. 35-36.

[5]The Yeshivah Etz Chayim was established in New York in 1886 as an Orthodox day school. It later merged with the Rabbi Isaac Elhanan Theological Seminary, which had been founded in 1897; today the merged institution is the Yeshivah University.

[6]Davis, p. 321.

[7]Henry Leipziger to Bernhard Bettmann, June 12, 1901, from the original in the American Jewish Archives [AJA], Cincinnati.

[8]The symposium appeared in AH, LXVII, Nos. 2-3 (May 25 - June 1, 1900), 37-39; 69-72. Singer's proposal appeared a year later in AH, LXIX (May 31, 1901), 40. In a letter to Dr. Solomon Solis Cohen of Philadelphia, dated June 19, 1900, Solomon Schechter expressed his opinion of the idea of merging the Seminary and the College: "The idea of combining the two colleges is a very unfortunate one. If a man is a Spencerian in his theology and a Chinese in his diet he ought not to go in for the ministry. It is not a question of trifles. . . . The real question is are we going to have a theology without a God and a Judaism without a Torah. As to the Minhag America, of which the pupils of Cincinnati are so proud, they ought to know that the tendency of our time is against geographical divisions in religion, its greatest virtue being universality. All religions strive now for Catholicity. No American theologian of any reputation ever speaks of American Christianity. . . . Besides, the state of American Reform at present must necessarily prove fatal to the cause of research and 'Wissenschaft.' For when the Bible, Talmud and the succeeding Jewish literature have ceased to be a factor in Jewish life and have no real influence upon Jewish thought, Jewish learning must prove a mere encumberance to men whose mission is greatly practical. Hence the fact that the Cincinnati people have so far so little to show in the direction of scholarship. Pray do not think me intolerant. It is time to stand by our Torah and our traditions or we shall disappear. . . ." (as cited by Bernard Mandelbaum in The Wisdom of Solomon Schechter).

[9]Jewish Theological Seminary Association Biennial Report [JTSABR], 1902-04, p. 10.

[10]Bentwich, Solomon Schechter: A Biography, p. 167.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid., p. 125.

[14]Ibid., p. 97.

[15]Ibid., pp. 168-69.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Solomon Schechter to Mayer Sulzberger, March 5, 1900, in the collection edited by Meir Ben-Horin in Jewish Social Studies, XXV:4 (October, 1963), 275-76.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Bentwich, p. 170.

[20]Ibid., p. 171.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ben-Horin, p. 281-82.

[23]Compare HUC Catalogs; 1900, pp. 12-13 and 1903, pp. 14-15.

[24]Bernhard Bettmann to Joseph Stolz, April 12, 1902, from the original in AJA.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Bettmann's report to the Board of Governors, October 28, 1903, from the original manuscript in the AJA.

[28]Bettmann's report to the Board of Governors, February 18, 1903, from the original manuscript in the AJA.

[29]Bettmann to Kaufmann Kohler, February 11, 1903, from the original amended draft in the AJA.

[30]Ibid. (Original text crossed out, but legible).

[31]Kohler to Isaac Bloom, Secretary of the Board of Governors, February 15, 1903, from the original in the AJA.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Bettmann's report to the Board of Governors, February 18, 1903, from the original manuscript in the AJA.

[34]The complete text of Kohler's address, entitled "A Well of Living Waters," may be found in Hebrew Union College and Other Addresses [HUCOA], pp. 1-10.

[35]From Schechter's address entitled "Higher Criticism--Higher Anti-Semitism," delivered at the Judean Banquet in Kohler's honor, March 26, 1903. The complete text may be found in Seminary Addresses and Other Papers [SA], pp. 35-39.

[36]From Kohler's memorial address for Schechter, delivered at the Hebrew Union College Chapel, December 18, 1915. The complete text may be found in HUCOA, pp. 323-36.

[37]Kohler to Jacob H. Schiff, January 9, 1902, from the original in the AJA.

[38]SA, pp. 38-39.

[39]Ibid.

[40]AH, LXXII (May 1, 1903), 795-6. For the complete text of this address, entitled "The College and Seminary," see the Appendix.

[41]Schechter to Kohler, October 12, 1903, from the original in the AJA.

[42]AH, LXXII (November 21, 1902), p. 37.

[43]JTSABR -1902-04, p. 101.

[44]AH, LXXII (November 21, 1902), 37.

[45]Text taken from the Act of Incorporation of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, February 20, 1902, in JTSABR - 1902-04, p. 16, as quoted by Schechter.

[46]Mayer Sulzberger to Jacob H. Schiff, November 27, 1902, from original in AJA.

[47]JTSABR - 1902-04, pp. 33-34.

[48]Ibid., pp. 32-33. For Schechter's complete curriculum see the Appendix.

[49]Ibid., p. 75.

[50]Ibid., p. 50.

[51]Ibid., p. 59.

[52]UAHCP, VI (1903-1907), 4998.

[53]Kohler, New Curriculum of the Hebrew Union College - 1903, p. 3.

[54]UAHCP, VI, 4977.

[55]For Kohler's complete curriculum, see the Appendix.

[56]UAHCP, VI, 5260.

[57]Bentwich, p. 237.

[58]See Kohler's inaugural address in HUCOA, p. 7.

[59]Bentwich, p. 97.

[60]JTSABR - 1902-04, p. 126.

[61]Herman H. Rubenowitz, The Waking Heart, p. 24.

[62]Bentwich, p. 184.

[63]Ibid., p. 315.

[64]Ibid., p. 318.

[65]UAHCP, VI, 4977.

[66]Kohler's annual report, November 1908, in UAHCP, VII, 6020.

[67]Kohler to Max Margolis, April 12, 1905, from the original in the AJA.

[68]Max Margolis, The Theological Aspect of Reformed Judaism, pp. 122-24.

[69]Minutes of the Executive Session of the Board of Governors of HUC, May 15, 1906, from the original manuscript in the AJA.

[70]AH, LXXX (April 5, 1907), 520.

[71]Reform Advocate, XXXIII:7 (April 6, 1907), 198-99.

[72]David Philipson, My Life As An American Jew, pp. 156-57.

[73]Cohon, p. 43.

[74]Discussion with Dr. Michael Meyer, HUC-JIR, Cincinnati.

[75]See Kohler's eulogy for Schechter in HUCOA, p. 334.

[76]Minutes of the Board of Governors of HUC, February 23, 1915, from the original in the AJA. Rabbi Max Heller (HUC '84), had long been a strong opponent of Kohler. On October 31, 1904, he wrote to Schechter: "What I should like to bring about, not only from personal feeling to-

wards you, but in the interest of American Jewdom [!], is to place you, with the whole younger Rabbinate, in the position of spiritual guide. Of course, the type of Rabbi-hustler will never understand you. The [J.] Leonard Levys [of Pittsburgh] and [Rabbi Moses J.] Gries . . . will sneer at you as an emotionalist and a medievalist. But if you could only meet a gathering of the H.U.C. Alumni, you would, I am sure, agree with me that they are . . . a body of earnest, aspiring, sincere-minded young men. They detest Kohler almost to a man; his egotism, his overbearing manner, his vacillations and tactlessness have estranged all, except possibly Philipson from him; he is making an egregious failure as President; it is only my loyalty to the interests of the H.U.C. which restrains me from exposing his complete unfitness as a teacher and leader.

I could get Leo Wise [Isaac M. Wise's son and then editor of the American Israelite in Cincinnati], in a minute, to make bitter warfare upon him; for Dr. Kohler, while professing admiration of Dr. Wise in public, omits no private opportunity for deprecating him; but I will not say anything in the Israelite which may throw discredit upon the College. . . . (Ben-Horin, Part II, p. 81).

[77]From Drachman's autobiography, The Unfailing Light (New York, 1948), p. 254, as cited by Ben-Horin in "Solomon Schechter to Judge Mayer Sulzberger (Part II)", Jewish Social Studies, XXVII:2 (April, 1965), 76.

[78]Ibid.

[79]Ibid.

[80]Ibid.

[81]Ibid.

[82]UAHCP, IX (1916-1920) 8582.

[83]UAHCP, VI (1903-1907) 5219.

[84]HUCOA, p. 40.

[85]SA, p. 240. For the complete text of Schechter's address, see the Appendix.

[86]Bentwich, p. 209. Schechter's original draft of the preamble of the United Synagogue may be found in Ben-Horin, Part II, p. 98.

[87]Ben-Horin, Part II, p. 98.

[88]Bentwich, p. 191.

[89]See Kohler's memorial address for Schechter in HUCOA, p. 331.

[90]Cyrus Adler, I Have Considered The Days, p. 288.

[91]Bentwich, p. 189.

[92]Ibid., p. 190.

[93]Ibid.

[94]Ibid., p. 189.

[95]Ibid., p. 191.

[96]S. Baruch, "Homage to Solomon Schechter," XXV:2 (April-June, 1937), 156.

[97]SA, p. 246.

[98]Bentwich, p. 196.

[99]Herman Lissauer, "A Student's Tribute to Dr. Schechter," in Jewish Theological Seminary of America Student's Annual, III (1916), 126.

[100]For the complete text of Kohler's memorial address for Schechter, see HUCOA, pp. 323-336.

[101]UAHCP, X (1921), 8997.

[102]For the complete text of Kohler's farewell sermon, "Israel's Solidarity, American Reform Judaism and the Hebrew Union College," see the Hebrew Union College Monthly, June 1922, 221-227.

[103]For the complete text of Kohler's Jubilee article, see the Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume, pp. 71-78.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources:

A. Manuscript Material.

American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

Personal correspondence of Kaufmann Kohler, Solomon Schechter, Cyrus Adler, Bernhard Bettmann, Max Margolis, Louis Marshall, David Philipson, Jacob H. Schiff, Joseph Stolz and Mayer Sulzberger.

Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati. Minutes of the Board of Governors, 1900-1921.

B. Periodicals.

American Hebrew. New York: 1900-1915.

American Israelite. Cincinnati: 1900-1921.

Hebrew Union College Journal. Cincinnati: 1900-1921.

Hebrew Union College Monthly. Cincinnati: 1914-1922.

Jewish Theological Seminary of America Student's Annual. New York: 1914-1916.

The Union [of American Hebrew Congregations] Bulletin, 1-7. Cincinnati: 1911-1917.

Union [of Am. Heb. Cong.] Tidings, 1-2. Cincinnati: 1919-1922.

Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Cincinnati: 1889-1920.

C. Books.

Kohler, Kaufmann. New Curriculum For the Hebrew Union College. Cincinnati: 1903.

_____. Hebrew Union College and Other Adresses. Cincinnati: 1916.

_____. Jewish Theology Systematically and Historically Considered. New York: 1918.

_____. Studies, Addresses and Personal Papers. New York: 1931.

_____. A Living Faith. Cincinnati: 1948.

Schechter, Solomon. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. New York: 1909.

_____. Seminary Addresses and Other Papers. Cincinnati: 1915.

Adler, Cyrus. Lectures, Selected Papers and Addresses. Philadelphia: 1933.

_____. I Have Considered The Days. Philadelphia: 1941.

Brav, Stanley. Telling Tales Out of School. Cincinnati: 1965.

Hebrew Union College. Ceremonies at the Installation of Rev. Dr. Kaufmann Kohler as President of the Hebrew Union College. Cincinnati: 1903.

Hebrew Union College Catalog, 1900-1922. Cincinnati: 1900-1922.

Hebrew Union College Annual. Cincinnati: 1904.

Jewish Theological Seminary Association. Proceedings of the Biennial Convention. Vol. 1-7. New York: 1888-1902.

Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Biennial Report, 1902-1904. New York: 1906.

_____. Documents, Charter and By-Laws. New York: 1903.

_____. Register, 1904-1915. New York: 1904-1915.

Marshall, Louis. Louis Marshall-Champion of Liberty (ed. by Charles Reznikoff). Philadelphia: 1957.

Centenary Papers and Others. Cincinnati: 1919.

Philipson, David. My Life as An American Jew. Cincinnati: 1941.

Rubenovitz, Herman H. The Waking Heart. Cambridge, Mass.: 1967.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Proceedings. V-X. Cincinnati: 1898-1921.

Wise, Isaac M. Selected Writings (ed. by David Philipson). Cincinnati: 1900.

Wise, Stephen S. Challenging Years (Autobiography). London: 1951.

D. Articles.

Abrahams, Joseph. "The Jewish Theological Seminary" (The New Era Illustrated Magazine IV:2). New York: 1903.

Ben Horin, Meir. "Solomon Schechter to Judge Mayer Sulzberger. Part I. Letters from the Pre-Seminary Period (1895-1901)" (Jewish Social Studies XXV:4). New York: 1963.

_____. Above article, Part II. "Letters from the Seminary Period (1902-1915)" (Jewish Social Studies XXVII:2). New York: 1965.

_____. Above article, Supplement to Parts I and II, (Jewish Social Studies XXX:4). New York: 1968.

Kohler, Max J. "A Biographical Sketch of Kaufmann Kohler" (Studies in Jewish Literature Issued in Honor of Kaufmann Kohler). Berlin: 1913.

May, Max B. "The Hebrew Union College" (The New Era Illustrated Magazine, IV:1). New York: 1903.

II. Secondary Sources:

A. Books

Adler, Cyrus. Jacob H. Schiff: His Life and Letters. New York: 1928.

Bentwich, Norman. Solomon Schechter: A Biography. Philadelphia: 1938.

Davis Moshe. The Emergence of Conservative Judaism. Philadelphia: 1963.

Goldman, Alex. J. Giants of Faith. New York: 1964.

Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume. Cincinnati: 1925.

Heller, James G. Isaac M. Wise: His Life, Work and Thought. New York: 1965.

Jewish Theological Seminary of America: Semi-Centennial Volume. New York: 1939.

Mandelbaum, Bernard. The Wisdom of Solomon Schechter. New York: 1963.

Neuman, Abraham A. Cyrus Adler: A Biography. New York: 1942.

Oko, Adolph S. Solomon Schechter: A Bibliography. Cambridge: 1938.

Parzen, Herbert. Architects of Conservative Judaism. New York: 1964

Philipson, David. The Reform Movement in Judaism. New York: 1907.

Rabinowicz, Harry M. The Jewish Literary Treasures of England and America. London: 1962.

Schwartzman, Sylvan D. Reform Judaism in the Making. New York: 1961.

Sklare, Marshall. Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement. New York: 1972.

B. Articles:

Adler, Cyrus. "Solomon Schechter: A Biographical Sketch" (American Jewish Year Book, 5677). Philadelphia: 1917.

Cohon, Samuel S. "The History of Hebrew Union College" (Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society XL:1). New York: 1950.

_____. "Kaufmann Kohler The Reformer" (Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume). New York: 1953.

Oko, Adolph S. "The Story of a Library" (American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 45). Philadelphia: 1943.

Philipson, David. "History of the Hebrew Union College" (Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume). Cincinnati: 1925.

Encyclopaedia References:

The Jewish Encyclopaedia. New York: 1902. "Hebrew Union College," "Jewish Theological Seminary," "Kaufmann Kohler," "Solomon Schechter."

Encyclopaedia Judaica. Jerusalem: 1972. "Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion," "Jewish Theological Seminary of America," "Kaufmann Kohler," "Max Margolis," David Neumark," "Solomon Schechter," Mayer Sulzberger."

ADDENDA

I. Primary Sources:

Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume. Cincinnati: 1925.

Margolis, Max. The Theological Aspects of Reformed Judaism. Baltimore: 1904.

II. Secondary Sources:

Baruch, S. "Homage to Solomon Schechter," (Menorah Journal, XXV:2 (April-June, 1937), New York: 1937.

Mandelbaum, Bernard, The Wisdom of Solomon Schechter. New York: 1963.