



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

Statement
by Referee

The Senior Thesis of Edward M. Maline

Entitled: "Controversies Over the Hamburg Prayer Book"

- 1) May (with revisions) be considered for publication (✓) ()
yes no
- 2) May be circulated () () () (✓)
to faculty to students to alumni no restriction
- 3) May be consulted in Library only () ()
by faculty by students
- () (✓)
by alumni no restriction

2. 20. 63.

(date)

John J. Petukh
(signature of referee)

Statement
by Author

I hereby give permission to the Library to circulate my thesis

(✓) ()
yes no

The Library may sell positive microfilm copies of my thesis

(✓) ()
yes no

Feb. 18, 1963

(date)

Edward M. Maline

(signature of author)

Library
Record

The above-named thesis was microfilmed on 3/28/68
(date)

For the Library

Lucia Hein
(signature of staff member)

CONTROVERSIES OVER THE HAMBURG PRAYER BOOK

by

Edward M. Maline

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters and
Ordination.

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
February, 1963

Referee:

Dr. Jakob J. Petuchowski

D I G E S T

This is a study of the controversies over the first two editions of the Hamburg Prayer Book. In the year 1819, when the first edition was published, the Beth Din of the Hamburg community issued a protest against the changes made in the new prayer book. A limited controversy ensued between the Orthodox leaders and the Hamburg Reformers.

Twenty-three years later, the Hamburg Tempelverein published a second edition of their prayer book. The orthodox community requested the services of Rabbi Isaac Bernays, known as "Chakham", to protest once again against deviations in the Hamburg Prayer Book from the traditional liturgy. Bernays issued his famous "Moda'ah" refusing to recognize as a Jew anyone who might use the prayer book for the fulfillment of his obligatory prayer.

The action of Bernays led to one of the most bitter controversies in the early beginnings of Reform Judaism. Leading rabbis of Europe were asked to state their opinions about the new prayer book and to justify the changes that had been made. Among the participants in the controversy were Abraham Geiger, Zacharias Frankel and Samuel Holdheim. Many of their general views were reflected in their attitudes toward the Hamburg Prayer Book controversy.

In this study, I have attempted to analyse the editions of the prayer book and to indicate its departures

from the traditional liturgy. The major section of this thesis consists of summaries of the theological opinions of the rabbis who engaged in the controversy over the 1841 edition. Included in this study is a chapter on the effects of the Hamburg Prayer Book upon the future development of the Reform Jewish Liturgy, as well as a brief analysis of the prayer books of Abraham Geiger and Leopold Stein.

Although every major study of the early beginnings of Reform Judaism mentions the role of the Hamburg Temple, no study, to my knowledge, has probed the background to the prayer book controversy. I, therefore, hope that this thesis may be a significant contribution to our knowledge of the many forces present in the early stages of the history of Reform Judaism.

To my parents

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

I express my indebtedness and thanks to my teacher, Dr. Jakob J. Petuchowski, for his interest and guidance in this project. His course, The Early Beginnings of Reform Judaism, offered at the Hebrew Union College, encouraged me to pursue this study.

To Dr. M. Arie Kahana my thanks in sincere appreciation for his helpful suggestions.

I express my gratitude to Mrs. Joseph Topel for her patience and skill in the preparation of this manuscript.

Cincinnati, Ohio

E.M.M.

February, 1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	i-vi
------------------------	------

CHAPTER I - (The Hamburg Prayer Book of 1819)

Summary.	1
Sabbath Service.	8
New Year Service	11
Service for Day of Atonement	12
Festival Service	19

CHAPTER II - (Controversies over the Hamburg Prayer Book of 1819.)

<u>Nogah-Tzedek</u>	21
<u>E'leh Dikre Ma-Brith</u>	27
<u>Cherem, Nokemeth Nekam Ma-Brith</u>	30
<u>Schutzschrift des Hamburger</u> <u>Gebetbuch</u> by Seckel Frankel.	35

CHAPTER III - (The Hamburg Prayer Book of 1841).

Summary.	41
Daily Service.	52
Sabbath Service.	58
Service for Day of Atonement	62
Service for New Year	66
Service for Festivals.	68

CHAPTER IV - (Controversies over the Hamburg Prayer Book of 1841.)

Biographical sketches of participants	69
Summary of Controversies.	85
Introduction to the <u>Israelitische</u> <u>Gutachten</u> , M. Frankel.	93

The Participants:

Joseph Aub.	96
Isaac Auerbach.	102
Aaron Chorin	104

Table of Contents (Cont'd)

Joseph Friedlander.	107
Moses Gutmann	108
Abraham Kohn.	112
Joseph Maier.	115
Ludwig Philippson	124
Isaac Mannheimer.	128
Leopold Stein	130
Abraham Geiger.	140
Samuel Holdheim	160
Gotthold Salomon.	166
Zacharias Frankel	176
Gotthold Salomon, (His response to Zacharias Frankel)	184

CHAPTER V -(The Liturgy Subsequent to the 1841 Edition).

Hamburg after 1841.	193
Geiger's Plan for a Prayer Book . .	198
Prayer Book of Leopold Stein. . . .	216

<u>EVALUATION</u>	219
-----------------------------	-----

<u>NOTES</u>	228
------------------------	-----

<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	237
-------------------------------	-----

I N T R O D U C T I O N

The nineteenth century was, for the Jews a period of political and religious emancipation. With the breaking down of the ghetto walls, and with the acceptance of the Jew into the general society in which he lived, the Jew for the first time began to breathe freely. The translation of the Pentateuch into German by Moses Mendelssohn and the opening of Jewish Free Schools were among the first steps which eventually would lead to the establishment of a new Jewish religious movement.

The translation of the Pentateuch, said Kayserling, had an important effect in bringing the Jews to share in the progress of the age. It aroused their interest in the study of Hebrew grammar, which they had so long despised, made them eager for German nationality and culture and inaugurated a new era in the education of the young and in the Jewish school system. At Mendelssohn's suggestion, Judische Freischule was founded in Berlin in 1778, the first organized Jewish school in Germany, after which many similar institutions were modelled. There, instruction was given not only in Bible and the Talmud, but also in technical branches and in German and French."¹ (M. Kayserling. J.E.H.P.)

The effect of this new era upon Judaism was twofold: some Jews who as a result of being exposed to the new culture and education felt that Judaism no longer had an appeal to modern people. They, therefore, abandoned Judaism openly or remained indifferent. Others felt

that the promise of emancipation was incompatible with the demands of the Jewish religion and they refused to follow the new trend and instead remained loyal to the tenets of traditional Judaism to the extent that it was possible to do so.

In order to cope, however, with the growing indifference toward Judaism on the part of many, some did feel the need to reinterpret Judaism in order to make it intelligible and appealing to the newly-acculturated Jew. The Reform Movement in Judaism owes its existence to the efforts of such individuals.

Reform Judaism began in Germany in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Among its early leaders were laymen like Israel Jacobson and Aaron Wolfsohn. Jacobson founded a school in 1808 at Seesen where he held services on the Sabbath. Two years later, he established a Temple and continued to introduce certain reforms in the service such as the sermon in the vernacular and the singing of Hymns in German. In 1815, he succeeded in opening a Temple in Berlin. It was here that Jacobson held the confirmation service for his son on the festival of Shabhuoth. To this service were invited David Friedlander, founder of a Jewish Free School; Jacob Beer, who inaugurated a similar service in his

home, and many others. Jacobson was enthusiastic over the response to his services. He continued to hold them in his home. Among the preachers at the Beer Temple were Edward Kley, who was later to become preacher at the Hamburg Temple; Isaac Mannheimer, later to become preacher at the Temple in Vienna. The Berlin Temple used for its ritual the prayer book edited by Gunzberg and Kley: "Die Deutsche Synagoge", published in the year 1817.

It was the main intention of the editors of that prayer book to shorten the service in order to allow for Hymns in German and for the sermon. In the introduction to the prayer book, Edward Kley explained his feelings about the preference of German over Hebrew in the service in these terms: "This language, (Hebrew) is holy and beloved by us because it is the language of our Torah and in it God transmitted the religious heritage to our fathers through Moses, His servant; thus this language is dear to us as a remembrance of the first days of our history---a remnant of that historical era when mankind yet stood in the spring of its youth. But holier than Hebrew is the language of our birthplace---the language of the present. And being that the majority of the children of Israel, women and children, do not understand the Hebrew language, it is, therefore,

urgent upon us to change the language of the prayers..."

However, in spite of this lengthy introduction explaining the superiority of German over Hebrew, the major part of the service was still conducted in Hebrew. The service, according to Die Deutsche Synagoge, had the following format: The Sabbath service opened with the "Mah Tobhu" followed by a hymn in German. The sections of the liturgy known as the "Pesuke deZimrah" until the "Barukh She'emar" were recited in German. The rest of the service was in Hebrew. A few of the omissions from the prayer book are significant. The "Ahabha Rabah" lacked the reference to the physical return of Jews to Palestine, an omission which is to be found in the Hamburg Prayer Book. Also omitted was the repetition of the "Amidah" as was also done in Hamburg. The Deutsche Synagoge, however, also omitted the Musaph service for the Sabbath. In the Shacharith service, the Kedushah of the Askkenazi Musaph service was used in order to avoid the references to Zion contained in the Shacharith Kedushah of the Ashkkenazi rite.

The service for the High Holy Days was almost entirely in Hebrew. In place of the Kol Nidre on the eve of the Day of Atonement, the following prayer was

to be found: "Holy Congregation; Seekers of God--strangers and dwellers, you who are standing here in this House of Prayer before the Lord, God of Hosts, Prepare--make yourselves holy--cleanse yourselves for this great and awesome day because on this day the Lord will atone for you to purify you."

Because of political conditions in Berlin, it was difficult for the work of Reform to continue. The orthodox enlisted the aid of the government in closing private worship services where reforms had been introduced. Beer's Temple had escaped the government edict because Beer claimed that the main synagogue had been undergoing repairs and thus made it necessary to use his house for worship. Though this was tolerated for a little while, the government finally issued a decree in 1823 stating that services must be conducted in accordance with the traditional Jewish ritual and without changes in language, ceremonies, etc.

Because of the failure in Berlin, the next stage in the development of reform was destined to take place in Hamburg. Edward Kley, formerly a preacher at Beer's Temple in Berlin, moved to Hamburg to accept the position of director of the Jewish Free School. Soon thereafter, he agitated for a Reform service and enlisted the aid of a few people who founded the Hamburg Temple, in the year 1818. Soon after the establishment of the Temple, the

founders began to see the need for a new prayer book which would reflect the views of its members and which would give public expression to their hopes and aspirations. This prayer book, published in 1819 and its subsequent edition of 1841, brought about the famous Hamburg Temple controversy which began in 1819, was suspended shortly thereafter and resumed again twenty-three years later.

It was in Hamburg that Reform Judaism began to take shape. Previous efforts were honorable and sincere, but unorganized and sporadic. The Hamburg Prayer Book, through its ideology and through the personalities who came to espouse its cause, tells the beginning of the story of Reform Judaism.

CHAPTER I

The Hamburg Prayer Book of 1819.

(S U M M A R Y)

Before attempting a detailed analysis of the 1819 edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book, it would perhaps be beneficial to summarize briefly the essential characteristics of the prayer book with emphasis upon the ways in which it differs from the traditional liturgy.

The aims of the redaction committee were as follows:

- 1) - To abbreviate the liturgy which by then had become rather lengthy and uninteresting;
- 2) - To adopt the Spanish-Portuguese pronunciation of the Hebrew as well as many of the Piyutim from the Spanish-Portuguese liturgy;
- 3) - To eliminate those ideas in the liturgy which were in conflict with the political status of the newly-emancipated German Jews; and
- 4) - To make the prayer book intelligible to all who might use it. Many of the critics of the prayer book believed that the committee proceeded with consistency in their task. Simon Bernfeld¹ stated that the editors distinguished between those passages indicating a physical

return of Jews to Palestine and those which could be interpreted to mean a spiritual return without implying the physical return of each individual Jew. The passages which would lend themselves easily to the spiritual interpretation were retained and the others were eliminated. Elbogen² mentioned that the choice of prayers included in the 1819 edition depended upon the distinction between standard and accessory prayers. The editors accepted the basic standard prayers but chose more selectively the accessory prayers. The "Opinions" included in this study indicate the difficulties which many of the Reformers confronted in attempting to discover a consistent principle in the efforts of the prayer book committee.

The Hamburg Temple Prayer Book of 1819 was limited to services for Sabbaths and Festivals. Later, a supplement for the Ninth of Ab and Purim were included. The service of the Temple included a sermon in the vernacular as well as German hymns found in the Hymnal edited by Edward Kley, preacher of The Temple. An important innovation in the service was the elimination of the Prophetic reading on Sabbath mornings. The Torah was read according to the three-year cycle and without cantillation.

In his exposition of the Reform Jewish Liturgy, Elbogen mentions that the Hamburg prayer book was not revolutionary in its undertaking but rather was very modest

since the Temple did not want a division in Jewish unity. The prayer book was composed by educated laymen who hoped that it would respond to the needs of the moment. The founders of the Temple, as opposed to the rabbis who condemned the prayer book, were practical men who knew well the world in which they lived and who had come to the realization that the older liturgy had become a meaningless and empty form.

The 1819 edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book differed from the traditional prayer book in the following ways:

- 1) - In its use of the vernacular;
- 2) - In the doctrine of Israel's future hopes;
- 3) - In its acceptance of Piyutim from the Spanish-Portuguese liturgy; and
- 4) - In making additions to the already established liturgy.

I - Use of the Vernacular.

The 1819 edition of the Hamburg prayer book not only included a German translation for all Hebrew prayers, but also substituted German prayers for many of the traditional Hebrew prayers. One of the aims of the redaction committee was to abbreviate the lengthy Pesuke d'Zimrah on Sabbath mornings to allow for prayers in German. In the Friday evening service, the blessings before and after the "Shema" as well as the "Birkath Sheba" are in German.

The "Shema" itself is in Hebrew. It is strange that the "Shema" did not appear in German since many of the Reformers justified the use of the vernacular on the basis of the Talmudic statement that the "Shema" could be recited in any language. However, on the eve of the Day of Atonement, the "Birkath Sheba" is in Hebrew and is recited aloud by the reader unlike the Friday evening service when it is recited silently by the congregation.

The Sabbath morning service until the "Barekhu" is in German. On the morning of the Day of Atonement, the introductory Psalms are in Hebrew.

II - Doctrine of Israel's Future Hope.

With reference to the hope of redemption and the restoration of Jews to the Holy land certain changes from the traditional text occur in the 1819 edition.

In places where the possession of Israel is mentioned as a remembrance of the history of the Jewish people in the past, nothing of significance was changed. However, those passages requesting that God break the yoke of the nations from over Israel and return the people of Israel to their land were not retained in their original form. Bernfeld³ suggests that this distinction explains why the "Retze" was retained and concluded with the words; "Who restoreth His presence to Zion". In the prayer, "Mipne Chata'enu" the phrase, "that you may bring us with

joy to our land" was replaced by the words, "that you may receive with mercy and with favor the words of our lips". The phrase, "Restore the worship of Thy sanctuary" was retained because it could be understood in the symbolic sense and need not be taken literally.

In the Sabbath morning service, the phrase, "Or Chadash al Tzion Ta'ir" is omitted. In the "Ahabhah Rabah", the phrase, "Bring us in peace from the four corners of the earth to our land" is replaced by the words, "Bring blessing and peace upon us", in accordance with the Spanish-Portuguese rite. But they did not conclude as did the Sepharadim with the words, "And break the yoke of the gentiles from upon us".

In the Festival service, the section, "Build Thy house as in former days and establish Thy sanctuary" was omitted but according to Bernfeld not because of a negative attitude toward the restoration of Zion, but rather because they did not want to have a duplication of words since the prayer immediately following contained the same thought and similar expression.

III - Influence of the Spanish-Portuguese liturgy.

The Hamburg prayer book was greatly influenced by the liturgy of the Sepharadim. Not only did the Hamburg community adopt their pronunciation of the Hebrew but they also adopted many of the Piyutim from the Spanish-Portuguese Machzor. Mention has already been made of the

section in the "Ahabbah Rabbah" which was adopted from the Sepharadi liturgy though not completely. In the Sabbath Musaph the Hamburg prayer book follows the Sepharadim in the recitation of the passage, "Le Moshe Tzvita" instead of the "Tikanta Shabbath". Among the Piyutim adopted from the High Holy Days liturgy are the following:

"Lema'anCha Elohai", a piyut of Rabbi David b. Bekoda;

"Ana Bekarenu;

"Yah Sheme"; and

"El Nora" "Alilah"

IV - General Omissions from Traditional Liturgy.

In addition to the influences and changes mentioned above, the prayer book of 1819 had some more general omissions and changes from the traditional liturgy. The Sabbath eve and morning services lacked the major part of the traditional introductory psalms. The "Kedushah" used in every service was the Ashkenazi Musaph version beginning, "Na' ritzkha" probably to avoid references to the restoration of Zion. It is perhaps noteworthy to mention, at this point, that a precedent for using the Musaph "Kedushah" in the Shacharit Service is already found in the Deutsche Synagoge,⁴ a prayer book edition by Kley and Günzburg in Berlin in the year 1817. This prayer book is most likely the one used by Israel Jacobson in his Berlin Temple. The Deutsche Synagoge didn't

have a Musaph for the Sabbath service. Therefore, it is more logical that the "Kedushah" used during the Shacharith service would be the version for Musaph. Where a Musaph service is retained, however, as for example on Rosh Hashanah, the "Amidah" for Shacharith does not contain the Musaph "Kedushah". Nor does it contain the Ash kenazi Shacharith "Kedushah" with its references to Zion and Jerusalem. Instead, it contains the Shacharith "Kedushah" of the Sepharadi rite.

Further changes in the 1819 edition are the abbreviated versions of prayers like, "Avinu Malkenu" and "Al Chet". The Kol Nidre prayer is not included on the eve of the Day of Atonement.

In many respects the prayer book which appeared in Hamburg in 1819 was similar to the Berlin prayer book of 1817 in terms of its deviations from the traditional liturgy.

On the Sabbath service, many of the introductory Psalms were given in the vernacular. The Deutsche Synagoge omitted the Silent "Amidah" and concluded the "Retze" similarly to the Hamburg 1819 edition. On Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur they adopted the Sepharadi Nusach by reciting "Go'alenu Adonai Tzebha'oth" instead of "Tzur Yisrael". The "Avinu Malkenu" was abbreviated and on the eve of the Day of Atonement, a new prayer was written in place of the Kol Nidre.

The Hamburg Prayer Book of 1819

(Sabbath Services)

(A N A L Y S I S)

The Friday evening service begins with the recitation of Psalm 92 (Tobh l'hodoth l'Adonai) followed by the mourner's "Kaddish".

The blessings before and after the "Shema" are found in German translation, while the "Shema" and the three paragraphs appear in Hebrew.

Following the Half Kaddish, the "Birkath Shebha" is said silently and in German. The "Magen Abroth" and the "RetzeW" are then recited in Hebrew. The "Birkath Shebha" is followed by the "Kaddish" and by a German hymn.

The "Kiddush" followed by the prayer for the departed "Kol Yisrael Yesh Lahem Chelek") and a final hymn "Adon Olam") conclude the service.

The introductory Psalms to the Sabbath morning service are considerably abbreviated. Those that are retained are found in German. The introductory prayers retained are:

"The soul which Thou hast given unto us..."

"Master of the world..."

"Thou are He from the creation of the world..."

"Blessed be He who said..."

Psalm 148

"The soul of every living being..."

Some changes and omissions are to be found in the blessings before and after the "Shema". Unlike the Friday evening service, these blessings appear in Hebrew along with the German translation. In the "Yotzer" section the phrase beginning with, "There is none like Thee" has an omission. The traditional text reads: "There is none to be compared to Thee O Lord Our God in This World and there is None like Thee Our King in the life of the world to come; There is none besides Thee, Our Redeemer, in the days of the Messiah and there is none like Thee, Our Saviour, in the resurrection of the dead." This section is omitted. The section beginning, "L'El Barukh" lacks the phrase, "Or Chadash...". The latter is also omitted from the Spanish-Portugese liturgy.

The "Ahabhah Rabah" does not have the section beginning, "Bring us in peace from the four corners of the earth" but instead, has adopted from the Sepharadi liturgy the text: "Bring upon us blessing and peace from the four corners of the earth".

Following the "Shema" the opening lines of the "Emeth V'yatziv" are in German and take the form of the prayer "Emeth V'Emunah". The "Ge'ullah" ends similarly to the

Sepharadi rite with the words, "Our Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts is His name..." "Tzur Yisrael" is omitted.

In the 'Amidah the "Kedushah" of the Musaph service is recited in the morning as well as in all of the services, the "Yismach Moshe" lacks the section beginning, "VeLo Netato". This section makes reference to the fact that the Torah was not given to the other nations of the earth but became the possession of Israel. The passage in distinguishing between Israel and the other nations was not considered fitting for Jews who had benefited from political emancipation. Though the elimination of such notions began with the edition of 1819, it was carried out more consistently in the 1841 edition.

The Torah service begins with "Lift up ye gates...", followed by "Blessed be He who gave the Torah..." ending with "It is a tree of life" and "Let us ascribe greatness to our God...". The Torah is read according to the three-year cycle and the blessings were recited before and after the readings. Following the Torah service, provision was made for a German hymn then the sermon, followed by another hymn and the prayer for the government which is found in the appendix to the prayer book.

The only changes in the Additional service consist in the substitution of the section, "Thou has commanded

Moses" for "Tikanta Shabbat" following again the Sepharadi rite. There is one emendation in the text however. The request that our obligatory sacrifices be accepted is replaced by the request that "the words of our lips be received with mercy and favor".

The recitation of the "Kaddish", the prayer for the departed, and the concluding hymn end the service.

Service for the eve of the New Year.

The service for the eve of the New Year begins with Psalm 92 which is read responsively followed by the "Kaddish" and the regular Sabbath evening service until the 'Amidah'.

The 'Amidah' is in German and is recited silently by the congregation. The 'Amidah' in vernacular contains the special inserts for the New Year in accurate translation of the original.

The Shacharith service for the New Year begins with the regular Sabbath morning service until the 'Amidah'. Before the "Borekhu", however, the Piyut , "Yah Shimekha" is recited.

The 'Amidah' is followed by a silent prayer in German (a translation of "Elohei N'tzor"...), the "Avinu Malkenu" in Hebrew, the "Kaddish", the sermon and prayer for the government.

Following the reading of the Torah, there is the Shofar service followed by a prayer in German as well as by a hymn.

The additional service for the New Year begins with the following Piyutim :

" <u>Ochila la'El</u> "	" <u>Adon im Ma'asim</u> "
" <u>L'EL Orekh Din</u> "	" <u>Be'en Melitz</u> "
" <u>Adonai Melekh</u> "	" <u>Haochez</u> "

The 'Amidah continues and includes the sections "Malkhuyoth, Zikhronoth and Shofaroth". The 'Amidah concludes with the Priestly Benediction given by the priest. The final benediction of the 'Amidah includes the "Piyut "Hayom...". The service concludes with the "Kaddish", the prayer for the departed, and the final hymn.

Service on the Eve of Yom Kippur

The service on the eve of the Day of Atonement has the following introductory prayers before the "Barekhu":

Opening Hymn; "Selach Na..."; "V'hu Rachum..."

A sermon and another hymn also occur before the "Barekhu". The regular Sabbath evening service from the "Barekhu" until the 'Amidah follows next.

The 'Amidah, unlike the Friday evening Service, is entirely in Hebrew and is repeated aloud. After the 'Amidah there appears a prayer in the vernacular expressing the theme of the Day of Atonement. It was the aim of the prayer book committee to abbreviate the rather lengthy service in order to allow for creative prayers in German expressing in particular the themes of the Holy Days. The "Al Chet" then follows in German and in an abbreviated version.

The service continues with the following Piyutim :

"Shome'ah Tefillah"

"Anenu Avinu Anenu"

"Leihu N'ran'nah"

"Adonai Chonnenu"

"Ana Bekarenu"

"Adonai Asseh"

Piyutim -in German expressing the themes of "Zekhor Rachamekha Adonai..." and "Shema Kolenu".

"Ye ratzeh Am Evyon"

"Eloheni Schebas hamayim"

"El Melekh"

"Eloheni...Tabho"

"Adonai El Rachum"

"As hamnu"

"Eloheni...Ans he' Emunah"

"Al Chet"

"Adir venaor"

"Teanu"

The recitation of the "Kaddish", a hymn, the prayer for the departed and the "Adon Olam" conclude the service.

Service for the Day of Atonement

The morning service for the Day of Atonement begins with a much larger section containing introductory , Psalms than did the Sabbath morning service. The following introductory prayers are included:

"Baruch She'amar"

"Psalms 19;34;90;91;135;
136;33;92;93;145;
146;147;148;149;150"

"Hodu ladonai"

"Romemu"

"Az Yashir"

Then follow the blessings before and after the "Shema" as in the Sabbath morning service.

The 'Amidah for the morning of the Day of Atonement is in Hebrew until the end of "Ya'aleh v'yavo" and includes the Musaph "Kedushah". The remainder of the 'Amidah appears in the form of a silent prayer in German. The silent prayer includes, in translation, the section beginning, "Mechal l'avonotenu"; "Retze"; "Modim"; "V'al Kulam"; "Sim Shalom"; "Al Chet" in an abbreviated version; an original prayer on the theme of forgiveness.

The 'Amidah then continues in Hebrew repeating the last three benedictions after a series of Piyutim, including - "Elohenu...al ta'azbhenu", "Elohenu...tabho", "Elohenu...mechal".

The Shacharith services continue until the Torah service with selected poetical insertions:

"Zekhor Rachmekha..."

"Adonai El Rachum..."

"Zekhor Lanu..."

"Anshe Emunah"

"El melekh..."

"Annenu"

"Lema'ankha..."

"Elohe¹nu sheba¹s hamayim"

and - "Te¹anu"

There are some significant omissions in the text of both the "Zekhor rachamekha" and the "Zekhor lanu..." in the 1819 edition of the prayer book. The "Zekhor rachamekha" is abbreviated considerably in that the references to Zion and Jerusalem are omitted. The following thoughts have been eliminated from the poem: "Remember O Lord the love of Jerusalem, the love of Zion do not forget forever...". The "Zekhor lanu brith..." lacks the verse: "Return our captivity and have mercy upon us as it is written, 'and he will return and gather you from all the nations whither he scattered you...'".

The Torah service follows the sermon and the singing of a German hymn. It is interesting to note that there is a prophetic reading following the reading of the Torah on the Day of Atonement in the 1819 edition of the prayer book. No other service in this edition contains any prophetic reading. The blessings before and after the Haphtarah are given in the text. A hymn concludes the Shacharit service after the scrolls are returned to the ark.

The Additional service on the Day of Atonement opens with the following poetical insertions before the 'Amidah;

"Ochilah leEl..."

"Athanu..."

"Hayom..."

"Le'el orekh din"

"Melekh Shokhen"

"Ha'omez..."

The 'Amidah for the Musaph service is similar to the 'Amidah of the Shacharit service in that the first three and intermediate benedictions are in Hebrew and the remaining benedictions appear in the form of a silent prayer in German. The "Umipne chata'enu" includes the significant emendation, "May you accept the words of our lips in place of the obligatory offerings...".

Following the silent prayer which includes the last three benedictions of the "Birkath Shebha", the abbreviated version of the "Al Chet", and an original prayer in German on the theme of the Day of Atonement, the service continues with the Avodah service. The service opens with the paragraph beginning, "Atah Konantah" which is taken from the Spanish-Portugese liturgy. The version in the Hamburg prayer book of 1819 is highly abbreviated, however. Following the Avodah service, the last three benedictions of the 'Amidah are repeated in Hebrew as in the Shacharith service.

After the "Kaddish" and a hymn the additional service concludes with the following prayers:

" <u>Anna selach na</u> "	" <u>Yisrael abhadekha</u> "
" <u>Anna rachum</u> "	" <u>Anshe Emunah</u> "
" <u>Ubhken...ve'atsh rachum</u> "	" <u>Adonai melek</u> "
" <u>El melek</u> "	" <u>Annenu</u> "
" <u>Adonai...el rachum</u> "	" <u>El rachum</u> "
"Elohen ¹ u shebas hamayim"	

The service concludes with the "Adon Olam" and the "Yigdal". The Afternoon or Minchah service opens with Psalm 145, the section beginning, "Ubha letzion goel", and a German prayer. It is to be noticed that the word "Goel" is translated as "Erlösung" in the German thus meaning "Redemption" and not "Redeemer". This is consistent with the translation for the word "Goel" in the second benediction of the 'Amidah in all services.

The Torah service in the afternoon of the Day of Atonement is followed by the prophetic reading as in the Shacharith service.

The 'Amidah for the Minchah service follows the 'Amidah of the morning service. After a prayer in the vernacular calling attention to the shadows of evening which begin to fall, the service of the afternoon concludes with the following poetical insertions, "Lekhu napil panenu"

"El melek"
"Yah Shema evyonekha"
"Anshe Emunah"

"Adonai Melekh"

"Annenu"

"Elohe¹nu shebas hamayim"

The Ne'ilah or concluding service begins immediately after the sermon with the Piyut "El norah'alila" adopted from the Sepharadi liturgy. The 'Amidah then follows the "Athanu" and the "Ochilahleel". The 'Amidah in the concluding service has the same form as in the morning and Additional services. However, more Piyutim are included in the Hebrew section which follows upon the silent prayer. These poetical insertions include the following:

"Elohe¹nu...al ta'azbhenu" "Elohe¹nu...tabho"

"Attahhibhdalta"

"Adir vene'or"

"Elohe¹nu mechal..."

Following the last three benedictions of the 'Amidah which are repeated in Hebrew the service concludes with the "Avinu Malkenu" in an abbreviated version; the "Kaddish", the recitation of the "Shema" and the "Adonai hu Haelohim" seven times, the "Teanu", "Kol keli", a Hymn followed by a concluding prayer in German.

A supplement of Psalms is included in the event that the service may end too early. In such an event the Psalms could be read before the concluding service. A note to this effect is included in the text of the service.

Service for the Festivals

The service on the eve of the Festivals began following the opening prayer and hymn with the regular Sabbath eve service until the "Birkath Shebha". The "Birkath Shebha", as on the eve of the Sabbath, is entirely in German. It contains the intermediate benediction "Attah Bechartanu"; "Vatiten lanu"; "Ya'aleh v'yavo"; and "V'hasi'enu". Following the last three benedictions of the "Birkath Shebha" the service concludes as does the regular Sabbath eve service.

The Shacharith service begins as does the Sabbath morning service until the "Birkath Shebha" and then continues with the "Birkath Shebha" as in the evening service. The Kedushah is taken from the Musaph service of the Ashkkenazi rite. The silent prayer following the 'Amidah' is merely a translation in the vernacular of "Elohai Ntzor". The blessing over the Lulab; the Hallel service and the reading of the Torah continue after the 'Amidah'. The service concludes with the sermon, the prayer for the government and the "Kaddish" only interrupted by the singing of some hymns in the vernacular. The festival Piyutim are completely eliminated.

It is in the Musaph service that some changes occur from the traditional liturgy for the festivals. The

"Umipne Chata'enu" contains the emendation already mentioned; that is, the substitution of the request that the words of our lips be received in place of sacrifices. A further change occurs in the passage beginning, "Elohe¹nu Velehe¹ Avothe¹nu Melekh Rachaman..." A section of this prayer reads in the traditional Machzor as follows, "Build Thy House as in the beginning and establish Thy sanctuary upon its place. May we look upon its building and may we rejoice in its establishment. And return the priests to their service and the levites to their songs. And restore Israel to their habitation..." This section is omitted and is replaced by the following, "Satisfy us with Thy blessings, let us rejoice in Thy seasons..."

The priests ascend the altar for the priestly benediction. The service concludes with the "Kaddish", the prayer for the departed and a hymn.

C H A P T E R I I

Controversies Over the Hamburg Prayer Book of 1819 ---

Nogah Ha-Tzedek -- Or Nogah

The collection of Responsa known as Nogah Ha-Tzedek is one of the first collections of Responsa to have appeared in the early history of Reform Judaism. It was occasioned by the opening of the "Temple" in Berlin in 1815 and attempts to justify the Reforms introduced there. However, being that the Hamburg Temple opened in 1818, the same year in which Nogah Ha-Tzedek appeared, there is some confusion among scholars of this period as to the real intention of Nogah Ha-Tzedek, that is, whether it was meant for Hamburg or for Berlin. In his study of Nogah Ha-Tzedek, Dr. Weizenbaum¹ notes that the dating of some of the Responsa contained within the collection indicates that it was intended to justify the reforms of the Berlin Temple. The opening of the Hamburg Temple, the same year of Nogah Ha-Tzedek's publication, was merely a coincidence. Yet, much of the material contained in Nogah Ha-Tzedek is certainly applicable to the Hamburg community and to its reforms.

One of the major sections of the Nogah Ha-Tzedek is a lengthy essay by Eliezer Liebermann in which the author deals with the specific reforms in question: - "May Prayers Be Recited in the Vernacular?"; "May the

Silent Recitation of the 'Amidah Be Omitted?"; May the Organ Be Played in the Synagogue?"; "May the Sepharadi Pronunciation of Hebrew Be Used in Prayer?"; May the Sefer Torah Be Read Without Chant and May the Calling of Men to the Torah By Name Be Avoided?"; "Is There in This Matter of Violation of the Precept: 'Ye Shall Not Form Factions'?"; and "Is There in This Matter the Forsaking of the Tradition of Our Fathers?".

I should like to summarize very briefly the arguments presented for each of the above reforms:

A) Recitation of Prayers in the Vernacular. The question of the vernacular in the early history of Reform Judaism seemed to be a major one. The question of vernacular occupies a central place in the controversies over the 1841 edition of the Hamburg Temple even though the actual reforms under Orthodox attack had nothing to do with the question of vernacular. Yet, the Reformers who justified the new Hamburg Prayer Book felt compelled to justify the use of the vernacular in spite of the fact that it was not a major issue at the time.

The main support for the use of the vernacular, according to Liebermann, comes from the rabbinic dictum that prayer may be recited in any language and that understanding is as essential as mere hearing. The

principle of Kavanah (intention) demands comprehension in the heart of man. Liebermann recognized that the "Shema" and the 'Amidah are central to Jewish worship. Although Tractate Sotah 36a states that these prayers may be recited in any language that one understands, the later literature is in disagreement over this. The principle in question is whether or not a vernacular language can help one to achieve true Kavanah. Liebermann saw no objection in the use of German since Aramaic, considered the most inferior of languages, was used in the "Kaddish" and in the "Kedushah". Yet, both Chorin and Liebermann encouraged the continued learning of Hebrew and the former felt that the "Shema" and 'Amidah should be recited in Hebrew even if permitted in any language.

B) Omission of the Silent Recitation of the 'Amidah.

The controversial point in connection with the repetition of the 'Amidah seems to be whether it is the reciting of the prayer or the hearing of the prayer that determines the fulfillment of the Jew's obligation to pray the 'Amidah. In Rosh Ha-Shanah 34b and 35a there is a discussion concerning the unlearned masses. However, the cantor fulfills the obligation of the masses whether they are learned or not. Maimonides

was opposed to the silent meditation of the 'Amidah on the grounds that the Jews did not pay attention to the cantor while he recited it because they had just finished it silently and slower readers would break off their prayer when the faster ones did, thereby not fulfilling their obligation.

According to Isserles' commentary to Orach Chayyim 232, the silent recitation of the 'Amidah was not considered an essential part of the liturgy. When the rabbis were pressed for time, they would recite the 'Amidah out loud.

C) May An Organ Be Played in the Synagogue? This particular reform seems to have evoked the most controversy. The objections to the use of the organ are:-
a) its being played by a Jew on the Sabbath could be considered work; b) it represents "Chukath Hagoyim"; and c) it is an act prohibited after the destruction of the Temple.

The Reformers in justifying their use of the organ, were concerned with the purpose for which the organ would be used in accordance with the rabbinic teaching that for the sake of a commandment something is permitted.

A Jew could not play the organ on the Sabbath since the preparing or repairing of the instrument was construed as work. If the gentile was to use the instrument

the question was whether or not the gentile could be asked on the Sabbath to play during the week, or during the week to play on the Sabbath. Even though whatever is forbidden for a Jew cannot be requested from a gentile, yet some of the sources do encourage the lenient view with regard to asking a gentile to prepare the instrument on the Sabbath for weddings for the honor due to the bride and groom.

Rabbi Kunitz felt that the organ made the service more appealing to those who didn't attend the synagogue and bringing Jews back to the synagogue was considered, by him, compelling reason to use the organ.

Liebermann and his respondents further questioned the meaning of the word "Chok" in the biblical injunction: "in their statutes (Gentiles') you shall not follow". The following meanings were found: - a) those things specifically used for idolatry; b) something the purpose of which is doubtful; c) in neither case could the organ be considered a "chok" of the gentiles. If it were a "chok" for the gentiles then all churches would have to have an organ and this is not the case.

With reference to the prohibition against the organ on the basis of the destruction of the Temple, Rashi stressed the prohibition as being a limited one applying to homes and taverns. Liebermann presented the

argument that if the organ were prohibited by the rabbis because of the destruction of the Temple, there would have been no reason for the rabbis to have debated its use on the Sabbath.

D) Use of the Sephardi Pronunciation of Hebrew. This reform was justified on the grounds that the Sephardi pronunciation was more correct than the Ashkenazi. Chorin and Kunitz argued that seven-eighths of the world's Jewish population use the Sephardi pronunciation.

E) The Reading of the Torah Without the Chant and Avoiding the Calling of Men to the Torah by Name.

The Biblical justification for this practice occurs in Nehemiah 8:8---"And they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly; and they gave the sense and caused them to understand the reading". Liebermann states that this only explains the diacritical marks. The chant confuses rather than "gives the sense". A second argument is that since the chanting of the Torah differs from community to community, there is no need for a standard practice among Jews in this matter.

With reference to men being called to the Torah, several instances are mentioned in the Responsa literature alluding to the fact that they do not have to be called up by name.

F) Violation of the Biblical Precept:"Ye shall not form factions". (Deut. 14:1)

Liebermann and Chorin find that the charge of factionalism had never been brought against communities where two congregations existed and one was more liberal in practice than the other.

G) Forsaking the Tradition of Our Fathers. Eliezer Liebermann felt that the criticism aimed at the reformers was unjust since they had not deviated from the general principles of rabbinic law any more than other Jews in the past. He was firmly convinced of the role of reason in religious tradition and sought a rapprochement between the traditionalist and the modernist in their respective approaches to the question of religion. He criticized the rabbis of his time for their failure to address themselves to the needs of contemporary Jews.

The response to Nogah Ha-Tzedek was, in reality, a response to the opening of the Hamburg Temple in 1818. The orthodox attack contained in the collection known as Eleh Dibre Ha-Brith focuses upon the two institutions of Reform Judaism---the Berlin Temple and the Hamburg Temple. Specific references apply to the changes in the Hamburg ritual. The general references are equally as applicable to Berlin as to Hamburg.

The Eleh Dibre Ha-Brith consists of reactions of

rabbis throughout Europe to the newly-formed Hamburg Temple. The three main issues under attack were the altering of the worship service, the use of the vernacular, and the use of the organ.

A) The Altering of the Worship Service. The orthodox rabbis viewed any alteration in the Jewish liturgy as an affront to Jewish unity. The leading participants in this collection were Moses Sofer and Mordecai Benet. They were both quite vindictive in their attacks both upon the reforms as well as upon the individuals in Nogah Ha-Tzedek like Liebermann and Chorin, who supported those reforms.

The Hamburg Temple was opposed for having omitted many of the morning prayers. In this connection, the Talmud was quoted, (Menachoth 43a) stating that David ordained the recitation of one hundred blessings daily. Likewise, the Hamburg Temple was criticized for not having daily services. They held services only on Sabbaths and Holy Days and, therefore, did not enable one to perform the commandments of reciting the "Shema", the "Kaddish" and the "Kedushah".

B) Use of Vernacular. The use of Hebrew was defended on two principal grounds; on the basis of Jewish law and on the basis of its value as an expression of Judaism. According to the orthodox, one had to pray

in Hebrew in order to fulfill the obligation of prayer according to Jewish tradition. Some orthodox rabbis would only permit the use of the vernacular in private worship, but not in public worship. Hebrew was also considered by them as a "Holy" tongue. It was differentiated from German and other languages which were the languages of the business world.

C) The Playing of the Organ. In general, the orthodox associated the use of the organ with levity and, therefore, wanted to avoid it in a worship service. The major point of controversy with regard to the organ was whether or not it could be played on the Sabbath. The major objection to playing the organ on Sabbath comes from Orach Chayyim 338 where the playing of an instrument is forbidden because of the prohibition against "clapping and dancing". There was the further danger that the instrument would require preparation and if it required preparation such preparation could be construed as work under rabbinic law. The orthodox interpreted Orach Chayyim 338 to mean that a Gentile could be asked to help in the performance of a commandment only if that commandment overrode the Sabbath or to prevent danger.

Cherebh Nokemeth Nekam Habrith

A response to the Eleh Dibre Habrith² appeared in the form of a brief pamphlet issued by M. Bresselau of the Hamburg Temple. This pamphlet was published anonymously and appears in full in Toledoth Hareformatziyon Hadatith Beyisrael, Bernfeld. Bresselau was a member of the original Prayer Book Committee and associate of Edward Kley. This document is perhaps one of the most interesting to have appeared in the early history of Reform. Its uniqueness as a document is to be found not in the content but rather in its style. It is full of satire addressed to the Beth Din of Hamburg on one hand, and to the participants in the Eleh Dibre Habrith on the other hand..The author takes the participants of the Orthodox attack to task for not having truly understood the position of Jewish tradition with respect to the possibility for changes in the liturgy. Bresselau shows how the rabbis of Eleh Dibre Habrith deliberately disregarded the principles of the Talmud and of other rabbinic authorities with regard to the liturgy.

The response opens with a description of the state of affairs in the Jewish community as a result of the first prayer book controversy and the prohibition issued by the Beth Din of Hamburg: "The earth trembles

under 'three' (Hamburg Beth Din)..these three men raised their voices in the camp of the Hebrews...it is a sad moment for Jacob..."Reference is made to the letters which came from abroad expressing opinions about the controversy contained in the Eleh Dibre Habrith.

At one point, Bresselau asks rhetorically for an explanation of the bitter attack upon the Hamburg Temple: "What does the service mean to you that you seize hold of torches in your left hand and 'shofarot' in your right hand and you blast all around the camp and cry out: 'Sword of the Lord!' Is this house a den of thieves...have we forgotten the name of God and have we extended our hands to a foreign god? Will not God Himself prove this for He knows the secrets of the heart. Far be it from us to rebel against God..."

The author looks forward to that time when the words and deeds of the Hamburg Temple will be accepted by all the communities. The manner in which he expresses his thought is typical of his style throughout the essay:

Go my people into thy chamber and close the door behind you...how long will this people be stubborn and will not believe in all the signs which are being performed in our midst? God knows what is His and your ears will hear the matter from behind you saying: 'This is the way in which you shall go..' Seek the Lord wherever he may be found, call upon Him

while He is near for the Lord is near unto all who call upon him in truth and with a perfect heart and the master of language has no preference; praise Him with the dance, praise Him with the organ!

We notice that in the course of citing Biblical references, the author makes a point with regard to the prayer book controversy. He applies the verses to the particular situation which he is discussing. Certain words are emphasized in the Hebrew text because of their relevance to the Hamburg Temple controversy. In the context of the above paragraph mention was made of the controversy over the organ and the use of the vernacular both of which were of central concern in the Eleh Dibre Habrith.

The second section of the "Cherebh Nokemeth Nekam Habrith" deals specifically with the question of the vernacular and with the organ controversy from a strictly halakhic point of view. Bresselau quotes the talmudic-rabbinic sources along with references to the discussion of these questions in the Eleh Dibre Habrith.

Mishnah Sotah

These are said in any language--Shema--Tefillah and Birkath Hamazon.

After citing the comment of the Gemarah upon the Mishnah, thus clarifying that "Shema" according to the

Gemarah means "understanding" and not merely "hearing", Bresselau cites the Eleh Dibre Haberith (p.79) which gives precedence to hearing over understanding. The ^{Tosefta} Tosefta further clarifies the matter by stating that the phrase: "Ubrakhta" means one can bless in any language since one is blessing God and one should praise Him with a perfect heart. The Rabbi from Presbourg, quoted in Eleh Dibre Haberith had the following to say with respect to this issue of language:

Before a king of flesh and blood one does not do this since he who speaks with a king must speak the language of the king... it is not the way of the land to speak in a popular language even though the king may understand it...if this is so then the language of the Holy One Blessed be He is Hebrew, the language in which the Torah was given and it is not possible to speak before Him in the everyday tongue.

Maimonides "Hilkhoth Berakhoth 6:

All the blessings can be said in any language and he who recited an abbreviated version as long as he mentions the name of God, His kingship and the content of the blessing, he has fulfilled his obligation even in another language.

In this connection, the letter of Rabbi Tovia in Eleh Dibre Haberith (p.83) is cited. Rabbi Tovia said all blessings had to be said in Hebrew and far be it from us to change it for that would be an abomination.

Again, Bresselau employs the method of satire by introducing his citation of Rabbi Moses Toviah's words with the following: "From Moses until Moses there arose no one like Moses Toviah...".

Orach Chayim 101:

One may pray in any language one wishes,
how much the more so in the congrega-
tion.

There follows upon this statement from the Codes the many references in Eleh Dibre Habrith which claim the opposite view that one may pray only in Hebrew in the congregation.

The second point discussed concerns the playing of the organ in the Synagogue. The Gemarah to Erubhin 2 is cited for there the question is asked: "Wherefrom in the Torah do we learn about song...?" The answer is found in the verse: "Because you did not serve the Lord with "Simcha"...What kind of service is implied by the word, "Simcha"? The answer given is "Shirah"--song. The opinions in the Eleh Dibre Habrith, however, were as follows: "From the day that the Temple was destroyed there is no rejoicing before us". Another interpretation of "Avodah" is that it means "Tefillah". Sefer Hachasidim says the following about musical

accompaniment to worship:

Pray with the melody that is sweet to you, then you will pray with intention. Your heart will follow the words of your mouth in the way that a melody follows the words of praise and causes the heart to rejoice...

The ¹Eleh Dibre Habrith, on the contrary, contains the verse:

The wisdom of man illumines his countenance. It also suggests that it is prohibited to draw pictures in prayer books lest it detract from pure "Kavanah".

In this case it is most certain that one would be detracted from "Kavanah" by inclining his ear to hear the sound of the music.

Bresselau concludes this brief response to ¹Eleh Dibre Habrith with an appeal for a "Covenant of Peace" which will never be removed so that it may be well for the generation at hand and for those yet to come.

Schutzschrift des Hamburger Gebetbuchs

Seckel Fränkel¹

One of the few "Opinions" to have appeared as a result of the publication of the 1818 edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book is contained in this "Postscript" by

Seckel Isaac Fränkel..

Seckel Fränkel was a German banker born at Mecklenburg-Schwerin in 1765. He died in Hamburg in June, 1835.

He acquired, through private study, a high degree of general culture and a thorough knowledge of nine languages. He became a bookkeeper in one of the large banking houses in Hamburg. Eventually, he founded his own bank and was able to accumulate a large fortune. Together with M. J. Bresselau, he issued the Hamburg Prayer Book of 1819. Fränkel had also translated the apocryphal books from Greek to Hebrew and wrote a poem in Hebrew about the sojourn of the French in Hamburg.³

This analysis and critique of the prayer book is heavily burdened with proof-texts many of which are the same cited in other Gutachten. I, therefore, propose to summarize briefly the contents of this study.

A) Reasons for leaving much of the prayer book in Hebrew:

1) The prayer book contains many verses and excerpts from Scripture which may be generally known and, therefore, can be preserved in the original.

2) In order not to cause the Hebrew language to eventually be forgotten.

3) If we were to abandon the use of Hebrew,

our Jewish brethren would think that it was our desire to abandon Judaism as well. For this reason the Hebrew language is to be preserved in the liturgy.

B) Many prayers were omitted and German prayers were added for the following reasons:

1) Those passages omitted are concerned with the sacrificial cult.

2) Passages desiring the extermination of the heathens in a spirit alien to Judaism were omitted.

3) The desire for a return to Jerusalem and Zion was omitted as it is a wish which issues from the heart of very few. "When the Israelites were permitted by Cyrus to return from Babylonian exile, only about 42,000 individuals accepted the offer to return. The others remained behind in Babylonia, Persia, Syria and Egypt, where they had built synagogues and schools. These examples are indications of the fact that one can be a good Jew without praying for a return to Jerusalem.

When we pray to God that He return us to Zion, it appears to be partly spiritual; but we do not request that He transport us physically and personally because we are satisfied with the ruling power under which we live and we can fulfill the words of the prophet, Jeremiah: "Do the will of the land."

There follow next a series of proof-texts justifying the changes made in the new prayer book.

A) It is permitted to pray in the vernacular and one must understand what one prays:

- 1) "If there is no understanding there is no prayer"
- 2) "Prayer without intention is like a body without a soul."
- 3) Prayer in any language one understands suggested by Sotah 33.

4) Rashi interprets this passage as follows:

A man should pray in the language to which his heart is accustomed. (the language which he uses all the day for his needs because it is easy for him to have pure intention) He who prays in another language, even though he may understand what he says, does not find it as easy to have pure intention...

5) All should pray in any language one desires in the congregation, but privately one should only pray in Hebrew. But a fixed prayer for the congregation may be said by the individual in any language. (Hilkhoth Tefillah) Orach Chayim 101.

B) It is permitted for prayer to change according to the circumstances of the time.

1) The prayer book of our Spanish-Portuguese brethren contains in many places prayers which are

completely different. In many of the prayers which they pray with us in common they use different words and expressions. This is indeed true with respect to the Eighteen Benedictions where instead of "Barech Alenu" something different appears.

2) If only one formula with regard to prayer had been accepted, there could not have been different usages such as the Polish, German, etc.

3) According to the rabbis the Musaph prayer, at the time of the Temple, was not the same as it is now after the destruction of the Temple, but rather the people prayed for their needs as the situation of the times demanded it.

4) Prayers were never fixed for all time. The Benedictions were never at one time fixed in their present form. They underwent a gradual development.

5) All blessings could be said in any language when they are arranged according to the way our Sages prescribed; one can change the formula as long as the content is the same; that is, that one preserves the name of God and the recognition of His Kingdom ("Azharah and Malkhuth").

C) Musical Accompaniment is allowed for Prayer and Songs.

1) According to Exodus 15:20 the custom has

scriptural foundation: "And Miriam, the prophetess, sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances..."

2) According to Orach Chayim--460: "For the performance of a commandment it is permitted to have musical accompaniment..."

CHAPTER III

The Hamburg Prayer Book of 1841

S U M M A R Y

Following the controversy over the Hamburg Prayer Book of 1819, the situation in Hamburg quieted down considerably until the publication of the revised edition of 1841. Concerning the period between 1819 and 1841, Elbogen¹ writes that the Temple in no way became the bearer of the hopes and aspirations which her leaders thought her to be. The revolutionary mood which dominated her in the beginning was soon thwarted. The members of the Temple thought more about their own personal affairs than about the status of their religion. They were satisfied with the new institutions--the Temple and the prayer book. According to Elbogen, the preachers at the Temple were not men of great significance and were preoccupied with preaching and instruction, but did not feel called to the spiritual leadership of Judaism. The founders of the Temple, being practical men who wanted to make immediate reforms, did not have the ability to go beyond what they had already achieved. Possibly, the most noteworthy activity of the Temple after 1818, according to Elbogen, was the creation of an affiliated group in the year 1820 at Leipzig.

Sad years followed for German Jewry after the Hamburg incident. Many Jews sought refuge in the dominant church. Others remained doubters. Among the many who converted to Christianity was the son of Israel Jacobson, founder of the Berlin Temple, and one of the pioneers in the early beginnings of Reform Judaism. Jacobson's son was confirmed by his father in one of the first confirmation services only a few years before the conversion.²

Meanwhile, the work of reform was destined to continue. The flames of controversy which burst forth in 1818 were to be seen again twenty-three years later in the same city of Hamburg. But the controversy which arose in 1841 differed considerably from the events of 1818 in that a new generation of leaders arose and their participation in the events of the fourth decade of the nineteenth century was most significant for the future development of Reform Judaism. The new generation of Reformers, including men like Abraham Geiger, Samuel Holdheim, Leopold Stein, Zechariah Frankel and others, wanted to establish Reform on a scientific basis.

They were determined to set forth clearly the principal truths of Judaism in order to see which religious institutions had outlived their usefulness and which ideas were in conflict with the modern spirit and modern needs.

Geiger proposed that what was needed were not practical changes and ameliorations of the liturgy but rather a pre-occupation with the structure of the religious life and religious thinking. The whole as well as the part should have sense and meaning. The whole religious structure had to be placed on a new and positive foundation and then it was the task to judge to what extent the prayers expressed the more ennobled views.

By the year 1840, the Hamburg Reform Temple had included approximately 1800 families in its membership. This large number merited the expansion of its facilities and thus led to building of a new Temple. The following year saw the publication of the revised edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book. The appearance of this new edition of the prayer book became the subject of a new controversy beginning in 1841 in which both orthodox and Reform leaders participated. The aid of many of the outstanding Reform rabbis of the day was enlisted for the purpose of justifying the changes that had been made in face of orthodox opposition.

In 1839, the Temple appointed a commission consisting of two rabbis; Drs. Gotthold Salomon and Edward Kley and three members of the congregation; Dr. M. Frankel, M. J. Bresselau and M. Wolfson, to revise the prayer

book of 1819. Following the resignation of Dr. Kley, his successor, Dr. Naphtali Frankfurter, replaced him on the commission.

The commission was guided in the work of revision by the following principles:³

1) The prayer book, which aims to be the expression of a religious community that rests on a positive historical foundation, must not only uplift and edify the spirit of the worshipper, as does every prayer book, but it must indicate the positive foundation in its peculiarity as it appears in doctrine and history.

2) Spirit and heart must be addressed in a manner as compatible with the modern status of European culture and views of life.

3) The existing and traditionally-received material is to be retained preferentially, as long as it does not controvert the requirements indicated above.

4) The entire content of the prayer book, as well as of the whole service, must be permeated with the pure teaching of our ancestral religion; whatsoever opposes this must be removed.

Basically speaking, the revised edition of the Hamburg prayer book in 1841 followed the pattern of the prayer book of 1819. It continued the practice of having prayers in the vernacular as well as in Hebrew.

However, many of the Piyutin which were formerly adopted from the Spanish-Portugese liturgy were now replaced by prayers in German. The High Holy Day services contain many prayers in German which express the theme of the day.

The new edition of the prayer book improved upon the German translations of many of the prayers. The tendency was toward a more literal translation than had appeared in the first edition of 1819. A good example of such change in translation is to be found in the prayer beginning: "Ya'aleh v'yabho". The 1819 edition translates the prayer very freely whereas the newer edition gives a more exacting translation of the Hebrew text.

Though the influence of the Spanish-Portugese liturgy was certainly felt in the new edition, the number of poetical insertions was considerably reduced to make room for more prayers in German. Many of the changes which had occurred in 1819, such as the change in the prayer, "AhabhahRabah", in the Sabbath morning service in accordance with the Spanish-Portugese rite, were also found in the newer edition. Other passages, however, omitted in the earlier prayer book were retained in the newer edition. In this connection, I might

point out an example of such a passage. In the "Yotzer" prayer, ^{the} section beginning with "Or Chadash Al Tzion Ta'ir..." was omitted in the 1819 edition. It does appear in the 1841 edition but in small type and is inserted within parentheses. It is also significant to note that the section in parentheses is not translated into German.

Other passages which were not omitted in the earlier edition underwent some change in the newer edition. An example of such a passage is the section of the "Retze" beginning: "Restore the worship to Thy sanctuary...". In the 1819 edition the entire passage was intact and the translation both on the eve of the Sabbath and on Sabbath mornings read as follows: "O Lord our God, look with favor upon Thy people Israel and upon their prayer, restore the true worship to Thy sanctuary. Accept the sacrifices and prayers of Israel Thy people may their service always be acceptable unto Thee". In the newer edition two changes occurred with respect to the above passage. First, the references to the restoration of the worship at the sanctuary and the acceptance of sacrifices were written in smaller type and were inserted in parentheses; secondly, the section inserted in parentheses in the Hebrew text did not appear in the German translation. On the one hand we have seen that

a prayer omitted in the earlier edition was restored half-heartedly in the later edition, and on the other hand a prayer retained in the earlier one was likewise inserted parenthetically in the newer edition. This is quite typical of the newer edition of the prayer book and caused much concern to many of the Reformers like Geiger and Holdheim who were compelled to call attention to such inconsistencies.

The prayer book of 1841 continued the practice begun in 1819 of omitting the repetition of the 'Amidah. In the evening service for Sabbaths and Festivals it was recited silently in the vernacular and in the morning was recited aloud by the reader. The Torah was read again according to the triennial cycle but the Prophetic reading eliminated in many of the services in 1819 was completely done away with in 1841.

Many of the introductory Psalms eliminated from the Sabbath morning service in the first edition were included once again in the new edition of the prayer book. We recall that the edition of 1819 was limited to services for Sabbaths and Festivals. The newer edition added a daily service as well as an afternoon service for the Sabbath.

Concerning these passages expressing ideas about Israel's future hopes the prayer book continued to omit

references to the physical return of Jews to Palestine and the restoration of the sacrificial cult. In this respect the edition of 1841 went much farther than the previous one in the elimination of such passages. The "Hashkibenu", on the eve of the Sabbath, in the 1841 edition omits the conclusion: "Praised be Thou who spreadest the tabernacle of peace over us, over Thy people Israel and over Jerusalem". Instead, it ends: "Praised be Thou who protects Thy people Israel". In the Musaph service for Festivals, the reference in the "Mipne Chata'enu" to the restoration of the Jews to their land is replaced by the request that the expressions of their lips be accepted in place of the sacrifices.

Rabbi Joseph Rauch⁴ indicates in his study of the Hamburg Prayer Book that the Reformers continued to accept the traditional view of the Diaspora as it is expressed at the beginning of the prayer "Mipne Chata'enu". He claims that the view known today as the Mission idea had not yet evolved. The Diaspora, at that period of history was not part of the divine plan for Israel to be God's servant in the world. However, though the Reformers admitted that the exile was punishment for Israel's sins of the past, they would not permit it to destroy their hopes for emancipation in the world in which they were living. He claims furthermore that in

spite of the inconsistency of the Hamburg Reformers in not eliminating other references to the rebuilding of the Temple, they had indeed parted sharply from orthodoxy in denying the hope for a return to Palestine. I shall postpone my evaluation of Rauch's argument until the end of this study. Though Rauch was commenting on the edition of 1819, his remarks in this case hold true for the edition of 1841 as well in that he explains what the Reformers had attempted to do.

The newer edition of the prayer book continued the practice of eliminating references of hostility toward the gentile nations and toward other peoples. The reference to the "Malshinim" in the Daily 'Amidah was omitted and the "Abhinu Malkenu" is abbreviated.

One of the interesting aspects of the 1841 edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book is a series of notes included as a supplement and entitled: "Anmerkungen". The notes explain something about the general structure of the liturgy from the traditional point of view and also justify some of the changes that have been made in the newer edition from the traditional liturgy.

This supplement to the edition of 1841 is most probably a consequence of the controversy over the earlier edition of the same prayer book. Similar supplements appear in all the later editions of the Hamburg Prayer Book after 1841.

The principal note explains that the essential parts of the Jewish service are the "Shema" and the "Tefillah". The "Shema" is then broken down into its constituent parts, the teaching of the unity of God; obedience to the Divine commandments; and the remembrance of God's commandments. An explanation of the nature of the blessings which precede and follow the "Shema" follows.

The "Tefillah" is likewise discussed in terms of seven benedictions which comprise the "Birkat Sheva" for Sabbaths and Holy Days. The "Shema" and "Tefillah" are known as the "typischen" or standard prayers and all other prayers are known as "accessorisch" or accrued prayers. This distinction made in the notes to the prayer book are essential for an understanding of the "Opinions" on the Hamburg Prayer Book included later in this study.

A note to page 58 of the new edition explains that the section which reads, "A new light will shine upon Zion..." was omitted from the first edition because it is undoubtedly a later addition to the liturgy and interrupts the praise of the light of nature with a request that a new light shine upon Zion. The attention of the reader is called to Zunz's explanation of the connection between this passage and the earlier "Ha'me'ir La'aretz" in Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge, pp. 368ff.

A third note refers to the "RetzeH" passage. It states that the customary formula of the "RetzeH" is neither the original nor the general formula. It is mentioned in Sefer HaTashbatz 11:161 that on the Day of Atonement, the "RetzeH" was not recited according to our formula. According to Rashi's comment upon Berakhoth 11b, the prayer read as follows: "Accept O Lord the worship of Thy people Israel and accept with favor the sacrifices of Israel and their prayers. Blessed be He who accepts with favor the worship of Israel. Blessed be Thou O Lord whom alone we serve in reverence". This concluding formula was the one that was used daily. It is interesting to note here that the edition of 1841 employs this older version of the concluding benediction to the "RetzeH". The note explains further that what is included in small print in the 1841 edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book represents a later addition which interrupts the context. Leviticus Rabah and Midrash Vayekhulu contain the older versions of the prayer.

A reference is made to the addition of the Minchah service on the Sabbath. For a long time the Temple intended to institute such a service. It was included in the newer edition to serve as a private prayer and also to be used on the Sabbath preceding the Confirmation service which normally took place on Sunday.

The Hamburg Prayer Book of 1841

A N A L Y S I S

Daily Service

Since the Daily service is a new phenomenon in the Hamburg Prayer Book beginning with the 1841 edition, I propose to discuss it in some detail. Linguistically speaking, the Shacharith service begins with several of the preliminary prayers before the "Barekhu" in German. The blessings before and after the "Shema" are likewise found in German. Of the many introductory prayers found in the daily service of the traditional liturgy, only the following are found in the Hamburg edition:

"Elohai Neshamah"

"Attah Hu"

"Yehi Ratzon"

"Barukh She'amar"

"Ribon Ha'Olamim"

"Yehi Kavod"

"Yishtabach"

Concerning the blessings before and after the "Shema" the change that occurred in the "Ahabhah Rabah" in the 1819 edition is likewise seen here. The change is in accordance with the reading in the Spanish-Portugese liturgy. The changed text reads: "Bring peace speedily upon us in all the parts of the world" and does not read, "Bring us in peace from the four corners of the earth and lead us to our land...".

In the paragraph beginning: "Ezrath Avothenu" a change of some significance appears in the daily and Sabbath service of the 1841 edition. The traditional text contains the section which reads:

True it is that Thou, Lord our God, hast redeemed us from Egypt and rescued us from the house of bondage, slaying all the first-born of Egypt and saving Thy first-born Israel. For him Thou didst part the Red Sea and sink His oppressors. Thy beloved passed through the Sea, but the waters covered their enemies, not one of them remained".

The passage is recognizably hostile toward Israel's enemies. This passage touches upon an issue of central importance in the Hamburg Temple controversies of both 1819 and 1841. It was one of the aims of the redactors of the first edition of the prayer book to remove from the worship of the Temple references which were contradictory to the newly-achieved political emancipation of German Jews. References such as those contained in the "Ezrath Avothenu" exalting the downfall of Israel's enemies reflected a period in Jewish history when Israel's particularistic aspirations and interests were focal. The Jews of the nineteenth century were embarking upon that period in their history when such particularism gave way to more universalistic aspirations. Therefore, prayers of a national particularistic

character were theoretically to form no part of the new ritual. In the earlier edition of the prayer book this idea was not carried out with great consistency. This is evident from the fact that the references quoted above in the "EzrathAvothenu" were retained in that edition. An attempt was made, however, to eliminate similar references from other prayers in that edition.

In the year 1841, however, a change did occur with regard to the wording of this prayer in both the daily and Sabbath morning services. The prayer in the newer edition reads as follows: "Lord our God, You have redeemed us out of Egypt and have freed us from the house of bondage; You parted the Red Sea, You sank the wicked, and caused Thy beloved to pass over it...therefore Thy beloved praised...". The editors of this revised edition of the prayer book indeed attempted to eliminate more completely such references as have been omitted here.

The first three benedictions of the 'Amidah and the last three are in Hebrew and the intermediate benedictions are in German only. The Kedushah for the Daily service, unlike the Kedushah for the Sabbath and Festival services is the Kedushah of the Ashkenazi Shacharith ritual. It is to be recalled that the Hamburg Prayer Book continued the practice in the 1819 edition already

begun in Die Deutsche Synagoge of adopting the Kedushah of the Ashkenazi Musaph service. This was done in order to eliminate the references to Zion and Jerusalem found in the inserts to the Sabbath Kedushah of the Ashkenazi Shacharit service. However, in the daily service, there are no inserts which contain such references and this is perhaps the reason why it was used.

Several changes occur within the intermediate benedictions of the 'Amidah in this service. The intermediate benediction concerning the "Malshinim" (slanderers) was omitted. This seems to substantiate further what has already been stated concerning the attempt of the redaction committee in 1841 to eliminate all references to the destruction and downfall of Israel's enemies.

The eleventh benediction traditionally reads:

Sound on the great Shofar the summons for our freedom; lift up the banner to gather our exiles, and bring us together from the four corners of the earth soon unto our own land. Blessed art Thou, Lord who gathers in the dispersed of Thy people Israel".

The text in the Hamburg ritual reads as follows:

Let the call of freedom sound forth,
may the banner of freedom be lifted
up for all who sigh in their servitude.
Break the yoke, O God from upon our
shoulders...Praised be Thou, God, who
gathers the banished of Thy people Israel".

The reference to the ingathering of the exiles in the traditional version is definitely omitted and is replaced by the cry for universal freedom.

The next benediction reads according to the traditional text:

Return with mercy unto Thy city
Jerusalem; set Thy dwelling again
in the midst of Jerusalem Thy city
as Thou hast spoken, and establish
soon therein the throne of David.
Build up Zion speedily in our days
for all time. Blessed art Thou,
Lord who rebuilddest Jerusalem".

The Hamburg edition reads:

May Thy glory be seen again in Thy
city Jerusalem; establish therein
the seat of truth as an eternal
foundation as Thy word has promised:
From Zion shall go forth the law,
the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.
Praised be Thou, O God, who buildest
Jerusalem".

Again, the particularistic aspiration of a return to Jerusalem is replaced by the more universalistic hope that Jerusalem be the city of truth from which will emanate the Torah of God.

The benediction referring to the descendant of the House of David reads as follows in the traditional liturgy:

Cause Thou the scion of Thy servant David soon to flourish, and may his strength be exalted through Thy saving power, for we have always hoped for Thy salvation. Blessed be Thou, Lord, who makest Thy saving power to flourish".

The same benediction has the following wording in the daily service of the Hamburg ritual:

May the promised salvation through the scion of Thy servant David soon flourish and be spread through Thy help; for we have always hoped for Thy salvation. Blessed be Thou, O Lord, who permits salvation and redemption to flourish".

It is to be noticed here that the emphasis is placed upon the idea of salvation or redemption as expressed by the German word, "Erlosung" and not upon the descendant of the House of David.

The Daily service concludes with the remaining benedictions of the 'Amidah, the reading of the Torah on the appropriate days, the prayer for the departed, and a final hymn.

The Minchah service for the weekday begins with an opening prayer and hymn; is followed by the "Ashre" and the 'Amidah of the morning service, and concludes with the "Kaddish".

The evening service for weekdays is completely in

German except for the "Barekhu" and the "Shema". The 'Amidah' follows exactly the pattern of the morning service except for the fact that in the evening it is recited entirely in German. It is most likely that the evening service was designed for private worship as has already been suggested with the case of the Minchah service for Sabbath.

The Sabbath Service

The Sabbath evening service of the revised edition follows the earlier edition without change except with regard to the German translation of the "Retze". This change has already been mentioned in the preceding summary of the prayer book.

There are two points that need to be mentioned here. One refers to something already seen in the Friday evening service of the 1819 edition and the other concerns a change of translation in the newer edition. Both the 1819 and 1841 editions of the prayer book employ the translation of the "Sim Shalom" version of the concluding benediction of the 'Amidah' and not the "Shalom Rav". The former is found in the Friday evening service of the Spanish-Portuguese liturgy and the latter in the Ashkenazi tradition. Secondly, the translation of the

"Shema" differs in the newer edition. This new translation is common to all the services of the prayer book and is not at all limited to the service for the eve of the Sabbath though I mention the change at this point. The word, "Echad" is translated in 1819 as "an only and eternal Being". In 1841 it is translated as "the one God". (See the biography of Gotthold Salomon in the next chapter).

The Sabbath morning service follows the pattern of the prayer book of 1819 until the "Barukh She'amar". In 1819 the small selection of introductory Psalms, including the above, were found only in translation. In the newer edition, many of the introductory prayers formerly omitted were restored and beginning with the "Barukh She'amar" are found in Hebrew. The following material is added:

"Hodu la'Adonai"; "Rommemu Adonai"; Psalms 19;
34; 91; 135; 33; 92; 93; 145; 146; 147; 148;
and 150. The sections from I Chronicles 29:10;
(Vayevorekh David); Nehemiah 9:6 (Attah Hu Adonai);
and Exodus 15:1 (Az Yashir Moshe); "Nishmat"
(in vernacular).

The "Shema" and its blessings appear as in the earlier edition with the exception of the change in the

paragraph beginning: "Le 'El Barukh..." which has already been mentioned.

The 'Amidah both for the Shacharith and Musaph services appear here as in the earlier edition. The Kedushah of the Ashkenazi Musaph service is again used both for Shacharith and Musaph. The Hebrew text of the "Retze" includes in parentheses the reference to the restoration of the worship at the sanctuary and the reference is omitted from the German translation. The 1841 edition does have the different conclusion to the "Retze" which, as has already been mentioned, is believed to be the earlier and the more original.

The Minchah service for the Sabbath not found in the earlier edition of the prayer book has the following order:

- 1) An introductory prayer and hymn (not specifically given in the text).
- 2) "Ashre"
- 3) Three introductory benedictions of the 'Amidah.
- 4) A silent prayer in German.
- 5) The remaining benedictions of the 'Amidah.
- 6) The "Kaddish".
- 7) Prayer for the departed.
- 8) Concluding Hymn.

It is to be noted that prayers included in the traditional liturgy for the Mincha service such as "Ubha leTzion Goel" and "Attah Echad Ushemekha Echad" are omitted in the Hamburg edition.

Service for the Day of Atonement

The service on the eve of the Day of Atonement begins here as in the older edition with "Selach na" and the "Hu Rachum". The Kol Nidre is omitted. The 'Amidah', unlike the 'Amidah for the eve of the Sabbath, is in Hebrew and is followed by a number of the Selichoth prayers which differ from those insertions in the prayer book of 1819. Among the Piyutim included in the previous edition but omitted here are:

"Te'anu"

"Annenu Avinu"

"Ashmanu...bagadnu..."

"Anshe Emunah"

After the prayer: "Yeratze", the order of service in the new edition has the following form:

"Adonai El Rachum"

"Adonai Chonnenu"

"Elohenu...al tabho bamishpat"

"El erekh apayim"

"Elohenu shebaschmayim"

"Adonai Melekh"

"Elohenu Tabho"

"Meyuchad"

"Mah nomar"

"Al Chet"

"Adir ve'naor"

The service concludes with the "Kaddish", the prayer for the departed, and a final hymn. It is to be noted that the selection of Piyutim is much larger in this edition but considerably smaller than the total number of poetical insertions found in the traditional service.

The morning service for the Day of Atonement begins with the regular Shacharith service for Sabbaths and Festivals until the "Barekhu". The service is slightly more abbreviated than in the previous edition because of the omission of many Piyutim. The order of service, however, is more in accordance with the traditional order of service.

The insertions before the last three benedictions of the 'Amidah include: "Al Ta'azbhenu"

"Tabho"

"Al Chet" -(in Hebrew)

"Adir ve'naor"

"KaKatubh"

"Mechal..."

Before the Torah service the following prayers are to be found:

"Lema'anekha Elohai"

"Adonai Chonnenu"

"El Melekh"

"Adonai Aseh"

"Adonai Adonai"

"Adonai El Rachum"

The essential change in the Musaph service for the Day of Atonement occurs in the Avodah service. It is considerably curtailed. Among the prayers included in this Musaph service are:

"Attah Konnanta"

"Tabho"

"Al Chet" (note that in the 1841 edition the "Al Chet" is found in Hebrew and not in both Hebrew and German

as in the earlier edition)

"Adir ve'naor"

Following the 'Amidah:

"Yisrael Avodekha"

"El Melekh"

"Adonai"

"Al Tabho Bamishpat"

"Adonai Channenu v'hakimenu"

"Elohenu shebaschamayim"

The Musaph service also contains those changes mentioned in the summary of the services.

The Minchah service for the Day of Atonement in the 1841 edition has the following order:

"Ashre"

Psalm 145

"Ubha leTzion Goel"(in abbreviated form)

Prayer in the vernacular on the theme of the Holy Day Torah service with no prophetic reading following Hymn in the vernacular and the "Kaddish".

Following the Birkath Shebha, the service continues in this order:

"Yah Shimekha"

"Adonai melekh"

"El Melekh"

"Meyuchad"

"Al Tabho Bamishpat"

"Adonai Channenu"

"El Erekh apayim"

"Adonai Aseh lema'an shimekha..."

"Elohenu shebaschamayim"

It is to be noted, with regard to the Minchah service above, that the choice of Piyutim differed from the selection of similar prayers in the earlier edition.

The Ne'ilah, or concluding service, begins as in the previous edition with the "El Norah 'Alilah" which was adopted from the Sepharadi Machzor. The rest of the service differs only slightly from the previous edition. The prayer in the vernacular is different in content. The "Aleinu Malkenu" which occurs before the "Kaddish" at the conclusion of the service is abbreviated here as in the other services where this prayer appears. The particular verses omitted are those containing references to the Messiah and those which ask for vengeance upon one's enemies. An example of the latter case is the verse: "Our Father our King, avenge before our eyes the blood shed upon thy servants".

Rosh Hashanah Service

The service for Rosh Hashanah, both for the eve and the morning, follows the same form in both editions of the prayer book. The morning service begins with the regular Sabbath morning sections until the "Barechu" and then continues after the "Yah Sh'mekha" until the "Birkath Shebha". The "Birkath Shebha" contains those emendations already mentioned in the summary pertaining to the "Retzeff". The blowing of the Shofar, however, is preceded in this edition by an explanation in the form of an "Anmerkung" of the significance of the shofar blasts. According to the explanation, the blast of the shofar has a three-fold significance; To cause us to remember the revelation at Sinai; to awaken man from his sins that he may return to God; and to look toward the end of days.

The Musaph service for the New Year begins immediately with fewer introductory prayers before the "Birkath Shebha" than in the previous edition. The "Ochilah leEl" and the "Adonai Melekh" preface the "Birkath Shebha".

The service contains the customary sections for the New Year mentioning the "Zikhronoth", "Malkauyoth" and "Shofaroth".

The 1841 edition also includes a Minchah service for

Rosh Hashanah afternoon. The order of service for Minchah is as follows:

- 1) Introductory prayer and hymn
- 2) "Ashre"
- 3) "Birkath Shebha" and "Abinu Malkenu"
- 4) "Kaddish"-prayer for the departed,
and final hymn.

In connection with the service for the eve of Rosh Hashanah, the translation of the "Birkath Shebha" in this edition is much more literal than in the previous edition. The "Alloth" section of the 1819 edition reads as follows: "Praised be Thou, Eternal One, our God and God of our forefathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, great, mighty...". The revised edition has this reading for the same section: "Praised be Thou, Lord, our God and the God of our Fathers, God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob...".

Service for Festivals

The service for the festivals in the new edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book hardly differs from the service in the earlier edition. The service is not included in the prayer book as a supplement, however, as it was in the year 1819. It is included in one of the main sections of the book.

The translation of the 'Amidah in the evening service is much more literal as is the general case with all of the German translations in the newer edition.

The emendations in the Musaph service in the 1819 edition are also found in the newer edition.

Also typical of the format of the revised edition is the appearance of the Minchah service for the afternoon of the festivals.

C H A P T E R I V

Controversies Over the Hamburg Prayer Book of 1841

The following section consists of a collection of theological opinions submitted by leading rabbis as a result of the publication of the second edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book in 1841. The main opinions are found in the collection of Theologische Gutachten uber das Gebetbuch nach dem Gebrauche des Neuen Israelitischen Tempelvereins in Hamburg. This collection contains the opinions of twelve European rabbis and includes the views of Abraham Geiger and Samuel Holdheim. The complete views of Geiger and Holdheim are to be found in their separate collections: Der Hamburger Tempelstreit--eine Zeitfrage and Gebetbuch des Israelitischen Tempelvereins Hamburg respectively.

Other opinions were expressed by Dr. Gotthold Salomon, preacher of the Temple, in Das Neue Gebetbuch und seine Verketzerung and in his Sendschreiben an Herrn Dr. Frankel; by M. Frankel in his preface to the Theologische Gutachten; and finally by Dr. Zacharias Frankel of Dresden.

A series of brief biographical sketches of these participants in the Temple controversy serves as a preface to the opinions.

DR. JOSEPH AUB (1805-1880)

Dr. Aub was born in Baiersdorf, Bavaria. He held rabbinic posts in Baireuth, (1830-50); Mayence, (1850-65); and Berlin, (1855-1880). He was one of the first Bavarian rabbis to deliver sermons in German and to have published them in pamphlet form. In 1846, he founded and later edited a journal entitled, "Sinai". Among his writings on theological questions were: "Betrachtungen und Widerlegungen"; "Biblisches Sprach gebuch fur den Vorbereitenden Unterricht in der Mosaiachen Religion"; "Grundlage zu einem Wissenschaftlichen Unterrichte in der Mosaischen Religion".¹

DR. ISAAC L. AUERBACH (1791-1853)

Dr. Auerbach, preacher at the New Israelite Temple in Leipzig, was born in Prussia. He was educated in Bible and Talmudic studies and studied languages and science at the University of Berlin. He was appointed preacher at the Jacobson Temple in which Kley and Günzberg delivered sermons in German. While teaching at the Jewish girls' school in Berlin, he was called to the Temple at Leipzig which he served for a period of twenty years. He published the following works: "Sind die Israeliten Verpflichtet Ihre Gebete Durchaus in Hebraischer Sprache zu Verrichten?"; "Die Aufnahme Israels in die Grosse Gemeinschaft der Nationen"; "Das Verstandnis der Zeit".²

AARON CHORIN (1766-1844)

Aaron Chorin was born in Weisskirchen, Moravia and died in Arad, Hungary. After having studied under Rabbi Ezekiel Landau in Prague, he accepted the position of Rabbi at Arad. He became involved in the famous sturgeon controversy in 1792. He followed the opinion of Ezekiel Landau that sturgeon was permitted as a food according to Scriptural law. His opinion was vehemently opposed by rabbis such as Mordecai Benet. Though Chorin was not defeated, he alienated himself from many of his colleagues who caused him difficulties in later years.

In 1818, he was inspired to write what is perhaps his most important work: "Kinath Ha-Emeth" which appeared in the collection of Responsa known as Nogah-Tzedek. This collection of Responsa attempted to justify the reforms introduced into the Reform Temple at Berlin. Co-incidentally, the year in which Nogah-Tzedek appeared also saw the opening of the Hamburg Temple.

Aaron Chorin declared himself in favor of many of the reforms such as the use of German prayers, the playing of the organ, etc. A year later, he published "Davar B'Ito" re-affirming his former views.³

JOSEPH A. FRIEDLANDER (1753-1852)

Joseph Friedlander was the nephew of David Friedlander.

He studied Talmud in Prague at Ezekiel Landau's school and later went to Presburg. In 1784, he became the chief rabbi of Westphalia and of the principality of Wittgenstein. He was one of the first reform rabbis to advocate reforms in Judaism. In his district, he abolished the observance of the second day of festivals and was opposed to many obsolete mourning practices. One of his publications; "Shoresh Ya'akobh", appeared in both Hebrew and German in 1834.⁴

DR. ABRAHAM GEIGER (1810-1874)

Abraham Geiger was one of the leading exponents of Reform Judaism. He was born in Frankfurt am Main and died in Berlin. He was learned in Talmudic as well as in secular studies. After having studied classics at the University of Heidelberg in 1829, he later went to Bonn to study Arabic. From 1832-38 he was rabbi at Wiesbaden. For many years, Geiger was interested in publishing a Jewish Theological review. In 1835 there appeared the, "Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Judische Theologie".

In an article written in the Review entitled, "Über die Errichtung einer Judisch-Theologischen Fakultät", Geiger pleaded for the recognition of the science of Judaism and the placing of the study of theology on an equal basis with other sciences. In 1838, Geiger sought

the position of Rabbi in the city of Breslau. Geiger being from Frankfurt am Main, was considered a foreigner in the Prussian city of Breslau. Because of orthodox opposition to his appointment, this became an issue and he could not be appointed until he became a citizen of Prussia. He did become Rabbi in 1840 but in second position to Titkin, until the latter's death three years later.

In 1854, Geiger published a prayer book which followed his plan already outlined a few years earlier in an article called, "Grundzuge und Plan zu einem Neuen Gebetbuch". Geiger's views on the liturgy reflect his general thinking about Judaism. To Geiger, Israel continued to be a people, but one united solely by a common faith, renouncing once and for all whatever political or nationalistic aspirations it may have had in the past. Geiger's concept of the science of Judaism was limited to the idea of religion and its development. Since to him the zenith of religion was a universalistic faith, he was interested in the national aspects of Judaism only to the extent to which they would help achieve the broader goal.

Abraham Geiger was an active participant in the rabbinical conferences of 1844, 1845, 1846 and in the Synods at Leipzig and Augsburg of 1869 and 1872 respectively.⁵

MOSES GUTMANN (1805-62)

Rabbi Gutmann was born at Baiersdorf and died at Rechwitz. He was one of the first rabbis in Bavaria to have an academic education as well as Talmudic training who expounded the cause of Reform. He contributed articles to Geiger's "Zeitschrift für Judische Theologie"⁶.

DR. SAMUEL HOLDHEIM (1806-60)

Samuel Holdheim⁷ was one of the great figures in the early history of Reform Judaism. He was born in Kempen, Posen and studied at the University of Prague in 1833. From 1836-40 he served as rabbi in Frankfort. He received the PhD degree at the University of Leipzig in 1839. From 1840-47, he was rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. He participated in the first rabbinic conference of 1844 and became rabbi of the Reformgemeinde in Berlin, in 1847.

His many publications include: "Autonomy of the Rabbis" and "Ceremonial Laws in the Messianic Era". In comparing Holdheim with Geiger, Simon Bernfeld claimed that it was Holdheim's aim to make Judaism in Germany "German" in every respect and to remove reminiscences of historical-nationalistic Judaism. With respect to his views on the nature of the religion of Israel, he said the following:

It is our obligation to be like the other inhabitants together as one people and to conduct ourselves by their laws--for the law of the country is the law--. From the time of the destruction of the Temple, Israel's national existence has become null and void.⁸ We have only a religion which remains.

The Encyclopedia Britannica sums up the life of Samuel Holdheim in these terms:

Within the framework of Judaism, he fought for the right to differ. He was animated with the sincere concern to arrest the decline of Judaism which he witnessed in the form of conversion and indifference. In this process he liberated Judaism from the shackles of parochial legalism and made manifest the latent universality of the Jewish religion. He dispelled the fatal belief that Jewish customs and ceremonies are Judaism in themselves and are therefore supposedly sacrosanct. This iconoclasm had a double effect: The religion of the fathers ceased to remain a museum piece and became viable once again; the gaze of Jews was directed to the fundamentals of their religion which invites the scrutiny of modern man...⁹

ABRAHAM KOHN (1807-1848)

Abraham Kohn was born in Bohemia and died in Lemberg, Galicia. He studied Philosophy as well as Rabbinics at the University of Prague. In 1833, he was appointed rabbi of Hohenems where, during his eleven years of service, he managed to introduce reforms into the worship service. In 1844, he opened a "Normalschule" in Lemberg

and dedicated a new Temple there. He also contributed articles to Geiger's Review.

Throughout his life, the enemies of progress and culture were actively engaged in embittering his life. They concocted a plan finally to take his life. On September 6, 1848, a man hired by the fanatical clique entered Kohn's kitchen and poisoned his dinner. Abraham Kohn and his youngest child died on the following day as a result. He is one of the first reform rabbis to have truly died a martyr's death.

DR. JOSEPH MAIER (1797-1873)

Dr. Maier¹⁰ was born in 1797 and died in Stuttgart. He was president of the first rabbinical conference at Brunswick in 1844 and was also a member of the Jewish consistory of Wurttemberg. He was ennobled by the King of Wurttemberg for his participation in all the spiritual movements of the day and for his philanthropic activities.

ISAAC N. MANNHEIMER (1793-1865)

Isaac Mannheimer,¹¹ the famous preacher at the Temple in Vienna, was born in Copenhagen and died in Vienna. He was also a recipient of both a talmudic and secular education. After having organized a congregation in Vienna, he was called to the pulpit left vacant by Zunz in Berlin. Because of difficulties encountered there,

he left for Hamburg and preached there as well as at Leipzig during the time of the fairs. In 1824, he was called back to Vienna and was inducted as head of the Religion School.

His publications include the translation of the Prayer Book and Prayers for Fast Days according to the ritual of the Vienna Temple. He also wrote: "Gutachten Gegen die reformpartei in Frankfurt am Main in Angelegenheit der Beschneidungsfrage".

DR. ZACHARIAS FRANKEL (1801-1875)

Dr. Zacharias Frankel¹² was the founder of the school of historical Judaism advocating freedom of research yet upholding the authority of tradition in practical life. Frankel was born in Prague, received an early Talmudic education at the Yeshibah and in 1825 went to Budapest where he graduated from the University in 1831.

Frankel held early rabbinic posts in Leitmeritz and in Teplitz. In 1836, he was called to Dresden as the chief rabbi. In 1843, he was invited to the chief rabbinate of Berlin but declined the offer. In 1843, he was called to the presidency of the Breslau seminary where he remained until his death.

Frankel had introduced slight reforms into the

service among them being the elimination of Piyutim and the introduction of a boys' choir. However, he was opposed to any innovations which were objectionable to Jewish sentiment.

His role in the Hamburg controversy displeased both the reformers and the orthodox leaders. He pointed out the inconsistencies of the reformers and told the orthodox that changes from the tradition were permissible.

In 1845, he left the rabbinical conference in Frankfurt which had resolved that Hebrew was unnecessary for public worship. Many of Frankel's views were later adopted by the Conservative movement in America.

Beginning in 1844, many of Frankel's principles were enunciated in his monthly journal, "Zeitschrift für die Religiösen Interessen des Judentums". The following are to be included among his published writings: "Historisch-Kritische Studien zu der Septuaginta Nebst Beitragen zu den Targumim"; "Über den Einfluss der Palistinensischen Exegesis auf die Alexandrische Hermeneutik"; "Darkhe Ha-Mishna" and its supplement, "Tosafot u-Mafteach le-Sefer Darkhe Ha-Mishna"; "Mabho Ha-Yerushalmi", etc. He also wrote the "Monatschrift" which was begun in 1851 and was succeeded by Graetz, in 1868, as editor.

DR. GOTTHOLD SALOMON (1784-1862)

Dr. Salomon was born in Sandesleben in 1784 and died in 1862. From 1818 until 1857, he acted as Prediger of the Hamburg Temple. During the earlier years he was associated with Edward Kley.

Salomon was called by Zunz the founder of the Wissenschaft des Judentums--the Science of Judaism. To Salomon he also attributed the fact that the achievements of the Hamburg Temple had great historical significance for Judaism.

Zunz wrote the following about Salomon's achievements in the art of homiletics,

What does one mean by a Jewish sermon? It is not a Jewish sermon because a Jew preaches in a Jewish House of Prayer before a Jewish congregation. A sermon is a Jewish one when the living Jewish spirit as it echoes through Jewish literature is captured and brought near to the listener. Salomon, as Preacher,¹³ was able to respond to this ideal challenge.

Dr. Bruno Italiener, in his article on Salomon in the Hamburg Temple Festschrift quoted from one of Salomon's sermons preached in the year 1827:

How can God's word be heard by you? In the Original! I mean Scripture--the teaching which was commanded to Moses as the inheritance of the House of Jacob without which our discourses would have no religious value or worth...^{13a}

In explaining Dr. Salomon's approach in the sermon, Dr. Italiener states that his sermons do not outwardly depend upon the Scriptures but rather reflect its strength and are possessed by its spirit--that specific Jewish spirit as he finds it in the Talmud, in Philosophic literature and in the Midrash. It was the art of Salomon to express these works not in the manner of the older Darshanim, but rather through the blending of the older thoughts with the views of modern life.

In addition to his preaching, Gotthold Salomon was celebrated for his School Bible for Israelites which appeared in Altona in the year 1837. It was in German with German letters. His Bible is thus to be differentiated from that of Mendelsohn which appeared in Hebrew type. Of the many sections only two smaller sections, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, were undertaken by his friend, I. Mannheimer of Vienna. This work marks the crown of Salomon's literary career and of his lifework. It is the compilation of all that he strove for as a rabbi of Judaism--to make Judaism living.

Dr. Italiener points out some interesting aspects of Salomon's translation. With reference to his translation of the name of God, "JHWH" was translated by Mendelsohn as "Der Ewige" (The Eternal), was translated by Salomon as, "Gott". The word, "EL" he trans-

lated as "Macht" (Power). In this sense, according to Dr. Italiener, Salomon is the child of his time in which the abstract--the general--as opposed to the specific and concrete, represents a higher degree in the development of religion. This same viewpoint is reflected in the first edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book where the word, "Erloser" (Redeemer) is translated by the indefinite and vague term, "Redemption" (Erlösung). Likewise in the "Shema" the word "Echad" translated normally as, "Einzig" is translated as "ein Einiges, ewiges Wessen".^{13b}

DR. LUDWIG PHILIPPSON (1811-1889)

Dr. Philippson¹⁴ was born at Dessau and died at Bonn. He attended the University of Berlin and at the age of 22 was called to be preacher at Magdeburg and remained there for twenty-eight years. He founded the Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums in 1837. His writings include: "Israelitische Religionslehre", and "Israelitisches Gebetbuch".

LEOPOLD STEIN (1810-1882)

Dr. Leopold Stein,¹⁵ District-Rabbi at Burkundstadt, attended the University of Wurzburg. In 1833, he preached his first sermon in Frankfurt and pleaded for

the introduction of reforms into the liturgy. In 1835, he became rabbi of Burg and Altenkunstadt. From 1844 to 1862, he was rabbi of Frankfurt am Main. He edited Der Israelitische Volkslehrer and his other writings include: "Gebetbuch fur Israelitische Gemeinden nach dem Ritus der Hauptsynagogue zu Frankfurt-am-Main".

Dr. Stein also composed a song for the reform ritual, "Tag des Herrn" intended to be sung to the music of the "Kol Nidre", which occupied a significant place in the later development of the liturgy within the Reform Movement.

RABBI ISAAC BERNAYS (1792-1849)

One of the principal personalities in the Hamburg Temple controversy was the Chief-Rabbi of Hamburg, Isaac Bernays,¹⁶ known by the title of "Chakham". Bernays was born in Mayence and after having finished his studies at the University of Wurzburg, he went to Munich and afterwards returned to Mayence to be a private tutor. In 1821, he was elected Chief-Rabbi of the Hamburg German-Jewish community. The community was then seeking a man of strictly orthodox views but with a modern education. Bernays accepted the office on the condition that all the religious and educational institutions of the community be placed under his personal

direction. He wanted to be responsible to the government only. In addition to this, he insisted upon the title of "Chakham".

Bernays was the first Orthodox German Rabbi who introduced the German sermon into the service. Bernays' best pupil was Samson Raphael Hirsch, the well known leader of neo-orthodoxy.

Following the publication of the second edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book in 1841, Rabbi Isaac Bernays issued this statement,

In the year 1819, a new prayer book entitled, 'Prayers for the Sabbath and Festivals' appeared and the rabbis of our city saw that it was the intention of this prayer book to change and to destroy the formula for the prayers of the sages regarding those matters concerning the essentials of religion. Therefore they declared in the year 1819 that every Israelite should be cautioned about praying from their prayer book and whoever does use that book has not fulfilled his obligation toward prayer. It has been demonstrated that their words have borne fruit since it has not occurred to any Jew to pray from that prayer book. Behold now they have printed this prayer book in a new edition entitled, 'Prayer Book for Israelites' without changing the formula of the first edition as indicated by the redactors of the prayer book in their introduction. And thus according to their words so they did: they emended, changed, and eliminated prayers according to their wishes in accordance with their goals, denying Israel's future hope in the form of the spiritual promise made to us. It appears that they have handled the

prayers with frivolity and because of this I find it urgent to remove a stumbling block from before our community, to proclaim publicly that the Issur (Prohibition) of 1819 applies equally to the prayer book recently published and that it is forbidden to pray obligatory prayers from this book.¹⁷

In a note to the above statement, Bernfeld furnishes the background to Bernays' participation in the Hamburg controversy. It seems that he did not engage in the controversy out of his own volition but was requested by the community which he represented "to take a strong hand" against the builders of the Temple. Bernays answered their request stating that he was powerless to deal with them.

However, on February 3, 1841, he advised the community that Judaism was in great danger because of the new congregation in that many youth were turning away from Judaism. On August 20 of the same year, Bernays addressed another letter to his community proving to them the "craze" of the Hamburg PrayerBook editors who claimed that as a result of the new edition many who had formerly left Judaism were returning to the fold. In his letter, Bernays wished to investigate what it was that "healed" the return to the fold. He held that Judaism stood upon religious principles and only

by believing in these principles and by following the commandments of the Torah could one's faith in Judaism be truly tested. The foundation of Judaism is in its future hope that "God will have mercy upon us and gather us to His holy mountain".^{17a} Bernays asks, "What is the nature of our spirit if they who come to the Synagogue continue to profane the holy law?"^{17b}

Following the proclamation of Bernays, the leaders of the Temple responded that Bernays had no authority over their House of Prayer and thus had no authority to exercise over them; his verdict against the prayer book indicated that he was their enemy and that he has not observed the content of the prayer book, has no correct knowledge of the law of Israel and of its religious literature; and finally, that the proclamation could be forgotten by the Temple members.

The proclamation of Bernays became the point of departure for the famous Hamburg Prayer Book controversy which began in 1841. Practically all the participants in the controversy began their opinions by stating their disapproval of the action taken by Bernays. Many, including Leopold Stein and Samuel Holdheim, were bitter about the manner in which the proclamation was issued. All of the respondents felt that

Bernays lacked any justification whatsoever for his claims. Each of the participants in his own way attempted to demonstrate that the claim of Bernays could find no support from rabbinic tradition. Using biblical and rabbinic proof-texts and other forms of justification, many attempted to justify any changes that were made in the new edition of the prayer book. Leopold Stein and Abraham Geiger were among the few who went farther in their critiques by indicating the inconsistencies of the prayer book and by truly evaluating the reforms that had been made.

For the purposes of summary, the principal questions which were discussed can be grouped under the following headings:

- 1) The Use of the Vernacular in Prayer.
- 2) The Beliefs in Messiah-Resurrection,
and Redemption.
- 3) The Repetition of the 'Amidah.
- 4) Definition of "Obligatory Prayers".
- 5) Prayers Alien to the Spirit of Judaism.

1 - The Use of the Vernacular in Prayer.

The question of the vernacular seems to be one of the most perplexing problems to have faced the early Reformers. In spite of the many attempts to clarify

the matter, it still remained a problem even at the time of the later rabbinical conferences. One of the main issues taken up in the Eleh Dibre Habrith and in the Or Nogah-Nogah Tzedek was the vernacular. The interesting point with regard to its role in the controversy of 1841 is the fact that the use of vernacular was not at all under attack by Rabbi Bernays. His "Moda'ah" was limited to the three main theological concepts of Redemption, Resurrection, and Messiah. Yet each of the participants in the Gutachten felt compelled to mention something about the use of German in the worship service, and some felt the need to justify its use once again with all the traditional arguments and proof-texts. The main argument for the use of the vernacular is taken from Tractate Sotah 33:a which states that one should pray in a language that one understands.

There is much discussion in the various opinions about the guiding principle of the prayer book committee in deciding which prayers were to be recited in Hebrew and which in German. Geiger and Holdheim are particularly concerned with this issue since they find many inconsistencies with regard to the use of the vernacular. This was a main issue in Zacharias Frankel's opinion and was discussed by Gotthold Salomon in his response to Frankel.

2 - The Belief in Messiah, Resurrection and Redemption.

These three doctrinal points are the main consideration of the Gutachten since they are specifically mentioned in Bernays' "Moda'a". The Hamburg Temple was accused of handling the passages in the prayer book, which deal with these concepts, in a frivolous manner. Since the preface to the new edition of the prayer book contained a note that the new book differs only in form but not in content from the traditional prayer books, it was incumbent upon the reformers to prove that any changes in the prayer book with regard to such passages were changes in form but not in doctrinal content.

Many of the participants were satisfied with reproducing those passages retained in the new edition of the prayer book which proved that there had been no deviation from the traditional views. Others were more critical by indicating those specific places in the liturgy where a change had occurred. These changes or omissions were justified by pointing to the uncertainty which surrounded many of these doctrinal notions in Jewish tradition. The dominant view stated that because there was so much uncertainty with regard to the meaning and practical consequences of the beliefs in

the Messiah, in future redemption and in the resurrection of the dead they could not be considered as dogma. One individual made reference to the ambiguity in rabbinic tradition concerning the distinction between "Techiyath Hametim" and "Olam Haba". With reference to the notion of the Messiah, it was the general opinion that the notion referred to a Messianic Age yet many hesitated to spell out clearly the viewpoint of the Hamburg Tempelverein.

The idea of a return to Jerusalem and the restoration of the sacrifices was of great concern to all the respondents. The majority interpreted the notion spiritually. The idea of a personal return to Zion was unacceptable since many were satisfied with life in their native or adopted country. Jeremiah's letter to the exiles and the fact that many Jews remained in Babylon at the time of Ezra served as ready justification for this view. The opinion of Aaron Chorin was an interesting one. He interpreted the notion to mean that all Jews would be united wherever they may happen to live by a universal synod in Jerusalem. All would be subject to the synod with regard to religious matters but the synod could not interfere with the political statutes of those governments under whom the Jews lived.

A dissenting view was presented by Isaac Mannheimer. He could not accept the spiritual notion but rather believed in the historical and national side of the Messianic idea.

Reference was frequently made in the Gutachten to the change in those passages in the prayer book mentioning the sacrifices. It was the conviction of the rabbis that prayer occupied a higher place in the religious life than sacrifice. The prophets and sages were cited frequently as proof of the superiority of prayer over sacrifice.

3 - The Repetition of the 'Amidah.

One of the major changes instituted in the Hamburg Temple was the elimination of the repetition of the 'Amidah. The 'Amidah was recited by the congregation along with the reader. This innovation caused much discussion and Samuel Holdheim in particular devotes some time to the discussion of this issue. Justification is found in talmudic sources for the Hamburg practice. Connected with this question of the 'Amidah is the further controversy over the language in which the 'Amidah is recited during the various services. Many of the participants pointed out the inconsistencies with regard to the language of the

'Amidah. Dr. Salomon's reply to Zacharias Frankel sheds some light upon this matter in that it disproves the assumptions held by Geiger and Holdheim.

4 - Definition of "Obligatory Prayers".

Since the "Moda'a" of Bernays stated that in regard to his obligatory prayers (Tefillath Chobhah) a Jew had not fulfilled his obligation from the Hamburg prayer book, the need was felt by many of the respondents to clarify what is meant by the term "obligatory prayers". This led men like Geiger to undertake a study of the historical development of the Jewish liturgy as an introduction to his critique. Many of the reformers demonstrated that with regard to "Tefillath Chobhah" the claim of Bernays was unfounded.

5 - Prayers Alien to the Spirit of Judaism.

The Hamburg prayer book, with inconsistency, attempted to eliminate those passages which in ideology were felt to be alien to the Jewish spirit. These passages either described Israel's estrangement from the other nations or distinguished between the rewards that would come to Israel and the punishment that would come to the peoples of other religious confessions. This change is characteristic of Israel's development from particularism toward universalism. For many of

the reformers, since Jews had adopted Germany as their new home, there was no longer any need to distinguish between Israel and the nation in this way. Geiger criticized the Hamburg reformers for going only half-way in this direction since the publication of the prayer book in 1819.

The Theologische Gutachten, which comprise the major section of this study, indicate most clearly the centrality of the Hamburg Temple controversy in the first half of the nineteenth century. The views contained in these opinions reflect the opposition met by the reformers on the one hand, and the thinking of many of the rabbis with regard to the liturgy and with respect to some essential Jewish theological doctrines on the other hand. Beneath it all one cannot but detect the real motivations of the Hamburg Tempelverein which were to modernize, abbreviate and edify the liturgical service without any theological basis. Gotthold Salomon himself indicated some of the practical considerations of the redactors of the prayer book especially with reference to the use of Hebrew and German.

I have attempted to analyze each of the opinions in terms of the sequence and development of ideas of each of the participants. Whenever possible, I have

cited the precise words of the author hoping thereby to recapture somewhat the "flavor" of the opinion.

The Gutachten are preceded by an introduction by Dr. Frankel in which he sets forth the principles which guided the redactors of the prayer book in their efforts. The four basic guiding principles were as follows:

1) The prayer book, which aims to be the expression of a religious community that rests on a positive-historical foundation, must not only uplift and edify the spirit of the worshipper but it must indicate that positive foundation in its peculiarity as it appears in doctrine and history.

2) Spirit and heart must be addressed in a manner as compatible as possible with the modern status of European culture and views of life.

3) The existing and traditionally-received material is to be retained preferentially as long as it does not controvert the requirements indicated above.

4) The entire contents of the prayer book, as well as of the whole service, must be permeated with the pure teaching of our ancestral religion; whatsoever opposes this must be removed.

In his introduction, Dr. Frankel states briefly

the history of the Hamburg Temple controversy in connection with the publication of the two editions of the prayer book and cites the literature in the form of Gutachen occasioned by the 1841 edition. In addition to the collection of twelve opinions contained in this series of Gutachten, he made reference to the sixteen theologians whose opinions were solicited. Two had refused to submit opinions and from one no answer was received. Dr. Frankel in Dresden submitted a Gutachten which, in essence, was a rejection of Herr Bernays' "Moda'a:" and a literary-critical review of the prayer book. Outside of the general collection of Gutachten, opinions by Geiger and Holdheim, Salomon and Frankfurter appeared and a discussion of these opinions will be included in this section of the study.

Dr. Frankel proceeds to state some further opinions about the guiding principles of the Tempelgemeinde as well as those of the Prayer Book Committee:

A) The Title of the Prayer Book.

Nach dem Gebrauche des neuen israelitischen Tempels in Hamburg. It is not a prayer book for the worship of all Israelites. It is an Israelite prayer book according to a particular "Minhag" in the same way as the Spanish-Portuguese or any other "Minhag".¹⁸

B) Aims of the Tempelverein.

The Tempelverein desired by its foundation in no way to make a scientific experiment;

it wanted to help the needs of practical living. It was the special task of the Tempelverein to give value and practicality to the cultic structure in order to preserve the fatherly religion for itself and for its children.

Not only individual persons, but whole families who formerly had lost all religious motivation and who had surrendered themselves entirely to materialism now find themselves participating in an edifying service. The ancestral religion of our Fathers has for the first time become understandable to many.¹⁹

C) The Program of the Tempelgemeinde.

With the cult one stands only on the periphery of the religious life. As the central point, that is, as our main communal task, we consider the unity of the religious idea with life in the spirit of further education and development to be of utmost importance. The teachings of religion must be in complete harmony with the practical needs of life. The word must become an act; knowledge must become truth. The reforms must not remain on the level of ideals and of being merely the specialty of a few but rather must be given practical legality.²⁰

D) Status of the Temple in the Jewish Community.

The Temple wanted to remain in the "Synagogue." It wanted to remain on a firm and positive Jewish foundation and sought in its total existence and in its organic activity to win itself such a place. It did not want in any way to loosen its ties with the total community. It desired that the idea of development should become the inheritance of the whole house of Jacob.

Development! - This is our motto. We distinguish in the Jewish religion between Spirit and Body, Essence and Form, Eternal

and Transitory, and in the same sense we distinguish between that which appears eternally and that which has a timely appearance.²¹

DR. JOSEPH AUB

Dr. Aub begins his Gutachten by questioning the claim of Rabbi Bernays that anyone using the Hamburg Prayer Book has not fulfilled the obligation of prayer.

It appears to us that Herr Bernays' judgment is not founded upon Talmudic and Rabbinic law and no rabbi who judges according to the law and instruction of the rabbis can assent to his words.²²

He proceeds to prove by the use of Talmudic proof-texts that the claim of Bernays is groundless. According to Tractate Berakoth 12a: "He who does not recite the section 'Emeth Ve yatsiv' in the evening service has not fulfilled his obligation". This was modified in the Codes in Tur (Orach Chayim) 66 where it reads: "Only when one has not mentioned the Exodus from Egypt in the 'Vayomer' section." Aub deduces from the above that Bernays had no right to make the claim that he did, since the failure to fulfill one's obligation toward prayer is limited to the omission of the above passages.

Bernays could only, therefore, have contested two basic points in the Prayer Book:

- 1) that the prayers in the book represents a deviation from the Jewish Form of prayer, and;
- 2) that the sections in the prayer book dealing with;
 - a) Redemption
 - b) Messiah, and
 - 3) Resurrection, were omitted.

Dr. Aub proceeds to justify any changes that appear in the Hamburg Prayer Book in the above mentioned sections. He points out the fact that the Prayer Book, according to the Hamburg rite, is not at all in accord with the Prayer Books of German-Polish and Spanish-Portugese Jews. The question at stake is whether the deviations are really against the Jewish religion or whether there have always been differences among the Jewish communities with reference to the Forms of Prayer. Believing the latter to be the case, Aub justifies the changes that have occurred in the Hamburg edition.

Aub proceeds further to find principles in the Talmud which will support the idea of change and modification in the liturgy. He quotes two statements from the Talmud which seem to oppose the idea of change

and then proceeds to clarify the true meaning and intent of those verses:

- 1) It is written in Mishnah Berakhoth 1:4:

In the morning two Benedictions are said before and one after; and in the evening two Benedictions are said before and two after; the one long and the other short. Where the long is prescribed the short is not permissible; where the short is prescribed the long is not permissible...

Dr. Aub calls attention specifically to the statement that a long benediction cannot be shortened, nor a short one lengthened. He indicates that the context of the Mishnah in which this appears speaks specifically about the benedictions before and after the "Shema". Furthermore, the interdict is limited to the beginning and ending of the Benedictions and not to the middle sections which can be changed. He, therefore, sees no reason for a disapproval of the changes in the Hamburg Prayer Book which occur in these middle sections. In a note at this point, Dr. Aub calls attention to two verses which to his surprise were included in the above sections but which should have been omitted:

- A) "Or Chadash Al Tzion Tair Venizkeh kulanu mehera l'oro" which is inserted in parentheses but not

translated in the German.

B) In the "Ezrath Avotenu" passage the insertion of the phrase; "Zedim Tibata, V'Yedidim heebarta". Yet the phrase referring to the killing of Egypt's first born and the redemption of Israel's first born was not included.

2) Secondly, there is a statement in Berakoth 40b to the effect that anyone deviating from the Formula established by the Sages has not fulfilled his obligation. Rabbi José says-"Anyone who changes the formula of the Sages in the blessings has not fulfilled his obligation". It is Rabbi Meir's opinion, however, that this statement refers to the thought and sense of the prayer but not to the specific expression and wording of the prayer. Maimonides, in Hilkhoth Berakoth 1:6, states that as long as the name of God, His Kingship, and the content of the prayer are mentioned, one has fulfilled his obligation even if the prayer is said in another language. Aub also quotes from Rabbi M. Isserles in Darkhe Mosheh, chapter 113:3 and from Rabbi Ephraim Cohen of Vilna in the Responsa "Shaar Ephraim" who agree that "one will not find a place in the world where the Eighteen Benedictions would be said in the same way letter for letter but rather some add and some abbreviate."

With reference to the second claim of Rabbi Bernays that passages dealing with Resurrection, Redemption and the Messiah have been modified or omitted, Dr. Aub stated that this claim is groundless. Not only has the teaching about resurrection remained but also the teaching about the Messiah. These passages have been retained generally. Only those passages which express the hope of a political regeneration of the Jewish people and the restoration of the sacrificial cult have been omitted. And these changes do not merit the condemnation which the Prayer Book has received. Dr. Aub clarifies further the point about Messianic teaching in Jewish tradition:

There is no dogma about which there is more uncertainty and need of explanation than the Messianic doctrine. In no time were Jewish scholars unanimous. The Talmud records the opinions of Samuel and of Rabbi Yohanan. The former saw in the Messianic idea a political freedom for Israel and the latter saw in the Messianic notion all the indications of a golden age in the future as foretold by the prophets.

There was so much uncertainty and contradiction over the condition of the Messianic Kingdom among the older rabbis that Maimonides in Hilkhoth Melakhim did not value very highly such interpretations which have no foundation in our religious tradition. Maimonides himself either combines or mixes together the two opposing notions of Samuel and Yohanan.²³

With reference to Herr Bernays' condemnation of the treatment of the sacrificial cult in the Hamburg Prayer Book, Dr. Aub mentions the many references in the Talmud which support the view that prayer was preferred over sacrifices:

(Midrash Yalkuth to Hosea 522) Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai was walking in Jerusalem and Rabbi Joshua was walking after him. He saw that the Temple was destroyed and said, 'Woe to us that the Temple, where we atone for our sins, is destroyed.' He answered him; 'My son do not feel badly, we have another atonement which is like it as it is said: 'For I desire lovingkindness and not sacrifice (Gemiluth Hasadim...)

Other references in support of this view are:

Sanhedrin 44b; "Greater is Torah than the bringing of offerings"; Sukkah 49b; "Greater is the doing of righteousness than all the sacrifices."; Rosh Hashanah 18:a; Yalkuth to the Psalms 522; etc.

Dr. Aub concludes that the condemnation of Rabbi Bernays is groundless since the Prayer Book "fully expresses the spirit of Judaism and every Israelite with assurance can pray from this book-a book containing only truth and can fulfill thereby his obligation. And God who is near to all who call upon Him will hear the sincere prayers of those who pray with devotion".²⁴

Gutachten---Auerbach

Dr. Auerbach protests against the proclamation of Herr Bernays and most specifically is bothered by the phrase: "One who prays from this prayer book is no Jew". He not only knows some of the participants in the Hamburg Temple but also recognizes many orthodox tendencies among many of them.

The author of this Gutachten objects further to the criticism of Bernays that the PrayerBook represents a frivolous handling and irresponsible destruction of the spirit of the liturgy through the omission of passages dealing with Redemption, the Messiah, and Resurrection. He admits that these passages exist in the Prayer Book in an unchanged form as in the traditional prayer book. He gives, as examples, the following prayers: "Attah Gibor"; "Yigdal" and the "Kaddish" in which appear verses dealing with the idea of Resurrection. He gives examples of verses containing the idea of Messiah and Redemption as well:

In the "Retzen": - "Restore the service to Thy sanctuary..."; The Musaph service for festivals has: "Therefore may it find favor before Thee to be merciful to us and to restore our sanctuary..."; "And it shall come to pass that day that the great shofar will be

sounded and those who are lost in the land of Asshur and those dispersed in the land of Egypt, will come and they will bow down before the Lord in the holy mountain...".

Dr. Auerbach mentions the various traditions within Judaism such as the Spanish-Portugese and asks the question:

Are the Sepharadim not Jews and would one who uses the Spanish-Portugese rite not fulfill his obligation to pray? ²⁵

He mentions some of the differences between the Spanish-Portugese Prayer Book and the other books:

'Yigdal' and 'Adon Olam' are missing in week-day prayers; in the blessing before the "Shema" the words; 'Vehatteenu leshalom mearba kanfoth haaretz'; the Shemone Esrai lacks the words; 'Le'verushahyim berachamim tashuv'; in the 'Aleynu' the whole passage from 'Al ken nikaveh' until the end is missing: etc. ^{25a}

Auerbach next cites some talmudic proof-texts which give clear indication of the flexibility of the rabbis with regard to the liturgy:

The Tefillath Musaph established at the time of the Temple is not the tradition of our prayers now when the Temple is destroyed but rather one prays and asks his needs according to the time. ^{25b}

Maimonides said that in every service each day a man should pray the nineteen benedictions but if he was disturbed or in a hurry he could pray the first three benedictions, one summarizing the intermediate benedictions and the last three. He would then fulfill his obligation toward prayer.²⁶

Auerbach concludes his Gutachten with the statement that Herr Bernays' proclamation against the Hamburg Prayer Book is not to be taken seriously by the Hamburg community.

Gutachten---A. Chorin

In his very lengthy introduction, Aaron Chorin expresses the idea that each community has the right to develop its own liturgy in accordance with its own religious spirit yet with the consciousness that all the communities are joined together as religious brethren. The various groups or parties should avoid hatred and bitterness in their relationship with one another and should live in the spirit of the pure Father religion, that is - to love God with all one's soul, with all one's heart and with all one's might and to love one's neighbor as oneself. Then the time will come when the differences in the outer forms will diminish and

everyone will be united in the true worship of God.

Following this homiletical introduction, Aaron Chorin deals specifically with the "Moda'a" of Herr Bernays. He quotes the proclamation:

This Prayer Book has an intentional mutilation of the principal prayers--it represents an intentional and purposeful deviation from the form of Jewish prayer and has brought about the destruction of the spirit of prayer through the omission of passages which speak of Redemption, Resurrection and the Messiah. 27

Chorin proceeds to prove that the claim of Bernays is unfounded and cites various passages in the prayer book which do contain the above ideas in an unchanged form:

'Vetechezana 'Enenu beshuvekha letzion berachamim; 'Vezikhron Yerushalayim vezikhron Moshiach ben David"; "Metim yechaye El yishlach leketz Yamim meshichaenu in the 'Yigdal"; etc. 28

After demonstrating that nothing significant of the doctrine of Resurrection and the Messiah has been omitted, Aaron Chorin addresses himself to the problem of personal longing for return to the Holy Land, and the future redemption of Israel through the establishment of the kingdom in the Holy Land.

When the worshipping Jew does not feel inclined to accept the hope of the promised restoration of the kingdom and the redemption of Israel as an independent nation in terms of a personal migration to that land, which

prayer should a rabbi recommend to him?
One which is in the highest interest of
unity and which should be in keeping
with the possibility of its being granted,
or one which is deceiving to the all-
knowing God and for whose fulfillment one
need be hypocritical?²⁹

Chorin's justification for the right of the Jew
not to emigrate personally to Jerusalem stems from the
passage in Jeremiah which says:

After seventy years are accomplished for
Babylon I will remember you and perform
any good work toward you in causing you to
return to this place; for I know the
thoughts that I think toward you, thoughts of
peace and not of evil to give you a future
and a hope...and I will turn your captivity
and gather you from all the nations and from
all the places whither I have driven you...³⁰

Chorin then asks the question:

Is this to be fulfilled indeed according
to the literal sense of the prophecy? A
small number of Israelites under Ezra
returned to Jerusalem, founded a small
state and also built the Temple; but didn't
the majority of people stay where they were?
Were there not among the many thousands
of Israelites who remained behind many who
loved God with all their heart? How could
they remain behind if the words of God's
promise to them were to be taken literally?³¹

It follows, says Chorin, that the promise in Jeru-
salem was not meant to be understood literally but
spiritually. That means that all the Israelites would

be united in the belief in the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob with respect to their liturgy and to their institutions with a universal Synod being in Jerusalem. From there all are to be subjected, in religious matters, to the Synod without its interfering with the political statutes of those states where the Jews are living. - "Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem" (Micah 4:2).

Chorin then considers the case of an individual or group of individuals who may want to return to Palestine or express the longing to return in his prayers. Even in the sections of the prayer book containing the general Redemption prayers, the expression of a personal return is included or taken into consideration. Chorin asks if his obligatory prayer is therefore not fulfilled.

Gutachten---Joseph Abraham Friedlander.

"Behold ~~the day will come~~ saith the Lord that I shall send forth a famine in the land, not a hunger for bread nor a thirst for water, but to hear the word of the Lord". 32

After this opening quotation from Scripture, Friedlander in formal manner declares himself to be in accord with the Hamburg Prayer Book of 1841 which is

in the service of religion and truth. He claims that the attack of Rabbi Bernays lacks justifiable grounds as well as liturgical and theological corroboration. He concludes that every adherent of the Mosaic religion who prays from this prayer book has fulfilled his obligation toward prayer.

Gutachten---M. Gutmann

This Gutachten begins with a reference to the Proclamation of Rabbi Bernays which stated that the Hamburg Prayer Book was guilty of frivolity in its handling of the major concepts of Resurrection, Redemption and the Messiah. Dr. Gutmann calls attention to the warning of the Prayer Book Redaction Committee found in the introduction to the Prayer Book, stating that this Prayer Book differs only in form from the traditional prayer books of other communities, but not in doctrine. He also makes reference to the "Yigdal" prayer in the Hamburg edition which contains the thirteen articles of faith in accordance with Jewish tradition. With reference to resurrection of the dead, many of the passages containing this notion are retained with minor exceptions such as in the preliminary prayers of the Sabbath and Festival morning service.

The main change in this Prayer Book, says Dr. Gutmann,

concerns those passages which expressed the idea of the restoration of the sacrificial cult and of the Israelite Kingdom as it existed in former times.

Dr. Gutmann admits however that in this case, there is a departure in the Hamburg Prayer Book not only in form but also in doctrine. The author of this Gutachten seems to be the first of the participants in this series of "Opinions" to have made the bold assertion that the Hamburg Prayer Book has indeed made a departure from a traditional Jewish doctrine. He claims that if Bernays had limited himself in his "Moda'ah" to this particular point of departure in the Hamburg Prayer Book and that one could not thereby fulfill one's obligation toward prayer by using such a prayer book, then he would have acted well in accordance with his convictions and he would not have overstepped his authority. However, since he did not limit his remarks to this one departure but rather issued an "Issur" (Prohibition) to other communities over which he has no authority, he has indeed gone beyond his authority.

Dr. Gutmann proceeds to justify this departure in doctrine from the point of view of reason as well as from Scripture itself. He is convinced that the notion of redemption must be interpreted and accepted in a more spiritual sense as the redactors of the prayer book had

done. The fact that we no longer pray for the restoration of bloody sacrifices to God is indicated not only by our reason which finds sacrifice compatible only with the lowest degree of religious development but Holy Scripture itself supports this verdict of human reason. Scripture, he declares, states in many places that it is opposed to sacrifice and has value at all only if bound together with a devotion to God through action and conviction. Scripture declares, however, that sacrifice even in this sense is only a means and never an end in itself. "But who would not deny that even as a means it has lost its significance today?" 33

A similar state of affairs exists with regard to the request stated in the liturgy for the return of all Israelites to Palestine. One must be very bold to claim, says Gutmann, that the many who repeat such requests in their prayers do so with seriousness.

The Jews are happy thanks to the progress of humanity in its legislation, and look forward with great anticipation to the time when they will be freed from the limitations which have been imposed upon them and will be able to take their place freely in society with full rights. Is it not, therefore, a gross contradiction on the one hand to pray daily to our Heavenly King to return us to a distant land in order to establish a unique kingdom and on the other hand to solicit from our earthly king the opportunity for full rights as citizens that we may value the land of our birth, the land upon which we depend and the land

which we love? If this doctrine were an incontestable teaching of our faith--that we should direct our hopes and aspirations toward Palestine--then we would have to renounce those other hopes of rights in a state in which we are merely temporary dwellers. But this certainly is not the case. At the very root of Judaism, hand in hand with the material view of the Messiah and of Redemption, there has always been a more spiritual view of these important dogma. These teachings have the support of the major prophets for whom Redemption, which will be foreshadowed by the coming of the Messiah is not associated with a particular land, and is not limited to members of the Jewish people but, on the contrary, the prophets await with the appearance of the promised Redeemer a re-awakening of all mankind from the circumstances of spiritual slavery and misery to the clear view and acknowledgment of the One Truth and to the realization of the great moral ideals upon which the fate of mankind here on earth so depends. Therefore, we should pray every day, morning and evening, prayers full of holy and inner devotion thus strengthening the feeling of brotherly love for all men who share this same inclination with us. We should utter those prayers which remember the former separation of Israel and which cause us to invite reproach upon ourselves through our aspirations to restore this separation from the peoples. 34

Dr. Gutmann concludes his Gutachten with the note that in 1836, six years before the publication of this Gutachten, his district Synod of rabbis discussed the question of Messianic doctrine and were in accord that this doctrine in no way implied a return to the designated land of our Fathers, a re-establishment of the Jewish state.

A proposal was also submitted stating that all passages in the prayer book dealing with the question of the Messiah or Redemption, which did not have the connotation of a spiritual Redemption, should be removed from the prayer book.

Dr. Abraham Kohn

Dr. Kohn, in the introduction to his Gutachten, states that there is no doubt that no change was undertaken by the redactors of the Hamburg Prayer Book without compelling reasons. The particular dogmas under attack by Rabbi Bernays--Redemption, Messiah and Resurrection--have never been restricted to any one formula. According to the Talmud, the dogmas have many different forms of expression. As long as the principal content is retained, the details are insignificant. Scripture says: "The Lord will not forsake His people and will not abandon His possessions" (Psalm 94:14).

In a note, Dr. Kohn indicates that the concepts "Olam Haba" and "Techiyath Hametim" were not sharply distinguished by the rabbis. The Mishnah to Sanhedrin 90:a states the following: "And these are they that have no share in the world to come: he that says that there is no resurrection of the dead prescribed in the law..." The Gemarah asks: "And why?" It teaches that

he who denies the resurrection of the dead therefore will have no portion in the resurrection of the dead". This passage thus indicates the lack of clarification as to the distinction, if any, between the two concepts. Furthermore, according to Sanhedrin 99a Hillel claims that Israel was not awaiting a personal Messiah, therefore, the prayer should not read, "Umebhi Goel" but rather, "G'ullah" which is also for other reasons to be preferred. Also, according to Abboth de Rabbi Nathan there is doubt whether or not the Abboth knew about the teaching of resurrection of the dead".

Antigonus had two students. They learned his words and taught others and their students taught others. They said, 'What did our fathers see? In saying it is possible that if a worker does his work all day that he does not receive his compensation in the evening? But rather if they knew that there is another world and that there is resurrection of the dead, they would not have said that'.³⁵

Dr. Kohn proceeds to point out that the Hamburg Edition in the "Abboth" and "Gethuroth" sections of the 'Amidah' remains unchanged and only what can no longer be believed by our brethern in Germany has been modified or changed.

Dr. Kohn points next to the most significant change which does appear in the Hamburg Prayer Book in his estimation. It is the omission of the bewailing over

the loss of the Holy Land, of the Temple in Jerusalem and of the sacrificial cult and the repeated petitions for the restoration of the same--repetitions which are overflowing in the Jewish service.

Since the goal of Judaism is the spreading of the knowledge of the One God over all the earth and the building of a kingdom of truth and love, whether the Restoration of Israel in the Holy Land is absolutely indispensable for such a hope is from a theological point of view not easy to stipulate.

When our fathers did not forget to implore the restoration of the Jewish Kingdom in their prayers, it could be understood that they had no way to better oppressed circumstances. Is this, however, the case with us? Isn't the well-being of the German Fatherland and the Betterment of Our brethren closer to us? And shouldn't this wish be expressed in our prayers as an expectation for whose fulfillment we look to God? It is a fact that our co-religionists do not believe at all in a political restoration of Israel and await the union of all men in the worship of the One God in truth and love as the fulfillment of the Messianic promise. Should they be obliged to pray for a return to that land? The question at stake is whether the worshipper must wish for or believe in what he is praying; a question that anyone who values truth and who believes in a God of truth can't doubt for one moment. 36

Dr. Kohn concludes his Gutachten with a quotation from Jeremiah 29:7 where the prophet addresses himself to the exiles in Babylonia telling them to pray for the welfare of the state where God has brought them, for

their welfare is connected with its welfare: " Seek the peace of the city whither I expelled you and pray for its welfare..."

Finally, he thanks the Tempelverein for having brought truth to our liturgy.

Dr. Joseph Maier.

Dr. Joseph Maier begins his Gutachten with a list of differences between the Hamburg Prayer Book and the traditional Sidurim, both in terms of content and form.

The differences in content are as follows:

1) Omission of many prayers in the Sabbath

Eve Service, such as:

"Adonai Mala'eh Geut"

"Le'kha Dodi"

"Le'khu Nerannena"

"Bameh Madlikin"

Omission of the following prayers in the Sabbath

Morning Service:

"Adon Olam"

"Perek Hatamid"

"Ezehu Mekoman"

"Shokhen Ad"

"Yekum Purkan"

"Ein Kelohenu"

Omission of "Uhha leTzion" and "Attah Echad" in

the Sabbath Vesper Service.

Omission of many Piyutim on Sabbath and Festivals and most of the Piyutim and Selichoth for New Year and Atonement.

2) Abbreviation of many prayers such as:

Blessings before "Barukh She'amar"; "Hakol Yodukha"; "Emeth Veyatziv"; "Emeth Ve'Emuna"; "Abinu Malkenu"; "Al Chet"; "Eighteen Benedictions", etc.

3) A change in the prayer, "Umipné Chataenu" in the Musaph Service for Sabbath and Festivals. The words, "Yehi Ratzon Milpanekha sheta'alenu besimcha leartzenu" changed to: - "Shetekabel berachamim ubratzon aresheth sephatenu binkom korbenoth chovotenu".

4) The introduction of new prayers, some Hebrew taken from the Spanish-Portugese Machzor, in particular the Piyutim contained in that prayer book for the New Year and the Day of Atonement; and some German prayers.

The differences between the Hamburg Prayer Book and the Sidurim with reference to form and structure are as follows:-

1) The order of prayer is much closer to the Sepharadi liturgy:

Introduction of the Sabbath and Festival Evening Service with "Mizmor shel Yom"; the evening service of Atonement with "Vehu Rachum"; the beginning of each "Tefillah" on the Day of Atonement with the prayer "Ochilah LeEl".

2) The language of the prayers is considerably different. Many prayers are in German: "Birkqth Shebha" on Sabbath and Festival eves; Benedictions before "Barukh Sheamar"; "Nishmath"; the intermediate benedictions of the "Shemone Esrai" are in German also.

A further difference between the Hamburg Prayer Book and the traditional Sidurim is partly in content and partly in form:

- a) No "Tefillah", on Sabbath and Festivals, and the Eighteen Benedictions on weekdays is not repeated;
- b) The Pentateuch is read not in one reading, but rather according to a three-year cycle;
- c) The reading of the Haphtarah has been omitted.

After giving this preliminary analysis of the differences between the Hamburg Prayer Book and the Siddur, Dr. Maier proceeds to state the principles which guided the Redactors of the Hamburg Prayer Book in making the changes and modifications as stated above.

- 1) The restoration of simplicity and dignity of the original prayers which are not essential to the liturgy and with which the liturgy has become overburdened in the course of time. A positive principle is

missing here and there is no reason to imagine why certain institutions already established in Talmudic time have become antiquated, while others which have later origins as for example the "Kiddush" and which, according to the Shulchan Aruch; Orach Chayim 269:4, could have better been omitted were retained. A supporter of a truly appealing and timely liturgy would have wished a further reduction and that one had gone even a step further in making further reductions which are justifiable even from the Talmudic point of view.

- 2) A revitalization of the liturgy which because of the long duration of the service and because of the incomprehensible nature of the prayers has lost all significance in the Synagogue. Therefore, the abbreviation of many prayers and of the Pentateuchal readings; the introduction of newer and more inspiring prayers and hymns in both Hebrew and German; the responsive readings with participation of the congregation and the accompanying German translation of the Hebrew text of the prayers.
- 3) Elimination of prayers containing thoughts alien to the spirit of Judaism: 'Abh Harachmim'; 'La'malshinim'; 'Alinu Malkenu' and others which express hostility. Many of these prayers gave opportunity for severe attacks upon Jews and Judaism.
- 4) Elimination of those prayers which expressed the aspiration to return to Palestine and the restoration of the Temple and of the sacrificial cult. Therefore, the modification in the Sabbath and Festival Musaph of "Yehi ratzon mil'hanekha shetaalenu besimcha leartzenu" and the "bene betekha kevatchila" in the Festival Musaph. 37

In this connection, Dr. Maier points to an apparent weakness of the prayer book in not modifying all passages

containing the above thoughts, for example; "Ya'aleh veyavo" and "Retzeh". He attributes this not to the Redactors of the prayer book but rather to the possible reaction that might result from such a total departure. The Dogma of the Messiah with which the Restoration of nationhood and the rebuilding of the Temple are connected does not only have deep roots in Jewish history, but is the ground upon which the whole liturgy was constituted: "Tephiloth keneged Temidin Tiknu". Yet, no decision has been made as to the practical implications of this Dogma. When it will be stated that our hope for Redemption neither implies a return to Palestine, nor the restoration of the Temple, but rather the redemption of all mankind and the brotherhood of all nations and that Judaism has no other mission than the unity of all men under the One God and everything else is only a form of this expectation, then will the omission of the national from the universal take place. Until now only partial attempts have been made and this prayer book is no more than this.

He then asks if a congregation has the right to make such changes in the liturgy without introducing schism into the Synagogue.

To simplify Dr. Maier's lengthy discussion on this question, it is sufficient to indicate the basic distinction which he feels must be made with reference to

the prayers contained in the liturgy. The distinction is between the fundamental (Typischen) and accrued (Accesorischen) prayers. To the first category belong the "Shema" and its blessings and the "Tefillah!" All the prayers before the "Barechu" and after the Eighteen Benedictions were really not intended for daily use but rather for certain occasions, according to Berakoth 60, and Maimonides Hilkoth Tefillah 7,9. Later on, however, this practice was misunderstood. In other liturgical matters there were differences not only between the different rituals such as the German and Polish, but also between the different communities where one differed from the other.

The one aspect of the liturgy known and practiced by all communities was the "Shema" and "Tefillah". Whenever or if ever a community would omit such prayers from their prayer book, they would introduce a schism and one could say that whoever wanted to fulfill the traditional obligatory prayers could not use such a prayer book. As long as this does not happen, the other changes come under the category of "Minhagim".

The men of the Great Assembly, he continues, in whose time the Eighteen Benedictions originated, held that only the last three of the Benedictions should not be modified according to individual needs, according

to Maimonides' Hilkoth Tefillah 1,4. In fact, it can be claimed with utmost certainty and truth that we no longer possess any prayer in the form in which it was originally fixed. These changes in form are due not only to the changes due to reproductions and copying, but to the fact that the communities gave themselves the right to modify them according to the needs of the time. Further elaboration on this practice can be found in Zunz:

Gottesdienstliche Vortrage p. 369.

Many of the modifications in the prayer book have moreover justification from the fact that they follow the Spanish-Portugese liturgy. "Ahabhah Rabah", "Al Chet"; and "Abhnu Malkenu".

5) The reading of the Torah following a three-year cycle instead of a one-year cycle is recognized even by the Talmud (Megillah 29) and is mentioned by Maimonides in Hilkoth Tefillah 13. This usage avoids the boredom and the disruption of the public worship which often is a consequence of the reading of long passages the majority of which are not understood by the congregation.

6) This same practical reason applies to the elimination of the Haphtarah. Not because the Haphtarah has any connection with the devotion but rather because it affords opportunity for further hypocrisy. "Who will

not admit", asks Dr. Maier, "that the beginning of the Haphtarah was a signal for many to leave the Synagogue until its completion?"³⁸ It can also be said that the prophetic readings were not introduced by Ezra like the Pentateuchal readings, but rather were introduced at a later time when it was forbidden to read from the Torah. Such a prohibition is no longer applicable today and its re-introduction is not at all commendable.

Dr. Maier points out further that the story of the Haphtarah is already found in the Talmud. Originally, the Haphtarah was read not only on Sabbath and Festival mornings but also on Sabbath and Festival evenings as well as on Mondays and Thursdays, as often as the Torah was read. It was too burdensome after a while to hear the Haphtarah both on weekdays and on Sabbath Eve. The continuation of the practice to read the Haphtarah on Sabbath mornings is in reality a further step in the elimination of the Haphtarah already begun in Talmudic times.

7) Likewise concerning the repetition of the 'Amidah there is the Talmudic principle, "Batel Ta'am Batel Dabbar" (If the reason is nullified so is the matter"). The repetition of the 'Amidah was originally introduced for those who could not pray by themselves and in order to have fulfilled their obligatory prayer

they recited "Amen" after the reader said the 'Amidah aloud. The repetition of this prayer appears today, says Dr. Maier, as a needless duplication of the prayer which is said three times daily. Its omission is in the best interests of the devotion and enhancement of the liturgy.

8) Dr. Maier's concluding point is with reference to the use of German in the service. He cites the various passages in the Talmud which recognize the fact that the vernacular may be used for certain prayers: (Berakoth 13; "Sotah 33; "Orach Chayim 62:2 and 101:4").

It is also a fact, he mentions, that even among the orthodox the use of German is legal and to reproduce their reasons in the course of this Gutachten would be superfluous.

Dr. Maier concludes that with this prayer book the Temple remains in the Synagogue if this term is used in the widest sense since many of the essential doctrines of Judaism are retained. Even where some doctrines, such as Redemption, Messiah and Resurrection, are omitted, in other places such as in the "Yigdal" they are retained. He points to the present crisis in which Judaism finds itself and is convinced that spiritually she must blossom forth again and that Judaism is destined to play an important role in world history.

It is up to the religious authorities of every age to suspend stipulations of Mosaic law when the preservation of the whole religion is at stake just as the doctor is compelled to take off a diseased limb in order to save the life of a man.³⁹

Dr. L. Philippson.

"The history of our liturgy demonstrates that our prayer book is a product of a later time and of a one-thousand-year period. Only through additions and insertions did it ever become a whole," said Philippson.⁴⁰

After this introductory note, Dr. Philippson enumerates the many statements in the Talmud which speak against "fixed prayer": "Do not make thy prayer fixed. "(Avoth) He whose prayer is fixed, his prayer is not supplication." (Berakoth 28b). The word "Keva" (fixed) in this sense is to be understood in connection with Berakoth 29b which states: "He who is unable to make changes." The tolerant spirit of the Talmud with regard to this point is seen in Sotah 32a, where it is stated: "The following can be recited in any language: Parashath Sotah, Viduyi, recitation of "Shema", "Tefillah" and "Birkath Hamazon".

There follows a brief outline of the basic framework of the liturgy during the time of the Second Temple:

"Shema"

"Ten Commandments"

"Emeth Vyatziv"

"Barekhu"

"Retzel"

"Modim"

"Ahabbat Olam"

"Sim Shalom"

With time, however, the liturgy underwent further change and development:

"Earekhu"

"Shema" with two blessings before and one after in the morning and two before and two after in the evening service.

"Shemone Esrai" with variations.

As the liturgies were augmented, different communities developed their own variations in the form of "Minhagin". In Maimonides' time, some communities, for example, said the "Shirah" in the morning service; others said "Ha'azinu", others used both. Generally, the Jewish liturgy always recognized a certain freedom of development.

Dr. Philippon alludes next to the three basic aspects of Jewish prayer which, in his estimation, have bearing upon the problem of change in the liturgy.

These basic aspects are:

- 1) Confession of religious truths.
- 2) Conscious feeling of "Kelal Yisrael"
- 3) Individual expression

The confession of religious truths and the concept of "Kelal Yisrael" are laid down in the basic prayers (Grundgebete). Such basic prayers which contain these two elements must be preserved in their basic form since they represent the positive Jewish confessions of faith and doctrine. On the contrary, the expression of individuality must be free to serve the needs of the time and personal truth.

The concluding section of the Gutachten deals specifically with the Hamburg Prayer Book. Dr. Philipppson analyzes the prayer book in light of the attack by Rabbi Bernays.

- a) The whole order or structure of the Jewish liturgy is preserved in this prayer book:
Daily, Sabbath and Festival prayers; the use of the Shofar; the Lulab; the prayers for Ten Days of Penitence; Reading of the Scroll of Esther at Purim; blessings at the circumcision, etc.
- b) The basic prayers (Grundgebete) of the Jewish liturgy are preserved. The translation of many sections into German is in accordance with the Mishnaic prescription. However, it is to be pointed out that three-quarters of the service

is still in Hebrew and the German translations do not imply a neglect of the holy tongue.

- c) The changes that have been introduced have neither violated the concept of "Confessions of truth" nor the concept of "Kelal Yisrael". The revelation of God to Israel through Moses and the prophets as well as the election of Israel and the role of the Exodus from Egypt are mentioned. In particular the teaching of "Resurrection" is preserved in an unabbreviated form and can be noticed in such prayers as "Attah Gibor"; the Kaddish, Uleachah meta... the teaching about Redemption and Messiah to the extent that they apply to all of Israel are preserved, as for example in the following prayers:

Umebhi Go'el

Vetechezena Enenu

Ya'aleh Viyavo

Abhinu Malkenu

The actual changes in the Hamburg Prayer Book, in addition to the introduction of certain prayers and hymns in German, and the translation of others into German are:

- 1) The omission of certain prayers such as the Piyutim;

- 2) The acceptance of forms from the Spanish-Portugese ritual; and
- 3) Word changes in places where the return to Jerusalem and the bringing of sacrifices are mentioned.

With reference to the last point, Dr. Philippon declares that the Synagogue teaches concerning this that in some future time there will be a restoration of all Israel and when this comes it will embrace and include all of Israel. However, in which way precisely this will come about it need not specify.

The Gutachten concludes with the statement that the Hamburg Prayer Book does not depart at all from the mainstream of Judaism and anyone who prays from this Book has indeed fulfilled his "Tefillah Chova".

Gutachten---Isaac Mannheimer.

- 1) The use of German as a language instead of Hebrew with the exception of a few texts like the Priestly Benediction, is valued according to original rabbinic point of view.
- 2) The omission of Piyutim and Selichot; the changing or transformation of the same is necessary for any reorganization of the liturgy. It is easy to prove that the introduction of these Piyutim was contested with more reasons than their omission today.

- 3) Many prayers in the ordinary Sidur according to the form in which they appear have neither binding authority nor value. "Hu Rachum"; Repentance Prayer for Mondays and Thursdays, "Yehe Ratzon"; "Al Chet" belong to this category and can be shortened or omitted completely.
- 4) The prayers which are considered integral to the liturgy for which the rabbis express binding authority are; "Shema" and the blessings before and after; and "Tefillah" "Shemone Esre", or "Birkath Sheba". The extent to which these prayers have been permitted to undergo change is not that clear or decisive since the prayers before and after the "Shema", as well as the "Tefillah" were enlarged in later times; there have been differences between the Sepharadi and German rituals and the difference in rituals in precisely the same places indicates that the Tradition was never alike and never binding and that the liturgy was permitted a certain freedom of movement in every age.

With reference to the principle: 'Where the Sages have a long prayer, we must not shorten...' this concerns only the beginning and concluding Benediction and only refers to the use of God's name and Kingship. In the concluding Benediction the Redactors of the prayer book (Hamburg) have only permitted one change according to my knowledge: instead of 'Hamachazir' they instituted 'She Otcha levadecha' which, according to the Talmud, is only an alternate form of the name.

- 5) The only deep-rooted change that the Redactors of the prayer book have permitted and which was carried over from the 1819 edition is in the Musaph "Tefillah" for Sabbaths and Festivals

where for the Restoration of the Sacrifices a prayer for the 'hearing' of our prayers was substituted.

These changes must appear resentful to the Jews of tradition and it would have been better in the interests of the total community to have one prayer book, one house of worship and one liturgy with more attention paid to the historic condition, situation and folkways of the people. The undersigned must also mention that the Redactors of the prayer book have used, as a guiding principle, what present-day theologians agree to in belief and traditional form. The undersigned belongs to those who with reference to Messianic teaching and Redemption do not recognize the rationalist position. He belongs to those who for whatever reason believe in the historic and national side of this Dogma and who hope for a Redemption of this kind. A restoration of the sacrificial cult is in no way part of this hope.

The prohibition of Bernays against this prayer book is unfounded in that he himself knows well that the worship of God--the obligatory worship of God by each Jew is not bound by the specific text of the prayer (Gebetsformeln) nor by the individual words and expressions of the prayer. Bernays recognizes himself that the ground is sinking underneath him since he casuistically modified the prohibition issued by the Hamburg Bet Din of 1818. There it said that no Jew could fulfill his "Chovath Tefillah" (obligation to pray) with this prayerbook and here Bernays declares that one cannot fulfill his obligatory prayers, "Tefillah Chova" leaving room, therefore, for the use of this prayerbook for voluntary devotion and upliftment.⁴¹

Gutachten---Leopold Stein.

Dr. Leopold Stein engaged in the controversy over the Hamburg Prayer Book and in the opening words of his

Gutachten he praises the achievements of the Hamburg Temple as well as the new prayer book which he feels has done much to bring life and spirit to an indifferent community. He personally spoke with people who had severed themselves from contact with Judaism but who now felt reborn spiritually, as a result of the efforts of the Hamburg Temple to beautify and clarify the liturgy.

His Gutachten begins with a bitter critique of the formal aspect of Bernays' proclamation against the prayer book. He quotes the Talmudic statement: "One should not punish but rather warn" and applies the statement to Bernays' action against the Hamburg community. It is Stein's opinion that Bernays had the obligation to state openly his discontent with the aims of the new Hamburg community as soon as they were formulated and made known. Furthermore, his discontent with the departure of the Hamburg ritual from the traditional liturgy should have been accompanied by proper grounds.

Secondly, it was Bernays' responsibility, according to Stein, to announce publicly his disapproval as soon as the prayer book appeared, again accompanied by his specific reasons and objections instead

of his cursory and damning proclamation.

Thirdly, the very form of the proclamation containing the words: "He is no Jew (who uses the prayer Book)" is indeed the form of an "Excommunication" which is full of indignation for the Tempelgemeinde.

With reference to the content of Bernays' proclamation, Stein points out the interesting fact that the "Moda'ah" of Bernays is not at all concerned with the changes in the prayer book such as the use of German prayers or the decorum and beauty of the service. Bernays does not seem to find any fault with these changes. Bernays' silence with regard to these points indicates that these changes are in no way to be condemned.

Stein asks, rather sarcastically, the question why Bernays does not try to transplant in his own synagogue some of these very changes. Bernays' service is chaotic with people talking to each other during the worship, especially in loud voices. Stein quotes Berakhot 24:6: "He who prays with a loud voice belongs to the small in faith".

Stein limits his critique to those points mentioned in Bernays' proclamation: "Redemption, the Messiah and Resurrection". With reference to Resurrection of the dead and immortality of the soul there is no

change whatsoever in the Hamburg Prayer Book. However, with reference to the other two points, Messiah and Redemption, the prayer book, says Stein, is protected against any heresy by the warning given by the Redaction Committee in the introduction to the prayer book. The introduction contains the following notice:

"The Tempelgemeinde differs from other Gemeinde only in form of cult but not in religious doctrine". 42

He cites the many examples to be found within the prayer book which indicate no departure on the part of the Hamburg Redaction Committee from the traditional versions of the above doctrines; "At the end of days may He send our Redeemer to redeem those who wait for his salvation". Also, "On that day the great shofar will be sounded and those lost in the land of Asshur and those dispersed in the land of Egypt will come and pray to God at the Holy mountain in Jerusalem".

"How could Herr Bernays ignore all of these passages and through his excommunication thus desire the exclusion of a part of his religious brethren who indeed aspire to be part of one Judaism?"⁴³

The Redactors of the prayer book, according to Stein, after pointing out their agreement with the basic principles of Judaism with reference to these

doctrines then proceeded to make changes in those sections of the liturgy which described the means of fulfilling Israel's hope for the future. The means, according to tradition, were the bringing of sacrifices. The Hamburg Prayer Book editors substituted for this the idea of the acceptance of our prayers in the place of sacrifice. The rationale behind such changes is the fact that Judaism is striving in the present moment to uphold its ancestral faith in the light of the new political circumstances. All desires, in this sense, issue from the heart. All expectations for a personal return to the Holy Land, however, issue for very few people from the heart. For many the expression to return to the Holy Land merely represents a habit of speech and the contradiction implied in such expressions is not apparent to them while they pray in a language which they do not understand.

Dr. Stein refers to an article written in the journal, "Allgemeine Zeitung N.1" by Oberrabbiner Ettlinger from Altona in which the latter spoke of the prayers of the liturgy which have existed now for so many hundreds of years and which should not be changed. Stein retorts that the Talmud itself was more tolerant in such matters than Herr Ettinger.

On every page of Tractate Berakhoth there is evidence of the flexibility of the liturgy in all times. He cites the dictum of the Talmud: "Whoever makes his prayer fixed, his prayer is not supplication".

Oberrabbiner Ettinger made the further point that Jews were not allowed to arrange prayers in any language other than in Hebrew. Stein retorts that the Talmud emphasizes that prayer in a language that is understood is not only allowed but is to be recommended.

According to Sotah VII, Mishnah I the following prayers may be recited in any language: 1) "Shema", 2) "Tefillah" and 3) Grace after meals. The Gemarah further maintains that the statement: "Hear O Israel" means that "Hearing" is the important element because this takes place in the soul and it must be understood and, therefore, only in a language that one understands. The "Tefillah" likewise is a matter of the heart. Rashi indicates that the "Tefillah" needs no justification to be recited in any language since it is a matter of the heart and needs to be said in a language which a man says from his heart. The Grace after meals can be said in any language because thankfulness is the important element in this prayer.

It is furthermore stated in Orach Chayyim 101:5 that "It is better for a man to pray in any language he understands if he does not understand Hebrew. There are passages or prayers in the vernacular since long ago, for example the "Yekum Purkan", the "Kaddish", etc.

Stein next raises the question of what will happen to the knowledge of the Hebrew language if more and more of the liturgy is translated into German. He answers:

The Hebrew tongue must always be heard in the halls of synagogues in order that the people in hearing it might preserve their many-thousand-year-old memories. But, alongside of Hebrew, the vernacular is to be permitted for the revival of the liturgy. In the interest of the synagogue this right must not be curtailed and we express our joy that Rabbi Bernays has silently permitted us this right and we regret that Herr Ettlinger did not wish to imitate the action of Bernays in this respect. We, therefore, declare that whoever prays from this prayer book has fulfilled his duty with regard to worship.⁴⁴

The second part of Dr. Stein's Gutachten concerns itself with a more objective critique of the prayer book itself in which he points out its faults as well as its strengths. In this respect, Dr. Stein differs from many of the other participants in the Gutachten. The majority of them limited themselves to a justification from the traditional point of view of the changes that had been made.

- A) The Evening Service for Sabbaths and Festivals is well arranged. One misses, however, an introductory hymn which addresses itself to the religious moment as does the 'Lekha Dodi'. The change in the prayer, "Emeth Ve'emunah" is suitable and fitting; the omission of "Ukeros Alenu sukath shelomekha" in the 'Hashkianu' is to be regretted. It was retained in the earlier edition.⁴⁵ Finally, for those well versed in Hebrew it is regrettable that the Birkath Shekha appears only in German. The German prayer is too long and tiresome.
- B) The Morning Service is well arranged. The Pesuke deZimrah are abbreviated. The 'El Nekamoth' is omitted, the translation of the 'Nishmath' is more beautiful; in the 'Hakol Yoducha' the phrase: "En kearkekha Adonai Eloheinu" is missed; the passage: 'LeEl Asher Shabath' has been abbreviated; 'Yismach Moshe' is changed in that the phrase "Velo netato" was omitted and it begins with 'Levisrael ametha natata', the excitement at the removal of the Torah from the Ark is sustained in the new ritual.⁴⁶

Dr. Stein notes, with some regret, the omission of the Prophetic Readings (Haphtarah). Also the new institution of reading the Torah in a three-year cycle would enable a larger number of prophetic readings to be included. The announcement of the New Moon in German is a beautiful innovation.

- c) Musaph Prayers. In the Musaph one had expectations of a much better handling of the prayers. Even those passages that were changed could have been improved upon stylistically. One would have hoped that the Scriptural references to the sacrifices would be treated in a manner similar to what

is found on page 175 of the prayer book with reference to the verse: 'And on the day of your rejoicing and your festivals'. However, the introduction of this verse introduces an inconsistency in that it remains unclear which promise is meant to be prayed by the words, 'Vekayem lanu'.

- D) Festival Prayers. The order of the reading of the Torah on Simchat Torah is beautiful. We do miss on this day the remembrance of Moses' work and death. Furthermore, we miss principally the German prayers in which the idea of the festival is expressed as in the prayers introduced for the Day of Atonement and the New Year.
- E) New Year Prayers. The Shofar Service is very appealing. On page 147 in the prayer 'Abinu Malkenu' the reference to the martyrs should not have been omitted. On page 167 the German words for 'Hayom Harath Olam' are beautiful; the ideas of 'Malkhuyoth', 'Zichronoth' and 'Shofaroth' are short, simple and well expressed.
- F) Atonement Prayers. On the Day of Atonement the combination of Hebrew and German is excellent. The prayer book has truly captured the mood and feeling of this holy day. The Memorial Service is well arranged. The Avodah rite in the Musaph service should not have been abbreviated to the extent that it was. Also, too little is mentioned or included about the theme of fasting with the exception of the prayer on page 252.
- G) The Eighteen Benedictions for Weekdays. It would have been worthwhile for many rabbis to have advocated the omission of the Blessing 'Lemalshinim' (slanderers). This blessing was originally introduced against sects which no longer exist. Its original name was the 'Birkath Tziddukim' (Berakoth 28:b). They were evil informers who oppressed their brethren. Being that this situation is no longer valid, it seems contradictory to implore God to rule over us in love and to

ask for the extermination of those slanderers.

It would, perhaps have been better and more fitting for this blessing to read: "Illumination of the erring..."

- H) Page 417, the short prayer following the reading of the Scroll of Esther, at Purim, is most timely. For the TishaB'ab observance more should have been undertaken for the stimulation of the emotions.
- I) Page 424, it is noteworthy that the 'Hare AT...' is given first in German and then in Hebrew. 47
- J) The Service for Circumcision is simple and beautiful.

Leopold Stein concludes his Gutachten with the plea that the battle in the sphere of religion be fought not for one's own honor, but for the honor of God. Then will there be results since, "All controversies for the sake of heaven are surely to be established".

Der Hamburger Tempelstreit---Abraham Geiger...

Dr. Abraham Geiger's masterful critique of the Hamburg Prayer Book is contained in Der Hamburger Tempelstreit--Eine Zeitfrage which was published in Breslau in 1842. His exposition is much more elaborate and detailed than his Gutachten published the same year and found in the collection of Theologische Gutachten uber das Gebetbuch nach dem Gebrauche des neuen Israelitischen Tempelvereins in Hamburg.

The latter document begins with the following statement from the author:

I can speak with full conviction that the ordering of the prayers is not in contradiction with the laws of the Talmud and the rabbis as long as the essential prayers, "Shema" and its blessings, expressing the acceptance of the yoke of the kingdom of heaven and the remembrance of the Exodus from Egypt, and the 'Amidah' are contained therein.⁴⁸

Geiger states that the commandment to fulfill the obligation of prayer according to the Talmud is fulfilled by the recitation of the "Haminenu" which contains in an abbreviated form the whole context of the Eighteen Benedictions. Many variations of this prayer likewise appear in the different rituals. According to the Talmud, the context of these prayers consists of the following elements:

- 1) Acceptance of the yoke of God's kingdom.
- 2) Remembrance of the Exodus from Egypt.
- 3) "Abkoth, Gekuroth, Kedushath Hashem".
- 4) Intermediate benedictions for weekdays or
the "Me'en Hayom" for Sabbaths and Festivals.

With specific reference to the intermediate benedictions according to the Talmud, a deviation in the form of expression from the traditional form is not only tolerated, but also suggested as long as it serves the needs of the worshipper.

Geiger concludes his very brief "Opinion" with the statement that the "Moda'a" of Herr Bernays claiming that the Hamburg Prayer Book is guilty of "frivolity" is completely unfounded and is in contradiction with the talmudic-rabbinic laws concerning the liturgy.

The critique of the Hamburg Prayer Book found in Der Hamburger Tempelstreit, is preceded by a rather lengthy exposition of the history of the development of the liturgy in Israel. It is characteristic of Geiger's approach to many problems like the liturgy to work within the context of historical development. By describing the various stages of development and by indicating the flexibility of the liturgy, he has ready justification for many of the reforms which he would like to have seen introduced

into the reform ritual. The first stage in the development of the liturgy, according to Geiger, was the biblical period. At that time in Israel's history, the sacrificial cult occupied a central place in worship. For the varied circumstances of life there were different sacrifices.

During the time of the Second Temple, a major development in the history of the liturgy took place. During this period a knowledge of the Pentateuch was brought closer to the people and the many public occasions for its reading were employed. At first, it was read on the Sabbath when people were free from work and later, also on Mondays and Thursdays, the market days when people from the smaller towns travelled to the cities. Such practice is recorded in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

The liturgy, during this period, took as its major themes the two basic ideas involved in the concept of Israel's peoplehood, for Israel at that time began to be constituted as a "people". The two ideas were the recognition of the Unity of God and the remembrance of the historical deeds such as the Exodus, which helped constitute the Jews into a people. The third idea embedded in the liturgy was the request on the part of the people for God's protection from danger.

For the first two ideas passages were found in Scripture. The "Shema" contained the thought of the acceptance of the yoke of heaven as well as the remembrance of the Exodus from Egypt in the passage beginning:

"Vayomer" (The third paragraph of the "Shema").

Next were added the blessings before and after the "Shema". In the morning, one recited the "Yotzer Or", "Ahabbah Rabah", and the "Ge'ullah". The first two preceded the "Shema", the third followed it. In the evening, there were two blessings before the "Shema" and two following it. Before the "Shema" one recited "Ma'aribh Arabbim"; "Ahabbath Olam", "Ge'ullah" and "Hashkibhenu" followed.

The next step in the development was the institution of the "Tefillah" as an integral part of the liturgy. The "Tefillah" consisted of three introductory and three concluding benedictions: "Abhoth", "Geburoth", "Kedushath Hayom" and "Abhodah", "Hoda'ah", "Birkath Kohanim". On weekdays, the individual would insert in the middle of these benedictions the requests of his own heart. On Sabbaths and Festivals, however, the intermediate benediction consisted of the "Me'en Hayom".

At this juncture in Israel's history as well as in the development of the liturgy, the prayers paralleled the sacrifices in the Temple. Corresponding to the

Tamid offering of the morning there was the Shacharit; parallel with the afternoon offering, there developed the Minchah service; corresponding to the additional offering on Sabbaths and Festivals, there developed a Musaph service; and later what was the voluntary sacrificial offering in the evening became the evening service known as Ma'aribh. Geiger makes the interesting point here that at that time the sacrificial service and the "newer" service were practised together without anyone ever questioning the right of this "innovation".

With the destruction of the Temple, the prayers were bound to take on a new significance above the sacrificial cult. Under Gamaliel II, the "Tefillah" had taken on a new form, that of "Eighteen Benedictions" for weekdays and Seven for Sabbaths and Festivals. In addition, to private prayer "Shema" said early in the morning and at the end of the day, there was a public service in the morning, in the afternoon, and a voluntary service in the evening, at which times these benedictions were recited.

Concerning the language of the prayers, Geiger mentions that it was not compulsory to use Hebrew for the later additions to the liturgy and even the essential prayers could be recited in any language (Bechol lashon she'attah shome'a).

A further step in the evolution of the liturgy is represented by the order of prayers: "Shema", "Ge'ullah", "Tefillah" for morning and evening arising out of the controversy recorded in Berakhoth 4b between Rabbi Yochanan and Rabbi Joshua. A special prayer was also suggested by Samuel as a substitute for the Eighteen Benedictions when one was prevented from saying the 'Amidah'. Special formulas were introduced for the benefit of late comers to the synagogue to enable them to catch up quickly with the service. These additions to the established liturgy include "Ubha le Tzion Goel" in the morning service, which contains the "Kedushah" as well as the Aramaic translation of the same; "Barukh Adonai Leolam" in the evening service describing the kingship of God and His unity; "Va'yechulu" and "Magen Abboth" in the Sabbath evening service, which repeats briefly the entire content of the evening "Tefillah".

Further additions included the "Kaddish" which originally was said after the completion of a religious discourse; the "Yekum Purkan", a prayer for the scholars and the rulers of Babylon, expressed in the first "Yekum Purkan" and a prayer for the communities expressed in the second "Yekum Purkan". Geiger states that the present day liturgy expresses most naively the request for the sustenance and long life of the "Resh Galutha",

the "Geonim" and heads of Babylonian communities while no such institutions exist any longer.^{48a}

The "Kol Nidre" prayer likewise, is a prayer that, according to the Talmud, was said during the New Year but later transferred to Yom Kippur. Likewise the meaning of the prayer was changed so that the sins that were being forgiven were those committed "from last Yom Kippur until this Yom Kippur" and not as had originally been stated: "from this Yom Kippur until next Yom Kippur". In the twelfth century, however, under the influence of Rabbi Jakob ben Meier (Tam) the meaning of the prayer was changed again this time in conformity with the original Talmudic formulation.

Geiger points out that this prayer has been the cause of much misunderstanding and the present formulation has no meaning and affords many further opportunities for misunderstanding.

Geiger concludes his discussion of the Piyutim, one of the last stages in the development of the liturgy, with an analysis of the importance of the Piyutim in the later liturgy. He sees the Piyutim as a protest against the fixed nature of the liturgy as well as a protest against the content of the liturgy which must always address itself to the contemporary religious spirit. The Piyut, for Geiger, is the medium whereby the liturgy is

kept up to date with the growing religious spirit. The Piyut provides for the right of the liturgy to undergo timely development.

Following this preliminary historical survey of the development of the liturgy, Geiger proceeds to deal directly with the Hamburg Prayer Book which is the main concern of his study.

According to Geiger, the main concerns of those responsible for the first edition of the prayer book were to beautify the service by restoring order and decorum to the service; to eliminate those aspects of the liturgy which brought the Jews into conflict with their present political status; the elimination of all the abuses in the Synagogue service, such as the selling of the "Mitzvoth", the calling up to the Torah by name, the unseemly melody with which the Torah was read. In the place of the chant which accompanied the recitation of the prayers, there was introduced simple musical recitations as well as choral singing accompanied by the organ.

Further innovations included the elimination of the repetition of the "Tefillah". Instead of repeating it aloud after being recited silently by the congregation, it was recited once only and aloud by the reader. The changes in the Torah service were limited to the three-year cycle instead of the one-year cycle and the

omission of the Haphtarah selections. The 1819 edition of the prayer book omitted many of the introductory prayers before the "Earekhu".

Dr. Geiger takes notice of the fact that the Hamburg Prayer Book preserves the repetition of the words, "Ani Elohekhem Emeth" after the "Shema" calling attention to the fact that it should read, "Adonai Eloheinu Emeth" (The Lord our God is Truth).

Passages, such as the "Vaykulu" and "Magen Aboth" are repeated superfluously and appear in Hebrew while the "Amidah" itself is in German. The repetition of such prayers gives the false impression that they are obligatory prayers but in fact they were introduced only for stragglers to the Synagogue.

Geiger objects to the fact that the "Kiddush" is said to initiate the Sabbath and Festival services in the Synagogue while this ceremony has meaning only in the home, at the meal (Ein Kiddush Ela bimkom Se'udah). The inclusion of this ceremony in the Synagogue service was intended only for strangers who happen to have their meal in the Synagogue--"something that certainly does not occur in Hamburg".^{48b} Geiger objects to the "Birkath Kohanim" in light of the fact that it is no longer delivered by the priests and the recitation of the blessings by the leader of prayer no longer has any justification

especially in consideration of the fact that in the course of time its usage became limited to the festivals and in many communities only to the Musaph service.

Geiger proceeds to discuss the criterion in the prayer book for the prayers being in either German or Hebrew. Here again he notices the use of an inconsistent principle, if any principle at all guided the Redactors of the prayer book in their decision as to the choice of Hebrew or German. The evening service for Sabbath and Festivals has the following characteristics with regard to the language of the prayers: The introductory and concluding blessings to the "Shema" itself as well as the "Tobh Le'hodoth", "Kaddish", "Magen Avroth" and "Vayikhulu" are in Hebrew.

The evening service for the Day of Atonement has the "Birkath Shema" recited aloud by the leader of prayer in Hebrew. The "Al Chet" passage is in German but later abbreviated and repeated in Hebrew. With reference to the question why the fundamental prayers in the evening service are recited in German, Geiger refers to the suggestion of Holdheim that according to the standpoint of the Talmud, the evening "Tefillah" does not belong to the obligatory prayers but rather is voluntary being that it does not correspond to any

sacrificial service in the Temple. Therefore, the "Tefillah" is recited silently by the congregation and aloud by the reader.

It is necessary, however, states Geiger, to distinguish further between the "Birkath Sheba" and the "Shema"-Ve Haya Im Shamo'a" and "Parashath Tzitzith". The latter two groups belong, according to the Talmud, to the obligatory prayers even in the evening. This refers likewise to their introductory and concluding blessings. Therefore, the accompanying blessings as well as the Biblical references should be in Hebrew, if the suggestion of Holdheim is correct that the criterion for the use of Hebrew and German rests in the distinction between "Basic" and "accessory" prayers. The "Shema" and its blessings in this case would be considered basic prayers. Furthermore, the passage known as "Parashath Tzitzith" could be recited in German since it wasn't recognized until later by the Talmud as part of the obligatory prayers.

Geiger then wonders why the Hamburg Prayer Book has given the "Birkath Sheba" on the eve of the Day of Atonement an "obligatory" character by having it recited aloud by the reader in Hebrew. Likewise, the recitation of the "Shema" and its blessings on Sabbath and Festival evenings in German would not be justified

according to this principle. Geiger concludes this section of his critique with a word about the Torah service at the Hamburg Temple. The fact that they still read the Torah in the original is again a "caput mortuum" from the past.

The second basic change in the Hamburg Prayer Book is in connection with those prayers denigrating peoples of other religious confessions and secondly with references to the coming of the Messiah. The following prayers were either entirely or in part omitted from the Hamburg edition:

- 1) The "Alenu" lacks the verse;
"Shehem mitpallelim lehevel
varek umitpallilim el El lo
yoshia ";
- 2) The morning service of the Day
of Atonement lacks the two
Piyutim; "Hagoyim" and "Melekh
Evyon".
- 3) The "Aminu Malkenu" lacks the
verse:
"Nekom leenenu nikmat dam avadekha";
- 4) The verse: "Setom Piyut mastinenu
umikatrigenu" in the prayer for the
martyrs;

5) In the Sabbath morning service the section from "Velo nitato... Arelim..." is omitted. The omitted section here expresses the thought that God did not bless the non-Jews with the Sabbath. This gift He reserved for the Jews.

Likewise does the prayer book omit many of the Piyutim in which the mood of the middle ages is dominant in accordance with their intention of removing the separatistic characters of the prayers and to replace it by a more universalistic character. Geiger criticizes the redactors of the prayer book, however, for lagging behind in their application of the guiding principle. The changes made were merely external and minor.

The doctrine of the election of Israel echoed in the prayer book liturgy should have made room for the idea of Israel's mission, her acceptance of the belief in the One God and her task to preserve this belief and to bear this mission throughout history until that time when all mankind will be united in the acceptance of this belief.⁴⁹

The second point of deviation from the traditional liturgy concerns those passages mentioning the return of all Jews to Palestine with the coming of the Messiah.

The older view of the Messianic concept conceived of Israel's salvation in their possession of the Holy Land and in the restoration of the sacrificial system. The role of the other nations, however, was vague, that is, whether by their acceptance of Judaism or by their allegiance to its fundamental principles. Yet, many passages in the prophetic writings picture the messianic age in a more spiritual manner. It will be a time when truth and love will reign among the peoples. The Messiah becomes a personification of the divine direction of the world and the value of Palestine is relinquished. The Jews as bearers of the pure God idea can realize the fulfillment of this idea in the different states in which they happen to live.

In this connection, many passages from the prayer book had been omitted:

- 1) In the morning prayers the section from "~~Vekayam lanu....Vekayam Amar Adonai~~"
- 2) The phrase: "Efes bilte^kha goal^uenu limoth hamashiach."
- 3) The sentence beginning, "Or Chadash Al Tzion Tair" which is also lacking in the Spanish-Portuguese rite;
- 4) the verse, "Vehavienu leshalom... vetolikhenu kom^miyoth leartzenu".

5) In the Musaph service for Festivals, the passage: "Vekareb pizurenu" and "Bene Betikha".

On the other hand, Geiger points to those several passages which have been retained in the Hamburg edition. These passages likewise speak of the founding of the Temple in Palestine. Dr. Gotthold Salomon, in his; Das Neue Gebetbuch und seine Verketterung, makes the following distinction between the passages omitted and those retained:

In the ordinary prayers the dominant thought is that the promise of Zion and Jerusalem's restoration can only take place or be fulfilled when Israel physically and personally gathers together in the Fatherland...The Temple-gemeinde believed most certainly in such a restoration. If not why would the prayer: 'Let our eyes behold Thy return to Zion' be so often repeated? How could she pray to God on every Festival: 'that He should have pity upon His Holy sanctuary, through His great love should rebuild it...'? The Temple Gemeinde does not believe, however, that the restoration postulates the physical and personal return of every Israelite to the land of Judah. We can hope for the restoration of the Fatherland with all our hearts, we can request the same from God, but in the land whither God had sent us, that land in which we live and work, the land to whose government we are obedient, the land which we serve...50

Salomon makes reference to those Jews who did not return at the time of Ezra to Palestine but who remained

in Babylon. Dr. Geiger questions whether the Templegemeinde really believes in the restoration as Dr. Salomon had explained it. Geiger calls attention, however, to two passages of Messianic import which are retained in the Hamburg edition:

1) Hamburg Prayer Book 1819, p. 28. In the section beginning: "Attah Hu Adonai Elohenu Bashamayim..." the verse: "Gather those who hope for Thee from the four corners of the earth...".

2) In the Musaph service of the New Year, the section: "Lift up a banner to gather our exiled". The justification for the retention of the above is that they leave open possibilities of interpretation other than in the literal sense.

Geiger looks upon the view of Salomon reflected in the prayer book as a compromise due to their reluctance to abandon much of the past tradition. A similar explanation to that of Dr. Salomon's is given by Bernfeld in his Toledoth Hareformatzion Hadatith in which he explains the distinction made by the redactors of the Hamburg Prayer Book between those passages to be omitted and those to be retained. He felt that those passages in which Zion and Jerusalem were used symbolically could be retained. The passages clearly indicating a physical return to Zion were to be omitted.

Geiger feels that the belief in the ingathering of all Israelites is an essential consequence of the belief in the existence of an independent Jewish state and if this link is broken from the entire chain, the whole chain itself falls apart.

With reference to the sacrificial passages, Geiger makes mention next of those passages omitted or changed in the Musaph service. In particular he points to the "LeMoshe Tzivita" of the Sabbath Musaph service where the text in the Hamburg edition is emended to read: "Shetikabel aresheth sifathenu bimkom korbonoth...". Geiger questions the meaning of the word, "Musaph" in this passage according to its usage in the Hamburg edition. The traditional version has the words, "Na'aseh venakribh" indicating the sacrifices. In the Hamburg edition, (page 62 of 1819 edition) these words are omitted. Therefore, the word, "Musaph" can either refer to the Musaph sacrifice or to the Musaph prayer. Yet, in the language of the Siddur, the word "Musaph", according to Geiger, always refers to the sacrifice. There is an inconsistency here, however, in that the same edition of the prayer book (1819) in the Day of Atonement service (p. 239) has the expression: "Uhmikom" indicating that sacrifice is not meant but rather the Musaph prayer. This is found

in the 1841 edition for Sabbath and Festival services as well. Geiger feels that the emendation in the 1819 edition is a "Halftruth" and not much different from the older traditional version. The redactors should have been more straightforward in their dealing with the concept of sacrifice by truly acknowledging that prayer occupies a much higher place than sacrifice.

There are some Piyutim, however, dealing with the sacrifices which are retained in the Musaph service. Geiger mentions the Piyut; "Attah Konnanta" and the various sections comprising the Akudah service on the Day of Atonement. (Hamburg Prayer Book pp.249-62).

Though Geiger criticized most severely the Redactors of the Hamburg Prayer Book for their failure to carry out their progressive principles, he confessed that the prayer book in spite of its "half truths" represented a first major attempt in reviving the Jewish liturgy. He ascribed this failure on the part of the Hamburg leaders to their lack of proper historical and theological perspective in light of developing "Science of Judaism". By focusing their attention upon the details of the liturgy, they failed to consider the ultimate importance of truly forward-looking principles.

In comparing the Hamburg Prayer Book edition of 1841 with its earlier edition, Geiger sees evidence once

again of the conservative thinking of the Temple leaders. The service, instead of becoming shorter, became more lengthy through the addition of the introductory morning prayers (Pesuke dezimra) and many prayers formerly in German translation now appear in the original Hebrew.

The idea of Israel's estrangement from the nations again was not completely removed but only a few passages were omitted. The phrase: "Kol Bekhorehem Horagta Ubekhorekha ga'alta" in the "Ezrath Avothenu" prayer was omitted. (Compare 1841 edition, p.64 with 1819 edition, p.42) The new edition lacks in the "Avinu Malkenu" the phrase: "Asehle 'ma'an harugim al shem kodshekha" (p. 148 to be compared with p.89 of earlier edition).

With regard to the hope of Israel for the future, the new edition, according to Geiger, leaves this concept in the same state of suspension as in the earlier edition. The passage beginning: "Vetechezena enenu beshuvekha le Tzion" ends with the words: "She'otkheca levadekha beyirah na'ehod". The section beginning, "Or Chadash" which was omitted in the first edition following the Spanish-Portuguese practice is taken up in the new edition but in smaller print and surrounded by parentheses. The insert does not appear in the German translation. Geiger questions the purpose behind this emendation.

The new edition does the same with the section beginning: "Vehashesh Et Ha'ahodah ledivir Betekha..."

It is inserted in parentheses and not translated.

The Ahodah service on the Day of Atonement omits the detailed explanation of the manner in which the priests of old performed the sacrificial cult.

The most noteworthy changes in the new edition of the prayer book, according to Geiger, is the addition of a Vesper Service for Sabbaths and Festivals. Yet, this must be recognized as a backwards step being that the addition of such a service is superfluous.

Furthermore, with reference to the minor festivals like Chanukah and Purim, the new edition furnishes the Hallel for four occasions: Chanukah, Purim, Festivals, and New Moon. The 1819 edition of the prayer book reserved the Hallel for festivals only. Yet, the blessing over the Hallel in the new edition is inserted in parentheses and appears in smaller print. Geiger suspects that because the blessing is for a non-biblical commandment, its suitability was held in question and, therefore, inserted in parentheses. Further evidence for this suggestion issues from the fact that the same blessing is used for the circumcision, lulab, and shofar without any distinction.⁵¹

S. Holdheim--Über das gebetbuch nach dem Gebrauche
des neuen Israelitischen Tempelvereins
zu Hamburg.

Dr. Holdheim's "Opinion" on the prayer book controversy is explained in detail in his major critique of the Hamburg Prayer Book in the form of a "First Vote". The collection of Theologische Gutachten includes some of the main points made by Holdheim in his major critique. I propose to summarize first some of Holdheim's views as they are found in the Theologische Gutachten and then I shall discuss in more detail a few of the points elaborated upon in the larger work.

- A) The liturgical content of the prayer book with reference to the fundamental and accessory passages and their historical and dogmatic meaning is not to be differentiated from any other prayer book in terms of its destroying the spirit of prayer. Therefore, it is fitting that this prayer book be known according to the general title of 'Prayerbook of Israelites...'
- B) The departures in content do not affect any essential points that would cause one to act with caution. The Jewish spirit of prayer as it developed from purely national motivations to pure religious motivations is generally preserved and is the very basis of the prayer book.
- C) The belief in Redemption and in the Messiah as well as the doctrine of the Resurrection of the dead have suffered no essential change in the prayer book and the main passages reflecting such beliefs have been preserved. The fact that the belief in the Messiah is more

spiritual than personal as the belief in Redemption is more universal in applying to all mankind, rather than to Israel alone, should not find disfavor from any Israelite in light of the fact that these beliefs, as they appear in prophetic thought, are now in harmonious agreement with their expression in the prayer book.⁵²

Holdheim mentions at this point that he cannot understand the statements of his colleagues who, when speaking about "Israel's religious future" seem to have in mind something other than the hope that Israel's future is to be associated with that of all mankind and not to be limited to Israel alone. Holdheim feels that one of the major contributions of the new prayer book is that it has brought the developing religious consciousness into full agreement with its expression in the prayers.

D) The additions to this book are all new prayers in German and should, along with the hymnal, replace many of the Piyutim. The content of such prayers addresses itself to the meaning of the day and is in harmony with the inner character of Jewish ritual and needs no further justification.

E) For those of the Hamburg community who pray from this book and for those not of the community who may come to pray from this book, we hope, as did Solomon in I Kings, 8, that the spirit of God may fill them with enlightenment, with piety, joy, and love.⁵³

One of the major points elaborated upon by Dr. Holdheim in his "First Vote" is the question of the repetition

of the "Tefillah". It is the practice of the Hamburg Temple to recite the Eighteen Benedictions or the "Birkath Shema", as the case may be, aloud. The congregation prays together silently. In the evening service, the entire "Birkath Shema" is recited silently in German and is not repeated aloud. The Hamburg Temple practice differs from the practice of traditional congregations where the Benedictions are first said silently by the congregation and then are repeated aloud by the leader of prayer.

Holdheim cites the discussion on this issue in the Talmud based upon the opinion of Rabbi Gamaliel, as stated in Mishnah Rosh Hashanah IV:9. It is Rabbi Gamaliel's opinion that the leader of prayer fulfills the obligation of prayer for the entire congregation. The opposing opinion to that of Gamaliel's claims that each congregant must pray himself and thereby must fulfill his own obligation. The Gemarah seemingly opposes Gamaliel in mentioning that the leader of prayer only fulfills the obligation of prayer for those in the congregation who are not versed. Those that are so versed must fulfill their own obligations. From this follows the custom of the synagogue that the congregation recites the Eighteen Benedictions silently and the leader of prayer repeats the same aloud for those unversed. (Maimonides, Prayer VIII:9,10, IX:2,3,4. Shulchan Arukh Orach Ghayim 124). Holdheim

indicates, however, that according to the Mishnah and Gemarah, those who are versed should pray silently with the leader of prayer since each must fulfill his own obligation. The practice of the entire congregation praying silently at first followed by the repetition of the leader of prayer is a much later institution and appears to have no foundation in the Mishnah and Gemarah. It follows, says Holdheim, that the order of service adopted by the Hamburg Temple, namely, that the congregation recites the Eighteen Benedictions along with the reader, though it comes into conflict with the later rabbinical authorities, does not at all violate the Talmudic ordinance.

Holdheim discusses next particular points in the content of the liturgy which the prayer book omitted or changed.

A) The omission of the "Alenu" appears strange to Holdheim. The reason for such an omission is not at all clear to him. The fact that at one time something unworthy was found to be implied in the prayer is no ground for its elimination today. The fact that the prayer does appear in the Musaph service of the New Year indicates that there is no motive at all for its elimination as a final prayer.

B) The second "Yekum Purkan" and the "Misheberakh" are replaced by German prayers at the end of the sermon.

C) Omission of those ideas which appear intolerant to our convictions, that is, those ideas which give opportunity for much misunderstanding concerning our religious principles and the beliefs of other religious confessions. In this connection the following prayers are to be mentioned:

- 1) "Abh Harachamim"
- 2) "Abinu Malkenu"⁵⁴
- 3) "Birkath Haminim"

"The expression of God's name associated with such a meaningless idea can only lead to the vanishing of God's name".

D) The omission of the "Kol Nidre" has its authority in Nedarim 23a which states: "It is not right that one should say it, because people would thereby act thoughtlessly with regard to vows...". Landrabbiner Hirsch in Oldenburg had already removed it in contemporary times.

E) All changes with regard to sacrifices are in accordance with the Talmudic principle that prayer is to be substituted for sacrifice. "The prayer book in question has included unchanged the principle of the Talmud as it refers to these passages!"^{54a} Holdheim admits, however, that in one point the Redactors of the prayer book have given themselves liberty over and

beyond what the rabbis of the Talmud would permit. They changed those passages which speak about the remembrance of the bringing of sacrifices to the Temple. The modified version speaks about the acceptance of prayer in the place of such sacrifices which formerly were brought to the Temple. "One may ask, has one the right to oppose a view such as that of the rabbis with regard to the restoration of the Temple and the sacrifices? If the community for whom this book is intended lives according to such a conviction, it has the right to omit from their prayers those passages concerning such conviction".⁵⁵ Holdheim states furthermore that he can only doubt the "obligatory" nature of such prayers since these passages do not belong to the main Benedictions. They were later accretions and have more the character of later Piyutim than of original prayers. Secondly, the restoration of the sacrificial cult ideologically was never accepted as Dogma in Judaism.

Maimonides expressed the view that sacrifices represented originally only an accomodation or reconciliation of God's wisdom during the time of Israel's lower cultural development and as a commandment it was originally only of temporary importance. Its importance in the future Messianic age will not at all be manifest in light of the fact that the pagan worship of God will be completely overcome all over the world and thus all forms of sacrifice will come to an end.

F) With reference to the concepts of Redemption, Messiah and Resurrection of the dead, this prayer book has permitted no essential change and all the passages reflecting such beliefs are included.

Reference is made to the intermediate benedictions of the "Tefillah"; the prayer for the New Moon and the "Yigdal", which contain references to the above-mentioned concepts.

G) Finally, with reference to the Prophetic Readings, (Haphtarah), Holdheim regrets that such an old and well-established practice should have been discontinued since it represents an important means of keeping alive the prophetic message in our time.

Gotthold Salomon--Das Neue Gebetbuch und Seine
Verketzerung.

Dr. Gotthold Salomon, one of the most important participants in the Hamburg Temple controversy, begins his "Opinion" by recounting the events which led to Rabbi Bernays' "Mo'da'ah" and to the need for justification of the reforms instituted by the Temple.

The new edition of the prayer book is significant, he feels, because it took into consideration not only the Sabbath and Festival liturgy, but the daily home liturgy as well. Equally significant is the addition

of the "Pesuke de Zimrah" which comprise pages 22-51 of the new edition.

Isaac Bernays, Chaham of the community, openly opposed the new prayer book and declared it illegal. The following proclamation was publicized in the three principal synagogues of the Gemeinde:

When in the year 1819 the so-called "Gebetbuch fur Sabbath and Festage" appeared and the then Beth-Din took notice with deep distress of the intellectual mutilation of our main prayers, of the intentional deviation from the Jewish form of prayer and of the ruin of the liturgical spirit through the omission of passages dealing with our religious future--Redemption, Messiah, and Resurrection--they laid down the following prohibition: 'The Beth-Din warns and informs every Israelite that he should not pray from this book and whoever prays from it has not fulfilled his obligation with regard to prayer. Meanwhile a new edition of the same book has appeared: 'Gebete der Israeliten' and is guilty of the same omissions, deviations and frivolous handling of our religious future. The 'Issur' of 1819 applies to this book as well.⁵⁶

Dr. Salomon proceeds to demonstrate that the claim of Rabbi Bernays was unfounded. He analyzes the Hamburg Prayer Book in light of the three basic concepts under attack by Bernays: Redemption, Messiah and Resurrection.

A - REDEMPTION

Rabbi Bernays claims that in the prayer book there is no mention of the redemption of Israel. Salomon retorts:

"The Tempelgemeinde prays along with all Jewish congregations on earth and indeed with the same words and expressions": 'Who bringest a redeemer to their children's children'".

However, the word; "Goel" is translated as "redemption" in accordance with the German word, "Erlösung". Dr. Salomon makes mention of this fact and cites the prayers in the prayer book where this usage may be found but feels no need to justify the change in translation.

According to rabbinic ordinance, the "Tefillah" must follow immediately upon the "Ge'ullah". Dr. Salomon asks whether this prayer book is opposed to this order as contained in the rabbinic ordinance and answers in the negative. He cites the Hamburg Prayer Book, 1841 edition, p. 8, where the order is maintained.

Two other examples of instances indicating the prayer book has not deviated in its teaching of the idea of Redemption are to be found in the New Year Service and in the Day of Atonement Vesper Service. In the first case we find the phrase, "Sound the great shofar for our freedom and lift up the banner to gather in our exiled". In the latter case, there is the section beginning: "Ubha leTzion Goel" describing the coming of a Redeemer to Zion.

B - MESSIAH

Dr. Salomon furnishes three examples from the new

edition of the prayer book which make reference to the coming of the Messiah: 1) "Ya'aleh Veyavo", "May the remembrance of us and of the anointed one, the son of David, Thy servant...".

2) On the New Year and on the Day of Atonement one prays: "Let the light of Thy son David shine forth...".

3) The "Yigdal" prayer contains the verse: "God will at the end of days send His anointed that He may redeem those who wait for His salvation...".

C) RESURRECTION.

The Tempelgemeinde prays along with all other congregations in the "Birkath Shema" as well as in the "Eighteen Benedictions" as follows: "Thou bringest the dead unto life...Praised be Thou O God who bringest life to the dead". Dr. Salomon asks if the belief in Resurrection of the dead could be more clearly expressed than in the above instance.

The "Kaddish" likewise includes the thought of Resurrection in the phrase: "Dehu Atid lechadata alma".

Dr. Salomon claims that the Tempelgemeinde has neither intentionally nor unconsciously deviated from the Jewish form of prayer. "We have not destroyed those passages describing Israel's future hope through deviation from the Jewish spirit of prayer." 57

The author concludes this first section of his critique with the following statement about the Hamburg Prayer Book:

The prayer book in its older and newer form is rooted in Jewish soil, it satisfies all requirements of mosaic-rabbinic Judaism and is neither in contradiction with the teaching of the Mishna and Talmud, nor with any one of the traditional prayer books.⁵⁰

The next point to be taken up is a further statement made by Rabbi Bernays in his "Moda'ah" concerning any Jew who prays from this prayer book. The statement reads: "He who prays his obligatory prayers from such a book is not a Jew...". Salomon challenges this statement of Bernays on several grounds. First, he finds it difficult to believe that the many Jews assembled in Hamburg and Leipzig who pray from such a prayer book are not to be considered "Jews" even though the prayer book does not lack one essential teaching of Judaism. Secondly, we know from the many rabbis, such as; Maimonides, Nachmanides, Albo, etc., that a Jew is one who recites the words: "Hear O Israel, the Lord Our God, the Lord is One". We are referred also to the statement in Megillah 13 that one who denies idolatry is to be called a Jew. "We cannot believe that such a claim has come from the lips of a rabbi and we should expect an apology for this unbelievable

remark contained in the interdict..."⁵⁹

Dr. Salomon states further that the liturgy as such consists principally in the recitation of the "Shema" and "Tefillah" according to Baba Kamma 92:2; Ta'anith 1:1, etc.

There is justification, says Salomon, for the fact that the new edition of the prayer book begins with the prayer: "Elohai Neshama" (p. 20) and not with the prayers with which other prayer books begin. With this new order, the Tempelgemeinde, in its prayer book has followed the Maimonidean principle that it would be a great error to read every benediction in the Synagogue. "The people were accustomed in many of our cities to recite these blessings one after the other and it is an error and not fitting to do this"

It is even less damaging to the prayer book that only a small number of Piyutim had been selected for the High Holy Days. In this respect, the Tempelgemeinde was guided by Scripture and by the rabbis: "Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter a word before God; for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few".⁶⁰ The rabbis have likewise said: "It is better to do a little with intention than much without intention. Prayer without pure intention is like a body without a soul".

In his next section, Dr. Salomon discusses that aspect of the Hamburg Prayer Book which differs from the traditional prayer book.

The Musaph prayer represents one instance in which the Temple prayer book deviates from the ordinary prayer books. The traditional reading is as follows: 'May it be Thy will, Lord our God, to bring us to our promised land with joy and to settle us within its borders and there will we bring the sacrifices enjoined upon us, the daily offerings according to their order, and the additional sacrifices according to their regulation; the additional sacrifice of this Sabbath...'.⁶¹

In the place of the above, the Tempelgemeinde prays as follows: 'May it be Thy will, Lord our God, to accept the words of our mouths in place of the sacrificial offerings, the daily, festival as well as today's prayer in the place of the additional Sabbath sacrifice as is the commandment of Thy will as ordained in Thy Holy Torah...'.⁶¹

Salomon explains that the deviation in this case from the traditional version is based upon a firm principle.

In this ordinary text, the restoration of Zion and Jerusalem can take place only when Israel is gathered to the Fatherland without implying a spiritual ingathering. The Tempelgemeinde believes in a restoration otherwise why would the prayer: "Vetechezenah Einene Beshuvekha leTzion..." be so often repeated and if the Tempelgemeinde did not believe in a restoration why would the following prayer be included in the service:

"She Tashub Uterachem Alenu Veal Mikdashekha..."?⁶²

The difference between the two views is that the Tempelgemeinde believes that the restoration has a spiritual connotation and does not postulate the physical and personal return of every Israelite to Judah. "We can wish with all our hearts for the restoration of the Fatherland, we can even request it from God, in spite of the fact that we live in a land which we serve and for which we work and this is in accordance with the teaching of Judaism".

Didn't the Jews exiled to Babylonia receive the promise from God: 'I will gather you from all the peoples and lands whither I have exiled you' (Jeremiah 29:14). Didn't Ezra himself stay seven years in Babylon? How many Levites remained there? The physical and personal presence in Palestine is no condition of the belief in Israel's religious future in which we do not in the least doubt.⁶³

The second point of departure in the Hamburg Prayer book from the traditional text is in connection with those passages in the Musaph Service mentioning the sacrifices. Salomon claims that in this case also there is a principle which guided the redactors of the prayer book in their decision to omit such passages. This principle is in accordance with Mosaic-Talmudic tradition. The bringing of sacrifices, according to Leviticus 1:2 is a voluntary act for each Israelite and

only the place where sacrifices are to be offered and the manner in which they are to be brought are stipulated in detail. Salomon mentions the many prophetic and rabbinic references which place the role of sacrifices in their proper perspective. I shall cite an example from each: Jeremiah 7:21-24: "I did not command your fathers concerning burnt offerings when I brought them out of Egypt". Midrash Rabbah (Exodus 32): "He who preoccupies himself with Torah does not need burnt offerings neither meal nor guilt offerings. Greater is the one who acts with righteousness than all the sacrifices, greater is prayer than all the sacrifices".

Salomon claims further, that the sacrificial cult had never been considered important or essential in any period and that it would probably have found no mention in the teaching of Moses if the cult had not been witnessed among those peoples and religious systems before the advent of Israel. Maimonides, in the Moreh Nevuchim 3:32, had the following to say about the role of sacrifice in early Israelite history:

At the time of the Mosaic legislation the sacrificial cult was not only a general practice but was a pre-occupation. The wise legislator used this folk opinion as a means toward his elevated goal which was to bring the people from the worship of many Gods to the worship of the One God.

The concluding section of Dr. Gotthold Salomon's Critique is concerned with the order of service on weekdays. He takes up the matter of the intermediate benedictions of the "Tefillah" which appear in German and secondly the twelfth benediction which is missing.

With reference to the intermediate benedictions being in German, we are reminded of the statement on Sotah 33:1 that the "Tefillah" is permitted in any language that one understands. Likewise, he cites Orach Chayim: Prayer in the vernacular is not only permitted, but is to be recommended".

Salomon justifies the omission of the twelfth benediction of the "Tefillah" known as the "Birkath Haminim" with the following words; "This prayer is missing in Tempel prayer book and should be missing in all the prayer books of Israel". 64^a

It is felt that such prayers as the "Birkath Haminim" are not at all in harmony with the teaching of Judaism which urges us to strive to become like God in heaven and to forgive the sinners (Exodus 34:6; Deut. 13:5). The Talmud also says: "Never pray that the 'Sinners', but rather that the 'sins' may disappear from the earth". (Berakoth 10:1).

Salomon concludes:

The sins may disappear from the earth,
but the sinners live and should improve
their ways! This is the spirit that

must live in the prayers of Israel. And if the new prayer book served no other purpose than to remove the twelfth benediction, it has replaced this negative idea and has performed a positive service which should be considered by all rabbis and imitated by all preachers in Israel.⁶⁴

Z. Frankel---Das Neue Hamburger Gebetbuch des Israelitischen Tempel. Schreiben des Oberrabbiners Dr. Frankel an die Direction des Tempelvereins zu Hamburg.

One of the significant opinions in the Hamburg Temple controversy of 1841 was submitted by Dr. Zacharias Frankel of Dresden. His opinion appeared in several issues of the periodical: Der Orient in 1842. A response to Dr. Frankel's opinion appeared that same year from Dr. Gotthold Salomon: Sendschreiben an den Herrn Dr. Frankel.

Dr. Frankel was critical of the manner in which Rabbi Bernays had issued his famous "Moda'ah" and was equally critical of the intentions of the committee responsible for the publication of the Hamburg Prayer Book.

The opening section of Frankel's opinion deals with his attack upon Bernays:

I studied all the passages (in the prayer book) and it is my judgment that Bernays took a course of action, concerning the manner in which he expressed his opinion about the prayer book, that is not at all worthy of a spiritual leader or of a rabbi.⁶⁵

Frankel continued to say that Bernays had failed in his endeavor because he forgot that it is through love and tenderness and not by hatred and enmity that true enlightenment can be achieved. He accused Bernays of being a fanatic in his methods and in particular with respect to the latter's statement that anyone praying from this book would not be considered a Jew.

Frankel criticized the prayer book committee for proceeding without a well thought out scientific principle being that there appears to be no definite motivation for the particular omissions or for the passages retained. He complained further that the prayer book had lost continuity with past Jewish tradition:

The redactors have regrettably set aside a more than thousand-year history that seized the hearts of thousands of worshippers and that was repeated in all the houses of prayer in Germany. The mixture of prayers from the Ashkenazi and Sepharadi rituals has also led to a conglomeration lacking inner consistency of ideas or feeling.⁶⁶

Dr. Frankel next takes issue with a series of passages or prayers in the new edition either because the prayer in question does not follow a firm principle or because it interferes with the national-religious continuity of the people.

1) - He makes reference to the note at the end of the 1841 edition of the prayer book which states the

following with respect to the changes that have occurred in the "Amidah" prayer of the "Tefillah". The note reads:

The ordinary formula of the 'Retze' is neither the original nor the general form. On the day of Atonement it was the custom of the high priest to pray the 'Retze' not according to our formula...We conclude the prayer with "Blessed be Thou O Lord whom alone we serve in reverence." This concluding formula was the daily one. What appears in our text in brackets ('Restore the worship to Thy sanctuary') is a later insertion with which the continuity was broken. According to Sefer Hatashbatz the tradition according to which we pray today is not the tradition used at the time of the Temple...⁶⁷

Frankel claims that if the insert: "Restore the worship to Thy Sanctuary" was omitted then the phrase: "Let our eyes behold the return to Zion with mercy" should likewise have been omitted since the latter is only the continuation of the former. However, if the Redactors thought that by retaining the section, "Vetechezenah Einenu..." they were acting in accordance with the principle: "Hamachazirin me'ein chatimah samukh lechatima" this could not be since the blessing: "Blessed be Thou whom alone we serve in reverence" is to be associated with the original version of the 'Retze' found in Leviticus Rabbah where it reads: "Retzeh Abinu Shokhen

BeTzion Mehera Ya'avdukha Bonekha". Here the phrase:
"Vetechezenah Einenu" is missing.

2) Frankel notes that the "Emeth VeYatziv" is omitted on page 62 of the prayer book. The "Emeth Ve'Emunah" is given. If the redactors used as their guiding principle the age and tradition of a prayer, surely they would have preserved the "Emeth VeYatziv" since it was recited by the priests each morning in the Temple, according to Tamid 5:1. Evidently, they wanted to avoid the "Tautology" which would arise from the German translation of the words of this prayer.

3) The "Magen Avroth" could have been omitted since it was instituted because of the danger of demons according to Shabbath 24 and Rashi to that passage.

4) The "Hashkithenu" on Sabbath Eve ends with the translation for "Shomer Amo Yisrael lo'Ad" (weekday version). It should end, according to Frankel, with "Pores Sukath Shalom" for, according to Leviticus Rabbah "For all good and comforting blessings which the Holy One Praised Be He brings to Israel one seals with "Hashalom". In the "Shema", therefore, one says: "Pores Sukath Shalom" and in the "Tefillah" one says: "Ha"Oseh Hashalom". The Spanish-Portugese and European rituals have, "Pores..." for Sabbath and Holy Days.

5) Frankel takes up next the same question which concerned both Geiger and Holdheim, i.e., the use of

Hebrew and German for the basic and the accrued prayers. In the evening service, the blessings before and after the "Shema" and the "Birkath Shebba" are in German; in the morning service, they are in Hebrew.

Is the opinion that because the evening service is voluntary or did the Redactors presume that the 'Magen Aboth' served as a substitute for the Hebrew? If the latter is true, then they are inconsistent since on the evening of the Holy Days the 'Birkath Shebba' is in German and there is no 'Magen Aboth'.

If the former is true, then it certainly is well known that the fact that the evening 'Tefillah' is voluntary, applied only to the 'Amidah and not to the blessings before and after the 'Shema'...

Why on the eve of the Day of Atonement have they put the 'Shemone Esre' in Hebrew? They would have been more consistent if it were in German like on the eves of Festivals and Rosh Hashanah. Does the German prayer on the Day of Atonement not have the same importance and value as the Hebrew whose place it fills all the year long? If Hebrew is used on this evening, why isn't Hebrew used for the blessings before and after the 'Shema'? 68

6) With reference to the theological notions of Redemption, Messiah and Resurrection, Frankel points out that on page 22 of the new edition, the section: "Vekayem lanu--~~Ve~~ Amar Adonai" is omitted in the translation. This same point was discussed by Geiger. Frankel states that the subject of this section is not a physical and personal redemption as he claims Dr. Salomon had

interpreted it to mean. This passage like many of those passages that were preserved refers to a different kind of redemption. This was omitted by the Redactors even though it was introduced by Maimonides with a slight variation.

Eight pages later, the following section is not omitted: "Gather those that wait for Thee from the four corners of the earth;" on page 122, the section: "Vekonen Mikdashekha" is omitted whereas on page 121, the passage: "Vetibnehu méhera Utégadel Kevodo" appears.

7) Dr. Frankel finds further inconsistency in the fact that many passages which are found missing on one particular page appear again in the same prayer on another page. In the Evening Service, for example, there is no translation for: "Mashiv Haruach Umorid Hageshem". However, in the Morning Service, the translation does appear. Secondly, on page 11, the translation for: "Veziphron Avothenu" is missing. On page 70, it appears in the Hebrew but not in translation and on pages 99, 141, 187 it appears in both the Hebrew and in the German.

8) Page 65 lacks the "Vene'emar" before "Go'alenu Adonai Zebha'oth Shemo".

9) Instead of the passage: "Velo Nétato...legoyye..." one finds the reading: "UleYisrael Amekha Nétato...", etc.

Dr. Frankel blames the Reformers for overlooking the

idea of history with respect to the omissions and changes they made. "They forget that man is rooted with his feelings not only in the present, but that our hearts are full of deep and emotive feelings of our past heritage and tradition".⁶⁹ He feels that the Reformers wanted to adopt a scientific outlook to their approach to religious questions but they forgot that reason can follow emotion only very slowly. He feels that they have gone astray in their omission of the many passages dealing with Israel's future independence as a nation for such feelings of independence which have always been esteemed by our people, evoke a living and dynamic spirit and should not be removed from the prayer book. With the mixture of prayers in both Hebrew and German, the older prayers have lost their meaning and the newer ones have not yet demonstrated their value.

10) Dr. Frankel's final point is with regard to the Abhoda Service on the Day of Atonement. "These classical passages evoked the dearest memories. These passages which evoked the holiest and most inner feelings from each Jew on this day, you have omitted".⁷⁰

The views of Dr. Frankel can best be summarized by citing the following statement he made with regard to the Tempelverein.

The Tempelverein should not wish to achieve noble intentions outside of the present-day Jewish community. Nor should they attempt to bring about a situation which is antithetical to the feelings and ideas of the majority of Jews. The Tempelverein wishes to ennoble the liturgy, to abandon many prayers and 'Piyutim! to reduce the quantity of prayers thus making the service more understandable and meaningful--with this every thinking individual is certainly in full agreement. But the Tempelverein fails to recognize the feelings which are deeply rooted in the past...so must we recognize regrettably that it has failed in its task and has opened the door for sectarianism and removes itself partly from Judaism. 71

Dr. Frankel, in conclusion, summarizes his views of the "Moda'ah" of Bernays and of the work of the Tempelverein:

A) Mr. Bernays has failed in the manner in which he spoke out against the Hamburg Prayer Book.

B) Bernays had judged incorrectly that one could not fulfill his obligation toward prayer from this book since the prayers which comprise "Tefillat Chovah" are found therein and even retain their form in the German.

C) This prayer book of the Tempelverein in no way belongs to those prayer books with a national view since the deepest feelings of the nation are omitted and inner devotion associated with the Hebrew language is missing.

D) The prayer book lacks a scientific basis and is guilty of many inconsistencies.

Dr. G. Salomon: Sendschreiben an den Herrn

Dr. Z. Frankel.

Dr. Gotthold Salomon responded to the Gutachten of Dr. Frankel which appeared in Der Orient in 1842. This response in the form of an open letter, is on one hand an attack upon Dr. Frankel and, on the other hand, a further elaboration upon Salomon's first opinion on the prayer book controversy.

Salomon claims that Frankel went even farther than Bernays in his critique of the prayer book, by criticizing such things as orthography, printing and other non-essentials. However, Salomon takes up each of the points of Frankel's Gutachten in the same order and suggests the principle whereby the Temple prayer book committee was guided.

A) Salomon criticizes Frankel for missing in the prayer book what he called a scientific principle. It will be recalled that Frankel attributed the inconsistencies to the lack of such a principle. Salomon responded that a prayer book which is the expression of the religious needs of a community and which mirrors its basic views and religious beliefs, whether it be called a Siddur or a Machzor must have a "religious" basis and not a scientific basis. He claims that what Frankel really

meant to say was that the prayer book lacked a "historical" basis. If the prayer book lacked a historical basis, then it would be difficult to explain, says Salomon, why certain passages were omitted and others retained. There must have been some historical consciousness. Certainly the redaction committee was well aware of the history of the development of the liturgy but wanted no other basis than what the prayer book is at present. Certainly there were many reasons which were adopted by the committee. These were partly religious, national, and universal whereby neither mankind nor the Jews were left out of sight.

B) With reference to the "Retze" passage, the justification for the elimination of the section: "Restore the worship of Thy sanctuary..." was that it was contradictory to the views of the committee on religious grounds. This insert expresses the request for the restoration of the sacrificial cult.

With regard to the section beginning: "Vetechezena" there is no justification for its elimination due to the fact that it has possibilities of interpretation in the more spiritual sense.

C) We recall that Frankel criticized the conclusion of the "Hashkibhenu" as it appears in the 1841 edition

of the prayer book. It concludes, "Shomer Yisrael lo'ad". Frankel suggests it take the form: "Hapores Sukath Shalom..". Salomon claims that by retaining the form: "Shomer Yisrael lo'ad", the Hamburg Temple is in no way isolated. He makes reference to the Tur Orach Chayim 267 which indicates that the Hamburg Temple is similar to one of the most important communities in preserving this practice. With respect to the change in the version of the "Chatimah" on Sabbath from the weekday version, Salomon cites the Midrash: "On the Sabbath one does not need protection..." He asks if the Redaction Committee should have reflected this absurdity?

D) Salomon proceeds to give his explanation for the fact that in the evening service the blessings before and after the "Shema" as well as the 'Amidah' are in German. Whereas, in the morning service, they are in Hebrew.

This innovation has good grounds that I will give you. One reason is purely local. The Redaction Committee was of the opinion that a city like Hamburg, in which merchants live, since in winter the evening service begins around 4:00 in the afternoon, the synagogue is visited mostly by women and young people. The morning service also could have been mostly in German but the German prayers would have been too many. Though the Hebrew prayers which are not understood can become boring and tiresome, the German prayers which are understood can even be more tiresome and boring if the service is too long. This one learns only from practice. Therefore,

the alternation in the Hamburg Temple is most suitable and timely. If you would ask Holdheim, Mannheimer and Stein about this they would answer that they used an 'unscientific edition' not knowing what 'Tefillath Arabith Reshuth' has to do with this.⁷²

"Your other question is: Why is the "Shemona Esrai" on the eve of the Day of Atonement recited in Hebrew? This is self explanatory. On the eve of the Day of Atonement men visitors who understand Hebrew are hardly lacking." 73

E) Referring to the omission of: "Vekayem lanu--" which was criticized by Frankel, Salomon calls attention to the fact that the same passage contains "Gather all those that wait for Thee from the four corners of the earth..." "Does the missing section say anything else?"⁷⁴ asks Salomon. He answers that the Redaction Committee wanted to avoid undue repetition in this case therefore they omitted the first passage.

F) Salomon ascribes the inconsistencies with regard to "Mashiv Haruach..." and "Vezikhron Avothenu" to printing errors. In some places they appear in translation, in others only in the Hebrew and in still others in both.

G) Frankel had attacked the Hamburg Prayer Book for omitting those significant passages dealing with Israel's future hope for national independence in the

land of Zion. By eliminating such passages Frankel feels that the continuity between Israel's national hopes and feelings in the past has been lost in the present. Salomon agrees that Zion and Jerusalem are the focal points in Israel's spiritual and religious rebirth and this notion is echoed in the prayer book, but the belief that such nationhood should again be prominent is contrary to the progress made by the enlightenment and is likewise in contradiction with the present state of European civilization and with the teachings of Judaism if they are correctly understood. Hundreds of Jewish communities would certainly protest against a national independence of that kind. Israel's hope should not be earthbound but rather should look forward to that time when princes and people recognize the rights of man and when we are free from political enslavement.

D) Salomon next responds to the claim of Frankel that the prayer book omitted much that evoked the mood and emotions of Israel's past historical experiences. Salomon mentions that Frankel failed to point out the large number of German prayers in the new edition which do evoke similar emotional responses. Likewise, the Hamburg community is not that young that it does not have memories and a history of its own that is reflected in the prayers. "How can you say that our prayer book

destroys all feeling when on the Day of Atonement, when the feelings and emotions mean the most, people of all ages and of all walks of life gather together in the House of prayer; there they pray with us, they fast with us and sing with us, are obedient and receptive to the words of instruction and enlightenment, and for whom the concluding prayer comes too soon?" 75

Frankel had also attacked the prayer book on the basis that the Piyutim borrowed from the Spanish-Portuguese liturgy were cold and interfered with the direct relationship between man and God which one sought in worship. Salomon denies this claim: " I ask anyone who possesses a knowledge of the Hebrew language and a feeling for poetry whether the responsive reading between reader and congregation in the prayer: "Deharim Lakachti Shema Adonai..." leaves one cold? Is the refrain spoken by the congregation to "Yerotze Am Evion" not spoken from the heart? A hymn such as "Yah Shimkha" one would have to search far and wide in the Askenazi prayer books and still not find one like it." 76

Salomon lists a few of the Piyutim in the prayer book which even reflect the dialogue between Israel and God and not merely between man with His creator: "Le'ma'ankha Elohei"; "Yisrael Avadekha"; "El Norah Alilah"; etc. Salomon also mentions the interesting

fact that when the Hamburg Temple was founded, among its first members were people from Spanish-Portugese families and backgrounds.

The author calls Frankel's attention once again to the many German Piyutim created by the prayer book committee for the benefit of women and younger people who are not familiar with Hebrew. The Memorial Service evidently was found to be appealing since it was adopted in the Festgebeten der Israeliten zu Wien as well as in the Synagoguen-Ordnung des Konigreich's Wurtemberg and by other communities.

Salomon addresses himself to the final claim of Frankel that the Hamburg Temple through its prayer book emendations and omissions has constituted itself into a sect. Salomon answers that a prayer no matter how it is presented whether in this language or in another language does not constitute a sect. If it did then there certainly would be many sects within Judaism because of the variety of "Minhagim" already in existence.

If we in the redaction of the prayer book were to act consistently and scientifically by removing all the introductory prayers before the 'Barkhu' and by limiting the public service to the one basic prayer and by having the whole "Tefillah" in German and the reading of the Torah in translation, then we would have awakened the sectarian spirit from its slumber. But we did not

want to do that! Therefore, we resisted too many changes from the existing liturgy; therefore, we decided that the service should be in accord with the historical development of the liturgy.⁷⁷

In response to Frankel's statement that the Hamburg Temple has had influence neither in its own community nor outside of the Temple, Salomon had the following to say, first about his own community and then about communities outside of Hamburg.

Our community itself numbers many whose home life is based upon strict or orthodox principles; people for whom the Sabbath and Holy Days are sacred; people who do not arrange their daily prayer without 'Tzitzith' and 'Tefillin'-- yet who come more to our synagogue than to any other for edification. And what should I say about the many others who come from all parts of the world to pray in the Hamburg Temple?

Why hasn't our Temple found any who would imitate or copy us? The answer to this lies neither in our institution nor in the administration of our institution, it lies in the spiritual haughtiness of our newer rabbis. If the rabbis who feel that changes must be made in the service would have come together to meet with us and to discuss in brotherhood the needs of the communities, the greater majority of European Jews within ten years would be joined together in unity from the point of view of the liturgy.

Instead, each of the communities has tried to reform the cult by its own hand... Vienna received its own kind of reform and its own prayer book; In Prague, reform

went another way; from both of these the
synagogue-reform in Toplitz departed;
the liturgy in Dresden has its own way...⁷⁸

Salomon feels, however, and most strongly, that in spite of the self-centeredness displayed by these other communities in their own Reforms, they were all somewhat influenced by the Hamburg experiment. Without the Temple in Hamburg, neither the Temple in Vienna nor Prague nor Dresden nor any of the other communities would have had an improved liturgy.

C H A P T E R V

The Liturgy Subsequent to the 1841 Edition

and

C o n c l u s i o n

In the final chapter of this study, before my evaluation of the Hamburg Temple controversies, I wish to trace briefly and in general terms, the influence of the Hamburg Temple upon the later development of the Reform Jewish liturgy. In addition, I wish to discuss some of the later prayer books issued by participants in the Hamburg Temple controversy in order to compare the results of their prayer book efforts with their earlier views on the liturgy.

Mention has already been made of the establishment of an affiliated congregation in the city of Leipzig in 1820. This event marks the first influence of the Hamburg Temple upon other communities. The sources seem to indicate that this service instituted in Leipzig was a great success and drew people from many surrounding and distant places, including Bucharest, Munich, Dresden, Florence and Amsterdam.

It is also without doubt that many of the communities in Germany and in other countries which instituted reforms in their synagogues were greatly influenced by the Hamburg experiment. The prayer for the departed

and, in particular, the section of the "Kaddish" beginning, "Al Yisrael V'al Tzadikayah" was used almost universally in subsequent prayer books. The introduction of sermons in the vernacular, choral singing, elimination of Piyutim, and the establishment of order in the Synagogue were among the many contributions of the Hamburg Temple to the development of Reform Judaism.

The Hamburg Templegemeinde itself published several editions of the prayer book after 1841, and a cursory glance at these later editions indicates clearly the direction taken by the Hamburg Reform community in the several decades following the prayer book controversies. Further editions were published in 1845, 1868, 1876 and in 1904. The 1876 edition was merely a reprinting of the 1868 edition and the 1845 edition was a reprinting of the 1841 edition. It is significant to note that the first three editions of the prayer book opened from left to right, the last three editions opened from right to left in the traditional Jewish manner. It is also interesting to note that the manner in which the prayer book of 1841 opened was in no way discussed among the issues of the famous controversy. The service in the 1819 edition was limited to the Sabbath (without an afternoon service) and the Festivals. Beginning with the edition of 1841, the prayer

book included services for the afternoon of the Sabbath, for the weekday, services for the home and other supplements. Within the course of eighty-five years after the founding of the Hamburg Temple, the following changes had occurred in the liturgy:

- 1) A return to the Ashkenazi pronunciation of Hebrew in place of the Sepharadi;
- 2) The reading of the Torah with the appropriate traditional melody;
- 3) The reading of the whole Scroll of Esther on Purim in Hebrew;
- 4) The establishment of a real weekday service;
- 5) Institution of Selichoth services;
- 6) Many of the prayers formerly in German were translated into Hebrew;
- 7) A restoration of many passages referring to Zion and Jerusalem;
- 8) A return to the musical traditions of the Ashkenazim.¹

It is clearly seen from the above changes since the early editions of the prayer book that the liturgy of the Temple became quite conservative and that there was a general return to traditional practices.

In 1854, Abraham Geiger published a prayer book in the city of Breslau. This prayer book is the result of

a Plan for a new prayer book which he published a few years earlier and which is included in his Nachgelassene Schriften. An examination of this prayer book indicates that it had some influence upon the later editions of the Hamburg Prayer Book. Geiger's prayer book is characterized by the free translation or paraphrasing instead of literal translations of the Hebrew text. An example of Geiger's paraphrasing is found in his translation of the "Ma'aribh Arebbim":

According to God's word the evening has again drawn near. Daylight has accomplished its task and now gives way to darkness. Even in the night the rays of God's grace shine forth and the moon and stars in their heavenly courses are also God's messengers and with their soft light illumine the night. So dost Thou, O Lord, alternate night and day; Thou rulest over one as over the other with equal paternal kindness; praised be Thy Holy Name! la

Abraham Geiger was one of the severest critics of the Hamburg Prayer Book at the time of the controversy. He chastised the Reformers of the period for being too conservative in their thinking and for not being outspoken in the reforms they wished to institute. A summary of Geiger's views on the Hamburg Prayer Book appeared in the Allgemeine Zeitung, Vol. XXII, N.27, p.320f:

I cannot very well let the mention of the Temple controversy pass without comment, for the issue has aroused a

lively interest...Of course, I am not satisfied with all this superficiality, and I see no excuse for the fact that, in a period of twenty-three years, the leaders of the Temple have achieved nothing beyond a second edition of their prayer book which reflects the same lack of decisiveness as the first one did. Despite their avowed Liberal position--nay, in spite of the obligation that grows out of their attitude which led them to separate from the majority..they have done almost nothing for the proper advancement of those ideas which, basically, the reforms in the divine service are merely an outgrowth. Hence, if we were to be dependent upon the results of their endeavors, the status of the controversy would still be the same as it had been at the beginning. The fact of the matter is that they are still beating about the bush today; they still refuse to speak out openly, and still persist in seeking to make the difference appear minute, while in reality the very value of this difference lies precisely in the fact that it is of great significance as part of that principle which has not yet adequately been put into practice. Fortunately, Rapoport and Zunz have shed some light on the divine service, and fortunately, my own journal has provided building blocks with which to construct a Liberal theology. Yet, all these gentlemen can make of these things is just a number of paltry changes in a few isolated words. Is this not a disgrace, a downright abuse of the position which they do not know how to use properly for the good of the whole...?

Geiger himself was not always totally consistent in his demands of others and in his views. Though

his attitude in the Hamburg Prayer Book controversy was that all practical reforms should take precedence, he is known to have reversed this position at the Frankfurt Rabbinical Conference in 1845. There he vetoed the proposal of Dr. Zacharias Frankel that practical reforms should be their primary concern. The same Geiger who attacked the Hamburg reformers for not going far enough with their reforms could not feel bound by the radical proposals of the Conference. The question of the use of Hebrew in the service was an accommodation and depended upon the individual congregation. He could not feel compelled to introduce everything in German in his congregation.

With respect to Geiger's prayer book of 1854, it was only partially consistent with his views on the Hamburg controversy and with his later proposals in the Plan zu einem neuen Gebetbuch. Before discussing Geiger's prayer book, I propose to summarize here Geiger's proposals for a new prayer book:

Geiger's Plan for a Prayer Book

I - General Principles

Each Jewish community is a link in the totality of Judaism. Each must represent the totality. Each moment in the course of Judaism's development builds a moment in history and

the present can no less be omitted from the past as the link from the whole Jewish body.²

Geiger seems to advocate a reform of the Jewish liturgy which will take two factors into consideration:

- 1) that each individual community feel itself a part of the totality, and
- 2) that there be a relationship between the present and the past in the sense that the past becomes workable in the present.

II - Content of the Liturgy

The essential point of difference between Jews of different convictions is concerned with the role of Israel in humanity. The true Israelite of today believes that it is his task to carry in its true purity the belief in the One God to all mankind. There are many prayers, says Dr. Geiger, which attest to this fact and, in particular, he recalls the many New Year prayers, including the "Alenu". A great part of the liturgy consists of those prayers expressing Israel's separation from the nations and the request or hope for the restoration of her ancient land, the ingathering of her exiles, the restoration of the priesthood and sacrificial cult, etc. However, it is natural, says Dr. Geiger, that the historical reminiscences insofar as

they pertained to the people's destiny, can no longer have the same meaning for us as they had for the past. The "people" Israel lives no longer, not even in the hearts and desires of the present, it is as "religious communities" that we live today. "Amalek and Haman" can no longer stir up in our hearts feelings of disgust and aversion as happened in former times. Many religious notions have become more spiritual in character and their expression in the liturgy must, therefore, become more spiritual. The hope after death instead of meaning a Resurrection unto life, must mean the immortality of the human soul.

III - Language

Dr. Geiger criticizes the language of many of the prayers in the present liturgy. The language is pompous, repetitious, sometimes boring and destructive to the mood of worship.

In his discussion of the language of prayer, he is more interested in the question of Hebrew and German.

The language of our prayers is not our mother tongue. Hebrew is no longer in our time the language which expresses the most eloquent and sincere feelings. Who in our community would express the wish that the Sabbath prayers, in German, for the government, prayers for a woman in childbed, prayers for the arrival of

spring and summer should be recited again in Hebrew? Certainly this forms an important ingredient in the service which one would not want to take away. 3

Dr. Geiger makes an important distinction in his discussion of the language of prayer between public and private worship. In private prayer the individual is involved in himself and only his individual feelings long for the appropriate expression. Even the silent prayer of the community would be better said in the mother tongue. For even in the silent prayer of the congregation, the individual worshipper contemplates within himself even though he finds himself within the congregation.

It is different, however, with public worship. In public worship, it is the community which comes forward. In the expression of prayers for the community feeling is as important as content. Geiger cites as an example the "Shema". The "Shema" to each person becomes the whole association of the past memories when our ancestors died with those words on their lips. "Could a sentence in translation capture this same expression--I must doubt this".⁴

Dr. Geiger suggests that the liturgy adopt the following use of language: For the private prayers of the individual as well as for the silent prayer of the

congregation, the use of the vernacular. Also the rabbi may use German for those prayers which he, as representative of the congregation, recites. The other prayers must be in both languages. The German translation must find a place for free expression (paraphrase) unbound by prior formulations. The German translation should both precede and follow the sermon. Dr. Geiger sees the order of the service for Sabbaths and Festivals as follows:

- a) A short Hebrew Shacharith
- b) Silent German prayers
- c) Torah reading (Prophetic reading in vernacular)
- d) Prayers in German for the congregation and government
- e) Prayers and Hymns in vernacular
- f) Sermon
- g) Hymn and Prayer
- h) Short Hebrew Musaph
- i) Silent prayers in German

IV - Length and Form

Dr. Geiger deplotes the length and duration of the liturgy both of which interfere with the spirit and mood of true devotion.

The 'Ashre' is repeated in each morning service twice; the 'Kaddish' sometimes five or six times; the 'Kaddosh and

Baruch Kevod' three times; the 'Shemone Esre' is first recited silently and immediately thereafter is recited aloud, etc.⁵

Dr. Geiger finds objectionable the practice in the synagogue where the one called to the Torah repeats the blessings before and after the reading and this is repeated for everyone that is called up. In former times, it was the custom, according to Mishnah Megillah 4:1,2 for the one who was called up first to recite the blessing before the reading and only the last one to be called up would recite the blessing after the reading. Furthermore, he finds objectionable the fact that on the Day of Atonement, the prayer for forgiveness is repeated nine times and another one is recited eleven times on the same day. Geiger states that as a result of this repetition the feeling of repentance is not stirred up, but rather is deadened.

The Festival Service must be abbreviated by omitting those passages which do not directly belong to that service. He suggests the elimination of the reading from the second scroll of the law which contains the sacrificial obligations.

For the form of the service, Geiger recommends the following: Hymns should be sung by the choir so that the entire congregation could participate; recitations

accompanied by the organ; responsive readings and silent prayers.

V - Times for Prayer

A public service for weekdays is not appropriate. Since the service would be limited to the early hours of the morning and to late in the evening, the liturgy would be conducted with great haste at an accelerated speed. The prayer for evening and morning should be in the form of private prayer at home.

Geiger proceeds to describe the diminishing importance of the weekdays in the history of Judaism as concerns the liturgy. Mondays and Thursdays, in ancient times, were market days, when people came with their wares from all parts of the land. For those who were not able to attend services on the Sabbath, a service was instituted for them on these days. The service included a reading from the Torah. On Purim, the Book of Esther was read publicly on either the Monday or Thursday before the holiday. (Mishnah Megillah 3:6; 4:1). However, such meaning no longer exists for us.

In biblical times, the New Moon was considered a festival day of equal status with the Sabbath and holidays. It was a day like the Sabbath whereon work was prohibited. A liturgy of festival character was arranged

for that day. Reference to this is found in Isaiah 66:23. In later times, however, the importance of the New Moon diminished and it became a workday like the others. The Talmud records that it was the custom for observant women to refrain from work on that day. In its place, gradually, mention of the New Moon was made on the previous Sabbath. The liturgy contains evidences or remnants of the older festival character of those days. Likewise does Geiger urge the elimination of the Ninth Day of Ab as a Fast Day which in Jewish tradition belonged to the category of festivals and holidays associated with the weekday.

With reference to the Sabbath Service, in addition to the evening and morning service, the afternoon service has a solemn character because of the reading of the Torah selection that will be read on the following Monday and Thursday.

This institution has as its rationale the fact that there were many people in the city who perhaps would be prevented from attending services in the middle of the following week, therefore, this reading on Sabbath afternoon made a good substitute. However, since this reason is no longer valid, the reading of the Torah in the afternoon can be dispensed with, thus limiting the reading of the Torah only to the main service (in the

morning) and, thereby preserving its true dignity. Geiger does recommend for those congregations that experience disturbances during the morning service an afternoon service. For this service one could use many of the German prayers and hymns of the morning service.

The various Sabbaths with special designation, such as Shabbat Parah, Zachor, Shekalim, Ha-Chodesh no longer have, according to Geiger, any significance and, therefore, should not be observed by us.

With reference to the second day of the principal holidays and festivals, it is obvious, says Geiger, that they have no meaning for us and are more bothersome than helpful. The ninth day of Sukkoth is not warranted since this last day known as Simchath Torah represents a rejoicing over the completion of the last passage of the Torah only when the Torah ends with it, that is every three years. (Geiger evidently followed the tri-ennial cycle). The second day of Passover and Sukkoth belong to the weekdays. Only the second day of the New Year and of the Feast of Weeks is still applicable, whereupon important festivals would not be limited to one day but their celebration would be for two days. The liturgy for the half-festivals or weekday festivals like, Chol Ha-Moed, Chanukah are differentiated from the weekdays. There is here no question

of the Torah or the Musaph. Also the seventh day of Sukkoth, known as Hoshanah Rabbah needs no elaboration. Though later mystic writers made of it a second Day of Atonement, we need not be concerned with that since there is enough on the Day of Atonement alone liturgically speaking.

In discussing the service for the Day of Atonement, Geiger states that it is perhaps difficult to pray continuously throughout the day without rest periods. This could perhaps disrupt the mood of the day or make it difficult to sustain the proper mood. However, to have certain set periods of rest and to open the synagogue door only for certain hours of the day would cause the day to lose much of its meaning. The worshippers themselves may decide when they wish to rest or to pause in the service.

However, Geiger recommends some noteworthy changes in the service for the Day of Atonement. On this day, especially, it is important to have a shorter German service between Shacharit and Musaph, between Musaph and Minchah, and between Minchah and Ne'ilah. Also many of the passages which are now considered inappropriate could be replaced by others.

Geiger's final major point in this section of his plan for a new prayer book concerns the matter of

synagogue attendance on the Sabbath. He deplores the fact that attendance at Sabbath services is not as good as it should be and blames the reformers for not having acted sooner in making the service more edifying so that people would want to attend. He asks the following question: "Shouldn't we use every occasion or opportunity which is provided us to win the larger number of people for God's house and thereby for the religious life?"⁶ He claims that the forefathers thought so and that is why they instituted the afternoon services on Mondays and Thursdays, for those who could not attend on Sabbath. Geiger advocates that their example be followed. "For us, too, there is a weekday which probably belongs to us for worship, when business is at rest, namely, Sunday. Let us use it, if not every week, then from time to time".⁷ He feels that a Sunday service once a month would provide the majority of the congregation with opportunity for public worship.

The prayer book, according to Geiger, must provide in addition to public worship, opportunities for private worship for those moments when an individual or a family in crisis may pray. Morning and evening prayers, and Table blessings should not be lacking.

Geiger advocated further the elimination of the distinction with regard to Kohanim and Levites when

one is called to the Torah. The priestly benediction should be recited by members of the congregation alternately under the direction of the rabbi. The counting of the Sefirah between Passover and Shavuoth has no longer any validity.

The blowing of the Shofar, according to Geiger, was prescribed by Scripture not only for the New Year but for every public religious celebration. In the time of the Mishnah the blowing of the Shofar was accompanied by trumpet blasts. (Mishnah Rosh Hashanah:3). If the outmoded tones are to remain, then the excessive repetition of the blasts should be eliminated. The Mishnah knows the three blasts of "Teki'ah, Teru'ah and Teki'ah" in three different places within the prayers. The middle tone later, because of doubt, was increased to four thus raising the total number of blasts to twelve. The Shofar was sounded after each of the three principal sections of the New Year Musaph] "Malkhuyoth, "Zikhronoth and "Shoferoth"). Later when the Shofar service was put before the Musaph Service, the number of blasts was increased to thirty. Together the service in the Musaph as well as the Shofar Service before Musaph, brought the total number of blasts to 40 or 42. An elaborate clarification of the development of the Shofar service is contained in Geiger's prayer book:

Israelitisches Gebetbuch, Breslau, 1856, p. 321.

In his plan for a new prayer book, Geiger suggests that if the Shofar service before the Musaph cannot be eliminated, the blasts should be reduced to the number ten and the service should be omitted on the second day.

With reference to content, Geiger did attempt to make his prayer book a true reflection of his views concerning Israel's future hopes. Since he did believe that Israel "the people" no longer lived, he sought to eliminate references to the role of Zion in Israel's future. By references to Zion, Geiger meant those specific references to the restoration of the Temple and the sacrificial cult; references to the ingathering of the exiles and the physical return of Jews to Zion. Included in Israel's future hopes were the idea of the resurrection of the dead and the separation of Israel from the nations. The latter notions were likewise altered in order that they might reflect Geiger's more universalistic outlook.

Though the references to Redemption and Resurrection were retained in the Hebrew text, the German translations of the text gave a different rendition. One of the standard references to the idea of Resurrection is found in the second benediction of the 'Amidah, known as the "Geburoth" section. It concludes:

"Praised be Thou O Lord who givest life unto the dead". Geiger's translation of the traditional text reads: "Praised be Thou O God, who givest life both here and beyond". Geiger is most consistent in this change throughout his prayer book.

The same prayer contains the word, "Goel" meaning Redeemer. Geiger translates the word as "Redemption" again, in keeping with Geiger's messianic notion that all mankind will participate in the Redemption which will come to the world.

With reference to the return to Zion, the prayer book contains many emendations and omissions. One of the significant emendations occurs in the "Kedushah" of the Shacharith Service. The "Kedushah" is in accordance with the Ashkenazi rite. The traditional text contains the following insertion: "Thou wilt reveal Thyself from Thy place and wilt reign over us, for we wait for Thee. O, when wilt Thou reign in Zion? Speedily, even in our days, do Thou establish Thy dwelling there forever". Geiger makes the following emendation in his Hebrew text: "Thou wilt reveal Thyself from Thy place and wilt reign over us, for we wait for Thee. When wilt Thou reign? Speedily, even in our days, do Thou establish Thy dwelling forever...". The reference to Zion is omitted. Further on in the same insertion the reference to 'Jerusalem, Thy holy city' is omitted

in the section reading: "Be exalted and sanctified in the midst of Jerusalem, Thy city and unto all eternity". Not only is his Hebrew text emended, but his German paraphrase is greatly abbreviated. This insertion in the "Kedushah" has the following translation: "For the kingdom is thine and from Zion it will extend over all the world...".

The "Retze" prayer, both in the Shacharith and Musaph Services lacks the phrase: "Restore the worship to Thy sanctuary" and the reference to the sacrifices is eliminated.

In the Musaph Service, the section known as "Tikanta" or "Shabbath" contains neither references to sacrifices nor to the physical return to Zion. The German translation or paraphrase is very free and expresses the hope that the Sabbath may be a day for the renewal and awakening of the spirit and that the rest of the Sabbath be acceptable unto God.

The conclusion to the "Retze" is generally in accordance with the 1819 edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book which has: "Praised be Thou O Lord who causest His presence to return to Zion with mercy". The Musaph Service for Festivals, however, contains the conclusion of the 1841 edition of the Hamburg Prayer Book: "Praised be Thou O Lord, whom alone we serve in reverence".

Though Geiger was rather consistent in his feelings about the return to Zion, he was not as consistent as the Hamburg Reformers of 1841 in dealing with passages referring to the separation of Israel from the nations. In the "Ezrath Avothenu" he retains those references to the distinction between the Hebrews and the Egyptians. God caused the Hebrews to pass over the Red Sea but drowned the Egyptians. God saved His beloved but killed the first-born of Egypt, etc. All of the distinctions found in the traditional text are retained in Geiger's prayer book in this particular section. However, in the section of the Sabbath morning service beginning: "Yismach Moshe", Geiger omits the "Velo netato" which mentions that God did not give the Sabbath as a possession to the uncircumcised. The "Abinu Malkenu" lacks the reference to the vengeance of the blood of God's servants but does include the remembrance of the martyrs.

We recall that Geiger criticized the Hamburg Reformers in his Gutachten for being halfhearted in their elimination of references to the separation of Israel from the nations. It appears that Geiger himself was not totally consistent in this either.

In his Plan for a new prayer book, Geiger insisted upon a free German translation of the Hebrew prayers.

All of the prayers in his book appear both in Hebrew and in German. The paraphrase is very free and at times departs totally from the Hebrew text, especially when the Hebrew text contains notions that might be objectionable. Geiger did insist upon the use of Hebrew for public worship and German for private prayer. It is characteristic of Geiger's service, for the intermediate section of the "Birkath Sheva", to be in the form of a silent prayer and to be recited in the vernacular.

Both the "Yismach Moshe" and the "Tikanta Shabbath" are to be recited silently. Though the Hebrew text is given, it is to be assumed, from Geiger's Plan, that they were recited in German by the individual worshipper.

Geiger criticized the traditional liturgy for its repetition. He did attempt to abbreviate his own service by eliminating much of the repetition. The 'Amidah' was recited only once at each service; the "Abinu Malkenu" and the "Al Chet" on the High Holy Days were not repeated too often. Many of the traditional Piyutim were eliminated, thus shortening the service on the Day of Atonement as he had suggested earlier.

There are many customs which Geiger did retain despite his earlier proposals that they be eliminated. He objected to the recitation of the blessing over the

Torah by each person who was called up. He wanted to revert to the older practice of having only the first and last persons recite the blessing. He did not make this change in his book.

Geiger wanted to eliminate the distinction between the Priests and the Levites and Israelites when calling men to the reading of the law. He also wanted to eliminate the recitation of the priestly benediction by the Kohanim. His prayer book contains ample evidence that these changes were not implemented. The order for the calling of men to the Torah contains the traditional distinctions; the Kohanim are instructed also to ascend to the Bimah for the priestly benediction.

Geiger no longer felt the need of the reading from the second scroll of the law. Neither did he see the importance of special services for the New Moon, Chanukah, Purim and other festivals which, according to him had the character of weekday observances. His prayer book, however, makes the necessary provisions for such services.

In form, Geiger's prayer book followed closely the traditional structure of the Ashkenazi rite. One of the major contributions of his prayer book was the introduction of the free translation despite its failure to express the true meaning of many prayers. Another significant contribution was the addition of notes about

aspects of the liturgy as was done in Hamburg beginning with 1841.

Though Geiger had many more radical suggestions as to the form his prayer book should take, he felt himself limited by both the needs and the views of his community especially in light of the fact that his prayer book was designed for more general use than was the Hamburg Prayer Book. Geiger's prayer book was later adapted to tradition by M. Joel. Many of the changes which Geiger had made were not accepted. The traditional wording of many prayers was included along with Geiger's free translation.

- - - - -

Another prayer book published by a participant in the Hamburg Temple controversy was the prayer book of Leopold Stein which appeared at Frankfurt am Main in 1860. I find a great deal more consistency in the views of Stein with regard to the liturgy than I found in the case of Geiger. It will be recalled, from Stein's Gutachten, occasioned by the Hamburg controversy, that he stressed the following:

- 1) The importance of Hebrew alongside of German in the worship service;
- 2) The elimination of references to the separation between Israel and the other peoples;
- 3) Regret that the prophetic readings were eliminated from the service, etc.

In the preface to his prayer book, he reiterated some of the views contained in his Gutachten. As earlier, he believed that the request for a return of Jews to Palestine and the wish for the restoration of The Jewish State did not issue sincerely from the heart of people. With respect to the sacrificial cult, he claimed that only a glance at the Talmud would show that the rabbis placed prayer on a much higher plane than sacrifices. In his prayer book, he did feel that references to the rebuilding of Zion and to the Messiah were acceptable if Jerusalem were to be conceived as the center from which would emanate the word of God. He would not accept, however, the idea of a return to Palestine.

We notice, in his prayer book, that references to the separation of Israel from other peoples are rarely found. In the "Emeth V'Emunah" a reference to God recompensing our enemies and a similar reference to God exalting us over our enemies are found in parentheses, in small print (undoubtedly an influence of the Hamburg Prayer Book upon Stein). These parenthetical inserts are not translated in the German text.

In the "Ahabbah Rabah", the statement: "Bring us in peace from the four corners of the earth" is found in parentheses and is not translated in the German.

Stein did institute the prophetic readings in his service and also included introductory prayers on the eve of the Sabbath, like: "Lekha Dodi" and "Lekhu Nerarēnah" which he found lacking in the Hamburg ritual.

E V A L U A T I O N

In the present study, I have attempted to analyze the first two editions of the Hamburg Prayer Book and to interpret the motivations and theological principles which guided the Reformers in their work. At the same time, I collected a series of Gutachten (Theological Opinions) written about the Hamburg Prayer Book by some of the leading rabbis of the period. The majority of the rabbis were sympathetic with the changes that had been made and, therefore, proceeded to dismiss the orthodox attack as unfounded and without talmudic justification. Others, particularly concerning the controversy of 1841, criticized their fellow-reformers for their inconsistencies and for their failure to make the new liturgy a true reflection of their views.

Throughout the controversy, it was difficult for me to feel that the Reformers were anywhere but on the defensive. They were holding the fort against the threats of their more traditional brethren. The fact that they expended so much energy in responding to the attack, indicates clearly that in this early stage of Reform, the Hamburg Tempelgemeinde did not want to constitute itself as a separate sect. On the contrary, they wanted to remain within the mainstream of Judaism. This accounts for their willingness to justify their actions and also for the conservative character of their liturgy.

The "Moda'ah" of Bernays, like the "Issur" of the Hamburg Beth Din in 1818, was, to some degree, unfounded. The language of the proclamation was harsh, the threat of excommunication bitter and demonstrated that the orthodox opponents had not read carefully the new prayer book. If they did read it, they pretended not to see much of the traditional content which it contained. The Hamburg Reformers, in 1819, were not too concerned with making "theological" innovations in their service. They were pre-occupied with the external form of the liturgy--decorum, language of prayer, duration of service, etc. The question of a return to Zion and the restoration of the sacrificial cult certainly passed through their minds now that their fellow Jews had assumed a more positive attitude toward diaspora life. These notions which have always been central to traditional thought, were a cause of some concern. This led them to eliminate certain references from the prayer book. However, the omissions and the changes that were made did not merit the condemnation which the prayer book received from the orthodox community. If the Reformers had "theological" motivations in mind at this early stage, they were merely interested in widening the horizon of Judaism's future hope and in clarifying the thinking of nineteenth century Jews in light of the new age which was dawning.

Furthermore, the Reformers insisted upon the right of each generation of Jews to legislate for themselves. No one generation was to be given the authority to legislate for all time. Yet, the orthodox interpreted these attitudes to mean a denial of the essential teachings of Judaism and a total departure from the traditional Jewish manner of worship.

The second edition of the prayer book in some respects attempted to accomplish more by way of reforms than the first. There was a more conscious desire on the part of the editors not only to make the service more asthetically appealing but also to eliminate more completely those ideas which by then had become outmoded. To this category belonged references to Israel's separation from the nations as well as references to the physical return of Jews to Zion. In both editions, however, the thinking was hazy; the ideology ambiguous, and there were also contradictions between the Hebrew text and the German translation of certain fundamental notions. I tend, therefore, to agree with many who criticized the Hamburg Reformers for their inconsistency and hesitations.

Many who have written about this period have tended to rationalize that the failure of the Hamburg experiment was due to the lack of dynamic leadership and scholarly guidance. One such writer said;

Let us bear in mind that reform, at this stage, had not yet brought into the arena Holdheim, Geiger, Zunz, Hirsch, and our own Dr. Kohler to point out clearly and in a scholarly way, the theology and philosophy of the new religious movement in Israel...⁸

Though Dr. Rauch probably meant the above statement to apply to the first edition of the prayer book, the controversy over the second edition did have the advantage of the opinions and guidance of Geiger and Holdheim. Yet, even a scholar like Geiger, who was soon to emerge in the "arena" of Reform Judaism as one of its greatest exponents, was not immune from inconsistency and from pressures which he would not withstand. The same Geiger, who was the severest critic of the Hamburg Prayer Book, produced a prayer book of his own which was quite traditional in form. He, himself admitted that the radical proposals of the rabbinical conference could not be implemented universally but only in individual congregations. At this time in the development of Reform Judaism, it was not only the orthodox opposition to Reform which halted progress and encouraged conservatism, but also the more traditional elements, even within the Reform community prevented their leaders from departing too far from traditional lines. Such was certainly the case in Hamburg.

As I investigate the period of the Hamburg Temple controversy, I cannot but admire the manner in which the participants conducted themselves vis a vis the orthodox opposition. Both the Reformers and their opponents spoke a common language--the halakhic tradition. The Reformers demonstrated their facility with the sources of the talmudic-rabbinic tradition which preceded them. For both it constituted an authority. They used the Halakhah selectively to justify that which they had changed. On the other hand, their actions and program implied a denial of the same authority which they used to justify their existence. Because of their zeal to retain the loyalty of Jews to Judaism, they may have attempted to hide their doctrinal differences by resorting to rabbinic authority to justify their departures and deviations from the fixed forms of worship. There is also evidence that they claimed to have no doctrinal differences but were distinguished from other communities merely by the form of their worship. Their recourse to the halakhic tradition is their best proof for wanting to establish Reform within the framework of traditional Judaism. What they claimed, however, was that their interpretation of the tradition was the correct one. It was "true" Judaism.

Despite the many criticisms which could be brought against the Reformers, it is necessary to place the

Hamburg period in its proper perspective. It might be claimed that the Hamburg Temple had no influence upon the later development of Reform Judaism in light of the fact that no mention of Hamburg is to be found in the discussions of the rabbinical conferences which took place in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Surely, many of the issues on the agenda of the conference had already been discussed and somewhat resolved during the Hamburg controversy. In particular, the role of the vernacular in the service, the use of the organ, the repetition of the 'Amidah, the three-year cycle for the reading of the law, the omission of Piyutim and other concerns were among the issues of the prayer book controversies and were opened up again at the later conferences. Hamburg seemingly did not serve as a precedent.

The explanation, however, may lie in the fact that the Hamburg Temple had instituted changes for its own congregation and not for all the congregations within the Gemeinde. It was the opinion of the rabbis, who participated in the conference, however, that such changes should be adopted by all the congregations. Because of the different situation, the issues were discussed once again. Also, because of the opposition of many congregations to the proposed innovations, very few practical changes were instituted as a result of the conferences.

The historian, Graetz, despite his general anti-reform bias, evaluated the work of the Hamburg Temple in the following terms:

The merit of the Hamburg Temple is not to be underestimated. It had removed from the house of God with one stroke and without any scruples, the trash which had gathered around it during many centuries; it has swept away in youthful impetuosity the holy spiderweb which nobody dared to touch, and it has awakened a sense for a regular form of decorum, order, taste, and simplicity during the divine service.

The Hamburg Prayer Book was not a liturgical masterpiece. Many of the original omissions were later restored in other editions. Those who engaged in the work of editing the prayer book attempted to meet the urgent needs of their day but perhaps lacked the ability to develop fully many of the implications. It had to take many more years before Reform Jewish ideology would be clearly outlined and implemented in the practical life.

Yet, Hamburg was the first stage in a long process of growth for Reform. The Hamburg Prayer Book was a product of men who had insights into an evolving truth. They laid the foundations for Reform by encouraging their co-religionists to be receptive to that truth.

A word about the implications of the Hamburg Prayer Book controversy for contemporary Reform Judaism in

America. The tremendous literature on this subject could lead one to form a judgment that between 1819 and 1841 the Jews of Hamburg had no other interests than the prayer book controversy. The sermons of the rabbis touched upon the events; the periodicals printed the "Opinions"; and the atmosphere was certainly tense and exciting. If one has any appreciation at all for the intellectual prowess of those who participated in the controversy, one cannot help but be amazed at the brilliant satire, homiletics and logical argumentation which the participants drew upon in their presentations. However, I am realistic enough to recognize that the controversy perhaps did not affect the daily lives of the businessman, the merchant and other members of the Temple who were preoccupied with more commonplace interests. But still, the controversy was a meaningful one in that it offered opportunity for discussion of what was then a significant concern to the cause of Reform.

Today, in America, the climate in which Reform Judaism has been developing is different, different from the climate in Germany in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Reform Judaism today is tolerated by the orthodox community since each of the major religious groups has obtained some degree of

acceptance from the other. Reform Judaism in America never had to fight as militantly against orthodoxy as did the Reformers in Germany. It has been the task of American Jews, Orthodox, Conservative and Reform alike, to create a new image of "American Judaism" and, as a result, changes in liturgy and in other areas have been more readily recognized as essential.

The German Reformers were concerned about their liturgy. A modern and dignified service was visualized as the means whereby the Jews who were drifting away from their faith might return to the fold. Ideological considerations were secondary and for many only a consequence of the improved worship. Today, in America, Reform Judaism needs more than an improved liturgy. An improved service does not lead people to religious faith and conviction. The Reform Jewish position today is being attacked from all sides and not merely from the side of Orthodoxy. The forces of humanism; psychology; philosophy and materialism constitute the real threats to the liberal position upon which Reform Judaism is based.

The Hamburg Temple controversy offers historical perspective. It reminds us of our humble beginnings and of the hard struggle of the pioneers of Reform for acceptance. Hamburg recaptures a "moment" of the many years which were destined to pass before its achievements could become our possession.

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. M. Kayserling. "Moses Mendelssohn". (The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VIII,
c pp. 479-485.)

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Simon Bernfeld. Toledoth Hareformatziyon Hadatith Beyisrael, Appendix.
2. I. Elbogen. Der judische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, pp. 402-409.
3. Bernfeld. Appendix.
4. Analysis, Prayer Book
Reprinted in Bernfeld, Appendix.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Dr. Joseph S. Weizenbaum. An Analysis of Nogah Tzedek, pp. 57-67.
2. This pamphlet was issued anonymously and is represented in full in the Appensix to Bernfeld's Toledoth Hareformatziyon Hadatith Beyisrael.
3. A. Feilchenfeld. "Zeckel Fränkel". (The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. V, pp. 482-484).

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. I. Elbogen. Der judische Gottesdienst in Seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, pp. 411-415.
2. S. Bernfeld. p. 72ff.
3. Ibid., Appendix.
4. Joseph Rauch. The Hamburg Prayer Book, pp.15-16.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. Alexander Chessin. "Joseph Aub", (The Jewish Encyclopedia (J.E.), Vol. II, p. 297).
2. Moses Beer. "Isaac Auerbach", (J.E., Vol. III, p.303.)
3. I. Low. Gesammelte Schriften, Vol. II, pp.251-302.
4. M. Kayserling. "Joseph Friedlander", (J.E. Vol.V, p. 516).
5. Max Wiener. Abraham Geiger and Liberal Judaism, p. 382. (See also S. Bernfeld, p. 125ff).
6. M. Kayserling. "Moses Gutmann", (J.E. Vol. VI, p. 114).
7. S. Bernfeld. p. 174ff. (See also Max Selinger, "Samuel Holdheim; Theologian of Early Reform Judaism", pp. 16-21).
8. S. Bernfeld. p. 174ff.
9. M. Selinger. pp. 96-97.
10. I. Warsaw. "Joseph Maier", (J.E. Vol. VIII, p.264).
11. E. Neumann. "I. Mannheimer", (J.E. Vol. VIII, p.295-6.)
12. G. Deutsch. "Zacharias Frankel", (J.E. Vol. V, pp. 482-484).
13. B. Italiener. "Dr. Gotthold Salomon", Festschrift zum hundertzwanzig jährigen Bestehen des Israelitischen Tempels in Hamburg, pp. 17-24.
- 13a. Ibid.
- 13b. Ibid.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV (Cont'd)

14. I. Singer. "Ludwig Philipson", (J.E. Vol.IX, pp. 684-685.)
15. I. Singer. "Leopold Stein", (J.E. Vol. XI, p.540).
16. S. Bernfeld. p. 137ff.
17. Ibid.
- 17a. Ibid.
- 17b. Ibid.
18. Theologische Gutachten, pp. 11-30.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid., pp. 32-45.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., pp. 45-51.
- 25a. Ibid.
- 25b. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., p. 55.
28. Refers in addition to pages 9, 316, 10, 13, 66 of 1841 edition for further references.
29. Theologische Gutachten, pp. 55-61.
30. Jeremiah 29:10-14.
31. Theologische Gutachten, pp. 55-61.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV (Cont'd)

32. Ibid., p. 61.
33. Ibid., pp. 66-73.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid., pp. 83-85.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid. (Quoted from Maimonides, Hilkhoth Mamrim 2:4).
40. Ibid., p. 101.
41. Ibid., pp. 101-108.
42. Ibid., p. 108ff.
43. Ibid., p. 112.
44. Ibid.
45. I note, however, that it is not omitted entirely in the 1841 edition but has a different wording and is not repeated at the end.
46. Theologische Gutachten, p. 112.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid., p. 63.
- 48a. Geiger, Der. Hamburger Tempelstreit-eine Zeitfrage, p. 46.
49. Ibid., p. 47ff.
50. Ibid.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV (Cont'd)

51. This criticism of Geiger was answered by M. Frankel in the Introduction to the Theologische Gutachten, p. 13, where it is stated that these blessings remained as old Nusachoth omitted in recitation and not translated.
52. Theologische Gutachten, pp. 73-77.
53. Ibid.
54. The verse in question reads: "Nekam le'enenu nikmath dam avodekha hashapukh".
- 54a. Theologische Gutachten, pp. 74-77.
55. Ibid.
56. Gotthold Salomon. Das Neue Gebetbuch und seine Verketzerung, pp. 1-4.
57. Ibid., p. 4ff.
58. Ibid., p. 10.
59. Ibid., p. 12.
60. Ecclesiastes 60:1.
61. Gotthold Salomon. p. 14ff.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid., p. 23.
64. Ibid.
- 64a. Ibid.
65. Zacharias Frankel. "Das neue Hamburger Gebetbuch", Der Orient, 1842, No. 24.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV (Cont'd)

- 66. Ibid.
- 67. Hamburg Prayer Book, 1841, "Anmerkungen".
- 68. Zacharias Frankel. Der Orient, No. 24.
- 69. Ibid.
- 70. Ibid.
- 71. Ibid.
- 72. Gotthold Salomon. "Sendschreiben an den Herrn
Dr. Z. Frankel", Der Orient, No. 25.
- 73. Ibid.
- 74. Ibid.
- 75. Ibid.
- 76. Ibid.
- 77. Ibid.
- 78. Ibid.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Caesar Seligman. "Hundertzwanzig Jahre Hamburger Tempel". Festschrift zum 120 Bestehen des Israel-itschen Tempels in Hamburg, pp. 7-13.
- 1a. Abraham Geiger. Israelitisches Gebetbuch.
2. Abraham Geiger. "Plan zu einem neuen Gebetbuch". Nachgelassene Schriften, Vol. I.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Joseph Rauch. The Hamburg Prayer Book, p. 20.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Prayer Books.

Ordnung der "öffentlichen Andacht des neuen Tempel-Vereins in Hamburg, Hamburg, 1819.

Gebetbuch für die "öffentliche und häusliche Andacht nach dem Gebrauch des Neuen Israelitischen Tempels in Hamburg. Hamburg, 1841.

Moses Beer. "Isaac Auerbach". (The Jewish Encyclopedia, (J.E.) Vol. III, p.303, New York and London, 1903.

Israel Bettan. Early Reform in Contemporaneous Responsa. Hebrew Union College Annual, 1925. (H.U.C.A.)

Simon Bernfeld. Toledoth Ha-Reformatzion Hadatith Be-Yisrael, Cracow, 1900.

M. J. Bresselau. Chereb Nokemeth, Nekam Brith. Hamburg, 1819.

Alexander Chessin. "Joseph Aub", (The J.E.), Vol.II, p. 297, New York and London, 1903.

G. Deutsch. "Zacharias Frankel", (The J.E.), Vol.V, pp. 482-484.

Edition of Eleh Dikre Habrith. Altona, 1819.

I. Elbogen. Der Jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Frankfurt on Main, 1931.

A. Feilchenfeld. "Isaac Bernays", (The J.E.), Vol. III, pp. 90-91.

Seckel I. Frankel. Schutschrift des zu Hamburg erschienenen Israelitischen Gebetbuchs. Hamburg, 1819.

Naphtali Frankfurter. Stillstand und Fortschritt. Hamburg, 1841.

M. Fürst. Der Orient, Nos. 23-25, Leipzig, 1842.

Abraham Geiger. Der Hamburger Tempelstreit-eine Zeitfrage. Breslau, 1842.

Bibliography (Cont'd)

- Abraham Geiger. Israelitisches Gebetbuch für den öffentlichen Gottesdienst. Breslau, 1854.
- Abraham Geiger. Nachgelassene Schriften. Vol. 1, Berlin, 1875.
- Heinrich Graetz. History of the Jews. Vol.V, Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America (JPSA), 1956.
- Samuel Holdheim. Verketzerung und Gewissensfreiheit. Ein Zweites Votum. Schwerin, 1842.
- Samuel Holdheim. "Über das Gebetbuch nach dem Gebrauche des Neuen Israelitischen Tempelvereins zu Hamburg. Ein Votum. Hamburg, 1841.
- A. Z. Idelsohn. Jewish Liturgy and its Development, New York, Sacred Music Press, 1932.
- Bruno Italiener. Festschrift zum hundertzwanzigjährigen Bestehen des Israelitischen Tempels in Hamburg, 1817-1937, Hamburg, 1937.
- A. Kaminka. "Abraham Kohn", (The J.E.), Vol. VII, pp. 533-534.
- M. Kayersling. "Joseph Friedlander", (The J.E.), Vol.V, p. 316, New York and London, 1903.
- M. Kayserling. "Moses Gutmann", (The J.E.), Vol. VI, p. 114.
- D. Leimdörfer. Festschrift zum hundertjährigen Bestehen des Israelitischen Tempels in Hamburg, 1918.
- Leopold Löw. Gesammelte Schriften, Vol. I, Berlin, 1875.
- E. Neumann. "Isaac Mannheimer". (The J.E.) Vol.VII, pp. 295-296.
- A. Peiginsky. "Seckel Frankel", (The J.E.) Vol. V, p.481.
- David Philipson. The Reform Movement in Judaism, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1907.

Bibliography (Cont'd)

- Joseph Rauch. "The Hamburg Prayer Book", Central Conference of American Rabbis Yearbook, Vol. XXVIII, 1918.
- Gotthold Salomon. Das Neue Gebetbuch und seine Verketzerung. Hamburg, 1841.
- Gotthold Salomon. Sendschreiben an dem Herrn Dr. Z. Frankel. Hamburg, 1842.
- Caesar Seligman. Geschichte der Jüdischen Reformbewegung. Frankfurt am main. J. Kaufmann Verlag, 1922.
- Max Selinger. "Samuel Holdheim: Theologian of Early Reform Judaism", Doctoral Thesis, H.U.C., Cincinnati, 1962.
- I. Singer. "Ludwig Philipson", (The J.E.), Vol. IX, pp. 684-685.
- I. Singer. "Leopold Stein", (The J.E.), Vol. XI, p.540.
- Leopold Stein. Gebetbuch für Israelitische Gemeinden, Frankfurt on Main, 1860.
- Theologische Gutachten über das Gebetbuch nach dem Gebrauche des Neuen Israelitischen Tempelvereins in Hamburg. Hamburg, 1842.
- I. Warsaw. "Joseph Maier", (The J.E.), Vol. VIII, p.264.
- Joseph Weizenbaum. An Analysis of Nogah Tzedek. D.H.L. Thesis, H.U.C., Cincinnati, 1962.
- Max Wiener. Abraham Geiger and Liberal Judaism. Philadelphia, J.P.S., 1962.