LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

JEWISH ACADEMIC IDEALS
IN GERMANIC LANDS DURING THE 17TH and 18TH CENTURIES

Referee: Dr. Jacob Marcus

Submitted by:
Robert I. Kahn
February 1st, 1935

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Ever since, when according to the rabbis, the Jews offered their children as guarantee that they would preserve the Torah, a most important phase of Jewish life has been education. Knowledge has always been the mark of Jewish aristocracy. The am ha'arez has been the butt of quips and jokes. The induction of the Jewish boy into manhood by way of Bar Mitzvah ceremonies has centered on the attainment by that boy of a certain minimum of Hebrew knowledge. We find, therefore, that every generation has labored mightily to found and preserve its schools, to secure teachers, to train its youth for a life of devout study.

This thesis will deal with the subject of Jewish education among Ashkenazic Jews in the 17th and 18th centuries. This thesis would answer the questions:

What records have we of Jewish education in this period?

What were the means of education?

What were Jewish children taught?

What pedagogic methods were used?

What were the aims of the community in this teaching?

What were the underlying causes that led to early reforms in education?

In dealing with these questions, we do not confine ourselves to the study of great men and their books. Rather do we survey the life of many communities as they set about upholding the dignity of the teacher, or supplying educational facilities for poor children. We survey a phase of Jewish history that was

part of everyday life, that was basic to the persistence of the Jewish group. This preoccupation of our forefathers with education should certainly remind us of our obligation to our own youth in carrying on the rich Jewish traditions.

CHAPTER I

Description of Materials Used

The source material for this thesis was contained in two books, Mekorot LeToldot Hachinuch Beyisrael by Simcha Assaf (Tel-Aviv, 1925) and Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Unterrichts und der Erziehungen bei den deutschen Juden by Dr. M. Güdemann (Berlin, 1891). Both of these books are collections of source material, sometimes in the original, sometimes translated from Hebrew to German, from Yiddish to modern Hebrew, etc., and also include brief prefatory remarks to most selections which give the source, its author, the date of publication, etc.

We would introduce you to the authors among Ashkenazic Jewry of the 17th and 18th centuries, who wrote of education, to the communities and organizations which made education their concern and to the books which treat in passing of education.

The first category of sources falls under the heading of Memoirs, Autobiography and Biography. These sources are most valuable, for they treat, not of theory or of ideals but of education in the lives of the authors.

The Memoirs of R. Asher b. Eliezer Halevi (1598-?) which were written between 1620 and 1635 in Reichshofen alsace and deal with life among the Bachurim.

The Memoirs of Glueckel von Hameln (1647-1718) which contain some material on her own education and that of her children. The author lived for the most part in Hamburg and Metz and wrote in Yiddish.

Megillat Sefer, the autobiography of Jacob Emden (1697-1776). The author lived in Altona, and, as an anti-Sabbatian, was involved in a controversy with Jonathan Eyebeschutz.

Sefer HaYichus by Jedidiah Tiah Weil (1721-1805). The author was a pious Cabbalist and a Rabbi in Prague, Metz, and other towns in Bohemia. The book is more or less of a genealogy of the famous Weil family.

Memoirs of R. Moses Wasserzug (1750-1818) who lived near Posen.

Toldot Jacob Joseph by R. Jacob Joseph HaKohen (18th cent.)

The second category of sources includes Testaments, i.e. ethical wills, which largely express the ideals of the people rather than their practice, although at times there are insights into the prevailing attitudes and habits of the Jewish group.

Testament of R. Jacob b. Abraham HaLevi Horwitz. (17th cent.)

Testament of Moses Chasid, an Austrian ethicist. (" ")

Testament of R. Jonah Landsofer of Prague (died ca.1710). The author was a Bohemian Talmudist, acquainted also with Massora and secular science. He and Moses Chasid (above) were sent to dispute with Sabbatians.

A third category of sources derives from letters, public or private. These need no evaluation as first hand sources.

A letter sent on the 16th of Kislev, 1619 from Prague to Vienna, which was part of a group seized and filed by the government.

A letter sent in 1755 from the German Kehilla in Amsterdam

by Gaon Saul b. Arye Lev (or Löwenstamm) (1717-1790). The author was Russian born and educated.

A letter from Ezekiel Landau to the Parnassim of Berlin. The writer was a rabbi in Prague, and, although he was a lover of Haskala, was opposed to the Berlin group of Maskilim. Likwise he opposed Chassidism. Mendelssohn's translation and Wessely's ideas both came in for his criticism.

An open letter published in Meassef (1785), concerning the Berlin Free School which was founded in 1781 by Daniel Itzig and David Friedlander and included in its curriculum both Jewish and secular subjects.

A letter of Herz Homburg (1749-1841) to the heads of Galician Jewish communities. The writer was at one time a tutor to Mendelssohn's son and a pupil of the father. He was a Maskil and in this letter he writes as the head, appointed by Joseph II, of the Galician schools.

A fourth class of sources includes the decisions of rabbis in the way of responsa or novellae. These, of course, deal with the subject more from the authoritative point of view. They show the ideal more than the real.

Responsa of R. Yair Chayyim Bacharach (1639-1712) under the title, Chawat Yair. The author was a systematic student of Jewish lore who possessed some secular learning. He was an agitator for advanced pedagogic methods and administration but was purely traditional in his view of the curriculum.

Novellae of R. Abraham Chayyim b. Naphtali Hirsch Shor, a Galician rabbi, collected under the title Torat Chayyim.

Responsa of Gaon R. Aaron Samuel Kaidanower, under the title, Emunot Shemuel.

Novellae and responsa of Abi Ezra Selig Margolioth (d.1715), who was a teacher in Kalisch and then in Prague, under the title Chibbure Likkutim.

?? Tanaim received by the rabbi in Cracow from R. Moses b. Abraham, Ab Beth Din of Grodno in 1700.

Responsa of R. Meir b. Zebi Hirsch Margolioth, a Talmudic scholar and Chasid, 40 years the rabbi of Lemberg, under the title Meir Netivim.

Responsa of R. Joseph Te'omim, teacher in Lemberg and later Ab Beth Din in Frankfort a.O. (1727-1793).

A fifth class of sources constitutes selections from the communal ordinances in many communities and synods and likewise rules laid down by educational societies, such as Talmud Torah Vereins, etc. These sources contain a wealth of material, not only on what was being done, but also on what was desired, i.e. some laws are against certain types of conduct or practice.

Customs of Worms, in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, as set down by Juspa b. Naftali, the Shamash.

Ordinances of the Posen district and community.

Protocol-Book of the Talmud-Torah-Verein in Cracow, 1551-1639.

Ordinances of Frankfort a.M. 1602.

Ordinances of the Cracow Kehilla. 1595.

Ordinances of the Moravian Medinah.

Ordinances of the Synod of the Lithuanian district. 1623-1764 which included Brisk, Pinsk, Grodno, Vilna and Slutzk.

Ordinances of Nicholsburg in Moravia (1670ff). The Jewish

population in this town, 50 miles from Vienna, was 3000 out of a total 6000.

Gemeindebuch of Dubno in Volhynia 1741.

Ordinances of the triple community composed of Altona, Hamburg and Wandsbeck, which were united after 1671.

Ordinances of the Ashkenazic Kehilla in Amsterdam, formed in 1635.

Ordinances of the Chevra for the Raising of Orphans, founded in Amsterdam, 1738.

Ordinances of the Talmud Torah Society in Side Laban in the district of Kiev. 1765.

Ordinances of the Kanal of the province Hesse.

Ordinances of Metz made at the meeting of 12 Parnassim of the Kehilla in 1690.

Ordinances of the Talmud Torah in Zolkiew.

Ordinances of the Chevra for the Raising of Orphans in Fürth, Bavaria in 1763.

An announcement in Prostitz, in Moravia. 1764.

An account book of the Cheder in Lemberg. 1784.

A sixth class of sources includes what might be loosely termed text books. This group includes translations of the Bible, or parts of it, or of other Jewish books, and dictionaries. It is usually the preface to this type of book that is valuable for us, in that it usually explains the author's purpose and ideas about education.

Torat Katan by R. Gedalian Faikus of Amsterdam, published 1758, contains two parts: Ele Hamizwot, a compilation of the 613 mizwot on a child level, and Chen Haloshon, a work on grammar in Yiddish.

Beer Moshe (Prague 1605) by Moses b. Issachar Halevi Baertel-es is a translation of the words of the Pentateuch and the Five Scrolls into Yiddish according to the Parashit.

Melammed Siach by R. Eljakim b. Jacob, the Shaliach Zibbur of the Amsterdam Kehilla, a cantor, teacher and translator. This book is a translation into Yiddish according to the Parashit of the words in the Pentateuch and Five Scrolls.

A translation of the Tenach into Yiddish by R. Jekutiel b. Isaac Blitz, a corrector of press in the printing office of Uri Phoebus in Amsterdam. (1679).

Liebliche Tefilla by R. Aaron b. Samuel of Hergershausen (1708) who claims to be a simple farmer and attempts to bring prayer into the vernacular.

Em Lebinah by R. Joseph Te'omim (above), a work on roots.

Milim L'eloah by R. Judah Leb b. Joel Minden. Berlin 1760. This book was a Hebrew German Dictionary.

Mikra Kodesh, a work on grammar by Elijah b. Azariel of Vilna (died 1748).

Still another classification, the seventh, includes sources that bear fully or almost so on education. They might be compared to modern books on education, since they deal with curriculum, pedagogy and administration. While they seem old-fashioned, they enjoyed some prominence in their own day.

Kezad Seder Mishna by R. Moses b. Aaron Morawczyk, a teacher in Bizenz, Bavaria. Printed 1655.

Maarechet Abraham by R. Abraham b. Model of Oettingen, a teacher in Prague.

Omer Meyehuda by R. Judah b. Loeb, a teacher in Pressburg ca. 1790. The book is a sort of Shulchan Aruch for teachers.

Or Le'et Boker by R. Naftali Hertz b. Judah Lev of Halberstadt. This book is an answer to those who attack him for former heresies.

Dibre Shalom We'emet by Naftali Herz Wessely (1725-1805), written after the Toleranzedikt of Joseph II in 1781. The author was one of the early Maskilim.

Sefer Giddul Banim, published in London, 1771, in German. The author is unknown.

Sermon of R. David Tavel, Ab Beth Din of Lissau, 1782.

Sermon of R. Ezekiel Landau against Wessely.

A Maamor of R. Yosel Rachnoi, one of the early Maskilim, in Breslau. Prtd. 1789.

Ketab Yosher, author unknown, (though he may have been Saul, Ab Beth Din of Frankfort a.O.), in favor of Wessely.

A statement of Landau in reference to a translation of the Torah and Five Scrolls by R. Zussman of Glogau.

An eighth class of sources includes excerpts from what can be called Moral Books (Sifre Musar). This class includes works on ethics, the Jewish religion, customs, life etc. It is a loose group and redolent of wishes rather than programs.

Leb Tob (1620) by R. Isaac b. Eliakim of Posen is a twenty chapter ethical work in Yiddish.

Brandspiegel, written in Hebrew in Jerusalem by Moses Henochs ca. 1570, was translated into Yiddish by Phinehas b. Judah Heilprin. This was a typical moral book for use by the masses.

Amude Shesh, by R. Ephraim Solomon b. Aaron of Lenczisa, published 1606. The author was a great preacher in the days of the Vaad, Ab Beth Din in Prague and died 1619.

The foreword to a collection of sermons by Berechya Berach.

(Died 1664).

Kab HaYashar by R. Zebi Hirsch Kaidanower, of Polish origin, who was Rabbi in Frankfor a.M. and died in 1712.

Wawe HaAmudim by R. Sabbatai b. Isaiah haLevi Horowitz, a Cabbalist, born ca. 1590 in Volhynia, died in Vienna, 1660. The book is an ethical treatise, introducing the following book by his father:-

Shene Luchot HaBerit (known as Shelah) by R. Isaiah Halevi Horwitz, a German by birth who studied in Poland, (1555-1630) and became chief rabbi in Cracow. The book is an unsystematic compendium of Jewish religion, ethics, holidays, etc., from the orthodox point of view.

Zedah LaDerech - by the same author.

Divre Zikkaron by R. Joseph Stadthagen, an apologist who died in 1715. The book consists of ethical reflections on the rules for ritual slaughter.

Tehorat Hakadosh by R. Benjamin Wolf b. Mattathias.

There is a small class which includes two rather pertinent statements by two Italian rabbis, who comment in passing on Ashkenazic ideals. They both praise and criticise and much can be inferred from their short statements.

Joseph Salomo del Medigo of Kandia.

Lenne del Bene of Ferrara.

The tenth and last class of sources includes general works, in the field of history, commentaries and the like which do not fit in the above groups.

Nezer Hakadosh, a commentary on Midrash Rabbah by R. Jechiel Michael b. Uzziel of Glogau. (d. 1730).

Nezach Yisrael, printed 1741 by R. Israel M. Samosc.

Kohelet Shlomah, printed 1722 by R. Solomon Salman of London.

Migdol Oz by Jacob Emden.

Chalon HaMizri by Jacob Emden.

Mitpachat Sefarim by Jacob Emden.

Lechem Shamaim by Jacob Emden.

Yosef Omez by R. Joseph Juspa Hahn, died 1637. This book treats in general of Jewish life from a rational and legal standpoint.

Yiddisher Theriak, an apologetic, written by R. Solomon Zevi Aufhausen (Hanau 1615) against Yiddish Schlangen Balg, a polemic, by Samuel Friedrich Brenz, an apostate.

Yewen Mizulot a history of Polish Jewry during the Chmielnicki riots by R. Nathan Nata ben Moses Hanover, a Russian historian, Talmudist and Cabbalist. (d.1683).

Shemen LaMaor, printed in Chawat Yair (above) by R. Moses Samson Bacharach (1607-1670) who preached in Prague and was Ab Beth Din in Worms.

Dibre Chachamim by R. Judah Lev Puchowitzer, a Cabbalist, born in Pinsk, living during the last quarter of the 17th century.

Kizur Shelah, a digest of Sheve Luchot Haberit (above) by R. Jechiel Michael Epstein (middle of the 17th century).

Yaarot Devash by the well-known Cabbalist R. Jonathan Eyebeschutz of Prague, (1690-1774).

Magal haOmer by R. Jacob b. Moses (Katz) of Januv. A critical introduction to prayers by R. Sabbatai b. Isaac of Przemsyl, a Galician Talmudist, grammarian and scribe of the early 17th century.

Manoach Halebabot, a commentary on Bachya's work, by R. Manoach b. Shemaria, a Polish rabbi, died 1612.

A Konteret by R. Jonathan of Höllleschau in Moravia concerning the German Jews in London.

Or Hayashar by R. Meir Poppers, a Bohemian Cabbalist who died in 1602.

Tochachot Mugulah added to Reshit Bikkurim of R. Chanoch.

CHAPTER II.

TRADITIONAL(ORTHODOX) IDEALS

The period from 1600 to 1800 witnessed far-reaching changes in Jewish life. Emancipation, politically as well as to a certain extent spiritually, was reflected almost immediately in the field of education. We have seen fit, therefore, to deal first with the traditional academic ideals and practices: that is, those in sway during the seventeenth and the first part of the eighteenth century. Naturally, no date can be set for the end of this "period". Some of its practices and principles still hold sway. But for clarity's sake we have sectioned off our period as we have explained. This chapter, then, will deal with education under conditions of Jewish separatism, wherein the Jews were a self-governed group and built up their own educational system to fit their particular conditions. The chapter will be divided into four sections:

A. Administration
B. Curriculum
C. Pedagogy
D. Aims and Ideals

A. Administration:

This section of Chapter II will deal with education from a functional standpoint. It aims to answer the question, HOW? How were the schools run? i.e. who was in charge, how were the schools maintained, what kind of teachers did they have, who were the pupils, how much time was given to education, what type of rooms and text-

books did they use? In other words, this section will deal with the mechanics of education. Inasmuch as there were actually three types of schools, the Cheder, or private school, the Talmud Torah, publicly supported school, and the Yeshibah, an institution of higher Jewish learning, each section of this chapter will be further subdivided to show the differences between these three. In many cases the problems were different, in many, the same; however, at the risk of duplication, we would explain all three.

1. Officers:

The responsibility of the community for the education of its young was not carried on by the Church, as in Catholic Europe, but by the community as a whole, which delegated its authority to regular educational officers or committees who were answerable only to the community.

a. Cheder:

There were several methods of officering the Cheders. One method in Nicholsburg, Moravia was extremely democratic. The Parnassim of the Kehilla would call an assembly of the teachers who would select by lot a committee of five who would, in turn, appoint two over-gabbaim, three sub-gabbaim, one auditor and two law-enforcers. At least one layman had to be included in this group. Any teacher was eligible for office except those who had not paid the association dues regularly for two years (implying two years of continuous teaching). One might think that the above mentioned nominating committee might proceed to elect themselves to office; a special ruling, however, provides that no more than two of the five can be made sub-gabbaim, and only one can be elected to the office of gabbai or auditor, and

even then only by a majority vote, excluding his own (i.e. by a vote of three out of the remaining four). Likewise the over-Gaboaim and the sub-Gabbaim may not be related. The auditor seems to have had the pivotal office, since the Gaboaim held office in turn, month after month, and turned over all money and account to the auditor. At the time of election, the elected must swear to uphold the statutes and to confer with the assembly of teachers and the communal heads before any significant change in policy. A Gabbai was elected for a three year term and had to have been out of office for more than a year before he was elegible for reelection. The duties of the Gabbaim were to uphold all the educational statutes (such as will be brought out later), to appoint examiners for each week and for the end of the semester, and to carry out their duties, they were given the power of fine and of cherem. The sub-Gaobaim were for filling the office if the Gabbai were sick or died, and had the regular duty of checking up the records turned in by the teacher (TNM).* How widespread this particular method of choosing officers and assigning their duties is somewhat of a question, since we find no other set-up quite like it. However, we may assume that either this community borrowed the plan from another, or that, if this community originated the plan, it was quickly adopted by others.

In Frankfort a.M. we read of an educational board of three men, elected (by whom?) for three year terms to supervise the teachers, set salaries and do the examining each week. This applied likewise to the Talmud Torah (TNM).

---

*The letters in parenthesis refer to abbreviations of works listed at the end of the thesis in alphabetical order.

In Russia, on the other hand, where the Yeshibah was in flower to a greater extent than in Germany, the Rosh Yeshibah usually attended to the education concerns of the community. He would appoint a Shamash who would go from cheder to cheder reminding children to be diligent and reminding them of the weekly examinations. The Rosh Yeshibah would conduct the examinations and the Shamash administer the punishments (NN). In Dubno, however, there seems to have been monthly overseers (TVD).

In some German towns the supervision was in the hands of the Kehilla council which would delegate their powers to two examiners and the Ab Beth Din (TKM).

While there was variation in personnel and in selection, we can see that almost every town had some sort of supervision over the chedarim; even though they were private schools, the community regulated them in the public interest. Naturally, we may expect even more supervision over the public schools, i.e. the Talmud Torahs.

b. Talmud Torah:

Although considerable concern was manifested over the average Talmud Torah, we find no record of how officers were chosen. Of course, in many cases there were particular societies, either for the Talmud Torah or for the raising of orphans, who made education their particular concern. (TOA. TZ. TSL et al). We may assume that the Talmud Torah societies were voluntary organizations based, perhaps, on fund giving, and that the society as a whole chose officers from its midst. In Zolkiev, for example, four Kuppah-Gabbaim were selected. (TZ) Requirements were that they be married, learned. They rotated in duty from month to month, each examining the helpers in his own month. The Gabbaim were expected to visit

the school twice a week (TOA). They had charge of the funds also (TTC). Naturally, the Gabbaim had to supervise the teachers (TOA).

An interesting record of the Posen Kehilla (TF) gives us additional information. Because of war alarms, the Yeshibah was depopulated. The school board was not examining the children and the teachers were inefficient. As a temporary remedy, the community asked that scholars should take it upon themselves to see that reviews were held, especially for students in the Talmud Torah. Teachers, whose pupils did poorly, were reprimanded. For long time planning, however, the overseers of education were asked to get together after the holidays, set up a proper curriculum and hire proper teachers who would teach only in the school house. The overseers of education in this case consisted of the Parnassim of the Kehilla, the Gaon, the head of the Yeshibah scholars. These, after setting the curricula and appointing teachers, would appoint a person who would attend to the school house and its problems.

Thus we see that in most communities a special society took charge of the education of poor children at community expense, but that when these societies fell down, the communal heads came to the rescue and continued the institutions.

c. Yeshibah:

In the matter of Yeshibot, the function of officers was more or less different. Inasmuch as the rabbi was usually the Rosh Yeshiban, and since the students usually met in the Beth Hakeneseth, the entire problem settled on that of maintaining the students who came from districts round about. Most communities had Kuppah-Gaobaim or treasurers who gave out the "weeks". (TM. JNW. MAC.) Naturally, these men were subservient to the rabbi (TM) inasmuch as he usually

had charge of admissions and could say who were to get their "weeks" first.

In another community, the Rosh Bet Din and the rabbi attended also to the educational needs of the surrounding community and made it possible for bright boys to get to the Yeshibah (TVL). In places where there was inter-communal organization, it became the duty of the heads of the Kahal or Vaad to see that each Yeshibah record its quota of students (TVL).

2. Maintenance:

The officers were in charge of funds. Whence did these funds come? What were teachers paid? By whom? These questions will be answered in the following:

a. Chedarim:

Cheders were maintained entirely by tuition paid by the parents of the children attending. The teacher usually had fixed fees for all pupils, although there were possibly some who catered to the wealthy and charged what the market would bear. At any rate, both writers (MAP. AM) and Takkanot (TSL. TKA) stress the fact that the teacher must be paid, and on time. The ideal would have been payment in advance for each semester, but the fathers should certainly pay each month. The purpose of such advice and rulings was both that the teacher should not have to worry about a living and that the parents might secure a regular education for their children. This idea will be developed in a later section.

Both tuition fees and maximum income were regulated by the various Kehilot. However, since the monetary angle of this question is complicated, first by a difference in coinage in eastern and central Europe and, second by a variance of the value of money from

time to time and from place to place, we will confine ourselves to comparative fees paid in the same town or district at particular times.

A teacher of Talmud in Metz (TKM) could teach eight one-hour lessons in one day, for which he would receive four Thaler per hour per month. His total income then would, at maximum, amount to 32 Thaler per month. Teachers of Tanach and of Mishnah, in this same community, could teach nine one-hour lessons per day and be paid three Thaler per hour per month. Thus, their maximum monthly income would be 27 Thaler. This scale of wages according to the ability of the teacher was carried out in most communities.

In Nicholsburg (TNM), for example, the same idea was carried out in a little different way. Whereas in Metz, the teachers evidently tutored in the homes of the parents, in Nicholsburg, the teachers had classes. Now a teacher could teach no more than 12 "hours" a day. An "hour" can be explained as follows: one student of the alphabet is equal to one half an "hour"; one student of the Pentateuch, equal to three-quarters; one student of the Talmud, equal to one; and one student of Talmud and Tossefot, equal to one and one-quarter "hours". Thus a teacher might have twenty four elementary pupils, eighteen Bible students, twelve Talmudic students, and only nine students of Talmud and Tossefot. For these students the teacher was paid six gulden for Talmud (maximum 72 gulden), three Thaler for Pentateuch (maximum 54 ~~gulden~~ Thaler). or 2 Thaler for alphabet and prayer book (maximum 48 Thaler).

In Lemberg (TL) primary teachers received five Polish zehuvim a year, teachers of chumash got double that, and teachers of Gemara received 36 zehuvim yearly. (36 zehuvim would buy a milch cow).

In Frankfort a.M. (TFM) Talmud teachers charged four Thaler while teachers of higher learning charged five. In the district of Kiev (TSL) elementary teachers received 150 gulden, Talmud teachers, 200 gulden, and teachers of Talmud and Tossefot, 15 ducats.

In Cracow(TC)teachers of chumash could teach 12 hours a day for four zehuvim per semester hour, and teachers of Gemara might teach 12 hours a day for 4 selaim per semester hour. However, if a teacher taught more than permitted, he was required to turn his extra earnings over to charity. Nor could the father offer more than the standard price. In this same community, those who taught Halacha and Tossefot might teach 10 hours at four and one-half selaim per semester, or, if they taught but eight hours, could receive 5 selaim for every hour. However, these men were checked on by the Shamash who on the first eight days of Iyyar would investigate all such cases.

b. Talmud Torah:

We are inclined to think of a Talmud Torah as a separate institution in the community, with its own building, etc. However, we are thinking in terms of today. In communities of the 17th and 18th centuries, there were very few Talmud Torah buildings. The communities were small, usually a Talmud Torah Society could care for all unfortunates by placing them with private teachers. This must be kept in mind as this section is developed.

What were the aims of the Talmud Torahs? One author (IEP) insists that the community must provide means for teachers so that the latter would not teach for money and that the poor may be taught. The district of Moravia(TM) decreed that a father, if he could not pay for his child's education, may turn to the authorities for help. He can not take his child out of school to learn a trade,

but must teach him reading and writing, prayers, Tanach and religion and ethics. The Gabbai is entrusted with the responsibility of seeing that orphans get schooling until they are Bar Mitzvah at the expense of the community. This was also the provision made by the Cracow Kehillah(TTC). The Kehillah in Metz (TKM) carried it a bit further and insisted that the Kehillah must support the education of all children whose parents apply without investigation. In Hesse (TKH) they went to the extreme of giving the money to the father who in turn would give it to the teacher, to avoid embarrassment. In this district also the age limit was raised to 14 years, and not until then might a boy drop his education. Although several communities had a special Chevra for the support of orphans and poor children, in Posen (TP) the responsibility was with the Yeshibah students and teachers who chose collectors for the support of the above. Then the community directors whose function was to hire two teachers for the needs of the poor of the community would do so. The pay for these teachers would be collected twice a year by collectors who had authority to compel payments.

Wherefrom did the Talmud Torah Societies derive their funds? One method of taxation and collection has been dealt with. In Cracow, on the other hand, methods were more ingenious (TTC). The Talmud-Torah-verein received:

One sixth of all the funds collected on Mondays and Thursdays in all synagogues and schools by passing the plate.

One and one-half groschen per month from each member of the Verein.

One tenth of the private gifts made in synagogues.

The rent of one building for religious purposes at 15 Polish groschen a week.

All funds collected by passing the plate at every brit milah and at every wedding.

In Posen again (TP), in addition to collection, the free will collection of each Monday in every synagogue was turned over to the Talmud Torah. This was also the case in Hesse (TKH), except that all free will offerings were used for the needs of the Talmud Torah. All such funds were used to pay the teachers and for the building if there were one.

In Hesse (TKH) teachers of poor children received their support from the Talmud-Torah-Kuppah. In Lemberg (TL), on the other hand, out of a population of about 10,000 there were only forty seven cases of children needing education that could not pay for it. The Chevra Talmud Torah oversaw all such cases, in addition to regulating the cheders, and the poor children were educated at the expense of the community. In Metz (TKM) private teachers taught those who could pay and those who could not. For those who could not, the teachers received from the community three shillings a month for elementary students, five shillings a month for advanced students. In Amsterdam (TOA) the community paid no more than 14 reichsthaler per pupil per semester for the education of the poor. If a teacher in Kiev (TSL) had no poor children in his classes, he paid an income tax of 3% if he was native and 4% if he was not native. The normal rule was, in this community, for each teacher to accept a student from the Talmud Torah, for which the teacher was paid one rovel for elementary students, two for students of Gemara and four for students of Gemara and Tossafot. Every child became Bar Mizva (including education up to that point) at the expense of the community. One community provided for more than minimum education for poor children.

In Fürth (TF) children of thirteen years were given an examination before the Gabbaim of the community, and if they read Gemara satisfactorily, they were given educational support for two more years. Otherwise they were taught a trade.

c. Yeshibot:

The Vaad of Lithuania (TVL) developed a Yeshibah system that seems to have been the model of its time. Certain Kehillot probably based on the number of householders (baale batim), called primary, accepted at least eighteen bachurim, including as many married students as the rabbi saw fit. The Kahal could not evade its responsibility by "supporting" wealthy bachurim, and had to supply double maintenance for married men. The five largest taxpayers, by vote, determined how many bachurim they could support; the rest were apportioned to the rest of the community. For other than primary Kehillot, the rule for the support of Bachurs was as follows: ~~to~~ to every minyan of householders paying taxes, one bachur and two youths would be apportioned. However, the Rosh Beth Din and the heads of the community may assign more if they see the opportunity. A fund of 6000 zehuvim became a permanent fund, and two mamonim were appointed to use the money, according to allotment, for the buying of books and for the support of bachurim up to the extent of 12 Polish groschen. At any rate, every Kahal with an Ab Bet Din must accept bachurim, and the "weeks" were apportioned according to the householders ability, some being given four weeks, others three, and still others two. Between semesters (the length of semesters will be dealt with later), the bachurim had to be maintained but also had to teach the younger children without pay. From the pains taken to specify just how the bachurim had to be maintained, we can understand the ex-

cellence of the Yeshibot in Lithuania.

This same idea was put into effect in Moravia, with some minor changes (TM). There, each Kahal with thirty taxpaying householders must hire a rabbi to manage the Yeshibah, where there must be at least six bachurim and six youths from other towns who were to be supported to the extent of 12 kreuzer for each bachur and 7 for each youth. Those Kehillot that supported Yeshibot were obligated for both semesters, but between semesters the bachurim were sent to surrounding towns where there were no Yeshibot to live with householders there. The district heads apportioned the vacationing students to the various small communities according to their taxpayers, but the students were expected to study every day either alone or with the rabbi. On Pesach and on Sukkot, each Kahal would take up offerings for the support of students, and those funds collected in the smaller communities were apportioned by the district heads to the Kehillot supporting Yeshibot, according to their size and the number of students they supported. Each Kehillah had at least two Gabbaim who administered the problems of student maintenance.

Orders sent to the Rabbi of Cracow (MAC) state that each Kahal, evidently in that district, must support thirty bachurim. We find that this is clarified by the remarks of Nathan Hanover (NN) who states that a community of fifty householders supported no less than 30 bachurim and youths, and that one bachur and two youths were assigned to a household where they ate at the table like members of the family. In fact, he states, before the Chmielnicki riots, there was hardly a house in which there was no student. In the average Kahal of 50, some twenty were usually titled Morenu or Chaber and would study regularly with the Rosh Yeshibah.

More light is cast on the administration of the "weeks" i the statutes of Zolkiev (TZ). There the four Parnassim each supported one student for the whole year. The four Tobim, or assist Parnassim, each supported one student for one semester, or, betwe them, two students for the whole year. The rest of the bachurim were taken care of by those who pay taxes of six groschen or more a year, each supporting one bachur for one semester. If any bachurim remained unsupported, they moved from month to month among those who pay a tax between two and six gedolim. This same distric imposed some restrictions on over ambitious communities. No Kehillah may support a Yeshibah unless there are at least forty taxpaying householders, and the penalty for breaking this law was a fine of 100 Hungarian adumim. The law was not, however, retroactive. In fact, communities of this size could not even hire rabbis, but could hire teachers who might give decisions but could not take position of rabbi nor found a Yeshibah.

The records of the Worms community (JNW) go into detail on the particular and detailed duties of the householder in the matter of "weeks". There, a communal Kuppah provided the evening meals. The householder provided meals on Sabbaths and holidays, breakfasts every day, a snack at supper time, and free oil for night study. The noon meal was eaten at the house of the Shammash to whom each bachur would pay one-half the price of the food before the semester began.

The care exercised in the field of higher education especially in Eastern Europe bore fruit in the impress on all Jewish life of the particular Polish Jewish outlook. The complaints we will hear in criticism of the Polish rabbis who usurp all the best positions

in Germany, England etc., were a subtle compliment to the educational system of Poland and Lithuania.

3. Teachers:

We have dealt in a small measure with teachers already. We discussed the supervision exercised by the communal or educational officers over them, and more fully, their wages. This section as a whole will deal with them from the point of view of their responsibility to the community, e. g. what were the requirements for a teacher? the relation of teacher to parents in the broad disciplinary sense and in the narrower financial sense; and also with the relation of teacher to teacher in competition and in cooperation, and last with helpers or assistants.

a. Requirements, standards, etc.

Nowhere are set down definite requirements for teachers. Evidently the rabbi of the community was trusted to select the proper men (SAL.TKA); in another case the teacher had to appear before the board (TC.JL). Stress is laid on the fact that the teacher must be God-fearing, (TC) and a good student (SAL).

Teachers were procured in various ways. At times (MW) melammedim would be picked out at the spring fairs. However, one man (JE) warns against picking up stray bachurim for teaching purposes; they get swell-headed and begin to give decisions on ritual matters; rather should a community pay a good salary to a good teacher and require him to have a certificate from a Bet Din. The community has the authority to run counter to a father's wishes in the choice of a teacher. He may desire a teacher from the Yeshibah, but helpers or bachurim are expressly forbidden to teach, unless they are married. (TNM)

Once elected, a teacher must fulfill several requirements. One is the payment of regular dues or taxes. In Nicholsburg (TNM) a teacher with as few as three pupils must pay "einkaufgeit". Likewise (TNM) he must pay three kreuzer a month, to be collected by the Gabbai on the penalty of a fine of one-half reichsthaler. Failure to pay incurred the penalty of not being able to run for office in the local educational association (see above). Likewise a teacher was always on good behavior in the way of ritual behavior (SAL) and was expected to put forth his best efforts for all pupils, whether poor or wealthy (JL.TNM). A further requirement was that the teacher be married within two years of becoming a teacher and be ordained chaber within two years (TNM).

There must have been a good many travelling teachers in those times, for we find many ordinances directed at "foreign" teachers. The most common requirement was that such a teacher could teach no longer than two years in one community, and could not return for another two year period (TNM.TVL). However, in Lithuania, a document from the teacher's wife or relatives giving him permission to stay carried weight with the authorities (TVL). Likewise, a teacher had to have an honorable discharge from the Bet Din of the town in which he had previously taught (TVL). In another community (TOA) the foreign teachers had to gather before the Parnassim who took their names and required that they leave in no more than three years, unless they received permission from home to stay longer (TKA). To come back to Nicholsburg (TNM) foreign teachers in that city had to pay a Rheinish gulden before the end of the first month and must pay a regular tax. Only three foreign teachers were permitted there at one time and these had to show that they were prepared to teach.

Likewise, in Kiev (TSL) foreign teachers were restricted in the number of pupils they might have. A rather extraneous but interesting fact is that in Lithuania, a teacher or rabbi could not become the head of a Yeshibah without recommendations from several Gaonim and Parnassim (TVL).

Thus we see that in spite of the fact that the greatest amount of teaching was carried on by cheder teachers i.e. essentially private, yet, for the public weal, the community had the first say-so in matters of person, wages, and the like. Let us deal next with the relationship between home and school; the relationship between the teacher and the fathers of his pupils.

Firstly, the home was obligated to support the school. If there were several householders in a town, no one father could hire a teacher for himself, but must cooperate with other fathers (TKH). Even should some fathers desire a teacher, and others not, a responsa (RAK) states that those who do not desire a teacher must nevertheless cooperate. In Metz the head of the district and another rabbi would set the pay of a teacher and the method of support for a community of less than 50 householders whether they wanted a teacher or not (TM).

Once a father hires a teacher, he is obligated to pay well and on time (AZ). This latter stipulation seems to have been a frequent stumbling block. Often, parents would be negligent (MAF) and the law in Dubno was that if the father did not pay each month, the child was not to be taught (TVD). The father had to pay the required fee (TKA) and in a dispute between the father and the teacher, if the gaonaim awarded in favor of the teacher, then the latter had to be paid in full before the child could again be in-

structed (TNM). However, a father could, for good reason, remove his child from the cheder in the middle of the semester (TSL).

It was in the realm of discipline that the home was asked for moral cooperation. Each father was asked to study with his son at least an hour a day or at the very least to show an interest in his lessons (JL). Parents were asked to have patience with teachers. It takes time and patience for real teaching, therefore let parents be patient and not hurry the child's teacher (GT). One teacher (MAP) complains that the teacher must flatter the fathers to keep his pupils and begs that fathers allow teacher to punish the child that he may have the proper respect for his teacher. Another writer (JL) tells how when a teacher strikes a child for discipline, it cries and reports to its father, who in turn reprimands the teacher. The result is that a teacher spends his days worrying about the reception of the child's learning by the father, who gives no credit to the teacher for good work and all blame for slow learning. Between semesters the teacher must busy himself getting new pupils, so that Shabuot is his only holiday.

All in all, parents were asked to give the teacher credit for sincerity and hard work and to help him by standing behind him in both discipline and in study.

Another problem met by each community was the relationship of one teacher to another. In other words, what were the rules of competition? We have seen already how many communities regulate the prices charged by teachers and also their total possible income. One community stresses this by stating definitely that price-cutting is not allowed (TNM). The only opportunity (outside of price-cutting) for keen competition was in the securing of pupils. One teacher complains that teachers try to rob each other of pupils (MAP). To

regulate this, communities set up different rules. During the semester there could be no transfer of pupils either by concurrence of the teachers or by request of the fathers (TC). However, in one case (TSL) the father can take his child from a cheder if he has paid in full for his instruction. But a teacher is not allowed to approach a father during the semester. Likewise, if the parents did not fulfill their obligations of paying the tuition, the case is not settled simply by changing teachers. The first teacher may bring suit against the father (TNM), the name of the child may be posted in the synagogue (TC) and no other teacher may receive the child (TNM.TC). If however a second teacher does receive the child for instruction, he must pay the amount due the first teacher, unless the latter has been paid by the father. Thus, teachers were forbidden price-cutting and taking advantage of the bad luck of another teacher.

In the realm of helpers or assistant teachers, we have very little material. One record shows merely that there were foreign helpers in one community (TA). Others speak of the tax imposed on both native and foreign helpers (TSL.TTC). Later we will notice the role a helper played in the life of the school. At any rate, a helper could not have pupils of his own (TSL) and had to receive permission from the Parnassim to teach (TA); could not wander from teacher to teacher (TNM); and if he broke his contract, he could not be hired by other teachers nor offer himself for tutoring positions (TNM). This same community forbade helpers to "spiel" on Purim since it rendered them inefficient for the next day's teaching.

While there is no adequate picture of the teacher painted in our sources, and while most statements have been somewhat negative, at the same time, we see how a good deal of legislation was centered on the subject of getting, maintaining and regulating teachers; some literature, especially by teachers, complains of the hard knocks that teachers had to suffer in spite of careful legislation. In general, we may say that precautions were taken to provide morally and mentally suitable men for the teaching of children. The faults of the times and its teachers will come out in a later chapter.

4. Pupils:

From the foregoing, it can be gathered that education was well-nigh universal and for all practical purposes compulsory. There are some matters of administration, however, that deal particularly with the pupils: how many were allowed in one class, the mixture of ages and so forth.

In the chedarim teachers were limited to a fixed number of pupils. A general rule in Cracow (TC) was that a cheder could have no more than forty pupils if the teacher had two helpers. One man suggested that forty could be handled with one assistant (AM) or twenty five without an assistant. However, certain limitations were placed on teachers depending on the subject they taught. In Zolkiev (TZ) a teacher of elementary hebrew could have eleven paying and one non-paying pupil (e.g. his son); a teacher of chumash and Gemara, fifteen paying and one non-paying; a teacher of Talmud, Rashi and Tossafot, eleven paying and one non-paying. In Kiev (TSL) the proportion was a little different: i.e. twenty-five elementary pupils, fifteen Talmud pupils or ten pupils of Talmud and Tossefot. In

Nicholsburg (TNM) the Takkanot to some extent contradict each other; (they were made at different times). A teacher could have 6 elementary pupils; at another time, it was decreed that teachers of Talmud, Commentaries and Tossefot might teach no more than eight pupils, whereas if only Tossefot were taught, ten pupils was the maximum, with the privilege of adding three to six at the end of the semester. In other words, the latter part of the above statement seems to make the first part rather foolish in view of the sliding scale used in other communities. At any rate, any infringement of the rule was punished by the Gabbai (TNM). The teacher had to give a list of his pupils once a month to the Shammash, who would in turn bring the inventory of all pupils twice a semester to the Gabbaim. The same was true in Posen (TP) where the decision of the elders of the community was binding on the teacher.

There was less material on the number of children in Talmud Torahs, evidently because, as we have seen, there were very few special Talmud Torah teachers, and the custom was to apportion the poorer children among the regular teachers. In one community (TSL) it was specified that foreign teachers might have no more than six children in their cheder outside of the Talmud Torah children. In Fürth (TF) a teacher of Gemara was allowed 12 orphans, but if there were not twelve in the community, he was allowed to supplement the ranks with private pupils. Otherwise, the general rules on the number of pupils allowed a teacher carried for both types of pupils, private and public.

In the matter of the number of pupils at the Yeshibot, we have already seen how the larger communities might support as many as sixty (see above). A specific law (TM) requires a Kahal of thirty

tax payers to support a Yeshibah in which there would be at least six bachurim and six youths from other towns, implying that there must have been a contingent of local young men attending the Yeshibah (how many we do not know). As was shown before, in some communities the rabbi, in others the Bet Din or the Parnassim saw to the apportionment of Bachurim to the various Yeshibot in the town or district. There seems to have been no limit to the number of bachurim except the financial ability of the community.

The word "girl" has not yet occured in these pages. however, we know that many of them were educated. The only takkanot enacted on the subject were restrictive and were aimed, for the most part, against co-education. If a teacher in Nicholsburg (TNM) had five girls in his cheder, then all his boys must be elementary pupils and no pupils of the chumash were allowed in the class. And furthermore, if he was teaching Gemara, he would not be allowed to have any girls at all in the class. If the classes were split, that is, if the teacher himself took charge of the boys and his wife taught the girls, then the two classes had to be on diffrent stories in the building. Two authors, furthermore, criticise the custom of sending girls to teachers who were bachelors (JEM.YH). These same authors say girls should be taught at home and not with boys.

5. Time:

This section will answer the questions: how long were children expected to go to school? How much time did they spend in school each day? How long were the semesters? Did they get holidays?

Previous references have shown that all boys were expected to become Bar Mitzvah (TA), which implies that they went to school until they were thirteen. Most children started at the age

of five, although some began school as early as three years (YE). In Metz (TKM) a child was expected to attend school all day till 14 years old and the length of schooling depended on the times and the community. After that he was to study one hour a day till 18. One author says (JL) that in his youth all children in Moravia would study at least till they were sixteen, but in Fressburg, ca. 1790, children of ten knew little and discontinued their schooling. The same author advises that children go to school beyond the age of thirteen. However, we may assume that from five to thirteen comprised the average education, and that after that age, the majority took up a trade or went into a shop, while the minority continued with higher education, ending as teachers, rabbis and the like.

A typical day in school is revealed in sources concerning Worms (JNW). In the summer, after morning services, the pupils went to the house of the teacher who was watched lest he shorten the day or the season. In the winter, the pupils got up an hour or two before dawn, went first to school, then to the synagogue with the teacher for Schacharit, then back to school. Both winter and summer, ten to eleven o'clock was lunch time. Likewise, the students were given short recesses after Schacharit in winter and at two o'clock in all seasons to hurry home for a snack. At the time of Mincha, i.e. late in the afternoon, the pupils were released from school to play or go home. Fathers are asked to see that pupils study during the long winter evenings.

During the week, instruction proceeded apace from Sunday to Wednesday. In Poland (NN) a Shammash would go from cheder to cheder to remind the pupils to be diligent, that they might be prepared for the weekly examination which was on Thursday and was given

by the Gabbai (NN) or by the Ab Bet Din (TKM). On Friday pupils were re-examined by two examiners picked by the Kehillah (TKM) or by the Rosh Yeshibah (NN). In Worms (JNW) Thursday was review day on which was added the Parasha with Rashi, and on Saturday, the pupils gathered at the home of the teacher for a short lesson. In the Yeshibot, instruction was in group form till noon, after which the bachurim could engage in individual study (NN).

The length of the semester is nowhere stated. We may infer from the complaints of one teacher (JL) who speaks of Pesach as the end of the semester and Succoth as the beginning, that there must have been at least two semesters a year: one from the last of Tisnri to the first of Nisan, and the other from the lastx of Nisan to the first of Tisnri, although in Worms (JNW) the pupils were given the 33 days of Omer as a spring holiday. The weight seems to be thrown on the winter semester, but when we consider the fact that the days were much shorter, the difficulty is ironed out. In the Yeshibot, semesters were much shorter; one from the first of Iyyar to the 15th of Ab, about three and one-half months; the other from the first of Cheshvan to the 15th of Shevat, likewise three and a half months (NN). Between semesters, the students boarded out in small towns where they taught and studied. One community (TM) require that the students be supported till the first of Adar, or of Adar Sheni and until the first of Ellul, which implies that they may have been longer semesters. Another community (TVL) required the inter-semester support of students to continue from the 15th of Shevat to the first of Nisan, or one and one-half months, and from the 15th of Ab to the middle of Ellul, or one month, which implies a still longer semester. The semester was marked by two examinations, one in the midule and one at the end of the term (NN). Furthermore, in the

summer, some teachers were required to teach only a half day between Yom Kippur and Succoth (TA). Naturally, holidays were given the day before such festivals as Pesach, Shaboth, as well as holidays on New Moons, Chanukah (SS), during the fairs, during weddings and three days of sorrow before the ninth of Ab (JNW). Teachers were held responsible for the proper play activities of his pupils (TNM.TA). Another author would make Friday a regular holiday (JL) evidently without an examination, but would require the children to attend the synagogue on Saturday and on festivals, after which the father should go over the Parasha with his son. The same man recommends only a half holiday on New Moons. In Metz (TKM) in spite of exams., the pupils were free on Thursday morning and Friday afternoon. At the end of a semester i.e. between semesters some pupils were assigned special make-up work, others given new assignments (TNM). We see that considerable attention was paid to both teacher and pupil in regulating the time of teaching, of examinations, of study and of vacations.

6. Facilities:

Almost no material is found in our sources dealing with the subject of school buildings, school rooms, or school room conditions. We do know that most cheders were conducted in the private dwelling of the teachers, in fact some pupils slept at the house of the teacher (MAP), which made his house something of a boarding school. However, one teacher tells us that there was a great need for school houses for the poor, who cannot afford a teacher who has a nice home. We can imagine, too, that conditions must have been none too good. The stories we hear of New World cheders, conducted in damp and dark basements, in tenements and the like

contrast so much with the light and airy Talmud Torahs that are now being built under the direction of trained educators, that we can hardly realize that this must have been the lot of pupils during the whole period we are studying: to study under physical conditions that made study and learning a laborious and almost unhealthy process.

In the realm of textbooks, more concern was shown. In Lithuania (TVL) each Kahal was expected to buy at least ten books before the semester began to be distributed among the students. A more pertinent question is: what text books were used? Naturally, we could expect regular texts of the Bible with Rashi, the Mishnah, Talmud and Commentaries. But we find many more books, compendiums, translations and so forth. Let us list them briefly.

Beer Moshe was a Yiddish dictionary to the Pentateuch and five scrolls, explaining the difficult words to the teacher (BMS). Its use was required in Cracow (TC).

Other texts in Yiddish (EA) were the Leb Tob, Mizwot Nashim, Brandspiegel, Sefer hamusar and Zena Urena, all of which have been dealt with in Chapter I, or are self-evident. These were probably not used in school but rather for unlearned adults who wished to study.

Frankfort a.O. (JT) used for grammar, dictionaries etc. Mikraot Gedolot (or Bible), Redak's Book on Roots, Michlal Yofi on grammar by R. Solomon b. Milich, Hameturgeman and Hatishbi by R. Aleph Bachur, hearuch hamussar and Meir Netib (concordances), Maarich Hamaarachot by R. Elijah Berdoch - on roots, and Ohel Moed by R. Solomon Morbena concerning - roots.

One author (GJT) recommends in responsa the study of such compendiums as Choshen HaMishpat, or Mikraot Gedolot (Bible), Redak's two grammars and Meir Netib. He likewise complains of the lack of books and the poor editions which quickly wear out.

Güdemann in his Quellenschriften spends a number of pages (289ff) on textbooks. It might be well to outline his remarks. For the study of Bible and prayers, there were really no textbooks outside of the actual books themselves. However, Rashi may be considered somewhat of a Bible text, as may Leb Tob by Saertele for which he was criticised and other commentaries. This demand for a special Bible text was answered in Amsterdam in 1749 by Eleazar Sussman b. Isaac Roedelsheim, a grammarian who published Mikra Meforash, a translation of the Pentateuch into German with a Yiddish introduction praising it for private and for school use. As for Bible dictionaries there was the Aruch nakazer, Makre Dardeke, Melammed Siach and others.

For the study of Mishna and Talmud, the student could use Rashi and other commentators; for a dictionary he might use the Aruch Kazer, for the study of Chillukim he might study Sugyot haTalmud.

For ethical teaching there were only two available books; Questions and Answers by Abraham Jagel (16th century) later an apostate, translated by Jacob Treves into Yiddish under the title Die Gute Lehre, and Ele Hamizwot by R. Gedaliah Taikus (see sources).

For the student of grammar: Heilbronn's Em Hayeled; R. Gedaliah Taikus' Chen Halashon.

For aritnmetic: Three texts in Yiddish, one in Hebrew and German, and one or two books on higher mathematics.

In the conclusion to this first section of the chapter "Traditional Ideals", we have dealt with the administrative problems of the many Jewish communities of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in forwarding the education of their young. Although there was much over-lapping, as there must be, when categories are fixed, and while many suggested problems must be left till later, we have built up a picture of Jewish education. We know whose was the responsibility, how the responsibility was met in the way of money and in the way of teachers. We have discussed the various pupil factors, the factor of time and the teaching aids, such as buildings and textbooks. Against this background Jewish children learned their Aleph Bet, their Chumash, their Mishnah, Talmud and Tossefot and, what is more important, their religion and morals. What was the content of that learning, and how it was taught shall now be our concern.

B. Curriculum:

Our purpose in this section is to answer the question: What was taught in the cheder, in the Talmud Torah, in the Yeshibah? What was the course of study, if any, for adults? How much secular education was given the average boy or girl? What ethical instruction was given? What were the principles of this or that set-up, i.e. what were the particular recommendations of individual authors as to the inclusion or exclusion of this or that subject?

1. Academic Curriculum:

In the matter of authority of the curriculum, little is re-

corded in our sources. A letter reveals that the Gaon would set the course of study (SAL) in one community, whereas in another, the teachers were obligated to teach the same masechta as the rabbi in the Yeshibah (TA).

As for the general curriculum, the subject matter and the age at which the subject matter was taught differed little from community to community. R. Asher b. Eliezer records in his diary (AEH) that he was six when his father began the Aleph bet with him, when he was twelve he began tossefot and when he was fifteen he was among the bachurim. Moses menochs (MH) recommends that a child should first be taught the blessings, then the hebrew names of clothing and household articles. Then he should be taught toran (TEF). A teacher (MAF) states that the child should study toran from the age of five to ten, Mishnah from the age of ten to fifteen, and at fifteen should be taught talmud. Others (JLX.SS) recommend that the Bible should be taught first, then four sections of the mishnah and after that the talmud with commentaries and tossafot. Others suggest that after Mishnah, if the child is not capable of studying talmud, he should return to the tanach and learn that which he has not yet studied (EL), (JHA). Many insist that the child should study grammar while or after he is studying the toran (HA.YE.GJT). Cabbalists recommend that after talmud, the student enjoy the pure search of the Cabbala(HHS. JAH). Aramaic grammar should be studied in conjunction with the talmud. It was advised that girls learn to read the Bible and heb tob in German (JAH.JLX). Thus the general curriculum was as follows: alphabet, blessings, toran with grammar, mishnah, talmud or tanach. However, there were certain stipulations as to the teaching of each of these subjects, stipulations as to order, commentaries etc.

In teaching the pre-Biblical material, i.e. alphabet and prayers, customs differed. Leb Tob (IEF) advises that children be taught "Torah ziwah lanu. . . " and the Shema before they are taught the alphabet. Others ask that the learning be from the letters to the vowels, to words, to the prayer book (JhA.TC).

In the teaching of Bible, so many warn against teaching a bit from this Parasha and a bit from the next and so on through the year, that this must have been done to a great extent. At any rate, advice is given the teacher that he teach the Torah in order, Parasha by Parasha, that the child may know the Bible thoroughly (SS. MAP.RJCB.SIM.EL.AM.IhS). It is suggested by some that the child begin with Leviticus and then proceed in the regular order (AM.YEM.GAH). The child should be taught every word, its grammar, syntax and the like (IHS.GT). The study of Bible should be accompanied by the study of Rashi(JL.TC), or at least by the study of Beer Moshe which was based on Rashi (TC.AM), although others suggest that Rashi may well be deferred till the Torah has been read once thoroughly (AM). The child has now studied the Torah, grammar and Bible commentary or commentaries. One man recommends the study of the Prophets and Hagiographa at this point but he stands alone (RJCB).

The average student now goes on to the study of Mishnah. It was recommended by some that he study all six tractates in order (IHS. RJCB). However others would be selective, and recommend portions dealing with daily life, then Kedoshim, Tumah and Tehora (EL) or at least Moed, Nezikin (JAh) or the study of Talmud along with Mishnah at the rate of a perek a day (RJCB). Having finished Mishnah, it is good for the student to go on to Alfasi (RJCB) or else directly to Talmud. The study of the latter may be simple, perek by perek (YW)

or with decisions (IHS). The study of Talmud might be accompanied by the study of the Shulchan Aruch and En Yaacob (JL. JLV) or by Rif and parts of the Turim (RJCB), although another suggests three years of Talmud and Rashi, followed by Tossefot (MAP) and still another says that the supercommentary on Rashi might be changed from year to year (JAH). By this time, the average child was through with his elementary education and learned a trade or went to a Yeshibah (TC).

The above curriculum, however, does not include the extra Jewish or secular subjects that were taught in many schools. Yiddish was a very general subject (TC.TOA) both reading and writing (TF). The teaching of Hebrew as a written language was taught in a few places (JNW). We have seen already in the section on textbooks that arithmetic was one of the few non-Jewish subjects, but only in an elementary form (TC). Glueckel of Hamln (GH) writes that a relative of hers knew French and could play the piano. This may or may not indicate that in western Germany, the secular subjects were pursued to a greater extent. We shall learn later, however, that most secular learning was attained either in secret or in the new schools of the latter century of our period.

In the Yeshibah study was largely directed toward the developing of rabbis and teachers who would be at home in the vast legalistic and Agadic fields of Jewish literature. The curriculum in Poland was set by the Vaad (NN). The first half of each of the two yearly semesters was spent in studying Gemara and Tossefot, at the rate of one column of Halacha with commentaries and Tossefot each day. The masechtot were taken in order, season after season. After this rigid discipline, the students were free in each Yeshibah to follow a course of study in the Poskim, Turim and Alfasi. In Moravia, likewise, all

Yeshibans went over the same material. The rabbi of the district was enjoined to make the curriculum known before the semester began (TM). One author (SIM) records that in the Yeshibot with which he was acquainted, the Gemara was studied first alone, then Rashi and Tossefot were added. No question was brought up outside of the masechta in which the group were studying. Often, the Gemara and the commentaries would bring up a question which would be argued out immediately. Another rabbi decreed (MAC) that the rabbi lecture on Talmudic disputes for three months of each semester at the rate of four disputes a week. The Parasha with Rashi would be read on Thursdays. A letter (SAL) records that in Amsterdam the Gaon would teach a daily lesson of two hours in any order he desired. A responsum (RJCB) infers that most bachurim were expected to have read Midrash Raba, and En Yaakov, and the same source states that in the old days (i.e. before ca. 1650) bachurim would study Arama's Akedat Yizchak, Albo's Ikkarim and Gabirol's Kuzari, but that they were not needed in his day since most believed as they were taught without speculation. Among the commentaries, Maharsha, Asher, Rif, Ran, Rambam, Tur and Bet Joseph were recommended (JIX). We see, then, that most of the curriculum of the Yeshibot was centered about the Talmud and its commentaries and a little about the agadic or homiletic materials of the same source and of the Midrash. Scant attention was paid philosophy or any secular study, for these men were being trained to lead a separatistic, code-guided community. They were taught the necessities for such a career.

When we recall that every boy received an elementary education centered in the Bible, and to some small extent, the Mishnah and Talmud, and when we recall that there must have been a high mortality

rate in Yeshibot, that is, that only a portion of the students ever received Semichah, we realize that there must have been a well-educated laity who continued their studies in an informal way throughout life. A number of sources deal with adult education, both in the way of private advice and from the point of view of adult study groups.

The testament of R. Jonah Landsofer (JLX) is replete with good advice to the adult who, though not a scholar, would spend part of his time in study. He advises such a student to try to learn all of the Bible and the commentaries of learned men on the Mishna. He should do this study before breakfast, in which he may use German; and on Saturday, he should read a portion of the Shulchan Aruch or Leb Tob. He lists, also, a large number of books suitable to such a student, among them: Sifse Kohen, Magen Abraham (both commentaries in the S. A.)and others. As a final program, he enjoins the amateur student to show respect to and give money for scholarship. In Frankfort (SH) a group of business men would gather at noon to study. There seems also to have been a Mishnah class after services, for the author complains of the fact that people study during services. Moses Chasid (MC) suggests that if a student knows little, then let him read Mishnah and Shulchan Aruch, but if he knows no Hebrew, he might read Leb Tob and Brandspiegel (EP). He suggests also the study of the Cabbala. A daily program for the more educated man would be a daily half-hour of Bible with Rashi, and on occasion Shulchan Aruch and Turim. Another author is lavish with advice (JhA) suggesting that if a student does not understand the Talmudic method he choose material he is capable of handling. Let him first learn the prayers, the piyyutim, the selichot and the Psalms, then the

Pentateuch, Prophets and Hagiographa, and also the Parashah regularly with Rashi and the Targum. A scholar, on the other hand, may set his own course of study, but should study some halacha daily by doing a lesson in Alfasi and a short bit of En Yaakob. He opposes the current practice of reading Rashi, then Nachmanides, then Bachya ben Asher, with the advice to read the Midrashim and Tanchuma. A student should beware of Cabbala until he is learned enough. Another testament (JAH) suggests the study of Gemara and Tossefot and Turim daily. R. Meir Poppers (MP) develops a regualr schedule of study for the adult. He says that a man must study every day in Tanch, Mishnah, Gemara and Cabbala. Especially on Friday evening should a man study Cabbala, if he is twenty years old and married. He warns the student not to neglect Midrash. In these ways and words, the rabbis stimulated and guided the adult study groups, and the individual adult student to continuous study of the Jewish heritage.

2. Ethical Curriculum:

In the field of ethics there is not much material on either the teacher or pupil. The curriculum, we see, was largely halachic, and the moral stress of the modern religious school was probably found in the home and synagogue. By way of religion, the child was taught by his parents to pray, and to perform the simple home ceremonies (BW.IEP.JHA.MN). The teacher was expected to build religious notions by tying up morals with the Bible verses (GT). There was some opposition to taking young children to the synagogue (IHT) (IEP) but it was advised that they be given a part in the holiday services and celebration (JHA). There were some who felt that children should be taught the meaning of prayers before they were allowed

to pray (SH) and another author (JLX) suggested that if a child knows no hebrew, he should be taught to pray in German but that in any case, he should have one German prayer for his particular needs to be changed each day, and also special prayers built of Psalm verses. The above dealt with education in religion, i.e. in prayer and ceremonies, and the like. But what provision was made for training in general ethics and the good life? Moses Chasid (MC) advises that children write Asher's rules of living in their prayer book and read them daily. Likewise they should learn the Bible commands through Maimonides and Nachmanides; Orach Chaim and Yoreh Deah were recommended (RJCB). We have already spoken about the Torat hatan of R. Gedaliah Taikus which was an abridged compendium of the 613 mizvot and which was recommended for ethical education (TB). In fact, "moral books" (sifre musar) always went through many editions. Every child also should be taught the Shema, the ten commandments, the ani maaminim of Maimonides (AM). Children must be taught respect for their parents (MAP), the rabbi and the old folks (BW.MH). Likewise, he should be taken along on visits to the sick, to weddings and the like (JHA.IEP). Then the teacher was expected to build character (SS), to oversee the child while it was neither at school nor at home, such as during recesses, grace before and after meals, and the like (MAP.AM). The teacher was not allowed to send children on errands (TC) and must see that children do not run on the streets. As for daughters, the Brandspiegel (MH) sets down the desirable traits to be trained in them as neatness, modesty, cleanliness, obedience, a healthy appetite, gossipless and equipped to work if need be.

All in all, however, it is rather a disappointment to find that morals and ethics were more or less left to the home. In view

of the great stress of Judaism on law, justice, etc., it seems rather strange at first that they did not stress these matters. However, when we consider that the bulk of Jewish literature deals with the ethical life, both in law and in legend, and when we recall that the subject of character building has been put on a semi-scientific basis only in the last few years, our surprise fades.

3. Special Occasions:

This section dealing with holidays, Bar Mizvah and the like, comes more closely to curriculum than to any other topic in this thesis, although even here it is out of place.

Children should go to the synagogue on the Sabbath, as was said previously (JL). Before the holidays, which have already been treated, children were taught the special rules, the services, the halacha and the piyyutim for the holidays (JNW). In this same community, the teacher was expected to provide brandy and cakes for his pupils for celebrations on Purim, the fifteenth of Ab and the fifteenth of Shebat.

When a child was close to thirteen he was taught to lay tefillin (TC) and in Furth (TF) the teacher had to teach the Bar Mizwa derash for nothing. The records of Worms (JNW) describe fully the Bar Mizwa ceremony. On the first Sabbath after a boy was 13 years old, most candidates for Bar Mizwa read the Sedra in the presence of the congregation. Those whose voices were pleasant also recited the opening Beracha on Friday night and at shacharit and Mincha. A boy who could not read the Torah was given a Misheberach. Of course, the child was dressed up in new clothes and was given a feast after Mincha at which he gave a derash on the customs of Bar Mizwa and recited Birchat hamazon.

In Worms also two very fine celebrations were held for the bachurim in the Yeshibah. It is worth our while to go into detail. The one was called Simchat Bachurim. On the Sabbath eve before Purim the bachurim would go to a house far from the house of study and dress in mantles, whence they would march in double file (at their head was a dancing boy and gabbaim with staves) to the synagogue where they would sit on the bimah through the Magen Abot. Then they would descend, coming to the Ab Bet Din for blessing, whence they marched into the women's section where the wife of the Ab Bet Din would also bless them. The next morning, the gabbaim, in long tallesim, like those of the bachurs, would collect funds and ask for the Aliyot, after which they would come to the Parnass of the month to beg forgiveness for the Segan (who would normally call the Aliyot) since this Sabbath belonged to the bachurim (unless it were Yahrzeit) and the bachurim conducted the service. Later in the day, wine was contributed by the householders of the community and Purim joy reigned supreme for the rest of the week.

The second special occasion for bachurim in Worms came at the time of finishing a masechta. Two gabbaim were appointed by the rabbi and the bachurim to provide the necessities for a feast. On the day of finishing, the Shamash and the recorder would announce in the synagogues that at a certain hour, the rabbi would finish the masechta. The Kahal would gather, talk and pray for about an hour; then the rabbi would finish off with a derash, and the next day would be signalized with a merry feast.

4. Principles of Curriculum:

This section might have been first under Curriculum, but the author felt it better to follow the facts with the theory. We know pretty well what was taught and the age at which it was

learned. We would now find out why it was taught? Why was it taught when it was? What principles guided the choice of commentaries, texts, and the like?

In relation to the order of study, the most common complaint was that students were advanced through Bible and Mishnah to Talmud much too quickly (EL.GT.JLP.SIM.MAP). One author insists repeatedly that Talmud should never be begun before the pupil is ten and then only if he is well grounded in Torah (MAP.EL.) Other complaints go still farther. One is that children study Cabbala before they know Talmud that they may show off before parents (NAS); another that too many children know something of the Shulchan Aruch but little of its source, the Talmud (JAH). Cracow was the only town (in the sources) to decree that a teacher cannot start Talmud with a pupil until the latter is found prepared three weeks in succession by examiners (TC). Another author (SH) cries out at the lack of education in Ashkenazic lands, and asks that a rabbinic conference set the order of learning.

Still more was said in reference to particular approaches to the curriculum. We shall deal with the problem of secular versus rabbinic learning in a later chapter. But in reference to pilpul, and the pilpulistic method, there were heated protagonists for both sides. One author complains that pupils who are pilpulistically bent got no respect (EL) while others merely comment on the fact that they are opposed to Talmudic disputes, i.e. pilpul and chillukim (IHS.JSM.RJCB.SIM.) In reference to grammar, also, there was a difference of opinion, although the only expressions were for it. One man is cautious and says that a little grammar is good, but too much of it is waste of time (RJCB), while others condemn teachers who know very little grammar and do not bother to include it in the cur-

riculum (MEJ.GT.SI).

Most of the material in this section was repeated, often as many as four times, therefore, the brevity of the presentation must not deceive as to the importance with which curriculum was regarded. It was of concern to teachers and communities just what was to be taught, what approach was to be used and why, and their many comments, only outlined above, are buttressed with reason and with prejudice.

5. Comparisons:

It is interesting to note briefly how much shift in the Jewish curriculum has taken place in America as against the curriculum outlined above. Today, the emphasis is almost entirely on history, the Bible as literature, rather than Hebrew, and Hebrew as a spoken tongue rather than a dead language. In these three directions, modern curricula have gone far afield from tradition, whether for good or bad is a question, but at any rate far. The legalistic aspect of Judaism has crumbled with the walls of the Ghetto and today history, ethics, ties of language and ideology are depended upon to hold the Jewish group together, in place of the social control and legalistic education of yesteryears.

C. Pedagogy:

No books were written on the art of teaching in those days. No volumes of experimental or practical psychology were available. Human nature was conceived of as a rather fixed invariable; people were expected to react in unison. Psychology was not even a word. For this reason, this section on pedagogy, which will deal with the psychology of learning, classroom management and discipline, will be

for the most part ~~xx~~ a compendium of by-the-way statements of our sources that touch, wittingly or no, on the subject. The source material is not systematic, the premises are not stated, very few general principles are laid down; it is our task to reduce the random thoughts of our sources to a system of pedagogy.

1. Psychology of learning:

Several men, teachers, rabbis and students went to the trouble of laying down principles of study. It is enjoined on a father, even if he is learned, to procure a teacher for his son (JHa) but to avoid an individual tutor (RJCB). If he cannot get a teacher, or does not need one, then the child should study in the Beth Midrash near a scholar who can help him (JAH.JLX). Learning obtained in the synagogue is not forgotten (MP.JAH). Night is best for study (IHS) if one studies in joy, or at least without worry (MP). An adult student should first get a general grasp of the material, then he should search deeper (IHS), and he should make provision for one day of review in every thirty (MP). To cultivate a reverence for books, or rather to express that reverence, he should kiss a book upon opening it (MP). In the study of Talmud, the student should take a long way, perek by perek, even if it takes four or five years, since learning is then so much the better (JAH). The same author suggests that if the meaning comes hard, to take a walk and recite the Ahava Raba, after which to study in a different place. An adaptation from Profiat Duran by the author of the Shela (IHS) sums up the foregoing. Study with the learned and upright. Read the works of great scholars. Read for understanding. Develope mnemonic systems. Study well-bound, well-printed books in a pleasant room. Study aloud. Study with cantillation. Read books in large print and

in Assyrian script. Teach others. Be a calm and happy student. Set a definite time for study. Study for study's sake. Pray for understanding. Do not teach Hebrew to Gentiles (?). All in all these simple rules are practical for controlled and sustained learning.

In starting children to school, several suggest a pleasant conditioning to the school routine and atmosphere. The child should be brioed with honey to start to school (JHA), either by having him lick it off a slate that has the alphabet on it (HK), or by giving him fruit, sugar cakes and other sweets (IEP.MH). Money, too, was sometimes given (IEP) and the rabbi might say that the money was dropped by an angel, thus teaching thanksgiving (MH). (My own father recalls his first days in cheder in the United States as being accompanied by a coin-dropping angel). The child should be taught to kiss books, even before he can read, to develope a favorable attitude toward them (IEP). Later, the child may be motivated with the desire for honor (JHA) or with the prospect of getting a wealthy wife or becoming a great rabbi, until he of himself will learn to study for study's sake (IEP.JHA.) It is good that child-centered material be used. R. Gedaliah Taikus brings forth psychological reasons for using his Ale Hamizwot (GT). He claims that many of the 613 mizwot have no meaning nor use for young children, and his book is abridged for that purpose. Likewise he claims that the study of grammar gives a fine motivation to further study, since it makes the language live. Of course, all study must be thorough (TVL.JL); therefore, prayers should be taught carefully (JLX) and some even recommend that prayer take place in Yiddish (ABOVE. ASH).

The greatest emphasis in teaching however was laid on regular weekly examinations given the pupils by the Gaon, the rabbi or

the Kehilla-appointed examiners. We dealt with this subject above, but we will cite a few references to show how important this was. The Kehilla usually saw to it that the rabbi gave examinations(JNW.TVL. TM.TP.etc.) and might force the issue by fining the teacher (TM). The examinees were sometimes punished for poor recitations (NN.JNW.), for it was felt that without repetition, motivated by examinations true learning could not be secured (MAP). In school life, then, the greatest emphasis was laid on getting off to a good start, thorough, slow and careful learning, and frequent reviews and examinations.

2. Classroom Management:

There were no training schools for teachers even remotely like our normal schools today. Knowledge of the subject was considered the only requisite for a teacher. For this reason, we found, in section 1 (Administration), that the Kehillot ruled concerning particular aspects of the class. These rules were centered on the number of pupils a teacher might have, and also on the homogeneity of classes, that is, that children at all stages of learning were not to be allowed in the same class. On the first of these i.e. limitations on the number of pupils in a class, we have heard enough already. On the latter, development is in order. If the class were by and large composed of Gemara pupils, then no children studying the alphabet and no girls were allowed (TNM) and only three students of the Siddur. However, complaints that teachers have pupils in all stages of learning (MAP.JL.), suggestions that teachers be specialists (MAP), other suggestions on the size of the class and its nature (AM.JL.), and the lack of much legislation on the subject, leads one to suspect that in general, especially in the smaller communities, classes were left more or less to the mercy of the teacher.

In teaching children in groups, there is very little material. A teacher (AM) sets down a few ideas: seat the children in rows and give them letters made of board with which they may learn the letters and the vowels. Then they should be taught to recognize the same letters on a chart, in paradigms, in the prayer book. Then the teacher begins on syllables in words already known. Letters and vowels should be taught in two months, the prayer book, by the end of a year. Another author suggests a very modern technique, that of teaching the alphabet through midrashim about the letters (MAG). The teacher should encourage questions and should answer them pleasantly (MAF.AM.). It was considered bad pedagogy to leave the school house for any purpose whatsoever (JL) or to use the students for messengers and handy woodcutters; and the teacher is warned not to dissipate, lest it impair his teaching. There is a little more detail on the method of teaching in the yeshibot. Nathan Hanover (NN) records that in Poland all the bachurim would go to the yeshibah where they would surround the rosh yeshibah and each would pose the question bothering him, to the rosh yeshibah, to which the latter would answer. Then the rosh would bring up a new halacha, after which there would be a Talmudic disputation over the disagreements in Rashi, the Talmud and the Tossefot. The same took place in Worms, where pilpul was the order of the day (JNW). But xx questions outside the masechta were not brought up (SIM). We see that classroom management, while it may have caused great concern to the teachers, was not the subject of much literature nor the provocation of much legislation.

3. Discipline:

Keeping order in the class room or out of it was largely a matter of punishment. Modern educators say that discipline prob-

lems usually show a lack of interest or some individual psychic difficulty. To our sources the child was a tabula rasa. If the tabula became refractory, well, spare the rod and spoil the child. The teacher was expected to correct the child on all occasions and to punish him if necessary according to the situation and according to the ability of the child to take it (JHW). Only young children, however, should be physically punished (HP.JmA). Older children are sensitive to praise and blame without physical treatment. When a bachur misbehaved, he was punished by the rabbi and communal head (MAC). Sometimes the father was given complete charge of discipline. If a child disturbed the synagogue services, his father might be fined (TA). Parents are asked to allow the teacher to punish the child (MAF.JL). In some places there was a discipline committee who took care of bad children and set them right (TC). Parents were advised not to scold children with vile language, nor to frighten them with any sort of bogeyman (JmA). Teachers are warned not to strike a child in anger (HME), but must treat children as their own (GT). Parents should not show love for children (GT.JmA) and must not wait for understanding, but rather punish them immediately, even in public (MH). Solomon Maimon in his autobiography speaks of the deplorable school conditions to which he was subjected, especially in the way of discipline. It is to be hoped, first , that he exaggerated and second, that he went to a poorer type of school than would be considered representative.

We might repeat the introduction to this section, for emphasis. Suffice it to say that in most particulars, our forefathers had rather good sense in their approach to human nature, and that in their errors they were at one with all educators before the recent growth of psychology as a science.

D.Aims and Ideals:

In this chapter we have discussed the traditional academic ideals of the two century period between 1600 and 1800. In other words, we have discussed the educational system of Ashkenazic Jewry in an orthodox environment. We have dealt with administration from the viewpoints of officers, finances, teachers, children, time, and facilities; with curriculum, academic and ethical; and with pedagogy. It is the purpose of this concluding section to express the educational aims and the ideals of the Jewish group. Immediately we run into a semi-philosophical snag. The question is whether we shall consider the normal practice or the highest expressions of the most intelligent group as the academic aims or ideals of our period.

If we consider as aims, the normal practice, then this section need be but a summary of the preceding. However, this leaves us more or less in the air. What people do may have some relation to what they wish to do, but the two may be widely disparate. We speak of Jewish ideals or ethics as the expression of great prophets and rabbis, not as the conduct of the masses. On the other hand, if we deal only with expressed ideals by enlightened individuals or communities, we are not dealing with educational practice. The actual facts are, of course, that different communities had different aims, if we may judge by the machinery set up to satisfy those aims, and that different men had different ideas e.g. Cabbalists and anti-Cabbalists, pilpulists and anti-pilpulists. The most we can do is present an inductive view of the aims shown by the preceding, interspersed with documentary support.

1. Inductive ideals:

The educational aims of any community are primarily to preserve the community. Thus, organized education becomes one of the conserving forces in communal life. Applying this principle to the period and group we are studying, we are struck with its truth. The educational ideal of the Ashkenazic Jews was to raise children to the position of their parents. Of course, this statement must be modified, for naturally, there was a desire to bring children up to be even better than their parents, but only in a quantitative way. We might state the aim of the educational system of this period, then, as the securing of Jewish education for all males (TM.TC.TOA). To this end, every boy was expected, even required to attend school or take private lessons at least until he was Bar Mitzvah. After this period, he should be taught a trade, (Mh) or he might be sent to a Yeshibah; but up to this point, his life resembled that of every other boy in the community or even in Ashkenazic Jewry.

In being educated every boy was exposed to that part of Jewish tradition which most clearly expressed the Ashkenazic spirit. His greatest training was in the law, written and oral. The Toran, the Mishna, the Talmud, the Shulchan Aruch, were his text books. Very little stress was laid on the ethical, the philosophical, the poetic. As an adult, he was expected to know the law of every day life, to observe that law, and if in doubt, to be able to consult the authorities about any point of dispute. As a personality, he was left to his own devices, at least as far as his education was concerned. His behavior was controlled only if he were unruly to the extent of giving trouble. From this, we can see that the Jewish educators of the day fell heir or rather were also deluded into be-

lieving that the child is truly father of the man in the narrow sense that the child is merely a little man, an adult on a small scale. They did not recognize the qualitative differences between children of different ages, the growth of personality, the change of personality and of psychological outlook were not among their concepts. Therefore, as we have seen, the curriculum was based on adult aims. There was practically no attempt to center the material of the curriculum on child nature or child desires as we understand them today. A few men wrote expressly for children, such as the book Ele hamizvot, but these men and books were few and far between. A child was introduced to Jewish life as a law code. He studied the Bible, not as a literary document, but as the word of God, an exercise in Hebrew and a compendium of law on which his later study would be based. In general, the Torah was considered a stepping stone to later, and according to the viewpoint of the times, more important Hebrew literature. The great legalistic works became the core of his education. His life was expected to be ruled by the education he received in this field. This then was the aim of the times, universal education in orthodox legalistic Judaism.

That the legalistic tradition and ideal led to pilpul, to the minute and searching examination of every jot and tittle of the law, we have heard again and again. The curriculum of the Yeshibot (see above) reveals this most clearly, and it must have been one of the accepted ideals of the group. However, many men object strenuously to this particular ideal. The personal factors that influence their thought are closed to us, but we do find them sometimes violent in their total disagreement with the legalistic pilpulistic training

given to most children and young men. The critics of pilpul are not a solid group, an organized minority, but rather a series of dissenters, from different generations and of different lands (SH.JSM.GT.SS. MSB.RJCB.EL.GJE.BB). Yet, the pilpulistic tradition was widespread and being the dominant practice, it needed no defence.

Likewise, the attitude of the age toward Cabbala, in view of the Messianic furors is interesting. There are many who advise the study of it (JHA.SH.), although some authors warn against its study until the child is old enough to wander in Pardes (NAS.MP).

For the needs of everyday life i.e. a living provision was made after a boy was Bar Mitzvah, not through schools but through apprenticeships. A boy may have been taught just a little arithmetic and reading and writing in Yiddish during his school years, but these were addenda to the curriculum and not an integral part of it. At any rate, equipped with a minimum of practical knowledge and skills, he was, if he were not considered fit for the scholarly or professional Jewish life, taught a trade, usually by a relative, sometimes at the expense of the community.

The community, however, took a much greater interest in boys who were not destined for a life of work or business, and for these they set up the great and small Yeshibot for higher Jewish learning. Out of these schools came the greatest practical result of all their aims - rabbis and teachers who would carry on the communal traditions. The effect of this is especially noticeable in the fact that Polish Yeshibah life colored Jewish life in the entire Ashkenazic diaspora, spreading even to Amsterdam and London. While the elementary education built Jews conditioned to a particular orthodox Judaism, the secondary educational system built leaders of the generation, leaders

who had been thoroughly inculcated with a legalistic point of view, leaders who would guarantee the preservation of extant values. And thus the cycle went on and on, one generation raising another to the same point of view as it held.

Of course, there was a great deal of opportunism among the rabbis and teachers, but from the more exalted spirits we have severe condemnation of all venal attitudes and practices (JLX.EL.SGA.), usually a condemnation of the other fellow (SIM). Communities were advised to provide for all teachers that they might not have to stoop to venal practices (TSL.IEP.TNM). In fact, it is the duty of people to be generous toward the support of rabbis and to hire the poor rather than the rich (SH). Nathan Hanover (NN) praises the Polish *Yeshibah* system whereby Gaonim and students were amply cared for.

There were of course practical difficulties. Those under the stimulation of the rabbis, were solved by the community. The communal heads were entrusted with the educational needs of the community. It was their task to set up an efficient school system, to superintend the gathering of monies of support in kind, to regulate teachers, to set curricula, to examine pupils and so forth. In some communities, this was left largely to chance, but in most there was a wealth of detailed ruling on any and all of these subjects. We see, then, that in spite of the fact that the community guaranteed continuity in orthodox ideals, it put a seal on that guarantee by regulating the very teachers whom it educated. Very little was left to the individual be he *melammed* or *Gaon*. His point of view, his methods, his moral and mental life were subject to the community. His initiative and ingenuity

were strictly limited. His only recourse was the communal legislature, whatever its nature. Thus, by two types of control, indirect or educational, and direct or legislative, the preservation of current life and values was insured.

Inductively, then, we have discovered that the educational aims of Ashkenazic Jewry were the inculcation of a particular point of view and the preservation of that point of view through institutions.

CHAPTER III.

Transition

We have briefly outlined the aims and ideals of traditional Jewish education as they were expressed in word and deed during the 17th and 18th century. It was at the very end of this period that a change in the status of Jewish life in Germany and Austria brought about the beginnings of what were to be vast changes in the educational ideology of a substantial group of westeren Ashkenazic Jewry. Historically viewed, the translation of the Bible into German by Moses Mendelssohn (Genesis was published in 1780), the growth of the Haskalah movement and the Toleranzedikt of 1781 by Joseph II of Austria were the immediate factors in the growth of Reform Judaism in ceremonial and education.

We must not assume, however, that the new movement grew full-fledged Minerva-like from the head of some Jew. The very title of this chapter "Transition" covers not a period of ten or twenty years in which the new order came into being, but rather the whole period with which we have been dealing. Inherent in the old system were certain faults that bred rebellion; co-cursive with it were a few isolated streams of liberal thought that, while they retained a traditional theology, flowed toward an educational system adapted to new conditions.

We have already spoken of the pilpulistic tradition of Polish Jewry that infiltrated all Ashkenazic lands and met with much opposition (see above), even in the 17th century. This concentration on the legalistic, although we tend to magnify it and

forget its good features, produced generations of rabbis and teachers who abandoned the entire philosophic tradition of the Middle Ages, who slighted the ethical and prophetic writings of the Bible, who condemned the secular growth induced by the Renaissance and who thereby turned Jewish life in upon itself.

Long before the rumblings of emancipation provoked assimilatory measures, long before Mendelssohn became a Schutz-Jude, long before Joseph II appointed Herz Homburg educational head of the Galician schools, there were foreshadowings of educational reform in the writings of both prominent and obscure Jewish authors. Much of this foreshadowing manifested itself in a vague discontent with the contemporary and a "back-to-the-good-old-days" tone of voice. The most common psychologically interesting foible was to compare the days of the author's youth with the days of his maturity. One man asserts that in Moravia during his youth, children went to school till they were sixteen whereas now (ca.1750) they know nothing of their lessons and play continually in the streets (EL.JL). Much earlier, an obscure teacher complains of his fellow teachers in that they are clock watchers, servants of the wealthy etc., (MAP) and another complains that they do not even know the variant readings of the dagesh, that textbooks are very poor, that teachers were not up to the standards set by earlier ages(SI.MEJ). We have mentioned several times the reaction against the talmudic disputation method. We would but emphasize that this continued throughout the period we are studying, and was the opinion, likewise of critical foreigners (LJ). Jacob Emden (YE) was very bitter about the Lithuanian and Polish teachers who invaded the western lands, and, in their erudition and in their tradition,

were very hard to get along with. They likewise made themselves objectionable by assuming airs. Here teachers would give legal decisions and be called Chaver (IME). We find others who complain that the good old days of the Yeshibah are no more. Students were no longer encouraged, support was niggardly, wealthy marriages for promising Bachurim were rare (JLF.GJM). There were also complaints of the lackadaisical attitude of parents. They were slow in paying the teacher, they would bring up their children for business, they refused to cooperated with the teacher in disciplinary matters (IME), and others avoided their responsibility by sending their boys to a larger community where they themselves would be rid of these responsibilities. These, in effect, were the complaints of those who were not reformers in education but rather critics of contemporary conditions. Their solution was essentially conservative, a return to the golden past (golden for them), a universal law on the the order of teaching (JES), a recovery of the fine days of the Waad. How much this discontent was influential in bringing about a new era is something of a question, but it reveals clearly the faults of the old that affected those who had more directly to do with later reforms.

A second phase of the transition was in the realm of an increasing emphasis on the secular by professional and lay Jews. In the realm of philosophy, science, and other secular learning, most of the leaders of the age were opposed to it (RJCB.IhS.MF. JHA.BB.MK), although some condemn it only if it is in excess (MC). An Italian rabbi finds it the great lack of Polish schools (JSM). On the other hand, there must have been many enlightened minds, for Rabbi R. Manoach Hendel b. Shemarja, himself no great light,

boasts of studying Albo, Bedersi, Arama and others, in addition to two books on mathematics and several on astronomy. Just how heretical or free thinking his philosophy was, is not determined (MS). Glueckel of Hameln (Gh) records that a member of the family knew French and could play a piano-like instrument (JEC.JHS). Jacob Emden complains that the bulk of business men and their families were aping the Gentiles in clothes, manners, haircuts etc., and that the wealthy taught their children French before they ever read a Hebrew letter, and that others even went so far as to read philosophy, although he himself admits to having studied Dutch and Latin by himself (YE). Still another author (HK) complains that many children went to secular schools where they learned French and other secular subjects which made their Jewish education secondary. A note by Assaf (p.102) reveals that fact that in that period (ca. 1750) Jewish boys did attend the gymnasium, but there was evidence neither of large numbers nor of molestation. A responsum regards it as all right for a father to teach the Polish alphabet to his boy, but says that from there on the child should study by himself (RMM). Thus, from the masses too came a degree of disintegrating influence in the direction of assimilation that played its part in bringing assent to a reform. Ber of Bolichow records in his memoirs that his father was anxious for him to be cultured in Polish and Latin. Of course, a Christian tutor was out of the question but the student could teach himself with a little aid.

Still a third stream in the growing cascade that was to lead to fundamental reforms was in the realm of education itself. The numerous translations, the emphasis on Yiddish for prayers, for

study, the growing use of German by the wealthy, point to a transitional influence within the very school house. We know already that in the realm of adult education (see above) Yiddish was advised strongly for all who did not know Hebrew. The same was suggested for children. One man suggests that each child spend three years on the prayers in Yiddish after which he can be taught Hebrew voluntarily. He cites the fact, too, that in Spain and Italy, children were taught the native language before they were taught Hebrew. This very man made a translation of the prayers called Liebliche Tefilla which procured him very little support and a very real cherem from the local raboi (ASH). Another author, evidently a rationalist physician (SGB) insists that children should know prayers in the mother tongue, and should also be taught the native language and one foreign language such as French. The same author also comes out in favor of Peshat translation of the Pentateuch along with the history of the development of the oral tradition. Still another raboi suggests the study of the sciences as a basis for a real examination of the Toran (LWS). It would seem that many of the Yiddish translations of the Bible were replete with Agadic legends woven into the text, for which reason Yekutiel b. Isaac Blitz made a translation of the Tanach according to the Peshat. This increasing tendency toward the simple direct interpretation of the Toran, this emphasis by teacher and translator on more of the secular learning, the gradual decadence of Hebrew even as a Lashon hakodesh joined the dissatisfaction of some and the increasing assimilation of others to make the time ripe for reform when the Berlin Free School was established and when the Toleranzedikt was promulgated. In spite of much opposition

the movements crystallized by these historic incidents had profound effect on the educational practices of later reform and orthodox Jews alike. It would be a separate thesis to tie up the effects of each of these tendencies, to show their interrelations in time and space. Suffice it to say that the slow growth of reforming tendencies was only stimulated and to a certain extent directed by social and political factors. It seems to the author that it had its real basis in the faults of the old system.

CHAPTER IV.

Liberal Attitudes

This last section actually deals with history in Jewish education of the last few years of the 18th century. For this reason, we will deal with it strictly from an historical point of view. That is, we will take up each author and his point of view in a consecutive and somewhat chronological order in order to show the rapid developments that took place in those few years and which laid the basis for so much reform in the next century.

An open letter in the magazine Meassef gives us a brief description of the Berlin Free School "Chinuch Nearim" founded in 1781 by David Friedlander and Isaac b. Daniel Itzig.(M3). The teachers were some well-educated Jews and some Christians. The curriculum included Hebrew, German, French, fractions, geometry, geography, history and natural science. No Tanach or Talmud had been taught up the time of publication 1783. These had been left to the discretion of fathers but the letter appealed for funds and promised a curriculum including better education in Hebrew.

One of the first and strongest protagonists of the new order was Naftali Herz Wessely who wrote shortly after the Toleranzedikt of 1781 a letter called Dibre Shalom Veemet (DNW), which purposed to secure a favorable reception to the edict. His letter begins on a Midrashic distinction between Torah of man and Torah of God (which later was a stumbling block for him). The Torah of man refers to morals, politics, history, geography etc., which actually precede in point of time the Torah of God, whereas the latter begins where the former leaves off carrying man's

knowledge into the realms of the religious. Therefore, a scholar in Torah is no real scholar unless he is also learned in the secular knowledges. He goes on to claim that many German and Polish Jews were learned secularly and were nonetheless respected. In analysing the causes of the average Jew's shut-in cultural outlook, he traces it to bitter feeling toward Gentile persecution which reacted in such a way as to drive the Jew to the narrow field of Jewish education and to trade. Even the Jew's knowledge of Torah was of little or no use. Again, he praises Joseph II for his humanity in that he has opened opportunities for education and wider occupational choice to the Jews. His proposal is a double curriculum in Hebrew and in the secular. Yiddish is to be dropped. Four hours a day of Hebrew should be enough - this to be in Torah and Mishnah along with intensive study in grammar. The remainder of the day is to be occupied with one half hour of reading and writing in the native language, one half hour of geography based on maps, one half hour of history. Brighter children might also be taught arithmetic, geometry and the natural sciences. In support of his point he shows how liberal Poles had educated themselves in the secular knowledges and how the Free School in Berlin had triumphed over the first opposition.

This tract aroused an immediate storm of opposition. Rabbi David Tavel (DT) came forth in a sermon to say that while the principles enunciated in Dibre Shalom Ve'emet were sound, he was opposed to Wessely himself. He felt that Wessely was stressing the secular too much; he differed with him fundamentally in the order of learning. Certainly the Torah of God is precedent to the Torah of man; under Wessely's proposed system the study of

Torah would become a duty rather than a pleasure. As a substitute motion, he recommends the study of Hebrew until a boy is Bar Mitzvah, then the study of Toreh Deah for the 'Torah of man' and later, if still desirable, the study of foreign languages and the like.

On the same day that the above sermon was delivered, R. Ezekiel Landau of Prague gave a sermon in which he attacked the piety of Wessely and the import of his platform (ELA). Judiciously, he praises the edict of Joseph II, admits that knowledge of the native language can stand Jews in good stead, but Torah is primary. Secular learning, after all, is an aid to making money. Likewise, all application of secular learning to the Torah is pernicious and perilous. Therefore, beware, even in secular lines, of teaching more than reading, writing, simple aritnmetic and derech eretz. In a later work, he again attacks the tract, insisting that the written and oral tradition contain all; why then learn the culture of those who persecute us. As for Wessely's attacks on contemporary education, these are based on faults of the system which can easily be corrected. He advises physical punishment. After all, he says, the ultimate of Wessely's program would be to rob a good many teachers of a means of livelihood since they know neither German nor grammar. As a final point, he enumerates a number of very poor books in Hebrew that deal with secular learning. At first glance, Landau may seem very reactionary but the facts are, according to the memoirs of R. Itzig Hirsch Weiss that he was quite versed in secular learning and that some of his pupils

went to the university (Assaf p.141). In short, he was opposed only to the philosophy of the Maskilim.

In reaction to these attacks, Wessely wrote a second letter, this time to Trieste, where he met with a friendlier reception (DNW). In this letter, he wriggles verbally out of some of his earlier and stronger statements and recommends a standard Italian translation similar to that of Mendelssohn. In this letter, he suggests a year of Torah with grammar, then Mishnah and Talmud without pilpul as an accompaniment to further study of Torah, until the student learns to study for himself.

Against the second letter Landau came forth in a strong indictment (ELB) in which he accuses Wessely of slandering Tavel and other great men of the time and asks for an apology through the Bet Din. He warns the community heads of Berlin to watch out for Wessel, and men of his ilk, lest they speak in the name of the community.

This provoked, in all, two more letters from Wessely - one to the Italian rabbis who were trying to smooth over the quarrel, and a fourth as a rebuttal to opposition.

Meanwhile, in Austria the edict was having its effect. An announcement in Prosnitz, Moravia, is included in our sources (TPA). It proclaims that a normal school was established for children ~~xx xxxx xx~~ who have left the Chedarim, and warns fathers to send their children on pain of a fine. Also, breakfast periods were cut out of the Cheder schedule to allow time for normal school.

Herz Homburg (HHG) was appointed Head of the Galician schools. In a letter to the Parnassim of the district, he refers to the decree and its motive, and explains his own position in regard to it. In discussing contemporary pre-edict education, he finds the cause of its faults lie in the fact that that poor teachers from eastern lands were employed; there was no supervision of teachers, no steady employment for them, the poor were left without education and there was no designated curriculum or administration. The united school system under his tutelage would remedy all these defects. It offers uniformity, system and regulation, and offers security to teachers. His experience, he feels, qualifies him, but he is willing to listen to advice and seeks cooperation.

An educational theorist of the period was Josel Rackmoi. In a maamor (YR) he addresses himself to the subjects of curriculum and pedagogy. He would introduce the Parasha of each week with a background that would stir up interest. He was against Talmud at an early age and suggests that Baba Kezia would be the best tractate with which to begin. At four, a child might begin the alphabet, at five he might begin the Torah and the study of his native language. The contents of the Torah should be carefully excerpted to keep to ideas and stories that the child can understand. After completing the study of Torah in this fashion, the pupil would begin again and study all parts of it except those about women. Then again a repetition of the Torah complete. At seven, the child would begin Hebrew writing and take up a little about Palestine, its history, geography, etc. By this time, he will have gone over the Torah

for the second time, and with the beginning of the third cycle of Torah, he would study the Prophets and Hagiographa, and begin the study of Hebrew grammar, secular writing and Rashi to the Bible. At the age of nine, Talmud is begun with bits of Rif and Rambam. In addition there would be regular instruction in ethics through hikes, walks and nature tramps. The author emphasizes also the new view that the teacher must be loved rather than feared, and he should know grammatical Hebrew as well as the native language so that he can make a smooth translation.

This last chapter has introduced us to a few of the first pages in the history of the growth of educational reform. These men and their followers were actuated by a variety of motives and carried on their cause with more or less effectiveness. Thus they gave birth to a new approach to Jewish education that has spread to all schools, orthodox and reform, to this very day.

SOURCES

AEH...R. Asher b. Eliezer Halevi..Diary.	Assaf	p.73
AM ...R. Abraham b. Madel of Oettingen. Maarechet Abraham.	Assaf	p.195
ASH...R. Aaron b. Samuel of Bergersmausen. Lieblicne Tefilla.	"	173
BB ...Berachya Berach. Forward to Collection of Sermons.	"	113
BMS...Moses b. Issachar Halevi Saerteles. Beer Moshe.	"	60
BW ...R. Benjamin Wolf b. Mattathias. Tehorat Hakadosh.	"	185
CT ...R. Chanoch. Tochachot Megulah (added to Reshit Bikkurim).	"	176a
CY ...Anonymous. Ketab Yosher.	"	242
DNW...Naphtali Herz Wessely. Dibre Shalom We'emet.	"	225
DT ...David Tavel. Sermon.	"	235
EA ...Elijah b. Azariel of Vilna. Mikra Kodesh.	"	176
EL ...R. Ephraim Luntschitz. Amude Shesh.	"	61
ELA...R. Ezekiel Landau. Sermon.	"	238
ELB...R. Ezekiel Landau. Letter to the Parnassim of Berlin.	"	239
ELG...R. Ezekiel Landau.	"	240
GH ...Glueckel of Hamlin. Memoirs.	"	197
GJE...Gaon R. Jonathan Eybeschutz. Yaarot D'vash.	"	205
GJT...Gaon R. Joseph Te'omim. Responsa.	"	214
GT ...R. Gedalian Taikus. Torat Katon.	"	201
HHG...Herz Homburg. Letter to the Galician Parnassim.	"	252
HK ...R. Hirsch Koidanower. Kab HaYashar.	"	102
IEP...R. Isaac b. Eliakim of Posen. Leb Tob.	"	75
IHS...R. Isaiah Halevi Horwitz. Shene Luchot Haberit.	"	65
IHT...R. Isaiah Halevi Horwitz. Zedah Laderech.	Güdemann	111
IMS...R. Israel M. Samosc. Nezach Yisrael.	"	194
JAH...R. Jacob b. Abraham haLevi Horwitz. Testament.	Assaf	p. 67
JE ...Jacob Emden. Lechem Shomaim.	"	206
JEC...Jacob Emden. Chalon Hamitzri.	"	207
JEM...Jacob Emden. Migdol Oz.	"	240
JES...Jacob Emden. Mitpachat Sefarim.	"	210b
JH ...R. Joseph Stadthagen. Dibre Zikaron.	"	169
JHA...R. Joseph Juspa Hahn. Yosif Omez.	"	80
JJK...R. Jacob Joseph haKohen. Toldot Jacob Joseph.	"	213c
JL ...R. Judah b. Loeb. Omer Meyenuda.	"	218
JLP...R. Judah Loeb Puchowitzer. Diore Chachamim.	"	164
JLX...R. Jonah Landsofer. Testament.	"	178
JM ...R. Judah Loeb b. Joel Minden. Milim Meloah.	"	200
JNW...Juspa b. Naphtali, Shamash. Customs of Worms.	"	117
JSM,..Joseph Salomo del Medigo of Kandia.	Güdemann	213
JT ...Gaon R. Joseph Te'omim. Em Lebinah.	Assaf	217
L ...A letter of 1619 from Prague to Vienna.	"	77
LB....Leone del Bene of Ferrara.	Güdemann	213a
MAC...R. Moses b. Abraham. Orders sent to Rabbi of Cracow.	Assaf	100
MAP...R. Moses b. Aaron Morawczyk. Kezad Seder Mishnah.	"	85
MB ...An Open Letter in Meassef.	"	251
MC ...Moses Chasid of Prague. Testament.	"	177
MEJ...R. Eljakim b. Jacob. Melammed Siach.	"	188
MH ...Moses Henochs. Brandspiegel.	"	54
MK ...R. Jacob b. Moses (Katz). Magal haOmer.	"	204b
MP ...R. Meir Poppers. Or Hayashar.	"	181
MS ...R. Manoach b. Shemaria. Manoach Halebobot.	"	41
MSB...R. Moses Samson Bacharach. Shemen Lamaor.	"	124
MW ...R. Moses Wasserzug. Memoirs.	"	213

NAS...R. Abraham Chayyim b. Naphtali Hirsch Shor. Torat Chayyim. Assaf p.84
NHH...R. Naphtali Hertz b. Judah Loeb. Or Le'et Sofer. " p.199
NN ...R. Nathan Nata ben Moses Hanover. Yewen Mezulah. " 110
RAK...Gaon R. Aaron Samuel Koidanower. Emunot Shemuel. " 102a
RJCB..R. Yair Chayyim Bacharach. Chawat Yair. " 125
RMM...R. Meir b. Zebi Hirsch Margolioth. Meir Nesiom. " 213b
SAL...Gaon Saul b. Arye Lev (Lowenstamm). Letter. " 191
SGB...Anonymous. Sefer Gidul Banim. " 222
SH ...R. Sabbatai b. Isaiah Halevi Horwitz. Wawe Haamudim. " 70
SI ...R. Sabbatai b. Isaac of Przemzyl. Introd. to Prayers. " 72
SIM...Abi Ezra Selig Margolioth. Chibbure Likkutim. " 165
SS ...R. Solomon Salman. Kohelet Shelomoh. Güdemann 197
SZA...R. Solomon Zevi Aufhausen. Yiddisher Theriak. Assaf 74
TA ...Takkanot of Kehillos Altona, Hamburg and Wandsbeck. " 188
TB ...A discussion of text books..in.. Güdemann 289ff
TC ...Takkanot of the Cracow Kehilla. " 98
TF ...Takkanot of the Chevra for Support of Orphans. Fürth. " 204
TFM...Takkanot of Frankfort am Main. " 116
TKA...Takkanot of German Kehilla in Amsterdam. " 190
TKH...Takkanot of Kahal in district of Hesse. " 150
TKM...Takkanot of the Kehilla in Metz. " 151
TL ...Account Book of the Cheder in Lemberg. " 247
TM ...Takkanot of the District of Moravia. " 134
TNM...Takkanot of Nicholsburg in Moravia. " 137
TOA...Takkanot of the Chevra for Support of Orphans.Amsterdam. " 189
TP ...Takkanot of the Kehilla in Posen. " 114
TPA...Announcement in Prostitz, Moravia. " 246
TSL...Takkanot of the Chevra Talmud Torah in Side Lavan. " 192
TTC...Protocol Book of Talmud Torah Verein in Cracow. " 99
TVD...Gemeindebuch of Dubno, Volhynia. " 192a
TVL...Takkanot of the Waad in Lithuania. " 104
TZ ...Takkanot of the Talmud Torah in Zalkowa. " 160b
YB ...R. Jekutiel b. Isaac Blitz.Introd.to Translation of Tanach. " 152
YE ...R. Jacob Emden. Megillas Sefer. " 208
YH ...R. Jonathan of Höllschau. Konteres. " 184
YM ...R. Yechiel Michael b. Uzziel. Nezer Hakadosh. Güdemann 192
YME...R. Yechiel Michael Epstein. Kizzur Shelah. Assaf 169a
YR ...Yosel Rachnoi. Maamor. " 256
YW ...Jedidian Tiah Weil. Sefer Hayichus. " 212