



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

Statement by
Referee

AUTHOR Wolfgang Kaelter

TITLE Liberal Judaism in Germany

(Not Necessary
for Ph.D.
Thesis)

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. ☐ D.H.L. ☐ Rabbinic ☒
Master's ☐ Prize Essay ☐

1) May (with revisions) be considered for Publication

☒ ☐
yes no

2) May circulate ☒

3) Is restricted ☐

Date

Signature of Referee

Statement by
Author

(Please consult with Librarian if copyright protection
is desired.)

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

The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis.

☒ ☐
yes no

May 31, 1969
Date

W. Kaelter
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed

June 5, 1969
Date

Armina Steiner
Signature of Library Staff Member

LIBERAL JUDAISM IN GERMANY
SINCE THE TIME OF THE RABBINICAL CONFERENCES
WITH SPECIAL STRESS ON
THE RITUAL AND THEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

by
Wolfgang Kaelter

Submitted in partial
fulfillment of the
requirements for the
degree of Rabbi.

Cincinnati, 1940

Ref. to Samuel E. Stone

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
PART I	
The Inner Development from 1844 to 1871	15
PART II	
Leading Personalities.	76
Notes	104
PART III	
Liturgical Developments.	111
Notes	134
Abbreviations.	i
Bibliography	ii

INTRODUCTION

The nineteenth century presents a period in the history of mankind which is distinguished by all sorts of shifts, changes, and developments in almost every field of human endeavour. All these have one element in common: they serve to ease up or even break the rigidity of conditions which seemed to have been petrified in their state for many centuries and were expected to remain so.

Countries and continents which at the beginning of the century were still separated by gaps of distance, found that in the course of it, they were more closely connected with one another through the great inventions of science. Along with the growing of mechanical possibilities went the industrial development, widening the scope of economic enterprises and changing the social structure of Europe. On the political scene the influence of the French revolution could be felt more and more. The absolute authority of the state, taken for granted during the greater part of the previous century now becomes^o subject of discussion. Revolutions take place in almost all the leading countries of Europe, the "Staendestaet" falls and the "Rechtsstaet" is established. The individual as well as particular groups in the state get a chance to exert influence upon the government of their countries.

The idea of progress ruled all minds and made everybody proud to be part of a generation which had achieved so much.

Even sporadic attempts at reaction could not really disillusion or disturb the "Gegenwartsseligkeit" of the age. One was not willing to, and actually did not see any limits for further accomplishments by the liberated spirit of mankind. The "Zeitgeist" not only required recognition but everything, art, politics, religion had to be brought into agreement with it. The general nature of this "Zeitgeist" as indicated above was liberal, lowering old established barriers, easing relations, adverse to authority as a whole and to all conventions. However, an analysis of this modern spirit will show that it was not at all as unified as it appeared to be.

The early part of the century is characterized by the struggle of the philosophical schools of enlightenment and romanticism for the dominating influence on the social, economic, political and cultural reconstruction of Europe. How deep this struggle must have gone, we will realize if we observe some of its phases. Reason was the dominant force for the school of enlightenment. Only what can be harmonized with the ratio of man deserves existence, is of eternal value; everything else is of a passing quality not worth being preserved. This cold rationalism is finally overcome by romanticism which although not discarding reason completely, yet stresses the equally important and valuable role which feeling plays, and must play in the lives of man. While enlightenment had tried to equalize all men, romanticism now emphasizes

the right of every individual; while the former was merely present-minded and present-conscious, romanticism takes a historical view. Although one intends by no means to maintain the past, yet one studies it, investigates (into) it, with the purpose of learning from history the eternal principles of development.

The latter part of the century stands under the influence of materialism slipping back into the rationalism of the period of enlightenment and going even beyond it. While during the period of enlightenment religion was to be harmonized with reason, now one tries to ignore it altogether. National feeling, so far imbued with liberal ideas changes into the idea of nationalism preaching respectively the singular exclusive value of one's own nationality.

It is with these developments in mind that we shall try to trace the development of liberal Judaism in Germany. Only after the walls of the Ghetto had been broken by the new spirit which permeated Europe, the conflict between European life and the Jewish way of living, between modern thought and the teachings of Judaism could occur and demand an adjustment which only a more liberal minded conception of Judaism could give. True, the Jew had had his domicile in Germany for many centuries before the emancipation, and yet he had not lived in Germany. Only with the emancipation, he becomes part of European life and partakes of its culture. (21*)

In the Ghetto he leads an almost exclusively Jewish life whose every detail was prescribed by the Shulchan Aruch, whose authority he had no reason to doubt. Leaving the seclusion of the Ghetto, however, he finds that he has to "set the table" anew somehow, if he wants to assume the rights which he has been granted. Another problem is added: in the Ghetto although an individual he is part of the Jewish community, he has a hold in it; entering upon the European scene, he becomes an individual without the restrictions, but also without the protection of the community. As a result, he frequently feels lost and lonely in so large a world. His task then is to adjust to the European world as an individual Jew, to become an integral part of it without losing his Jewishness.

The spirit which brought about his liberation is that of the rationalism of enlightenment. It also furnishes him with the first tool with which to make the necessary adjustment. The process of his inner emancipation is dictated by this spirit, since the world into which the Jew enters is dominated by it. It was on the basis of reason that Mendelssohn in his "Jerusalem" denied the existence of dogmas in Judaism and designated it as revealed law.¹⁾ He thus gained freedom of thought although subjecting his will and action to the ceremonial law²⁾, believing that its validity would only cease after God revokes it.³⁾ It was on the same ration-

alistic basis that Samson Raphael Hirsch re-interpreted the laws of Judaism and established the position of Orthodoxy anew. And the critique of Judaism and its forms as championed by the early Reform, ran along the same exclusively rationalistic lines even though in direct contradiction to Mendelssohn; it maintained that something like dogmas, namely, principles of faith, make up the very essence of Judaism on whose basis alone it deserves to be preserved. Giving up the ceremonial practices as of intrinsic value in Judaism - so far indicative of one's Jewishness - the leading spirits of Reform had to discover a creed, the professing of which would designate one as a Jew.⁴⁾ One must, however, bear in mind that the rationalistic spirit of enlightenment did not grow naturally and organically out of the Jewish spirit of previous centuries, but that it was forced upon the Jew on account of his changed position in society.

Some of the leading spirits of enlightenment as Humboldt, for instance, hoped for a complete assimilation of the Jews. In the opinion of many of the enlightened, the only things preventing the Jews from being fully accepted was not the Gentiles' contempt of them, but the Jews' own pride as a historio-religious group kept alive by national festivals, ceremonies and the common hope for the Messiah.⁵⁾ Giving up all these meant, especially after the conclusion of the Holy Alliance had brought about the idea of the Christian State,

equating "Christentum" and "Deutschtum", to accept the state religion. Baptism seemed to be the inevitable price of admission for Jews into European culture. To counteract this movement which had lead many away from Judaism already, Reform became more and more necessary. Going hand in hand with the fight for complete emancipation, it was colored by opportunism at times. However, it is very difficult to draw the line where opportunism plays the dominant role, and where the individual reformers actually stand under the influence of the spirit of their time, and acted unreservedly in accordance with their conviction derived from it.

On the one hand we grow, of course, suspicious if we find an agreement between the reasons for refusing full emancipation to the Jew and the demands and problems of Reform. The dietary laws, the foreign Day of Rest, although already disregarded by many of the younger Jewish generation, played an important role in the fight for emancipation as well as in that for Reform.⁶⁾ On the other hand we must become doubtful about the purely political and opportunistic motives of the early reformers realizing that parallel Reform movements took place in the Christian Churches. The German Catholics⁷⁾ in breaking away from the ceremonialism, and the authority of the Church, in displacing Latin and introducing German into their services were certainly lead only by the progressive spirit of the time and not by any opportunistic

considerations, as there was no doubt about their emancipation.⁸⁾ The same holds true for the movement of the "Lichtfreunde" in the Protestant church, claiming for its followers the right of unrestricted scientific investigation and complete freedom for personal development. The Bible becomes their Palladium. They strive to interpret it rationally and humanly. The inner connection between these groups and the Reform movement in Judaism is self-evident.⁹⁾ Both are assimilatory in their essence, trying to assimilate themselves to the spirit of the time. However, it is safe to say that on account of their changed political and social status Jews in general and the educated Jews of this time in particular were apt to exaggerate the process of this assimilation so that their Reform did not mean so much a development of Judaism as a development away from Judaism.

Their religion had to be brought up to date, had to agree with the spirit, the fashion, the public opinion of the time. While religion's task is to assimilate the world to God's kingdom, for them not religion but the "Zeitgeist" became standard and in their overemphasized modernity they proclaimed a Reform of Judaism which was not based on its foundation. That this was the case is only too understandable: liberated people always try to be thoroughly modern. And the comedy frequently is that what they accept as modern,¹⁰⁾ in the meantime has come to be quite old fashioned.

The classical example for this attitude is the Frankfurt Society of the Friends of Reform. In 1837 there appeared in Geiger's "Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fuer die juedische Theologie" (pp. 161 - 171)¹¹⁾ an anonymous article by a Frankfurt layman stating the case quite clearly: Reform of Judaism is necessary, due to the higher education and the emancipation of the Jews. It is the duty of the rabbis to lead in this direction, however, being rabbis of the entire community they are afraid to do so. Therefore, it is up to the non-theologians to state their position clearly and to make a solemn declaration on their stand to the rabbis who are called upon to state whether this declaration is truthful or not. Although admitting that the laymen have neither the knowledge nor the authority to bring about changes, the author demands that all those who sign such a declaration shall make known that they refuse to invest the Talmud and later codes with any greater authority than other temporary religious institutions whose reasonableness has to be established first. This article, however, was but the prelude to the founding of the "Verein der Reformfreunde" in Frankfurt whose program of August 1843 expressed the following sentiment:

established at Frankfurt. "Thousands have renounced allegiance to Talmudic rabbinical Judaism and are connected outwardly with the Mosaic religious community only by habit, by the control

of the state, or by family ties. This state of affairs is destructive and immoral: for as long as a man lives in a community, he should not pass as something altogether different externally from what he is in thought and inner conviction.¹²⁾ Clearest expression finds the ideology of this group in the famous declaration issued together with a circular letter and the program in August 1843 which reads as follows: 1) We recognize the possibility of unlimited development in the Mosaic religion. 2) The collection of controversies, dissertations and prescriptions commonly designated by the name Talmud possesses for us no authority, neither from the dogmatic nor from the practical standpoint. 3) A Messiah who is to lead the Israelites back to the land of Palestine is neither expected nor desired by us; we know no fatherland except that to which we belong by birth or citizenship.¹³⁾ In addition to this it became known that a paragraph disavowing circumcision had been part of the original declaration and had been omitted more or less for reasons of diplomacy.

Analyzing the three documents from which we quoted, the anonymous article of 1857 and the program and declaration of 1843, we will discover four striking elements which characterize this Reform movement which although unsuccessful in itself, exerted great influence on similar groups

in Berlin and Breslau with which we will have to deal later on: 1) The movement is a lay-movement, and although complaining about the inactivity or slow progressiveness of the theologians, it really does not want their leadership. 2) In stressing the Mosaic character of Judaism it complies with the true spirit of Christian reformation, going back to the original sources and disregarding later developments completely. 3) Disregarding circumcision and the concept of the Messiah (not transforming it but disregarding it completely) bears witness to the opportunistic motives of the movement. 4) Reason is the basis and highest criterion even of matters religious.

The publication of the Hamburg prayerbook, especially of its second edition in 1841, had caused a great controversy within German Jewry.¹⁴⁾ However, all this was nothing compared to the storm roused by the declaration of the Frankfort reformers. In the second controversy on the Hamburg prayerbook it was mainly the adherents of strict Orthodoxy who protested vigorously and condemned the new prayerbook completely, while the more progressive spirits among the rabbis of Germany were sympathetically and even favorably (even a conservative like Zacharias Frankel) understandingly disposed towards it. Here, however, in the case of the Frankfort friends of Reform, all orthodox, progressives and

conservatives were up in arms with resentment and protest.

Bernays calls the Society a "Heusekte". Giving up the Jewish past (circumcision) denying the future (Messiah) and the law of the present (tradition) they cast themselves out of the Jewish fold and do not even deserve any theological discussion.¹⁵⁾

Gabriel Riesser, the champion of emancipation, voiced his indignation in calling point 1 of the declaration: a mere phrase, while he considers 2 and 3 merely retorts upon the watchword Judaeophobia. He despised its tendency "for it does not serve the truth, its only purpose is the effect it may produce upon the civic authorities".¹⁶⁾

Geiger also declares himself against the statement of the Frankfort Society and formulates a declaration of his own against theirs, 1) Judaism is the original expression of the pure religious consciousness. We maintain that it is destined to demonstrate this religious consciousness at all times, and to spread it among its professing adherents. We identify ourselves with it. 2) External expressions of Judaism changing with the standpoint of different times, have to be separated from its eternal spirit. The middle ages in particular encrusted Judaism, and although we feel the pulse beat of its spirit even through this crust, still this shell as evidenced in Talmudic and other Rabbinic

literature, cannot be of normative value for us. We are obliged to fit in Judaism into our time as a truly religious power. 3) Judaism is destined to become the religion of humanity. So far it was apparent in one people which was permeated with its spirit. Judaism must be separated from all national elements, which - necessarily so - became part of its expressions. We do not think that Judaism depends on the belief that its followers will once again form a political unit. On the contrary, we proclaim that we consider ourselves as being closely related to the country in which we live: "it is our fatherland."¹⁷⁾ This so much more positive statement carried by a true feeling for Judaism and based on knowledge of it is quite striking as compared to the cold, rationalistic, purely negative declaration of the Frankfort reformers.

Samuel H. Oldheim, although much closer to the spirit of the Frankfort declaration than Geiger, also found himself in disagreement with it, and reformulated its first statement in accordance with his standpoint as follows: "We acknowledge the Mosaic religion as taught in Pentateuch and Prophets as the eternal religion of Israel - omitting everything which concerns the Mosaic constitution, and refers to the conditions of Israel as a separate nation, as well as laws and rites connected with all that."¹⁸⁾

Thus the storm rages, and the Frankfort Society is sentenced to death from all sides. However, it succeeds in one way: it brings to a climax the general turmoil over the adjustment of Judaism to the new conditions of the Jew and focusses the attention of the Jewish public upon the rabbis. One expects leadership from them as a whole, and especially from those whose progressive spirit was widely known already. Ludwig Philippson, one of the greatest organizing spirits of this period who "frequently finds the right word at the right time"¹⁹⁾ sums up the entire situation when calling for a conference of rabbis. He writes on January 15th, 1844: "...The fundamental fault of our time is the disunion and distant relationship of those who are destined to be the spiritual leaders of the congregations....Judaism at the present is subject to many fluctuations. Not only that there exist parties, but they confront each other unrestrainedly and in a hostile spirit. A short while - and the break will be irreparable. Of essential importance is not anymore the permissibility or non-permissibility of this or that ritual institution, of alleviating this or that law for the sake of civic and social life, but we are concerned with the entire content of our religion which we must express and confirm in its purity and divinity to protect it against the deadly petrification on the one hand and to

save it from the conserving disbelief on the other. The essence of Israelitic religion becomes weaker from day to day. Every laymen asks us (the ra bis) : What are you going to do about it? Therefore, let us clasp the brotherly hands whole-heartedly," 1) to meet and to come closer to each other, 2) to stimulate each other in the practice of the rabbinate, 3) to undertake and plan common works and institutions, 4) to consider and take council about all matters concerning us Israelites.

P A R T I

The Rabbinical conferences of the forties of the last century are of outstanding importance for the development of the liberal movement within German Jewry. Their significance lies not so much in what was actually accomplished by these assemblies as in the very fact that they were held at all, and in the spirit in which they were conducted. It is in the course of these conferences and through the personalities who assumed leadership in them that the Liberal Judaism originated as something distinct from the Reform movement which at the time could look back upon a history of more than a quarter of a century.

1)

Ludwig Philippson's invitation for this first gathering of the spiritual leaders of the Jewish communities in Germany was very well received. Representatives of all the parties within the Jewry of that time expressed their willingness to participate. Forty rabbis from as strictly orthodox a man as M. Sachs to a radical of Mendel Hess' type ; from a moderate reformer like Bodenheimer to Z. Frankel, foremost champion of conservative Judaism, declared their readiness to take up the challenge and bring order into the chaos of developments and wilful, unsystematic and unorganic changes which, as described in the previous chapter ruled the age. However, only twenty three actually put in an appearance when the conference began its sessions in the

3)
middle of June 1844 . Why the rest stayed away is difficult to determine. Three topics for discussion had been announced in the "Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums"⁴⁾ :

1) The foundation of a Jewish theological faculty. 2) Participation of the conference in the founding of a Jewish hospital and a Jewish school in Jerusalem. The third point is the only one which hints at a controversial issue, but it, too, is phrased so carefully that it should not have been in the way of those who actually desired to participate with heart and soul: 3) How can an agreement regarding the improvement of the ritual be reached. - In other words, the discussion is to serve purely practical purposes. And this goal is actually realized. Abraham Geiger who is unable to be present at the first meetings, warns the conference in his lines of greeting⁵⁾ against the discussion of all issues of principle (as e. g. any definite stand for or against the Frankfort Society of Friends of Reform). The conference must be entirely practical. Questions of ritual and custom, e. g., the eating of legumes on Passover should be aired. Founding of a seminary and necessary reforms of the service are the burning issues of the day.

The first paragraph of the constitution of the conference also stresses this practical aspect: "The rabbinical conferences serve the purpose to commonly consider

means by which the preservation and development of Judaism and a revival of the religious spirit can be effected." ⁶⁾

President Maier in his opening words also reminds the members of the conference to keep in mind the demands of modern life with which this gathering is confronted, and in regard to which it is expected to reach conclusions. ⁷⁾ The entire conference and its influence later on suffers from this lack of principle. One agrees only on one thing: reforms are necessary. However, the majority is not prepared or not willing to say the least to determine what the basis for these "necessary reforms" as Geiger calls them, should be. It is, therefore, only natural that those of the members of the Braunschweig meeting who have developed set principles for themselves try to base the resolutions of the conference on these principles. Thus, in regard to the question of the oath for Jews which in some German states was still administered more judaico, Holdheim attempts to set up his distinction between Jewish law and Jewish religion as the guiding principle by which the question should be decided. Only Jewish law requires guarantees against "reservations mentales", but not Jewish religion. Only the Bible can be asked about the meaning of the oath for the Israelite, and only the Bible can determine his stand. - On the other hand, Maier, his opponent in this discussion, stresses that for

them as Talmudic rabbinical Jews the prescription of the traditional law, namely the [אין חובה] presents an absolute necessity. The highest authority for Goldheim in this matter is the Bible ⁸⁾, while Haier accepts the binding power of the Talmud. ⁹⁾

Even more obvious becomes the basic weakness of the conference due to its lack of principles in the discussion on liturgical changes and the role of Hebrew in the service of the synagogue. In an inspired speech Frankfurter of Hamburg says regarding this: "We do not want to patch, but we want to heal thoroughly and completely; we want to build firmly, so as to preserve the Sacred, and to secure for our children and for the future a religious life, which is pure and takes hold of the entire soul." ¹⁰⁾ This is very good oratory, and the majority of the conference falls for it. There are only three who recognize the hollowness and superficiality of all changes without establishing first some sort of a platform. Bod enheimer is the first to stress the importance of formulating articles of faith on the basis of which one should introduce reforms. He contends that every liturgy must be based on a definite creed. Hess and Formstecher support his plea ¹¹⁾, however, without any success. Most of the speakers in this debate try to avoid the question of the "Glaubensbekenntnis"; Hirsch, e. g., thinks that

to decide whether a creed is necessary or not is entirely up to the committee which will consider the liturgical changes. Holdheim on the other hand, takes a strong stand¹²⁾ against the formulation of articles of faith. Creed and the coerciveness of dogmas are one and the same thing. One's Jewishness does not depend on the recognition of this or that declaration or dogma, but alone on one's being born a Jew. The men of the Great Assembly had authority for all their decisions in and for their time; we today have¹³⁾ just as much authority for our time. The inconsistency of his position here is self-evident. On the one hand, this otherwise brilliant logician advocates the breaking of authority and refuses to recognize dogmas; on the other hand, he claims authority for himself on the basis of the old authority which he wants to do away with, not only because it is old, but because authority as such stands in contrast to the spirit of the age.

How necessary also from a merely practical standpoint the establishing of a common platform would have been, will become clear when we realize how much difference as to basic conceptions existed between individual members of the conference. While Maier in his motion¹⁴⁾ states as a fact that Hebrew is not understood anymore by nine-tenths of the German Jews, and, therefore, advocates the introduction of

the vernacular into the services, Goldmann blames the teachers of the communities for this sad state of affairs, and claims that the liturgy once one teaches people to understand it, does not have to be changed at all. He also takes the opportunity to attack the Temple as a religious institution. The Polish synagogue, despite its lack of discipline, has much more religious effect on those who participate in its service than the Temple with all its beautiful order. From the Polish synagogue the Jew comes home truly inspired, while those who attend the Temple belong to the most irreligious elements. The Temple is "anstaendig", the Polish synagogue "religieus"¹⁵⁾. It seems that a clarification of the term "religious" would have been in place here. However, nothing of the sort happens, except a furious attack on the sincerity of those who pray in the Polish synagogue, launched by Salomon, the preacher of the Hamburg Temple. Most of the speakers express themselves to the effect that as far as a definite change of the liturgy is concerned, they would like to shift the responsibility to a committee which will present its suggestions to the next conference.

Here it is L. Philippson who now realizes that a Reform of the liturgy without any firm basis is almost impossible. Hence, he tries to force his personal principle

upon the committee which is to be elected for further discussion of the liturgical questions. Although he does not seem to make much of an impression with his words on the members of the conference, still in them he voices ideas which later on determine the development of Liberal Judaism in Germany. "The great gap which dominates Judaism today must not be overlooked. A revised liturgy does not satisfy. On the other hand, it is very difficult to introduce anew one. Even those who are most favorably disposed towards something new, at times want to have the old ritual preserved. Our task is that of mediation. We have to start from the practical standpoint. We must work for the future, however, on the firm ground of the past. Religion in the heart of man is - Idea. Within the ritual the form of the Idea becomes manifest. Divine service of a definite religion must always maintain the historical form. Therefore, Hebrew must remain besides the German - national element and permeate it organically. We want to be Germans and also Jews. Every people has its mission in history----The Jews' mission is that they are the people of religion. For this mission a special language was needed. Hebrew is the most perfect language of religion."¹⁶⁾

Also the conference sermon preached by Herzfeldt of Brunswick contains elements which we will find again and

again in the later development of the liberal Jewish movement. It is of particular importance, since it bears witness to the overcoming of the pure rationalism of enlightenment with which some of the leading spirits of this conference are still imbued. Taking his text from Daniel 12.5, the preacher asks who are the **מַשְׂכִּילִים**, who the **מַצְדִּיקֵי רַבִּים**? ".....Follow only the directions of your intellect, and deny everything for which you cannot offer a tangible proof,express doubt concerning every historical memory which elevates the spirit,reject every emotional custom which was holy unto your fathers and contributed towards the golden glamour of your youth, - do all that and see whether you still have left something warm and fresh and joyful, whether you do not find yourself as someone pitiful and poor; your only possession a certain trend of thinking ("Geistesrichtung") which makes you feel miserable." On the other hand, we must also remember **קִיּוֹב הַלֵּב מִכָּל** As intellect is all eyes and nothing else, so the heart in itself is without eyes and does not know for what goal it strives.....Understanding without piety is of no value as is also piety without understanding. He who wants to be counted among the **מַשְׂכִּילִים** of Daniel must possess both. And everyone can and should fulfill these requirements, the theologians even to a higher degree. He shall foster

and cultivate the development of the spirit; and then with its light he shall enter courageously into the religious life of his congregation. Let him not fear lest he reveal faults. His light meliorated by piety will never become a fire brand but a light of guidance. Whatever cannot stand this pious light, shall flee, and return to the darkness where it belongs, it has no place in the religion of light.....The theologian shall revere what was holy unto our fathers, if it is capable of being purified. Our religion possesses so many things of this type which under the skillful hand of the gardener can be cultivated for God's garden.....He who regards the new and healthy turn with contempt, and sees in the Judaism of today naught but disruption and dissolution, will, of course, consider the small remnant of the old type Orthodoxy as the kernel of Israel. However, such a man is not a מצדיק רבים, but a מרשיע רבים for he passes negative judgment on the vast majority, while the מצדיק רבים say: the mass of the people so far is still healthy, however, their health is threatened. If they shall retain their life power, we will have to meet the modern, religious needs half-ways, removing everything which is incompatible with or offensive to modern feeling, and creating that which our time, our Weltanschauung, our education demands of us.¹⁷⁾ The influence

of romanticism with its historical interest, and its emphasis on feeling as being as important as reason is clearly noticeable here.

16)
Evaluating the results of the conference, we must confess that the assembly certainly did not measure up to the high standard proclaimed in this sermon. Major discussions were passed mainly on the more or less political issues as, e. g., the declaration that the essence of the Jewish oath consists merely of calling upon the name of God, or the confirmation of the answers of the French Sanhedrin. This did not exactly contribute towards the recognition of the work of the conference, as it had a tinge of opportunism and bargaining for emancipation, especially since all issues of inner Jewish importance as the question of Hebrew, changes in the liturgy, revision of the marriage laws, and adjustment of the conflict between modern life and the Jewish Sabbath were postponed for the next conference after committees had been appointed to prepare their discussion. On the other hand, such criticism is hardly justified, since as far as practical results are concerned hardly anything more could be expected of this first gathering. It could only be of a more or less preparatory nature. Yet, the negative tenor of the meeting was severely criticized by important members of the conference from within

as well as from without.

¹⁹⁾
Zacharias Frankel, as mouthpiece for the conservatives, doubts the religious seriousness of the rabbis assembled in Brunswick and questions whether they were actually aware of the great responsibility which they had taken upon themselves. Showing the inconsistency which was evidenced by the conference on account of its unwillingness to adopt a platform as principle basis for its discussion, he writes: "If the Talmud was silent, if according to the statement of many a speaker, it conceived the laws in a purely legalistic sense, and did not go beyond its limited scope, then it is the duty of those who want to develop Judaism spiritually, to go beyond the Talmud, and not to claim the authority of the orthodox rabbinical standpoint for themselves.....If he wants to reform, let him follow truth also herein, let him not shun from giving something positive; let him not direct his eyes towards the outside; let him not flirt with modern time, but let him deal honestly and sincerely with his faith."²⁰⁾

Ludwig Philippson is bitterly disappointed in the conference which he himself had called. He decries its purely critical attitude setting the surgeon's knife to everything, destroying every possibility for a regeneration and rejuvenating of Judaism, which he had anticipated from such a gathering

of the religious leaders of German Jewry. The reformistic or as he would like to call it, the "logical party" won the upper hand in Brunswick, while the "principle of mediation which wants to continue building on the foundation of the historically developed.....which reveres the religious custom not because it is sanctified through the letter or the word, but because life has caused it to become the firm ground of positive Judaism" - did not find the proper response at this first conference.²²⁾ However, not those who attended the conference are really to blame for the dominance of the rationalistic, critical, negative element during the conference, but those who did not come,²³⁾ carry the responsibility for it. Philippson's conclusion, therefore, is that the conservative element must be strengthened in the following conferences. Everything, their authority and effect depends on the fulfillment of²⁴⁾ this one condition.

As to the practical influence of the Brunswick decisions on the religious life of the Jewish communities in Germany, we can only state that it was quite negligible. Even a minor change like the abolishment of the Kol Nidre (with the explicit understanding that it should be done away with this very year) does not seem to have found widespread regard by the members of the conference, although

it had been adopted²⁵⁾ unanimously, and only Bodenheimer and Goldmann went on record as being doubtful whether they would be able to comply with this decision this year already. The "Allgemeine Zeitung für das Judentum" records only two congregations as siding with the decision²⁶⁾ of the conference. The editor of the magazine, Philippson, himself does not seem to have abolished the Kol Nidre in his own service, as he reports the change in the Bernburg and Braunschweig communities and does not make mention of Magdeburg, his own congregation. This is the more surprising as paragraph 11 of the conference's constitution reads: "The decisions of the conference are binding for those who voted in their favour. They are morally obliged to put them into practice in their own congregations to the best of their abilities, and as far as conditions permit." We must realize, of course, that in many cases any liturgical changes may have been forbidden by government orders, and that the opposition to even slight reforms on the part of some congregations must have been very stubborn. Nevertheless, we would have expected the liberalizing influence of the conference to be much stronger and more widely spread than that.

However, despite all this the reaction of the different camps and parties within German Jewry to the Brunswick con-

ference is quite remarkable. Seventy-seven orthodox rabbis voiced a furious protest against this assembly of their colleagues, storming against everything for which it ⁰strived to stand. For the first time - as they thought - in Jewish history an organized body of rabbis had not only given sanction to reforms, but had also actively participated in planning and realizing them, not to speak of their attacks on Talmud and Shulchan Aruch. ²⁸⁾

At the other extreme, namely in the party of the educated laymen who craved for Reform the meager results of the conference, the disunion in spirit and extreme caution of its members were received with disappointment. It seemed to them that these progressive rabbis who were one with them as to ideas, however, not in regard to action would accomplish much more, once-so to speak- a moral background was provided for them to fall back on by a parallel laymen-organization. Thus, the year 1845 witnesses ^dthe founding of two Societies for Reform, one in Breslau and the other in Berlin, even before the second Rabbinical conference convenes. While the activities of the former ceased ²⁹⁾ already in 1846, the latter in its distinct development which departed more and more from the general trend of Liberal Judaism in Germany is of great importance. Undoubtedly, the thirty educated laymen ³⁰⁾ who signed the Berlin

Declaration in April 1845 had learned their lesson from the fate of the Frankfort Society. Their proclamation to their "German brethren in faith" is much more positive in spirit than the creed of negations which the former had issued.³¹⁾ Even those of its parts which expressed criticism of the old, and desire for something new, were worded so carefully that they, too, gave the impression of positive statements. Therefore, although agreeing with the Frankfort Society of the Friends of Reform in their aversion to the Talmud, the Berlin Society, along with the negation of its binding authority of Talmud and Codes, states at the same time its acknowledgement of them as a platform for past times when it says: rabbinical Judaism with its firm basis does not have this firm foundation for us anymore, although taking practically the same negative attitude towards the traditional Messianic idea, their statement expresses merely a change of this belief, and not an abandoning of it altogether, as they voice their hope that Judaism's God concept will be accepted by all mankind.³²⁾ According to Holdheim, the most essential difference between the spirit of these two groups as voiced in their declarations, becomes apparent in that the Frankfort reformers directed their attack against antiquated Judaism, and were moved to issue their statement only for

the sake of their own individual freedom, and for the purpose of justifying themselves before their own ethical consciousness, while the Berlin "Genossenschaft" turns only against the antiquated forms of Judaism and accepts responsibility for the entire religious community of Jews. As its final goal, therefore, it sets up a synod which will decide on all important questions of German Jewry.

However, despite this more positive and more earnest attitude the Berlin Reform group, at least its majority, was just as much guided by shallow rationalism and a plain desire for accomodating their Judaism to the needs of the time as their Frankfurt predecessors. The present alone counted and even in their not wanting to break with the whole of the Jewish community this present-mindedness is evidenced. Only the "now" and everything in it finds acknowledgement with them. A historical view fitting Jews and Judaism of the present as a link in the chain of Jewish generations seems unimportant to them. Not the development of Judaism through the many centuries of its history serves as standard for their Reform, but only present-day conditions. This unhistorical attitude becomes particularly evident in the furious attack against anything rabbinic which is launched by S. Stern, the leader of the movement, in a speech only one month after the declaration was issued.

Even the modern theology of progressive rabbinism based on the science of Judaism is included in this attack and rejected as "ausgedroschenes Stroh der Schriftgelehrsamkeit".³³⁾ With indignation the question is posed: shall rabbinism, or the middle ages deny the rights to reform according to the urgent needs of the present?³⁴⁾ To Holdheim's mind this is only one more proof for the lack of true understanding of Judaism on the part of Stern who, as it were, is haunted by the "ghost of rabbinism" past and present. For consistently the Bible should, of course, have been included in this question, because, according to Holdheim's conception of Reform, only that which throughout all the different developments of Judaism - regardless whether in Bible or later tradition - has proven itself eternal, shall be preserved.³⁵⁾ Nevertheless, it is this complete lack of historical understanding which wins the upper hand in the Berlin Society, and is largely responsible for transforming what had started out as a movement willing to bear the burden of responsibility for the entire Jewish community, and intending to revitalize Judaism on a large scale into a separate congregation whose narrow view-point and private character finally deprived it of all positive influence.

The critique of and the different reactions to the

conference of 1944 are important factors for the setting of the stage on which the Frankfort conference takes place the following year. The protest of the orthodox against the Brunswick meeting had evoked sympathies for it from numerous congregations who were desirous of a change in their religious life and looked with great eagerness for the guidance and leadership of the progressive rabbis. Proof for this are the many letters which were received by the Frankfort conference. Some of these addresses give a clear picture of the conditions which demand a Reform.³⁶⁾ Most characteristic among them is a memorandum from Worms, which wants to present to the conference religious feelings and wishes of "the most educated part of this community", as far as they could be of interest for the discussion of the rabbis. Their first complaint concerns the conducting of the service which does not give them the inspiration which they expect from it. There is no prayer on the Sabbath morning before the reading of the Torah which could really serve to establish the inner contact between congregation and God. The lack of religious stimulus causes many to converse with each other, so that before the taking out of the holy scrolls, quiet has to be established in an undignified fashion. The reading of scripture itself in the traditional "trop" is foreign

to their ears; music and text do not seem to agree with one another. The sermon presents the only oasis in this wilderness. However, its effect is soon destroyed through the "Mussaf" prayer which follows it and which in its references to the sacrificial cult is perfectly meaningless to the modern mind. The only inspiration during this part of the service is the "Kedushah". It can be easily understood how on account of these conditions the most important element of religion namely, the divine service, loses all meaning, and educated Jews are thus deprived of their religious rebirth which they hope to derive from such hours of worship.

The second part of this address is mainly concerned with the difficulty of its authors to see any religious significance in the dietary laws. What shall they teach their children in this regard? Shall they permit them something whose permission has not been acknowledged officially? After all, they do not have any authority to do that. On the other hand, shall they present the breaking of these laws as something which is forbidden even now in our modern days? Do they not risk by doing that the collapse of all religious certainty on the part of their children as life most probably will change the youth of the day in this respect, just as it has changed them? -

Also within their homes they feel the lack of sacredness with which religious forms and ceremonies had invested it for former generations. The creation of a modern book of devotion may be of great help in this respect. As things are, their homes are void of the spirit of religion, and it is with grief that they see the coming generation thus³⁷⁾ deprived of religious inspiration. Although denying it, this and most of the other addresses were intended to bolster up the moral of the conference which, as these laymen feared, was imperiled by the violent pronouncements of the orthodox rabbis against it. Education, modern thinking, progressiveness, improved social position, close connection with the German spirit are the elements which let most of these communities turn to the second conference and express their confidence and appreciation for its work. The desperate struggle for a completion of their emancipation speaks out of these letters with crystal clearness. They seem, as it were, to stand constantly before a mirror and take a look at themselves trying to find out what, in their external and spiritual appearance, might not fit into the general pattern of the people and the time of which they now are about to become a part. Most of them want to remain Jews, however, European Jews, free of even the slightest Asiatic tinge.

The critique of the purely negative attitude of the Brunswick gathering and Philippson's call for strengthening the conservative element in the conferences to take place during the year following, did not go unheeded: The most prominent leader of conservative Judaism and one of the severest critics of the Brunswick conference was finally persuaded to actively participate in Frankfort.

All these different factors contributed to making the conference of 1845 an event of greatest significance for the development of the movement with which this study is concerned. For it is in the course of the Frankfort conference that the line is drawn between the element out of which liberal Judaism grows, and all other movements related to it. The center of discussion at this meeting forms the problem of the use of Hebrew in the service of the synagogue. The question as formulated by the committee appointed in Brunswick runs as follows: "Whether and to what extent can Hebrew be considered (objectively) necessary in divine service and, if its objective necessity be denied, whether and to what extent does it seem advisable to continue its use."³⁸⁾

However, even before the discussion of the point proper, could begin, the lack of a principle as basis for the Reform planned which, as was pointed out above, dominated

the last conference, was challenged here immediately by Z. Frankel who stresses the necessity of adopting a basic principle before the discussion can be continued. "Real reforming is always something constructive, however, that does not hold true for reforming without principles. The lack of principles is the greatest enemy of faith." His principle is the platform of positive historical Judaism. We cannot return to the letter of scripture, distance separating us from it is too far, however, we must also not permit ourselves to be influenced only by the changing spirit of our time. The basis of every Reform, and especially of one which is concerned with the change of activities prescribed by law, and not with a transformation of creed, must be science. The aim of this assembly must not consist of creating new parties, but of reconciling those which exist at present. The president of the conference, Stein, who was instrumental in obtaining Frankel's participation in and cooperation with the conference answers immediately and states under demonstrations of general consent that the conference also stands by the principle of revealed positive-historical Judaism as developed by science. Frankel, apparently satisfied with this declaration, continues now to speak on the question under discussion, and points out that inasmuch as the conference finds it-

self on the firm ground of positive-historical Judaism, its positive attitude should not be veiled by as playful a question as the one on the floor. Everyone realizes, of course, that objectively the Talmud permits the use of any language for the purpose of prayer. However, Hebrew is an organic part of the very essence of Judaism. Besides, retaining it in the service assures the continuance of its knowledge which is absolutely necessary for the understanding of the Bible, so that misinterpretations of it as Philo on the basis of the Greek text gave them, might not be multiplied.³⁹⁾

Formstecher takes the opportunity to state again as he did in Brunswick that on the basis of the positive historical standpoint first a normative authority must be acknowledged by the conference before the objective necessity of Hebrew can be decided upon. Geiger, on the other hand, refuses to look at the question from any other than a merely practical standpoint, and does not want to discuss principles. He equates objective necessity with legal necessity which, of course, does not exist, and does not seem to realize that by this he accepts the Talmudic legal principle as norm. The undecidedness on the question of the leading principle again wins the upper hand here, the adopted platform of positive historical Judaism being

so broad as to leave room for many different norms and principles within it. The majority of the rabbis accepts Geiger's view and denies the legally objective necessity of Hebrew in the service of the synagogue. Frankel and Formstecher alone abstain from voting.

The second part of the question is re-formulated by the president as follows:⁴⁰⁾ "Is the retaining of Hebrew in public worship, objectively necessary for any other reason outside of legal consideration?" It is at this point that the different opinions clash against one another with great vehemency. Holdheim, leading the radical wing, declares himself definitely against the use of Hebrew altogether. He is convinced that the abolishing of Hebrew will have a beneficent influence upon the purification of the conception of Jewish religion. Instead of harming the mission of Judaism, it will, on the contrary, strengthen it inwardly and gain for it recognition from outside. Surprisingly enough he is joined in this completely negative stand by Geiger who declares that praying in one's mother tongue is most desirable. As for himself, he can state that despite the fact that Hebrew was the first language he ever learned, still a German prayer stimulates his devotional spirit much more deeply than one in Hebrew. Furthermore, Hebrew is not alive anymore within the people

as can be seen from their apathy or lack of attention during the reading of the Torah. He considers it an insult to Judaism to say that with the abolishing of Hebrew, Judaism will be shaken in its very foundation. It would be sad, indeed, were one to assume that Judaism could not continue existence without the help of the crutches of language. Besides, language is mainly a national characteristic, however, no member of the conference would seriously claim that Judaism necessarily is linked with a separate nationality.

To find Geiger in this question so completely on Holdheim's side, is the more surprising for us as the two men, as we shall have occasion to point out, differ so completely in their basic conceptions, and Geiger as a whole, from his starting point on down to his aim seems to be so much closer to Frankel and quite far removed from Holdheim. His words here seem to be completely isolated, as neither in any of his writings nor in the prayer book which he edits in 1854, and which we shall discuss in greater detail later on, do we find such radicalism expressed or put into practice. His statement in this discussion impresses us as a strange exaggeration from this otherwise so cautious and moderate man. It is difficult to tell what the reason for this queer attitude might have been.

Frankel in his answer considers the national aspect of Hebrew in this context as perfectly unessential. Emancipation has nothing to do with the Religious; no religious

element must be sacrificed for its sake. We have to preserve whatever is religious. And if nationality should be something religious, we would have to profess it without reservation. Hebrew for the Jew has stronger religious power than any other language. Religion as something abstract needs an external bond which will remind us of God at all times. Hebrew just as phylacteries and the Mezuzah serves this purpose. Hebrew is the language of revelation. Hence it must dominate the service of the synagogue which does not mean that German shall be banned from it altogether. On the contrary, it is very necessary to conduct part of the service in the vernacular. However, Hebrew was always considered so important in Jewish worship that one might have fixed its permanent position by a law, had one thought it at all possible that its necessity might be doubted at any time.

The majority of the speakers who follow in this debate are radically opposed to any extensive and some even to any use of Hebrew in the service of the synagogue. They would have it limited to a minimum. Their reason is rather strange, considering that it is given by the leaders and teachers of a generation: time and again it is stated that Hebrew is not understood anymore, and Jewish youth has more important things to do than to learn this ancient

tongue which in the opinion of many a rabbi at the Frankfurt meeting is rather poor and limited in its expression. Here an element appears which we shall find again and again in later developments, namely, the fear of the leaders to make demands on the people they lead. Too frequently at these conferences we have the feeling that it is the flock which guides its shepherd, and not vice versa, as it would normally be expected. And in reality even those who try to point out the complete estrangement of the people from Hebrew, later on in the discussion, have to admit that the necessity of a Hebrew service is still felt rather strongly by the vast majority of the people. The others, who are convinced of the absolute necessity of maintaining Hebrew in the service, have a particularly difficult stand. They try to express more or less a feeling, namely, that the Hebrew language represents a symbol of loyalty to the Judaism of the past, and a bond of unity between all Jews of the present. These emotional arguments are met by cold logic, and are, of course, defeated.

The margin by which the absolute necessity of maintaining Hebrew in the service of the synagogue is voted against is surprisingly small. The most important men on the winning side, fifteen in all, are: Einhorn, Auerbach, Geiger, Maier, Salomon, Huldshain, while the opposition of thirteen among others is comprised of: Bankel, Philipp-

son, Jost, Hirsch, Stein. The next question concerning the advisability on subjective necessity of maintaining Hebrew in parts of the service finds unanimous affirmation. Three main reasons are offered. 1) The belief of the people still requires Hebrew in prayer (Formsteeger). 2) Hebrew is necessary today as an accommodation to the present conditions in the congregations. (Holdheim, Geiger)⁴¹⁾ 3) It is the common bond between Jews. (Guildenstein).

As to the problem how much of the liturgy should be conducted in Hebrew, the suggestion of the committee is adopted by a majority vote. Thus, only those parts of the service are to be retained in Hebrew which express common faith, common descent and common hope. Everything else should be in German. The service as a whole must be brought back to the original simple forms in accordance with the studies of Zunz. Hebrew is, therefore, to be maintained only in the: **ברכו** and its response, **שמע** until the end of the first section, the three first and the three last benedictions of the **תפלה** and the **קריאת תורה**.⁴²⁾

As the motion of the committee was accepted only in principle nothing practical developed from this decision. Thus the only important result which the entire discussion produced was purely negative, namely, Frankel's withdrawal from the conference. In a letter to the pre-

sident he states as reason that since the majority of the conference decided that Hebrew be maintained in the service only for reasons of advisability, and that it is the task of the rabbi to see to it that it be removed gradually, he must confess that he does not only differ from this standpoint in opinion, but in basic tendency. This spirit which pushes aside the Historical, in his eyes, is not the spirit of preservation but the spirit of the destruction of the positive historical Judaism, which he had stated as his principle⁴³⁾ on the floor of the conference.

In its answer to this communication the conference protests against the allegation made by Frankel that it had abandoned the standpoint of positive historical Judaism. Although it did not consider the Hebrew element in the service as absolutely essential, still the great value of Hebrew was recognized by it. The positive-historical standpoint stands for development out of the existing, not creation from a void. Our prayers also shall take shape, if at all possible out of that which exists already. The firm ground of the Historical is not forsaken by praying in a language other than Hebrew, just as it had not been denied by the Talmudists who offered the holiest prayers in Aramaic. The conference expresses the belief that Frankel by taking issue with this particular point and raising it to a

question of essential ideological difference has not only left the conference but abandoned his own standpoint and its consequences as well. Thus both Frankel in his attack, and the conference in its defense, claim the positive historical standpoint for themselves. While the stress on the Historical stands out clearly as far as the former is concerned, we must not be led astray so as to believe that the latter only pretended to abide by this principle. The vast majority of the conference actually stands by it, and differences result mainly from changes of emphasis as we shall have occasion to point out when we discuss the position of the leading personalities in the liberal movement among the Jews of that period. At times, however, political motives becloud this principle of positive historical Judaism as can be shown particularly well in the treatment of the role of the Messianic concept in the liturgy.⁴⁴⁾ H. Goldheim, the only member of the conference who seems to act consistently all the way through, emphasizes, in accordance with his principles, radical as they are, that nothing political may be considered as being part of the sphere of religion. The Messianic hope must be conceived of as a purely religious one. Everything political inherent in the conception is incompatible with the duties and feelings towards the fatherland.⁴⁵⁾ Auerbach goes even beyond

Holdheim, expresses in his statement the great optimism and faith in the modern age, and in modern society when he says: In our days righteousness and brotherly affection among men as evidenced by the laws and institutions of the modern state have laid a foundation which will never be shaken. We witness today the approach of God's kingdom on earth, hastened through the striving of mankind; therefore, we may abandon all national hopes. In other words, he, as well as many of the other speakers, identifies the old Messianic belief of Judaism with the progress idea of modern liberalism. What Frankel had hinted at, namely, the possibility of an inner connection between the religious and the national element does not find any consideration at all. The national and political hope of Israel is sacrificed on the altar of universal human perfection, and this despite the fact that some of these outstanding exponents of German Jewry realize from their historical position that the national element will never disappear from the memory of the Jewish people altogether on account of the strong bond of its common descent. Most of them, however, wish to leave this historical fact to the past. It may serve as a common basis or starting point, yet, they are not willing to close the cycle, and accept the political and national as also part of their

46)
future . Carried by the liberal spirit of their time, they want to know themselves - in their hopes and in their prayers for a future at least - one with all mankind, at last accepted completely, and without any reservations. Important to note in this context is that the belief in a personal Messiah does not present a central problem here, as it does later. In other words, the political at this stage, still plays the major, the theological, the minor role. For most of the rabbis present here, a personal Messiah is acceptable.

As in the question of the Messiah, and the restoration of Israel to Palestine, a line of distinction was drawn between that which as a historical memory may be mentioned in prayer, and that which throughout history expressed national hopes and, therefore, must be transformed in accordance with the modern spirit; a similar distinction arises now in the liturgical discussion, namely in the question of retaining the Mussaph prayer in a modern service.

47)
The conference is unanimous in declaring itself against the prayers for the restoration of the sacrificial cult. Some even want to substitute for them a prayer of thanksgiving for the wonderful blessing that prayer now takes the place of sacrifice. However, the motion of the committee to abolish it altogether is clearly defeated.

Even H^oldheim admits that such an act would meet with too much opposition. The majority of the conference votes in favor of retaining the scriptural passages in the Mussaph prayer which contain the laws of the festival offering for the different holidays. However, a special stipulation is attached to the vote: these passages shall be retained in the service "if the text is in Hebrew". This seems rather strange, as we know that the conference agrees that most congregations do not understand Hebrew anymore. Why then does it emphasize the use of Hebrew here? Once before in the discussion on the Hebrew element in the service itself, Wechsler expressed an opinion concerning the reading of the Torah which seems to have the same underlying reason: The reading of the Torah should be conducted in German. Only for those passages which, on account of their content, cannot be read in the vernacular, Hebrew shall be used.⁴⁸⁾ It seems justified to conclude from these two instances, small as they might be, something very significant as to the attitude of the conference which is also perpetuated in later developments, especially in the liturgical field. - Out of a certain formalism one feels uneasy in eliminating certain things which - to say the least - are not very meaningful in the eyes of these rabbis. One tries to get out of this dilemma, not by rationalizing

or re-interpreting these undesirable elements, but by leaving them in the original Hebrew, rendering them thus unintelligible. This attitude stands in crass contrast to the basic idea which was voiced time and again in the debate on the question of Hebrew, namely, that one could only pray what one understands. It contradicts also the principle which the committee report expresses in its introduction of the liturgical question here: Until the present, reforms of the service tried to please all the different elements of a community. What is needed today, however, is not such a compromise, but a new organic forming of the Jewish liturgy. For the sake of peace within the communities, one shuns from making too radical a change⁴⁹⁾, and is ready to make all sorts of compromises, incompatible with one's convictions as they may be. This inconsistency is again only due to the lack of a definite principle of Reform⁵⁰⁾, on the basis of which changes are to be made. In this discussion, again it becomes strikingly clear how many among the progressive rabbis are willing to do almost anything to get sanction for their changes from Talmudic tradition, which by conviction they do not really acknowledge as last and highest authority. However, the lack of a common principle of Reform does not seem to be felt by the conference itself, which becomes particularly evident in its attitude towards the Berlin

Society of Reform. This organization having at that time still a synod of laymen and rabbis before their eyes as their aim, had not only addressed the conference by letter, but had also sent a delegation which participated in its sessions. Although, as has been pointed out above, not too friendly disposed even to progressive theologians, one felt that one ought to build up relations with this assembly of rabbis, since if anything at all should result from the synod, it would have to be effected by the cooperation of the two organizations, the conference of rabbis, whose goal was Reform, and the Society which had been founded for the same purpose. Although their delegation does not take any active part in the proceedings, their address tries to exert some influence, especially in pointing out to the conference its limitations, and fixing its activities as being merely preliminary to the synod.

The true development of Judaism must have its roots in the body corporate. The future shape of Judaism cannot be accomplished by the laymen alone. But from the common striving of the Society for Reform and the conference of rabbis, the synod will result. "Both will not put exclusive stress as individual groups, one on his need, the other on his knowledge, but as representatives of a body corporate will the laymen bear witness to the religious

consciousness and the religious needs of modern Jewry, while the rabbis will represent the eternal unchangeable essence of Judaism in its right and justification. Then only will that "Gestaltung" of our religion be achieved, which in its divine life of eternity stands above the high standard of the age, however, in its forms can and shall raise itself to the same high standard. Until then we shall look forward most eagerly to the resolutions and decisions which will result from your enlightened assembly. We hope to find in them satisfaction for our claims (Ansprueche). Our demands are rooted in the needs of the people." ^{50a)} The letter as a whole, although carefully worded, breathes a rather patronizing spirit. Since it denies all authority to the conference, and speaks only of "hopes for satisfaction, and of demands or claims", the real interest of the Society in rabbinical leadership must be doubted. From the answer of the conference, we can judge that it was not fooled by the round about wording, and that it understood the full implication of this message. However, it took the polite phrasing which might have misled it, as an opportunity to reply to this communication in the style of teachers to their pupils. Thus the rabbis state how gratified they were that the need for Reform is felt not only in their midst, but within

the people as well. They appreciate that the Society did not permit itself to enter the road of change on its own. The conference recognizes its serious striving for Reform, as something truly religious, and expresses the wish that this striving in its spread may select only such paths as will not endanger the unity of the Jewish religious group. The conference hopes to find in the Society the proper background where its results can be realized. It assures its support to the Society in all those undertakings which agree with those principles which in the opinion of the conference, must determine all Reform. ⁵¹⁾ What the conference may have meant when it spoke of "principles" is difficult to say. Most probably, it referred to the positive historical attitude which most of its members had declared as the starting point for their reforms, and in regard to which the loyalty of the Society was suspected. However, there seems to be still another principle alluded to which is of great significance in this reply. It is contained in the warning to the Society to beware of disrupting the unity of the Jewish religious group. With that, the rabbis who attend the Frankfurt conference pledge themselves to be always conscious in their reforms of the responsibility towards the entire community. They are rabbis of the community and must see to it that it will

always remain united, even if inconsistency with their own principles is involved by doing so. The Jewish community as a whole and its firm unity are declared here as setting the limits for liberal Judaism which is born in the course of these conferences. The Society of Reform, on the other hand, although originally being concerned with the entire community as expressed in the proclaiming of a synod as its aim abandons this principle very soon, only a few months after it had voiced it. For already in June 1845, before the conference of rabbis had assembled, they discuss the institution of an own service⁵²⁾, a practical and important issue, of the type which in their declaration they had assigned for the synod to act on. There is some opposition to such an isolated undertaking, but in the end such a reformed service for Berlin is decided upon, to be called to life before the decisions of the synod. With that, the Society practically abandons the entire idea of such a general assembly, and limits its activities, at first planned to be expanded over all of Germany, exclusively to Berlin. This action also throws light on the true significance and sincerity of the message of the Society to the Frankfurt conference of rabbis. It can really only be considered as an act which was prompted by politeness.

S. Holdheim, who as member of the conference, and later on as spiritual leader of the Society, undoubtedly understands best the psychology of either group, is certainly right when he states that there existed hardly any common ground for these two bodies to work together. Nothing good could be expected from the cooperating of these intellectual laymen on the one, and the theological experts on the other hand, for the latter are too cautious and have - and this is important to note, coming from Holdheim⁵³⁾ - too many historical sympathies with which men of practical life, whose striving is directed towards a satisfaction of their aesthetic feeling, cannot agree. According to Holdheim, science can influence life, yet it cannot work together with life, The only true relation between these Berlin laymen and the rabbis of Frankfurt was that the rabbis could point to the Society and say: "We are not alone; also congregations want a Reform of Judaism;" while the Society could use the conference as a proof that even rabbis in Israel were planning reforms. However, strange as it may seem, the relations between some members of the conference and the Society were most amiable ones. Frankfurter and Hirsch participated in the discussion on its prayerbook, and one of the most conservative among the progressive rabbis, Ludwig Philippson,

who was opposed to a purely negative Reform, void of all historical understanding, officiated at the first service of this group during the High Holidays of the year 1945. The liturgical reforms at this service exceeded, as was to be expected, by far those planned by the conference. To name only a few of them: 1) German is the language of the service except for the Shema, the Kedusha, and the V'nislach 2) The shofar is not sounded on Rosh Hashonoh. 3) Intermission of a few hours between the morning and evening services on the Day of Atonement. 4) The congregation prays with uncovered heads. Interesting to note is that despite the use of female voices in the choir, men and women are not allowed to sit together, however, they are at least seated in the same room, the one on the right, the others on the left side. The effect which this service produced on the members of the Society was so favorable, that they decided to have also weekly services. A compromise had to be reached between those in the group, who emphasizing the adjustment to modern times, wanted to hold such a service on Sunday, and those who claimed that a connection with Saturday as the historically Jewish day of rest should be maintained. Therefore, one decides to conduct services on Saturday and on Sunday with the explicit provision that neither day be invested with special sacredness. 54)

However, the Saturday service was later on discarded as its attendance was too small, a fact which may again serve as a proof how far removed from any historical conception of Judaism the members of this group were, how untouched, in this respect also, by the spirit of romanticism which, at that time, was at its height in Germany. As previously for the High Holidays, the prayerbook for these weekly services as well as for the festivals, had to be compiled rather hurriedly, and on account of this soon became subject to revision.⁵⁵⁾ Despite its anti-theological tendency the necessity of engaging a rabbi was soon felt by the Society, not only for the purpose of preaching and teaching, but one was also convinced that the identification of a rabbi with the group, which gradually was growing into a separate congregation, would add to its prestige. Quite a few rabbis had been repeatedly in contact with the Society. Salomon, and Frankfurter, both of the Hamburg Temple, had preached there during the summer, Hirsch had conducted the service on Passover, and Holdheim had dedicated the new house of worship⁵⁶⁾ in April 1846. The executive board of the Society tried to secure the leadership of Geiger who at that time was in Breslau. However, he declined as he did not want to become the rabbi of only part of the community. Had he accepted, the entire development of the liberal and the Reform movements in Germany might have been different,

just as in the case of the general Jewish community in Berlin Frankel's acceptance of the position of rabbi instead of Sachs, might have brought about similarly important changes. At last, Holdheim was elected, who of all the progressive rabbis was closest at heart and in mind to the ideas and attitudes which determined the Reform of the Berlin laymen. In a later part of this study, a sketch of the principles of this brilliant logician will be given. In this connection, it may suffice to say that he is largely responsible for the widening of the gap between the "Gemeinde", the all inclusive Jewish community organization and the Society or "Reformgemeinde", as it was called since 1850. To say the least, he did not do anything to temper the endeavours of those among the lay leaders who were aiming at complete autonomy for the "Reformgemeinde", separating it from the "Gemeinde", except for common charitable enterprises. A petition for recognition as an independent autonomous religious corporation is presented to the government, and refused by Oberpraesident Flottwell on the grounds that any religious group desiring autonomy must have a positive creed, since this alone is sufficient guarantee that it will not disband too quickly. The "Reformgemeinde" lacks such a creed; according to the first paragraph of its constitution, it is not yet a congregation,

57)
but only in the process of becoming one. In the discussion ensuing from this rejection, and the reasons given for it, important points of difference arise between Stern and Holdheim. The former protests and says that the establishing of a fixed creed contradicts the principle of development which is the basis of their Reform. Holdheim, on the other hand, claims that the "Reformgemeinde" is in a position to satisfy the demands of the government, as Reform Judaism has basic principles of faith which might be stated. The answer to the authorities presents a compromise between these two standpoints. However, also this new petition is again rejected. Thus the "Reformgemeinde" leads a rather isolated, although not completely separate, existence within the "Hauptgemeinde" whose originally hostile attitude towards this group changes into a more liberal and tolerant one. The "Gemeindestatut" of 1854 provides for an exemption of the members of the "Reformgemeinde" from contributing funds towards the maintenance of institutions of cult and religious education belonging to the "Hauptgemeinde", as they had been compelled to do, so far. The influence of the "Reformgemeinde" on German Jewry in general, can be called rather slight. It remained, outside the Jewish community, just as it lived its inner life, so to speak, in the periphery of Judaism.

While the Society for Reform in Judaism was still in the bloom of its initial stages, the third conference of rabbis took place in Breslau, which made the separation of roads between progressive rabbinism and the Reform laity definite. In its address to this conference the Society makes it clear, once and for all, that it wants to act independently of the decisions of the conference. In a, more or less, fatherly fashion the rabbis are landed for their good intentions, and are encouraged to continue their work. The entire letter is replete with the silly pride of a pupil who although realizing that he does not know as much, yet thinks that he is getting far ahead of his master. This time the greater part of the conference feels that this communication does not deserve an answer since, - as Holdheim puts it - it represents an act of complete divorcement from the union which the Berlin reformers had entered into at the previous meeting. However, if there is anyone, it is just Holdheim who realizes best the impossibility of a true inner relationship between the Society and the conference, despite their common aim: Reform. Ten years after the conference, after he has been a rabbi of the Berlin "Reformgemeinde" for some time⁵⁹⁾, he even states⁶⁰⁾ that the Society should never even have tried to enter into any relation with the conference of rabbis,

since they should have realized themselves, that their position is much higher than that of the rabbis. While they are free, the rabbis are handicapped by legalistic considerations. "The relation of the Berlin proclamation of 1845 to the protocols of the conference is like that of the book of Deuteronomy to Leviticus, like the prophetic spirit of religion to the spirit of the law....., like the gospels to Talmudic casuistry." At the time of the conference, however, no agreement could be reached as to a reply to the letter. Therefore, it remained unanswered. Thus even this "polite" relationship, though meaningless, was discontinued.

The Breslau conference stands completely under the impact of one problem: the Sabbath. Here the conflict between modern life and Jewish teaching was particularly striking, and demanded a solution. A committee report from the last conference served as basis for the heated discussion, establishing as its principle: return to the Biblical conception of the Sabbath in its simplicity. Practically, however, that did not mean more than expressing the consensus of opinion of the committee, which was borne out later also by the conference, that the rabbinic restrictions and prohibitions which had built fences around the Biblical Sabbath laws in order to assure their strict

observance, had to be broken down. ⁶¹⁾

The problem itself was perfectly clear to every member: The Sabbath disappeared more and more from the lives of modern Jews, and something had to be done to save this great Jewish institution. However, what is its true nature? Is rest its most characteristic element, or is its consecration to be achieved mainly through the medium of celebrating it ("Feier") by a special service? No agreement can be reached on this fundamental question. Basing their arguments on casuistic reasoning, some of the rabbis are willing to permit a Jew whose economic position might be endangered by closing down business on the Sabbath, to have a non-Jew take care of his work for him. ⁶²⁾ Others are diametrically opposed to such inner inconsistency as it contradicts the very spirit of the Sabbath day. The entire debate shows how desperately one struggled to cling to tradition, if at all possible, realizing at the same time that its principle is hardly applicable to the present and knowing that, with all reverence for tradition, one has to take practical considerations for the demands of modern life. A much easier stand in his consistency has again Holdheim. For him the original idea of the Sabbath as found in the Bible is absolute rest, symbolizing God's rest after the creation of the world. The Biblical Sabbath

Eng

has nothing to do with consecration or celebration ("Feier"). These have been added in the course of the historical development to the element of rest which in itself is something entirely negative. In modern times this religious symbolism has been overcome. Therefore, for the modern Jew not rest, but consecration through celebration is the essential in Sabbath observance. As formerly everything interfering with rest was forbidden, now everything disturbing the celebration must be prohibited and the element of rest must only be observed so far as the celebration is dependent on it. The conflict with civic life can only be solved, if the Sabbath is transferred to the official day of rest, the Sunday⁶³⁾. Realizing that a motion of this sort would evoke a general protest, he merely offers this idea in form of a suggestion. Such a transfer does not mean a concession to Christianity, but presents a necessity to save religion from its certain destruction. The Sabbath loses more and more ground in its struggle with modern life, and is bound to lose unless such a change takes place which really does not touch the essence of the Sabbath idea which can very well get along without the anthropomorphic conception of God resting on the seventh day. Today the emphasis is no longer on man who sanctifies the Sabbath, but on man who sanctifies himself on the Sabbath day. -

However, this idea tempting as it might have been does not fall on fruitful ground and is denounced in the strongest of terms by many of the subsequent speakers, regardless of whether they belong to the more radical or conservative group. Thus Salomon, blaming the conference for maintaining the prohibition of all work of earning one's living, even in the case of those who cannot postpone such work, as e.g., bakers, butchers, and farmers, - speaks with horror of the possibility that this attitude might bring about a transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday: "May God protect us against something like that. That would be like serving two masters at the same time, like flirting with Christianity and destroying Judaism wilfully.⁶⁴⁾" Stein, on the other hand, who holds for absolute rest on the Sabbath, puts it even more strongly: "If we transfer the Sabbath to Sunday, we bury Judaism on Friday in order to resurrect it on Sunday morning as a different religion."⁶⁵⁾ Thus the battle of lengthy oratory rages for eight of the eleven days during which the conference meets, and yet, no agreement on this most practical of practical problems can be reached. Finally, one member voices the faint hope that since it is impossible to build a bridge over the gap between life and doctrine, Sabbath rest and Sabbath ob-

servance may again assume their place in the lives of coming generations, if the conference succeeds in re-shaping the celebration of the Sabbath and enhancing it with greater beauty. Today, almost a hundred years later, we can state that this hope has been sadly disappointed. Despite all attempts and many a success in beautifying the Sabbath celebration - to which in later years the new form of the Oneg Shabbath was added -, true observance of this day consisting of recreation of the soul through celebration and rest has not been re-established. The problem is of as much practical importance for us today as it was then.

However, it would be wrong to state that the conference did not agree on any aspect of the question. We mentioned before that hardly any objection was raised to breaking down all legalistic fences which had been built around the original Sabbath observance. In addition there existed agreement in one more point, and significantly enough, in the only aspect of the problem which was of a more or less political nature: the permissibility for Jewish government officials and members of the army to fulfill their duty towards the State even on the Sabbath. On the one hand, one refused to acknowledge the authority of Jewish tradition, on the other hand, one accepted in its place something else as highest standard, namely: the

State."The State either has already become the realization of highest morality or it must be elevated to this level. In the first case: Should we Jews for religious reasons allow ourselves to be forced to abstain from this highest activity? If the second be true: Should we be forbidden to cooperate and help to bring about the moralization of the State, the coming of the Messianic era? We are after all the oldest and most obligated workers in the building of this structure whose top reaches into the heaven."⁶⁶⁾

"The Israelite realizes that his entire existence, spiritual and religious as well, will be threatened if active participation in the life of the State will continue to be closed to him....The individual who is active in civil service fulfills not only his personal duty, but also that of Israel as a whole. This duty is of such import that other obligations.....must give way to it....We shall not sacrifice our religion for the State, however, we must enable the individual Israelite to become a healthy member of its organism. That is our religious duty."⁶⁷⁾

In evaluating this attitude, we must always keep in mind that we are dealing with a generation that fights for its emancipation. Although this question of the work of Jewish government officials on the Sabbath had hardly any practical value⁶⁸⁾, it was discussed at great length

as a demonstration that one was prepared to assume all the obligations and rights of full-fledged citizens. The fact, however, remains that the only important, practical Reform was again achieved, not so much in the religious as in the political sphere, for compared to the difficulty of the problem the resolutions⁶⁹⁾ of the conference are most insignificant. "A mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse."

Regarding the question of the second day of the festivals the conference basing itself on the scientific standpoint, reached much more definite conclusions. It declared that the second day of all the festivals has no good reason in our time (with the exception of the second day of Rosh Hashonoh which shall find special consideration). Those congregations who wish to abolish it, do not violate any religious precept, on the contrary, they are in their good rights. However, in case this should conflict with the conviction of part of the congregation, they are advised to retain the festival character of the service on the second day, even if this part of the congregation should be very small.⁷⁰⁾ In this last recommendation the spirit of real tolerance and true consideration is expressed, which we find all the way through the development of liberal Judaism. Again the unity of the communities stands in the foreground, precedes all other considerations of

scientific consistency, principles etc. In order to maintain this unity, the rabbis call upon the majority to live up to the liberal idealism and in keeping with it, to comply with the demands of the more traditionally minded minority as far as public manifestations like services are concerned. The more conservative elements within a community are not, and cannot be expected to be tolerant and show sympathy for reforms and changes. It is, therefore, up to the liberal spirits to practice such tolerance which will be the easier for them, the more reverence and understanding they will show for the historical tradition. However, this element of tolerant concession on the part of the conference carries something else with it which we will find again and again in the attitude of liberal rabbis, namely, the conception of an "official Judaism" as something distinct from the ideas concerning, and the solution of problems as proposed by them as progressive theologians, and something to be represented and upheld by them as rabbis and leaders of the entire Jewish community. - Eng

The conference adjourns with the understanding of meeting again the following year. However, attendance of ⁷¹⁾, as well as reaction to the conference and its activities indicated a decrease of interest in these meetings in which so many had set their hopes, expecting results,

solutions to the burning questions, clarification of the Jewish religious issues, way~~shot~~ of the horrible dilemma. - Ideologically they are of interest since they show how, with very few exceptions, the religio-legalistic character of Judaism was not denied, and was permitted to serve as basis; how, nevertheless, all attempts to outline new simplifying norms are without success. A terrific mix-up consisting of halachish^c motives which one is not willing to give up on the one, and opportunistic considerations for the civil, political and economic position of the Jews on the other hand, obscures the religio-critical principle of positive historical Judaism so frequently proclaimed.⁷²⁾ Also from a practical standpoint, the conferences had proven to be rather fruitless, and their actual influence on the life of German Jewry in its different communities, is very difficult to determine, especially since the political turmoil of the years following them made itself felt particularly strongly within the Jewish group, and diverted the attention from the issues which had dominated the previous decades.

A period of more than twenty years elapsed, before new attempts at an organized Reform of the religious affairs of the Jews in Germany were undertaken. This intervall is distinguished by an enormous amount of activity on the

part of individual rabbis, especially in the field of liturgy. Almost every bigger Jewish community had its own prayerbook.⁷³⁾ Agreement among them existed only to a very limited degree and on such points as the installing of organs in most of the new synagogues which were erected during this period, the introducing of regular preaching⁷⁴⁾, and the abolishing of almost all "pintin". As to other reforms, "everyone did what was right in his eyes." The only rabbi who at this time tries to unify the various, more or less, reformed rituals of a limited German district at least, is Leopold Stein who calls "independent conferences of rabbis" which meet regularly during the years 1854 - 1857 in Wiesbaden, Giessen, and Frankfurt. The merit of these assemblies consists of the establishing of a common liturgy which later on served as basis for Stein's Frankfurt prayerbook⁷⁵⁾.

This feverish output of prayerbooks is also an indication of the growth of the liberal spirit within the Jewish communities, a fact which manifested itself very strongly in the elections for the board of the Berlin community. Their result was a sweeping victory for the liberal party, wiping out the half-orthodoxy around Michael Sachs⁷⁶⁾. The new board according to a report in the "Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums" is to consist of:

thirteen friends of Reform, nine members of the Reform congregation, seven neo-orthodox and two honestly (!) orthodox ("Ehrliche Orthodoxe")⁷⁷⁾. Thus the largest Jewish community is won for the cause of moderate progress, as "the majority of Jews in civilized countries, were in favor of a Judaism which was regenerated on a historical basis and in accordance with the achievements of modern thinking."⁷⁸⁾

Previous to the conferences of the forties the situation was quite similar. The difference now - in this interval between them and the Cassel meeting - is that the need for reforms is felt much more widely, and the lack of organization, therefore, even more destructive, creating cold indifference on the part of the laity. Twenty-four rabbis, among them seven of the former conferences, meet in 1868 to take a common stand which will bring order into the now "totally confused public service". Their intention is to create something like a union prayer book by bringing back the service to its simple forms, freeing it from all unessential additions. However, even among this small number of rabbis all of whom were friendly disposed towards Reform, an agreement could not be reached. This conference can only be considered a preliminary to the Leipzig synod for which it prepared the ground and which followed upon it a year later. The synod idea had first been proclaimed by the Berlin Society of Reform which, however, soon dis-

79) carded it. Now, after the failure of the rabbinical conferences and the unsatisfactory results of individual sections, one sought refuge in this type of assembly consisting of laymen and rabbis joinedly. Its attendance can be called extremely good for the first meeting of its kind; fifty German and ten congregations outside the German border sent their delegates to this meeting. However, we have but to take a glance at the proceedings and the resolutions of the synod to realize that it had not taken a lesson from the mistakes made by the rabbinical conferences twenty years ago, and followed blindly in its hopeless path. Again, the only pronouncement which is generally accepted⁸⁰⁾, and which in M. Philippson's⁸¹⁾ judgment presents the only accomplishment of the synod, is of a political nature. Ludwig Philippson moves⁸²⁾ that the synod declare that Judaism agrees completely with the principles of modern society and modern state; namely, the unity of the human race, equal rights and duties for all men towards the fatherland and the state, and complete freedom of the individual in his religious conviction and in his professing it. This motion, which to put it differently equates Judaism with the modern liberalism, is greeted with tremendous applause. Again the question of a principle on which liturgical reforms should be based is purposely avoided to give once more way to merely "practical considerations".

The result are some unimportant changes most of which had
been acted upon by the conferences twenty years ago ⁸⁵⁾.

On this very question of the adoption of principles Geiger and Philippson clash. The latter having learned nothing from the development after these meetings still insists on the purely practical tasks of such assemblies and refuses to discuss anything but particular practical aspects of the problem. Geiger, on the other hand, amends the attitude which he had taken at the rabbinical conferences of the forties and stresses in the thesis which he presents to the synod as basis for the discussion of the liturgical issue, more the general principle which should serve as a foundation than the practical aspects. In reply to Philippson's arguments, he tries to make it clear to the members of the synod that the special practical reforms which they are about to discuss, have been put into practice by some congregations already, while others may refuse to adopt them at all. The congregations do not expect the synod to issue immediate practical decisions which are to determine the changes in their respective services. What they are looking for is the adoption of general principles on which they will be able to base the Reform of their service, inasmuch as every special Reform must be linked organically to the particular traditions of the individual congregations. However, the synod, as

previously the conferences, is afraid to discuss any issues of principle. It considers as its foremost goal gaining the confidence of the people and preserving peace in the communities, superficial and external as this sort of peace prevailing in most congregations might be considered.

The second synod two years later at Augsburg suffers⁸⁴⁾ in its attendance a great deal from the effects of the Franco-Prussian war. It, too, pursues the path of practicality, and passes mainly motions the most important of which concern themselves with problems⁸⁵⁾ which had been decided twenty years ago by the conferences. Most of the synod's resolutions were not put into practice. The mediating middle party of the Breslau Seminary type kept neutral towards them, and the progressives did nothing to actually realize them. The congregations showed as much distrust in the combination of laymen and rabbis at Leipzig and Augsburg as they had shown previously in the rabbis' meetings and their meager results. Orthodoxy raged against the synod, its resolutions and personalities, just as⁸⁶⁾ furiously as during the forties .

Among the points under discussion at the last synod Dr. Wassermann's motion for a revision of the "Shulchan Aruch"⁸⁷⁾ deserves mentioning as its discussion brings out important differences between the individual members of

the assembly. Wassermann explains his motion by stating that the general impression of Judaism's exclusively legalistic character arises on the basis of the Shulchan Aruch in which moral injunctions are only incidental. To amend only individual provisions of the code as the synod has done is of little import; it must be opened to the moral and ethical laws of Judaism; it must be revised so thoroughly that it will become again a code which serves our religious needs and is compatible with our modern thinking. In other words, Wassermann recognizes the necessity of an authoritative code of laws as such. Szanto, a layman from Vienna, who calls himself a conservative Jew, strongly protests against any concession of authority to the Shulchan Aruch. Rabbi Adler of Cassel, on the other hand, does not seem to disagree with Wassermann in principle, he merely states from a more or less practical point of view that a revision of the Shulchan Aruch would be too big a task to undertake. He pleads, therefore, for a stronger recognition of the Bible instead of a revision of the Shulchan Aruch. Dr. Bruell, rabbi of Frankfort, seems to be the only one who realizes that a revision of the code, implying a recognition of it, runs contrary to the entire idea of development which the synod had adopted. The establishing of any authoritative code necessarily demands a freezing of

the stream of development. He, therefore, moves that the synod declare openly "that the Shulchan Aruch has no significance for us as a religious codex; the views written down in the Shulchan Aruch never were our theoretical convictions and never should be such." However, the synod does not act upon this and the entire discussion of this question ends with Wassermann's withdrawal of his motion which in itself bears witness of the struggle for new norms within the liberal movement of this period. The only decision among the forty-nine made by the synod, which really left a lasting impression and was of real consequence, was the one appointing a committee for the establishing of institutes of higher Jewish learning for the promotion of the Science of Judaism which at last in 1872 lead up to the realization of many a dream: in the founding of the "Lehranstalt fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums" in Berlin. This accomplishment was largely due to the initiative and energy of Moritz Lazarus, the president of both synods. Next to Geiger and Loew he was by far the most outstanding personality. Himself inspired, he carries the others with him in his spirited speeches, and succeeds in keeping the flame of enthusiasm burning while the synods last.

Although another synod had been planned for 1875, it never took place. The reasons may be sought and found in

a general lack of interest in these assemblies. One was weary of them since one remembered only too well how little fruit they had borne. The time for conferences and synods was over, many of their leading spirits dead. Thus this period of the initial stages in the development of Liberal Judaism finds its end. Our treatment of it would, however, be incomplete without giving at least a brief presentation of the basic ideas of those men ~~who~~ exerted influence upon it and according to - or in contrast to - whose views its further development was shaped.

PART VI

The early Reform of Judaism, as was mentioned previously¹⁾, stood completely under the influence of the philosophical school of Enlightenment for which Reason was the criterion of all things. Most closely related to this school of thought among the men who assumed leadership in the life of German Jewry during the middle of the nineteenth century was Samuel Holdheim. Unburdened by any historical perspective, his mind sharpened by early training in the study of the Talmud, he set about to establish a logical system of Reform for Judaism, which would do away with the contrast between the old teachings of Jewish tradition, and life in the modern society.

A question of fundamental importance was, therefore, for him the relation of Judaism to the State. He tries to solve this problem by a separation of - what he calls - the political and the religious in Judaism. His arguments are quite logical: Religion's realm is faith, the state's domain - law. The relationship to this law of the state is not subject of faith or of religious ceremonies. True enough Mosaic legislation must be considered religious, even in regard to its state- and civil law since everything coming from God, is commanded as religious law. Herein lies the uniqueness of Mosaic law. All other legislations derive from religion, from God's own teachings, merely

the precept of the justice of and the obedience to the authority of the State in general, and base the particular commandments of their law on reason. This difference, however, was only important as long as the Jewish state existed. The Jew of modern times entering other states as citizen, can, of course, not consider their laws as religious statutes. "However, in place of the particular civil laws of the Jewish state which have become obsolete, there appears now the general commandment of strict obedience to the laws of the country." Only in Palestine and only living in the theocracy is the Jew in possession of civil laws. In every other state he is only a Jew as far as his religion is concerned. Hence, only the purely religious part of the Mosaic legislation has been given to Israel for all eternity, under all circumstances and conditions. Its sphere is the relation between God and man. Its influence upon the legal relationship between men goes only so far as to command them to deal justly with each other in every regard. With the destruction of the Jewish commonwealth, every political bond between Jews is dissolved. Hence, all laws which were commanded to him, not as follower of the Jewish faith but as citizen of the Jewish state, do not exist for him any longer. He must not know any other nationality save the one of the country of which

he is now a part. After the destruction of the Temple, our rabbis tried to eternalize as religious purely-civil and political institutions, since they were in no position to conceive of the term "State". We, however, today understanding this concept and knowing how to distinguish between the Religious on the one hand, the Civil and Legal within Judaism, foreign to the state in which we live, on the other, have to solve this problem accordingly. "Whatever in Mosaic legislation and in the later historical development of Judaism - one may call it divine tradition or human progress - is of a purely religious content, and refers to the relation between man and God, his heavenly father, has been commanded to the Jew for all times. What, however, happens to be of a political, legal or civil nature, and has reference to the mutual relation of men within a political and civil society, and - as scripture states time and again - was to have validity and to be put into practice only under given political and civil conditions, must lose its validity wherever the Jew enters into relations with a state different from that for which these laws had been given."

The ceremonial law represents, so to speak, the external manifestation of the theocratic holiness of the Jewish people as distinguished and separated from Pagan

nations. In the Messianic era, however, freest universalism will rule instead of such limited theocracy, - world-wide reign of God eliminating the differences between nations. The distinct holiness of the Jewish and its consequence, the ceremonial law, will then become void, meaningless and purposeless, unworthy of God's highest wisdom. For within Mosaic legislation the relationship between the individual Israelite and God, as that of a child to his heavenly father is absolutely religious. However, the relationship between Israel as a selected people and God its Lord is only relatively religious, and must disappear as soon as the Israelite takes part in universally human relationships as e.g., within the State.

The selection of Israel as nation has ceased. However, the divine covenant with Israel as part of the human family persists. Israel has still a mission. Its task is to preserve monotheism in its purity and to propagate the ethical law, both for its own and for all humanity's sake. Then Israel will become a blessing unto mankind, a distinction, however, which will also vanish in the Messianic era. As long as Judaism continues to teach ethical monotheism, it will persist and fulfill its mission.²⁾

Holdheim thinks Mendelssohn is perfectly right when he says Judaism is not a system of dogmas but a system of

laws. It commands the will rather than the thinking spirit. Judaism in contrast to Christianity grants complete freedom of belief. Salvation in the Jewish religion is not dependent on faith as in Christianity, but on the deed. In other words, Judaism does not link salvation to faith as an inner act of the thinking spirit, but as an act of the will devoted to God, performing a deed which is pleasant in His sight. Not faith as such is the essential thing for the religious Jew, but an ethical attitude. Judaism's commandments are not directed to the thinking spirit but to the free will of man. It does not issue merely a law of faith, but a law of a faith to be actualized and put into practice. It permits freedom of thought and claims for itself only the deed.³⁾

There was a time when the acts prescribed by the ceremonial law, were ^{to} inductive to remind the individual Jew as well as the congregation of the ethical deed which their religion demanded of them. However, the spirit has died in most ceremonial forms of Judaism depriving them thus of what had filled them with a divine and heavenly content, leaving but the earthly, empty shell.⁴⁾ Besides, many of these forms are responsible for separating the Jew in his daily life from his Christian neighbour which serves as one more reason to abandon them. Helpful as

ceremonial forms may have been at one time, in their externality, they are most repugnant to the modern mind. It is to the merit of Reform that it furthers the process of inwardization by stressing the ethical deed, directly, discarding the external ceremonial law which other generations had used as crutches on their way towards the fulfillment of the demands of their religion⁵⁾. Recognizing errors, Reform struggles for truth and thus purifies Judaism. The strongest ceremonial law for our time is the congregation since it is the external form for the common faith which unites all Jews, orthodox and liberal alike; it is their last castle of unity after so much external of necessity has disappeared⁶⁾.

However, Reform as such is nothing but a striving. To realize its goal, it must be based on a creed. Holdheim, therefore, shortly after his election as preacher of the Berlin Society of Reform, publishes for the benefit of this group "Religious Principles of Reformed Judaism"⁷⁾. In them the Bible is proclaimed as eternal norm of faith. The right for Reform is derived from the different stages in the interpretation of Holy Scripture which was never fixed in a creed. Reform's task is to determine the demands which Judaism made of its adherents in accordance with the ideas which - throughout its historical develop-

ment until its present form - have always had an inspiring and rejuvenating effect on it.

Talmudic Judaism modified and adjusted Biblical Judaism which may be cited as proof for the ability of Biblical Judaism to lend itself to development as it grants the religious consciousness of its followers the right to always bring the Biblical religion into agreement with their progressed religious consciousness. Holdheim calls this the "Reform principle of positive historical development." Although claiming this principle for himself as well as for the Society whose leader he now is, some of the statements in this creed of reformed Judaism reveal such absence of any historical perspective that we sometimes wonder whether a man of Holdheim's intellectual quality actually lacks this historical understanding or whether he purposely disregards it. That is e. g., the ⁸⁾ use in the following statement which, in our opinion, can only be conceived of as a wilful misinterpretation of Jewish history: "Even though the normative authority of Holy Scripture for all Jews and the traditional interpretation of it for the rabbanite Jews was never challenged, still the latter admitted that the supposedly traditional exegesis of rabbinic-Talmudic Judaism in most cases deviates so obviously and in essentials from the

natural meaning of Scripture as derived by way of scientific exegesis, that the religious life based on these interpretations of Scripture - if not supported by the belief in tradition⁹⁾ - must be termed anti-biblical, and that every Jew whose belief in tradition has actually been shaken, must find himself in open conflict with the Bible as far as his Talmudic religious life is concerned." A similar misinterpretation, in this instance, of a historical institution can be found in the latter part of these "Religionsprinzipien" which is of a more practical nature: The Society of Reform observes the first of Tishri as Day of Remembrance. "Its later meaning as beginning of the new year has become obsolete as far as civil life is concerned. It never had any religious significance; furthermore, this could be unessential in order to give a sufficient hold to the institution of a divine service on this day, since the import of the beginning of a new year lies only in the influence which it exerts upon the civil conditions of life."¹⁰⁾

Also in the question of the Sabbath, no historical sympathies prevent him from taking a most radical stand. Although he realizes how important it is for a religious group to have the day of rest in common, he, nevertheless, advocates a transfer of the traditional Sabbath to Sunday

for the sake of assuring Judaism's preservation among its adherents now and its continuation for future generations. 11)

His total indifference towards the historical elements within Judaism becomes evident in his attitude towards the Hebrew language. Clinging consistently to his thesis that prayer with devotion is only possible in a language one understands, he bans Hebrew almost entirely from the service of the synagogue, as one look into his prayerbook for the High Holidays will indicate. 12)

However, he emphasizes that that part of the service which is concerned with teaching, namely, the reading of the Torah, must be conducted in Hebrew. The Bible in its original text, and not a translation of it, can serve as source for Jewish teaching. The reading of the Torah in its original text is at the same time a symbol of the wish that the knowledge of Hebrew may always continue to be alive within the Jewish people. 13)

This last statement in particular gives the impression of a very positive attitude towards Hebrew on his part; and we expect, of course, that he will do all in his power to preserve the knowledge of the language of the Bible. However, this is what we find in a discussion of the curriculum of his religious school: "As to the instruction in Hebrew, we have to say that one special lesson per week has been set aside for it, for boys only. 14)

As desirable as we consider the participation in the Hebrew classes to be, still we do not want to establish it as a condition for admittance into the school, so that those who do not want to learn it will attend only for two or, at the most, for three hours per week, like the girls." As consistent as he is in realizing his reforms according to his principles, here where the preservation of a historical element of Judaism - which he himself even recognizes as such - is concerned, he fails, giving once more proof for his basically unhistorical disposition.

And indeed, Holdheim's approach is not at all determined by history, but by two factors which are drastically different from any such concept: the political and the rational. Both, stressing the uniqueness and superiority of modern times, the modern spirit and the modern State, are responsible for H. Holdheim's abstract and universalistic view of Judaism which, destroying its historical individuality, ascribes validity only to that which it considers to be beyond time, namely, its rational content. 15)

In contrast to this unhistorical school of thought there arise with the wake of romanticism and directly under its influence those great spirits to whom the concept of Judaism is unfolded in the singularity of its historical

development. History with its changes, but also with its continuity serves them as basis for the adjustment of Judaism to the changed conditions of life. Judaism must not be sacrificed in the fight for emancipation as Hordheim does, unconsciously or unconsciously. For him and his like modern life and time form the highest standard. Only that among the teachings of Moses and the prophets which is compatible with them is to be considered valid, regardless of whether it still has historical meaning for the Jew as Jew. The battle cry of old: All for faith, is changed in their mouths into: All for life. In the place of faith one puts some meaningless generalities which do not rest in the depth of faith, but swim on the surface of life. It is of such shallow faith that so-called rationalistic Judaism is composed. ¹⁶⁾ That is how Zacharias Frankel with Geiger, the outstanding representative of positive historical Judaism views this remnant of the philosophy of Enlightenment as applied to Judaism. For him the twofold task with which modern time burdens the Jew in regard to his Judaism consists of: preservation and progress. ¹⁷⁾ In order to find the standard for prudent progress, we first have to see clearly our point of departure. Judaism is a great historical truth. One highest will dominates everything according to its teachings: God. The laws re-

vealed by His form until the present day a protecting wall around Judaism. Their purpose varies. Some are an end in themselves as e. g., the dietary laws aiming at abstinence, or the laws concerning sex destined to teach chastity and purity of morals. Others, apparently, mean to make us continually conscious of God's power in His creation, in the wonders which he has wrought. Judaism was preserved only because of the fixed and definite form into which its content was poured. Its abstract ideas in themselves might have been defeated by other religious or philosophical systems. Furthermore, ideas on account of their spiritual character are not always accessible to everybody. Hence, there was need for something which would convey them without requiring the effort and special disposition which a purely spiritual conception would demand. This was found in the revealed commandments. They were not considered any longer something purely external and ceremonial, but they became a ritual, deeply felt and vividly conceived. Every commandment united in itself contained idea and form. Practice of the commandments was sufficient for through it the idea was strengthened. A religion of ideas, in its particulars, belongs mainly to the theologians. A religion of practice, however, reminding its adherents of itself in manifold ways, repeating itself

frequently in the life of the individual, is always present and becomes the common possession of everyone of its followers.

Particularly striking is the difference between these two types of religion in regard to reforms. While the Reform of a religion of ideas has very little to do with life itself, since it moves in the sphere of abstract thought, the Reform of a religion of practice, however, cuts deeply into the life of all its faithful. The former is mainly the concern of the theologians, the latter will find stubborn resistance on the part of the entire people. Most characteristic of the radical Reform of Judaism is that it wants to give up all forms and return to the original ideas. By that, however, it proves that it has a false conception of the essence of man and disregards the history of all times. For history teaches that ideas are always then in danger of losing their purity if they are to be comprehended without any form. Such a cold and rationalistic Reform of Judaism cannot give satisfaction to the heart. "The limitlessly negating Reform cannot be considered part of Judaism. It has forsaken it altogether. Its adherents do not even form a sect within it, since they belong as little to Judaism as to any other positive religion. They cling to a standpoint which negates Judaism completely, a

compromise with them, therefore, cannot be made; a satisfaction of their demands is in no wise thinkable....They have disavowed Judaism morally."

Not a rationalistic philosophy then can bring the solution to the problems of the present, but only "thinking faith" rooted firmly in history. The mission of Jewish science, therefore, is not to direct Judaism as if it were something lifeless, but its positive historical task consists of revealing the development of Judaism until the present, and of determining how it should continue in this same spirit. However, Frankel does not conclude that any consequences as to religious practice should result from the work of Jewish science, certainly not for the present at least. Everybody has the right to think differently, and to make scientific investigations and studies independently and freely. However, in regard to divergence in religious action such individual freedom does not exist. It is up to Israel as a whole to decide such changes in practice. For whatever has been accepted into the life of the people as a statute is holy and has to be preserved.¹⁵⁾ History has given it unto the people as a charter.

Besides the immediate divine revelation there exists something like revelation within the general consciousness of a religious people, which, unlike the revealed manifestation of God's will, is finite in its individual

parts. Just as some new elements may enter into this religious consciousness of the people, an old element may disappear from it under the effects of certain conditions. However, everything which is still alive in it must not be touched, and even elements which the scientific mind may consider undesirable can only be attempted to be removed through tactful teaching. For, the historical faith, that which for generations has been considered kernel and essence of Judaism must not simply be rationalized or ridiculed out of existence.¹⁹⁾ Radical Reform must fail on account of the simple fact that the people is used to certain forms, bad as they might be, it considers them part of its sanctuary, and does not want to be deprived of them. Besides, we must remember that not all demands of our modern time are just, and that adjustments today are particularly difficult on account of the complete standstill in Jewish development during past centuries. Until a few decades ago Judaism was motionless. Apparently the will of the people was satisfied, and thus the teachers had no right for reforms. The great gap between that time and our day is not yet filled. The will of the people is still rooted in the past. Therefore, the teachers through tactfulness and patience have to gain the confidence of the people, so that it in turn may give them the power to reform.

"Worthy representation of the will of the group in its totality and science will lead to the goal to find a standard for reforms which will live not only in the sphere of abstraction but in that of reality."²⁰⁾

In this emphasis on the religious consciousness of the entire group as well as in his establishing the positive historical standpoint as the guiding principle of Reform, Frankel is closely related to Abraham Geiger. And yet, it is exactly in the points just mentioned that important differences arose between these two champions of a regenerated Judaism. Geiger, like Frankel, recognizes that only that which is alive in history and in close touch with the feeling of the people, can continue to live on vigorously. However, he does not share the latter's pessimism that it will not be possible for the men of the Science of Judaism to influence the people by the results of their scholarly investigations. Frankel maintains that whatever has become part of the religious life of the people and has been accepted by it, cannot be changed by any authority. Geiger, however, realizes that folk religion is frequently responsible for the preservation of Paganism. Spiritual worship of God is not taught by the masses of the people, but it is the duty of its teachers to impart such knowledge to them. Geiger, therefore, appeals to the

men of Science to live up to what he considers to be their task, namely, to teach to the people the purified Judaism at which they have arrived in the process of their studies, making such concessions to the "Zeitgeist" as are most necessary and are compatible with a historical conception of Judaism. He sees in Science an instrument of critique. Frankel, on the other hand, wants to use it in order to establish Judaism's position more firmly. His purpose is to halt reforms rather than to further them. Here the difference between the two men in their historical conception becomes noticeable as we had occasion to mention before. Frankel emphasizes the static element of historical continuity; for him the inert is most essential. Geiger stresses the dynamic element of development; motion and progress assume highest importance in his philosophy of history.²¹⁾ Due to his realization of the slow process of historical development he refrained from one-sided consequentiality²²⁾ which for him was revolution and Reform into the void rather than the true adjustment at which he aimed in his striving for Reform.²³⁾

It is on historical grounds that he is opposed to the symbolic-philosophical school of Schelling which, misunderstanding historical development completely, is not satisfied with the simple meaning which justified a standpoint

at its particular time, but which interprets into the monuments of history from its present point of view. ²⁴⁾

He differentiates himself also from those who, without consideration for that which has developed within history, want to shape religion only according to the ideas and needs of their time. His own theological method is the historicocritical which he describes as stressing the following three things in particular: "1) The critique of existing axioms according to the gradual development of their form...

2) The history of the spiritual currents within Judaism as viewed through the medium of literary achievements.....

3) The critique of life according to the spiritual height of the present which will be followed by the demand to shape life accordingly and not to be content with a concession here and there....." ²⁵⁾

Only when the modern rabbi will apprehend the spirit of times past, and recognize the spirit of the present will he be able to give expression to the religious truths of Judaism in accordance with the needs of the time. For, the unlimited power of the spirit enables men not only to recognize that which is antiquated, but also to create anew. Also within Judaism we find this power. Bearing mighty ideas, it can remove many accessories which it has acquired in the course of its development and by its creative force bring forth new forms of ex-

pression.²⁶⁾ Judaism never presents a closed process, but with progressing time has shaped its forms of expression in various ways.²⁷⁾ Science which conceives of Judaism in this wise is truly devout. It trusts in revelation, believes in God's spirit which by its absolute creative power awakened religious and moral truths in Judaism, recognized nowhere else, strengthened them and led them to victory. It trusts in tradition, believes in the divine spirit which within Judaism preserves its creation, replenishing it continually with a fresh influx of new spirit. Thus Science of modern times is free and devout at the same time, since it performs its task in the same free spirit which produced faith. Such Science will always remain in close contact with all earlier stages of development. "Everything for it is, as it were, Judaism's inalienable possession from the first word of the Bible to the last (of ^{is student} a sage of the) Talmud. It recognizes the original spirit in everything, variant as to period and degrees of spiritual endowment, yet an inseparable unit."²⁸⁾

Science will only succeed in its task of regenerating and rejuvenating Judaism when it remains close to tradition²⁹⁾ continues as a link in its chain. For, tradition is the power of development which persists in Judaism throughout time; it is the soul which animates the body of Judaism. Like revelation tradition originates from God, it is really

the daughter of revelation holding the same rank as the latter. The divine spirit working within Judaism at all times, that, for Geiger, is tradition. Had it been stifled in post biblical times, the thread torn could not have been mended, and we today could never continue where Isaiah and Jeremiah once ceased.

Historical continuity must never be disregarded in Judaism. Geiger considers Hillel and Akiba truly great masters, since - from the standpoint of their time, of course, and according to its intellectual level - they expressed the urge for a transformation of the Judaism of their time.³⁰⁾ They were confronted with a problem which similarly during the period of the first Temple occupied Jewish thinking: the aristocracy of the priesthood with its formalism trying to dominate the people versus the ethical leadership of the prophets. Now it appeared in a new form: Sadducees contra Pharisees. The latter could not fight the priesthood as such, as this would have meant to contradict a divine institution. They objected, however, to the restriction of this holy task to a small select group. By extending it over the entire people they fought for a perpetuation of priestly Judaism. At the same time they preserved the weapons of prophetic teachings to be employed when the time had arrived for a transformation

of Judaism in their spirit. The dissolution of the national existence of the Jewish people brought any development in this direction to a sudden stop. Since then chaotic conditions prevailed. Reform is to continue the development which was then interrupted. It must be founded, therefore, on the teachings of the prophets. Its task is not an easy one, since the form which Pharisaism had imposed on Judaism even today is considered to be that of official Judaism, and their Halachah, now codified, the norm of Jewish life. Only rising from the firm ground of history will Reform be able to give the present generation of Jews religious ideals. However, since Reform intends to infuse Judaism in its entirety with a new spirit, it must take consideration for those for whom the rise to prophetic heights is still too difficult. That does not imply that any true ideal should be given up for the sake of such sentiments of consideration. We must always keep the prophetic idea clearly before our eyes as aim. Only in practical questions is a mediating procedure permissible, however, under no circumstances in thought and theory. A mediating theology to Geiger's mind is nothing but a lie.⁵¹⁾ His personal life is ample proof for the fact that he was actually willing to make concessions as far as practical issues were concerned. Although fighting vigorously against formalism as an end in itself, still he observed, faithfully, however, with the restraint which he

advised others to practice the precepts of tradition remembering always that he as rabbi of the entire Jewish community should avoid to give offense to others in this respect as much as possible. ⁵²⁾ As a letter to his friend Wechsler indicates, he is thoroughly convinced that circumcision should be replaced by a different ceremony, nevertheless, he conforms with this "rite" as far as his own son is concerned. Although he is not at all so certain about the eternal value and validity of the dietary laws, still he complies with them. At the Frankfort conference he expressed the desirability of praying in the vernacular and dispensing with Hebrew altogether. In his religious school, however, where he has the best opportunity to realize the ideal then proclaimed, where he actually was in a position to bring up a generation of young Jews who would pray in German only, we find that instruction in Hebrew is included in the general plan. Here lessons in the language of the Bible are not restricted to the extracurricular activities of some boys who show a sort of archeological interest in it as in Holdheim's case, but Hebrew is part of the regular curriculum and just as obligatory as all other subjects. Boys and girls alike learn how to translate and thus understand the prayers of the synagogue. Strange, -indeed-, to notice also with Geiger the differentiation made between the ex-

tent of religious and particularly Hebrew instruction between the two sexes, apparently a remnant of the old educational system among Jews.³³⁾ While the Hebrew education of the girls is limited to a translation of the prayers, the boys' curriculum includes: rudiments of Hebrew philology, exercises in Hebrew, translation of one prophetic book, "Religionsunterricht" with reference to Hebrew sources. Herein as in his activity as an educator of Jewish youth in general Geiger was again guided by the positive historical principle. In spite of his lofty ideals which embraced all mankind he never lost the firm ground of historical Judaism under his feet. The fundamentals to be taught in religious instruction should be: "1) The belief in the one and holy God. 2) The belief that man is endowed with a higher dignity than all other beings; that he is animated by a thinking spirit; that he possesses a soul, in other words, that he is created in God's image. 3) The belief that it is every man's duty to combine his efforts with those of all others towards the high aim of humanity's perfection; that mankind is charged to strive for the ideal of mutual fraternization, for the rule of justice, for love and peace which form the essence of the Messianic belief...."³⁴⁾ However, he realized that these fine teachings could only bear fruit when the ground had been cultivated beforehand by creating love and reverence for

the Jewish faith in the hearts of Jewish youth, a goal which could only be reached by acquainting them thoroughly with Jewish history, the source of all Jewish love and loyalty.

In his emphasis on the historical Geiger is undoubtedly influenced by the philosophy of Romanticism which reached its climax during his life time. The same holds true for his systematic theology. Here Schleiermacher's influence can clearly be discerned: "Das Bewusstsein von der Hohe und Niedrigkeit des Menschen, dieses Streben nach Vervollkommenung, mit dem Bewusstsein, dass man zur hoechsten Stufe sich nicht emporringen koenne, dieses ^{sehen} des Hoechsten, der als freiwaltender Wille vorhanden sein muss, dieser Weisheit, aus der auch unser Stuecklein Weisheit hervorgeht, einer unendlich waltenden Freiheit, aus der auch unsere bedingte Freiheit erzeugt ist, dieses Sich-emporsehen, Sich-erheben mit aller Kraft der Seele, ist dies nicht recht das Wesen der Religion?

*Rather of
Jewish*

Religion ist ein inneres Verlangen des ganzen Menschen, des denkenden, empfindenden, sittlich wollenden; sie ist ein Gemeingut der Menschheit, sie ist eine besondere Empfaenglichkeit im Menschen, die unwiderstehlich in ihm sich hervorbildet, die mit ihren Wahrheiten ihn bald klaren, bald minder klar erleuchtet. Die Religion ist daher von

Ewigkeit her vorhanden und wird es weiter sein." ³⁵⁾

However, in spite of this kinship to Schleiermacher as it is expressed in this definition of religion Geiger does not find himself in agreement with the latter's conception of the unconditional, absolute dependence of man. In contradistinction to this concept which he considers to be of Christian origin, Geiger stresses the consciousness of the height of the human soul, which serves as counterbalance to man's feeling of dependence. Kant had revealed the great gap which separates man as a creature within nature from man as an ethical personality. Geiger believes that it can be bridged at least, even if not filled completely, by the burning longing of man which creates religion in him and serves as stimulus for his striving for greater ethical perfection.

Religion is not the product of any one particular faculty inherent in man but feeling as well as intellect and imagination are important sources for it. In his emphasis on the role of feeling and emotion Geiger is diametrically opposed to the philosophy of Neo - Hegelian school: "I confess openly, he once writes, that I acknowledge something incomprehensible over us. The feeling which increases into the consciousness of dependence has its place. I would not want to have it crippled. I re-

ject the denial of religion, as a very dangerous error." ³⁶⁾
Jewish religion as well as the Jewish God concept did not grow out of the observation of a purposeful order of the universe. Religion in general is the immediate revelation of God's spirit to the spirit of man; it is the contact of human reason with the "Urgrund" of all things. Judaism is such a religion of revelation; it was born out of such a view of the Divine. It is a religion of truth since it sees the essence of things and confronts the eternal. ³⁷⁾

Judaism from its very beginning was intended to become the religion of all mankind. Its national gerb was only of temporary import and served only to establish the faith of its adherents so firmly that they will be able to maintain it even when they are dispersed among the nations. ³⁸⁾
The prophets of Israel proclaimed the ethics for humanity. Jewish nationhood was only necessary for the confirming of these universal ideas within one definite group, permeating it with them, so that it might become their bearer. Hence, with the destruction of the Jewish state, Judaism finds only its fullest expression. Herein Geiger stands in crass contrast to Herder for whom the national individuality and the universally humane content of a nationality ("Volkstum") form an insoluble unity. The national existence of the Jewish people and its universal idea are irrecon-

cilable in Geiger's system, since the former stands in the way of the acceptance of Judaism by all mankind.³⁹⁾ Judaism "proclaimed as its goal the uniting of all humanity under the banner of its radiant recognition of God and its noble ethical teachings. Therefore, the only worthy task for the Judaism of our time is to comprehend in earnestness its universal mission which embraces all mankind. It must nourish within itself the recognition that a religion which out of principle or out of a false faithfulness towards statutes handed down through the ages narrows down its scope, limiting itself to a mere part of mankind, degrades itself. It becomes a miserable sect, based only on temporary, passing conditions. Religion has only then the right to bear this venerable name when it feels in itself the strength to bring the thought of salvation to all mankind."⁴⁰⁾

Christianity with its doctrine of its founder being the center of the world's history and its demand of divine reverence for him is incompatible with human reason. However, giving up these teachings, it would become but a temporary phase of Judaism which is destined to give satisfaction for a mankind thirsting for salvation. Therefore, any concession to Christianity is out of the question. The transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday which some reformers

are contemplating would signify even more than a mere concession, it would imply a subjection to Christianity. The more Judaism ceases to be the religion of but a part of humanity; the more it aspires to concretize the Messianic ideal of becoming the religion of all mankind, the less can Jews consider to transfer their Sabbath to the Christian Sunday.⁴¹⁾ No religion can exist without ceremonial forms. Genuine ceremonies are not merely something external but the appropriate corporeal illustration of the spirit of religion. Even though they are subject to change and transformation, yet they present the spirit's persistent form of expression.⁴²⁾ Forms have proven to bear and strengthen the spirit of Judaism. They must, however, never be considered holy in themselves but only through the spirit which they express.⁴³⁾

Of the three personalities discussed in this part of our study, Geiger exerted by far the greatest influence upon the development of liberal Judaism in Germany. He was aglow with the same zeal as Holdheim; yet he did not adopt the dogmatic narrowness with which this brilliant man pursued a path of definite logic, disregarding feelings and emotions which had been the lifeblood of his people for centuries. - His was the scientific and historical approach of Frankel; however, he was not hampered by the latter's cautious inertness which made for

a continuation of the stagnant state in which Judaism found itself rather than for its spiritual regeneration. In addition, Geiger possessed a clear understanding and a warm heart for everything Jewish. Realizing the peculiar situation of German Jewry in his time, and keeping always in mind that its unity must never be disrupted, he set about to transform its inner life gradually and with utmost tactfulness.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. Moses Mendelssohn, Jerusalem, Gesammelte Schriften p. 311f.
2. Samuel Holdheim, Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der Juedischen Reformgemeinde in Berlin, p. 120, pp. 283ff.
3. For a more elaborate discussion on the early Reform and Mendelssohn, see Holdheim: Moses Mendelssohn und die Denk- und Glaubensfreiheit.
4. MGWJ 1926 LXX pp. 225 ff
5. Albert Lewkowitz, Das Judentum und die geistigen Stroemungen des 19. Jahrhunderts, pp. 304ff.
6. I. Elbogen, Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland, pp. 269ff.
7. HERE vol. 4, pp. 672 ff
8. ibid. p. 674
9. It is interesting to note that on this very basis the Court party influences the king in 1347 against Geiger's reforms, claiming that they run along the same lines as those of the Deutsch-Katholiken and Lichtfreunde which were considered revolutionary in the eyes of the court. See Leben, pp. 92ff.
10. World Conference for Progressive Judaism 1923, pp. 61ff
11. Also cited by David Philipson in RMJ pp. 147ff
12. RMJ pp. 166
13. Ibid. p. 168
14. Ibid. pp. 102 ff
15. AZaJ 1844
16. M. Isler, Gabriel Riessers Leben nebst Mittheilungen aus seinem Briefen, I, pp. 358-9
17. Leben pp. 121ff
18. Reformgemeinde pp. 63 ff
19. I. Elbogen, Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland, p. 254
20. AZaJ, January 15, 1844
- *21. World Conference for Progressive Judaism, p. 62, Leo Baeck, The Message of Liberal Judaism to the Jew of Today.

PART I

1. Weisbaden Conference which Geiger called in 1837 was too limited in scope and too private in character to make the deep impression that the other conferences made in their time. Its procedure was rather unsystematic and Geiger did not deceive himself about the unimportance of this gathering. Leben p. 45
2. The only rabbi who stood by the Frankfurt Society.
3. This time was chosen as it fell after the Feast of Weeks "which in most congregations is linked with the confirmation service" and before the time of mourning. See AZaJ, 1844 pp. 257 ff.
In other words an institution of Reform and an institution of traditional Judaism, significantly enough determined the time of the first conference.

4. AZdJ March 1844
5. Ibid. June 1844
6. Prot. Braunschweig p. XIII
7. Ibid., p. 2
8. Only here though, since in his entire system of reform he is not "awed" by the authority of the Bible but accepts only its purely religious laws, rejecting its legal aspects as we shall have occasion to refer to later in this study. See pp. 76ff.
9. Prot. Braun. pp. 36ff.
10. Ibid. p. 46f.
11. Ibid. pp. 55, 54.
12. Although three years later he himself publishes "Glaubensprinzipien des reformierten Judentums".
13. Prot. Braun. pp. 55f.
14. Ibid., p. 91.
15. Ibid., p. 56.
16. Ibid., p. 61. The entire discussion on Hebrew has been omitted here since it plays a central role at the Frankfurt Conference and will be treated in full in this context. See below pp. 35ff.
17. AZdJ 1844, p. 360.
18. Ibid., p. 371.
19. ZRIJ 1844, p.
20. Ibid., p.
21. AZdJ, pp. 385ff.
22. Ibid., p. 387.
23. Ibid., p. 490.
24. Ibid., p. 387.
25. Prot. Braun, p. 41.
26. AZdJ 1844, p. 577.
The Hamburg Tempel had done away with this prayer long before the conference. See first edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book 1819 pp. 126- and second edition 1841 p. 192.
27. Prot. Braun. p. XVI.
28. מכתב לאחיינו בני ישראל על דבר האסיפה אשר נוסדו יחד בעיר ברוינשווייג נחמד יוני בשנת תר"ד לפ"ק. ספר קונא ציון
ל' אמשטרדם תר"ל
29. RBJ, p. 371.
30. Reformgemeinde pp. 49ff. It is noteworthy that a third of the signers of the declaration had the title of Doctor.
31. Supra p. 9
32. Reformgemeinde, pp. 52 ff.
33. Ibid., p. 101.
34. It should be mentioned that the people opposed to this attitude, namely Simeon, Rebenstein and Lesser, seemed to be the only ones in the group who are well versed in Jewish learning. See also Simion's letter to Frankel in ZRIJ 1845, pp. 219 ff.

35. Reformgemeinde, pp. 109f.
36. The terms in which the writers of these letters refer to themselves is quite interesting:
"All thinking Israelites"
"All better Israelites"
"German men and women in Israel"
"All those adherents of our religion who have their eyes turned towards progress"
"Men in Israel who have absorbed the education of our age"
See Prot. Frank., pp. 217-270.
37. Prot. Frank., pp. 261ff.
38. Ibid., p. 18.
39. We wonder whether this reference to Philo is not meant as a hint to a comparison between Hellenistic assimilation and that of the nineteenth century.
- *40. For this and the following see Prot. Frank. pp. 50ff.
41. It is of interest to note that Reform in this instance does not make adjustment of Judaism to modern times but feels the necessity of adjusting itself to Judaism.
42. These particular points of the committee's motion have not to my knowledge been observed in any of the liturgies of the time. Not even Haier who as chairman presents the motion, follows it in the Prayer Book that he edits in 1861.
43. Prot. Frank., p. 86.
44. Ibid., pp. 75ff.
45. We have to note, however, that he does not cast any aspersions on the patriotism of those Orthodox Jews who for religious reasons still hope for the restoration of the Jewish people to Palestine.
46. It is this universal-mindedness of Liberal Judaism that is responsible for its later opposition to Zionism. Liberal progressive universalism contra Nationalism are the two parties then.
47. Prot. Frank. pp. 106ff.
48. Ibid. p. 63. Mishnah Meg. IV:10 may have been Wechsler's basis.
49. The mentioning of the sacrificial cult is also accepted by the majority.
50. The phrase "positive historical Judaism" which accepted as principle, and which is claimed as such by all parties of the conference, is really so wide and lends itself to so many various interpretations that it really does not set the lines and limits along which reforms shall be developed. It would be much more correct to refer to it as an attitude rather than a principle.
- 50a. Prot. Frank. pp. 241ff
51. Ibid. pp. 276ff.
52. Reformgemeinde, pp. 118ff.

*40 add here note 40a. In the report of the committee on liturgy we find the following reasoning concerning the elimination of Hebrew: If Hebrew is to be abolished, knowledge of the Bible will disappear since Hebrew will then not be taught in the schools.

53. Ibid., pp. 121f.
54. The second day of Sabbath (that is what it practically amounts to) is particularly striking as second day of the Festivals was abolished at the same time. See Reformgemeinde, p. 159.
55. We shall, therefore, later on discuss the revised edition.
56. This, however, was only a provisorium. A new Temple was dedicated in 1854.
57. Reformgemeinde, p. 228.
58. Prot. Bres., pp. 15ff.
59. Reformgemeinde, pp. 154ff.
60. He was elected rabbi in September 1846 and installed a year later.
61. The prohibition of music in house and Temple falls into this category. Travelling for divine services and other higher purposes is permissible, etc. See report of the committee at Frankfurt which serves as the basis of the discussion in Breslau. Prot. Frank. p. 349.
62. Typical of this group is Kahn who points out that prohibition against having non-Jews do the work for Jews on the Sabbath refers only to idolatrous slaves and has, therefore, no validity in our time. He, as well as Wechsler, justify their stand by referring to Orach Hayyim 246 where the work of a Jewish tax-collector may be done by a non-Jew on the Sabbath.
63. Prot. Bres., pp. 371-73.
64. Ibid., p. 115.
65. Ibid., p. 120.
66. Ibid., p. 108. Herzfeldt.
67. Geizer in resume, pp. 92f.
The Edict of 1847 excluded Prussian Jews from office in State and community.
68. Even in theory and by law the exercise of citizen rights independent of creed was established in the Prussian edict of 1848 and confirmed in the Constitution of 1850, not to speak of the practical exclusion of and discrimination against Jews as regards civil and communal service, which was only broken by the Weimar Republic. Lewkowitz pp. 321f.
69. Prot. Bres., pp. 311f.
70. Ibid., p. 312.
71. Attendance Record of the three Conferences:

The surprising answer to this argument is: Very well, at least they will not be taught a dead tongue in the school. Prot. Frank. p. 285f

- Braunschweig: Registration 40; Actual Attendance 24.
 Frankfurt: " 37; " " 34.
 Breslau: " 29; " " 25.
72. M. Weiner, Juedische Religion im Zeitalter der
 Emanzipation, p. 110.
73. Gebetbuch fuer das ganze Jahr (Einheits Gebetbuch) 1929
 Vorrede p. XII.
74. This was even true for the orthodox congregations
 bearing witness to the influence of the Liberal movement.
 This is the more surprising as it was one of the
 objections raised against the Jacobsen in 1823.
75. Seligmann p. 144.
76. M. Philippson, Neueste Geschichte des juedischen
 Volkes, p. 353.
77. AZdJ, 1854, p. 143.
78. M. Philippson, op. cit., p. 353.
79. See supra p. 52.
80. Verhandlungen der ersten israelitischen Synode zu Leipzig,
 p. 12.
81. M. Philippson, op. cit., pp. 357ff.
82. Die Beschlüsse der ersten u. zweiten israelitischen
 Synode, p. 5.
83. E.g., the Harkaroth may be read in German and may also
 taken from the Ketubim.
 Recommendation of the organ for Sabbath and Holidays.
 Objection to the restoration of the Sacrificial Cult
 and the return of the Jews to Palestine.
 Piutim are to be abolished.
84. Only thirty congregations were represented as compared
 to sixty at Leipzig. See RMJ p. 432.
85. E.g., permissibility of riding on the Sabbath.
 Permissibility of playing the organ on the Sabbath.
 Resolutions on circumcision.
86. A protest against the synod was signed by 130 orthodox
 rabbis of central and western Europe. AZdJ, 1871, pp. 780.
87. RMJ, pp. 451ff.

PART II

1. See supra Introduction.
2. Levin, pp. 44-55.
3. Reformgemeinde, pp. 225f.
4. S. Hildheim, Juedische Glaubens- und Sittenlehre, pp. 113ff.
5. Reformgemeinde, pp. 120ff, footnote 1.
6. Reformgemeinde, pp. 98f.
7. Reproduced in Levin, pp. 55-58.
8. Ibid., p. 57, Paragraph 6.
9. As if any thought of this sort would at all be conceivable
 for Rabbanite Jews in their centuries old tradition.

10. Levin, p.85, #51
11. ibid. p.83, #46 - How successful this shift actually was in revitalizing, as was intended, the religious interest by making it possible for every Jew to attend services may be judged by the following statements from a sermon which Holdheim preached in 1859: "If we are asked by our co-religionists: What is the reason for, what the nature of this non-Jewish Sabbath, then we can unfortunately not answer them by saying: *הַסַּבָּת הַזֶּה הוּא הַסַּבָּת* the Sambatyon River is our proof. For this day the stream of business life stops, material interests rest, earthly worries are silent, and the need for devotion can find expression. Unfortunately we are in no position to give such a reply. For they will point at the emptiness of this house, at the streets which lead to this Temple, and which are empty and sad like the streets of Zion which nobody treads at the time of the festivals. They will say to us: Can you bear the responsibility before God and before your own conscience that for this handful of people you dare to touch an institution holy for many millenia, bringing discord into the peaceful camp of Israel? Is it not mostly the children of your religious school who attend your Sabbath services? Could you not have observed the old Jewish Sabbath with them just as well? - We, my friends, must listen to these accusations and remain silent."
12. As Holdheim, Gebete und Gesaenge fuer das Neujahrs- und Versoehnungsfest, 1859
We refer to this particular prayerbook, since it is the only one, to our knowledge, which Holdheim compiled himself while rabbi at the Berlin Reform Congregation. The new edition of the latter's prayer book was merely revised by him.
13. Reformgemeinde, p.197
14. This distinction is strange as in his system of Judaism women had the same religious rights and duties as men. We may mention here that within ten years only 300 children had attended the school of the Reform Congregation.
15. Lewkowitz, p.383
16. ZRIJ II. p.6-13
17. - I. p.4-27, from which most of the following is taken.
18. MGNJ vol.45, pp.267 ff, as cited by Lewkowitz, p.370
19. Lewkowitz, p.371
20. cf. note 17 supra; I. Elbogen, Streit um die historische
- 21.* Reform, in Festschrift for C.G. Montefiore, pp.24-29.
22. Herein lies one important point of difference between Geiger and Holdheim who is the foremost representative of this consequentiality. With all personal respect for him Geiger calls his and his Reform Congregation's method unhistorical and refuses to identify himself with these views. He characterizes Holdheim as a man of dogmatic nature. WZJT vol.6, pp.14f.

23. A. Geiger, Unser Gottesdienst, pp.6,7.
24. WZTJ, vol.3, p.405.
25. ibid. vol.5, p.374.
26. A. Geiger, Das Judentum und seine Geschichte, vol.1, p.19.
27. N.S. pp.326f.
28. JZWL, vol.1, pp.6f. "Alles ist ihr wie des Judentums unveräusserliches Eigentum, vom ersten Worte der Bibel bis zum letzten eines Talmudisten. ... Ueberall erkennt sie den ursprünglichen Geist nach den verschiedenen Zeiten und der verschiedenen Begabung und dennoch in voller Einheit."
29. Leben, p.239.
30. ibid. pp.217, 239.
31. ibid. pp.305 ff.
32. Regarding this attitude, Goldheim says about Geiger's Breslau ministry the following: "A sharp separation between the followers of orthodoxy and the friends of religious reform had taken place in that community (Breslau). The greater part of the latter had been won over to Reform only by the fact that the head of the community, the scientifically very able Dr. Geiger, saw fit to obscure the last aims of Reform rather than unveil them. While in Science he worked more and more for a widening of the breach between the old conception of religion and the present religious consciousness ... in life he sought to cover up this breach by filling it with his personality. As Rabbi of the entire community, he considered it his duty to be above party divisions. Lifting the veil of the aims of Reform only partly ... he expected gratitude from the Orthodox for the self-denial with which he afflicted himself by not lifting it altogether." See Reformgemeinde, p.86.
33. "Dem weiblichen Geschlecht kann das eigentliche Erlernen der hebraeischen Sprache nicht zugeutet werden." See N.S. vol. p.319.
34. Quoted in Leben, pp.134f.
35. JZWL, vol.2. pp.169ff.
36. Leben, p.248.
37. A. Geiger, Das Judentum und seine Geschichte, p.36.
38. JZWL, vol.11. p.280. vol.3. p.64.
39. Lewkowitz, p.349.
40. JZWL, vol.8. p.1.
41. ibid. p.23.
42. N.S. vol.1. p.259.
43. ibid. p.15.

P A R T III

"Since Mendelssohn's translation of the Bible into German, no book has exerted greater educational influence upon modern Judaism than the prayerbook of the "Ehrwürdige Tempelgemeinde in Hamburg." This statement, as it appears in the preface of the 1903 edition of this prayerbook, may sound like an exaggeration. However, it is absolutely correct as far as an essential part of modern Judaism is concerned: namely, its liberal liturgy. The prayerbook of the Hamburg Temple laid the foundation for the improvement of Jewish worship and pointed the way to liturgical reforms which would eradicate the chaotic conditions prevailing in most German communities during this period, and, at the same time, would meet the demands of the modern mind. The second and revised edition (1841) of this pioneer work of liberal Judaism in particular, influenced greatly not only the liberal liturgies within Germany, but also those of England and America.¹⁾ It is for this reason that we shall discuss it at greater length, although it does not fall into the exact scope of our study.

The Hamburg prayerbook of 1819 had succeeded to a certain extent in reviving the religious interest of many groups and classes within the Jewish community. A revision of this work, however, was yet deemed necessary

in order to attain more fully the goal which its compilers had set for themselves, namely: "to bring back Jewish worship to its original simplicity and dignity." The reworking of this first liberal liturgy was mainly founded on the experience which had been gathered during the twenty-two years of its use in the "Tempel." Hence, the editors of 1841 were in a better position than those of 1819 "to differentiate more correctly the ineffective from the effective, the unessential from the essential." The distinction between "characteristic" or essential parts - so to speak: the body of the liturgy, and unessential, or unnecessary prayers served again as principle basis for the reforms as it had previously in the first edition. "The service as such, begins on evenings and mornings alike with the **ברכו** and consists in private as in public worship of two main parts namely, the **שמע** and the **תפלה** The **תפלה** contains these six essential **ברכות** : 1) Regarding the selection of the fathers, **אבות** ; 2) Regarding God's omnipotence, **גבורה** ; 3) The sanctification of God, **קדושה** ; 4) Regarding worship, **עבודה** ; 5) The prayer for peace, **שלום** ; 6) Thanksgiving, **"הודאה"** ²⁾ The middle benedictions which are inserted after the first three, are not considered a characteristic or essential part of the service. In other words, the static and characteristic

element of a Jewish service is comprised of the שמע with its benedictions and the three first and last benedictions of the תפלה. On Sabbaths and Holidays, the reading of the Torah is added. All other prayers outside of those just mentioned are of an accessory nature and tend only to increase the devotional spirit of the worshipper.³⁾ It is apparently for this reason that changes of the actual Hebrew text of the prayerbook are only noticeable in the accessory parts of the liturgy. The body of the service is left untouched.

It can be easily understood that such a procedure had to lead to many an inconsistency. To cite only a few examples: 1) in the first ברכה of the תפלה the phrase¹⁾ is found, although it is translated as if the text read ומבית נאולה. 2) Although all references to a restoration of the Jewish people to Zion have been eliminated, we find that the passage ותחינו עינינו בשוכן לציון is retained in the ברכה. This inconsistency is even more pronounced at first sight since the closing blessing which contains the same thought has been changed, eliminating thus a reference to the restoration of God's glory to Zion which is decidedly weaker than the one preceding. While the former expresses definite longing and hope, מחזיר שכינתו לציון can be considered, more or less, but a factual statement. However, in their notes which

form a small appendix in the back of the prayerbook, the editors explain this change with the fact that the customary version of the רצה represents by no means the one originally used in the sanctuary in Jerusalem nor is it generally accepted. According to Rashi on Berachoth 11 b, the רצה in former times read as follows: רצה יי אלהינו עבודת עמך ישראל ותפלתם תקבל ברצון. ברוך המקבל עבודת ישראל ברצון. אינן שאותן לברך ביראה ועבוד.

This closing phrase in former times was used in the תפלה for week-days.⁴⁾ In other words, the change expresses only preference to the older reading as it is also found in the Palestinian liturgy. Referring to the ספר התעב"ן the editors take in the explanatory note from which we just quoted the opportunity to emphasize that only prayer as such has been commanded by the Torah, however, not its various forms of expression: הנוסח אינו מן התורה

Another inconsistency becomes apparent in this same passage: while references to a restoration of the sacrificial cult are eliminated or changed in most places,⁵⁾ the phrase והשב את העבודה לדביר ביתך ונו' is retained here. However, it is printed in smaller type, put in parenthesis, and cannot be found in the translation, which means - as the editors inform us again in the appendix - that it is not to be used in the service. The

reason offered for the peculiar handling of this phrase is again based on scientific considerations. Referring to הקדמה ויכחל 175 a and ויקרא רנה par.326 the editor's claim that this phrase, as a later addition interrupts the continuity of the text of this passage. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the phrase as such has not been eliminated from the Hebrew text, obviously for the reason that though an addition, it had been linked to a characteristic prayer which, according to the principle on which the reformers of the Hamburg prayerbook were founded, was not to be subject to any radical change. The differences of the Tempelgemeinde from other Jewish communities were to be limited to some forms only and were not intended to include religious doctrines.

These inconsistencies indicate already that the new edition of the prayerbook presents only to a very limited degree an improvement as far as its inner progressiveness is concerned. Also this new work lacked - as Geiger had put it in his criticism of the 1819 edition - "in almost every respect, the clear and systematic following through of a progressive principle."⁷⁾

However, despite all these shortcomings, the progress which the Hamburg prayerbook of 1841 represented in the field of liberal liturgy must not be underestimated.

The translation of the Hebrew text was reworked whereby special consideration was taken to make the prayers also suitable for private worship. The same holds true for the German prayers and the paraphrases of Hebrew prayers in the vernacular, both of which in the first edition had been rendered in a style too stiff and too stilted to be elevating and inspiring. However, the most important improvement of the revised prayerbook lies in its greater fullness. While the first edition had limited its contents to the liturgy of the Sabbath and festival services, the new book contained prayers for all occasions on the order of the regular siddur.⁸⁾ This widening of the scope of the liberal prayerbook provided a simple opportunity to extend and to complete some of the characteristic parts of the liturgy. Thus the service for week-days finds again place in it. Its form is as follows: After a hymn and a German prayer based on **מה טוב** the shortened **ברכת השחר** is rendered in German, then the Psalms which are to be rendered in Hebrew, they too are somewhat abbreviated. The **שמע** with its **ברכות**⁹⁾ and the **תפלה** follow; both of which are to be read in Hebrew with the exception of the middle benedictions of the **תפלה**¹⁰⁾. The Kaddish and a German hymn conclude the services.

As to the accessory or non-characteristic parts of the service, particularly the piyutim, those were eliminated

to which the congregation had not become accustomed during the twenty-two years of the first prayerbook's existence.¹¹⁾

"This was the more permissible as the piyutin in the liturgy of the "Tempel" were replaced effectively by the German Hymnal." Of those which were retained, some were taken from Sephardic, some from Ashkenazic sources. The service as a whole, based itself on the Ashkenazic ritual and incorporated only in some places a few Sephardic¹²⁾ elements.

Much more consistent in its reforms than the Hamburg liberal liturgy, was the prayerbook which the Berlin Society for Reform published in 1846. As its individual parts were compiled at different intervals within that year, and everyone in itself rather hurriedly, the work¹³⁾ as a whole was of a more or less fragmentary nature. Its different parts were gathered, and arranged systematically in the so-called revised edition of 1848 under the guidance of Holdheim who had become rabbi of the group in 1847. However, the revision at that time did not consist of more than, as indicated above, of organizing and unifying the material which was already in existence, introducing but minor changes.¹⁴⁾

The year 1848, and particularly its summer, seething

with political excitement and general unrest, did not lend itself, for a more thoroughgoing reworking of this reformed prayerbook. Holdheim, more than any other member of the Society at that time, felt that the work called for such a complete revision. He realized that its general tendency was much too radical and negative, lacking especially all consideration for historical elements most important for Jewish worship. Also most of those prayers which were new and not based on the traditional liturgy, gave expression to modern phrases rather than being true creations of the spirit of the time. They were neither close to the spirit of the Bible, nor did they express the leading ideas and principles of the Reform of Judaism. However, Holdheim did not live to see a revised edition of the book in which his plans and wishes would become a reality. 15)

The question of such a complete revision was taken up again in 1856, when at the suggestion of C. A. Salomon the executive board of the "Reformgemeinde" decided to act on it and for this purpose appointed a special committee. Holdheim, as chairman of the committee prepared a thorough analysis of the prayerbook showing its good and its weak points, and making many suggestions for improvement. These were accepted by the committee, but apparently, they were not passed by the board. No practical results can

be discovered. The 1859/62 edition of the Berlin prayer-book with the exception of two insignificant additions is identical with the one of 1851/2 which in turn represents but a reprint of the so-called revised edition of 1848. All three are preceded by a preface in which Holdheim discusses the principle basis for the Reform of the traditional prayerbook in general, and this revision - rearrangement would be a much more correct term - in particular.

The following are the main points mentioned by him:

- 1) The selection of Israel as a holy people is referred to in the prayers as a subjective fact of the past because it has lost all truth as an objective fact for the Jew of today. 2) Man's enlightened spirit is and remains the last criterion of the greater or lesser importance of the contents of a revelation. Nevertheless, Biblical passages which describe supernatural acts of revelation are retained in the liturgy. They are to be conceived of as poetry and are to manifest the harmony of feeling between our generation and that of our oldest ancestors. As they in ancient times, so we today derive divine truth from these words. (cf. Vol. II p. 26;84) 3) The traditional idea of **יְהוָה יְהוָה** has lost all meaning for the modern Jew. As a matter of fact in its superficial but

customary interpretation it is more Christian than Jewish. Its deeper meaning, however, can still find expression in our prayers, namely the merits of the fathers may serve as a challenge to the children to strive to be just as deserving. (cf. II p. 22; 80 and others)

As to its form the re-arranged prayerbook of the Berlin "Reformgemeinde" is divided into two parts. The first contains nine different sets or cycles of prayers which are to be used alternately for the weekly services. Every service in itself consists of five parts: an opening hymn, the prayers, reading of the Torah, the sermon, and a closing anthem.

The following are the prayers which form the static nucleus of the nine different liturgies: 1) שמע

2) ונברך 3) ונאמנת 4) אבות 5) ונברך

6) Prayer for mourners and Yahrzeiters. 7) קדושה

Of these 1), 2), 7) alone are recited in Hebrew. 16) The

remainder of these liturgies for the greater part is comprised of prayers which are based on psalms or prayers used in the traditional liturgy for evening, morning or Sabbath services.

The second part of the Berlin reformed prayerbook contains the services for all the holidays and festivals. It is interesting to note that special evening services

are only provided for New Year - whose second day, by the way, is also observed - and the Day of Atonement. All services have in common the nucleus, which we discussed in respect to the weekly services,¹⁷⁾ to which the priestly benediction in Hebrew is added after the sermon at every morning service.

The liturgy of the Berlin "Reformgemeinde" as a whole departed so completely from the traditional structure of a Jewish service that it could only be acceptable to very few individuals who at that time already were sufficiently dejudalized as to be satisfied with such a prayerbook which certainly did not alleviate the monotony of which its creators were constantly accusing the traditional service. A thorough revision of the work along the lines which Holdheim had suggested, and going even beyond them, was undertaken by H. Levin, in 1865, who tried to bring back the service to its traditional foundation. Nevertheless, the stream of development away from Judaism (instead of progress within Judaism) which had begun its rapid flow in 1846 could not be stemmed and lead consistently to the travestylike prayerbook which was used in more recent years by this congregation. This booklet "wrought the miracle" of reducing the wealth of Jewish gratitude, praise and hope as manifested

abundantly in a truly Jewish service, to 63 pages. *for the entire year*

The Hamburg and Berlin liturgies with which we dealt so far purported to provide a prayerbook for a group within the general Jewish community which, to a certain extent, had become isolated from the main body because of the progressiveness of its ideas. We shall now turn in our discussion to the Breslau prayerbook of 1854, which already in this respect differed essentially from the previous works. For the first time in the history of German Jewry the executive board of a Jewish community organization ("Gemeinde") commissioned its rabbi to compile a liberal liturgy which was to be used as the only prayerbook in the main synagogue of that community. For the past eight years slight reforms and changes had been introduced into the service of the Breslau congregation. Since, however, all of these were superimposed upon the structure of the orthodox prayerbook, great confusion resulted from this procedure, which was particularly disturbing during the High Holiday services. Inconsistencies were naturally also unavoidable as most of these reforms were improvised on the spur of the

moment. Hence the demand for a prayerbook which would express in a systematic and organized fashion the liberal spirit which permeated the service, already grew more and more.

Abraham Geiger, rabbi of the Breslau Jewish community since 1838 had laid the groundwork for such a modern liturgy. In a pamphlet which he published in 1849¹⁸⁾ and which was directed to the members of the Breslau "Gemeinde", he presented the general outline which now served as principle basis for the new liberal prayerbook. A brief summary of the results at which he arrives in this essay must be given here, as it is necessary for the understanding of the Breslau liturgy:

- 1) Every liturgical Reform must aim at satisfying the demands of the modern mind.
- 2) All those passages in the traditional Siddur and Machsor call for a change which concern Israel's relationship to mankind. While Jewish generations in the past, suffering from persecutions, may have needed to reassure themselves by referring in their prayers, time and again, to Israel's¹⁹⁾ supremacy over all other nations, such expressions must evoke protest from the modern Jew. For him it suffices to say: "Thou hast called us for thy holy teachings."
- 3) All references to Israel as a nation of its own must be eliminated since they are untrue

today. Israel's national existence has ceased. 4) All anthropomorphic allusions and all references to the resurrection of the body must disappear from the prayer-book. 5) Not only the medieval piyutim must be considered unfit for stirring the religious emotions, but many other liturgical compositions which are overladen with innumerable repetitions, of one and the same idea²⁰⁾ likewise are detrimental to the spirit of devotion. 6) The Haphtarah and some special prayers are to be read in German. Nevertheless, Hebrew must remain the dominant language of public Jewish services. The vernacular without any Hebrew is to be preferred for private worship. 7) The public services must be shortened considerably, which can easily be achieved by avoiding repetitions of the same prayer within one service, and reducing the enormous amount of Biblical passages, beautiful as they might be.²¹⁾ Also the reading of the Torah must be shortened. 8) The services on Mondays and Thursdays are not to be distinguished by any special liturgical features as they had only significance and meaning as market days in the ancient Palestinian environment. The same holds true for the distinctive character of some Sabbaths which goes back to some local events in Palestine, but has lost all meaning for us.

9) A "solemn Sunday service", to take place once a month, would give a large part of the congregation an opportunity for worshipping together without interfering with the rights of the Sabbath.

In the " כרך הפלה דבר יום ניומו

Israelitisches Gebetbuch fuer den oeffentlichen Gottesdienst im ganzen Jahr", Geiger tries to follow this set of principles as closely as possible. However, editing the book for the use of the entire Jewish community, he had to take refuge in a trick or remedy - whatever one may call it - to which we had occasion to refer time and again in our study: Changing the Hebrew text only in

22) a few places , he gives expression to the inward change and development of ideas in accordance with modern thinking in the German text which accompanies the Hebrew at the bottom of the page. Geiger himself in his preface, calls our attention to the fact that this German part is not intended to provide a translation of the Hebrew text, but rather a modern commentary on its contents.

23) Thus, for instance, while the reference to the resurrection of the dead is retained in the Hebrew, 24) the German text reads as follows: "Thy omnipotence o God giveth life, preserves and renews it. Thou refreshes flowers when they thirst, and when they wither

thou lettest others sprout. Thou upholdest the falling, sendest cure to the sick, and keepest thy faith also with those who sleep in the dust. Verily, thy omnipotence filleth the dead with the promise that their salvation will bloom forth in life eternal. Praised be thou, o God, who giveth life here and there."

Another striking example can be found in the handling of the seventeenth benediction of the תפלה.

Although the preface states: "Jerusalem and Zion are places from which teachings went forth.....they are as a whole rather an idea of the spirit than a definite part of the earth linked to God's predestination for all times,"²⁵⁾ nevertheless, the Hebrew text contains the phrase: וְתַחֲנוּנֵינוּ עֵינֵינוּ בְּסוֹכֵךְ לְצִיּוֹן בְּרַחֲמִים. בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יי
הַמְחַיֵּה שְׁכִינָתוֹ לְצִיּוֹן²⁶⁾. However, the German makes up for this apparent inconsistency: "Thus we have put before thee our heart's yearning and desire. Turn thou in in mercy to our supplications and entreaties and let us not go forth from thee empty. Fulfill our wish, if it is in accord with thy holy will, and grant us rest and modest resignation, if before the council of thy wisdom our wish should not find favor. Thou listenest with pleasure to childlike supplications when they come from a pure heart. Be praised for that, o God!" Other

passages similarly disguise inconsistencies found in the Hebrew text by disregarding them completely in the German commentary.²⁷⁾

As may be concluded already from the preceding, this German "Bearbeitung" is a novel and by far the most outstanding feature of this prayerbook. Its style is simple and yet beautiful and is by far superior to that of the clumsy translations in the Hamburg liturgy or of the supposedly elevating and inspiring text of the prayerbook of the Berlin Society for Reform. Geiger, by means of this German text, is quite successful in giving expression to the true spirit of the prayers or in reinterpreting them in such a way that they continue to have meaning for the modern Jew.²⁸⁾

A few examples will illustrate this point. The *Shema* with its many repetitions which in the translation of most prayerbooks is rendered literally,²⁹⁾ in Geiger's paraphrase reads as follows: "This word is true and reliable, our joy and our hope, the vigor of our life and our strength for ever and ever. Verily God is eternal and persistent. His word is faithful and gives life."³⁰⁾ The *Shema* which Geiger in the pamphlet mentioned before gave as the classical example for a prayer whose very spirit suffocates on account of

the fact that the same idea is repeated in it time and again finds this fore in the German text: "At God's word, the evening has come. The light of day has fulfilled its task and now makes way for darkness. But also in the night there gleams for us the ray of divine grace. Also the moon and the stars in their regular course according to their wondrous order are messengers of God. With their mild light they illumine the night in a friendly fashion. Thus thou, o God, causest the change of day and night ruling the one as well as the other with equal fatherly love."³¹⁾

Of particular beauty is the transformation which the great confession of sins for the morning prayer of the Day of Atonement found in Geiger's "Bearbeitung." It is for this reason that we shall include it here in the original German:³⁷⁾

"Und zum zweiten Male will ich vor Deinem Angesichte, mein Gott und Vater, mein Herz und meinen Wandel untersuchen. Schon am Abende habe ich einen Blick in mich geworfen und manches reuige Bekenntniss vor Dir abgelegt; aber noch bin ich nicht ruhig, bis ich Alles vor Dir ausgesprochen habe, was mich belastet. Ich will wahr vor Dir erscheinen, ohne zu verschweigen und zu beschoenigen, und wenn auch da manches Widrige hervortritt, das ich selbst mit Beschaemung erblicken muss,

so ist es besser, dass ich beschaent vor Dir stehe, als dass ich suendlich luegen sollte. Ja, ich will wahr sein! Wie oft aber bin ich es nicht gewesen in meinem Leben! Ich habe den Irrthum in mir fortwachern lassen, weil er mir geschmeichelt hat, weil er mir bequem war, und habe es an dem ernstesten Streben fehlen lassen; mich eines Bessern zu belehren. Und nicht selten habe ich auch wissentlich und absichtlich der Luege gefroehnt, habe die Wahrheit verletzt, die mir von Dir verliehene Sprache entweicht, indem ich sie nicht zum Ausdrucke, nein, zur Entstellung meiner Gedanken und Empfindungen angewendet habe. Ich fuehle es, wie ich mich dadurch entwuerdigt habe, ich habe die Einheit in meinem Innern gestoert, ich war anders mit dem Munde als im Herzen und habe meine Lippe entweicht durch Worte, die in meiner Brust keinen Widerklang gefunden. Mein zeitlicher Vortheil hat mich bestimmt, truegerische, falsche, gleissnerische Reden zu gebrauchen, und ich habe nicht bedacht, dass ich mich dadurch mir selbst, meinem besseren Triebe und Dir, mein Gott, entfremde. Vielleicht habe ich auch die Bethenerung einer solchen falschen Aussage nicht gescheut, vielleicht - o, mein Gott, ich erschrecke bei dem Gedanken - gar Deinen Namen missbraucht, Dich zum Zeugen meiner unwahren Behauptung angerufen, Dich, den Heiligen, Reinen Allwissenden! Ach, wie darf ich das

Auge vor Dir aufschlagen? Ich habe den Menschen geschmeichelt, um mich in ihre Gunst einzuschleichen, habe die Einfalt des Herzens mit listiger Klugheit vertauscht, habe Gesinnungen erheuchelt, um mich mit einem Glanz der Froemdigkeit zu umgeben, waehrend mein Herz leer von ihr blieb. Ja, mein Herz fuehlt sich so leer, wenn ich mich ernstlich pruefe, der aeussere Schein schwindet, der Glanz erbleicht, und ich stehe nackt vor Dir. Ach verlass mich nicht, Dein huelfesuchendes Kind! Ich will von nun an wahr und offen vor Dir wandeln, will der Versuchung zur Unwahrheit ausweichen. Was ich bis jetzt scheinen wollte, das will ich von jetzt an mich bestreben zu werden und zu sein. Gieb Du mir Kraft dazu, dass ich den vielen Verlockungen des Lebens entgehen kann, dass ich aufrichtig und gerade mit den Menschen verkehre, dass der Friede meines Herzens und Dein Beifall mir hoeher stehe als aller Gewinn und alle menschliche falsche Ehre! Lass aus der Thraene, die in mein Auge sich draengt, eine reiche Saat der Besserung aufgehen, und schaerfe Du immer meinen Blick, auf dass ich nicht wieder verfall in den Fehler, zu bemaenteln und zu verschleiern! Du bestaerkst ja so gern in jeder guten Regung; o staerke, kraefftige auch mich, dass ich im frohen Aufblicke zu Dir mein Antlitz nicht zu verhuellen brauche! Amen!"

One of his objectives, namely, to improve the service of the synagogue by making it briefer, Geiger achieved not so much in regard to the daily or Sabbath services as to the liturgy for the Festivals and especially the High Holidays. Here the multitude of piyutin provided ample opportunity for cutting down the quantity of the service without harming its inner, spiritual weightiness and contents. Thus he succeeds, for example, in reducing the long benedictions and confessions of sin at the end of the תפלה שהרי"ת של ראש השנה from thirty-five to ten pages.

The daily and the Sabbath services remained essentially unchanged inspite of the radical ideas which Geiger had voiced regarding them in the original outline of this work which we summarized at the outset of our discussion. The only elements which were introduced for the purpose of shortening them to a certain extent, were the abolition of repeating the תפלה and the triennial cycle for the reading of the Torah on Sabbaths.

Geiger's סדר תפלה דבר יום ניומו as a whole did not quite come up to the standard of Reform proclaimed in 1849 and differed most strikingly from the principle of the scientific basis on which liturgical reforms must be founded which the author had set forth in his rigorous critique of the two editions of the

Hamburg prayerbook.³³⁾ As a matter of fact, his own prayerbook makes this critique appear rather ridiculous and unwarranted, to say the least. However, we must not forget that twelve years of experience had passed in the meantime. Although himself much more liberal than we might judge from this prayerbook alone, Geiger realized that he had to adjust his personal wishes for a Reform of the liturgy to the ideas and needs of his congregation. In later years, during the time of his activity in Frankfurt and Berlin, he re-edited the book with special considerations for the German and the Polish rites. In these new editions the German element which in the original was mainly intended for private worship, occupies a greater place in the public service itself. Also the ideological discrepancies between the Hebrew and the German text have disappeared and all services are rendered in a briefer form.³⁴⁾

While Geiger liberalized his prayerbook of 1854 in these new editions his successor in the Breslau rabbinate, Joel, re-edited it in a much more conservative form. In a way the latter may even have believed that he followed consistently the liberal principle of tolerance. For the peculiar character of Joel's re-working of Geiger's prayerbook lay in the fact that in

the critical places of the liturgy which were subject to serious differences between conservatives and liberals it contained both: the traditional and the changed text. While the cantor would recite the latter, the individual worshipper was free to use the former which was printed in smaller type.³⁵⁾ Geiger protested strenuously against this half-way and dishonest liberalism in a series of essays in his "Zeitschrift fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums"³⁶⁾ under the title: "Etwas ueber Glauben und Beten. Zu Schutz und Trutz." Nevertheless, it must be stated that Geiger's prayerbook not in its liberalized revision of 1870 but rather in its original edition of 1854 or in the conservatized form which Joel gave to it, served as pattern for the multitude of liberal prayer books which appeared in the greater Jewish communities of Germany during the following decades.

NOTES

PART III

1. Not to speak of the use which the book itself found in various congregations in Europe and America.
2. Gebetbuch des neuen israelitischen Tempels in Hamburg 1845 (a reprint of the 1841 edition) p. 434.
3. *ibid.*
4. *ibid.* p. 435
5. As for instance in the Mussaph for the Sabbath.
ibid. p. 83 f.
6. *ibid.* p. 435
7. I. Elbogen, Geschichte des juedischen Gottesdienstes p. 404
8. e. g. circumcision, wedding, funeral, grace.
9. Without the קדושה של מרכנה
10. The regular Ashkenazic morning Kedusha is also used here.
11. This is particularly evident in the Mussaph service of Rosh Hashana. While the first edition (p. 94 ff.) has four introductory piyutim, the second carries only two short poetic pieces.
12. cf. I. Elbogen: Geschichte des juedischen Gottesdienstes p. 402 ff.
"Dem Gebetbuch wurde die Ueberlieferung des portugiesischen Litues zugrunde gelegt, auch die Aussprache des Hebraeischen geschah nach der Weise der Portugiesen..... Durch die Benutzung der sephardischen Gebetordnung waren zahlreiche Abweichungen von dem bei der Mehrzahl der Juden Hamburgs ueblichen Wortlaut der Gebete bedingt....."
As becomes evident from our statement above, we disagree with Professor Elbogen in this point and believe that on closer examination the Ashkenazic structure of the Hamburg Temple liturgy becomes evident so that his assumption of the Portuguese foundation of this liberal liturgy is not born out by the facts. Although the scope of this study does not permit us to furnish a thorough analysis, the few

examples which we are going to cite will prove our contention sufficiently.

1) The **חצ' קריש** on page 2 of the "Tempel" prayerbook is identical with the Ashkenazic version and at variance with the Sephardic as found in M. Gaster's "Book of Prayer" p. 25.

2) The translation of the **השכ'נו** on page 8 of the Hamburg prayerbook follows the Ashkenazic ritual. This is particularly interesting as the Sephardic version seems to be more suitable from the standpoint of Reform since it does not contain any reference to the

שם nor to any anthropomorphic conception of God as one may detect it in the phrase **ונצל כנפך חסידנו** (cf. M. Gaster *ibid.* p. 85)

3) Also the passage **וחתונה ונו** in the former on pages 11 and 70 does not contain the additional sentence **ואתה ברחמיך הרבים חתמן בנו וחרצנו**

as it is found in the Sephardic ritual (cf. M. Gaster *ibid.* pp. 87)

4) The use of **שיום שלום** for mornings and evenings alike in place of the Ashkenazic **שיום רב** for the evening service, seems to be due to the influence of the Sephardic ritual.* (It is, however, doubtful whether the same change on page 19 of "Evening Services for The Sabbath from Union Prayer Book" published by the Central Conference of American Rabbis in 1935 could find the same explanation.)

5) The same holds true for the passage **כל ישראל יש להם** which is taken from the Sabbath service of the Portuguese ritual where it is recited after the **Mussaph**, between the **קריש התקלי** and a passage from **Misimah** **Maccoth** chap. III (cf. M. Gaster, *ibid.* p. 120)

6) The **שתח** of the Hamburg prayerbook on page 54 is identical with the Ashkenazic prayer and at variance with the Sephardic version. (cf. M. Gaster *ibid.* p. 100)

7) The use of the Ashkenazic **אהבה רבה** in the morning service stands in strong contrast to the Sephardic ritual which has **אהבה קלים** for both, evening and morning services.

8) The Torah service of the Hamburg prayerbook presents a strange combination of Ashkenazic and Sephardic elements.

9) The morning Kedusha and the **Mussaph** Kedusha on the Sabbath are identical; both correspond to the Ashkenazic **Mussaph** Kedusha, although the idea of the morning Kedusha in its difference from the Ashkenazic version seems to be borrowed from the Sephardic ritual. Its text, however, differs from it entirely. The Kedusha for week-

See last
Hand R.

days agrees perfectly with the Ashkenazic morning Kedusha.

10) The middle benediction in the פתח מוסף של שנה in its beginning at least, is taken from the Sephardic prayer למה צוית and has then been changed in accordance with the liberal spirit.

11) As to piyutim, on the High Holidays for instance, an equal number seems to have been taken from Sephardic and Ashkenazic sources. The same, however, holds true for many other liberal liturgies which prefer Sephardic piyutim because they are less complicated than some of the Ashkenazic poems, but in all other respects are in no wise related to the Sephardic ritual.

cf. also A. Geiger "Nachgelassene Schriften" p. 157 where Geiger claims that the Hamburg liberal liturgy is based on the Polish ritual.

* -However, the insertion for the ten days of repentance is of Ashkenazic origin.

13. Reformgemeinde p. 193 f.

14. ibid. p. 194

15. cf. I. Elbogen, Geschichte des juedischen Gottesdienstes p. 424 f. The author states the revision of 1856 as a fact. In reality it took only place in Holdheim's plan (cf. Reformgemeinde p. 195 ff.) and was never actually realized. In other words, the book of which Elbogen speaks as having been reworked according to Holdheim's criticism was never published but "Holdheim's Umarbeitung" as far as publication is concerned, consists only of the rearranged edition of 1848 of which we are speaking in this section, and which has been reprinted till after Holdheim's death.

16. We learn, however, that these Hebrew passages are but concessions to the habits of individual members (cf. Reformgemeinde p. 196 A)

17. With the exception of the evening services which do not contain the קריעה. On the eve of the Day of Atonement ונסלח is added.

18. "Grundzuege und Plan zu einem neuen Gebetbuch", Breslau 1849, which was republished in 1861, under the title: "Notwendigkeit und Mass einer Reform."

19. e. g. אשר נחר בנו מכל עם ורוממו מכל לשון

20. e. g. the מערבונות or the אמת ויציב
21. e. g. eight big Psalms for Sabbaths and Holidays, then again six Psalms of equal size and finally multiple passages from Chronicles, Nehemia, and the Pentateuch.
22. Frequently rather clumsily e. g. the tenth, eleventh, and seventeenth benediction of the עשרה or the changes in the עלינו לשבח
23. "The mourning about Israel's lost national independence, the prayer for a gathering of the dispersed in Palestine, the restoration of the priestly and sacrificial cult is removed to the background." We wonder whether we must not interpret these words in the preface to the prayerbook to mean that the Hebrew text serves, so to speak, as the background to which these things are referred, as will become evident from the examples quoted above.
24. " דבר תפלה דבר יום ביומו Israelitisches Gebetbuch fuer den oeffentlichen Gottesdienst im ganzen Jahr mit Einschluss der Sabbathe und saemmtlicher Feier und Festtage", Breslau 1854, p. 38 f.
25. ibid. p. VI
26. ibid. p. 46
27. e. g. ibid. p. 244 ומכאן חסאינו וכו' which despite changes is not quite in accord with Geiger's principles.
28. The latter is particularly true for the free paraphrase on the עבודה in the Mussaph service of the Day of Atonement which in this form - with its Hebrew interruptions - has found entrance in almost every liberal prayerbook in Germany.
29. cf. e. g. Daily Prayers by Dr. A. Th. Philips p. 101 "True and firm, established and enduring, right and faithful, beloved and precious, desirable and pleasant, revered and mighty, well ordered and acceptable, good and beautiful is this Thy word for ever and ever."
30. Israelitisches Gebetbuch p. 36
31. ibid. p. 78
32. ibid. p. 415 - 418
33. Der Hamburger Wampelstreit, eine Zeitfrage, Breslau 1842, N. S. I p. 113 - 196
To cite only one example: Criticizing the editors of the Hamburg prayerbook for their lack of scientific under-

standing Geiger mocks at them for retaining the Kiddush in the evening service, since it is a ceremony limited to the home and found only entrance into the synagogue because one used to feed wayfarers there after the conclusion of the services, "something which is certainly not done in the Hamburg Temple." But how surprised are we when in his prayerbook we find the Kiddush in its traditional place in the evening service of Sabbaths and festivals without any special indication that it is only to be used in the home.

- 34. cf. the Berlin edition of the book in 1870.
- 35. cf. " סדר תפלה Israelitisches Gebetbuch, bearbeitet von Dr. M. Joel," Breslau 1872.
- 36. Vol. VII.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AZdJ - Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums
- HERE - Hastings, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics
- JZWL - Juedische Zeitschrift fuer Wissenschaft und Leben
- Leben - Geiger, Ludwig: Abraham Geiger, Leben und Lebenswerk
- Lewkowitz - Lewkowitz, Albert: Das Judentum und die geistigen Stroemungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts
- Levin - Levin, Moritz: Die Reform des Judentums
- MGWJ - Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums
- Prot.Braun. - Protokolle der ersten Rabbinerversammlung gehalten in Braunschweig vom 12. bis zum 19. Juni 1844
- Prot.Frank. - Protokolle und Aktenstuecke der zweiten Rabbinerversammlung gehalten in Frankfurt am Main vom 15. bis zum 28. Juli 1845.
- Prot.Bres. - Protokolle der dritten Versammlung deutscher Rabbiner abgehalten zu Breslau vom 13. bis 24. Juli 1846
- Reformgemeinde - Holdheim, Samuel: Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der juedischen Reformgemeinde in Berlin
- RMJ - Philipson, David: The Reformmovement in Judaism
- WZTJ - Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fuer juedische Theologie
- ZRIJ - Zeitschrift fuer die religioesen Interessen des Judentums

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Abraham Jakob: Die siebenundsiebzig sogenannten Rabbiner und die Rabbiner-Versammlung (in Braunschweig) Heft I.
C. Enders Wwe. Frankenthal, Mannheim 1845
- Baeck, Leo: Das Wesen des Judentums, 4. Auflage.
J. Kaufmann Verlag, Frankfurt a.M. 1926
- -: Wege im Judentum - Aufsätze und Reden,
Schocken Verlag, Berlin 1935
- Bernfeld, Simon: Juden und Judentum im neunzehnten Jahrhundert,
Verlag Siegfried Cronbach, Berlin 1898
- : חולדות הריפור מציון הדתית בישראל
מאת ד"ר שמעון ברנפלד הוצאת חברה
בדפוס של יוסף פישר קראקא חר"ם
Verlag Achiasaf, Warschau, Krakau 1900
- Beschlusses der ersten und zweiten Israelitischen Synode
J. Gottsleben'sche Buchdruckerei, Mainz 1871
- Cohen, Hermann: Deutschtum und Judentum,
A. H. Pöpelmann, Giessen, 1915
- Deutsch, David: הפסד דת או Protestation gegen die Versammlung. Ein Wort eigens abgefasst gegen die erste Rabbiner-Versammlung zu Braunschweig im Jahre 1844, aber auch anzuwenden gegen die zweite zu Frankfurt am Main im Jahre 1845
Sohran, Selbstverlag, 1846
- Deutsch, I.: Zur Würdigung der Braunschweiger Rabbiner-Versammlung,
Leopold Freund, Breslau, 1845
- Dienemann, Max: Liberales Judentum,
Schocken Verlag, Berlin 1935
- : מנוח חנוכה Zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet vom
Vorstand der Israelitischen Religions-Gemeinde, Offen-
bach am Main unter Mitwirkung von Leo Baeck, Martin
Buber, Ismar Elbogen, Max Gruenewald, Siegfried Hug-
genheimer, Bruno Italiener, Paul Lazarus, Sali Levy,
Claude G. Montefiore, Caesar Seligman, Eugen Taubler,
Max Wiener
J. Kaufmann Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 1935
- Dubnow, Semion Markovich: Die neueste Geschichte der juedischen
Volkes (1789-1914) Deutsch von Alexander Eliasberg.
Bd. 1-3
Juedischer Verlag, Berlin 1920-1923

Elbogen, Ismar: Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland,
Erich Lichtenstein Verlag, Berlin 1955

- : Der juedische Gottesdienst in seiner geschicht-
lichen Entwicklung,
Buchhandlung Gustav Fock G.m.b.H., Leipzig 1911
- : Ludwig Philippson - 28. Dez. 1811 - 28. Dez. 1911 -
Vortrag gehalten in der Generalversammlung der Gesell-
schaft zu Berlin am 3. Januar 1912,
Buchhandlung Gustav Fock G.m.b.H. Leipzig 1912

Entwurf der Statuten der juedischen Gemeinde von Berlin,
Julius Sittenfeld, Berlin 1850

Erste Weltkonferenz liberaler Juden, Die . Reden - Diskussion -
Beschluesse, Gruendungsversammlung der World Union for
Progressive Judaism, London 10.-12. Juli 1926.
Deutsche Ausgabe herausgegeben von der World Union
for Progressive Judaism, Deutsche Sektion: Vereinigung
fuer das liberale Judentum E.V. Berlin SW 48, Wilhelm-
strasse 147.
Berlin 1926

Festgabe fuer Claude Goldsmid Montefiore ueberreicht anlaesslich
der Tagung des Weltverbandes fuer Religioes-Liberales
Judentum in Berlin,
Philo Verlag, Berlin 1928

First Conference of the World Union for Progressive Judaism,
Berlin, 1928

Frankel, Albert: Das moderne Judenthum, die Frankfurter Reform-
freunde und die neue Zeit.
Ein Beitrag zur Kritik religioeser und socialer Zu-
staende der Gegenwart.
I.C.Maecken Sohn, Reutlingen 1844

Frankel, Zacharias: Zeitschrift fuer die religioesen Interessen
des Judenthums, 3 volumes,
H.C.Teubner, Leipzig 1846

Frankel, Zacharias, und Heinrich Graetz: Monatsschrift fuer
Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums,
Schletter'sche Buchhandlung (H. Skutsch) Breslau

Gebetbuch fuer das ganze Jahr - פתח לכל השנה
Zweiter Teil: Neujahr und Versoehnungstag,
M. Lehrberger & Co., Frankfurt am Main 1931
Erster Teil: Werktag, Sabbat und Festtage,
M. Lehrberger & Co., Frankfurt am Main 1929

Gebetbuch fuer juedische Reformgemeinden - Dritte Auflage
Selbstverlag der juedischen Reform-Gemeinde
Berlin 1859

Gebetbuch fuer die oeffentliche und haeusliche Andacht der Israeliten - סדר העבודה
B.S.Berendsohn, Hamburg 1845

Gebet-Ordnung fuer den Jugendgottesdienst in der juedischen Gemeinde zu Berlin (Sabbath-Nachmittag)
Julius Sittenfeld, Berlin 1889

Gebetbuch herausgegeben vom Israelitischen Tempelverband in Hamburg - סדר העבודה
Selbstverlag des Tempelverbandes, Hamburg 190

Geiger, Abraham: סדר תפלה דבר יום ביומו
Israelitisches Gebetbuch fuer den oeffentlichen Gottesdienst im ganzen Jahre, erster und zweiter Teil, zweite Auflage.
Louis Gerschel, Berlin 1870

- : סדר תפלה דבר יום ביומו
Israelitisches Gebetbuch fuer den oeffentlichen Gottesdienst im ganzen Jahre, mit Einschluss der Sabbathe und saemtlichen Feier- und Festtage, Julius Hainauer, Breslau 1854

- : Unser Gottesdienst,
Schletter'sche Buchhandlung (H.Skutsch), Breslau 1868

- : Nothwendigkeit und Mass einer Reform des juedischen Gottesdienstes, zweite Auflage
Julius Hainauer, Breslau 1861

- : Die dritte Versammlung deutscher Rabbiner,
F.E.C.Leuckart, Breslau 1846

- : Juedische Zeitschrift fuer Wissenschaft und Leben,
H.Skutsch, Breslau 1875

- : Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte. In zwelf Vorlesungen. Abthlg. I-3, bound in one vol.
Schletter, Breslau 1864/1871

- : Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fuer juedische Theologie,
W.Lepsohn, Gruenberg und Leipzig 1844

Geiger, Ludwig: Abraham Geiger. Leben und Lebenswerk.
Georg Reimer, Berlin 1910

- : Geschichte der Juden in Berlin. I. Als Festschrift zur zweiten Saekular-Feier.
J.Gutwentag (D.Collin) Berlin 1871

Geiger, Ludwig: Abraham Geiger's Nachgelassene Schriften, vols.1,5.
Louis Gerschel, Berlin 1875

Goldmann, Felix: Zionismus oder Liberalismus, Atheismus oder Religion,
J.Kauffmann (Voigt & Gleiber) Frankfurt a.M.1911

Gottesdienst-Ordnung fuer die Synagogen des Königreichs Württemberg,
Unter Hoehchster Genehmigung festgesetzt von der Königl.
israelitischen Ober-Kirchenbehörde.
Hallberger'sche Verlagshandlung, Stuttgart 1838

Graetz, Heinrich: - Braun Markus: Geschichte des juedisch-theologischen Seminars (Fraenkel'sche Stiftung) in Breslau. Festschrift zum funfzigjaehrigen Jubilaeum der Anstalt.
T.Schatzky, Breslau 1904

- - : History of the Jews, vol.V.
Jewish Publication Society of America,
Philadelphia 1895

Hastings, James: Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 12 vols. and
index volume.
Charles Scribner's Sons, Edinburgh:T.&T.Clark,
New York 1908

Hazan, Moses Israel: קול ישראל (A collection of letters protesting against the resolution of the "Rabbiner-Versammlung" at Brunswick, by M.J.Hazan and other rabbis of Palestine.)
David Proops, Amsterdam 1846

Herlitz, Georg und Bruno Kirschner: Juedisches Lexikon, 5 vols.
Juedischer Verlag, Berlin 1927.

Holdheim, Samuel: Das Ceremonialgesetz im Messiasreich als Vorläufer einer groesseren Schrift ueber die religioese Reform des Judenthums,
C.Kuerschner'sche Buchhandlung, Berlin 1845

- - : Drei Predigten,
W.J.Peiser, Berlin 1864

- - : Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der juedischen Reformgemeinde in Berlin,
Julius Springer, Berlin 1857

- - : האמונה והדעה, Juedische Glaubens und Sittenlehre Leitfaaden beim Religionsunterricht der juedischen Jugend. Zunaechst fuer die Religionsschule der juedischen Reformgemeinde zu Berlin.
Julius Springer, Berlin 1857

- - : Moses Mendelssohn und die Denk- und Glaubensfreiheit in Judenthum,
J.C.Huber, Berlin 1859

Holdheim, Samuel: Die Rechte Russe, Predigt,
Leopold Lessar, Berlin 1850

- : Ueber die Autonomie der Rabbinen und das Princip
der juedischen Ehe,
C. Kuerschner, Schwerin 1843

Horovitz, J.: לא בחיל ולא במח . Rede ueber die Richtlinien gehalten
am vierten Tage des Chanukahfestes 5673.
J. Kauffmann, Frankfurt am Main 1912

International Conference of Liberal Jews held at the Liberal
Jewish Synagogue, London, Saturday, July 10th - Mon-
day, July 12th, 1926. Organized by the Jewish Religious
Union for the Advancement of Liberal Judaism. Liberal
Jewish Synagogue, 28 St. John's Wood Road, London, W. 8.

Isaak, Bernhard: Der Religionsliberalismus in deutschen Juden-
tum.
Werkgemeinschaft, G.m.b.H., Leipzig 1935

Isler, Meyer: Gabriel Riesser's Leben nebst Mittheilungen aus
seinen Briefen.
Riesser- Stiftung, Frankfurt am Main 1871

Jewish Encyclopedia, The, 12 vols.
Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York & London 1901-1906

Joël, M.: סדר תפלה לימות החול ולשבתות ולכל מועדי השנה
Israelitisches Gebetbuch fuer die oeffentliche Andacht
des ganzen Jahres. 2. Aufl. 1. & 2. Teil.
Wilh. Jacobssohn, Breslau 1888

Jost, Isaak Markus: Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten,
Abt. I. 1-3
Doerffling & Frankl, Leipzig 1857-1859

Juedische Idee und ihre Traeger, Die; Beitrage zur Frage des
juedischen Liberalismus und Nationalismus.
Verlag der Juedischen Rundschau, Berlin

Kaulla, Rudolf: Der Liberalismus und die deutschen Juden,
Das Judentum als konservatives Element,
Duncker & Humblot, Muenchen & Leipzig 1928

Lazarus, Moritz: Die Erneuerung des Judentums,
Georg Reimer, Berlin 1909

Leimdoerfer, David: Festschrift zum hundertjaehrigen Bestehen
des israelitischen Tempels in Hamburg. 1818 - 1918.
M. Glogau jr. Hamburg 1918

Levin, Morris: Die Reform des Judentums,
Rosenthal & Co., Berlin 1895

- Levin, Morris: Lehrbuch der juedischen Geschichte und Literatur,
4.Aufl.
M.Poppelauer, Berlin 1908
- : Lehrbuch der Israelitischen Religion, 3.Aufl.
M.Poppelauer, Berlin 1910
- Lewkowitz, Albert: Das Judentum und die geistigen Stroemungen
des 19. Jahrhunderts,
A. & H. Marcus Verlag, Breslau 1935
- Lewkowitz, Julius: Die Grundsätze des juedisch-religioesen Li-
beralismus,
Berlin 1927
- Loew, Leopold: Gesammelte Schriften, Herausg. v. Immanuel Loew,
2 vols.
Alexander Baba, Szegedin 1890
- Margolis, Max L., & Alexander Marx: A History of the Jewish
People,
Jewish Publication Society of America,
Philadelphia 1934
- Mendelssohn, Moses: Gesammelte Schriften, 7 vols.
F.A. Brockhaus, Leipzig 1843
- Norden, Joseph: Grundlagen und Ziele des religioesen-liberalen
Judentums, 2.Aufl.
Berlin 1927
- Ordnung der oeffentlichen Andacht fuer die Sabbath- und Festtage
des ganzen Jahres. Nach dem Gebrauch des neuen
Tempel-Vereins in Hamburg. Herausg. v. S.J. Frankel und
M.J. Bresslau,
Hamburg 1819
- Philipson, David: Abraham Geiger as Reformer,
C.C.A.R. Yearbook, Charlevoix 1910
- : Centenary Papers and Others,
Ark. Pub. Co., Cincinnati 1919
"Samuel Holdheim 1806-1906", "Abraham Geiger 1810-1910",
"Max Lillienthal 1815-1915"
- : The Reform Movement in Judaism,
Macmillan Co., New York 1907
- Philipson, Ludwig: Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums -
Ein unparteiisches Organ fuer alles juedische Interesse.
Rudolf Morse, Berlin 1921

Philippson, Ludwig: Gesammelte Abhandlungen, vols.1,2.
 Edited by M. Philip son.

G.Fock. Leipzig 1911

- : Gesammelte Schriften, Abthlg.2. Herausg.von
 M.Philippson.

Schlesische Buchdruckerei, Breslau 1892

- : Neues Israelitisches Gebetbuch fuer die
 Wochentage, Sabbathe und alle Feste,

Louis Gerschel, Berlin 1864

Philippson, M.: Neueste Geschichte des juedischen Volkes, vols.1-3
 G.Fock, Leipzig 1907-1911

Protokolle der ersten Rabbiner-Versammlung abgehalten zu Braun-
 schweig vom 12ten bis zum 19ten Juni 1844,
 Friedrich Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig 1844

Protokolle und Aktenstuecke der zweiten Rabbiner-Versammlung
 abgehalten zu Frankfurt am Main vom 1sten bis zum
 28ten Juli 1845,

E.Ullmann, Frankfurt am Main 1845

Protokolle der dritten Versammlung deutscher Rabbiner, abgehalten
 zu Breslau vom 13. bis 24. Juli 1846,
 F.E.C.Luckart, Breslau 1847

Richtlinien zu einem Programm fuer das liberale Judentum nebst de
 Referaten und Ansprachen auf den Rabbinerversammlungen
 zu Berlin und Frankfurt am Main und auf der Delegier-
 tenversammlung der Vereinigung fuer das liberale
 Judentum zu Posen, 1912

Riesser, Gabriel: Gesammelte Schriften, Hrsg. im Auftrag des
 Comité der Riesser-Stiftung von M.Isler. vols.1/4.
 Riesser-Stiftung, Frankfurt am Main 1867-1868.

Ritter, Heinrich Immanuel: Mendelssohn und Lessing als Begruender
 der Reformation im Judenthum,
 L.Steinthal, Berlin 1858

Salomon, Gotthold: Die Rabbinerversammlung und ihre Tendenz,
 B.S.Behrendsohn, Hamburg 1845

Seligmann, Caesar: Eine Abrechnung mit Dr. Joseph Wohlgenuth
 und mit den "Erklaerungen" gegen die Richtlinien
 zu einem Programm fuer das liberale Judentum,
 J.Kauffmann, Frankfurt am Main 1913

- : Geschichte der juedischen Reformbewegung
 von Mendelssohn bis zur Gegenwart,
 J.Kauffmann, Frankfurt am Main 1922

- : Liberales Judentum, Monatsschrift fuer die

religioesen Interessen des Judentums, herausgegeben
von der Vereinigung fuer das liberale Judentum in
Deutschland,

Frankfurt am Main, 1917/18

Seligmann, Caesar: Religioes-liberales Judentum, Predigt in
der Neuen Synagoge zu Berlin anlaesslich der Tagung
des Weltverbandes fuer liberales Judentum am 13.
August 1928

J.Kauffmann, Frankfurt am Main 1928

Stein, Leopold: סדר העבודה, Gebetbuch fuer Neujahr und Ver-
soehnungstag,

J.Schneider, Strassburg i.E. 1878

Erster Band,

J.Schneider, Mannheim 1882

Schreiber, Emanuel: Reformed Judaism and Its Pioneers - A Con-
tribution to Its History,

Spokane Printing Co., Spokane, Wash., 1892

Statut fuer die juedische Gemeinde zu Berlin,

H.S. Hermann, Berlin 1860

Strassburger, R.: Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts
bei den Israeliten, mit einem Anhang: Bibliographie der
juedischen Paedagogie.

Levy & Mueller, Stuttgart 1865

Verhandlungen der ersten Israelitischen Synode zu Leipzig, vom
29. Juni bis 4. Juli 1869 (Enthaltend: Protokolle, Ste-
nographische Niederschriften, etc.)

Louis Gerschel, Berlin, 1869

Waxman, Meyer: A History of Jewish Literature, vol.III.

Bloch Publishing Co., New York 1936.

Wiener, Max: Juedische Religion im Zeitalter der Emanzipation,

Philo Verlag, Berlin 1933

Windelband, Wilhelm: Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie,

J.C.Mohr, Tuebingen 1907

ספר קנאת ציון
ברפוס דוד בן המנוח בהר"ר אלקב פופס כ"ז זצ"ל
אמסטרדם בשנת תר"ו לפ"ק