1

Introduction

Presentation

Chaim Gurland, Chaim Jedidjah Pollak and Isaac Lichtenstein were all Jews born in Eastern or Central Europe in the 19th century, and they all embraced the Christian faith. Their attitudes to Judaism and Christianity were, however, very different.

Rabbi Chaim Gurland, later known as *Pastor Rudolf Hermann Gurland* (1831–1905), from Lithuania, was in his lifetime one of the most famous and prominent characters within the evangelical church and its mission to the Jews, especially in the Russian Empire.[1] Gurland apparently followed the traditional pattern for converted Jews, leaving behind all connection to his Jewish background, and none of his descendants cultivated any connection to their Jewish origins.[2] In this Gurland appears representative of the vast majority of Jews who were baptized during this period. However, a close reading of the sources concerning Gurland seems to modify this image.

Chaim Jedidjah Pollak, later known as *Christian Theophilus Lucky* (1854–1916), from modern-day Ukraine, was a gifted scholar of Jewish tradition who made a significant contribution to the Christian missions and churches that were involved in evangelizing the Jews. He was baptized and was ordained in a Protestant denomination in the USA. He accepted Christianity and published Christian periodicals for Jews both in

1. Lillevik, "Rudolf Hermann Gurland," 22–23.
2. Hans-Heinrich Gurland, in a letter to Raymond Lillevik, November 2004.

Hebrew and English (*Edut leIsrael* and *The Peculiar People)*, yet fiercely criticized traditional mission work to the Jews. Lucky maintained that Jewish believers in Jesus should stay within the Jewish people and their traditions as much as possible.

Rabbi Isaac Lichtenstein (1825–1908) openly confessed his belief in Jesus while still in office as a relatively highly-ranking Hungarian rabbi. He never joined any Christian denomination by being officially baptized, but baptized himself in a synagogue *mikve* (ritual Jewish bath). In a number of publications and letters in response to criticism from both Christian and Jewish circles, he defended his belief in Christ and his ambivalent relationship to Judaism and the Christian church.

The aim of this dissertation is to present critical biographies of Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein and analyze how these three Jews viewed their Jewish identity in relation to their Christian faith. For the sake of comparison, Gurland is assumed to represent the standard or stereotypical convert missionary who assimilated into non-Jewish society, while Lucky and Lichtenstein represent different attitudes and strategies for Jewish believers in Jesus to maintain a Jewish identity. The chronology of the dissertation will therefore follow the order in which Gurland is described and discussed first, followed by Lucky and Lichtenstein.

Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Road Less Taken

The existence of Jesus-believing Jews who claim some sort of Jewish identity (today often called Messianic Jews) has traditionally been regarded as controversial or quite simply neglected by the majority of people in both Christian and Jewish tradition.

From the Jewish point of view, a Jewish believer in Christ has been regarded as an apostate, a *meshummad*, lost to the Jewish nation as well as to Judaism as a religion. Because of the traumatic experiences of the Jewish Diaspora in Christian Europe since antiquity, the antipathy towards Jewish converts to Christianity can be quite strong. Traditionally, a conversion to Christianity has therefore been regarded as social suicide as well as an attack on the Jewish community.[3] The consequences of such a conversion still vary, but even today baptized Jews are explicitly regarded as non-Jews, having "separated themselves from the national destiny of the Jews." This leads to conflicts within families as well as ju-

3. Harris-Shapiro, *Messianic Judaism*, 177.

dicial and political consequences.[4] After having lost a member of the family to the Christian faith, some traditional Jewish families observe *Shiva*, the traditional week of mourning for the dead, while according to the Israeli Supreme Court, Jesus-believing Jews who immigrate to Israel cannot become Israeli citizens: "But the Jewish people has decided during 2,000 years of its history" that Messianic Jews "do not belong to the Jewish nation and have no right to force themselves on it."[5]

At the same time, the church has tended to suspect these Jewish Christians of syncretism or the "Judaizing" of Christianity. Since the beginning of the Constantinian period, the idea of being a Jew and a Christian simultaneously has been regarded as impossible, or at the very least controversial. For many Christians, Jewish believers in Jesus with a strong Jewish identity not only represented some sort of religious and cultural hybrid, but also challenged the traditional framework of Christian tradition and belief, even the understanding of what a Christian is.

This phenomenon is a paradox, as the first Christians were all Jews who also worshiped the God of Israel. However, the fact that the majority of the Jewish people followed what became rabbinic Judaism, and that the majority of the church very soon consisted of Gentiles, led to an estrangement between the two religious bodies.[6] After Constantine, the number of converted Jews was never high, except for the enforced mass conversions in Renaissance Spain. The number of Jewish conversions to Christianity increased significantly during the 19th century; according to estimated numbers from the beginning of the 20th century approximately 200,000 Jewish persons were baptized during the 19th century.[7]

4. Hertzberg, "Jewish Identity," 370.

5. Justice Menachem Elon quoted in *New York Times*, December 27, 1989 in the article "Israeli Court Rules Jews for Jesus Cannot Automatically Be Citizens." See http://www.nytimes.com/1989/12/27/world/israeli-court-rules-jews-for-jesus-cannot-automatically-be-citizens.html. Although the State of Israel grants its inhabitants religious freedom, a Christian from a Jewish background will not be given status as a citizen. This practice has been confirmed several times in Israeli decisions in court cases on the Law of Return since 1950. For references to the Law of Return since 1950 and the different cases of the Israeli authorities vs. Brother Daniel (1962), Eileen Dorflinger (1978) and Beresford (1989 and 1992), see Stern, "Court Cases," 87–96; Cohn-Sherbok, *Messianic Judaism*, 199.

6. Hvalvik, "A New Sect," 19–26. See also Nerel, "Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History,*" 65–86.

7. Thompson, *A Century*, 264.

This was a result of the European emancipation and the new possibilities of advancement within European society. Baptism was frequently regarded as the sole key to upward social mobility: "they moved from nominal Judaism to nominal Christianity."[8] However, the increase in converts is also due to increased missionary efforts by many Protestant churches and mission organizations starting around 1800, especially in Great Britain and the USA.

Over the next 100 years an increasing number of converts became more aware of their Jewish heritage. Some of the converts became part of small congregations designated for Jews by both denominational and non-denominational missionaries.[9] After World War 2 (WWII) and the establishment of the State of Israel, Jewish-Christian (in English-speaking countries called Hebrew-Christian, later Messianic) congregations slowly emerged across the church landscape. In 2004, there were about 200 self-identified Messianic congregations in the USA and 80 in Israel.[10] Their ties with traditional churches vary widely, but all base their confession of faith on the New Testament. In addition, there are also an unknown number of Jewish believers in Jesus in traditional churches all over the world.

Because of the shock of modern anti-Semitism, and particularly the *Shoa* (the Holocaust), many of the major Protestant churches in Europe and North America have more or less abandoned traditional mission work to Jews, replacing it with inter-religious dialogue.[11] In addition, European mission work has lost its influence in general. Before WWII, the predominant mission activity among Jews came from British missions like the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews and the Mildmay Mission to the Jews. After the war, American organizations took over that position.[12]

In this new religious atmosphere, mission work toward the Jewish people is often regarded as attempted spiritual destruction of a people already threatened by assimilation, and theologically superfluous. The claims of Messianic Jews are troublesome for the on-going dialogue between Christians and Jews, as they seemingly blur the traditional

8. Endelman, *Jewish Apostasy*, 9.
9. Glaser, "A Survey," 421.
10. Zaretsky, *Jewish Evangelism*, 23–27.
11. Rudnick, *Studium zum christlich-jüdischen Gesprach*.
12. Ariel, *Evangelizing*, 215.

boundaries between Judaism and Christianity. Although conversions in both directions continue, the traditional pattern, in which the convert assimilates into the new community, is usually followed. When some Jews insist on having a place in both communities, this disturbs many people's image of what makes a Jew.[13] However, in the last two decades there has been a certain shift in the awareness of the phenomenon among scholars. While Jewish academic articles and studies during the 1970s and 1980s either ignored the movement of Jesus-believing Jews or found it hard to take them seriously, from the mid-1990s the tendency has been to describe the converts more impartially and less stigmatically.[14]

Contemporary Messianic Jews still face many challenges, not only from traditional Jews and Christians, but also in the form of internal tensions. Although many Messianic Jews find a place within the Messianic movement, many also place themselves in traditional churches and denominations.[15] Although the question "Can Jews believe in Jesus and

13. Describing a certain Jewish identity today is a very complex task. Traditionally, Jewish identities were defined by where people were living and how they practiced Judaism. Generally there was a distinction between Sephardim and Ashkenazim, but these were usually broken down into several sub-groups depending on where the person came from. In relation to religious practice, people would either be pietists (the *Hasidim*), formalists (*mitnagdim*) or modernists (*maskilim*). For the last 200 years, parallel to growing anti-Semitism and assimilation, there has been a disintegration of Jewish identities. Today there is much debate not only on whether Jewishness should be defined in secular or religious terms, but also between different religious Jewish denominations like Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and Reconstructionist, just to mention a few. Sergio DellaPergola states, "Judaism is a multi-faceted complex of normative, cognitive, behavioural affective and other types of expression. It can be at the same time religion, ethnicity, culture, organized community, social group, collective and personal historical memory, folklore, and more. Therefore, no single indicator or measure can adequately catch the complexity of Jewish identification. Jewish identification can and should be described and measured through a variety of different indicators" (DellaPergola, "Jewish Identity/Assimilation/Continuity").

14. Ariel, *Evangelizing*, 268–73. See also the bibliography in Schainker, "Imperial Hybrids," 317–31.

15. This includes the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox as well as the Protestant churches. It is therefore interesting to see how e.g., Russian Jewish Christians see themselves as a part of the Russian Orthodox Church, Kornblatt, *Doubly Chosen*. As the characters that will be treated in this study all became more or less associated with Protestant churches and Jewish missions, the situation within the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox churches is not a topic here. However, it should be noted that particularly since the establishment of the State of Israel, so-called Hebrew Catholics have become a factor of certain weight within the Catholic Church in Israel, and a competitive force against Palestinian Catholics. Nerel, "Nostra Aetate," 47–58.

still be Jews?" is answered with a "Yes," the practical consequences are intensely debated. Some of the discussion is related to the general internal Jewish discussion about Jewish identity that has been going on since the Enlightenment. However, theological disagreements on topics such as the doctrine of the Trinity, Christology, soteriology (teaching on salvation) and the role of the Torah also surface.[16]

From the Christian mission's point of view, the challenges facing Jesus-believing Jews are not unique. For centuries both Protestant and Roman Catholic missions increasingly have had to deal with issues related to contextualization of the Christian message, particularly related to the churches in the non-European world. Traditionally, mission activity has led to a certain adaption of the missionaries' culture among the new Christians, and in most churches in the non-Western world issues concerning local identity are discussed. In recent years there have been discussions related to so-called Muslim Background Believers and Jesus Bhaktis. As the terms indicate, these are groups of people from a Muslim or Hindu background that seek to combine Christian faith with their cultural identity while living in their traditional context.[17] This phenomenon in many ways resembles the positions of Lucky and Lichtenstein.

In this study I seek to describe the idea of sameness, coherence and continuity in regard to the combination of Christian faith and being Jewish as it was understood by three particular individuals. Why have I chosen to study Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein for this purpose? First of all, the embryonic period of the modern Messianic movement is usually held to be the last decades of the 19th century, when Jewish/Hebrew Christians and the mission societies first faced the discussion about Jewish-Christian congregations that followed the growing national consciousness among the Jewish people at that time. Lichtenstein, Lucky and Gurland represented different solutions to the issue of Jewish Christians' relationship to their Jewish identity. The fact that they were either rabbis or talmudic scholars makes them significant because it is interesting to see how Jews rooted in the Jewish people and with a good understanding of Judaism viewed the relationship between Judaism/Jewish tradition and Christian faith. It is no coincidence that

16. Karabelnik, "Competing Trends," 52; Telchin, *Some Messianic Jews Say*.

17. For some, this means that they participate in the prayer in the mosque, and during the recitation of the Muslim creed they profess faith in Jesus instead. Chandler, *Pilgrims of Christ*, and Blystad, "Muslimske Jesus-disipler," 6–7.

Kai Kjær-Hansen counts Lucky and Isaac Lichtenstein among the four "big" Jewish Christians around the year 1900, together with Joseph Rabinowitz (1837–1899) and Yechiel Lichtenstein (or Herschensohn; ca. 1830–1912).[18] Gurland appears as a character who is representative of the many Jewish Christians who associated with mainstream denominations instead.

Second, the quantity of the literary material from Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein lends itself to research and comparative study. Because of the confiscation and destruction of the German and Austrian Jewish mission archives as well as the *Shoa* itself, much of the material is today only available in Scandinavia, Great Britain and the USA.[19]

Third, the stories about Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein are in many ways part of a rather unknown chapter of Scandinavian church history. All three of them had significant contact with the mission societies in Norway and Denmark. In the 1860s and 1870s, Gurland was one of the first missionaries of the Norwegian Israel Mission, and was later employed by a Norwegian-American mission, while Lucky and Lichtenstein cooperated with missionaries and representatives from these missions.[20]

Previous Research

Much of the available information about these three has never been collected or compared. Basically, this dissertation is therefore the first academic contribution to provide new historical knowledge and understanding of Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein.

In his work about Jewish mission history in the 1890s, Joh. de le Roi presents Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein, giving his readers his evaluation of them and even advice on how one should relate to Lichtenstein and Lucky. Later Jewish mission literature and histories of Hebrew Christianity only describe one or two people in each work, with the exception of Oskar Skarsaune's work in Norwegian on the Norwegian Israel Mission, which includes all three. Few Jewish studies

18. Kjær-Hansen, "Lucky," 3. In comparison, Mark Kinzer operates with very much the same list, although exchanging Yechiel Lichtenstein with Paul Levertoff, Kjær-Hansen, "Mark Kinzer," 4.

19. Baumann, "The History," 26.

20. Lillevik, "Rudolf Hermann Gurland" and "Lucky—møteplager?," 22–24.

on conversion to Christianity in the modern age focus on individuals, and when they do, it is often within the context of assimilation or studies on cults and identity. One of the few individuals who have been studied by both camps is Joseph Rabinowitz, from Kishinev (today's Chisinau[21] in Moldova/Bessarabia), the founder of the first Jewish-Christian synagogue in modern times. That congregation was a result of the same cultural process that influenced Gurland, Lichtenstein and Lucky.[22]

Method: A Narrative and Analytical Approach

To be able to provide new insight about Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein, the first step is to make a critical reconstruction of their life-stories, depending on what is possible to know from the sources and what is believed to be relevant for the question about identity. However, this dissertation does not limit itself to presenting biographies of these three individuals, but seeks to analyze their perception of Christian faith and Jewish identity. This raises several methodological challenges. As far as the approach to sources is concerned, there is not any established use of theory that has won canonical status in historical studies.[23] This makes the choice of methods even more crucial, and basic questions need to

21. Due to the historical and political events of the twentieth century many places in Central and Eastern Europe have changed names one or several times the last 150 years, and/or there have been a great variety of spelling standards, depending on the languages. Cities like Stanislau (now Ivano Frankovsk), Kishinev (today Chisinau) and Mitau (now Jelgava) are good examples of this. Although not always consistent, I have used the names that were in use in the timespan of this dissertation.

22. The following list presents some of the works that refer to Gurland, Lucky, or Lichtenstein: Joh. F. A. de le Roi: *Geschichte der Evangelischen Judenmission seit Entstehung des neueren Judentums* (3 vols.; 2nd edition; Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin no. 9; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899), vol. 2 (Grossbritannien und die aussereruopäischen Länder während des 19. Jahrhunderts); Thompson, *A Century of Jewish Missions*; Hugh Schonfield, *The History of Hebrew Christianity from the First to the Twentieth Century* (London: Duckworth, 1936); Jacob Jocz, *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ: The Relationship between Church and Synagogue* (3rd edition; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979); Oskar Skarsaune, *Israels venner—Norsk arbeid for Israelsmisjonen 1844–1930* (Oslo: Luther Forlag, 1994); Glaser, "A Survey"; David Eichorn, *Evangelizing the American Jew* (New York: Jonathan David Publishers, 1978); Steven J. Zipperstein, "Heresy, Apostasy, and the Transformation of Joseph Rabinovich," in *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World* (ed. Todd Endelman; New York: Holmes & Meier, 1987), 206–31; Kai Kjær-Hansen, *Joseph Rabinowitz and the Messianic Movement: The Herzl of Jewish Christianity* (Edinburgh: Handsel, 1995).

23. Rüsen, *History,* 93.

be considered. Social identity is connected to self-definition and self-understanding, and in many ways it constitutes a person's values and worldview. An analysis of an individual's Jewish identity therefore demands a systematic approach, making it possible to single out certain variables and elements of Jewish identity. On the other hand, a connection of Jewish identity to one or several individuals makes it necessary to deal with historical and biographical questions as well, as the formation of identity follows the personal development of the individuals. This development is influenced by their cultural, social and ideological context. It therefore seems most relevant to use both the analytical and narrative approaches in the outline, a combination that is well known in literature and biographical studies.[24] Based on a large selection of source material by and about Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein, I will describe and discuss their ideas in light of relevant aspects of their historical and cultural situation as well as a functional theory on Jewish identity.

Consequently, this dissertation builds not only on church and mission history before World War 1 (WWI), but also on modern Jewish history, studies in Judaism and studies in Jewish demography. The specialization of scientific disciplines makes it difficult for many scholars to give statements about phenomena that lie under another discipline, and as a Lutheran theologian, I do not claim any professional competence in Jewish studies. However, to address the topic I believe this approach most useful, although I risk being criticized for being light-handed on certain issues.

In the following I seek to describe and explain history, and will not explicitly establish normative theological solutions for either Jewish or non-Jewish believers. Neither is it my intention to make affirmative research on behalf of sympathizers or opponents of the Messianic movement. Nevertheless, it is well known that historical comparison can easily carry some sort of political agenda in the choice of comparative situation, hidden or not.[25] In light of the controversial aspects related to Jewish believers in Jesus, many will probably find that there is an element of sympathy to the phenomenon in the choice of topic for the study itself. I am also aware that reconstructing the lives and views of Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein can become part of constructing contemporary Jewish-Christian identity (or identities). However, regardless

24. Longum, *Drømmen*, 15.

25. Penslar, *Israel in History*, 4.

of any controversial aspect of the choice of topic, the dissertation itself follows ordinary scientific values.

Sources

Neither Gurland, Lichtenstein, nor Lucky operated with a clear program on Jewish identity for Jewish believers in Jesus, with the partial exception of Lucky, and even he did not discuss the topic systematically. Consequently, most of the material I have found on identity and faith in Jesus is not written in a systematic form, but rather as autobiographies, mission reports, conference minutes and more or less polemical articles and letters. The material I have used for this study is primarily selected from the literature where Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein describe, comment, or discuss issues that are related to Jewish identity. In addition, I build upon material from people who were friends or coworkers with them, where the same issues are in focus and related to Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein. Both my presentation of their life stories and my analysis also rely on some secondary sources that are important for understanding the socio-political, religious and cultural contexts of the individuals.

The material was produced in certain contexts and situations, and the content is determined by demands about which we cannot be sure we know everything. In addition, most of the sources were written in the context of Christian mission, and the reader needs to consider the ideological background and purpose of the particular material. The background and context might have influenced what material was selected or omitted, and how it was edited. It is necessary to take into account that the individuals behind the source material were not only observers, but their perspectives may have influenced the material. Not least, they could also have operated as agents for their own or others' interests, a natural dimension in many sources historians deal with.

When reading Gurland's, Lucky's and Lichtenstein's ideas about issues like, e.g., Jewish-Christian congregations or the Zionist movement, one must consider the possibility that they would write what was expected of them, or that they had certain agendas when writing. This is an obvious aspect when reading much of Gurland's material, which usually was aimed at friends and supporters of the Jewish missions. This may also have been the case even for Lichtenstein's writings and Lucky's

Hebrew journal *Edut leIsrael*. At different periods Lucky cooperated on the journal with different mission societies in New York and in Berlin, and it must be considered whether this influenced his editorial work. Isaac Lichtenstein's material may have been colored by how he clearly was in opposition to the leadership of the Hungarian Reform Jewish community before WWI. In addition, from the 1890s, he and his books were dependent on financial support from a committee of mission leaders in Britain.

Similarly, one must consider the motives for writing of those who wrote about Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein. Both Gurland's widow, Helene Gurland, and Joh. de le Roi wrote for friends of the Jewish missions in the German societies in general, and would possibly highlight material that was of particular interest in these circles. However, Helene Gurland also appears to have in mind her contemporary Baltic German society. Moses Löwen, August Wiegand, Max Weidauer and Gisle Johnson not only had been either sympathizers or opponents of Lucky, but at the time they wrote, some of them were involved in discussions about Jewish identity for Jewish Christians in the mission societies. Theodor Zöckler's (one of Lucky's friends) article about *Edut leIsrael* in *Saat auf Hoffnung* in 1892 and 1893 is particularly interesting in this regard. This article does not only present much material from the Hebrew journal translated to German, but was published at a time when Lucky's agenda caused much debate among the Jewish missions in Germany. The same issues were highly controversial when David Baron and Ragnvald Gjessing wrote about Lichtenstein as well.

The main languages for this study are English and German. As *Edut leIsrael* was written in late 19th-century Hebrew, I have been dependent on Hilary Le Cornu's English translation of many of the Hebrew volumes.[26] In addition, in the 1890s Theodor Zöckler wrote a detailed article about this journal that includes much material translated into German, which I also refer to.[27]

Obviously this material must be read in its biographical context as much as possible. The written material by Gurland, Lucky and

26. Unpublished translations by Hilary Le Cornu of excerpts of *Edut leIsrael* 1 (1888); 2 (1890); 3 (1891); 4 (1897); and 5 (1898). The volumes from 1897 and 1898 are entitled *HaEdut.* The Hebrew material is made available by Jorge Quiñónez at http://vineofdavid.org/remnant_repository/theophilus_lucky/.

27. Zöckler, "Judentum und Christentum," *Saat auf Hoffnung* 29 (1892) 205–15, 249–65; 30 (1893) 41–54. The English translation in the notes is mine.

Lichtenstein extends over several decades, which means that the investigation must take the relevant time span into consideration. While Lichtenstein's literary production took place from 1886 to about 1900, Lucky's was between 1888 to close to the beginning of WWI. In Gurland's case his biography uses material that spans from his teenage letters in the 1840s to his death in 1905. However, the use of (auto) biographies as sources must also be done with much care. Narratives and personal stories are usually not straightforward and accurate reproductions of life as it was lived, and the reader of the material must consider several characteristic features of the genre:[28] 1) Memory is a reconstruction of past events, interpreted in light of contemporary need to create meaning. In addition, the passage of time erodes a person's narratively constructed identity, making it necessary to reconstruct it time after time.[29] 2) The biographical narrative draws out from the background those elements that compose the plot that is the focus of attention. 3) The use of culturally available plots, like the conversion narrative pattern, not only shapes the reconstruction but may lead to exclusion of material.[30]

These considerations are relevant for all of the persons who are the objects of this study. In particular they are relevant for Gurland's *In zwei Welten*. The biographical material on Lucky is special, as he seems to have avoided, and perhaps even mocked, the standard conversion narrative. On Lichtenstein, the biographical material is scarce. Still, the material is in no way worthless for any of them. The notion that historical narrative explanations are selective and interpretative does not mean that any actual occurrences referred to in the narrative are fictional and mere projections of the narrator.[31] The challenge is to balance methodological skepticism of the sources while writing history based upon them.

In addition, writing biographical sketches of Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein is in itself something that needs consideration. Stephen Walton describes the fundamental elements of modern biographies as a combination of a human life, described more or less chronologically,

28. Polkinghorne, "Narrative Psychology," 9–18, 9.

29. Ibid., 14.

30. In pietistic and evangelical circles, salvation was largely understood as the experience of conversion. This consequently formed the conversion narrative genre, describing the convert as moving from darkness to light in the given scheme of spiritual experience. Hindmarsh, *The Evangelical Conversion Narrative*, 15.

31. Polkinghorne, "Narrative Psychology," 18.

with some sort of (pseudo)intimacy, usually describing the erotic life of the individual. In addition, the individual is supposed to represent values or ideas worth paying attention to or even imitating. The disposition of the biography is usually based on anecdotes. Walton claims it is misleading and positivistic to believe that a biography can explain how a person "really" was, and he thinks scholars instead should let the sources speak for themselves as much as possible.[32] In fact, the life and the work of an individual can be totally irrelevant for each other, and consequently he wants more focus on the works of the individual, and less on the person himself.[33]

Although I find Walton's perspectives valuable, I disagree with this separation of the subject from her/his work. Generally, in fruitful research one cannot separate the subject from the work, although one needs to distinguish between them while (re)constructing a life story. I also disagree with his view of anecdotes as useless. As a biography tries to combine the characteristic and original about a person with how this person represents his own background and contemporary society at the same time, anecdotes may be adequate and relevant sources. The anecdotes found in the sources used in this dissertation usually describe exactly what was felt to be characteristic about Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein, and how they acted in extraordinary or unexpected ways. In fact, research on identity often relies on insights from social sciences, and I believe it is essential to keep in mind some of the criticism these disciplines have met on behalf of human free will. One of the most famous critics of the social sciences, Hannah Arendt, not only distrusted these sciences for misunderstanding the social society they tried to understand, she also claimed these sciences underestimated human freedom itself.[34] On the other hand Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein were children of their times, like everybody else, and it is important to survey the socially determined aspects in their attitudes to Jewish identity.

32. Walton, *Skaff deg eit liv!*, 32–34.
33. Ibid., 37.
34. Baehr, *Hannah Arendt*, 4.

Constructing Identities

Individual and Social Identities

Identity refers to the totality of characteristics that individuals hold to constitute their self, which is based upon pre-adult identifications with behavior and values of persons close to the child. Later these identifications are (usually) integrated in society.[35] The term "identity" is related to *idem*, and describes an idea of sameness, continuity and coherence for a thing or a person at all times and in every situation. In social sciences the term is usually used in two ways: self (or personal) identity and social (or collective) identity.[36] While the first use for many is particularly associated with Erik Erikson's theory on identity formation, the latter refers to the idea of belonging to and identifying with certain groups, like ethnicity. Social (or collective) identity, which refers to the idea of similarity with a group, includes a notion of being different and separated from others. Studies in social identity are related, among others, to Fredrik Barth's ideas of boundaries and boundary crossing, as well as to Benedict Andersson's discussion of large social groups as "imagined communities." Related to this is the term "collective identity," which is based on memory and collective practices that usually define a frame of reference for constructions of solidarity and trust.[37]

Barth has pointed out that it is not so much the culture enclosed in an ethnic group that defines the group, but the ethnic boundaries. These boundaries make it possible to identify other individuals as fellow members of the group who are "playing the same game," sharing the same criteria for evaluation and judgment. On the other hand, the dichotomization of others as strangers implies an assumed restriction of common understanding and mutual interest.[38] Within complex polyethnic systems with close inter-ethnic contact (as in pre-WWI Eastern Europe, chapter 2 below), the cultural characteristics have to be constant to maintain the established social system. It is only these systems that

35. Meyer, *Jewish Identity,* 6.

36. Friese, "Introduction," 1–13, 1.

37. Ibid., 6–7, and Eder et al., *Collective Identities*, 19. However, among scholars the term is not yet fixed. In some studies collective identity refers to the identity of a social group as such, while in most cases it refers to the sense of belonging and identification of the individual.

38. Barth, "Introduction," 9–38, 15.

survive a flux of members (like converts) from one community to the other.[39] As newcomers, converts could be more or less free to participate in their new society, but often they would nevertheless be "disabled" in their interactions with the majority language and culture.[40]

Complications on Identity

However, in spite of being one of the most central topics in disciplines like psychology and sociology in the 20th century, identity as an academic topic is controversial amongst scholars. While social studies like feminist and postcolonial theory for decades have paid particular attention to social identity, within social theory and philosophy some have questioned the concept altogether. One of the reasons for these frustrations is the term identity itself, as the content of the word has not been fixed. Nevertheless, the idea of belonging to social groups, or the individual feeling some sort of continuity or discontinuity, is not a new phenomenon. Admitting that the term identity is "insufficient," Peter Wagner nevertheless claims that the phenomenon it represents is well worth investigating, as "personal identity and collective identity do occur."[41] I therefore believe that fruitful research is not always dependent on a scholarly consensus about the term as such, but on whether the concept of identity or social identification helps give relevant knowledge for historical research.

In addition, one needs to consider whether the object of study can be adequately grasped by the traditional distinction between social and personal identity. Individual claims of continued Jewish identity while professing Christian faith not only seriously challenge a master narrative and blur traditional boundaries, but may evoke identity complications on a personal level as well. The aspect of solidarity in any social identity is often related to a memory of collective trauma or triumphs.[42] As central memories in the Jewish community are associated with disastrous Jewish-Christian relations, the traumatic experience is often integrated in Jewish identity. When studying identity among Jewish believers in Jesus, one therefore cannot overlook the significant antipathy to the phe-

39. Ibid., 19–21.
40. Ibid., 32.
41. Wagner, "Identity and Selfhood," 32–55, 48.
42. Alexander, "Toward a Theory," 1–30.

nomenon in the Jewish community. In the Jewish consciousness, Jewish believers in Jesus are regarded as not only lost coreligionists or some sort of national traitors, they are often an outright abnormity. Individuals from this group can even be described in pathological terms, as in the titles of the studies by Carlebach and Schainker: *Divided Souls* and "Imperial Hybrids."[43]

Jewish believers in Jesus have in some works been associated with psychiatric diseases. In his survey of American Hebrew Christians from the 1950s to the 1970s, Sobel concludes that "Hebrew Christians tend to be essentially marginal people who suffer from a long list of defeats and frustrations ranging from the psychological to the economic to the social."[44] This perception is related to the fact that some of the boundaries that are drawn by social identity can be understood as natural, objective and inaccessible, and are thus removed from the arena where things can be changed.[45] For many Jews the distinction between Jews and Christians would be such a boundary. Consequently, Jewish believers in Jesus would find that the perception that Jews who believe in Jesus are traitors is internalized in their worldview even after their conversion.[46] Personal identity may be a manifestation of social identity, which certainly is the case here, making any absolute distinction between these concepts of identity rather fruitless for this study.

While Gurland, Lichtenstein and Lucky identified themselves in different ways with the Jewish people, the general opinion in the Jewish community, then and now, would be that having embraced Christian faith, they no longer belonged to the Jewish community. Does this mean that making any references to their Jewish identity would be an anachronistic example of how the terms "Jewish" and "identity" were emptied of their contents?[47] A Jew who converts to Christianity usually represents

43. Carlebach, *Divided Souls*; on Schainker, "Imperial Hybrids," see footnote 14 above [**x-ref**].

44. Sobel, *Hebrew Christianity* as quoted by Kjær-Hansen, "Neither Fish nor Fowl," 9–18, 15. Sometimes the tragedy of Hans Herzl, son of Theodor Herzl (the main Zionist ideologist), is used by Jewish anti-missionary circles to illustrate this point. Herzl converted to Christianity in the 1930s, and suffering from depression, he later committed suicide; Glaser, "A Survey," 239. Kjær-Hansen rejects this idea, referring to Siegel, *Depression*, 85–87.

45. Friese, "Introduction," 4.

46. Ariel, *Evangelizing*, 47.

47. Hruby, "Zur Problematik," 76–87.

a radical break with his former orientations in life. To describe converts to Christianity as Jews would be to stretch the concept of continuity and coherence too far for many Jews, although it was the same person who made the religious reorientation from Judaism to Christianity. This raises the question of who represents an authentic version of Jewish culture and identity, as it implies that Jewish believers in Jesus cannot be regarded as legitimate carriers of such an identity.[48]

Philosophers associated with deconstruction theories made the concept of the subject and personal identity their main target in the 1960s. Foucault denied any correspondence between the terms of identity and any essential self. Consequently we need to deconstruct our historical selves. However, although Foucault has influenced cultural studies as well as psychiatry, etc., cultural studies generally has returned to a modified version of the traditional Western understanding of the human subject and identity, leading Strozier to note that there is usually a weak connection between many studies and the theory in this respect.[49] In general, though, the understanding of identity and history as being fluid has made a great impact on Western thinking. This process has also made some Jewish scholars more nuanced and inclusive in their view of the place of Jesus-believing Jews in the Jewish community. Dan Cohn-Sherbok suggests that Messianic Judaism should be placed within the Jewish people in the same way as traditionally Jewish denominations like the Orthodox, Reform and Conservative Jews.[50] Others, like Shoshanah Feher and Carol Harris-Shapiro, describe the Messianic movement as bridge-builders between Judaism and Christianity.[51] Daniel Boyarin says:

> I suggest that the affiliation between what we call Judaism and what we call Christianity is much more complex than most scholars, let alone most lay folk, imagine and that that complexity has work to do in the world, that we can learn something from it about identities and affiliations.[52]

48. Max Weber calls such agents that claim to represent a collective memory "carrier groups." Alexander, "Toward a Theory," 11.

49. Strozier, *Foucault*, 267. See also Paul Veyne's criticism of the antipathy toward Foucault among historians, recorded by Clark, *History, Theory, Text*, 71–73.

50. Cohn-Sherbok, *Messianic Judaism*, 203–9.

51. Harris-Shapiro, *Messianic Judaism*; Shoshanah Feher, *Passing over Easter.*

52. Boyarin, *Border Lines*, xii.

Jewish Identity between 1860 and 1914

These new approaches to Messianic Jews are apparently related to the general attitude about cultural and religious pluralism in the Western world today, at least in major academic circles.[53] Still, I do not believe one need to make Gurland, Lichtenstein and Lucky into deconstructionists to label them "Jewish." First of all, Gurland, Lichtenstein and Lucky publicly claimed they belonged to the Jewish people, and Lichtenstein and Lucky even insisted they were within the Jewish tradition. Second, around 1900, Eastern European Jewry could very well operate with several types of Jewish identity. When discussing the role of Zionism for the Jewish identity of Norwegian Jews, Vibeke Banik claims that Jewish communities even prior to the establishment of the State of Israel contained several different and parallel Jewish identities, so-called double identities.[54] At least in certain political contexts this phenomenon appears to have been used for later Jewish-Christian identities. In her studies on how Soviet Jews in the 1960s and 1980s rediscovered their Jewish identity after becoming members of the Russian Orthodox Church, Judith Kornblatt explains how Russian Jewry distinguishes between being ethnically Jewish (*evrei*) or belonging to the religious community (*iudai*).[55] Thus it was, within a certain cultural context, possible to create a space where Jews in the Diaspora could be (Orthodox) Christians and still be looked upon as Jewish.[56] Although what Kornblatt is describing is strongly connected to the particular cultural situation within the Soviet Union, it nevertheless indicates how, in the modern age, one could find ways to identify oneself as Christian and Jewish at the same time. According to Ellie Schainker, the phenomenon described by Kornblatt may even be traced back to the beginning of the 19th century. In the Russian Jewish community, conversion to Christianity did not have to be the end of being Jewish in every aspect.[57] Such double identities,

53. E.g., within queer theory, which may describe Jewish believers in Jesus as a showcase for its own understanding about identity as result of construction; Roden, "Introduction," 1–18, 10.

54. Banik points to how the Bund (the Jewish Socialist party) in Poland, which wanted to combine a Jewish and a Polish identity, cultivated a context and ideology where a double identity was possible. See Banik, *Solidaritet*, 43 and 75.

55. Kornblatt's spelling.

56. Kornblatt, *Doubly Chosen*, 49; and Gershenson, "Ambivalence," 175–94, 176.

57. Schainker, "Imperial Hybrids," 294.

where individuals or groups were combining Christian and Jewish identification markers, could also be observed around 1900, according to Banik. The Jewish acculturation in Europe during the 19th century did not necessarily lead to a weakened Jewish identity as such. For example, Banik refers to how Jewish women in German countered the German culture by combining German/Christian traditions with a certain Jewish twist.[58]

For other Jews, this modern self-definition as Jews was, and is, highly problematic. Double identities, even attachment to Zionism, could be seen as an expression of weak identification with the Jewish people. Today, religiously oriented Jewish scholars claim that a secular Jewish identity becomes increasingly meaningless, at least when it comes to maintaining collective identity and a sense of mutual belonging. Jonathan Sacks is representative of these claims when insisting that Jewish unity is a religious concept: "Jewish unity is in the end an irreducibly religious concept. There is no coherent secular equivalent."[59] As Gurland, Lichtenstein and Lucky also were religiously motivated, it is of interest to see whether they were content with a secular Jewish identification, or if religious and Jewish identity had meaning for them.

The Problematic Term "Jewish Christian"

James Carleton Paget points out how the term "Jewish Christian" and the German *Judenchrist* have been used in different ways among scholars as well as in pious literature, and suggests that one should consider new terms for describing these individuals.[60] However, while these considerations are particularly relevant within the field of early church history, for Jewish believers in Jesus in the last decades before WWI the situation was different. Although not very precise, the terms "Judenchrist," "Hebrew Christian," and "Jewish Christian" were nevertheless used by sympathizers as well as opponents of the phenomenon. The problem was not the term itself, but what it tried to describe, namely how individuals with a Jewish background could embrace Christianity with some sort of

58. Banik, *Solidaritet*, 78.
59. Sacks, *One People?*, xii.
60. Paget, "The Definition," 22–52.

legitimacy. In spite of the obscurity of its meaning, "Jewish Christian" appears to have been used relatively often.[61]

However, the discussion about technical terms is probably not as controversial as the theme itself. If we understand social identity according to Anderson's "imagined communities," where the collective identity is founded and shaped by identification with certain boundary markers, it is understandable that the concept of "Jewish Christian" would not make sense for representatives of either Christianity or Judaism.[62] According to Peter Wagner, the idea of personal and collective identity is associated with some sort of fundamental continuity and coherence.[63] For Jews in general, and particularly within traditional Judaism, Jewish individuals expressing faith in Jesus represent neither continuity nor coherence within a Jewish framework. Within these frames the term Jewish Christian therefore becomes meaningless, at least when speaking about a continued Jewish identity, because of the phenomenon itself and not necessarily semantics.

Nevertheless, as Wagner points out, in spite of the confusion often related to identity discourse, "there is 'something' that is being investigated."[64] For him the problem does not lie so much in the research findings as such, but in the inadequacy of the term "identity." For the same reason I use the terms Jewish/Hebrew Christian and Jewish believer in Jesus interchangingly in this dissertation. Both terms are adequate for my purpose, namely to describe the discourse about the phenomenon itself: ethnic Jews who show adherence to Christ and the Christian faith while maintaining some sort of continued Jewish identity.

Jewish Identification: Sergio DellaPergola

As Vibeke Banik points out, an essentialist framework stresses social identity (like ethnicity) as a fixed category, while a constructionist framework focuses on how the content of identities is fluid and changes throughout history. While the essentialist approach will have a rather

61. Some of Lucky's followers claimed that "Jewish Christian" was the best term, while Gurland and Lichtenstein do not seem to have used it very often. Anonymous "What's In a Name?," 110.

62. Friese, "Introduction," 4.

63. Wagner, "Identity," 48–49.

64. Ibid.

exclusive attitude against elements that do not fit into the collective memory, constructionist ideas will be able to see significant differences within one social group.[65] Such a cultural approach to the formation of identity opens up for the individual choices related to forming an identity, something that makes it relevant to see cultural concepts (e.g., Zionism) as central Jewish identification markers. As I see it, a cultural and constructionist approach also appears useful for studying Jewish identity among Jesus-believing Jews in the decades before World War 1. Theoretical perspectives are necessary not least to distinguish between important and unimportant source findings, and I have therefore chosen Sergio DellaPergola's categories as my key reference for Jewish identification.[66] The use of DellaPergola's categories and variables not only serves the aim of effectively extracting facts from the sources, but also constitutes a paradigm of Jewish identity to which Gurland, Lichtenstein and Lucky can be compared. Likewise, by the use of relevant theoretical knowledge, here represented by DellaPergola, missing empirical information can be located. Lastly, this system makes it possible to suggest a generalization of how Gurland, Lichtenstein and Lucky were building an identity.

Although DellaPergola describes Christian Jews in his own works as people with a distanced relationship to the Jewish community, he still claims that any survey on social identity first of all has to relate to the individual's self-identification. DellaPergola operates with a number of variables of Jewish identification which he holds to be manifestations of Jewish identity, based on the assumption that identity is created by a series of identifications during childhood and later. These variables are organized in three categories representing differing attitudes to Jewish identity: A) Particularistic; B) National-community; and C) Universalistic. DellaPergola thereby makes a distinction between religious and non-religious identities, which is usually done within contemporary Jewish demographic studies to include people of Jewish origin who would not be included in traditional halakic terminology. Category *A* is regarded as the strongest identification to Jewish religious and cultural tradition, while *C* identifies those with the most distanced relation to this part of the Jewish heritage.[67]

65. Banik, *Solidaritet*, 32–34.

66. DellaPergola, "Jewish Identity," 25; and Rüsen, *History*, 103.

67. *Particularistic* (the Jewish tradition): 1) Form a family and honor parents; 2)

In this project I use DellaPergola's categories of Jewish identification for identifying and structuring Gurland's, Lucky's and Lichtenstein's sense of identification with Jewish tradition and the Jewish people. In other words, I use categories *A* and *B*, but not *C*, as I want to focus on identification concepts that are commonly held to be explicitly Jewish. To describe and discuss the attitudes to Jewish tradition and the Jewish people, I focus on some core concepts/variables given for Jewish identification with the particularistic or national-community categories that are expressed in the sources. I do not intend to apply all of DellaPergola's variables in the two categories, but will use the lists of variables as a help to extract elements that are connected to Jewish identity from their writing or their life-stories, and to find if there are elements missing that one should expect to be there. The core concepts of Jewish identity that will be discussed in depth will, to some extent, vary with each individual, as the issues which are commented on or described in the material sometimes differ.[68]

However, applying contemporary concepts of Jewish identity to pre-WWI individuals may appear to be a questionable approach for several reasons. First of all, when reconstructing the past one needs to avoid what John Henry named "Whiggism," i.e., the tendency to judge

Study Tanak; 3) Believe in God and be a religious person; 4) Give Tzedaka; 5) Celebrate Jewish holidays; 6) Study Talmud; 7) Participate in the Seder of Pesach; 8) Fast on Yom Kippur; 9) Observe the Sabbath; 10) Observe kashrut at home; 11) Circumcise male children; 12) Have Bar-Mitzvah and Bat-Mitzvah; 13) Not marry non-Jews; 14) Have a religious burial; 15) Study Torah; 16) Belong to an Edah (Jewish origin group); 17) Feel part of the Jewish people; 18) Be a Jew.

National-community (the Jewish people): 1) Help the needy; 2) Live in Israel; 3) Support Zionism or other Jewish nationalist ideas; 4) Peace among Edoth of the Jewish people; 5) Peace among religious/secular Jewish people; 6) Love your neighbor; 7) Speak Hebrew or Yiddish; 8) Strengthen Hebrew or Yiddish; 9) Be a Zionist or other Jewish nationalist.

Universalistic: 1) Be at peace with one's self; 2) Pay income tax as due; 3) Be a decent person; 4) Take care of your environment; 5) Succeed in studies; 6) Succeed economically; 7) Peace between Israel and its neighbors; 8) Peace among Jews and Arabs. See DellaPergola, "Jewish Identity," 25; and Ahituv, ed., *Historical Atlas*, 466–67.

Concerning the use of languages in category *B*, there is not always necessarily a connection between language and identity, as pointed out by the social anthropologist Øyvind Eggen. In the cases of Gurland, Lucky, and Lichtenstein, however, there seems to be a relationship between these concepts that will be discussed in each case. See Eggen, "Troens bekjennere," 55.

68. One example is Zionism, which was regarded as important by Lucky as well as Gurland, but which Lichtenstein does not even mention in his writings.

and interpret the past in terms of the present.[69] In particular, I will argue that one cannot understand the ideas or positions of pre-WWI Jewish believers in Jesus to be direct anticipations of the situation of the current Messianic movement. There is also a risk that the source material from the decades before WWI will be presented and analyzed in light of contemporary variables without considering that they are constructions and products of history, and possibly of only limited durability.[70] With the radical historical experience and development of the Jewish people over the past 150 years, it would be anachronistic to simply apply contemporary variables of identification directly to Jews living before WWI. One obvious example is the relationship to the State of Israel, one of the strongest elements of Jewish identity after 1948.[71] Referring to the current situation for Jewish identity, Jonathan Sacks claims that until the last decades of the 19th century, for Jews to "define themselves as Jews without reference to religious belief or halakic practice would have seemed . . . a contradiction in terms."[72]

Nevertheless, in the late 19th and early 20th century most of the thoughts and processes that shaped modern Jewry had been visible and discussed for decades, and with some adjustments I believe DellaPergola's variables and categories are still valuable for a historical project.[73] After all, in the wake of the Enlightenment, anti-Semitism and Zionism in the last decades of the 19th century, Jewish identity and identification was highly debated within and outside Jewish circles. Elements of the debate were a combination of the stereotypes of what was Jewish claimed by non-Jewish societies, as well as the Jewish religious, cultural, political and linguistic experiences in the Diaspora, the exclusion by European

69. Henry, *Scientific Revolution*, 3–4.

70. Wagner, "Identity," 51–52.

71. Indeed, Robert Paine claims that within a Zionist framework, Jewish Israelis would identify more strongly with Jewish history before the revolts in 70 and 132 than to Eastern European Jewry before 1948. Paine, "Israel," 126–36.

72. Sacks, *One People?*, 214.

73. The absence of the State of Israel can, to some extent, be compensated for by references to Jewish nationalism such as Zionism. As described by Banik, several decades before the State of Israel Zionism became a key marker for Jewish identification in many Jewish communities. However, it can be argued that Zionism has a different function before and after 1948, in the sense that before the creation of the State of Israel, the state was regarded as a means to avoid assimilation, while today Zionism is a means in itself to identify as Jewish. Banik, *Solidaritet*, 81, and Kahn-Paycha, *Popular Jewish Literature*, 126.

nationalism, and the religious aspects of divine selection.[74] The outcome of the process is a striking continuity in the way of thinking within the Jewish communities in the last 200 years. In spite of the time span and of the crucial experiences of *Shoah* and the creation of the State of Israel, Sacks states that:

> . . . to a degree that is quite striking, Jews remain heirs of the nineteenth century. The disintegration that took place then still haunts Jewish existence today. The ideological battle-lines are the same. The same questions are asked and receive the same conflicting answers. Much has changed in the Jewish world, but our habits of thinking have not.[75]

Another question is whether a phenomenon as complex as Jewish Christians may be grasped sufficiently by sociological categories at all. The fact that social identity builds on social relations might have made Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein express themselves differently from one situation or context to another, in a way that may obscure the findings. This does not necessarily mean that they would contradict themselves, but rather focus on different aspects depending on whether they were involved in, e.g., a polemical dispute or dealing with family relations. Such questions must be considered during the dissertation.

For a project like this it is essential that the text material be expressed through the methods, and not the opposite. When applying DellaPergola's scheme like this, there is a risk that Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein are described as more Jewish than they actually were, particularly since I have omitted DellaPergola's third category, "universalistic." In addition to DellaPergola's two categories, I have therefore added a number of concepts that I have arranged into three categories, representing (from a Jewish perspective) traditional transgressions or taboos, namely Christian doctrine, the Christian community, and the contemporary (premature) Hebrew Christian movement or individuals associated with this movement. Traditionally, a friendly relationship to these phenomena is seen as a clear expression of boundary-crossing from the Jewish majority's point of view.[76] A combination of DellaPergola's iden-

74. For Jewish nationalists, the implication of the last was that marriage to non-Jews was unwanted. See variable 13 in DellaPergola's category *A*, and Banik, *Solidaritet*, 81.

75. Sacks, *One People?*, xiii.

76. DellaPergola excludes "those of Jewish descent who have formally adopted another religion" from what he calls the "core Jewish population," and locates this group

tification markers with such examples of boundary-crossing visualizes the complex situation for many Jewish believers in Jesus since the 19th century.

This way of structuring the material as well as the different phenomena is not something I have copied from others, but is based on some core concepts found in the sources. These concepts are believed to be representative examples of what was found characteristic of their identification with the non-Jewish community. These examples, which I see as core concepts or markers for such social identification, are therefore not always symmetric. When dealing with Gurland's, Lucky's and Lichtenstein's attitudes to Christian tradition and doctrine, baptism and ideas on supersessionism in regard to Christianity vs. Judaism are central topics. However, these attitudes would be expressed within the framework of certain traditions or denominational preferences, and also in contrast to others, directly or indirectly. Similarly, the discussion on their relationship to the Christian community will focus on official church membership, but also needs to consider the potential tension between the status of being baptized or unbaptized and their real social or ideological position among Christians at the same time. Much of this material is expressed in the discussions on mission strategy and phenomena that took place within Christian Europe and the USA, particularly the assimilation process and anti-Semitism.

While these two categories (relationship to Christian tradition and to the Christian community) reflect the categories for identification to Christianity, I also use a third, which reflect Gurland's, Lucky's and Lichtenstein's identification with other Jewish believers in Jesus. This category constituted a social group or a more or less loose community of contemporary fellow Jewish believers in Jesus. In this community, one can either assume some degree of mutual acceptance for Jews who wanted to combine their national identity with a Christian faith, or that the topic was an arena for controversy. The fame and influence of the persons I have found in the sources varies, and sometimes the most influential were not very well known in all circles. Except for the social

in the "enlarged Jewish population." On the other hand, he claims that the concept of a "core Jewish population" is meant for those who identify themselves as Jewish, and ultimately rests largely on self-identification and "people's subjective, individual awareness of belonging and willingness to belong (directly or indirectly) to the Jewish collective." DellaPergola, *World Jewry*, 9–11.

dimension, the issue of Jewish identity and faith in Jesus in this loose network was highlighted in discussions about independent Jewish-Christian congregations and Torah observance for Jewish Christians.

In addition to DellaPergola's two first categories, I have therefore used the following list to structure the dissertation:

The relationship to Christian tradition and doctrine: 1) Baptism; 2) Ideas of supersessionism/replacement theology; 3) Theological and denominational preferences (like pietism, dispensationalism, millenarianism and liberal theology).

The relationship to the Christian community: 1) Church membership; 2) Mission societies and mission-strategic preferences; 3) Anti-Semitism.

The relationship to contemporary Jewish (Hebrew) Christian groups and individuals: 1) Gurland's, Lucky's and Lichtenstein's relationships with famous and/or influential contemporary Jewish believers in Jesus (like Joseph Rabinowitz, David Baron and Yechiel Herschensohn-Lichtenstein, as well as the relations between Gurland, Lucky and Lichtenstein themselves); 2) Gurland's, Lucky's and Lichtenstein's relationships to fellowships of Jewish believers in Jesus (e.g., the Hebrew Christian Alliance); 3) Gurland's, Lucky's and Lichtenstein's position in the debates about Torah observance for Jewish believers in Jesus and Jewish-Christian congregations.

Outline

Based on the above-mentioned considerations the book follows this outline:

1. Introduction
2. Eastern European Jews between 1860 and 1914 and Christian missions
3. The biographies of Gurland, Lucky, and Lichtenstein
4. A comparative analysis:
    a. The relationship to Jewish tradition
    b. The relationship to the Jewish people
    c. The relationship to Christian tradition and doctrine

d. The relationship to the Christian community

e. The relationship to Hebrew Christian groups and individuals

6. Conclusion