

1996

Reformation Memories: Issues Still with Us

Alice L. Eckardt
Lehigh University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://preserve.lehigh.edu/cas-religion-faculty-publications>

Recommended Citation

Eckardt, Alice L., "Reformation Memories: Issues Still with Us" (1996). *Faculty Publications*. 8.
<http://preserve.lehigh.edu/cas-religion-faculty-publications/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Religion Studies at Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact preserve@lehigh.edu.

June 1996
at Jerusalem

Reformation Memories: Issues Still With Us*
Alice L. Eckardt

As we today look back at the Protestant Reformation we have quite a different reaction than Christians have had at almost any previous time. For one reason, we cannot separate the Reformation from the vilification and at times persecution of other dissenters (all considered linked to the devil), the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation, and the wars of religion that in the next century ravaged so much of central Europe. For another reason, we see that Christian anti-Judaism and antisemitism¹ continued and even increased in its virulence. However "reforming" the Reformation may have been in some respects, it was not so with respect to views about the Jewish community and its religious beliefs. With that in mind let us take another look at that period and at the reformers.

As I observed about ten years ago we need to acknowledge that, for the most part, "it took the German Nazis' "Final Solution" to make Christians begin to be aware that the so-called Jewish problem is in reality a Christian problem and that it has always been so." At stake is not Christian survival but the church's "moral and spiritual integrity." As I studied recent church statements in which Christians have attempted to deal with the problem I discerned six fundamental issues: (1) Christian identity: Is it defined over against and in contrast to Jews and Judaism? (2) Theology: Can the Christian confession of faith be proclaimed without denigrating other religions, especially that of Jews? (3) Scripture: Do (must) Christians interpret the Tanakh/"Old Testament" as proving the authenticity of the church and the inauthenticity of the synagogue or the Jewish people? And the "New Testament" to confirm the church's traditional teaching that Christians have replaced Israel as God's people? (5) God's role in history: Is it essential that Christianity insist God acted definitively and finally in Jesus the Christ? (If so, what are the implications for other faith communities?) (6) The historical record: How will the churches deal with the reality of Christian responsibility for initiating hostility, legislative discrimination, oppression, and various forms of violence against Jews (long before the Third Reich)?²

We need to keep these questions in mind as we listen to the words and thought of the reformers and consider to what extent their ideas may still be regnant.

While the Reformation is often presented as the beginning of

* Paper presented to a conference in Jerusalem of the Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity in Israel, the Ratisbonne Christian Center of Jewish Studies (Israel), and the Christian Scholars Group on Judaism and the Jewish People (USA), May 19-22, 1996.

final version 6/17/96

the modern world, I would argue that the Reformation, at least in its sixteenth-century form, is not really modern in its basic conceptions or intentions. The preceding century of Renaissance was much more modern with its interest in pre-Christian literature, philosophy, and culture, its readiness to engage in more objective and scientific study (even of some documents considered sacrosanct by the Church), its greater openness to the erudition of Muslim and Jewish scholars, and its somewhat more generally secular outlook. In fact, the Reformation was to a considerable degree a reaction against the Renaissance, an attempt to reassert the vitality of a total Christian civilization, such as medieval Christendom represented, but now purified by the removal of irrelevant or false ecclesiastical and doctrinal accretions that reformers believed stood in the way of a proper understanding of God's redemptive action in Christ.

Only in a very few figures of the magisterial Reformation, and in some aspects of the left-wing Reformation, do we find even beginning possibilities of a new understanding of Judaism and a new relationship to the Jewish people. For by and large the reformers continued the church's *adversus Judaeos* tradition, some more vehemently than others, even in the new circumstances of the breakup of the papal-dominated church and the emergence of new national and independent churches. These conditions generally did not improve the Jewish situation and in most cases worsened it. The polemics of the verbal warfare between Catholics and Protestants, between Lutherans and Calvinists, between mainline Protestants and sectarians and those called heretics caught Jews in the crossfire just as military battles usually did. No accusation was seen as more condemning of one's opponent than that of "judaizer" and that accusation was used constantly by all parties.

Toleration was a rare commodity in the sixteenth century; it was not considered to be a virtue since false belief and teaching were held responsible for destroying souls and bringing God's vengeance on all involved parties.³ Instead, the ideal was monolithic Christian unity. The breakup of this monolith put an end to Jews being the only religious minority though it did not put an end to their being considered dangerous threats to the "true faith."

In this period Jewish views also remained primarily traditional, with the conviction that Judaism represented the purest form of faith and the way of life most closely attuned to the divine will. Both sides -- Christian and Jewish -- looked and hoped for the conversion of the other to its own truth. Thus, new movements within either community were evaluated in terms of this possible outcome, or the reverse: a hardening of positions and a deepening of the antagonism.

I

The reformers of the first stage of the Reformation are dominated by the figure of Martin Luther -- a figure of compelling conviction and domineering power; an advocate who could become a raging opponent; a man who recognized and utilized the potency of the printed word, who used coarse and brutal language against any and all antagonists and yet produced a magnificent German translation of the Bible that shaped the modern German language and literary style; a person who appealed to the nationalist aspirations of princes and people but advised ruthless suppression of the oppressed peasant's revolt rather than have his reform be seen as a social revolution.

Luther set out to reform the one church and the Christian state within the framework of the medieval synthesis. He saw Scripture as the only genuine source of Truth and hence rejected all innovations whether of the Church Fathers, church councils, or popes. He was concerned with scriptural interpretation in the church's theology and its application in the church's structure since he believed the church was meant to be the people of God by virtue of faith alone. Instead, he saw an institutional church that focused on rituals and priestly roles, making salvation into a mechanical process and therefore utterly useless: "Because the Papists, *like the Jews*, insist that anyone wishing to be saved must observe their ceremonies, they will perish *like the Jews*."⁴ There was *no* truth outside the gospel. Luther was not open to other points of view; he was absolutely certain that he had received his doctrine "from heaven and by the grace of God,"⁵ and had a mission to deliver it. Since there was only one truth and only one way of salvation, Luther came to be just as committed to rooting out heresy as the patristic and medieval church had been. Heretics were tools of the devil who led the gullible faithful into sin and eternal damnation. But because he was convinced early on that the "end of time" as we know it was at hand, and that the Reformation was but a grace period, everything had to be done quickly.⁶

When the historical situation led him to turn to the princes as the civil arm of Christendom to correct abuses in the church which the sacerdotal arm of Christendom (the clergy) had failed to do, and when his reformed church became the established state church, the question of religious belief became further complicated by the issue of civic loyalty or treason. Moreover, Luther himself became less and less willing to allow other forms of Christianity a public role: by 1525 the mass was forbidden as "blasphemy" and the proper state authority was expected to suppress it; as of 1529 people were to be forced to attend the sermon even if they did not believe, so that they would learn at least the "outward works of obedience"; and in 1531 he agreed that Anabaptists and other Protestant extremists could be "done to death by the civil authority."⁷

But these measures were directed at other Christians; what about Jews? Although Luther was quite prepared to make radical changes in the proclamation of the gospel (in order to make it rest on faith alone) and in church practices and government (to remove mechanical representation of redemption, end clerical celibacy, and abolish all "judaic" emphasis on works-righteousness), he saw no need to alter the *adversus Judaeos* theology of Christian teaching. For by this time Judaism was so universally seen as the enemy of Christ and his church that practically no one in the church could imagine holding a different view without thereby disavowing the gospel.

In Luther's first writing on the Jews, in 1514-15 (before his initial challenge to Rome), he reiterated the traditional church position that God had rejected the Jewish people. Their situation of insecurity and dispersal throughout the world made this obvious to anyone not blinded by willful obstinacy. Yet Jews had not learned from this divine punishment, and they remained obdurate foes of Christianity -- hence foes of God -- and wished to lead others astray also. According to his interpretation of Old Testament prophecies only a small remnant of them would be saved.

Does Luther's well-known writing of 1523, *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew*, indicate that he broke with this traditional anti-Judaism? His language is temperate (for him) and his strategy is humane: Christians are to be guided "by the law of Christian love" in dealing with Jews, should receive them cordially, and permit them to work and trade with Christians. He argued that treating Jews with scorn and arrogance -- as the Catholic Church had been doing for so long -- and making false accusations against them was hardly going to attract them: "If the apostles, who also were Jews, had dealt with us Gentiles as we Gentiles deal with the Jews, there would never have been a Christian among the Gentiles....we in our turn ought to treat the Jews in a brotherly manner...." He even admitted that "after all, we ourselves are not all good Christians either." And he noted that God has not granted to any other nation "so high an honor as he has to the Jews. For from among the Gentiles there have been raised up no patriarchs, no apostles, no prophets, indeed, very few genuine Christians either....He committed the Holy Scriptures, that is, the law and the prophets [to no others]."

In the second half of the treatise he presented an "elaborate argument from Scripture and history to convince the Jews of Christ's messiahship," along with a plea to fellow Christians to treat Jews more kindly in the hope of converting "some of them." He hoped his own reform of the church would enable at least some Jews to see the truth of the purified gospel. But Luther did not expect a mass conversion. He closed by saying, "Here I will let the matter rest for the present, until I see what I have accomplished."⁸

Martin Luther was, in fact, using much the same argumentation

utilized over centuries when Christians tried to persuade Jews that the Old Testament points forward to Christ, and that the New Testament testimony is reliable as well as consistent with earlier prophecies. Even Luther's recommendation of kindness as an instrument of conversion was commensurate with much papal policy. In other words, he had not broken with the past for all his legitimate denunciation of "the papists" on this score. In contrast with many modern scholars of this period Heiko Oberman insists that "Luther's critique of Judaism ... is just as uncompromising in 1523 [even if more mildly expressed] as it is in the later years: Christianity and Judaism are mutually exclusive; *Reformation does not imply salvation for Jews*" (italics added). "The basis of Luther's anti-Judaism was the conviction that ever since Christ's appearance on earth, the Jews have had no more future as Jews."⁹

Although Luther made no practical attempts to alleviate the Jews' situation in Saxony or elsewhere, his admonition regarding kind treatment apparently had some prompt effect among his followers, according to Rabbi Abraham b. R. Eliezer Halevi writing at the time.¹⁰ Unfortunately, this was not to endure for very long. None of the reformers protested when the Emperor imposed the yellow badge on all Jews in his domain. When in August 1536 the Elector John Frederick ordered all Jews to leave Saxony, perhaps even on Luther's advice,¹¹ Rabbi Josel of Rosheim approached Luther with a letter of introduction and an appeal from Wolfgang Capito, a reformer of Strasbourg, asking Luther to intercede on behalf of the Jews in this situation. Capito used a form of Luther's own 1523 position in arguing that the Jews should be helped so that they would realize that Christians "are prepared to treat kindly . . . even our enemies."¹² But Luther refused to intercede because he was certain that such action would only increase Jewish obstinancy, and that nothing but acceptance of their "kinsman and Lord, the beloved crucified Jesus Christ" could "reverse the misery of the Jewish exile."¹³

During the 1530s there was a "Judaizing wave of major significance" as numbers of Christians adopted circumcision and much of Jewish ritual. It is not surprising to find that in 1538 Luther wrote *Against the Sabbatarians*, which was mainly intended to win back the newly made Jews to Protestant Christianity. But of course it attacked everything Jewish and hence is considered among the anti-Jewish writings.¹⁴

In 1543 (twenty years after writing *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew*) Luther produced three works dealing specifically with Jews: *On the Last Words of David; Vom Schem Hamphoras* ("Concerning the Ineffable Name"), and *On the Jews and Their Lies*. Even if we were to ignore the first two because of their viciousness, hatred, lack of human decency, and incoherence,¹⁵ we would need to recognize that they went beyond attacking Jews as persons by dealing with Jewish sources in similar fashion. The last of the three, *On the Jews and Their Lies* (actually the first one written), attacked the

Jews' false pride (of lineage and homeland), their "works-righteousness" (reliance on the covenant of circumcision and the law), their false interpretation of key biblical passages, their calumnies against Jesus and Mary, their hatred for Goyim and their crimes against Christendom. (Here he specifically mentioned the accusations that they poison wells, kidnap and pierce children, and use the blood of Christians.¹⁶) All three of the 1543 writings are bizarre in that they were based on Luther's conviction that Jews had the "evil desire" to convert Christians, whereas obviously the Christian desire to convert Jews was not evil.¹⁷

The last section of *On the Jews and Their Lies* asks, "What shall we Christians do with this rejected and condemned people? Since they live among us, we dare not tolerate their conduct, now that we are aware of [it, because] if we do, we become sharers in their lies, cursing, and blasphemy ... we cannot extinguish the.... fire of divine wrath,...nor can we convert the Jews. [Therefore,] we must practice sharp mercy to see whether we might save at least a few from the glowing flames." Then followed his now well known advice, which was not just given once but three times: burn their synagogues, schools, and houses, and bury all traces of them, remove all their prayer books and Talmudic writings, forbid their rabbis to teach, abolish safe-conduct for them on the highways, prohibit usury to them, and take away all cash and treasure of gold and silver.¹⁸

It is no wonder that Professor Jules Isaac, coming across these words in the midst of the *Shoah* and of his people's and his family's suffering, should write: "Patience, Luther, Hitler will come. Your wishes will be granted, and more! Let us recognize here the family ties, the blood ties, uniting two great Germans, and let us place Luther in the place he deserves, in the first row of Christian precursors -- of Auschwitz."¹⁹

The last words (almost literally) of Martin Luther once again dealt with the Jews. As he travelled to Eisleben in January-February 1546, plagued by a multitude of ills and pains,²⁰ he wrote to his wife that he "must do something about these Jews" (that is, the few still living in some villages) as well as doing something about a Countess who was protecting a few of them.²¹ At the end of a sermon delivered but a few hours before he died, he spoke to the Eisleben congregation about the need to bring their Jewish neighbors to the baptismal font. But, he continued, *if* such efforts should be unsuccessful, "*then* we must not suffer them to remain for they daily abuse and blaspheme Christ....you must not be a partaker in the sins of others."²²

In these last three years we find Luther advocating a very different policy from that of 1523, and a radical one on all counts. Why? The usual explanation that he was disillusioned and embittered by the Jews' failure to embrace Christianity after the reforms and more kindly treatment he advocated is inadequate. It

does not pay sufficient attention to his earlier opposition and antipathy and the consistent anti-Jewish polemic in his Biblical commentaries and lectures. Oberman offers an alternative explanation: that Luther was an apocalyptic who was convinced that the Reformation was the beginning of the end of time, a period of three stages. The first (1519-23) was his own discovery and proclamation of the true gospel; the second (1523-29), the organizing of the reform congregations through catechism, liturgical and institutional reform; and finally (1539ff), the concentration of all enemy forces against God's truth. When he spoke of the Counter-Reformation he meant not only the Catholic Church's counterattack but also the amassing of all the opposing forces of Antichrist and Devil against the true church: the Turks threatening Germany, "Sabbatarians" embracing the Jewish law, Anabaptists and other "false Christians" within the ranks of the Protestant church creating dissent and deserting the gospel. Oberman argues that these signs indicated to Luther that the time left before the end must be very brief; consequently he had no more time for patience with the Jews for their very presence might bring God's vengeance down on their hosts. So if even new harsh conditions would not bring them into the church, then they must be thrust out of the Protestants' realm.²³

At the time a number of Luther's colleagues were somewhat disturbed and embarrassed by these particular writings. Heinrich Bullinger in Zurich denounced Luther's "lewd and houndish eloquence" and "scurrility," and considered *Vom Schem Hamphoras* to be "most vilely written." Andreas Osiander wrote to Elias Levita expressing his severe disapprobation, and also criticizing a number of Luther's inaccuracies.²⁴ Fortunately none of the rulers of the time acted on Luther's advice in these years,²⁵ although when the Emperor died, most of the German states expelled any remaining Jews.

Because the Jews were at the center of Luther's theology in a number of ways, and because Luther's influence was and remained so extensive, a few more observations about him are necessary:

1. Luther insisted that biblical prophecy of salvation is not addressed to Jews *as Jews*; therefore Christians may "despair" of them "with a clear conscience."²⁶

2. For Luther Jews represented the human willfulness that seeks to manipulate and control God, a willfulness found equally in the Roman church and even among "false Christians" within Protestantism such as the Hebraists.²⁷ "Works" became a code word for "the enemy and nemesis that threatens true Christian salvation." But "if the church lives in original sin, Jews live in double sin, that of sinning and causing others to sin, . . . more grievously misleading others."²⁸ Conversion was the only route of salvation for Jews (as reform was for Christians).

3. Luther's lifetime preoccupation with the Old Testament (on which he spent two-thirds of his teaching years) made him less

friendly, rather than more, to Jews of his day. Their stubborn adherence to their own interpretation of Scripture infuriated him and convinced him that it was a result of Satan standing alongside them.²⁹

4. It is particularly important to note that Luther's "ideological Messianism" left no place, no dignity, no rights to those who would not accept it: "whoever does not accept and honor [the New Testament] does not accept and honor God the Father himself."³⁰

We need to recognize inconsistency in Luther's theological interpretation of suffering, an inconsistency that is all too often found even in contemporary Christian circles: The suffering of Christians is seen as a sign of their being God's "new Israel," participating in Christ's suffering and becoming martyrs to the truth of the gospel. But the suffering of Jews is seen as a sign of God's rejection and punishment for their not acknowledging Christ or the salvation God offers through him.³¹

Of particular interest to us today is realizing that Luther was convinced that Jewish homelessness was such an overwhelming proof of God's permanent rejection that he took an oath: "If it should happen that the diaspora comes to an end, and Jews are led back to Jerusalem, then we Christians will follow on their heels and ourselves 'become Jews.'" He even went so far as to say that, if Jews are not led back, "then let them head for Jerusalem, build temples, set up priesthoods, principalities, Moses with his laws, and [thus] become Jews again and take the land into their possession. [W]hen this happens, they will see us come quickly on their heels and likewise become Jews." But, he added, if they do not act in this way, "then it is entirely ludicrous that they would want to persuade us into accepting their degenerate laws...."³²

There are three other Lutheran leaders of the time who deserve honorable mention and a fourth, dishonorable. Andreas Osiander issued (anonymously, in about 1540) a work defending Jews against the allegations of blood libels and ritual murders, by carefully disproving the so-called proofs of their guilt. Moreover he accused "the monks and priests of libelling and persecuting the Jews" for economic reasons.³³ Though he sought to convert Jews to Christianity, he had great respect for the learned rabbis, the Kabala and the Talmud.³⁴

Justus Jonas emphasized the common features of Jews' and Christians' destinies: both had been led astray -- Jews by Talmudic hair-splitting, Christians by scholastic subtleties. Both would be won to the cause of reform by Christians' recovering their Holy Scriptures, and by Jews "entrusting themselves to the unadulterated" Tanakh (that is, giving up the Talmud). Christians ought to recognize Jews as their brethren and companions in destiny, and therefore include them in their prayers. For Christians are guests in the house of Abraham and are united in one

body with Jews -- under the single head of Jesus Christ. For that very reason the church has a responsibility for the mission to the Jews to save as many as possible "from a sinking ship," and he considered Luther's *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew* an excellent missionary tract. However, when Jonas translated some of Luther's works into Latin, he deliberately modified some of the harshest words and arguments, even substituting some of his own ideas. Jonas believed it was more urgent to convert the heathen than the Jews.³⁵

Of the Strasbourg reformer Wolfgang Capito Rabbi Josel of Rosheim (his contemporary) wrote that he was "a mild, warm personality.... In his undogmatic way he was the most broadminded of all the German reformers, the protector of the persecuted and the oppressed."³⁶

Rabbi Josel could not say the same of the other Strasbourg reformer, Martin Bucer, whom he described as "scheming."³⁷ Bucer accused Jews of raging and blaspheming against "our Lord," hating and persecuting Christians, leading a "decadent, selfish and idle life," and corrupting Christians (through bribes) to defend them. Five years before Luther's *On the Jews and Their Lies* Bucer "created the first Protestant plan for the Jews" when he advised Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, that the state should severely punish them both socially and religiously: compel them to attend Christian sermons, force them to reject the Talmud, and require them to do the most despicable, burdensome, and unpleasant jobs "including breaking stone, making charcoal, cleaning out chimneys and latrines."³⁸ Even so, we find the same strange ambivalence in Bucer as we find in so many other churchmen and reformers. For example, commenting on Paul's letter to the church at Rome, he wrote, "We must oppose and love [the Jews] at the same time, and treat them as both enemies and friends -- enemies because of their infidelity and for the sake of the saints among the Gentiles, to whom the Jews stubbornly denied participation in the Kingdom of God" and "friends because of their original selection as God's people and for the sake of the Patriarchs, whose physical descendants they indubitably are." He insisted that "we must view this people even now as one which must be preserved and maintained until its ultimate salvation." Yet, ironically, he was suspicious of those very converts.³⁹

II

When we consider the Reformed or Calvinist tradition, we find that Ulrich Zwingli, who led Zurich into the Reformation camp, censured the Catholic Church for its "judaizing ceremonies," but he had very little consciousness of contemporary Jewry. He followed a more or less traditional theology that saw Jews as once having been God's people, but no longer, having been replaced by Gentile Christians. "There is only one people of God, not two." He held a fairly liberal doctrine of election that saw righteous non-Christians as included in that election, although *no postbiblical*

Jews were listed among some ancient Greeks, Romans, and Old Testament figures he named.⁴⁰

Heinrich Bullinger, who followed Zwingli in the main Zurich pulpit, insisted more than any other reformer on the unity of the Old and New Testaments, though he held that Jews were wrong in refusing to interpret the Old in light of the New dispensation. However, he also insisted that despite all appearances, Jews still "possessed the divine promise and selection."⁴¹ Unfortunately, neither Bullinger nor Zwingli fully developed these ideas that held a more positive view of Jews and Judaism.

With John Calvin (1509-64) we are faced with a complex amalgam of negative and positive positions. We have no evidence of whether his views about Jews and Judaism were influenced one way or the other by his two years of exile in Strasbourg. He knew both Wolfgang Capito and Martin Bucer. And nearby Jewish communities at that time had relatively good relations with their Christian neighbors. In his earlier years in France he had not had any contact with Jews (since they had been expelled long before) nor later in Geneva (for the Swiss cantons had expelled them in the fifteenth century and made no move to readmit them in the sixteenth.⁴²)

With regard to the Mosaic law Calvin took a very positive stand; it is, he said, a teaching of perfect righteousness. It is embedded in every person's conscience. But God also wrote it down because we cannot tolerate "inward accusation." If anyone *entirely and exactly* fulfills all that is commanded, "he will be rewarded with eternal life." But if anyone fails to observe every detail of the Law, "he will receive the condemnation of eternal death." Thus, the Law reduces us to hopelessness, and drives us to surrender ourselves to God's mercy. In order to meet this situation, the Lawgiver did not set aside the Law and thus condone injustice; rather, he fully entered into the man who perfectly obeyed the Law and yet was punished as one who had broken it. Christ has kept the Law for us, and shares the reward for doing so with us. Again in a positive way, Calvin asserted, "The whole intention of the Law is to teach love" -- love of God and love of neighbor. Though it is hard to keep the Ten Commandments, we are not thereby excused. The Law instructs and stimulates us to our duty. Since a believer can never be certain that he has kept it entirely, or that he will not disobey it in the future, he must rely on God's forgiveness. Faith is both the acceptance of, and assent to, the relationship God has established with humans -- through Jesus Christ and the doctrines of the Creed. Faith is acceptance of and reliance on God's promise.⁴³

Is the Mosaic law then eternally valid? In the only exchange Calvin had with a Jew (as far as we can tell), he replied, No. In support of that "no" he used one of the pre-Christian Jewish contentions that in the messianic age the law is automatically

abrogated.⁴⁴ Basically, the Law for Calvin is preparation for Christ, but even so it is still useful in governing a modern political entity such as Geneva, as it is for guiding much of a person's life.

On the negative side of things Calvin consistently attacked Jews for what he saw as their "misinterpretation" of scriptural passages that testify to Christian faith, and their "stubbornness ... to the last ditch" in sticking to their traditional interpretation of the Bible. He was sure this was a sign that God had struck them with blindness for "rejecting the light of heaven when [it was] presented to them [and thus having] kept themselves in voluntary darkness."⁴⁵ Calvin also contended that though the Law was "given for salvation, ... the Jews made their covenant with God invalid at once, and have, by violation of the justice of the Law, called God's anger down even more upon them[selves].... God's covenant [and] adoption [of] the sons of Abraham to himself has been to many the cause of a double destruction" since redemption "becomes twice harmful when it is profaned unjustly." (Calvin did not understand, or accept, that for Jews observing the law is a response to grace.⁴⁶)

Although in his *Institutes* Calvin used Paul's chapters 9-11 of Romans in a relatively sympathetic way, in his later *Commentary* on Romans 11:28-32, and in the *Commentary* on Jeremiah 19:9, he concluded that the Jews' "greatest crime consisted in their lack of faith," and that the Jews' "impiety, ingratitude, and rebelliousness exceeded the crimes of all other nations." Therefore, it was not at all astonishing that God severely avenged Himself.⁴⁷

Calvin lumped together papists and Jews, and attributed the rise of the Antichrist to the Jews. (By contrast Luther attributed it to the pope.)⁴⁸

To the unknown Jewish debater's question, "In what way was your Messiah the king of peace, when ... from that time the world has not rested from wars?" Calvin replied (in part): "the fault does not stick elsewhere than [with Jews who] first among men, ... showed by their obstinacy that they did not want peace with God."⁴⁹

On another point that is relevant to some of our interests both Calvin and Luther opposed Christians making pilgrimages to the Holy Land. Christians should instead focus their attention on the "heavenly Jerusalem" in contrast to Jewish this-worldliness.⁵⁰

In the latter part of his life (1549 and 1550) when many Reformed Christians were being persecuted and living in exile, Calvin may have given some evidence of "a growing sense of the hidden community of fate shared by Christians and Jews in their homeless state of persecution." Two sermon quotations may indicate this tendency:

When we see, then, that we are like the Jews, we feel we are like the Jews, we have a mirror for recognizing rebellion against God. But as it will [lead] to our being punished quite harshly, shall we be able to tell ourselves that not enough has been attempted, and that on our part we have shown ourselves incorrigibles up to the end? And so, when we read [Jer. 16:1-7], let us learn to condemn not the Jews but ourselves, and to realize that we are no better....

...if one makes comparison with those of whom the prophet speaks here [Lam. 1:1], one will find that we are perhaps much worse than those at that [former] time.⁵¹

One significant difference between Calvin and Luther with regard to our subject is that Calvin never produced writings that focused solely on Jews (with the exception of the one exchange with "a Jew" that has been mentioned above but which was never published by him). Rather his references to Jews and Judaism, whether negative or partly positive, are found embedded throughout his writings, in conjunction with his denunciations of Roman Catholics and Anabaptists. Thus Calvin made a sharp distinction between the suffering of Anabaptists and post-biblical Jews and of "pious worshipers . . . in France" and ancient Israelites. In the former case Calvin detected the "damning or 'hardening' function of suffering" as being operative, whereas in the latter cases suffering purified the sufferers and proved their faith was true. Calvin meticulously distinguished between God's curse and wrath meted out to "the impious" and God's chastisement (which is actually a blessing and manifestation of his love) of his true (pious) servants. "Only the true church suffers . . . as a test of faith and as a goad to repentance" whereas "the others suffer . . . as punishment of . . . their errors."⁵²

It is only fairly recently that much specific work has been done to discern just what Calvin had to say about Jews and Judaism.⁵³ He held a theory of development wherein pre-New Testament Israel not only prepared the way for Christ but still provided politically and morally useful laws. He never advocated the use of force against Jews (as he did against Christian heretics), and did not make any effort to undermine the position of Jews still living in Germany or expanding numerically and economically in Polish and Lithuanian territories (where, incidentally,⁵⁴ there was then a sizeable community of Reformed Christians). (However, neither did he consider admitting Jews into his own Geneva community.)

III

It is impossible to go into the complexities of the Anabaptist movement, but a few of the ideas and tendencies in a short-lived South German and Austrian group deserve mention because they

represent a totally different theological tradition. Some of these Anabaptists rejected both the authority the reformers gave to *sola scriptura* and the Catholics' shared authority of Scripture and tradition. For these mystical Anabaptists, for example Hans Denck, rejected Luther's law-gospel dichotomy. His group of Anabaptists denied the usual understanding of the trinity. Christ was not the Son of God but was a son of God, as are all folk (though, to be sure, others in a lesser degree than Christ). Christ himself was seen as a great exemplar and teacher. These Anabaptists put great emphasis on discipleship and martyrdom. It is not enough to believe that Christ died as an atonement for oneself; rather the pilgrim must suffer *with* Christ. Along with the popular medieval mystics, who appear to be the chief source of this Anabaptist movement, they believed that human cooperation with the divine presence in oneself is part of the salvation process. But most important for us is finding that Hans Denck resisted the concept of "external coercion in matters of faith" and sought religious tolerance -- that rarity of the sixteenth century -- and ecumenical dialogue, *including with Jews*. He apparently was a universalist in his theology of salvation.⁵⁵

In addition to this South German and Austrian group we find some Swiss Anabaptists were not as anti-Jewish as most Protestants because they relied primarily on the Old Testament and especially the Five Books of Moses, and were convinced that the history of ancient Israel should be the guide for a modern state. One man -- Augustin Bader -- even had a vision of a multi-religious society in which all faiths and peoples would live in harmony.⁵⁶

IV

One other small group needs a brief mention, though the variety of their views and the complications of their life situations deserve more. These were the Christian-Hebraists, of whom the first half of the sixteenth century produced a goodly crop of excellent scholars, especially from among the Reformed churches. Many of these men began as humanists, influenced by Erasmus, with a scholarly interest in Hebrew of the same sort as those who had an interest in Greek. They hoped the ancient sources could be used to reshape their own societies. (Christian-Hebraists were often fascinated with Kabbalah.)

Christian scholars of Hebrew often "expressed a diminished faith in traditional Christian belief and practice," and of course this immediately raised fears and created antagonism on the part of the church leaders, whether Protestant or Catholic. As Friedman puts it, "the problem posed by Christian-Hebraica was that the scalpel used had a Jewish blade." And since anti-Judaism and antisemitism were so omnipresent, "the integrity of anyone studying Hebrew would be questioned and compromised." All of them were accused of judaizing at one time or another, and it appears that they produced some anti-Jewish writings simply to prove that they

also could be and were against the Jews. This seems particularly evident in the allegedly missionary treatises. Under such a cover the scholars were able to publish some of their most controversial works.

One of the most interesting of this group is Paul Fagius, who is called by Friedman a "Christian Pharisee." Fagius was centuries ahead of his time in being interested in the Pharisaic milieu from which Jesus and the apostles emerged, and in the Jewish origins of Christian practices, beliefs, and prayers. He showed the congruence of New Testament ethics and the *Ethics of the Fathers*, and defended ancient Jewish piety, which "was not corrupted by the passage of time." (Nevertheless, he condemned the rabbis as blind and foolish, and the "dogma of the Talmud" as empty and stupid.)⁵⁷

V

As we consider Jewish reactions to and evaluations of the Reformation and its various leaders (the other side of our subject), we need to be aware that the Jewry of western Europe was in a severe crisis situation. The year 1517 when Luther nailed his 95 theses to the Wittenberg church door was only twenty-five years after the largest, most learned, cultured and established Jewish community of Europe had been forced to choose between conversion to Christianity or expulsion from Spain; only nineteen years after a sizeable portion of those who left Spain for Portugal were faced with a royal decree ordering conversion; and only eleven years after the 1506 massacre of Lisbon, the climax of a wave of pogroms against the "new Christians" (Jewish converts) of that country. The destruction of this centuries-old Iberian community virtually ended Jewish existence (as Jewish) in western Europe, since Jews had already been expelled from England, France, Sicily, southern Italy, and the Swiss cantons. In Central Europe there was no security and new pressures of antisemitism were felt in the German principalities, the imperial cities, and other areas of the Holy Roman Empire where small Jewish communities still existed. As Gordon Rupp has put it, "the 16th century was a time when, for the Jewish people, the dim lights were going out, one by one, across Europe."⁵⁸

Many Jews wondered whether this multitude of sufferings were signs of the Messiah's coming. In any case, given their critical situation, they naturally wondered about the meaning of the Reformation, the many conflicts to which it gave rise, and what implications it would have for their communities, for Judaism as a faith, and for God's plan of redemption. Earlier, in the fourteenth century, a Provence scholar had attributed Jewish suffering to the actions of some Jews who, in the first century, had transgressed by spreading Christianity among the Gentiles, and leading "multitudes without number" astray into this "folly." Exile would be prolonged, he maintained, until "we return to the Lord in complete penitence" and help others "back to the true faith" through Jewish missionary

propagation.

Some of this type of thinking influenced Jewish responses both to the pre-Reformation Hussite movement in Bohemia, and then to the early Luther. His emergence and the vigor of the transformation taking place astonished many Jews and at first led to optimism: Messianic hopes were revived and Rabbi Zacuto chose 1524 as the messianic year of the beginning of the Redemption. Even though Rabbi Joseph ben Joshua haKohen in Italy had no messianic expectations, nor any illusions that Luther was anything but a devout Christian, he nevertheless saw value in the rejection of icons and worship of saints. It was a triumph of wisdom -- and *tikkun*. He was also impressed by the heroism of the French reformers in Provence who remained firm in the face of "Catholic brutality." He hoped that the religious strife with all its sacrifices⁵⁹ would ultimately bring toleration to the European kingdoms, a hope that proved partially correct eventually.

In Germany itself, however, disenchantment soon set in. As Jews there witnessed Luther's growing absolutism, they realized that their own existence was more precarious. Even so, the ever-widening divisions within Christendom still seemed to presage a better time ahead. Rabbi Eliezer Ashkenazi interpreted his time as the "Generation of the Tower of Babel" with Christians seeking to create a "universal caliphate," absolute conformity, and no allowance for religious diversity. This was evil, and therefore God put division among them, for only in a mixed environment (what we would call pluralism) can an individual search for truth and attain it through free choice. Rabbi Eliezer believed that only truth arrived at by free choice had enduring value.⁶⁰

A number of Jews interpreted the fragmentation of Christianity and the religious wars as God's punishment of Christendom for its vilification, expulsion, and other forms of mistreatment of themselves, God's people. Abraham ben Eliezer Halevi, a Spanish Jew, saw the Reformation as a necessary crisis, following the terrible events of 1492, a crisis in which "Luther was God's agent sent to destroy corrupt Rome before the world's end." In the late 1520s Halevi found Luther to be the one he had been anticipating as early as 1478, the one who would "pursue justice and loathe debauchery, [who would] originate a religion, and destroy the houses of the clergy." Luther was, he believed, this man, "'exceedingly noble in all his undertakings'"⁶¹

Another rabbi worked out a chronology of redemption in which 1520-21 and Luther's early activities were the first stage: Luther was seen as a "crypto-Jew" whose revolt would "draw the gentiles near to the Jewish Religion and its laws." Similar wishful thinking led Rabbi Zacuto to think of Luther as a Jew at heart, but using circumspection in order to be successful in winning the public to his views.⁶²

Given the Jewish experiences in Catholic Europe, we might expect to find more silent cheering on behalf of Protestantism. Though this tended to be more the case among Spanish Jewish refugees and Marranos, several factors mitigated against it becoming the predominant position. Italian Jews were still benefitting from the Renaissance atmosphere; antisemitism had increased in Germany from about 1480 and the cities from which Jews were expelled were often Protestant.⁶³ On some of the theological and ecclesiastical issues that mattered to Jews, their own views more often seemed closer to Catholicism. For example, Rabbi Yehiel of Pisa attacked the anti-freewill stance (and especially predestination) of the reformers, and supported the Catholics' pro-freewill position. Likewise he agreed with the Catholics on the merit of good works as against the Protestants' insistence on faith alone.

Rabbi Josel of Rosheim had excellent relations with the reformer Wolfgang Capito at Strasbourg, even attending some of his lectures and sermons, but when Martin Bucer attempted to compel Jewish attendance at sermons, and when Bucer advised Philip of Hesse about how to deal with Jews there, Rabbi Josel went on the counteroffensive. In a 1539 debate at Frankfurt, Bucer treated him so acrimoniously that Josel felt it necessary to say, "God . . . has preserved us since the days of Abraham and will doubtless, in His mercy, also preserve us from you in the future." When Luther published *On the Jews and Their Lies*, Rabbi Josel was able to persuade the Strasbourg city council to prohibit its being reprinted in the city (although he was unable to get them to prohibit its sale). He argued that "never has . . . any scholar [contended before] that we Jews ought to be treated with violence and such tyranny."⁶⁴ He turned to favoring Roman Catholicism more and more, seeing the old system as having better safeguards in it. He did not foresee, nor live to witness, the disastrous change in papal policy that was initiated in 1555 by the newly elected Pope Paul IV (formerly the Grand Inquisitor while he was Cardinal Caraffa). This pope forced Roman Jews into a ghetto, made Catholic toleration of Jewish existence dependent on Jews soon converting, and burned both living Marranos and Jewish books.⁶⁵ Josel also saw Luther's reforms as inclining toward casting off the yoke of restraint, and pandering to the brutish instincts of the mob. The Luther of later years was viewed as a Haman, set to annihilate Jews by harsh measures and forced conversions.⁶⁶

VI

Did anything positive emerge from the Reformation with regard to Christian attitudes toward Jews and Judaism, or religious toleration and liberty? The interest in the Hebrew language and the Jewish literature to which it had given birth helped lay a foundation for a less biased understanding of Jewish faith to emerge eventually. Ulrich Zwingli put forward a democratic concept of the church that would, when combined with other factors largely

outside the churches, contribute to a separation of church and state and freedom of conscience. John Calvin and his colleagues developed a branch of Christianity that had a deep appreciation of Hebrew Scripture and biblical law/"Teaching" (heretofore only regarded as "Jewish legalism," a "dead letter," or an instrument of condemnation). This positive attitude toward Torah and toward Israel would develop in the latter part of the sixteenth century and in the seventeenth century among Dutch and English millenarians and English puritans into a genuine interest in Jews as persons (though still with conversion as a goal).⁶⁷ In 1614, in Brandenburg [Germany], the Elector John Sigismund proclaimed liberty of conscience for his Christian subjects,⁶⁸ while in the 1630s Roger Williams founded the American colony of "Providence Plantation" in order to allow liberty of conscience to be practised by all, including Jews.

In recent decades almost all of the Protestant (as well as Roman Catholic) churches have issued statements expressing regret for the sufferings of the Jewish community and some kind of acknowledgement of the Christian role in this.⁶⁹ These statements need to be examined closely to see how -- and whether -- they address the six crucial issues mentioned at the start of this paper. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky reminds us that the Lutheran church conceives of Christianity as a life of reform; therefore the contemporary rejection of the late Luther's "diatribes and violent recommendations" on the Jews and Judaism⁷⁰ makes the church *more* Lutheran! The most explicit Lutheran repudiation of the church's mission to Jews is expressed by the Synod of the Evangelical [Protestant] Church of the Rhineland (1980): because we "believe that in their calling Jews and Christians are always witnesses of God ... before each other. Therefore, we are convinced that the church may not express its witness toward the Jewish people...."⁷¹ This view is not accepted in many Lutheran circles, and the conviction that conversion is essential remains particularly strong among some of the European Lutheran churches as well as in some other American denominations. The Southern Baptist Convention on June 13, 1996 resolved to *intensify* its efforts to convert Jews, thus maintaining a position taken officially since 1867 in 10 resolutions.

The Reformed churches are also divided, with the Presbyterian Church (USA) revealing some ambiguity on the question whereas the United Church of Christ statement (1987) unambiguously affirmed: "that Judaism has not been superseded by Christianity; that Christianity is not to be understood as the successor religion to Judaism; God's covenant with the Jewish people has not been abrogated. God has not rejected the Jewish people; God is faithful in keeping covenant."⁷²

As we approach the end of this millennium we must not delude ourselves with false optimism, though we need to cling to the signs of hope. We must remain aware of the danger posed by absolutist

views of all kinds and alert to the rise of new or renewed forms of exclusivist claims to truth and rejectionist views of all those believed to be outside the exclusivist ("saved") circle.

Notes

1. I refuse to concede that the word "antisemitism" only belongs to the 19th and 20th century form of hostility to, and hatred of, Jews. We must see the deep-lying psychological and sociological roots of this mass hatred instead of seeing it purely as religious in nature. We must recognize the continuity of hostility and fear that wedded religious teachings to prejudice and hate. Moreover, we must recognize and acknowledge that religious and secular leaders were themselves caught in that web, rather than being free of its entanglements. See William Nicholls on Voltaire in this regard: *Christian Antisemitism: A History of Hate* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc., 1993).

2. Alice L. Eckardt, "A Christian Problem: Review of Protestant Documents," pp. 16-17.

3. See T. H. L. Parker, *John Calvin*, p. 146; Luther, "An Admonition Against the Jews," in Heiko A. Oberman, *The Roots of Anti-Semitism*, p. 121. Luther warned the authorities, do "not make yourselves party to the sins of others" and incur God's wrath on account of the presence of Jews in your midst. If the Jews refuse to convert, "neither tolerate nor suffer their presence" (15 February 1546).

4. Cited in Salo Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, XIII, p. 218, italics added. This view is repeated in various forms in many of Luther's writings, since it was so central to his theology and ecclesiology.

5. Baron, XIII p. 219.

6. Oberman, p. 113.

7. Paul Johnson, *A History of Christianity*, pp. 288-89.

8. *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew*, in *Luther's Works* (hereafter, *LW*), 45, pp. 229, 200, 229, 201, 198, 201, 229. The first half is a reply to accusations made by his opponents that he was teaching that Jesus was conceived by Joseph, that Mary was not a virgin, and that she had many sons after Christ.

9. Oberman, *The Roots of Anti-Semitism*, pp. 111, 46. Heinrich Bornkamm goes even further by finding that Luther asserted that the old covenant did *not* prepare for the new covenant but was its absolute antithesis: "Law and gospel [Old and New Testament] are deadly enemies;" so much so that a believer in the Old Testament "must beat Moses to death" in order to accept the new

covenant. Bornkamm concludes that Luther demolished the whole scheme of salvation history (*Heilsgeschichte*) as the early church interpreted it (*Luther and the Old Testament*, pp. 146, 254, and citing Luther's *Table Talk*, 1532).

10. Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson, "The Reformation in Contemporary Jewish Eyes," pp. 166-67.

11. Baron, XIII, p. 115: "Luther doubtless collaborated." H. Ben-Sasson reports that Josel of Rosheim accused Luther of responsibility for the order of expulsion (*A History of the Jewish People*, p. 651).

12. John W. Kleiner, *The Attitudes of the Strasbourg Reformers Toward Jews and Judaism*, p. 67. See more on Capito later in these pages.

13. Oberman, p. 120, citing Luther's letter to Josel dated 11 June 1537.

14. Oberman, pp. 118-19, 133-34 n. 88.

15. Jerome Friedman advises this course in *The Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 204.

16. *LW*, 47, p. 264.

17. "... the Jews would like to entice us Christians to their faith and they do this whenever they can" (Friedman, *The Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 204; see also *On the Jews and Their Lies*, *LW*, 47, p. 149).

18. *LW*, 47, pp. 268-270, 285-88ff, 292.

19. Jules Isaac, *Jesus and Israel*, p. 249.

20. He was convinced that Jews were causing his ill health as well as perverting Christianity and world order (letter to his wife, 2 January 1546, in Friedman, *The Most Ancient Testimony*, pp. 203, 210 n.1; and *LW*, 50, p. 290).

21. Gordon Rupp, "In the Context of His Life and Times," p. 9.

22. Sermon published as "An Admonition Against the Jews," cited in Rupp, p. 10 (*italics added*).

23. Oberman, pp. 113-117.

24. Baron, XIII, pp. 228, 231, 232; Oberman, pp. 10, 47. Philip Melancthon, Luther's devoted disciple but also a seeker after harmony among the various reformers, kept knowledge of Osiander's letter from Luther out of fear of how the latter would

react. However, Melancthon sent a copy of *On the Jews and Their Lies* to Philip of Hesse with a comment about the useful lessons to be found in it (Baron, XIII, p. 231).

25. What is more interesting, however, is the apparent lack of popular response to these later writings; a much smaller number of them were purchased. Salo Baron believes the public was resentful of the uncouthness of these anti-Jewish tracts, even though it normally enjoyed the mutual recriminations of the theological opponents (Baron, XIII, p. 228). Alternatively, could it be that there was so much of this type of literature available that it simply did not create the same interest as Luther's earlier writings, which had a spiritual force to them despite the invective that was so endemic?

26. Betsy Halpern Amaru, "Martin Luther and Jewish Mirrors," p. 96; Oberman, p. 49 (full quote on p. 137, n. 64).

27. "Many [Christian] Hebraists are more rabbinical than Christian" (Baron, XIII, p. 229; Friedman, *The Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 204).

28. Sholom Singer, *Jews, Luther and the Reformation*, p. 11.

29. Baron, XIII p. 222. See S. Bernhard Erling, "Martin Luther and the Jews in the Light of His Lectures on Genesis," pp. 64-78.

30. *LW*, 47, p. 280.

31. See discussion of Calvin's distinction between the suffering of the "impious" and of the "pious," p. 12 below.

32. Oberman, pp. 49, 64 n. 137, citing *Weimarer Ausgabe, Abteilung Werke*, 50:323, 324, 8.

33. Ben-Sasson, pp. 650-51. Osiander earned the fury of Johannes Eck who hated the reformers and who produced a vicious counterattack, *Against the Defense of the Jews* (1541), (Oberman, pp. 36-37). See p. 7 herein for an earlier comment about Osiander.

34. Oberman, pp. 35-36.

35. Rupp, p. 6; Oberman, pp. 47-49.

36. Selma Stern, *Josel of Rosheim*, cited by Jerome Friedman, "The Reformation in Alien Eyes," p. 35.

37. Friedman, *ibid.*, p. 36.

38. Jack Hughes Robinson, *John Calvin and the Jews*, p. 31; and John Kleiner, *The Attitudes of the Strasbourg Reformers*, pp. 242, 245, 251, 252, 227.

39. Kleiner, pp. 266, 265; Baron, XIII, p. 241.

40. Baron, XIII, p. 236.

41. Baron, XIII, p. 238.

42. In 1632, in Geneva, a pastor was strangled for apostasy and conversion to Judaism (Jules Isaac, *Jesus and Israel*, p. 249).

43. Parker, *Jean Calvin*, pp. 44-45, 46; see also Jack Hughes Robinson, *John Calvin and the Jews*, pp. 184ff.

44. Calvin was responding to the Jewish challenger's use of Matthew 5:17: "I am come not to destroy but to fulfill [the Law]" (Mary Sweetland Laver, *Calvin, Jews, and Intra-Christian Polemics*, pp. 232-33; Baron XIII, p. 290). The full document, *Ad Quaestiones et Obiecta Iudaci Cuiusdam Responsio Io. Calvini* ("Response to Questions and Objections of a Certain Jew") is translated and produced in Laver's volume, pp. 229-61.

45. Baron, XIII, pp. 291, 148-49.

46. Robinson, p. 186.

47. Baron, XIII, pp. 287-88.

48. Baron, XIII, p. 287; Oberman, p. 108; and many passages in Luther's writings.

49. Question VIII and Calvin's response, in Laver, pp. 239-41; and Calvin, *Opera*, IX, pp. 653-746.

50. Mordechai S. Chertoff, "Jerusalem in Song and Psalm," in Alice L. Eckardt, ed., *Jerusalem: City of the Ages* (Washington, D.C., 1986), p. 226.

51. Oberman, pp. 141, 144 n6 (sermons, 8 July 1549, 6 September 1550). Translation provided by Dr. Edna de Angeli.

52. Laver, *Calvin, Jews, and Intra-Christian Polemics*, pp. 204-206, 201-202, 203. All of chapter IV is pertinent to this point.

53. Significant among these recent studies are those by Mary Sweetland Laver and Jack Hughes Robinson, cited herein.

54. Baron, XIII, pp. 291, 462 n100; and "John Calvin and the Jews," p. 159.

55. Werner O. Packull, *Mysticism and the Early South German-Austrian Anabaptist Movement, 1525-1531*, pp. 40, 44, 49-50, 159, 176, 178, 179-80. Such a belief in divine-human cooperation shares an affinity with Judaism.

56. Baron, XIII, p. 244.

57. Friedman, *The Most Ancient Testimony*, pp. 5, 260, 261, 244, 214, 100, 116, 115.

58. Through the fifteenth century and up until 1519 urban expulsions in the German Empire were extensive. After 1520 they were relatively few (Rupp, p. 4; Oberman, p. 93).

59. Ben-Sasson, "The Reformation in Contemporary Jewish Eyes," pp. 244, 263 n78, 277, 283.

60. Friedman, *The Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 257; Ben-Sasson, "The Reformation . . .," pp. 315, 258-59.

61. Friedman, "The Reformation in Alien Eyes," p. 32. Halevi saw all the good things he wanted to see in Luther's *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew*: that Jews had rightly resisted Catholicism; that to be a good Christian one had almost to become Jew; that Catholics could call him (Luther) a Jew if they tired of calling him a heretic.

62. Gershom Scholem, cited in Ben-Sasson, "The Reformation in . . .," p. 264. The view of Luther as anti-Christian was based on his iconoclasticism and detestation of priests (266-67).

63. A negative association was made even when Protestants had not been around at the time of expulsion. We must realize that there was only a very small German Jewish population then -- probably only a few hundred in all Germany, Frankfurt being the largest with about 78 (Kleiner, pp. 43-44).

64. Ben-Sasson, "The Reformation in . . .," pp. 287-88.

65. Kenneth R. Stow, *Catholic Thought and Papal Jewry Policy 1555-1593* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America and Ktav, 1977); Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, pp. 243-44. Paul IV's successor, Pope Paul V, was "even fiercer," expelled Jewish communities which had existed since antiquity (Johnson, *ibid.*, p. 245).

66. Not all rabbis reached this conclusion. Rabbi Hayyim ben Bazalel believed that the reformers' search for truth might make a rapprochement with Judaism possible, whereas Catholicism's asceticism was totally un-Jewish (Ben-Sasson, "The Reformation in . . .," p. 298).

67. Among some twentieth century evangelical Protestants -- not to mention some in mainline denominations -- this appreciation would go much further and even eliminate the conversionist emphasis.

68. D. Clair Davis, "The Reformed Church of Germany," p. 83.

69. See Helga Croner, *Stepping Stones to Further Jewish-Christian Relations* and *More Stepping Stones to Jewish-Christian Relations*; Harold Ditmanson, ed., *Stepping Stones to Further Jewish-Luther Relationships*; and *The Theology of the Churches and the Jewish People: Statements by the World Council of Churches and its Member Churches*. Some important recent statements are not published herein and must be sought elsewhere (e.g., that of the United Church of Christ, 1987; Disciples of Christ [Christian Church], 1988; and Presbyterian Church [USA], 1994).

70. "The Declaration of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to the Jewish Community," adopted April 18, 1994. Earlier, in 1979, the American Lutheran Church adopted a document in which solidarity is affirmed on the basis of all being God's children as well as on the heritage that Jews and Lutherans share. At the same time it acknowledged that differences of understanding remain between the two communities, and, further, that Lutherans remain divided on the matter of mission and conversion (Helga Croner, ed. and compiler, *More Stepping Stones to Jewish-Christian Relations*, pp. 177-84 passim).

71. Croner, *ibid.*, *More Stepping Stones*, p. 208.

72. The full statement was published in *New Conversations* 12, 3 (Summer 1990): 67-68. Subsequent to its adoption it became clear that many in the United Church of Christ did not agree with it.

References and Bibliography

- Amaru, Betsy Halpern, "Martin Luther and Jewish Mirrors, *Jewish Social Studies*, XLVI (Spring 1984).
- Baron, Salo. "John Calvin and the Jews," *Harry A. Wolfson Jubilee Volume*. Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1965, pp. 141-158.
- _____. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Second Edition, Vols. XIII, XIV. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953-1969.
- Ben-Sasson, Haim Hillel. *A History of the Jewish People*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- _____. "The Reformation in Contemporary Jewish Eyes," in *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, IV: 12, pp. 241-326. Jerusalem, 1971.
- Bornkamm, Heinrich. *Luther and the Old Testament*. Trans. Eric and Ruth Gritsch; Victor I. Gruhn, ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- Calvin, Jean, *Ad Quaestiones et Objecta Iudaei Cuisusdam Responsio* ("Response to Questions and Objections of a Certain Jew"), in *Opera*, IX, 653-74.
- Cooperman, Bernard, ed. *Jewish Thought in the Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Croner, Helga, ed. and compiler. *Stepping Stones to Further Jewish-Christian Relations*. New York & London: Stimulus Books, 1977.
- _____. *More Stepping Stones to Jewish-Christian Relations*. New York: Stimulus Books/Paulist Press, 1985.
- Davis, D. Clair. "The Reformed Church of Germany," in W. Stanford Reid, ed. *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1982, pp. 123-40.
- Dickens, A. G. *Reformation and Society in Sixteenth Century Europe*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1966.
- Ditmanson, Harold. *Stepping-Stones to Further Jewish-Lutheran Relationships: Key Lutheran Statements*. Augsburg: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1990.
- Eckardt, Alice L., "A Christian Problem: Review of Protestant Documents," in Croner, ed. and compiler, *More Stepping Stones...* pp. 16-23.

- Erling, S. Bernhard. "Martin Luther and the Jews in the Light of His Lectures on Genesis," *Immanuel* [Jerusalem], 18 (Fall 1984): 64-78.
- Freidman, Jerome. *The Most Ancient Testimony: Sixteenth-Century Christian Hebraica in the Age of Renaissance Nostalgia*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1983.
- _____. "The Reformation in Alien Eyes," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, XIV, 1 (1983):23-39.
- _____. "Sebastian Münster, the Jewish Mission and Protestant Antisemitism," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 70 (1979): 238- 59.
- Gritsch, Eric, W. and Marc H. Tanenbaum. *Luther and the Jews*. Reprinted by Department for Ecumenical Affairs, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 1995.
- Gutteridge, Richard. "Luther and the Jews," Appendix I, *Open Thy Mouth for the Dumb: The German Evangelical Church and the Jews, 1879-1950*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976.
- Halpern Amaru, Betsy. "Martin Luther and Jewish Mirrors," *Jewish Social Studies*, XLVI 2 (Spring, 1984): 95-102.
- Isaac, Jules. *Jesus and Israel*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.
- Johnson, Paul. *A History of Christianity*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976.
- _____. *A History of the Jews*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1987.
- Kleiner, John W. "The Attitudes of the Strasbourg Reformers Toward Jews and Judaism." Ph.D. thesis, Philadelphia: Temple University, 1982.
- Klenicki, Leon and Franklin Sherman. "Luther, Lutheranism, and the Jews," in *Interfaith Focus*, Year 2, 1, 1995.
- Laver, Mary Sweetland. *Calvin, Jews, and Intra-Christian Polemics*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1987./
- Luther's Works*, Vol. 45, Walther I. Brandt, ed. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962.
- _____, Vol. 47, Franklin Sherman, ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- "Martin Luther and the Jews," *Face to Face*, X (Spring 1983).