

# Hungarian Yeshivot, Lithuanian Yeshivot and Joseph Ben-David

Shaul Stampfer

One of the more vivid memories I have of my years as a graduate student is related to the article this Forum is celebrating. I had just started studying with Professor Jacob Katz, my future doctoral adviser, and he suggested that I look at Ben-David's description of Hungarian Jewry. As I read, I was overwhelmed by thrill and excitement. The article revealed to me, in a way I had never sensed before, the power of analysis to uncover a whole new level of understanding in seemingly familiar material. From that day on, much of my own work has been an attempt to emulate this article. I even went on to write a Ph.D. thesis dealing with modernization, but in Lithuania, and I too, concentrated on yeshivot.

As soon as I had finished reading the article, I sought out the author. It is difficult to describe my sense of puzzlement and disappointment at what ensued. I approached Ben-David and asked him, as an opening question, if I could read his thesis and whether he had continued on his research. He replied that he had mislaid his copy of the thesis but that if he ever found it, he would be happy to share it with me. However, I should know that he had nothing to add. I approached him a few times subsequently. He was always very polite and friendly to me but he never found his copy of the thesis. He had little to say to me besides general words of encouragement. For an enthusiastic reader still very much under the spell of his article, this was strange indeed.

We had moved in different directions. I was getting more and more involved in the study of Jewish history and in my personal life, in things Jewish. I could not resist imagining that for Ben-David his article had been a cathartic valedictory to a world he was drifting away from. I have no idea if this is true. A biographical study of Ben-David would no doubt yield interesting insights and explain what for me was and remains a rather puzzling phenomenon.<sup>1</sup>

Looking back at Ben-David's article now, more than a few years later, my

responses are more mixed. Much of what was novel at the time has now become standard in analyses of the process of change in modern Jewish history. At the same time, it seems that some of Ben-David's points need refinement and perhaps correction. However, the magic is still there – in the scope, in the ability to see the world as it was seen in the past and in the attempt, largely successful, to liberate analysis from preconceived notions. I would hope that this critical view of the Ben-David thesis – with its mixture of admiration and doubt – is written in his spirit.

The question of the accuracy of Ben-David's general analysis of Hungarian Jewry is one which I must leave to specialists on Hungarian Jewish communal history. They can best consider whether the past communities were as stable as Ben-David pictured them and if the social fabric was as undifferentiated as he claimed. Since he wrote, important studies on Hungarian Jewry and specifically on Hungarian orthodoxy have been published.<sup>2</sup> In this paper, I wish to deal in detail with just one of the key topics raised by Ben-David – the rise of the yeshivot and their role in Hungary. As he put it, one of the goals of his paper was to explain a process that led “to the emergence of a modern Jewish society on the one hand and to conservatism (*notably conservative yeshivot*) on the other.”<sup>3</sup> Since he wrote his paper, valuable research has been carried out on Hungarian yeshivot<sup>4</sup> and on higher Jewish education in other regions.<sup>5</sup> On the basis of my work on yeshivot in Lithuania and with reference to some of the more recent studies of Hungarian Jewry, I want to deal with Ben-David's discussion of yeshivot and ultimately to offer an alternative to his explanation for the rise of the Hungarian yeshivot.

There is no question that yeshivot in Hungary were a very important institution of Jewish communal life. A master list, prepared by Armin Friedman, of yeshivot that operated in Greater Hungary and covering the period from Rabbi Moses Sofer up until the First World War includes over 230 yeshivot.<sup>6</sup> Of course, many of these were small and possibly transient institutions and most probably did not teach advanced students. Nonetheless, Abraham Fuchs<sup>7</sup> in his two volume study of Hungarian yeshivot managed to describe in some detail over one hundred of these institutions with short remarks about many more. It is clear then that we are dealing with a phenomenon and not a number of isolated cases.

Yeshivot were neither unique to modern Jewish societies nor limited to Hungary. They date back to antiquity though there were of course changes in the structure of yeshivot over time.<sup>8</sup> Common to all medieval and modern yeshivot were a number of characteristics: they were educational institutions with a teacher or teachers, a defined group of students and a common curriculum consisting mainly of Talmud. However, these common traits leave many options for variation in terms of the nature of both the institution and its importance in Jewish society. As noted above, Ben-David attributed a great deal of importance to Hungarian

yeshivot – both as an indication of the rise of a conservative Jewish society and as an element that made that society work.

There was much that was not novel about the Hungarian yeshivot and Ben-David was careful to mention this: “There were no innovations with regard to the curriculum, didactic methods, examinations and the like.”<sup>9</sup> This is indeed correct. A classic description of the structure and educational program of Polish yeshivot in the pre-1648 period could be applied almost word for word to the nineteenth-century Hungarian yeshivot that Ben-David described,<sup>10</sup> though there were of course differences.<sup>11</sup> It seems clear here that the Hungarian yeshivot rose out of a living tradition of educational institutions with all of the structure and order which that implied.

However, Ben David also claimed that there were significant innovations in the Hungarian yeshivot. He stated with regard to the Yeshiva of Pressburg, that “unique relationships emerged between the rabbi and his students.”<sup>12</sup> He also claimed: “The yeshiva students saw a need to create a new and independent social framework. They no longer viewed the yeshiva as an educational institution that prepared them for their future life in the ‘real world’ but as a free standing goal”<sup>13</sup> and adds further: “The unique social phenomenon that interests us here is the consolidation of part of a crumbling community into a group with a charismatic leadership.”<sup>14</sup> These assertions must be considered carefully.

Ben-David wrote with scope and sometimes with breathtaking authority. However, a critical reading of his study suggests that the evidence for some of his claims is problematic. Moreover, it is often possible to point to the factors which led Ben-David to some of these problematic conclusions, which is of course, instructive. At least five points that he raised with regard to yeshivot require, in my opinion, reconsideration or restatement.

1) Ben David claimed that the charismatic power of the leadership played a major role in Hungarian orthodoxy in general and especially in the modern Hungarian yeshiva. He based this assertion on his analysis of the Pressburg yeshiva. The large number of yeshivot in Hungary would suggest that the opposite was the case. From the beginning of the nineteenth century to the Holocaust, yeshivot were ubiquitous in Hungary and it is quite possible that there were more yeshivot in Hungary during this period than anywhere else in Europe. It is hardly likely that all of the many *roshei yeshiva* in Hungary were charismatic personalities.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, one must be very cautious about attributing the spread of yeshivot to charismatic individuals. As we shall see below, institutional charisma and more prosaic explanations should be considered.

In this case Ben-David seems to have been influenced by the prominence of the Pressburg Yeshiva and the fascinating personality of Rabbi Moses Sofer. In its time, this institution was the best known yeshiva in Hungary and its founder, R.

Moses Sofer, was the leading rabbi in the country. While its rise is certainly worthy of study, it can hardly be regarded as being typical of Hungarian yeshivot. Indeed, much of the success of the Pressburg Yeshiva can be credited to the charisma of its founder. However, Rabbi Sofer was far from being a typical Hungarian rabbi. His activity was crucial to the development of an orthodox ideology in Hungary and in the adoption of the tactics used by the orthodox camp. Many of his students went on to be rabbis and tried to emulate him even though they were not as exceptional as he was. They often, among other activities, established yeshivot. For these and many other reasons, the personality, deeds and ideology of Rabbi Sofer are worthy of careful attention. However, if examining the rise of a social phenomenon such as yeshivot, the study of a "random sample" of Hungarian yeshivot might well have been more enlightening, and this Ben-David did not do.

There is no doubt in my mind that Ben-David's emphasis on the importance of charisma has much to offer to an understanding of the development of orthodoxy in Hungary and especially its organization in a national movement. In the absence of a basis for the authority of communities and their lay leaders, such as filling the function of official tax collector, rabbinic charisma helped hold together the orthodox organization of communities. Charisma was also a crucial element of the Pressburg Yeshiva. However, that does not mean that charisma played an equal role in every aspect of orthodoxy. The importance of charisma in one framework, such as communal organization or synagogue politics, does not necessarily carry over into other areas, such as education.

2) A related claim of Ben David was that the only reward the *roshei yeshiva* in Hungary could give to their students was praise and the only sanction at their disposal was scorn.<sup>16</sup> This fits in of course with Ben-David's emphasis on the new role of charisma in the Hungarian yeshiva. However, the reality was more complex. The *rosh yeshiva* could withdraw financial support or get others to withdraw support. He could also influence matchmaking and rabbinical appointments. All of this was implied rather than explicit and was not necessarily openly discussed. Perhaps this is why Ben-David ignored these very real powers. However, this does not make them any less real.

3) Ben-David also claimed that the students in Hungarian yeshivot formed a separate society<sup>17</sup> and that this, too, was a new phenomenon. He based this claim on the fact that students founded special organizations "that solicited funds from the householders."<sup>18</sup> This is far from proof for his far-reaching statement about the social isolation of yeshiva students. Independent fund raising certainly would fit a reality of separate societies but it does not prove that such a separation existed. Such fund raising could be done even when students were very much a part of a community. It is not clear to what extent the society of Hungarian yeshiva students was more isolated from the general society in the nineteenth century than previously. In fact, it seems just as likely that the separate society

of Hungarian yeshiva students was similar to that of yeshiva students in other periods and of university students in other societies. In those cases, the students shared a social life with fellow students but identified with the values of their parents and broader society, which they anticipated entering. This is something quite different from the alienation from society that one finds in revolutionary movements or with Lithuanian yeshiva students in the *mussar* movement and similar groups.

It is not difficult to explain where Ben-David's view came from. Today it is a commonplace to view modern society as characterized by heterogeneity unlike society in the past which is seen as integrated. This of course is more easily claimed than proved, but it is an assumption that seems to have influenced Ben-David.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, while he was careful to provide the historical description of developments in Hungary in the eighteenth century, he naturally concentrated on analyzing sources from the nineteenth century. A careful examination of sources from the earlier period might have led Ben-David to somewhat different conclusions about heterogeneity.

4) Ben-David went on to claim that the development of the yeshivot was part of a process of alienation from bourgeois society.<sup>20</sup> He suggested that yeshiva students "no longer viewed the yeshiva as an educational institution that prepared them for their future life in the 'real world' but as a 'free standing goal.'"<sup>21</sup> However, this view should be reconsidered because this change may have been more apparent than real. Yeshivot in the past never provided skills needed for activity in economic spheres. A Talmudic education was always a preliminary to taking a role in society but not a preparation for it. One could claim, especially with regard to the yeshiva in Pressburg, that the reverse took place. We know that many of the graduates of the Pressburg Yeshiva became rabbis while many yeshiva students in previous generations seem to have gone into business. In retrospect, it appears plausible that in nineteenth-century Hungary, the rabbinate was a reasonable vocational route for yeshiva students. Thus one could consider the possibility that yeshivot in nineteenth-century Hungary functioned more as institutions for professional training than had previously been the case.

The practical side of yeshiva study in Hungary extended to other areas as well. Hungarian yeshivot emphasized the study of halakha. In a society which not only believed in but observed law, the study of the correct way to observe it is just as "practical" as the study of arithmetic or languages. Moreover, there was a great emphasis in Hungarian yeshivot on the mastery of large amounts of material, and of many pages of Talmud. This is the kind of knowledge which can easily be measured and demonstrated to unlearned householders. Depth of analysis or sharpness (which apparently characterized Talmud study in Lithuania) is far more difficult to measure and quantify. Hence, in its own terms, study in Hungarian yeshivot could have been regarded as eminently practical.

5) A very important and complex issue is the nature and causes of what

Ben-David termed the moderate nature of the Hungarian yeshivot. Ben-David attached great importance to the fact that there was “opposition to the institutionalization of the charismatic group” and this is why “this movement did not impinge upon the organizational framework of the old community.”<sup>22</sup> He attributed this to the views of Rabbi Moses Sofer who was opposed to Torah scholars breaking off from the unlearned.<sup>23</sup> However, there may well have been a far more prosaic cause for the absence of a split.

Moderation may have been built into the nature of the Hungarian Jewish community. The Hungarian yeshivot in the nineteenth century were funded by the local community or by local townspeople without regional, national or international fund raising campaigns. This was precisely what had been done in previous generations. For nineteenth-century Hungarian Jewry, the communal yeshivot of Moravia and Ashkenaz were still a living tradition. Thus yeshiva students in Hungary were supported by pious householders as in the past.<sup>24</sup> Hungarian yeshiva students often undertook to raise funds themselves and thus could organize financial support for their needs. However, this was done locally or in the nearby region. Nationwide fund raising for yeshivot, which was practised in Eastern Europe and was based on ideological identification rather than local pride, does not seem to have developed in Hungary before the First World War. Indeed, a significant multiplication of yeshivot each of which required complex frameworks for fund raising would not have been possible in Hungary.

Since many local communities continued to support yeshivot, the institution remained communal and communities could continue to have a moderating influence on yeshivot. It is when a separation from communities took place that conditions become ripe for more radical steps – both as a reflection of the personality at the head of the yeshiva as well as a means to appeal to a certain ideologically committed segment of a diffuse and geographically dispersed population. A movement such as the *mussar* or ethicist movement, which appealed to a very narrow element of East European Jewish society, could successfully develop yeshivot in Eastern Europe despite its proverbial strained relations with householders because there were individuals in various locations who supported the ideals of the movement. It would be difficult to imagine such a movement in an Hungarian context.

Although reservations may be in order with regard to Ben-David’s analysis of Hungarian yeshivot, his analysis is very relevant to the Lithuanian yeshivot, even though he did not refer to them at all in his study. It is hard to imagine that Ben-David did not give thought to Lithuanian yeshivot while writing his thesis. In his youth they had been very well known in Europe and the Lithuanian yeshivot which had transplanted to Israel were certainly prominent at the time Ben-David was writing. Ben-Zion Dinur, who was Ben-David’s adviser for his

M.A. thesis, was himself a product of the Telz Yeshiva who had been attracted to Zionism and the study of Jewish history. In the discussions between adviser and student the characteristics of the Lithuanian yeshivot were no doubt analyzed and compared. Whether this influenced Ben-David is hard to determine.

Though the Hungarian yeshivot were in many respects a continuation of traditional patterns of Central European yeshivot, the Lithuanian yeshivot were indeed a new type of institution.<sup>25</sup> They were not communal institutions since they were financed by donations from sympathizers who lived in many different communities. The heads of Lithuanian yeshivot were not even necessarily the rabbis of the local communities. As long as the donations kept coming in, the *roshei yeshivot* could be oblivious to local concerns and interests. The students of Lithuanian yeshivot were generally supported by the yeshiva and not by the local community. They indeed formed a separate society and an independent economic unit. What is more, it was often the case that in effect a yeshiva supported the local economy and not the reverse. The *rosh yeshiva* of a Lithuanian yeshiva had to be a charismatic personality, for only such leaders could raise the funds needed to support their institutions. In the Lithuanian context, yeshiva students formed a distinct, perhaps even a "counter" culture. Their values went against prevailing values, and many of the Lithuanian yeshiva students did not see a place for themselves in their society. The institution of the *kollel* was developed in Eastern Europe as an alternative to marrying off Talmud students to daughters of businessmen and ultimately led to the increased isolation of the class of Torah scholars from general Jewish society, even of the traditional (or orthodox) elements of the community.

The differences between the Hungarian and Lithuanian yeshivot appear to have been related to the conditions under which they developed. In Lithuania, the yeshivot did not grow out of a previous tradition. Rabbi Haim of Volozhin, who founded the first modern yeshiva in Lithuania, did not have an existing model to build on, only literary references and oral traditions. This led to one of the important differences between the two types of yeshivot. Rabbi Haim drew upon the pattern of study in Batei Midrash (communal study halls) which was common in his day in Lithuania. In this system, young men studied in a Bet Midrash entirely on their own. These students were supported by pious householders (as in central European yeshivot), who frequented the study halls for the purpose of prayer or part-time study and thus monitored the diligence of their student-guests. In Volozhin as well, the students spent most of their time in independent study in the study hall of the yeshiva except for the daily lesson given by the head of the yeshiva. However, participation in this lesson was voluntary and the independent study of students did not necessarily concentrate on the lesson's subject matter. The lesson was secondary in importance to the act of independent study.

The framework for study in Hungary was quite different. The buildings used by

yeshivot were often not very large, and many of the students, if not all, studied in their rooms. The progress and diligence of students was supervised by means of weekly tests and monitoring. Tests were almost non-existent in Lithuanian yeshivot and supervision there was often rather haphazard. In the Hungarian yeshivot there were regular periods of study as well as accepted “vacation” periods, a phenomenon unheard of in Lithuania, where study was a year round activity until the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>26</sup> In Lithuania, the head of the yeshiva was not necessarily the rabbi of the local community. However, in Hungary it was the communal rabbi who was usually the head of the local yeshiva, and this was often specified in his letter of appointment. Thus one can certainly term the Hungarian yeshivot communal institutions.

It seems likely that the differences between Hungarian and Lithuanian yeshivot were also tied to differences in the economic life of Jews in both regions. Here, as well, Ben-David’s analysis needs some modification.

Ben-David emphasized the changes in the scope and level of Jewish business activity in Hungary. However, for all of its development, the economic characteristics of Hungarian Jewry did not change as much as was the case with East European Jewry. Many Hungarian Jews, especially those who did not migrate to the growing urban centers, stayed in their traditional sectors of trade and services, albeit in new forms. In the Russian empire, Jewish society experienced the development of a proletariat, widespread pauperization, the rise of political movements and significant waves of emigration – all of which were absent or almost absent in Hungary. Ben-David gave a great deal of attention to large-scale changes in economic behavior in certain locations and in certain circles. This overshadowed the basic continuity in economic patterns in Hungary which of course contributed to stability in values in smaller communities where the orthodox Jewish elements generally lived. However, even within the framework of continued patterns and outside the new urban centers, the economic well-being of many Jews changed for the better. A rise in economic security and disposable income had implications for the growth and spread of yeshivot. It was in Lithuania and in the Czarist empire in general that major structural changes took place in Jewish economic life and these had an impact on other aspects of society.

The nineteenth century was also a period of rapid population growth as Ben-David knew quite well. However, considering the population growth and the economic prosperity of the nineteenth century, together with the traditional values of the Jewish community, it is no surprise that yeshivot multiplied in nineteenth-century Hungary just as previously they had multiplied in sixteenth-century Poland – without any modernization! In the period of R. Moses Sofer means became available to achieve goals previously unrealizable. Newly affluent and secure communities could begin to support yeshivot. Since sending a son to yeshiva had long given status in traditional circles, increasing wealth

and population growth meant that more and more families could afford to send adolescent sons to yeshivot. The fact that the ideology actively preached by Rabbi Sofer supported this behavior could only strengthen the growth in numbers of yeshivot and yeshiva students. In other words, perhaps it was not so much ideology that determined the path of Hungarian Jewry as social and economic factors. In Lithuania, which was undergoing a demographic and economic crisis, there was a rise in the number of yeshiva students in the second half of the nineteenth century but the total number of full-time Talmud students dropped in the same period because the Bet Midrash system was collapsing.

All of the objections and doubts raised with regard to Ben-David's analysis of Hungarian yeshivot, such as the links between their rise and social and economic factors, dissolve when his analysis is applied to Lithuania. Indeed, only after rereading Ben-David's article did I realize how deeply I was influenced by his analysis and how many of my findings with regard to Lithuanian yeshivot were simply corroborations of what he thought he had found in Hungary. I was much embarrassed to notice that I had not only neglected to give Ben-David his due in my book but had not even cited him – an omission which I can explain only by the fact that I had so totally assimilated his approach that I was no longer aware what its sources were.<sup>27</sup>

The alternatives I have suggested to Ben-David's analysis are, I hope, very much in his spirit. I can say with certainty that it is only because I was inspired by Ben-David's approach that I came to tinker with his analysis and to suggest a more conservative approach. It appears to me that the changes which took place in Hungary were somewhat less dramatic than would appear from his description. I reached this conclusion both from a careful reading of his study and by comparing what he found in Hungary to what I was familiar with in Lithuania. Examining two or more communities simultaneously forces one to consider factors which are often implicit and to be cautious about labeling innovations and changes. No doubt further analysis will lead to even greater precision and to other corrections. However, the pathbreaking quality of Ben-David's work remains. Moreover, many of his conclusions retain their value. His study will therefore remain a starting point for studies for many years to come; one can only regret that he never took the opportunity – or had the will – to follow it up.

## NOTES

*Author's note:* I am very grateful to my teacher, Professor Jacob Katz, for his careful review of this article and his sage advice. I also wish to thank Gershon Bacon for his careful readings of this study and helpful suggestions.

1. See the tantalizing article by Edward Shils "Joseph Ben-David: A Memoir", in *Minerva* 25/1-2 (Spring Summer 1987), 201-5.
2. See notably Michael Silber's very important but unfortunately unpublished Ph.D. thesis, *Roots of the Schism in Hungarian Jewry: Cultural and Social Change from the Reign of Joseph II until the Eve of the 1848 Revolution* (Jerusalem, 1985) and Professor Jacob Katz's recently published book *The Unhealed Breach* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem 1995).
3. Gad Freudenthal p. 2 in typescript. My emphasis.
4. See notably Samuel HaKohen Weingarten, *The Yeshivot in Hungary: Their History and Problems* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1976); Armin Friedman, *Major Aspects of Yeshivah Education in Hungary*, unpublished Yeshiva University Ph.d. thesis (New York, 1971); Abraham Fuchs, *Hungarian Yeshivot* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem, vol. 1: 1978, vol. 2: 1987). See also the volume edited by Samuel Mirsky, *Jewish Institutions of Higher Learning in Europe* (in Hebrew) (New York, 1956). A short but interesting article is Moshe ben Zeev, "On the Method of Study in Hungary," *HaZofe* 5 Kislev 5788, 7. I am indebted to Rabbi Ishaq Dor, rabbi and educator, for the last reference.
5. I recently published a volume on the yeshivot in Lithuania. See Shaul Stampfer, *The Lithuanian Yeshiva* (Jerusalem, 1995) (in Hebrew).
6. Friedman, *Major Aspects*, Appendix A: "List of Yeshivah Communities," 317-38.
7. *Ibid.*
8. The question of these developments will not be dealt with here. For a broad overview on the history of yeshivot see Jacob Katz, "Jewish Civilization as Reflected in the Yeshivot," *Journal of World History* 10 (1967), 674-704.
9. See above, p. 85. However, on the same page Ben-David states with regard to the yeshiva in Pressburg that "its customs and internal arrangements provided the archetype of all the other Hungarian yeshivas of that period and the next". If these customs and arrangements were also typical for central European yeshivot, which he himself states on the same page, then saying the the Pressburg Yeshiva was an archetype is not saying very much. It is of course true that the yeshiva in Pressburg was an inspiration for many other Hungarian yeshivot.
10. See the description of Polish yeshivot before the catastrophe of 1648 in Natan Hanover, *Yeven Meisula*, ed. Israel Halpern (Tel Aviv, 1966), 83-8. He mentions there the tutoring of younger students by older students, the provision of meals by householders, semesters, study in private rooms, weekly tests – all characteristic of Hungarian yeshivot as well.
11. Gershon Bacon pointed out that very possibly there were differences in the role of *pilpul* and the study of *sugyot* between Hungarian yeshivot and previous ones. In this short paper it is impossible to address this issue.
12. Here as well it should be noted that the Hatam Sofer was far from being the first charismatic *rosh yeshiva* in Central Europe even though his contemporaries may have regarded him as *sui generis*. Of course, for Hungarian Jews, his persona was much stronger that of *roshei yeshiva* in previous generations whose lives and roles were known only from books, and that even rarely since history was not a central element of the yeshiva curriculum.
13. See above, p. 85.
14. See above, p. 89.
15. My astute colleague, Shlomo Fisher, pointed out to me that Ben-David may have been referring more to institutionalized charisma, such as the charisma of the rabbinate, than to personal charisma. This would strengthen Ben-David's argument of course. However, the charisma of the rabbinate as an institution was hardly an innovation of the modern period. Much evidence for institutionalized charisma can be found in Katz, *The Unhealed Breach*.
16. See above, p. 87.
17. This is in the broad sense and not the narrow meaning of founding organizations or clubs.
18. See above, p. 84.
19. See for example, p. 64ff.
20. See above, p. 85.

21. See above, p. 85.
22. See above, p. 89.
23. See above, p. 88. See the recent collection of the Hatam Sofer's views: Jacob Weiss, *Rabbinate and Community in the Thought of the Hatam Sofer* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1987). In general, Ben-David echoes orthodox historiography in attributing a crucial role to the Hatam Sofer.
24. For valuable comparative materials on Moravian yeshivot, see Israel Halpern (ed.), *Constitutiones Congressus Generalis Judaeorum Moraviensium* (in Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1951).
25. This description is based on my book *The Lithuanian Yeshiva* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1995).
26. This appears to have been introduced in the Telz Yeshiva. See the chapter on Telz in my book *The Lithuanian Yeshiva*.
27. This omission will hopefully be corrected in a future edition or translation. I am grateful for the opportunity here to make a very partial rectification.

*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*