

THE AMERICANIZATION OF THE JEWS

Edited by Robert M. Seltzer
and Norman J. Cohen



NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS
NEW YORK AND LONDON

1995

The Evolution of the American Synagogue

Jonathan D. Sarna

The idea that ours is an "evolving" American Jewish community seems, at first glance, self-evident. A closer look, however, discloses that the word "evolving" is cognate to "evolution," a controversial term in modern culture that most of the time is used all too loosely. "Evolution" has meant different things to different people, and each meaning is ideologically freighted.

According to Raymond Williams, the word "evolution" derives from a Latin forerunner meaning "to unroll," as in "unrolling a book." Used in this sense, "evolution" implies *inherent development*, the unrolling of something that already exists. In the nineteenth century, particularly under the influence of Darwinism, "evolution" took on a different meaning. The new definition, according to Williams, involved "a process of natural historical development," a nonteleological process, unplanned and without any sense of inherent design, such as in the common understanding of the phrase "the evolution of humankind." Over the course of the past century, "evolution" has taken on an additional meaning: slow change that is "controlled by what already exists." In this sense evolution is juxtaposed to revolution, which involves "faster changes designed to alter much of what exists." Evolution is unhurried and conditioned; revolution is sudden and violent. (This leads to an implicit value judgment: slow, measured change—evolution—is seen as in step with nature and good; sudden, rad-

ical change—revolution—is seen as out of step with nature and bad.)¹

All three definitions of “evolution” have their counterparts within the American Jewish community, resulting in three interpretations of the phrase “the evolving American Jewish community.” Following the first definition the community’s history is viewed as unfolding (or “unrolling”) along a predetermined course, usually one leading inexorably to assimilation and decay. According to this interpretation, the question is how far American Jewry has already come along the road to its inexorable end. Are we close to our inevitable fate, approaching the midway point, or still back at the beginning of the journey, with miles to go before we weep?

By contrast, the second definition looks upon the American Jewish community as an object of history, shaped and reshaped by forces external to itself. Like an evolving humanity, the community is constantly evolving and will continue to do so. It may be transformed, but it will not necessarily disappear.

According to the third definition, the Jews have control of their own communal destiny: they can promote evolution by pursuing modest changes, or they can promote revolution through more radical ones. “The evolving American Jewish community” is a prescriptive rather than a descriptive title and, by implication, usually favors an evolutionary strategy for American Jews as against a revolutionary one.

With these definitions in mind, I should like to focus on one aspect of American Jewish communal evolution: the development of the American synagogue. “The evolution of the Synagogue as the basic institution in Jewish group life is central to the history of the Jewish community in America,” according to Moshe Davis,² so one could scarcely hope for a better case study. In the concluding section, I will attempt to delineate those elements that shed light on broader questions of religious and institutional change within the American Jewish context and to explain why the ambiguity concealed in the definition of the word “evolution” is appropriate.

The first American synagogue was founded in the late seventeenth century in New York City. Jews had settled in New Amsterdam

back in 1654, but by law they could not worship publicly, only privately. After the surrender to the British in 1664, this changed; by 1700 a rented piece of real estate on Mill Street (now South William Street) had become known as the “Jews’ Synagogue.” Appropriately, the congregation’s official name would be Shearith Israel (“remnant of Israel,” see Micah 2:12); it is today popularly known as “the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue.”³

In 1728, the members of Shearith Israel purchased a small parcel of land on Mill Street for a new synagogue. Consecrated on the seventh day of Passover, April 8, 1730, “it was the first structure designed and built to be a synagogue in continental North America” and is known historically as “the First Mill Street Synagogue.”⁴

Like all early American synagogues, and indeed most synagogues in Europe, Shearith Israel saw itself as a *kahal kadosh*, a holy congregation, an all-embracing synagogue-community. It was lay dominated—no ordained rabbis graced American pulpits until the 1840s. It followed Sephardic ritual, even though by 1720 the majority of American Jews were already of Ashkenazic descent.

The synagogue-community had no legal standing in the colonies. Jews were not required to join it. In practice, therefore, on many issues, the congregation could only act on the basis of consensus—a pattern that holds true for many American synagogues today. Unlike the contemporary synagogue, the early American synagogue-community held a virtual monopoly on most aspects of Jewish religious life, including circumcisions, marriages, and burials, making it easier to enforce its authority. (The standard punishments meted out by synagogues throughout the Western world were fines and threats of excommunication.) “In this phase of Jewish history,” Martin Cohen writes, “the synagogue reinforced the basic values . . . which traditionally have shaped Jewish life. Socially it was the place where Jews met, commented on events, communicated their needs, planned their charities, adjudicated their disputes, and held their life-cycle events. In the synagogue, bridegrooms were given recognition, mourners comforted, strangers fed and housed, and the *herem* or ban of excommunication, pronounced against recalcitrants.”⁵

The American Revolution brought about great changes in the American synagogue. By that time America’s Jewish population

had grown to over one thousand. There were five synagogues operating in the former colonies, one in each of the major communities where Jews lived. Buffeted by contemporary ideological currents, Jews widely approved of the new values: democracy, liberty of conscience, church-state separation, voluntarism. If synagogues wanted to maintain their members, they had to adapt.⁶ This was not just another case of Jews blindly following the supposed rule that "as go the gentiles so go the Jews." Instead, Jews and Christians alike were influenced by similar communal and cultural developments, ones to which all religions needed to respond. In studying "the evolving American Jewish community," we should be wary of dismissing as assimilation what might more appropriately be understood in terms of challenge and response.

How did synagogues respond? For one thing, they composed new constitutions. The very term "constitution" was an innovation; formerly, synagogues had called their governing regulations by the more traditional Jewish term of "Hascamoth." The new documents contained large dollops of republican rhetoric and permitted more democracy within the synagogue than before. One constitution began, "We the members of K. K. Shearith Israel . . ." Another opened, "We, the subscribers of the Israelite religion resident in this place desirous of promoting divine worship, . . ." and then proceeded to justify synagogue laws in staunchly American terms.

Several synagogues introduced into their laws what they called a "bill of rights": provisions that set forth members' "rights and privileges" and made it easier for all members to attain synagogue office. Formerly synagogues had been run by a self-perpetuating elite that paid the bills and made the rules. In the post-Revolution era, particularly in Shearith Israel of New York and Mikveh Israel of Philadelphia, younger leaders emerged, among them men of comparatively modest means. Several synagogues now used a new term, "president," to describe their leader, replacing the traditional Hebrew term "parnas." At an early stage, then, the American synagogue sought to harmonize itself with the values, traditions, and even the standard vocabulary of the larger society.⁷

The next critical juncture in the history of the American synagogue—perhaps the most important change from the beginning

until now—was the shift in the first half of the nineteenth century from synagogue-community to community of synagogues. For over a century each community had one synagogue and no more, a practice that unified Jews but stifled dissent; from then on communities would be divided among many different and competing synagogues. Philadelphia is the first city to have had two synagogues: a Sephardic synagogue, Mikveh Israel, was founded in 1771; an Ashkenazic synagogue, Rodeph Sholom, was established in 1802 (possibly earlier). Why this second synagogue was founded is unclear, but the name, meaning "pursuer of peace," hints at the absence of communal peace; *shalom*, in most such cases, was more hope than reality.⁸

In 1824–25, in Charleston and New York, the power of the synagogue-community was effectively broken through secession. In both cities the challenge came largely from young Jews dissatisfied with synagogue life and concerned that Judaism would not survive unless changes were introduced—a perennial theme in modern Jewish movements. In both cases, the young Jews petitioned for changes: the Charleston Jews sought rather radical reforms, the New York Jews more moderate ones. In both cases their petitions were denied. The dissenters then did what religious dissenters usually do in America: they formed their own congregations, B'nai Jeshurun in New York and the Reformed Society of Israelites in Charleston.⁹ Henceforward, in larger communities, dissenters no longer needed to compromise principles for the sake of consensus: they could withdraw and start their own synagogue—which they did time and again. In New York, there were two synagogues in 1825, four in 1835, ten in 1845, over twenty in 1855. Some synagogues split several times over.¹⁰ Five corollaries about American Jewish religious history can be derived from this development:

1. *De facto pluralism.* Although throughout the nineteenth century American Jewish leaders continually sought to unify Jews around a single ritual—what Rabbi Isaac M. Wise liked to call "Minhag Amerika"—religious pluralism became the reality for American Jews, like Protestants before them. Nineteenth-century Jews (and their Christian counterparts) considered this to be a misfortune. In the twentieth century, as American Jews embraced

cultural pluralism as an alternative to the melting pot, many came to see the development as a good, even as a key factor in preserving American Judaism from one generation to the next.

2. *Competition.* The existence of multiple synagogues within one community fostered competition for members. Synagogues thus had a new interest in minimizing dissent and keeping members satisfied. They emulated one another's successes, exploited failures, and instituted changes to stave off membership losses. Synagogues that refused to compete disappeared.

3. *The end of synagogue coercion.* Pluralism changed the balance of power between the synagogue and its members. Before, when there was but one synagogue in every community, it could take members for granted and discipline them, for they had no option but to obey. Now, Jews did have an option; in a sense, synagogues now needed them more than they needed any particular synagogue. As a result, by the midnineteenth century, synagogue bylaws listed punishments (fines) only for a small number of infractions—unexcused absences from meetings or funerals, unwillingness to accept proffered synagogue honors, or gross breaches of discipline—and most fines were later remitted. The once feared *herem* (excommunication) virtually disappeared. Where competition was sharpest, synagogues became more concerned with attracting members than with keeping them in line.

4. *Ashkenazic predominance.* Sephardic synagogues suffered most from the breakdown of the synagogue-communities because the conditions that had maintained Sephardic hegemony for more than a century after the Sephardim themselves had become a minority now disappeared. Practically all the new synagogues were in one way or another Ashkenazic in ritual and custom (German rite, Polish rite, English rite, and so forth) because, with the growing democratization of American Jewish life, the majority ruled.

5. *Communal reorganization.* Increasingly, American synagogues—autonomous congregations based upon ritualistic, ideological, and region-of-birth differences—came to represent diversity in American Jewish life; they symbolized and promoted fragmentation. To bind the community together and carry out functions that the now privatized and functionally delimited synagogues could no longer handle required new organizations capable of transcending

these differences. Beginning in the 1840s, philanthropic and fraternal organizations—*B'nai B'rith*, the Hebrew Benevolent Society, and other associations—moved into the void. Henceforward, the community's structure mirrored the federalist pattern of the nation at large, balanced precariously in a tension between unity and diversity.

Within congregations themselves, the breakdown of the synagogue-community set off a period of enormous change. Pent-up dissatisfaction, fear for the future of Judaism, the need to attract new members, the influence of European Reform Judaism and American Protestantism, a desire to win the respect of Americans for Judaism, and a feeling that the synagogue had to come to terms with the realities of American life all resulted in a series of reforms that completely revolutionized synagogue life and worship. Throughout the country, synagogues moved more into line with Protestant-American religious norms in the hope that this would make them more appealing to the younger generation.¹¹

What kinds of changes were introduced?

1. *Rules concerning decorum and etiquette.* "The chaotic, self-governing congregation," in the words of Leon Jick, now became "a training school in propriety." Explicit rules, welcomed by most congregants, banned talking, spitting, loud kissing of *tzitzit*, walking around, standing together, conversing with neighbors, and cracking jokes or "making fun."¹²

2. *English-language Bibles, prayerbooks, and prayers.* Most American Jews did not understand Hebrew; many could not even read the language. As a result, and probably influenced by the vernacular prayers of American Protestants, some expressed deep dissatisfaction with the traditional liturgy that contained no English whatsoever. Translations that individuals could read while the traditional Hebrew was intoned solved the problem in part. Many congregations admitted selected English prayers into the worship service.

3. *Regular vernacular sermons.* Sermons, the centerpiece of Protestant worship, were no more than occasional features of the traditional Sephardic liturgy, delivered only on special occasions or when emissaries came from the Holy Land. The move to a regular weekly sermon in the vernacular was inaugurated in 1830 by Isaac

Leeser, the foremost traditionalist American Jewish leader of the early nineteenth century and at the time the minister at Congregation Mikveh Israel in Philadelphia. His example was widely emulated.¹³

4. Aesthetic improvements to the synagogue. In an effort to make the synagogue more appealing so that it might attract new members and proudly be displayed before Jews and gentiles alike, architectural and aesthetic reforms were introduced, aimed at transforming the synagogue from a simple house of prayer into a showpiece. The new focus on aesthetics affected not only the physical appearance of the synagogue but also the worship itself, which became more formal and performance oriented.

In addition to these reforms, which could be justified on the basis of Jewish law, an increasing number of synagogues by midcentury initiated more radical changes. They feared that cosmetic alterations alone would be insufficient to preserve American Judaism for subsequent generations. Hoisting the banner of Reform, these synagogues introduced bolder innovations than had hitherto been sanctioned. The pace and extent of reform differed from synagogue to synagogue, but generally the changes included liturgical and theological innovations, increasing use of the vernacular, the introduction of an organ and a mixed choir, a shift from separate to mixed seating, and abandonment of headcoverings, prayer shawls, and the second ("extra") day of Jewish holidays.¹⁴

For many Jews in the nineteenth century, the synagogue now became the locus of religion, replacing the home, where fewer and fewer ceremonies were observed. Indeed, traditional home ceremonies like candlelighting, *kiddush*, and *sukkah* were increasingly shifted into the synagogue. This had important implications for women, whose domain formerly had been the home. In the nineteenth century they flocked to the synagogue, just as Protestant women flocked to church, and synagogues had to find ways of meeting their needs. Suddenly, and perhaps for the first time in history, some synagogues had more women in attendance on Saturday morning than men. The significance of this phenomenon has only begun to be studied, but on the basis of what we know already, we can conclude that the impact of these women on the life of the synagogue was enormous.¹⁵

East European Jewish immigrants, in the period of mass immigration (1881–1924), found the American synagogue alien, different from anything that they had experienced before. They therefore created *landsmanshaft* synagogues that at once linked them to the Old World, replicated many of the broad functions of the traditional synagogue-community (burial, sick care, etc.), and aided them in the process of Americanization. In other words, the synagogue served as a "mediating structure," easing immigrants' transition from Old World to New. In time, these synagogues underwent many of the transformations experienced by the Sephardic and Ashkenazic synagogues of the previous century. Showpiece synagogues, performance-oriented Judaism, an emphasis on decorum, and a liturgy spiced with English and highlighted by a weekly sermon all came to characterize the congregational life of East European Jews too, with further changes introduced later for the sake of their children.¹⁶

By the end of the nineteenth century a spectrum of synagogues dotted the American landscape, from traditionalist Orthodox to middle-of-the-road Conservative to innovative Reform. Synagogues proliferated, competing with one another and catering to different tastes and needs. Despite talk of unity, diversity had become institutionalized through different movements, and individual synagogues still preserved their own autonomy. What did unite synagogues—and what continues to unite them—was the determination to preserve Judaism, to keep it alive for the next generation. There was, of course, no agreement as to how to do this. Instead, different synagogues pursued different strategies directed toward this aim.

This brings me to twentieth-century developments, which, given constraints of space, I can do no more than outline. Many of the following themes in recent synagogue history have nineteenth-century roots.

1. Professionalization. Rabbis, cantors, and synagogue administrators have become professionals over the past century, complete with their own professional training schools and their own professional organizations. This has improved their status and pay but has tended to create a "professional distance" between them and those they serve. It has also tended to make the atmosphere of the

synagogue more businesslike—so much so that many contemporary synagogues are run on a corporate basis, with charters, board rooms, and a chairman of the board.

2. *Synagogue involvement in social action.* Influenced by the Protestant Social Gospel and the challenge posed by Felix Adler's Society for Ethical Culture, this movement in synagogue life has attempted to prove that Judaism is no less concerned than Christianity about the ills of our society, and that one need not abandon Judaism in order to become active in social reform. It also offers those who find regular worship unappealing a way of involving themselves "Jewishly" in a religiously sanctioned manner.

3. *The synagogue-center movement.* The effort to broaden the reach of the synagogue by turning it into a full-fledged community center, or *bet am*—a place where organizations can meet, recreation and education take place, and Jews socialize—has deep roots in Jewish tradition, including, as we have seen, in American synagogue history itself. It also was influenced by the Protestant institutional church movement, by a perceived need to involve the synagogue in the effort to solve urban problems, and, most of all, by the desire to find a way of luring the disaffected children of Jewish immigrants back to the synagogue. Championed (but not originated) by Mordecai Kaplan, this idea has had an enormous influence on all American synagogues by encouraging them to broaden their activities into areas that they had neglected.

4. *Pastoral care.* The allure of Christian Science and the popularity of such books as Joshua Loth Liebman's *Peace of Mind* demonstrated a demand by American Jews for psychological guidance from their religious leaders. In response, seminaries introduced into their curricula courses in pastoral psychology, and synagogues encouraged their rabbis to set aside time for pastoral counseling. This further broadening of the synagogue's role illustrates the process by which the twentieth-century synagogue confronted new challenges and met them successfully.

5. *Child-centeredness.* One of the major objectives of the twentieth-century synagogue has been to instill Jewish consciousness into school-age youngsters. More adults join a synagogue when their children reach school age than at any other time, and they do so in the hope that the synagogue can inspire their youngsters to main-

tain Judaism when they grow up. To meet this challenge, synagogues have become increasingly child centered. Activities, rituals, and even the worship service itself are frequently arranged with children in mind.

6. *Feminism.* The feminist movement has affected American synagogues in a variety of ways. Women now serve as rabbis, cantors, officers, and in other important capacities, and more women expect to be treated equally in all aspects of Jewish law and practice. Synagogues have become more conscious of women's issues, sensitive to "sexist language," and innovative in their approach to women's rituals and spirituality. Indeed, feminism may well prove to be the most far reaching of all the challenges that the twentieth-century synagogue has encountered.

7. *Privatization.* While less noticed than the other themes I have touched upon, privatization has had a major impact on contemporary synagogue life by emphasizing family at the expense of community and by elevating intimacy into a spiritual goal. This development is particularly apparent in architecture: "intimate settings," back from the street and nestled among the trees, have become favorite locales for new synagogue buildings. Within the synagogue, joyous family celebrations, including bar and bat mitzvah, are now more often private events, shared with family and friends, not with the full community of worshippers. The *havurah* movement and the proliferation of Orthodox *shtiblekh* reflect, in part, a similar search for intimacy. Indeed, Harold Schulweis, who views "the primary task on the agenda of the synagogue" as "the humanization and personalization of the temple," once described the *havurah* as a "surrogate for the eroded extended family."¹⁷ This is a far cry from the idea of the synagogue as community that was for so many years widely articulated.

What do all of these changes teach us about the evolving American Jewish community? First, that change has historically come about in the American Jewish community through a process of challenge and response. In the eighteenth century, religious liberty introduced free-market competition into American religion; dissatisfied Jews now had the option of looking elsewhere. The fear that Jews might trade in old loyalties for more accommodating new ones acted as a major spur to communal change. Prevented by

American law and tradition from either locking out external challengers or banishing internal ones, the community, in order to survive, has had to keep its constituents reasonably contented. That goal has frequently entailed sanctioning modifications ("reforms") of one kind or another to prevent defections and to hold challengers at bay. The paradoxical result is that those who have sought to weaken the community have often been the catalyst for changes that made it stronger.

Second, communal challenges have usually been met in ways that reflect different strategic analyses of how best to promote communal survival. Historically, some sectors of American Jewish leadership have emphasized the importance of educating Jews to ward off challenges, others have insisted that Judaism itself must bend to survive, and most have called for some combination of these strategies. Diversity of religious options within the American Jewish community mirrors the diversity of the community itself. Changes in American Judaism have proceeded along a multitude of paths, some of which have ultimately led to dead ends while others have broadened into spiritual thoroughfares.

Third, young Jews have played a disproportionate role in promoting communal change. In 1825, the movement for religious change in New York was led by "young gentlemen," while the average age of those involved in the Charleston Reform movement around the same time was thirty-two. Subsequent movements for Jewish "reform," "revitalization," "advancement," and "reconstruction" have displayed a similar tendency to attract young people (or "Young Israel") for understandable psychological reasons. Where such movements have likewise attracted older Jews, their justification usually lies in concern for communal survival—the fear that unless Judaism changes, the next generation will abandon it.

Fourth, changes in the American Jewish community have in many cases run parallel to changes taking place in other American faith communities and within the nation at large. Religious liberalism, the social justice movement, pastoral psychology, neo-Orthodoxy, religious revivalism, feminism—all are examples of movements that have left a broad impact on American religion, transforming Christianity and Judaism alike. Mutual influences, important as they are, are not the critical factors here, nor can

these phenomena be explained on the basis of "mere" assimilation or independent parallel development. Instead, both Christianity and Judaism have been influenced by developments affecting the nation as a whole, developments to which all American faiths have been challenged to respond.

Finally, although nobody doubts that the American Jewish community has evolved through the decades and continues to evolve, disputes over the meaning of these changes and their long-term implications for Jewish life have flared repeatedly for almost two centuries. From one direction have come warnings that changes of all kinds only hasten American Jewry's inevitable demise—whether through assimilation, antisemitism, or communal division. From another direction, assurances have been heard that celebrate many of these same transformations as signs of communal vitality and ongoing creativity. From a third direction have come voices of compromise, championing modest changes as a brake against radical and dangerous ones.

Each of these arguments can be defended, and as we have seen, each may be inferred from the word "evolution" itself, as it has been variously defined. Indeed, the three approaches stand in vigorous tension to one another: each corrects the other's excesses. This "evolution debate" is more than just a problem of definition and interpretation. At a deeper level, the ambiguity of meaning be-speaks a cultural ambiguity: the dynamic struggle between tradition and change that lies at the heart of the American Jewish experience as a whole.¹⁸

Notes

1. Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (New York: Oxford, 1976), 103–5.
2. Moshe Davis, "The Synagogue in American Judaism," in *Two Centuries in Perspective: Notable Events and Trends, 1896–1956*, ed. Harry Schneiderman (New York: Monde, 1957), 210 (emphasis added).
3. David and Tamar de Sola Pool, *An Old Faith in the New World: Portrait of Shearith Israel, 1654–1954* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955).
4. *Ibid.*, 44.
5. Martin A. Cohen, "Synagogue: History and Tradition," in *The Encyclo-*

- pedia of Religion*, vol. 14, ed. Mircea Eliade (New York: Macmillan, 1987), 212.
6. Jonathan D. Sarna, "The Impact of the American Revolution on American Jews," *Modern Judaism* 1 (1981): 149–60.
 7. Many of these constitutions are reprinted in Jacob R. Marcus, *American Jewry Documents: Eighteenth Century* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1959). See also Sarna, "The Impact of the American Revolution," 155–56; and Jonathan D. Sarna, "What Is American about the Constitutional Documents of American Jewry?" in *A Double Bond: The Constitutional Documents of American Jewry*, ed. Daniel J. Elazar, Jonathan D. Sarna, and Rela Geffen Monson (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1992).
 8. Edwin Wolf II and Maxwell Whiteman, *The History of the Jews of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1956, 1975), 222–33; Jacob R. Marcus, *United States Jewry, 1776–1985*, vol. 1 (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 221–23.
 9. The history of the Charleston Reform Movement has been frequently recounted. The most complete and up-to-date account is in Gary P. Zola, "Isaac Harby of Charleston: The Life and Works of an Enlightened Jew during the Early National Period" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati), 336–463; see also Marcus, *United States Jewry*, 1:622–37; Michael A. Meyer, *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 228–35; and Robert Liberles, "Conflict over Reform: The Case of Congregation Beth Elohim, Charleston, South Carolina," in *The American Synagogue: A Sanctuary Transformed*, ed. Jack Wertheimer (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 274–96. For B'nai Jeshurun, see Israel Goldstein, *A Century of Judaism in New York: B'nai Jeshurun, 1825–1925* (New York: Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, 1930), 51–56; Hyman B. Grinstein, *The Rise of the Jewish Community of New York* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1945), 40–49; Marcus, *United States Jewry*, 1:224–26; and the documents in Joseph L. Blau and Salo W. Baron, eds., *The Jews of the United States, 1790–1840*, vol. 2 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), 533–45.
 10. Grinstein, *Rise of the Jewish Community of New York*, 472–74; Gerard R. Wolfe, *The Synagogues of New York's Lower East Side* (New York: New York University Press, 1978), 37.
 11. Lance J. Sussman, "Isaac Leeser and the Protestantization of American Judaism," *American Jewish Archives* 38 (April 1986): 1–21; Leon A. Jick, *The Americanization of the Synagogue, 1820–1870* (Hanover, N.H.: Brandeis University Press, 1976).
 12. Jick, *Americanization of the Synagogue*, 115–16.
 13. Lance J. Sussman, "The Life and Career of Isaac Leeser (1806–1868): A

- Study of American Judaism in Its Formative Period" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati), 84–96.
14. Jick, *Americanization of the Synagogue*, 76–194; Naomi W. Cohen, *Encounter with Emancipation: The German Jews in the United States, 1830–1914* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1984), 159–202; Meyer, *Response to Modernity*, 225–63.
 15. Karla Goldman, "The Ambivalence of Reform Judaism: Kaufmann Kohler and the Ideal Jewish Woman," *American Jewish History* 79, no. 4 (Summer 1990): 477–99.
 16. Jonathan D. Sarna, ed., *People Walk on Their Heads: Moses Weingerber's Jews and Judaism in New York* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1982), 4–29.
 17. Harold M. Schulweis, "Restructuring the Synagogue," *Conservative Judaism* 27 (Summer 1973): 18–19.
 18. Portions of this essay have appeared previously, in different form, in my introduction to *American Synagogue History: A Bibliography and State-of-the-Field Survey* (New York: Markus Wiener, 1988), 1–22; and in my "The American Synagogue Responds to Change," *Envisioning the Congregation of the Near Future* (typescript, Benjamin S. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, 1990), reprinted in *Cincinnati Judaica Review* 2 (1991).