

THE SUNDAY-SABBATH CONTROVERSY
IN JUDAISM

KERRY MARC OLITZKY

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination.

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion

March 1981

Referee: Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus

PREFACE

This thesis represents more than just one year of intensive research. It also represents years of striving toward the worthiness of Ordination. Formally, it is the beginning of my attempt to live up to the honor of being called a rabbi in Israel.

Many people have fostered my growth along the way. My parents, Abe and Frances Olitzky, have always nurtured me by providing me with a Jewish home in which to grow, love, and be a Jew. My second parents, Mel and Sandy Rosenblatt, have always supported me in my endeavors, no matter how controversial. My big brothers, Lee and Earl Olitzky, have pushed me through childhood, and my little brothers, Steve and Scott Rosenblatt, have pushed me into adulthood. For all of this, I thank all of them.

The staff at the American Jewish Archives was always there to help me in my work—whether it was by providing me with documents to examine or an ear to listen. Especially to Abe Peck and Fannie Zelcer, I give my thanks. I have to thank my new friend and teacher Jon Sarna for painstakingly going over every bit of my research, time and time again, always providing me with new areas to explore. Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus, whose compassion, concern, and scholarship support me every step of the way, is truly blessed with the gift of life.

Finally, I dedicate this work and all it represents to my wife, Sheryl. With her, I am capable of reaching the mountaintops. She is with me in my hours of trial and tribulation, in my hours of joy and jubilation. She is God's gift to me.

DIGEST

The Sunday-Sabbath emerged in the early nineteenth century in Europe as a response to the emancipation of the Jew. As soon as the idea of transfer was voiced, controversy began. This thesis initially traces the roots of the Sunday-Sabbath controversy. It then follows the history of the movement, focusing on major supporters and opponents. In 1854, the Sunday-Sabbath movement was introduced in America. It grew slowly between 1855 and 1879; experienced a spurt of growth between 1880 and 1891; matured between 1891 and 1899; and thereafter began its decline which was felt sharply between the years 1900 and 1919. By 1920, the Sunday-Sabbath movement was dead, though remnants of the controversy remain with us today.

I have collected materials for this thesis through various means. I examined all available relevant synagogue histories. I explored selected Jewish newspapers and journals. I investigated manuscript collections. And I analyzed personal letters, diaries, congregational minutes and rabbinic sermons. In addition, I used secondary sources to augment this research, providing the necessary background for my work. When necessary, I used appropriate rabbinic sources.

This thesis includes a chronology listing major events which affected the Sunday-Sabbath movement. Charts have been included to illustrate the growth

and extent of the movement in America. Finally, representative documents have been provided to aid further research in the area.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
DIGEST	vi
CHAPTER I. EUROPEAN ANTECEDENTS	I
CHAPTER II. INTRODUCTION OF THE SUNDAY SERVICE IN AMERICA 1800 - 1854	11
CHAPTER III. GROWTH OF THE MOVEMENT 1855 - 1879	18
CHAPTER IV. RENAISSANCE 1880 - 1891	45
CHAPTER V. MATURATION 1891 - 1899	61
CHAPTER VI. A NEW CENTURY 1900 - 1919	85
CHAPTER VII. DECLINE 1920 - 1980	94
SUMMARY	101
CHRONOLOGY	103
CHARTS	108
SELECTED DOCUMENTS	110
ENDNOTES	123
BIBLIOGRAPHY	150

FOR SHERYL,
WITH YOU, I AM BORN AGAIN

CHAPTER I

EUROPEAN ANTECEDENTS

Jews have worshipped daily for many centuries. Their central day of worship has been the Sabbath. The Sunday-Sabbath controversy began when certain Jews wanted to transfer the central day of worship to Sunday. Some individuals have advocated the actual transfer of the Jewish Sabbath to Sunday. Others simply preferred to institute an additional worship service on the civil day of rest, as it was called. Whether or not the Sunday service was called a Sabbath service, advocates of the Sunday service are classified in this thesis as advocates of the Sunday-Sabbath if their Sunday service tended to become the central Jewish worship service. Sometimes this happened of its own accord. A few of the advocates, however, wanted the Sunday service to gain central status. They simply were reluctant to state their views explicitly.

Sunday and the Sabbath are antagonists, a result of Christianity's sanctification of Sunday, as well as the beginning of acculturation for the Jew in Europe and its influence on American Jewry. The observance of the Saturday Sabbath was an economic hardship. For many, it meant the closing of businesses on the busiest day of the week. In addition, stores were forced to keep closed on Sunday, the civil day of rest.

The history of the institution of Sunday as the Lord's Day is unclear. Apparently, Sunday had a special purpose in the New Testament, whether it was the service of preaching in Acts 20:7 or the Emmaus story in Luke 24. According to Christian tradition, Jesus appeared before his disciples at Emmaus on the Sunday after his crucifixion and resurrection. The early Jewish-Christians probably observed the Sabbath on Saturday, as well as the Lord's Day on Sunday. As Christianity spread into non-Jewish groups, Saturday observance lost its meaning. This may have been one of the points of contention between the early Jewish-Christian Church and the Gentile Church. But when the Gentile Church took over the notion of a Lord's Day, it apparently took with it the Jewish notion of a seven-day week.

The Roman calendar was entirely different from the Jewish calendar. It was based on the various calends, nones, and ides of the month. For example, in Mithra, the first day of the week was observed as the day of the sun, and the day of Saturn was celebrated with banquets and rest. After Constantine rose to power, he legislated in 321 C.E. that Sunday was to be a public holiday. Although Constantine probably wanted to straighten out the disfigured Roman calendar, he was also influenced by cults like Mithra. In addition, he was aware of the importance of the sun-god to his empire. Although Jesus as Christ was not related to the sun-god, there may have been a suggestion of a relationship between the original creation and the creation of Jesus as Christ.

The Lord's Day, Sunday, was never a day of rest for the early Christians. It was a day which contained worship, but was a regular work day. It was not until the Middle Ages that severe restrictions on Sunday work were enacted by the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, Saturday and Sunday were made distinct, because there was a conscious attempt by the Church to make Sunday a day of work in emphatic contradistinction to the Jewish Saturday as a day of rest, a Sabbath.¹

Partly because they preserved their distinctive Sabbath, it took the Jews many years to gain emancipation. Thus, the first proposal for a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath to Sunday was made in Germany where the struggle for emancipation was keenly felt in the nineteenth century. Although many rational arguments were provided to support such a transfer, the arguments might never have been made if the civil day of rest in Germany was not Sunday or had the German government previously given the Jews full emancipation. But the proposal had been made, and it became the basis for the Sunday-Sabbath movement wherever it arose.

The idea of a Sunday-Sabbath was first publicized in Germany in the early decades of the nineteenth century. The Frankfurter Journal contained an article which debated the issue as early as 1837.² On the opposing side of the issue was Michael Creizenach, a leading lay reformer. He agreed that there may have been no difference to God whether the Sabbath was celebrated on Sunday or even Monday. However, the Sabbath, like other holidays and

festivals were institutions of Israel. All Israel would have to agree before a Sabbath transfer could be made.³

Other reformers did not agree with the position of Creizenach. In the famous German rabbinical conferences of the eighteen-forties, this became obvious. Though nothing was really said about a Sunday-Sabbath at the Brunswick Conference in 1844, at the Breslau Conference in 1846, measures were taken.⁴ Samuel Hirsch, then chief rabbi of Luxemburg, did not attend the Conference, but he sent a communication in which he urged the Conference to make a formal declaration stating that the Sabbath could only find its proper expression on Sunday.⁵

Samuel Holdheim, rabbi of the Berlin Reform Congregation, who did attend the Breslau Conference, refused to make such a resolution. He felt that it would have been rejected by a majority of the rabbis in attendance, although he believed that the transfer should be made.⁶

All of our effort for the restoration of a worthy celebration of the Sabbath is fruitless and there is unfortunately no thorough remedy whereby the conflict between the Sabbath and the demands of daily life can be removed other than the transfer of the Sabbath to a civil day of rest. I deny that this is a concession to Christianity; I have in view the only possibility of a worthy celebration of the Sabbath.⁷

An early proponent of the Sabbath transfer, Holdheim based his proposal on his concept of revelation. He believed that there were two types of things revealed in the Torah: universal, ethical principles and ceremonial, legal

principles. The ethical principles were eternally binding and formed the essence of ethical monotheism. The ceremonial and legal principles merely formed the constitution for the theocratic Israelite nation which was destroyed in 70 C.E. Thus, this constitution was no longer valid. In the case of the Sabbath, the Sabbath concept was part of the eternal revelation, but its observance on a specific day of the week belonged to the theocratic state. Since Jews in Germany were living under German law, they should feel free to observe the eternal Sabbath on the day established by the German government as the civil day of rest: Sunday.⁸

Both Hirsch and Holdheim believed in a Sabbath, but neither felt a specific day of observance was important. For Samuel Holdheim, a Sunday-Sabbath could repair the breach between religious observance and civil life.⁹ For Samuel Hirsch, the Saturday Sabbath was valid only for Jews who lived all together in one country. Sunday had become the civil day of rest in Germany. Thus, there was no choice for the Jews. They too should rest on Sunday.¹⁰

The proposal which Hirsch made explicitly, and Holdheim made implicitly, became a formal resolution at the Breslau Conference. The issue was hotly debated, but only one rabbi sided with Hirsch and Holdheim: Mendel Hess.¹¹ Hess, too, was a radical reform rabbi. While chief rabbi of Saxe-Weimar, he carried out a government decree of 1823 requiring all synagogue services to be in German. He also edited a weekly journal, Der Israelit des neunzehnten

Jahrhunderts which publicized his views. In 1848, Samuel Holdheim co-edited this periodical with him.

Hess, Hirsch, and Holdheim could not convince their opponents. Samuel Adler opposed the transfer of the Sabbath, but he recognized the need for congregations like the Berlin Reform Association to hold Sunday Services. He wanted the Conference to go on record denouncing a transfer, while supporting new congregations. Adler was then chief rabbi of the Alzey (Rhenish Hesse) district. Later, he was rabbi of Temple Emanu-El in New York City. He was known for his work toward the improvement of Jewish education and the removal of legal disabilities for Jews.¹²

Solomon Formstecher too was opposed to the Sabbath transfer. One year later, however, he instituted a Sunday afternoon service in Offenbach where he was rabbi.¹³ Formstecher was a well-known philosopher in Germany, known for his interpretation of Judaism based on the German idealism of Schelling and Hegel.

Ludwig Philippson, founder of Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums and preacher in the Magdeburg Jewish community, considered Sunday services "an urgent need of the time."¹⁴ He did not sanction a Sabbath transfer, but advocated daily services on Sunday. Of those rabbis who addressed themselves to the proposal of Hirsch and Holdheim, only Gotthold Salomon and Leopold Stein rejected Sunday services of any kind. For them, Sunday services were Christian.¹⁵ Salomon was then rabbi at the controversial Hamburg Reform

Temple. Stein was rabbi of Frankfort-on-the-Main. Both were radical reformers who excluded Sabbath transfer in their philosophy of Reform Judaism. Salomon suggested that "to transfer the Sabbath to Sunday would mean to serve two masters; it would mean coquetting with Christianity: That would signify the destruction of Judaism."¹⁶ In an extremely poignant image, Stein argued:

I am firmly convinced that Holdheim is actuated by the purest motive and the sincerest desire to help our sick Judaism [by his plea to transfer the Sabbath to Sunday]; but I beg him to consider, as a faithful physician, whether the medicine he prescribes is not a dangerous potion the imbibing whereof will mean either life or death; and whether he who has said so truly elsewhere that we are gardeners who cut away the dead branches must beware lest we cut into the living wood, really considers our Sabbath so dead that he does not fear that he is cutting into the living wood! . . . If we transfer the Sabbath to the Sunday, we will bury Judaism on Friday evening to permit it to be resurrected on Sunday morning as another religion.¹⁷

Feeling an emotional attachment to traditional Judaism, Abraham Geiger, rabbi in Breslau, wrote after the Breslau Conference that any congregation could institute a Sunday service, but each congregation must be careful in its institution of such a service. He later advocated a monthly Sunday service so that worshippers would have an opportunity to attend services occasionally. In this way, no one could suggest that he advocated the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday.¹⁸ Abraham Geiger believed that tradition was a progressive concept. The ancient rabbis made changes in order to adapt

Halacha (Jewish law) to their changing contemporary conditions. Reforms were made which affected the total Jewish community. Thus, Geiger felt that modern reformers had to make changes guided by the past. He believed in reform from within the Jewish community. He hoped that his concept of reform would prevent a split in the German Jewish communities.

It must be noted that the organization of German Jewry at the time was by communities, not synagogues within the community. In 1847, membership in community synagogues was compulsory. Thus, there were no reform or traditional synagogues, only community synagogues. This framework remained stable until the law for compulsory membership was abolished in Prussia in 1876. The new law permitted Jews to disassociate themselves from the community synagogue in order to establish separate synagogues.

Although there appeared to be comparatively little said about a Sunday-Sabbath at the three major German rabbinical conferences, congregations were instituting Sunday services and rabbis were conducting them.

On November 19, 1845, the Berlin Reform Congregation instituted its first Sunday service. Later, this congregation held services solely on Sunday, rejecting the Saturday Sabbath completely.¹⁹ This action established the Berlin Reform Congregation as the Sunday-Sabbath pioneer in Europe.

Apparently, there was a great desire for Sunday services. A wealthy

merchant in Frankfort-on-the-Main, home of Leopold Stein, pledged two thousand talers (a former German silver coin) toward the erection of a synagogue which would hold bi-weekly Sunday services with organ music and a sermon.²⁰ In March 1846, some members of the Brussels congregation requested Sunday services. They were unable to attend services on Saturday, but still wanted to attend weekly services with their families.²¹ On May 30, 1847, a supplementary Sunday service was introduced in Koenigsberg by Rabbi Joseph Lewin Saalschuetz. After an appeal to the government, apparently by a group of traditional Jews, the rabbi was ordered to discontinue these services.²² A few months later, the prohibition was withdrawn, and Sunday services were once again held.²³ That same year, Solomon Formstecher instituted his Sunday afternoon services in Offenbach.²⁴ Again, opponents tried to stop these services, but they failed in doing so.²⁵ In Pesh, Hungary, a reform congregation was organized in August 1848, holding its services on Sunday under the leadership of Ignaz Einhorn.²⁶ On December 8, 1850, a Sunday afternoon service was instituted in Vienna so that apprentices who could not attend Saturday services could attend on Sunday.²⁷

These congregations had instituted services on Sunday, but their notion of a Sabbath was different than the traditional Jewish concept. It was perhaps even different than the Sabbath of their co-reformers in America. Kaufmann Kohler, a major spokesman for the Sunday-Sabbath movement in America,

recognized this problem:

The German notion of celebrating the Sabbath as a day of mere bodily recreation and social gathering is just as far from serving the higher aims of society. For a day spent entirely in noisy, sensual pleasures, without the ennobling thoughts and elevating influences of the spiritual world working on the mind, is of no real benefit to the people; the least to its lower class, lacking so much the higher impulses of moral action. It leads to excess and endangers society, while the German Sunday, as a day of recreation, requires another day of rest -- a "blue Monday" -- from pleasure and excitement.²⁸

CHAPTER II

INTRODUCTION OF THE SUNDAY SERVICE IN AMERICA 1800-1854

American Jews were vaguely aware of a movement in Europe in the early nineteenth century which advocated the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday. As early as 1824, Mordecai Manuel Noah wrote:

We copy from an English Paper:" The Jewish Sabbath -- Warsaw, December 6 -- The Jewish Rabbis and Elders have met in a general assembly at Platskow and have decided that the celebration of the Sabbath shall be changed to Sunday." The above cannot be true. Considering the Sabbath as a political as well as religious institution, intended not only as a day of rest for man, but humanely for servants and animals, it may not be of much consequence what day is selected. It is an affirmative precept, however, "Six days shalt thou labour, and the seventh day thou shalt rest;" and there is not diversity of opinion throughout the world that Saturday was the Sabbath of the Lord -- the day on which he rested -- the day which is always sanctified by the chosen people. The celebrations of the new moons; the observance of many ceremonials and the computations of time depended upon Saturday being, as it ever has been considered, as the Sabbath day. The Council of Nice, in balloting [sic] for a religion, and changing the Sabbath, give no reason for the measure excepting expediency. The religion in itself has been productive of much good, in enforcing the obligations of morality, and encouraging acts of charity and good will; but

there never appeared to us any reason for altering the Sabbath; and a class of Christians, called seventh day baptists, still keep Saturday instead of Sunday; particularly in Connecticut. These reports must always be received with caution and doubt. That which has existed 5582 years, will not be abandoned at this day.¹

Noah was not alone in his sentiments. Two years after he had expressed his defense of the Jewish Sabbath and his disbelief in the transfer rumor, Samuel Gilman, Unitarian minister of the Second Independent Church in Charleston, wrote:

We have heard it vaguely suggested, besides other things, that the new reformers among the Jews, both in this country and in Europe, have it in contemplation to remove their Sabbath forward one day, so as to make it coincide with the day of rest of the Christians. But nothing of this kind is hinted at in the documents before us² nor does it come from an authentic source of information with which we are acquainted.³

Isaac Leeser, the leading American Jewish preacher of the nineteenth century, remarked on the idea of a Sunday-Sabbath in 1849. Although Leeser's remarks came after the early German rabbinical conferences, these remarks pre-dated the 1854 introduction of Sunday services in Baltimore. Leeser said that although the early Christians were wrong in changing the Sabbath day, they may be excused. However, no Jew was to be excused if he advocated the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday:

There is one excuse for them, -- they are not the children of Israel. . . . But how much more sinful must it be in men who call themselves the sons of Jacob debating about transferring the Sabbath to the first day; and how unreasonable is it for them to institute a public worship on that day for those who, pursuing their business on the Sabbath, prevent themselves and their families from entering the house of God to worship, and to be instructed on that holy rest, which He sanctified by his example, his blessing, and his word. It is painful to speak harshly of our erring brothers but it were sacrilege not to condemn those who violate knowingly the precepts of Heaven, and their endeavor to gloss over the crime by pretending to offer up a sacrifice of prayer and devotion on a day not known to our fathers, not demanded by God.⁴

In 1854, a group of Jews in Baltimore, calling themselves the "Hebrew Reformed Association,"⁵ attempted to institute Sunday services under the guidance of Dr. Morris Wiener, reader and lecturer for the congregation. This group of individuals was in sympathy with the reform movement in Germany,⁶ and in Pesth, Hungary, where Jews had recently introduced Sunday services.⁷ One Sunday morning, "members who came to the service found the Temple closed against them by order of a majority of the Board of Trustees. The members favorable to Sunday services, nothing daunted, rented a hall." After six months, "they gave up their Sunday service and rejoined the parent organization."⁸ This organization would later become Har Sinai Congregation of Baltimore; its members would attempt to reinstitute Sunday services again and again.

When the Hebrew Reform Association in Baltimore discontinued its Sunday services after only six months, the European phase of the Sunday-Sabbath movement in America concluded. Sunday service supporters in Baltimore had said that they introduced Sunday services in sympathy with their European brethren. This was no longer the case. American Sunday-Sabbath advocates were no longer interested in the European Sunday-Sabbath movement.

When the Sunday-Sabbath movement reached America, emancipation was not a major issue. However, advocates of the Sunday-Sabbath provided another reason for the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday. They stressed the factor of economic necessity. Businesses were forced to keep closed on Sunday, and Saturday was one of the busiest and most-profitable days of the week. How could Jews be requested to neglect their fiscal responsibilities to their families? If a Saturday Sabbath could not be kept, however, why not a Sunday-Sabbath?⁹

Isaac M. Wise, organizer of the reform movement in America, among others, answered the question. As a defender of the biblical Sabbath, he wrote strong articles against Sabbath transfer:

Any Jew or body of Jews imitating the Christian custom of Sunday-Sabbath for the sake of accomodation or business purposes, may justify that course on the principle of utility, of worldly advantages, social pleasantries, or national habits; but not on the principles of Judaism or

Jewish history.¹⁰

Perhaps Wise was being overly unfair. Today, we readily condemn those early radical reformers for attempting to transfer the Sabbath for economic reasons, but we are living with a five-day work week. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a six-day work week was the norm. For many, another day off would have been a financial disaster. An attempt was therefore made to transfer the Sabbath, not destroy it.

Jacob Voorsanger, a leading member of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, summarized the problem:

Sunday, aside from every other consideration, is the popular day of rest. All business is suspended on Sunday. Not a single religious consideration that we might present would induce the American people to change its consensus in that matter. Our people are but a small minority. We are barely three percentum of the population of the United States, and though our volume of business may far exceed that percentage, it is not so large in the aggregate that we can venture upon a trial of strength with our neighbors. Business has no soul. The energies of a man in the pursuit of legitimate channels of operation stops at no obstacles except such as are placed in its way by law. Three Jewish citizens of the United States are in full and open competition with ninety-seven citizens of other faiths, or no faith, under this condition; the three Jews are expected to succeed by the exercise of five days of energy in at least the same degree that the others achieve by the exercise of six days. How this can be done I do not know. To my mind it could only result in the systematic, gradual, and ultimate pauperization of the Jew.¹¹

There were other reasons proffered for Sunday services. Rabbis were tired of preaching on Saturday to empty sanctuaries, filled with only a few women and young children.¹² But the Sunday advocates claimed their Sunday services were not a "cheap attempt to appeal to the masses."¹³ Joseph Krauskopf, leading Sunday service advocate, then rabbi at Keneseth Israel in Philadelphia, said:

We publicly declare that Divine Services [on Sunday] have by no means been instituted for the benefit of what certain people are pleased to call "the masses," but they are intended for all, for the learned as much as for the ignorant, for the high as much as for the low, for the busy as much as for the idle, that all have need to have at least once a week their character cleansed, within the church, from debasing weekday defilement, their conscience awakened, their emotions stirred.¹⁴

One segment of these masses was indeed the target of the Sunday movement. Sunday service advocates had one consistent concern: youth. Many supporters of the Sunday movement were afraid that the new generation of American Jews would, in time, reject Judaism. One goal of Sunday services was to ensure that this did not happen.¹⁵

There were Jews who attended church services on Sunday, because Sunday was their only day off from work. Since the synagogues were generally closed, this was their only alternative.¹⁵ An unsigned article appeared in the American Israelite which focused on this particular issue.

If you visit Masonic Hall in this city on a Sunday morning, you will there find a gathering of persons, usually large enough to almost fill it. Among this gathering one notices a number of Jewish faces, and sometimes this number is large enough to form perhaps a tenth part of the congregation. These persons go there -- and some of them hardly miss a service -- to hear Mr. Frothingham preach. . . . Why do these Israelites prefer the eloquence of a Frothingham -- who is not an Israelite -- to the eloquence of an Einhorn, a Gottheil, or a Huebsch? . . . It is because Mr. Frothingham lectures on Sunday, and this enables hard-working Jewish business men to listen to him.¹⁷

The Jews were attending church services on Sundays. Sunday services provided a Jewish alternative for these "church-goers."

There was also one final issue which was crucial for both the advocates and opponents of the Sunday-Sabbath. Opponents to the institution of a Sunday-Sabbath said that the Sunday-Sabbath would lead to the total demise of the Jewish Sabbath, leading to the success of Christianity over Judaism.¹⁸ In other words, the Sunday-Sabbath was the first step toward complete assimilation of the Jew.¹⁹ Advocates, like Joseph Krauskopf, rejected the notion.²⁰ Attendance in many instances had increased in many of the synagogues where Sunday services had been instituted. This was the barometer of success, as well as proof that Sunday services were preventing the assimilation of the Jew, not encouraging it.

CHAPTER III

GROWTH OF THE MOVEMENT 1855-1879

The American phase of the Sunday-Sabbath movement began in 1855 with a great deal of debate and discussion. Discussion apparently began during the Cleveland Rabbinical Conference called by Isaac M. Wise in 1855. Shortly afterwards, David Einhorn, Wise's opponent, wrote a very sarcastic analysis of the Conference in Sinai. He intimated that Wise was prepared to neglect the Sabbath, rather than make the radical transfer from Saturday to Sunday.¹ There was little else written about the Sunday-Sabbath discussion during the Cleveland Conference.

In 1855, Dr. David Einhorn was installed as the rabbi of the Har Sinai Verein in Baltimore. In his inaugural sermon, he hinted at the Sunday-Sabbath controversy, but refrained from making a formal statement in front of his new congregation. After discussing the principles of the Decalogue, a major issue in early American reform, Einhorn stated, "Among these [principles] the Sabbath is included which has symbolic significance only with reference to the selection of the day." For Einhorn, a Sabbath was necessary, but a Saturday Sabbath was not. Debates continued in

synagogues and in newspapers. In the Weekly Gleaner of March 5, 1858, Julius Eckman, formerly rabbi of Congregation Emanu-El in San Francisco, adamantly refused to change the Sabbath to Sunday. Eckman was a moderate reformer. Although he praised David Einhorn as his mentor, his philosophy placed him in the traditional sphere of Judaism.²

Returning to the Decalogue theme, Isaac M. Wise followed the same line of reasoning as had Einhorn, his most bitter opponent. For Wise, the Sabbath represented one of the ten divinely given commandments. In 1859, he wrote in the American Israelite, "Every Israelite knows that the Sunday is no Day of Rest for him."³ Two months later, he added:

No friend of our cause does or ever will countenance a movement like the abrogation of the Biblical Sabbath, and much less, will one give his consent to the observance of the Sunday as a Sabbath, as this is a bare faced and downright hypocrisy and lie. . . . The Sabbath is the sign of the covenant between God and Israel made on Mt. Sinai; whoever abrogates the Sabbath denies the covenant for himself and has no desire to be ours.⁴

In the years following, Wise repeated these sentiments; he spoke increasingly harshly of those individuals who advocated the Sabbath transfer. In 1860, the Occident reported the first attempt to hold Sunday services in America since 1854. Concerning Abraham Cohen of Chicago, invited to be the second spiritual leader of the Scranton Hebrew Congregation (Anshe Chesed), the Occident reported:

It is very gratifying to note the organization of a new religious congregation, in Scranton, under a capable Pastor, although the parties now composing the present organization have for years met and worshipped in a room as a Jewish congregation. With regard to the Pastor we copy the kindly notice of our neighbor of the Republican, and will add that the reverend gentleman purposes [sic] to give, every alternate Sunday, a lecture to the young men of the Jewish faith, who from inability, cannot attend divine worship on Saturday. This (is) a move in the right direction and is highly praiseworthy.⁵

Two important issues must be identified in the Occident's notice concerning the Scranton Hebrew Congregation. First, the main service remained on Saturday. In this way, the occasional Sunday service would not threaten the traditional Sabbath. The congregation did not advocate the transfer of the Sabbath by this action. Second, the salient feature of the Sunday service was to be the lecture. Perhaps the lecture was the only feature of the Sunday service in Scranton at the time. The concept of a Sunday lecture later played a prominent role in the whole Sunday-Sabbath movement and controversy.

Some years later, in 1865, Isaac Loew Chronik of Koenigsburg became the rabbi of Chicago Sinai Congregation. Little is known of Chronik's short stay in America. Apparently, he was not well-received in his new congregation, for he returned to Germany after only six years.⁶ During his tenure as rabbi at Chicago Sinai Congregation, he became one of the earliest reform rabbis in America to advocate the actual replacement of the traditional

Jewish Sabbath by the Sunday-Sabbath.⁷ He paved the way for one of his future successors: Emil G. Hirsch.

An unsigned article from New Orleans appeared in the American Israelite only months prior to the famous Philadelphia Rabbinical Conference in which Chronik and others took part. The author of the article concluded:

We select Sunday because in the fear of God, with reverence for his great name, and eye to His glory, it is more convenient, observed as it is by millions, because it can be hallowed and because it is a practicality, while ours at present arranged, is an utter impossibility.⁸

Since the article was unsigned, a reader made the following request to Isaac M. Wise, editor of the American Israelite:

I must call your attention to the fact that the article in reference to changing the Sabbath to Sunday is generally credited to the Israelite instead of one of your correspondents, and unless an authoritative denial of this is made, it will be generally believed.⁹

In 1869, less than a year after the article appeared, the famous rabbinical conference convened at the home of Dr. Samuel Hirsch in Philadelphia.¹⁰ There was a great deal of discussion concerning the Sabbath, but little was mentioned concerning the Sunday-Sabbath. Only two things were recorded in the minutes of the Conference. Dr. Chronik proposed the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday.¹¹ There was no comment

made on the motion. Instead, the motion was referred to a committee which was ordered to report at the next meeting. This meeting was to have taken place the following year in Cincinnati, but it was never held.¹² Next, Dr. Einhorn made the following motion:

The Rabbinic Conference should earnestly recommend congregations which have not been able to achieve the closure of businesses even during the hours of divine service to introduce a fortnightly Sunday service of strictly week-day character.¹³

Thus, Einhorn opted for an alternative, similar to the one previously proposed by Abraham Cohen of Scranton, as well as the one proposed by Abraham Geiger in Germany. That would allow worshippers to attend a weekday service on Sunday once or twice a month.

At times, critics of the Sunday service caused radicals to retreat. There were, they claimed, alternatives to the Sunday-Sabbath. The actual transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday was unnecessary.

The foremost and most obvious variation of the Sunday-Sabbath was the Sunday service which used a weekday liturgy. It usually featured a full-length English sermon. At times, this service became a central worship service, although it was not called a Sabbath service.¹⁴ In some cases, like in Keneseth Israel in Philadelphia, the central distinction was that it was the only service which featured a sermon in English instead of German.¹⁵

A similar variation was proposed by individuals like Aaron Hahn, then rabbi of Tifereth Israel in Cleveland. Hahn kept Saturday services intact, but introduced Sunday lectures with some worship.¹⁶ Although worship was a part of the Sunday service in this case, it was a very small part.

Others went a step further; they featured only a Sunday lecture in their Sunday morning gathering.¹⁷ These Sunday lectures had three goals. First, the lectures were intended for the exposition and explanation of the nature and scope of modern Judaism. Second, they were supposed to disseminate secular and religious knowledge. Third, they were instituted to encourage religious and intellectual activity among the indifferent.¹⁸ The Sunday lecture was stimulated by Felix Adler, founder of the New York Society for Ethical Culture and organizer of the Sunday lecture movement.¹⁹ Adler lectured every Sunday. His lectures were introduced by a little organ music, but there was absolutely no worship.²⁰ It was probably little different than contemporary Sunday morning gatherings in synagogues featuring noted speakers or discussion groups. Adler was held in disdain primarily because of what his Society for Ethical Culture stood for, not for his Sunday lecture per se.

For some individuals, like William Rosenau, a weekly Sunday lecture, with or without liturgical embellishment, was tantamount to a Sunday-Sabbath. They held that any weekly Sunday lecture or service could potentially destroy the Jewish Sabbath.²¹ Originally, Abraham Geiger, the great German reformer,

promulgated the idea of an occasional Sunday service. To counter critics of a weekly service, some of his American colleagues adopted this practice.²²

In addition to celebrating the Sabbath on Sunday, Berthold Lowenthal, president of the historically radical Chicago Sinai Congregation, delivered his annual message and declared:

The truth of the doctrine that religion is not confined to any particular day or days is settled beyond dispute by this congregation. This being so, I can see no sound reason why, as a matter of convenience, and on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number, our holidays should not be transferred either to the Sunday preceding or succeeding the day fixed by the calendar.²³

This marked an improvement on the Sunday-Sabbath, as well as a variation: the celebration of holidays on the Sunday closest to its fixed date on the calendar.

The Sunday-Sabbath movement in its many variations aroused controversy. It found supporters and critics in all corners of Jewish life. An article from the B'nai B'rith Menorah, a monthly magazine for the home, summarized the whole movement, as well as criticisms leveled against it.

The holding of lectures on Sunday in several of the prominent synagogues or "Temples" as modern fashion (in imitation of heathen custom) prefers to call them, awakens fear on the part of many (probably the great majority of Israelites), that such practice may eventually lead to the substitution of the Christian for the Jewish Sabbath. . . . Sunday lectures are certainly better than Sunday gambling as practiced in

many fashionable Jewish clubs. . . . The Jew, However, who would give up the "Sabbath of the Lord," the day appointed as the Sabbath of his God, would not only become despicable in the eyes of his own people but contemptible in those of Christians.²⁴

Although Isaac M. Wise was included in the Philadelphia Conference, he called his own meeting of rabbis in Cleveland on July 12, 1870. Among the resolutions passed at this meeting, it was resolved that "No Sabbath service shall be tolerated on any other day."²⁵ Thirteen men in attendance signed their names to this resolution, many of whom later figured prominently in the Sunday-Sabbath controversy.²⁶

As organizer of the Reform movement in America, Isaac M. Wise tried to establish a central body of American Judaism. In 1872, initial meetings were held in Cincinnati. Some months prior to these meetings, Wise again voiced his protest against the Sunday-Sabbath movement: "We repeat our solemn protest against any and every attempt to give synagogical sanction to the Pope's Sunday-Sabbath."²⁷ These sentiments were echoed by Moritz Loth, President of Congregation Bene Yeshurun in Cincinnati, at a meeting held on October 10, 1872, in preparation for the establishment of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations:

. . . and it shall be a fixed rule that any Rabbi who, by his preaching or acts, advises . . . to observe our Sabbath on Sunday . . . has forfeited his right to preach before a Jewish congregation, and any congregation employing such a Rabbi shall, for the

time being, be deprived of the honor to be a member of the Union of Congregations.²⁸

The debates continued in Chicago Sinai Congregation,²⁹ where Kaufmann Kohler had replaced Isaac Loew Chronik in 1871.³⁰ Kohler addressed the issue from the pulpit on numerous occasions. In a published abstract of two of the sermons which he delivered in 1873, he suggested that

the Jewish Sabbath is, and was always, considered a day of delight for the body and for the soul, for the heart as well as the mind . . . it brings man's whole being in harmony and union with the divine idea of all that is good and true and beautiful. . . . This is the Jewish Sabbath in its character. Thus, our customs and traditions, we will preserve and propagate even when we shall, in a time not very far off, adopt the Sunday as our Sabbath. We transfer all the blessings, and all the rich seed of moral and spiritual elevation, all our clear remembrances from the old historical Sabbath day to the public Sabbath, which we are in fact already celebrating with our young, with our employees, with our fellow-citizens.³¹

After a series of special meetings in 1873 of the Board of Directors of Chicago Sinai Congregation, the following was resolved:

A motion to address two letters to Dr. Kohler one to ask him to inaugurate a Sunday service, signed by all advocates of the same, and one signed by all the supporters of the biblical Sabbath, to continue a Sabbath service, and pledge for good attendance, also a resolution signed by all the members to assure the Rev. Gentleman our confidence as our spiritual guide.³²

This resolution was a compromise in order to keep both the supporters of the

Sunday-Sabbath and the supporters of the biblical Sabbath as supporters of Chicago Sinai Congregation. Apparently, the Board of Directors was afraid of losing Kaufmann Kohler who had become disillusioned preaching to small numbers of congregants. They considered the Sunday service as a means to provide a greater listening audience for Kohler. Initially, the compromise was unsuitable for Kohler and some of Chicago Sinai's congregants:

1. Resolved, That the Sinai Congregation express its full and implicit trust and confidence in the ability, learning, and devotion to Judaism of the Reverend Doctor Kohler, and its wish to retain his valuable services for the benefit of the young and the old by all means.
2. Resolved, That we consider it the duty of every member of our congregation to attend promptly to public worship on the historical Sabbath, and are willing to preserve it in its proper integrity, but it appears from practical experience that a large number of our members are prevented by circumstances from enjoying the benefits thereof and in order to give them and to the rising generation an opportunity to receive religious instruction weekly, provision shall be made for this purpose as soon as practicable in addition to the present worship.³³

Although it appeared that the Board was attempting to appease both sides, Kohler was not convinced that the compromise would work. However, he accepted the transfer. In a letter to his congregants, he wrote:

I therefore declare myself, without reserve, in favor of Sunday evening lectures, by which our congregation would most assemble, gain many sympathizers and loose [sic] none. Should however the Board of Directors insist upon having the

service held on Sunday-forenoon, I would before carrying it into effect, most humbly and earnestly request to have the signatures of fifty members of our congregation, pledging themselves to attend the Sunday service with their ladies and children for a whole year by any means.³⁴

Kohler, like many of his fellow rabbis, attempted to preserve the traditional Sabbath, but wanted to serve the needs of his congregants. His main concern was the lack of attendance at worship services whether these services took place on Saturday or Sunday. He sought to preach to an overflowing congregation. He favored the Sunday-Sabbath as a remedy to poor attendance at worship services. Once he became an advocate of the Sunday-Sabbath, he supported it unequivocally for many years.³⁵

Obviously, all of Kohler's congregants were not in favor of the Sunday-Sabbath service. In a response to the aforementioned resolutions, fifteen congregants wrote a letter addressed to the president of Chicago Sinai Congregation:

Whilst we do not object to a Sunday service or lecture, we deem it our duty to protest against any measure that may serve to lessen among our members the interest heretofore manifested in the historical Jewish Sabbath.³⁶

The letter came to no avail. On January 15, 1874, the first regular Sunday service of Chicago Sinai Congregation was held in Martin's Hall.³⁷

The institution of the Sunday-Sabbath in Chicago brought immediate reaction from the American Jewish community. Solomon Hirsch Sonnenschein

of St. Louis wrote:

The celebration of the Sunday may yet be preferable. . . .As long as they bring better evidence than the "claims of convenience," we shall not move a hair's-breadth toward the Sunday, and warn our friends not to join a movement that seems to lead to deformation rather than to reformation. . . .Thus, if we perceive it clearly, that the introduction of the Sunday service is not at all a matter of principle, not at all the practical result of a scientific, unbiased analysis, but merely the effect of what we call "accommodation in religion."³⁸

Kaufmann Kohler responded to Sonneschein by way of the Jewish

Times:

In reference to a certain malicious article in the Israelite, misrepresenting me and my congregation before the public, I feel induced to make the following declarations:

1. The introduction of an additional service on Sunday in my congregation is by no means intended to supplant, or to injure, our regular Sabbath service, which is as well attended as before, and as I am informed, a great deal better than for instance that of Dr. Sonneschein of St. Louis.
2. My Sunday lectures prove to be of great service to the holy cause of Judaism in this city, by attracting from all sides a great many people, old and young, and giving the desired opportunity of hearing Jewish religion and history preached and expounded.
3. It is for those who are compelled to neglect the Sabbath service that I maintain the Sunday service to be a substitute, a kind of שבת שני for those who are prevented from keeping the Sabbath.
. . . Finally, it is beneath my dignity to enter into any discussion with a minister who, by his

writings as well as his preachings, does not reflect reflect honor on the Jewish pulpit.³⁹

Kohler's defense was carried by a number of Anglo-Jewish newspapers. A textual debate ensued between Kohler and Sonneschein. It soon ensnared others.

Some members of the Sunday-Sabbath movement refused to advocate a transfer of the Sabbath without finding a legal precedent in Jewish history which would support such an action. As a result, their debates contained some textual references.

The initial text was Num. 9:10-11, concerning Pesach Sheni:

Speak unto the children of Israel, saying: If any man of you or your generations shall be unclean by reason of a dead body, or be on a far off journey, he shall keep the Passover unto the Lord; in the second month on the fourteenth day at dusk they shall keep it; they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.

According to the text, an individual should eat unleavened bread and bitter herbs on the fourteenth day of Iyar instead of the fourteenth day of Nisan.

According to the commentator Rashi, the festival was not celebrated, but the individual ate unleavened and leavened bread during the Pesach Sheni, as long as the two breads were not eaten together.

Although the Sunday men who utilized these verses neglected to take into account Num. 9:13, it is important to mention the verse here.

But the man who is clean, and is not on a journey, and does not keep the Passover, that individual shall be cut off from his people; because he did not bring the offering of the Lord in its appointed season, that man shall bear his sin.

Thus, the additional text explained that there were only two cases which permitted an individual to observe a Pesach Sheni. If these cases were not applicable, then the individual was culpable.

From the Pesach Sheni, the Sunday-Sabbath advocates created a Shabbos Sheni⁴⁰, as it was called. Samuel Holdheim, the radical German reformer, was one of the earliest proponents of the Shabbos Sheni. From him, a number of reformers adapted this analogy to fit their needs.

No less significant than the Sabbath is the highest and most important national festival, the celebration of the Passover sacrifice, and lack of observance was punishable by extirpation from God's community. Because of its purely symbolic significance this celebration is firmly bound to a definite day, the eve of the fourteenth day of the month of Aviv, which is the date of the Exodus from Egypt. Scripture even stresses quite frequently, and with sharp emphasis, the expression b'etsem ha-yom ha-zeh. And even so (according to Numbers ch. 9) this particular festival was changed to the next month for those who, because of impurity or absence, could not observe its celebration at the proper time (vss. 10, 11), while those who were ritually clean, and present must, under punishment of extirpation, observe it at the appointed time. The fact that the obstacle in the celebration of Passover consists in the ritual impurity or physical absence from the congregation, and that as regards the Sabbath, it consists of an uncompromising conflict with civil conditions, makes no difference either in principle or in spirit. The religious purpose

of the Passover festival could be realized through a postponed celebration by those who were prevented from observing it at the given time, just as the religious purpose of the Sabbath can also be realized on some other day. It is a delusion to think or fear that the preservation of Judaism is conditioned by ceremonial externals. Sabbath year and jubilee, which as is well known, are intimately and closely related to the symbolic Sabbath concept, representing indeed, the most widespread expansion and noblest flower of this idea, have not been celebrated for nearly two millenia, and yet the spirit and core of Judaism have not experienced the slightest change because of this deficiency. We wish to save the Sabbath for Judaism and to save Judaism through the Sabbath, even if we have to give up its symbolic framework.⁴¹

Holdheim presented a very clear, concise proposal based on what he considered historical precedent. Opponents to this proposition were not as easily convinced of its efficacy. They felt that the Shabbos Sheni was an abuse of the Pesach Sheni idea.

When the Shabbos Sheni was explained in a sermon given in Louisville, Lewis N. Dembitz responded:

But the Pesach Sheni analogy, on which the speaker relied, will best illustrate the hollowness of the Sabbath-shifting attempt. I do not rely on the mere formed ground, that in the case of the Passover, the Torah itself, which gave the rules, also allowed the exception, and that we can not make such an exception for ourselves.

Nor would I make much of the significant words, that they who can not attend to the Passover in its time, are either "unclean of person" or on a far-off journey, that is, far gone in the faith.

I want to take the matter rationally, and, therefore, I can

object to the analogy from the postponed Passover, only upon the ground of its closing words: "According to all the ordinances of the Passover thou shalt do toward it." Can we keep a Sabbath on Sunday according to all the ordinances of the real Sabbath?⁴²

Solomon H. Sonneschein was not as polite responding to the idea, although he accepted the notion of a Sunday-Sabbath in his later years. In 1874, he wrote a direct response to a sermon which Kaufmann Kohler had given in Chicago proposing a Shabbos Sheni:

Have you ever heard of such a scurrilous idea as that of comparing the Sunday service in a Jewish congregation with the obsolete celebration of פסח שני? Did you ever think, or even dream of it? . . . Every reader of the Biblical passage quoted by Dr. Kohler will notice forthwith that the "Substitute Passover" was intended to be the "exception" and not the "rule." Since Dr. Kohler took the liberty of citing the obsolete "Substitute Passover," we claim the same privilege and call his attention to the thirteenth verse of the same chapter nine in Numbers, only very slightly altering it, having his odd שבת שני in view: "But the man that is pure-minded and not going too far off in his commercial pursuits, and forbears to keep the regular Sabbath, that same person shall be excommunicated from among his people: because he did not sanctify the Sabbath of the Eternal in its appointed season -- that this man shall bear his sin."⁴³

The next favorite textual reference was again based on analogy, which, though not specifically biblical, involved the public reading of Scriptures. Kaufmann Kohler employed this analogy frequently:

Follow the example of our rabbis of yore, who instituted the reading of the Sabbath lesson on Monday and Thursday, then the market days, for the benefit of the villagers who

could not come to town to participate in the Sabbath service, and establish a substitute on Sunday, in order to prevent the people from becoming altogether estranged from Judaism.⁴⁴

Kohler had presented another brilliant analogy, a reform from within the historical context of Judaism. But his opponents were not so easily or readily convinced.

Advocates of this second analogy were reminded that

Monday and Thursday were market days in Palestine. Inhabitants of small villages came into town twice a week. Thus, the ancient rabbis gave these individuals the opportunity to listen to the reading of Torah. But neither Monday nor Thursday were days of rest. On the contrary, they were both days of commerce.⁴⁵

Other textual references, used as prooftexts to either support or oppose the institution of a Sunday-Sabbath, were utilized only to further substantiate positions already taken. I am listing them with a brief explanation.

Deut. 6:7⁴⁶ and Joshua 1:8⁴⁷ were combined to lend support to the institution of a worship service on any day of the week, including Sunday.⁴⁸

It was always legitimate in Judaism to worship on Sunday. However, making a Sunday service a Sabbath, or even a central service, was not within a legitimate Jewish historical framework.

Exod. 31:1-3,⁴⁹ 20:11,⁵⁰ and Deut. 5:15⁵¹ were strung together by William Rosenau, then rabbi of Congregation Oheb Shalom in Baltimore, an opponent of the Sunday-Sabbath. He wanted to defend Reform Judaism while condemning the

institution of a Sunday-Sabbath by radical reformers. He considered the biblical Sabbath as part of Judaism's spiritual life, an important aspect of the early philosophy of reform.⁵²

Sifra to Lev. 19:30 was cited in order to prove that Jews had the right throughout history to make changes, as long as the spiritual idea was not changed in the process. This passage from Sifra "You should not fear the Sabbath, but Him in whose honor the Sabbath was instituted" was linked to Exod. 23:10 in which the Sabbatical year was enjoined upon the Israelites. Jacob Voorsanger, the reform rabbi who utilized these particular texts, noted that the Sabbatical year

was abolished when changed environment made its observance impractical. Similarly, many another institution Judaism has again and again adopted or abandoned or reshaped in harmony with the needs of ever changing times; but itself survives.⁵³

Finally, texts were abused by both advocates and antagonists alike in order to insult their opponents. For example, Isaac M. Wise spoke of Joseph Krauskopf's proposal to hold services on Sunday:

if consummated it would exclude him from the Jewish people as מרמר לזלל שבת⁵⁴.

He reiterated this when he cited Maimonides explanation of the same text.

If one is a Mumar in Sabbath breaking, (i.e., according to the definition of Moses Maimonides, (Teshubah iii, 9) if he by his words or actions declares that the commandment of the Sabbath exists no longer for him) is a Mumar to the whole of Judaism.⁵⁵

Texts were used by some reformers to substantiate their radical reform. Others

felt it was unnecessary to make a conscious break with tradition by basing it on tradition itself. They were prepared to make a revolutionary break with Judaism. These were radical reformers who cared little for the sanction of their actions by Jewish tradition.

Kaufmann Kohler, who skillfully employed texts to substantiate his Sunday-Sabbath position, was still unhappy with attendance at worship services. Sunday services had not proved as successful as he had hoped. Unwilling to admit that the innovation of Sunday services was a failure in Chicago, or that his sermons were unable to attract throngs of listeners, Kohler, on November 27, 1876, delivered a sermon entitled, "Origin of the Sabbath." He told his congregation that he longed for the traditional Sabbath, but accepted the Sunday-Sabbath as the "Jordan of our land of promise." He conceded that the Sunday-Sabbath could only be a substitute for those who could not keep the "genuine day of Jewish worship."⁵⁶ In 1877, he sent a letter to Godfrey Snyder, president of Chicago Sinai Congregation stating that:

The welfare of Sinai Congregation demands speedy deliberation on the measures to be taken for improving the Sabbath service and again bringing it to a tolerable condition. The few regular attendants are constantly getting more discouraged by the disgraceful indifference of the rest, the paralyzing influence of which is felt on the pulpit and even by the choir, so as to make matters worse and worse all the time. In consideration then, I consider it my duty to present this sad state of affairs to you for immediate action (relief) [sic] and to insist on a better attendance of the Sabbath service, too and the presence of at least ten gentlemen

of the Congregation at the commencement of the sermon.⁵⁷

It seems obvious that Kohler's main concern was that no one was present to listen to him preach. He was unsuccessful in drawing crowds to any service. His successor, Emil G. Hirsch, drew large crowds whenever he spoke. The success of the Sunday-Sabbath service, it appears, was dependent on the success of the orator.

Kaufmann Kohler resigned from Chicago Sinai on June 6, 1879, citing lack of attendance as his main reason for leaving. It seems likely that his resignation stemmed from the lack of expected participation in worship after the introduction of Sunday services.

As you are no doubt well aware, it has since years been a matter of constant complaint from the pulpit, and of sad discouragement both to the members of the congregation and to myself, that my persistent efforts and pleadings in behalf of participation in Divine services. . . . I could not help longing for a more promising and fertile field of labors.⁵⁸

Kohler left Chicago in order to go to New York to replace his father-in-law, David Einhorn, as rabbi of Congregation Beth El. Undoubtedly, he was lured by the offer of a large congregation and a lucrative position, but probably would have left Sinai, nonetheless. Kohler was replaced by Emil G. Hirsch. Hirsch, son of Samuel Hirsch, was a radical reformer and an excellent orator. He published widely on biblical, theological, and sociological topics. Sunday services flourished under his leadership; people flocked to hear him preach.

Chicago Sinai was a pioneer in radical reform. Other congregations tended to follow its lead. Many times, the same discussions and arguments that took place at Chicago Sinai were repeated in other cities and congregations. The American Israelite reported that a rabbi in New Haven, Connecticut wrote:

We have instituted Friday evening services⁵⁹ and during the past year I have delivered regular lectures. This would be the strongest argument against the Sunday Sabbath⁶⁰ which is now discussed by some of our extreme rabbis. . . . Let every minister do all in his power to influence his congregation to a better observance of the Sabbath and there will be no necessity for Sunday worship.⁶¹

In New York, the issue surfaced shortly after Congregation Beth El was formed.⁶² Dr. David Einhorn was serving as Beth El's rabbi at the time, and according to an account published in the American Israelite:

Congregation Beth El held its first annual meeting, at which a motion was made that daily services be held. . . . An amendment was offered, moving that instead of these services, the temple be open for divine services on Sunday. The amendment was voted down.

Isaac M. Wise added, "I am informed that Dr. Einhorn strongly favored Sunday services."⁶³ Wise considered this a personal victory for himself since Einhorn opposed him on a large number of issues.⁶⁴

Congregation Beth El was not alone in New York City in its struggle in 1874.⁶⁵ The Emanu-El congregation, another leading reform congregation, began discussing the issue that same year. Emanu-El was planning to introduce a Sunday

weekday service featuring an English sermon instead of the customary German sermon which was preached during the regular Sabbath morning services.⁶⁶

Toward the end of 1874, two congregations in Chicago, K.A.M. (Kehillath Anshe Ma'arav) and Sinai, attempted to merge with one another. Sunday services proved the only stumbling block. Chicago Sinai Congregation appointed a committee to work with the individuals negotiating the merger in order to preserve Sunday services. On October 6, 1874, the congregation voted that the merger should take place only if Sunday services would be guaranteed to Sinai. On November 24, 1874, K.A.M. opposed the Sunday services under all circumstances. The merger never took place.⁶⁷

The orthodox Louis N. Dembitz of Louisville decided to make a statement denouncing the Sunday-Sabbath in 1876. Although Dembitz was initially a supporter of Hebrew Union College, he transferred his allegiance to the Conservative movement when the Hebrew Union College became a decidedly Reform institution. Dembitz wrote:

As long as even a few men, in any city, or even in any country stand by the old flag, and don't bend the knee to Baal Sunday, the Sabbath-shifters can never keep their new-fangled day of rest with any feeling of satisfaction. . . . When you attend the synagogue on Sunday instead of on Saturday, you do it simply because you dislike to lose the Saturday profits of your business.⁶⁸

Later the same year, on May 15, 1876, Felix Adler and some friends developed the idea of a Sunday lecture movement. As noted previously, this

lecture movement later developed into the New York Society for Ethical Culture.⁶⁹

Adler asserted that the choosing of Sunday was intrinsically irrelevant. Since American society had already chosen Sunday, it was selected for convenience. The Sunday meetings featured a lengthy lecture, the most common component of the Sunday-Sabbath movement.⁷⁰ Adler's first Sunday lecture took place on October 15, 1876.⁷¹ Although he indicated that he was not initiating a worship service on Sunday, the main criticism leveled against his movement was a response to his choice of days.⁷²

As an advocate of the biblical Sabbath, Isaac M. Wise saw Adler's movement as part of the Sunday-Sabbath movement. Prior to Adler's first Sunday lecture, Wise wrote in the American Israelite:

Dr. Felix Adler's supporters contemplate engaging Chickering Hall. . . . It seems highly probable that this purpose will be carried out, and next fall Israelites may witness the novel spectacle of Sunday services for Hebrews.⁷³

Later that year, Wise conceded that Adler's Sunday lectures

. . . would consist of a lecture and music, that they would in no way interfere with the Temple or the Synagogue, and that Sunday was chosen because they were intended for the benefit of those who could not attend a place of worship.⁷⁴

In an obvious reaction to Adler's statements concerning the biblical Sabbath, a distraught individual wrote in the Jewish Messenger that the Sabbath should not be rejected because it is inconvenient. Apparently, it was felt that the

Sunday lecture movement was teaching "that breaking the Sabbath was not a sin." The writer added that perhaps we should teach that swindling is not stealing. Since we are doing away with one-tenth of the Decalogue, why not make it two-tenths since many people swindle also?⁷⁵ Adler's Sunday lecture movement was thus associated with the Sunday-Sabbath movement in Reform Judaism, even though Adler himself did not make the connection.

Felix Adler was an example of a successful orator. As "Sylvia" wrote in a very sensitive letter to the Jewish Messenger:

We are an enquiring age -- we look for variety and if any of us drop in on Sundays at Mr. Frothingham's or Dr. Adler's, it is not because we have abjured Judaism, but because we like to be instructed on subjects with which we sympathize. We prefer to listen to all sermons on Saturdays. . . .but do not blame us for figuring among the Sunday audiences.⁷⁶

Sylvia was speaking for the generation which Kaufmann Kohler and others were trying to reach.

Isaac M. Wise brought the controversy back to the editorial pages of the American Israelite in March of 1879:

Mark it, those who say we do not worship with you, because you do so on Saturday, would not worship on Sunday, which is the society day.⁷⁷

At the time, Wise may have been correct, but he was soon proved wrong in Chicago. He nevertheless maintained his vendetta against the Sunday-Sabbath movement. His words were even quoted in the somewhat traditional Jewish Messenger,⁷⁸ which added its own addendum to Wise's words:

We recognize perfectly well that something must be done for Israelites who cannot attend synagogue on our Sabbath. -- Try brain power in the pulpit and common sense in the ritual, and see if these will have more attractive force. Try Sabbath afternoon services for children and parents, as is now the custom at Paris and Brussels. Try union services among the various congregations on Sabbath eve, the ministers preaching in turn. ⁷⁹

For Wise, enough was not said. He attacked more viciously each time. In

May 1879, he wrote:

Those Sunday services have invariably proved a failure, because they are without any religious or historical sanction. The Sunday is peculiarly a Christian holiday, which cannot be converted into a Jewish historical Sabbath -- unless one believes Jesus resurrected on Sunday, the day has no particular significance for him. . . . Therefore, the Sunday-Sabbath will not do for Jews, unless all of them by means unknown to us come to the conviction that Sunday and not Saturday is the Seventh Day of the week. ⁸⁰

The members of Congregation Beth El in New York brought up the issue of Sunday services days before Kaufmann Kohler became Beth El's new spiritual leader. ⁸¹ Almost immediately after his arrival in New York, he began a series of Sunday lectures. ⁸² On December 27, 1879, he delivered a sermon in which he addressed the topic "Sabbath Observance and Sunday Lectures." This sermon marked a crucial point in Kohler's career as a Sunday-Sabbath advocate. For the first time publicly, he admitted that his advocating a Sabbath transfer had been wrong. He lamented that the divine character of the Sabbath could not

be changed to a day which had been instituted by human beings. He frankly admitted "that a Jewish Sunday-Sabbath is for any sober-minded, conscientious advocate of reform out of the question today." Instead, he requested:

In the name of better humanity and Judaism we must have the Jewish Sabbath restored. For it alone offers rest to the body, joy to the heart, and enlightenment to the mind.

But Kohler was still concerned with attendance at worship services. Thus, he advocated the holding of Sunday lectures "every fortnight."⁸³ Having modified his position, Kohler wanted to protect himself from any new-found critics. He wrote:

I wish to state that far from intending to deprive our Sabbath Queen of her sceptre and crown, I merely desire through lectures of mine to spread Jewish knowledge abroad, and thus promote the cause for which every synagogue was built and for which every pew stands a witness and a guardian.⁸⁴

Still in 1879, Dr. Samuel Sale recommended that Friday evening services be held at Har Sinai in Baltimore instead of Sunday morning services. On October 5, 1879, the Board of Trustees adopted this recommendation.⁸⁵ Other congregations were also making strides in the discussion of Sunday services. For example, Congregation Emanu-El in New York, after five years of debate, concluded its discussions concerning the adoption of Sunday services. The Board of Trustees requested that a special meeting should be held so that the congregation could vote on the matter.⁸⁶ The resolution read:

Whereas every true friend of Judaism recognize(s) the fact that every young man, and our members engaged in active business, fail to attend the regular Public Worship on the Jewish Sabbath, compelled as they are to neglect Divine Service from necessity, and by the imperative demands of the vocation which they follow. Without trespassing upon ordained institutions of the Jewish Religion, of which the cardinal pillar is the Jewish Sabbath, it becomes our sacred duty as a Congregation, to provide opportunities for religious instructions, and intellectual communion, on such a day, and at such a time as will bring the public to our house of worship in larger numbers, than is the case at present. We cannot shirk from performing this duty, if our rising generation is not to grow up in total ignorance of our holy mission, and become estranged to religious aspirations. Much of the prevailing indifference and pronounced infidelity is due to the neglect of providing opportunities for religious instructions. There can be no objection upon religious grounds, against religious communion at any time, on any day, and it is in keeping with the tradition, the history and the spirit of the Congregation, to take the lead in any measure, by which the elevation and advance of Judaism can be obtained.

Be it therefore resolved: That a Special Meeting of the Members of this Congregation be called and take place, for the purpose of taking into consideration, and act upon the facts stated in the foregoing Preamble, and for the purpose to inaugurate a Service in the Temple on Sunday, at such hour as may be expedient and proper.⁸⁷

The resolution was tabled indefinitely, a measure applauded by many individuals, including Isaac M. Wise.⁸⁸

CHAPTER IV

RENAISSANCE

1880-1891

The Sunday-Sabbath movement experienced a short-lived renaissance beginning in 1880. Growing anti-Semitism produced two opposite reactions, both of which influenced the Sunday-Sabbath movement. Assimilationists sought to establish more Sunday services in order to "prove" that there was little difference between Jews and non-Jews. They hoped in this way to assuage the anti-Jewish element.¹ On the other hand, anti-assimilationists rejected emancipation by reestablishing their own roots, and eliminating all traces of acculturation, the Sunday-Sabbath included. Some of this interplay is made manifest in the liturgical material which began developing in 1880 for the Sunday-Sabbath, as well as for daily services held on Sunday. One can also see it evidenced in the statements made by those intimately concerned with the Sunday-Sabbath controversy.

Isaac M. Wise began the new year of 1880 with a poignant challenge that focused on the essence of the Sunday-Sabbath controversy: the question of whether or not it was a concession to Christianity. He found all of the arguments which were proffered by Sunday service advocates to be unprincipled, and queried:

What would our anti-Sabbath advocates do if the
Protestants, for the sake of consistency would give

up the Pope's Sunday and, like Jesus and his immediate disciples, observe and keep holy the Sabbath of the Decalogue? What will our anti-Sabbath advocates then advocate?

Wise called the assimilationists to task for their mimicry of Christian practices. Although he was a reformer, he wanted Reform Judaism to stand on its own, a legitimate response to emancipation. He did not attack anyone by name, but Solomon Sonneschein probably best represented the assimilationists he had in mind.

Sonneschein had delivered a sermon in St. Louis which was reprinted in the Jewish Voice. Although the sermon ostensibly dealt with the question of Sunday services, he was using the issue to flirt with the Unitarian Church. He felt that perhaps the Sunday-Sabbath would be the issue which would unite Reform Judaism and Unitarianism. Some radical reformers, like Sonneschein, were allured by the principles of Unitarianism. They saw in the Sunday-Sabbath a potential for unity, one less obstacle between Unitarianism and Reform Judaism. This is the same Solomon Sonneschein who years before accused Kaufmann Kohler of advocating the transfer of the Sabbath as a matter of convenience to the Jew.

There is no way to account for Sonneschein's inconsistency. He just was a peculiar individual who took radical stances on issues unpopular with his colleagues. Nevertheless, his new position illustrated the renewed interest in the Sunday-Sabbath at the time. Others, like Kaufmann Kohler, were modifying their Sunday positions, striving for alternatives which would not be assimilationist

in nature but would serve popular needs.

Consequently, Kaufmann Kohler reinitiated his campaign for Sunday services at Beth El in New York. This time, he proposed to have a divine service every Sunday morning for the pupils of the Religious School.³ He made no attempt to substitute Sabbath services with Sunday services. Nevertheless, Coroner Gerson N. Herman, one of Kohler's congregants, objected to any Sunday gathering, whether the gathering was intended for worship services or lectures.⁴

Another innovation had also been introduced. Temple Ahawath Chesed had introduced Saturday afternoon services. This was a way of making concessions to Jews who could not attend Saturday morning services, without introducing Sunday services. As a sympathizer of Ahawath Chesed wrote in the Jewish Messenger:

If the older members of the Jewish community would pay this service a visit, they would come to the conclusion that they had enjoyed a most pleasant Saturday afternoon. And since its remarkable success has been achieved in a few months only, I think it should be a hint for Dr. Kohler to abandon his almost herculean efforts to institute Sunday services, as he might easily perceive that the Jewish mind, even from childhood, is more inclined to the Sabbath of the Decalogue than the one of fashion.⁵

Each congregation struggled in its own way. Although the innovations were enticing, their execution was difficult. For instance, a resolution was adopted by the Board of Trustees of Keneeth Israel in Philadelphia in 1881 to make

a provision for the innovation of Sunday services. Although the resolution was endorsed by the congregation, Sunday services were not introduced successfully until Joseph Krauskopf became Keneseth Israel's rabbi, replacing Samuel Hirsch.⁶

Not only was the renaissance felt by the congregants, it was also felt by rabbis. The Sunday-Sabbath issue had not been discussed by an organized American rabbinical body since 1869. Now, the issue was real for many rabbis, supporters and opponents alike. The proceedings of the Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference of 1885 noted that a "heated and lengthy discussion took place" concerning Sunday services.⁷ However, only a small amount of discussion was recorded. Dr. Adolph Moses, the noted radical, initiated the discussion. Admitting that he had changed his position from opponent to proponent of Sunday services, he noted that "unless we boldly advocate and strenuously strive to introduce Sunday services, the future of Judaism in this country looks gloomy in the extreme."⁸ He added, "Who dares say that it is sinful to worship God and teach the ways of righteousness on Sunday, or on any other day of the week?"⁹ Emil G. Hirsch, an outspoken advocate of the Sunday-Sabbath added to Moses' statement:

I know Sunday is not the historical Sabbath; I know the history of the Sunday Sabbath. But does all this refute the fact, that Sunday has become the virtual day of rest for most of our people? Deplore this fact as much as you will, the fact stands.

Hirsch pleaded with the Conference to endorse the Sunday-Sabbath movement as

a group. He contended, "I know that a single congregation is powerless to transfer the Sabbath to Sunday. . . . Give the people their Sunday services."¹⁰

Hirsch focused on a crucial point in this controversy: assimilation. He stated frankly,

Are we in Chicago Christians for our Sunday services? The chasm between us Sunday-worshippers and Christianity is as wide, if not wider, than that which separates from the religion of the majority those congregations that make a pretense at keeping the Sabbath of the past.¹¹

Isaac M. Wise was dissatisfied, but he stated unequivocally,

I am not opposed to the idea of a Sunday service where it is a necessity. It is not contrary to Judaism, it means not falling into Christianity, but I cannot recommend Sunday services. . . . Sunday service has been tried, it has failed in many places.¹²

Wise strived for harmony among his colleagues by not denouncing the Sunday service which many favored. He did not want to make a divisive issue out of it at the time.¹³

Following Wise, Solomon H. Sonneschein added:

I never could vote for any resolution that makes the Jewish Sabbath subservient to the Christian Sunday. But I would not hesitate for a moment to introduce Sunday services in my own Jewish community, should a practical and urgent demand for them be made known to me from a respectable source, respectable in numbers and reliable in quality.¹⁴

Sonneschein was concerned with the historical Sabbath, but he did introduce Sunday services later in his career, again showing his inconsistency in thought and practice.¹⁵

Finally, Emil G. Hirsch proposed a resolution. This resolution was unanimously accepted, even by Isaac M. Wise. It read:

Whereas, We recognize the importance of maintaining the historical Sabbath as a bond with our great past and the symbol of the unity of Judaism the world over; and
Whereas, On the other hand, it cannot be denied that there is a vast number of working men and others who, from some cause or other, are not able to attend the service on the sacred day of rest; be it
Resolved, That there is nothing in the spirit of Judaism or its laws to prevent the introduction of Sunday services in localities where the necessity for such services appears, or is felt.¹⁶

Hirsch emphasized the plight of the working men. It was probably a rationalization for his position. Surely, there was not an overwhelming number of working men in his congregation.

The issues were not new. The positions taken at the Pittsburgh Conference were not novel. What is important is that a group of assembled rabbis addressed themselves to the issue.

After returning home from the Conference, Solomon H. Sonneschein wrote a report in his letterbook:

Woe unto the hand that with a desperate effort
throws the destructive brand into the innermost
sanctum of the Traditional Sabbath! On that

point I am now and forever ready to separate from any band of men no matter how much beloved.¹⁷

As part of the Sunday-Sabbath renaissance, groups formed which made the Sunday-Sabbath their cause celebre. For example, Louis Jackson, sponsor of the World's Day of Rest League, wrote in the American Israelite:

. . . human capacity is becoming so great that unless the workmen take measures to preserve a uniform day of rest, they may lose . . . (the) original and humane intent of Mosaism, namely, the guaranteeing to labor a day of rest.¹⁸

To this, Isaac M. Wise responded:

Why should the Jews change their Sabbath day, why not the Christians and the Mohamadans? The Jewish Sabbath rests upon divine authority. . . .the Christian Sunday is for rich people and not for the laboring classes. Go to your Christian neighbors with your reform proposition. They are fast losing their day of rest.¹⁹

Samuel M. Brickner and Louis Wiley began publishing in 1887 the Jewish Tidings in Rochester, New York which slowly made the Sunday-Sabbath its cause celebre also.²⁰ Both Brickner and Wiley were members of Temple Berith Kodesh, whose leader was the radical Max Landsberg.

Later, the Jewish Tidings began to moderate its position concerning the Sunday-Sabbath and began to call only for supplementary services on Sunday.²¹ Apparently, the editors felt that they had failed, but it was the Sunday-Sabbath renaissance which had really failed. Even their own congregation had not yet introduced Sunday services.²² The Jewish Tidings was criticized by the St. Louis

Jewish Voice for its unwillingness to stand its ground.²³

The editors of the Jewish Tidings thought that the opposition to exclusive Sunday services was much greater than the opposition to supplementary services. In order to determine whether their assumption was correct, they requested statements from rabbis and laymen alike.

Among the individuals who responded to the Jewish Tidings' request, as well as agreeing with its new position, were: Louis Marshall, a lawyer and communal leader from Syracuse; David Philipson, rabbi of K.K. Bene Israel in Cincinnati; and Joseph Silverman, a leading reform rabbi from New York. Those who opposed even the moderated position of the Jewish Tidings were Cyrus Adler, a traditional Jew, a scholar from Baltimore; Nathan Barnett, a businessman, public figure, and philanthropist from Paterson, New Jersey; Moses A. Dropsie, an attorney, businessman, philanthropist, and patron of Jewish learning from Philadelphia; Solomon Schindler, a social worker and rabbi at Boston's Congregation Adath Israel (Temple Israel); Aaron David Meldola de Sola, an orthodox Jew and ardent anti-Sunday spokesman from Montreal; and Jacob de Silva Solis-Cohen, a surgeon and pioneer in laryngology from Philadelphia.²⁴

Other periodicals reacted to the symposium and campaign of the Jewish Tidings, claiming that the Tidings had failed. Subsequently, the issue of Sunday services was removed from the Tidings' editorial pages.²⁵

The Sabbath Visitor, a children's magazine, published a letter concerning

the Jewish Tidings' campaign for Sunday services. David Rich of Syracuse

wrote:

Cousins all, I wish to ask your opinion on a question of importance. A Jewish paper in Rochester proposes to hold Sunday services, or in plainer words, that paper proposes to tear down, trample under our feet and thrust down into oblivion the great, antique, and dear principles of Judaism. They propose to substitute Sunday services for Saturday. By doing so we would almost be accepting the doctrines of Christianity as substitutes for Jewish. . . . Cousins all, do you think it is right to tear down and destroy our principles? Is it not folly to meddle with such vital things as Jewish principles? Cousins, I will leave this question for you to decide Judicate cum cura [judge with caution] and I am certain that you will decide there is no occasion for holding services on Sunday.²⁶

Mabel Marks of Cincinnati responded:

Coz David Rich, your letter was grand, and as to the question of Sunday services, I think it is a shame, because if one begins it no doubt but every one will follow them, and so in years to come our religion will be nothing, for now very few people are how they used to be in earlier years. Half do not keep Saturday nor the holidays either, and are not at all particular in what they eat, nor in any way do they pay attention at all to their religion. That plan was tried in this city [at K.K. Bene Israel], but so many were against it that after a few weeks it died out, to the joy of every one. I hope that the Sunday services which are to be held in Rochester will end as they did here, and that no other city shall begin it.²⁷

Two issues later, Sappho, also from Cincinnati, took up the matter again:

Coz Mabel Marks, in your letter you referred to the plan of having temple on Sunday. Yes, I agree with you in saying it is a shame to think that perhaps in the future our dear old "Shabas" will be spoken of as old-

fashioned. It is not only that we feel ashamed of our own Jewish people to want to change our day of rest from Saturday to Sunday, but no doubt some prejudiced Gentiles will think we have come to believe in their faith and have left our own to continue as it please.²⁸

In the following issue, "The Critic" commented on Sappho's letter. After correcting a bit of Sappho's grammar, "The Critic" wrote "I fully agree with you in regard to our Shabbos, the day of God and the Bible, and not the day of Constantine, the day of the Sun -- Sunday."²⁹ Mermaid, from Rochester, New York, agreed:

Coz Mabel Marks, you are laboring under a false impression when you speak of "Sunday services which are to be held in Rochester." If I recollect correctly David Rich said in his letter that the editor of the Jewish Tidings advocated Sunday services. This is true, but he is only one of a large Jewish community, and even though he does not like Saturday services, it is no reason why we do not have them. As far as I know, our congregation has no idea of changing the Sabbath. I for one would not like to see any difference and for some time, at any rate, the Saturday services will continue. When they are changed, I'll tell you.³⁰

Three congregations and their rabbis became focal points during this renaissance phase of the Sunday-Sabbath controversy. The first was Joseph Krauskopf, initially the rabbi of Temple B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City, Missouri. Apparently, the issue was ignited when a gas works explosion prevented adequate lighting for an extended period of time. He was given the opportunity to conduct his Friday evening lectures on Sunday morning.

This would have been an excusable reason for the institution of temporary Sunday services, according to Isaac M. Wise, but Krauskopf refused.³¹

Wise added in the American Israelite, "And still the Jewish anti-Pittsburgh Salvation Army claims that reformers wish to abolish the Jewish Sabbath."³²

Later, Joseph Krauskopf delivered a sermon on "The Jewish Sabbath" in his temple which the Kansas City Journal reprinted. He initiated the address by stating, "Tonight we are to offer the remedy that promises to cure religious apathy in Israel." He too had been affected by the Sunday-Sabbath renaissance. He continued:

Abolish the Saturday, substitute for it the day universally observed as the day of rest, the Sunday, and, as if by the spell of magic, the malady will disappear. . . .The Sabbath transfer is the remedy offered. It is proposed by large numbers of people. The pulpit has ceaselessly favored the Sabbath of the Decalogue. . . .Overpowering arguments speak eloquently and convincingly for the Sunday. The malady is upon us. The religious apathy is appalling. The present Saturday farce is a disgrace, and works greater havoc in our ranks than ever a Sunday observance could possibly do. The question between Saturday or Sunday is the question between the life and death of Israel. Choose.³³

In this dramatic presentation, Krauskopf reversed his position entirely. It is interesting to note that while Krauskopf opposed Kohler when Kohler had advocated the transfer of the Sabbath, now Kohler would oppose Krauskopf's new stance, all a result of the Sunday-Sabbath renaissance. Such ironies cannot really be explained. Each man reacted in his own way to the ever-changing

events of the world. Only eight months prior to this sermon, Krauskopf had told the Kansas City Journal that the Pittsburgh Conference determined "not to do away with the Jewish Sabbath."³⁴

The sermon understandably aroused a great deal of suspicion.³⁵ The Kansas City Evening Star of June 19, 1886 devoted its entire front page to it. Krauskopf said that:

all objections to a Sunday-Sabbath were irrefutable, providing the Saturday Sabbath was kept. But it is folly . . . to speak of Saturday as the cornerstone of the religion of Israel, when, on it, as far as the rest is concerned, our men and women toil as on any of the other working days of the week.³⁶

Isaac M. Wise was bewildered. He wrote:

It is certainly not true that Rabbi Joseph Krauskopf, of Kansas City, as one of the local papers reported, proposed in a sermon to displace the Sabbath of the Decalogue by the Pope's Sunday.³⁷

Krauskopf continued to lead Saturday services for those interested in attending.³⁸ What is unclear is whether the Sunday services actually began in 1886 or not. Whatever the case, Isaac M. Wise was not frustrated; he continued his diatribes.³⁹

Almost at the same time in Cleveland, a new territory was being cultivated for the Sunday-Sabbath controversy. Tifereth Israel's rabbi, Aaron Hahn, introduced Sunday lectures with some worship.⁴⁰ It would be six years before Hahn's successor, Moses Gries, determined to transfer the Sabbath to Sunday, completely abolishing Saturday services. Isaac M. Wise, however,

saw the change coming. In the American Israelite, he wrote:

The opposition is grounded on the fact that those lay sermons are delivered on Sunday, although they are largely attended by young people who cannot or do not attend any divine service. The apprehension is that they will ultimately lead, as in one congregation in Chicago, to the entire suspension of the Sabbath service. We are assured that this will never be the case in Cleveland as long as Dr. Hahn is there. . . . He and they understand that no man can establish a Sunday-Sabbath in the Jewish community. You can desecrate the Sabbath, but you cannot consecrate the Sunday.⁴¹

The third congregation was in St. Louis, where the now infamous Solomon H. Sonneschein was rabbi. A split occurred at Shaare Emeth as a result of Sonneschein's radicalism.⁴² Sonneschein had done a number of things which the congregation disapproved. He had performed a mixed marriage on the first night of Passover.⁴³ He had considered becoming a Unitarian minister, noting that the Jew could "cooperate with the radical Unitarians without changing any of his beliefs or discarding any Jewish doctrine."⁴⁴ Sonneschein's followers formed a new congregation: Temple Israel. Shortly thereafter, Sonneschein introduced Sunday services.⁴⁵ The Constitution of Temple Israel contained a provision which said that Sunday services were to be a prominent feature of the congregation's "common mission."⁴⁶ That common mission was never clearly defined.

Before the renaissance was over, a number of things happened which are significant. Joseph Krauskopf left B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City in order

to replace Samuel Hirsch as rabbi of Keneseth Israel in Philadelphia.⁴⁷ Shortly after Krauskopf's arrival in Philadelphia, he successfully introduced Sunday services.⁴⁸ It has been suggested by his biographer, William W. Blood, that Krauskopf's superior command of English was the reason why his Sunday services were successful at Keneseth Israel.⁴⁹ As a result of Sunday services, some congregants left Keneseth Israel, and local rabbis condemned Krauskopf.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, increasing numbers attended his Sunday services year after year.⁵¹ Eventually, Keneseth Israel became one of the largest reform congregations in the United States.

Some congregations joined Keneseth Israel in its institution of Sunday services, including Adath Israel in Louisville, Kentucky.⁵² Others justified their already existing Sunday services, like Chicago Sinai Congregation.⁵³ Still others were busy denying that their actions were, in fact, Sunday services. An excellent example of one of these denials appeared in the American Hebrew. It took the form of a letter from an individual, calling himself "Z" [Maier Zunder] from New Haven, Connecticut. The writer stated:

There is no truth to the statement that appeared in the New York Times correspondence to the effect that Dr. Kleeberg and his followers have decided to transfer the Sabbath to Sunday. The facts in the case are these: Dr. Kleeberg gives a lecture every four weeks after the close of the Sabbath School, at 11 o'clock AM., for the young people of the congregation. There are but very few, if any, of the congregation who would vote for any such radical change. In fact the matter never came up even in the Board of Trustees,

of which your informant is a member.⁵⁴

The greatest of all effects of the renaissance was on the person of Kaufmann Kohler. In late 1891, he decided to state publicly in an article "The Sabbath Day of the Jew" that he had found sufficient reasons to change his views, hoping to reach a greater number of Jews than he had in his lecture.⁵⁵ In an articulate article in the Menorah, Kohler quoted all of his former arguments supporting the Sunday-Sabbath, but, this time, he critically destroyed the foundations of his own reasoning. He rejected even Sunday lectures. This article represented the final and complete reversal of Kohler's position on the Sunday-Sabbath. He wrote:

Will the Sunday, with its colorless cosmopolitanism, with its forms of devotion void of the positive Jewish character, awaken the dormant spark of religious fervor, arouse the much-needed self-respect in the Jew, and imbue him with heroic valor in defense of his own sacred heir-loom? If I am allowed to judge by my own experience, I venture to say that there is something in the very air of the Sunday service that chills the heart. . . .The principles of Jewish faith have nowhere taken a deeper hold on Sunday audiences.⁵⁶

Kohler admitted that his position had changed. He justified the change by citing the renewal of anti-Jewish feelings in the world. "It is the changed attitude of the world towards the Jew and the principles he represents."⁵⁷ Kohler ended with a new plea "Our duty today is to maintain our Jewish identity, and to preserve our Jewish institutions without faltering, without yielding. We must, with limited forces, rally around our sacred Sabbath."⁵⁸

He concluded:

In the issue between the Christian and Jewish Sabbath, there is no choice left for the Jew loyal to his past, but to protest against the doctrine that Christianity stands for the redemption of the human race. All that we know from our experience of nineteen centuries, is that the name of the Jewish Messiah has served to slander and abuse the race that gave the Church her saviour. Our faith, our hope, therefore, must be bound up with the sign of the old covenant, the Sabbath, until history will put a seal of perfection upon the completed work of mankind, and proclaim the earth as the holy mountain of God and man as its king, the vicegerent of the Ruler on high. Which Sabbath will then obtain the victory? Which ring will then prove to be the genuine one? We leave that to God to decide, and in the meantime, we wait and hope.⁵⁹

Kohler's complete reversal marked the end of phase two. The movement had progressed, and congregations were instituting Sunday services. Kohler's new position foreshadowed the fate of the movement in the years ahead.

CHAPTER V

MATURATION

1891-1899

Kaufmann Kohler's new position marked the beginning of the third phase of the Sunday-Sabbath movement in America, a phase during which the Sunday-Sabbath matured. It was the phase which foreshadowed the future tensions of the movement. Advocates and opponents responded to world events in various ways. The forces of anti-Judaism had turned the tables. Jews in Europe were in trouble. The messianic vision of the early reformers was destroyed. Jews were being systematically excluded from everything in Rumania. The blood libel was renewed in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Even in Vienna, the infamous anti-Semite, Karl Lueger, was elected mayor on a blatantly anti-Jewish platform. Against this background, Kaufmann Kohler, former outspoken advocate of the Sunday-Sabbath, became a committed advocate for the traditional Jewish Sabbath. The editors of the American Hebrew applauded Kohler.¹ This traditional newspaper had previously condemned the Sunday-Sabbath movement. It viewed Kohler's new position as a victory for itself and other defenders of the biblical Sabbath.²

Kohler defended his new position in an article, "Rocks Ahead," written for Menorah. He admitted that he had in the past heartily favored the idea of a

transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday, on the basis that there was nothing wrong with holding a worship service on that day. However, citing Abraham Geiger as his mentor, he now reiterated the claim that Sunday services would eventually destroy the Sabbath. He decided to shield the Sabbath and accordingly, changed his views. Kohler was prepared for new attacks, but promised to stand his ground.³

Kaufmann Kohler was criticized by many people and newspapers. The greatest criticisms came from his former supporters; they felt that their leader had disowned them. In a bitter article in Menorah, Eugene Cohn wrote "The Sabbath Day of the Jew: An Answer to the Rev. Dr. Kohler." Cohn mentioned that Kohler had neglected to evaluate the original conditions cited in the institution of Sunday services, and lamented that the "ship of Sabbath Reform has been abandoned by its captain."⁴ But Cohn stated that he would remain faithful to the ship, nonetheless.

Following Kohler's change of attitude, Isaac M. Wise felt that it was time to reiterate his well-known position in the pages of the American Israelite. He seized the opportunity to advocate his Friday evening services.⁵ Kohler had suggested Friday evening services for Congregation Beth El instead of Sunday services, although he was doubtful about the innovation.⁶ David Philipson lambasted Wise in his personal diary. He did not appreciate Wise placing his own congregation, Bene Yeshurun, on a plateau above

Philipson's Bene Israel, in order to stress Friday evening services. Concerning Wise's Friday evening lectures, Philipson wrote:

They have not been a success in his own Temple, he never has more than a corporal's guard and yet today in the Israelite, he goes into hysterics about Sunday Lectures, warns the people not to have anything to do with the innovation, bids them take care of Friday evening lectures. . . . Not a word of truth in the whole business, but it is quite in the Israelite's usual style, whitewashing, boasting of Cincinnati, B'ne Jeshurun and everything with which the editor of the Israelite has anything to do.⁷

Although Kohler had changed his position and Sunday service advocates had lost a leader, congregations still discussed the issue with a great deal of fervor. This prompted newspapers, like Hazefirah, to conduct local opinion surveys.⁸

The success of the Sunday service was being questioned and re-evaluated. It was obvious that crowds were flocking to hear mighty orators such as Felix Adler, Emil G. Hirsch, and Joseph Krauskopf. But how many of those in attendance at Sunday services were non-Jews? In Tifereth Israel in Cleveland, for example, the president of the congregation admitted that the greater portion of the individuals in attendance were non-Jews, as well as non-members.⁹

By 1895, the Sunday-Sabbath controversy had reached inside the formal walls of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Emil G. Hirsch made a statement about the Sunday-Sabbath in a presentation which he entitled, "The Philosophy of the Reform Movement in American Judaism":

We, the radicals indeed, in making the day generally observed by choice and law by our neighbors in this land of the free, as their day of rest, also ours, do not disguise the fact that originally the Sunday was the symbol of ideas antagonistic and antithetical to those which Judaism distinctly entertains. And still with all this and perhaps all the more on account of the difficulty, we would give this, our de facto day of rest, a Jewish character and celebrate it with true Jewish fervor.¹⁰

Hirsch had not changed his message. Seldom before, however, had he admitted that Sunday was actually antagonistic and antithetical to Judaism. Usually he felt that he had to defend the Sunday-Sabbath, not only as not a negative reform, but as a positive one:

The Sunday service has in our experience, in Chicago, been a most potent partner in this campaign of education. My colleague, so earnest and so gifted, our Rabbi Stolz, as well as I, have spoken regularly on Sunday to hundreds of non-Jews. Is this slight service on behalf of positive Judaism?¹¹

Obviously, all of the members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis were not as enamored by Sunday services as were Emil G. Hirsch and Joseph Stolz. At the 1896 convention, Israel Aaron initially spoke against Sunday services. He agreed to them if, and only if, there were no alternatives.

Some congregations declare that they have more virile manifestations of Judaism now that they meet on Sunday. However that may be, there will be small profit in perpetuating the present feeble compromise between lofty ideals and doctrines and real facts of Israel's life. We should not, for instance, acquiesce in the existence of an emaciated Sabbath

and a dissipated Sunday. The manly course is to decide upon a sturdy, heroic, self-sacrificing policy, marking toward a re-sanctification of Saturday, or obeying circumstances we seem unable to control, seek to invest Sunday with the spirit of the Jewish Sabbath.¹²

By 1902, the Central Conference of American Rabbis devoted a large part of its annual convention in New Orleans to the "Sabbath Question." The thirty-three members of the Conference in attendance discussed Sabbath reform in toto, including the Sunday-Sabbath. The issues had not changed. Jacob Voorsanger presented a major paper, and his colleagues responded to it. He declared:

The spirit of the American Sunday is more rigid, more intolerant, more exacting than the biblical Sabbath. . . . We are not ready to confess that the future has nothing in store for our Sabbath but an assimilation with the National day of rest.¹³

Jacob S. Raisin noted that:

the conclusion [of Voorsanger's paper] is self-evident. Since the Saturday Sabbath can no longer be maintained, let us substitute a Sunday Sabbath in its stead. Let us transfer the day of rest to the day of rest, and then everything will be all right again. Shift it but to the day following it, the day recognized by the State, and by the majority of our citizens, as the official day wherein all toil and labor must cease, and its glory will be renewed as of old, and Israel will be once more blessed with the sanctity and consecration of Sabbath rest.¹⁴

Raisin had been speaking facetiously. He really considered the transfer of Saturday to Sunday impossible.¹⁵ He did not oppose Sunday services; however,

he concluded his appeal for the maintenance of the traditional Sabbath by declaring: "Let us decide unconditionally to preserve and perpetuate this great day of peace and rest to the soul for the glory of the God of Israel and mankind."¹⁶

Isidore Lewinthal agreed with Raisin. He contended: "The Sunday Sabbath can never become a holy day and I hope that the backbone of our Sabbath will still remain firm and unbroken. If we respect ourselves, all that need be done is to keep the Sabbath day holy."¹⁷ Lewinthal objected to Sunday services, because they would lead to the suspension of Sabbath services. For Lewinthal, mere attendance at public worship was not the same as Sabbath observance.¹⁸

Hyman G. Enelow disagreed with the positions taken by both Raisin and Lewinthal. He believed that Saturday was called the Sabbath, but was no day of rest. And Sunday, the real day of rest, was no Sabbath. He asked the convention body: "Shall we have an official worship without the day of rest, or shall we have the day of rest with worship?"¹⁹ Enelow favored Sunday services. Louis Wolsey agreed with him. Wolsey preferred to retain the Saturday Sabbath, but found nothing for him to retain. He summarized his own position by stating:

If Sabbath means rest, let us have that Sabbath on Sunday for that is the only day when modern business conditions will allow a rest. Secondly, if you wish to be logical in your Judaism; if you wish to consult your reason in so far as the whole progressive tendency of this Conference is vested

in its being logical -- you must, you should accept the Sunday Sabbath.²⁰

Henry Cohen tried to establish a compromise. He saw no harm in Sunday services or lectures, but refused to make the actual transfer of the Sabbath. For Cohen, "a Sunday for a hundred reasons would never be to us a Sabbath, such as Saturday is."²¹

Joseph Krauskopf, well-known for his position in the Sunday-Sabbath movement, declared that the Sunday service had strengthened the attendance at Keneseth Israel's Saturday service. At Keneseth Israel, the Sunday service had become a supplementary service, regardless of how it had been instituted. Krauskopf was a successful Sunday service man "and proud to be one."²²

Although Tobias Schanfarber had made his pro-Sunday position known on several occasions, he emphasized one point this time: "A supplementary Sunday service may open the way toward bringing our thought to the non-Jew."²³ To many of his listeners, this was not a good reason for implementing Sunday services.

A few of the statements made by the rabbis present at the 1902 Central Conference of American Rabbis Convention were short and straightforward. For example, Adolph Guttmacher said that when holiday services fell on Sunday, the temples were crowded. But he declared, "Let the Jew identify himself with the best thought of the age; let no Jew, instead of being a follower, become a leader."²⁴ Joseph Herz, on the other hand, did not advocate a Sunday service,

but he was unaware of any practical proposition to rehabilitate the Sabbath.²⁵ And Gotthard Deutsch simply stated that "the idea of Sunday must neither be advocated nor refuted, because it is the Christian Sabbath."²⁶

Only Joseph Silverman proposed an extended Sabbath, a novel idea. For him, Sabbath at Temple Emanu-El began on Friday at sunset and concluded after services on Sunday morning. For Silverman, this was a legitimate reform within a traditional framework. This way, Sabbath was celebrated at its proper time, and Jews who could not attend services on Friday evening or Saturday morning were able to do so on Sunday morning. Traditionally, Jews were allowed to extend the celebration of the Sabbath until the third day of the week: Tuesday.²⁷

Jacob Voorsanger concluded the discussion. He contended that his paper was misunderstood. He was not an advocate of the Sunday-Sabbath, but felt that the advocates were free to make their own choices. His intention was merely to raise the "Sabbath Question" so that the members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis could discuss it as they did.²⁸ Voorsanger delineated seven things which were to be considered by another special committee. Only two of these considerations concerned the Sunday-Sabbath question.

This conference should define as a matter of information to the people the difference between a mere Sunday service and the endowment of Sunday with the characteristics and significance of Israel's historical Sabbath.

This conference should inquire whether the institution of Sunday Sabbath is or is not inconsistent with the historical and theological principles underlying the

same, and whether or not such an institution would not be productive of schismatic action, by which its advocates would expose themselves to the possibility of creating a new sect in the midst of the Jewish people.²⁹

The committee which the Central Conference of American Rabbis appointed was to report on these two questions during its annual meeting the following year.

During the annual meeting in 1902 of the Federation of Zionists, the Central Conference of American Rabbis' discussion concerning the Sabbath was mentioned. Indicative of the anti-assimilationist standpoint of Zionism, it was vigorously denounced by the whole convention body.³⁰

In 1903, the Central Conference of American Rabbis met in Detroit for its annual convention. The report of the Commission on the Sabbath Question was presented by Jacob Voorsanger. This time, the discussion was more voluminous than it had been the previous year. The commission was made up of Gotthard Deutsch of Cincinnati, Hyman Enelow of Louisville, Leon Harrison of St. Louis, Max Heller of New Orleans, Samuel Sale of St. Louis, Solomon H. Sonneschein of Des Moines, and Jacob Voorsanger of San Francisco.³⁴ Voorsanger presented his position, then he allowed each member of the commission to address one of the considerations which the commission had been ordered to discuss. Acknowledging the limited powers of authority of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Voorsanger noted that he did not want to discuss why a Sabbath was better than the Sabbath. He knew that the "historical consistency and the ethnological and metaphysical considerations entering in Sunday, should

imbue us with the virtuous desire of maintaining our historical ground."³²

The Sabbath commission presented nothing new. Its task was to present the current situation to the members of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and with a great deal of textual support, it accomplished this. Only one decision was made:

The common unanimous reply to point number two, that Sunday services are not only commendable but must be considered as in strict accord with all Jewish precedent. Judaism regards both public worship and instruction on every day of the week as necessary to the religious discipline of our people.³³

Not surprisingly, a great deal of discussion followed.

Solomon H. Sonneschein, a member of the commission, voiced the concern that the institution of a Sunday-Sabbath would lead to a terrible schism.³⁴ Apparently, he was referring to a possible division in the ranks of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Reform movement. In 1903, no definite schism was observed. Following Sonneschein, there was a great deal of issue avoidance accomplished through the guise of parliamentary procedure. It was obvious that the Central Conference of American Rabbis was afraid to take a stand. The members agreed that one rabbi or body of rabbis could not institute such a change. They were interested in the whole problem of Sabbath observance, not just the question of a Sunday-Sabbath.³⁵ But throughout the discussion, the Sunday-Sabbath kept returning. Rabbis like William Rosenau, whose views were then well-known, objected to the Sunday service: "I object

to the Sunday service because I consider the Sabbath a symbol and not simply an idea."³⁶ He was interrupted by a request to return to the Sabbath question. In the end, no decisions were reached.³⁷

At the Central Conference of American Rabbis convention in 1904, a discussion ensued which repeated earlier discussions. However, this time, a resolution was made:³⁸

We recommend the principle expressed in the resolution adopted at the Pittsburgh Conference, November 1885, presenting it in the following form:

Whereas, We recognize the importance of maintaining the historical Sabbath as a bond with our great past and a symbol of the unity of Israel and the world over; and

Whereas, On the other hand, it cannot be denied that there is a very large number of Jews, who, owing to economic and industrial conditions, are not able to attend services on our sacred day of rest; be it

Resolved, That in the judgment of this Conference there is nothing in the spirit of Judaism to prevent the holding of Divine service on Sunday or any other week day wherever the necessity of such services is felt.³⁹

In 1905, the Central Conference of American Rabbis decided to accept a new task: preparing a uniform ritual for Sunday services.⁴⁰ In addition, a separate committee was appointed to study the influence of the Sunday service in Jewish congregations in Europe and in America. But the Central Conference of American Rabbis was afraid to sanction the publishing of a ritual for Sunday services, especially for only thirteen congregations.⁴¹

The committee which was appointed to study the influence of Sunday services was ordered to report at the next convention. Its task was to determine:

the results attained by the additional Sunday service, of a week-day nature, as to the influence it has exercised on the Saturday Sabbath observance, as to the influence on the congregation in the way of developing deeper religious feeling and greater enthusiasm for our sacred cause.⁴²

Although many people had doubts concerning the future of Sunday services, some people were convinced that Sunday services had become a permanent feature of American Reform Judaism. For example, David Marx of the Hebrew Benevolent Congregation in Atlanta wrote to his colleague in Detroit, Leo M. Franklin:

My year has been successful and I believe that the Sunday Services South have come to stay. It was pioneer work in a section of the country inclined mightily to conservatism under the shadow of the conservative christian churches and in the face of great obstacles in the congregation. But the deed is done and I have not lost a single member thereby.⁴³

At the 1906 Central Conference of American Rabbis convention in Indianapolis, Hyman Enelow read his committee's report: "The Influence of the Sunday Service."⁴⁴ Chicago Sinai was used as the prototypic example of the influence Sunday services had had on a congregation. Chicago Sinai had instituted Sunday services as supplementary services and later abrogated Saturday services altogether.⁴⁵ But after a lengthy description, the committee

refrained from any categorical assertions, listing the following reasons:

- (1) The general difficulty of calculating influences, particularly those of religious movements.
- (2) The brevity of time that the service has existed.
- (3) The strife which attended the birth of the institution, and which has not yet been forgotten.
- (4) The different interpretations of the character and purpose of the Sunday service, and its fateful relation to the Sabbath question.
- (5) The inadequate number of congregations having introduced it.⁴⁶

Thus, twenty-two rabbis who were known to be associated with the Sunday-Sabbath movement were asked a series of questions by the Central Conference of American Rabbis committee:

1. Do they think they do any good?
2. a) Do they help the Jew?
b) Do they help the non-Jew?
3. Do they help or hurt?
a) The Sabbath idea and practice.
b) The observance of the Saturday Sabbath.
4. Has your attendance at the Sunday services been increasing or decreasing?
5. Would you urge the introduction of Sunday services in congregations where they do not now exist?⁴⁷

Although none of the answers to these questions were new, a few insights can be drawn. Leo M. Franklin said that "Practically all the communal work inspired from the pulpit is done by those who come on Sunday."⁴⁸ Joseph Stolz noted that "the daily newspaper reports the Sunday sermon, rarely the Saturday sermon."⁴⁹ Moses Gries remarked: "They [Sunday services] offer an opportunity for the non-Jews who have outgrown the ordinary Christian Church

to find a place of worship."⁵⁰ Kaufmann Kohler candidly said: "The average people want lectures by powerful orators but care little for the service. Hence, when the novelty is worn off the Sunday attendance decreases in most cases."⁵¹

Samuel Hirshberg of Milwaukee added:

The Sunday service, wherever it has been a success -- and it has been a failure in quite as many places as it has been a success, I think investigation will show -- has been purely individual success of the Rabbi, gifted in a more than capable degree with the power to attract people.⁵²

The committee submitted the following conclusions:

1. The Sunday service is found to be helpful to the maintenance and the cultivation of the religious spirit among the people, particularly the men and the young people.
2. In view of the non-attendance of the people in general on Saturday, the Sunday service affords a weekly opportunity for worship, apart altogether from the question of Sabbath observance.
3. The Sunday service brings the congregation, especially the male portion thereof, under the more direct and more constant influence of the pulpit, which often leads to a more energetic communal and congregational activity.
4. The Sunday service, in almost every instance, is attended by a considerable number of non-Jews, who in that way are given enlightenment on Jews and Judaism, and are afforded an opportunity for possessing themselves of our conception of religion.
5. It remains to be added that in response to the question: Would you urge the introduction of Sunday services in congregations where they do not exist? All seem agreed that the introduction of Sunday services, as supplementary services, is a question that should be determined in each instance by local condition.⁵³

The committee report appeared favorable, unsurprisingly, since members of the committee were already advocates of the movement. Some of the Central Conference of American Rabbis members thus felt a certain disclaimer was necessary. Joseph Jasin of Ft. Worth and Harry W. Ettelson of Ft. Wayne proposed the following resolution:

Be It Resolved by the Conference, That in receiving the report of the Committee on Sunday Service for publication in the Yearbook, the Conference in no way commits itself either for or against the report as a whole or for or against any single recommendation contained therein, except where such a recommendation is specifically taken up for discussion by the Conference and voted upon.⁵⁴

In 1907, the discussion in the Central Conference of American Rabbis centered around a special liturgy for the Sunday service congregations.⁵⁵ A special committee had been appointed which produced two-thousand copies of an offprint of weekday services from the Union Prayer Book.⁵⁶ A few more congregations and rabbis were added to the list of congregations interested in this new liturgical material. The Central Conference of American Rabbis, however, decided not to call this collection of services a Sunday service prayerbook. Instead, it was called a Prayerbook for Weekday Services. In this way, no one would be able to accuse the Central Conference of American Rabbis of advocating Sunday services.⁵⁷

Just as these congregational rabbis were discussing the Sunday problem in their professional meetings, they were also discussing them with lay members

of their congregations. In Cleveland, at Tifereth Israel, Sunday services were not doing well. Few members were attending, though attendance was ostensibly the raison d'etre for instituting Sunday services in the first place. A committee was delegated to discourage members who were merchants from going to work on Sunday. They were urged to attend services with their families instead.⁵⁸ Perhaps Isaac M. Wise was correct when he said that those who would not worship on Saturday would not do so on Sunday either.

Sunday services drew larger crowds in other cities. The Reform Advocate, a competitor of the American Israelite, reprinted a sermon which had been preached by Rabbi Tobias Schanfarber of Har Sinai Temple in Baltimore. He had returned from joining Keneseth Israel Congregation in its celebration of the conclusion of ten years of Sunday services.⁵⁹ Har Sinai was then finishing its ninth year of Sunday services. Yet, Schanfarber felt the need to question the validity of Sunday services. "What does Judaism owe to the rising generation?"⁶⁰ His answer was Sunday services. But Schanfarber lamented: "The cry is back to the old, and they have been encouraged in this because two congregations that have been holding Sunday services have discontinued them."⁶¹ He continued:

But for the two that have discontinued these services, there have been three that have started them: one in Louisville, one in Pittsburgh, and another in Rochester; so that today in twelve congregations in this country Sunday services are being held, and they will continue to be held; and they will

continue to grow. It is bound to come. Either this or no Judaism at all.⁶²

Schanfarber appeared to be verbalizing his own doubts. Some congregations had discontinued Sunday services. Others had started them.⁶³ But Schanfarber incorrectly predicted future success.

The same day that the Reform Advocate published the sermon delivered by Schanfarber, William Rosenau, a local colleague of Schanfarber, delivered a sermon on "The Sabbath Question" before Congregation Oheb Shalom in Baltimore, Maryland. In this long, detailed, and well-developed speech, Rosenau meticulously refuted the arguments posed by Sunday-Sabbath advocates. Then he made three basic points. First, he claims that there was nothing wrong in worshipping on Sunday. The Sunday-Sabbath, however, would encourage greater neglect for Saturday. Second, he rejected all reasons for the institution of the Sunday-Sabbath, especially the one which suggested that Sunday services broadened the mission of Reform Judaism. Third, he claimed that the Jewish Sabbath must be kept, because it was the historical Jewish Sabbath -- a mark of Jewish distinction. Jews should not lose their self-respect at the slightest provocation of the non-Jewish world. Rosenau conceded that the Sunday service might gradually find its way into the synagogue. If it happened, according to him, then it was time to sound the death-knell for Judaism.⁶⁴

The student rabbis at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati did not agree with some of their future colleagues in the Central Conference of American

Rabbis. A student wrote:

One of the first and most destructive of these modern iconoclasts was the Sunday service movement. Led on by the illusion that the presence of one hundred and fifty souls, of the don't-care, indifferent stripe, at the Sunday service, is more desirable than the attendance of one hundred conscientious worshippers of God on Saturday, they took the bold, destructive leap which has proved fatal to pure Judaism, and has caused such genuine ravages in our ranks.⁶⁵

Another rabbi, Moses Gries of Tifereth Israel in Cleveland, had advocated the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday. Gries was among the men of whom the student wrote. A frantic congregant wrote to the American Israelite, requesting an opinion from Isaac M. Wise:

There is considerable excitement among our people in Cleveland. Some want to transfer the Jewish Sabbath to the Christian Sunday and your readers would like to know what you think about it.⁶⁶

Wise responded with probably the best quotation culled from the annals of the Sunday-Sabbath movement.

It was the proposition of a Rabbi made solemnly in his Sunday Lecture, discussed in the pulpit, and the Rabbi is a graduate of the Hebrew Union College -- we considered it a duty to say something about it, not in behalf of the Israelite, but in behalf of the Hebrew Union College, whose opinions on the subject are not so well known as those of the Israelite. In behalf of the College, whose spokesman we claim to be, we declare that any Rabbi, being licensed by said College, who proposes to change the Sabbath to Sunday, does it on his own responsibility, he has not learned it in the College, it is not written in his diploma, he was not given this privilege, he speaks and teaches independent of the College and its teachings, for which the

College disclaims all responsibility. . . . We have to make the same declaration in behalf of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, as that body never discussed the Sabbath question, never voted upon it.⁶⁷

A correspondent for Hamagid L'Israel was puzzled by Wise's consistent, traditional stance concerning the Sabbath as illustrated by this quotation. Apparently, he felt that a defender of the traditional Sabbath should also be a Zionist. Since Wise was an anti-Zionist, the correspondent could not understand why he defended the biblical Sabbath. For the writer, Wise's philosophy was inconsistent since Zion and the Sabbath represented traditional Judaism.⁶⁸ Wise continued his attack against the Sunday-Sabbath movement.

Isaac M. Wise was particularly angry because of the recent developments in Cleveland.⁶⁹ Since Wise was Moses Gries' former mentor, he felt former anti-Sunday statements were insufficient. More had to be said. He told the people that he did not take the developments in Cleveland seriously. He wrote:

The little ripple caused by a Cleveland rabbi advocating the substitution of the Sunday for the Saturday Sabbath received no serious consideration, not even from his own congregation. . . . Saturday services have been abandoned in only one congregation in the United States, Sinai of Chicago, and this was not done as a change of the Sabbath day, but because Rabbi Dr. Emil G. Hirsch objected to preaching on Saturday morning to a congregation composed of women. The Doctor, in a recent sermon in New York, stated most positively that in spite of the abrogation of the Saturday service his congregation

in no wise regarded Sunday as the Sabbath. This is up to date the full extent of the movement.⁷⁰

Although Wise probably wanted to believe what he had written, he was wrong. Chicago Sinai Congregation had abandoned Saturday services, as well as having substituted those services with Sunday-Sabbath services. Apparently, Emil G. Hirsch was in favor of the transfer, having advocated it on numerous occasions. In addition, Lloyd Gartner claimed that Tifereth Israel, Moses Gries' congregation, had also abandoned Saturday services in 1898 through a lack of attendance, rather than through a formal resolution.⁷¹ The abandonment of Saturday services was an important issue. It was a step beyond Sunday services. It suggested that the Sunday-Sabbath had succeeded in supplanting the Saturday Sabbath.

Chicago Sinai Congregation and Tifereth Israel were not alone in their abolition of Saturday services. William Goldstein, president of Shaare Emeth of St. Louis, during Samuel Sale's ministry, advocated in his annual report that:

We should, as loyal Americans and as components of this civilization, prize and utilize this day [Sunday] as one of the most precious institutions of our time and country and employ it sacredly in religious worship, in social intercourse, and in intellectual improvement.⁷²

Goldstein wanted to go beyond a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath to Sunday. He wanted to make the Jewish Sunday-Sabbath an American Sabbath. The duty of citizenship was referred to constantly by advocates of the Sunday service. For

certain advocates, this was the primary reason for maintaining Sunday services.⁷³

For Isaac M. Wise, the argument of citizenship was not convincing. Wise responded to Mr. Goldstein's report:

What we want to do is point out the absurdity of the assumption that a man's preference for a particular day of worship has anything whatever to do with his loyal citizenship, more especially as the national constitution is entirely silent on the subject and recognizes no special religion or sacred duty.⁷⁴

The final and major event of this period of maturation took place toward the end of 1898. Chicago Sinai Congregation was preparing to celebrate the twenty-fifth year anniversary since Sunday services had been instituted.⁷⁵ Thus, on January 15, 1899, the Jewish world watched a radical reform congregation celebrate twenty-five years of an innovation which many people thought would never work. Still more thought that Sunday services would die out in Chicago soon after they were instituted. In honor of the celebration, the Congregation published a Report of the Services of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Introduction of Sunday Services in Chicago Sinai Congregation. This one-hundred page published document represented the largest, most-comprehensive single document of the Sunday-Sabbath movement in American Judaism. In addition, Jewish and secular newspapers, like the Jewish Comment, the Jewish Exponent and Unity recorded the historical event. Furthermore, the celebration was recorded in journals throughout the world, such as the London Jewish Chronicle and the London Jewish World. Some liberal newspapers

like Emanu-El in San Francisco applauded the event as a triumph for liberal thinkers of radical change. Others, like the Jewish Spectator of Memphis, Tennessee would only admit that services at Sinai were successful because of its rabbi, Emil G. Hirsch.⁷⁶ And the editor of the American Israelite said that "our secular and Christian contemporaries are liable to be misled by the recent celebration in Sinai Temple, Chicago, into attaching to it a significance greater than it deserves."⁷⁷ The American Israelite stressed that the Sinai Congregation was celebrating Sunday services, not an abolition of the Saturday Sabbath.⁷⁸

The celebration took place from morning until night. Friends of the Sunday-Sabbath movement were invited to address the congregation and guests during the festivities.⁷⁹ The Report included greetings, speeches, and relevant correspondence. One thing was obvious. The Sunday service at Chicago Sinai Congregation was a Sabbath service. There was no pretext; there were no false pretenses. For Chicago Sinai and its rabbi, "Sunday was not to be a forum for pseudo-scientific discourses on microcosm and microbe and protoplasm and on Goethe and on Milton, not even on Heine."⁸⁰ It is ironic that Kaufmann Kohler had initiated Sunday services at Chicago Sinai; he returned to celebrate with his former congregants. However, he had a new message for them. He had changed his attitude since leaving Chicago Sinai:

You, under the powerful sway of your peerless leader,
have persistently and consistently moved on, unconcerned

about the rest, on the road of radical reform, scoring triumphant success for the Sunday service, while dropping the ancient Sabbath and the Torah scroll from sight. I, amid surroundings in which the historical Sabbath has not lost its sanctity in the hearts and the homes, have become more solicitous than ever of the progress and welfare of the body of Judaism rather than of a mere portion, and, consequently, also more insistent on the Sabbath institution as an indispensable safeguard and bulwark of Judaism.⁸¹

Speaker after speaker addressed the congregation. Everyone applauded the success of Chicago Sinai Congregation, because the Congregation represented not only a successful Sunday-Sabbath but also a successful Reform movement. Thus, the rabbis were praising the Reform movement as well as Chicago Sinai Congregation. In addition, speakers praised their mentors: Samuel Holdheim, David Einhorn, and Samuel Hirsch. To the rabbis in attendance, the success of radical reform was attributed to the initial work of these three men.⁸²

Other congregations, whose members or rabbis could not go to Chicago, celebrated in their home congregations. Joseph Krauskopf addressed his congregation. He discussed the "Sunday Sabbath."⁸³ In nine pages, he brilliantly summarized the whole Sunday-Sabbath movement. He identified with Chicago Sinai Congregation. He believed that the Sunday-Sabbath had conquered American Judaism.⁸⁴ According to Krauskopf, twenty-two rabbis in over ten cities had instituted Sunday services. He believed that by

1924, two-hundred-and-fifty rabbis would be advocating the Sunday-Sabbath.⁸⁵

The American Hebrew refused to celebrate with Chicago Sinai. It even excoriated Joseph Krauskopf. Its editor, Philip Cowen, wrote:

Nay, nay, brother, talk not such utter nonsense, you humbug by it no one so much as you do yourself. Of course, in one way the Sunday-Sabbatharian set a good example to many of us who are stupid enough to stick to the old-fashioned day of rest; they do not shop on Sunday nor do they market on their new Sabbath, nor do they go to matiness, to the stock-exchange, or⁸⁶ to the bull match -- but that is not quite their fault.

The students at Hebrew Union College were also not convinced that the celebration in Chicago had meant that Sunday services were a success. In fact, one individual wrote, apparently quoting Kaufmann Kohler: "Judaism is still sick, and Sunday services have not effected a cure."⁸⁷

The nineteenth century ended with an apparent victory for the Sunday-Sabbath movement. Congregation Berith Kodesh finally introduced Sunday services. Others followed.⁸⁸ The movement entered 1900 with triumph ringing in its ears, ready to conquer new territory for its cause.

CHAPTER VI

A NEW CENTURY 1900-1919

The Sunday-Sabbath movement had matured by the beginning of the twentieth century. It still felt the tensions of world events but was prepared for its inevitable failure. By this time, the Sunday-Sabbath controversy had reached inside organizations like the Council of Jewish Women. The Council's secretary, Sadie American, during a major meeting "denounced the maintenance of the Jewish Sabbath as indicating a lack of progressiveness and as a manifestation of narrowmindedness, and she advocated the substitution of the Christian Sunday therefore."¹ Many people were offended by American's remarks, including Isaac M. Wise, who thought it was inappropriate to make those remarks from the platform of the Council of Jewish Women.² However, the president of the Council of Jewish Women at the time, Hannah Solomon, agreed with American that the Saturday Sabbath should be entirely abolished.³ The body of the National Council of Jewish Women disagreed. The Philadelphia Section of the Council of Jewish Women, insulted that the National organization tried to dictate to them, advised its delegates that the historical Sabbath was to be observed.⁴ Others, as Isaac

M. Wise pointed out, dismissed the issue entirely:

While at first glance it may seem that in the re-election of Mrs. Hannah Solomon as president and Miss. Sadie American as corresponding secretary of the central body of the Council of Jewish Women, the advocates of the abolition of Saturday as a day of worship and rest have gained a victory, their success is after all more apparent than real. The Sabbath question, all important as it is, was never brought before the convention in Cleveland. Every attempt to bring the matter before the delegates in such a manner as to ascertain the sense of the convention and put it on the record, was foiled by the skillful use of parliamentary procedure.⁵

The issue of a Sunday-Sabbath continued to swell beyond the confines of major organizations. Rabbis continued to debate the issue from the pulpit, and lay people debated the issue during congregational meetings. There was a great deal of give and take during this period. Often, Sunday services were interrupted by a change in rabbi or buildings. The new rabbi may not have been fluent in English, or was perhaps unwilling to lead services on Sunday. If the new rabbi was not a good orator, he could not draw crowds on Sunday. Consequently, a congregation might have chosen to discontinue its services. Likewise, if building repairs were made, Sunday services may have been interrupted in that they were not considered an integral part of the synagogue's activities. Ultimately, it was the rabbi that made the Sunday service a success or failure.

Joseph Krauskopf made his Sunday services a success:

Many who have strayed from the faith of their fathers have been attracted back to their spiritual homes by these Sunday Services, and have remained there, faithful and helpful, ever sure. . . . No figures can tell, no measures estimate, what numbers of hatreds and prejudices have there been put to flight by the Sunday services, what centuries-hardened barriers have there been torn down, what weights of ignorance have been lifted, what numbers of non-Jewish hearts have been made to beat in fraternal unison with our own.⁷

The same thing may have been true at Pittsburgh's Rodef Shalom Congregation, where Sunday services were resumed in 1901 under J. Leonard Levy, formerly Joseph Krauskopf's assistant.⁸ Congregants responded so favorably to Levy's Sunday service lectures that the congregation decided to publish them for distribution.⁹

In the south, the Hebrew Benevolent Congregation of Atlanta, Georgia introduced Sunday services, apparently, at the request of its rabbi, David Marx. These services were intended to supplement the Saturday services, not replace them. More people attended the Sunday service, however, than did the two Sabbath services combined.¹⁰

Sunday services were not a success everywhere. At Temple Israel in St. Louis, Leon Harrison was worried that his message was not reaching his congregation. Apparently, Christian attendance at Sunday services at Temple Israel surpassed Jewish attendance. Harrison expressed his concern by sending a letter to the congregation urging its members to attend services on both

Saturday and Sunday.¹¹

Other rabbis were also discouraged. Moses J. Gries of Tifereth Israel in Cleveland told his congregation:

I believe in a Sunday Sabbath. Let us put forth an effort to make our day of rest, our day of worship, a real Sabbath for ourselves and our children. It is not now a true Sabbath. It brings only partial rest. Only half the day is holy, the other half, too often devoted to pleasures and pursuits not uplifting.¹²

Regardless of this discouragement, some congregations still introduced Sunday services. For example, services were held only on Sunday morning at Temple Beth El in South Bend, Indiana when it was organized in 1905. Any kind of temple activity on Friday evening was forbidden unless Rosh Hashanah or Yom Kippur happened to fall on Friday night.¹³ Other congregations also introduced Sunday services at the same time.¹⁴ Of note were Joseph Stolz of Chicago and Stephen S. Wise of New York City.¹⁵ The formal institution of Sunday services in Chicago was not newsworthy. However, when Stephen S. Wise instituted Sunday services at the Free Synagogue in New York City, the whole Jewish world looked on. The act was applauded by Sunday service advocates.¹⁶ However, Stephen S. Wise himself later regretted his action. He wrote:

It was the pulseless, meagerly attended Sabbath service that moved me to establish within the Free Synagogue in the fall of 1907, a Sunday-morning service. This was not meant to replace the traditional Sabbath service but to supplement it for those who

could not take part in the seventh-day Sabbath service. We did not seek to disestablish the Jewish Sabbath, as Emil Hirsch had rankly, even militantly, moved Chicago's Sinai to do. What we sought was to substitute the living voice of the Hebrew Prophets for the little-understood reading of the Hebrew Pentateuchal Torah scroll. Herein we erred.¹⁷

As Sunday services were taking hold in some cities, certain organizations took up the gauntlet against the advocates of Sunday services. In Ha-Yehudi, Bernard Drachman, founder and president of the Jewish Sabbath Alliance, condemned the innovation of the Sunday-Sabbath.¹⁸ The Alliance had been formed to advocate the observance of the traditional Sabbath and provide legal defense for transgressors of "blue laws." Drachman felt that Jews must not change the day of the Sabbath but should rather strive to preserve it.

By 1910, the controversy over the advocating of a transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday had subsided considerably. The Reform vision of Jewish-Christian relations had been destroyed. People needed time to rethink the issue of the Sunday-Sabbath. Congregations still debated the issue, and others reevaluated their positions. Few newspapers and journals, however, gave publicity to the controversy; few rabbis discussed the issue from the pulpit.

The Sunday-Sabbath movement was losing steam, but it was also gaining new territory. Its major advocates still made headlines when they spoke.¹⁹ The movement appeared to be taking two steps backward for every step forward. The idea of a Sabbath transfer was novel for the new generation

so it made a short-lived appearance in some congregations. It had done nothing to improve attendance at other congregations. Sunday services had fallen the way of Saturday services: unattended. For example, special meetings of congregation Mishkan Israel in New Haven were held a number of times during 1913. During the last meeting, on January 24, 1913, it was decided by a vote of nineteen to fourteen to continue Sunday services for one more year only.²⁰ Apparently, attendance was still a problem there.

Temple Beth El in Detroit, on the other hand, celebrated "A Decade of Sunday Services" on June 8, 1913. Beth El's rabbi, Leo Franklin, decided that it was time to evaluate Sunday services once again. And evaluate he did. He sang the praises of Sunday service advocates. He claimed that Sunday services were a success, especially at his Temple. According to Franklin, attendance at Saturday services had increased drastically in the ten years since the first Sunday service had been introduced at Temple Beth El in Detroit.²¹ Furthermore, he believed that Sunday services would soon be part of "every progressive Jewish congregation in the land."²² He was also convinced that "the Sunday service . . . has fostered the Sabbath sentiment and kept alive the Sabbath spirit in a way that the single observance of the traditional Sabbath would never have made possible."²³ Franklin did not state it explicitly, but he believed in the Sunday-Sabbath. Saturday attendance may have increased, but his Sunday service was the central worship service at Temple Beth El.

It was not only large congregations like Beth El which continued Sunday services successfully. Small congregations had done the same. For example, Congregation Leshem Shomayim in Wheeling, West Virginia introduced Sunday morning lectures.²⁴

Toward the end of this period, Israel Friedlander, an architect of Conservative Judaism in America, offered an important teshuvah (responsum) to a question posed by the Jewish Student Congregation of the University of Michigan.²⁵ The students had asked his aid "in arranging a ritual for a religious service on Sunday evening, 'to satisfy men and women who come from orthodox, reform, and radical homes.'"²⁶

Friedlander's responsum was simple and straightforward:

After carefully considering the problems confronting you, I have come to the conclusion that a ritual which would appeal to a congregation such as yours is a matter of impossibility. If religious services were merely a medium of expressing beliefs this attempt might be made to find a common platform . . . although the beliefs thus expressed would probably be of so general a nature that they might be shared by broad-minded Christians and would scarcely provide for a specifically Jewish association. But religious services like religion in general, include a psychological element. . . . To cite one or two concrete examples: The wearing of the hat during prayer has certainly little to do with the essence of Judaism; it can even be shown that it is a comparatively recent custom. Yet the practice has become so deeply ingrained in the association of Conservative Jews all over the world that to such Jews to take off their hats constitutes, in my opinion, a serious oppression of conscience. The same applies to even a higher degree to the holding of services on Sunday which practically implies the denial of one of the

fundamentals of Judaism. . . .I cannot sympathize with a service which in the nature of things cannot be anything but a poor makeshift.²⁷

Instead, Friedlander suggested Sunday evening study meetings devoted to Jewish religious literature. Unknowingly, his suggestion became the main remnant of the Sunday-Sabbath movement: brotherhood brunches featuring a noted speaker.

Sunday services continued to be instituted and discontinued, a common feature of this period of flux. At B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City, Missouri, a long-time Sunday service congregation, the president, Daniel Lyons, lamented the state of Sunday services, as well as all worship services.

Aside from the holidays, the Temple is almost bare -- no large or enthusiastic assemblies greet the Rabbi at the Sunday lectures or attend the Friday evening services. Our beautiful edifice is untenanted and the feet of the prayerful come not this way. . . .For all the good this Temple does us to worship in, it might as well have not been built.²⁸

In Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Congregation Shaarai Shomayim tried Sunday services once again. They had been discontinued shortly after they had been introduced in 1892. Its rabbi in 1917, Isadore Rosenthal, had been looking unsuccessfully for ways to increase attendance at Sabbath services. So, in 1917, he dropped Saturday services. Instead, Sunday morning services were held. Since religious school students were required to attend after religious school on Sunday, the sanctuary was always well-filled.²⁹

Har Sinai in Baltimore, on the other hand, an early long-time supporter of the Sunday-Sabbath movement, discontinued its Sunday services. Instead, the congregation adopted late Friday evening services.³⁰

In Kansas City, Missouri, Sunday services continued to be on the decline at Congregation B'nai Jehudah. During the congregation's annual meeting, Louis H. Ehrlich, then chairman of the Educational Committee, questioned the accomplishments of Sunday services. He proposed that the services be discontinued. The congregation requested that the Board should poll the membership on the question. Sixty-three opposed the continuing of Sunday services, and thirty-eight were in favor. The Board decided to continue the services.³¹ In analyzing this action, Frank Adler, author of the congregation's history, wrote:

Possibly there was some feeling that an abandonment of Sunday services, especially in time of war, might be thought of in the general community as unpatriotic. A member who was a student in the Sunday School during World War I told the 1960 annual meeting he had been taught to regard Sunday as the American weekly day of rest.³²

The Sunday service had been abandoned by many long-time supporters of the movement. It was a trend that continued, although some new congregations made an attempt at Sunday services. Nevertheless, the Sunday-Sabbath movement had almost concluded running its course.

CHAPTER VII

DECLINE 1920-1980

By 1920, the Sunday-Sabbath movement was evidently dead. The five-day work week had begun to spread, eliminating the economic reasons for a Sunday-Sabbath, the ecumenical reasons long destroyed. Reform Judaism had absorbed a great many of the Eastern European immigrants, a death blow to the radical German wing of Reform Judaism which led the Sunday-Sabbath movement.

Congregations like Rodef Shalom in Pittsburgh, however, could still draw approximately three-hundred seventy-five in attendance on Sunday mornings,¹ but those crowds came to hear J. Leonard Levy speak on any day of the week. On the other hand, congregations like Temple Israel in St. Louis discontinued Sunday services. Their rabbis grew tired of preaching the Jewish message to crowds of non-Jews.³

Smaller congregations in smaller communities, like those in West Virginia, volleyed the idea of Sunday services back and forth. At times, the services were instituted. At other times, the same services were discontinued, depending on the whim of the congregation or its rabbi. At still other times, smaller communities like Ohev Shalom Congregation in Huntington, West Virginia shared its rabbi in 1923 with other communities. Sunday services became an issue of logistics,

not conscience.⁴

At the 1921 meeting of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, however, Isaac W. Bernheim of Louisville, Kentucky, advocated the change of the Sabbath to Sunday. He was ignored; his statements were not even included in the published proceedings of the meeting. He said:

My other suggestion is not my own, but has been even better known sponsors than the first. Holdheim in Germany; Hirsch and Kohler in America preached the need of an honest Sabbath. The observance of Sunday as our Saturday has been carried out for over fifty years by some of our most progressive leaders. It is undeniable that a divided allegiance is just as vicious in matters of religion as it is in matters of patriotism. It is possible to work on Saturday and still have a sentimental regard for it as the Sabbath of our fathers, but we do it at the risk of our mental, moral and religious integrity. Our children of today will be our men and women of tomorrow on whom will devolve the responsibility of carrying forward our spiritual work. How is it possible to prepare them for that task if in our Sabbath School we lend ourselves to powers of deception and willful misrepresentations? We teach them the ten commandments -- the very corner stone of our faith. . . . This faulty training, this violation of truth, has developed a moral standard in the minds of our children, seriously threatening to undermine, if not destroy, all spiritual values. We must be brave and consistent enough to face and absolutely determine to discontinue our pitiful compromise and observe Sunday as a real Sabbath, as a day of rest and spiritual recreation -- any other course carries with it the seed of disintegration and must ultimately result in spiritual bankruptcy.⁵

At B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City, Rabbi Harry H. Mayer decided to discontinue his Sunday services in 1925, because "a throat ailment would

prevent him from occupying the pulpit for the foreseeable future."⁶ This rabbi had an easy way out of Sunday services. If he could not preach on Sundays, what use would the congregation have for them?

Sunday morning services at Tifereth Israel in Cleveland were attracting as many as fifteen hundred people in 1926, and as many as eighteen hundred in 1928. There were as many as twenty-two hundred reported on several occasions in 1927. However, only seventy percent of those in attendance at anytime were members or guests of members. At least thirty percent were non-members.⁷ Nevertheless, prior to Abba Hillel Silver's tenure at Tifereth Israel, Sunday services were not well-attended.⁸ Silver was a tremendous orator.

Member congregations of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations were apparently not alone in conducting Sunday services. In a study conducted in 1932 by the Rabbinical Assembly of America, the conservative rabbinical body, it was reported that one congregation had occasional Sunday services, but two congregations conducted regularly scheduled Sunday services. Although the congregations were not mentioned by name, it was noted that the rituals used in both synagogues contained prefaces which stated: "the Sunday morning assembly is in no wise supplanting but supplementing the regular Friday evening and Sabbath morning services which both congregations conduct."⁹ Since these congregations made no effort to transfer the Sabbath, their Sunday

services were relatively non-controversial. Had the Reform movement done the same thing, perhaps it would not have received as much condemnation as it did.

Following the trend of other congregations rejecting long-held Sunday services, Temple Beth El in South Bend, Indiana, decided to hold Friday evening services instead of Sunday morning services. This decision came immediately after Albert M. Shulman was elected as Beth El's rabbi.¹⁰ It seems that the change was due to his prompting since the Board had voted to continue Sunday services only one week prior to his arrival.¹¹

One year later, in 1935, Professor Samuel S. Cohon was asked to respond to the question "Shall We Change the Sabbath to Sunday?" in The Jewish Laymen.¹² Cohon replied that instead of observing Sunday as a day of rest, we should observe "Erev Shabbos." In addition, Jews should keep whatever part of the Sabbath they can. Not everyone worked on Saturday, said Cohon. Whoever was home could keep the Sabbath, even though the breadwinner may have been working. Cohon concluded:

What is needed is not a change of day but a change of heart. If we are genuinely concerned with the perpetuation of our faith and with the spiritual welfare of our people we must not lightheartedly sacrifice the day which has brought untold blessings to many nations and has lent dignity to human life and labor. In our state of spiritual poverty, we cannot afford to permit the Sabbath to drop out of our lives.¹³

The Collingwood Avenue Temple (Congregation Shomer Emunim, now the Temple of Sylvania, Ohio) discontinued its Sunday services in 1935 when Leon I. Feuer was installed as its rabbi.¹⁴ One after another, congregations discontinued their Sunday services. The Hebrew Benevolent Congregation discontinued Sunday services in the late 1930s as did Adath Israel in Boston. Some years before, the Hebrew Benevolent Congregation had dropped choir music and organ because of the expense involved in both. Perhaps this was the impact of the great Depression. All that remained was a lecture series. Soon that too was discontinued.¹⁵

During the same period in the thirties, the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods conducted another survey entitled: "The Layman's Attitude Toward the Reform Synagogue Service." In this survey, 19.7% of the respondents preferred a Sunday service. Of these 19.7%, there was a ratio of men to women of two to one in the preference of Sunday morning services, proving that those who were employed, generally men, were interested in a Sunday service.¹⁶ Presumably, working on Saturday prevented them from attending Saturday services.

In 1941, Keneseth Israel in Philadelphia discontinued Sunday services. Ostensibly, they were suspended in order to facilitate the renovation of the sanctuary. The intended temporary replacement, late Friday evening services, became the permanent major Sabbath service.¹⁷

In 1945, B'nai Jehudah in Kansas City tried Sunday services once again. Some old-time Sunday service men refused to give up. They were discontinued in 1946. In 1949, they were reattempted. This time, the response was so poor that the Sunday services were discontinued after only seven weeks.¹⁸ Even the long-time radicals had to admit that the Sunday service had seen its day.

Temple Emanuel was organized in St. Louis, Missouri in 1957. A provision for Sunday services was included in its articles of incorporation.¹⁹ The congregation was led by Harold Rubens, then a rabbinic student at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. Rubens refused to use a Sabbath liturgy on Sunday. The service thus retained a weekday format.²⁰ They were originally supposed to be held on a temporary basis. These services are still being held today. In 1958, Friday evening services were inaugurated at Temple Emanuel, initially in the summer,²¹ making Sunday services supplementary.²²

In the final analysis, the Sunday-Sabbath movement failed. Two congregations, Chicago Sinai and Temple Emanuel in St. Louis, have remained faithful to the Sunday service cause, holding services on Sunday morning instead of Saturday morning.²³ Others have services both on Saturday and Sunday. The liturgy does not differ from any other daily morning service (or brotherhood breakfast) as held at Reform congregations throughout the country.

The Sunday-Sabbath had been instituted for two major reasons: economics

and Christian acceptance. Neither of these factors were sufficient enough for the Sunday-Sabbath to survive in the American Jewish community. The economic situation of America improved substantially, and Jews were part of the financial success. They were able to celebrate the Jewish Sabbath on Saturday and participate in the leisure of Sunday. The Gentile world continued to wage war on the Jews wherever they went, regardless of what they did. The messianic vision of the early German reformers was shattered and so was the dream of Jewish-Christian brotherhood. The Reform movement began to retrace its steps, toward the traditional Sabbath, away from the Sunday-Sabbath. The Sunday-Sabbath had failed.

SUMMARY

The Sunday-Sabbath movement and its subsequent controversy is an important chapter in the history of Reform Judaism in America. Although the American Sunday-Sabbath movement had its roots in Europe, it developed independently on American soil. It began with the introduction of Sunday services in 1854 by the Reform Association of Baltimore, Har Sinai's predecessor. It took hold when Kaufmann Kohler, a major figure in the Sunday-Sabbath controversy, introduced Sunday services at Chicago Sinai Congregation in 1874. Chicago Sinai Congregation has remained the pioneer, holding uninterrupted Sunday services for over one hundred years. These services have been modified, but, nonetheless, are a remnant of one of the most radical innovations American Reform Judaism has ever known.

The movement grew significantly during 1855-1879 when, even in congregations which rejected the notion of a Sunday-Sabbath, heated debates took place. Rabbis discussed it in professional meetings and lay persons discussed it in congregational meetings. Journals and newspapers followed the controversy very carefully, often taking sides. Some variations were introduced. Some individuals expressed displeasure with the notion of a Sunday-Sabbath but hoped that a Sunday service might slow the process of complete assimilation. Supporters wanted to be accepted by the non-Jewish world, and were ready

to break down any barrier between their non-Jewish neighbors and themselves.

Between 1880 and 1891, the Sunday-Sabbath experienced unprecedented growth, peaking in 1895 when fifteen congregations were holding such services. World events, however, severely curtailed this growth. Anti-Semitism mounted in Europe. The messianic dream of the early reformers was destroyed. Radical reformers were reevaluating their positions. Kaufmann Kohler completely reversed his position during this period. Once an ardent advocate of the Sabbath transfer, he completely rejected any Jewish religious activity on Sunday whatsoever.

By 1900, only seven congregations were holding Sunday services, even though in 1899 Chicago Sinai Congregation had just celebrated its twenty-fifth year of them. Debates continued in the twentieth century, but by 1920, the movement was virtually dead. Even long-time advocates such as Har Sinai in Baltimore voted for discontinuance. Still, as late as 1958, St. Louis' newly organized Temple Emanuel instituted Sunday services. They remain in force today.

What has happened to the Sunday-Sabbath? Its memory lingers, especially in congregations like Pittsburgh's Rodef Shalom which continues to hold daily services on Sunday. Hundreds of Reform congregations across the country who hold brotherhood breakfasts and the like on Sunday are, quite unknowingly, its functional equivalents, alternative responses to the same problems.

CHRONOLOGY

- 1845 Berlin Reform Association institutes Sunday services
- 1846 Breslau Rabbinical Conference debate on the Sunday-Sabbath
Congregation in Brussels requests permission to hold Sunday services
- 1847 Samuel Holdheim proposes the institution of the Sunday-Sabbath in
his Principles of Reformed Judaism
Sunday afternoon services are instituted in Offenbach, Hungary
by Solomon Formstecher
A Sunday service is instituted by Joseph L. Saalschuetz in
Koenigsberg
- 1848 Sunday services are instituted in Pesth, Hungary
- 1849 Berlin Reform Association discontinues Saturday services
- 1850 Sunday afternoon services are instituted in Vienna for the benefit
of apprentices whose occupations prevent them from attending
on Saturday
- 1854 Hebrew Reformed Association (Baltimore) institutes Sunday services
- 1860 Scranton Hebrew Congregation (Anshe Chesed) institutes Sunday
lectures
- 1869 Isaac Loew Chronik advocates the Sabbath transfer during the
Philadelphia Rabbinical Conference
- 1874 Chicago Sinai Congregation institutes Sunday services
Congregation Beth El (New York City) votes down a resolution
to institute Sunday services
- 1876 Felix Adler and his supporters begin Sunday lectures

- Leshem Shomayim (Wheeling, West Virginia) institutes Sunday morning lectures
- 1879 Temple Emanu-El (New York City) votes down a resolution to institute Sunday services
- 1881 Congregation Shearith Israel (San Francisco) institutes Sunday services under Falk Vidaver
- 1883 Congregation B'nai B'rith (Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania) institutes Sunday services
- David Stern prepares Sunday Services for Jewish Reform Congregations, the first attempt to organize a special liturgy for Sunday
- 1885 Max Landsberg publishes a Ritual for Jewish Worship, eventually used for Sunday services
- Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference resolves that there is nothing in the spirit of Judaism or its laws to prevent the introduction of Sunday services in localities where the necessity for such services appears or is felt
- Tifereth Israel (Cleveland) institutes Sunday services
- 1886 Temple B'nai Jehudah (Kansas City, Missouri) institutes Sunday morning services
- Temple Israel (St. Louis) institutes Sunday services
- 1887 Chicago Sinai Congregation eliminates Saturday services
- Joseph Krauskopf institutes Sunday services at Keneseth Israel (Philadelphia)
- 1888 The Jewish Tidings adopts the Sunday-Sabbath as its cause celebre
- Temple Beth El (New York City) institutes Sunday services
- 1889 Congregation Beth El (Detroit) institutes Sunday services

- 1891 Congregation Adath Israel (Louisville) institutes Sunday services
Kaufmann Kohler reverses his advocacy of the Sunday-Sabbath
- 1892 Congregation Shaarei Shomayim (Lancaster, Pennsylvania)
institutes Sunday services
- 1893 Congregation Rodef Shalom (Pittsburgh) institutes Sunday services
- 1896 Emil G. Hirsch translates David Einhorn's Olath Tamid so that
Chicago Sinai can use it for Sunday services
Rodef Shalom (Pittsburgh) discontinues Sunday services
- 1897 Five thousand signatures are collected, petitioning the trustees
of the Berlin Jewish community for Sunday services, led
by Gustav Levenstein
Shaare Emeth (St. Louis) institutes Sunday services
- 1898 Tifereth Israel (Cleveland) abandons Saturday services
- 1899 Attempt by Hampstead, England Jews to organize Sunday
services fails
Chicago Sinai Congregation celebrates twenty-five years of
Sunday services
Sunday services instituted at Temple Berith Kodesh (Rochester)
- 1900 Secretary of the National Council of Jewish Women, Sadie
American, advocates the Sunday-Sabbath
- 1901 Rodef Shalom (Pittsburgh) reintroduces Sunday services
- 1902 J. Leonard Levy writes A Book of Prayers to be used at Sunday
services in Congregation Rodef Shalom (Pittsburgh)
- 1903 L'union Liberale Israelite resolves to institute a service on Sunday
morning to give those who are not free on Saturday,
opportunities of instruction and edification

- 1904 Hebrew Benevolent Congregation (Atlanta) institutes Sunday services
Leo M. Franklin produces an Order for Worship for Sunday Services
for Temple Beth El (Detroit)
- 1905 Temple Beth El (South Bend, Indiana) institutes Sunday services
- 1907 Stephen S. Wise institutes Sunday services at the Free Synagogue
(New York City)
- Temple Israel (Boston) institutes Sunday services
- 1908 Mishkan Israel (New Haven) institutes Sunday services
- 1910 B'nai Jehudah (Kansas City, Missouri) attempts Sunday services
again
- Temple Israel (Minneapolis) institutes Sunday services
- 1914 Mishkan Israel (New Haven) discontinues Sunday services
- 1916 Leshem Shomayim (Wheeling, West Virginia) institutes Sunday
services again
- 1917 Shaarai Shomayim (Lancaster, Pennsylvania) discontinues Sunday
services
- 1918 Har Sinai (Baltimore) discontinues Sunday services
- 1919 K.K. Bene Israel (Rockdale Temple in Cincinnati) institutes
Sunday services
- Harry Levi compiles a prayerbook, Sunday Services
- 1923 B'nai Israel (Huntington, West Virginia) institutes Sunday services
B'nai Israel (Williamson, West Virginia) institutes Sunday services
- 1925 B'nai Jehudah (Kansas City, Missouri) attempts Sunday services
again
- Temple Israel (Minneapolis) discontinues Sunday services

- 1932 B'nai Israel (Huntington, West Virginia) discontinues Sunday services
- B'nai Israel (Williamson, West Virginia) discontinues Sunday services
- 1933 Central Conference of American Rabbis publishes Morning Services for Worship, instead of issuing a separate ritual for Sunday services
- 1934 Temple Beth El (South Bend, Indiana) discontinues Sunday services
- 1936 B'nai Israel (Keystone, West Virginia) institutes Sunday services
- 1938 B'nai Israel (Charleston, West Virginia) institutes Sunday services
- 1939 Hebrew Benevolent Congregation (Atlanta) discontinues Sunday services
- Temple Israel (Boston) discontinues Sunday services
- 1941 Keneseth Israel (Philadelphia) discontinues Sunday services
- 1942 B'nai Israel (Keystone, West Virginia) discontinues Sunday services
- 1944 B'nai Jehudah (Kansas City, Missouri) attempts Sunday services again
- 1946 B'nai Jehudah (Kansas City, Missouri) makes a final unsuccessful attempt at Sunday services
- 1952 Virginia St. Temple (Charleston, West Virginia) discontinues Sunday services
- 1958 Temple Emanuel (St. Louis) institutes Sunday services

Document No. 1
Initial Approval for Sunday Services at
Chicago Sinai Congregation¹

Special Meeting Tuesday Apr. 4/73
B. Lowenthal presiding. The Roll of
members was called & found absent:
J. Weiersdorff & M. Reitler, Sign. Hyman
The meeting was called to lay before the
Board a Communication of Dr Kohler.
Upon motion, the communication was received
to be acted upon.
A motion to address 2 letters to Dr Kohler
one to ask him to inaugurate a Sunday
Service, signed by all advocates of the same,
and one signed by all the supporters of the
biblical Sabbath, to continue a Sabbath service,
& pledge for good attendance, and also a
Resolution signed by all the members to assure
the Res. Gentleman of our confidence as our
spiritual guide, withdrawn to bring the matter before
^{the congregation}
It was moved to call a Congregational meeting
for the purpose of acting on the Communication
of Dr Kohler, and to lay before the meeting also
a Report of the Board of Directors, carried.

It was moved & carried that the special meeting be held on Monday coming ^{next} at 7 1/2 P.M. at Standard Hall.

It was moved & seconded to appoint a Committee of 3, to prepare a Report to the Congregation on all the different questions to be brought before the meeting, carried. Committee appointed as follows: E. G. Jacobson, A. Cahen & G. Snydacker.

It was moved & seconded to hold another special meeting of the Board on Sunday next at 10 A.M. at the lower Standard Hall, to lay before the Board the Report of the Committee for adoption, carried.

It was moved & carried, that the Secretary is authorized to issue an order for \$2000.00 Interest due on our Note of 10,000.00 on Sept 1st 1873. carried.

Adjourned
L. W. Reisz
Secy

Special Meeting of the Board

Chicago, Nober 18th 1893

The Meeting was called for the purpose of inaugurating the Sunday Service according to Resolutions passed at last Congregational Meeting. It was moved to hold a Sunday Service ~~at~~ in the forenoon from 10 to 12, ^am. carried. It was moved to appoint a Committee of 5 to procure a place suitable for public worship on Sundays, with full power to act, and also to make all necessary arrangements for that purpose, carried.

The following were appointed the Committee named:
S. Snyderker S. J. Seaford Elias Greenbaum
B. Loventhal & J. L. Getzert.

It was moved that the Committee on Choir be requested to see at what price an organist and leader of Choir can be had, and a melodicon be rented, and report at next Board Meeting, carried.

Adjourned

L. W. Reisz
Secretary

Document No. 2
A Typical Motion to Institute Sunday Services
During the Early Period of the Movement,
Including a Motion to Table Discussion²

TEMPLE MANUAL,

CORNER FIFTH AVENUE AND 43D STREET.

New York, December 2d, 1879.

DEAR SIR:

You are respectfully requested to attend a *SPECIAL MEETING* of our congregation on
MONDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 15TH, 1879.

At 8 o'clock,

at the Lecture Room of the Temple. The *OBJECT OF THE MEETING* is to take action on
the following Preamble and resolution, as offered at the Annual Meeting.

By order of The Board of Trustees,

MYER STERN, Secretary

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTION.

Whereas every true friend of Judaism recognizes the fact that every young man, and our Members engaged in active business, fail to attend the regular Public Worship on the Jewish Sabbath, compelled as they are to neglect Divine Service from necessity, and by the imperative demands of the vocation which they follow. Without trespassing upon ordained institutions of the Jewish Religion, of which the cardinal pillar is the Jewish Sabbath, it becomes our sacred duty as a Congregation, to provide opportunities for religious instructions, and intellectual examination, on such a day, and at such a time as will bring the public to our house of worship in larger numbers, than is the case at present. We cannot shrink from performing this duty, if our rising generation is not to grow up in total ignorance of our Holy Mission, and become estranged to religious aspirations. Much of the prevailing indifference and pronounced infidelity is due to the neglect of providing opportunities for religious instructions. There can be no objection upon religious grounds, against religious communion at any time, on any day, and it is in keeping with the tradition, the history and spirit of this Congregation, to take the lead, in any measure, by which the elevation and advance of Judaism can be obtained.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED:

That a Special Meeting of the Members of this Congregation be called and take place, for the purpose of taking into consideration, and act upon the facts stated in the foregoing Preamble, and for the purpose to inaugurate a Service in the Temple on Sundays, at such hour as may be expedient and proper.

*A Motion of Mr. A. Stern, to lay the Subject on the Sabbath with the consent of the Board
is withdrawn. Mr. Stern's Motion was duly seconded and the subject
remained open to any one to propose Sunday Service.
The Motion was carried, 53 out of 54, in the affirmative, and the subject
is referred to the next meeting.*

Document No. 3
A Typical Notice for a Special Meeting
To Discuss Sunday Services

Office of Secretary Congregation Beth Shalom
Dear Sirs:
There will be a special meeting of the
Congregation Sunday, October 12th, at 10:00 a.m. to
discuss the question of holding services in
the Temple on Sundays.
Please be present in full number.
Yours truly,
JUDAS ROBINSON, Secretary

Document No. 4
A Typical Resolution to Institute Sunday Services
in a Later Period of the Movement⁴

Pursuant to notice a special meeting to consider the subject of Sunday services was held in the Trustees' Room at eight o'clock P.M. with President Beckman in the chair.

Messrs. Hoffheimer, Trager, Mack, Livingston, Gutmann, Kahn, Davis, Meiss, Schild, Schottenfels, Seasongood and Friedman were also present.

It was moved and carried that the following resolutions be adopted:

"WHEREAS at the annual meeting of the Congregation Bene Israel that part of the President's Report recommending Sunday Services was referred to the Board of Trustees for its consideration, and

"WHEREAS said matter was informally discussed at a meeting of the Board of Trustees held on the Fifth day of December, 1918, and was made a special order of business for a meeting of the Board of Trustees to be called for that purpose, and

"WHEREAS this special meeting of the Board of Trustees has now been called this nineteenth day of December, 1918, to act on said question so submitted to it,

"RESOLVED: That it is the sense of the Board of Trustees of K. K. Bene Israel, without impairing, minimizing or in any way changing our present beautiful Sabbath (Saturday) Services, that there be held in the Temple, religious services on Sunday mornings, during the winter months of each year, said services to be of about one hour's duration and to be arranged by a committee of the Board acting in conjunction with Dr. David Philipson; that it is the sense of the Board that the holding of such services will have a beneficent and spiritual influence, and will fill a decided longing for Temple worship on the part of many who find it impossible to attend divine services with any reasonable regularity on the Sabbath."

Messrs. Hoffheimer, Beckman, Trager, Mack and Friedman were selected to serve on the Committee referred to in the foregoing resolution.

Document No. 5
A Typical Response to the Sunday-Sabbath
Movement by Anti-Sunday Reformers⁵

**Sunday
Services.**

That after a trial of a quarter of a century, the Sunday-service panacea for the ills of Judaism should prove to be not altogether successful, is both sad and suggestive. And, for those who have an eye for literary color, no further proof of that movement's inefficiency can be desired than the slight tinge of blue noticeable in the masterful addresses of the ablest advocate of Sunday Services. For, with whatever heinous crimes his

enemies may charge him, not even his dearest antagonist can deny him the ability accurately to feel the pulse of Judaism and the courage fearlessly to declare whether the patient be sick or well. His opinion, on this matter, therefore, may safely be taken: Judaism is still sick, and Sunday Services have not effected a cure.

Not that the remedy is too radical, but not radical enough. Or, to be more exact, it is rather the diagnosis which fails to go to the bottom of the matter. The assumption all along has been that Sabbath violations were due simply to business conditions; so that it needed only the transference of the Sabbath to Sunday to bring about a rejuvenation of religious sentiment and an ardent longing to rush to Temple. The actual failure of the movement even under the most favorable circumstances, was hardly necessary to prove the falsity of the analysis; for long ago it could easily have been seen that the lack of reverence was for the Sabbath and not the Saturday. Therefore it is quite possible that the disease from which Judaism, or at least the reform wing of it, is suffering may be not local, but systemic.

In fact, we are of the opinion that this is just what ails Reform Judaism; it is, to vary the metaphor, swamped by a belated tide of Rationalism, which in non-Jewish territory attained its flood during the last century. Lack of reverence for the Sabbath is but one phase of a general lack of reverence for all things not directly utilitarian, or the truth of which is not directly demonstrable. It is the result of that spurious universalism, which denies race to the Jew and makes of his religion a sort of Ethical Culture Association, with God as its honorary member. To be consistent, the holders of this view ought to join forces with Felix Adler; for, if the very sum and substance of religion and of Judaism be ethics, then is Adler's system certainly more logical and far more practicable. To be sure, these modern Do-Dos, who burn their fathers' houses in order to enjoy roast pig, make some allowances for God in their scheme of things; they mention him patronizingly, and in view of his long service as ruler of the Universe accord him the place of honor in the ritual and an occasional allusion in their lectures. But their passion is for Righteousness and their hunger is for Justice. However, the trail of Materialism is none the less over them all. For, what else is this but the naturalistic philosophy engrafted on a system of ethics, plus an absentee God!

But this hodgepodge is not Judaism; it is merely the ill-assorted union of "Das neue Wissen" and a misconception of "Der Alte Glaube." The old faith does not make its center an ethical system; but it says first, last and all the time, "and thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might." Some modern Jews are ashamed to speak of God, let alone, to love him—the old back-number, who in his treatise on cosmogony betrayed such woeful ignorance of evolution. A simple faith in the Rock of Israel, we call cant; and religious devotion, hypocrisy. God, therefore, being out of fashion and the stress being laid on

that portion of religious teaching which seemed not to conflict with scientific theories, we have preached to us a religion of deed in assonant antithesis to one of creed.

And how these preachers, after propagating waves of Philistine goodness by such epigrams as "Religion is Life and Life is Morality," and teaching that ethics is the essence of Religion and that to be good and charitable is to be religious—how, after doing this, they can yet expect a genuine passion for God and an intense desire to worship him, is to our untutored mind a cabalistic puzzle and an occult mystery. From the hypothesis that Morality is identical with Religion the command to observe the Sabbath, or at any rate to attend religious services either on Saturday or Sunday, we are naive enough to believe, cannot be inferred. And in this lies the key to the whole matter. Cease spreading that untruth of the pre-eminence of Morality in Judaism. Teach the people that there is a God in Israel and a Providence in the world. Tell them that worship is as essential as charity, and that a certain amount of distinctively Jewish symbolism, ritual, and prayer is just as necessary to preserve the spark of true religiousness as the forming of philanthropic associations and women's councils.

A reconstruction of Jewish teachings along the lines indicated would, we believe, solve the Sabbath and kindred questions. For, as has been said, the root of the matter lies not in business conditions alone; there is a deeper, wider sub-stratum of indifference to all matters religious as opposed to ethical, caused mainly by Christian influences, partly by the doctrines of our own Reform Rabbis, and to some extent, of course, by the constant factor of religious inertia. The first cause can, under present conditions, certainly not be removed; the last is, on this sphere, perhaps inevitable; but there can be surely no excuse for the existence of the second. The transference of the Sabbath to Sunday, therefore, is a reform entirely inadequate, in that it serves but temporarily to mitigate the evil, and that only in communities exceptionally favored by Providence with brilliant Rabbis and cultured non-Jewish audiences. But powerful orators and magnetic Gentile auditors are unfortunately not to be had for the asking; so we must content ourselves with suggesting a remedy, which, if humbler is nevertheless, more generally salutary and available.

W. H. F.

Document No. 6
A Typical Response to a New Sunday Service
by a Sunday Service Advocate



CONGREGATION Keneseth Israel in the North has sent its delegate to Congregation Adath Israel in the South, and has charged him with the pleasant duty of extending to you its heartiest congratulations upon this proud event in your history, and its sincerest wishes that this day and this edifice may inaugurate for you an era of spiritual usefulness even greater than that which has distinguished you in the past.

Many are the congregations that rejoice in the progress you have made, and in the proud name you have won for yourself, for the many reform measures which you have consistently championed and persistently maintained. But none rejoices more than Keneseth Israel, she that has battled for reform under an Einhorn and a Samuel Hirsch, at a time when reform was generally held to be but another name for treason against Israel, she that established Sunday services at a time when the holding of such services meant execration and defamation of the brave innovators. In all the South you have been the only congregation, which, while loyally adhering to the Seventh-Day Sabbath as the outward link of union with your sister congregations all over the world, has had the wisdom and the courage to supplement it with a Sunday service of a week-day nature. It was your public declaration that you were not content with conducting a Sabbath service before a handful of the very aged or very young, that you were not content with introducing on Friday evening a Sabbath service that was succeeded on the following morning by the hardest day's work of all the week, not content with looking idly on the Jew's sinking into the mire of materialism because of his want of the spiritual influence of weekly Sabbath services, not content with hearing the Jew complaining of being misunderstood, when on his one rest-day of the week, on which an opportunity is af-

The Sunday
and the
Synagogue.

Rabbi Joseph
Krauskopf.

THE SUNDAY AND THE SYNAGOGUE

forded to both Jew and non-Jew for becoming acquainted with the real teachings of Judaism, the doors of his synagogue are kept tightly closed, not content with repeating in prayer and sermon that the enlightenment and spiritualization of mankind, the unification of it into a common brotherhood under the Fatherhood of the one God, is the mission of Israel, and then doing little more in the way of preparation for a realization of that lofty mission, than gathering in the synagogue for consecration and instruction once or twice in all the year.

Yours was the conviction, as it has been of other Jewish Sunday service congregations, that ignorance of the Jew is and has been one of the most prolific causes of hatred of or prejudice against the Jew, that the only knowledge the non-Jew has of the Jew, for the most part, is that which he imbibes from the nursery tales or Sunday-school stories, in which the Jew is generally the bogeyman, or from novel or drama, in which the Jew is commonly depicted as the Shylock or Fagin.

And so you resolved to open wide the doors of your synagogue on the day on which not only the Jew is free to worship his God and to receive instructions in the history of his people, and in the aspirations of his faith, but on which also the non-Jew is free to hear what he needs to hear and to see what he needs to see. Hundreds and thousands of non-Jews have attended your Sunday services, and many of them that came to scoff remained to pray, many of them that entered with prejudice went away feeling kindlier in their hearts toward the people and faith that gave them the God they worship, the Bible they reverence, the ideals of right and justice they cherish.

Many have been the lessons that your old Temple has taught you, but no lesson more forcibly than that there is no better cure of anti-Semitism than the Sunday service, no better specific against prejudice than the invitation which

THE SUNDAY AND THE SYNAGOGUE

the open door of the synagogue extends on Sunday to all to come and hear the lessons of humanity which the Jew preaches, the spirit of brotherhood he teaches, the principles of eternal justice and universal right he inculcates, the evils of credal hatred and racial warfare he denounces.

And what you have so nobly done in your old synagogue you will carry on with yet greater zeal and larger success in this magnificent new structure of yours. There has never been greater need for larger work than at this present hour. The spirit of modern research has written upon many an old-time anti-Jewish creed in letters of fire, *Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsim*, "thou hast been counted and weighed and found wanting." Doctrines and dogmas that have been responsible for most of the hatred against the Jew are tottering under the heavy blows of modern scientific scholarship. The truths for which the Jew has suffered and died on all the theological battlefields of the world are with each day winning more and more golden victories for themselves. Our long-awaited opportunity is at hand. The work for which destiny has chosen us and for which it has preserved us through untold trials and tribulations is about to begin.

Your splendid record of the past is surety that in that larger work of the future you will have a nobler part. With all the signal services rendered by your former leader, the never-to-be-forgotten Dr. Adolph Moses, such was the foundation that he laid, that under the brave and brilliant leadership of your present spiritual guide, you will attain unto heights unattained before.

God grant that, encouraged by your past success and inspired by the yet greater triumphs to follow, congregations still doubtful and wavering may take heart, and, joining our ranks, further that larger work which lack of courage can but retard, never prevent.

NOTE: Rabbi Krauskopf was unavoidably kept from coming to the services, but he was so kind as to send the address he meant to deliver.

Document No. 7
A Typical Question Concerning the Sunday-Sabbath,⁷
Posed by a Reform Jew, Answered by a Reform Rabbi

Question: Since American conditions make the observance of Saturday as a day of rest almost impossible, why not change to Sunday? Would not Judaism be strengthened by doing away with the existing hypocrisy of working on the day on which we should rest? —J. A.

Answer: Mr. A. has raised a difficult question that has troubled the leaders of Reform for over a century.

We, who have given the Sabbath to the world, are now in danger of losing this day of rest and of sanctification. Where the Jews live in seclusion, they can still observe it with ease, but where they stand in close contact with the non-Jewish world, they find it extremely difficult to keep the Sabbath. The industrial revolution of the last century has changed the modes of social as well as of economic and commercial life of our people. We have been drawn into the vortex of the new life. To our neighbors the seventh day of the week is a day of busy toil. Should the Jewish worker refuse to labor on that day he may lose his work on the remaining six days. The business man who closes his store or office on the Sabbath may have to keep it closed also the rest of the week. Exceptional cases appear here and there. But, in the main, the economic conditions of our country militate against the Jewish Sabbath.

Few Practice Sabbath Rest

As long as Judaism was held with great tenacity, Jews were ready to sacrifice their worldly possessions in order to comply with its requirements. Under the temper of the present age, with the cooling ardor for religion, few are the men and women in any religious communion who are ready to give up their livelihood for the demands of ritual. In consequence, otherwise conscientious Jews are constrained to work on the day of rest and to rest on the day which has always been to them a day of work. Every time we read the ancient prayer: "May our rest on the Sabbath be acceptable unto Thee," we feel the glaring contrast between our profession and our practice. To some it indeed sounds like hypocrisy. How can our rest on the Sabbath be acceptable to either God or ourselves?

In view of the hollowness of our position, the suggestion is made now and then: Why not transfer the Sabbath to Sunday, the day upon which we are free from labor and business? If the seventh day Sabbath cannot be kept let us at least save the Sabbath *idea* by observing it on the first day. Reform has made other changes, why not this one as well, and thereby reinvigorate Judaism by restoring to so many Jews the institution which is so vital to their spiritual life?

Seventh Day Hallowed by Memories

This suggestion leaves out of consideration a number of vital considerations. In the first place, religious institutions are deeply rooted in the thought and feeling as well as in the customs of the people. They grow slowly through the centuries and come to dominate the subconscious as well as the conscious life of the passing generations of men. Only when they are interwoven in the very texture of the lives of nations do they possess sanctifying power. The seventh day Sabbath has exercised its wondrous powers over the Jewish people by virtue of more than three thousand years of development, in the course of which it has been hallowed by historical associations and memories. Imponderable elements have entered into its composition. It has been nourished by rich streams of tradition and legend, and has been colored by poetry and music. And it has been embodied into folk customs and practice. Transfer it to another day and you sever it from the emotional springs and roots that have fed it and thereby deprive it of its power over the lives of men. It will cease to be the sign of the covenant between God and Israel. All that would be left of the day is an opportunity for worship at the Synagogue. But synagogue attendance is but one part of the Sabbath. The home aspect of the Sabbath is no less vital than the service at the Temple.

Furthermore, judging from the way our Christian neighbors observe their day of rest, we can entertain little hope that a transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday would solve the problem even of worship. Large numbers of churches complain about their attendances. Vast throngs of nominal Christians turn on

Sundays to amusements rather than to the churches. Synagogues that conduct Sunday services—with but a few exceptions—can hardly claim to have attracted attendances worthy of the effort. And most of the men and women who come on Sunday morning in all likelihood, would come on Friday evening. The call of the golf links, the open road and of the gaming table seems to be stronger for many of our people than the call to worship.

Of course, there can be no harm and possibly some good in holding Sunday services, supplementary to those on the Sabbath. However, the attempt to transfer the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week is doomed to failure. We, of the Reform movement, are but a handful. Unless all Jewry changes the day, the problem remains where it is. And such a change is out of consideration. By disregarding the rest of Jewry we would only widen still more the gulf between Reform Jews and the rest of world Jewry. Much of the strength of Reform has been derived from its holding fast to the parent body. It must never permit itself to become a mere sect.

Observe Erev Shabbos

What, then, shall we do under the circumstances? In the first place, the situation is not as hopeless as it appears. The five day labor week which seems to be spreading in this country may enable large numbers of our people to keep the Sabbath. In the second place, if the whole Sabbath cannot be kept, what prevents us from keeping the *erev shabbos*? Friday evening is generally free from work and from trading. The myth of the tired business man has been exploded long ago. Our men and women are not too tired for cards, social parties and theatres. The social entertainments and secular amusements in private homes and in public places can be easily transferred to another evening. Friday evening should be set aside for the cultivation of Jewish values. Through the time honored and beautiful ceremonies of kindling Sabbath lights, blessing the children, of the Kiddush prayer and of grace at the meal, the family circle is cheered, and the

home is filled with a Jewish atmosphere. The synagogues, too, should be filled on that night not only with mourners who come with heavy hearts to recite the Kaddish in memory of their departed kinsfolk, but also with men and women whose hearts are full of joy, who come to sing songs of praise and thanksgiving and to seek counsel and guidance in the ways of life.

And not only on Friday night but on Saturday as well there is much that can be done. Not all men and women are at work on Saturdays. If all those who are free from labor, in our big cities, were to attend services, the Synagogues would be overcrowded. The root of the trouble is that many people have gotten out of the habit of considering the Sabbath at all. If it be impossible for the breadwinner to keep the Sabbath, why should the rest of the family disregard the day? The shopping, house-cleaning, laundry, etc., can be postponed to another day. Without over-burdening the Sabbath with all the restrictions of former times, we can observe it in a delightful and beautiful way and distinguish it from the rest of the week by setting it aside for religious devotion and pleasant social relations.

What is needed is not a change of the day but a change of heart. If we are genuinely concerned with the perpetuation of our faith and with the spiritual welfare of our people we must not lightly sacrifice the day which has brought untold blessings to many nations and has lent dignity to human life and labor. In our state of spiritual poverty, we cannot afford to permit the Sabbath to drop out of our lives. It was well said that "far more than Israel has kept the Sabbath, it is the Sabbath that has kept Israel." A Sabbathless Israel is doomed! As a people and as individuals we need the consecrating influence of the Sabbath, as did our fathers, to elevate our lives, to redeem us from the bondage to our tasks and to ourselves, and to foster that spirit in the home which unites the hearts of the parents with the hearts of their children.

ENDNOTES

CHAPTER I

EUROPEAN ANTECEDENTS

¹The history of the Sunday was adapted from Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, 1962 ed., s.v. "Lord's Day."

²Hebrew Union College Journal 5(October 1900): 25.

³*ibid.*

⁴David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907), p. 292.

⁵*ibid.*

⁶*ibid.*, pp. 292-293.

⁷*ibid.*, p. 293.

⁸*ibid.*, p. 292.

⁹*ibid.*, p. 295, note 2.

¹⁰Samuel Hirsch, Systematischer Katechismus des israelischer Religion (Luxemburg: Druck und Verlag, 1856), p. 157.

¹¹Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 296.

¹²*ibid.*, p. 298.

¹³*ibid.*, p. 298, note 2.

¹⁴*ibid.*, p. 299.

¹⁵*ibid.*, p. 296.

¹⁶ibid.

¹⁷ibid., pp. 296-297.

¹⁸ibid., p. 295, note 3.

¹⁹ibid., p. 359.

²⁰Orient, 4 June 1845, p. 178.

²¹Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, 26 April 1847, pp. 264-265.

²²Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, 14 June and 5 July 1847, pp. 378, 478-429.

²³Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, 12 July, 2 August, and 15 August 1847, pp. 448, 491, 523.

²⁴Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, 14 June and 5 July 1847, pp. 378, 428.

²⁵Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, 9 August 1847, p. 504.

²⁶Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, p. 387. This congregation was the one with which the early reformers of Baltimore particularly sympathized when they instituted their Sunday service in 1854. See Charles A. Rubenstein, History of Har Sinai Congregation of the City of Baltimore (Baltimore: Har Sinai Congregation, 1918), p. 21. Ignaz Einhorn fled to Leipzig after the Hungarian national uprising. He changed his name to Eduard Horn.

²⁷Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, 16 December 1850, p. 712.

²⁸Kaufmann Kohler, "Jewish Reform," Inter-Ocean, August 1873, pp. 1-8.

CHAPTER II INTRODUCTION OF THE SUNDAY
SERVICE IN AMERICA
1800-1854

¹National Advocate, 13 March 1824, p. 2.

²Gilman was speaking of the Constitution of the Reform Society of Israelites.

³Samuel Gilman, "Review of Harby's Discourse," North American Review, July 1826, p. 68.

⁴Isaac Leeser, Discourses in the Jewish Religion, 10 vols. (Philadelphia: By the author, 1867-1868), 8:110-111.

⁵David Philipson, "Jewish Reform Movement in the United States," The Jewish Quarterly Review 10 (October 1897): 96, note 3.

⁶Charles A. Rubenstein, History of Har Sinai Congregation of the City of Baltimore (Baltimore: Har Sinai Congregation, 1918), p. 21.

⁷William S. Rayner, Souvenir: Jubilee Year of Har Sinai Congregation (Baltimore: Har Sinai Congregation, 1992), p. 11.

⁸Rubenstein, History of Har Sinai, p. 21. There is an interesting account of the split between the Har Sinai Association and the Hebrew Reform Association in David Einhorn, "Geschichte des religiösen Umschwunges," Sinai 1 (August 1856): 198-199.

⁹Otto Irving Wise, ed., Sermons and Addresses by Jacob Voorsanger (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1913), p. 268.

¹⁰American Israelite, 6 August 1886, p. 4.

¹¹Wise, Sermons and Addresses by Jacob Voorsanger, p. 270.

¹²Benny Kraut, From Reform Judaism to Ethical Culture: The Religious Evolution of Felix Adler (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1979), p. 114.

¹³ Martin P. Beifield, Jr., "Joseph Krauskopf 1887-1903" (Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1975), p. 105.

¹⁴ Joseph Krauskopf, Sunday Lectures (Philadelphia: Keneseth Israel, 1888-1924) 15:1 in Beifield, "Joseph Krauskopf," p. 105.

¹⁵ David Davidson, Sabbath or Sunday (Cincinnati: Bloch Publishing Co., 1889), p. 21.

¹⁶ American Israelite, 5 May 1876, p. 5.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Leo M. Franklin, "A Decade of Sunday Services, 8 June 1913," Leo M. Franklin Collection, Box 3335, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Beifield, "Joseph Krauskopf," p. 106.

CHAPTER III

GROWTH OF THE MOVEMENT 1855-1879

¹ David Einhorn, "Die Rabbiner Conferens zu Cleveland," Sinat 1 (February 1856):8.

² Robert E. Levinson, "Julius Eckman and the Weekly Gleaner," in A Bicentennial Festschrift for Jacob Rader Marcus, ed. Bertram Wallace Korn (New York: KTAV and American Jewish Historical Society, 1976), p. 331.

³ American Israelite, 28 October 1859, p. 132.

⁴ American Israelite, 2 December 1859, p. 172.

⁵ Occident, 15 November 1866, p. 208.

⁶Sefton D. Temkin, The New World of Reform (Bridgeport: Hartmore House, 1974), p. 12.

⁷Hyman L. Meites, ed., History of the Jews of Chicago (Chicago: Jewish Historical Society of Illinois, 1924), p. 120.

⁸American Israelite, 20 November 1868, p. 5.

⁹American Israelite, 1 January 1869, p. 2.

¹⁰Meites, History of the Jews of Chicago, p. 110.

¹¹Temkin, The New World of Reform, p. 112. Wise reviewed the Philadelphia Conference, as well as developments concerning the Sunday service in Chicago and Baltimore in his Die Deborah, 15 July 1870, p. 2.

¹²Meites, History of the Jews of Chicago, p. 110. This is the same Samuel Hirsch who was previously the chief rabbi of Luxemburg.

¹³Temkin, The New World of Reform, p. 112.

¹⁴American Israelite, 22 April 1887, p. 4.

¹⁵William W. Blood, Apostle of Reason: A Biography of Joseph Krauskopf (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Co., 1973), p. 45.

¹⁶Lloyd P. Gartner, History of the Jews of Cleveland (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society and Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978), p. 155.

¹⁷Kaufmann Kohler, Sabbath Observance and Sunday Lectures (New York: Temple Beth El, 1880), p. 4.

¹⁸Solomon Hirsch Sonneschein, Sunday Lectures (St. Louis: Temple Israel, 1886-1887)1:1.

¹⁹Kraut, From Reform Judaism to Ethical Culture, p. 109.

²⁰American Israelite, 2 June 1875, p. 6.

²¹David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907), p. 295, note 3.

²²Chicago Occident, 15 November 1866, p. 208.

²³"President's Annual Report, 27 March 1885," Chicago Sinai Congregation, Box 2, Folder 10, Manuscript Collection No. 56, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

²⁴Menorah 4(February 1888): 217-219.

²⁵American Israelite, 22 July 1870, p. 8.

²⁶The signers of the resolution were: Liebman Adler of Chicago; Gustavus M. Cohen of Cleveland; Maurice Fluegel of Quincy, Illinois; Julius S. Goldhammer of Cincinnati; Adolph Huebsch of New York; Isidore Kalisch of Newark; Louis Kleeberg of Louisville; Max Lilienthal of Cincinnati; Jacob Mayer of Cleveland; Abraham Levy Mayer of Richmond; Solomon H. Sonneschein of St. Louis; Simon Tuska of Memphis; and of course, Isaac M. Wise of Cincinnati. During the same year as the Cleveland Conference, Samuel Hirsch may have tried to introduce Sunday services in Philadelphia at Keneseth Israel. There seems to be a disagreement concerning the actual attempt at an introduction of Sunday services at Keneseth Israel. In Hebrew Union College and Other Addresses, Kaufmann Kohler claimed that Samuel Hirsch had actually introduced Sunday services in his congregation in Philadelphia, but Kohler did not provide any date or documentation to support his assertion. In From Reform Judaism to Ethical Culture, Benny Kraut provided a date without documentation. It was known that Hirsch was at Keneseth Israel from 1866-1888. In the October 1897 issue of the Jewish Quarterly Review, David Philipson wrote an article entitled, "Jewish Reform Movement in the United States," in which he claimed that Sunday services were reintroduced at Keneseth Israel on October 13, 1881 by a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees and endorsed by the congregation.

²⁷American Israelite, 17 May 1872, p. 8.

²⁸Proceedings of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Vol. 1 (Cincinnati: Bloch and Company, 1873), p. 1.

²⁹Reform Advocate, 4 May 1901, p. 323.

³⁰Jewish Exponent, 3 June 1887, p. 9.

³¹Kaufmann Kohler, "Jewish Reform," Inter-Ocean, August 1873, p. 8.

³²"Special Board of Directors Meeting, 4 November 1873," Board of Directors Minute Books, Chicago Sinai Congregation, Box 9, Folder 5, Manuscript Collection No. 56, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

³³"Congregational Meeting, 10 November 1873," Minute Books, Chicago Sinai Congregation, Manuscript Collection No. 56, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio. This meeting was reported in the Reform Advocate, 4 May 1901, p. 325.

³⁴Kaufmann Kohler to Chicago Sinai Congregation, 1 December 1873, Chicago Sinai Congregation, Box 1, Folder 3, Manuscript Collection No. 56, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

³⁵Later in Kohler's life, he completely reversed his Sunday-Sabbath position.

³⁶Kaufmann Kohler to Chicago Sinai Congregation, 11 December 1873, Chicago Sinai Congregation, Box 1, Folder 3, Manuscript Collection No. 56, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

³⁷Chicago Sinai Bulletin, 13 December 1951, p. 5.

³⁸American Israelite, 3 April 1874, p. 5. The entire text of this letter was also printed in the Jewish Messenger, 17 April 1874, p. 3.

³⁹Jewish Times, 17 April 1874, p. 121.

⁴⁰American Hebrew, 13 January 1899, pp. 372-373. The Ashkenazic transliteration is being used, because this is the way it was used by the Sunday-Sabbath movement.

⁴¹W. Gunther Plaut, The Rise of Reform Judaism: A Sourcebook of its European Origin (New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1963), pp. 194-195.

⁴²American Israelite, 28 April 1875, pp. 4-5.

⁴³American Israelite, 1 May 1874, p. 4.

⁴⁴Kaufmann Kohler, Are Sunday Lectures a Treason to Judaism? (New York: Temple Beth El, 1888), p. 8.

⁴⁵American Israelite, 1 May 1874, p. 4.

⁴⁶And you should teach them diligently to your children, and should speak of them when you sit in your house, when you walk by the way, when you lie down and when you rise up.

⁴⁷This book of the law should not depart from your mouth, but you should meditate on this day and night, so that you can observe all that is written on it, then you will make your plans successful and you will be successful.

⁴⁸David Davidson, Sabbath or Sunday (Cincinnati: Bloch Publishing Co., 1889), p. 6.

⁴⁹Speak thus unto the Israelites: You will keep my Sabbaths, because it is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations, so that you will know that I am the Lord who sets you apart.

⁵⁰In six days, the Lord made the heaven and earth, the sea and all that they contain, and rested on the seventh day; therefore, the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.

⁵¹And you should remember that you were a servant in Egypt, and the Lord your God brought you out by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm; therefore, the Lord your God commanded you to keep the Sabbath day.

⁵²William Rosenau, The Sabbath Question (Baltimore: Press of Kohn and Pollock, 1897), p. 8.

⁵³Central Conference of American Rabbis, Yearbook, 1903 (Baltimore: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1903), p. 169.

⁵⁴American Israelite, 2 July 1886, p.4.

⁵⁵American Israelite, 2 December 1859, p. 172.

⁵⁶Kaufmann Kohler, The Origin of the Sabbath (Chicago Sinai Congregation, 1876), p. 20.

⁵⁷Kaufmann Kohler to Godfrey Snyder, 21 October 1877, Kaufmann Kohler Collection, Box 1, Manuscript Collection No. 29, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁵⁸Kaufmann Kohler to Chicago Sinai Congregation, 4 June 1879, Chicago Sinai Congregation, Box 2, Folder 4, Manuscript Collection No. 56, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁵⁹The innovation of a late Friday evening service was introduced in Cincinnati at Congregation K.K. Bene Yeshurun by Isaac M. Wise on October 19, 1866.

⁶⁰The congregation, Mishkan Israel, later instituted Sunday services.

⁶¹American Israelite, 5 June 1874, p. 5.

⁶²There was a great deal of controversy concerning the history of Sunday services at Har Sinai Congregation in Baltimore. Again, Philipson claimed that Har Sinai reinstated Sunday services twenty years after its first attempt in 1854, but he did not provide any documentation. Kraut did not include this congregation in his listing of Sunday service congregations in the early 1870s. Kohler mentioned that David Einhorn died "with a prayer for the success of the Sunday services on his lips." Einhorn served Har Sinai Congregation from 1855 to 1861. Finally, Abraham Shusterman, in Legacy of a Liberal, claimed that "Einhorn and Sale introduced Sunday morning services and abandoned them. Philipson's lectures on Sunday met with the same failure. In later years, Rabbi Israel conducted very successful Sunday morning services, only to abandon them. Rabbi Schanfarber was the only one to continue them throughout his ministry. In Rabbi Rubenstein's time, in September 1918, the congregation abandoned them completely in favor of Friday evening services." Although Shusterman offered no documentation for these dates, the later ones can be verified. It is known that Solomon Deutsch served Har Sinai from 1862-1873; Jacob Mann served from 1874-1876; Emil G. Hirsch served from 1877-1878; Samuel Sale served from 1878-1883; David Philipson served from 1883-1888; Tobias Schanfarber served from 1888-1898; Charles Rubenstein served from 1898-1920; and Edward Israel served from 1923-1941. Thus, the early years remain controversial. However, various sources indicated that Sunday services existed at various times during the ministries of Hirsch, Sale, Philipson, and Schanfarber. It is unlikely that these services existed in Baltimore as early as 1874, excluding the 1854 attempt.

⁶³American Israelite, 5 June 1874, p. 5.

⁶⁴Congregation Beth-El was one of the very few American Reform congregations which conducted daily worship services during the period under discussion.

⁶⁵It took five years before the controversy was finally resolved.

⁶⁶Philip Cowen, Memories of an American Jew (New York: The International Press, 1932), pp. 93-94.

⁶⁷Reform Advocate, 4 May 1901, pp. 323-326. See also William Pollack, "Crisis and Congregation -- Institutional Reform in Chicago Sinai Congregation," Term paper, Chicago, Illinois, 8 March 1971.

⁶⁸American Israelite, 28 April 1876, p. 4.

⁶⁹Kraut, From Reform Judaism to Ethical Culture, p. 108.

⁷⁰ibid., p. 109.

⁷¹ibid., p. 110.

⁷²ibid., p. 113.

⁷³American Israelite, 19 May 1876, p. 6.

⁷⁴American Israelite, 2 June 1876, p. 6.

⁷⁵Jewish Messenger, 19 May 1876, p. 1.

⁷⁶Jewish Messenger, 28 March 1877, p. 5.

⁷⁷American Israelite, 21 March 1879, p. 4.

⁷⁸Jewish Messenger, 25 April 1879, p. 4.

⁷⁹ibid.

⁸⁰American Israelite, 30 May 1879, p. 4.

⁸¹American Israelite, 27 June 1879, p. 4.

⁸²American Israelite, 7 November 1879, p. 2.

⁸³Kaufmann Kohler, Sabbath Observance and Sunday Lectures (New York: Temple Beth El, 1880), pp. 4-5, 8. For an interesting account of Kohler's new position by a lay leader of Chicago Sinai Congregation, Julius Rosenthal, see the American Israelite, 27 June 1879, p. 4.

⁸⁴American Israelite, 7 November 1879, p. 2.

⁸⁵Rubenstein, History of Har Sinai Congregation, p. 55.

⁸⁶"Annual Congregational Meeting, 5 May 1879," Board of Trustees Minute Books, Congregation Emanu-El, Box 811, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁸⁷"Special Meeting of the Congregation, 15 December 1879," Minute Books, Congregation Emanu-El, Box 811, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

CHAPTER IV RENAISSANCE 1880-1891

¹For example, during the week of February 6, 1880, Dr. Falk Vidaver, rabbi of Congregation Shearith Israel in San Francisco, introduced Sunday services. Although these services were announced in the American Israelite, it is difficult to determine the exact nature of the services. American Israelite, 6 February 1880, p. 6.

²American Israelite, 2 January 1880, p. 4.

³American Israelite, 24 June 1881, pp. 4-5.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Jewish Messenger, 28 October 1881, p. 5.

⁶David Philipson, "Jewish Reform Movement in the United States," The Jewish Quarterly Review 10 (October 1897):97 and Joseph Krauskopf, Sunday Lectures Vols. 1-37 (Philadelphia: Oscar Klonower, 1888-1924), 5:21:2.

⁷Proceedings of the Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference November 15, 17, 18, 1885 (Richmond, Virginia: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1923), p.33.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 34.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid., p. 35.

¹³See David Philipson and Louis Grossman, eds., Selected Writings of Isaac M. Wise (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke Co., 1900).

¹⁴Proceedings of the Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference, p. 35.

¹⁵It is interesting to note that in a letter preceding the Conference, dated March 12, 1885, Solomon Sonneschein wrote to J. Leonard Levy, "I am in my office every morning, except Sabbath 'Sunday.'" Solomon H. Sonneschein to J. Leonard Levy, 12 March 1885, Solomon H. Sonneschein Collection, Letter Book No. 3, Box X-132, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹⁶Proceedings of the Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference, p. 38.

¹⁷Solomon H. Sonneschein, "Report, ca., 9 December 1885," Solomon H. Sonneschein Collection, Letter Book No. 3, Box X-132, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹⁸American Israelite, 15 January 1886, p. 4. The original article which Wise quoted was from the New York Times, 31 December 1885.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Stuart E. Rosenberg, "The Jewish Tidings and the Sunday Service Question," Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society 42(June 1953):372.

²¹Ibid.

²²Rosenberg, "The Jewish Tidings and the Sunday Service Question," p. 377.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid. According to Rosenberg, Max Landsberg was also among the opponents

to Sunday services. Rosenberg claimed that Sunday services had not yet been instituted at Berith Kodesh in Rochester where Landsberg was rabbi. However, Landsberg indicated in the preface to his prayerbook that the prayerbook was adopted by the congregation for weekday and Sabbath services in 1884. It is unclear whether Berith Kodesh conducted daily services on weekdays and Sundays. Yet, Rosenberg claimed that the Jewish Tidings had initiated a campaign for Sunday services in 1890 at Berith Kodesh, but it failed in its undertaking.

²⁵According to Rosenberg, Sunday services were introduced at Berith Kodesh in 1899. Thus, the Jewish Tidings had not failed in its campaign for Sunday services at Berith Kodesh.

²⁶Sabbath Visitor, 1 August 1890, pp. 211-212.

²⁷Sabbath Visitor, 1 September 1890, p. 226.

²⁸Sabbath Visitor, 1 October 1890, p. 326.

²⁹Sabbath Visitor, 15 October 1890, p. 353.

³⁰Ibid., p. 360.

³¹American Israelite, 8 June 1886, p. 5.

³²Ibid.

³³Kansas City Journal, 19 June 1886. Clipping in Joseph Krauskopf, Miscellaneous File, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

³⁴Kansas City Journal, 21 November 1885. Clipping in Joseph Krauskopf, Miscellaneous File, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

³⁵For an analysis of this reaction, see Frank J. Adler, The Centennial History of Congregation B'nai Jehudah of Kansas City 1870-1970: Roots in a Moving Stream (Kansas City, Missouri: Congregation B'nai Jehudah, 1972), pp. 72-74.

³⁶Kansas City Evening Star, 19 June 1886. Clipping in Joseph Krauskopf, Miscellaneous File, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

³⁷American Israelite, 2 July 1886, p. 4. In the American Israelite, 30 July 1886, Isaac M. Wise retracted his statement; he accepted Krauskopf's new position on the Sunday-Sabbath.

- ³⁸American Israelite, 30 July 1886, p. 6.
- ³⁹American Israelite, 1 July 1887, p. 6.
- ⁴⁰Gartner, History of the Jews of Cleveland, p. 155.
- ⁴¹American Israelite, 22 April 1887, p. 4.
- ⁴²Julius Nodel to Jacob Rader Marcus, 13 October 1966, Correspondence File, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- ⁴³American Hebrew, 18 June 1886, pp. 82, 84.
- ⁴⁴American Hebrew, 23 July 1886, p. 162.
- ⁴⁵Joseph D. Cosoe, From Leffingwill to Spoeder: Highlights in the History of Temple Israel (St. Louis: Temple Israel, 1977), p. 7.
- ⁴⁶Solomon H. Sonneschein, "Draft of Religious Constitution, 15 October 1886," Solomon H. Sonneschein Collection, Letter Book No. 3, Box X-132, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- ⁴⁷Samuel Hirsch mentioned during Shavuot services that he would find a rabbi to conduct Sunday services in English. Jewish Exponent, 3 June 1887, p. 4. Although Joseph Krauskopf's actions would speak differently, he wrote a letter to Augustus Binswanger of Chicago Sinai Congregation, "I am an outspoken Sunday advocate but I should never dare to cast the old Sabbath aside so unconcernedly as you do, and upon the ground you do." Joseph Krauskopf to Augustus Binswanger, 18 March 1887, Chicago Sinai Congregation, Box 3, Folder 3, Manuscript Collection No. 56, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- ⁴⁸William W. Blood, Apostle of Reason: A Biography of Joseph Krauskopf (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Co., 1973), p. 44 and Joseph Krauskopf, Sunday Lectures, 5:21:2.
- ⁴⁹Blood, Apostle of Reason, p. 45. Attendance at Saturday services also increased after Krauskopf's arrival.
- ⁵⁰Ironically, Samuel Hirsch complained that the services were not as he would have conducted them. However, the congregation, in a special meeting held December 1, 1887, decided not to interfere with Krauskopf in matters of

ritual. As a result, Hirsch later left Philadelphia in order to spend the last year of his life with his son, Emil G. Hirsch, in Chicago.

⁵¹Martin P. Beifield, Jr., "Joseph Krauskopf: 1887-1903" (Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1975), p. 101.

⁵²History of Congregation Adath Israel, Louisville, Kentucky (Louisville: Congregation Adath Israel, [1906]), p. 23. This congregation adopted a proposition for Sunday services in June 1891.

⁵³Morton Kaplan, "Some Religious Attitudes of Emil G. Hirsch as Reflected in the Reform Advocate 1891-1897" (Term paper, Hebrew Union College, 1965), p. 5.

⁵⁴American Hebrew, 9 January 1891, p. 227. Arthur A. Chiel listed a few of the members who were in favor of such a transfer in the Connecticut Jewish Ledger, 27 July 1972 quoted in Arthur A. Chiel, Looking Back (Woodbridge, Connecticut: Congregation B'nai Jacob, [1974]), n.p. They included Alderman Sonneberg, Sieguart Spier, and Maier Zunder.

⁵⁵Kaufmann Kohler, "The Sabbath Day of the Jew," Menorah II (September 1891): 151-160.

⁵⁶*ibid.*, p. 155.

⁵⁷*ibid.*, p. 156.

⁵⁸*ibid.*, p. 158.

⁵⁹*ibid.*, p. 160.

CHAPTER V

MATURATION 1891-1899

¹American Hebrew, 4 September 1891, p. 82.

²*ibid.* Apparently, Kohler's actions prompted the editors of the American Hebrew to include a history of the congregation in the September 18, 1891 edition, focusing on Kohler's advocating the discontinuing of Sunday services.

³Kaufmann Kohler, "Rocks Ahead," Menorah II (October 1891): 284-293.

⁴Eugene Cohn, "The Sabbath Day of the Jew: An Answer to the Rev. Dr. Kohler," Menorah II (November 1891): 283.

⁵American Israelite, 29 October 1891, p. 4.

⁶Central Conference of American Rabbis, Yearbook, 1905 (Baltimore: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1905), p. 62.

⁷David Philipson, 24 October 1891, David Philipson Collection, Diaries, Box 3, Manuscript Collection No. 35, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁸Hazefirah, 2 February 1892, p. 70.

⁹Gartner, The Jews of Cleveland, p. 155.

¹⁰Emil G. Hirsch, "The Philosophy of the Reform Movement in American Judaism," 1895 Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (Cincinnati: Bloch Publishing Co., 1895), p. 109.

¹¹Ibid., p. 110.

¹²Israel Aaron, "Our Shifting Attitude," 1896 Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (Cincinnati: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1897), pp. 97-98.

¹³Jacob Voorsanger, "The Sabbath Question," 1902 Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1902), pp. 114-115. The full report was also published in Otto Irving Wise, ed., Sermons and Addresses by Jacob Voorsanger (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1913), pp. 258-280.

¹⁴1902 Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, p. 124.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 128.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 129.

¹⁸ibid., p. 130.

¹⁹ibid., p. 133.

²⁰ibid., p. 135.

²¹ibid., p. 136.

²²ibid., pp. 137-139.

²³ibid., p. 140.

²⁴ibid., p. 141.

²⁵ibid.

²⁶ibid., p. 143.

²⁷ibid., p. 146.

²⁸ibid., p. 151.

²⁹American Jewish Yearbook, 1902 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1902), p. 97.

³⁰ibid., pp. 18, 102.

³¹Central Conference of American Rabbis, Yearbook, 1903 (Baltimore: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1903), p. 140.

³²ibid., p. 143.

³³ibid., p. 55.

³⁴ibid., p. 56.

³⁵ibid., p. 61.

³⁶ibid., p. 79.

³⁷Rabbi Charles Levi of Peoria, Illinois said: "I had my congregation go on record during the past year. Out of 85 members, 82 were in favor of

retaining the historical Sabbath. Three were in favor of supplementary Sunday services, and 85 were against the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday." *Ibid.*, p. 84.

³⁸The following rabbis affixed their names to the resolution: Bernard Felsenthal, Maurice H. Harris, Max Heller, Max L. Margolis, David Philipson, Samuel Sale, Tobias Schanfarber, and Joseph Stolz.

³⁹Central Conference of American Rabbis, Yearbook, 1904 (Baltimore: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1904), p. 117.

⁴⁰Central Conference of American Rabbis, Yearbook, 1905 (Baltimore: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1905), p. 112.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, p. 114. According to Rabbis Moses, only thirteen congregations were conducting Sunday services in 1905.

⁴²*Ibid.*, p. 197.

⁴³David Marx to Leo Franklin, 8 June 1906, Leo Franklin Collection, Box 3332, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁴⁴Central Conference of American Rabbis, Yearbook, 1906 (Chicago: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1906), p. 87.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p. 90.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 92-103.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, p. 96.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*

⁵¹*Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁵²*Ibid.*, p. 106.

⁵³*Ibid.*, pp. 112-113.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 67.

⁵⁵The Central Conference of American Rabbis was not the only organization interested in knowing about Sunday services. In the United States Census of 1906, it was reported that 19 out of 1769 Jewish congregations in the United States held Sunday services. United States Census, Part II, Special Report, Religious Bodies (Washington: Government Printing Office, [1910]), p. 322. See also Uriah Zevi Engelman, "Jewish Statistics in United States Census of Religious Bodies 1850-1936," Jewish Social Studies 9 (1947): 142.

⁵⁶Apparently, this was done so that the Central Conference of American Rabbis would not be producing a competitor to its own Union Prayer Book. Sunday service congregations were encouraged to use the weekday services in the Union Prayer Book. Lou H. Silberman to Kerry M. Olitzky, 19 February 1980, personal letter.

⁵⁷According to the correspondence of Hyman Enelow, chairman of this particular Central Conference of American Rabbis committee, the following people were interested in the new publication for their congregations: Leon Harrison of St. Louis; Meyer Lovitch of Paducah; David Marx of Atlanta; Samuel Schulman of New York City; Tobias Schanfarber of Chicago; Joseph Silverman of New York City; Joseph Stolz of Chicago; Samuel Thurman of Lexington; and Stephen S. Wise of New York City. Hyman Enelow to Colleagues, 27 September 1907, Hyman Enelow Collection, Box 24, No. 16, Manuscript Collection No. 11, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁵⁸"Congregational Meeting, 19 October 1896," Tifereth Israel Collection, Box 834, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁵⁹Reform Advocate, 22 May 1897, p. 224. This issue of the Reform Advocate contained two articles by Emil G. Hirsch in which he supported and defended the Sunday-Sabbath movement. In one article, Hirsch provided a list of some of the rabbis who supported the Sunday-Sabbath movement at the time. The only new names were Aaron Norden and Joseph Stolz of Chicago.

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³It is difficult to determine which congregation Schanfarber was speaking

of. However, it is not difficult to make certain assumptions. Philipson, "Jewish Reform Movement in the United States," p. 10, note 3, listed the following congregations in 1897: "Since then [1885] Sunday services have been instituted, and are at present conducted in the following congregations, besides the three already mentioned [Chicago Sinai; Har Sinai, Baltimore; Keneseth Israel, Philadelphia]: Emanu-El, New York City; Berith Kodesh, Rochester; Adath Israel, Boston; Tifereth Israel, Cleveland; Isaiah, Chicago; Shaare Emeth and Temple Israel, St. Louis; and Adath Israel, Louisville.

⁶⁴William Rosenau, The Sabbath Question (Baltimore: Press of Kohn and Pollock, 1897), pp. 1-14. Wise applauded Rosenau in the American Israelite, 24 June 1897, p. 4. Wise wrote: "He replies to Judge Sulzberger's advice to the Russian Jews to transfer the Sabbath of the Decalogue to the Pope's Sunday with a strong 'it cannot, it will not be done. Judaism will not commit suicide for the special benefit of those who maintain they cannot observe the seventh day to keep it holy. . . .' Mr. Rosenau deserves special recognition for this piece of work, especially as being the first that discussed the question before the congregation and, in spite of all cowardly hypocrites, who lack the moral courage to have a decisive opinion and announce it publicly and solemnly."

⁶⁵A. H., "Judaism's Iconoclasts," The Hebrew Union College Journal 2 (November 1897): 22-23.

⁶⁶American Israelite, 30 December 1897, p. 4.

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Hamagid L'Israel, 10 February 1898, pp. 45-46.

⁶⁹Gartner, The Jews of Cleveland, p. 154.

⁷⁰American Israelite, 24 March 1898, p. 4.

⁷¹Gartner, The Jews of Cleveland, p. 156.

⁷²American Israelite, 26 May 1898, p. 4.

⁷³This is particularly important during World War I and World War II.

⁷⁴American Israelite, 26 May 1898, p. 4.

⁷⁵"Board of Directors Meeting, 19 November 1898," Board of Directors

Minute Books, Chicago Sinai Congregation, Box II, Folder 5, Manuscript Collection No. 56, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁷⁶Clippings from all of these newspapers were found in Box II, Folder 6, Chicago Sinai Congregation, Manuscript Collection No. 56, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁷⁷American Israelite, 2 February 1899, p. 4.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*

⁷⁹Invitations were sent to: Gustav Gottheil, Moses J. Gries, Leon Harrison, Morris Jastrow, Jr., Kaufmann Kohler, Joseph Krauskopf, Max Landsberg, J. Leonard Levy, Lippman Mayer, Adolph Moses, and Samuel Sale. Report of the Services in Commemoration of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Introduction of Sunday Services at Chicago Sinai Congregation (Chicago: Chicago Sinai Congregation, [1899]), p. 2.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*

⁸¹*Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

⁸²*Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁸³Krauskopf, Sunday Lectures, 12:4:1.

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁸⁵*Ibid.* Krauskopf used the words Sunday-Sabbath and Sunday service interchangeably, without distinction. Apparently, his criterion for the Sunday Sabbath was the same as I have stated in this opening paragraph of this thesis. If a Sunday service ascended to be the central worship service of a particular congregation, it was considered a Sunday-Sabbath service. Krauskopf listed the following cities in which Sunday services had been instituted (by 1899): Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Louisville, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Rochester, and St. Louis.

⁸⁶American Hebrew, 20 January 1899, p. 420.

⁸⁷The Hebrew Union College Journal 3 (February 1899): 104.

⁸⁸"Congregational Meeting, 5 November 1899," Minute Books,

Temple Berith Kodesh in Rosenberg, "The Jewish Tidings and the Sunday Service Question," p. 385.

CHAPTER VI A NEW CENTURY 1900-1919

¹American Israelite, 18 January 1900, p. 4.

²American Israelite, 8 February 1900, p. 4.

³American Israelite, 15 February 1900, p. 4. See also the December 1900 issues of the American Jewess. Note particularly the material concerning Rosa Sonneschein, wife of Solomon Hirsch Sonneschein. Unlike her former husband, Rosa Sonneschein was not in favor of making the Sabbath transfer.

⁴American Israelite, 22 February 1900, p. 4.

⁵American Israelite, 15 March 1900, pp. 4-5.

⁶Beifield, "Joseph Krauskopf," p. 108.

⁷Krauskopf, Sunday Lectures, 14:27 in Beifield, "Joseph Krauskopf," p. 108.

⁸Apparently, the service had ceased when J. Leonard Levy's predecessor had left the congregation. Walter Jacob to Kerry M. Olitzky, 19 November 1979, personal letter.

⁹"Congregational Meeting, 29 September 1901," Minute Books, Rodef Shalom Congregation, Box 905, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹⁰Janice O. Rothschild, As But A Day: The First Hundred Years 1867-1967 (Atlanta: Hebrew Benevolent Congregation, The Temple, 1966), p. 59; and David Marx, Hebrew Benevolent Congregation: Atlanta, Georgia 1867-1917 (Atlanta: Hebrew Benevolent Congregation, 1917), p. 22.

¹¹Cosoe, From Leffingwill to Spoede, p. 12.

¹²Moses J. Gries, "What Jews Believe About Sabbath and Sunday," Moses J. Gries Collection, Box 4, Folder 7, Manuscript Collection No. 53, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹³Abraham Cronbach, "Autobiography," American Jewish Archives II (April 1959): 27. Abraham Cronbach served the congregation as its first rabbi beginning in 1906. On the same page of his "Autobiography," he related the following incident: "Following a practice which I, as a student, had begun when functioning at Lafayette, Louisiana, and at Lincoln, Illinois, during the Holy Days, I held penitential week-night meetings in the vestry room of the South Bend Temple every evening between New Year and the Day of Atonement. The president of the congregation, who was also its founder, happened to be away on a European trip. The president returned on the Friday night after New Year. He came to the interim service which I was holding in the vestry that evening. He proceeded to reprimand me sternly for conducting a Friday evening service. He warned me that kind of conduct would destroy the congregation. Never again did I venture a gathering of that type in South Bend."

¹⁴Joseph Stolz to Hyman Enelow, 10 October 1907, Hyman Enelow Collection, Box 22, Folder 8, Manuscript Collection No. 11, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹⁵Floyd Lloyd Herman, "Some Aspects of the Life of Stephen S. Wise" (Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1964), p. 6.

¹⁶Emil G. Hirsch and J. Leonard Levy, The Free Synagogue (By the Author, 1907), p. 7.

¹⁷Stephen Wise, Challenging Years (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1949), p. 97. According to Herman, "Some Aspects in the Life of Stephen S. Wise," p. 20, Max Heller condemned Wise's action in a vitriolic article in the American Israelite, 25 November 1907, p. 4. Heller did not mention Wise by name, however.

¹⁸Ha-Yehudi, 28 May 1908, p. 16.

¹⁹Ha-Yehudi, 23 March 1911, p. 16.

²⁰"Special Meeting of the Congregation, 24 January 1913 and 2 July

1913, " Minute Books, Mishkan Israel Collection, Box X-162 , American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio. Sunday services were to be discontinued on May 1, 1914.

²¹Leo M. Franklin, " A Decade of Sunday Services," p. 2. Leo M. Franklin Collection, Box 3335, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

²²Ibid., p. 3.

²³Ibid., p. 9.

²⁴Abraham I. Shinedling, West Virginia Jewry, Origins and History 1850-1958 3 vols. (Philadelphia: By the Author, 1963), 3:1410. This author suggested on p. 1374 that the congregation had requested "Dr. A. L. Meyer, minister, to give lectures in the synagogue on the second and fourth Sunday of every month during the winter season [from 1876], until March 1877." However, the same author stated on p. 1410 that in January 1916, the first Sunday lectures were introduced. One may assume that either the author made a mistake, his documents were contradictory, or the congregation never instituted lectures in 1876, although Meyer had been instructed to do so. It is possible that the term "Sunday Lecture" was used when it became a standard weekly event.

²⁵Herbert Parzen, Architects of Conservative Judaism (New York: Jonathan David, 1964), p. 167.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 168-169.

²⁸Adler, Roots in a Moving Stream, p. 134.

²⁹Brenner, The Jews of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, p. 122.

³⁰Rubenstein, History of Har Sinai Congregation, pp. 65-66. According to Rubenstein, "the Sunday service was never officially accepted by the congregation. It was held as a temporary expedient."

³¹Adler, Roots in a Moving Stream, p. 134.

³²Ibid.

CHAPTER VII DECLINE 1920-1980

¹Report of the Committee of Unassigned Pew Seats (Pittsburgh: Rodef Shalom Congregation, 1920), p. 3.

²Ibid.

³Golden Jubilee of Temple Israel (St. Louis: Temple Israel, 1936), p. 15; and Cosoe, From Leffingwill to Spoede, p. 12.

⁴Shinedling, West Virginia Jewry, 3:911. Shinedling provided the following dates for other Sunday service congregations in West Virginia. Generally, these congregations were served by circuit rabbis or by student rabbis: B'nai Israel, Charleston, 1938-1952 under Ariel Goldberg, pp. 550, 568, 624; B'nai Israel, Huntington, beginning in 1939, p. 938; Ohev Shalom, Huntington, 1923-1946, pp. 633, 921; B'nai Israel, Keystone, 1936-1943 under Julius Kravitz, p. 984; and B'nai Israel, Williamson, 1923-1932, 1953 under Abraham Feinstein, pp. 1580, 1596, 1948 under Jerome Grollman, p. 1587.

⁵Isaac W. Bernheim, An Open Letter to Rabbi Stephen Wise (Louisville: By the Author, 1922), pp. 8-9. Although this material was mentioned in the published proceedings of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the text of the address was not included. Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Convention (Buffalo: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1921), p. 8895.

⁶Adler, Roots in a Moving Stream, p. 149.

⁷Milton Richman, "A Study of Three American Reform Temples Between the Two World Wars" (Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1952), p. 26.

⁸Ibid., p. 27. Abba Hillel Silver had been rabbi in Cleveland since 1917.

⁹Rabbinical Assembly of America, Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Convention (New York: n.p., 1933), p. 333.

¹⁰"Special Meeting of the Board of Directors, 22 May 1934," Minute Books, Temple Beth El Collection, Box 665, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹¹"Board of Directors Meeting, 15 May 1934," Minute Books, Temple Beth El Collection, Box 665, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹²Samuel S. Cohon, "Shall We Change the Sabbath to Sunday?" The Jewish Laymen 9 (May 1935): 3, 7.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Elliot Rosenstock to Kerry M. Olitzky, 2 April 1980, personal letter. It is unclear when the congregation initiated Sunday services. It was incorporated in 1875 and may have begun Sunday services shortly thereafter.

¹⁵Rothschild, As But A Day, p. 59.

¹⁶The Findings of An Inquiry on the Layman's Attitude Toward the Reform Synagogue Service, compiled by Arthur L. Reinhart (Cincinnati: National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, [193?]), pp. 19-21.

¹⁷Beifield, "Joseph Krauskopf," p. 109.

¹⁸Adler, Roots in a Moving Stream, p. 193.

¹⁹Board of Incorporation Meeting, 31 January 1957, p. 2, Temple Emanuel, St. Louis, Missouri, Microfilm No. 2505, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

²⁰Board of Directors Meeting, 28 February 1957, p. 3, Temple Emanuel, St. Louis, Missouri, Microfilm No. 2505, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

²¹Proposed Statement of Principles, December 1958, Temple Emanuel, St. Louis, Missouri, Microfilm No. 2505, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

²²Board of Directors Meeting, 2 July 1958, Temple Emanuel, St. Louis, Missouri, Microfilm No. 2505, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

²³Theodore Lenn, Rabbi and Synagogue in Reform Judaism (West Hartford, Connecticut: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1972), pp. 119-120.

SELECTED DOCUMENTS

¹"Special Board of Directors Meeting, 4 November 1873 and 18 November 1873," Board of Directors Minute Books, Chicago Sinai Congregation, Box 9, Folder 5, Manuscript Collection No. 56, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

²"Special Congregational Meeting, 15 December 1879," Minute Books, Congregation Emanu-El, New York, Box 811, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

³"Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees, 6 October 1889," Board of Trustees Minute Books, Temple Beth El, New York, Box 745, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁴"Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees, 19 December 1918," Minute Books, K.K. Bene Israel (Rockdale Temple), Cincinnati, Box 18, Folder 2, Manuscript Collection No. 24, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁵W.H.F., "Sunday Services," The Hebrew Union College Journal 3 (February 1899): 108-110.

⁶History of Congregation Adath Israel (Louisville: Congregation Adath Israel, 1906), pp. 85-87.

⁷Samuel S. Cohon, "Shall We Change the Sabbath to Sunday?" The Jewish Laymen 9 (May 1935): 3, 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, 4 June 1845 - 25 June 1897.

American Hebrew, 7 December 1888 - 18 June 1907.

American Israelite, 28 October 1859 - 27 February 1919.

American Jewish Yearbook. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1902.

Bernheim, Isaac W. An Open Letter to Rabbi Stephen Wise. Louisville: By the Author, 1922.

Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, 1895-1938.

Chicago Alliance, 10 March 1874.

Chicago Sinai Congregation Nintieth Anniversary Souvenir. Chicago Sinai Congregation, 1951.

Chicago Sinai Congregation Bulletin, 13 December 1951.

Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Chicago Sinai Manuscript Collection No. 56.

Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Congregation Mishkan Israel (New Haven) Manuscript Collection, Box No. X 162.

Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. David Philipson Manuscript Collection No. 35.

Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Edward P. Cohn Correspondence File.

- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Hyman G. Enelow Manuscript Collection No. 11.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Joseph Krauskopf Miscellaneous File.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Kaufmann Kohler Manuscript Collection No. 29.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. K.K. Bene Israel/Rockdale Temple (Cincinnati) Manuscript Collection No. 24.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Leo Franklin Correspondence File.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Moses Gries Manuscript Collection No. 53.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Rodef Shalom Congregation (Pittsburgh) Manuscript Collection, Box No. 905.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Solomon Hirsch Sonneschein Manuscript Collection, Box No. X 132.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Temple Beth El (Detroit) Manuscript Collection, Box No. 745.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Temple Emanu-El (New York) Manuscript Collection, Box No. 811.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. Temple Emanuel (St. Louis) Manuscript Collection, Microfilm No. 2505.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. American Jewish Archives. William Rosenau Manuscript Collection No. 41.
- Cohn, Eugene. "The Sabbath Day of the Jew: A Reply to the Rev. Dr. Kohler" Menorah II (November 1891): 277-283.
- One Hundred twenty-fifth Anniversary Service. Boston: Congregation Adath Israel, 1979.

Connecticut Jewish Ledger, 27 July 1972.

Cowen, Philip. Memories of An American Jew. New York: The International Press, 1932.

Cronbach, Abraham. "Autobiography." American Jewish Archives II (April 1959): 3-81.

Davidson, David. Sabbath or Sunday. Cincinnati: Bloch Publishing Co., 1889.

Die Deborah, 15 July 1870.

Einhorn, David. Inaugural Sermon. Translated by Charles A. Rubenstein. Baltimore: Har Sinai Congregation, 1909.

Einhorn, David. Olath Tamid: Book of Prayers for Jewish Congregations. Translated by Emil G. Hirsch. Chicago: Chicago Sinai Congregation, 1896.

Franklin, Leo M. Order of Worship for Sunday Services. Detroit: Temple Beth El, 1904.

Freehof, Solomon B. and Kavalier, Vigdor W. J. Leonard Levy: Prophetic Voice. Pittsburgh: Rodef Shalom Congregation, 1970.

The Free Synagogue Reports Read at the Seventh Annual Meeting. New York: The Free Synagogue, [1914].

Golden Jubilee Year of Temple Israel. St. Louis: Temple Israel, 1936.

Hamagid L'Israel, 1 July 1897 - 30 August 1900.

Ha-Yehudi, 28 May 1908 - 4 February 1907.

Hazefirah, 2 February 1892.

Hebrew Union College Journal 3-5 (February 1899 - October 1900).

Hirsch, Emil G. and Levy, J. Leonard. The Free Synagogue. N.P.: By the Author, 1907.

Hirsch, Samuel. Systematischer Katechismus des Israelitischen Religion. Luxemburg: Druck und Berlag, 1856.

Jewish Exponent, 3 June 1887.

Jewish Messenger, 14 January 1859 - 28 October 1880.

Jewish Reformer, 1 January 1886.

Jewish Times, 17 April 1874.

The Jewish Voice, 25 February 1885.

Kansas City Evening Star, 19 June 1886.

Kansas City Journal, 21 November 1885.

Kohler, Kaufmann. A Living Faith. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1948.

_____. Are Sunday Lectures a Treason to Judaism? New York: Temple Beth El, 1888.

_____. Hebrew Union College and Other Addresses. Cincinnati: Ark Publishing Company, 1916.

_____. "Jewish Reform." Inter-Ocean, 22 August 1873: 2-8.

_____. Origin of the Sabbath. Chicago: Chicago Sinai Congregation, 1876.

_____. "Rocks Ahead." Menorah II (November 1891): 284-293.

_____. "The Sabbath Day of the Jew." Menorah II (September 1891): 151-160.

_____. Studies, Addresses, and Personal Papers. New York: Hebrew Union College Alumni Association, 1931.

Krauskopf, Joseph. The Service Ritual. Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott Co., 1888.

_____. Sunday Lectures, 36 vols. Philadelphia: Keneseth Israel, 1888-1924.

Landsberg, Max. Ritual for Jewish Worship. Rochester: Temple Berith Kodesh, 1890.

Leeser, Isaac. Discourses on the Jewish Religion, vol. 18. Philadelphia: By the Author, 1868.

- Lenn, Theodore I. Rabbi and Synagogue in Reform Judaism. West Hartford, Connecticut: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1972.
- Levi, Harry. Sunday Services. Boston: The Stetson Press, 1919.
- Levy, J. Leonard. A Book of Prayers. Pittsburgh: Publicity Press, 1902.
- Mirsky, Norman. "Sabbath Work and Play." CCAR Journal 15 (January 1969): 51-56.
- Morning Services for Worship. Cincinnati: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1933.
- National Advocate, 13 March 1824.
- Occident, 15 November 1866.
- Orient, 4 June 1845.
- "Origin of the Christian Sabbath," Menorah 4 (February 1888): 217-219.
- Proceedings of the Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference November 15, 17, 18, 1885. Richmond, Virginia: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1923.
- Proceedings of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Vol. I. Cincinnati: Bloch and Co., 1873.
- Rabbinical Assembly of America Proceedings of the Twenty-seventh Annual Convention. New York: Rabbinical Assembly of America, 1933.
- Rayner, William S. Jubilee Year of Har Sinai Congregation. Baltimore: Har Congregation, 1892.
- Reform Advocate. 19 November 1876 - 29 May 1926.
- Reinhart, Arthur L., compiler. The Findings of an Inquiry on the Layman's Attitude Toward the Reform Synagogue Service. Cincinnati: National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, 193?.
- Report of the Committee of Unassigned Pew Seats. Pittsburgh: Rodef Shalom Congregation, [1920].

Report of the Service Committee of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Sunday Services in Chicago Sinai Congregation. Chicago: Chicago Sinai Congregation, [1899].

Rosenau, William. The Sabbath Question. Baltimore: Press of Kohn and Pollack, 1897.

The Sabbath Visitor, 20-22 (1890-1892)

"The Service Ritual." Menorah 5 (October 1888): 265.

Sinai, 1 (1856).

Sonneschein, Solomon Hirsch. Sunday Lectures. St. Louis: Temple Israel, 1886-1887.

Southern Israelite, 31 January 1958.

Stern, David. Sunday Service for Jewish Reform Congregations. Philadelphia: Edward Hirsch and Co., 1883.

Temkin, Sefton D. The New World of Reform. Bridgeport: Hartmore House, 1974.

Weekly Gleaner, 5 March 1858 - 28 June 1861.

Wise, Otto Irving, ed. Sermons and Addresses by Jacob Voorsanger. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1913.

Wise, Stephen S. Challenging Years. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1949.

Zeitgeist, 1 (1880).

SECONDARY SOURCES

Aaron, Marcus L. One Hundred Years: Rodef Shalom Congregation. Pittsburgh: Rodef Shalom Congregation, 1956.

- Adler, Frank. Roots in a Moving Stream: The Centennial History of Congregation B'nai Jehudah of Kansas City 1870 - 1970. Kansas City: Congregation B'nai Jehudah, 1972.
- Beifield, Martin P., Jr. "The Early Years of Joseph Krauskopf of Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel," 9 January 1973. (Typewritten.)
- Beifield, Martin P., Jr. "Joseph Krauskopf: 1887 - 1903." Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1975.
- Blood, William W. Apostle of Reason: Joseph Krauskopf. Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, 1973.
- Brenner, David. The Jews of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Lancaster: Congregation Schaurai Shomayim, 1979.
- Chiel, Arthur A. Looking Back. Woodbridge, Connecticut: Congregation B'nai Jacob, [1974].
- Cosoe, Joseph D. From Leffingwill to Spaede: Highlights in the History of Temple Israel. St. Louis: Temple Israel, 1977.
- Felsenthal, Bernard. Kol Kore Bammidbar: The Beginnings of the Chicago Sinai Congregation. Chicago: Chicago Sinai Congregation, 1898.
- Gartner, Lloyd P. History of the Jews of Cleveland. Western Reserve Historical Society and the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978.
- Glazer, Nathan; Blau, Joseph; Stein, Herman; Handlin, Oscar and Mary. The Characteristics of American Jews. New York: Jewish Education Committee Press, 1955.
- Gottheil, Richard. The Life of Gustav Gottheil: Memoir of a Priest in Israel. Williamsport, Pennsylvania: The Bayard Press, 1936.
- Grumbacher, Peter. "The Sabbath Concept in Judaism." Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1972.
- Heller, James. Isaac M. Wise -- His Life and Thoughts. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916.
- Herman, Floyd Lloyd. "Some Aspects of the Life of Stephen S. Wise."

- Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1964.
- History of Congregation Adath Israel. Louisville: Congregation Adath Israel, 1906.
- Hunnicut, Benjamin Kline. "The Jewish Sabbath Movement in the Early Twentieth Century." American Jewish History 69 (December 1979): 196 - 225.
- Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 1962 ed. S. v. "Lord's Day."
- Kaplan, Morton. "Some Religious Attitudes of Emil G. Hirsch as Reflected in the Reform Advocate 1891 - 1897." 26 May 1955. (Typewritten.)
- Karff, Samuel E., ed. Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion At One Hundred Years. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1976.
- Korn, Bertram Wallace, ed. A Bicentennial Festschrift for Jacob Rader Marcus. New York: KTAV and the American Jewish Historical Society, 1976.
- Kraut, Benny. From Reform Judaism to Ethical Culture: The Religious Evolution of Felix Adler. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1979.
- Marx, David. Hebrew Benevolent Congregation 1867 - 1917. Atlanta: Hebrew Benevolent Congregation, 1917.
- Marx, Robert. "Kaufmann Kohler -- Reformer." Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College, 1953.
- Mayer, Harry H. "The Kansas City Experiment with Reform Judaism: The First Eighty Years: Congregation B'nai Jehudah." 1953. (Typewritten.)
- Meites, Hyman L. History of the Jews of Chicago. Chicago: Jewish Historical Society of Illinois, 1924.
- Minda, Albert. The Story of Temple Israel. Minneapolis: Temple Israel, 1971.
- Parzen, Herbert. Architects of Conservative Judaism. New York: Jonathan David, 1964.
- Petuchowski, Jakob J. Prayerbook Reform in Europe. New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1967.

Philipson, David. "Jewish Reform Movement in the United States." The Jewish Quarterly Review 10 (October 1897): 52 - 99.

_____. The Reform Movement in Judaism. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907.

Plaut, W. Gunther. The Rise of Reform Judaism: A Sourcebook of its European Origin. New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1963.

_____. The Sabbath and the Reform Movement. Cincinnati: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1965.

Pollack, William. "Crisis and Congregation: Institutional Reform in Chicago Sinai Congregation." Term paper, Chicago, Illinois, 8 March 1971. (Typewritten.)

Rosenberg, Stuart. "The Jewish Tidings and the Sunday Services Question." Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society 42 (June 1953): 371 - 385.

Rothschild, Janice O. As But A Day: The First Hundred Years 1867 - 1967. Atlanta: Hebrew Benevolent Congregation, 1966.

Rubenstein, Charles A. History of Har Sinai Congregation. Baltimore: Har Sinai Congregation, 1918.

Shinedling, Abraham I. West Virginia Jewry, Origins and History 1850 - 1958. 3 vols. Philadelphia: By the Author, 1963.

Shusterman, Abraham. Legacy of a Liberal. Baltimore: Har Sinai Congregation, 1967.

Synott, Marcia Graham. The Half-Opened Door. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1979.

Wilansky, Dena. Sinai to Cincinnati. New York: Renaissance Book Co., 1937.