

Christian influence on early german reform judaism

Autor(en): **Meyer, Michael A.**

Objekttyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Judaica : Beiträge zum Verstehen des Judentums**

Band (Jahr): **38 (1982)**

PDF erstellt am: **28.04.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-961262>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

CHRISTIAN INFLUENCE ON EARLY GERMAN REFORM JUDAISM (*)

by Michael A. Meyer

When Christianity emerged from the matrix of Judaism nearly two thousand years ago, it brought with it a rich heritage of religious ideas and practices. The early Jewish-Christian community was no more than a sectarian offshoot of Judaism, a variant form which became wholly distinct from it only as Christianity grew into the larger pagan world. But as the daughter faith gradually became the dominant religion, it increasingly moved away from its Jewish origins and isolated the Jewish community on the periphery of Christian society. It came to regard itself as the true Israel, even as the Jewish people continued to see itself as perpetually chosen by God, destined to preserve its religious identity by complete faithfulness to the covenant. Under such circumstances the exponents of one faith could have little considered and conscious desire to borrow religious ideas and forms from the other. Only when situations of relatively free contact arose — as for example in Renaissance Italy or in seventeenth-century Holland — did the situation of mutual abhorrence give way to a new relationship whereby Jews began to look more favorably upon some of the religious forms developed through the centuries by Christianity. This process gained momentum when, in the course of the eighteenth century, Western Christianity in some circles underwent a process of rationalization causing it to accept the Enlightenment's insistence upon the validity of other faiths and giving it more common ground with Judaism. Thus, especially in Germany, some 1900 years after Christianity had departed from Judaism, the milieu was created for the first major influence of Christian practices upon Judaism, and certain of the Jews of Germany began to consider seriously whether Judaism in the modern world did not need to reshape itself according to the contemporary model of Christianity.

(*) Dieser Artikel ist mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Verlags (Ktav Publishing House, Inc., New York) übernommen aus: *Studies in Jewish Bibliography, History and Literature*, in honor of I. Edward Kiev, edited by Charles Berlin, New York 1971.

Michael A. Meyer ist Professor of Jewish History, Hebrew Union College — Jewish Institute of Religion Cincinnati, Ohio.

It is the purpose of this article to explore the evolution of Christian influence as it was exercised upon Reform Judaism in Germany during the first half of the nineteenth century. I shall limit myself principally to forms rather than theology, since the latter category, in Judaism at least, has remained highly individual. My interest lies in those elements which were taken over by the Jewish community as a whole, or rather by that portion of it which was most concerned with confronting the new world now visible to the Jewish community outside the ghetto. The thesis which I shall try to support is that during the first three decades of the nineteenth century the tendency among Jewish reformers was to take over Christian practices as acceptable and desirable modern forms in which to clothe the content of Judaism, but that by the thirties and forties, for various reasons which I shall endeavor to explicate, there was a reaction within the Reform leadership against the earlier tendency and a reevaluation of the entire form-content relationship.

In order to explain the course of developments within Reform Judaism it is necessary, first of all, to devote brief attention to the history of the Protestant Church in Germany during the same period. For Church historians, the Age of Enlightenment is generally considered an age of Christian decline, a trough which separates the spiritual vigor of the Reformation from the renewed creativity of the nineteenth century. During this period Protestantism in Germany subjected itself to the dictates of *Aufklärung*; its dogmas were submitted to the scrutiny of reason; eudaemonism — the ideal of happiness — replaced concern for individual redemption. The pulpits of Berlin and other centers of German Enlightenment no longer resounded with the preaching of orthodox doctrine or with expressions of deep spiritual conviction. Preachers, instead, delivered even-tempered moral addresses or provided practical advice for living. Reformation hymnody, which had remained vibrant in the Pietistic era, gave way to the singing of flat, moralizing verses. Enthusiasm for the unique truth of Christianity was dissipated by the Enlightenment view that non-Christians as well might achieve salvation. The «neologians», the most thoroughgoing rationalists among the enlightened clergy, were interested above all in inculcating virtue and good taste. They regarded Jesus principally as moral paradigm and spoke little of the Cross. Spiritual leadership in large measure passed out of the hands of the clergy to the popular philosophers and moralists, who in more than five hundred moralistic weeklies published during the eighteenth century, set forth a model of the good life based on the psychological needs of the individual.

When a Christian revival followed in the early nineteenth century, it rejected this heritage of the Enlightenment. Under the profound influence of Schleiermacher, and intimately linked with the Romantic movement, the new Protestant theology in Germany staked out an independent realm for itself and rejected the earlier dependence upon philosophy. Enlightenment religion came to be seen as shallow if not entirely misplaced, unhistorical and unresponsive to the inner realm of feeling.¹ By 1821 Christian religiosity had rebounded so forcefully that Schleiermacher could claim that the educated of that day — unlike those of twenty years earlier — were more likely to err on the side of hyper-piety than that of hyper-rationalism.² In the first third of the nineteenth century Christianity in Germany succeeded in regaining most of the influence it had lost in the previous generation.

The period of the *Aufklärung*, which church historians have come to regard as an ebb in the Protestant tide was, on the contrary, regarded by Jewry as a mighty wave of progress. In the eighteenth-century stress on the eternal truths of natural religion, in the highlighting of morality rather than dogma, and in the willingness to neglect historical revelation, a rapidly acculturating element of the Jewish community found a common ground with Christianity and reason to hope for a happier and closer coexistence. These Jews therefore felt it incumbent upon themselves to bring the Jewish religion more directly into line with a freer and more flexible Christianity. Thus there arose a new willingness to be influenced by Christian forms and to disregard Jewish historical precedent, even as the church was breaking some of its links with the past.³

When Protestantism reversed itself in the nineteenth century and returned to tradition, Jewish leaders could only regard this shift as a great step backward, especially as it was accompanied by the reimposition of political and economic disabilities. At first many of them regarded the rejection of Enlightenment rationalism in Christianity as only temporary, and assumed that the tendency toward an increased stress of Christian differences from Judaism would soon abate. By the thirties, however, Reform Judaism was itself becoming historically conscious and beginning to rethink its attitude toward the acceptance of Christian practices.

There were various Protestant forms which served as models for Jewish reform in Germany. Our purpose cannot be to make an exhaustive study of each of them, but only to trace their influence, most briefly, over the first half of the nineteenth century in order to determine whether there was a common pattern. I shall deal in sequence with the architecture of the synagogue, the role of the rabbi, the sermon, the nature of the worship service, and religious education.

Christian influence upon synagogue architecture ⁴ is not a modern phenomenon. Throughout the Middle Ages Jewish houses of worship were patterned on styles prevalent in the various countries of Jewish habitation. In Muslim lands synagogues bore a distinct resemblance to contemporary mosques; in Christian lands to the local churches. In Muslim Spain, for example, the elevated Torah reading desk was apparently modeled after the Arabic *mimbar*; in medieval Germany we know of at least one synagogue which employed stained-glass windows. Even the use of such seemingly indigenous symbols as the Eternal Light and the tablets of the Ten Commandments within the synagogue may have been influenced respectively by the practice of Catholic and Protestant churches in the premodern period. ⁵ Until the last century, synagogues in Central and Western Europe were designed by non-Jewish architects who, quite naturally, chose the models with which they were most familiar. Variations were introduced to avoid the use of patently inappropriate elements, such as the cruciform floor plan of the churches, and to provide for the specific requirements imposed by the nature of Jewish worship.

Thus when Israel Jacobson built the first «Reform» synagogue, or «temple», ⁶ as he called it, in Seesen, Westphalia (completed in 1810), he did not break with precedent by employing a Christian architect who modeled the interior after the local Andreas Church. What made Jacobson's temple different was only the provision for three items closely associated with Christian religious practices: a bell tower complete with church bells, an organ, and a raised pulpit directly in front of the ark and facing the congregation. The novelty lay not in the choice of a foreign architectural model, but in the reflection of Jacobson's new conception of Jewish worship.

Israel Jacobson desired to make his temple as little specifically Jewish in appearance as possible because he wanted Christians as well as Jews to feel at home in it. But a generation later, when intellectual and social acculturation had begun to wear away Jewish identity for large numbers of German Jews, preservation of uniqueness rather than the alignment with Christian example became the more prominent concern. Consequently we find a determined desire not to imitate the architecture of the contemporary church, and a serious consideration of how to make the synagogue building distinctively Jewish. For the first time there are Jewish architects engaged in synagogue construction, and one sees congregational leaders and professionals discussing just how a synagogue in its overall architectural design, not just in its interior arrangements, can be given a peculiarly Jewish character. It is now felt that the synagogue should awaken historical memories. The Temple of Solomon is considered as

model though it was built according to a Phoenician design; the Moorish style, setting the synagogue sharply apart from the church, comes to be favored by some architects in Germany as representative of the Jews' Oriental heritage. In Cassel protracted discussion over the choice of a synagogue style during the 1830's leads finally to the selection of a form intended to represent the pre-Gothic architecture which was thought common to both early churches and synagogues in the late Roman period.⁷ The absence of any indigenous Jewish architectural tradition necessarily frustrated the search for any definite single model.⁸ But whatever the solutions reached, the tendency by mid-century was clearly to seek architectural precedent in some phase of the Jewish past.

A second area of Christian influence in the early nineteenth century was that of the role of the clergy. In the Jewish tradition of preceding centuries the rabbi's task principally had been that of legal authority and teacher. In Ashkenazic Jewry his role had not included the preaching of weekly sermons nor the functions of a pastor. He spoke to the congregation in Judeo-German, generally on a Talmudic subject, and only twice a year; he shared such obligations as visiting the sick with every other member of the community. At the turn of the nineteenth century the rabbinate in Germany consisted of men trained to this traditional role and quite unwilling and, indeed, incapable of preaching a vernacular sermon or of assuming the other specific functions of Christian clergy. Yet that group within the Jewish communities of the larger cities which desired forms of worship more appropriate to the Christian environment also sought a new kind of leadership. We thus find a number of young Jewish men who become *Prediger* for the newly established Reform services in Berlin and Hamburg and gradually also in more traditional congregations. They become for the Jewish community the equivalent of the Protestant clergyman, taking on the same sermonic and pastoral duties. They exist side-by-side with rabbis who retain their consultative role in matters of Jewish ritual law.

The new Jewish preachers don the garb of their Christian contemporaries — the clerical robe and collar bands⁹ — supplemented by the Jewish prayer shawl and black silk cap; they receive doctoral degrees at German universities to supplement the extensive traditional Jewish education obtained in youth. Gradually this new generation of Jewish leaders succeeds to rabbinical positions as well, when the need is felt to place all aspects of spiritual leadership into the hands of individuals trained both in Jewish law and tradition and in secular disciplines.¹⁰

By the 1830's there was thus a new type of rabbi who could preach from the pulpit and discuss philosophy and history as well as argue points of Jewish law. The question then arose whether to continue with the title of «preacher», which did indeed represent the principal function, or to return to the use of «rabbi», though it now meant a very different role. It is significant in terms of our thesis to note that the title «preacher» gradually disappeared, to be joined to or replaced with «rabbi» by even the most extreme reformers. In order to justify their expanded role with its wide range of clerical functions, these new rabbis sought precedent in Jewish tradition for the far-reaching spiritual leadership of the rabbi while at the same time attempting to differentiate the modern rabbi from the Protestant minister.¹¹ When Samuel Holdheim assumed leadership of the Reform congregation of Berlin, he not only chose to be called «rabbi», but he declared that he regarded his new role principally as that of a teacher and only secondarily as that of a preacher and pastor.¹²

The Reform rabbis at mid-century, both in outlook and in role, were certainly far more similar to many of their fellow Christian clergy than to the traditional rabbis of earlier times.¹³ Yet here, too, as in synagogue architecture, there was a desire to reestablish a link with tradition. It was done by reassuming the title of «rabbi» and, at least in one instance, by interpreting it to mean «teacher».

If we proceed now to the influence of the Christian sermon, we shall discover a similar course of development.¹⁴ In the eighteenth century the Protestant homily in Germany became more of a moralistic discourse than a preaching of the Gospels. As acceptability to reason became an indispensable criterion of judgment, the more extreme of the neologians reduced the Christian message to those elements considered free of super-rational dogma. They chose to discuss only that portion of their tradition which they themselves and their congregants found credible. The Bible served them mainly as a source of illustrations for the truths of natural religion and examples of the moral, and hence happier life.¹⁵ The first modern Jewish preachers in Germany were drawn to this kind of sermon because it had little Christological character and was therefore easily adaptable to the Jewish service. Even if the respective liturgies would remain very different, the sermon could provide a common form for Jewish and Christian worship. The pulpits would give clear evidence that Jewish spiritual concerns were very much the same as those of Christians. And, not unimportantly, the political and social acceptability of the Jews would thereby be advanced.

The earliest Jewish sermons of the new type in Germany were thus predominantly in a universal vein. They dealt with such matters as the

proper use of time, religiosity and morality, and the like.¹⁶ At first the younger generation, coming of age in the twenties, likewise looked to Christian models and shied away from topics too specifically Jewish. They chose quotations from the Bible rather than rabbinic literature.¹⁷ Their listeners could think of no higher expression of esteem than to compare them to the more famous Christian preachers of the day. But Christian preaching was not to continue in its eighteenth-century course. In the early nineteenth century it began to react to the «flat *Kanzelberedsamkeit*» of the earlier period and turn instead either to the utterance of personal faith in Christian mysteries, as in the case of Schleiermacher, or to the renewed expounding of Christian dogma, as in the now resurgent orthodoxy. The rationalistic discourse was no longer highly regarded in a Christian world much under the influence of romanticism. Its Jewish counterpart, however, modeled after the older form, could obviously not adapt itself to the new, more Christian type of sermon. Yet neither were the Jewish congregations willing to give it up entirely, for the German sermon, after initial opposition by the orthodox, was making steady headway wherever governments allowed its use. It was ever more widely accepted as an important part of the Jewish service.

As the Christian sermon began to draw more heavily from its own tradition, its Jewish equivalent was set adrift. Since especially in Reform-minded circles there was no desire to give it up, the attempt was made to disclose a native Jewish homiletical tradition. When Leopold Zunz, the founder of scientific study of the Jewish past, published his classic *Sermons of the Jews* in 1832, he was desirous not only of proving to a reactionary Prussian government that Jewish sermons were not a radical, politically subversive innovation, but also in showing his fellow Jews that they possessed their own tradition, however much the midrashim of earlier times might differ from the Jewish sermons of that day. Two years later the reformer Ludwig Philippson established a Jewish homiletical journal devoted to the development of a specifically Jewish type of sermon. In the following decade, as the sermon found its way into more and more synagogues, Jewish preachers made distinct efforts to define their task. They agreed in rejecting slavish imitation of the Christian model and chose instead to build somehow on the traditional homily, the *derasha*, though purified of timebound dross. To base Jewish homiletics on those of another religion, one writer argued in 1840, would be to set the building on a foundation which it simply did not fit; inevitably the structure would collapse.¹⁸ It was Gotthold Salomon, one of the preachers at the Reform Temple in Hamburg, who is credited with being the father of a new, specifically Jewish modern homiletics.¹⁹ By mid-century a regular

German sermon, but now drawing freely from rabbinical as well as biblical tradition, was widely accepted in Jewish congregations. Its adoption by the synagogues of Germany had been unquestionably due to the Protestant example, but its form and content were now far more distinctly Jewish.

Aside from the German sermon, a number of other Christian practices influenced the Jewish Reform service. Some of them remained throughout the period and were never questioned, others underwent the same process of Judaization which we have already noted above. A third category consisted of those elements of Christian worship which were scarcely or not at all adopted during this half-century but which did find subsequent acceptance in Reform circles.

The conviction that a proper worship service should be decorous was a Christian sentiment which, to the best of my knowledge, was never questioned by early Reform and which spread to more traditional Jewry as well. Over the centuries Ashkenazic Jewish prayer had become a highly individual matter, each participant in the service responding or not to the prayer leader as the spirit moved him. Congregants talked freely to one another on topics sacred and secular, milled about, feeling very much at home in the synagogue, sometimes achieving great spontaneity and exuberance, but hardly creating an atmosphere of reverence. To outsiders it seemed chaotic. And to the reformers, no doubt with the dignified solemnity of the church service in mind, such free reign of expression and such informality seemed destructive of true worship as they now conceived it.²⁰ When reconsideration of Christian forms came in the thirties and forties, the reformers' insistence on decorum was not diminished; it was however justified by attributing it to «the German sense of order» rather than the imitation of Christian practice.²¹

The use of an organ in the service was another lasting innovation of early German Reform. But unlike decorum it did not spread to orthodoxy, which opposed its introduction bitterly. Much ink was spilled between reformers and traditionalists over the entire course of our period in arguments as to whether any musical instrument, and specifically an organ, might, according to Jewish law, be played in the synagogue. The issues of this legal discussion do not concern us here.²² What is of consequence for our purpose is that the organ, unlike the sermon, did not allow of Judaization. Aside from *halakhic* arguments regarding its permissibility, the reformers who wanted the instrument in the synagogue could only try to justify its use historically with the precedent of similar musical instruments in the ancient Temple and, as Zunz noted, the fact that an organ had existed «for centuries» in a synagogue in Prague.²³ But there was no getting away from the intimate association of the organ with

the church and this bothered the more conservative reformers.²⁴ Abraham Geiger, the principal leader of the more radical group, however argued that the «pressing need» to elevate the service by music and song here justified the adoption of a Christian form. The best Geiger could do in its defense was to refer once again to the playing of an organ-like instrument in the ancient Temple and to ask whether it was not desirable for the Jews now to reclaim their inheritance, with appreciation to Christianity for perfecting its use through the centuries.²⁵

Unlike the organ, the ceremony of confirmation lent itself to Judaization. It was widely adopted by German Reform, at first as an individual ceremony for boys and then for groups including girls. It, too, became permanent in Reform Judaism and its acceptance was also clearly the result of Protestant influence. At first the ceremony in Judaism was very similar to its Protestant model. It, too, included a confession of faith by the confirmand as part of the ritual.²⁶ But once again, after a lapse of some years, serious questions about Jewish confirmation were raised by the reformers themselves. The value of the ceremony, pedagogically and religiously, drove out any consideration of its rejection. But it was frankly admitted that Judaism contained no precedent for confirmation, the Bar Mitzvah ceremony representing only a distant analogy. Judaization therefore had to proceed by eliminating those aspects of the ceremony which were held to be foreign to Judaism and by reinterpreting its significance. Thus Solomon Herxheimer argued in 1835 that since a Jew becomes a member of his faith by birth, and circumcision is not an equivalent of Christian baptism, confirmation could not represent the consummation of entry into Judaism. Moreover, a confession of faith was entirely foreign to the Jewish religion. However, as a solemn examination in Judaism and as a pledge of Jewish loyalty, Herxheimer found confirmation both acceptable on the basis of Jewish tradition and eminently desirable, especially at a time when children were exposed to much anti-religious thought. In the view of the reformers the Christian ceremony of confirmation thus became a means for preserving Judaism.²⁷

Certain Christian forms, however, did not find acceptance in German Jewish Reform during the first half of the nineteenth century, although they made headway later in the left wing of the movement in Germany and in the United States. These included worship without a head-covering, sitting together of men and women, and Sunday services. During the period of our discussion such departures were, with few exceptions, judged too radical.²⁸

The last illustration of our thesis lies in the area of religious instruction. Here it was the Protestant catechism which served modern

Jewish educators in Germany as a model for the transmission of religion.²⁹ Judaism as a faith based on certain articles of belief had not been taught in the traditional Jewish schools where the curriculum was limited to the study of sacred texts. Jewish educators, and in some cases governments,³⁰ were interested that Jewish youth become familiar with the tenets of their faith in the same manner that Christian children learned the essentials of theirs. As Judaism of the early nineteenth century was almost totally bereft of any pedagogical model of this type, it was only to be expected that the catechism should be adapted for Jewish use. Of course Jewish content was substituted for Christian: the principles of Maimonides or Albo for those of Luther, along with the Ten Commandments which were common to both. Yet some objections were raised to the adoption of the catechism — in this case from the very beginning. Some educators regarded catechizing as against the spirit of Judaism, or pointed out that, in their opinion, Judaism, unlike Christianity, possessed no *Glaubenslehre*, no system of beliefs.³¹ But the form of question and answer was at this time considered a most effective means for presenting Jewish teachings and commandments. On this account it was employed by some of the orthodox as well as by the reformers. But whereas especially the earlier catechisms tended to stress the common core of morality in all religions, the later ones often placed more emphasis on specifically Jewish doctrines. An ultimate stage in this respect was reached slightly beyond our period, in 1859, when a Jewish educator published a *Catechism of Doctrines Differentiating Judaism from Christianity*.³² A Christian form was thus employed to point out which Christian doctrines were foreign to Judaism. But the catechism as such did not become a permanent form of Jewish instruction. It disappeared gradually after our period, apparently less out of reaction to its Christian origins than because the form was no longer considered pedagogically effective.

After an examination of these individual areas of influence, it remains to summarize and to account for this changing Jewish attitude toward the adoption of Christian forms in terms of the overall development of Reform. Until the late eighteenth century Christian exclusiveness supported a Jewish attitude to religious assimilation best characterized by the biblical dictum: «You shall not walk in their statutes» (Lev 18,3). But as Enlightenment influence on Christianity made it more congenial to Judaism and the achievement of political equality for the Jews became a real possibility, Jewish attitudes markedly changed. Christianity, in its late eighteenth-century form no longer seemed so hostile or strange. The new Europe could encompass Judaism and Christianity as variant forms of a rational faith. But it was widely felt that Judaism would have to make

certain adjustments in order to become a religion in the modern sense. If it was to become one of the religious denominations of Germany, and not an entity apart, Judaism would have to adopt certain forms, found in the church, but considered proper to all religions. The earlier reformers thought that some adjustment to the Christian model was expected of them and their own aesthetic and religious sensibilities, conditioned by exposure to Christian practices, drove them in the same direction.³³ They seldom found reason to oppose pouring Jewish content into Christian forms. In fact, unlike the orthodox, they regarded this transfusion as the best way to preserve the contents of Judaism in a Christian environment.

That this attitude was significantly altered in the thirties and forties must be explained by the course of developments both outside and within Judaism. As Christianity returned to its separate theological path in the early nineteenth century and, in the spirit of romanticism looked to its historical rather than its rational foundations, it continued to exercise an influence on Judaism, but in this case a separative rather than an imitative one. The reformers who in their earlier enthusiasm had favored the use of Christian forms began to turn to Jewish history and seek links between their efforts and Jewish tradition. As we have seen, in some cases this led to the attempt to find Jewish precedent for a Christian form, in others to eventual rejection of the form, and in still others to efforts at Judaization. In 1820 such forms as the modern sermon and the textbook of religion were strange to Judaism. They had to be learned from Christianity. But once the form was mastered, it was possible to depart significantly from the model.

By the 1830's and 40's there was a great desire to do so. For the new generation was trying to regain its balance. It looked to the Jewish past, increasingly cognizant that religious forms as well as content grow out of historical traditions from which they cannot arbitrarily be severed. This is a sentiment not limited in this period to the conservative reformer Zacharias Frankel, who developed a «positive-historical» approach to Judaism, but is found generally in German Reform. The synagogue, Geiger argued in 1835, must develop out of itself and its own tradition if it is to face the world with dignity. Nothing is to be gained by giving up all the unique elements in Judaism and imitating Christianity (*Christeln*) in the vain hope of thereby gaining full acceptance in society. Judaism must maintain its «religious independence».³⁴ Even among the radical reformers of Berlin the unreflective simulation of Christianity had fallen into disrepute. It was argued that mere change of forms — the addition of choir and preacher, German prayer, and choral singing — would not cure the disunity (*Zerrissenheit*) within a Jewish community divided on the

significance of its own tradition. The exposed nakedness could not be covered by «the foreign dress of Christianity.»³⁵ These reformers also raised the objection that using contemporary Christian forms creates the false impression that Judaism is thereby modern and thus directs attention away from the unresolved problems posed by biblical criticism.³⁶

Yet if this rejection of imitation was deemed necessary for maintaining the religious independence of Judaism, it was also seen as creating the possibility of a more fruitful relationship between the two faiths. In 1843 Sigismund Stern, a lay leader in Berlin, summed it up: «Judaism, which for a time thought itself drawing nearer to Christianity because it was departing from its own character, is now drawing nearer to it in truth, but *with an awareness of its own personality ...*»³⁷ That awareness, which had been dimmed during the period of its origins, was what Reform in its second generation was trying to achieve.

NOTES

1. Luther Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy* (Philadelphia: 1947), pp. 139-54; J. A. Dorner, *History of Protestant Theology* (Edinburgh: 1871), II, pp. 293, 467; Karl Kahnisch, *Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus* (Leipzig: 1860), pp. 30, 228; and especially F. W. Kantzenbach, *Protestantisches Christentum im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Gütersloh: 1965).
2. F. Schleiermacher, *Über die Religion* (3d ed.; Berlin: 1821), pp. xiii-xiv.
3. A good example is David Friedländer, *An die Verehrer, Freunde und Schüler Jerusalems, Spaldings, Tellers, Herders und Löfflers* (Leipzig: 1823).
4. On this subject in general see R. Wischnitzer, *The Architecture of the European Synagogue* (Philadelphia: 1964); A. Grotte, *Deutsche, böhmische und polnische Synagogentypen* (Berlin: 1915).
5. J. Gutmann, «How Traditional are our Traditions?» *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal*, April 1968, pp. 59-61.
6. Wischnitzer (p. 176) thinks that the name «temple» was inspired by the French Reformed churches which were also called «temples». However, Jacobson more likely had in mind the Temple of Solomon. See his specific reference to it in *Sulamith*, III, 1 (1810), pp. 311-12. The building is discussed in detail in N. Friedland, *Zur Geschichte des Tempels der Jacobsonschule* (Seesen: 1910).
7. R. Hallo, *Kasseler Synagogengeschichte* (Kassel: 1931), pp. 43-66.
8. See, for example, the revealing article by the Jewish architect Max Fleischer, «Über Tempelbau», in the Viennese Jewish weekly *Die Neuzeit*, XIV (1884), pp. 134-37, 154-56.
9. The use of the clerical robe and collar bands (*Bäffchen*) by Jewish clergy was, however, neither a Reform innovation nor limited to the reformers. Rabbis wore them as early as the seventeenth century. Illustrations may be found in Alfred Rubens, *A History of Jewish Costume* (London: 1967), pp. 175-94. On the subject in general see Leopold Löw, «Die Amtstracht der Rabbinen», *Gesammelte Schriften* (Szegedin: 1898), IV, pp. 217-34.

10. The higher level of general education demanded of the new generation of rabbis paralleled developments in the Christian community where higher educational standards and greater professionalism were characteristic of the Protestant clergy after the Prussian Church Union of 1817. See R. M. Bigler, «The Rise of Political Protestantism in Nineteenth-Century Germany», *Church History*, XXXIV (1965), p. 436; Kahn, p. 235.
11. David Rothschild, «Über den geistlichen Charakter des Rabbiner-Amtes», *Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland*, II (1844), pp. 199-210.
12. Samuel Holdheim, *Antrittspredigt* (Berlin: 1847); *idem*, *Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der jüdischen Reformgemeinde in Berlin* (Berlin: 1857), pp. 173, 179. In Vienna, however, I. N. Mannheimer kept the title of «preacher» and allowed matters of Jewish law to remain in the hands of a traditional rabbi. Unlike Holdheim, Mannheimer regarded his pastoral duties to be of greater significance than his teaching or preaching. See «Zwei interessante Briefe Mannheimer's», *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, XX (1871), pp. 279-81.
13. See, for example, the duties outlined for the rabbi of Sondershausen in *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, X (1846), pp. 37-40.
14. On this subject see the two important articles by Alexander Altmann: «Zur Frühgeschichte der jüdischen Predigt in Deutschland», *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, VI (1961), pp. 3-57; and «The New Style of Preaching in Nineteenth-Century Jewry», *Studies in Nineteenth-Century Jewish Intellectual History*, ed. A. Altmann (Cambridge, Mass.: 1964), pp. 65-116. For earlier developments in Italy, see Ellis Rivkin, «The Sermons of Leon da Modena», *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXIII² (1950-51), pp. 295-317.
15. Reed, p. 147; Kantzenbach, pp. 88-98; Dorner, II, p. 468.
16. The best example is provided by the sermons written, but not delivered, by David Friedländer: *Reden der Erbauung gebildeter Israeliten gewidmet* (Berlin: 1815 and 1817).
17. Even Leopold Zunz in his *Predigten, gehalten in der neuen Israelitischen Synagoge zu Berlin* (Berlin: 1823). See also the personal testimony of I. M. Jost, *Geschichte des Judentums und seiner Sekten* (Leipzig: 1859), III, p. 333.
18. M. Kayserling, *Bibliothek jüdischer Kanzelredner*, II (1872), pp. 40-42; Holdheim, *Geschichte*, p. 180; J. A. Fränkel, «Zur Geschichte der Homiletik», *Literaturblatt des Orients*, I (1840), p. 557.
19. *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, VII (1843), p. 621; Kayserling, I (1870), pp. 154-55.
20. For a consideration of the *Synagogenordnungen* promulgated by German governments to maintain decorum, often at the behest of Jewish leaders, see: Jakob J. Petuchowski, *Prayerbook Reform in Europe* (New York: 1968), pp. 105-27.
21. *Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland*, II (1844), p. 66.
22. For a survey of the literature, see the unpublished Hebrew Union College prize essay by Meir Ydit, «The Controversy Concerning the Use of the Organ During the 19th Century in Europe and in America».
23. L. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (Berlin: 1832), p. 476.
24. See, for example, the remarks in the 1830 letter of I. N. Mannheimer in *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, XX (1871), pp. 334-35. The Jewish composer, Meyerbeer, in 1855 made the interesting suggestion that if instrumental music was to be used in the service it would be more appropriate to compose it for flute and trumpet, as in Solomon's Temple, than for what he regarded as «a purely Christian instrument» (*Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, XXVIII (1864), p. 541).
25. A. Geiger, «Die Begleitung des gottesdienstlichen Gesanges durch die Orgel», *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, I (1862), pp. 89-98.
26. E. Kley, «Zur Konfirmation der Mädchen», *Predigten* (Hamburg: 1819), pp. 47-65.

27. S. Herxheimer, «Über die synagogische Zulässigkeit und Einrichtung der Konfirmation», *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*, I (1835), pp. 68-96. J. Heinemann very early chose to call a similar ceremony he instituted in his school in Berlin «Religionsfest» in order thereby to differentiate it from the Christian ceremony (*Jedidja*, II, 1 (1818), pp. 207-16).
28. Even the radical *Reformgenossenschaft* in Berlin, when it held its first New Year services in 1845, had separate seating of the sexes and provided head coverings for the worshippers (*Zweiter Bericht der Genossenschaft für Reform im Judentum* [Berlin: 1846], pp. 10-11). By 1849 the Sunday service of this congregation had supplanted its Saturday morning worship but was justified by its rabbi only as an «unfortunately» necessary concession to insure attendance. Holdheim called it «the most painful operation which we have had to perform on the deathly ill patient» (Holdheim, *Geschichte*, pp. 180-84, 209).
29. See Jakob J. Petuchowski, «Manuals and Catechisms of the Jewish Religion in the Early Period of Emancipation», *Studies in Nineteenth-Century Jewish Intellectual History*, (see above note 14) pp. 47-64.
30. In Denmark in 1814 the government made systematic religious instruction and confirmation a requirement for obtaining economic and civil equality, I. N. Mannheimer was engaged as «royal catechist» for Danish Jewry (M. Rosenmann, *Isak Noa Mannheimer* [Vienna] 1922, pp. 30-31).
31. *Sulamith*, I, 1 (1806), 51n; *ibid.*, IV, 1 (1812), pp. 246-54.
32. Emanuel Hecht, *Katechismus der Unterscheidungslehren des Juden- und Christenthums* (Hoppstädten: 1859).
33. An excellent example of this point of view is the article by David Fränkel, «Die Lage der Juden alter und neuerer Zeiten», *Sulamith*, I, 2 (1807), pp. 353-86. See also Israel Jacobson's speech at the dedication of his temple in *Sulamith*, III, 1 (1810), pp. 303-17.
34. A. Geiger, «Das Judentum unserer Zeit und die Bestrebungen in ihm», *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*, I (1835), pp. 1-12.
35. S. Stern, *Die Aufgabe des Judentums und des Juden in der Gegenwart* (Berlin: 1845), pp. 109-12, 180.
36. A. Rebenstein [Aaron Bernstein], «Unsere Gegenwart», *Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland*, II (1844), pp. 65-102.
37. S. Stern, «Das Judentum als Element des Staats-Organismus», *ibid.*, I (1843), p. 138. Emphasis in the text is Stern's.