The Frankfurt a.M. Memorbuch: 
Gender Roles in the Jewish Community Institutions

Tzvia Koren-Loeb, Duisburg-Essen University, Germany

Abstract
This paper, based on a chapter in the author’s Ph.D. dissertation, brings to the forefront information that can be discerned from the Frankfurt Memorbuch [FM] with regard to gender roles in Jewish community institutions, such as the synagogue, house of study, burial societies, and cemeteries. Research of the Memorbücher literature, viable historical sources of daily life in different Jewish communities, has generally been neglected. Here for the first time, the author explores the literature of the Frankfurt a.M community.

Introduction

Pertaining to German Jewry, Memorbücher are handwritten manuscripts that include lists of deceased community members from the 13th century until the end of World War II. Memorbücher usually comprise the following three main sections:

(1) Memorial Prayers: These were traditionally recited by the cantor at the ‘al-memor’ stage in the synagogue. Examples are: Yizkor, Av Harachamim, Yiqom Purqan and different versions of Misheberakh prayer. Other prayers included in this section are Lekhah Dodi, special prayers for sick, several prayers for special cases, rules for shofar blower and for the reading of the Megillat Esther, and bans against various members of the community.

(2) Private Memorial Prayers: This part includes lists of late prominent members of the local Jewish community. It mentions only names of rabbis and scholars, who were active in Ashkenaz. The names listed in this section were usually read aloud twice a year, on the Sabbath before Shavuot, when the massacre of the First Crusade against the Jews occurred in 1096, and on the Sabbath before the Ninth of Av, the fast commemorating the destruction of the two temples in Jerusalem – by the Babylonians in 586 BCE and the Romans in 70 CE.

(3) Local Memorial Prayers: This section mentions the names of martyrs and the locations where they were murdered. It mentions the three major persecutions against the Jews: the First Crusade (1096), the Rindfleisch libel (1298) and the Black Death pogroms (1348-49). MaHaRIL [Jacob ben Moshe ha-Levi Mölln (1360 Mainz – 1427 Worms)] made the reading of the entire third part compulsory for the Ashkenazi communities on the Rhein. Other communities had to read only the lists of places.

Several Memorbücher contain a title page, resembling a colophon, includes a description of the community that used the Memorbuch and contained additional details about the author(s) and date of entries.

There are conflicting opinions among the researchers concerning the oldest Memorbuch, composed in 1296. Sigmund Salfeld (1843-1926), a Mainz rabbi (b.1880), claims that the Nürnberg Memorbuch is the oldest, while Magnus Weinberg (d. 1943, Theresienstadt), a
rabbī from oberpfälzische Neumarkt, believes that the title belongs to the Mainz Memorbuch. However, Dr. Shlomo (Fritz) Ettlinger (1889-1964), lawyer, decendant and genealogist of Frankfurt (out of private interest), believes that the Memorbuch of 1296, which is mistakenly called The Mainz Memorbuch, was brought to Mainz when the Jews were expelled from Nürnberg to Mainz.

There are several opinions concerning the origin of the word Memorbuch. Different terms are used with the same meaning: Memorbuch, Buch des Seelengedächtnisses (German); Memory Book, Memorial Prayer Book (English); מַמְמוּרְבּוּךְ (Hebrew); and מַמְמַרְבּוּךְ, מַמְמַרְבּוּךְ, מַמְרַבּוּךְ, מַמְרַבּוּךְ (Yiddish).

Like Magnus Weinberg, many researchers assume that etymologically the word Memorbuch is rooted in the word Almemorbuch, which is related to the word Almemor. The connection between these three terms is the word Almemorbuch, which appears at the opening page of the Hengstfeld Memorbuch. The Memorbuch was usually read aloud from the Almemor, namely the reading stage during the synagogue service. Some scholars claim that the word Almemor originated from the Arabic word al-Manbar, meaning the reading and preaching stage during the synagogue service. However, other scholars find this theory unacceptable: If the Arabic prefix `al` is removed from the word Almemor, the word Memor is left, and there is no Arabic root for this word.

Salfeld claims that the word Memorbuch is rooted in the term of Memoria, namely, souls’ commemoration, which leads to the debate of who borrowed the term from whom: the Jews from the Christians, the Christians from the Jews, or both from the Romans? There are also two Biblical references indicating a possible source in the Jewish tradition: Malachi 3:16 mentions the term memory book and Esther 6:1 mentions a memories book.

The term Memorbuch has three definitions in the modern era. The first definition is that of memorial manuscripts similar to the Frankfurt am Main Memorbuch [See: FM], i.e. the handwritten manuscripts listing the deceased members of Jewish communities in Ashkenaz from the Middle Ages till the middle of the 20th century. The second meaning is that of Memorbücher that list the names of Holocaust victims who had no grave, and the Memorbuch is therefore seen as their burial ground. The third meaning, the research of graveyards, is also called Memorbuch.

This paper examines the Frankfurt Jewish communal institutions as reflected in the Memorbuch. The paper reiterates the main conclusions in the relevant chapter of my Ph.D. dissertation about the FM, which investigates gender roles in the Frankfurt Jewish community institutions during the 17th-20th centuries. The introduction includes a brief survey of previous scholarship on the topic and a few introductory words to the FM. The discussion examines applicable gender roles in the Frankfurt Jewish community according to its Memorbuch. The gender characteristics of different communal institutions is compared (or contrasted), with a particular focus on which institutions were more common for men, which for women, and which were common for both. The last part of the paper briefly summarizes the various sections of this article and their gender-related issues. Final words are dedicated to general conclusions and/or questions raised consequently.

The Memorbücher Literature
The first evidence to Memorbücher is found in the last quarter of the 17th century in an anti-Jewish publication written by the convert Samuel Brenz. He mentions the Memorialbücher and the custom to read the memorial prayers aloud for the community’s deads and martyrs on Sabbaths. The first Jewish academic research on the Memorbuch was conducted by Leopold Zunz (1794-1886), the founder of the Wissenschaft des Judentums (Association for Culture and Science of Jews), who mentioned the term Memorialbuch in 1845 in his research, *Das Gedächtnis der Gerechten*. Two works of the Viennese scholar Adolph Jellinek (1820-1893) significantly encouraged an intensive occupation with Memorbücher in the beginning of the 1880s. The research of Memorbücher reached its peak with the publication of the Nürnberg Memorbuch by Sigmund Salfeld. During the 20th century it was Rabbi Magnus Weinberg who contributed to the research of Memorbücher. Very little was published on Memorbücher after the work of Weinberg on the topic. Simon Schwarzfuchs published the French translation of the Metz Memorbuch in 1977. In the same year Beate Linde Weiland wrote about the Alzey Memorbuch. Twenty years later Aubrey Pomerance offered a serious scholarly study, gathering all the Memorbücher “under one roof” by analyzing their history and structure.

The great significance of Memorbücher was in assisting other research, especially in the fields of epigraphy, the investigation of persecutions of the German Jews during the Middle Ages, genealogy, local and regional history, or biographical information about specific personalities, who were the subject of other research.

On the occasion of the acquisition of the FM in 1963 and in commemoration of the Frankfurt Jewish community, the historian Cecil Roth (1899-1970) published a small bi-lingual (Hebrew-English) booklet sponsored by the Jewish National University Library [JNUL] in Jerusalem. Shlomo Ettlinger compared a 688-page private copy of the FM to the lists of the chevrah qaddisha and the gravestones of the old cemetery in Frankfurt. The lawyer and historian Paul Arnsberg (1899-1978) dedicated a few pages in the first of three volumes *Die Geschichte der Frankfurter Juden: seit der Französischen Revolution* (On the History of the Frankfurt Jews from the French Revolution onwards) to several central figures of Frankfurt, as they appear in the FM.

Since most of the existing Memorbücher are still in manuscript form, copied or translated, but not thoroughly analyzed, it is not possible to compare the gender-related social history of the FM to any other Memorbuch. Research on the FM could be compared to the 18th century protocols of the Frankfurt court (JMF B 86/288). It could also be partly compared to the Frankfurt pingass (Heb. 4° 662, JNUL) thanks to the comprehensive article of Mordechai Nadav on the subject, in which he methodically classifies the different documents that this pingass contains. The FM could be compared to the gravestones’ inscriptions in the old cemetery of Frankfurt. In 1901 Rabbi Markus Horovitz (1844-1910) published a list of gravestones’ inscriptions that he copied from the old cemetery, but Ettlinger scrutinized and criticized Horovitz’ work for imprecision. In 1996 Michael Brocke published an analysis of 113 gravestones from the old cemetery of Frankfurt. His book is part of a larger project, which attempts to analyze about 6000 of the gravestones in this cemetery. All other topics that the FM includes need to be analyzed according to the existing relevant literature.
The Frankfurt am Main Memorbuch [FM]

The FM is one of the most important Jewish masterworks, created by one of the largest and most outstanding Jewish community in Germany and the only historical source that maintained its form continuously from the Medieval period until the 20th century. It is a significant meeting-point between the Frankfurt Jewry and the general German culture. It provides a wide spectrum of the Frankfurt Jewish community and could potentially contribute to research in different fields.

The FM accompanied the Frankfurt a.M. Jewry since the Middle Ages: The first FM was lost in 1614 during the Fettmilch resistance. The second FM was burned during the great fire in the Frankfurt Ghetto (Jewish Lane, Jüdische Gasse) on January 14, 1711. It was assumed that this fire was a punishment, since it began in the house of R. Naphtali ha-Kohen KaZ (1645-1719), a theoretician and poet, who served as the Rabbi of Posen and Frankfurt am Main, and allegedly dealt with practical mysticism. This FM was probably destroyed in the fire. The restoration of the Jewish Ghetto included the restoration of the communal Memorbuch, but the lists of the burial society were burnt as well, and records traced back to the 17th century vanished. This FM extends to 1907.

Shortly before Kristalnacht (November 9, 1938), the director of the Jewish archive in Frankfurt a.M. received an anonymous telephone call. He was informed that the Nazis planned to order him to send all the archive's documents to Berlin, in order to assist them in tracking members of the Jewish race. The director tried to save whatever documents he could but the FM disappeared. It was assumed that it was burnt together with other Jewish documents by the Nazis in Berlin at the end of World War II. However, a 688-page copy was kept by Shlomo Ettlinger. In 1963, the FM was donated anonymously to the JNUL in honor of the Rothschild family, descendents of Frankfurt.

The FM is an enormous manuscript with impressive dimensions: Height 38 cm.; width - 29 cm.; thickness - 18 cm.; weight - 14 kg., 1073 vellum pages, black leather binding; approximately 6,000 names from the 17th-20th centuries; mostly written in Hebrew with a few words in Yiddish. The first entry of the FM is dedicated to Mrs Troni SeGaL, who passed away on the 8th of Kislev 1629 (p. 8). The last entry is dedicated to Baron Wilhelm von Rothschild, who passed away on the 5th of Shvat 1901 (p. 1073).

A typical entry in the FM includes the following components:

Yizkor (memorial word); God; the soul of; adjective and/or occupation of the individual; sacred/formal name [שניר של שם]. Women: first name + daughter of….; Men: first + family name, with the soul of Avraham, Yitzchak and Jaacov, Sarah, Rivka, Rachel and Lea; sentences that praise/describe the individual; payment of (21) Gulden; May his/her soul be bound up in the bond of everlasting life, Amen/Amen Selah; day, month, year (by the abbreviated era) of death; nickname/informal name [חול של שם] (in the case of women: wife/widow of…); and the name of the house of the person in the Frankfurt Ghetto.

Gender Roles in Jewish Community Institutions in the Frankfurt Memorbuch

The FM facilitates the study of gender roles in Jewish community institutions since it includes information about men and women who participated in certain communal institutions. In
respect to men, the FM provides information about the following communal institution: synagogue, bet ha-midrash (House of Study), school, yeshivah, mikveh (ritual bath), court, chevrah qaddisha (burial society), society for visiting the sick, hakhnassat kallah society, society for wood in winter, learning societies, cemetery and other charitable societies.

With reference to women, the FM provides information about the synagogue, bet ha-midrash (House of Study), social societies, chevrah qaddisha (burial society), society for wood, and cemetery.

**The Synagogue**

In thousands of entries the FM mentions at least a few words about the person’s synagogue affiliation. This fact demonstrates that the synagogue was the center of a highly spiritual Jewish community.

In 1150 there is already evidence for the presence of the Jews in the Free Imperial City. Their synagogue was situated south of the cathedral at Weckmarkt, directly next to the Leinwandhaus. This synagogue was destroyed in the 1241 riots and the 1349 Jewish massacre - and rebuilt each time.

There were four synagogues at the end of the 17th century:

1. **The Big (Old) Synagogue** (1463/4 - November 9/10, 1938): After Friedrich III expelled the Frankfurt Jews from the Old City, forcing the Jews to abandon the old synagogue at Weckmarkt, they built a new (Altschul) synagogue in the Jewish Lane in 1464. The Altschul synagogue ceased playing a major role in Frankfurt Jewish life in 1854, when the Ghetto was destroyed.

2. **The Small (New, Backyard) Synagogue**: located behind the old synagogue.

3. **The Klaß or Klaus Synagogue**: located at the south of the west built-up area.

4. **The Hospital Synagogue**: located in the old hospital near the cemetery.

Between 1860 – 1910, there were four monumental synagogues and dozens of prayer rooms in Frankfurt. The four active synagogues in Frankfurt from the second half of the 19th century were:

1. In 1852-3, a synagogue, along with a schoolhouse and a mikveh was built with the financial backing of the Rothschild family at the corner of Schützen Str. and Rechneigraben Str. (Community Rabbi: Samson Raphael Hirsch).

2. A loan of 80,000 Gulden from the City Senate enabled the Jewish Community to begin construction of the new main synagogue on March 23, 1860.

3. The Horovitz synagogue: a new orthodox Börneplatz Synagogue (located at Judenmarkt) was inaugurated on January 31, 1881 and the community Memorbuch was read there aloud (Community Rabbi: Markus Horovitz).

4. The Westend (Reform) Synagogue: built in 1910 and is the only one to survive Kristalnacht (November 9-10, 1938). During World War II, it served first as the opera warehouse and later as a furniture warehouse. The first prayers after World War II at the Westend Synagogue were conducted by Rabbi Dr. Leopold Neuhaus.

**Men’s Membership in Frankfurt Synagogues**
As expected, the synagogue reflected the religious character of the community. In addition to being a place for public prayer, the synagogue was given multiple secondary functions as part of the communal administration. It was the place where warnings were issued, decrees of excommunication pronounced, and oaths taken. All in all, the synagogue was a symbol of a persecuted dispersed Jewish people, united by the worship in the synagogue.

In entries for men, the FM refers to the synagogue not merely as a synagogue, but also as house of prayer, house of song and prayer, the house of the living God, little temple and several abbreviations of these terms.

Therein, the FM cites numerous synagogue-related activities. Most are connected with prayers and worship, specifically a minyan (a quorum of ten males, aged thirteen and up). The FM also mentions that men secured regular times for the study of the Torah, gave lessons, recited psalms, and “poured out their hearts to God” during the services. It records men as attending the synagogue regularly in the mornings and evenings. Some men attended the synagogue for many years, even when very old and infirm. The FM attributes a special importance to the prayer during the Days of Awe (the ten days between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur). The prayer was performed loudly in front of the Ark of the Covenant. After all, as Jacob Katz claims, the importance of praying with the congregation varied according to its significance for the individual or the community on a specific day of the Jewish calendar. Sabbaths, festivals, and naturally the Days of Awe became the occasion when the individual was almost totally immersed in the community.

In addition to prayer and studying, the FM mentions other duties in which male members participated in the synagogue: beadle, cantor, Shofar blower, reader, and lighter of candles at the bama (synagogue stage). These people were always available to join the public prayer in the synagogue. In fact, the ideal of the entire community attending synagogue twice daily was never realized completely. Certain individuals who had occupations not related to the synagogue ventured out of the Jewish quarter, particularly during the afternoon prayer in the short winter days. Therefore, the moralists and authors of taqqanot (regulations) tended to make fewer demands on such people, insisting only that they attend synagogue on Mondays and Thursdays, when the Torah portion was read, or at least on Sabbaths and festivals. Because of inconsistent attendance, the FM finds it imperative to point out the fact that men did attend the synagogue regularly, even during the cold winter days.

About twelve private synagogues existed next to the Big Synagogue during the 18th century. Though they were called synagogues, they did not have dedicated buildings, but were sort of prayer rooms in existing buildings. The FM records the following Frankfurt synagogues as meeting places for men: the Big (Old) Synagogue, the Small (New, Backyard) Synagogue, the Klaß or Klaus Synagogue (called in FM: Klois), the Klois Synagogue of R. Löb Reiss, the Hospital Synagogue, the synagogue of R. Sanvil Haas, the synagogue of Samson Wertheimer, the synagogue of R. Gdaljah Rofi, the Yeshivah Synagogue, the Klois of R. Mosche K. (probably: Kann), minyanim (of R. Hirsch Worms, Meir Rothschild).

The large number of private synagogues created a serious problem towards the end of the 18th century. The split between the worshippers grew to such an extent that it created the need to
collect money from every minyan. Pursuit of honour, pride, comfort and the wish to separate oneself from the society resulted in a growing number of private schools. The frequent conflicts between reformists and orthodoxs in the Frankfurt Jewish community propelled every religious stream to establish its own minyan or synagogue. The large number of synagogues and private minyanim caused losses to the alms box; synagogue’ attendance dropped and seats could be bought for cheap prices, as Pingass Frankfurt (MS heb. 4° 662, JNUL) acknowledged (documents nr. 460-461).

**Women’s Membership in Frankfurt Synagogues**

The Halakhah obliges women to pray. Jewish sources reveal that women used to visit synagogues often. They took part in the service whether by reading the Torah or by listening to the preacher in the synagogue and/or in the house of study.

However, the Halakhah forbids men to hear women sing. The reason for this prohibition goes back to the talmudic reading of a verse in the Song of Songs (2:14), “Sweet is your voice, comely your appearance”. The talmudic texts in Berakhot 24a, Kiddushin 70b and Sotah 48a interpret, “kol be-ishah ervah” and compare the voice of a woman to nudity, i.e., licentious, provocative, sexually inciting, and forbidden. Many poskim, legal decisors, ruled that it is forbidden to listen to a woman sing, but it is acceptable to listen to her speech and have a conversation with her.

In entries for women, the FM uses similar terms to the male entries, such as synagogue, house of prayer, house of God, as well as several abbreviations. The women’s gallery is explicitly mentioned only once, in the entry for Sorle Unna (1748), who was among the first to arrive at the Ezrat ha-Nashim (the women’s gallery) and the last to leave it [FM, P. 298b]. In many other entries concerning women, the term the ‘place of singing’ probably distinguishes the women’s gallery from the house of prayer (synagogue) and house of prayer and singing, used for male members. In one entry, the FM uses the term women's synagogue, where Hindche Flörsheim (1810) prayed. This may indicate that it was too trivial to mention the women’s gallery as a special place allocated in the synagogue for women. However, it is also feasible that several synagogues in Frankfurt during the 18th-19th centuries had to improvise a separation between men and women in the synagogue, possibly in the form of sitting arrangement, but not by a separate partition or a permanent barrier. It is probable that they could not afford such a separation for economic reasons or shortage of space. Nonetheless, it is believed that in the ancient world the likelihood of women praying in a separate building away from men is quite remote.

Most of the women mentioned in the FM attended the synagogue in order to pray to God, publicly thank God, fulfill the mitzvot, bless their children, and read psalms and praises for God. The minyan, which is so important for the male members, scarcely appears in relation to female members, except in two entries: Lea Kulpa (1788) [FM, P. 623b] and Miriam Kann (1836) [FM, P. 993c].

The FM states that women attended the synagogue very early in the morning, in the evening and at noon year round. Some attended regularly; others as often as they could; some attended as long as they were healthy; and others -- despite blindness, sickness and old age. They
continued to visit the synagogue frequently although they combined it not only with working outside the home, as is the case with men, but also with housework.

According to Sefer Chassidim, women’s prayer is important, and therefore a woman who had no knowledge of Hebrew should pray in her mother tongue. Customarily, a Jew who has no knowledge of Hebrew, but prays publicly in the synagogue with other Jews who do, is fulfilling the same obligation as if he had prayed himself. This might in part explain why it was common for both men and women to pray in the synagogue, as reflected in the FM. The FM mentions Lieble Mohrich (1750) [FM, P. 324c], who stammered. She hired a woman to pray aloud for her and in this way she could continue praying.

Furthermore, women supplied the synagogue with wine for qiddush and havdalah, and lamp wicks and candles for reading the Torah, as a way to earn a living. Other women supplied the synagogue with sacred Jewish artifacts ("קדש כלי"), but the FM does not offer explicit information on this subject. Unfortunately, there is not enough evidence to verify the nature of these artifacts, since most of them vanished in the various fires that spread through the Frankfurt Ghetto. Among the several artifacts that survived, one can find items such as chanukkah lamp, Sabbath lamp, qiddush cup, Torah shield, spice jars and Torah crown. Other women like Eleche Schuster KaZ (1770) bequeathed the synagogue a certain amount of money upon her death. The FM has relatively few entries for women, compared to thousands of entries for men, possibly representing women’s lesser involvement in the synagogue life. Yet, this fact seems odd when compared to the very high percentage of women who attended synagogue services.

In most of the entries for women, the FM does not identify a specific Frankfurt synagogue. The few synagogues that are mentioned in connection with women are: The Klois synagogue, the Samson Wertheim yeshivah Synagogue and the synagogue of the village Bockna (Bockenheim). The sources supply very little information on the attitude of women toward the Frankfurt synagogues. One interesting detail is that 300 women participated in a petition against the new building of the Hauptsynagoge in January 1853. Conceivably, women were satisfied with the existing religious policy in Frankfurt, which in all probability allowed them to better express themselves. They regretfully had no chance against the building plans of a new conservative synagogue, constructed with the support of the Rothschilds. The Synagogue in Schützenstrasse was finished on September 29, 1853 with a capacity for 250 men and 200 women.

Beit ha-Midrash (House of Study)

The most important institutions in Jewish public life during the Talmudic period were the synagogue and the house of study. Both served as spiritual, religious, social and cultural centers. B. Talmud, Megilah 27a defines the synagogue as house of prayer ("מתקן שמדיע"), and beit midrash as house of study ("מתקן שמדיעו be Tora". Sources from the period of the Second Temple indicate that the synagogue and the house of study were two separate entities. While synagogues were found everywhere Jews lived, the house of study was located in major urban areas, or in cities where scholars dwelled.
Community members used to enjoy an hour of study with regional scholars during the 13th century. The subject of their study was usually not academic. However, it was customary to study the Talmud, Bible or rabbinic commentary with a group of other scholars.

During the 17th and 18th centuries German Jews engaged in what is referred to as ‘traditional’ learning, studies following the Bar Mitzvah, namely listening to the weekly portion of the Torah and the Prophets, or various commentaries on the Bible. Beyond this level, almost everyone studied commentaries on the Mishnah and the Talmud, each according to his background and ability.

Later on during the 19th and 20th centuries, as German Jewry became more assimilated, interest in adult education declined rapidly. Traditional Jewish learning was practiced by a small minority in western Germany, strengthened occasionally by the immigration of East European Jews to Germany. The philosopher Franz Rosenzweig (1886 Kassel – 1929 Frankfurt a.M.) revived the practice of Jewish learning among adults and was proceeded by a general German movement of adult education.

**Men’s Membership in Beit ha-Midrash**

The fact that the FM records several men daily visiting both the synagogue and the house of study shows that there was a physical separation between these institutions. Other houses of study that the FM mentions belong to the richest and most respected families in the Frankfurt Ghetto, like the Oppenheims, Scheuvers and the Flörsheims. The FM entries reveal that the house of study was actually a place for public prayer. Beit ha-midrash was an institution for the education of the poor, attending scholars and young promising boys. The fact that only a few men are mentioned visiting the house of study, as opposed to thousands of men who were affiliated with a synagogue, might explain that the house of study was an institution for elite students. Yet still, the FM does not state specifically whether the house of study in Frankfurt was open mainly to scholars, or to ordinary people.

Men who were affiliated with a house of study in Frankfurt and Offenbach am Main used to finance it too. Offenbach, located east of Frankfurt, was an industrial center for textiles, jewelry and leather and attracted Jewish traders from Frankfurt. These traders wanted to continue to pray and study regularly, and most likely established there a house of study or strengthened the existing one, thereby creating good connections between the two cities.

**Women’s Membership in Beit ha-midrash**

FM entries indicate that women were connected to a house of study, supported and attended to its needs. Some women, like Frajdche Schammes (1763) [FM, P. 400a] and Henna SeGaL (1771) [FM, P. 461c], are mentioned in connection with a house of study only because of their husbands’ or sons’ attendance. Hindle Schuch (1768) [FM, P. 433b] bequeathed in her will a fund to support a house of study.

**Jewish Schools**

Jews could obtain their education in Frankfurt not only in buit ha-midrash, but also in schools. There is little evidence on the history of Jewish schools in Frankfurt. Starting in the
Middle Ages, *chadarim* (rooms that served as religious elementary schools) and *yeshivot* were considered as standard Jewish schools. The philosopher and reformer Moses Mendelssohn (1729 Dessau – 1786 Berlin) demanded equality in general Jewish education and recognized the value of learning the German language under the influence of the Enlightenment movement (*haskalah*). At that time liberal Jews started to look down on the *chadarim*. The Enlightenment movement was the catalyst for the founding of Freischulen (free schools). The Orthodoxs reacted with building the school of Samson Raphael Hirsch in 1852, *die Schule der Israelitischen Gesellschaft*, which was followed by the establishment of more like schools (for example in Fürth, 1862). In the 19th century education was compulsory throughout Germany.95

In the 17th and 18th centuries almost all Jewish teachers arrived at north Germany from Poland.96 However, in south Germany, Polish teachers were a minority.97 Teachers were treated badly and disrespectfully.98 Certain communities, like Bibra for example, accepted only celibate teachers.99 In 1662 the average teachers’ salary in Frankfurt was between four and five Taler per year. Daily classes lasted from eight to nine hours.100 In 1709 six teachers taught in communal schools and eighteen were tutors. Parents, teachers and students opposed the attempts of the Frankfurt community to control education. Hence schools were open to all.101

FM entries during the 18th-19th centuries mention schools attended by men. One of the largest schools in Frankfurt was called the Philanthropin. In 1804 a new school in the house of Halberstrasse was founded by the Jewish community. Philanthropin offered classes in general subjects in addition to classes in religion. It initiated a new pedagogical method of study that greatly influenced the entire German culture.

There are very few entries regarding this issue, all of which are mentioned here: Löb Reiss (passed away in 1778) financed a school for young boys; Gdaljah Kulpa (1841) established schools for young Jewish boys; Jaakow Sachs (1843), a tutor by profession, was the first man to found a school where young Jewish boys learned modern curriculum and languages.

Jeschaja(hu) Bretenheim (1843) and Michael Creizenach (1842) were teachers in the big school in Frankfurt, named also Philanthropin.105 Bretenheim taught young Jewish boys calligraphy for six years; Creizenach (1832) was a Torah teacher.107 Dr. Michael Creiznach wrote books against normative Judaism. He founded together with the historian and pedagogue Isaak Markus Jost (1793 Bernburg, Anhalt – 1860 Frankfurt) the new Hebrew periodical *Zion* in order to make the Hebrew language popular.108

As a memorial book, the FM dose not divulge too much information about the education system in the city. After all, its main purpose was to record and commemorate the dead.

**Yeshivah**

The FM mentions *yeshivah* in connection with male occupations, including learning and teaching Torah, and as principal of the *yeshivah*. It mentions once, in p. 696b, the *yeshivah* of R. Teble Scheuer, which was active during the 18th century. R. Kalman Oppenheim was one of the students in this *yeshivah*. 
Typically to the FM, it does not clarify the difference between the *yeshivah* and other places of study, such as the *cheder*, the house of study or the school. Regrettably, it does not state anything about the relationships between teachers and their students.

*Mikveh/Ritual Bath*

Remnants of ancient *mikvot* (12th-15th centuries) were found in Germany in Worms, Speyer and Köln. As the Judengasse of Frankfurt was built between the years 1460 and 1463, a *mikveh* was also founded in the southern part of the city. The *mikveh* was located in a cellar of a house, and served the tenants of the house as well. The communal house of dancing was located next to the *mikveh*. It collapsed in 1587 and re-built later. In 1602 a second *mikveh* was located next to the synagogue but it was probably insufficient due to the increasing number of visitors. Toward the end of the 18th century a new *mikveh* was built.

The FM mentions the *mikveh* in connection with men only once: Ahron Unna (passed away in 1740), who went from the ritual bath to the house of prayer. The buildings might have been very close to each other. Still, it is puzzling why the FM only mentions Unna. Thousands of other men in all probability did the same. It might be that Unna was particularly pious and therefore visited the *mikveh* regularly, or perhaps he was employed by the *mikveh*, and used to hurry from the *mikveh* to the synagogue.

*Rabbinical Court*

Jews did not cease appointing judges ever since biblical times (Deuteronomy 16:18). Jewish communities never stopped fighting for the right to practice their own judicial system. The independent Jewish jurisdiction in Frankfurt a.M. began on November 19, 1366 when the Kaiser allowed the Frankfurt mayor to found an independent rabbinical court. The regulations of the rabbinical court were changed from time to time by the community or at conferences during the 15th and 16th centuries. In 1614 the Jews were expelled from Frankfurt. When they returned to the city in 1616, the community received instructions stating the duties and rights of Jews in Frankfurt. In an arbitration on which both sides agreed, the right for independent Jewish jurisdiction was re-instituted. Only in 1621, the community decided to appoint *dayyanim* (judges), who carried the title *morenu* (our teacher).

A collection of the rulings of the rabbinic court (*beit din*) in Frankfurt a.M. from the years 1768 to 1792 (JMF B 86 / 288) illustrates the character and procedures of this court. In contrast to other communities, the Frankfurt’s rabbinic court was recognized as an authority for a long period of time by the local Jewish community, the German Jewish community at large and the civil government. The powers of the court were both extensive and varied and covered all civil and religious matters. In addition, the court served as a court of appeals regarding judgments of courts in other communities. Notwithstanding its powers, the means to enforce judgments, such as excommunication or fines, rested largely with the Jewish communal leadership (*va’ad ha-qehillah*). Nevertheless, relative to other contemporary Jewish communities, the court’s authority remained intact.

Apart from its main areas of jurisdiction, the court functioned in matters such as levirate marriages, the appointment of guardians for orphans, care and support for widows, property transactions, including the sale of seats in synagogues. Additionally, the court decided on
religious matters, addressed by the community or civil authorities. In fact, the court influenced one’s relationships with family, neighbors, friends, artisans, communal institutions and even God.

The functions of the court were determined by the constitutional rules of the community and amendments were introduced from time to time. The constitution was based upon the Halakhah, Jewish law. In the Frankfurt court, which operated most days of the year, it appears that two teams of judges served simultaneously. Each team consisted of three judges, led by a ‘rosh beit din’ (chief judge). At the head of the judges stood the chief Rabbi of the community with the title ‘av beit din’ (chief justice). There was a clear separation between the functions performed by the chief judge and chief justice. During most of this period a judge was appointed to replace a deceased judge instead of being elected as required by the constitution of the community. A beadle, messenger and a recording secretary assisted the judges. The court served diverse clientele, individuals from all walks of life, from both within and outside the community.

The FM is not interested, like the pingassim of the community or the court, in the Jewish law as it is interested in recording the deceased and their eulogies. It mentions several Jews, who served as chief judges and justices in Frankfurt. Rabbi Abraham ben Zwi (from) Lissa (died 1796) served as chief justice in Frankfurt, and became famous as a result of the Cleve Case, in which he decided that a man who was mentally ill was not capable of divorcing his wife. The FM does not mention the Cleve Case at all in the entry for R. Lissa. However, it states that Lissa was a halakhist and kabbalist, who healed, taught and practiced charity, but was extremely dissident.

Another chief justice, mentioned in the FM (1817) [P. 897b], Rabbi Hirsch (Zwi) ben Pinchas halevi Horovitz, opposed the preference of the commentary of Mendelssohn to the Bible. He was in favor of the commentary of Rashi. His FM entry tells that he was a teacher and a leader of the community. He was an expert not only in the contents of the Holy Scriptures, but also in their exegesis. The FM entries hint to the fact that chief justices had to be rabbis as well. In addition, they were religious and halakhic teachers.

Several other men are mentioned in the FM as chief judges. R. Nathan ben Salomon Maas (died 1794) was the acting communal rabbi after R. Lissa. R. Maas was the head of the yeshivah and he tried to make the Hebrew language compulsory in communal classes. The FM entry of R. Maas records that he served forty years as dayyan (judge) and more than twenty years as head of the yeshivah. Before his death, he asked not to be mourned, eulogized or named Gaon (genius). His entry mentions his main book binyan shlomo (Shlomo’s Building), which is an exegesis of the tractate Sanhedrin, where he refers to the commentary of Rashi. His entry mentions that his death caused a great sorrow to the community.

The FM entry for Meir Schiff KaZ tells that he served as dayyan for about forty years and that he visited the house of study of R. Löb Reiss. He was a pious teacher, learned and sharpwitted. His main work, written in two parts, was derekh oniyot be-lev yam (the course of boats in the middle of the sea). He asked that his other works will be published after his death, but refused to be named tzaddiq (righteous).
The FM entry for Chajim Gundersheim records that he served as dayyan for twenty eight years. Like Meir Schiff KaZ, he attended the house of study of R. Löb Reiss. His entry states that he studied the Torah and the Talmud and that he had a very good reputation as a teacher. Though he suffered from health problems, probably in his legs, he never stopped attending the synagogue on a regular basis. After his death he was titled morenu (our teacher) and was eulogized.

Other judges that the pingass beit din mentions are Abraham Trier Kohen (died 1794), R. Jizchak Meir Schwarzschild, R. Anschil Zunz and R. Jakob Schames.

Chevrah Qaddisha (Burial Society)

The origin of the term Chevrah Qaddisha (Holy Brotherhood) is controversial. It might be a translation of the German Heilige Bruderschaft or Bruderschaft der Heiligen. The name could be rooted in older Jewish traditions and means the honored, worthy, or respected association, society, community, or community council.

The first societies, hebrot, confradias, confratrias, dealing with the burial of the dead, education and support for the poor, dowering of orphan brides, and visiting and providing for the sick, appear in Spain during the 13th century. The first Brotherhood made its appearance on German soil seventy years after the expulsion of the Jews from Spain (1492). Social welfare societies or funds were established in Frankfurt a.M. in 1597 by Rabbi Akiba Frankfurt, but neither in this city, nor in Prague, was there any evidence that these sixteenth century Germanic/Jewish fraternities concerned themselves with the care of the sick. The FM mentions that the purpose of the chevrah qaddisha was charity and prayer.

The FM provides details on the structure, purpose, occupations, financial sources and duration of working for the chevrah qaddisha in Frankfurt. The chevrah qaddisha had to formally fulfil the traditional mourning duties. It was divided into two branches that originated in the 18th century: (1) Chevrah Qaddisha de-Qabronim (holy/burial society of undertakers) existed in Frankfurt from the onset of Jewish dwelling in the city; (2) Chevrah Qaddisha de-gomley chassadim (holy society of benefactors) was established in 1370. The FM first mentions the chevrah qaddisha on page 34 in the entry for Moshe Schmuel( ), who died in 1656 and was a member of chevrah qaddisha g“ch.

The FM does not mention the customary number of eighteen active members in burial societies. Most of the men that the FM cites in connection with chevrah qaddisha were regular members of the society; it also mentions other male occupations in the burial society, including a treasurer, beadle, rabbi / rav maggid and leader. The entries imply that it was a permanent male duty to be involved in the affairs of chevrah qaddisha, since the FM speaks about men who were members in the chevrah qaddisha for a long time or all the time.

Women’s Participation in Chevrah Qaddisha

In Christian guilds women seemed to play a more vital role than they did in the Jewish Brotherhoods. Because of the traditional negligible role assigned to women in religious life,
and because of perceived decorum, there was little room for women in the Brotherhoods or in hospital service\textsuperscript{147}. The FM reinforces this historical fact. In contrast to men, who were very active in different types of chevrah qaddisha, women were rarely involved in chevrah qaddisha.

It could be assumed that when the German burial societies began to function in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, women were called in to wash and help bury the female dead. No later than the end of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century were there already loosely organized female auxiliary societies under the name of the Pious Women (nashim tzadqaniyyot)\textsuperscript{148}.

The FM has two entries for Rajzchen Wormser (1681) [FM, P. 62l] and Bila RindsKopf (1694) [FM, P. 85c], who hosted members of the chevrah qaddisha at their homes. One entry records Gelche Neustätl (1831), a member of the burial society, who donated money to the community.

A women’s care for the sick society was established in 1761 to care for local women who did not use the itinerants’ hospital. This women’s society, which had its own hospital rooms, was patterned after similar men’s societies that were created in the city in 1738 and in 1758\textsuperscript{149}. There is no evidence in the FM to such an organized society of women. However, the FM mentions individual women who tended to the sick and performed charity work extensively.

\textbf{Cemetery}\textsuperscript{150} 

Interestingly, the FM seldom uses the term ‘cemetery’, although it does indicate that the act of burial occurred. One of the rarest indications can be found in p. 133b, where the FM calls the cemetery "beit almin". Most of the deceased members of the Frankfurt Jewish community mentioned in the FM were buried at the cemetery in Battonstr. (Börneplatz / Rechneigrabenstr.).

The FM mentions two other minor cemeteries in Bockenheim and Offenbach a.M. Following are the entries mentioning them: Bockenheim - R. Pinchas Halevy Isch Horovitz (1817) [FM, P. 897b]; Offenbach a.M. - Ahron Aachs (1779?) [FM, P. 524a], Ahron Schloss (1786) [FM, P. 600b], Mosche Reiss (1799) [FM, P. 737a], Schmuel Landau (1803?) [FM, P. 789a], Izzek Speyer (1808) [FM, P. 835a], Mosche Flörsheim (1809) [FM, P. 849a], Mosche Riesselheim (1818) [FM, P. 899e].

Most of the women mentioned in the FM were buried in Frankfurt. However, a few were buried in the suburbs, indicative of the existence of Jewish cemeteries in that vicinity: Offenbach a.M. - Chawa Schloss (1758) [FM, P. 410a], Michle Glogau (1783) [FM, P. 570c], Fradl Speyer (1811) [FM, P. 869a], Fradche Hammel (1825) [FM, P. 932e]; Bockenheim - Edel Halle (1790) [FM, P. 633a], Rechle Reiss (1792) [FM, P. 652a]; Hedderneheim - Brendle Walla(u) SeGaL (1823) [FM, P. 925e].

\textbf{Summary} 

This paper examined the vast information that can be gathered from the FM concerning gender roles in Jewish community institutions. The FM entries mention the following Frankfurt communal institutions in connection with both men and women: the synagogue,
house of study, chevrah qaddisha, and cemeteries (Frankfurt, Offenbach, and Bockenheim). However, the roles of men and women at each institution were different.

Women most likely sang while praying in the women's gallery, "תפלה זו הרינה מקום,", while men had their own "house of prayer" ["בית התפילה"]. There was a physical separation, at least in certain periods and/or synagogues, between men and women who prayed in the synagogues of Frankfurt. The FM records that both men and women attended the synagogue from early in the morning until late in the evening, but while men had a duty to pray in minyan and in front of the Ark of the Torah during the Days of Awe, women read psalms during prayer time. At this point, it is clear that the FM text reflects a dissonance between social mores and duties with regard to gender roles. The fact that the FM states that people attended the synagogue does not necessarily reflect the reality. However, examining dozens, hundreds and thousands of entries that reiterate the same information, leads to the conclusion that the text is not a mere collection of elegies, but must reflect a certain ‘standard’ of behavior that community members were expected to maintain, and frequently did.

The FM indicates that while men had several religious occupations, such as beadle, cantor, shofar blower and reader, only a small number of women supplied the synagogue needs with wine, candles and holy artifacts. This small number of women is incomparable with the numerous entries of the FM mentioning the deceased regularly attending synagogue and participating in prayer. Indeed, the FM gives the impression that the synagogue played a key role in the lives of both men and women, but only the Klois Synagogue and the Synagogue of Samson Wertheim are mentioned in entries of both men and women. While the FM explicitly mentions the synagogue in Bockenheim in connection with women, it frequently mentions both major and minor synagogues: the Big, Small, Löb Reiss, Hospital, R. Sanvil Haas, Gdaljah Rofe, yeshivah, Mosche K. Synagogues and minyanim (Worms, Rothschild – 19th century). A possible reason for such a fundamental difference is that women were not obliged to pray and when they did, they attended their husbands’ synagogue.

The references to chevrah qaddisha in FM indicate that most members held other positions (the chevrah qaddisha was divided in two branches: chevrah qaddisha of undertakers and chevrah qaddisha of benefactors), including treasurer, beadle, rabbi (maggid), and leader. FM entries for men provide considerable information about the structure, purpose, roles, membership duration and financial resources of the Frankfurt chevrot qaddisha (holy societies). However, FM entries for women specifically mention their hospitality, charity, and bequeaths in regard to burial societies.

The FM entries for both men and women indirectly mention the location of Jewish cemeteries where they were buried: Frankfurt, Bockenheim and Offenbach, while in one case a woman was burried in Hedderenheim.

Bibliographical sources such as the FM reflect gender differences, attitudes, and roles, which may or may not be an issue depending on perspective, era, and personal opinion. In addition, reflecting, albeit partly, the social-gender state of affairs in a certain period of time (17th to 20th centuries) in the Frankfurt am Main Jewish community, the FM raises general questions regarding gender issues, such as whether it shows a development in gender attitudes as compared to the present time. Are current gender roles more progressive (or more equal), or does each generation repeat the patterns of its predecessors?
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The FM may often prompt the reader to revisit existing gender roles. As time passes, Jewish institutions may change their characteristics, but not necessarily the importance of the roles men or women play within the Jewish community.

This attempt to present and compare gender roles, as reflected in the FM during the 17th-20th centuries in the Jewish community of Frankfurt a.M., could deepen our awareness and contribute to the research on gender roles in the past, which have left their mark on the present generation. The historical facts of the Jewish community in Frankfurt are well-known. The FM does not attempt to revamp or change them. It primarily records traditional Ashkenazi eulogies. Yet, in its typical selective way of presenting information about organized Jewish life, it could enhance our knowledge and add to the field of social history.
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