

Jewish Identities in Synagogue Architecture of Galicia and Bukovina

Sergey R. Kravtsov

The present article discusses how Jewish identities were constructed through the synagogue architecture of the easternmost provinces of the Habsburg Empire – Eastern Galicia (hereafter Galicia) and Bukovina – until the World War I.

Defining the inferior status of Jewish communities by means of architecture was an objective of the dominant society in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth until its partition in 1772. In the urban space, Catholic supremacy was emphasized by the dominant location, height, and refinement of churches and monasteries. The clergy and burghers tried to prevent construction of synagogues in the town centers and on streets on which Christian churches were located and where they held their processions; they also limited synagogue height and tried to ensure that synagogues' exterior design was unpretentious.¹

In Galicia and Bukovina, territories that fell under Austrian rule during the late eighteenth century, the urban landscape lost much of its sacred meaning. The power of the Christian clergy was now limited, and the monasteries – “parasitic” in the eyes of the new rulers – were stripped of their property. The traditional framework of Jewish self-government had been formally dismantled with the abolition of the *kehillot* (Jewish self-governing authorities) in 1789. Now, Jews became

loyal Habsburg subjects of the Mosaic faith. Many Jews played active roles in promoting this move, inspired by the Enlightenment, as it contributed in their eyes to the modernization of Jewish society. However, other – quite numerous – groups of Jews preferred to hold fast to their traditional beliefs and practices. This split led to construction of Progressive, traditionalist, and even more specific identities in Jewish sacred architecture in Galicia and Bukovina.

The array of Jewish groups included the adherents of the Enlightenment, or *maskilim* (literally, “educated”), the Hasidim, and the *mitnagdim*, traditionalist opponents of the Hasidim. The enlightened Jews welcomed Austrian-German culture in the first half of the nineteenth century, and gradually shifted towards a Jewish-Polish identity in a later period, especially after 1873, when the Polish autonomy of Galicia was established. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, resistance to assimilation increased, and Jewish nationalism and Zionism gained popularity among educated Jews. In Galicia, Reform Judaism, the movement preferred by the *maskilim*, took the shape of a moderate Progressive denomination. Its followers preached in German, later also in Polish, and paid much attention to order, dignity, and decorum in their liturgy.² Hasidim were considered by the *maskilim* a harmful obscurantist sect. They followed their own

1 Maurycy Horn, *Żydzi na Rusi Czerwonej w XVI i pierwszej połowie XVII wieku: Działalność gospodarcza na tle rozwoju demograficznego* (Jews in Ruthenia Rubra in the Sixteenth and the First Half of the Seventeenth Century: Economic Activity against the Background of Demographic Development) (Warsaw, 1975), 21–25 (Polish); Maria and Kazimierz Piechotka, *Bramy Nieba: Bóżnice mурowane na ziemiach dawnej Rzeczypospolitej* (Gates of Heaven: Masonry Synagogues in the Lands of the Old Commonwealth) (Warsaw, 1999), 58–61 (Polish). An

English translation has been published.

2 The Reformers in L'viv followed the advice of their moderate brethren from the Stadttempel of Vienna; see Majer Bałaban, *Historia Lwowskiej Synagogi Postępowej* (History of the L'viv Progressive Synagogue) (L'viv, 1937), 30–40 (Polish); Marsha L. Rozenblit, “The Struggle over Religious Reform in Nineteenth-Century Vienna,” *AJS Review* 14, no. 2 (Autumn, 1989): 185.



Fig. 1. The Great Synagogue of the walled city, 1799–1801. Photograph from south-east, between 1924 and 1931. National Museum in L'viv




Fig 2. Project of redoubt, theater, and hotel in L'viv, architect Mörz, 1784. Central Historical Archives of Ukraine in L'viv

spiritual leaders, the *zaddikim*, who proclaimed fidelity to the traditional Jewish lifestyle and whose courts amazed contemporaries by their unprecedented magnificence and influence on Jewish religious and everyday life. In their liturgy, Hasidim used the Sephardi (Spanish) rite

in order to reconcile their ancestral Ashkenazi customs with Lurianic Kabbalah, which originated in Sephardi circles and penetrated eastern Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The *mitnagdim* followed their Ashkenazi rite, perceiving it as ancient and hence the

true one.³ These religious and ideological divisions could hardly exist side by side in the same synagogue building. Therefore, the followers of the two rites seldom prayed in the same “great” communal synagogue. Usually, the “great” synagogue remained the Ashkenazi place of prayer, while a “Temple” served the Progressive congregation, and the Hasidim built their own houses of study and prayer: the bigger *kloizn* and smaller *shetiblekh*. As each religious group pursued its own ideals and customs, which were reflected in their houses of worship, one may speak of diverse identities in Jewish sacred architecture of Galicia and Bukovina. The initiative for self-expression increasingly emerged from the Jews themselves, rather than from the host society.

Baroque Survival and Revival

An early synagogue constructed in L'viv under Austrian rule was the Great Synagogue of the walled city (1799–1801, fig. 1).⁴ Together with its traditionalist Ashkenazi liturgy, it retained a number of customary architectural features, coined in the region from the late sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries: the central *bimah*, the four-pier and nine-bay interior layout of the prayer hall, and the tripartite division of its walls. Pilasters divided the synagogue facades into even bays, pierced by tall round-headed windows on three sides. The synagogue also featured some design novelties resulting from the construction law of 1780, which demanded confirmation of every project by the Police Directorate:⁵ the synagogue was attached to a block of apartment buildings; it consequently matched their height, and acquired regulated street facades. Another novelty was the oculi pierced above

the tall round-headed windows to let more daylight into the prayer hall. The oculi, Baroque forms, echoed those of the Reduta, or the Redoutensaal, built in 1784 at the Castrum Square of L'viv, and which burnt down in 1848 (fig. 2). In the eighteenth century, Redoutensaal, public assembly halls used for dancing and musical events, were especially popular in German-speaking lands.⁶ In such halls, the upper register of square, round, or oval windows lit the musicians' gallery, or merely provided additional daylight. The Reduta of L'viv featured elegant oval oculi, but the windows of the synagogue were less playful, being round; their shape, size, and rhythm delicately emphasized the synagogue's magnitude in relation to the neighboring dwellings. Thus, Baroque forms, tempered by the latest building regulations promoting Neoclassicist uniformity, survived in the synagogue architecture of L'viv.

Similar upper-tier oculi were constructed in the Great Synagogue of Chernivtsi in 1853.⁷ The interior layout of this synagogue followed the “Polish” four-pier scheme, slightly increasing its central bay. On the exterior, the edifice combined late Baroque features, the oculi, and a mansard roof with a Neoclassical monumental portico-like vestibule containing the staircase. The oculi only gave light to the upper floor of the two-story women's section, and thus remained a mere plaster decoration that gave a measure of consistency to the structure, being evenly distributed over other facades elsewhere on the building (fig. 5).

The same architectural device – oculi above tall round-headed windows – was introduced into another Ashkenazi house of prayer, the Great Suburban Synagogue of L'viv. This revered synagogue was built in 1624–32, probably

3 See Israel Bartal, “The Image of Germany and German Jewry in East European Jewish Society during the 19th Century,” in *Danzig, between East and West: Aspects of Modern Jewish History*, ed. Isadore Twersky (Cambridge, MA, 1985), 7.

4 Polish: Lwów, German: Lemberg, Russian: L'vov. Hereafter, the present Ukrainian geographic names are given as primary ones, while alternative names are mentioned in notes.

5 Volodymyr Vuitsyk, “Budivel'nyi rukh u L'vovi druhoi polovyny XVIII stolittia” (Building Activity in L'viv in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century), *Memoirs of the Shevchenko Scientific Society*, 241 (L'viv, 2001), 116–17 (Ukrainian).

6 For the definition of “redoubt” (equivalent to the Polish *reduta* and

Italian *ridotto*) as an assembly hall rather than a fortification, see James Stevens Curl, *Dictionary of Architecture* (Oxford, 1999), 541. L'viv's Reduta was designed and built, along with a hotel and theater, by the city architect Mörz (or Mörtz, whose first name is unknown), in the Castrum Square of L'viv; see Volodymyr Vuitsyk, “Do istorii teatral'nykh budynkiv u L'vovi” (On the History of Theater Buildings in L'viv), *Visnyk Ukrzakhidproektrestavratsii* (Proceedings of West Ukrainian Institute for Conservation) 14 (2004), 171–72 (Ukrainian); Vuitsyk, “Budivel'nyi rukh,” 123–24.

7 The city of Chernivtsi, Czernowitz in German, was the administrative center of Bukovina. For the construction date of the synagogue, see *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums* 22 (1854), 271.




Fig. 3. The Great Suburban Synagogue of L'viv, 1624–32. Cross-section, reconstruction design by Michael Gerl, 1870. State Archives of L'viv Region



Fig. 4. The Great Suburban Synagogue of L'viv, 1624–32, reconstructed in 1870. Photograph from south-west, 1921. National Museum in L'viv



Fig. 5. The Great Synagogue of Chernivtsi, 1853. View from south-west (photo: Sergey Kravtsov, 2004)




Fig. 6. The Jakob Glanzer, or the Belz *Hadashim* Synagogue in L'viv, 1841–44. Reconstruction design by Włodzimierz Podhorodecki, 1912. State Archives of L'viv Region

by Giacomo Medleni. It was reconstructed by architect Michael Gerl as late as 1870 to accommodate an extra floor for small groups of worshipers (figs. 3, 4).⁸ Here, the function of the oculi changed to that of lighting the upper-floor prayer rooms. Apparently, upper oculi as at the “great” synagogues of Chernivtsi and both the walled city and suburb of L'viv had become recognizable signs of an Ashkenazi synagogue, rather than simply functional devices meant to illuminate the prayer hall.

Towards the end of the nineteenth and during the twentieth centuries, this feature became popular among the smaller *mitnagdic* synagogues of L'viv, including the barbers' *Shomrei Shabbat* (Sabbath Observers) Synagogue (1878),⁹ the *Mefarshei ha-Yam* of Lwia Street vicinity




Fig. 7. The Great Synagogue of Belz. Photograph from south-east, before World War I. IS PAN

(1886, by Leonard Warchałowski),¹⁰ the *Ohel Yesharim* (Tent of the Upright, Prov. 14:11) of the Bohdanivka suburb (1902, by Jan Ertel),¹¹ and the *Maor ve-Shemesh* (Light and Sun, Ps. 74:16; 1903, by Salomon Riemer).¹² The fenestration scheme made these structures identifiable as Jewish, and established visual affiliation with their “great” predecessors.

Much more integral usage of Baroque forms was made at the Great Synagogue of Belz (1834–43, fig. 7): it replicated the Great Synagogue of Zhovkva,¹³ which had been constructed in 1692 with its nine-bay layout, an attic wall and tall round-headed windows (fig. 8).¹⁴ The synagogue of Belz stood apart from the town center, surrounded by a *beit midrash* and a rabbi's house within a

8 Oksana Boyko, *Synahohy L'vova* (Synagogues of L'viv) (L'viv, 2008), 72–73 (Ukrainian); Sergey R. Kravtsov, “Juan Bautista Villalpando and Sacred Architecture in the Seventeenth Century,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 64, no. 3 (September, 2005): 319–24.

9 Zeev Zohar, “Batei kneset ve-'kloizen” (Synagogues and *kloizn*) in *Encyclopaedia of the Jewish Diaspora: A Memorial Library of Countries and Communities; Poland Series, Lvov Volume, Part 1*, ed. Nathan M. Gelber (Jerusalem, 1956), 458 (Hebrew); Oksana Boyko, *Synahohy*, 165–66.

10 State Archives of L'viv Region, col. 2, reg. 2, file 204. The name of the synagogue referred to a halachic commentary (1828) by R. Yosef Shaul

Nathanson and R. Mordechai Ze'ev Segal Ettinger.

11 Joseph Gelston, “Synahohy L'vova” (Synagogues of L'viv), *Halys'tka Brama* (The Halich Gate) 34–35 (1997): 7 (Ukrainian) (Gelston misspells the architect's name). The *Ohel Yesharim* was “great” as a communal one, but comparatively small in size; see Zohar, “Batei kneset,” 461. The Polish name of the suburb is Bogdanówka.

12 Zohar, “Batei kneset,” 454; Gelston, “Synahohy L'vova,” 7; Boyko, *Synahohy*, 45.

13 Belz in Polish: Bełz; in Yiddish: Belza. Zhovkva in Polish: Żółkiew.

14 Piechotka, *Bramy Nieba*, 290–94.



Fig. 8. The Great Synagogue of Zhovkva, 1692. View from south-west (photo: Sergey Kravtsov, 2006)

traditional *shulhoyf* (synagogue courtyard). Though built as the “great” synagogue of the town, the Belz synagogue was founded by the *zaddik* R. Shalom Roke’ah (1779–1855) of the emerging Belz dynasty, and soon became the center of Galician Hasidism.¹⁵ The synagogue’s congregation and the followers of the *zaddik* saw themselves as the

15 Oksana Boyko, “Hebrei Belza ta istoriya postannya synahoh” (Jews of Belz and History of the Erection of Synagogues), in *Belz i Belz’ka zemlya* (Belz and Land of Belz), vol. 1 (Belz, 2004), 104–6 (Ukrainian).

true guardians of Jewish faith and tradition. They communicated this view by various means: communal and political work, publication of the newspaper *Kol Mahzikei ha-Dat* (Voice of the Holders of Faith), and by using an old-fashioned Baroque survival style for their synagogue.

The Neo-Baroque, or Baroque revival style, was introduced into Galicia and Bukovina in the second half of the nineteenth century from western and central Europe. It found a broad range of uses in L’viv, from triumphal arches for greeting the emperor (1892–94), to



Fig. 9. The Great Synagogue of Bus'k, after 1881. View from south-west. Postcard



Fig. 10. The Old Synagogue of Sokal, late 17th–early 18th century, western extension of late 19th century. Photograph from north-west, before 1931. IS PAN

the aristocratic Sapięha and Potocki palaces (1868 and 1889–90, respectively), a casino (1897), an opera house (1895–1900), and the numerous apartment buildings of the prosperous bourgeois. It was applied to synagogues, too. For a number of reasons, including similarity of formal attributes and long periods of construction, Baroque survival and revival overlapped in a number of new Galician synagogue buildings. In new structures, the imported plasticity and dynamism were applied to the traditional Baroque forms of some synagogues. This was evident mostly in the treatment of synagogue extensions, as at the Great Synagogue of Bus'k.¹⁶ Its construction, begun in 1866, progressed slowly because of disagreement between the *mitnagdim* and *Hasidim* within the community, and was finished only after 1881 (fig. 9).¹⁷ Its two-story western annex, crowned with a high and exotically shaped parapet wall, concealed the traditionalist nine-bay prayer hall. In synagogues at Sokal¹⁸ and Belz, the later extensions acquired a wavy, sinuous skyline, which might

be seen as a Neo-Baroque development of the older and more restrained saw-tooth forms known from the Great Synagogue of Zhovkva (figs. 7, 8, and 10).

In 1912, the Neo-Baroque style was chosen for renovation of the largest Hasidic synagogue of L'viv, called Belz *Ḥadashim* (Belz the New). It was built by a childless merchant, Jakub Glanzer, in 1841–44, as his private possession (fig. 6).¹⁹ Initially, it followed the Ashkenazi rite, despite Glanzer's esteem for the Hasidic *admor*²⁰ of Zhydachiv,²¹ as the sectarianism was not welcomed by the authorities: they preferred to deal with one Jewish group. After the official approach to the divisions within Jewish community became less negative, the congregation changed the liturgy to the Sephardi rite and, finally, the synagogue was taken over by the Hasidim of Belz. In the twentieth century, Hasidic formal control over this synagogue ended and it came under the auspices of the communal authority, although it retained its Sephardi rite.²² Reconstruction was carried out in 1912 by Polish

16 Polish: Busk.

17 On conflict within the Jewish community of Bus'k, and the construction date of the synagogue (after 1881), see Nathan M. Gelber, *Busk: toldot yehudehah* (Busk: History of Its Jews) (Tel Aviv, 1962), 40 (Hebrew).

18 Polish: Sokal.

19 Zohar, "Batei kneset," 466–68; Jurij Biriulow, *Lwów: Ilustrowany przewodnik* (L'viv: Illustrated Guide) (L'viv, 2001), 64 (Polish).

20 A contraction of *adonenu morenu ve-rabbenu* (our master, teacher, and

rabbi), the title of a Hasidic rabbi.

21 Polish: Żydaczów; Yiddish: Zidichov.

22 Zeev Fischer-Schein, *Be-sod yesharim ve-'eda: pirkei ha-historiah ve-zikhronot min ha-gdullah be-kehilot Yisrael be-Galiziah – Lvov* (In the Council of the Upright and in the Assembly: Chapters from the History and Memories of the Magnificence of the Jewish Communities in Galicia – L'viv) (Bnei Braq, 1969), 102–9; Bałaban, *Historia Lwowskiej Synagogi Postępowej*, 29.

architect Włodzimierz Podhorodecki, a prominent Neo-Baroque designer.²³ Podhorodecki supplied the synagogue with rich Baroque decoration, and with oculi above the round-headed windows – a motif borrowed from two “great” synagogues of L’viv – and a graceful Belz-related attic wall.

Thus, the Baroque survival and revival played persistent roles in synagogue architecture of Galicia and Bukovina, establishing the identity of many traditionalist, Hasidic, and *mitnagdic* communities which sought continuity of their customs and found architectural patterns in their usable past.

Neoclassicism

The Neoclassicist synagogue called “Deutsch-israelitisches Bethhaus” (German-Israelite House of Prayer) reveals




Fig. 11. The Temple Synagogue. L’viv, architect Lewicki. 1840–46. reconstruction design by Julian Zachariewicz. 1896, in Zachariewicz, “Kilka słów o niedoszłej restauracji Synagogi na placu Rybim we Lwowie,” *Czasopismo Techniczne* 14, no. 5 (1896): 60–61 pl. 6, fig. 7

23 Boyko, *Synahohy*, 134–41. Podhorodecki’s design was signed, among others, by Dr. Jacob Diamand, the board member of the Progressive Synagogue and its president in 1898–1904. See Bałaban, *Historia Lwowskiej Synagogi Postępowej*, 142–44, 180–82, 234. The most remarkable Neo-Baroque work by Podhorodecki was the Neo-Baroque apartment building of the banker Edward Landau at 19 Sykstuska St. in L’viv (1911–12, in collaboration with sculptor Piotr Wójtowicz); see Romana Cielątkowska and Lilia Onyszczenko-Szwec, *Detal architektury mieszkaniowej*

changes undergone by Galician Judaism. Its building committee, which was comprised of wealthy *maskilim*, invited R. Abraham Kohn (1807–48), a rigorous adherent of Reform, Jewish Enlightenment, and German assimilation to officiate in the city. Favored within enlightened circles, he was hated by both Hasidim and *mitnagdim* as “German, ignorant, and non-kosher.”²⁴ The committee proclaimed its intention to model the new synagogue on those of Vienna and Prague.²⁵ Unlike the synagogues of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, L’viv’s German-Israelite House of Prayer was highly visible, located in the midst of the Old Market Square of the suburb, outside the formal Jewish quarters and close to the city’s oldest Catholic Church, St. John the Baptist (1260). It was designed in 1840 by a certain Lewicki and erected under the supervision of the architect and *Baudirektion* official Johann Salzmann in 1843–46.²⁶ Its interior was largely modeled on the Stadttempel at the Viennese Seitenstettengasse (1824–26, by Josef Kornhäusel), featuring a skylit oval prayer hall. In their layout, both synagogues followed the Reform pattern, in which the *bimah* was shifted towards the Torah ark. On the exterior, L’viv’s synagogue looked impressive due to its monumental, centralized domed mass (fig. 11). Its Neoclassicist style did not differ greatly from that of another work by Salzmann in L’viv, the Skarbek Theater (1837–42, designed in partnership with Alois Pichl), though the sinuous skyline of the synagogue’s dome and its apse’s roof bore a touch of the Biedermeier elegance.²⁷ Neoclassicism, once chosen by the Enlightenment as a “universal” and “timeless” style, became the official norm in Metternich’s Austria, and was then found suitable for the ends of Reform Judaism as a token of integration into contemporary society.²⁸ In its style and location, the German-Israelite House of Prayer, since the late nineteenth century called the Progressive

Lwowa XIX i XX wieku (Details of Dwelling Architecture in L’viv, Nineteenth and Twentieth Century) (Gdańsk, 2006), 167–68 (Polish).

24 Bałaban, *Historia Lwowskiej Synagogi Postępowej*, 30–40.

25 *Ibid.*, 25.

26 *Ibid.*, 30.

27 Biriulow, *Lwów*, 30.

28 See Dominique Jarrassé, *Synagogues: Architecture and Jewish Identity* (Paris, 2001), 138.




Fig. 12. Synagogue in Kassel, main façade, architect Albert Rosengarten, 1836–38, in [Albert] Rosengarten, “Die neue Synagoge in Cassel,” *Allgemeine Bauzeitung* (1840), 205–58, pl. 350

Synagogue or the Temple, was purposefully alienated from the traditionalist synagogues of L’viv, which were situated in the midst of the Jewish quarters, whether inside or outside the walled city.

Rundbogenstil

The early developments of the movement which would soon dismiss Neoclassicism and overshadow the Baroque survival style, surfaced in Galicia in the 1840s. This trend started with the *Rundbogenstil*, proposed by German architect and theoretician Heinrich Hübsch (1795–1863) in the third decade of the nineteenth century. The *Rundbogenstil* was derived neither from Enlightenment classicist doctrine nor from historicist revivalism, but as an adjustment to the German climate, building materials,

29 Heinrich Hübsch, *In welchem Style sollen wir bauen?* (Karlsruhe, 1828), passim; Michael J. Lewis, “Rundbogenstil,” in *The Dictionary of Art*, ed. Jane Turner, vol. 27 (New York, 1996), 334–36.

30 Carol H. Krinsky, *Synagogues of Europe: Architecture, History, Meaning* (Cambridge, MA, 1985), 313–16.

31 “Kassel, 1. November [1838]. Neue Synagoge. Land-Rabbinat. Gemeinde-Anstalten,” *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums* (January 5, 1839): 11–12.



Fig. 13. The Great Synagogue in Drohobych, 1844–63. View from west (photo: Sergey Kravtsov, 2006)

and construction methods. Hübsch proposed this style for every kind of building in Germany, for any function or religious affiliation.²⁹ The *Rundbogenstil* was adopted by Jewish architect Albert Rosengarten for a synagogue constructed in Kassel in 1836–38.³⁰ The contemporary Jewish reviewer praised it as an apt conjunction of “oriental,” Byzantine style with the “occidental” layout of Roman basilica.³¹ Its design became widely known due to its publication in the Viennese *Allgemeine Bauzeitung* of 1840 (fig. 12).³² Under the influence of *maskilim*, this pattern was adopted in Galicia for the Great Synagogue of Drohobych as early as 1844–63 (fig. 13).³³ Proposed by an educated minority, and being a German enlightened design, it was well suited to the situation in the community of Drohobych, where the “oriental”

32 [Albert] Rosengarten, “Die neue Synagoge in Cassel,” *Allgemeine Bauzeitung* (1840): 205–58, plates 349–53.

33 Polish: Drohobycz. For the synagogue’s construction date, see Nathan Michael Gelber, ed., *Sefer zikkaron le-Drohobych, Boryslaw ve-hasvivah* (Memorial to the Jews of Drohobych, Boryslaw and Surroundings) (Tel Aviv, 1959), 31 (Hebrew). The synagogue’s ground plan appears on the detailed map of Drohobych in 1855, see Central Historical Archives of Ukraine in L’viv, col. 186, reg. 10, file 494, fol. 10.



Fig. 14. The Great Synagogue in Stryi, reconstructed ca. 1886, view from north-west. Postcard

and “occidental” modes could stand for the disparate Ashkenazi and Sephardi (Hasidic) parties.³⁴ Side by side with a *Rundbogen* exterior, its interior layout employed an older nine-bay scheme, only remotely resembling Roman basilicas. Thus, the community forged a unified identity in the architecture of their single Great Synagogue, in which the *maskilim* foisted their cultural taste on their traditionalist brethren.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, *Rundbogenstil* arched bands underwent significant change in Galician synagogue architecture. In a number of cases, the round arches were transformed into Moorish horseshoe arches, or trefoil, cusped, and pointed arches, as was the case in the synagogue of Stryi,³⁵ remodeled after a fire of 1886 (fig. 14).³⁶ In this compilation, the oriental decorative components may have stood for the Sephardi,

literally Spanish, rite. By adding an oriental aspect to the *Rundbogenstil*, that was occidental by its origins, the community and its architect achieved two goals: they visually overrode the conflict between the Ashkenazi and Sephardi rites in the same synagogue, and concomitantly made it dissimilar to other applications of the *Rundbogenstil*, which were used for a range of public edifices, from barracks and railway stations to Greek-Catholic churches.

Thus the meaning and design of the *Rundbogenstil*, initially an icon of Germanness, was adapted to represent Galician-Jewish identity.

Romantic Historicism

The revolutionary Spring of Nations of 1848 promoted a new generation of Viennese architects. They replaced Neoclassicism with a new trend, called in later literature Romantic Historicism;³⁷ at this time, the doctrinal form of Neoclassicism was rejected as a symbol of the oppressive apparatus of the state.³⁸ The outstanding representatives of Romantic Historicism, the partners (till 1851) and in-laws Ludwig von Förster (1797–1863) and Theophilus von Hansen (1813–91), managed to create a version of the new style, which Hansen pretentiously called “the Viennese Renaissance.”³⁹ Hansen was well acquainted with and enthusiastic about the brickwork and polychrome effects of Byzantine architecture; Förster was familiar with Islamic architecture.⁴⁰ The partners, hired by Baron Adolf Pereira in 1846–47 to design his villa, managed to “express the romantic, and adopt forms in the Byzantine and related Arab way of building,”

34 On relations in the community of Drohobych see Gelber, *Sefer zikkaron le-Drohobych*, 27–28; Danuta Dąbrowska, Abraham Weiss, and Aharon Weiss eds., *Pinkas ha-kehillot Polin: enziklopedyah shel ha-yishuvim ha-yehudiyim le-min hivvasdam ve-ad le-ahar sho'at milhemet ha-olam ha-shmiyah* (The Book of the Communities, Poland: Encyclopaedia of the Jewish Communities since Their Establishment and until after the Holocaust of World War II), vol. 2: *Galizyah Ha-mizrahit* (Eastern Galicia) (Jerusalem, 1980), 162–63 (Hebrew).

35 Polish: Stryj.

36 On history of the Great Synagogue in Stryi, demands of the Hasidim, and the resulting Ashkenazi rite, see Natan Kodish, Shimon Rosenberg, and Avigdor Rotfeld, eds., *Sefer Stryj* (The Stryi Book) (Tel Aviv, 1962), 77 (Hebrew). On the fire of 1886 and subsequent reconstruction, see Bronisław Chlebowski and Władysław Walewski, eds., *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich* (Geographical

Dictionary of the Polish Kingdom and Other Slavic Countries), vol. 11 (Warsaw, 1890), 434 (Polish).

37 Renate Wagner-Rieger, *Wiens Architektur im 19. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1971), 95–102.

38 Inge Podbrecky, “Austria, Architecture, 1848–c.1890,” in *The Dictionary of Art*, ed. Jane Turner, vol. 2 (New York, 1996), 786–87; Rolf Toman, ed., *Vienna: Art and Architecture* (Cologne, 1999), 162.

39 Stefan Muthesius, “[untitled review]: Renate Wagner-Rieger and Mara Reissenberg, *Theophil von Hansen* (Die Wiener Ringstrasse, Bild einer Epoche, vol. 4 Section VIII) (Wiesbaden, 1980),” *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 42, no. 1 (Mar. 1983): 80–81.

40 Renate Wagner-Rieger and Mara Reissenberg, *Theophil von Hansen* (Die Wiener Ringstrasse, Bild einer Epoche, vol. 4 Section VIII) (Wiesbaden, 1980), 33.



Fig. 15. The Waffenmuseum in Vienna, main façade, Theophilus von Hansen, 1852–56 (photo: Sergey Kravtsov, 2007)

thus poetically expressing their client's Sephardi Jewish roots.⁴¹ However, in the post-1848 projects Hansen and Förster employed their style in such imperial projects as the Waffenmuseum in Vienna (1852–56, fig. 15), and the

41 [Ludwig von Förster], "Die Baron Pereira'sche Willa aus der Herrschaft Königstetten im Tullnerboden nächst Wien," *Allgemeine Bauzeitung* (1849): 107. English translation of the quote by Rudolf Klein.

Invalidenhaus in L'viv (1855–60, fig. 16). Like another seminal structure of Romantic Historicism, the Viennese Town Hall (1869–83, by Friedrich von Schmidt), which combined Flemish, Italian, and German references in its overall Gothic Revival design, Hansen's and Förster's projects eagerly employed details from the Habsburgs' historical domains, Spain and Italy, with the addition of



Fig. 16. The Invalidenhaus in L'viv, Theophilus von Hansen, 1855–60 (photo: Sergey Kravtsov, 2007)

facets from the Balkans and elements of Romanesque.⁴² Romanic Historicism thus became a multi-faceted style of the Austrian Empire.

Due to its synthetic nature, Förster's and Hansen's style was capable of fine-tuning to suit the identities of their clients, including the Evangelical community of Gumpendorf (1849), the Greek Orthodox Church in central Vienna (1857), or a synagogue. Förster's synagogues in the Leopoldstadt in Vienna (1856–58)⁴³ and in Dohány Street in Budapest (1854–59) exemplify the Jewish adaptation of Romantic Historicism.⁴⁴ This was achieved through decorating these synagogues with Moorish elements from Spain and Italy as well as Byzantine and Romanesque components, and through their tripartite composition of masses, which followed the

sequences at the Temple of Jerusalem. This avoided any comparisons between synagogues and cruciform church plans, which at the time were thought to be modeled on the crucified body of Jesus.

The theoretical foundations of Austrian Romantic Historicism may be virtually reconstructed by comparing them to the preceding concepts. Seventeenth-century architectural theory already emphasized the continuity of architecture, which had passed from God to Adam, Cain,

42 For the program of the Viennese Town Hall, see Anthony Alofsin, *When Buildings Speak: Architecture as Language in the Habsburg Empire and Its Aftermath, 1867–1933* (Chicago, 2006), 20–23.

43 Ludwig Förster, "Das Israelitische Bethhaus in der Wiener Vorstadt Leopoldstadt," *Allgemeine Bauzeitung* (1859): 14–16 pls. 230–35.

44 Rudolf Klein, *The Great Synagogue of Budapest* (Budapest, 2008), passim.




Fig. 17. The Metropolitan Church of Sts. Basil, Gregory, and John Chrysostom in Czernivtsi, architect Josef Hlávka, 1864–73 (photo: Sergey Kravtsov, 2004)

and Seth, to the Babylonians and Egyptians, Phoenicians and Jews, and then to the Greeks and Romans.⁴⁵ In the second half of the eighteenth century, the culmination of the classical architectural canon in ancient Greece was deemed absolute. In German Neoclassicist theories, the Greek canon stood for the expression of the entire development of world architecture.⁴⁶ Structures built by Romantic Historicists expressed opposing ideas: they emphasized historicity and the mutual relatedness of cultures and architectural schools. In the mid-nineteenth century, a feeling of a shared cultural destiny, of culturally and historically interwoven East and West, of tradition and future, was poetized and romanticized.⁴⁷ This feeling not only helped to formulate the “Moorish” (supposedly Jewish) version of Romantic Historicism, but it also shaped

the modern Jewish identity as “other,” though related to co-existent national identities and, in Jewish eyes, co-equal.

In the decades following Förster’s and Hansen’s innovations, Romantic Historicism penetrated Bukovina and Galicia. Chernivtsi’s buildings were designed by the Vienna-educated architects Josef Hlávka (1831–1908) and Julian Zachariewicz (1837–98). Hlávka adjusted the new style to the Orthodox church of Sts. Basil, Gregory, and John Chrysostom, and to the Orthodox Metropolitan residence (1864–73, fig. 17), using remote Byzantine,

45 Lydia M. Soo, *Wren’s “Tracts” on Architecture and Other Writings* (Cambridge, 1998), 128–29.

46 Mitchell Schwarzer, *German Architectural Theory and the Search for Modern Identity* (Cambridge, 1995), 65–66.

47 See, for instance, Heinrich Heine’s poem *Jehuda ben Halevy* (1851).

Romanesque, Gothic, Renaissance, Moorish, and regional Romanian features.⁴⁸ In the Armenian Catholic Church of the Apostles Peter and Paul (1869–75, fig. 18) he employed Gothic, Romanesque, and Armenian medieval details.⁴⁹ Zachariewicz applied Förster’s stylistic concept to the Temple of the Jewish Progressive Community of Chernivtsi (1873–78, figs. 19, 20), a monumental edifice placed close to the city center, far away from Synagogengasse with its Great Synagogue.⁵⁰ Following Förster, he combined mostly Moorish decoration with a tripartite longitudinal layout, reiterating his desire to “exclude any imitation of humane body and image of God.”⁵¹

Zachariewicz introduced a cupola into his Temple, a feature which Förster had never used in synagogues. He explained various technical matters when discussing this cupola in his article of 1882, but remained silent about its meaning.⁵² Only in his statement of 1896 did the architect claim that the cupola was a shape alien to Jewish architecture, and attributed to it a meaning of open sky, and thus of a courtyard, which preceded the sanctuary of the Jerusalem Temple.⁵³ Zachariewicz’s design was enthusiastically accepted by the enlightened Jews of Chernivtsi, the construction plans were joyfully

greeted, and contributions flowed in freely; clergy of all the Christian churches participated in its inauguration.⁵⁴ Karl Emil Franzos, an assimilated Jewish-German writer, praised the city of Chernivtsi in the following words: “Would you like to see a corner of Byzantium? Here it rises before your eyes: the [Orthodox] Metropolitan residence, a gorgeous edifice, and nearby – a magnificent cupola of the synagogue [...], a little piece of the Orient.”⁵⁵ This comment gives us an additional clue towards understanding Romantic Historicism as a style created for an empire embracing both East and West, in which diverse religions harmoniously coexist under the enlightened regime.

A remarkable rendition of Romantic Historicism is to be found in the New *Kloiz* of R. Avraham Ya’akov Friedmann, son of R. Israel of Ruzhyn (fig. 21) in Sadhora,⁵⁶ now a suburb of Chernivtsi. Hasidic tradition dates its design too early, ca. 1850.⁵⁷ A reliable construction date rests between 1864, when modern technical capabilities necessary for the Metropolitan residence became available in Chernivtsi, and 1881, when the Sadhora *kloiz* served as a model for the branch synagogue in Chortkiv. The meaning of its style oscillates between the unique identity of the magnificent Sadhora Hasidic court with its regal

48 Dagmar Redl, “Pomizh Vidnem i Chernivtsiamy: Do stanovlennia i vplyvu istorychnoi arkhitektury tsisars’ko-korolivs’koi monarkhii” (Between Vienna and Chernivtsi: On Establishment and Influence of Historicist Architecture in the Imperial and Royal Monarchy), in *Das Architektonische Erbe in Czernowitz der Österreichischen Periode*, ed. Petro Rychlo (Chernivtsi, 2003), 55 (Ukrainian).

49 Ibid., 57.

50 Julian Zachariewicz, “Israelitischer Tempel in Czernowitz,” *Allgemeine Bauzeitung*, 47 (1882): 48–49 pls. 28–32.

51 Ibid., 49.

52 Ibid.

53 Zachariewicz stated: “Aby zachować cechy świątyni Salomona przy restauracyi bóżnicy, z drugiej zaś strony ocalić kopułę istniejącą, której nie znosi styl żydowski, projektuje prelegent wejście do sanktuarium z odpowiednim portalem, umieszczonym naprzeciw dzisiejszego wejścia głównego po stronie przeciwnej wnętrza kopuły. Miejsce pod kopułą, której strop według projektu ma naśladować strop nieba, przedstawiał by dziedziniec dla wiernych” (In order to preserve features of Solomon’s temple while reconstructing the synagogue, and, on the other hand, to keep the existing cupola, which the Jewish style cannot endure, the presenter [Zachariewicz] designs the entrance to the sanctuary [i.e., the apse] with a relevant portal, placed on the opposite side of the cupola

from the actual main entrance. The space under the cupola, which, according to the project, has to stand for the sky, would represent the courtyard for the believers); see “Sprawozdanie ze zgromadzenia odb. d. 29 stycznia r.b.” (Report on Meeting Held on January 29 of the Current Year), *Czasopismo techniczne* (Technical Magazine) 14, no. 5 (1896): 58 (Polish); Eleonora Bergman, *Nurt mauretański w architekturze synagog Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej w XIX i na początku XX wieku* (The Moorish Trend in Architecture of Central-Eastern European Synagogues in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries) (Warsaw, 2004), 36 (Polish).

54 Herman Sternberg, “Zur Geschichte der Juden in Czernowitz,” in *Geschichte der Juden in der Bukowina*, ed. Hugo Gold, vol. 2 (Tel Aviv, 1962), 32.

55 Karl Emil Franzos, *Aus Halb-Asien* (Berlin, 1901), 252.

56 Yiddish: Sadagora.

57 Itzhak Even, *Funem rebens hoif: zikhroines un maises* (From a Rabbi’s Court: Memories and Stories) (New York, 1922), 84–85 (Yiddish). In 1850, only the leading Viennese architects could produce this kind of architecture. However, the present author’s enquiry into Hansen’s archives disproved his authorship of the Sadhora *kloiz*. Jaroslav Klenovský’s studies indicate that Hlávka was not connected to this project either. Authorship and precise building date of this *kloiz* await further study.



Fig. 18. Armenian Catholic Church in Czernivtsi, interior of the cupola, architect Josef Hlávka, 1869–75 (photo: Vladimir Levin, 2007)




Fig. 19. The Temple Synagogue in Chernivtsi, architect Julian Zachariewicz, 1873–78, southern façade, in Julian Zachariewicz, "Israelitischer Tempel in Czernowitz," *Allgemeine Bauzeitung*, 47 (1882): pl. 29



Fig. 20. The Temple Synagogue in Chernivtsi, architect Julian Zachariewicz, 1873–78. Photograph from south-west, 1894. Nationalbibliothek, Vienna



Fig. 21. Kloiz of R. Avraham Ya'akov Friedmann, Sadhora, 1860s–80s. Photograph from south-west, ca.1914. Nationalbibliothek, Vienna

lifestyle and Sephardi rite, and its competition with other sacred buildings in neighboring Cernivtsi.⁵⁸

The Sadhora *Kloiz* was replicated at least twice. Between 1881 and 1885 the Polish railway engineer, Jan Marcin Cieślowski (1842–1927), constructed the *kloiz* of R. Israel's son, R. David Moshe Friedmann at Chortkiv (fig. 22).⁵⁹ The history of the second replica is less known. It was founded by R. Menahem Mendel Hager (Zemah Zaddik, 1830–84), a son-in-law of R. Israel Freidmann in Vyzhnytsia (fig. 23).⁶⁰ In both replicas, the oriental expression of Sadhora was omitted; that is, “Moorish style” was no longer attractive for this Hasidic bunch.

An unusual T-shaped ground plan, formed by symmetrical extensions flanking the porch, is a common feature of these three synagogues. Several Hasidic stories compare the Sadhora *Kloiz* to the Jerusalem Temple, and the *admor* to an archpriest.⁶¹ These accounts probably

reflect more than the messianic fervor of the narrators. They may well refer to the shape of the *kloiz*, which evokes the description of the Herodian Temple in the Mishnah: “The sanctuary was narrow behind and wide in front” (Middot 4:7).⁶²

58 On the lifestyle of the Sadagora court, see David Assaf, *The Regal Way: The Life and Times of Rabbi Israel of Ruzhin* (Stanford, 2002), 271–72.

59 Aleksander Czołowski and Bohdan Janusz, *Przeszłość i zabytki województwa Tarnopolskiego* (History and Monuments of Ternopil Province) (Ternopil, 1926), 177 (Polish); Walerian Charkiewicz, “Cieślowski Jan Marcin,” in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (Polish Biographic Dictionary), ed. Władysław Konopczyński, vol. 4 (Cracow, 1938), 69–70. Chortkiv is called Czortków in Polish.

60 Romanian: Vijnita; Yiddish: Vizhnitz.

61 Even, *Funem rebens hoif*, 3, 83, 153.

62 The T-shaped layout of the Herodian Temple has been known to European theologians and architects since 1630, due to the Latin translation of the Mishnaic tractate Middot by Emperor Constantine of Oppyck: *Maseket midot mi-Talmud Bavli hoc est, Talmudis Babylonici*




Fig. 22. Kloiz of R. David Moshe Friedmann in Chortkiv, architect Jan Marcin Cieślukowski, 1881–85. Photograph from south-west. Postcard




Fig. 23. Kloiz of R. Menaḥem Mendel Hager of Vizhnitsa, by unknown architect, late 19th century. Photograph from south-west. Postcard

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the Jews of many central European countries shied away from the “Moorish” style, which made their otherness stand out.⁶³ The Jews of L’viv, by contrast, felt comfortable with this style well into the twentieth century. It was applied by Polish architect and theoretician Kazimierz Mokłowski (1869–1905) to the Israelite Hospital in L’viv (1898–1902). The perspective of St Anna Street focused on the exotic cupola of the hospital; this structure dominated the skyline of the neighborhood (fig. 24). The hospital’s “pure Moorish style” aroused the admiration of a contemporary Jewish reviewer, the historian Majer Bałaban.⁶⁴

codex Middoth sive De mensuris templi, unà cum versione Latina, additis, præter accuratas figuras, commentariis, quibus tota templi Hierosolymitani structura ... explicatur, variaque Scripturæ S. loca illustrantur (Leiden, 1630). European Jews referred the Mishnah for drawing plans and sections of the Temple in Jerusalem even earlier; see Rachel Wischnitzer, “Maimonides’ Drawings of the Temple,” *JJA* 1 (1974): 16–27.

63 Krinsky, *Synagogues of Europe*, 88.

64 Majer Bałaban, “Szpital żydowski we Lwowie” (The Jewish Hospital in L’viv), *Wschód* [L’viv] 108 (1902): 4 (Polish).

65 Polish: Stanisławów. For its Progressive Synagogue, see Leon Streit, *Dzieje synagogi postępowej w Stanisławowie* (History of the Progressive Synagogue in Stanisławów) (Stanisławów, 1939), 19–45 (Polish); Żanna Komar, *Trzecie miasto Galicji. Stanisławów i jego architektura w okresie autonomii galicyjskiej* (The Third City in Galicia: Stanisławów and Its Architecture in the Period of Galician Autonomy) (Cracow, 2008), 125–28 (Polish).



Fig. 24. The Israelite Hospital, Lviv, 1898–1902, architect Kazimierz Mokłowski, view from Kleparowska Street, photograph from early twentieth century. L’viv Historical Museum

A restrained oriental style for the Progressive Synagogue in the third largest Galician city, Ivano-Frankivsk, was proposed by a well-known Viennese architect, Wilhelm Stiassny (1842–1910), in 1894–95 (fig. 25).⁶⁵ The structure was plainly plastered, no brickwork was exposed, and masonry lattice imitated a jali. The centers of round-headed openings and niches were elevated above their imposts to imbue the edifice with oriental flavor. The most exotic elements of the synagogue, its four tall turrets



Fig. 25. Temple Synagogue in Ivano-Frankivsk, architect Wilhelm Stiassny, 1894–95, view from south-east. Photograph Henryk Poddębski, 1933. IS PAN

crowned with canted onion domes and Stars of David, dominated the skyline, and accentuated the synagogue's location outside the historical Jewish quarters.⁶⁶

Dissatisfaction with the “Moorish” style emerged among professional architects, rather than the Jewish public. Once its devotee, Zachariewicz pejoratively listed it in a random inventory grouping together “Moorish, Gothic, Roman, etc.” conventional styles in his public statement of 1896.⁶⁷ For the reconstruction of the Temple of L'viv, he proposed a more historically-based and stricter definition of the Jewish style. Zachariewicz derived this model from the image of the Temple created in 1887 by Charlez Chipiez.⁶⁸ According to Chipiez and his co-author Georges Perrot, the Temple could have been built in a mixture of ancient Egyptian and Assyrian styles. Zachariewicz's bold design was, however, rejected by the client. No convincing contemporary account

explains the community's retreat, but we may reasonably suppose that the historicist and exotic expression broke too sharply with the progressive self-identification of the congregation, which emphasized the politically and culturally constructed present.

National Romanticism

A new trend, National Romanticism, emerged in the Jewish architecture of Galicia in the 1900s; this movement

66 The Temple occupied the plot of a Greek-Catholic Church, dismantled in 1815; see Sergiej R. Krawcow (Sergey R. Kravtsov), “Stanisławów w XVII-XVIII wiekach: układ przestrzenny i jego symbolika” (Stanisławów in 17th and 18th Centuries: Spatial Composition and Its Symbolism), *Kwartalnik Architektury i Urbanistyki* (Architecture and Urban Building Quarterly) 1 (1995): 18 (Polish).

67 “Sprawozdanie ze zgromadzenia” (note 53 above), 58.

68 Sergey R. Kravtsov, “Reconstruction of the Temple by Charles Chipiez and Its Applications in Architecture,” *AJ 4* (2008): 25–42.

was related to the growing national awareness of the peoples inhabiting the Austro-Hungarian Empire. By that time, a number of architects had expressed their intention to integrate synagogue architecture into the Polish national curriculum. In this regard, a modest attempt by Jewish-Polish art historian Mathias Bersohn (1823–1908) to define some features of the old wooden synagogues as original Jewish characteristics met with harsh criticism by the aforementioned Mokłowski, who saw these structures exclusively as monuments of Polish architecture.⁶⁹ According to Mokłowski, the wooden synagogues were only surrogates of Polish noblemen’s manors; he saw the steep multi-tiered roofs of both as genuine Polish elements, unlike the imported Italianate attic walls and sunken roofs of the late sixteenth and seventeenth century.⁷⁰ Another Polish architect and theorist, Alfred Szyszko-Bohusz (1883–1948), proposed Polish Baroque as an ideal pattern for synagogue architecture, even for a “Choral” Progressive synagogue.⁷¹ Szyszko-Bohusz, like other Polish architects, sought “the native style” which would reinstate the Polish character of architecture – including that of Polish Jews – that had allegedly been lost under the partition of the country.⁷² The Jewish party to this discourse was represented by the L’viv architect and theorist Józef Awin (1883–1942), who recognized the necessity for construction of a Jewish style from the local legacy, though with some modifications. According to him, the legacy survived in the ghetto due to its nearly total isolation, and it could be revived by a Jewish architect owing to his subconscious ethnic affiliation, but without slavish application of historicist details. Some of Awin’s projects that proposed the use of raw stone cladding were close to the German National Romantic style of the 1900s. Awin was able to absorb this style

during his studies at the Royal Polytechnic University of Munich in 1906–07 (fig. 26).⁷³ The details that Awin employed in 1909 to represent “a synagogue in a Polish town” showed the oculi above round-headed windows (fig. 27), which were characteristic of synagogues of L’viv from 1801, and a steep mansard roof, appreciated by Mokłowski as truly Polish. This theoretical proposal was free of any oriental details. It bore local “Jewish” features, seen as “the healthy, revitalizing motifs” from which the new Jewish architecture, in Awin’s opinion, could be born.⁷⁴




Fig. 26. The Old Cemetery Synagogue in L’viv, reconstruction design by Józef Awin, ca. 1910, in *Almanach Żydowski*, ed. Leon Reich (L’viv, 1910) [unpaged]

69 Mathias Bersohn, *Kilka słów o dawniejszych bożnicach drewnianych w Polsce* (Few Words on Old Wooden Synagogues in Poland) (Cracow, 1895), vol. 1, 5, 13; *ibid.* (Cracow, 1903), vol. 3, 5–6 (Polish); Kazimierz Mokłowski, *Sztuka ludowa w Polsce* (Folk Art in Poland) (1903), 324–443.

70 Mokłowski, *Sztuka ludowa*, 352–53.

71 Marian S. Lalewicz (Lialevich), “Otzyv komissii sudey po konkursu proektov zdaniia khoralnoy sinagogi v g. Khar’kove” (Opinion of the Jury on the Competition Proposal for Building of the Choral Synagogue

in Kharkiv),” *Zodchiv* (Architect) 40 (1909): 395 pl. 33–34 (Russian).

72 Cf. Krzysztof Stefański, *Polska architektura sakralna w poszukiwaniu stylu narodowego* (Polish Sacral Architecture in the Quest for National Style) (Łódź, 2000), 152 (Polish).

73 Kravtsov, “Reconstruction”: 38–39; *idem*, “Józef Awin on Jewish Art and Architecture” (forthcoming).

74 Oskar Aleksandrowicz, “Do naszych ilustracji” (About Our Illustrations), in *Almanach Żydowski* (The Jewish Almanac), ed. Leon Reich (L’viv, 1910), 245.

Constructing Jewish identities in the synagogue architecture of Galicia and Bukovina has led from the




Fig. 27. A synagogue in a Polish town, architect Józef Awin, 1909, in *Almanach Żydowski*, ed. Leon Reich (L'viv, 1910) [unpaged]

present back to meaningful historical and geographical destinations. The Progressive Jews in Galician L'viv modeled their “German-Jewish House of Prayer” on the Stadttempel, the Progressive synagogue of metropolitan Vienna. The traditionalist groups and the less rigorous Progressive congregations associated their architecture with the glorious periods of the host nations, emphasizing the shared past. Synagogue architecture tended to follow established canons for related congregations; it looked for clear distinctions between separate Jewish denominations, for signs of mutual compromise, and for various degrees of integration into the Polish or Austrian milieu. Exclusively Jewish components of synagogue architecture were explicated by references to the Temple of Jerusalem. Borrowed from synagogue to synagogue, these references gained authority and promoted continuity.