

Abstracts

Elhanan Leib Levinsky and his writings

Elhanan Leib Levinsky – A man of his times and place

Aviva Avidan

The Levinsky College of Education was founded in Neve Zedek in Jaffa in 1912, around two years after the death of Elhanan Leib Levinsky. This decision of the Odessa committee of the Hovevai Zion emanated from their wish, *“to found a memorial to E.L. Levinsky by creating a cultural institution in Eretz-Israel which is worthy of his name, which will advance the nationalist education in Eretz-Israel, which was so close to the deceased’s heart, by a respectable amount. And, therefore, the committee has decided to provide a vital need, and found in Eretz-Israel, in memory of Levinsky, a teaching college for teachers in elementary schools and pre-schools...”* (Haolam, 17 September 1910).

Elhanan Leib Levinsky was born in 1857 in the Vilna district of the Russian Empire (now Lithuania). He was a Hebrew and Yiddish author, a Hebrew journalist and editor, a Zionist activist, and an enthusiastic proponent of the Hebrew language. He was one of the first members of the Hovevai Zion society in Russia, a Hebrew publisher, one of the respected authors of the city of Odessa, and the manager of the Carmel Eretz-Israel branch in the city. Levinsky was known as a close friend of Ahad Ha’am. He participated in several Zionist congresses, and earned his fame by publishing various articles in the *Hapardes*, *Meilitz*, and *Hashiloah* newspapers, about the events of the time, while using folklore and *midrash* [homiletical exegesis of the bible]. Levinsky arrived in Eretz-Israel in 1881, together with the first Bilu members, and the spirit of the Hovevai Zion movement, which he joined on his return to his country. After a two month trip, he returned to Europe, convinced of the need to establish a Jewish center in Eretz-Israel. Until the day of his death, Levinsky continued to dream and think about Eretz-Israel, but he did not merit seeing the realization of his Zionist dreams. Levinsky died in Odessa in 1910, and the Levinsky College of Education, Levinsky Street, and the Levinsky Market in Tel Aviv are named after him, as well as streets in other cities throughout Israel.

The article will introduce the man behind the famous name from a biographical-

historical-educational viewpoint. We will discuss the following topics – his pluralistic philosophy, his educational-cultural activity, his publications on the topic of education, his attitude to teaching in general and the teaching of the Hebrew language in particular. Likewise, the article will attempt to examine what Levinsky was – a dreamer? An interpreter of dreams? Or a prophet?

Elhanan Leib Levinsky – A moderate yet paradoxical Zionist follower of the Jewish Enlightenment

Rafi Sheniak

The article will discuss the unique Jewish-Zionist philosophy of Elhanan Leib Levinsky (1857, Podberez'ye, Vilna district – 1919, Odessa), as learned from the study of his writings, and in relation to what his contemporaries wrote about him.

His philosophy is typical of that of the Jewish *maskilim* (followers of the Jewish Enlightenment) from Eastern Europe who chose the nationalist path. Like most of the Eastern European *maskilim*, Levinsky was raised in an observant Jewish household, educated in traditional institutions, exposed to Hebrew Enlightenment literature, and was unsuccessful in being accepted as a regular student for medical studies at a university. While studying unofficially, he was exposed to the beginnings of the nationalist movement as expressed in the Bilu movement, began to be involved in setting up Hovevai Zion organizations, and became a Zionist activist and Hebrew author, a member of the circles of Ahad Ha'am, and an activist in the secret Bnei Moshe society. By studying his writings we can also see that he had unique views, particular to him and his personality, which are different to how his contemporaries viewed him. When eulogizing him, his spiritual mentor, Ahad Ha'am, notes the layers which built his worldview, without one disturbing the other, and resulting in a harmonious figure. He studied in a *heder* (religious elementary school) and yeshiva, followed by the world of Jewish Enlightenment and general human ideals, with the nationalist movement level being built on them, without destroying the earlier levels.

The question we will attempt to examine is, did all these views really exist in harmony within his personality, or were there contradictions or even opposing views beneath the surface? We will answer this by examining the various components of his life and personality as expressed in his various writings – particularly essays on current affairs, travel literature, feuilletons, philosophical thoughts, and mainly the utopia of *A Journey to the Land of Israel* which will indicate the possibility that contradictions and difficulties in making decisions lie behind the image of a harmonious and moderate person. For example, regarding his attitude to Yiddish, life in the Diaspora, political Zionism and Herzl, Eretz-Israel (to which he emigrated,

and returned to Russia after a short while), and even to his teacher – Ahad Ha'am.

This is summarized in the question of which model of the New Jew is conveyed by his personality and writings, and if his worldview expressed in his book on utopia truthfully reflects the outlook of the Eastern European Hovevai Zion and their criticism of the political Zionism of Herzl and Eastern European Jewry, as his generation wished to see it – or if the picture is far more complex, ambiguous, and a merging of various contradictory components of the New Jew.

**“I had to be in the Land of the Hebrews”:
A literary and educational look at Levinsky's utopia**

Ilana Elkad-Lehman

The article discusses Elhanan Leib Levinsky's book, *A Journey to the Land of Israel in the Year 5700 (2040)*, which was first published in 1892 in the *Pardes* journal in Odessa, and later several times in book form, translated into Yiddish, and became the most important of his works for many people, including the author himself. The article notes the reception given to the story and how it gained renown, despite not being a masterpiece; attempts to answer the question of what it was about the book which led to Levinsky's acclaim, and wonders about its educational role.

The work is examined in the article in connection with two genres: firstly, travel literature as written at the end of the nineteenth century in colonialist Europe, and in light of the tradition of literature about travel to the Land of Israel; and secondly, the classic tradition of utopian literature and the medieval tradition in which the reference to utopia was part of the Menippean satire genre, which included components of socialist utopia, included in the form of a dream or a journey to unknown lands, in which the hero moves in a yearned for and idyllic chronotope.

The article presents the futuristic world of Eretz-Israel in 2040, which Levinsky painted in his work, and examines its methods of literary design, including its weaknesses and singularity. This, while referring to two points of view: a view of Levinsky according to his times, when his book's reception was met with acclaim. As well as from a modern day view, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, when the book arouses interest, but also invites a critical look at what it both contains and lacks in light of the choice of genre, from the poetic and ideological aspects (for example: the status of women, the Arab residents of Eretz-Israel, and the return to the Diaspora).

The choice of utopia and Levinsky's impersonal writing explain the two extremes of how to view the work: on one hand – the identification felt by the readers of the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, who felt that the person discussed was every Jew who wished for a better life and hoped

to reach Eretz-Israel. However, conversely, among contemporary readers the story seems theoretical and superficial, and does not succeed in creating an experience, empathy, or identification.

An interesting artistic and social phenomenon of the twenty-first century is the blurring between utopia and dystopia, important genres in education. Both present the reader with a real piece of life rather than an abstract idea, and thereby invite thought, confrontation, sometimes arouse emotions, and lead to identification and an agency for change. These genres allow the reader to reflect on his life in the present and his possibilities for life in the future, through literary works, using criticism, hope, and an attitude of active agency for the future.

Journey to the Land of Israel in the Year 2040 –
About the characteristics of E. L. Levinsky's literary Hebrew

Rachel Hitin-Mashiah

The utopian story of *A Journey to Eretz-Israel in the Year 2040* was published at the end of the Enlightenment period, which was defined (with reference to the development of the Hebrew language) as the transition period from a primarily written language to a living one. During this era, in which writing was supposed to reflect a modern reality, the writers adopted freedom of language and used Hebrew from all periods. Their language is based on vocabulary from various sources (sometimes with a change in meaning), and when required (due to a lack of words), includes words and collocations coined in modern times, as well as foreign words. In this article, I will introduce E. L. Levinsky's literary Hebrew, as it appears in *A journey to the Land of Israel in the year 2040*, and note some of its characteristics.

Levinsky's language is typical of the late Enlightenment period. We find clear biblical foundations in his writing, in regard to both vocabulary and collocations, as well as morphology and syntax. Levinsky frequently uses the *Waw consecutive* [the "transformative" letter *waw* – the strongest characteristic of biblical Hebrew] and the jusive form [*atid mekutzar*]. The *he locale* [letter *he* at the end of a word, indicating direction] also recurs in his writing; he revives the use of the letter *he* alongside biblical forms, and expands its use to the point of adding it to the names of foreign locations. We also find that his writing includes post-biblical words and collocations, originating in Mishnaic Hebrew and the Middle Ages, and the use of foreign words and neologisms which were conceived during his times are not foreign to his literary work.

Levinsky's linguistic-style choices are noticeable in the story, through the usage of language alternatives, such as the exchanges *hayoter / beyoter*, and exchanging the stand-alone pronouns *ani / anohi*.

The characters in the story have names from Jewish sources (most of them biblical), and the name usually hints to their role – thereby anchoring the characters in the Eretz-Israeli experience.

For the contemporary reader, the language of the story is an unconventional and surprising tapestry. What catches our eye and is foreign to our ears is not the use of an assortment of language. On the contrary! Mixed language is common in post-biblical texts and is the basis of our own Modern Hebrew. The foreign feeling stems from the large-scale use of typical and prominent elements of these languages and, moreover, from the new configuration of the typical forms, which are not foundation stones of either post-biblical language before the Enlightenment period, or of contemporary Hebrew.

The first principals and teachers of Levinsky Seminary

**Dr. Nisson Touroff and Dr. Yitzhak Epstein- two principals of
the “Levinsky College for Teachers in Jaffa” between the
years 1912-1923: Lines of similarities and differences in their
leadership and in their methods of management**

Aviva Avidan

This article discusses the type of educational leadership of two principals at the Levinsky College of Education, a teachers college in Tel Aviv. These respected men, Dr. Nisson Touroff and Dr. Yitzhak Epstein, served as principals between the years 1912-1917 and 1920-1923 respectively. The article will present the similarities and differences between the two principals' methods of running the College. Moreover, it will examine their educational leadership and personal management style in light of the definitions and theoretical models of educational leadership as they appear in the research field.

The purpose of analyzing these two leadership types is to shed light on the study of educational leadership from a historical perspective. The article will try to combine educational administration research, which examines administrative theory and practice of education in general, and educational institutions and educators in particular, with the field of history of education. This will broaden our knowledge of college principals and their working and operating methods during the period in which the new Hebrew education system was being established.

The findings indicate that the two principals belonged to a group of pioneer teachers with a sense of national calling. They each felt personal responsibility

which led to them investing all their efforts in both the scholastic-pedagogical and social-cultural domains. Both Dr. Touroff and Dr. Epstein worked in the same educational setting and during the same era, and were obviously influenced by each other's work. Therefore, it is no wonder that many lines of similarities have been found concerning their professional and managerial behavior.

The findings also show that both principals played a major part in the establishment of the new Hebrew education system. Their unique and colorful personalities, their methods of running the teachers college as principals leading a revolutionary change, unique educational initiatives, modern and innovative teaching methods, and their deeds throughout their lives are described elaborately. They undoubtedly served as an example and role model for numerous teachers and principals all over the country and the world.

However, some differences were found regarding their personal ideological values and philosophies and in their management style for the College. Dr. Epstein based his management style on his symbolic and charismatic personality, whereas Dr. Touroff's style was one of consulting with others.

There were also differences in who they focused on at school. Dr. Touroff chose to place the *teachers* at the center of his educational activity and work in collaboration with them, while Dr. Epstein set the *students* at the center and expressed a more authoritative management style towards his colleagues.

Tradition and innovation in the teachings of the first teacher of drawing – Avraham Aldema at the Herzliya Gymnasium and the Levinsky Seminar

Miri Steinhart

Avraham Aldema (1884-1963) was a well-known activist in many fields: theater, entertainment, and security; but he earned his living by teaching drawing at the first Hebrew gymnasium (Herzliya, 1907), and at the first Hebrew teacher training college (Levinsky, 1912). His curriculum, in his own handwriting, for the teaching of drawing, enables us to learn the ideology of the first teacher of this subject in Palestine, and his working methods.

What lay at the heart of his curricula? From where did he derive their fundamentals? What was their influence on later curricula for the subject?

The Herzliya Gymnasium, and later other gymnasia, were founded on the European model. In Europe, drawing was part of acquiring a general education, and its goals were teaching drawing skills, aesthetics, and providing technical foundations to meet the needs of society.

Aldema graduated from the academy of art in Odessa (1905), immigrated to Palestine (1906), and began to teach drawing (1907) in all the gymnasium classes. Concurrently, he also taught the seminar students. The subject goals at the gymnasium were in line with the teacher training goals, although more intense: teaching drawing on the blackboard, and preparing posters for festivals or classroom decoration.

Aldema, who was educated with the European model and was the product of academia which believed in that same model, preserved this method in his drawing lessons too. The European model is also present when analyzing nineteen curricula for the subject in various gymnasia in Eretz-Israel. There are testimonies that the gymnasia drew from the Herzliya curricula to build their own.

Local goals in Eretz-Israel were added to the European model corpus. Aldema's teaching of drawing was harnessed for its realization: educating to connect with past traditions (through biblical topics or links with Jewish festivals); a connection with the present (trips, celebrations), and shaping the New Man of the future (developing imagination and ability of expression). Another innovation in his documents testifies to his consideration of the student's development in drawing ability and his psychological traits.

In summary, the structure of teaching drawing was shaped in the European gymnasium, "immigrated" to Eretz-Israel, and implemented by Aldema and his followers. The tradition of teaching drawing has remained mainly with its functional program of training the young person, and nurturing his aesthetic sense. What was new was the inclusion of relating to the unique needs and educational values of Eretz-Israel. Aldema did not deviate from this framework of "what" to teach, but changed the methods of "how", in consideration of the pupil's personality. In this way, Aldema, with his humanistic and creative personality, impacted his pupils at Herzliya and the Levinsky Seminar, and influenced his colleagues by publishing his curricula for the new subject in Palestine.

Educational Institutions

From an elitist agricultural boarding school to an agricultural-technological youth village: The story of Kadoorie, 1948-2001

Nirit Raichel

For around eight decades Kadoorie's central stone building stood facing the round-topped and splendid Mt. Tabor. For eighty years its students looked towards

the mountain, heard the lowing of the cows, the bleating of the sheep, the noise of those ploughing, sowing, and reaping the fields, and the sound of the students talking and reviewing... The single story stone houses, built during the Mandatory period, which are spread over Kadoorie, are occupied, as they were then too, by the boarding school staff. New housing has recently been constructed for the dormitory students, but, the mischievous (to say the least) deeds still take place. Eight decades and hundreds of graduates and students, dozens of teachers, thousands of stories and dreams, successes and failures.

The story of Kadoorie – an elitist agricultural boarding school, a boarding school for students needing special help, for absorption of new immigrants, a regional school, an agricultural-technological youth village – has not yet ended. On the contrary, the village is thriving, the school is growing, struggling, having difficulties, engaging in conflict, trying, failing, succeeding, renewing, and so on. The days pass and the song of education at Kadoorie, opposite Mt. Tabor, in the heart of the Lower Galilee – remains.

What are the characteristics of this song of education, on the timeline? What distinguishes its notes and beat?

How did (Eretz-)Israeli society's progress influence the various components of Kadoorie's development – the dormitories, the agricultural farm, and the post-elementary school?

How did Kadoorie's location affect its development? (periphery vs. center)

Can we sketch common characteristics between Kadoorie's beginnings and its current image?

These questions and others arising from them will accompany us on our journey through time with Kadoorie.

The story of Kadoorie is divided into four sub-periods determined by developments or changes in the school's path:

From *yishuv* to a State (1934-1948) – The initial years of Kadoorie taking form and its growth.

The State of Israel's first decades (1948-1977) – Changes in Kadoorie's dormitories and purpose.

Economic and ideological changes (1977-1991) – The effects of the agriculture crisis and the integration reform on Kadoorie.

The development of technological education and immigration absorption (1991-2001) – The processes of shaping a new world and educational philosophy, changes in the purposes of the school and dormitories.

Institutional History: The College of Judea and Samaria in Ariel (1982-2007) – From college to university

Dana Zelikovski

This article discusses the history of the College of Judea and Samaria (CJS), and analyses its development over the years 1982-2007; from an extension of Bar-Ilan University to a regional college, and then an academic college which aspired to become a university.

The College of Judea and Samaria was established for the religious and ideologically motivated settlers of Kedumim – one of the first Jewish settlements in the occupied territories in the West Bank.

The College was initially committed to the subjects of Hebrew literature, Jewish thought, Land of Israel studies, and the social sciences. However, during its process of growth and development into a more comprehensive institution of higher education, the CJS has undergone critical changes. I argue that, during its early years, the CJS emphasized its public-ideological ethos more than its academic-scientific one. As opposed to the later years (1990-2007), when its academic ethos led to a profound development aimed at legitimizing its aspiration to become a university.

Alongside its academic development, the College administration has struggled to promote its status by achieving recognition as Israel's ninth university. However, the CJS became controversial due to its location in the West Bank. Moreover, after obtaining temporary status as a university (August 2007), it was renamed the Ariel University Center of Samaria. This, despite a permanent decision of the Israeli Council for Higher Education to avoid establishing new universities in Israel. I argue that while being located in the West Bank enables the CJS to fulfill its mission "to become a university," it also questions both its political and academic legitimacy.

Curricula

Is the melting pot policy giving way to one of multiculturalism?

The narrative featuring the "Mizrahi" in the *Alumot* anthologies, 1958-1966, as compared with the *Pashut Sifrut* Anthologies, 2000-2001

Sara Zamir

[The aim of this research is to examine the narrative featuring Mizrahi characters in the *Alumot* [Sheaves] school anthologies (1958-1966) in contrast to that in the

Pashut Sifrut [Simply Literature] anthologies (2000-2001). The findings show that in the first, *Alumot*, there are, in all, three stories representing oriental characters. All three discuss the Zionist narrative of immigration to the Land of Israel – the return to the homeland and its settlement. Two of the stories even extol the virtues of the melting pot immigration policy of those days, which intended to assimilate the immigrants into the new nation. Accordingly, the immigrants underwent a process of desocialization which involved the shedding of their previous identity in all its varieties, followed by a resocialization process.

In the *Pashut Sifrut* anthologies, there are eight literary works representing Mizrahi characters. Its narrative is entirely different, including both direct and indirect criticism of the absorption and integration policy practiced in the country during the 1950s and 1960s.

The motif of poverty of the Mizrahi communities in the country described in the great majority of the literary works in these anthologies, serves to a large extent as an indictment against the melting pot policy of the authorities. At the same time it perpetuates the Mizrahi stereotype in modern Israeli society, which pays only lip service to the value of multiculturalism.

The portrayal of German history (until 1939) in Israeli high school curricula and textbooks (1952-2009)

Kfir Teomim-Frenkel

(The article was written with the guidance of Professor Avner Ben-Amos).

The history curriculum and related textbooks play an important, even crucial, role in any country, as they reflect and create collective memory and consciousness. They change over time according to social and cultural transformations, especially in the elite classes, and thus may serve as an indicator of the country's social and cultural codes.

Zionist historiography (like that of many other national movements worldwide) is intended to create, reproduce, and promote certain political and ideological objectives in a variety of different contexts. The selective choice of certain historical chapters regarding the topic of Germany was meant to create monolithic collective identity elements. The historical chapters chosen for teaching in high school were selected in order to strengthen the public holocaust memory and link the events of the Bismarck period, the Weimar Republic, and the Nazi regime, and the establishment of the State of Israel (The Holocaust-Revival narrative).

This article includes all schooling programs and textbooks published for use in Israeli high schools between the years 1952-2009. Throughout the article I will

conduct a critical-literary analysis of the way German history is portrayed in the history textbooks of the State of Israel's educational and school system. The article will discuss German and German-Jewish history until the beginning of the Second World War (1939).

In conclusion, this article offers a review of the history curricula and related textbooks between the years 1952-2009, and demonstrates that only one perspective is taught in schools today – German and German-Jewish history – leaving other perspectives untaught, which distorts student understanding of the subject.

Documentation and Sources

Comparative research: Moshe David Schub and Israel Belkind, as establishers of the Hebrew language at the end of the nineteenth century, and the beginning of the twentieth

Menahem Stern

In my article I will introduce the wonderful activity of these two people in ingraining the Hebrew language in Eretz-Israel.

Moshe David Schub was born in Moinești, Romania, in 1854. He studied in a yeshiva until the age of 18, married, learned Jewish ritual slaughter and worked in that profession. He therefore changed his surname from Yankowitz to Schub – an acronym for *shohet u' bodek* [slaughterer and examiner], his occupation. He derived his love for Eretz-Israel from his uncle who had already immigrated to the Land in 1864. His uncle returned several times to Romania to encourage Jews to emigrate to Eretz-Israel.

On his return to Moinești, he told the young Moshe many stories about the Land, and even prepared him for his bar mitzvah. After the disturbances in Romania in 1881, Schub founded the Society for Settlement of Eretz-Israel, moved there, and established Rosh Pina. Schub decided to change to educational work, due to his inability to accept the authority of Baron Rothschild's officials. From 1885-1890 he was principal of the Rosh Pina School, and introduced teaching in Hebrew, despite all the obstacles placed in his way by the parents, who wanted him to continue teaching in Yiddish. He also established the Safa Brura Society in Rosh Pina, with the goal of introducing the Hebrew language to adults, too. He later resigned as school principal, due to his inability to support his family from his salary. He took the position of administrator of the Mishmar Hayarden *moshava*, traveled to America and stayed there for four years, and established a pre-school and religious boys' school where the teaching was in Hebrew. After returning to Eretz-Israel, he was

the head Hebrew teacher at the Alliance Israélite Universelle School in Jerusalem, and significantly advanced the integration of Hebrew in the school. He also served as director of the orphanage in Tzfat for three years, founded a professional training framework there, and nurtured the students' Hebrew speaking.

Israel Belkind was born in 1861 in Russia. His father was one of the more prominent Hebrew teachers in Russia. His mother was particular to speak only Hebrew with her children. After completing high school, he began to study at the college in Kharkov.

After the 1881 disturbances, Belkind established the Bilu organization, and he immigrated to Eretz-Israel in 1882 at the head of a group of fourteen Bilu members. They had difficulties in adapting to the country. In 1884 they founded the *moshava* of Gadera. In 1886, Belkind was elected to the Hovevai Zion committee in Jaffa, and was involved in public activities, with his farm suffering as a result. He therefore abandoned the field of agriculture, and began to work in education.

In 1889, he founded the first school in Jaffa where teaching was in Hebrew. The school closed after two years, due to a lack of funds. He then taught Hebrew for two years at the Alliance Israélite Universelle School in Jerusalem. He became principal of the elementary school in Rishon LeZion, and began to work to establish an agricultural school where the teaching would be in Hebrew, to compete with the Mikveh Yisrael School, where the studies were in French and only a few of its graduates continued to work in agriculture. He brought orphans from Russia to Eretz-Israel, and founded his institution: Kiryat Sefer, in Rishon LeZion. From there the institution moved to many locations: Shfeyah, Ben Shemen, Heftzibah, Hadera, and Tzfat. The many moves came about due to his lack of ability to find a budget for his institution, and it eventually closed. Despite all the relocations, he made sure that the pupils would learn in Hebrew and speak it, and encouraged them to do so.

My article ends with lines of similarity and differences between these two personalities, regarding several characteristics: their motives for immigration to Eretz-Israel, activity in introducing the Hebrew language, character, and achievements.

A Sorrowful Episode from the Days of the Languages War: The Story of Sarah and Miriam Henkin

Yosef Lang

The struggle of the Zionist socialist secular circles in the German-Jewish Ezra Society for the supremacy of the Hebrew language at the not yet opened Technion was absolute, without consideration of all its implications. The struggle began with

letters, protest rallies, strong attacks in the press, and actual injuries and damage to institutions and individuals.

Not everyone in the *yishuv* joined the “Languages War”, and there were many people in the towns and agricultural villages who expressed their doubts regarding the goals of those fighting, and opposed their aggressive methods. There were also those who identified with the denounced Ezra Society, and expressed their support for it and its institutions, all of which taught in Hebrew. The Teachers’ Union leaders, who bore the banner of revolution against Ezra, incited the teachers and students to abandon the association’s institutions and acted to open new Zionist educational institutions. The struggle in Jerusalem was fought jointly by the students of the Hebrew Teachers Seminary which had founded by Ezra in 1904, most of its teachers headed by David Yellin, and teachers and pre-school teachers, including some from the girls’ orphanage adjoining the Ezra girls’ school. The struggles which took place in 1913-1914 caused social and economic crises, arguments and division among teaching staff, and families being torn apart.

The tragic story of the orphans (from their father), Sarah and Miriam Henkin, the granddaughters of Yehoshua Barzilai (Eisenstadt) – one of the prominent activists in the new *yishuv* – is a tragic testimony to that war known as the Languages War, or the Languages Quarrel.

The personal crisis which occurred to the girls’ mother, Henya Malka, the daughter of Yehoshua and Tova Barzilai, by her husband’s death, was solved by her marriage to a widower, Haim Aberbaum from Safed, who was raising daughters from his previous marriage. He agreed to the marriage on condition that Henya Malka give over her daughters to the orphanage in Jerusalem, and she, under duress, agreed. As a result, the guardianship for the girls was given over to their grandfather, Yehoshua Barzilai, and their uncle from Gederah, Mordechai Henkin.

Those who recorded the story of the Languages War tried to explain its idealistic, political, and cultural reasons, and told little of its dark side, and the price paid by those hurt by it.

Four letters preserved in the Central Zionist Archives shed a little light on what happened during the “War” to the orphans, and the testimonies of their children and grandchildren helped describe the fate of the sisters during their lives. It is a sad story which testifies to the results of a war which tore apart a family, without any possibility of healing the rift. The orphans were first taken away from their mother, and then separated from each other due to the War. The sisters, Henya Malka and Shifra Matka from the Barzilai family and the brothers-in-law (Moshe Barzilai and Yisrael Chervinsky) also cut off ties with each other. We don’t have detailed information on the entire episode, but even the little remaining from those dark days is enough to sketch the damage wrought by the Languages War in one particular case, which may illustrate what happened to other families.

**A double jubilee for the first graduating class of the Tarbut
Gymnasium in Grodno**

Ruth Marcus

The summer of 2010 (5770) marked the 80th anniversary of the graduation of the 1930 (5690) class, which was the first graduating class at the Tarbut Gymnasium in Grodno, Poland, now Belarus. These graduates were born in 1910-1913, so that 2010 was also one hundred years since the birth of some of them. The purpose of the article is to describe the Jewish education and experience at the Tarbut Gymnasium, as characterizing the cultural, social, and spiritual life of the students of the Tarbut network which operated at that time in Poland, and as a memorial to the 1930 graduating class.