INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Lucy H. F. Dinner

TITLE Changing Religious Conceptions As Reflected In Modern Liberal Haggadoth

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [✓]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [✓]) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) for Ph.D.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ✓ yes ___ no

2/29/88
Date

Lucy H F Dinner
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed ___
Date

___
Signature of Library Staff Member

CHANGING RELIGIOUS CONCEPTIONS AS REFLECTED IN MODERN LIBERAL HAGGADOTH

by

Lucy H. F. Dinner

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Rabbinic Ordination.

Referee: Dr. Jakob J. Petuchowski

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

1988/5748

והגדת לבנך ביום ההוא לאמר בעבור זה עשה יי לי בצאתי ממצרים

"And you shall tell your child on that day, saying: It is because of what God did for me when I came forth out of Egypt."

(Exodus 13:8)

To my husband,

Jeffrey A. Dinner,

THANK YOU

DIGEST

The Haggadoth produced by the liberal branches of Judaism reveal a great deal about both the priorities of movement leaders and the religious preferences of the laity. Within the pages of these Haggadoth lie the movements' philosophies, beliefs, ideals and goals. The liberal Passover service affords non-Orthodox Jews the opportunity to participate in the *Seder*, using readings and prayers that reflect their own contemporary outlook on Judaism.

The modern liberal branches of Judaism in North America and England-- American Reform, Conservative, Reconstructionist, British Reform, and British Liberal-- have each produced Haggadoth that reflect the concerns of their respective movement. In producing these services, the liberal institutions confronted weighty questions. They made important decisions about what to include and what to omit from the service. Considerations of whether or not readings, such as those mentioning God's vengeance, should be omitted, modified or retained in their traditional form told a great deal about the ideological and aesthetic considerations of the movements. Each of the liberal branches of Judaism created liturgies that they hoped would integrate their ideals and enhance their congregants celebration of the Passover festival.

The purpose of this study is to examine liberal Haggadoth in light of the philosophy and ideology professed by their respective movements. This is carried out through a presentation of the growth and development of each movement followed by an analysis of the movement's Haggadoth. Both the process of how the movements develop Haggadoth and how they incorporate their ideals within their liturgy is incorporated into the analysis.

The variety of movements and wealth of Haggadoth studied cannot be neatly catagorized as generally reflecting one trend or another. Some of the Haggadoth closely mirror the ideals of their movements, while others merely bring to light the philosophy of a few individuals who were given control of the publications. Nevertheless, this study reveals the earnest attempt by modern liberal movements to produce Haggadoth that meaningfully portray their respective interpretations of the Passover story.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis comes near the end of what has been a long and enlightening period of studies at the Hebrew Union College. My gratitude goes out to my professors who have opened avenues of Judaic study for me and enriched my life through gifts from the tree of knowledge.

I am also grateful to the many individuals who assisted me in the completion of this thesis. The support of friends and family, most especially Jeffrey, helped me to keep my focus on the light at the end of the tunnel. So, too, I am indebted to Laurie Simon Goldman whose keen sense of English assisted me in clarifying my own thoughts.

I especially want to thank my parents who, through their love and dedication, planted the seeds within me for my devotion to the Jewish heritage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Throughout modern times the Passover *Seder* has been a pinnacle of Jewish family practice. The *Seder* ritual, because it is celebrated primarily at home, is fairly unique among liberal Jewish liturgies. In the Haggadah we are commanded:

והגדת לבנך ביום ההוא לאמר בעבור זה עשה יי לי בצאתי ממצרים

"And you shall tell your child in that day, saying: It is because of that which God did for me when I came forth out of Egypt" (Ex. 13:8).

In every generation Jews explore the personal meaning of יציאת מצרים. Ex. 13:8 beckons each individual to understand and interpret the Passover story. The commandment calls upon us to come to terms with how the Exodus has affected our lives. The individual and group interpretations of how the commandment והגדת לבנך should be carried out vary from generation to generation and from movement to movement. This study examines the Haggadoth of the modern liberal Jewish movements and reveals how these branches of Judaism have chosen to tell the Exodus story.

The Haggadoth analyzed in this thesis represent liturgies published by institutions rather than individuals. Passover services from the American Reform, the British Liberal and Reform, the Conservative, and the Reconstructionist movements have been selected. Though many Haggadoth have been published by individual members of these movements, this study concentrates solely on those liturgies published by the institutions and

organizations representing the liberal Jewish branches. This choice reflects the fact that many of the liturgies published by individuals do not wholly adhere to the ideology of their movements. Those Haggadoth sanctioned and published by the branches of Judaism best portray their goals.

The Passover Haggadoth published by liberal movements offer a unique microcosm of progressive goals and ideals. One of the most public and obvious ways for Jewish groups to express their philosophy is through their liturgy. As a liturgical work the Haggadah is an especially important gauge of the ideology of the liberal branches of Judaism because its primary usage is in the home. Whereas Daily, Shabbat and Festival prayerbooks are all designed for use in the synagogue under the guidance of trained persons, leading the *Seder* ritual falls to the discretion of individual families. Congregations cannot depend on a Jewish scholar living in each and every household; therefore the Haggadah must be presented in a form that meets the needs of the laity as well as the professionals.

Haggadoth produced by liberal institutions offer insight into the groups' approaches to Judaism. The specifics of how the service is presented, what is included and what is left out disclose the priorities of the movements with regard to the Passover Festival. These insights, in turn, reveal particular liberal philosophies and ideologies. By considering the development in these Haggadoth, this study underscores how the priorities of the liberal movements have evolved.

All of the liberal branches of Judaism have grown and developed in the relatively short time span between their births and the present. Each has gone through a stage of exploring who they are and what they represent. In the beginning none sought to denominationalize, rather they wished to mesh the reality of the modern world with their Jewish heritage. Early

American Reform sought to present Judaism in a form viable for all American Jews. Isaac M. Wise is renowned for the organization of Hebrew Union College, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations-- all institutions that conspicuously do not label themselves as "Reform" in their titles. When Solomon Schechter took over leadership of the Jewish Theological Seminary, his intention was to educate "American" rabbis not to create a new branch of Judaism. Similarly, the Reconstructionists insisted for years that their ideology was compatible with existing Jewish institutions and that they were not a separate denomination. It was not until long after the Reconstructionists had defined their philosophy, published liturgies and had congregations following their ideologies that Reconstructionism differentiated itself as an branch of Judaism. So, too, in England neither the Reform nor Liberal movements intended to split off from the Orthodox, they simply wished to offer alternatives for those who could not follow the Orthodox regimen.

Concerned with meeting the needs of Jews, the developers of the Haggadoth, across the board, express the intent to preserve tradition while compiling liturgies that would fulfill contemporary needs. There is a wide discrepancy between the movements both in regard to which portions of the liturgy are needed to preserve tradition and in regard to what constitutes modern Jewish needs. The American Reform Haggadoth initially disregard much of the order and content of the traditional Haggadah. Gradually, later Reform publications reinsert more and more traditional landmarks. The Liberal movement of Great Britain follows a similar pattern. Leaders of the Conservative movement were slow in their development of liturgy; they chose to reinterpret the traditional liturgy to meet modern needs, rather than to rewrite it. Yet eventually they too felt the need for a new expression

of the Haggadah, which expunged sections they found offensive and revitalized the presentation of the Exodus story. The Reconstructionists and the British Reform branches developed their liturgy to express more precise ideologies than found in the other movements. The leaders of these two movements had clearly stated views about the place of Judaism in modern society; these positions can be traced through their Haggadoth. Although both the Reconstructionists and the British Reform have undergone significant changes since the publication of their first Haggadoth, their subsequent Haggadoth still reflect positions articulated of the early days of their movements.

This study attempts to analyze the ideology found in liberal Haggadoth and compare that with the goals and concerns of the branches from which they originated. At times the connection between the materials included in Haggadoth and the movement from which they are derived will be obvious, at other times we can only speculate as to what the editors had in mind. It must be recognized that the individuals and groups who compile liturgies can never fully encompass movement goals, especially considering the fluctuation of ideology within the individual branches of Judaism. Nevertheless, the Passover Haggadoth offer at least snapshots of the movements' priorities-- the Haggadoth represent how the movements have chosen to asseverate their views at any given time.

The work that follows considers the context of the liberal Haggadoth, and evaluates how these liturgies match movement concerns. In order to accomplish this, an overview of the philosophy of each movement precedes the presentation of its Haggadoth. Each Haggadah is then evaluated in terms of its relation to the traditional Haggadah, to previous movement Haggadoth, and to the ideology of the movement. This is followed by an analysis of how

the Haggadah reflects the liberal branch's goals and, when appropriate, how it reveals change within the movement. By evaluating the Haggadoth, this work seeks to bring into sharper focus the methods by which liberal Jewish institutions actualize their ideals through their liturgy.

In terms of technical aspects, this thesis generally employs Hebrew characters to render the Hebrew text, rather than transliterations. The Hebrew portions that are transliterated represent either the major rubrics of the Haggadah, or Hebrew words in common English usage. Although it is impossible to perfectly transliterate Hebrew into English characters, the transliteration used herein strives to offer consistent and straightforward renderings of the Hebrew text.

The American Reform Movement: Its Philosophy and Its Liturgy

Liturgical innovation has stood as one of the most public symbols of American Reform Judaism, representing a gauge of change in the movement. Soon after its inception, the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) set to work at publishing a prayerbook to be used by its constituents. Ever since that time the CCAR has diligently attempted to match the content of liturgy with the sentiments of the movement. The history of American Reform liturgy is characterized by evolution and revolution, corresponding to the changing conceptions and values in Reform Judaism.

Change in Reform liturgy occurs naturally as an outgrowth of the movement's development and philosophy. As Dr. Bernard Bamberger explained:

> The writing, revision, and publication of prayer books has been a preoccupation - and occupation - of Reform Jewish leaders ever since our movement began. . . . This is altogether in keeping with the spirit of Reform. It reacts to changing social and intellectual conditions sometimes accepting and sometimes resisting . . . Reform Judaism will reveal in its form and style of worship the changes of outlook and emphasis it has undergone.[1]

Thus, Reform rabbis consider very carefully the implications that new liturgical publications have for their movement. Every alteration from previously published liturgy faces the scrutiny of rabbis and lay leaders who question the intent behind the change. Authors must account for every modification of Hebrew or English prayers, explaining why changes are consistent with present Reform ideology and practice. Other sectors of the

---

[1] Bernard Bamberger, "On The Revision of The Union Prayerbook," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal 13 (April 1965): 37.

Jewish community evaluate Reform Judaism based upon the content of its liturgy. When publishing liturgy the CCAR knows that the proverbial eyes of כלל ישראל are watching. To those from within and without, the published liturgy of the movement reflects its philosophy, concerns and values.

Editors of Reform liturgy enter the world of Reform Judaism with the understanding that their writing reflects not only the history and direction of the movement but also the richness of Jewish tradition. Reform liturgists must take into account that the liturgy they create is a reformation not a new creation. Dr. Eugene Mihaly instructs those who write Reform liturgy to keep in mind that:

> the prayer books, ancient and modern, reveal more than the fluctuating response to a changing environment. Preserved in the liturgies are perhaps the most clearly discernible rays of the Jewish continuum.[2]

Each successive Reform prayer book adds a new link to the chain of tradition and makes a statement about the movement's relationship to the Jewish heritage. Consequently, every liturgical publication of the Reform movement must first undergo the scrutiny of the CCAR membership.

The process of creating Reform liturgy has always been a long and arduous one. Reviewing the process offers insight into the priorities of the movement. Liturgy written for the Reform movement is composed by groups appointed for the task. First, a committee must review the existing liturgy and determine if there is a real need for change. Once a need has been established the committee examines all the available resources and assesses the priorities which will shape the presentation of the new prayer service. Next the committee writes and compiles a new edition with the

---

[2] Eugene Mihaly, "A Guide For Writers of Reform Liturgy," CCAR Journal 13 (April 1965): 5.

assistance of editors, poets and theologians. Each member of the CCAR receives a copy of the completed first draft, and has the opportunity to review it. After all comments are carefully researched and the document is re-edited, a second draft copy is circulated for Conference approval. Often hundreds of people will have commented on a draft before the final liturgy receives approval.

This process requires great patience on the part of the authors. They have to be willing to stretch their own priorities in order to fulfill the needs of an often diverse and conflicting constituency. One need only consult the CCAR Yearbooks to witness the debates that precede the publication of new Reform liturgy. Concerning the creation of the first Union Haggadah, some rabbis argued for retaining as much of the Hebrew as possible, while others argued that the main goal should be the reworking of the traditional service to bring it up to the realities of the present Jewish community.[3] In addition to contending with philosophical disagreements over the liturgy, the Committee had to write carefully so as to not to offend the various factions and personalities within the Conference.

In spite of the difficulties inherent in this process, the Reform movement has found it necessary to revise and rework its Haggadoth more than any of the other liberal Jewish movements in North America. The need for dynamic and changing liturgy in the Reform movement reflects the very nature of Reform Judaism.

The need for so much liturgical change becomes evident when reviewing the three major position statements of American Reform Judaism. Diversity and growth mark the development of Reform over the past

---

3 Central Conference of American Rabbis, "Report of the Committee on Haggadah," CCAR Yearbook 12 (1904): 87.

hundred years. Whereas the Pittsburgh Platform of 1885 approaches religious practice by denying the authority of outmoded Mosaic and Rabbinic laws, the 1937 Columbus Platform demands observance, stating: "Judaism as a way of life requires . . . the preservation of the Sabbath, festivals . . . [and] the use of Hebrew . . . ."[4] The 1976 Centennial Perspective goes one step further when it states:

> The past century has taught us that the claims made upon us may begin with our ethical obligations but they extend to many other aspects of Jewish living, including creating a Jewish home . . . private prayer and public worship; [and] daily religious observance . . .[5]

The position statements clarify the historical development of Reform Judaism in regards to the issues of nationalism, universalism, mission and particularism. For instance, the Pittsburgh Platform denies the necessity of a Jewish homeland, whereas the Columbus Platform recognizes the need to support a homeland for Jewish cultural and spiritual growth. Yet, the Centennial Perspective goes step further voicing support for Reform Jews wishing to make *Aliyah*. The concept of Israel's mission has evolved from a universal call to work for justice and righteousness, to a call for balancing these global ideals with concern for the maintenance of the particular Jewish heritage.[6] The American Reform movement has weathered a great deal of change in its relatively short history; at one extreme was the rejection of the particularistic aspects of Jewish tradition, at the other, the assertion of obligations to the Jewish people and to Reform Jewish practice. It is no

---

[4] Eugene B. Borowitz, Reform Judaism Today III (New York: Behrman House, Inc., 1978), supplement.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

wonder the Reform movement has published several editions and revisions of its prayerbooks during the last century.

Unlike the Orthodox, who duplicate liturgy from one generation to the next with few changes, Reform Judaism's liturgy reflects the continuing dynamic process of growth within the movement. Almost by the definition of Reform there will always be groups demanding updates, revisions, and rewriting of the liturgy. How then can the Reform publish a Haggadah that will not be outdated by the time it reaches the press? Rabbi David Polish suggested: "Today we should create a new prayerbook with only one generation in mind because of so many disparities in our day . . . ."[7] Yet, the fact remains that even in single generations the Reform liturgical changes still do not receive across the board acceptance in the movement. Rabbi Solomon Freehof encapsulated the paradox of Reform liturgy when he wrote: "Is it possible ever to have a prayerbook that shall be consistent in thought and yet meet the variety of ideals which are actually existent in American Liberal Judaism?"[8]

The task of matching liturgy to ideals requires a dedicated group of meticulous and methodical writers. The principles that guided early Reform liturgists in their endeavors have endured and, in fact, reflect the method used in the century of revisions of the American Reform Haggadoth. In 1840, in Hamburg, the Commission for Revising the Prayer book used the following guidelines:

> 1. The prayerbook, which aims to be the expression of a religious community that rests on a positive historical

---

7 David Polish, "Where Do We Go From Here?," CCAR Journal 14 (January, 1967): 69.

8 Solomon Freehof, "The Union Prayerbook in the Evolution of Liturgy," CCAR Yearbook, 40 (1930), p. 252.

> foundation, must not only uplift and edify . . . but it must indicate that positive foundation in its peculiarity as it appears in doctrine and history.
> 2. Spirit and heart must be addressed in a manner as compatible as possible with the modern status of European culture and views of life.
> 3. The existing and traditionally received material is to be retained preferentially, as long as it does not controvert the requirements indicated above.
> 4. The entire content of the prayerbook . . . must be permeated with the pure teaching of our ancestral religion . . . .[9]

The interpretation of what represents the "positive foundation" and of what controverts modern status and views of life has varied greatly over the years. Yet, the influence of these early guidelines is evident in all of the American Reform Haggadoth to this day.

All of the Reform Haggadoth to be examined reflect a process of linking the ideals of the present generation to those of traditional Judaism, as well as to those of the preceding reforms. The Committee that set out to publish the first Union Haggadah recommended "that the work to be issued shall embody the quaint charm and traditional sentiment of the original Haggadah, as far as this is consonant with the spirit of the present time."[10] Each new Reform Haggadah attempts to struggle with this process of re-evaluating the place of tradition and coming to terms with changes in the service. As will be shown, the Reform movement vacillates in its relationship between maintaining tradition and modernizing texts.

In the short history of American Reform the need for liturgical change has focused on several issues. Bernard Bamberger enumerated four specific

---

9 David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1931) p. 80.

10 CCAR, "Report of Committee on a Passover Haggadah," CCAR Yearbook 13 (1903): 64.

areas of change which can be traced through the various revisions of Reform liturgy: shortening the service, getting rid of prayers that are not within the realm of Reform philosophy, adding variety to the service, and inserting uplifting and inspiring writings.[11] The versions of The Union Haggadah and A Passover Haggadah reflect these changes. The Union Haggadah strips away much of the traditional *Seder*, shortening the service considerably and removing prayers and references that offended many Reform Jews. A Passover Haggadah adds a wide variety of optional readings to edify the Passover experience. Yet this Haggadah made it clear that the service need not be read in its entirety, so as not to make it prohibitively long.

One key to understanding the process of revising Reform liturgy is to recognize that the Reform movement does not bind itself to a set form. While using tradition as a guide, authors of Reform liturgy are not compelled to retain any given prayer. Instead, they maintain the freedom to utilize the most gifted liturgists of their time to compose prayers that match the contemporary philosophy and social milieu. This freedom has allowed Reform liturgists to produce bold Haggadoth reflecting the true feelings of the movement's constituents.

Still, Reform Jews must keep in mind that this openness requires well thought out application. Freedom taken to its ultimate limits has the potential of allowing Reform liturgists to divorce themselves completely from the chain of tradition. As Dr. Mihaly cautions writers of Reform liturgy: "the more open we are to innovation . . . the more essential it is that we confront the historic Jewish experience, that we immerse ourselves in the

---

[11] Bamberger, p. 37.

tradition . . . ."[12] The freedom to create Reform Jewish Haggadoth carries responsibility to the religion which is its basis.

The evolution of Reform Jewish liturgy, as is evident in the Reform Haggadoth examined, seeks to offer prayer services which are meaningful to Reform Jews. The movement toward or away from tradition, the addition of explanations, poetry and songs all attempt to: "deepen the bonds which link the worshipping individual . . . with כלל ישראל," and to "serve as a vehicle for the expression of the . . . individual's needs to place the total content of his life within the divine presence . . . ."[13] The Haggadoth that follow adhere to these goals.

An Introduction to the Major Publications of American Reform Haggadoth

The development of American Reform Haggadoth has followed the path of general changes in the American Reform movement. For example, the Haggadoth for home use had to meet the needs of a movement in which practice, during parts of its history, had been relegated primarily to the rabbis. The emphasis that early Reform put on synagogue practice and the rabbis' leadership can be seen in the first Haggadoth published by the movement. These publications of the early 1900's contain little Hebrew and omit a great deal of the *Seder* ceremony, which may have been foreign and unusual to those leading the service at home. The 1923 Union Haggadah begins the return to tradition and heightens the symbolism in the service.

---

12 Mihaly, p. 7.

13 Dudley Weinberg, "What Should be in the New Prayer Book?," CCAR Journal 14 (October, 1967): 41.

The 1974 A Passover Haggadah breaks with the mold of the previous Haggadoth and offers an even deeper commitment to the original Passover ritual.

Although many individual Reform rabbis wrote their own Haggadoth, Rabbi I. S. Moses edited the first of the *Seder* rituals found in a publication of the movement. This Haggadah -- an English translation of Leopold Stein's 1882 Haggadah -- appeared in the first Union Prayerbook. This Passover service was representative of only Moses' editing for it never had faced the scrutiny of the CCAR Ritual Committee. Moses slipped this service into the prayer book without the knowledge of the Ritual Committee. Dr. Mielziner, who chaired the Ritual Committee, called attention to the unapproved addition to the prayer book and made certain that Moses' Haggadah did not appear in subsequent Union Prayerbooks.[14]

It was not until fifteen years later that the Reform movement published the first Passover liturgy that was subject to the long process of approval characteristic of Reform to this day. The 1907 Union Haggadah set down the pattern for the Reform Haggadoth that would follow. It grew out of the ideals set forth in the Pittsburgh Platform and offered the first separately bound Haggadah of the American Reform movement. The Union Haggadah went through several revisions and reprints in its early years, but the changes were largely corrections and edifications rather than major ideological shifts.

In 1923, after years of extensive growth in the Reform movement, a revised Union Haggadah was adopted. In addition to stylistic changes, the 1923 Haggadah contained more Hebrew and traditional passages than its

---

14 David Jessel, "Reform Versions of the Passover Haggadah" (Rabbinic Thesis, HUC-JIR, 1963), p. 89.

predecessor. It represented a move toward the innovations that would be vocalized more than a decade later in the Columbus Platform. Through the revisions in their platform and liturgy the CCAR revealed some of the pressures placed on Reform Jews by both growth and anti-Semitism.

Finally, over fifty years later, a Committee spearheaded by Rabbi Herbert Bronstein produced A Passover Haggadah in 1974. This new service represented radical departure from the previous Union Haggadoth. Taking into account the horrors of the Holocaust and a realization of the necessity of the State of Israel, this Passover service offered a more modern outlook on worship, the people of Israel, and Jewish tradition. Subsequent revisions have retained the general tenor of these changes. The only additional major alteration was made in 1982 when it modified the English to reflect non-gender-based or inclusive language.

THE I. S. MOSES HAGGADAH IN THE 1892 UNION PRAYER BOOK

As secretary of the CCAR Ritual Committee I. S. Moses utilized the power of his position to publish his own Haggadah within the first Union Prayer Book. As previously mentioned this Passover service was neither developed nor approved through Committee. This Haggadah appeared only in the first Union Prayer Book, and no other Haggadah, either approved or unapproved, has since appeared within American Reform synagogue liturgy. The subsequent Passover services accentuate the importance of the *Seder* as a home ritual, and thus are not found in a book developed primarily for synagogue use.

Moses indicated that his version of the Haggadah had been "adapted from the German of the late Dr. Leopold Stein."[1] He chose to follow the lead of German Classical Reformers, who made changes that edified the service and removed concepts foreign to modern "enlightened" society. They were guided by the traditional liturgy and deviated from it only to express Reform values that were in contention with tradition. Thus the basic rubrics in this Haggadah remain traditional, and the sections that deviate from tradition flow from the Reform ideology of the time.

Moses' Haggadah is mostly English: only the *Kiddush*, the *Barekh*, and the blessings over the *Matzah* and *Maror* are found in Hebrew. Further, the service omits the custom of hand washing and the references to God's revenge, details which may have been construed as less than dignified

---

[1] Central Conference of American Rabbis, Ritual Committee, Union Prayer Book (Chicago, IL: CCAR, 1892), p. 227. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically, by year of publication within the paper).

in a home service of the 1890's. The service itself is shortened considerably from the traditional Haggadah, presumably to meet the demands of the laity.

The service opens with a preliminary explanation of how to arrange the table. The suggested list of items includes: covered *Matzah*, roasted meat, bitter herbs, fruit, salt-water, a boiled egg, *Haroset*, and wine (1892, p. 227). The spring fruit presumably alludes to the traditional parsley or lettuce, as a symbol of the spring harvest aspect of the festival. Moses made no mention of the searching for חמץ nor of the necessity for pronouncing an ערוב on years when Passover begins on Wednesday evening. Both customs probably fell out of practice among the early American Reform Jews.

As tradition dictates, the service begins with the *Kiddush* in Hebrew, however it contains no references to the added blessings necessary when the holiday falls on the Sabbath or on מוצאי שבת. The Hebrew portion of the blessing leaves out the traditional line: ורוממנו מכל לשון -- "and exalted us above every tongue." This omission is interesting considering that the rest of the Haggadah retains the references to chosenness. The *Kiddush* itself contains the line: אשר בחר בנו מכל עם -- "and selected us from all nations." Moses was willing to commit to the Jewish people being chosen, however, saying they were chosen above the rest went one step too far. The English rendition of the *Kiddush* paraphrases rather than translates, couching the idea of chosenness within universalism. Prominent in the English of the blessing is the emphasis on the mission and duties of the Jews.

The service then continues with the uncovering of the *Matzah* preceding the Aramaic introduction. As was mentioned earlier, this service does not include the *Urhatz* nor does it contain the first dipping of the *Karpas*. While the traditional Haggadah instructs the leader to break the middle *Matzah* in half, concealing one half, Moses' version only stipulates

that the *Matzah* be uncovered so as to be visible. So, too, the Union Prayer Book service does not specify the number of *Matzoth* nor call for the hiding of the *afikomen*. The Aramaic introduction offers a reflection of the three major themes of הא לחמא: the bread of affliction, inviting the poor to eat, and freedom. Instead of the call for a return to the land of Israel in the year to come, this version focuses on God freeing all from suffering.

After the Aramaic introduction, Moses' Haggadah skips major portions of the traditional rubrics of the service. The liturgy abbreviates the four questions, omits the *Mishnah* of Rabbi Eleazar and the explanation to the four sons. In the four questions the service excludes references to dipping twice and to reclining, practices that are not mentioned elsewhere in the service. It retains the references to the *Matzah* and bitter herbs and adds a more general question about the purpose of all of the symbols on the the *Seder* table. These alterations of the traditional text reflect a trend in the service to trim sections considered unnecessary and to revise the sections contained to match contemporary practice.

In reply to the four questions, Moses' Haggadah begins with humiliation stating: "In times gone by our fathers suffered great want and distress in the land of Egypt" (1892, p. 229). It leaves out references both to our ancestors' humiliation when they worshipped idols and to ברוך שומר. Then the Haggadah continues with a paraphrase of והיא שעמדה, the prime message being that each generation must understand how God redeems the Jewish people. Just as the reference to the Israelites' ancestral idolatry is left out, so too is the humiliation of the infighting that occurred when the Israelites faced threats from Laban. Moses limited the humiliation in this service to acts committed against the Jews by outsiders. He did not utilize

the traditional formula of sighting both acts committed against the Jews by outsiders and harm that the Jews brought upon themselves.

From here, the text continues with the traditional interpretation of Deut. 26:5-8. Appended to this section is Deut. 26:9 and its interpretation The *Midrash* interpretations vary somewhat from their traditional counterparts by adding allusions to Israel's mission, the spiritual as well as physical affliction, and the burdens Jews have faced throughout the ages. In the commentary to Deut. 26:9, Moses inserts a text implying that this redemption by God should lead us to carry out God's mission: "Let us now enter more fully into the spirit of this passage of Sacred Writ, that our hearts may be filled with love to God, and with zeal for our holy mission" (1892, p. 232). Also evident in Moses' rendering is the omission of statements that tell of how God destroyed those who oppressed the Jews, such as the killing of the first born and other specifics of the plagues; these ideas are replaced by a focus on God's rescue of those in need.

The Union Prayerbook's interpretation of וירד שם gives a new reason for why the Israelites went down to Egypt. The *Midrash* in the traditional service explains that Jacob went down because of his obligation to follow God's word. The 1892 Union Prayerbook hints that the purpose of Israel's descent was to be made worthy of the revelation they were to receive. The interpretation concludes: "Jacob was compelled to go down into Egypt, where his children were destined to remain long, to suffer much, and to be prepared for their great destiny" (1892, p. 233).

Interestingly, Moses' version also includes reference to the Egyptians' repentance for the way they oppressed the Israelites. Oppression is portrayed as an ethical wrong in and of itself, not just as an evil committed

against the Israelites. In commenting on ובמורא גדול, the interpretation states:

> And the deceiving magicians of Egypt recognized the finger of the divine Omnipotence, and the proud tyrant acknowledged: The Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked' (1892, p. 239).

Similarly, in commentary on באותות ובמופתים the service contains the following admission:

> Then they saw that a higher power ruled above the mighty of the earth, a stronger hand was stretched out to protect the oppressed innocence.-- Then at last they repented . . . (1892, p. 240).

This section of Moses' Haggadah highlights the hope for the repentance of evil doers and the redemption of all the oppressed rather than just the specific oppression of the Israelites in Egypt.

Moses's Haggadah concludes the traditional *midrashic* exposition with the providential verse from Deut. 26:9. Goldschmidt reported that verse nine had been included in the traditional text until the destruction of the Second Temple.[2] At first, it would appear surprising that this text, literally recalling the riches of the land of Israel, would appear in Moses' Haggadah. However, the interpretation of this verse clearly indicates that the Zion of today lies in America. Thus, it was perfectly appropriate for Moses to insert this, for he considered America to be the new home of the Jewish "Temple."

Concluding the *midrashic* interpretation, the text moves directly to the explanation of the *Seder* symbols. It skips both the ritual of spilling a drop of wine for each plague and the three discourses on the plagues by Rabbis Yose Hagalili, Eliezer, and Akiba. It also omits the popular Passover hymn of thanksgiving, דיינו.

---

2 דניאל גולדשמידט, הגדה של פסח והולדותיה (ירושלים: מוסד ביאליק, 1981), p. 30.

As a lead-in to the symbols of Passover, the miracles of redemption are placed at the end of the commentary on Deut. 26:9; this replaces the traditional statement of obligation made by Rabbi Gamliel. The explanations of the *Pesah*, *Matzah*, and *Maror* are basically parallel to tradition. Again, an allusion is made to spiritual oppression, as the text explains that the weight of the *Matzah* symbolized the affliction on our ancestors, "forcibly keeping down every wise and upward movement of their spirit" (1892, p 244).

Before moving to the blessing of redemption and the *Hallel*, the Haggadah instructs the leader to recall the family's blessings of the past year. Thus, it accentuates the individual's blessings as well as the blessings of the Jewish people. The redemption blessing and the prelude to the *Hallel* leave out the traditional biblical references and paraphrase the ideas of the traditional Haggadah. As is expected in a Reform service, the redemption blessing deletes references to Zion, sacrifices and future redemption. Replacing these themes, the blessing focuses mainly on God leading the Israelites out of Egypt and the mission of Israel. Although the *Hallel* is left out, a replacement poem of praise is found in its place.

In the final section before the meal, the text contains the second of its three Hebrew sections of prayer. The Hebrew blessings of *Motzi*, *Matzah*, and *Maror* appear in their traditional form. The English translations follow the Hebrew; however, the blessings do not include any instructions for the eating of the ritual foods. Not surprisingly, the blessing for the *Korech* is left out completely.

The third Hebrew portion of the service comes after the meal and includes portions of the traditional ברכת המזון. The Grace after Meals begins with traditional responsive phrases starting with: (אלהינו) נברך

שאכלנו משלו. It then contains the response and the first two paragraphs of the traditional blessing after meals. The first paragraph repeats the tradition word for word. However, the second paragraph contains several changes: it leaves out ועל בריתך and from ועל הכל to אשר נתן לך, concluding with ברוך אתה יי על הארץ ועל המזון. In the English, the first paragraph provides a closely paraphrased translation of the Hebrew. In the second paragraph, Moses substituted a reference to the inherited land of our ancestors with a blessing for the land of present residence. The English also contains the special blessing for holidays and the Sabbath. In sum this blessing offers thanks for God's sustenance-- for food, shelter, and freedom-- and it deletes objectionable references to the Messiah, Zion and to Israel's uniqueness.

Following the *Bareki*, the service includes a song of thanks for God's gifts and several concluding songs before the final blessing. The song of thanks ends with instructions to drink the third cup of wine, however no blessing is inserted before the partaking of the third cup. Included among the songs are: an English song sung to the tune of אדיר הוא, a song that paraphrases portions of כי לו נאה, and portions of "And It Came to Pass at Midnight." The texts of these songs omit references to the rebuilding of the Temple and details of the destruction wrought by the plagues. Some verses are added praising God's nearness and hoping for the messianic age.

Moses' Haggadah contains none of the traditional portions which conclude the *Seder* except for the final wine blessing and a paraphrase of the נרצה. Although the wine blessing is not found in its Hebrew or English forms, the text instructs the leader to recite the blessing. Instead of praying for next year in Jerusalem, the final statement asks for God's mercy and governance in the year to come.

Moses' Haggadah is replete with Classical Reform nuances. From the abundant citations stressing the mission of the Jews, to the omission of most of the Hebrew in the service, Moses presented a service that would reach out to the hearts of his congregants' needs. His Passover service carefully removed all practices which might have appeared indelicate in a "proper" family setting, like hiding the *Matzah*, the ritual hand washing, and the recounting of the plagues. So, too, the service leaves out the traditional references to Zion, the Messiah, rebuilding the Temple and the sacrifices, that are normally prominent in the redemption blessing, the *Bareka*, and other sections of the Haggadah.

The universal message of Moses' Haggadah leaps out at the reader throughout the service. In the first blessing over the wine, Moses paraphrases the meaning of the prayer, adding the universal intent: "Thou hast called our ancestors to Thy service to proclaim Thy truth, that Thou art the Father of all men, and the Ruler of the destinies of all nations" (1892, p. 228). In the *midrashic* description of oppression, this Haggadah removes Israel as the central focus of the suffering. Instead, the text focuses on all who face embitterment from other humans. The Haggadah leaves out the traditional statement prohibiting the Israelite men from visiting their wives; in its place it adds: "The just and merciful God saw with indignation how men oppressed, tortured, and crushed men . . ." (1892, p. 238). In the traditional rendering the children of Israel are the specific targets of the oppression, whereas in Moses' version, all who face human cruelty fall into the category of oppressed.

Moses' universalization of the Passover liturgy portrayed his emphasis upon America as the new promised land. Israel and the hope for return to Zion do not have a place in this Haggadah. At the conclusion of both הַלֵּל

לחמא and at the end of וארצה, references to the return to the land of Israel are left out. Although Moses added to the traditional text Deut. 26:9, announcing the entrance into the promised land, he made it clear that America is the promised land to which he referred. Though God may have redeemed the Israelites by leading them out of Egypt into the land of Israel, modern Jews have found redemption in the freedom of the United States. There is no question of what Moses meant when he stated, "He has made us co-workers in and partakers of the liberty and the free government of this glorious Republic. Here is the haven of our peace . . . " (1892, p. 242). Clearly this Haggadah removes any trace of the idea that Jewish loyalty to Israel might supercede loyalty to their present homeland, America. In another *midrashic* interpretation Moses added that America is not only as good for the Jews as the land of Israel, but in fact, it is even better. The service states: "He has given us and our children a lot infinitely better than ever fell to the share of our fathers in Palestine" (1892, p. 240).

According to Moses' Haggadah the Jews of America have a special mission to carry out. The text implies that the oppression of the Israelites prepared future Jewish generations for the faith needed to spread God's word (1892, p. 241). This special mission involves bringing God's message of mercy, justice, morality and truth to the rest of the world. The purpose of the mission is not to strengthen the Jewish people exclusively, rather it is to make the world a freer place.

Another value found in this Haggadah is the importance of the family celebrating the holiday together. This Haggadah calls for the retelling of the family's blessings of the past year, as a central part of the Passover ritual. Over and over again the service reiterates the importance of the role of youth. Youngsters are called upon to read lines throughout the longest part

of the narrative. In fact, Moses goes as far as to say that the purpose of the Passover celebration is to entice the young. The text explicitly claims:

> The ceremonies and observances . . . are intended principally to impress the mind of the young with the greatness of God . . . so that the hearts of the children be filled with love for the faith of their fathers (1892, p. 230).

The God that this Haggadah portrays is one of love and mercy. The vengeful God who slays Israel's enemies cannot be found here. Instead, Moses portrayed God as compassionate and forgiving. When God led the Israelites out of Egypt, God fought "warfare against the darkness of heathenism and the degrading worship of false gods" (1892, p. 239). It is noteworthy that this text does not condemn the people, rather it condemns their evil actions.

The stress that I. S. Moses placed on universalism, mission, and America as the new promised land reflect both the German Reform heritage from which the Haggadah came and the direction of the American movement as stated in the Pittsburgh Platform of 1885. The Union Prayerbook Passover service echoes the sentiments expressed at the 1869 German Synod, which proclaimed:

> All petitions which are not of a confessional character are to be so framed as to include all mankind and all prayers of thanksgiving for the spiritual benefactions of God to Israel . . . are to be expressed in a positive manner, and in such a way as not to offend our brethren of other faiths.[3]

---

[3] David Phillipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1931), p. 302.

Similarly, statements in the Pittsburgh Platform which proclaim Judaism's God as the "central religious truth for all the human race," are concretized in the liturgy of Moses' Passover service.

This first Haggadah published by the American Reform movement offers a glimpse of what is to come in the movement's future Haggadoth. The strong emphasis on universalism and mission foreshadows two major focuses of the developing Reform movement in America. The centrality of the family in the service is a thread that will be found in all American Reform Passover services. So, too, the reluctance to condemn the enemies of the Jews remains a common theme in the American Reform Haggadoth. The German Reform heritage that Moses presented in this Haggadah offers a basis for the expansion and growth that the movement sustains through the following generations.

THE UNION HAGGADAH: 1905 Draft, 1907 First Edition, 1907 Second Edition, 1908 Third Edition.

The writing of the first Union Haggadah reflects the movement of Reform away from "*Minhag* America" as proposed by Isaac M. Wise, and toward the development of distinctly Reform rituals. No longer were the rabbis looking for ways to bring the Orthodox and Reform into one accord; rather, the CCAR called for a Passover service that would satisfy the palates of Reform Jews who found little edification in the traditional liturgy. From the conception of the idea to write a Union Haggadah, the CCAR sought to provide a service that encompassed the movement's ideals. To simply recapitulate the works of the many efforts put forth by individual rabbis would have been insufficient for this task. The Haggadah Committee of the CCAR reported at the 1904 conference:

> The Committee further recommends that, following the precedent established, in the preparation . . . of the Union Prayerbook, the proposed Haggadah shall aim to harmonize the efforts already made by individual members, and to utilize, with the consent of these writers, whatever may be found available in their productions, to the end that one unified and standard form of service be adopted by all.[1]

The Union Haggadah represents the first Reform Haggadah that follows the arduous process of drafting, review, and scrutiny explained above. Reflective of this process is the fact that the 1907 completed version comes replete with explanations and historical and ritual observations that serve to educate the reader about the holiday. The sixty-five pages that make up the liturgy of the Haggadah are accompanied by over thirty pages

---

[1] CCAR, "Report of the Haggadah Committee," CCAR Yearbook 14 (1904): 83.

of historic and ritual explanations. The close scrutiny is also evident when, in frustration over the seemingly endless drafting and redrafting, Rabbi Berkowitz, the chairman of the Haggadah Committee, exclaimed:

> Now you ask [after reviewing two drafts] another opportunity to read the proof, and ask for thirty days or more. If you cannot read it in that length of time, you are not fit to pass judgement . . . . We should have some confidence in someone.[2]

The final product of the Committee process was a Haggadah that provided an attractive home service for Reform Jews of the day. The rabbis insisted over and over again that their Haggadah not bow to every "jot and tittle" of the traditional text, but rather should reform the old in a way that would make a contemporary home service more appealing. Though the Union Haggadah retains a skeleton of the traditional rubrics, the omission of the plagues, the mention of Israel, references to the Paschal sacrifice, etc., leaves a service with a much different focus than the traditional Haggadah.

To understand the development of this Haggadah, the study of it will begin with an examination of the 1905, original draft of the service. The draft indicates a rough outline of the priorities that would be encompassed in the final version. From comments made about the manuscript several changes were adopted that reveal important issues for the movement.

The original draft of the Union Haggadah reads from right to left, but the final editions of the Haggadah read from left to right. It is not until A Passover Haggadah, in 1974, that the Reform movement publishes another Haggadah that reads from right to left. The service itself is preluded by a list of items that adorn the *Seder* table. The list calls for all of the traditional items, including the roasted lamb bone, four cups of wine per

---

2 CCAR, "Report of the Haggadah Committee," CCAR Yearbook 16 (1906): 86.

participant and an added cup for Elijah. In addition, the manual suggests that the table be dressed with the family's best dishes and ware, and that flowers and an American flag also adorn the table for the evening. The appendix to the Haggadah mentions the custom of searching for חמץ, however, neither בדיקת חמץ or ערוב תבשילין are found as suggested rituals in the Union Haggadah.

The service opens with the traditional *Kiddush* in Hebrew and English, including the additions for the Sabbath and for *Havdalah*. The only portion missing from the Hebrew and English is the portion in the *Havdalah* mentioning the holiness of the Shabbat: את יום השביעי מששת ימי המעשה קדשת הבדלה וקדשת את עמך ישראל בקדושתך. This omission is unusual considering that the blessing for the Sabbath day, which expresses the same sentiments about the holiness of the day, is left in. Perhaps the writers left out this portion in order to shorten the service, yet even this explanation points out they were inconsistent in what they considered dispensable.

Next, the *Seder* service deletes the first hand washing and continues with the traditional rubrics of the Haggadah, including *Yahatz, Karpas* and *Maggid*. הא לחמא follows, appearing in Hebrew instead of the customary Aramaic, with changes in the third section referring to hopes for a return to the land of Israel. Both the Hebrew and English clearly indicate that freedom is the goal for all the Jews of the world, not that all Jews should be together in Israel or in any one land.

Trying to arrange the service in an order that flowed logically for their congregants, the writers place the four sons after הא לחמא, possibly so as to explain early in the service the necessity for telling the Passover story year after year to all generations. With the exception of the response to the wise son and a minor change in the response to the wicked son, the

explanation to the four sons retains the traditional form. Instead of answering the wise son with Deut. 6:20, the draft states: ליראה את יי אלהינו לטוב לנו כל הימים.[3] This verse, from Deut. 6:24, employs part of the biblical response to the question posed in Deut. 6:20 by the wise son. The reply clarifies the editors' purpose in presenting the Passover service-- to cause the readers to "revere the Lord" (1905, p. 16). The other alteration in this section occurs in changing the response to the wicked son from the third person to the second person: from לי ולא לו, to לי ולא לך. The response to the wicked son also leaves out the harsh statement כפר בעקר found in the traditional text. Presumably, for the sake of shortening the service, the final paragraph of this section concerning why we celebrate Passover on the fifteenth of ניסן is left out.

After explaining that the story of Passover must be told to all children, the text continues with a form of the four questions. In place of the traditional four questions the Union Haggadah asks only: "Why is this night distinguished from all other nights, and what is the meaning of this service?" (1905, p. 18). The traditional questions about *Matzah* and *Maror* are asked later in the service, before the explanation of the purpose of these symbols. Since the service does not contain reference to dipping twice or reclining, these questions do not appear at all.

In answer to the one question asked, the Haggadah continues with Rav's beginning, emphasizing the spiritual slavery of the Jews, rather than the humiliation of physical servitude. This order offers a chronological rendering of the story, and naturally the telling of the slavery under Pharaoh follows the section on idolatry. Both of these selections repeat the

---

[3] CCAR, The Union Haggadah, manuscript edition (Baltimore, MD: CCAR, 1905), p. 17. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the paper, by year of publication).

traditional Hebrew, except for the absence of the word "Pharaoh" in the pronouncement: had not God saved us, we still would be slaves in Egypt.

From here the service deviates again from the traditional order and jumps directly to the דיינו. No mention is made of the words of the sages Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Eleazar, which usually follow Samuel's introduction to the telling and offer some insights into the laws concerning Passover. The דיינו retains only five of the fourteen traditional verses. It leaves out all of the references to God bringing vengeance upon others for the sake of the Jews. In accordance with prophetic Classical Reform, the service adds the verse: "If only he had given us the Law and not sent us true prophets . . ." (1905, p. 20). Traditionally דיינו follows the recitation and explanation of the plagues; however, the plagues would have been too unseemly for a Reform Haggadah at the beginning of the century.

Having elaborated briefly upon the reasons that Jews celebrate at Passover, the service continues with an explanation of the three essential elements of the *Seder*. Although Rabban Gamliel's dictum is not included, the service contains the traditional responses with a couple of additions. Instead of offering the customary reading for the Paschal lamb (a sacrifice recalling God's passing over the houses of Israel), the Union Haggadah suggests that the lamb symbolizes the haste in which the Israelites had to leave. This explanation leaves out both any reference to sacrifice and to God harming others for the sake of the Jews. The conclusion of this section contains the traditional statement that God redeems us in every generation, but leaves out Deut, 6:23, which suggests that God brought us out of Egypt for the purpose of bringing us into the land of Israel. The customary questions about the purpose of eating *Matzah* and *Maror* precede the traditional explanations of these symbols.

Following the explanation of the three Passover symbols, the service skips back to present a drastically shortened version of the *midrash* interpretation of Deut. 26:5-8 and its introductory passages. The ברוך שומר is not included. Instead והיא שעמדה opens the section; this selection fits in well here, accentuating the compelling nature of the theme of redemption in every generation. והיא שעמדה is followed by the biblical verses from Deut. 26:5-8, which comprise the center of the Exodus story. The *midrashim* that usually accompany the biblical telling are left out completely.

With the concise story of the Passover history and symbols completed, The Union Haggadah turns to the summary statement of praise that precedes the *Hallel*. The CCAR version repeats the same sentiments as the traditional statement of לפיכך אנחנו, but it leaves out some of the synonyms for praise. The *Hallel* that follows contains no variations in the Hebrew and only one change in the English. It leaves out the translation referring to God bringing joy to the barren woman.

The redemption blessing following the *Hallel* institutes some typically Reform innovations. The last section of the traditional blessing: נאכל שם מן המובחים . . . גאל ישראל, was unacceptable to the reformers on several levels. First, the references to the building of the land of Israel and the restoration of the sacrifices were not consistent with Reform philosophy. In addition, the particularistic redemption theme of אשר גאלנו contradicted the universalistic trends in the movement. While other liberal Haggadoth simply omit these references, the Union Haggadah transforms the traditional blessing to reflect Reform concerns. The deleted passages have been replaced by:

שמחים בישועתך וששים בצדקתך ונוכה לראות בהגלות זרועך על ישראל
משיחך וחמצך יצליח ביד יעקב עבדך בחירך יתקדש שמך בתוכנו לעיני כל

חי ותהסוך אל עמים שמה ברורה לעבדך שכם אחד ונודה לך שיר חדש ברוך
אתה יי מלך על כל הארץ קדש ישראל
(1905, p. 31).

The blessing opens with the customary praise for Israel's redemption from Egypt. From here, it leaves tradition and moves into the theme of the mission of Israel. The focus of the new section is on Israel "vouchsafing" future redemption for all mankind. The paraphrase of the blessing concludes with the universal petition: "May all peoples be moved to worship Thee with one accord, singing new songs of praise unto Thee" (1905, p. 30).

The ideas expressed in this version of the redemption blessing mirror the values introduced in the redemption blessing introduced in David Einhorn's עולת תמיד. Einhorn's version of the blessing appears only in the language of the vernacular. It petitions "to allow Israel to see the day of redemption of all mankind; that we may sing to Thee a new song together with all nations of the earth."[4]

The significance of the Union Haggadah version of the redemption blessing lies not so much in the Reform themes which are emphasized but in the method of introducing these themes. Presenting Reform ideology in Hebrew as well as English demonstrates a recognition of the role that Hebrew plays in the heritage of the Jews. While one may have argued that the reformers retained the Hebrew of the traditional prayers only for historical reasons, the introduction of new Hebrew text indicates a deeper commitment to Hebrew as a mode of Reform Jewish liturgical expression.

Following אשר גאלנו and the blessing over the second cup of wine, the service moves to the traditional blessings before the meal. Again, the ritual for the washing of the hands is left out. The only other change in this

---

[4] David Einhorn, Book of Prayers for Israelitisch Congregations (New York: 1872), p. 387.

section is the omission of the ritual for the symbolic eating of the *Karekh*. The Hebrew heading of *Karekh* appears alongside of the heading *Maror*, yet there is no mention of it in the English nor is mention made of the Hillel sandwich.

Before the *Barekh*, the manuscript edition calls for the door to be opened while Ps. 23 is recited; however there is no recognition, either before or after the Grace, of the significance of Elijah or the special Cup of Elijah, which is called for in the preparations to the service. Grace after Meals begins with the traditional responsive call and first paragraph. נודה לך follows with the deletion of the following expressions of gratitude for Israel's inheritance and for God's covenant with Israel:

(1) על שהנחלת לאבותינו ארץ חמדה טובה ורחבה
(2) ועל בריתך שחתמת בבשרנו

After skipping ועל הכל and the references to Jerusalem and Zion in the רחם paragraph, the blessing continues with אלהינו אבינו. In the remainder of this paragraph the text follows tradition with the exception of replacing הקדושה with הגדושה.

Further changes in the *Barekh* serve to accentuate Reform ideology. For example, the רצה omits the last section of the paragraph, והראנו יי אלהינו . . . ובעל הנחמות, which calls for Jerusalem's remembrance. And, the יעלה ויבא deletes references to the Messiah and to Jerusalem and replaces them with the construction: וזכרון עמך ישראל משיחך לפניך (1905, p. 37). The traditional call for the rebuilding of Jerusalem is replaced by: ומלוך עלינו אתה יי לבדך במהרה בימינו ברוך אתה יי מלך ישראל וגואלו אמן (1905, p. 37). The introduction section to the "compassionate One" passages, האל אבינו, is not found in the Union Haggadah, nonetheless the manuscript retains most of the verses of הרחמן. It deletes only those passage which

express sentiments unacceptable to Reform ideology. In addition to these, the manuscript affixes an added הרחמן verse: הרחמן הוא ירים קרן ישראל משיחו (1905, p. 39). The מגדול paragraph is omitted completely from the Grace, thus avoiding mention of the Messiah altogether. The *Bareki* concludes with "יראו את ה" up to נער הייתי.

The form of the *Bareki* contained in the Union Haggadah follows a pattern typical of early American Reform. The usual offending references to Zion, the Messiah, and Israel's unique inheritance and covenant are cut out. The theme of Israel's mission replaces traditional messianic conceptions. Through reconstructing various sections, the Grace portrays Israel as God's messenger unto the world.

This emphasis on the mission of Israel is marked by the earlier work of Rabbi David Einhorn. Einhorn, who held that Israel is the priest people of God, reinterpreted messianic passages to reflect Israel's divine mission in bringing about the messianic age. Einhorn's Haggadah in עולת תמיד contains passages stressing mission in both אשר גאלנו and the *Bareki*, which are forerunners to the Union Haggadah's treatment of these sections.[5]

Following the Grace, a shortened version of *Hallel* and an original modern *piyyut* conclude the service. The *Hallel* consists of most of Pss. 117 and 118. The abbreviation of this section is consistent with the editors' desire to curtail the length of the service.

An original contribution, written by Max Margolis and translated by Henry Berkowitz completes the formal service.[6] The poem, "Our Passover Hope," once again proclaims Israel's faith and looks toward the age when all

---

5 Eric Friedland, "Olath Tamid by David Einhorn," Hebrew Union College Annual 45 (1975): 331.

6 Eric Friedland, "The Historical and Theological Development of the Non-Orthodox Prayerbooks in the United States" (Doctoral Thesis, Brandeis University, 1967), p. 134.

will worship God. This poem is representative of the movement's willingness to express its interpretation of the holiday in original Hebrew compositions. Dr. Eric Friedland explained the significance of these contributions:

> Nearly all the Liberal prayerbooks set forth their liberal sentiments in the Hebrew, often where it is least noticed or appreciated by the lay congregant, as if to acquaint *kelal yisrael* with their position.[7]

The Union Haggadah is rounded out with several appendices including songs, history, rituals, symbols and literature of Passover. All the songs found in the traditional service are included except ואמרתם זבח פסח. The songs are all in English, but the draft indicates that some Hebrew will be included in the final edition. Just as in the body of the service, the songs omit references to the Temple, sacrifices, and God destroying Israel's enemies. In "Who Knows One" the text replaces the indecorous citations regarding the eight days of wait until circumcision and the nine months of pregnancy with the eight nights of Ḥanukkah and the ninth day of Av. Care is taken to explain that some of the songs represent fanciful nursery rhymes rather than serious liturgy. In addition to these changes that soften the implications of the text, the Reform service would not be complete without the singing of "America."

The appendices of the Union Haggadah offer a wealth of information elucidating and complementing the service. These appendices contain expositions on the holiday, covering traditional and modern customs. Many of the rituals left out of the actual service are explained herein. These rituals include: recounting the plagues, the custom of wearing white robes, reclining, hand washing, and searching for the leaven. They are referred to

---

[7] Ibid., pp. 133-134.

generally in the past tense as customs and rites appropriate for a day gone by. The editors carefully distanced themselves from these practices as is evident in the following explanation of the plagues:

> These ten plagues are named and discussed in the old Haggadah. It was customary to dip the finger into the wine-cup, as each plague was mentioned, with a gesture of rejection. This was, as some declare, a form of superstitious practice for warding off evil spirits and influences by a libation (1905, p. 76).

The manuscript edition of the Union Haggadah made great strides in creating a new Reform Passover service. Though the Haggadah is influenced by both I. S. Moses' work and the Passover ritual in Einhorn's עולת תמיד the editors succeeded in presenting a unique service. Methodically, the editors deleted references to the Messiah, the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Temple cult, and Israel's special status in God's eyes. Portions added emphasize the message of the movement-- that righteousness and justice can overcome the evils of the world and bring about the day when all will worship God.

On the whole, the 1905 draft of the Union Haggadah deviated greatly from its traditional source and came up against major opposition from the Reform rabbinate. It left out a great deal and changed the form of what it retained, to such an extent, that the service expressed a very different sentiment than the original. The reaction to the draft by the CCAR membership elucidated the difficulties the Committee had in producing an acceptable liturgy. At the 1905 Conference, complaints resounded, from Rabbi Kohler's dissatisfaction because certain portions were not modern

enough, to Rabbi Moses' lamentation that "the innovations it contains are too modern."[8]

Nevertheless, the 1907, Union Haggadah contained the same basic format as the draft. Several changes were made to tighten up the style of the service and a few structural changes were introduced as well. The final published edition reads from left to right and adds art work and music that were not ready at the time of the draft. The suggested table protocol is altered slightly as well: no longer do the directions suggest that a cup for Elijah or the American flag be placed on the table.

The 1907 version of the Haggadah cuts out even more of the traditional readings. It retains fewer direct translations of the Hebrew prayers, because it replaces them with paraphrases and explanations. Instead of the traditional English rendering of the *Kiddush*, for example, the text reads: "Like a bride, radiant and joyous, comes the Sabbath . . . . The brightness of the Sabbath light shines forth to tell that the divine spirit of love abides within our home. . . ."[9] The *Havdalah* blessings are excised completely from the 1907 service, as is the introduction to the four sons. Additionally, in the section about the four sons, the English offers a short description of each child rather than a full translation of the Hebrew text. The first Union Haggadah leaves out Rav's beginning of the telling, which refers to spiritual slavery. Although the 1905 draft had already abbreviated the telling down to the minimum of Deut. 26:5-8, the first edition leaves out this main section altogether. In the *Hallel* before the meal, Ps. 114 does not

---

8 CCAR, "Report of the Committee on Seder Haggadah," CCAR Yearbook 15 (1905): 79-81.

9 CCAR, The Union Haggadah, (Philadelphia: L. H. Cahan and Co., 1907), p.11. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the paper, by year of publication and number of the edition).

appear at all after the draft version. The explanation of Rites and Symbols also deletes portions that are inappropriate for the context of this Haggadah. For example, there is no mention of the ritual for searching for leaven, washing of the hands, nor is there reference to the custom of reclining, wearing a white robe, placing a cup aside for Elijah, or the recitation of the plagues.

Some interesting changes occur in the *Bareki*, which are indicative of the goals of the editors. Ps. 23, which preceded Grace after Meals in the manuscript edition, is left out completely, as is any mentioning of opening the door. Where the call for the rebuilding of Jerusalem was replaced by a plea for God to rule over the Jews in the 1905 version, this alteration has been further modified in the first edition. The text now expresses a universal rather than particular hope. It replaces: ומלוך עלינו אתה יי לבדך במהרה בימינו ברוך אתה יי מלך ישראל וגואלו (1905, p. 37) with the more global sentiments of: ומלוך על כל העולם כולו בכבודך ברוך אתה יי מלך על כל הארץ ומקדש ישראל והזמנים (1907, 1, p. 34). This formulation is an adaptation from the liturgy of the Rosh Hashanah and Festival *Amidah*.[10] The first edition excludes most of the הרחמן passages, keeping only those verses that bless the family and those sharing in the *Seder*. Instead of concluding the Grace after Meals with יראו את יי', as the manuscript does, the first edition concludes with the ומצא חן passage from the traditional במרום paragraph. With the exception of the introduction of the universal theme in ומלוך, the variation on the *Bareki* serves to curtail the length of the service.

---

10 David Jessel, "Reform Versions of the Passover Haggadah" (Rabbinic Thesis, HUC-JIR, 1963), p. 103.

The universalizing of ומלוך, in the Grace after Meals, is accompanied by a variation in the redemption blessing that expresses the same theme. The manuscript had altered אשר גאלנו in order to remove some concepts unacceptable to Reform, but the editors found the revised prayer contained elements that still did not match Reform ideology. The particularistic message of יתקדש שמך בתוכינו לעיני כל חי was changed to יתקדש שמך בתוך כל הארץ (1907, 1, p. 28). This reading better reflected the mission of Israel held in such high esteem by the reformers.

The modifications in the first edition of the Union Haggadah appear to serve two purposes: they cut away some of the traditions that some rabbis objected to, and they shortened the service to a more acceptable length. The removal of Rav's introduction brings more uniformity to the service, by ridding the service altogether of negative images of Israel. This move began in the draft with the removal of reference to Laban's plan to utterly destroy the Israelites. When focusing on the persecution by Pharaoh, the editors of the Union Haggadah do not want the main theme to be clouded by faults the Israelites may have themselves possessed. Similarly, the service deletes the explanation of rituals not followed by the Reform movement so as not to denigrate the authenticity of the Reform practice.

Complementing the removal of these traditional portions, the 1907 first edition reinserts some traditional texts. After the publication of the manuscript, Rabbi Kohler complained about the inconsistency of translating the Aramaic הא לחמא into the equally incomprehensible Hebrew. The editors realized the logic of Kohler's objection and restored the section to Aramaic. Whereas the 1905 draft leaves out Deut. 6:23 from the section בכל דור, the first edition restores it and leaves out the other biblical verse of the section, Ex. 13:8. However, even though the Hebrew restores the

traditional reference of God redeeming us and giving us the land of our inheritance, the English reads: "The people were liberated from physical bondage in order that they might secure spiritual freedom" (1907, I, p. 19). The message of the English thus remains the same as in the draft. The reason for the change in Hebrew is unclear as it still does not represent the message the editors portrayed in English.

Several other revisions reinsert parts of the tradition removed in the draft. The 1907 first edition includes Rabban Gamliel's declaration of the obligation to teach the three symbols of Passover. Also, the Hebrew explanation of the *Pesah* includes part of Exodus 12:27 which mentions God passing over the houses of the Israelites. The fourth cup of wine, which was probably left out of the draft by oversight, is found right before the concluding benediction of the first edition. And though all the songs in the 1905 draft appear in English only, the 1907 version gives the Hebrew for בי לו נאה, אדיר הוא and אחד מי יודע, and the Aramaic for חד גדיא. The songs אין באלהינו and "God of the Mighty Hand" are added to the song section, but "America" is left out. Adding the Hebrew songs helped preserve a particularistic flavor in a heavily universalistic Haggadah. The net effect of these changes was to tighten up the traditional sections that do appear in the service and to lend more continuity and consistency to the flow of the service.

Several other changes also contribute to the continuity of the service. These modifications offer interpretations that make the service relevant for modern Jews. For example, the דיינו adds the new concluding verse:

> In spite of the destruction of Jerusalem . . . and the cruelties that Israel has suffered throughout the ages, God in His mercy has preserved us and given us the freedom of these days. He has thus confirmed within us

> the hope that . . . our sublime mission of redemption and peace shall at last find fulfillment throughout the world (1907, 1, p. 21).

With this conclusion the יי"ד offers a reason to give thanks for what is happening today and what will happen in the future. It also re-emphasizes the importance of Israel's mission. Similarly, at the end of the explanation about the three Passover symbols, added interpretations offer a modern view of movement from slavery to freedom. The *Pesah* represents the Israelites revolting against the Egyptians; the *Matzah* teaches the Israelites of the importance of obedience to God; and the *Maror* stands for the blessing that comes from hard work (1907, 1, pp. 22-25). Hence, the lesson taught herein is that the road to freedom involves rejecting evil, trusting in God's help, and working hard.

In summary, the major alterations between the draft and the final edition of the Union Haggadah involved tightening the focus of the service around the ideals of American Reform Judaism. The service trims the traditional portions down to a bare minimum and clarifies the retention of tradition with plenty of explanation in the appendices. Accentuating the major concerns of the day, the 1907 first edition-- even more clearly than the 1905 draft-- delineates its universalistic slant and its focus on the hope for world-wide freedom.

As a reflection of American Reform Judaism, this Haggadah reveals some of the priorities of the movement. Becoming fully accepted citizens of American society played an important role in shaping the values of Reform Jews at the beginning of the twentieth century. Jews were asking themselves: "How can we be good Americans?" Religiously, they believed this could be accomplished by stressing those Jewish values that emphasized the contribution that Jews made to the country. Reform Jews pushed for

higher standards of decorum in ritual and acclaimed the Jewish mission as the ideal for American society as a whole. At the same time, the importance of the land of Israel, reference to customs of the Temple cult and the particularistic tendencies within Judaism were greatly downplayed.

These priorities, from universalism to the value of global freedom, clearly find prominence in the first Union Haggadah of 1907. The Reform Haggadah fully embodies the sentiments of the early Reform Jews toward nationalism, expressed by Philipson:

> the national existence of the Jews ceased when the Romans set the Temple aflame and destroyed Jerusalem. The career in Palestine was but a preparation for Israel's work in all portions of the world."[11]

The omission of "Next year in the land of Israel," "Next year in Jerusalem," and ובנה ירושלים from the service represent three examples of the attempt of the Haggadah to minimize Jewish nationalistic sentiments.

Expressions of this nationalism were replaced by emphasizing the role of universalism in Judaism. The ideals of the Pittsburgh Platform find themselves actualized by the addition of several passages to the first edition of the Union Haggadah. In the explanation of the history and traditions of Passover, the Union Haggadah explicitly states: "But the lesson of the Passover has a universal application. It proclaims to the world man's inalienable right to be free, and the final victory of light and justice over dark and injustice" (1907, 1, p. 79). These ideals are clearly expressed in the modification of the redemption blessing: "Thy name shall be sanctified in the sight of all men. May all peoples be moved to worship Thee with one accord . . . " (1907, 1, p. 29). These sentiments express the desire of the

---

[11] Philipson, p. 5.

American Reform Jews to stress that their ideals would benefit the whole country.

Alongside the universal emphasis in the first Union Haggadah stands the affirmation of the mission of Israel. That mission, as the Reformers saw it, was completely compatible with the ideals of American government. At the 1869 Philadelphia Conference of Reform Judaism, the importance of this mission surfaced. The principles adopted by the conference read: "The Messianic aim of Israel is . . . the union of all the children of God in the confession of the unity of God, so as to realize the unity of all rational creatures and their call to moral sanctification."[12] The addition to the יי"ד in this Haggadah reflected the Jewish mission by stating, "He [God] has confirmed within us the hope that . . . our sublime mission of redemption and peace shall at last find fulfillment throughout the world" (1907, 1, p. 21).

The first Union Haggadah placed a high priority on the role of the family in the *Seder*, and on the efficacy of the Passover liturgy for the family as a whole. The family, it was hoped, would become the ideal place to foster the values and beliefs of Judaism. Thus, the rabbis composed the liturgy to meet the concerns of the family. Rabbi Kohler vocalized the centrality of the family when he complained about the draft of the service: "As a literary man I can appreciate it, but I cannot appreciate it as a Jewish father of a family."[13] The service highlights this concern throughout. At the beginning of the Haggadah, it explains that the family *Seder* has replaced the service at the altar. So, too, the explanation added to the four sons emphasizes the importance of reciting the *Seder* service from one generation to the next.

---

12 Ibid., p. 354.
13 CCAR Yearbook, 1905, p. 80.

Another attempt to make the service more harmonious with American society was obvious in the stress placed on decorum in the Union Haggadah. The Union Prayerbook and the Union Hymnal sought to strengthen the ties and unity within the Reform movement; these liturgies changed the worship service to match the style and ceremony present in the churches of their Protestant neighbors. Philipson relayed that early reforms "arose from the desire to make the public services decorous and intelligible."[14] The seriousness of the Union Haggadah liturgists is evident from declarations informing the reader that "Whatever does not belong to the devotional part has been relegated to an appendix. . . . The lighter, more joyous . . . features of the celebration are thus to follow the more earnest devotional exercises" (1905, p. 10). The deletion of hiding the *afikomen*, spilling wine on the table for each plague, and God's wrath upon the enemies of the Jews denoted that games and untidy expressions did not fit the mold of a dignified service. Even though the introduction to "Who Knows One" explained that the poem was but a nursery rhyme not to be understood as serious liturgy, the text still left out references to circumcision and the nine months of pregnancy. These omissions point out that even in a fanciful poem mentioning of certain themes was too delicate a subject for the Union Haggadah.

Just as some references were removed because they did not properly represent the mood of Reform Jews of the day, others were excised because they conflicted with current ideological concepts. The elevation of "American Zion" ran counter to calls for the re-establishment of the land of Israel and for the reinstatement of the Temple cult. Thus the writers of the 1907 first Union Haggadah did not mention the sacrifices and the hope for return to the

---

[14] Philipson, p. 23.

land of Israel. Although the draft of the Haggadah left in the heading of *Koreikh* it included no explanation of it. The first edition left out the heading altogether. These references, in addition to being too vulgar for the Reform liturgy, were also objectionable because of what they implied about the priorities of the movement.

The sum of the parts of the first Union Haggadah offers a synthesized reflection of the Reform Judaism of its day. The rabbis who participated in the writing of this Haggadah had the gratification of watching Reform Jews use it in their homes for fifteens years. The values, customs, and standards of this Haggadah would stand for another sixty years before a radically new Reform Haggadah was written.

In comparison to the first Reform Haggadah published by I. S. Moses, the Union Haggadah offers a document more congruent with the early reformers' demands. The work by Moses adheres more closely to the customary order of the traditional service than does the first Union Haggadah. Moses's version is less preoccupied with covering up the plagues and the destruction that God wrought as a result of the Jews' suffering. On the other hand, compared to Moses' version, the first Union Haggadah contains a great deal more Hebrew and has the Hebrew integrated throughout the whole service. However, the biggest difference between the two services lies in the process of their acceptance into a Reform publication. As was explained earlier, Moses' Haggadah was published first but, it hardly represents the first authentic American Reform Haggadah. Moses' service inserted into the Union Prayer Book never met the scrutiny of the CCAR. Although his service might have met the needs of the movement, because it came in through the back door, it was destined to be ushered out the same way. In contrast, the process of Committee authorship and CCAR approval

produced the Union Haggadah -- an integrated Reform response to the needs of the movement. As a group effort, with group investment, the Union Haggadah had the deep support necessary to sustain it for years as the Passover liturgy of the Reform movement.

The acceptance of the first Union Haggadah proved that the Reform movement was ready for a home Passover service that was consistent with its own ideology. The service clearly followed the lead set by its predecessor, in the first Union Prayer Book, by carving a separate niche for Jews who felt uncomfortable with the traditional Haggadah. With the publication of the first Union Haggadah many changes in American Reform Judaism were reinforced. One important result of the service was that it emphasized that the Reform movement was committed to a Judaism that was to be lived in the home as well as in the synagogue.

The 1907 Second Edition and 1908 Third Edition of The Union Haggadah

The first two revisions of the Union Haggadah make only minor changes from the first edition. As Rabbi Berkowitz explained in asking that the Haggadah Committee not be disband: "Your Committee asked to be continued, until the second edition of the Haggadah has been published, in order to supervise the same and insure the elimination of some minor defects."[15] Philosophically, the alterations show little significant difference from their predecessor. However aesthetic changes in the layout and in

---

15 CCAR, "Report of the Committee on 'The Union Seder Haggadah'" CCAR Yearbook 17 (1907): 95.

some of the artwork occurred in both revisions. The 1908 revision basically follows the text of the second edition, but it uses a bolder and larger Hebrew type-set than previous editions. Delineated below are the major variations and a discussion of their implications.

In the opening sections of the service only a few variations occur. The introductory portions that precede the *Seder* table directions omit the reference to the Temple and its destruction, which was considered unseemly. The first edition reads: "As the altar wrought atonement during the time of the Temple, so after destruction, did the table" (1907, 1, p.10). The second and third editions modify that to: "The family table is as sacred as was the altar in the Temple."[16] As will be explored in another chapter, the 1923 revised edition is less cautious about removing these types of references. However, the Reform Jews of the early twentieth century wanted to make a clear separation between themselves and the reminders of ceremonies that took place in the Temple.

The revisions of the *Kiddush* indicate a strengthening of the reformers' stance on playing down the concept of chosenness. The translation of כי בנו בחרת ואתנו קדשת מכל העמים is changed from: "Thou has chosen us . . . above all peoples," (1907, 1, p. 13) in the first version, to: "Thou has chosen us . . . amongst all peoples" (1907, 2, p. 13) in the second and third editions. Although one might conclude that this represents an attempt to get rid of the particularism in the liturgy, the fact that no change is made in the translation of: "Thou has chosen us from all nations," in the very same paragraph, weakens this argument (1907, 2, p. 13). Still, some would argue that the implications of superiority in the word "above"

---

16 CCAR, The Union Haggadah, second ed. (New York: CCAR, 1907), p.10. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the paper, by year of publication and number of the edition)

warranted such a change. Clearly, the removal of references to Jewish superiority is in line with the goals of the Committee in writing the Haggadah.

Several sections in the revisions contain insertions of additional portions from the traditional liturgy. While the first edition gives only a brief explanation of the four sons in English, the later editions offer a paraphrased translation of the Hebrew. The paraphrases, while incomplete, give the reader a flavor for the different types of personalities that the Passover service must reach. Two traditional verses are reinserted in ויגד. The verses tell of God leading the Israelites to Mount Sinai and later building the Temple (1907, 2, p. 21). The reference to the building of the Temple would seem to contradict the deletion of the reference to the Temple in the opening of the service. Perhaps, this inconsistency can be attributed to the contradictions that often result with Committee authorship of liturgy.

Alongside the move toward more tradition in the service, the revisions further emphasize the universal mission of the Jews. For example, the summary paragraph of ויגד states that the purpose of redemption has been "to bring all hearts nearer to the divine kingdom of righteousness and peace" (1907, 2, p. 21). In the first edition, these universal sentiments were expressed only after the summary of the ויגד: "our sublime mission of redemption and peace shall at last find fulfillment . . . " (1907, 1, p. 21). The latter edition's emphasis on mission, immediately following the verses of ויגד, serves to counter the very particularistic messages of the two added verses that precede it.

Subtle changes are made in the presentation of the three Passover symbols, which refine the Haggadah. The second edition deletes the Hebrew of the final part of the *Pesaḥ* question. Although the full question was

never translated in any of the previous editions, the Hebrew text had contained passages, concerning eating practices, which were irrelevant for contemporary Reform. In the English explanation of the *Motzah*, the phrase: "This is a beautiful lesson, teaching obedience to God" (1907, 1, p. 24), is omitted from the revised editions. The writers probably preferred the more subtle approach to seeking obedience that is presented in the same paragraph: "so should we be prepared always to follow God's leading" (1907, 2, p. 24).

Two final insertions into the text of the service occur in the presentation of the *Hallel* and its introduction. Whereas in the first edition the traditional passage לסיבך appears only in Hebrew, the second and third editions translate this passage. The second change occurs with the replacement of the verse: אל יי ויאר לנו אסרו חג בעבותים עד קרנות המובח (1907, 1, p. 42), from the first edition, with: אלי אתה ואודך אלהי ארוממך הודו ליי כי טוב כי לעולם חסדו (1907, 2, p. 42). Though the English remains the same in both versions the omission of the Hebrew reference to the horns of the Temple altar is consistent with the rest of the service.

The concluding sections of the Haggadah contain some minor revisions and rearrangement of order. For example, the modern *piyyut*, "Our Passover Hope," is moved from the end of the service to the section on Songs and Poems. In "Who Knows One," instead of seven referring to the Sabbath, it stands for the days in the week. The nine festivals are named for the first time in the second edition. Additionally, the traditional Hebrew and Aramaic texts of "Who Knows One" and "An Only Kid" are included in these revisions.

These revisions tighten up minor inconsistencies in the text. They do not represent the insertion of major new ideals; rather, they serve to strengthen the philosophy that was integrated in the original development of

the service. The service still is not totally congruent. Some major portions are deleted, seemingly randomly, to abbreviate the service. Although the editors may have intended to rearrange the service order to aid in clarity, the rubrics of the Haggadah been juggled so much so that they hardly accomplish this goal. The traditional sections have been cut and rearranged to such an extent, by the end of the second revision, the 1923 Union Haggadah had to radically change the order and presentation of the Seder

The UNION HAGGADAH : Revised Edition, 1923

The 1907 version of the Reform Haggadah, with minor revisions, served the distinct needs of early American Reform. However, the depth and breadth of the changes introduced could not sustain a prolonged existence in the changing face of Reform Judaism in America. In the 1919 report on the revision of the Haggadah the Committee apologetically preluded its report with the following statement:

> The Union Haggadah . . . aimed at enhancing the beautiful home service of Passover eve . . . . However, the editors of the Union Haggadah must have been at least partly conscious of the fact that their work needed many improvements to . . . endear it to every Jewish heart.[1]

The first version of the Passover Haggadah had succeeded in producing a service appropriate for the hearts of a specific group during a specific time, by 1919 a rejuvenation was needed to match the hearts of a new generation.

Many changes had occurred in American society and religion since the writing of the first Union Haggadah. Anti-Semitism, in the form of quotas and negative propaganda, was changing the way Christians looked at Jews and the way Jews viewed American society. No longer did Jewish leaders feel that the bulk of inherited tradition should be buried with the past. Whereas the Passover liturgy of earlier years had focused on overcoming the "almost insurmountable" difficulties of meshing modernity with tradition,[2] the present Committee did not view tradition with such negative eyes. The words of Rabbi Samuel S. Cohon brought into focus the historic hope of the reformers to move toward unity among all Jews. He stated,

---

[1] CCAR, "Report of Committee on Revision of the Haggadah" CCAR Yearbook 29 (1919): 55.

[2] CCAR, ed., The Union Haggadah (Philidelphia: L.H. Cahan and Co., 1907), p. vi

> It was the thought of the Committee that it could get out an Haggadah that would be acceptable to all - orthodox as well as reform. We are sure that the orthodox would welcome the Haggadah if they found in it all the old landmarks.[3]

The original Union Haggadah's rejection of the traditional order and many of the traditional rubrics of the service proved too radical for the rabbis reworking the Haggadah. They wanted a service that felt more "Jewish."

The Committee on the Revision of the Haggadah reflected the desire for a move back toward tradition, both by restoring much of the traditional order of the service and by reinserting some traditional portions that were previously omitted. From the beginning of the revision, the Committee made it known that the new service would follow the order of the traditional Passover *Seder*. They also proposed to reincorporate: the four questions, מתחילה עובדי, והיא שעמדה, צא ולמד, דיינו, and several songs.[4] Although the final revision contained only a few of these suggested additions, the stress on restoring a more traditional service is evident. Instead of seeing tradition as weighing down the movement, the revisors viewed it as a vehicle to enrich and "lend color" to the service.[5]

The 1923 Union Haggadah presents the Passover story in a more straightforward manner than its predecessor. Though the revisors tended meticulously to the aesthetic layout of the Haggadah, they did not feel that tradition necessarily had to be hidden for the sake of more pleasant presentation. This Haggada, as will be seen in the analysis, does not rewrite every reference to the sacrifices, nor does it shy away from every possible

---

3 CCAR Yearbook 29, p. 57.

4 Ibid., p. 56.

5 Samuel S. Cohon, ed., The Union Haggadah, revised ed. (New York: CCAR, 1923), p. viii. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the paper, by year of publication)

controversy with reference to Israel or mention of the truths of Jewish history.

Unlike the earlier versions, the 1923 Union Haggadah begins with an extensive compilation of preliminary and preparatory instructions. Instead of jumping from the foreword directly to the table setting and service, the revised edition includes a new section on the philosophy of the Union Haggadah. The section on "Rites and Symbols," which is located in the appendix of the older edition, receives more prominent standing, being placed before the service itself. In addition, the authors have placed a new section prior to the introduction, delineating the service order. These changes are significant both in their content and in the implications of their placement before the service begins.

From these preliminary sections it becomes obvious that the service to follow will vary considerably from earlier versions. The section on the philosophy of the Haggadah speaks of the importance of this family celebration as a link to the chain of tradition. Instead of presenting the service as a stately ritual, it describes it as combining the "intensely spiritual tone mingled with bursts of humor, its serious observations on Jewish life . . . with comments in a lighter vein . . ." (1923, p. viii). Thus, in this service tradition is presented in a fuller fashion reflecting both the dignified elements and the full drama of the Passover story.

The additions to the section on "Rites and Symbols" demonstrate the writer's intention of presenting a more complete account of the traditional service. Included in the revised edition are the Cup of Elijah and the roasted shank-bone, which were not explained in earlier editions. The description of Elijah's role speaks in a straightforward fashion about the Messiah and the Messiah's role in tradition. The three pieces of *Matzah* are expounded upon

here, where they are referred to as the three divisions of Israel. This is highly unusual, as even today the Reform movement makes no distinction between Jews on basis of paternal descent. The explanation of the roasted egg differs from earlier descriptions, focusing on its significance as a symbol of the free-will offering at the Temple. Sensitive to those who opposed references to the Temple cult, previous versions refer to the egg as the generic burnt-offering for the feast. This reference could be understood to include the Paschal offering as no mention was made, in the earlier Haggadoth, of the shank-bone. In contrast, the 1923 revision offers the more traditional explanation of the egg as a symbol of the feast offering at the Temple in Jerusalem. These changes foreshadow further modifications which reinstate references to sacrifices.

As significant as the content of these changes is the placement of them. In previous versions, the "Rites and Symbols" section were appended at the end of the book, leaving them as a mere reference for the curious. With the "Rites and Symbols" at the beginning of the Haggadah, this material serves a more prominent and preparatory role for readers. So, too, the the reinserted list of the order of the service gives readers a guide to the organization and the emphases of the *Seder*. The revised content of these introductory sections echo the intentions listed above of the revisers of the service.

The 1923 service begins with the lighting of the festival candles, a ritual left out of previous editions. The traditional blessing appears in Hebrew, English and also includes a transliteration of the Hebrew. In addition, the שהחיינו, which usually follows the blessing over the wine, comes after the blessing over the candles. The candle lighting is left out of many traditional Haggadoth because it is assumed that one has completed

this task before beginning the service. However, its placement at the beginning of this Haggadah assures that those who are not familiar with the tradition will be able to participate in the *mitzvah* of lighting the festival candles.

Following the candle lighting, the service continues with the blessing over the wine. Immediately the reader realizes the benefit of the new lay out found in the revised service, with the major Hebrew portions appearing on the left and the English appearing on the right. Previous Union Haggadoth, in order to fit whole prayers as a unit on one page, used very small type set in both Hebrew and English; this was problematic for some readers. This difficulty is overcome in the new printing and uniform type setting. The *Kiddush* itself differs from the 1908 version in that it leaves out the additional English section welcoming the Sabbath bride. It also switches the order of the *Kiddush* itself, ending with the more familiar בורא פרי הגפן. This switch in order may have been instituted because many families were not accustomed to reciting the full *Kiddush* and may have mistakenly drank prematurely, if the order were not reversed. Since the שהחינו blessing was recited after the candle blessing, it is not repeated here.

Skipping the hand washing ritual, the service follows the format set down in earlier versions. Apparently, though the service reincorporated many of the traditional rubrics, public hand washing was still considered passe in Reform homes. The Aramaic introduction contains a slight variation from the previous texts, leaving out the introductory phrase of the final sentence: לזמנא הדין. In addition, the Aramaic and English texts add the phrase: "May it be God's will to redeem us from all trouble and from all servitude" (1923, pp. 18-19).

The 1923 edition then continues with the traditional four questions. Whereas the previous Union Haggadoth had switched the order, placing the explanation to the four sons before its one question, the 1923 edition restores these sections to their customary order. In Hebrew the questions follow the traditional format. Varying slightly, the English portion changes the third question to: "On all other nights, we do not dip herbs in any condiment. Why, on this night, do we dip them in salt water and *haroses*?" (1923, p. 18). In contrast to the Hebrew and reminiscent of the one question contained in the 1907 Haggadah, the final question reads: "On all other nights, we eat without special festivities. Why, on this night, do we hold this Seder service?" (Ibid.). Although the revised version moved back toward the traditional format, the writers were not yet prepared to fully return all the traditional customs, such as reclining.

Moving in the traditional order, עבדים היינו and the four sons follow with but a few changes from the previous editions. The Hebrew adds back the word לפרעה in the statement: הרי אנו . . . משעבדים היינו לפרעה במצרים (1923, p. 21). So, too, the Hebrew question of the evil son reinserts the phrase כפר בעקר (Ibid.). These changes represent attempts to restore the original Hebrew, in instances where the changes make little philosophical difference and no emendation need be made to the English text. In the same vein, Ex. 13:8 is added back to the English rendering of the answer to the simple son.

On the other hand, a philosophical change in the Hebrew does occur with the changing in the referent of the wise child's question. Whereas the wise son traditionally questions about the laws that were given אותכם, the revised version refers to the laws as being given אותנו. This change reflects the desire to differentiate between the answers to the wise and wicked sons,

since in the traditional Haggadah and the earlier Union Haggadoth, both the wicked and wise sons refer to the service as yours instead of ours. This modification is not without rabbinic precedence. In the Jerusalem Talmud and in *Mekhilta* the question is worded אותנו instead of אתכם.[6] With this traditional wording, the difference between the wise son and the wicked becomes more obvious.

Though the Committee indicated that it intended to make more extensive additions, the 1923 version's main addition to the *Maggid* section includes only והיא שעמדה and Deut. 26:5-8 (without its *midrashic* commentary). This section also contains additional biblical verses and explanation which fill in the historic background of the story. For instance, we find Ex. 1:8-12, telling how the Israelites fell into disfavor with the new Pharaoh, as well as a summary of the joyous expressions led by Moses, Aaron and Miriam which culminated in the group recitation of the מי במוכה (1923, pp. 26-27). These changes fill out the movement from desolation to elation that characterizes the Passover story.

The Ten Plagues still do not find a place in the 1923 revision; however, the דיינו section that follows adds five new verses not contained in the 1908 Haggadah. These verses include the traditional: "divided the sea for us, permitted us to cross the sea on dry land, fed us with manna, led us into Israel," and the new verse: "made us a holy people" (1923, pp. 28-31). The conclusion of the דיינו contains a statement referring to the mission of the Jews that is not found either in the traditional text or the earlier Union Haggadoth-- ושמנו לעם קדוש עולם במלכות שדי באמת ובצדקה (1923, p. 33).

---

6 Nahum N. Glatzer, ed., The Passover Haggadah, (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), p. 26.

Continuing in the pattern of reinserting discrete sections of the traditional Haggadah, the text introduces the three Passover symbols with Rabban Gamliel's declaration printed in both Hebrew and English. The English explanation of the symbols contains a few alterations from the earlier versions: it adds the hope that God will protect all from the grip of slavery (1923, p. 34), eliminating the conclusion to the *Maror* that was found in previous editions ("Thus is it shown how the hardest toil may be turned into blessing").[7] The next section, the prelude to the *Hallel* and the redemption blessing, also incorporate more of the traditional Haggadah. In the section beginning with בכל דור, the Hebrew of the manuscript version contained only Ex. 13:8 and the 1907 - 1908 editions contained only Deut. 6:23. The 1923 revised edition contains both of the traditional biblical references in Hebrew. Nevertheless, the English does not translate the nationalistic sentiments of Deut. 6:23. As in the earlier version, the prelude to the Hallel ends with the לסיכך. In addition, the 1923 edition adds an English reading on Israel's contemporary mission:

> While enjoying the liberty of this land, let us strive to make secure also our spiritual freedom, that, as the delivered, we may become the deliverer, carrying out Israel's historic task of being messenger of religion unto all mankind (1923, p. 40).

The *Hallel* is expanded from previous versions to include both Pss. 113 and 114. Restoring the last verse to Ps. 113, the revised service does not find mention of the barren women too unseemly for the *Seder*. The Hebrew added to the redemption blessing, which had been written especially for the earlier Union Haggadah, is here emended to read: ונזכה לראות בהגלות זרעך על ישראל עמך... ויעבדוך עמים שכם אחד ונודה לך שיר חדש על גאלתנו

---

[7] CCAR, ed., The Union Haggadah, third edition (New York: CCAR, 1908), p. 28.

ועל מדות נפשנו (1923, p. 49). In addition, the 1923 version restores the traditional ending of the prayer: ברוך אתה יי . . . גאל ישראל. Thus, the newer version more readily admits the particular benefits of Israel as a people set aside before God.

The final section before the meal is comparable to the previous versions, with added transliterations for the blessings. Earlier editions either eliminate reference to *Korekh* or combines it under the benediction for the *Maror*, but in 1923 this section contains a separate mention of the *Korekh* in conjunction with the reference to the practice of Hillel and the traditional instructions in Hebrew and English. Again, this demonstrates the attempt of the 1923 Committee to follow the traditional rubrics more closely.

Before the blessing after the meal, the Haggadah instructs participants to partake of the *afikomen*, which the children have found from the place where the leader hid it. The hiding of the *afikomen* is strictly a ritual developed to spark the interest of the children. Conveniently, it gathers all the children back together after the meal, as they present the *afikomen* to the service leader. In previous services the hiding and eating of the *afikomen* are mentioned in the appendices, but there is no formal place found for them in the body of the service. The inclusion of this custom displays a more relaxed approach to the ritual-- one that is less conerned with maintaining a solemn mood throughout the service.

The blessing after the meal varies somewhat from the earlier publications, consolidating previous changes to the blessing. The beginning of the blessing is emended to read: רבותי נברך לאלהינו שאלכנו משלו (1923, p. 57). While in earlier versions the section from נודה לך to אלהינו אבינו had been included in modified forms, the 1923 Haggadah leaves out this section altogether. Also deleted is the רצה, indicating the limited

observance of the Sabbath among the Reform laity. Although יעלה ויבא is retained, it is altered significantly from previous editions and the traditional text. Gone is the petition for the remembrance of the Messiah, Jerusalem, and Israel the Chosen People. In its place the 1923 edition states: וזכרון עמך ישראל משיחך לפניך (1923, p. 59). This construction focuses on Israel's mission as God's messianic people. Here again the theme of Israel's role in bringing about the messianic age is highlighted. These modifications shorten the blessing and eliminate some of the inconsistency of previous versions, which cut parts of the blessing's sections and did not always flow smoothly.

Several traditional lines are added back to the הרחמן section of the blessing. These include: petitions of thanks to God for sustaining us and blessing us, blessing for teachers as well as parents, and the concluding sentence, ונשא ברכה מאת יי וצדקה מאלהי ישענו (1923, p. 61). The conclusion of the blessing is expanded with the traditional יראו את יי through לא יחסרו כל טוב (Ibid.). However, the addition leaves out Ps. 37:25, which refers to the righteous man never being forsaken. This is followed by the blessing over the third cup, written in Hebrew and also transliterated.

Though previous editions do not instruct one to open the door for Elijah, the revised 1923 edition provides for this. Not surprisingly the door opening is not accompanied by the reintroduction of the שפוך passage; instead it precedes the completion of the *Hallel*. The *Hallel* appears basically unchanged from the 1908 edition, with the exception of some added musical selection and the verse: אל יי ויאר לנו אסרו חג בעבתים עד קרנות המובח (1923, p. 75).

The concluding section of the service differs from earlier editions. Leaving the fourth cup of wine as the final benediction, the original Hebrew poem of hope inserted in the previous Union Haggadoth is eliminated. The petition that precedes the final cup of wine contains elements of the traditional נרצה. It opens with the traditional line: "The festive service is completed" (1923, p. 78). Although the 1923 formulation does not continue with the traditional statement of the fulfillment of the laws and customs of Passover, it does recount how the service has unfolded "with songs of praise" and the cups of wine (Ibid.). From here the prayer breaks from the particularistic message of נרצה and concludes:

> May He who broke Pharoah's yoke forever shatter all fetters of oppression, and hasten the day when swords shall, at last, be broken and wars ended. Soon may He cause the glad tidings of redemption to be heard in all lands, so that mankind-- freed from violence and from wrong, and united in an eternal covenant of brotherhood-- may celebrate the universal Passover in the name of our God of freedom (Ibid.).

This conclusion stresses the contemporary hope for a messianic age when all will be redeemed. Immediately following this version of נרצה is a paraphrase of the priestly benediction, stressing universal freedom, openness, and justice. The traditional ברכת השיר and the final benediction that usually comes after the fourth cup of wine are not incorporated into this Haggadah.

The songs and rhymes that liven the completion of the service contain only a few variations from previous editions. As in earlier versions, כי לו נאה is found in Hebrew, but for the first time it is also found in English in the 1923 edition. "Who Knows One" includes changes in the Hebrew to match the changed English of previous editions. Eliminating the longer

apologetic notes accompanying אחד מי יודע and חד גדיא in the earlier Union Haggadoth, the 1923 revision explains חד גדיא with the following introduction:

> Allegorical meanings have been sought in the *Had Gadya*, on the supposition that it illustrates the working of Divine justice in the history of mankind. In reality, it is a rhyme for children . . . . As in the preceding number so in this one, grown people become children (1923, p. 94).

This change indicates that by 1923 Reform Jews felt more comfortable with the lighter side of Jewish ritual tradition. So, too, the addition of the songs אין באלהינו and "America" signify the desire to include more familiar music in the liturgy.

The reorganized appendices of the 1923 version are easier to follow than their predecessors. The section on "History of Passover" clearly presents the traditions behind the holiday, by dividing the section into historical explanations for each of the traditional names associated with the holiday. The revision also adds selections on preparing for the feast, that include searching for חמץ, *kashering* utensils, and observing the first and last days of the festival as holidays. These practices are recognized as valid, though, the text does mention that "Reform Judaism does not consider these practices essential" (1923, p. 142). Many of the selections, listed under "Passover in Literature" in previous editions, are consolidated into a section titled "Reform Judaism and Passover." Several readings also describe variations of the Passover celebration among Jews around the world, and the role that Passover has played in the Jews' relationship with Christians. These readings emphasize the ironies of anti-Semitism in the midst of a holiday which Christians associate with the time of Jesus' death.

In form as well as content, the revised Union Haggadah differs from its predecessors. Restoring the service to its traditional order offers a more logical arrangement. The lay leader, using this service at home, can easily follow its clear order and instructions. The transliterations of selected prayers also add to the value of the liturgy as a tool for home use. With uniform Hebrew and English printing, the service flows more smoothly in this revised edition. The careful attempt to produce a revised edition with an improved lay out made the book more palatable and increased the longevity of the Haggadah in the American Reform Movement.

Rabbi Cohon, as editor of the 1923 Union Haggadah, made a distinct effort to offer a liturgy that met the needs of all American Jews. Although the minutes of the CCAR conferences indicate that the original intent was to go much further in restoring tradition, the final product does contain significant steps toward tradition. The restoration of the traditional four questions, the biblical text of Deut. 26: 5-8, the traditional ending to the redemption blessing, and Ps. 114 represent a major return to traditional passages. These changes, the reordering of the text and the minor changes in several Hebrew sections reflect the implementation of the stated goals of the Committee. Moreover, the increased number of rituals expounded in the "Rites and Symbols" section reinforces the increased emphasis on tradition. The new section on "Reform Judaism and Passover" reiterates the attention to observance and ritual when it states:

> One thing to me is clear: namely, the urgent present duty of all Liberal Jews to observe the Passover. And when I say 'to observe' it, I mean to observe it properly with its ancient symbolism and its ancient forms (1923, p. 151).

Clearly the move toward increased ritual and observance, mandated in the 1937 Columbus Platform, had roots in these earlier liturgical changes. The

fact that Cohon was the driving force behind both the 1937 Platform and the 1923 Haggadah accounts for this consistency.

Accompanying the move back to more tradition in the service is a lessened concern with genteel presentation of all aspects of the service. In the section on the "History of the Passover" the book refers graphically to the sacrifice of the lamb: "The first man carried his lamb to the altar where it was sacrificed. The blood was caught in one of the basins and handed from priest to priest . . . ." (p. 132). Surely, this type of depiction would have been considered grotesque and inappropriate in previous Reform Haggadoth. As was pointed out above, the writers no longer felt they had to conceal the final verse of Ps. 113 referring to barren women. So, too, for the first time in the Union Haggadah, the writers do not neglect to mention the significance of the roasted lamb's bone. Similarly, the revision no longer always overlooks historical fact by avoiding mention of the Land of Israel. Though the movement was not prepared to talk about modern hopes for return to the homeland, the text of דיינו does include the traditional verse about God leading the Israelites into the Land of Israel.

On the other hand, some ideological stances, highlighted in the earlier editions, are strengthened in the revised version. The mission idea is reinforced with added statements, including the following English rendition of the priestly benediction:

> May God cause the light of His countenance to shine upon all men, and dispel the darkness of ignorance and of prejudice . . . . May God lift up His countenance upon our country and render it a true home of liberty and a bulwark of justice. And may He grant peace unto us and unto all mankind (1923, p. 79).

The concept of chosenness also finds new prominence in the 1923 edition. This is seen in the rendering of דיינו, where the text adds the new verse in Hebrew and English: ולא שמנו לעם קדוש, "and not made us a holy people" (1923, pp. 30-31).

The final revised version of the Union Haggadah also made changes that demonstrated loyalty to the United States. As indicated previously, several sections of the service refer specifically to the special mission of the Jews living in the land of liberty. The addition of the song "America" stresses the compatibility of Judaism with American culture. In order to counteract the prejudices that Jews were beginning to feel, the section on Christians and Passover tells of good and bad relations between Christians and Jews throughout the ages.

In summary the 1923 revised Union Haggadah adds a great deal of continuity to the existing service. The restoration of the traditional order, the careful printing, and the elimination of previous inconsistencies contribute to the completeness of the service. Although writing services in Committee often results in a watered down and inconsistent liturgy, the fourth revised Union Haggadah goes a long way to overcome these problems. This improvement was, in no small part, due to the fact that the revision was guided by one person, Rabbi Samuel S. Cohon. Unlike previous editions that went through Committee editing, Rabbi Cohon initiated the changes in this service. The revision was still subject to Committee and Conference approval in the end; however, Cohon had the revisions in place before the Committee reviewed the service. The reordering of the service and strategic addition of selected traditional portions add depth to the liturgy and meet the continuing call in the CCAR for more ancient rites in liturgy. In fact, this Haggadah met these needs so successfully that the service lasted over fifty

years before a new Reform Haggadah was undertaken. Even until this day, many families and congregations steadfastly use this concise, meaningful edition of the Passover Haggadah.

A Passover Haggadah: 1972 Draft, 1973 Draft, 1974 First Edition, 1975 Second Edition, 1982 Third Edition

In the years between the publishing of the 1923 Revised Union Haggadah and the movement's most recent Haggadah, world events had transformed the outlook of Jews. The 1920's anti-Semitism of Henry Ford and his contemporaries seemed like child's play in the face of the atrocities that occurred during the Holocaust. The move towards a more traditional format in Rabbi Samuel S. Cohon's 1923 Passover service barely scratched the surface of the ritualistic and ideological return to tradition that would transpire in the fifty years that followed. The 1937 Columbus Platform reflects Cohon's formal statement of the return to tradition found in the 1923 Haggadah. And by the 1976 Centennial Perspective the move back to tradition is absolutely profound.

Since the time of the Columbus Platform, Reform Jews have viewed the Torah as a repository of wisdom, teaching ritual and law in addition to morals. The idea that Judaism constitutes a people as well as a religion has become a more accepted part of Reform Jewish thinking. The shapers of the Pittsburgh Platform believed that customs obstructed the way to the essence of Judaism; they aimed to shape Judaism as a religion to be practiced at set times in the synagogue. On the other hand, the Columbus Platform mandated the observance of Judaism as a "way of life" and, in so doing, expanded the scope of Judaism from the synagogue to the home.[1]

In the thirty-five plus years between the Columbus Platform and the Centenary Perspective, Jews saw more change than in any period in modern

---

[1] Eugene B. Borowitz, Reform Judaism Today III, (New York: Berhman House, 1978), Contained in supplement at end of volume.

history. The Holocaust devastated the Jewish hopes that somehow modernity would wipe out the evils of anti-Semitism. Since this time a survivalist mentality has pervaded the actions of the Jews. This new attitude is reflected in all aspects of Judaism, from civic involvement to liturgical development. Reform Jews began reforming their opinions about the necessity of a safe place of refuge for Jews. Many who were previously violently opposed to the re-establishment of the Jewish State, now started pouring dollars into the rebuilding of the homeland. After the 1967 war, even many of the most stalwart of Jewish anti-Zionists began to change their opinions about the need for the State of Israel.

These changes were reflected in the most recent statement of the Reform position in America, the Centenary Perspective. New Reform themes found in the Centenary Perspective include the concept that faith in God is integral to Jewish survival, and the idea that Jews hope for a time of redemption. The Perspective also puts much greater emphasis on action over beliefs and suggests that specific holidays and observances be celebrated and followed. The Columbus Platform supported the upbuilding of Israel; to this the Centenary Perspective adds an encouragement of *Aliyah* -- as one viable Jewish lifestyle.

The new Haggadah published in 1974 reflects these monumental changes in American Reform Judaism. Only a completely new text could properly express the transfiguration of sentiments felt within the movement. A Passover Haggadah reincorporates a great deal of the traditional text considered unacceptable in previous Reform Haggadoth. Ceremonies such as *Havdalah*, which were foreign to most Reform Jews in the first half of the century, are added back into the service. Mention of the plagues, sacrifices,

and the land of Israel finds a place in A Passover Haggadah. The service follows the practice initiated in the Gates of Prayer by offering a multitude of alternatives. One can read through the traditional portions of the service, or one can fill the *Seder* with modern day parallels, poetry, and song. Clearly, as is stated in the introduction, A Passover Haggadah is not meant to be read in its entirety at any one *Seder*.

Rabbi Herbert Bronstein, leading the group who composed A Passover Haggadah, explained the philosophy behind the service. He emphasized:

> So this Haggadah is not a revision of the previous Union Haggadah. It is an attempt at *renovatio ab origine*: a return to the creative beginning so as to bring forth what is utterly new from what was present in the old.[2]

The format, content and style of the previous service was so entirely out of line with the thinking of the contemporary writers that a new creation was necessary. Thus, the Committee began with a clean slate, examining the traditional text and the previous Reform texts to glean the best from each, but to replicate neither.

The following analysis will compare the 1974 first edition with the traditional Haggadah. The page numbers indicated will refer to the 1974 edition. Where appropriate, the comparison will indicate changes made from the original draft versions of 1972 and 1973, and changes instituted in the 1975 and 1982 revisions.

From the introductory sections of the book, it becomes clear that A Passover Haggadah will assume a radically different stance than its predecessors. The change in purpose becomes evident in comparing the

---

2 Herbert Bronstein, ed., A Passover Haggadah, (New York: CCAR, 1974), p. 5. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the paper by year of publication)

foreword of A Passover Haggadah to that of the first Union Haggadah. The foreword of the 1907 Union Haggadah states:

> He [modern man] can no longer regard rites and symbols with the awe that vested them with mystic meaning. . . . This work aims to supply the demand of those to whom the old form of the Haggadah no longer appeals.[3]

On the other hand, the 1974 Haggadah states:

> The household must be prepared for this week of fuller Jewish observance. . . . The following recommendations are presented in the hope that our families will choose to intensify their observance and thus their awareness of Passover's meaning (1974, p. 13).

The emphasis has changed from what the Jew will accept in the service to what what observances are recommended to the Jew in order to celebrate the holiday in its completeness.

While the previous Reform Haggadoth either left out reference to בדיקת חמץ or relegated its mention to an appendix, A Passover Haggadah begins with an explanation of the proper way to remove חמץ from the house. Included in the instructions are the commandments to get rid of all leaven and to burn it while reciting the accompanying benedictions. The suggested preparations also include the recommendation that families use dishes and utensils especially set aside for Passover during the time of the festival. This hint that one should keep some form of *Kashruth* during the festival is a unique addition to the service, one that would have been considered close to heresy in previous American Reform Passover liturgies.

The section on preparations is concluded with a list of the food that should be prepared for the holiday table, and some customs of the holiday.

---

[3] CCAR, The Union Haggadah, (Philadelphia: L.H. Cahan and Co., 1907), p. 7.

All of the Passover symbols, with traditional explanations, are represented here. A new symbol of hope, characteristic of the survival mentality prevalent since the Holocaust, is also mentioned here. The text explains:

> It is customary to leave an extra chair at the table denoting those of our people who live in lands where they cannot celebrate the Passover as free men. They are remembered in the Jewish household on this night (1974, p. 15).

Also suggested as Passover customs are: not eating חמץ during the seven days of the festival, synagogue attendance, recitation of memorial prayers, and *Havdalah* services appropriate when the holiday coincides with the close of the Sabbath. The 1972 manuscript of the service also includes here a song presenting the order of the service. Later editions contain the song in the music section of the book, but do not indicate that it should be sung at this point.

The liturgy opens with a call to worship and the recitation of the biblical commandments to observe the Passover. This innovation reiterates the purpose of the service clarified in the introduction. It states: "We assemble in fulfillment of the *mitzvah*..."(1974, p. 21). Both Ex. 12:17 and 13:3 are read in Hebrew and English, so as to stress the importance of guarding and remembering the observance of the holiday. Words like duty, obligation, and *mitzvah* which would have been foreign to the previous Reform Haggadoth, find prominence as the 1974 service opens.

The lighting of the candles is preceded by two inspirational meditations (which were not contained in the manuscript versions). In the 1974 and 1975 editions the first of the two readings appears in Hebrew as well as in English, while the Hebrew is omitted from the 1982 revision.

Reflecting the mood of post-Holocaust Judaism, the first meditation focuses on those who have faith even after the difficult times. The poem reads:

> Happy are those of steadfast faith
> Who still can bless the light of candles
> Shining in the darkness . . . (1974, p. 22), [emphasis mine]

The mood of darkness found in this generation reflects a major change from previous Reform Haggadoth, which accentuated the gift of freedom afforded in the land of America. The second of the two meditations offers a social action message, inspiring the readers to further the cause of freedom through individual actions. This is followed by the candle blessing in Hebrew and a translation with added comments on the meaning of the blessing. The manuscript contains only a simple translation of the blessing, in the 1975 revised edition the blessing is also transliterated. Thus, as the Haggadah was revised, more and more detail was added.

The *Kiddush* follows the lighting of the candles, beginning with the traditional explanation of the first cup from Ex. 6:6. In an unusual omission, the 1974 manuscript edition does not contain the the first part of the *Kiddush* blessing. In subsequent additions the text of the *Kiddush* uses the traditional liturgy in both Hebrew and English. In the 1975 revision, the first portion of the *Havdalah* blessing, בורא מאורי האש, is transliterated along with the first part of the blessing of the wine and the שהחיינו. The successive editions of the service add more poetry into the English of the blessing. For example, while the 1972 manuscript translates the *Havdalah* section: "who enables us to distinguish between light and darkness . . . . As we perceive Your holiness, we are ourselves consecrated,"[4] the first edition

---

[4] Herbert Bronstein, ed., A Passover Haggadah, draft (New York: CCAR, 1972), p. 5.

reads: "Who teaches us to know light from darkness .... As we sense the holy, and sanctify the Sabbath ... we are ourselves consecrated." (1974, p. 25). Later editions introduce the *Havdalah* section differently from the first edition. The 1974 edition offers an explanation of the purpose of the *Havdalah* service, while the 1975 revision only instructs the reader to include the section when the holiday falls at the end of the Sabbath. Thus, the revisers of the 1975 edition either assume more knowledge on the part of their readers or do not want this type of explanatory material in the midst of the text.

As in all previous Reform versions of the Haggadah, the ceremonial hand washing is left out and the service continues with the first dipping. Song of Songs 2:10-12 precedes the traditional rendering of the *Karpas* blessing. The service explains that the poetry is indicative of springtime renewal and of the special relationship between God and the Jews. The blessing over the *Karpas* is traditional in Hebrew and English, and a transliteration is included in the revised editions.

The breaking of the middle matzah and hiding of the *afikomen* are explained with an added statement on the theme of redemption, introducing the הא לחמא. The text universalizes the redemption theme:

> For the sake of our redemption, we say together the ancient words which join us with our own people and with all who are in need, ... For our redemption is bound up with the deliverance from bondage of people everywhere (1974, p. 26).

For the first time in a Haggadah published by the Reform movement, the complete Aramaic text appears along with its translation. The inclusion of the reference to "next year in the land of Israel" represents nothing less than

a revolution in comparison with previous Reform Haggadoth. Rabbi Bronstein explains that the text is not meant to be taken literally. He asserts:

> Thus religious statements are almost always best made in myth and symbol and image; in sum, through metaphor, in likenesses and parables. . . . Though for many it is a present physical longing, the statement 'Next year in Jerusalem!' far transcends the actuality of present geographical aspirations. It speaks also in the mode of our mystics . . . of the homecoming of all existence. . . (1974 p. 6).

In the order of the service, the only major change involves the placement of the *Motzi, Matzah, Maror* and *Korekh* sections. While these portions customarily appear immediately before eating the meal, in A Passover Haggadah they follow the Aramaic introduction to the service. The original 1972 draft of the service leaves these portions in their traditional placement. In a letter to those utilizing the 1973 manuscript (which contains the change in placement) Bronstein explains:

> MOTZI - MATZAH - MAROR - KORECH are all included early in the *Seder* immediately after YAHATZ. There is, as in every other case in this Haggadah, a classical basis for this and a very good practical one as well. It allows for a full *Seder* experience for the family instead of a headlong rush to the meal.[5]

The classical basis apparently refers to the fact that "in ancient times, the eating of the ceremonial foods took place earlier in the *Seder*" (1974, p. 7). Nevertheless, the text still offers the option of returning the section to its normal position in the service. The text appears in its traditional form in both Hebrew and English. There is no mention of eating the *matzah* while

---

5 Herbert Bronstein, ed., A Passover Haggadah, draft (New York: CCAR, 1973). Contained in letter attached to beginning of the draft.

reclining. *Motzah* is added to the bitter herb that is eaten, instead of dipping it in the *Haroseth* and the Hillel sandwich includes *Haroseth* as well as *Maror*. The 1973 draft version switches the order of the *Maror* and *Korekh* and contains no translation of *Motzi*. The text of the three blessings is transliterated in the revised edition, although the Hebrew explanation of the *Korekh* is not transliterated.

The text now returns to the four questions, which are introduced with the biblical verse Ex.10:9. This verse and its explanation emphasize the place of children in the service. Following this introduction, the four questions appear in traditional form in Hebrew and English. The only variation from tradition is the translation of the fourth question, which reads: "On all other nights, we eat in an ordinary manner; tonight we dine with special ceremony" (1974, p. 29). This is an understandable change, considering that this service does not incorporate into its body the commandment of reclining. Interestingly, the 1973 draft places the section explaining the four types of sons before the four questions.

Deviating from the traditional order, the service continues with an explanation of the four sons. In addition to the traditional Hebrew and English, the service contains group responses which summarize the outlook of each type of child. Minor changes in the Hebrew about the wicked son include personalizing it from לי ולא לו to לי ולא לך, and from אלו היה שם to אלו היית שם (1974, p. 30). The English paraphrase of the wicked child includes the writer's definition of what the child rejects, stating: "he rejects the essentials of our faith: the unity of God and the community of Israel" (Ibid.). The conclusion of the text about the four children speaks of the modern obligation to answer the questions of all types of children. This

statement is followed by several modern interpretations of the four children. Apparent in these readings is the modern survivalist mentality that has pervaded Judaism since the Holocaust. This theme is highlighted by Albert Einstein's reference to the "age of moral decay" and by the the story of Rabbi Levi Yitzhak, which concludes: "I do not ask You why I suffer. I wish to know only that I suffer for Your sake" (1974, p. 33).

After the explanation of the four children, the text returns to the portions it skipped, and begins to tell the story of the Exodus. Prior to the *Maggid* the text gives a short outline, in Hebrew as well as English, of the narration that follows. The Hebrew and English text are found in their traditional form, with a marginal note indicating that this first text recalls the "physical servitude" of the Israelites (1974, p. 34). To conclude this portion the group recites: "For Redemption is not yet complete," accentuating the theme of past and future redemption in the service (Ibid.).

Another feature not previously found in Reform Haggadoth is מעשה ברבי אלעזר. This section would have been considered superfluous in previous Reform texts. Here it serves to introduce the spiritual bondage that Jews faced and fits perfectly before Rav's beginning of the Haggadah. The second *midrash* of Rabbi Eleazar is not found in this text. A shortened version of the מתחלה follows, only citing Jos. 24:2, again recognizing the state of "spiritual bondage" of Jews (1974, p. 36). The sections ברוך שומר and והיא שעמדה are left out here and later placed at the end of the explanation of Deut. 26:5-8. צא ולמד does not appear in the *Seder* at all, showing that the movement was still not willing to compare the deeds of Laban to those of Pharaoh. Completing the section on spiritual bondage, the

text contains several optional readings focusing on modern and ancient examples of spiritual wrestling.

The interpretation of Deut. 26:5-8 includes some of the traditional explanation. It contains additional biblical verses and interpretation which serve to fill in the story of the Exodus. Although the text leaves out much of the traditional *midrash*, it offers a rich history of Passover using the historical sources of Judaism. The section opens with the traditional ארמי אבד אבי, stressing the social bondage of the Israelites. The added readings contain the traditional *midrashic* interpretation of "a great nation" along with a reading on redemption and Edmond Fleg's "I am a Jew." The main liturgy continues with more background information about how the Jews got down to Egypt. Here, the text of Jos. 24:3-4, which was left out of the מתחלה, appears. Also found in this introduction to the Israelite oppression are Ex. 1:5, and Gen. 41:45, 54, 55, and 57, and Ex. 1:6, and 8-10. These verses are paraphrased in English, presenting a sketch of the history of Israel coming to Egypt. Surprisingly, the text omits Deut. 26:6, though it does talk about the Egyptians not trusting the Israelites. The only text from the traditional interpretation of this section is Ex. 1:10. Other than this, the verses strung together here present a summary of the Exodus story using texts that are not employed in the traditional liturgy.

Following two optional readings that offer additional interpretation, the service continues with a expansive version of the story of Israel's oppression. Though most of the traditional *midrash* is left out, it is replaced with biblical verses that tell the story. Added to the classical explanation of oppression in Ex. 1:11, one finds Ex. 1:14-15. At the completion of this section of narration the text adds the traditional text Deut. 26:7.

Immediately following the telling of Israel's oppression in Egypt are optional readings that deal with the oppression of Jews in other historical situations and their reaction to it.

The narration continues with an account of God hearing the pleas of the Israelites. While the editors did not use the full text of the traditional *midrash*, they employed the biblical verses of the *midrash*, shaping the story with Ex. 2:24-25. In adding the biblical notations, the 1975 and 1982 revisions mislabeled this passage as Ex. 1:24-25. After another optional reading, the main text continues with the story of the redemption. Again, the biblical text (Ex. 12:12) is used without its accompanying *midrashic* explanation; playing down the role of God's revenge against the Egyptians, the text does not complete the verse with the account of God killing all the first born. The conclusion of this section of the narration contains the traditional *midrash* along with Deut. 26:8. This *midrash* emphasizes the power of God and thus fits the tenor of the service.

After optional readings on ways that one can find redemption, the narration concludes with Ex. 12:40-42. This completes the story of the Israelites' stay in Egypt and repeats the ordinance to mark Passover as a night to be recalled each year. The string of biblical verses that are combined from the beginning of this section to the end offer a full accounting both of the Israelites' plight in Egypt and of God's redemption. Although most of the formal *midrash* is left out, the text gives a complete story using the main biblical texts. This compilation of biblical texts indicates the editors desire to portray the Passover story through the Jewish sources.

Only after the recounting of the redemption does the service call for the participants to raise their wine cups while reciting ברוך שומר and

והיא שעמדה. The first section of ברוך שומר does not include Gen. 15:13-14, as this would be redundant given the preceding narration. These traditional readings are followed by optional readings that tell of oppression during the Holocaust and rising above that atrocity.

The service continues with the section on the Ten Plagues, which opens with a quotation from the Talmud, Sanhedrin 39b. This *Aggadic* passage is interpreted, portraying God's concern for all humanity. The original statement from the Palestinean Talmud was referring to God's concern for Israel; in that context the story unfolds as the Israelites stood stranded between the Egyptians and the Red Sea. Later the Babylonian Talmud universalized the story, changing the context to after the Israelites had safely walked through the split Red Sea.[6] After the selection from Talmud, the service presents a modern interpretation of the spilling of the drops of wine; it teaches that the drops of wine we spill represent how the celebration of the holiday is tempered somewhat by the knowledge that others suffered. As an alternative to fighting enemies, the liturgy proceeds to quote *Mishnah* and *midrash* in order to show that justice is always a better solution. Finally, before the recitation of the plagues the group is instructed to recite a prayer of hope to cleanse all humanity of ten qualities that feed hatred and war. The recitation of the plagues follows the traditional formula. Interestingly, the Hebrew version of the plagues is the only Hebrew transliterated in the 1974 edition.

The inclusion of the Ten Plagues marks another sharp break between A Passover Haggadah and earlier Reform Haggadoth. Whereas the Union

---

[6] Jakob J. Petuchowski, "The Vast Variety of *Aggadah*, a Review" Judaism 26 (Spring, 1977): 248.

Haggadah went to great lengths to omit references to God taking vengeance on Israel's enemies, this is not a pressing concern in the newer Haggadah. In view of the murder of six million, vengeance does not seem so unjust to the modern mind. Nevertheless, a decision as monumental as the inclusion of the plagues was not made haphazardly. In fact, the 1972 draft of the service contained only the plagues. Realizing the offense that this inclusion might cause, in the 1973 draft the editors preluded the recitation of the plagues with a listing of the acts of redemption. Finally, in the 1974 edition, the authors decided that the plagues should be placed before the acts of redemption and that individual leaders could judge which of the two sections to read. In the first edition, A Passover Haggadah sandwiches the plagues between readings suggesting that seeking solace in another's misery is not the answer and that universal justice is the fervent hope. The traditional concluding texts to the plagues, accentuating their severity, are left out of this text. For those whom even this version offends, the liturgy offers the option of replacing the plagues altogether with a recitation of "Acts of Redemption" (1974, p. 48). The inclusion of reference to the plagues results in a more complete version of the Passover story than is found in previous Reform Haggadoth. The priority has changed from offering a genteel service to offering a more "authentic" service.[7]

Immediately following the plagues is the alternative reading highlighting God's redemption of the Israelites. The section concludes with the recitation of מי כמכה, focusing on a positive celebration of God's wonders and leading up to the דיינו.

---

[7] A Passover Haggadah, 1972, Contained in letter attached to beginning of the draft

In A Passover Haggadah the דיינו duplicates the formulation of the 1923 Union Haggadah. All references to God hurting Egyptians for the benefit of the Israelites are deleted. The two verses added to tradition in the Union Haggadah also appear in this rendering. The 1972 draft service switched the order of the plagues and דיינו; however, all subsequent editions followed the conventional ordering.

The service leading up to the meal continues with the *Mishnah* of Rabban Gamliel, ordaining the explanation of *Pesah*, *Matzah* and *Maror*. After the *mishnaic* formula, each of the symbols is explained with traditional and modern references. In the explanation of the *Pesah* although the Hebrew refers to בנגפו את מצרים, the English leaves out this phrase (1974, p. 55). Instead, the paraphrase speaks of the actual Temple practice of eating the lamb in remembrance of God passing over the houses of the Israelites. The modern response emphasizes God as the present day "guardian of the household of Israel" (1974, p. 55). In the elucidation of the *matzah*, the text omits the reference to God redeeming our ancestors before the dough they were preparing had leavened. The modern response is taken from Deut. 16:3, emphasizing the present day obligation to eat *matzah* for seven days. Using the traditional explanation, the liturgy teaches about the symbol of the *Maror*. The modern interpretation universalizes the symbol and speaks of the bitterness that Jews feel when anyone faces slavery. A break in the service is suggested following these explanations. The text advises that children might be engaged with the song "*Pesach* Time" (1974, p. 56).

The formal service continues with the prelude to the *Hallel* בכל דור and לסיבך. In בכל דור the text is traditional up through Ex. 13:8; at which

point it adds a responsive reading that stresses the responsibility of Jews to welcome the stranger because of the slavery the Israelites faced when they were strangers. The responsive reading ends with Deut. 6:23, the traditional completion of בכל דור. The text of לימיכך follows the traditional Haggadah. Both Pss. 113 and 114 appear in their entirety in Hebrew, with Ps. 114 shortened in the English; the service instructs that one may choose to read either of the Psalms. The redemption blessing is preceded by the second part of Ex. 6:6, which explains the symbolism of the second cup of wine. Not surprisingly, the reference to eating the sacrifices offered at the Temple is omitted from the redemption blessing. The blessing over the second cup of wine then follows in Hebrew, English, and, in the revised editions is transliterated as well. Since the blessings that normally precede the meal were moved toward the beginning of the service, the meal is served following the second cup of wine.

The meal concludes with the sharing of the *afikomen*, which has been found by the children. The *Barekh* appears first in a shortened form, but is followed by the traditional text of the blessing. The shortened version includes: שיר המעלות; the responsive opening; the first main paragraph of the prayer; ובנה ירושלים; the portion of יעלה ויבא that specifically mentions the remembrance of the festival; הרחמן for God's dominion, for worthy professions, for the Sabbath, for the coming of the Messiah, and for the house and all loved ones; עשה שלום; and יי עז. The full text follows the tradition with the addition of the word טובים in the phrase הושיענו and of לחיים to the phrase אל יחסרנו . . . ומכל טוב לעולם (1974,p. 66).

At the beginning of the traditional *Barekh*, a *Kabbalistic* formulation is added to the text:

הנני מוכן ומזומן לקים מצות עשה של ברכת המזון שנאמר ואכלת ושבעת וברכת את יי אלהיך על הארץ הטובה עשר נתן לך לשם יחוד קודשא ברוך הוא ושכינתיה על ידי ההוא טמיר ונעלם בשם כל ישראל
(1974, p. 65).

The fact that a Reform Haggadah would include a *Kabbalistic* insert into the *Bereikh* is noteworthy. Reform liturgy characteristically leaves out most of the *Kabbalistic* additions. The inclusion seems to be an oddity rather than a precedent for new direction in the movement's liturgy. The revised editions takes out the ending phrase of this insert. על ידי ההוא טמיר ונעלם.

Just as the first two cups of wine are introduced with an aspect of the redemptive message found in Ex. 6:6, the third cup is preluded by the third part of this verse. The blessing follows the same format as the previous two cups. After the third cup of wine the service continues with the ritual of opening the door for Elijah. After giving some background information about Elijah, the text concludes:

> We open the door that he may enter, and set a cup of wine to represent the final Messianic promise for us and for all peoples: 'I will bring you into the Land' (1974, p. 68).

This open reference to a hope for return to the land of Israel would not have been acceptable in previous Reform Haggadoth. In place of שפוך and its wrathful imagery, the text continues with readings of hope for a world where justice and redemption overcome pain and destruction. Here again, though the traditional text is not used, the new reading that replaces it is composed of biblical verses. Thus, the addition is rooted in the Jewish heritage. The section ends with אליהו הנביא, the traditional song that expresses a hope for the coming of the Messiah. Whereas the Union Haggadoth refer mainly to the messianic age, A Passover Haggadah includes

recognition of both the Messiah and the messianic age. Both the *Rereith* and the section on Elijah contain specific references to the Messiah.

A reading about the strength of all peoples united precedes the *Hallel* The leader decrees: "Our song is one with all the hymns of flesh and blood which sing of the triumph of men together over the powers of destruction," and the group responds: "And will be one with the praise songs of all peoples. . ." (1974, p. 71). The *Hallel* section contains portions of the traditional verses from Pss. 115-118, with no remnant of the Great *Hallel* Pss. 117, 118:1, 9-14, 24, and 115:1-8 are contained in the first edition. Later editions add Ps. 118:2-4, and 25. A responsive reading made up of selected biblical verses concludes the *Hallel*

Other firsts contained in A Passover Haggadah are the inclusion of ברכת השיר and the setting aside of a fifth cup of wine The Hebrew includes the reading from נשמת כל חי through ובכל קרבי את שם קדשו. This section of praise to God must have been considered redundant and thus unnecessary. As additional praise and testament to the hope for future deliverance, the fifth cup is set aside. While the group reads responsively about the favors of Israel and their faith in the future, they hold their cups high. The cup is set down untasted, since this final cup represents the redemption yet to come.

Prior to the fourth cup of wine and concluding blessings, the Haggadah includes selected Passover songs and poems. "Who Knows One" incorporates the changes of "Eight are the days to the service of the covenant," and "Nine is the number of holidays" (1974, p. 82). The Hebrew retains the traditional text, both in the service and in the appendix of songs. Following "Who Knows One," the 1974 edition suggests that אדיר במלוכה might be sung. Later

editions include the lyrics in the service as well as the appendix. After a modern poetic interpretation of "An Only Kid," the text of the poem appears in Aramaic and English. "And It Came to Pass at Midnight" contains the first and last of the traditional Hebrew verses. The English, however, deviates from tradition and poeticizes Jewish history, encompassing creation, redemption, revelation and the hopes for the future. Concluding the section of songs is the musical version of Saul Tchernichovsky's modern Hebrew poem שחקי שחקי על החלומות.

The conclusion of the service includes the fourth cup of wine, נרצה, and the singing of אדיר הוא. Ex. 6:7 introduces the last cup of wine. The blessing follows the pattern established with the first, second, and third cups. Leaving out the final blessing after the last cup of wine, the service skips to the traditional final decree. Included in the decree is the hope: "Next year in Jerusalem." However, this is tempered by the parenthetical interpretation: "(Next year in Jerusalem is ever the hope of our people. Still we affirm that all people will rejoice together in the Zion of love and peace)" (1974, p. 93). The Hebrew text of אדיר הוא includes the first, second sixth and seventh verses. In the first edition, the English offers only two verses, while the later editions offer three verses.

There are several minor changes and one major textual change, not yet discussed, found in the 1975 and 1982 revisions. In a cover letter accompanying his 1972 manuscript of A Passover Haggadah, Bronstein stated:

> While not putting the group at a Seder in a straightjacket by hard and fast rubrics. . . we have carefully made it

> possible for a leader simply and with dignity . . . to lead the group through the religious experience.[8]

By 1975, the Haggadah Committee found that the service had gone a little too far in taking out references to specific rubrics. Therefore, the 1975 revision instituted a more clear method of distinguishing between primary texts and peripheral readings. These changes come in the form of a new system of marking the end of the optional readings with three asterisks and indicating page numbers where optional text ends and regular text continues. The 1982 revision takes this one step further, printing the regular text in black and the optional text in brown.

Whereas the first version of the Haggadah contained transliterations only in conjunction with songs, the 1975 revision adds transliterations for several Hebrew prayers. In a statement about the role of Hebrew in the service the 1972 manuscript indicated:

> A continuous Hebrew text for the entire basic Haggadah service is projected. By this, I mean the main part of the Haggadah which would <u>usually be read</u> at every Seder.[9] [emphasis mine]

It seems that Bronstein later realized that many Reform Jews did not usually read Hebrew unless it was transliterated; the added transliterations made the Hebrew accessible to more individuals. The selection of transliterated prayers indicates the Committee's priorities regarding what should be read at the service. Generally, it seems that the blessings that are transliterated are short formula prayers (like *Motzi*) and the more familiar prayer (like the blessing over the four cups of wine).

---

[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid.

The 1982 third edition contains an additional major alteration of the text. Recognizing that many people in the movement object to gender-biased liturgy, the 1982 edition changes most of the English readings so as to provide a gender-neutral service. The sensitivity to changing gender-biased language was evident on a smaller scale in the drafts to the Haggadah. For example, while the 1972 draft concludes: "Peace for us! For everyone! For all men,"[10] the 1973 draft changed the text to: "Peace for us! . . . For all people."[11] In the more broad-based alterations of the 1982 revision, the language changes are primarily found in traditional portions of the service. In conjunction with this change the revised version no longer translates יהוה as "Lord." Instead, the Tetragrammaton is left in Hebrew in the midst of English sentences. Another consistent change is the replacement of the translation, "King of the Universe," with "Sovereign of Existence." In addition to replacing the male God language of the service, the revisers also replaced most of the male references to humanity. The prelude to the second cup of wine illustrates this change. Whereas the 1974 edition reads: "Remembering . . .the redemption of our fathers. . .we look now with hope to the . . . building of the City of Peace in which all men will rejoice" (1974, p. 60), the 1982 revision replaces fathers with ancestors and leaves out the word "men" all together.

Even with all the care taken to reform so much of the text, there are a few places where the sexist language was not changed. In the *Hallel*, for example, after changing the translation of Ps. 113, Ps. 114 retains references

---

10 Ibid., p. 50.

11 A Passover Haggadah, 1973, draft, p. 48.

to God and God's as "Lord" and "His."[12] The few places that do not change the language seem to be oversights rather than intentional retentions. However, the language in the optional text was generally not altered. In selection after selection of the optional text gender-biased language is left intact, while the main body of the service carefully cuts away these references. Uncharacteristically, one of the optional readings, in the midst of the explanation of Deuteronomy, changes: "The God-inspired know that men must . . ." (1974, p. 43) to "The God-inspired know that people must. . . ."[13] The reason for the editors free hand in changing traditional text and reluctance to alter the optional texts is unclear. Perhaps, the fact that Reform liturgists have been paraphrasing the traditional liturgy for generations explains their willingness to alter the liturgical text. The modification of modern insertions, on the other hand, may not have met the approval of the individual authors of the readings.

An overall analysis of A Passover Haggadah reveals a new direction in Reform liturgical development. Clearly, Rabbi David Polish articulated the heart of the new development when he observed.

> We need the security to enter the womb of tradition that represents the indispensable spiritual component [of]. . . that lustrous time in the past. But we must have the courage to breach the future with radical departures.[14]

A Passover Haggadah makes great strides in incorporating the richness of tradition, while boldly reflecting the concerns of modernity. In accomplishing these changes, the *Seder* acknowledges the present move to

---

[12] Herbert Bronstein, ed., A Passover Haggadah, revised edition (New York: CCAR, 1982), p. 60.

[13] Ibid., p. 43.

[14] David Polish, "Where Do We Go From Here?" CCAR Journal, 14 (Jan. 1967): 70.

establish a particular identity that complements the years of universalistic focus in Reform Judaism. Additionally, the Haggadah recognizes the need for a renewal of hope and faith after the horrors of the Holocaust.

When writing about the philosophy behind A Passover Haggadah, Bronstein reiterates:

> No matter how small, every strand should be strong and worthy in that miraculous interweaving of life, the שלשלת הקבלה, the great bond of our tradition.[15]

Indeed his ideal is reflected in the work from beginning to end. This is exemplified by the reinstitution of many traditional portions, that were left out of previous Reform works. Furthermore, the tenor of what is expected in this service reveals a Judaism different from the Reform of the past. In the early 1930's Philipson reported that in Reform Judaism "No ceremonial law can be eternally binding . . . ."[16] In contrast, the preface to A Passover Haggadah states: "Every religious symbol is rooted in heaven, like the burning bush never consumed, though continually alight with inexhaustible meaning" (1974, p. 6). Thus, it is not surprising that the text suggests:

> Minimal observance would consist of not eating bread either at home or elsewhere. More religious observance would consist of not eating any hametz. For lunch, it may be convenient to bring food to work or school (1974, p. 16).

The earliest of American Reform Passover services would not have been taken seriously had they instructed their readers in the more traditional customs that are found in Bronstein's Haggadah (like how to *kasher* homes

---

15 Herbert Bronstein, "The New Union Haggadah," CCAR Journal 21 (Spring, 1974): 10.

16 David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1931), p. 10.

and what to eat in and out of their homes, etc.). Nonetheless, this instruction is accepted and incorporated by many of today's Reform Jews.

In reinserting much of the traditional service, Bronstein could not help but produce a service that reflected a more particularistic outlook than its predecessors. The Centenary Perspective states, "A universal concern for humanity unaccompanied by a devotion to our particular people is self-destructive. . . ."[17] Bronstein obviously felt similar sentiments in composing A Passover Haggadah. He explained: "My intention from the beginning had been to reveal the universalism of the Seder experience, but through our own particular authentic Jewish sources."[18] Many of the optional readings express this particularistic theme. The following prose of Elie Wiesel offers one of many examples:

> The Jew who repudiates himself, claiming to do so for the sake of humanity, will inevitably repudiate humanity in the end. A Jew fulfills his role as a man only from inside his Jewishness (1974, p. 33).

In the explanation of the wicked son's position, the text reveals a significant statement of the particular beliefs of today. It states: "he rejects essentials of our faith: the unity of God and the community of Israel"(p. 30). Thus the unity of God and the community of Israel steal the focus from the mission of Israel and the universal truths. There is a much stronger sense of belonging to a people in addition to being a member of a religious group. Whereas the 1923 Haggadah reinforced the mission of Israel within America,

---

17 Reform Judaism Today I, p. xxiv.

18 A Passover Haggadah, 1972, draft, Contained in letter attached to the beginning of the draft.

A Passover Haggadah places more emphasis on building a sense of individual Jewish identity.

Alongside the increased tradition and particularism of the service stand modern interpretations of the traditional themes. The plethora of new readings cause the Haggadah to be cumbersome at times, nevertheless, the readings do serve a purpose. They over and over again allude to the suffering, faith, and hope that bound the Jewish people from the Holocaust to the creation of the State of Israel. In recognition that the Holocaust and creation of the State of Israel represent extraordinary events in Jewish history, Bronstein explained that their inclusion in the service was not for the sake of offering a "current reference" (1974, p. 6). These modern events, rather have been the motivation of much of the return toward tradition and particularism. They have caused Reform Jews to reformulate the idea of universal redemption in terms particulars to their faith.

Through meshing the traditional theme of redemption with the modern tests and trials, A Passover Haggadah produces a work replete with a renewed sense of hope. The theme of hope is intertwined in the symbols of the *Seder*, as is evident when the text states:

> Together they shall be: the matzah of freedom, the maror of slavery. For in the time of freedom, there is knowledge of servitude. And in time of bondage, the hope of redemption (1974, p. 29).

Along the same lines, each of the cups of wine is introduced with a quotation from Ex. 6:6-7 indicating the elevated role that the redemptive hope plays in Reform Judaism today. In the explanation of the Passover story, the service recognizes that though we are physically free today, we still face the threat of spiritual and social degradation. Today's task is to guard against these

prevalent threats to religious well being, to seek the day when society is redeemed from these threats of bondage.

The introduction of A Passover Haggadah reflected a revolutionary change in the status of Reform liturgy. In the Gates of Prayer the Reform movement had expressed its desire for diversity. Bronstein furthers this goal by producing a Haggadah that "will be a gateway to the actual experience of redemption, new and different each year" (1974, p. 6). By offering a wide range of options, the service can be experienced differently from home to home and year to year. In addition to the prevailing quest for diversity, A Passover Haggadah expresses a clear preference for the richness of tradition. In restoring the normative order of the service the 1923 Haggadah began a return to tradition, the 1974 service continues in this direction with the addition of traditional texts, customs, and ideals that were deemed inappropriate for previous Reform Haggadoth.

In the American Reform Haggadoth, one sees the unfolding development of American Reform Judaism. The committee process, which produced many inconsistencies in the early Reform Haggadoth, gave way to a system in which individual editors took primary responsibility for the publications. Though the Committee, and ultimately the Central Conference, have final say over the Haggadoth, the individual editors have been able to add more substance to the service. Cohon's 1923 Union Haggadah and Bronstein's A Passover Haggadah both offer more consistent liturgies than the previous process produced. The changing priorities in the movement are documented by the direction taken in the Haggadoth. Ideological changes, from the movement's attitude toward tradition to its position concerning the State of Israel, and particularism are portrayed in the successive

publications of Reform Haggadoth. In summary, the Reform Haggadoth offer one measure of how the movement has developed in the past century.

The Reform Movement of Great Britain: Its Philosophy and Liturgy

The Reform movement of Great Britain was born out of both discontent with and philosophical objection to the established Orthodox practices. Jews from Ashkenazi and Sepharadi congregations were unhappy with the strict leadership in their respective congregations. A number of Jews, from both the Portuguese and German congregations, joined together in 1840 to organize the West London Synagogue. They were dissatisfied with the distance they had to travel to get to services as well as the length and atmosphere of the service.

The reformers petition did not call for radical departure from tradition, rather their goal was to elevate the religious experience by instituting more order and decorum in the service. The founders of the congregation adopted a resolution stating:

> That a revised service be there performed in the Hebrew language in conformity with the principles of the Jewish religion, and in a manner best calculated to excite feelings of devotion, and that religious discourses be delivered in the English language.[1]

Though they were definitely asking for reforms, it is clear that they did not see these changes as counter to Jewish tradition. While their German counterparts fought for changes on ideological levels, the British reformers sought a service that captured the sense of devotion they believed befit the Jewish heritage.

The new community insisted on designating itself as a British Synagogue, emphasizing that they were breaking down the barriers that

---

[1] David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism (New York: MacMillan Co., 1931), p. 96.

separated the Ashkenazi and Sepharadi Jews. The families made it clear that they did not intend to start a separate British form of Judaism; instead, they wanted "to efface the distinction now existing between the German and Portuguese Jews."[2] The founders of the congregation had similar complaints about their respective traditional communities; both found the synagogue services to be unsatisfactory. The Ashkenazi group had complained of the selling of Torah honors and the lack of order at services; the Sepharadi leaders lamented over the lack of relevance in the synagogue service. They joined together in seeking a place of worship that could compensate all their grievances.

After trying unsuccessfully to make changes within their Ashkanazi and Sepharadi congregations, a number of families broke away from the Orthodox and formed the West London Synagogue of British Jews. They did not immediately declare their synagogue the birthplace of the Reform movement in England. In fact, the Reform movement of Great Britain remained a docile group of three fairly conservative-minded congregations, until the 1930's.[3] They simply wanted a place where they could express their Judaism meaningfully. The group supported: "abbreviations of the Sabbath service (to last two and a half hours!), curtailment of the *Siddur*, [and] abolition of *Aliyot*, [and] *Mi Sheberachs* (all relatively minor reforms)."[4] These changes, all revolving around the prayer service, did not involve doctrinal modifications.

---

2 D. W. Marks, ed. Forms of Prayer used in the West London Synagogue of British Jews (London: West London Synagogue, 1841), p. xi.

3 Dow Marmur, ed. Reform Judaism: Essays on Reform Judaism in Britain (London: Reform Synagogues of Great Britain, 1973), p. 41.

4 Ibid., p. 24.

The most radical of the reformers' calls was for the abolition of the second day of holiday celebrations. The reformers felt that the second day celebration evolved out of a ghetto attitude toward the oppression of the exile.[5] These sentiments were no longer relevant in nineteenth century Great Britain. Though it may be argued that the reformers called for this change in order to bring Judaism in line with the times, the fact that this omission represents a rejection of Rabbinic law cannot be minimized. Dr. Jakob J. Petuchowski, in "Karaite Tendencies in an Early Reform Haggadah," concludes that the reformers "attacked the validity of the 'Oral Law' as a whole, and, in so doing, they took their stand on the literal meaning of the Bible as against the Rabbinic elaborations."[6]

Rev. David Woolf Marks, the first spiritual leader of the West London Synagogue, clearly did not adhere to the unbending authority of the Oral Law. He saw the Bible as the source of Jewish teaching and faith, but viewed the Rabbinic teachings as a guide that did not command equivalent authority. In his opening sermon to the West London Synagogue of British Jews, Rev. Marks stated:

> We recognize in them [the Rabbinic records] a valuable aid for the elucidation of many passages in Scripture ... we hold it our duty to reverence the sayings of men, who, we are convinced, would have sacrificed their lives for the maintenance of that Law which God has vouchsafed to deliver unto us, but we must (as our conviction urges us) solemnly deny, that a belief in the *DIVINITY* of the traditions contained in the Mishna, and the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds, is of equal obligation to the Israelite faith in the divinity of the Law of Moses. We know that

---

[5] Philipson, p. 97.

[6] Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Karaite Tendencies in an Early Reform Haggadah," Hebrew Union College Annual 31 (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1960) 225.

> these books are human compositions; and though we are content to accept with reverence from our post-biblical ancestors advice and instruction, we cannot *unconditionally* accept their laws.[7]

Marks did not deny the importance of the Rabbinic contribution; however, he did not see it as authoritative. He felt that the Rabbinic law was geared toward the specific concerns of one time period and was subject to human fallibility. Though he respected the work of the Rabbinic sages and scholars, he found parts of the law contradictory to the advancement of Judaism for his time. In an 1840 correspondence with a friend, Marks wrote: "many institutions and observances have been introduced by the Rabbins, perhaps with good intent but which have had the effect of perverting the pure principles of Judaism . . . ."[8] With this attitude, it is not surprising that Marks did not comply with Rabbinic ordinances he found untenable. Even before his engagement with the West London Synagogue, Marks had refused to read Torah on the second day of Festivals.[9] Marks' approach met the needs of the early reformers, who for political and philosophical reasons expressed similar sentiments.

As strongly as Marks renounced the binding authority of Rabbinic Law, he supported the veracity of the written Torah. The same sermon in which Marks denied the supremacy of the Mishnah and Talmud, reiterates the supreme role of the Bible, stating: "For Israelites, there is but One immutable Law-- the sacred volume of the scriptures, commanded by God to be written down for the unerring guidance of his people until the end of time."[10] Marks viewed the Torah as the sustaining source of the Jewish

---

7 Marks in Petuchowski, pp. 225-226.
8 Marmur, p. 28.
9 Ibid.
10 Petuchowski, p. 226.

people. He found the Scriptures' teachings inspiring, comforting, awesome and uplifting. In the Introduction to his synagogue's first prayer book, Marks wrote:

> Yet how much more direct has been the influence of these holy books on the dispersed sons of Israel? Here they found the balm for present evils, a stirring record of the prosperous past, and the firmest assurance of a future regeneration . . . .[11]

Nevertheless, Marks did not go so far as to say that Biblical law was beyond change; he, in fact, felt that most of the levitical precepts were "not intended to be in force in all places."[12]

Although Marks made strong statements against Rabbinic authority, the activities of the early reformers, for the most part, adhered to traditional standards. The reformers did not seek to abrogate the laws of *kashrut*, nor did they desire to break the Sabbath laws. Besides their abolishing the second day of Festivals, the members of the West London Synagogue demonstrated their variance with tradition through the liturgy which they developed. But even their modified liturgy was much closer to tradition than were the Reform liturgies of the early German and American Reform. They retained references to the Sacrificial Cult, return to the land of Israel, the Messiah, and the restoration of the Temple, aspects that were customarily omitted from the Reform services of the German rite.

The introduction to the Forms of Prayer of the West London Synagogue clearly established the right of the editors to modify the liturgy. Like many of the Reform explanations for liturgical modifications, the West

---

11 Marks, p. vi.
12 Petuchowski, p. 226.

London reformers pointed to the failure of traditional forms of worship, as justification for change. Marks claimed:

> History bears us out in the assumption, that it becomes a congregation to adapt the ritual to the wants of its members; and it must be universally admitted that the present mode of worship fails to call forth the devotion, so essential to the religious improvement of the people.[13]

Marks went further to trace the right to institute liturgical change through the development of Jewish history. He stated:

> But sure as it is that a regular form of divine service has existed amongst the Israelites ever since the biblical times, nothing can be more incorrect than the current notion, that the whole of the Prayer Book, as we now possess it, was composed by the men of the Great Synagogue . . . . Nothing, we repeat, is more fallacious than such a notion; and the mere existence of considerable differences between the rituals now in use is alone sufficient to establish its inaccuracy.[14]

Given this outlook and considering Marks' view of Rabbinic authority, one might expect the Prayer Book of the West London Synagogue to differ radically from tradition. Marks' prayer book contains a few alterations including the use of Hebrew in place of Aramaic and the omission of the benedictions for Hanukkah and Purim. Since neither the use of Aramaic nor the celebration of Hanukkah and Purim were mentioned in the Bible, the reformers did not recognize them in the prayer book either. These changes reflect the Karaitic tendencies in early London Reform.[15] For the most part, however, the Forms of Prayer resembled the traditional service far more than it differed from it.

---

13 Marks, p. ix.
14 Ibid., pp. vii-viii.
15 Petuchowski, p. 232.

Domestic Service for the West London Synagogue of British Jews 1842 and the 1921 Revision

The Passover Haggadah contained in the second volume of Forms of Prayer, in contrast to the general trend of the rest of the Prayer Book, embodies more fully Marks' approach to rabbinic and biblical tradition. The service offers a unique example of the ideology that the early reformers professed. Its name, הגדה למסח, would, at first, seem to indicate a Sepharadi bias; however, the heading on the pages retains the Ashkenazi title, הגדה של מסח. The service omits so much of both the Ashkenazi and Sepharadi rubrics of the Haggadah that it would be misguided to suggest that the service reflects either of the rites. It freely eliminates many of the rabbinic requirements for the Seder, and it liberally adds biblical passages that reshape the tenor of the service.

The West London Synagogue had a liturgy committee, charged with the responsibility of composing the prayer book, but Marks alone is listed as the editor of the liturgy. Petuchowski asserts that it is likely that Marks was assisted by Professor Hyman Hurwitz, who, "like Marks, voiced his disbelief in the 'divine truth' of the Oral Tradition."[1] The 1921 revisions to the Haggadah, which occurred well after Rev. Morris Joseph had taken over the leadership of the congregation, do not reflect much change from the first edition. Morris Joseph's ideology was based solidly within the Rabbinic

---

[1] Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Karaite Tendencies in an Early Reform Haggadah," Hebrew Union College Annual 31 (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1960) : 230.

tradition; nevertheless, the revised Haggadah does not revert to his "more normative" approach.[2]

The following examination of the Passover Haggadah of the West London Synagogue will outline the specific additions to and deletions from the service, in light of tradition. The additions, which reveal a different approach from the other liberal Haggadoth studied, will be of particular interest. The edition to be quoted is the 1842 הגדה לפסח: Domestic Service for the First Night of Passover, a freestanding volume. The service also appeared within the Festival edition of the Forms of Prayer. The references to the revised edition will follow the 1921 edition of Forms of Prayer (Vol. II).

Unlike most Haggadoth, the West London Synagogue service is not replete with instructions, explanations and suggested approaches to the *Seder*. This can be attributed partly to the fact that it was first published within the midst of the Festival prayer book. In a liturgy with the scope of the Festival volume, explanations for each and every individual service could result in an overly cumbersome book. Nevertheless, with the unique nature of the *Seder*, as a liturgy mainly used within private homes, the absence of even the most minimal instruction is noteworthy. This absence of preliminary notes foreshadows a service that deviates from many of the expected norms in the Passover liturgy.

The liturgy is arranged in traditional style, with Hebrew passages on the right side and translations facing the Hebrew on the left. Marks, generally, does not attempt to soften the presentation of the English with

---

2 Dow Marmur, ed., Reform Judaism: Essays on Reform Judaism in Britain (London: Reform Synagogues of Great Britain, 1973) p. 34.

fanciful paraphrases. As will become evident, those portions which the editors found inappropriate were excised completely from the Haggadah.

The service opens with the traditional *Kiddush*, minus the insert for *Havdalah*. The phrases אשר בחר בנו and ורוממנו מכל לשון are included and translated literally. This was contrary to the example set by other Reform Haggadoth of the day. Immediately following the *Kiddush*, the service contains biblical passages and an original prayer, which accentuate the commandment of observing Passover. The theme of the liturgy is introduced by Ex. 12:40-42, which focuses on giving thanks for God redeeming the Israelites from slavery. The original prayer is highly unusual for a Reform liturgy. After an introduction, encapsulating the miracles God wrought for the Israelites, the petition concludes: והביאנו במהרה לציון עיר קדשך ושם נקריב לפניך את קרבנות חובותינו ואת קרבן פסח הזה כבל משפטו וחקתו.[3] The added call for return to Zion and the reinstatement of the sacrifices runs counter to the customary minimization of these concepts in many early Reform liturgies. The 1921 version does not contain this added citation of the sacrifices. The petition precedes Ex. 12:1-20, which describes the Passover feast in Egypt and the feast ordained to be commemorated throughout the generations.

Leaving out the customary ורחץ, the service continues with the benediction for the first dipping. The Haggadah, in one of its few directive comments, instructs the participants to "dip the parsley in the vinegar" (1842, p. 3). After this many of the most familiar and enticing sections of the service are skipped. It omits: מה, עבדים היינו, עניא לחמא הא, יחץ,

---

[3] D. W. Marks, ed., Domestic Service for the First Night of Passover used by the members of the West London Synagogue of British Jews (London: West London Synagogue, 1842), p. 2. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the text, by the year of publication).

נשתנה, the midrashim of מעשה ברבי אליעזר and אמר רבי אלעזר, and the explanations for the Four Sons. The biblical commandments delineated above function to replace these introductory rabbinic portions of the service.

The retelling of the Passover story opens with Rav's beginning of the *Maggid*. The rabbinic designation for God, המקום, is replaced with יי אלהינו. Whereas many Reform Haggadoth delete the references to Esau as well as other formulations that might portray Israel in a bad light, the West London Synagogue service retains a well rounded picture of Jewish history. The service offers a balanced view of the Jewish people, rather than the exalted and heroic portrayal found in some other liberal Haggadoth.

The traditional formulation of ברוך שומר is next, followed by the biblical verses from Deut. 26:5-8. Again here, the traditional *midrash* is not employed to elaborate on the biblical verses. It is surprising that the translation for ארמי אובד אבי utilizes the rabbinic interpretation: "An Assyrian had nearly caused my father to perish," rather than the more direct translation: "A wandering Armean was my father" (1842, p. 4). The 1921 revision alleviates this inconsistency by using the simple rendering of the verse.[4]

The *midrash* אלה עשר מכות precedes the recitation of the Ten Plagues. The Haggadah does not contain the customary instruction to spill a drop of wine for each plague. The summary of the recounting of the wonders that completes the דייינו comes after the Ten Plagues. Although the verses of the דייינו are left out and the first line to the concluding paragraph is amended to read: מה רבו מעשי יי ונסלאותיו עמנו, the summary paragraph

---

[4] The Ministers of the Congregation, editors, Forms of Prayer used in the West London Synagogue of British Jews II, fourth edition (London: West London Synagogue, 1921), p. 11. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the text, by the year of publication).

mentions all of the miracles that God performed, with the exception of ונתן לנו את ממונם (1842, p. 4). Other Reform Haggadoth omit references to God destroying the enemies of Israel; however, Marks' Haggadah is not reluctant to highlight God's showing favor to the Israelites.

In place of the mishnaic pronouncement of Rabban Gamliel, the three symbols of *Pesaḥ* are introduced by: מצוה על כל איש ואיש מישראל להזכיר שלשה דברים פסח (Ibid.). The explanation of the symbols uses the biblical proof texts of the traditional Haggadah; however, the introductions to the biblical proofs vary from tradition. Here, again, Marks retains the biblical quotation and the general intent of the section, while replacing the rabbinic texts that traditionally comprise the service.

The three symbols of *Pesaḥ* are followed by בכל דור, a modified version of לסיכך אנחנו, Pss. 113 and 114, and the blessing of redemption. The redemption blessing includes a detailed description of the Paschal sacrifice, which is often omitted from Reform Haggadoth. The 1921 edition, consistent with the change it made in the blessing that follows the *Kiddush*, takes out the reference to the blood of the sacrifice. Customarily, the redemption blessing is concluded with the benediction over the second cup of wine. However, this Haggadah omits all except the first of the four cups of wine.

The benedictions for *Motzi, Matzah,* and *Maror* precede the meal. No mention is made of *Raḥatz* or *Korekh*. The deletion of the reading בן עשה הלל is consistent with the anti-rabbinic tendencies in the Haggadah. However, with the inclusion of all the citations of sacrifices, it is unusual that the editors did not replace this rabbinic reading with a modern formulation, recognizing the role of the sacrifices.

The service after the meal is greatly abbreviated. Grace after Meals follows the Sepharadi rite and includes the plea for return to Zion, the coming of the Messiah, and the reinstatement of the sacrificial cult. Petuchowski attributes the shortened Grace to the desire for "brevity" in the service.[5] Though support of the Messiah, return to Zion and the sacrificial cult might not seem unusual in a Reform service, this Haggadah, throughout, has not hesitated to retain readings that would have been unacceptable to many reformers around the globe. The 1921 edition varies only slightly from the earlier Haggadah, taking out: התקין מחיה ומזון לכל בריותיו אשר ברחמיו וברוב חסדיו בראו.

The traditional service after the meal consists of Psalms and readings that express thanks and hope for the Jews. Marks' service leaves out the bulk of these readings and offers instead a greater elaboration of Israelite history. The West London Synagogue Haggadah replaces the ceremony for opening the door for Elijah and Pss. 115-118 of the Hallel with Ps. 78. This long and detailed Psalm recounts how the Israelites failed to live up to God's commandments and how God's power shaped Israel's destiny. The focus on Israel's past transgressions, rather than their hopes for the future, is highly unusual at this point in the service. The originally composed prayer that follows the Psalm, reiterates the Psalm's theme and pleads for participants to have the strength to follow God's commandments. The use of Ps. 78 and its accompaning prayer clearly demonstrate Marks' intention to ignore tradtional forms, in deference to his own interpretation of the holiday.

The Haggadah concludes with readings that reflect more traditional Passover sentiments. The Great Hallel, Ps. 136, reviews once again the story

---

5 Petuchowski, p. 234.

of God redeeming the Israelites from Egypt. ישתבח שמך, נשמת כל חי, and יהללוך complete the service, on a note of thanksgiving and praise.

Rev. D. W. Marks' הגדה לפסח represents a unique creation among liturgy of the Reform movement, in general, and of the services published by the West London Synagogue, in particular. The Reform movement of Great Britain has had the reputation of being very conservative in nature. It was not until the 1940's that the movement really gelled in Great Britain. The 1842 Passover service of the West London Synagogue embodies the extremes of an ideology professed by the reformers-- an ideology that was, in most other cases, expressed in modest rather than blatant forms.

The Domestic Service for the First Night of Passover, under the "assumption that it becomes a congregation of Israelites to adapt the ritual to the wants of its members," offers a liturgy that has liberally adapted the traditional Haggadah. While the editors of the first edition of Forms of Prayer were generally accurate "when they asserted that the service they had adopted was altogether based on the existing ritual with the exception of . . . few slight changes,"[6] they could not have applied that statement to the הגדה לפסח, which appears in the festival volume of that liturgy. The omission of so many of the familiar rubrics of the *Seder* results in a service that is highly distinct from its traditional counterpart.

On the other hand, the Haggadah retains many traditional elements that reformers from other countries rejected. The service offers a complete Hebrew rendering of all of the readings contained therein. No attempt is made by Marks to alter the particularistic elements found in prayers like the *Kiddush*. In addition to leaving in the references to the blood of the

---

6 David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism (New York: MacMillan Co., 1931), p. 101.

sacrifices and to the rebuilding of the Temple in the ברכת המזון; the service inserts an original prayer, "אנא", which again mentions the sacrificial cult. The inclusion of the biblical verses from Ex. 12, which outline the obligation of Jews to observe Passover, demonstrates that the editors were not reluctant to emphasize commandments incumbent upon Jews. In fact, these additions indicate the editors' strong identification with particularistic aspects of Jewish tradition. Thus, one can conclude that the British reformers were not reticent about their historical past nor the traditional hopes for the future of the Jewish people.

The composition of the הגדה לפסח cannot be fully understood by the terms set forth in its Introduction, which states: "We have removed those parts which are deficient in devotional tendency; and have expunged the few expressions which are known to be the offsprings of feelings produced by oppression . . . ."[7] The service clearly has anti-rabbinic tendencies and characteristics similar to Karaite ideology, as Dr. Petuchowski thoroughly demonstrates in his article on this Haggadah. Marks' view that the Bible is superior to rabbinic writings was obvious from his addresses and writings. The exclusion of the explanation to the four children, the Hillel sandwich, the *midrashim* on Deut. 26:5-8 offer just a few of the many examples of ways in which Marks minimized the rabbinic underpinnings of the service.

The specific biblical passages that Marks added to the liturgy, also indicate a rejection of rabbinic interpretations. Petuchowski points out:

> Ex. 12 deals specifically with the *first* Passover, and Rabbinic Law clearly distinguishes between פסח מצרים, that first Passover, and פסח דורות. . . . Many of the

---

[7] D. W. Marks, ed., Forms of Prayer used in the West London Synagogue of British Jews (London: West London Synagogue, 1841) p. xv.

> details mentioned in Ex. 12 were to have no further application after the first Passover.[8]

Thus, the traditional Haggadah naturally does not encompass this citation from Exodus. In the case of Ps. 78, which retells the story of the Exodus as well as tracing the Israelites' lapses in faith, Petuchowski explains that the placement of the text violates the mishnaic arrangement which begins with degradation and ends with praise.[9] Marks' biblical additions to the service pointedly contradict rabbinic teachings; they work to reshape the message of the *Seder* toward a biblical focus. These biblical additions emphasize Marks' dedication to the Torah and his markedly anti-rabbinic attitude.

The service, which resulted from Marks' many modifications to the traditional Haggadah, strips away much of what was familiar in the *Seder*. Not only is the Haggadah unusual, given the generally conservative approach of the West London reformers, it also does not follow the typical reforms found in liberal Haggadoth. The service leaves out a great deal of what was captivating and inspiring in the traditional liturgy, and replaces it with readings that, though they may reflect a specific ideology, do not seem to invoke "the heart of every member of Israel." It is difficult to understand how the הגדה למסה fulfilled the liturgical needs of a congregation that followed a much more traditional format in its other services. Marmur writes that it was likely, even though this service appeared in the Festival prayer book, "in all probability [the Haggadah] was hardly used by anyone except Rev. Marks."[10]

---

8 Petuchowski, p. 247.
9 Ibid.
10 Marmur, p. 30.

The Liberal Movement of Great Britain: Its Philosophy and Liturgy

The Liberal Jewish movement of Great Britain owes its birth to two courageous and insightful people, Lily Montagu and C. G. Montefiore. In 1902, Montagu gathered together a group of Jews, who were searching for purposeful ways to express their Jewishness. The group, made up of liberal Jews as well as observant Orthodox Jews, established a Sabbath afternoon worship. They instituted reforms in the service including: prayers in English, mixed seating, instrumental music, a liturgy that was more relevant, a free pulpit, and a place of worship for those who were obliged to work on Shabbat.[1] These changes were made with the intention of adding dignity and appeal to Jewish worship, for those who found "the traditional beliefs untenable."[2]

The early leaders of the Liberals, like others who founded progressive Jewish movements, did not intend to start a new movement. The original group designated itself "The Jewish Religious Union," with no adjectives indicating a denominational preference. In a statement of the Union's aims, the group declared:

> Our Union does not seek to interfere with the belief or practice of any observant Jews, or to awaken discontent among those who are satisfied with the Synagogue Services. But it tries to make those who are drifting away from the community realise the essentials of Judaism afresh, and pay them homage.[3]

Nevertheless, by 1909 the leaders of the group felt that establishment of a separate synagogue was expedient and they renamed their group: "The

---

1 Lily Montagu, "The Jewish Religious Union and its Beginnings" Papers for Jewish People 27 (1927): 5-6.

2 Ibid., p. III.

3 Ibid., p. 16.

Jewish Religious Union for the Advancement of Liberal Judaism."[4] The move to establish a synagogue, the change of name, and a manifesto of the groups aims distinctly divided the Liberals from the Orthodox community. C. G. Montefiore, one of the founders of the movement, still insisted that: "We do not deny that Judaism is inclusive, and that we are united with all religious Jews by beliefs greater than the beliefs which separate and sever."[5] Despite the rhetoric, there was a definite break off.

In 1912, Rabbi Israel I. Mattuck was appointed the first rabbi of a Liberal congregation in England. He had been secured with the help of leaders of the Hebrew Union College. The Liberal group had previously turned to Dr. Stephen Wise and other Reform leaders from abroad for guidance. Mattuck, in addition to providing spiritual leadership for the congregation, helped to shape the direction of the Liberal movement. Among other things, he edited the first prayer book published by the movement. The selection of Mattuck demonstrated the Liberal movement's close ties with the Reform movement in the United States.

The Liberals' sincere hope was to create a forum for Jews who felt alienated by what they saw as the antiquated approach of the Orthodox. The West London reformers had, in practice, deviated very little from the Orthodox, and thus they were not meeting the needs of this group. Rabbi John Rayner, one of the present leaders of the movement, summed up the Liberals' goals, stating: "First and foremost, it is Judaism. It is the Judaism of the past brought up to date. It maintains essentially the same beliefs and

---

[4] The term "Liberal," for the purposes of this study, will hereafter designate the Progressive movement of Great Britain, which has ultimately come to be called the Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues.

[5] C. G. Montefiore, "The Jewish Religious Union: Its Principles and Its Future" Papers for Jewish People 19 (1918): 4.

practices as all Judaism, but with modifications necessitated by modern life and thought."[6] The purpose of the movement was to facilitate these modifications.

The Liberals were rejected early on by the Reform movement led by the West London Synagogue. The England reformers felt that the Liberals were too extreme and that the new group might threaten the balance that they had with the Orthodox of Great Britain. The Liberal leaders leaned more toward the ideas of progressive revelation and beliefs that were attained through reason than they did toward the West London Reformers' Karaitic tendencies. When the Liberals requested the use of the West London Synagogue for the purpose of holding services, the Synagogue placed so many restrictions on the use of their facility that the Liberals chose to remain independent.

Thus, it was not surprising that much of the Liberal ideology was analogous with views of the Reform movements in Germany and America. Like their counterparts around the world, the Liberals claimed:

> We must not only . . . be free to talk about principles and fundamentals, but we must also be free to co-ordinate them, and even separate them off from other principles which are not ours, and which we . . . reject and repudiate.[7]

The Liberals began with the same goals as American Reform; they wanted to offer a modern Judaism that, while mindful of Jewish heritage, followed natural conceptions of humanity, authority and the world. Montefiore explained:

---

6 John D. Rayner, Liberal Judaism (London: The Jewish Liberal Synagogue, n.d.), p. 1.
7 Ibid., pp. 4-5.

> The conscience and the reason are the final authority, but not an easy, hasty, conceited conscience and reason, but a conscience and a reason which, as they are the product of the past, listen with care and reverence to the gathered wisdom of the ages and to the words of the great teachers, prophets, law-givers and saints.[8]

From the start, the Liberals have felt that without changes many Jews would simply reject Judaism altogether. While it had taken the Holocaust to bring out a survivalist attitude in American Reform, Liberals had expressed the importance of the perpetuation of Judaism all along. Rabbi Rayner reiterated that concern for the present Liberals, when he stated: "it [Liberal Judaism] has one principal aim: to perpetuate Judaism and to enhance its influence upon its adherents, and, through them, upon mankind."[9] The driving force to perpetuate a rational Judaism, that was congruent with the hearts and minds of concerned Jews, held together the movement through early years of ostracism and later years of strengthening the movement.

The Liberal approach to liturgy was very similar to the approach of the American reformers. They endeavored to produce a service that would be understood by and influential upon the individuals who joined in the worship. Rabbi Mattuck emphasized the importance of the movement's liturgy when he stated:

> If Jewish public worship can make the Jew who participates in it feel that Judaism has that meaning and power for him, it will then also serve a second purpose; it will establish, or strengthen, in him the attachment to Judaism and to the Jewish brotherhood, making the

---

[8] C. G. Montefiore, "Liberal Judaism and Authority" Papers for Jewish People 22 (1919): 14.

[9] John D. Rayner, p. 1.

> individual feel at one with the House of Israel, past, present and future.[10]

An examination of the previously listed changes, instituted during the movement's first Sabbath afternoon services, reveals the priorities that were employed in the development of what the Liberal movement considered to be meaningful liturgy.

One strong priority was the desire for liturgy that was easily understandable. This necessitated the use of a great deal of English in the service, since many Jews did not understand Hebrew, even though some could read it and had memorized many of the prayers. The Liberals have consistently maintained the stance that prayers in the vernacular were not only expedient for modern Judaism, but also followed a long-standing precedent in Jewish history. Rabbi Mattuck, in the preface to the Sabbath Prayer Book that he edited, wrote: "Traditional Judaism used, and uses, two languages in its worship: Hebrew and Aramaic," which he said; "would give us traditional support, if we wanted it, for our English in ours."[11]

Another strong sentiment of Liberal Judaism expressed in the liturgy is its rational scientific approach. In the early years of the movement, N. S. Joseph, one of the leaders of Liberal Judaism, denounced reliance on miracles and miraculous revelation as out of line with modern thinking:

> Miracle, as the foundation of revelation, has disappeared from the religious programme of most intelligent believers. Modern knowledge, based on facts beyond all doubt, has falsified much that official clerics have . . . taught . . . .[12]

---

10 Israel I. Mattuck, ed., Liberal Jewish Prayer Book I (London: Liberal Jewish Synagogue, 1937), p. x.

11 Ibid., p. ix.

12 N. S. Joseph, "Essentials of Judaism" Papers for Jewish People 1 (Oct., 1906): 2.

Therefore, liturgical references to miraculous biblical events, the hope for a Messiah who would miraculously redeem the world, and the resurrection of the dead are omitted from Liberal liturgy or emended.

Equally difficult for these Liberal Jews were petitions for the return of the sacrificial system and for all Jews to return to Palestine. Traditional prayers mentioning these ideas, have been reinterpreted or excised from the service.

The Liberals view the worship service as the catalyst for Jewish commitment and satisfaction. Therefore, they strive to produce liturgy that set this goal in mind above the minute details of each prayer, above the question of Hebrew usage, and above the myriad of Jewish Laws that prescribe specific order. Mattuck in his conclusion to the introduction of the Liberal Jewish Prayer Book stated:

> The way to judge a service is not whether it is traditional or untraditional, but whether it helps Jews to feel the power in Judaism, whether it will help Jews and other who come to worship in our Synagogues to feel in Judaism the satisfaction of their spiritual longing and the impetus to spiritual striving.[13]

---

13 Mattuck, p. xix.

Haggadah in Services and Prayers for Jewish Homes, 1918, Passover Eve Service for the Home, 1949, and 1962 Revision

The Haggadoth produced by the British Liberal movement offer three distinct pictures of the growth of Liberal Judaism. The first Haggadah the movement published was in the volume Services and Prayers for Jewish Homes, 1918. Rabbi Israel Mattuck was one of the foremost leaders in the movement at the time and he was probably the main editor. The Haggadah which was published in the 1918 Home Prayer Book was issued as a separate volume in the 1930's; however, there were no revisions made at that time. In 1949,[1] a revised edition, Passover Eve Service for the Home was issued under the direction of Mattuck. Later, Rabbi John Rayner oversaw the development of the 1962 edition of the Liberal Haggadah. An illustrated edition of the 1962 service was issued in 1968, with no textual changes. The Liberal movement matured immensely in the period between the publications of the 1918 and the 1962 Passover services, and the Haggadoth attest to this growth.

The 1918 Haggadah follows the philosophy set down by Liberal leaders in the movement's early years. Montefiore had insisted from the beginning that "all desire that no religious ceremony or institution should be maintained which does not possess a religious significance or value."[2] Implementing this philosophy, the 1918 Passover service eliminates many

---

[1] The 1949 revised Passover Eve Service for the Home was unavailable to the present author. The information on this volume was obtained through a detailed study in the rabbinic thesis of David Jessel, Reform Versions of the Passover Haggadah (Hebrew Union College, 1963). Jessel indicates that the Passover Eve Service for the Home contained no date of publication. He used the date 1953? which was assigned to the volume by the HUC library. However, the introduction to the 1962 volume states that the revision was published in 1949.

[2] C. G. Montefiore, "The Jewish Religious Union: Its Principles and its Future," Papers for Jewish People 19 (1918): 14.

portions of the traditional liturgy. So, too, Montagu asserted: "The changes it [Liberal Judaism] makes in teaching and practices of Judaism are supported by the belief in the right to change, and the necessity to change which issues from the belief in Progressive Revelation."[3] Thus, the Haggadah takes liberties in paraphrasing passages in ways that deviate greatly from the Hebrew original, but express meaning that matches Liberal beliefs.

The 1937 revision returns a few of the traditional rubrics to the service, confirming a trend in the movement. Since the movement had already clearly asserted its right to be different, they no longer had to cut out so much of tradition to support this right. In the Liberal prayer book published in the late 1930's, Mattuck explained the purpose of worship, stating that it should: "combine the permanent spiritual values in Jewish Tradition with modern thought, and . . . express the spiritual and moral direction of Judaism in a way particularly suitable to the needs of modern Jewish life."[4] The revised service finds more "spiritual value" in traditions than its predecessor, and it sharpens the original with added details about the *Seder*.

The 1962 revision presents a Haggadah that refines the previous service and shows that the movement has changed some of its priorities. The move toward tradition is evident through the restoration of many traditional rubrics previously omitted. The text also provides a detailed appendix that offers the sources, traditional or modern, for each section of the service. Instead of paraphrasing most of the Hebrew, the Haggadah offers a closer translation. In the introduction to the Service of the Heart,

---

3 Lily Montagu, "The Jewish Religious Union and its Beginnings," Papers for Jewish People 27 (1927): vi.

4 Israel I. Mattuck, ed., Liberal Jewish Prayer Book I (London: Liberal Jewish Synagogue, 1937) p. xiv.

which was published shortly after the revised Haggadah, the editors explained: "Our guiding principles have been that the language of prayer should be exalted, yet honest and direct, both intellectually and emotionally; and that a translation should be, as far as possible a translation rather than a paraphrase."[5]

In addition to a more traditional presentation, the 1962 revision also adds new prayers within the rubrics of the service. The introduction to the service explains: "Our aim has been twofold: to use as much as possible of the traditional material, and to sound a modern universalistic note throughout."[6] Both goals have been admirably accomplished in the treatment of the text. The service itself also distinguishes between what is considered essential and what is optional. The editors instruct: "The passages in large type are considered essential to the Service. Those in smaller type may be omitted at the discretion of the leader" (1962, p. v).

All of the services reflect the movement's strong commitment to the family. The very fact that the first edition was published in a Home Prayer Book attests to this. So, too, the introductory paragraph in the 1962 Liberal Haggadah stresses that the family *Seder* should take precedence over the widely practiced community *Seder* (1962, p. xii.). Each service has ample notes of guidance and explanation to enhance the family celebration.

The following study of Liberal Haggadoth will examine how the three Passover rituals compare with the traditional Haggadah. Since the latter two services were developed using the previous works as a base, the Haggadoth will be examined together. This will facilitate comparison of the works to

---

5 Rabbinic Conference of Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, ed, Service of the Heart (London: ULPS, 1967), p. xi.

6 John Rayner, ed., Passover Eve Service for the Home (London: ULPS, 1962), p. v. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the text by year of publication).

each other as well as to tradition. The texts will be referred to by date of publication; 1918, 1949, and 1962.

The 1918 service does not contain any introductory or preparatory material for the *Seder*. In part this can be attributed to the fact that the service was one of many printed in the volume of Services and Prayers for Jewish Homes, and there was not room for explanatory notes for each service. Both the 1949 and 1962 editions contain a list of preparations for the *Seder*. The list in the 1949 edition includes all of the traditional items with the exception of a cushion for leaning. The 1962 revision adds the cushion to the list and also includes a historical introduction to the Haggadah. None of the services mention the searching for חמץ or the special preparations made if Passover begins on Sabbath eve. This exclusion is not surprising given the movement's attitude toward Jewish Law. Rayner offered an example of how the Liberals view the Law, when he said: "Abstention from leaven during this festival is recommended, but not carried to legalistic extremes."[7]

In the 1949 and 1962 editions, the blessing over the kindling of the festival lights precedes the *Kiddush*, while the 1918 version simply mentions that the candles should be lit before the service begins. The 1962 version adds a meditation before the benediction, an alternate English interpretation of the prayer, and the priestly benediction for children, to be recited by parents or the community. Two important themes of the 1962 Haggadah emerge in this opening section. The universal theme is reiterated by the meditation, which states: "We kindle these lights as . . . a symbol of the hope we cherish for the coming of the day when the whole world will be

---

[7] John Rayner, Liberal Judaism (London: The Jewish Liberal Synagogue, n.d.) p. 14.

delivered from bondage and illumined by the worship of God" (1962, p.1). And both the alternative English and the blessing for children emphasize the prominent role that family plays in the latest edition of the Haggadah.

Prior to the *Kiddush*, the 1949 and 1962 editions offer an introduction to the meaning of the four cups of wine and the origin of using wine in the *Seder*. The Haggadoth assert that the wine represents both prosperity and freedom. The 1949 and 1962 revisions add an introduction to the Cup of Elijah here, that speaks of the coming of the messianic age and the "deliverance of all mankind" (1962, p. 3). While this explanation of the purpose of Elijah's cup describes it as symbolizing "Jewish hospitality and brotherhood" (Ibid.), the שמור passage, which is traditionally read as the door is opened for Elijah, implies quite the opposite. Here, the ethical implications supplant the traditional symbol of God destroying Israel's enemies.

The *Kiddush* is found in Hebrew and English in all versions, but none of the services include either the special introduction for Shabbat or the *Havdalah* service. The 1962 edition mentions that *Havdalah* can be inserted, but provides no text for this purpose. The Hebrew of the 1918 and 1949 editions retains the particularistic references to God choosing and exalting the Jewish people, which are often modified in Reform Haggadoth. However, the English paraphrase weaves out the implications of the Jews being chosen above other groups; it translates אשר בחר בנו מכל עם to read, "who hath given us our religion."[8] The 1962 revision shows a different approach. This latter service, in its attempt to reinstate tradition, offers

---

8 Liberal Jewish Synagogue, ed., Services and Prayers for Jewish Homes (London: Liberal Jewish Synagogue, 1918), p. 34. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the text by year of publication).

much closer translations of the Hebrew text. In order to be consistent with this policy, the 1962 edition revises the Hebrew to read: ליחד שמו בעולם, instead of the traditional: ורוממנו מכל לשון בולו (1962, p. 4). The English rendition of the blessing then modifies the idea of chosenness as follows: "who didst choose us from all peoples to proclaim thy unity throughout the world" (Ibid.). Likewise the translation of כי בנו בחרת ואותנו קדשת מכל העמים reads: "Thou hast chosen us and consecrated us to thy service" (Ibid.). Thus the particularistic is tempered by the universal mission of Israel.

All of the Liberal Haggadoth leave out the *Seder's* ritual hand washings from the service. This custom has never gained acceptance in any of the Haggadoth published by the Reform or Liberal movements. The tradition has no direct relation to the Passover celebration, nor is it practiced regularly by Liberal Jews regularly on Shabbat; thus, it does not contribute to the relevance of the *Seder*. The benediction over the first dipping and the custom of *Yahatz* are left out completely from the 1918 Haggadah; these are two of several major portions of the *Seder* ritual that are not found in the earliest edition of the Liberal Haggadah. The service explains the meanings of most of the Passover symbols, however, the editors do not feel it is necessary to retain all of the rituals associated with the symbols. This is congruent with the philosophy towards liturgy expressed by the founders of the Liberal movement. They stated as their goal: "to draw up a liturgy, which contained only those readings and prayers, which combined historic interest with the spiritual need of the actual worshippers."[9]

The latter editions modify their position on what meets the "spiritual need" of the participants, and include the benediction over the *Karpas* and

---

9 Montagu, pp. 5-6.

the instructions for *Yahatz* as well as several of the other sections left out of the 1918 edition. The text offers the traditional explanation of the three *Matzoth* representing the Kohen, the Levi and the Israelite, and then remarks that this "distinction . . . has little meaning today" (1962, p. 5). The inclusion of this information, despite the fact that Liberal Judaism rejects such classifications, indicates the immense shift in philosophy from the time when the first Liberal Haggadah was published.

הא לחמא follows in all three editions, with modifications in the text in each of the liturgies. The 1918 and 1949 editions contain the Aramaic text up to, כל דצריך ייתי ויפסח, and an English paraphrase that refers to the invitation to the poor (1918, p. 35). It is not surprising that the text does not mention either slavery or the hope for return to the land of Israel. The early Liberal movement opposed repeated reminders of Jewish oppression, and was cautious not to imply that they were unhappy with the government of Great Britain. These sentiments are replaced by a concluding paragraph, appearing in all three editions, that stresses brotherhood and freedom for all. The 1962 revision reinserts the phrase השתא עבדי לשנה הבאה בני חורין, and universalizes the translation to read: "This year many are still oppressed; next year may all be free" (1962, p. 6). Here the 1962 edition uses, as it does throughout the Haggadah, a much closer translation of the traditional text.

Prior to the abbreviated rendition of the four questions the 1918 and 1949 editions mention several other Passover symbols which are later explained later in the service. This straightforward presentation presumably replaces the need for inserting the full text of the traditional four questions, which are not directly answered in the Haggadah. The editors include only the question: מה נשתנה הלילה הזה מכל הלילות. The translation goes into a

little more detail, asking: "Why is this night different from all other nights, and what is the meaning of this service and the things that are on the table?" (1918, p. 36). This version of מה נשתנה serves as the introduction to the four types of sons. The explanation of the four sons, in English only, sets the tone for how the Seder will progress, reiterating the obligation to recall the Exodus. In line with its attempt to include more tradition, the 1962 revision reinstates the complete Hebrew and English text of the four questions and adds an alternative question, for those who do not recline. The new question singles out the unique presence of the lamb bone and the roasted egg at the Passover celebration. Its presence is significant, as it demonstrates a new way for the Liberal's to formulate modern liturgy. The added question uses a traditional mode to reshape the service.

The traditional text of עבדים היינו is contained in all three versions of the Haggadah. The first two editions add the statement: "We share in the blessing of the redemption that came to our fathers" (1918, p. 37), thus connecting the historical event to the Jews of today. The 1962 edition, in line with its aim to follow tradition more closely, deletes this sentence and adds an English version of the tale of Rabbi Eliezer, which does not appear in the first two editions. Further, restoring the traditional order, the 1962 service places the Four Sons after the עבדים היינו. The question of the wise son uses the Talmudic form of "the Lord has commanded us" instead of the traditional "the Lord has commanded you," as is the case in the previous editions. The 1962 edition adds further emphasis to the the alternative use of "us" in its new answer to the question, stating: "Because he includes himself . . ." (1962, p. 8).

At this point, all of the Haggadoth dispense with the preliminary readings of והיא שעמדה, ברוך שומר, מתחלה, and צא ולמד, which lead up to

the main body of the Exodus story. The text continues with the reading of the Israelite redemption, as portrayed in Deut. 26:5-8. None of the traditional *midrashim* accompanies this reading. Each of the Haggadoth follow the recitation from Deuteronomy with readings pertinent to the redemption and the history of the Exodus. The 1918 and 1949 versions instruct the participants to embellish the story with further details and both offer readings that highlight the importance of the holiday for Jews. Included within these readings, the rabbinic teachings that usually follow the עבדים היינו passage are paraphrased.

The 1962 edition, indicating the text is optional by its use of small print, presents a much more extensive selection of readings. It offers several explanatory passages, which incorporate portions of traditional passages that have been omitted from the main body of the service. Of particular interest is the reference to the Ten Plagues. Though the appendix explains thoroughly the irrelevance of the Ten Plagues, the concept of the defeat of our enemies, inherent in the reading of the plagues, is compelling after the Holocaust. This viewpoint eclipses the earlier philosophy that the message of the oppression of the Jews was not fitting for today's times. Nevertheless, the editors feel the mere mention of the destruction of our enemies must be tempered by the rabbinic writing from Sanhedrin 39b, Megillah 10b, which speaks of God rebuking the angels for singing with joy while the Egyptians were drowning (1962, p 10). The optional text is concluded by a detailed account of the history of the Exodus and the revelation of the "common system of ethics and law and a religious expression incomparably higher than anything the world had previously known" (1962, p. 11). This concluding statement emphasizes that the focus of the celebration is not merely on the redemption, but rather, on the

inspired religion that the Israelites received in conjunction with their freedom.

The version of דייינו in the Liberal Haggadoth mirror the pattern set down in the Union Haggadah, excluding the references to acts that God committed against others for the benefit of the Jews. While for the most part this service omits references to the Temple and the heritage of the land of Israel, both are mentioned in the דייינו. The liturgy also adds a verse similar to the one added to the Union Haggadah; it states, ולא שלח לנו את עבדיו הנביאים (1918, p. 39). The 1949 edition adds a version of the traditional על אחת כמה וכמה. As a confirmation of faith, the דייינו is concluded with the ברוך שם, שמע and ואהבת in the 1918 and 1949 editions. (The 1962 edition moves these three to the Concluding Prayers of the service.) In the 1962 revision three new verses appear that progressively explain how Jews have carried forth their heritage. The three verses: נתן לנו את בית הבנסת, שלח אותנו בין הגויים ליחד שמו בתוכם, הקים לנו חכמים וצדיקים בכל דור ודור, underscore the modern mission of Israel (1962, p. 13).

In the elucidation of the significant Passover symbols, the 1918 and 1949 editions use the traditional Hebrew passages for *Pesaḥ*, *Matzah*, and *Maror*. The English paraphrase of the *Pesaḥ* symbol avoids the translation of the miraculous way in which God "passed over" the houses of the Israelites, while killing the first born in Egypt. The supernatural reference and the acknowledgement of God harming Israel's enemies were counter to the philosophy of the Liberals. Supplementing the three traditional symbols, the service also gives short descriptions of the purpose of the *Haroset*, the roasted egg, and the significance of the Passover as a celebration of Spring. This follows up on the mention of these items after הא לחמא.

The 1962 version frames the Passover symbols in the format of answers to the four questions. Therefore, it rearranges the order in which the symbols are presented and adds explanations so that each of the questions is fully answered. The text for *Matzah* and *Maror* utilizes the traditional renderings about these symbols. This is followed by descriptions of the purpose of the *Haroset*, of the custom of leaning, and of the role of the lamb bone and roasted egg. It is surprising that the editors did not choose to offer these added portions in Hebrew as well as English. In several other sections of this Haggadah, new sections are found in both languages. It is also unusual to find that the depiction of the symbol of the Paschal Lamb is abbreviated and found only in English, considering the general return to tradition in the 1962 Haggadah. This rubric ends with readings that express the spring aspects of the festival, and acknowledge the fulfillment of the duties set forth by Rabban Gamliel.

At this point, the 1918 and 1949 editions skip בכל דור and continue with לפיכך. Again, the English paraphrases rather than translates the Hebrew. The message that God led the Israelites from slavery to freedom is left out of the English, and praise is offered for the "lovingkindness" that God has bestowed upon Israel and <u>all mankind</u> [emphasis mine] (1918, p. 43). In the 1962 edition, בכל דור is restored with the full text exclusive of the line from Deut. 6:23, which speaks about returning to the Land. This is replaced in Hebrew and English by Lev. 25:42 and an elaboration of its message: ובשם שלא נגאלו אבותינו אלא לעבוד אותו, שנאמר כי עבדי הם אשר הוצאתי אותם מארץ מצרים בן חיבים אנחנו ובנינו ובני בנינו לעבוד את יי אלהינו ולדבקה בו בל ימי חיינו (1962, p. 17). The new text extends the story past the redemption and reminds the participants of their present duty to serve God, because of the many gifts God has given us. This is followed by

לסיבך, which is translated more literally than in previous versions and focuses on what God did for Israel, rather than for "all mankind."

The 1918 and 1949 editions consolidate the before and after the meal portions of *Hallel* into one poem. Here, the purpose seems to be to curtail the length of the service and do away with some of the repetition of themes. The reading, found in English only, combines Pss. 113, 114, and parts of 115, and is completed with הודו לי״, of Ps. 118. Congruent with its goal to follow the traditional order more closely, the 1962 revision separates the two portions of the *Hallel* It contains Pss. 113 and 114. All of the Liberal versions omit the unseemly reference to "who makes a barren woman to dwell in her house" of Ps. 113.

The redemption blessing follows in all editions, without the petitions for return to Jerusalem and restoration of the sacrificial cult. Here, again, "all mankind," rather than Jews alone, are the beneficiaries of God's redemption. This addition is only in English in the first two editions, but is found in both Hebrew and English in the 1962 edition. Additionally, the the 1962 Haggadah replaces the omitted petition with a modern prayer for the coming of the messianic kingdom: שמחים בביאת מלכותך וששים בעבודתך (1962, p. 20). Traditionally, אשר גאלנו is followed by the second cup of wine. The 1918 edition contains only the benediction over the first cup, and makes no further mention of the other cups of wine. The 1949 edition mentions here, and at the two remaining appropriate places, that the cups of wine are consumed; however, it only offers a benediction over the first cup. The 1962 edition restores the traditional benediction here, and over the final two cups. Nevertheless, even in the 1962 version, the blessings appear in the smaller optional text, rather than as part of the main body of the service.

The blessings before the meal offer only the *Motzi* and *Matzah* benedictions in the 1918 and 1949 editions. The participants are instructed to eat the *Maror* dipped in *Haroset*, however, the blessing marking the fulfillment of this commandment is left out. Breaking further from tradition, the 1918 edition omits the recognition of the *Korekh* and the passage כן עשה הלל from the ritual before the meal. The 1949 revision gives the historical background to the *Korekh*, but does not contain the traditional text associated with it, or suggest that a "Hillel sandwich" be consumed. This omission, in both early editions of the Haggadah, follows the pattern of the movement's early liturgy, which excised readings that were not considered relevant. The more traditional 1962 revision reinserts both the benediction over the *Maror* and the formulation preceding the eating of the "Hillel sandwich."

Only the 1962 edition specifies the custom in which the children search for the *afikomen*, and it does so in the optional text. The abbreviated Grace after Meals varies in each of the editions. The 1918 version opens with the responsive call of נברך, and continues with the traditional first paragraph. The 1949 edition leaves out, from this paragraph: ובטובו הגדול. לכל בריותיו אשר ברא . . . תמיד לא חסר לנו The 1962 version opens with שיר המעלות and the responsive call to the Grace, and it restores this passage that was omitted in the first paragraph of the 1949 version. In the נודה paragraph, the 1949 version omits the phrase: בכל יום ובכל עת ובכל שעה. The 1962 *Bareikh* adds the traditional phrase back into the blessing. All of the editions leave out רחם and רצה, indicating the rejection of the hope for return to Zion and the reluctance to accept the stringencies of the Sabbath Law. However, the 1962 version replaces the Sabbath prayer with an originally composed English Shabbat reading that incorporates Deut. 5:13-15.

Here again the 1962 Haggadah inserts its interpretation of the ritual in place of the unacceptable traditional reading. This new paragraph emphasizes the theme of the Mission of Israel to work for the freedom of all mankind (1962, p. 24). In the 1918 and 1949 edition the *Bareikh* concludes with יעלה ויבא ברוך הגבר" and יי עז. The blessing is apparently shortened in consideration of reducing the length of the service. The 1962 rendering adds back several of the traditional הרחמן passages and offers a liberal version of: הרחמן. הוא יזכנו לימות המשיח The liberal version reads: הרחמן הוא יזכנו לימות הגאלה ולחיי העולם הבא (1962, p. 25). It is interesting to note that the traditional verses of הרחמן appear in the smaller text, while the liberral addition is in the larger print of the main section of the service. The *Bareikh* then concludes with עושה שלום and an optional recitation of the benediction over the the third cup of wine.

The 1918 Haggadah makes no mention of Elijah; however, both the 1949 and 1962 editions explain the Cup of Elijah and provide for the opening of the door. Even though the introduction explained that the Cup of Elijah represents hospitality and brotherhood,[10] the Psalm that is recited when the door is opened is reminiscent of the dangers that Jews have faced from enemies. Ps. 27 is not as harsh as שמוך, which speaks of God killing Israel's enemies; however, it does portray God as Israel's protector against enemies. Other than those verses unacceptable to Liberal ideology, the whole of the *Hallel* appears.

The *Hallel* that follows the *Bareikh*, in the 1918 edition, is made up of a few select lines from the customary *Hallel*. The selections serve to express

---

10 Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, Passover Eve Service for the Home (London: Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, 1949), p. 2. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the text by year of publication).

gratitude to God, as the service comes to a close. The 1949 edition contains a few more select verses expressing similar sentiments and most of the text of Ps. 136. As has been the case with previous rubrics of the service, the 1962 Haggadah restores much of the traditional text that was left out of the earlier versions. The portions of Pss. 115, 116, 118 and 136, which the editor omits, refer either to death, idol worshipping, or God taking vengeance on Israel's enemies.

In the 1918 edition, the *Seder* service concludes here and is followed by a few Passover songs and poems. In the 1949 edition, a *piyyut* authored by Isaac Ibn Giat of eleventh century Spain, precedes the instructions to drink the final cup of wine. The *piyyut* also appears in the Poems and Songs section of the 1962 edition. Some of the themes in the *piyyut* are not what one would typically expect in a Liberal Haggadah. The poem alludes to God avenging Israel:

> Who makes the men of might, their pomp and state,
> As passing shadows seem;
> Then like a vision of the night is stilled
> The haughty tumult of the foe . . . (1949, p. 27).

It also explicitly describes the resurrection of the dead at the coming of the messianic age, when it states:

> Seek'st thou a sign to know the dead once more
> Shall rise to life, their troubles past,
> And that earth's pilgrims, all their wand'rings o'er,
> Shall dwell in peace at last (Ibid.).

These expressions, couched in poetry as they are, still go against the grain of Liberal ideology. The poem certainly relates to the theme of Passover, but it does so in a way that is uncharacteristic of the Liberal movement. The only hint to the reason for its placement in the Liberal Haggadah could be the fact that the poem was translated by Claude Montefiore's sister (1962, p. 54).

The 1962 edition restores most of the traditional text of נשמת כל חי and the blessing over the final cup of wine. In an added section of Concluding Prayers the Haggadah opens with an original prayer written by John Rich. It is here that the editors choose to recognize the major Jewish events of modern times, the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel. These events heighten the relevance of the Passover theme of redemption. The final paragraph of the prayer calls on participants to learn the lesson of the Passover and to use it to help bring about the messianic age. It beckons readers:

> Let us resolve to use this freedom, so dearly bought, to labour with renewed zeal for the establishment on earth of the kingdom of God. Then every man shall sit under his vine and under his fig tree, and none shall make them afraid (1962, p. 35).

This prayer is followed by the the *Shema* which completes the major text of the Haggadah.

The Poems and Songs at the end of the Haggadoth all contain "God of Might," the English and Hebrew of כי לו נאה and the English and Aramaic of חד גדיא. To these the 1962 edition adds "It Came to Pass at Midnight" and אחד מי יודע. Verses eight and nine of אחד מי יודע are emended to read: "Eight days of Chanukkah" and "Nine candles of the Menorah" (1962, p. 42). The appendix to the service gives the traditional verses and explains that the verses are changed in the service "on the ground that these items are likely to be more meaningful to children and more in keeping with the context" (1962, p. 55). Unlike most of the Haggadoth in this study, the Haggadoth of the Liberal movement do not place the songs and poem prior to the final prayer of the service; thus the service is considered complete without these songs and poems.

The Liberal Haggadoth of England show the movement's development over the course of some forty-five years. The 1962 version incorporates the ideals of its predecessors while applying a fresh philosophy to its construction. This results in a service that is deeply rooted in Liberal goals, yet not afraid to utilize traditional rubrics in presenting those goals. The Liberal Haggadoth all show a dedication to the furthering of the Mission of Israel and the realization of the universal ideal of freedom and peace for all peoples.

The Liberal movement has always expressed strong ties to universal themes. Montefiore, in conceiving of the movement, wrote: "I hope and believe that we should all 'stand for' the view that Judaism is essentially a universal religion. By this I mean that its doctrines are not only suited to one race, but might be the common belief of many races."[11] The 1918 edition reveals its universalistic intent, at the start of the service. The meditation which follows הא לחמא states: "May this spirit of brotherhood fill us too. May the time come speedily when no want shall be to any man, and when a festival of redemption from all misery and servitude shall be decreed for all mankind" (1918, p. 35.). Likewise, the חתימה of the redemption benediction expresses the universal theme, stating: "Blessed art thou, O God, Redeemer of Israel and all mankind" (1918, p. 45). The 1949 revision furthers this theme. One example of this is found in the explanation for the Cup of Elijah, mentioned earlier, which explains the Cup as a representation of the Jews' willingness to reach out to help the stranger (1949, p. 2). The 1962 edition states that presenting the universal element of the holiday is one of its two major goals. It builds upon the previous

---

11 Montefiore, "The Jewish Religious Union . . .," p. 13.

edition by emending both the Hebrew and English texts to accomplish these ends. The meditation before the candle lighting, and the changed wording of the *Kiddush* demonstrate two examples of the commitment to the universal ideal.

Like the American reformers, the Liberals saw the Mission of Israel as the mode in which to the establish these universal ideals. Montefiore continued the presentation of Liberal ideals, stating: "And we further believe that the Jews have been entrusted by God with the duty of maintaining, developing, and even diffusing these affirmations to the best of their power and in the most suitable ways."[12] While some progressive Jewish groups do not adhere to the notion of "chosenness," the Liberals affirm that notion in terms of the Mission of Israel. The 1962 edition portrays this ideal in several places in its text. For example, the new verses in the ד"ייו show the importance of the Mission ideal, linking the thanksgiving for redemption to the duty of Jews "to proclaim unity among the nations" (1962, p. 13). So, too, the final prayer stresses Mission as a closing charge when it states: "Let us resolve to use this freedom, so dearly bought, to labour with renewed zeal for the establishment on earth of the kingdom of God" (1962, p. 35).

The increased emphasis on the universal theme was accompanied by an equally as strong increase in the adherence to traditional forms and rubrics in the services. The 1918 and 1949 Haggadoth employed the philosophy that the Hebrew forms, if used, should be left intact, because of their historical significance. The English however is paraphrased to allow for comprehension and "naturalness" (1918, p. iii). As was explained

---

12 Ibid., p. 7.

previously, the 1962 edition changes stance and offers more literal translations. Another measure of the progressing tendency toward more tradition is the addition, in each revision, of more traditional prayers. The 1949 revision adds the benediction over the *Karpas* mentions the four cups of wine at the appropriate places, and Ps. 136 to the service. The 1962 edition contains those as well as many others. It reinserts the traditional four questions, restores the Four Sons reading to its traditional place in the service, and includes the benediction over *Maror* and the reading for *Korekh*

This progressive movement toward tradition is accompanied by an increasingly bolder approach to creating new liturgy in each Haggadah. All of the services express Liberal ideas throughout. However, the 1962 edition is particularly noteworthy in the way in which it interweaves Liberal ideas with traditional texts. The 1918 and 1949 editions convey Liberal ideology through paraphrases and added meditations. The 1962 edition, on the other hand, makes changes through the traditional rubrics, in order to express its philosophy. The modern Hebrew and English additions to the *Kiddush*, דיינו, and בכל דור show how the 1962 editors conveyed their priorities through the existing framework of the service. Whereas the earlier editions left out sections that did not fit the Liberal movement, the 1962 version found ways to make the traditional framework useful for modern ideals.

One constant throughout the Liberal Haggadoth is the commitment to present a modern Judaism. Scientific advancement had made the belief in miraculous intervention obsolete. The ideal of all Jews returning to the land of Israel had always been viewed as unrealistic, by the Liberals. So too, they rejected the references to the rebuilding of the Temple and the sacrificial cult. The evidence of these beliefs is most clear upon examining what is

omitted from the services. None of the services include the mention of miraculous plagues. All omit the calls for return to Jerusalem. The notes that accompany the 1962 Haggadah verify the ideological changes. The appendix gives an in-depth explanation as to why modern knowledge of the workings of nature raises difficulties in the belief in miracles (1962, p. 49). Rayner confirmed that these changes represent more than just a shortening of the service, when he stated:

> In the traditional prayers it also makes some changes on doctrinal grounds. That is to say, it omits or amends all references to beliefs and aspirations which Liberal Jews no longer hold, such as those relating to the personal Messiah, the Ingathering of the Exiles, and the restoration of the Temple and its sacrificial cult, and the Resurrection of the Dead.[13]

The examination of the Liberal Haggadoth has uncovered the growth of a movement that has remained true to its ideal:

> Liberal Judaism . . . belongs fairly and squarely to the historic continuity of the Jewish Tradition, but it conceives that continuity in dynamic, not static terms. It stands for the continuity of growth. And growth spells life.[14]

As the movement has matured, the Haggadoth demonstrate a stronger commitment to the Liberal ideals of universalism and the Mission of Israel. The comparison of the Liberal Passover services depicts a movement that is both reclaiming and reshaping tradition-- continuing to delve into the rich Jewish heritage and to inject into that heritage the zeal of its ideology.

---

13 Rayner, Liberal Judaism, p. 8.

14 Rayner, The Practices of Liberal Judaism, revised edition, (London: ULPS, 1960), p. 2.

The Conservative Movement: Its Philosophy and Its Liturgy

Historically, the Conservative movement adheres to traditional Judaism, while maintaining the right to reinterpret and add to the Jewish heritage. Conservative leaders have consistently sought to present the tradition so as to maximize observance among their members. Nevertheless, the Conservative Movement has not merely repackaged the *Halakhah* for the edification of its congregants. They have modified customs and, at times, reinterpreted the tradition in a fashion that stretches the limits of the law. Dr. Robert Gordis, along with the movement's Commission to publish a prayer book, developed the following guiding principles:

> (a) Continuity with tradition,
> (b) Relevance to contemporary needs and ideals,
> (c) Intellectual integrity.[1]

Upon examination of the Conservative movement's orientation toward Jewish law, it becomes evident that the ordering of the principles was not accidental. The Conservative movement has always placed a high premium on maintaining tradition. Many Conservative Jews echo the sentiments of Dr. Marshall Sklare who declared:

> In spite of the claims made in other quarters it is we [Conservative Jews] who are the authentic Jews of Rabbinic Judaism. . . . In a sense, then, Conservatism is conceived by its elite as twentieth century Orthodoxy.[2]

Conservatism's mission is to modernize without nullifying-- to preserve the tradition in a context appropriate for contemporary society.

---

[1] Robert Gordis, "A Jewish Prayer Book for the Modern Age," Conservative Judaism 2 (October, 1945): 9-11.

[2] Marshall Sklare, Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement, (New York: Schocken Books, 1972), p. 263.

Unlike the Reform movement, which was born amidst Jewish scholars' calls for ideological change, Conservatism grew out of a response to the laity's desire for congregations that would establish familiar Jewish communities congruent with the American way of life. The Reform congregations had done away with too much of the familiar, while the Orthodox synagogues were not flexible enough for the founders of the Conservative movement. In developing congregations to meet their needs, the Eastern European immigrants, who were the builders of Conservative Judaism, sought to adapt the Jewish legalistic system to meet the demands of their new political, social, and economic environment.[3]

The stringent requirements of Orthodoxy and the emphasis on Jewish scholarship before all else were incompatible with the American way of life. Yet the immigrants were committed to working within the fold of Jewish tradition to come up with a solution. Sklare explained:

> In contrast with Reform, the growth of Conservatism took place after Jewish political emancipation had been granted. Thus there were no practical considerations dictating radical changes in content, such as deletion of references to Zion out of fear of being charged with dual loyalties.[4]

These Jews did not want to desert the customs and practices of their Judaism, nor did they find an inherent contradiction between tradition and modernity. Ideology was not the point of contention for early Conservative Jews, rather they were concerned with form and style.

Conservative Jews approached the building of communities ever mindful of the desire to replicate their customs and traditions in America.

---

[3] Ibid., pp. 31-32.
[4] Ibid., p. 113.

Preserving the old was the goal; therefore it is not surprising to find that change was slow in emerging in the ranks of the movement. The main concern was how to make the Jewish way of life practical for the daily lives of American Jews. Dr. Seymour Siegel delineated the Conservative approach to innovations when he wrote:

> In a progressive society change is constant and the great question is not whether you should resist change which is inevitable, but whether that change should be carried out in deference to the manners, customs, and the laws and traditions of the people, and not in deference to abstract principles.[5]

Clearly, Siegel and the Conservative movement favored the approach of change within the fold of the Jewish heritage.

Exemplifying this approach, two of the mentors of the Conservative movement, Zechariah Frankel and Solomon Schechter, espoused ideals of Conservatism. Zechariah Frankel originated the idea of "positive-historical Judaism," which has been a guide for Conservative Judaism throughout its existence. Positive-historical Judaism (commonly referred to as historical Judaism) posits that Judaism is more than a religion of one God, it represents the "historical product of the Jewish mind and spirit."[6] The implications of historical Judaism for the movement are two-fold: first, as an historical group Jews have grown out of a distinct and flavorful past, that connects them to a vibrant heritage; second, connection to that history is not static; rather it evolves as Jews progress in each generation.[7]

---

5 Seymour Siegel, Conservative Judaism and Jewish Law, (New York: The Rabbinical Assembly, 1977), p. xix.

6 Ibid., p. 5.

7 Sklare, p. 230.

The historical approach insures that liturgical change will follow a path that reveres inherited tradition. The traditional *Siddur* fulfilled this need for many years. In fact, the Conservative leaders did not publish their own *Siddur* until well after the establishment of their seminary, rabbinic body, and congregational union. They found that their needs were met with but a few changes in the way they interpreted the traditional prayer book. Sklare explained,

> Reinterpretation involves the redefinition of traditional concepts and practices. . . . In essence, after stating a religious concept in its original form, one goes on to ask: 'What meaning does this have for us today?' Thus the sense of the liturgy can be changed without disturbing the wording; there is no necessity, as in early Reform Judaism, for expurgation.[8]

Allowing for family style seating and prayer books that included English translation, Conservative Jews were contented with their worship service for several generations.

Dr. Solomon Schechter introduced another idea, "Catholic Israel," which shaped the way that liturgical change transpired in the movement. According to Schechter's doctrine:

> Catholic Israel is the body of men and women within the Jewish people, who accept the authority of Jewish law and are concerned with Jewish observance as a genuine issue.[9]

All those who accept the body of Jewish law, whether or not they follow it to the letter, make up the category of Catholic Israel. The opinions of those who make up Catholic Israel shape the direction in which Conservatism develops. Since Catholic Israel is composed of individuals who accept Jewish

---

[8] Ibid., pp. 124-125.
[9] Siegel, p. 64.

law, Jewish practice generally evolves from within the fence of tradition. Rarely will those who accept the authority of *Halakhah* suggest innovation diametrically opposed to that system. Individuals who, though they call themselves Conservative Jews, do not assent to the veracity of the *Halakhic* system do not fall within the fold of Catholic Israel, and therefore have no claim on shaping the direction of Conservatism.

This philosophy has had a profound effect on the conception of liturgical forms in the movement. Taken to its limits, the concept of Catholic Israel would allow for little or no change in the liturgy. Anyone committed to the authority of Jewish law would have limited motivation to change the liturgy that has unfolded under that system. One would expect that innovations would come more in the form of additions to the *Siddur*, rather than deletions from the service. Deviations from the traditional rubrics of the various services would have to come from the consensus of those in Catholic Israel. If they felt that change was warranted given a knowledge of modernity and the general practice of Conservative Jews, then it would be accepted. For example, from its early years the constituents of Conservative Judaism sought to have mixed seating in their synagogues. Given the American culture in which they lived, they found traditional segregated seating to be outmoded. However, this shift did not cause an equal shift in regard to the role of women in Judaism as a whole. Even to this day, some Conservative congregations do not allow women to sit on the pulpit, to lead services, or to read from Torah. They feel that equality in society should not supercede the chain of tradition that has been passed down through generations. Even though the Jewish Theological Seminary, of the Conservative movement, now ordains women rabbis, many Conservative

congregations still do not allow women to assume the traditionally male duties.

The precepts of both Catholic Israel and historical Judaism offer approaches to the practice of Judaism, and both neatly avoid addressing the issue of a Conservative ideology or philosophy. Consistently, the Conservative leaders have refused to adhere to one set ideology. The flexibility to maintain diverse ideologies, while utilizing the guide of tradition as a check, has kept Conservatism viable. Dr. Mordecai Kaplan claimed that any attempts to force unity would be detrimental to the movement.[10] He identified three major philosophical positions in the movement and outlined their varying approaches to tradition.[11] Difficulties arise when toleration wanes and when the commonalties uniting the movement are overshadowed.

In view of the varied philosophies within Conservatism, all falling within the bounds of Catholic Israel and historical Judaism, the movement has, at times, lacked direction. Kaplan lamented: "it [the Conservative movement] has been functioning to this day without an acceptable philosophy or program to guide its adherents."[12] Sitting on the fence between Reform and Orthodoxy, the movement has often defined itself by what it is not, rather than by what it is. This middle-of-the-road position is naturally subject to attack from all sides. The Orthodox reject Conservatism's deviations from tradition, however slight they may be. The Reform movement feels that Conservatism is too constricted to meet the needs of the modern Jew.

---

10 Mordecai Kaplan, Unity in Diversity in the Conservative Movement, (New York: The United Synagogue of America, 1947?[date indicated by library, not in publication]), p. 4.

11 Ibid., p. 9.

12 Ibid., p. 3.

By the 1940's, leaders in the movement, growing frustrated with the lack of positive definition, began to call for clarification of Conservatism. Calls from Rabbis Mordecai Kaplan and Morris Adler echoed the concern for a declaration of purpose in Conservative Judaism. At the United Synagogue of America convention in 1948, Rabbi Adler warned: "We must move forward to a stage in which Conservative Judaism revolves about an axis of positive and unambiguous affirmations."[13] During this same time-period Dr. Kaplan proposed four uniting principles for the Conservative movement:

> (1) The indispensability of *Eretz Yisrael* for Jewish life in the Diaspora, (2) the primacy of religion as the expression of collective Jewish life, (3) the maximum possible plenitude of Jewish content, including the use of Hebrew, and (4) the encouragement of the scientific approach in Jewish higher learning.[14]

Along with attempts to formulate a more precise philosophy, the Conservative movement decided that the time had come to publish its own liturgy. For many years, Conservatism skirted the development of its own prayer books, allowing individual congregations to choose from the traditional liturgies available. By 1944, the movement recognized the necessity for developing its own independent and viable liturgy. A Commission was appointed by the Rabbinical Assembly and the United Synagogues of America to publish a Conservative prayer book.[15] Using Rabbi Morris Silverman's Sabbath and Festival Prayer Book as a working manuscript, the Commission operated with total autonomy.[16] The Commission had final and complete authority over the published liturgy;

---

13 Herbert Rosenblum, Conservative Judaism. A Contemporary History (New York: United Synagogue of America, 1983), p. 46.

14 Kaplan, p. 5.

15 Gordis, p. 9.

16 Ibid.

neither the Rabbinical Assembly nor the United Synagogue of America had the opportunity to accept or reject the final product. With this power intact, the Commission developed a methodology for reviewing and revising the prayer book, and went to work at production.

The basis for the liturgical development were Gordis' guiding principles outlined above: maintaining tradition, meeting modern needs, and preserving intellectual integrity.[17] With these ideals in mind, the Commission set out to produce a distinctly Conservative prayer book; they accepted some of the reforms other movements had established and defined their own limitations. Wherever possible the Commission sided with tradition and chose to reinterpret rather than replace material. Additionally, supplementary readings were inserted to account for the special concerns of modernity. Nevertheless, the Commission found: "the undeniable fact [is] that there are passages in the traditional prayer book that do not seem to express our convictions and hopes."[18] References to the hopes for the restoration of the sacrificial cult were altered. English paraphrases, which more succinctly expressed the sentiments of the Hebrew prayers, often replaced literal translations.[19] In summary, the Commission produced a liturgy that was more decorous, directive, and indicative of the needs of Conservative Jews.

Subsequent to the production of the 1945 Sabbath and Festival Prayer Book, the Conservative movement has published liturgies using the same basic process delineated above. The most recent publications, including Siddur Sim Shalom and Passover Haggadah: Feast of Freedom, reflect the

---

17 Ibid., pp. 9-11.
18 Ibid., p. 11.
19 Ibid., p.18.

move to bring the liturgy even more in line with the beliefs and practices of congregations. Rabbi Gilbert Rosenthal voiced a more lenient approach to alterations of liturgy when he explained:

> We are understandably reticent to tamper with the Bible because it is God's word to us. We need feel no such inhibitions concerning the *Siddur* which consists of our words to God. In this regard, it is worth noting that the Palestinian tradition . . . insisted on novelty in prayer.[20]

This viewpoint may indicate an area of increasing divisiveness within the movement. The right wing of the movement has recently begun raising more objections to the fact that liturgical publications do not require approval by the Rabbinical Assembly.[21] Rabbi Jules Harlow, the Director of Publications for the Rabbinical Assembly, emphasizes the Committee's loyalty to tradition, pointing out:

> the overwhelming majority of Hebrew texts in new editions of the prayer book published by the Conservative movement preserve and perpetuate texts which have been in existence since the classic age of Jewish prayer composition.[22]

Analyzing the Conservative Haggadah will disclose how the traditional text is maintained amidst innovations in both the Hebrew text and its English interpretations.

---

20 Gilbert S. Rosenthal, "Prayer and the Conservative Jew," Conservative Judaism 36 (Summer, 1983): 26.

21 Interview with Rabbi Richard Eisenburg, Congregation "Sheareth Israel," Columbus, Georgia, 22 December 1987.

22 Jules Harlow, "Introducing Siddur Sim Shalom," Conservative Judaism 37:4 (Summer, 1984): 6.

A Passover Haggadah, 1979, preliminary edition, and Passover Haggadah: Feast of Freedom, 1982, second edition

The development of the Conservative Passover service parallels the movement's developments in ceremony and practice. Until 1982, Conservative Jews had to rely on the publications of individual rabbis or other movements for a Haggadah. Lacking a movement service for so many years, it is not surprising that the Feast of Freedom is so full of explanations and teachings from Jewish tradition. In addition to a fairly traditional text, the Conservative Haggadah contains extensive directions, commentaries, and modern interpretations, providing the reader an opportunity to study the Exodus from a variety of viewpoints. In the introduction to the text, the Haggadah Committee clarifies its goals employing the traditional text from *Pesahim* 10:5, stating:

> Every individual should feel as though he or she had actually been enslaved in Mitzrayim and redeemed from Mitzrayim. Therefore, each of us should speak of our own Exodus - in the language that we understand, in the context familiar to us, and with the knowledge and experience that we have acquired.[1]

The Conservative Haggadoth respond to this call through the combination of a service rich in tradition, and commentary that teaches, explains and offers modern referents for the history of the festival. Thus, within the fence of the traditional liturgy and a multitude of interpretations, Conservative Jews can experience their own redemption each year.

The approach articulated by Rachel Rabinowicz is somewhat novel for a Conservative movement liturgy. Schechter's philosophy of Catholic Israel

---

[1] Rachel Rabinowicz, ed., Passover Haggadah: The Feast of Freedom, (New York: The Rabbinical Assembly, 1982), p. 8. (Hereafter this Haggadah will be cited parenthetically within the text by year of publication).

emphasized the group experience; while, Rabinowicz's introduction focuses on the individual's experience. Yet the actual style of the service fits well with the Conservative approach to tradition. Virtually every ritual, ceremony, and prayer is accompanied by notes that either explain, evoke thought, or supplement the original text. This method of presentation allows participants at once to feel a part of their historical past and to understand the contemporary implications of Jewish tradition. Although the text deviates in minor ways from tradition, it meets the legal requirements for a complete *Seder*. These requirements for the *Seder*, found in the Mishnah, include:

> (a) even the poor of Israel must have at least four cups of wine, (b) the story concerning the exodus from Egypt to be told beginning with the lowly beginnings and concluding with praise, (c) the significance of the essential Passover symbols . . . must be explained, and (d) . . . *Hallel* be recited.[2]

Although the text contains changes of many aspects of the traditional Haggadah, the Feast of Freedom thoroughly covers the four areas mentioned above. The Committee justifies its most pronounced deviation from tradition, found in the *Maggid* section of the service, explaining:

> Passages in this section are often obscure . . . . It thus fails in its primary objective- to clearly tell the story of the Exodus. While retaining part of this section, we have deleted some passages and have introduced . . . interpretations in an attempt to . . . tell the story of the Exodus in a more straightforward fashion.[3]

---

[2] Alan J. Yuter, "The Haggadah as Teacher," Conservative Judaism 32 (Summer, 1979): 89.

[3] Michael Strassfeld, ed., "A Passover Haggadah" Conservative Judaism 32 (Spring, 1979): vii. (Hereafter this Haggadah will be cited parenthetically within the text by year of publication).

Thus, the Committee believed it brought this section more in line with the intent of the mishnaic law.

The Conservative Haggadah is part of the recent surge of liturgical development in the movement. This modern work shows an increased willingness to take a stand and to support innovations that have been generally accepted by members of the movement. In the past, the Conservative movement has been very reticent about altering the traditional Hebrew text. The Feast of Freedom, however, often substitutes traditional renderings of the text for other biblical and rabbinic readings.

Another unique feature in The Feast of Freedom is the method by which it was developed. Unlike other Conservative liturgies which were conceived, edited, and scrutinized in the confines of the Publications Committee, the preliminary Haggadah text was released to the public for comments. Published in Conservative Judaism, the preliminary edition invited "all comments, criticisms and recommendations" (1979, p. iv). From the suggestions received, Rachel Rabinowicz edited the service and the Committee approved it. As was the case in previous Conservative liturgy, the Publications Committee had final say over the Haggadah.

Unlike the American Reform movement which seeks rabbinic consensus for its published liturgy, the Conservative movement delegates full authority to its Publications Committee. In the development of The Feast of Freedom, all criticisms of and comments on the manuscript were sent to and considered by the Committee alone. No discussion of the appropriateness of changes appeared in the Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly; no vote of the rabbis occurred before the publication of either the preliminary or final edition of the Haggadah. Instead, the Publications

Committee operated autonomously in accepting the work of the editors of the respective volumes.

The following analysis will compare both the preliminary and second editions of the Conservative Haggadah to their traditional counterpart. The preliminary edition will be referred to as the basic text and changes made in the 1982 edition will be outlined. Variations between the two editions will also be discussed. The analysis will further detail how The Feast of Freedom reflects the ideals of the Conservative movement. In citing references in the two editions the preliminary edition, A Passover Haggadah, will be designated "1979" and the second edition, Feast of Freedom, will be noted as "1982."

The Haggadah opens with a lengthy and detailed exposition about preparations for the festival. This section serves to instruct the leader of the *Seder* in the options available when using the Haggadah. Included within the preparatory section are the traditional formulas for the removal of חמץ and the pronouncement of an ערוב if Passover falls on Thursday. The instructions open in an assertive fashion, notifying the reader that: "Preparation begins weeks before the holiday" (1979, p. x). This is followed by a detailed discussion of how to properly rid the house of forbidden foods and how to prepare the kitchen and utensils for the holiday. Interestingly, the meticulous instructions deviate from tradition, suggesting that it is acceptable simply to store away products that contain חמץ. Alan Yuter, in an article reviewing the preliminary Haggadah, criticizes this departure from tradition, stating: "Since Jewish law prohibits both ownership and possession of חמץ, a sale is *halakhically* obligatory unless one rids oneself of all חמץ"[4]

---

[4] Yuter, p. 92.

The 1982 edition eliminates most of the detail in these instructions. It does not suggest that חמץ merely be put aside, nor does it offer the alternative of selling any remaining leaven to a non-Jew.

The section on *Seder* preparations includes a brief description of all the customary Passover symbols. In addition to the items necessary for the table, the introduction describes the customs of reclining and wearing a *Kittel*. The preliminary edition describes the *Kittel* as part of the symbolism of the table: "transformed into an altar upon which lies the *Pesah* offering and around which are gathered the people of Israel" (1979, p. xii). Softening the reference to the sacrificial offering, the 1982 version reads: "The *Kittel* is a reminder of the vestments of the Temple priests and of the raiment worn by the ancient Israelites on festivals. The people wear white . . . for they know that the Holy One . . . performs miracles for them" (1982, p. 19). The later version also adds marginal notes, with added descriptions of the various festival symbols.

Preluded by the candle lighting ceremony and the *Seder* mnemonic, the service opens with the *Kiddush*. The 1979 version of the mnemonic includes both a description of what takes place at each section, and page numbers of where the various sections are found, while the second edition leaves out these details. In place of the detail, the 1982 edition introduces the mnemonic with a statement explaining the structure that these elements have provided for Haggadoth throughout the centuries. This statement seems to validate that the service fits the requirements of historical Judaism.

The English translations in the Conservative Haggadoth fastidiously use inclusive language in reference to humanity. Significantly, the 1982 edition extends this sensitivity to a few non-traditional Hebrew portions as well as to the English portions of the text. Whereas the preliminary edition

opens with: "הנני מוכן ומזומן לקיים" (1979, p. 1), the final edition adds to the reading: "הנני מוכן/מוכנה ומזומן/ומזומנה לקיים" (1982, p. 24). These revisions of the Hebrew only include modern additions to the service; no gender changes in the traditional Hebrew text occur.

The text of the blessings over the wine and first dipping and the hand washing ritual follow the traditional formulas. The paragraph recited with the *Kiddush* on the Sabbath is preluded by the biblical verses, Gen. 1:31-32. In the preliminary version a meditation concludes the *Kiddush*, invoking God's help in opening our eyes to the injustice in the world. This reading is eliminated from the later edition. Following the blessing over the wine, the preliminary version contains a *midrashic* interpretation of the *Kiddush*. Similarly, after the first dipping, the main text contains an added reading from Song of Songs. In the later edition, all interpretative and added readings fall in the margins rather than in the sections containing the main text. Marginal notes in both versions give the "how" and "why" behind these ceremonies. Whereas the marginal readings in the preliminary version focus mainly on the how's and why's of the ceremonies in relation to Passover, in the later version these also include readings that teach about the ceremonies in general.

The text continues with *Yaḥatz* and the Aramaic introduction. An original plea for redemption of today's persecuted Jews accompanies the traditional opening call for freedom. The 1979 version explains that part of the purpose of the introduction is to spark the interest of the children and goes on to tell of several different customs used to involve children in the service. In the final edition, this comment is left out, indicating a decreasing emphasis on children in the service.

Breaking with the traditional order, the preliminary version goes directly to the four types of children. One of the marginal notes helps to explain the reason for the switch in order. It states:

> Before we ask the Four Questions, we tell of Four Children, four types of people, each of whom understands the meaning of this night differently. . . . . even the questions are viewed in many ways by different people (1979, p. 11).

Apparently, the reordering served to remind the service leaders of the necessity of shaping the service to meet the needs of the participants. Nevertheless, the second edition restored the text to its traditional order. Another variation from the traditional Haggadah is the use in the wise child's question of אותנו instead of אתכם. This change has its roots in variant versions of the four sons that appear in rabbinic literature (*Pesaḥim* 10:4), so even though this represents a departure from the traditional Haggadah, it is consistent with other historical renderings of the text. This Haggadah also eliminates the final paragraph about the four children, which offered an interpretation of Ex. 13:8. Here, one might assume, the editors are eliminating material that they find extraneous to the traditional Passover story.

The presentation of the Four Children highlights again the preference for inclusive language in the Haggadah. The translation offers a clear example of the care that the editor took in presenting an English text that refers to people without specifying males only. Instead of referring to the "sons," the text speaks of: "children" (1979, p. 12). This change is carried through in the translation of the question asked by each of the four children.

After the presentation of the four children, the service returns to the conventional order, with the four questions, and עבדים היינו. Both sections

appear in their original form. The preliminary version reintroduces a talmudic custom of removing the *Seder* plate during the recitation of the four questions. This innovation is not retained in the 1982 edition.

The *Seder* continues with Samuel's introduction to the *Maggid*. The preliminary version eliminates the rabbinic lessons of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Eleazar ben Azariah, juxtaposing Samuel's and Rav's versions of Israel's degradation. This change emphasizes that Israel's degradation can be derived from spiritual as well as physical slavery. Reciting the passage that describes our ancestors as idol worshippers, immediately following the passage on Egyptian bondage, reminds the participants that freedom involves the soul as well as the body. The 1982 service opts to reinstate the two rabbinic lessons left out previously. The later editor chose to maintain tradition rather than use this opportunity to stress the many facets of bondage.

The central portion of the service covers the details of the Exodus story. In the traditional text, Deut. 26:5-8 is deciphered and explained with *midrashic* commentary. The Conservative Haggadah retains this formula; however, many of the traditional *midrashim* are replaced either by other *midrashim*, biblical quotations or more modern interpretations. The editors skillfully replaced portions of the *Maggid* which had become "a little too recondite for the average modern Jew."[5] With the new interpretations, the editors succeed in presenting a detailed version of the Passover story, while eliminating elements that they felt did not add to the understanding of the Exodus. As will be shown, the two Conservative Haggadoth differ markedly

---

5 Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Review of Passover Haggadah: The Feast of Freedom" Conservative Judaism 35 (Spring, 1982): 81.

in this section of the service. The changes, however, do not disrupt the movement's aims.

After presenting Samuel's version of the degradation, the preliminary text skips the two paragraphs proclaiming God's redemption and protection of the Jews, ברוך שומר and והיא שעמדה. Both passages reappear in the final edition of the service. In place of the account of Laban's attempt to annihilate the Israelites, the story begins with a reading of the biblical verses that will be expounded. The preliminary version adds an explanation of ארמי אובד, that is neither in the traditional text nor the later Conservative edition. This explanation clarifies "that our ancestors wandered from place to place among the nations" (1979, p. 20). Replacing the traditional explanation for וירד מצרימה, the interpretation focuses again on the "spiritual descent" of the Israelites (Ibid). Instead of the traditional interpretation of ויגר שם, the text continues setting the stage for the Israelites' slavery. The biblical verse Gen. 15:13 foreshadows the bondage of the Israelites. The 1982 edition uses the traditional *midrashic* explanation for וירד מצרימה and adds to it the proof text Gen. 15:13, that had been employed in the earlier edition.

Both services maintain the traditional explanation of במתי מעט; however, the 1979 versions adds an explanatory sentence and the 1982 edition switches the order of this explanation, with the interpretation of ויגר שם following במתי מעט. There is no readily apparent reason for this transposition in the 1982 text. Perhaps, the editor wanted to separate the interpretation of במתי מעט from the next verse, ויהי שם לגוי גדול, so that it would not imply that Israel was great solely in numbers. The addition to the traditional *midrash* used for ויהי שם, supports this possibility. The addition stresses the morality of the Israelites and their dedication to the *mitzvoth*

Although the wording of the Hebrew and English of this interpretation differs between the 1979 and 1982 versions, the meaning conveyed is the same. Instead of dividing the text at גדול עצום, the Haggadah continues with עצום ורב. The interpretation for this section uses the customary explanation of גדול עצום. However the traditional sexual references found in of Ezek. 16:7 are not included in the elucidation.

In explaining the opening to Deut. 26:6, the Haggadah adds Ex. 1:8-9 to the traditional Ex. 1:10. The 1982 version inserts readings stressing the guilt of the Egyptians, stating: "They made us appear to be bad . . ." (1982, p. 47). The story continues with the combination of the traditional explanations for ויענונו and ויתנו עלינו under the sole heading of ויענונו. This allows for a new interpretation of ויתנו עלינו. Embellishing the story, the Haggadah describes the ways that the Egyptians further weakened the Israelites. Again, in this section, the Hebrew and English differ slightly between the preliminary and second editions, while the substance of the text remains comparable.

The elucidation of Deut. 26:7 opens with the traditional *midrash* to ונצעק אל יהוה, and supplements this with an extra interpretation for אלהי אבותינו. The preliminary edition contains a description of the Israelites rising up that is eliminated in the later edition. Focusing on the "merit of the fathers," the explanation of אלהי אבותינו employs the traditional *midrash* for וישמע יהוה. In the preliminary version וישמע יהוה is expanded upon with Ex. 3:7-8, which explains God's reaction to the Israelites' suffering. Ps. 91:15 and Is. 63:9, emphasizing God's empathy with the Israelites' pain, are added to this explanation the 1982 edition. Instead of the traditional comment on ויראו, the Conservative text explains how the Israelites cared for each other. While the traditional Haggadah explains that men and

women were separated, the Conservative text adds an interpretation of את עניינו focusing on the role that the women played in keeping faith that redemption would come. Further embellishing the text of ואת עמלנו is the story of the dedication of the Israelites who continued to circumcise their sons. In a similar fashion, the story is expanded in the explanation of ואת לחצנו. In place of the customary reading, the text employs Ex. 5:7, which stresses the commitment the Israelites had to each other. Clearly, these edifications give a fuller picture of the strength of the Israelites under the stress of slavery.

The Conservative text begins the interpretation of Deut. 28:8 utilizing the traditional text. It describes God's personal judgment against the Egyptians. However, instead of continuing in the description of the plagues with ביד חזקה, the Conservative Haggadoth describe God's mercy in redeeming the Israelites. Skipping the explanation to ובזרוע נטויה, the text continues with the traditional rendering for ובמורא גדול. The preliminary edition offers an alternative explanation for באותות, explaining that the redemption will be a sign of the covenant between God and the Jews. The 1982 edition restores the traditional interpretation and moves this alternative explanation to the דבר אחר. The Conservative text places the final *midrash*, explaining ובמופתים as a prelude to the Ten Plagues. The section telling the story is concluded by the spilling of a drop of wine for each plague and additional verses from the book of Exodus detailing the Israelites' flight out of Egypt. The text includes the *aggadah* that explains why God was so harsh to the Egyptians, and yet refused to let the angels rejoice at their destruction. This serves to temper the celebration with a universal compassion for all who suffer pain. In the 1982 edition these final

paragraphs do not appear. The apologetics for the pain of the Egyptians is removed.

Leaving out the discourses on the plagues, the *Seder* continues with the recitation of דיינו. The preliminary edition leaves out the following verses: passed judgment on their gods, killed the first born, gave us their substance, and sunk our oppressors. This gets rid of all of the verses that reflect acts that God committed against the Egyptians, with the exception of the included verse; "brought judgments against them" (1979, p. 36). This transforms the דיינו from its dual focus, on God's victory over the Egyptians and on God's benevolence to the Israelites, to a hymn solely for the latter. The 1982 edition also includes the verse: "passed judgment on their gods" (1982, p. 61). The tenor of the reading reflects praise for the many positive acts that God performed for Israel, while minimizing God's vengeance. Instead of a repetition of all of the miracles God has enacted for Israel, the summary of דיינו offers thanks for the wonders that God has performed for us. Following דיינו, the 1982 edition adds additional biblical verses detailing the Israelites' reaching dry land, Pharaoh's army drowning, and Miriam leading the women in song and dance.

At this point, the preliminary edition deviates from the traditional texts and continues with בכל דור. Rabban Gamliel's ruling that the *Pesah*, *Matzah*, and *Maror* be explained and the elucidation of these three symbols are not found it their original place. Instead, they are broken up into the section of the blessings over the symbols before the meal. Consistent with other restorations of the traditional order, the 1982 edition places the explanation of the symbols back to its customary place. From בכל דור, to לפיכך and *Hallel*, the Conservative text does not deviate from tradition. The redemption blessing omits the reference to restoring the bloody

sacrificial offerings in the Temple: ונואכל שם מן הזבחים . . . יגיע דמם על קיר מזבחך לרצון (1979 p. 39). Preceding the blessing over the second cup of wine, the text contains a meditation retelling God's redemption, as detailed in Ex. 6:6.

The remainder of the customary blessings that precede the meal are found in their traditional form. Woven between the blessings are the explanations of the Passover symbols. These explanations also appear in their original form. The only change is the omission of the last line of the *Pesah* explanation, ויקוד העם וישתחוו. Like the elimination in the redemption blessing, this change indicates Conservatism's decreasing emphasis on the Temple Cult. The preliminary edition adds suggested topics to discuss during the meal itself, while the later edition eliminates this directive.

After the sharing of the *afikomen*, the service offers both a short and long version of the Blessing after Meals. Added to the traditional blessing is a petition for the State of Israel, and in the 1982 edition a petition for the company of the righteous and for "this land." This introduction of a petition for the United States of America echoes the reality of the Conservative movement, where a minority may choose to make *Aliyah*, but most are both thankful and satisfied to be in America. Instead of translating לימות המשיח as "for the days of the Messiah", the translation reads: "consider us worthy of the messianic era" (1979, p. 55). The preliminary edition transfers הרחמן הוא ישלח לנו את אליהו הנביא so that it precedes the fourth cup of wine; the 1982 edition leaves this portion in the *Bareki*. Interestingly, the responses to the first part of the *Bareki* are transliterated. The only other Hebrew that is transliterated are several songs in both editions, and the call for "next year in Jerusalem," in the 1982 version. The short version of

Barekh includes the responsive introduction, the first paragraph, a modified version of נודה לך combined with parts of ועל הכל, a portion of רחם יי (concluding with ובנה ירושלים), a section of האל אבינו with the addition of hopes for the coming of the days of the Messiah, הרחמן for those gathered, for Shabbat, and for the festival, a final call for blessing and עושה שלום (1979 pp. 57-60). The 1982 short blessing also includes most of the paragraph beginning רצה והחליצנו and a modified version of יעלה ויבא, and concludes with a petition for satisfaction and יהוה עז (1982, pp. 88-93). *Barekh* is followed by a portion of Ex. 6:6 as the meditation before the third cup of wine and the blessing over the third cup.

Before opening the door for Elijah and the recitation of *Hallel*, the Haggadah inserts several readings that expand on the theme of the evening. Included in the selection are the following traditional portions, that were left out of the prior text, מעשה ברבי אליעזר, ברוך שומר, והיא שעמדה and אמר רבי אלעזר. Stories of modern bondage from the Holocaust to oppression in the Soviet Union are also found here. In the midst of these stories the 1979 version inserts Pss. 79:2-9 and 69:25. These Psalms contain the traditional plea for God to pour wrath upon those who have harmed Israel, which usually accompanies the opening of the door for Elijah. The 1982 edition modifies this section, adding several modern readings and excising most of the traditional rabbinic materials. Many of the traditional readings that are displaced to this section in the preliminary version are found in their traditional places in the 1982 edition. In the 1982 edition the layout very clearly marks this section as supplementary, while in the preliminary text only a marginal note differentiates the supplementary material from the main text.

Verses from Maleachai, Jeremiah, and Deuteronomy replace שמוך in the text read while the door is opened for Elijah. Culminating with Deut. 26:9 these verses speak of the coming of Elijah and the fulfillment of God's promise to return the Jews to the Promised Land. The 1982 text opts to restore שמוך, but it tempers it with the message of hope found in Mal. 3:23-24. Accompanying the wrathful שמוך are two pages of apologetics which incorporate interpretations of Elijah as the "herald of the messianic era" (1982, p. 103). So, too, the second edition inserts an explanation of the fifth cup set aside for Elijah and the future redemption that it represents. Following the ceremony of opening the door, the latter edition contains several more supplementary readings focusing on the hope for the messianic age.

The *Hallel* appears in complete form, with the deletion of Ps. 136. Added to the conclusion of יהללוך יהוה is the benediction, ברוך אתה יי מלך מהלל בתשבחו (1979, p. 79). The preliminary edition does not include נשמת כל חי; however, it is restored in full form in the 1982 edition. Prior to the final cup of wine and the concluding blessings, the service inserts the familiar songs and poetry of the festival. All of the customary songs, with the exception of "And it Came to Pass at Midnight" and ואמרתם זבח פסח, are represented in full or partial form. While the preliminary version provides some translation for כי לא נאה and אדיר הוא, the 1982 edition only offers the Hebrew. The preliminary edition includes poetry from the *piyyutim*, several verses from Song of Songs, and the song "Let My People Go." The 1982 text eliminates these additions and inserts the counting of the *Omer* in this section. However, the customary conclusion to the counting of the *Omer*, which calls for the rebuilding of the Temple, is left out.

The service concludes with the fourth cup of wine and the final benedictions in their traditional form. As with the previous cups of wine, the fourth cup is preceded by a meditation on redemption. The message before the final cup comes from Ex. 6:7 and stresses God's special relationship with the Jews. The preliminary edition also includes the petition for God to send Elijah, which was left out of the blessing after the meal. The benediction, שעשני בן חורין, is added to the final prayer in the 1979 edition. These two additions are left out of the 1982 Haggadah. Both editions conclude with the traditional Hebrew pronouncement: חסל סדור פסח (1979, p. 99; 1982, p. 136). The preliminary version offers an English translation of this text. The final edition replaces the translation with a summary of the service, from retelling of the story to praying for redemption.

A wealth of marginal notes supplement the main text of The Feast of Freedom. These readings are composed of commentary on the service ranging from *midrash* to modern philosophy. Some of the comments address theological issues, while others focus on values and practice. Many clarify the historical context of the *Seder* text. The marginal notes also offer explanations about how to carry out specific aspects of the ritual and why the service contains these rituals. Serving as an educational tool, these notes are not meant to be read in their entirety during the *Seder*. They refrain, for the most part, from offering modern historical parallels to the events of the Exodus. Instead, expressions of the modern suffering and hopes for redemption are contained in the supplementary sections that follow the meal.

Comparing the 1982 Feast of Freedom to the 1979 preliminary edition, it is evident that the Committee heard a loud cry in favor of more tradition

in the service. The 1979 edition's reordering of the service was uncharacteristic of the Conservative movement, which allows for deviation from tradition only after all attempts to reinterpret the original forms are exhausted. Not surprisingly, the 1982 edition restores the four children and the explanations of the *Matzah, Maror,* and *Haroset* to their traditional places in the service. Readings that had been "exiled" to the supplementary section, (including: שמור, והיא שעמדה, ברוך שומר, and others) are returned to the main sections of the service. These changes result in the presentation of a text that adheres to the traditional order more closely.

Aesthetically, The Feast of Freedom adds colorful illustrations to accent the service. The art work serves to heighten the experience of the service, by accentuating specific parts of the liturgy. The supplementary sections are set off by colored pages that clearly distinguish where the main text stops and picks up again. Additionally, The Feast of Freedom moves to the margins the commentary that followed the main text of many sections of the preliminary service. The resulting layout is much easier to follow and much more pleasing than the preliminary version.

Although the revisions were significant, the final text retains the same basic flavor of the preliminary edition. The Feast of Freedom is a markedly Conservative document. The following analysis will explore how the service echoes the priorities and the values of the movement. The treatment of Zion, peoplehood, the messianic age, and other philosophical concerns of the movement will be examined. Though the service deviates from tradition in some places, on the whole, it presents a viable Haggadah for the Conservative movement.

The Conservative movement has always placed a high value on the particularistic nature of the Jewish people. Jews are part of a special

covenantal relationship with God, that involves responsibility to respect Jewish law. Robert Gordis summed up a Conservative view of particularism when he wrote:

> When God reveals Himself . . . it requires a seeing eye and a sensitive heart to recognize his presence. Herein lies the unique role of Israel as the instrument of Revelation. . . . Its [Israel's] distinction has lain in its genius for religion.[6]

These beliefs are portrayed in the main text of the Haggadah and in the marginal notes as well. The translation of the *Kiddush* retains the references to Israel being chosen to follow the *mitzvoth*. One marginal reading states: "On this night of bonding, of unity and community, we gather together to celebrate our birth as a nation . . . to ratify our collective covenant" (1982, p. 27). Moreover the reformulation of the section on Deut. 26:6-8 serves to enhance the unique image of the Jewish people. In this section the Israelites are described as persevering, dedicated, highly moral and just. The section added to the traditional rendering describes the Israelites as "unique, recognized as a distinctive nation . . . . They were never suspected of unchastity or of slander; they did not change their names and they did not change their language" (1982, p. 47). Thus the Conservative Haggadah describes Jews not only as chosen but also as morally exceptional.

Support for the State of Israel in The Feast of Freedom, reflects one of the strongest and longest standing positions of Conservatism. Solomon Schechter heralded Zionist ideals from the earliest days of the movement. He felt that "such participation is more than a matter of politics; it is a matter

---

[6] Robert Gordis, Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement (New York: Schocken Books, 1972), p. 53.

of the spiritual well-being of the Jew."[7] The Feast of Freedom is replete with references to the State of Israel and to the messianic hopes linked to the Homeland. In commenting on the blessing after meals, the text carefully explains how Diaspora Jews can be loyal both to Israel and to the land in which they live (1982, p. 85). Conservatism believes the spiritual hope of Israel lies in the vision of a messianic age as well as hope for the welfare of the physical state. The Conservative Haggadah expresses this in the cup of wine set aside for Elijah, stating: "It is proposed that the Cup of Elijah become the Fifth Cup of the *Seder*, the Cup of Redemption, in honor of Israel, the beginning of the flower of our redemption" (1982, p. 11). Thus, one finds the strong sense of allegiance to the State of Israel throughout this Haggadah.

Ever since Zechariah Frankel walked out of the Frankfurt Conference over an argument about the use of Hebrew in the liturgy, allegiance to Hebrew as the Jewish language for prayer has been a pillar of the Conservative movement. Consistently, the liturgies of Conservatism have employed traditional Hebrew texts. Recently, though, the movement has begun to recognize that many of its members have not mastered an understanding of Hebrew. Rabbi Jules Harlow concedes:

> Responsive readings in English enable people who otherwise would not be able to participate in a service to do so. While everyone should be encouraged and helped to learn enough Hebrew to be able to pray in the original.[8]

---

[7] Mordecai Kaplan, Unity in Diversity in the Conservative Movement, (New York: The United Synagogue of America, 1947? [date indicated by library, not in publication]), p. 6.

[8] Jules Harlow, "Introducing Siddur Sim Shalom," Conservative Judaism 37 (Summer, 1984): 14.

The Conservative Haggadah seems to reflect Harlow's philosophy toward Hebrew. All Hebrew passages appear in translation, or paraphrase. Sections which have been added to the main text are found in both Hebrew and English. Much of the new Hebrew text was carefully re-edited for the 1982 edition. However, keeping with the movement's respect for tradition, very few changes occur in the traditional Hebrew of the service.

Instead of praying for the coming of the Messiah and for the restoration of sacrifices at the Temple, Conservatism focuses on hopes for a messianic age. Since the publication of the first Conservative Sabbath and Festival Prayer Book, the movement has sought to curtail references to hopes for the return of the sacrificial cult.[9] This ideal is carried through in the Conservative Haggadah. The hope for the coming of the Messiah and for restoration of the Temple cult has been replaced with petitions for the coming of the messianic age. Gordis explained the movements goals:

> For us today, the Messiah is the poetic and infinitely moving symbol of the Messianic age, which is to be ushered in through the united effort of all men to achieve social and economic justice, universal freedom and world peace.[10]

Generally, the Conservative text translates לימות המשיח as "to the messianic era," instead of "to the days of the Messiah." The ideas expressed in the commentary on the third cup of wine reflect the ideals of the redemptive and messianic age found frequently in the Haggadah. It states:

> Some believe that redemption- like revelation- is continuous and that every human being is intimately implicated in the process, endowed with the ability to help or hinder, advance or delay it (1982, p. 92).

---

9 Robert Gordis, "A Jewish Prayer Book for the Modern Age," Conservative Judaism 2 (October, 1945): 14.

10 Gordis, Conservative Judaism: An American . . ., pp. 51-52.

Conservatism's acceptance of women's participation in traditionally male aspects of Judaism has evolved over the history of the movement. The language used in The Feast of Freedom reflects the present-day status of this issue in Conservative Judaism. On the one hand, women are being given more and more freedom to participate from the pulpit; on the other, a group of right-wing Conservative Jews are raising objections and excluding women more and more. The Haggadah leans more toward inclusion of women in ritual. As was mentioned in the analysis of the service, the English text uses inclusive language in reference to people. Several of the marginal readings serve to indicate the status of women in Jewish history. One example explains that the midwives, Shifra and Puah, defied Pharaoh and started a resistance movement encouraging the Israelite women to continue to get pregnant (1982, p. 50). However, the references to God still use the male pronouns which are equivalent to the Hebrew counterparts. None of the traditional Hebrew text is altered to reflect inclusive language.

Conservatism approaches Jewish law from the perspective of "conservation." All else being equal, the *Halakhah* should be preserved and followed. Nevertheless, the law can be altered or modified if it defies modernity. Seymour Siegel outlines an approach to modifying Jewish law. His steps include:

> Seek out the precedent. Unless there is good reason to do otherwise, we are bound to the precedent. . . . If the precedent is deficient in meeting the needs of the people, if it is clearly foreign to the group of law-observers in the community . . . then the law can be modified either by outright abrogation, or by ignoring it, or by modifying it.[11]

---

11 Seymour Siegel, Conservative Judaism and Jewish Law, (New York: The Rabbinical Assembly, 1977), p. xxv.

The text of the Conservative Haggadah seems to follow this procedure in its selection of liturgy. Generally deviations from tradition are thoroughly explained.

The Haggadah's retelling of the history of the Exodus, presents an unusual break with tradition. This innovation is partially explained but the explanation seems to be counter to the general Conservative approach. It seems doubtful that the Conservative leadership would accept the replacement of traditional portions of the Shabbat liturgy in order to present a more "straightforward" (1979, p. vii) version of the service. It is more likely that the Publications Committee would supplement the traditional text with new interpretations to make the passages less obscure. However the result of the carefully reconstituted version of the Exodus story offers a clearer picture of the Israelites journey from slavery into freedom. It replaces traditional interpretations that are of little significance to most contemporary Jews with readings from biblical and rabbinic texts. These readings match the form of the original section and contribute a meaningful formulation of the Exodus story. Perhaps, since the goal of the Haggadah is the <u>understanding</u> of the story as well as the recitation the service, the standards for alteration may be different than in the case of a service that is purely liturgical. Surely the reformation of this section has resulted in a retelling that is both more intelligible and appealing to most readers than its traditional counterpart.

The introduction to the second edition of the Conservative Haggadah states: "This one [Haggadah] is different primarily because it is the first that faithfully reflects Conservative ideology" (1982, p. 6). Although it would be hard to pinpoint one specific ideology that represents Conservatism, the process by which Conservative Jews approach Judaism is certainly reflected

in The Feast of Freedom. The service presented is obviously the result of an in-depth study of the history and tradition of the Passover *Seder*. The innovations do not substitute tradition with modern idioms, rather they evolve from depths of Jewish learning. The three directives that guided Robert Gordis in the first major Conservative liturgical publication--"continuity with tradition, relevance to contemporary needs, and intellectual integrity"[12]-- have served the movement well in the production of The Feast of Freedom.

---

12 Gordis, "A Jewish Prayer Book . . ." pp. 9-11.

The Reconstructionist Movement: Its Philosophy and Liturgy

Reconstructionism was first developed as a philosophy, an intellectual way of viewing modern Judaism, rather than as a separate movement. Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan formulated the basis for the Reconstructionist understanding of Judaism while serving on the faculty of the Jewish Theological Seminary of the Conservative movement. His Judaism as a Civilization redefined Judaism as more than just a religion or people. He explained: "The Reconstructionist Movement: -- Defines Judaism as an evolving religious civilization which includes peoplehood, history, language, music, literature and art as well as religion."[1] The Reconstructionists conceptualize an integrated Judaism, in which religion, culture, history and ethical ideals are inseparably intertwined.

Reconstructionist thought asserts that it is critical for the Jewish civilization to respond to modernity. The emphasis on evolution indicates that each generation must grapple with ways to keep the intricacies of the organic whole viable. Kaplan explains, "we fail to grasp the meaning of Judaism . . . unless we see it as the dynamic life-pattern of a people with a long history and with the aspiration for a creative future."[2] Without dynamic change, Reconstructionists predicted that Judaism was destined to wither away. Static traditional concepts were failing to answer modern dilemmas. Reconstructionism offers the bridge between tradition and change:

---

[1] Mordecai M. Kaplan, Judaism as a Modern Religious Civilization (New York: Reconstructionist Press, 1957), inside cover.

[2] Mordecai M. Kaplan, "The Meaning of Reconstructionism," Reconstructionist 6 (Feb. 16, 1940): 8.

> it gives Judaism 'concreteness and adequacy.' In formulating a modern scientific ideology based on the assumption that Judaism is an evolving religious civilization, Reconstructionism is habituating Jewish life to the scientific climate of our day [3]

In this light Reconstructionism shapes Jewish practice around both historic responses and the prevalent conceptions in society.

In the early days of Reconstructionist thought many felt that the existing Jewish movements lacked ideologies which could offer a clear path for this dynamic process. Both the Conservative and Reform movements allowed for changes in light of modernity; however, neither provided direction specific enough for the Reconstructionists. Kaplan warned,

> No civilization . . . that is content to drift aimlessly has the slightest chance of surviving. It is in the spirit, therefore, of adopting the best in other civilizations and cooperating with them, and not in . . . yielding to their superior force or prestige, that Judaism should enter upon what will constitute the next stage in evolution.[4]

Thus, Reconstructionists developed a Jewish response to society that revitalized Judaism in light of today's civilizations.

This response was an answer from within the existing Jewish community structure, rather than a revolt against that structure. Kaplan and his followers were not satisfied with the alternatives offered by the liberal movements in America, but they were not rejecting the philosophy behind the movements themselves. The editors of the Reconstructionist emphasized early on: "Reconstructionism does not seek to . . . enter a new organization into the competition for American Jewry. It seeks to enlist members who

---

[3] Mordecai M. Kaplan, "Aims of Reconstructionism," reprinted from Reconstructionist 28 (June 15, 1962): 1.

[4] Kaplan, Judaism as . . ., p. 2.

will . . . influence the course of Jewish life through the existing institutions."[5] The boldness of Reform was admired, though the Reconstructionists felt that the reformers had gone too far in reducing Judaism to just a religion. They not only accepted Conservative methodology, they saw it as congruent with the program they were advocating.

Rabbi Ira Eisenstein, a co-founder of Reconstructionism and Kaplan's son-in-law, articulated that Reconstructionism was a natural extension of Conservatism. He explained that Schechter's conception of Catholic Israel

> meant that it was the Jewish People who established in every age what Judaism should mean to it in that age . . . . The obvious inference . . . was that Judaism should be understood as the evolving religious civilization of the Jewish People.[6]

Though this seemed so obvious to the Reconstructionists, the Conservative movement never embraced the major deviations from tradition preferred by Reconstructionism. In 1960, realizing that they would never fully fit into the Conservative or Reform programs, the Reconstructionist movement finally declared itself a separate branch of Judaism. Kaplan remained a professor at the Conservative seminary until his retirement. However, the Reconstructionists began forming their own congregations and eventually in 1968, formed their own Rabbinical school, the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College (R.R.C.). By then it was hard to deny that Reconstructionism had evolved into a separate movement rather than just an ideology to guide other movements.

The ideology of Reconstructionism stresses the growth of the Jewish civilization through a specific program. The Reconstructionists have always

---

5 Editorial Board, Reconstructionist 6 (Feb. 16, 1940): 3.

6 Ira Eisenstein, The Reconstructionist Movement (New York: Reconstructionist Press, 196?), pp. 6-7.

supported Zionism, and since the birth of the Jewish State, have considered Israel the cultural center of Jewish activity. Instead of adhering to supernatural views of God, revelation, and redemption, Reconstructionism introduced natural theological conceptions considered compatible with modern scientific understandings of the world. Further, Reconstructionists feel that emancipation and democracy rendered the concept of Jewish chosenness obsolete and even destructive.

In order to implement these beliefs, Kaplan put forth a platform of six priorities for action in the movement:

> 1. Active participation in the upbuilding of Palestine.
> 2. The reinterpretation of our tradition in light of growing knowledge.
> 3. The reorganization of all our communal endeavors with a view to their functioning as a means to Jewish survival.
> 4. The democratization of the synagogue and the vitalization of its religious, ethical and cultural functions.
> 5. The fostering of Hebraic cultural creativity.
> 6. Active participation in social reform.[7]

It is not accidental that the building of Palestine appeared first on the list. The movement has seen the State of Israel, since its rebirth, as the center of Jewish nourishment and growth. Since Reconstructionist ideology rejects the notion of supernatural salvation in a hereafter, the State of Israel is adopted as the focus of salvation in this world. The Jewish quest for a fulfilling life depends on a physical place that can serve as the catalyst for unification of Jews.[8] The State of Israel functions to provide a creative example for Jewish development.

---

[7] Kaplan, "The Meaning of . . .," p. 10.

[8] Mordecai M. Kaplan, Judaism Without Supernaturalism (New York: Reconstructionist Press, 1967), pp. 185-186.

After the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel, Kaplan refined his priorities somewhat, emphasizing Jewish survival around the world. He claimed:

> First, the Jewish People can no longer be expected to become a landbound people. Second, *Eretz Yisrael*. . . can no longer be counted upon to contain all who are Jews, or even the majority of them. Third, the Jewish religion can no longer be required to be entirely uniform in its practices and beliefs.[9]

Although Kaplan offered one distinct program that fit his world view, he realized that Jews must all have the right to choose practices that fit their own ideas. Kaplan, in this writing, had acknowledged the need to accept the pluralism that had become a fact of the Jewish people.

The ramifications of the Reconstructionists' ideology and plan of action have been clearly expressed in their liturgy. They have reconstructed worship services to reflect interpretations consistent with their views. Although Reconstructionism did not become a separate movement until relatively late, their liturgy dates back to the early years of Reconstructionist thought. The leaders of the Reconstructionist ideology began creating liturgy that they felt was compatible with the other liberal movements of America. They felt that the consideration of preserving unity through tradition had to be modified when that tradition was so out of line with modern understandings. The writers of the Sabbath Prayer Book lamented: "Many modern Jews have lost . . . their sense of need for worship and prayer . . . . The motions survive; the emotions have fled."[10] Thus, they wanted to

---

9 Ibid., p. 183.

10 Mordecai M. Kaplan, Eugene Kohn, Milton Steinberg, Ira Eisenstein, eds., Introduction to the Sabbath Prayer Book, reprinted from the first ed. (New York: Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, 1945), p. 3.

restimulate the interest of Jews by offering liturgy congruent with contemporary thinking.

Specifically problematic were the references to supernaturalism in respect to God, revelation, and past and future redemption. Along with these, the doctrine of the Jews as a Chosen People also did not fit well with Reconstructionist thinking. Changes in their liturgy reflect their ideals, eliminating what was outside the parameters of their ideology and replacing it with more congruent forms of worship. Unlike the Conservative liturgy which focuses on retaining tradition and reinterpreting it, the Reconstructionists felt that honest presentation often required replacement of offensive passages. The editors of the new liturgy explained:

> To read those new meanings into the traditional text by way of translation is to violate the principle of forthrightness. To assume that the average worshipper will arrive at them of his own accord is to expect the unattainable . . . . We dare not take the chance of conveying meanings which do not conform with the best in our religious thinking and feeling.[11]

Nevertheless, the writers of the new liturgies felt compelled to maintain traditional forms. The rich tradition of generations of Jewish civilizations could not be tossed out for generic humanist forms. The leaders of Reconstructionism realized that the uniqueness of each civilization lay in the ability of its own customs to stimulate the values of the universal goals of freedom, justice and peace. They found it "necessary to retain the classical framework of the service and to adhere to the fundamental teachings of that tradition concerning God, man and the world."[12]

---

11 Ibid., p. 9.
12 Ibid.

Reconstructionism suggests that individuals choose practices that meet their needs and brings them closer to the Jewish people.

Development of liturgy was one of the main activities of early Reconstructionism. They sought to reinvigorate a worship experience which had grown meaningless for most Jews. The New Haggadah, published in 1941, was the first liturgy written by the Reconstructionists. It was soon followed by the publication of Sabbath and Festival prayer books. These early writings indicate the zeal to present acceptable and stimulating forms of worship.

The New Haggadah: 1941, 1942 Revised Edition, 1978 Revised Edition

The Reconstructionist thinkers developed their Passover service because they felt the old service was so fraught with unacceptable formulations it had lost its effectiveness in emphasizing the central call for freedom. Given the Reconstructionist re-evaluation of past and future redemption it is not surprising that they turned to the Haggadah for their first liturgical revisions. The *Seder*, as Kaplan explained, "is inherently a fascinating religious observance. Yet when we note the way in which it is conducted, we cannot help feeling that our people fail to make the most of it."[1] Thus, the Haggadah offered a receptive testing ground for Reconstructionism -- Jews had positive feelings about the holiday and were in need of a service to match their expectations.

The traditional Haggadah was unsatisfactory for many reasons. Kaplan complained that the traditional service is "entangled in legalistic discussion" and bogged down by "labored rabbinic rendition."[2] He felt that many of these passages distracted from the beauty of the *Seder* experience. Equally objectionable were the supernatural references, depicting God's miraculous redemption of the Israelites and the hope for similar future redemption. The possibility of retaining these concepts, which are not part of the Reconstructionist world view, was considered hypocritical. Kaplan explained that adhering to old forms "makes of the Haggadah a means of taking us into a world of make-believe . . . . This nostalgia for the old . . . is actually nothing more than a form of spiritual inertia."[3] Intellectual

---

1 Kaplan, "The New Haggadah," The Reconstructionist 7 (April 18, 1941): 17.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., p. 18.

integrity was paramount to the Reconstructionist liturgist, and the traditional Haggadah contained too many passages that were intellectually incompatible with their ideology.

Nevertheless, the Reconstructionists did not wish to imply that their new *Seder* service was the definitive liturgy. Reconstructionists have consistently viewed tradition as a vehicle to contribute to the continuation of the Jewish People. They have held that those traditions beneficial to one's identification with Judaism should be observed. Likewise, they have stressed that those who find the parts of tradition detrimental to their practice of Judaism should have other Jewish forms from which to choose. Thus in explaining the liturgy, the editors gave the following disclaimer:

> The impression must not be gained, however, that the New Haggadah is offered in any sense as a new dispensation. . . . It has no authoritative . . . status. The Reconstructionist Foundation has no intention of declaring 'in error' those who do not utilize the New Haggadah.[4]

It was in this light that the editors of The New Haggadah formulated the principles behind their liturgy. The production of an intellectually congruent and stimulating service was paramount to their efforts. Kaplan considered it important that, "Especially an observance like the Passover *Seder*, which still retains something of its historic appeal, does not contain anything that is . . . meaningless. Every moment . . . should be exciting and uplifting."[5] In keeping with Reconstructionist ideology, this required excising references to chosenness, the restoration of the Temple cult and God's supernatural revelation. To preserve intellectual integrity, deletions are made both in the Hebrew and in English texts.

---

[4] Editorial board, "Postscript to Pesah" Reconstructionist 7 (May 16, 1941) 5

[5] Kaplan, "The New Haggadah," p. 18.

Replacing the texts that were considered obsolete, the Haggadah adds a variety of new readings. Many of the changes substitute biblical readings for the traditional text; this is consistent with the Reconstructionist ideal of maintaining a connection to the Jewish heritage. Examples of this are found in the reformation of the story of the Israelites' journey from slavery, and the added reading on Moses' contribution. Additionally, the service includes explanations that clarify sections of the service and highlight the services emphasis on the theme of freedom.

The revisions to The New Haggadah do not contain substantial changes from the original versions. The few modifications made are more structural than philosophical. For example, small sections of the English are reparaphrased, to facilitate a smoother service. So, too, both revisions read from right to left, while the original version reads from left to right. The 1978 edition makes changes that also reflect philosophical considerations. The newest edition updates both language and ideas in some readings to make them more meaningful to the modern Jew. Also new in the 1978 edition is a meditation on the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel.

The following analysis of the Reconstructionist Haggadah will compare the service to its traditional counterpart and to Reconstructionist ideals. References to The New Haggadah will apply to all of the editions unless differences in the revisions are mentioned. In the evaluation of the text, it becomes clear early on that the English represents more of a paraphrase than a translation. The analysis will reveal that much of the English is simplified to present a clear understanding of the *Seder*.

The preliminaries to the service omit the explanation of the custom of searching for חמץ and ערוב תבשילים. It is unclear why these traditional

customs are left out, as neither of them seem to present ideological problems for Reconstructionism. The service is preceded by a delineation of the traditional *Seder* symbols. Though the service does not open with the lighting of the festival candles, the directions for arranging the Seder table include reference to the candles. All of the traditional symbols are explained fully, including references to the Temple sacrifices. The Reconstructionists did not seek to change the historic perception of Israel's sacrificial past; however, they did not adhere to the hope for restoration of the sacrifices. The preliminary section concludes with the list of the order of the service, including short explanations and page numbers for each section. The introduction to the Haggadah using this traditional framework demonstrated the Reconstructionist commitment to restructuring the liturgy through utilizing the lessons of the Jewish heritage.

Before the formal benediction for the *Kiddush*, the service opens with an invocation. The invocation foreshadows the theme of universal freedom in the Haggadah. It states:

> On this night . . . our forefathers hearkened to the call of freedom. Tonight that call rings out again . . . commanding us to champion the cause of all the oppressed and the downtrodden, summoning all the peoples throughout the world to arise and be free.[6]

The *Kiddush* omits the traditional references to chosenness. In the sanctification the text leaves out:

אשר בחר בנו מכל עם ורוממנו מכל לשון & בנו בחרת ואותנו קדשת מכל העמים. The latter is replaced with: בי אותנו קרבת לעבודתך. (1941, p. 7). Passages similar to those left out in the sanctification are also omitted in the

---

6 Mordecai M. Kaplan, Eugene Kohn, and Ira Eisenstein, eds., The New Haggadah (New York: Behrman House, 1941), p. 3. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the text by year of publication).

Havdalah It eliminates: בין ישראל לעמים and הבדלת וקדשת את עמך ישראל בקדשתך All of these changes reflect the Reconstructionists' philosophical opposition to the concept of the Chosen People.

The hand washing and first dipping follow the traditional formats as do the *Yahatz* and the Aramaic introduction. The blessing over the first dipping is preceded by an introductory statement emphasizing the green as a symbol of spring. With this reference the editors reiterated one of the traditional interpretations of the Passover Festival. The 1978 edition expands this statement with an English paraphrase of Song of Songs 2:11-13. After the breaking of the middle *matzah*, the importance of the *afikomen* is explained. The reading includes the interpretation of the *afikomen* as reminiscent of the sharing of the Paschal lamb (1941, p. 9). The reference to the Paschal sacrifice again demonstrates the Reconstructionist dedication to presenting a complete portrayal of Jewish history. The Aramaic introduction follows the tradition in Aramaic. The universal theme of justice for all is emphasized in the English. The paraphrase inserts the hope for the time when "all mankind will enjoy freedom, justice and peace," and replaces the call of "next year in Israel" with the hope that "*Eretz Yisrael* will be upbuilt" (1941, p. 10).

Following the הא לחמא, the theme of freedom is expanded further, through a series of new readings. The readings explore the physical, emotional, economic, and bigoted forms of bondage that enslave humanity. The text indicates clearly that slavery reaches all segments of society through the torment that individuals bring upon themselves and the injustices that individuals bring upon each other. Added to these all-embracing forms of injustice, the Haggadah adds the specific form of degradation that has most affected the Jews: prejudice and intolerance.

While the other impediments to freedom are mentioned in terms of all humanity, that of intolerance is illustrated solely by the hardships that Jews have faced. The universal lesson is tempered with a particular Jewish orientation. The presentation of the added text here epitomizes the Reconstructionists' approach to altering the text. On the one hand they present universal ideals, and on the other they portray the specific Jewish orientation toward those ideals.

The four questions, recited by the youngest child, follow the traditional Hebrew. The English translations are embellished with details that clarify the purpose of the questions. For example, in the third question, the text gives the details of the two dippings, stating: "why, on this night, do we dip the parsley in salt water and the bitter herbs in *Haroseth*?" (1941, p. 14). This clarification serves to make the sometimes elliptic traditional text more accessible to the participants. However, some of the English seems a bit over-simplified here. For example, the third question opens: "On all other nights, we never do anything like dipping one food . . ." (Ibid.). The latter editions refine this English somewhat, replacing it with: "On all other nights we never think of dipping herbs . . . ."[7] The fourth question, concerning reclining, is left intact, even though the service does not indicate that one should recline at the usual blessings. The answer that follows implies that everyone should recline on special cushions throughout the whole service.

Unlike the traditional service, which never formally answers the four questions, The New Haggadah offers two pages of responses to the specific questions. The answers briefly tell of the reasons for the major changes in

---

[7] Mordecai M. Kaplan, Eugene Kohn, and Ira Eisenstein, eds., The New Haggadah rev. ed., 1942, p. 15. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the text by year of publication).

the *Seder* meal. Using the format of directly answering the questions solves one of the problems that Kaplan had with the traditional service, namely, that the service was not direct enough. Additionally, the writers once again take the opportunity to highlight the cause of freedom. In the explanation of reclining, the narration leaves out the fact that reclining used to indicate wealth, and only states: "reclining at the table was a sign of a free man in olden times" (1941, p. 19).

This section seems especially geared towards the young. The language is more typical of a children's primer than of a solemn liturgy. The passage opens: "Indeed, tonight *is* very different from all the other nights of the year, for on this night we celebrate one of the most important moments in the history of our people" (1941, p. 18). It continues with an even more condescending reply, exclaiming: "I am glad you asked the questions you did, for the story of this night was just what I wanted you to know" (Ibid.). The 1978 revision modifies this second paragraph to make it more fitting for the liturgy. It replaces "I am glad you asked . . ." with "On this night, too, we retell our people's story. . . . Before the telling begins, we can answer these four questions in a few short words."[8]

After this diversion, the text continues with the traditional *Maggid* עבדים היינו appears in its standard form in Hebrew, and has a fairly close English paraphrase. The English introduces the passage by pointing out its roots in Jewish texts, again stressing the Reconstructionist commitment to the Jewish heritage. Instead of completing the passage with the general traditional phrase: "whosoever tells the story of the departure at great

---

8 Mordecai M. Kaplan, Eugene Kohn, and Ira Eisenstein, eds., The New Haggadah newly rev. ed., 1978, p. 18. (Hereafter referred to parenthetically within the text by year of publication).

length, he is surely to be praised," the text ends with the specific: "the more we dwell upon the story . . . the deeper will be our understanding of what freedom means . . .[emphasis mine]" (1941, p. 20). By now, it has become clear that the call for freedom is to be the overarching theme of The New Haggadah.

A descriptive paragraph preludes מעשה ברבי אליעזר. The language here is once again geared towards the young, stating: "There is a quaint little tale told about these five Rabbis" (1941, p. 20). The 1978 text employs more sophisticated language, explaining that the "Rabbis became so engrossed in talking" (1978, p. 21), rather than "became so interested" (1941, p. 20). Even with such changes, the language in these introductions to the rituals seems to serve the purpose of expanding the text to the young or those unfamiliar with it, rather than edifying the liturgy for the adult participant.

The tale of Rabbi Eliezer follows in its traditional form in both Hebrew and English and leads into the explanation of the four kinds of children. The *midrash* of Rabbi Eleazar is left out totally; this passage is one that Kaplan specifically mentions as superfluous to the text.[9] In place of an English rendition of ברוך המקום, the text offers an elucidation of the need for telling the story in manners fitting for different types of children. This follows the didactic method prevalent, thus far, in the Haggadah. In Hebrew, the description of the four types of children uses the traditional text, while the paraphrase adds descriptive narratives about the types of children. In the reply to the wise child, the stress on the theme of freedom

---

9 Kaplan, "The New Haggadah," p. 17.

appears again, where the text calls upon the leader to indicate to the wise child the "noble ideal-- the ideal of freedom for all men" (1941, p. 24).

The text now continues with the core of the telling of the Exodus story. This section cuts out much of the traditional *Maggid* which runs counter to Reconstructionist teachings. The supernatural images of God's redeeming acts defy the naturalistic world image held by the writers of the Haggadah. The story is told in chronological fashion, however, instead of God redeeming the Israelites, the God presented here simply informs the Israelites that one day they will be free.

The *Maggid* strings together the Hebrew text of מתחלה, Deut. 26:5-8, ברוך שומר, and והיא שעמדה. The Hebrew is accompanied by an English paraphrase which leaves out the more ignoble details of Jewish history and replaces the supernatural redemption theme with God warning the Israelites that they will "be enslaved" and "later go free" (1941, p. 30). The reworking of the *Maggid* in this fashion accomplishes several important tasks for the Reconstructionists. First of all, objectionable portions of the traditional text are removed. More importantly, the interpretation of the story brings to light the purpose of slavery: "to be made ready for the role they were destined to play as the defenders of justice and freedom" (Ibid.). In this way, the editors inserted their priorities and ideology into the service.

The 1978 text adds to this two paragraphs delineating God's covenantal relationship with the Israelites and recognizing further God's involvement in the redemption. It states: "He redeemed His promise and delivered them. So we celebrate tonight the everlasting covenant of faith binding God and His people as one" (1978, p. 32). Although this addition may at first seem counter to Reconstructionist thought, the covenant spoken

of does not imply that God relates exclusively to Jews, nor does the mention of redemption assume God's supernatural involvement. Nevertheless, the readings added in the latter version do allow for wider interpretations of God's involvement in the redemption of the Israelites.

In place of most of the customary detailed rabbinic account of Deut. 26:5-8, the Hebrew substitutes alternate *midrashim* from והתעמרו on Ex. 1:13-14. These additions serve to set up the Israelites' struggle in slavery and provide motivation for the fight for freedom. The editors chose readings that depict both the hard physical labor and the mental anguish the Israelites endured. Where the traditional Haggadah focused primarily on God's role in redeeming the Israelites, The New Haggadah emphasizes the human struggle.

The remainder of the traditional explanation of the Exodus is replaced by an alternate description of how Moses redeemed the Israelites. This substitution is highly unusual, since the traditional Haggadah purposely avoids any reference to Moses. The traditional rationale is that God, rather than an individual or group, deserves glorification for the miracle of redemption. Reconstructionists, however, deny the miraculous and opt instead to explain the story as the result of the power of Moses who was inspired by God. The editors do not seem to fear that Jews will come to glorify Moses through this type of heroic depiction, nor do they fear that this version will supplant the supremacy of God in the Exodus. Instead, their priority is to present a version of the Exodus story which is rationally and intellectually accountable.

The story of Moses' growth and his inspiration to lead the redemption is taken completely from traditional sources, following the movement's priority of employing the Jewish heritage wherever possible. In the

Hebrew texts from Ex. 2 and 3 are combined with *midrashim* from שמות רבה, ending with a passage from one Mishnah. The English version includes paraphrases of the Hebrew, and elaborates further with details of Moses' birth and his leading the Israelites out of Egypt. In the unfolding story Moses is depicted as compassionate, strong-willed and just-- all adjectives which describe God in the traditional service.

Given Reconstructionist ideology, two inclusions in this section are unusual. Both the story of the burning bush and of the plagues imply supernatural intervention in the activities of the Israelites. The story of the burning bush is presented here as Moses' inspiration to redeem the Israelites. Clearly, God speaking to Moses from a burning bush represents supernatural intervention. However, this intervention by God results in natural human actions. God does not physically lead the Jews out of Egypt, rather, Moses leads the redemption described in The New Haggadah. The second item, the plagues that God brought upon Egypt, is even harder to explain through Reconstructionist ideals. The New Haggadah clearly states. "Then God brought plague after plague upon the Egyptians" (1941, p. 48). In the 1978 edition the plagues are named in Hebrew and English as participants spill a drop of wine for each plague. Though some argue that natural causes could have brought about the first nine plagues, the slaying of the first born cannot be explained away in this fashion. And, The New Haggadah makes no attempt to play down God's supernatural role in carrying out the plagues. Perhaps the inclusion of these two supernatural references represents the Reconstructionist concession to the powerful image of God in Jewish history.

Following The New Haggadah's version of the Exodus story, the text expounds upon lessons to be learned from slavery. The first selection of

readings focuses on the many types of oppressors that Jews have faced. In this section the universal hopes for freedom and liberty for all are again emphasized. The second section offers biblical readings that reflect the principles to be learned from our redemption from slavery. These biblical lessons emphasize the moral commandments and the ideal of Jews serving God and God alone. The Haggadah instructs that this section should be read responsively in Hebrew and English. This highlights the value that the Reconstructionism places on the Hebrew literacy of its constituents.

Returning to the traditional text of the Haggadah, the service continues with וַיְהִי. The verses included stress the positive things that God did for the Jews. All of the negative references to acts God committed against others for the sake of the Israelites have been omitted. So, too, the verse that praises God for building the Temple is left out. These deletions are consistent with the tenor of the Reconstructionist service.

The explanation of the three symbols mandated by Rabban Gamliel follow the traditional format in Hebrew. Again here, the English paraphrases and expands upon the Hebrew. An introductory explanation precedes the traditional reading for the *Pesah* symbol. It emphasizes the centrality of families celebrating the festival together, bringing out a theme that is prominent throughout the service.. Supplementing the traditional explanation of the *Matzah*, the Haggadah offers three additional interpretations of the symbol. *Matzah* represents the bread of affliction, the simple life of the dessert, the cry for less greed and envy, and the call for equality and justice for all (1941, pp. 66-67). The 1978 revision leaves out the reference to greed and replaces it with a universal call to share the *Matzah*-- "the symbol of our flight from oppression," with all who face

forms of bondage (1978, p. 66). Thus, the editors depict the *Matzah* as a meaningful modern symbol, as well as an important historic one.

The ritual surrounding the *Hallel* is left basically intact in The New Haggadah. Both בכל דור and לפיכך are contained, except for a few of the synonyms for praise in the latter. The English rendition of בכל דור leaves out the reference to the inheritance of the land of Israel. This omission is unusual considering the strong support in Reconstructionism for the State of Israel. The *Hallel* follows with both Pss. 113 and 114. The Hebrew of the redemption blessing contains the same changes that the later Conservative edition adopted. Namely, יגיענו למועדים replaces הגיענו למועדים, and the sentence referring to eating the sacrifice is left out. The blessing over the second cup of wine follows the traditional format.

The blessings that precede the meal-- *Rahatz*, *Motzi*, *Matzah*, *Maror*, and *Korekh*-- appear with little variation from tradition. An added meditation accompanies the *Maror* blessing, which emphasizes the *Haroset* as "a symbol of the hope of freedom which enabled our ancestors to withstand the bitterness of their slavery" (1941, p. 84). At the end of the meal, the *afikomen* is redeemed from the children and all share in it as the final sustenance of the evening. The retention of the children's game of searching for the *afikomen* stresses once again the role of the whole family in the *Seder*.

The blessing after meals includes most of the traditional portions. The paragraph of רחם leaves out: ועל מלכות בית דוד . . . שנקרא שמך עליו and, in יעלה ויבא, the clause: ויגיע ויראה וירצה וישמע is left out. Also removed is the message that those who fear God will have no wants, traditionally expressed by: יראו את יי . . . לעולם חסדו. The English translation abbreviates even further, leaving out some of the translations of

"the compassionate one." Yet, both English and Hebrew remain close to the traditional rendition of the blessing. Many of the Haggadoth from liberal movements abbreviate the *Rereik* in order to shorten the service. However, the Reconstructionist Haggadah retains the traditional format of the Grace.

After the third cup of wine, the 1978 revised edition adds a meditation on the Holocaust and the rebirth of the State of Israel. Unlike the Conservative and Reform Haggadoth, which insert separate sections of reflections on the Holocaust from survivors, the Reconstructionist Haggadah offers a prayer that fits in with the flow of the normal service. The State of Israel is described here as the "moral example for all humanity" (1978, p. 104). The added section concludes with the singing of אנו מאמין. Clearly, the message of the addition is that humans working toward a moral world can bring about the messianic age and rid the world of horrors like the Holocaust.

Instead of opening the door for Elijah while reciting שפוך, The New Haggadah offers a message of hope for the coming of the messianic era. The singing of אליהו הנביא and the poem, "The Hope of Israel," accompany this reading. Though the Reconstructionists do not espouse a belief in a messianic saviour, they hope for a messianic age that will be brought about through the joint effort of the peoples of the world seeking peace. Thus the inclusion of reference to Elijah refers not to the coming of the Messiah *per se*, rather, it looks toward a time when people will treat each other with justice and love.

The *Hallel* after the meal excises most of the traditional Psalms. The section is comprised only of Ps. 117 (in its entirety) and Ps. 118: 1-6, 8-9, and 13-25. Though the other sections may have been left out for brevity,

Ps. 118:7, 10-12 was obviously deleted because of its content. Ps. 118:7 refers to God's actions against Israel's enemies, and verses 10-12 speak of God cutting off the other nations. The Reconstructionist ideology rejected the idea implied in these verses that God favors one people over another. The Great Hallel, Ps. 136, is left out completely from the text. נשמת כל חי appears in complete form with the exception of the concluding paragraphs. The deletion of the ending seems to be for the purpose of abbreviating the service.

As is the case with most of the liberal Haggadoth, the songs and poetry precede the final cup of wine and concluding blessings. Two *piyyutim*, adapted from the traditional liturgy, open the section. The inclusion of these *piyyutim* is highly irregular both because *piyyutim* are generally removed from rather than added to liberal liturgy and because these *piyyutim* offer images that are unusual for Reconstructionist worship. The first of the two, שירה חדשה, written by Judah Halevi, is found in the traditional liturgy for the seventh day of Passover. The *piyyut* customarily appears in the the morning service, in the section following the *Shema*, accentuating Israel's liberation. The poem, which depicts the relationship between God and Israel as a marriage, looks toward the renewal of that marriage. The complete version of the poem compares the relationship between God and Israel to the relationship between Judah and Tamar.[10] However, the verses that highlight this theme are excised from the version of the poem in the Reconstructionist Haggadah. So, too, the Reconstructionist rendition changes the second stanza, from the somewhat obscure: הטבעת בתרמית רגלי בת ענמית ומעמי שולמית יחו בנעלים, to the more direct: יום בצר מכבדת ואלי נחמדת ולך עז יסדת

---

10 Jakob J. Petuchowski, Theology and Poetry (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978), pp. 64-65.

מסי עוללים (1941, p. 131). The translation adds a stanza of the traditional poem, referring to the signs of the covenant relationship between God and Israel. In the subsequent editions this stanza is deleted. The *piyyut* was probably selected because of its opening stanza, which mentions the Exodus, and its closing stanzas which speak of the messianic hope for the age when God and Israel will again be wed. Though the messianic hope for unity fits within Reconstructionist ideology, the representation of God's unique relationship with Israel is uncharacteristic of the movement.

The second *piyyut*, מסח אמונים, excerpts four stanzas from the poem found following the *Shema* in the evening service for the seventh day of Passover. The traditional version of the poem contains an alphabetical acrostic comparing מסח מצרים to מסח לעתיד. The four stanzas selected for the Reconstructionist Haggadah focus on the theme of freedom-- the freedom that resulted from God's redeeming the Israelites and the freedom that will come from the redemption that lies ahead. This *piyyut* reinforces the theme of freedom and peace that resounds throughout this Haggadah. However, the prominent role that God plays in the physical redemption does not fit standard Reconstructionist ideology.

The section continues with several of the customary songs and poems and a medieval poem on the redemption theme. All of the Hebrew verses of כי לו נאה are contained in the service; the English contains the first verse and a note explains that the stanzas left out only add more synonyms of glory (1941, p. 138). The medieval poem שדי אלי follows in Hebrew and English. It speaks of God redeeming and gathering the Jews in Zion. The last verse also expresses hope for the restoration of the Temple. This verse, which is counter to Reconstructionist ideology, is eliminated from the revisions of the service. Like כי לו נאה, the text of אדיר הוא is found in its

totality in Hebrew with one verse sufficing for the English. The two poems, "Who Knows One" and "An Only Kid," both appear in complete form. In "Who Knows One," the Hebrew and English change the text of eight and nine to "Eight are the Ḥanukkah lights," and "Nine stands for nine festivals of the year" (1941, pp. 154-156). The 1942 revision adds back the traditional Hebrew for these verses, but maintains altered English, and the 1978 edition restores both verses to the traditional English as well. Additionally, the 1978 edition changes the English wording of the third verse from: "Three stands for the fathers of our race" (1941, p. 149), to "Three stands for the fathers of our line." The modern sensitivity to the difference between a race and a group of people with a shared culture probably motivated this change.

In the conclusion of the service, the blessing over the fourth cup of wine and נרצה are recited. The final benediction that normally accompanies the last cup of wine is not included in The New Haggadah. The Hebrew of חסל סדר פסח leaves out: כאשר זכינו לסדר אותו כן נזכה לעשותו, though the English retains the message. The reason for the abbreviation of the Hebrew is unclear. The English rendering of חסל סדור recounts the story that has been told during Seder. Ending on the note of freedom that the service began with, it states: "next year, again, in joy, in peace and in freedom" (1941, p. 173). The English of "לשנה הבאה בירושלים," reads: "May the coming year witness the rebuilding of Zion and the redemption of Israel" (1941, p. 174). The final message is expanded in the 1978 edition to read: "May the coming year bring freedom to the oppressed, peace to Zion and Jerusalem and witness the redemption of Israel" (1978, p. 174). It is important to note that the Haggadah never gives the impression that Zionism is the answer for all Jews, yet, it consistently supports Zionist ideals. The service concludes with the songs "התקוה" and "America."

The Reconstructionist movement clearly expresses its philosophy in The New Haggadah. Unlike the Conservative and Reform movements, which do not always specifically define their ideologies, Reconstructionism states its ideals and punctiliously implements them in its liturgies. The New Haggadah well represents the movements position on utilizing tradition, while replacing the elements that are incongruent with readings considered more appropriate.

The Haggadah's heavy emphasis on freedom reflects one of the strongest ideals of Reconstructionism. The Reconstructionists point out that living outside of the land of Israel requires Jews to "fulfill their own religious vocation as well as express their loyalty to their country in terms of universal spiritual values."[11] World-wide liberation and freedom of all humanity represents one pinnacle of universal values. In introducing the service Kaplan explains:

> Nothing so lends itself to the kind of edification we need for our day as the story of Israel's redemption from Egypt, provided that story is transposed into the key of the struggle for freedom in which all men and nations are perpetually engaged . . . .[12]

As has been pointed out, the theme of universal redemption and freedom is found throughout the service. From the invocation, stating: "Let us pray that the time be not distant when all the world will be liberated . . ." (1941, p. 3), it is evident that the Reconstructionist interpretation of the Passover holiday revolves around this theme. The call for a time "when all the Pharaohs will be vanquished . . . and all men will be brothers" (1941, p. 51), the embellished paraphrase of הא לחמא, "Pesah calls us to be free . . ."(1941,

---

[11] Mordecai Kaplan, "Aims of Reconstructionism," reprinted from Reconstructionist 28 (June 15, 1962): 2.

[12] Kaplan, "The New Haggadah," p. 18.

p. 13), and a multitude of additional readings confirm the significance of this theme in the Haggadah. Thus, the Reconstructionist ideology, supporting universal freedom, is actualized in The New Haggadah.

Another area in which this Haggadah offers a straightforward picture of Reconstructionism is in its orientation toward tradition. The movement strives to search the entirety of tradition in order to employ those rituals and practices which best meet present needs.[13] Instead of depending on new creations, the Reconstructionists creatively employ texts inherited from Jewish tradition. The movement does not view Jewish law as binding, rather it believes the law offers an important mode of identification for the Jewish people. Therefore, the Reconstructionists delve into the Jewish heritage and utilize the tradition in order to maximize the ability of Jews to identify with Jewish civilization. The use of biblical and *midrashic* citations, is an example of how the Haggadah implements the Reconstructionist approach to tradition.

One of the best known platforms of Reconstructionism is its opposition to the doctrine of the Chosen People. This doctrine neither fits the Reconstructionists' view of God nor their view of the world. In the Introduction to the Sabbath Prayer Book published in 1945, the writers explained:

> Modern-minded Jews can no longer believe, as did their fathers, that the Jews constitute a divinely chosen nation. That belief carried for them the implication that the history of mankind revolved around Israel.[14]

---

13 Mordecai Kaplan, Judaism as a Modern Religious Civilization, (New York: Reconstructionist Press, 1957) p. 9.

14 Mordecai M. Kaplan, Eugene Kohn, Milton Steinberg, Ira Eisenstein, eds., Introduction to the Sabbath Prayer Book, reprinted from the first ed. (New York: Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, 1945), p. 10.

Thus passages in the *Kiddush* that emphasize Israel's chosen status have been deleted from the Haggadah. Additionally, the story of Israel's unique redemption has been universalized to teach the lesson of eradicating oppression among all peoples.

Since the Reconstructionists rejected the doctrine of the Chosen People, they felt the need for a central place for Jewish life all the more. Though they could not adhere to the traditional view that God designated the Jews as the people above all peoples, they supported Zionism as crucial for Jewish survival. Kaplan explained: "Judaism requires at least one place in the world, where it may be the primary one for its adherents. . . . *Eretz Yisrael* will have to serve as both the instrument and symbol of the Jewish renascence and as center of Jewish civilization."[15] The New Haggadah supports this ideal by including traditional references to the rebuilding of the land of Israel and adding a specific meditation in the 1978 edition, which reflects the movement's feelings toward Israel.

One reason that Reconstructionists value the State of Israel as a center for Judaism is because they do not believe that a miraculous Messiah will one day redeem the world. Instead, they contend that individuals living by ideals can move toward a messianic age. The New Haggadah refers repeatedly to the messianic age, rather than to an individual Messiah. Specifically, the Haggadah asserts that the messianic age will come about when all humanity practices the natural laws of justice, brotherhood and peace. This message reiterates the Reconstructionist faith that religion inspires people to work for the good of all humanity.

---

15 Kaplan, Judaism as a Modern . . ., p. 3.

Though The New Haggadah well represents the Reconstructionist approach to tradition, it does not consistently follow the movement's theological position. Kaplan introduced the idea of a transnaturalist God supplanting the theology of the supernaturalist Deity. He explained:

> Transnaturalist religion beholds God in the fulfillment of human nature and not in the suspension of the natural order. Its function is not to help man overcome the hazards of nature, but to enable him to bring under control his inhumanity to his fellow-man.[16]

Revisions in the telling of the Exodus story portray this theology. Instead of painting a picture of God superceding nature, The New Haggadah depicts the Exodus story through the hero Moses. Moses was able, with God's inspiration, to harness the forces around him and to lead the Israelites out of slavery. So, too, the section on Torah lessons that resulted from the Exodus refers over and over to duties that are incumbent on Jews because of the remembrance of God's role in the redemption. These duties, including helping the stranger and sustaining the poor, offer ways for individuals to naturally curb the "inhumanity" of the world.

However, as has been explored previously, the references to the Ten Plagues and the burning bush directly contradict the Reconstructionist transnaturalist theology. So, too, some of the imagery contained in the added *piyyutim* are not consistent with the Reconstructionist concept of God. In these cases the Haggadah undermines the ideals of the movement which it represents. This author can find no explanation for the inclusion of passages that are so blatantly out of place in Reconstructionism.

---

16 Mordecai M. Kaplan, Judaism Without Supernaturalism (New York: Reconstructionist Press, 1967), p. 10.

It is somewhat surprising that the 1978 revision made so few changes in the Haggadah. Both Reconstructionism as a movement and the world around had changed substantially in the years since the 1942 revision The movement underwent some major changes in the 1960's; with the birth of the R.R.C., Reconstructionism had renewed its focus.[17] An example of the discrepancy between the Haggadah and modern Reconstructionist ideology is the sexist language employed in the service. The movement strongly advocates gender-inclusive language; yet, no attempt was made to change the sexist language of The New Haggadah. A close inspection reveals that the 1978 edition even uses the same printing plates as the original, with only a few minor changes. Although reconstructing may be a dynamic process at the R.R.C., in Reconstructionism's The New Haggadah the process seems to have stagnated.

Another major drawback in The New Haggadah lies in its lack of aesthetic appeal. The introduction states: "The English version of the text is in large part a paraphrase . . . designed to attract and hold the interest of the young people" (1941, p. viii). This simplification of the English text has resulted in a service that, at times, lacks sophistication. One would expect to find language like "Once upon a time" (1941, p. 22) and "Moses spent many an hour thinking about his fellow-Israelites in Egypt" (1941, p. 44), in a child's book, rather than in a serious liturgy. Often the paraphrases used are neither inspiring nor enticing liturgically. The attempts to render straightforward language have gone so far that one could well miss the point of some of the carefully thought out philosophical changes in the service.

---

17 Diane Levenberg, "The Fourth Branch," Present Tense 15 (Nov./Dec. 1987): 43.

The 1941 The New Haggadah presents a Seder service that attempts to maintain Reconstructionist ideals. It omits intellectually incompatible sections and replaces them with readings that reflect Reconstructionist thinking. Consistent with the movement's commitment to the Jewish heritage, the additions in the Haggadah come from traditional Jewish sources. Other liturgical movements take great pains in stretching and reinterpreting Hebrew text into benign paraphrases; Reconstructionists, on the other hand, omit many incompatible Hebrew texts altogether.

The Reconstructionist philosophy is refreshing because of its clear and consistent presentation. The Reform and Conservative movements are often reticent about taking strong ideological stands. Reconstructionism, though, presents precise and cogent ideology-- and one would expect their liturgy to reflect this. But as has been pointed out, The New Haggadah contains several sections which are incongruent with Reconstructionist thought; the Haggadah does not exemplify the clear cut philosophy professed by the movement.

The publication of The New Haggadah represented a bold attempt by the Reconstructionist; nevertheless, it falls short of encompassing the integrated philosophy of Reconstructionism. The 1941 The New Haggadah, as the first liturgy published by the movement, offered an innovative way of practicing Judaism. It would be understandable if this first edition attempted to mollify some of the radical ideals of Reconstructionism, and thus contained some inconsistencies. However, the first edition took so many bold steps in altering the traditional text that this cannot explain the editors' retention and addition of readings that were counter to Reconstructionism. So, too, the fact that, in the revisions, the editors never attempted to rectify these glaring contradictions indicates a marked lack of concern for matching

the Haggadah to movement ideology. One can only conclude that the Reconstructionist leaders were not prepared to fully incorporate their progressive ideas into their Haggadah.

EPILOGUE

In the preceding chapters we endeavored to describe the development of Haggadoth in modern liberal movements. After presenting an overview of each movement, the thesis has evaluated the movements' respective Haggadoth. The Haggadoth of some liberal branches show marked change and growth, while others indicate a reluctance to tamper with the original liturgies. The analysis of the Haggadoth offers insight into both the processes involved in liturgical development and the methods by which movements implement their priorities in their liturgies.

Clearly, all of the Haggadoth indicate recognition of continuing changes in contemporary society. Whereas the influence of emancipation, freedom, and scientific understanding affected the early Haggadoth, the later editions incorporate the more modern historical realities of the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel. Nevertheless, it would be foolish to assume that historical developments had an equal effect on all of the branches of Judaism. Each movement's successive Haggadoth reflect its reaction to contemporary society from the basis of its philosophy, adapting its particular ideology to changing modern circumstances.

On one level we have found that the movements' goals are not widely divergent. Each branch of Judaism expresses the desire to maintain a connection to Jewish heritage and traditions. In the introduction to almost every liturgy, the editors assert their concern for maintaining the traditional form and structure of the Haggadah. Even the liturgists who composed the first Union Haggadah, while excising much of the traditional service, stated: "The effort has been made to embody the quaint form and the traditional

sentiment of the Haggadah . . . ."[1] The successive Reform publications have integrated more and more of the traditional service into their Haggadoth, indicating an increasing affiliation with the Jewish heritage. The Liberal movement in England followed a similar path, with each additional Haggadah adhering to more of the customary order and rituals. Even though the Conservative, Reconstructionist, and British Reform have not published revisions reflecting increasing traditional emphasis, all of the Haggadoth of these movements make a point of accentuating their authenticity as Jewish liturgies.

Just as each of the branches recognized the importance of maintaining a connection with Jewish tradition, they also strove to bring Jewish practice in line with contemporary needs. From statements made by movement leaders, it is obvious that each movement felt that their philosophy was the catalyst for the preservation of Judaism in the modern world. All of the liturgists sought to develop services that would be relevant and compelling for the modern Jew. The following statement made by Mordecai Kaplan is typical of sentiments restated over and over again throughout the introductions to the Haggadoth: "Many modern Jews have lost their sense of need of worship and prayer . . . . The motions survive; the emotions have fled."[2] Each of the liberal Haggadoth offered what it thought was the solution to the problem of reinvigorating Jewish worship. The American Reform and British Liberal movements demonstrated the most outward

---

1 CCAR, The Union Haggadah, second edition (New York: CCAR, 1907), p. vi.

2 Mordecai M. Kaplan, Eugene Kohn, Milton Steinberg, Ira Eisenstein, eds., Introduction to the Sabbath Prayer Book, reprinted from the first edition. (New York: Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, 1945), p. 3.

concern with meeting modern needs. They re-edited, revised and rewrote their Haggadoth over and over. Although it may be argued that this represents an inherent dissatisfaction with their Haggadoth, it is probably better attributed to the dynamic nature of these two movements. The Reconstructionists have the most defined ideology of the liberal movements; this is reflected in their Haggadah, which creates a fairly unique service in order to implement those ideals. So, too, the British Reform express their solution to the problem of creating a relevant liturgy through their interpretation of contemporary Judaism. The British Reform Haggadoth echo the Karaitic tendencies that those early Reformers felt were essential for a modern conception of Judaism. The Conservative Haggadah, replete with explanation after explanation, clearly demonstrated its concern for offering a service that would answer modern questions about the centuries old service.

Even though the liberal branches of Judaism share the goals of maintaining tradition and meeting modern needs, they differ widely in their implementation of these goals. The American Reform movement rewrites and revises its Haggadoth more frequently than any other liberal movement. This indicates the dynamic nature of the movement-- always evaluating and searching for improvement. One manifestation of this dynamic nature is the thorough process of Committee and Conference evaluation of American Reform liturgy. Yet, the abundance of American Reform Haggadoth also reveals a paradox in Reform liturgy: since the movement neither clearly defines its relationship to traditional Judaism nor has one source of authority, its liturgy will perpetually be subject to revisions. With the wide variety of acceptable practices in American Reform, it is unlikely that any one liturgy will satisfy even a single generation of Reform Jews. The leaders

of American Reform prefer the dissension that their open philosophy allows to a philosophy that might curtail the freedom of its membership.

The Liberal movement of Great Britain has also been quite prolific in its development of Haggadoth. However, they have not published nearly as many revisions as the American Reform. Though the Liberal movement's philosophy is very close to American Reform, the implementation of this philosophy does not mirror the American movement. The revisions of the British Liberals Haggadoth do not generally involve minor emendations of the text. Rather, the revisions incrementally introduce more tradition and cultivate the movement's ideal. The smaller size of the British movement accounts for a great deal of the difference between the ways the Liberal movement of Great Britain and the American Reformers have carried out their ideals. Because the size of the movement does not result in the diversity found in America, individual leaders in the Liberal movement establish themselves and direct the movement with authority. The Liberal Haggadoth reflect this consistent leadership.

The British Reform movement is more closely tied to tradition than its Liberal counterpart. The Haggadah produced by this movement is representative of David W. Marks' philosophy carried to an extreme. It would be unfair to evaluate the whole movement based on this Haggadah, because the Haggadah itself was an anomaly in British Reform. However it remains significant that long after Marks relinquished leadership, the Haggadah was republished in the movement's festival prayer book.

The Conservative leadership implements movement ideals in their liturgy more through interpretation than revision. This explains the Conservative leaders' fairly late creation of a movement Haggadah. When the movement finally produced a Haggadah, the resulting work incorporated

most of the traditional service. Explanatory notes expounding upon the service occupy the margins of the pages of the Conservative Haggadah. This very layout emphasizes the great value the movement places on interpretation. The Conservative liturgists more liberally omitted traditional readings from their Haggadah than they did in their Sabbath and Festival prayer books. This can be attributed in part to the fact that the laws governing the contents of the prayer books are more detailed than those governing the Haggadah.

The first Haggadah produced by the Reconstructionists made great strides toward instituting the philosophy of the movement. More than any of the other liberal movements, Reconstructionism defines its philosophy, ideology and goals. The movement's reconstruction of the Haggadah actualizes a great deal of this ideology. However, the major deviations from specific Reconstructionist ideals are not rectified in revisions of the Haggadah. So, too, as the movement's philosophy was reshaped by contemporary society, the liturgists did not incorporate these new ideals into their revisions of the service. The continued re-publication of the Reconstructionist Haggadah, with only minor changes, points out that though the movement professes strong ideals it does not yet fully practice those ideals.

The Haggadoth studied reveal much about their respective movements. Whether they adhere to movement objectives or deviate from them, they tell a story about their developers. Not only do the Haggadoth disclose how the movements choose to tell their children the Exodus story, they unmask the philosophies and priorities of the liberal Jewish movements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Bronstein, Herbert, ed. A Passover Haggadah. New York: CCAR, 1974.

_____. A Passover Haggadah. Draft ed. New York: CCAR, 1972.

_____. A Passover Haggadah. Draft ed. New York: CCAR, 1973.

_____. A Passover Haggadah. 2nd ed. New York: CCAR, 1975.

_____. A Passover Haggadah. 3rd ed. New York: CCAR, 1982.

Central Conference of American Rabbis. The Union Haggadah. Manuscript ed. Baltimore, MD: CCAR, 1905.

_____. The Union Haggadah. Philadelphia: L. H. Cahan and Co., 1907.

_____. The Union Haggadah. 2nd ed. New York: CCAR, 1907.

_____. The Union Haggadah. 3rd ed. New York: CCAR, 1908.

_____. Union Prayer Book. Chicago, IL: CCAR, 1892

Cohon, Samuel S., ed. The Union Haggadah. Revised edition. New York: CCAR, 1923.

Kaplan, Mordecai M., Eugene Kohn, and Ira Eisenstein, eds. The New Haggadah. New York: Behrman House, 1941.

_____. The New Haggadah. Revised. ed. New York: Behrman House, 1942.

_____. The New Haggadah. Newly revised ed. New York: Behrman House, 1978.

Liberal Jewish Synagogue, ed. Services and Prayers for Jewish Homes. London: Liberal Jewish Synagogue, 1918.

Marks, D. W., ed. Domestic Service for the First Night of Passover used by the members of the West London Synagogue of British Jews. London: West London Synagogue, 1842.

The Ministers of the Congregation, eds. Forms of Prayer used in the West London Synagogue of British Jews II. Fourth edition. London: West London Synagogue, 1921.

Rabinowicz, Rachel, ed. Passover Haggadah: The Feast of Freedom. New York: The Rabbinical Assembly, 1982.

Rayner, John D., ed. Passover Eve Service for the Home. London: ULPS, 1962.

Strassfeld, Michael, ed. "A Passover Haggadah." Conservative Judaism 32 (Spring, 1979).

Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, ed. Passover Eve Service for the Home. London: Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, 1949.

Secondary Sources

Bamberger, Bernard. "On The Revision of The Union Prayer Book." Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal 13 (April 1965): 37-42.

Bronstein, Herbert. "The New Union Haggadah." CCAR Journal 21 (Spring, 1974): 9-13.

Borowitz, Eugene B. Reform Judaism Today I, II and III. New York: Behrman House, Inc., 1978.

Central Conference of American Rabbis. "Report on Committee on Haggadah." CCAR Yearbook 13 (1903): 64.

_____. "Report of Committee on Haggadah." CCAR Yearbook 14 (1904): 83-89.

_____. "Report of Committee on Revision of the Haggadah." CCAR Yearbook 29 (1919): 55-59.

_____. "Report of Committee on Seder Haggadah." CCAR Yearbook 15 (1905): 78-83.

_____. "Report of Committee on Seder Haggadah." CCAR Yearbook 16 (1906): 83-87.

_____. "Report of the Committee on The Union Seder Haggadah." CCAR Yearbook 17 (1907): 94-95.

Einhorn, David. Book of Prayers for Israelitisch Congregations. New York, 1872.

Eisenburg, Richard. Congregation "Sheareth Israel," Columbus, Georgia Interview, 22 December 1987.

Eisenstein, Ira. The Reconstructionist Movement. New York: Reconstructionist Press, 196?.

Freehof, Solomon. "The Union Prayerbook in the Evolution of Liturgy." CCAR Yearbook 40 (1930): 251-159.

Friedland, Eric. "The Historical and Theological Development of the Non-Orthodox Prayerbooks in the United States." Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1967.

_____. "Olath Tamid by David Einhorn." Hebrew Union College Annual 45 (1975): 307-332.

גולדשמידט, דניאל. הגדה של פסח ותולדותיה. ירושלים: מוסד ביאליק, 1981.

Gordis, Robert. Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.

_____. "A Jewish Prayer Book for the Modern Age." Conservative Judaism 2 (October, 1945): 1-20.

Harlow, Jules. "Introducing Siddur Sim Shalom." Conservative Judaism 37:4 (Summer, 1984): 5-17.

Jessel, David. "Reform Versions of the Passover Haggadah." Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1963.

Joseph, N. S. "Essentials of Judaism." Papers for Jewish People 1 (Oct., 1906).

Kaplan, Mordecai M. "Aims of Reconstructionism." Reprinted from Reconstructionist 28 (June 15, 1962).

_____. Eugene Kohn, Milton Steinberg, Ira Eisenstein, eds. Introduction to the Sabbath Prayer Book. Reprinted from the first ed. New York: Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, 1945.

_____. Judaism as a Modern Religious Civilization. New York: Reconstructionist Press, 1957.

_____. Judaism Without Supernaturalism. New York: Reconstructionist Press, 1967.

_____. "The Meaning of Reconstructionism." Reconstructionist 6 (Feb. 16, 1940): 8-19.

_____. "The New Haggadah." The Reconstructionist 7 (April 18, 1941): 17-18.

_____. Unity in Diversity in the Conservative Movement. New York: The United Synagogue of America, 1947?. [date indicated by library, not in publication].

Levenberg, Diane. "The Fourth Branch." Present Tense 15 (Nov./Dec. 1987): 41-45.

Marks, D. W., ed. Forms of Prayer used in the West London Synagogue of British Jews. London: West London Synagogue, 1841.

Marmur, Dow, ed. Reform Judaism: Essays on Reform Judaism in Britain. London: Reform Synagogues of Great Britain, 1973.

Mattuck, Israel I., ed. Liberal Jewish Prayer Book I. London: Liberal Jewish Synagogue, 1937.

Mihaly, Eugene. "A Guide For Writers of Reform Liturgy." CCAR Journal 13 (April 1965): 5-20.

Montagu, Lily. "The Jewish Religious Union and its Beginnings." Papers for Jewish People 27 (1927).

Montefiore, C. G. "The Jewish Religious Union: Its Principles and its Future." Papers for Jewish People 19 (1918).

_____. "Liberal Judaism and Authority." Papers for Jewish People 22 (1919).

Glatzer, Nahum N., ed. The Passover Haggadah. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.

Petuchowski, Jakob J. "Karaite Tendencies in an Early Reform Haggadah." Hebrew Union College Annual 31 (1960): 223-249.

_____. "Review of Passover Haggadah: The Feast of Freedom." Conservative Judaism 35 (Spring, 1982): 80-83.

_____. Theology and Poetry. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

_____. "The Vast Variety of *Aggadah*, a Review." Judaism 26 (Spring, 1977): 248.

Philipson, David. The Reform Movement in Judaism. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1931.

Polish, David. "Where Do We Go From Here?." CCAR Journal 14 (January, 1967): 69-77.

Rabbinic Conference of Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, ed. Service of the Heart. London: ULPS, 1967.

Rayner, John D. Liberal Judaism. London: The Jewish Liberal Synagogue, n.d.

_____. The Practices of Liberal Judaism. Revised edition. London: ULPS, 1960.

Reconstructionist Editorial board. "Postscript to Pesah." Reconstructionist 7 (May 16, 1941): 5-6.

Reconstructionist Editorial Board. Reconstructionist 6 (Feb. 16, 1940): 3.

Rosenblum, Herbert. Conservative Judaism: A Contemporary History. New York: United Synagogue of America, 1983.

Rosenthal, Gilbert S. "Prayer and the Conservative Jew." Conservative Judaism 36 (Summer, 1983): 24-27.

Siegel, Seymour. Conservative Judaism and Jewish Law. New York: The Rabbinical Assembly, 1977.

Sklare, Marshall. Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.

Weinberg, Dudley. "What Should be in the New Prayer Book?." CCAR Journal 14 (October, 1967): 41-44.

Yuter, Alan J. "The Haggadah as Teacher." Conservative Judaism 32 (Summer, 1979): 88-93.