HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
NEW YORK SCHOOL

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESIS

AUTHOR: Robert Alan Nosanchuk

TITLE: Israel Related Liturgy in the Prayer Books of Reform Judaism

TYPE OF THESIS:

RABBINIC (X) SSM ( ) D.H.L. ( )

D.MIN. ( ) M.A.R.E. ( ) M.A.J.S. ( )

1. (X) May be used without my written permission.

2. ( ) My written permission is required for use during the next ____ years.

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

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

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

2/27/01
Date

Signature of Author

THE KLAU LIBRARY
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
BROOKDALE CENTER
ONE WEST FOURTH STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10012

LIBRARY RECORD

Microfilmed: _____ *Date*

_____
Signature of Library Staff Member

March 5, 1996

Israel-Related Liturgy in the Prayer Books of Reform Judaism
An Analysis of the Methods of Liturgical Reform

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of Ordination
Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, Graduate Rabbinical Program,
New York Campus: March 1, 2001

Student: Robert Alan Nosanchuk

Advisor: Dr. Lawrence A. Hoffman

Israel-Related Liturgy in the Prayer Books of Reform Judaism

Table of Contents

Deliver us Eternal Our God
and gather us from among the nations
to acclaim Your holy name,
to glory in Your praise.

Blessed is the Eternal, God of Israel
from eternity to eternity.
Let all of the people say, Amen.
Halleluyah.

-Psalm 106:47-48

Acknowledgments

In the course of choosing this topic and preparing this rabbinical thesis, I learned a great deal from many sources. I am extremely grateful to all of those who have helped bring me to this day, those who have informed my research with their insights, their support and the benefits of their experiences.

First, I have truly enjoyed the opportunity to work on this thesis with my thesis advisor, Dr. Lawrence A. Hoffman. He has challenged me as a teacher and rabbi to deepen the meaning of all my work by articulating a vision and pursuing it. I am very grateful for Dr. Hoffman's critical eye. But more than that, he has shown great care and support during the preparation of this work. In addition, he has written many seminal essays on liturgy that have guided my research. With the benefit of his support and scholarship, I have been given a gift that I treasure.

It was Dr. David Ellenson whose presentation at the HUC-JIR New York campus in 1999 gave me the impetus to choose this topic. As this thesis reveals, Dr. Ellenson's trailblazing efforts in researching Israel-related liturgy have had a major impact on my own research. But additionally, Dr. Ellenson provided a recommended bibliography and even helped me to obtain prayer-books that I needed. His friendship, his teaching and his mentschlikeit are most appreciated.

I wish to acknowledge the support of my colleagues at Temple Beth El in Chappaqua, where I have served as the rabbinical intern. Rabbi Chaim Stern, Rabbi David Thomas, Cantor Dana Anesi and Sharon Halper. I am particularly grateful to Rabbi Stern for spending several hours with me, reviewing the approach to liturgical reform he has taken in his distinguished career as rabbi and liturgist in the United States and Great Britain. Thank you, Chaim.

At HUC-JIR in New York, I have been additionally guided and supported in this endeavor by Dr. A. Stanley Dreyfus, Dr. Phil Miller and the HUC Library Staff, and by Rabbi Aaron Panken. Also input and support has been given by many of my classmates, but in particular I wish to acknowledge Elizabeth Goldstein, Fred Greene, Jill Maderer and Ruth Zlotnick.

Finally, the incomparable love and support that I receive from my wife, Joanie Berger and our new son, Zachary, make any and all of the dimensions of my work and my education sweeter. As I approach rabbinical ordination, I celebrate the profound blessing of calling Joanie and Zachary my family.

Introduction

Modern studies of Jewish liturgy have taken a range of different perspectives. This has especially been true since the emancipation of European Jewry in nineteenth century Europe. For after Jewish emancipation, "critical tools...came to be applied for the triple purpose of ascertaining the correct text, determining its historical background, and finding out the actual intended meaning of each prayer unit." [1] The Zunzian approach, for example, focused critically upon philological clues contained in our prayers. In his scientific study of the words in our liturgy, Leopold Zunz (1794-1886) sought to "demonstrate the intimate connection between the political vicissitudes, intellectual and moral cravings and the literary productions of the Jews," [2] and Zunz included *siddurim* as "literary productions" of the Jewish people. Subsequent critical editions of the prayer book more pointedly attempted to establish the dating and history of particular prayers.

In the twentieth century, modern researchers added yet another type of data to modern liturgical research. In close analysis of both the *siddur* and Jewish history, they came to view liturgy as the "carefully devised expression of the religious spirit of its author... a way in which to understand the various religious, social and ideological postures of a religious community at a certain moment in history. [3] In other words, the choices made in the editing of a prayer book could offer critical data about the people who lived in a particular era.

---

[1] Friedland, Eric, Were Our Mouths Filled With Song: Studies in Liberal Jewish Liturgy, (Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press, 1997), p. 9.
[2] Sachar, Howard, The Course of Modern Jewish History, (New York: Random House, 1990), p. 164.
[3] Ellenson, David, Between Tradition and Culture: The Dialectics of Modern Jewish Identity, (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994) p. 197.

Lawrence Hoffman places this issue more squarely on the table. He maintains that the *siddur* not only reflects an author's ideology, but it also acts as a type of mirror reflecting the self-image of Jews who are worshipping at any point in time. Hoffman's research has led him to call for an extension of the "purview" of research "to include not only the books of prayer but the people who pray as well, the worship community for whom the prayers exist as something to be prayed." [4] For when we apprehend the social and communal context for decisions made by prayer-book editors, we gain a glimpse of a community's "liturgical self-definition."

For instance, we may learn from the way in which a particular rubric in the worship service is translated by the author or editor. We may take additional clues from new prayers that a particular editor composes to fit the exigencies of his time period. Finally we must pay close attention to structural cues offered by the editor, such as choreography, size of the printed typeface, or direction in which the book opens. For Hoffman reminds us that prayer books do not appear in a vacuum. Each *siddur* acts as the artistic rendering of a particular artist (editor) in his milieu, attempting to mirror the image of the Jewish worship community.

In the liberal Jewish movement of nineteenth century Germany, this view of the *siddur* as a liturgical "mirror" became a dominant theme for prayer-book editors who developed each community's *siddur*. This was because Reform Jews in such places as Hamburg, Breslau and Berlin had come to believe each word of worship should express

---

[4] Hoffman, Lawrence, Beyond the Text: A Holistic Approach to Liturgy, (Bloomington, IN: Indianapolis University Press, 1987), p. 6.

the "truthful" convictions of the Jewish people who pray them. These early Reformers focused their attention on the literal "truth" of each assertion made in the liturgy.

Liberal rabbis from Germany and elsewhere in Western Europe brought this vision of liturgy as "truth" to America. In the United States a massive influx of German Jews during the mid-1800's, and their classical Reform Judaism emphasizing "reason," "truth" and "scientific study" of Judaism gained a widespread following. In his nineteenth-century prayer book *Olat Tamid* [5], for instance, Rabbi David Einhorn explicitly demonstrated his concern for "truth." Einhorn wrote:

> We come into this house sacred by associations which cluster about it. O God, to lift our soul up to Thee, and to be... confirmed in the spirit of loyalty to duty, and devotion to right and truth. [6]

One sees in this passage that Einhorn not only felt worshippers should devote themselves to "truth," but that his liturgy asks for God to "confirm" their "devotion to right and truth" as well. In other words, when we approach God in prayer, we bring our sincerity and integrity for God's acknowledgement. Only in "truth" and honesty can we hope that our prayer reaches God at all.

With this theory of worship as "truth-telling," the question arose as to how to maintain a sense of integrity when a traditional Jewish prayer contradicted one's personal or communal ideology? Should one reform the liturgy? If so, using what method of reform and why?

---

[5] Note: *Olat Tamid* served as basis for *Union Prayer book*, the dominant Reform *siddur* of the 20th century.
[6] Plaut, Gunther, W., Growth of Reform Judaism: American and European Sources Until 1948, (New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1965), p. 300.

One of the most critical dilemmas in this regard is how to respond to the doctrine of the personal Messiah as it appears in our liturgy. According to traditional Jewish prayers, the messiah's "appearance [is] connected with the restoration of the Temple and of the sacrificial cult, the ingathering of the dispersed people of Israel and their return to Zion." [7] Each of these related concepts poses significant challenges in that they negate much of what modernity has taught Jews about their theology. It is Reform's various methods of responding liturgically to such Zionist doctrines that interests us here.

The related doctrines of a return to Zion and the restoration of the ancient Temple were by no means simple obstacles for the prayer book reformers to overcome. After all, the Bible repeatedly describes the dramatic vision of the Israelites being returned to their land by the hand of God. It is a central aspect of the covenant between God and Israel. Particularly in prophetic sources, from which early Reform Jews took their inspiration, the promise of Zion as future home for Israel is bestowed and glorified. For example, Amos 9:11-15 records:

> In that day will I rise up the tabernacle of David that has fallen, and close up its breaches. And I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old...And I will turn the captivity of my people Israel and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them. And they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof. They shall also make gardens and eat the fruit of them. And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be plucked up out of their land that I have given them.

This passage from Amos is just one among many in the Bible that reaffirm the traditional vision of Israel restored unto Zion in order to rebuild its ancient homeland. Passages in Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Isaiah, echo these same Zionist sentiments of return, resettlement and rebuilding of Israel's land.

---

[7] Ibid., p. 304.

But more than with any other prophet, it is with Isaianic imagery that the traditional liturgy most delights in petitioning God for Israel's return from dispersion. In the *Amidah*, for example, the liturgical vision of redemption is vividly described with Isaiah's image of a *shofar gadol* ("great shofar") to herald Israel's messianic deliverance, and its *nes lagoyim* ("banner to the nations") signaling the gathering of Israel from the four corners of the earth. These prophetic symbols will be explored further. But for now, it is worth noting that Reform Jews were accustomed to Isaiah's grand messianic vision. The promises of Zion as a homeland and Jerusalem as spiritual center were critical aspects of their prayer.

Michael Prior reminds us of the generations of rabbis whose literature redoubled emphasis on the biblical promise of Zion as a key to Jewish worship: "When the rabbis prescribed the recitation of the [*Amidah*], the emphasis was on the Temple, rather than just the land. Zion was 'the abiding place of Thy glory.' And...the prayers were to be said facing Jerusalem, or at least while orienting the heart toward the Holy of Holies [Mishnah Berakhot 4:5)." [8] Such a rabbinically-affirmed doctrine of Zion in the prayer book could not help but affect the decisions made by early Reformers, especially since Reform rabbis themselves inherited the traditional liturgy with its Zionistic centrality. Over the centuries prior to emancipation, "Jewish liturgy played a critical role in keeping alive the attachment to the land.....Constant reference to the ritual patterns endowed the land of Israel with almost mystical significance." [9]

---

[8] Prior, Michael, Zionism and the State of Israel, (London, England: Routledge Press, 1999), p. 58.
[9] Ibid., p. 59-60.

Many Jews had grown accustomed to this "mystical significance" of the land of Israel within liturgy, Bible, and rabbinical literature. But still Reform rabbis began early efforts to edit out Zionist doctrines from the liturgy. This was a controversial practice for early Reform to undertake! It meant the willingness of early Reform rabbis to accept a great deal of criticism, for they were suggesting that liturgical yearnings toward Israel now contradicted the "truth." They were saying ultimately that there is little value to Israel-directed worship if not backed up with the "truthful" aspirations of modern Jews. Also, as increasingly acculturated people, Reform prayer book editors could not help but see that a liturgical link with a "homeland" was no match for the modern desire to integrate into society.

Shlomo Avineri summarizes: "For all of its emotional, cultural and religious intensity, this link with Palestine did not change the praxis of Jewish life in the Diaspora. Jews might pray three times a day for the deliverance that would transform the world and transport them to Jerusalem, but they did not emigrate there. They could annually mourn the destruction of the Temple... but they did not move there." [10] Avineri's statement amounts to an indictment of the crime to which modern Reform Jewry felt guilty. They had prayed a liturgy in which they ultimately did not believe. The Zionist vision of messianic redemption was not only something they questioned, it was something they directly opposed.

---

[10] Avineri, Shlomo, The Making of Modern Zionism: The Intellectual Origins of the Jewish State, (New York: Basic Books, 1981), p. 3.

Recognizing the massive dissonance between the traditional Israel-related liturgy and the reality of their ambivalence to Israel, the editors of Reform prayer books applied their editorial pens liberally to the *siddur* and its Israel-related prayers. No phrase in the liturgy was off-limits, even if it only *appeared* to advocate a nationalist agenda. Among other pieces of liturgy, they challenged the petition of God during the prayer *Ahava Rabbah* to ""Bring us home in peace from the four corners of the earth, and make us walk upright to our land." (*V'havienu l'shalom me'arba kanfot Ha'aretz v'tolichenu kom'miyut l'artzenu.*)

Given the perspective of prayer as expressing literal "truth," *V'havienu* had to be edited by Reformers. For Reform rabbis interpreted its literal meaning as an actual physical restoration to Palestine, which belied the "truth" of their communal opposition to Zionism. Modern Reform communities already felt themselves to be perfectly at home in their current countries. They did not want to be taken from their "corners of the earth" and brought to Zion. Germany or America were their destined homelands! These modern Reform Jews had no intention of advocating a return to Zion in either a political or theological sphere. On this point they were unified.

But there remained points of disagreement in terms of how to effectively reform the prayer book of its Zionistic centrality. One could not simply leave the *siddur* exactly as handed to them. So Reformers desired to know how to liturgically rid themselves of the conflict they felt between nationalist prayers and modern rationalist aspirations. To answer this question the Reform prayer book editors developed a range of different methods to alleviate their concerns over Zionism.

Our research, outlined in the chapters that follow, will focus on the methods that the prayer books of Reform Judaism have utilized in reforming the prayer book relative to Zionism. Using the *siddurim* of nineteenth-century Hamburg as our first case study, we will suggest that three different methods were developed by early Reform. These we call the "pathways" of excision, echoing tradition and emendation. Each "pathway" for reforming the *siddur* of Zionism had its benefits and its challenges. But all of these strategies were effective in their efforts to neutralize or edit the nationalist prayers that most conflicted with Reform movement ideology.

In the first chapter, we suggest that the first method used by Reform prayer book editors was the pathway of excision. Following this pathway, Reform rabbis could choose to omit a prayer phrase such as *V'havienu* or the entirety of the *Ahava Rabbah* if they saw fit. The choice of how much to excise depended upon how radically the editor wished to challenge the traditional prayers. For if so desired, the *siddur* could be reformed not only of Zionism but other concepts which contradicted their rationalism.

But when a prayer book editor followed the path of excision, they must have that they would face the wrath of traditional rabbinical leaders in their Jewish communities. Liturgical reform was never a great boon to intra-Jewish relations. Particularly in Germany, early Reform prayer book editors were subject to a barrage of criticism from rabbis claiming a particular excised prayer was fundamental to Jewish theology. On the other hand, by excising various prayers from the liturgy, Reformers gained not only a more "truthful" service, but a step toward another reform goal-- brevity in worship. [11]

[11] Elbogen notes "the abridgement of the traditional prayers" as a main characteristic of Reform prayer." (Elbogen, Ismar, Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History (Phila, Jewish Publication Society, 1994) p.

A second method that was used by Reformers in editing the *siddur* and its Zionism was the pathway of "echoing tradition." This method was certainly at the other end of the spectrum from the pathway of excision! For Reformers who wished to "echo tradition" in their *siddurim* were not necessarily concerned about the length of the service at all. An example of one early Reformer who often chose to "echo tradition" in his liturgy is Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, whose *Minhag America* will be examined in Chapter Two. For Wise and other Reformers like him, few modifications or excisions would need to be made to the traditional prayer text. Instead the pathway of "echoing tradition" favored the addition of more prayers. Thus a multiplicity of voices, traditional and modern were included in such *siddurim.* Yet we note that these same *siddurim* were often criticized for their difficulty to be accessed by the average worshipper.

The third path which Reform prayer books utilized in response to Zionist liturgy is the pathway of emendation. This was the most well traveled pathway of Reform, involving direct changes made to either the Hebrew or vernacular translations of prayers to reflect an alternative and less controversial meaning. As Reform Judaism grew in various communities, more support grew for rabbis to follow the pathway of emendation to reflect the new modern self-image of an emancipated European Jewry.

Yet a serious challenge was faced by those who used the method of emendation. For it often meant imposing new, often modernistic beliefs upon ancient prayer texts, which were not necessarily a good match with each other. In some ways, following this pathway of emendation meant wading into dangerous waters, perhaps even more than by echoing tradition or excision.

331.

Since the Reform movement held the traditional liturgy to the test of whether or not it told "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth," it would also need to hold its newly emended prayers to the same standard. Thus any particularity or alternative symbolism used in the newly emended prayers would come under significant scrutiny. In such an environment, prayer-book editors focused upon making the prayers more palatable to the non-particularistic tastes of the modern Reform worship community. The most direct consequence of such a situation was that prayers subject to emendation often took on the quality of being wholly universalistic and generalized.

For instance, prayers that once called for Israel's freedom from captivity now only spoke of the general issue of freedom for all humankind. And Jerusalem, which traditional Jewish prayers had hoped to be rebuilt as a site of the Davidic temple was now, to paraphrase the prophet Isaiah, only the site from which God's Teaching had emanated. We indicate "had emanated" in the past tense here, because one of the most pronounced emendations to the traditional liturgy was the imposition of the past tense onto the Isaianic vision: *Ki mi tzion tetzei torah, u'davar adonai mirushalayim.* This ought to be translated as "for out of Zion *shall* go forth Torah and the word of the Eternal from Jerusalem.") But many Reform prayer book editors in Germany changed the tense of the word *tetzei* in translation of the verse, so as to delineate a historical attribution of importance to Jerusalem and Zion, rather than a future messianic hope.

On occasion, Reformers used the pathway of emendation in order to experiment with new radical paradigms for Reform Jewish worship. Some examples of radical emendation are in David Einhorn's work, which will be discussed in Chapter three.

Among Einhorn's most radical emendations, we will see, are when he uses Isaiah's motif of the "suffering servant" to help guide his understanding of Jewish history in his emended Tisha B'Av liturgy. [12] We will find that this radical emendation, born in Einhorn's *Olat Tamid,* was carried over into the subsequent liturgy of the1895 Union Prayer Book . In Chapter Four, we will discuss the way in which Einhorn's liturgy generally served as a model for the Union Prayer Book. However, we will also see that by the time of the UPB's publication, emendation was not its preferred method. Rather the editors of Union Prayer Book most often used the pathway of excision to reform the traditionally Zionistic and nationalistic liturgy. For the UPB may ultimately have served as a liturgical version of the 1885 Pittsburgh Platform, the CCAR's official statement which expressly negated Reform ties to Jewish nationalism.

In Chapter five, we will see the effect of challenges made to the 1895 UPB and the new climate within Reform that made it more acceptable for Zionism to find a place within the public pronouncements of Reform. We will review some of the major criticisms of the manner in which the early editions of Union Prayer Book handled traditional liturgical statements. We will see the texts of the 1937 CCAR Columbus Platform and UAHC Pro-Zionist Resolution that helped plant the seeds by which UPB editors chose to include a radically pro-Zionist prayer in one of their new Sabbath evening service liturgies. The prayer in the 1940 edition of UPB was evidence of the usage of a new method relative to Israel-related prayers – the reclamation of Zionism in the *siddur.*

---

[12] See Chapter 3 for more information on Einhorn's method of liturgical reform in his siddur *Olat Tamid.*

Finally in Chapter six we will discuss the most recent *siddur* published by the Reform movement: *Sha'arei Tefila:* Gates of Prayer. The Gates of Prayer was edited by Rabbi Chaim Stern and published under the province of a CCAR commission on Jewish liturgy led by Rabbi A. Stanley Dreyfus in 1975. It succeeded the Union Prayer Book as the official liturgy of American Reform Judaism, even taking as its subtitle "The New Union Prayer Book." But this *siddur* had a vastly different historical background than the UPB. For it had the distinction of being the first Reform prayer book published after the twin peak experiences of twentieth century Jewish life: the Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel.

Because of the unique impact of the Holocaust and the State of Israel, the new method of "reclaiming Zionism," begun in the 1940 UPB, was continually used in the editing of Gates of Prayer. After all, by the 1970's publication of GOP, the Reform movement had completely renounced its official policy of opposition to Zionism. The Columbus Platform in 1937 obligated American Reform Jews to support the nascent efforts in Palestine in consonance with their reform ideals. But also the 1975 CCAR Centenary Perspective declared "that while the ethics of universalism implicit in traditional Judaism must be an explicit part of our Jewish duty, the survival of the Jewish People is of highest priority." [13] With "Jewish survival" as an expressed value, editors of the liturgy in Gates of Prayer were careful not to negate the meaning of the modern Jewish State as a place of survival for Jews battered by the Holocaust. Yet the editors also did not want to ascribe all hope to the Jews of the State of Israel.

---

[13] *Encyclopedia Judaica CD-Rom*, (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1999), "Reform Judaism," p. 5.

To express these fine points in GOP, editors primarily treaded the pathway of emendation in their work of liturgical reform. We will show that no new excisions were made to the traditional liturgy in Gates of Prayer that hadn't been applied in earlier Reform prayer-books. Rather the path of "reclaiming Zionism" was often followed by Gates of Prayer editors. Examples of "reclaimed" Zionist prayers in GOP included the *Av Ha'rakhamim* and *Ha-makhzir shekhinato l'tzion*. Also *Havinenu* served as a place in which GOP editors reclaimed Zionism for the reform liturgy.

Our research paper will conclude with some concluding reflections. These will list some of the findings of each chapter. Then a brief comment will be included, concerning the application of the methods of reforming Zionistic liturgy to the building and distinguishing of Reform Judaism in general.

One might say that the daily liturgy of the Jewish people acts as a mirror. As Jews offer their prayer, they examine the mirror's reflection and see their place amid the national, ethical and religious views of the Jewish people. For liberal Jews, a personal relationship to the literal meaning of liturgy has been an essential part of relating to the images presented in the mirror. "Am I speaking the truth?" early Reformers questioned, knowing that nascent liberal Judaism advocated such self-scrutiny. Indeed a liberal Jewish outlook not only allowed for but encouraged liturgical reform. So new methods of liturgical reform were developed to make the words of the liturgy a better match for the outlook of the modern Jew.

Barry Holtz explains, "Prayer, we like to hope, is a moment of true speaking. At that instant we become the words we say. There is no deception, no ego to defend, no manufactured self. We speak from the heart." [14] Note the key phrases in Holtz's aspiration for modern Jewish prayer. He defines prayer as "true speaking," adding the conditions that there be "no deception" and "no manufactured self." In other words, the modern Jewish worshipper should not make believe the reflection in the liturgical mirror is an honest reflection when it is not. For the Jew to seek God, genuineness and authenticity must be part of the communication.

It would seem that Holtz inherited his conceptualization of prayer from the early Reform Jews of the nineteenth century. For the early Reformers, the idea of prayer as an articulation of the "truth" was taken very seriously. Such an approach precipitated a serious conflict as Jews confronted petitions in our daily liturgy that beg in nationalist terms, for such desires as a restoration to Zion or rebuilding of Jerusalem.

Thus in the prayer books of each liberal Jewish community, a range of methods were employed in order to reform the liturgy of its advocacy for Jews as a nation.

Now it is conceivable, even probable that Jews in prior generations had conflict as well with relating to Israel-related expressions of prayer. Historically, a range of views were held about several pieces of liturgy in the *siddur*. Jews have publicly expressed opposition or their desire to reframe particular prayers lest their words be misunderstood.

An example is the vocal opposition of Saadiah Gaon to the inclusion of the prayer *Or chadash* in the *Yotzer* prayer. This prayer, understood literally, beckons that a "new light" shine upon Zion "speedily" so that our eyes may witness its messianic glow. But in the case of this dispute, Saadiah's objections to the messianism of this prayer were recorded as liturgical commentaries and Jewish communities were presented with a choice of whether or not to include *Or chadash* in their *siddur*. The *Seder Rav Amram* records Saadiah's objection: "Anyone who concludes the blessing [*Yotzer*] by saying "May a new light..." makes a mistake, since the sages established this blessing not over the future light of messianic days, but over the light of the present which shines each day... It would thus be fitting to silence anyone who mentions it." [15]

From the inclusion of this objection in *Amram*, one can see that conflicts with messianic and nationalist particularism in the liturgy go well back into Jewish history. Saadiah in his time objected to it as well.

---

[14] Holtz, Barry, Finding Our Way: Jewish Texts and Lives We Lead (New York: Schocken, 1990) p. 110.
[15] *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, Goldschmidt, Daniel, ed., (Jerusalem, 1971), p. 13, translation by Hoffman, Lawrence, Canonization of Synagogue Service, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979), p. 25.

But the nineteenth century was different. Why? Several factors specifically encouraged a nineteenth century emphasis within Reform on responding to nationalist liturgy. All of these factors, to a greater or lesser degree, helped Jewish communities unlock themselves from their continued perpetuation of Zion-oriented prayers. These contributing factors included: (1) the technological competence allowing early Reform to print new prayer books, (2) the scientific study of Judaism- *Wissenchaft des Judentums*, (3) inclusion of vernacular translations of the traditional Hebrew prayers in the prayer book and (4) the spirit of revolution emerging from the European Jewish emancipation.

First of all, at the dawn of modernity, we note that the Jews in the communities of Western Europe were beneficiaries of a great boom in the production of prayer books. German communities were centers of publishing Judaica and liturgy in particular. [16] This simple capability to print new books, using the vastly increased technological competence of the day, encouraged community leaders to produce enough prayer books to place a *siddur* into the hands of each worshiper. This was revolutionary for many communities who had relied on an oral prayer tradition and a relative dearth of *siddurim*.

Now with the ability secured to produce new prayer books en masse, prayer book editors could respond directly to the issues raised by particular prayers that mot troubled them. The new *siddur*, in a widely distributed written volume, would be able to depict the religious truths of Judaism for the Jews and for the community at-large. It would be a "mirror" with which to reflect on the "truth" of Judaism for each community.

---

[16] Especially significant: W. Heidenheim and M. Lehrberger in Roedelheim, published editions of the liturgy, M.W. Kaufmann in Leipzig, synagogue music and J. Kaufmann in Frankfort, leading Jewish publisher for three generations. (*Encyclopedia Judaica CD-Rom*, Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House), "Publishing," p. 10

Holding fast to this vision of the *siddur* as a repository of truth, the prayer book editors of Reform increasingly confronted a gaping dissonance between the Zionist content of the liturgy and the advancing position of the Jew in society. No community took this dissonance between liturgy and reality as seriously as nineteenth century Germany. For in Germany many communities began to encourage Jews to pray not only in Hebrew but also in their beloved vernacular language. Like ancient Aramaic had once functioned for the Jewish people in rabbinical times, so also did the early Reformers of modernity encourage German to be used as a new language for prayer. After all, it was the language that most Jews knew. So why shouldn't it be the language in which they prayed? *Yachol likrotah b'col lashon* ("One may pray in any language,") [17] a principle as old as the Halachic codes, found its actualization in the work of early Reform.

It was not that they objected to the usage of Hebrew, rather they felt it was a barrier to the expression of the true emotional feeling of the people. At the 1845 Frankfort Conference, a fiery debate occurred on the subject of Hebrew, and David Einhorn explained the prevailing view on the limitations of prayer in Hebrew. He said: "Aforetimes prayer was only the cry of pain: scarcely intelligible expression sufficed for this; but now the people need a prayer that shall express thoughts, feelings and sentiments; this is possible only through the mother tongue." [18]

But translation into the vernacular German posed challenges as well. In some ways, Jews had been better off in their prior method of echoing tradition by using Hebrew. In Hebrew, Jews had shrouded their prayer voice with a mysterious cloak.

---

[17] *Orach Chayim 62:2, Shulchan Aruch*

[18] Philipson, David. "Religion of the Prayer Book," *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy* I (1919), p. 75.

There was a particularity and an exoticism to Hebrew that Jews, unwelcome to integrate into society, may have indulged in during their worship. As Jews intoned their prayers in their ancient tongue, they were expressing their differences from the community around them. So it didn't matter whether or not the literal "truth" of prayer found glory in such differences. Hebrew kept particularism under the surface.

In this climate, no one needed to consider how to cope with the sense that the literal meaning of the words did not match their personal/communal ideology. Hebrew, as a link to tradition and to prior generations, superceded such concerns over the true convictions of the Jewish heart in prayer. By following the practice of praying in Hebrew, Jewish communities had imbibed the notion of "not confusing the text of a prayer with the act of praying." [19] So in many ways petitioning God in Hebrew made a great deal of sense for the pre-Haskalah European Jewish community. If they were not concerned with the precise nature of the prayer text it might as well be prayed in the traditional language.

But beginning with events in the late eighteenth century, emancipation liberated Jews from their prior practice. Emancipation brought with it civic and social rights for Jews of Western and Central Europe and legal protections for their entry into general society. Jews who were "locally restricted to Jewish quarters, became full-fledge citizens of the respective states." [20] The French Revolution was a pivotal event, since it posited the ideal of full brotherhood for all French citizenry. After the revolution so long as Jews acted as loyal Frenchmen or as loyal German citizens, their safety and survival were

---

[19] Hoffman, Lawrence, Beyond the Text: A Holistic Approach to Liturgy, (Bloomington, IN: Indianapolis University Press, 1987) p. 6.

[20] Katz, Jacob, Jewish Emancipation and Self-Emancipation, (Philadelphia: Jewish Pub. Society, 1986), p. 5.

assured. This was the deal emancipation wrought for Jewish communities across Europe. They ran toward the political reforms and equality offered to them at the expense of Jewish particularity but with the goal of becoming Jews as religionists but patriotic as nationalists. With the spirit of revolution in tow, they were creating a new classification: the French Jew, the Austrian Jew, the German Jew. Only they realized that that "concessions of various kinds and degrees were going to have to be made if Jewish identity was to be maintained and Judaism to survive." [21]

Jacob Katz speaks of the nature of these concessions, what he calls the "complexities" and "ramifications" of emancipation. In particular he points to Leopold Zunz, founder of *Wissenchaft des Judentums*- the scientific inquiry into Jewish history, literature and religion that developed in the nineteenth century. We are told that Zunz "remarked that the political emancipation of the Jews would be attained only when the study of Judaism was similarly emancipated." [22] Zunz's approach to emancipating Judaism involved the close philological study of the entire corpus of Jewish literature, the *siddur* included. This was significant because a modern scientific approach to the *siddur* had not been seriously attempted. For Zunz it meant accessing Jewish history by finding the philological contributions of prior generations, determining the date and original wording of various prayers. Lawrence Hoffman emphasizes that although "on the face of it, Zunz was studying Jewish literature, on a deeper level, he sought to reveal the history of the Jewish spirit as it had unfolded through the centuries. [23]

---

[21] Friedland, Eric, Were Our Mouths Filled With Song: Studies in Liberal Jewish Liturgy, (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1997), p. 9.
[22] Ibid., p. 75.
[23] Hoffman, Lawrence, Beyond the Text, 1987, p. 4.

Ultimately Zunz's finding that most deeply informs our discussion was that each succeeding generation of Jews wrote the various liturgies. Jews had used their blessings to help explain the conditions of the time in which they lived. Prayer book editors took their cue from this aspect of Zunz's research and much of the rest of *Wissenchaft*. They realized that if human beings, prior generations of Jews had written the prayers, then modern Jews could change and contribute to the prayers as well. The liturgy was not handed down *mi-Sinai*, as though revealed with Torah on Mount Sinai. Indeed Zunz's scientific and rational approach to Judaism necessitated a serious questioning of whether Sinai had even occurred as a authoritative event of revelation. So with an all encompassing era of scientific truth as the milieu for nineteenth century Jews, changes were made in substance and form to Jewish prayer books.

One of those changes which came in the after-effects of emancipation and Zunz's *Wissenchaft* was that prayer book editors enshrined German, the language of their host nation, as the language of prayer too. Emancipation had wrought many of its victories in the political and communal sphere, but this forced issues of change for internal Jewish practices such as prayer. Now the same language in which Jews could now openly shop at markets and businesses outside of ghetto life was now their language of God's praise. The same language in which Jews participated in society and commerce, new gains of emancipation, was their language of petition to God. No longer was Hebrew worship alone a significant desideratum for Jewish communities. As Jews were emancipated, they wanted for their prayers to make immediate sense to them in their spoken language. Hebrew seemed too great a barrier. They also did not want for the Hebrew language of

prayer to even appear to mask even a hypothetical secret "truth" of Jewish life and living. So Jews began to translate each prayer literally, and this process raised with it concerns about the specter of a charge of dual allegiance (i.e. "homeland" vs. "fatherland.")

Eugene Borowitz in Liberal Judaism notes that according to the literal meaning of the liturgy, "the anticipated Son of David was to reestablish political rule and bring the exiles of his people back to their homeland." Borowitz asks rhetorically of the early Reformers: "If they prayed for such national restoration could the Jews be genuinely loyal to the countries in which they lived? Should citizenship be granted to people of such divided loyalties?" [24] In his discussion of these questions, Borowitz shows how a "true-speaking" approach to the liturgy would have exposed serious conflicts for the German communities in which Reform was born.

With these conflicts exposed, reforming the liberal prayer books of the nineteenth century German communities, in particular of their nationalism, ultimately became an important means by which community leaders could respond to issues of dual allegiance. After all, if prayer were an opportunity to voice religious truth with "no deception," then the gap would have to be significantly lessened between the yearnings of Israel-related liturgy and the actual Zionism of modern liberal Jews. Jews did not want to return to a home outside of Germany! So a range of methods were developed to narrow the gap between the Zionist-oriented words of the Jewish mouth and the patriotic meditations of the Jewish heart. These methods guided many liberal prayer book editors well into the twentieth century, when new methods of liturgical reform were devised.

---

[24] Borowitz, Eugene, Liberal Judaism (New York: UAHC Press, 1990), p. 81.

Jakob Petuchowski indicated that this process of creating new methods to modify Jewish liturgy was the defining principle under which Reform was born altogether. "Reform Judaism," Petuchowski wrote, "made its first appearance on the stage of Jewish history as a movement for liturgical reform." [25] One of the values which clearly guided reform from its start was the desire to negate several nationalistic concepts advocated by the traditional liturgy. The early reformers, according to this value, felt that the meaning n various rubrics of Jewish worship no longer corresponded to the way in which modern Jews saw themselves. They choked on words of prayer that appeared to separate Jews from other peoples on nationalist grounds. They simply could not pray what no longer looked or sounded like the truth.

Lawrence Hoffman reports that for the early Reformers, "the manifest content of the *Siddur* was simply at odds with [their]...self-perception." [26] He explains that liberal Jewry of Germany, from which much of prayer book reform was conceived, were "composed of that very vanguard of Jewish society most at home in the world of modernity...Judaism for them was a religion; their nationality was that of their Christian neighbors." [27]

In other words, this Jewish "vanguard" carried a vision of full integration into a modern European society. They saw themselves as full German citizens whose eyes did gaze Eastward toward Jerusalem as a place of hope. They had lived through emancipation and had embraced its revolutionary spirit.

---

[25] Petuchowski, Jakob, Prayer book Reform in Europe (New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1968) p. xi.

[26] Hoffman, Lawrence, "The Liturgical Message" in Gates of Understanding, (New York: UAHC/CCAR, 1977), p.141.

Only instead of carrying out that revolutionary spirit against Germany, they had chosen to revolt against the particularism of their Jewish past. Jews wanted to be seen as patriotic as other German citizens, speaking of the concept of Germany as a "fatherland." Many had assimilated into German life and left their practice of Judaism altogether. Thus Jewish prayer book editors could not see why the liturgy should continue to define Jews as a separate nation. The pervasive spirit of revolution and change in Europe reminded them they had the power to remove such nationalistic designations. So they began to edit out the nationalism of traditional prayer, and this became one of the defining marks of the early Reform movement. [28]

In every rubric of the service, liturgical statements would be targeted for reformation. The aim was to exclude statements that could even be perceived as advocating for Jews as a nation. Neither Jews nor any other citizens who examined the new liberal prayer books would find reasons to perceive Jews as dually loyal to Germany and Palestine.

One of the targets for reform was the recitation of the *shemoneh esreh* or *Amidah*, the central rubric of the worship service. Eric Friedland observes that "the fertile improvisatory talents applied to the *Amidah*...were brought to life again...the products of reaction against a fixed liturgy which no longer fitted the modern outlook." [29] The "modern outlook" of early Reform rabbis could not bear the nationalist and messianic tone of the *Amidah* petitions. The tenth benediction called for Israel's return from exile.

---

[27] Ibid., p. 141.

[28] Note: in contrast, returning nationalism (albeit muted) to the liturgy became the task of 20th century Reform prayer book editors, especially after the State of Israel's founding in 1948. (See Chapter 5)

The fourteenth petitioned God to rebuild Jerusalem and establish the throne of David. Finally, the seventeenth blessing begged that our eyes witness God's return to Zion. The rabbis of early Reform Judaism heard within these petitions an overriding message that said: "We Jews are only a temporary part of society. We are not loyal to the nations in which we dwell. We will soon be restored to our land." Given this interpretation, one could hardly speak of these words as the "true speech" of liberal Jews. So the prayer book editors of early Reform Judaism sought to negate such messages by editing them out of the prayer book.

Yet another value which guided early prayer book Reform was a positive construct. It was that early Reform Jews wanted to assert through their new liturgy an optimistic universalism as a new outlook for modern Jewish life in the Diaspora. This was, in some ways, an extension of the spirit of "revolution" alluded to above. Jews, integrated and emancipated into their respective countries, wanted to express a new "truth" of the modern era that included each and every nation as recipients of God's blessing. In this spirit, they wanted for universalism to prevail and particularism to fade.

Jacob Katz explains that the work of the early Reformers as "a positive act... their primary experience was one of rediscovery of the vitality of Judaism after it had been abandoned and neglected." [30] Specifically the Jews of the nineteenth century "rediscovered" within Judaism the concept of dispersion from Israel and re-oriented this concept so that it no longer could be seen as a punishment for Jewish sins. Rather they emphasized in their prayers the notion of being scattered for the "mission of Israel."

---

[29] Friedland, Eric, L. Historical and Theological Development of the Non-Orthodox Prayer Books of the United States, (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1967), p. 195

Israel's "mission" among the nations was to shed the light of their devotion to Jewish religious truth. Each Jew was to act as an *Or lagoyim*, a "light unto the nations."

By emphasizing a universal mission within his prayer life, each Reform worshipper could simultaneously convey a political message to non-Jewish communities surrounding them. Namely, they were "at home" outside of Zion. They were true citizens of the lands in which they dwelt and were ready to positively assert their allegiance within worship. In so doing they reached out to non-Jews in a shared universal pact.

An example of this vision was expressed in the daily Amidah of Isaac Mayer Wise which petitioned God for freedom for the sake of *l'cherut amim* ("for the liberty of all nations") and for the ultimate purpose of uniting all nations *b'vrit shalom* ("in a covenant of peace"). [31] This re-appropriation of the covenant and its application to this benediction in the Amidah was absolutely novel to the liturgy. Wise had re-appropriated one of the most particularistic aspects of Judaism, the idea that God singles out Jews in covenant. [32]

Wise had certainly turned the concept of *brit* into a radically new symbol, different from the historic Israel-specific covenant which had characterized prior Jewish theology. It was a major reform to this blessing. Yet Wise's reform did not only serve to negate the traditional *Amidah* which equated freedom with messianic ingathering. Rather it was an assertion of a new era on the horizon, wherein Jews would unite with non-Jews in a shared *brit* ("covenant") of peace and tranquility. There was no precedent for including the *brit* imagery in the *Amidah* at all! So it becomes clear that this insertion into

---

[30] Katz, Jacob, Jewish Emancipation and Self-Emancipation, 1986), p. 57.
[31] Wise, Isaac M., Minhag America: The Daily Prayers, Part I, (Cincinnati: Bloch., 1857), p. 22
[32] Such a radical reformation in the liturgy is out-of-character with Wise's typical approach of "gradual emendation" (See Chapter 2) but it nonetheless prominently asserts a positive-oriented universalism.

the liturgy was influenced by a newly ascendant modern universalism positing the new Jewish paradigm of a *brit shalom* for all peoples.

But one may ask, which value, negation or universalism, was more prominent in the minds of the early reform rabbis? It is difficult to determine this for certain. Surely much of the literature supports the premise that negation was the value being brought to bear by early Reform. Yet an examination of the methods employed to reform the liturgy of its Zionism illuminates a path by which both values affected the process.

Abraham Geiger, a German reform rabbi, is perhaps the best illustration of a rabbi whose work took into account both values as he edited the Zionist liturgy from the prayer book. Petuchowski characterizes Geiger as having a role that was "decisive in the whole evolution of European Liberal and Reform liturgy." [33] For Geiger spoke of reforming the *siddur* to arrive at a pure sense of Jewish religious truth. He explained his philosophy in an 1869 *Denkschrift*: "religious concepts which have had a temporal validity, but which have been displaced by a progressively purer conception, must not be retained in a one-sided and sharp accentuation. Rather they must be either totally removed or recast into a form which does not contradict the purer conception." [34] Geiger went on to indicate that a natural consequence of this displacement: "the national aspect of Israel must recede into the background." [35] Early Reform prayer book editors sought just such a "recession" into the background for Zionist oriented prayers. So they followed both methods Geiger outlined (excision and emendation) and added one additional method (echoing tradition).

---

[33] Petuchowski, Jakob, J. Prayer book Reform in Europe, 1968, p. 235
[34] Ibid., p. 165.
[35] Ibid., p. 166.

In total, the three basic categories of liturgical reform were: the pathway of excision (omitting controversial prayers), the pathway of emendation (changing the prayer text), and the pathway of echoing tradition (listing the prayer in a traditional form to allow for a traditional recitation along with translation.) Each of these pathways achieved a particular goal for a given prayer book and its editor. There are even sub-categories under these three main headings. But at this point, it may be useful to consider how a particular prayer book turned to each of these methodologies of liturgical reform to express particular values and ideological statements.

My first case in point is the nineteenth century liberal community of Hamburg. In 1819 Hamburg, Germany, a prayer book was adopted which would ultimately serve as the benchmark from which, A.Z. Idelsohn contends, "all succeeding prayer books of the Reform movement are based." [36] Among the reforms in the 1819 Hamburg *siddur*, "all references to national restoration in Palestine were eliminated [and] such prayers were rephrased to mean the general restoration of mankind." [37] So in 1819 Hamburg, the *Neue Israelitische Tempelverein* established two different methods of liturgical reform that helped serve to edit out the Zionist content of the liturgy. The first method was the path of excision, the cutting out of entire controversial prayers. The second was the pathway of emendation, or the "rephrasing" of said prayers to reframe their orientation.

First, let us deal with the path of excision. For the 1819 Hamburg reformers were clearly not bashful about following this path. To that end, they excised the entire weekday

---

[36] Idelsohn, A.Z., Jewish Liturgy and its Development, (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1932), p. 269.
[37] Ibid., p. 270.

service from the 1819 Hamburg *siddur*.[38] In excluding the entire weekday prayer ritual, the 1819 Hamburg reformers avoided the need to present a contrary ideology to the Israel-oriented *Amidah* benedictions cited above. This is one of the virtues of the pathway of excision— the power to speak volumes without verbalizing a particular argument. Simultaneously, by omitting the entire daily service, which opens most traditional prayer books, the Hamburg reformers demonstrated their concern as to the relevance and efficacy of daily Jewish prayer at all. Prayer was to be considered the practice of the modern Jew only during sacred occasions such as the Sabbath or the Festivals. They would be Jews on Jewish days and Germans at other times. What a strong ideological statement to have been made by this early nineteenth century community. Indeed, what an effective technique for editing out Zionism from Jewish liturgy!

Yet the founders of the Hamburg Temple were clearly not convinced in the enduring value of the editorial decisions they made in the 1819 prayer book. They knew that their reforms would need to be reassessed to measure their effectiveness. Elbogen contends the founders of Hamburg were committed to a continuous process of revising and reforming. "Their only goal was to give the entire ritual dignity and effectiveness... [They] edited the prayer book for the needs of the moment. They did not see it as finished work, final and immutable. It had come into being under the sign of progress and development, and would need to be re-appraised and altered from time to time." [39]

This became an important principle of early German Reform which carried its way through many of the European and later American prayer books: the need to

---

[38] Petuchowski, Jakob. J., Prayer book Reform in Europe, 1968, p. 217.

[39] Elbogen, Ismar, Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society,

reappraise one's liturgical reforms to see if they stood the test of time. Twenty two years later, the Hamburg community engaged in just such a reappraisal and altered their prayer book once again, this time with a daily service included. They were now faced with the need to respond to the objectionable Zionist blessings in particular. Now in 1841, they followed the pathway and not the pathway of excision. In other words, the editors chose not to omit prayers but rather to radically rephrase them and even translate them into German. In so doing, Jews who once prayerfully called for the national restoration of Israel now spoke of a universal vision of freedom for all humanity. Their translation of all the intermediate benedictions of the *Amidah* to German made it so that all who examined the prayer book could see it as a clarion call for freedom of all peoples. [40]

An example of the pathway of emendation followed in Hamburg can be gained from examining their emendations to the tenth benediction of the Amidah. In the first known Jewish prayer book, Seder Rav Amram (ninth century), the tenth benediction of the Amidah is listed as follows: *T'ka ba-shofar gadol l'cherutenu, v'sa Nes L'kabetz Galuyotenu v'kara dror l'kabtzenu yachad me'arba kanfot ha-aretz. Baruch ata Adonai, m'kabetz nidchei amo yisrael.* One may translate the Amram text as: "Blow the great shofar of our freedom and lift up a banner to gather our exiles and proclaim liberty to gather us together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed are You, Adonai, who gathers the exiled of God's people Israel."

1994), p. 303.

[40] Elbogen notes that "of the Amidah, the first three and the last three benedictions together with the Kedushah were given in Hebrew, and the others in German." (Elbogen, 1994), p. 309.

Note how in the Amram, God is called upon to lift a *nes* ("banner") as a signal of Jewish ingathering. This is in accord with the general mode of the prayer which collects a range of Isaiah's images to draw a complete picture of the onset of God's redemption. Isaiah 11:12, from which this liturgical phrase ("*V'sa Nes*") emanates, reads: *V'nasa Nes lagoyim v'asaf nidchei yisrael u'n'futzot yehudah y'kabetz me'arba kanfot ha-aretz.* ("God will hold up a banner to the nations and assemble the banished of Israel and gather the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.") According to the verse in Isaiah, the banner is a *nes lagoyim*, a "sign unto the nations" of the impending assembly of the people Israel. The editors of the 1841 Hamburg *siddur* saw fit to emend Isaiah's prophetic vision, perhaps in consideration of how such a banner might be seen by modern *goyim* ("nations") where Israel now dwelt. Fearing that their non-Jewish neighbors would see the *"nes"* as a banner of particularism, the editors of the 1841 Hamburg prayer book emended the tenth *Amidah* blessing and left it utterly transformed. It now read: "Sound the call of freedom, and lift up the banner of freedom for all who grown in slavery. Break the yoke, O God, from upon our shoulders wherever it still rests heavily upon us. Praised art Thou, O God, who truly carest for the outcasts of Thy people Israel." [41]

From this 1841 Hamburg version, one can see that the tool of emendation would be wielded even more radically than excision. When you excise, you simply leave something out. But by the path of emendation, reformers could divorce all the prophetic images of the tenth *Amidah* benediction from their Biblical origins. At the beginning of the benediction, only a "call of freedom" is included, lest the worshipping community

[41] English translation of German paraphrase, excerpted from Prayer book Reform in Europe, 1968, p. 217

mistake it for the "great shofar" Isaiah describes when Israel assembles "to come and worship the Lord on the holy mount, in Jerusalem. (Isaiah 27:13).

The *nes* was now redefined so that it no longer signaled Isaiah's vision of *Kibbutz G'luyot* ("Ingathering of Exiles"). Now the *nes* was a signal of freedom directed only to "those who groan in slavery." This denied the particular nature of God's covenantal relationship with an exilic Israel, and at the same time established the Jew as explicitly concerned with the issue of freedom for all humanity. This newly articulated concern for the "universal freedom" for all humanity should not be cast aside given the context of the emancipation and the spirit of the revolutions that had occurred in Western Europe.

The most particular request in the new 1841 version was for God to "break the yoke...from upon our shoulders, wherever it still rests heavily upon us." No one even bothered to describe the nature of the "yoke" that God is asked to break or the people who bear this burden! Was it the "yoke" of tyranny under an external oppressor? Did it apply to German Jews or other European brethren? These questions were significant because, given the new orientation of prayer as a means to "true speaking," Jews would have sought to know whether the concept of the yoke was antiquated or out-of-synch with their modern platform as a religious people. Yet the *chatimah* ("seal") which eulogizes the 1841 Hamburg benediction marginalizes any concerns one might over the symbolism of the "yoke" described above. In the simplest terms it praises God who "truly carests for the outcasts of Thy people Israel." This new *chatimah* was essentially an entire re-write of *Seder Rav Amram*, wherein God's redemptive power was underscored as *M'kabetz Nidchei Amo Yisrael* ("who gathers the exiled of God's people Israel.")

In the 1841 Hamburg *chatimah,* no trace was left of the praise for God's redemptive power to gather Israel's exiles. This emendation to the *chatimah* thus served to limit the benediction as applying only to hope for endangered "outcast" Jews. In other words, the emendation to this *chatimah* served as a way for Hamburg Reform worshippers to tell the "truth...from the heart" but not about their own needs, only the needs of the poor "outcasts" of society. Even for the "outcasts" praise is extended to God not as a source of redemption, but only a source of divine empathy, a God who "truly cares" for their plight.

A third option available to the reformers in Hamburg, the path of echoing tradition, was also exercised by their prayer book editors, but not until the 1868 revision. In 1868 Hamburg, the traditional Hebrew text for the tenth *Amidah* benediction was returned to the prayer book alongside a German translation based on the 1841 edition. [42] This path of echoing tradition, listing both a traditional Hebrew version and an emended translation, is a form of presentation that has often been used in the reformation of prayers in liberal *siddurim*. The traditional Hebrew text is included, it would appear, so that those who wish may hearken to the earlier version of the prayer. However, the vernacular translation acts to temper the severity of the Hebrew. Lawrence Hoffman explained that the Reform movement "decision to translate [Hebrew liturgy]... made its literal meaning suddenly, and often uncomfortably, obvious to all..." [43] This discomfort led the 1868 editors of the Hamburg prayer book not to translate the benediction literally, but rather to include the 1841 German emendation. Including the emended version told

---

[42] Petuchowski, Prayer book Reform in Europe, 1968, p. 218.
[43] Hoffman, Lawrence, Gates of Understanding, 1977, p. 139.

the worshipper that he might choose from either presentation of the blessing. But it also may have misguided some into believing the 1841 emendation was a literal translation.

By using this case study of nineteenth century Hamburg, one sees that the early reform movement struggled with the notion of finding an appropriate methodology to respond to the Zionist-oriented prayers. They could follow the path of excision, omitting the prayer entirely and cutting away what appeared contrary to the spirit of modern integration. They could follow the path of emendation, using their own re-defined terms to communicate both a positive universal outlook and a strident opposition to Zionism. Or they could echo the traditional blessing with a translation so as to present a diverse worship community with a choice of how to personally worship.

All of these pathways of reforming the liturgy developed in German Jewish communities, were brought to nineteenth century America by the many rabbis who immigrated here. A massive influx of Jewish immigrants, particularly from Germany during the 1840's, established the need for many new reform synagogues. But of those new synagogues, built in American communities, many remained a bastion of German culture and practice. Elbogen notes that the reforms made to the liturgy of these new American temples were "usually based on the Hamburg prayer book" [44] and on various other reforms undertaken in other German communities. Yet one 1846 immigrant, a Bohemian rabbi, championed the notion of reforming Jewish liturgy from what he felt would be a uniquely "American" perspective. The name of this immigrant was Isaac M. Wise, and his aim was to re-conceive Judaism for the American Jew.

Rabbi Wise's new liturgy would not be untouched by the reforms of Hamburg. Friedland points to Wise's "obvious" consultation with the *Gebetbuch* of Hamburg. [45] Yet Wise clearly saw himself as building the framework for a new Judaism in a new land. At the time of his arrival in the United States Wise was "a man of 27, inspired by the liberal ideas of the Reform movement in Germany, and by the vision of civil liberties." [46] A biography recalls with great romance the goals that animated Wise in his immigration to America. "Wise came ...to liberate the Jew from his narrow bigoted environment, to secure for him the enjoyment of equal political and religious rights, and make him an

[44] Elbogen, Ismar, Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History, 1994, p. 322.
[45] Friedland, Eric, History of Non-Orthodox Prayer Books in the United States, 1967, p. 74-75.
[46] Trepp, Leo, ed., A History of the Jewish Experience, (West Orange, NJ: Behrman House, 1962) p. 379

independent and respected citizen of the community in which he lived." [47] Although Wise is most often remembered for founding American Jewish institutions to bring such lofty goals to bear, he placed a great emphasis in his rabbinate on developing a form of the traditional liturgy with no less grand goals of integrating Jews into their American surroundings.

It should be understood from the above statement that Wise saw his project as consonant with the "traditional liturgy" he and other American Jews inherited. Certainly, the structure of Wise's prayer book gave every signal of such a consonance. The first edition of Wise's prayer book (1857) opened from either end, with both Hebrew and English opening. The worshipper is instructed in the English opening: "Pray in the language thou understandeth best" [48] and the Hebrew opening begins with several traditional laws concerning prayer excerpted from the traditional halachic code of the *Shulchan Aruch*. Wise clearly felt that there was at least a segment of American Jewry conversant with such law yet eager to pray from his modified prayer text.

But also one notes the subtle reference on the opening page where Wise credits himself only as "translator" of the liturgy in the prayer book. From this reference, one may surmise that he saw the liturgy in his prayer book as primarily remaining traditional. The translator, it would appear, simply made the emendations necessary to help the liturgy reflect newly found American values. So just as it was important for German liberal prayer book editors to confront examples of the Israel-related liturgy and reform

---

[47] May, Max B., Isaac Mayer Wise: The Founder of American Judaism, (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1916) p. 43.
[48] Wise, Isaac Mayer, Minhag America, 1857, p. 2.

them for a German milieu so also were the Zionist longings of the traditional *siddur* a target for Rabbi Wise.

In particular, it has been said that in the choices Wise made to reform Zionism in the liturgy, he was influenced by the seeds sown by Rabbi Abraham Geiger, who reformed the liturgy for his congregations in Breslau, Frankfort and Berlin. [49] Geiger, we note, is widely considered to have founded Reform Judaism in Germany just as Wise ultimately did in America. But Petuchowski has referred to the link between these two rabbis as a product not of their shared accomplishment but of shared philosophy. Both Geiger and Wise's shared philosophical approach could be summarized as: "*Mutatis mutandis*, an evolutionary concept of Reform... a Reform growing organically out of the previous stage of religious development." [50] Such a philosophy sought no radical overhaul of the liturgy but rather a natural meeting point between the liturgist and the community of worship. This remains a significant challenge for liturgical reform to this day, striking the balance between new "stages of development" foreseen by rabbis and continuity with traditions from which many in the laity draw comfort.

Wolfgang Hamburger explains that Geiger excelled in meeting this challenge by virtue of his "*Pastoralklugheit*, [his] ability to gauge the congregation's readiness to accept the changes and innovations... Geiger suggested repeatedly that desirable goals, presently beyond reach, should not be permitted to divert the attention from more modest

---

[49] For more on ties between Wise and Geiger see Ellenson, David, "Prayers for Rain in the *Siddurim* of Abraham Geiger and Isaac Mayer Wise: An Exploration into a Dimension of the Relationship Between Reform Jewish Thought and Liturgical Practice," in forthcoming Festschrift for Rabbi A. Stanley Dreyfus Bachman, Andrew N. and Bronstein, Daniel M., Eds., (Pittsburgh, PA: Rodef Shalom Press, Date T.B.A.)

[50] Petuchowski, Jakob, J. "Abraham Geiger and Samuel Holdheim: Their Differences in Germany and Repercussions in America," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book XXII* (1977), p. 151

goals within reach." [51] In other words, Geiger felt that a gradual and conservative approach to reforming prayers and other aspects of Judaism would be a distinctive and winning strategy for the acceptance of reform at-large. It may be argued then, that his Geiger-inspired emphasis on modest immediate goals served to energize Isaac Mayer Wise and also strengthened his *Pastoralklugheit,* his awareness of liturgical changes that a vast array of American synagogues could accept in a spirit of unity and purpose.

But at the outset, let us acknowledge that in publishing a prayer book for all American Jews, he had set out on a path that was unprecedented in German Reform. For the *siddurim* in Europe had often been localized efforts. Indeed the publication of a range of liberal *siddurim* in Germany flourished under the premise that a reform in Hamburg was not necessarily adopted with uniformity in Berlin or Breslau. Liturgists were inspired to new creativity since neither Geiger nor Stein nor Joel were beholden to one another's liturgical reforms. [52] In this environment a unique Jewish religious message could be presented in each community's liturgy.

In contrast, Wise set out to edit one ritual for all American Jews. He took the opportunity raised by the 1855 CCAR Cleveland Conference as a way to secure support for the project. [53] Eric Friedland explains that among the early American Reform rabbis

---

[51] Hamburger, Wolfgang, "Abraham Geiger's Reforms: Ideas and Limitations," *CCAR Journal*, Volume XXII, Issue #88 (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, Winter 1975), p. 43.

[52] Manuel Joel who succeeded Abraham Geiger as rabbi in Breslau, followed a unique pathway of echoing tradition in his prayer book revisions. His technique was "printing the traditional text in small type alongside the altered text, so that while the precentor recited aloud the reformed version, every individual was free to recite traditional one." (Elbogen, Ismar, Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History, 1994, p. 318)

[53] The credits in the 1857 edition of Minhag America indicate that it was "Revised and Compiled by the Committee of the Cleveland Conference."

there grew "a growing sentiment that the multiplicity of *minhagim* only engendered confusion and unnecessary division within the...fragile Jewish community." [54]

With this as the prevailing attitude, Friedland indicates that "the Cleveland Conference in 1855 commissioned...Wise and others to prepare a liturgical text to appeal to conservative and liberal congregations alike."[55] He thus gained support from his rabbinical colleagues for the idea of a universal liturgy for the entire American movement. So Wise ambitiously matched his prayer book title to its mandate. He called the new *siddur Minhag America* ("American rite.") Such a title implied that a uniform ritual would hasten the sense of Jewish unity to which American Jewry aspired. As Temkin noted, *Minhag America* was a "practical embodiment of his quest for unity." [56]

In 1857, Wise's liturgical magnum opus was first published and actively used. Lawrence Hoffman describes how at *Minhag America's* publication, Wise "and the small coterie of rabbis associated with the project fervently anticipated that the prayer book would ultimately be adopted by every Jewish congregation in America." [57] With this goal in mind, a prayer book universally used by American congregations, Wise adopted a special posture toward liturgical reform, and Israel-related liturgy in particular.

---

[54] Friedland, Eric, Were Our Mouths Filled With Song: Studies in Liberal Jewish Liturgy (Cincinnati: HUC Press, 1997), p. 50

[55] Ibid., p. 50.

[56] Temkin, Sefton, Isaac Mayer Wise: Shaping American Judaism, (Oxford, England: Littmann Library, Oxford University Press, 1992) p. 141.

[57] Hoffman, Lawrence, Beyond the Text: A Holistic Approach to Liturgy, (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987) p. 60-61.

Wise favored the pathway of emendation in reforming the prayer book of its nationalism. Yet his emendations were of a gradual type, often leaving traditional forms of prayer intact. These gradual emendations were reflective of what Ellenson has called Wise's "communal-historical sensibility." [58] By analyzing Wise's presentation of prayers for rain in *Ha'aretz* such as *G'vurot G'shamim* and *Tal Umatar*, Ellenson concluded that Wise treaded along the same path of emendation as Abraham Geiger in his *Israelitisches Gebetbuch*. Ellenson explains that both Wise and Geiger included the prayers for rain in their prayer books but they were "fixed...as a constant element in [the] liturgy so that the prayer would no longer be linked to a specific geographic venue" [59] in the land of Israel. This was a subtle method to echo the traditional liturgy but at the same time vocalize an opposition to diaspora Jews praying for God's benevolence upon Zion.

This same issue (God's benevolence to Zion) was also a concern raised by Wise and Geiger's respective emendations to the fourteenth *Amidah* blessing. This petition, known as *Birkat Yerushalayim*, could be found in traditional Ashkenazi prayer books as having a clear emphasis on God's relationship to Jerusalem as a holy unique city. The traditional benediction in Ashkenazi *siddurim* is: *V'lirushalayim ircha b'rachamim tashuv, V'Tishcon b'tocha ka'asher dibarta, U'vneh ota b'karov b'yameinu binyan olam V'chise David m'herah l'tochah tachin. Baruch ata Adonai, boneh yerushalayim.* [60]

---

[58] Ellenson, David, "Prayers for Rain in the *Siddurim* of Abraham Geiger and Isaac Mayer Wise," p. 15.
[59] Ellenson, David, Ibid., p. 15.
[60] As published in Birnbaum, Philip, Ha-*Siddur* Ha-shalem: Daily Prayer Book, New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, 1977) p. 89.

One may translate this as: "To Jerusalem, your city, return in compassion and dwell in it as you have spoken. Rebuild it soon, in our days, as an eternal building, and speedily establish in it the throne of David. Blessed are you Adonai, Builder of Jerusalem." In reforming this benediction, Wise took his characteristic gradual approach to emendation, omitting just one idea from the benediction and only slightly altering its meaning. The idea he dropped concerned reinstated Davidic rulership ("*V'chise David*".) Wise's solution mirrored Geiger's in the latter's 1854 prayer book, although Geiger and Wise chose different concepts for omission. In the *Israelitisches Gebetbuch*, edited by Geiger in 1854 Breslau, much of the substance of the fourteenth *Amidah* blessing was left intact. Geiger removed only the petition that calls upon God to quickly rebuild Jerusalem's great Temple, the "*Binyan Olam*" ("Eternal building.")

Also in the *chatimah*, Geiger does not call upon God with the attribute of "*Boneh Yerushalayim*, a God who "builds Jerusalem." This phrase would imply that God particularly awaits the opportunity to re-build Jerusalem for the reinstatement of Israel's sacrificial cult. Instead Geiger described God as "*Shochen Birushalayim*," a more benign vision of God who merely "dwells in Jerusalem" [61] but extends blessing throughout the world. These were two significant emendations made to the prayer text.

Yet David Ellenson also points us to the 1872 Geiger prayer book in which he made further revision, joining together the fourteenth and fifteenth benedictions of the *Amidah*. This eventual joining of the two *Amidah* benedictions was an effort to combine particularism and universalism: "Remember Jerusalem in compassion, and may You

---

[61] Petuchowski, Jakob, J., Prayer Book Reform in Europe, 1968, p. 226

cause the sprout of salvation to blossom quickly" (*Vi'rushalayim b'rachamim tizkor, V'tzemach y'shu'ah m'herah tatzmiach.*) [62]

Already, in 1854, Geiger had done away with visions of a rebuilt Jerusalem temple. In 1872, the prayer was changed from a petition for God to act upon Jerusalem by "returning" to it (*tashuv)* to a "recollection" (*tizkor*) of Jerusalem's unique and precious heritage. But in both of the Geiger editions, although God's actions are limited, the emended text of the *Amidah's* fourteenth benediction still conveys a strong theological tie between God and Jerusalem.

Wise's 1857 *Minhag America* retained both the benediction's traditional *chatimah*, (*boneh yerushalayim*) and the phrase *(binyan olam)* that Geiger had omitted. Yet Wise parted with the tradition by excluding the petition for a Davidic throne to be re-established in Jerusalem. His new prayer book presented the benediction as follows: "*V'lirushalayim ir'cha b'rachamim tashu,v V'tishcon b'tochah ka'asher dibarta, U'vneh otah b'karov b'yameinu binyan olam, Ki mi'tzion tetzei torah udavar adonai mirushalayim. Baruch ata adonai, boneh yerushalayim.*"

Wise's translation read: "Let thy glory kindly return to Jerusalem thy city, reside therein as thou hast promised; and rebuild it speedily in our days, to an everlasting structure; for divine instruction shall go forth from Zion and the word of God from Jerusalem. Praised art thou, God, who buildest Jerusalem." [63]

---

[62] Ellenson, David in Minhag Ami: My People's Prayer Book- The Amidah, Hoffman, Lawrence, Ed., (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 1999), p. 140.

[63] Wise, Isaac M., Minhag America: The Daily Prayers, Part I, (Cincinnati: Bloch and Co., 1857), p. 22.

This rendition of the prayer replaces the traditional longing for a Davidic return to Jerusalem with a biblical phrase that still rings of Zionist purpose and glory. Wise inserted Isaiah 2:3 "*Ki mitzion tetzei torah udavar Adonai mirushalayim.* ("For divine instruction shall go forth from Zion and the word of God from Jerusalem.") The phrase from Isaiah still glorifies the land of Zion and the city of Jerusalem as holy sites of God's inhabitation. Like Geiger, Wise simply muted the aspect of the traditional blessing that most disturbed his modern rationalism. Wise felt the *binyan olam* ("eternal building") of God could be symbolically conceived, but the glory of David's throne could not be. So he pinned the glory of Jerusalem to the crown of the Torah rather than the Davidic-Messianic Kingdom to come. In so doing, his emendation achieved its trademark balance and the hope of a connection to a wide range of American Jews. [64]

Now let us turn to Wise's occasional use in *Minhag America* of the pathway of excision. For excision was used by Wise primarily as a method for responding to the prayers that were widely agreed as being out of the boundaries of the modern Judaism. Such a sense of widespread agreement could pertain to the excision of daily prayers such as *Or chadash* in the *Yotzer* or to *Av Harachamim* in the Torah service. Either of these Zion-oriented prayers had a significant history of excision in the early German reform prayer books. Also, both Wise and many of the German *siddurim* excised the prayers of lamentation on the traditional fast day of Tisha B'Av. Ellenson suggests that from the perspective of Wise in preparing *Minhag America*, Tisha B'Av did not merit even a

[64] Yet apparently this emended blessing did not connect with a wide range of American Jews. How else to describe his resorting to the more radical pathway of excision to modify the same prayer in the 1872 *Minhag America*! In this edition, Ellenson reminds us that the fourteenth Amidah benediction was "completely transformed...by asking God to cause the spirit of holiness to dwell among the People Israel so

mention because "a service in commemoration of the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem was out of the question for an American Israel" [65]

Yet there were instances where Wise again showed a more gradual and conservative approach to excising Zionist prayers than he did with the dirges of *Tisha B'Av*. In such instances, Wise's excisions were mindful (as had been his emendations) of the desire not to omit an entire prayer rubric simply because of the presence of a single phrase in which Zionism appeared to be manifestly expressed.

Silberman wrote that "it was Wise's intention to write a prayer book in which changes to the traditional prayer book would be as minimal as possible." [66] Nevertheless, he did believe there were places in which to modify the traditional liturgy. Wise later explained the principles that guided him in his excision. He wrote: "It was out of the question to retain the old prayers unchanged, because the belief in the coming of a personal messiah descended from the House of David had disappeared... The return to Palestine, the restoration of the Davidic dynasty, of the sacrificial cult and the accompanying priestly caste were neither articles of faith nor commandments of Judaism, while the lamentations over oppression, persecution and the accompanying cry for vengeance were untrue and immoral so far as American Jews were concerned. " [67]

---

that Israel could serve as a "light to the nations." (Minhag Ami- My People's Prayer Book: The Amidah, 1999, p. 141.)

[65] Ellenson, David, Between Tradition and Culture: The Dialectics of Modern Jewish Religion and Identity, (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994), p. 184

[66] Silberman, Lou, "The Union Prayer Book" in Korn, Bertram Wallace, ed., Retrospect and Prospect, (NY: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1965), p. 60.

[67] Wise, Isaac M., Reminiscences, trans. by David Philipson, (Cincinnati: Arno Press, 1901), p. 343-44

In this recollection, Wise delineated the main criteria for determining prayers for excision. The categories determinative of excision were (1) prayers that "disappeared" from the Jewish mindset. (2) prayers that were not considered as "commandments" of Judaism or finally, (3) prayers he and others considered "untrue." Finding all three of these categories to be met, Wise excised one of the Zionist petitions contained within the rubric of *Shema* and its Blessings. We speak here of the phrase "*V'havienu*" in the daily *Ahava Rabbah* prayer. One recognizes with this Wisean reform to *Ahava Rabbah* the more typical gradual method of Wise's excisions to the prayer book. For he did not omit the entire prayer despite the one phrase envisioning Israel's physical unity in its land.

He kept most of the *Ahavah Rabbah* prayer intact, excising only the following line: "*V'havienu l'shalom me'arba kanfot Ha'aretz v'tolichenu kom'miyut l'artzenu*" ("Bring us home in peace from the four corners of the earth, and make us walk upright to our land.") [68] One may examine this rejection of *V'havienu* from several perspectives. To begin with, Wise saw the phrase in question as a late addition to the original prayer. As such it was an eminent candidate for excision. Second, Wise may have excised *V'havienu* simply to negate the Jewish nationalism it exposed. Many writings wherein Wise criticized early American Zionist efforts corroborate this assertion. Finally another perspective is that his excision of *V'havienu* may have actually been motivated by the desire to assert Jewish unity (expressed earlier in *Ahava Rabbah*) albeit symbolically rather than as an actual physical ingathering.

---

[68] Ashkenazi version and translation excerpted from Birnbaum, Philip, ed., Daily Prayer Book: Ha *Siddur* Hashalem, (New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, 1949) p. 75-76.

First, let us examine the perspective of negation. By this standard, Wise would have linked *V'havienu* to the biblical and rabbinical doctrine known as *kibbutz g'luyot* ("ingathering of the exiles"). [69] According to the classical Jewish vision of *kibbutz g'luyot*, at the time of God's redemption, all Israel will be assembled under one leader in one land: Israel. At the time of Israel's "ingathering" it does not matter how far Jews live from their ancestral land. This is explained in Deuteronomy 30:4: *Im yih'yeh nidachacha bik'tzeh hashamayim misham yikabetz'cha Adonai Elohekha umisham yikachecha.* ("Even if your dispersed ones are at the ends of the world, from there the Eternal your God will gather you, from there God will take you.")

The liturgy in *V'havienu* echoes the call made in Deuteronomy by describing the Jewish people as returning to Zion *Me'arba kanfot Ha'aretz* ("from the four corners of the earth.") The implicit message is that no distance in the world is beyond God's reach in the task of bringing you to the land. But the "four corners" imagery is actually drawn from Isaiah 11:12 wherein the prophet vividly describes an ancient ingathering of Israel dispersed in Egypt and Assyria. Yet ultimately the American Jewry to whom Wise was appealing would have seen Isaiah's and Deuteronomy's rhetoric here as neither compelling nor relevant. American Jews simply rejected the notion of Egypt or Assyria as metaphors for their modern lives in America. According to modern Reform Jews, *artzenu* ("our land") was any nation in which modern Jews lived.

---

[69] Marked disagreement with the notion of "Kibbutz Galuyot" may be said to characterize the subsequent Reform *siddur*, the Union Prayer Book in all its editions. This will be discussed in some detail in the chapter on UPB. Yet, it is worth noting that *V'havienu* does not directly characterize Jews outside of Zion as in a state of *galut* ("exile") so it is possible that Wise would not have necessarily drawn such a connection.

Wise it would appear, also cast aside the notion of "ingathering" in *V'havienu* on just such grounds. Seeking a liturgical message of universal appeal to American Jews, Wise saw prayers for an "ingathering" as incompatible with the freedom that characterized American Judaism. Wise articulated the need for "to become thoroughly Americanized," [70] to restore pride and dignity. As a leader he avoided advocating Zionism in any respect. Late in the nineteenth century, Wise sternly wrote: "Those who live on this free soil, who are granted every liberty imaginable, dare not pray for the restoration of a kingdom, or rather, in fact, would not do it; and those who wish to return to Jerusalem can do so now quite conveniently." [71] This statement emphatically denied the relevance of praying to return to Jerusalem.

But as we saw, there is yet another perspective from which one might view the choice to excise *V'havienu* from the *Ahavah Rabbah*. It is that Wise wished to advocate the positive value of Jewish "unity" far and above the limiting physical unity that is envisioned by traditional messianic ingathering. From this perspective, it would be proposed that Wise simply did not see the Zionist imagery of *V'havienu* as a necessary component of the Jewish unity advocated in other passages of *Ahavah Rabbah*. Therefore excising the Zionist portion of the prayer would not radically alter its message. To Wise, as to many generations of Jewish prayer book editors, the overriding topic of *Ahavah Rabbah* was love between Israel and its God and Torah as a symbolic token of that love.

As modern Reform Jews who favored rationalism over nationalism, the concept of Israel's unification as one people could be seen as a consequence of God's great love.

---

[70] Marcus, Jacob R., Memoirs of American Jews, (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955), p. 133.

Yet only a symbolic unification could be espoused for the prayer to remain genuine and true to modernity. This "symbolic unification" may be seen earlier in the text of *Ahavah Rabbah* that calls for God to *yached levavenu* ("unite our hearts") as a means of inviting Israel's affection. Perhaps it was such a "unity of heart" that Wise preferred to the physical unity called for in *V'havienu*! For this is a way of understanding Wise's decision as a reflection of a positive value. Indeed, the literature on Wise supports the idea that Jewish unity was a driving force behind Wise's work. David Ellenson explains, "one of Wise's major requirements for his prayer book ... was that it foster Jewish unity...Wise had been concerned with promoting unity among America's Jews ever since his arrival on these shores from his native Bohemia in 1846." [72]

---

[71] *CCAR Yearbook*, Volume 6, (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: CCAR, 1896), p. 12.

[72] Ellenson, David, Between Tradition and Culture, 1994), p. 180.

The aim Wise articulated, building Jewish "unity" in America, clearly pervades his work. He sought to actualize the value of "unity" for the sake of all succeeding American generations. The Hebrew Union College and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, two of the organizations he founded, prominently included the term "union" as a part of their respective titles. The college would "unify" the educational training of rabbis on the basis of a truly American spirit and approach. The UAHC would cultivate a sense of Israel "united and fraternized," [73] to advance the cause of American synagogue life. In editing *Minhag America*, it was clear that he also took great pains to seek a broad "unity" by adopting a gradual approach to the emendation and excision of traditional prayer. Finally, Wise felt the true significance of his 1855 rabbinic convention was the opportunity to found an American "synod" with universal representation.

The 1855 "synod" in Cleveland was indeed a major turning point for Wise. The conference gave him the necessary approval to complete his *Minhag America,* and it also served as an important step in building "unity" to ensure Jewish American survival. At the 1855 conference, he appealed to colleagues: "We must have peace and union, at any hazard or sacrifice, principles excepted. And we shall shout for this great principle, until the cry is re-echoed by every heart yet beating for the welfare of Judaism." [74] But these passionate convictions of Wise were not persuasive enough to outweigh concerns which arose from several Reform colleagues who had not attended or not been invited to Cleveland.

---

[73] Excerpted from first UAHC Constitution. See Meyer, Michael A. and Plaut, Gunther W., eds., The Reform Judaism Reader: North American Documents (New York: UAHC Press, 2001)

[74] Plaut, Gunther W., Growth of Reform Judaism: American and European Sources until 1948, (New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1965), p. 18.

Wise had called for a union of American Jewry "at any hazard or sacrifice." Yet many of his colleagues heard in that phrase a hint of "hazards" and "sacrifices" they would have to swallow for the sake of Wise's ambiguous vision of Jewish "unity." Many feared that Wise was so desperate to achieve his American "unity" that he might fail to keep faith with the essential Reform values established in Germany.

These fears of Reform leaders about Wise were confirmed when word was received of the Cleveland platform. For along with the Conference's support of Wise's new prayer book, it had also agreed to a set of "unifying" principles that seemed to fall far short of the boundaries which Reform had already staked out. It affirmed, for instance, that "the Bible as delivered to us by our fathers and as now in our possession is of immediate divine origin and the standard of our religion."[75] Equally, if not more controversial, was the claim that "the Talmud contains the traditional, legal and logical exposition of the biblical laws which must be expounded and practiced according to the comments of the Talmud."[76]

Such views on the Bible and Talmud were anathema to many liberal rabbis then arriving in America. Reform had long since come to see the Talmud as a relic of narrow and nationalistic Jewish thinking which had lost its authoritative power and mystique. For moderns, it was certainly not the lens through which American Jews were advised to develop an understanding of the Bible and modern Jewish life. Besides, Reformers believed that the battle over Talmudic authority had already been fought and won in Germany. They questioned why a leader of liberal American Jewry would capitulate to

---

[75] Ibid., p. 20.
[76] Ibid., p. 20.

traditional views on such a critical topic. Wise's concession on this critical issue could not help but make him an object of some suspicion. A link was made between Wise's ideological betrayal in Cleveland and doubts concerning the ideological underpinnings to his proposed new *siddur*. For if this was how Wise defined the platform of American Judaism, what "hazards" and "sacrifices" had he in mind in his American prayer rite?

Rabbi David Einhorn who arrived in America in 1855, the same year as the Cleveland Conference, was one of the American Jewish leaders who opposed Wise's leadership, and ultimately, his prayer book as well. He was immediately a rival to Wise, for he simply could not forgive Wise for the platform on which he yielded in Cleveland. A well-known rabbinical leader in Germany, Einhorn had already served as one of the most far-reaching voices of "liturgical reform." He had participated actively in rabbinical conferences in Germany, held in the mid-1840's. So he was well aware of the environment of rabbinical conventions, perhaps not altogether different than the one held in Cleveland. Eric Friedland reminds us that at Frankfurt-am-Main, Einhorn served as a member of the commission on liturgy, where he made known his liberal views, particularly with regard to the use of vernacular and the exclusion of references to the sacrificial cult, the levitical rites, Zion and messianism in the liturgy." [77]

Einhorn called for the excision of all of these particularistic aspects of the traditional liturgy. Apparently his vocal leadership and his advocacy of such radical liturgical reform ultimately made it very difficult for him to continue working in many German communities. Among other things, Einhorn was opposed to Zionist statements remaining in the liturgy. He sought to replace such sentiments with universalistic visions.

Einhorn thus stood out as a controversial figure in German Jewish life, who immigrated to America, and from his new pulpit at Congregation Har Sinai in Baltimore, acted as no less an ardent spokesman for radical Reform.

In particular, Einhorn immediately spoke out harshly against the Wise-led Cleveland concessions. Whatever "unity" was pursued in Cleveland was no great gain for American Jews, according to Einhorn. To voice his dire concerns, he contacted Isaac Leeser, rabbi of Philadelphia's Mikveh Israel Congregation and publisher of *The Occident,* and published an attack against Wise and the Cleveland Conference. In the article he took direct aim at the provision in the platform that spoke of Talmud as the accepted and "legal obligatory comment" on the Bible. He wrote that accepting this "would condemn Judaism to a perpetual stagnation, consign its countless treasures, available for all time to the narrow confines of an exclusive Jewish nationality, and expose to derision its entire historical development..." [78] This "exclusive Jewish nationality" promoted in the Talmud was of deep distress to Einhorn, especially since he saw Wise's compromises concerning the Talmud as having re-ignited a battle that Reformers had already fought and won.

German liberal Jews had already replaced the Talmud's narrow nationalistic outlook with universalism. So Einhorn condemned the idea that the Talmud's rulings should be binding on modern Jews. Feeling that Wise and his Cleveland colleagues had slapped Reform in the face, Einhorn continued to lace into Wise, depicting him as leader of a "hierarchical movement" intent on again "forging chains" on Jewish freedom. He

---

[77] Friedland, Eric, Were Our Mouths Filled With Song, 1997, p. 17.
[78] Plaut, Gunther W., Growth of Reform Judaism, p. 23-24.

asked self-defensively if "members of the German Rabbinical Conference...have ceased to be Israelites?" [79] This pointed rhetoric was meant to cast suspicion on Wise's definition of the boundaries of American Judaism.

But Einhorn truly made his case when he warned the membership of "free American Israel" not to "err long by a *Minhag America*." [80] In this well-crafted piece of rhetoric, Einhorn was taking aim at the project most identified with Wise and most precious to Wise's values. Einhorn was saying, point blank, not to trust Wise and his prayer book to represent the values of American Jewry any more than his platform in Cleveland. This famous line directly attacking *Minhag America* could be seen as an arrow shot at Wise personally in *The Occident*. For Sefton Temkin reminds us that although *Minhag America* described itself as a "collective enterprise by the committee of the Cleveland Conference it was regarded as Wise's very own child. He advanced its claims without inhibition, and attempts to supersede it aroused his protective instincts." [81]

With the battle lines now drawn, Reform Jewish leaders had to decide between the two approaches of Wise and Einhorn on a wide range of liturgical issues, including the question of Zionism and nationalism in the prayer book. Wise's approach involved gradual and conservative emendations and excisions to the traditional *siddur*. This would likely go hand in hand with broad platforms intended to build cohesion and unity. Alternatively, Reform could move in the liturgical direction Einhorn proposed, sacrificing a grand vision of "unity" to hard-fought principles of Reform.

---

[79] Ibid., p. 23.
[80] Ibid., p. 24.
[81] Temkin, Sefton, Isaac Mayer Wise: Shaping American Judaism, 1992, p. 149.

It is worth noting that at the time of Einhorn's arrival in America, neither he nor Wise had published a prayer book. But it took both men little time to publish their respective competing liturgies. Einhorn, the newly arrived outsider, saw the preparation of a new liturgy as his best chance to present a serious alternative to Wise's program of "hazards" and "sacrifices." So Einhorn quickly edited his own new *siddur* for American Jews and uniquely titled it *Olat Tamid* ("Eternal Offering.") It appeared in 1856 and Wise's *Minhag America* was published in 1857.

Sefton Temkin discusses how the two *siddurim* of Einhorn and Wise represented very different strategies within the spectrum of nineteenth century Jewish life. "Wise was fighting for union, Einhorn for reform. Wise believed that if the disparate elements in American Jewry could be brought into one organization, an American *minhag* would emerge; Einhorn believed that an association except on the basis of a prior agreement as to principle was a 'foul peace;' and where Einhorn's principles presupposed that the new age demanded a new Judaism, Wise was content that the old should be touched up." [82]

These broad ideological comparisons help us distinguish the nature of Einhorn's *Olat Tamid* from Wise's *Minhag America*. In particular, there is the charge that Wise sought only the "touching up" of Jewish tradition. Lawrence Hoffman points to particular structural criteria showing *Minhag America* as "recognizable as the traditional prayer-text known as the *Siddur*. "Important prayers are more or less intact; Hebrew abounds." [83] With abundant Hebrew in his *siddur*, Zionistic prayers would have to be modified not only in English translation but also in the traditional Hebrew text.

---

[82] Ibid., p. 141
[83] Hoffman, Lawrence, Beyond the Text, 1987, p. 61.

To this end, in both Hebrew text and translation, Wise "grafted...his messianic faith in universalism and the inevitability of human progress." [84] Such a grafted "messianic faith" was evident in Wise's vision of a *brit shalom* for all peoples as the basis for his tenth *Amidah* benediction. This was a conspicuously radical reform to Wise's often conservatively modified liturgy. It simultaneously reformed the imagery of the traditional *Amidah* and the particularity of the God-Israel covenant. It was a bold step intended to more ideologically match the views of American Jews.

But Hoffman deduces, Wise's reforms, even when occasionally radical, turned out not to be successful. For the *siddur* could not be easily accessed by American Jews. There were so many traditional forms of prayer in *Minhag America* and so little of newly American values that it "fell short of its promise. It was, if anything, a prayer book for an immigrant generation, not for those immigrants' children." [85] A true American rite would have to speak in an enduring way to more than one generation.

As Wise's *Minhag America* failed to achieve a widespread foothold, it became apparent that any "universal" American Jewish prayer book would have to be uncompromisingly consistent with reforms hard-fought in German communities. Though Wise had perhaps been uncompromising in his organizational work, he was not so uncompromising in his reformation of liturgy. Friedland contends that "Wise, though never at any point averse to reform... was of a Bohemian-Prague conservative bent, a trait

[84] Ibid., p. 61.
[85] Ibid., p. 61.

that remained with him all his life. While in many areas he brought Reform to its logical, extreme conclusion, in other respects, he let things well enough alone." [86]

This approach of "let things well enough alone" was evident in Wise's seventeenth Amidah benediction which continued to call for *hamachzir Shechinato l'tzion* ("God's presence be restored to Zion.") Amazingly, such a particularity remained in *Minhag America*. It was simply not a battle Wise thought was worth fighting.

But such a conservative approach to prayer book reform would never pass muster for David Einhorn's new prayer book *Olat Tamid*. Einhorn excised the entirety of the seventeenth benediction from his daily service including the phrase *hamachzir Shechinato l'tzion*. The combination of language calling for a restoration of the sacrificial temple and the *chatimah* emphasizing God's relationship to Zion doomed this benediction. It had to be excised. For from the beginning American worship had emphasized the need to pray with sincerity and truthfulness. The only sacrifice worth celebrating, as Einhorn's title amply demonstrates, was the *Olat Tamid* of modern Reform worship.

Einhorn even decided to compose additional liturgy to reverse the traditional *Amidah's* meaning. For example, he inserted into his *Olat Tamid* a vernacular blessing which calls for God to "turn Thee... in Thy love unto all that serve Thee by doing justly and loving mercy." It adds the request that God "Vouchsafe unto us that our lines may fall in lovely places where we, too, may help to spread happiness among our brother men." [87]

---

[86] Friedland, Eric, Historical and Theological Development of Non-Orthodox Prayer Books, 1967, p. 70
[87] Einhorn, David, ed., Olat Tamid: Book of Prayers for Jewish Congregations (New translation after the German original), 1896, p. 135.

See how in this new blessing God is envisioned as turning not toward Israel *the place* but toward Israel *the people* alongside all "brother men." This reflected an intentional and thorough emphasis in *Olat Tamid* on humanistic and non-nationalist values. For example, according to Einhorn, we as the people Israel are especially "vouchsafed" by God. But it is not as in the traditional *Amidah*, where our purpose was continued holy service and perpetuation of God's name. Rather, Einhorn sees our purpose as Jews as being agents of "happiness among our brother men." This was a radical revision of the traditional *Amidah*. For it made clear Jews were praying to God not to deliver happiness by means of eventual messianic fulfillment centered in Zion, but as universal human deliverers of happiness in their own lands. This neutralized the effect of prior *Amidah* versions in which particularistic and nationalist ideals were emphasized.

But along with his radical response to benediction seventeen, Einhorn replaced several traditional blessings in the *siddur* with new prayers of his own making. Many times the new compositions bore little resemblance to tradition. But his general approach was to excise radically. For instance, "no middle blessings appear in the text of [Einhorn's] *Amidah*. The traditional themes of wisdom, forgiveness, healing, justice and righteousness can be identified. However, all particularistic themes...are completely purged from Einhorn's composition." [88]

One of the themes "purged" by Einhorn's radical excisions from the *Amidah* was *gevurot geshamim*. David Ellenson describes how Einhorn "displayed none of the concern for tradition that marked Geiger and Wise in their liturgical efforts regarding the

[88] Ellenson, David, Between Tradition and Culture, 1994, p. 195.

gevurot geshamim insertion. Einhorn resolved the universalistic-particularistic tensions attached to these insertions by simply *omitting gevurot geshamim* altogether." [89]

Another casualty of Einhorn's strategy of radical excision was *Birkat Yerushalayim*, the blessing extolling God's benevolence and compassion for Jerusalem, and asking for its rebuilding. This was dropped entirely from *Olat Tamid* seemingly because Einhorn found no way to replace it with a meaningful alternate composition. Also there was no way that Einhorn would consider "leaving well enough alone" as did Wise by keeping *Birkat Yerushalayim* intact.

Finally, a third example of Einhorn's radical excision was the *Hoda'ah*, a traditional prayer offering thanksgiving to God for daily miracles. This prayer conflicted not with the modern disdain for Zionism but with the prevailing modern rationalism that did not allow for the notion of miracles. The closest Einhorn could come to the *Hoda'ah* was when he called for Israel to "learn to be truly helpful one to the other. For love for man is the only offering of our thanksgiving which we may bring unto Thee, from whom all blessings flow." [90]

In other sections of the liturgy, where Einhorn did not excise, he followed a radical path of emendation. For example, there is Einhorn's emendation of the tenth *Amidah* benediction. Here Einhorn's background as a German Reform rabbi came into play. He was influenced, among other prayer books, by the Hamburg *Gebetbuch* and by Leopold Zunz's *Die gottesdienstliche Vortraege*. [91]

---

[89] Ellenson, David, "Prayers for Rain in the *Siddurim* of Abraham Geiger and Isaac Mayer Wise," p. 16
[90] Einhorn, David, ed., Olat Tamid, 1896, p. 137.
[91] Friedland, Eric, History of Non-Orthodox Prayer Books, 1967, p. 43

In his version of the *Amidah's* tenth benediction Einhorn adopted the type of universalistic language used in Hamburg but he takes Hamburg's reforms a step further. Einhorn wrote: "Let, O Lord, freedom sound in all the regions of earth, speed the day when wickedness shall be no more, and selfishness shall cease from troubling the hearts of Thy children. Thou, who lovest justice and righteousness, grant that soon Thy kingdom be established on this earth. Then our mourning will have come to an end and we shall praise Thee in joy. [92]

See how in this vernacular edition of the *Amidah's* tenth benediction, the vision of messianic deliverance was generalized and reformed with even more uncompromising force than used by the Hamburg reformers in 1841. The Hamburg *Gebetbuch* explicitly petitioned God to "sound the call of freedom, and lift up the banner of freedom." Several of the prophetic symbols of Isaiah were left in the prayer. Also, in line with prophetic ideals, God was still viewed as the source of humanity's freedom. Yet in Einhorn's *Olat Tamid*, God is conveyed as only the One who permits freedom's sound, but God is not actually the source of freedom itself. Einhorn simply asks God to "let freedom sound" and "speed the day when wickedness shall be no more." In other words, God is now merely a clock-keeper who causes time to "speed" up until humanity overcomes wickedness.

The rest of the tenth *Amidah* benediction in *Olat Tamid* amplifies the sense that Einhorn saw messianic fulfillment not in God, but in the hands of people striving for lives of justice, righteousness and joy instead of wickedness, selfishness and mourning. This

---

[92] Ibid., p. 135.

transformation, according to Einhorn's emendations, was the great liberation our prayers sought for all humanity in the *Amidah*.

Yet another place in which Einhorn radically emends a traditional prayer in *Olat Tamid* is in the prayer *Sim shalom*. This traditional prayer, according to its literal meaning, particularly asks for peace only for the people Israel. It is essentially a particularistic and nationalistic piece of liturgy. The prayer begins: *Sim shalom tovah uv-rachah, chen vachesed v'rachamim* ("Grant peace, happiness and blessing, grace and mercy"). But then Einhorn adds *aleinu v'al kol banekha* ("unto us and unto all the sons of men, Thy children.") in place of *Aleinu v'al kol yisra'el amekha* ("unto us and unto all Israel your people.") Einhorn includes the nation of Israel only among the universal category of *al kol banekha*.

Later in *Sim shalom*, Einhorn's true ideology recurs, as he inserts more pointed Hebrew emendations beginning with the phrase *V'tov b'einekha*. Here the worshiper using *Olat Tamid* prays to God *l'varekh et kol ha'amim b'khol-et uv'khol-sha'ah bishlomekha*. A literal translation would be: "Bless all people with your peace at all times and at every hour." But Einhorn not only valued universalism but also Israel's particularistic role as universalistic agents. Here in *Olat Tamid*, Einhorn translates *l'varekh et kol ha'amim* as "bless *us* with Thy peace at all time and in every hour."

Note how Einhorn clearly ties Israel and "all peoples" together by translating the blessing as "us" - namely, both Jewish and non-Jewish receivers of peace. For Einhorn to tie Israel together with all the nations in the same category of "us" reflected an entirely modern and optimistic outlook on Jewish relations with non-Jews.

To Einhorn, the emancipation of Jews in the modern era and Jewish arrival on American shores represented nothing less than a time of messianic proportions. So with the power of the liturgical pen, he built the ideological stance of *Olat Tamid* as an unwavering commitment to universalism and a broad vision of peace encompassing all humanity.

Nowhere was Einhorn's grand and universal vision of peace for all humanity better represented than in his lengthy *Olat Tamid* insertion of a new liturgy for the day of the "Anniversary of the Destruction of Jerusalem." This inclusion of a *Tisha B'Av* liturgy was in itself a highly radical step for Reform Jewish prayer books. Most *siddurim* in America had abandoned any significant ritual observance for *Tisha B'Av*. After all, what could American Jews truthfully pray as they recalled the destruction of the temple? Could they lament the loss of the Temple and pray for restoration? Clearly not.

But instead of excising the service for *Tisha B'Av*, Einhorn radically emended the prayers to convey a vastly different conception of the meaning of the holy day. As one reads his six-page length vernacular prayer, it becomes clear that Einhorn involved himself here in a massive project of liturgical reform. This was no mere "touching up" of Jewish tradition as critics were wont to say of Wise. Rather Einhorn, was radically re-orienting the way in which Jews could see the observance of *Tisha B'Av*.

For instance, Einhorn alludes to the destruction of the sanctuary but offers in *Olat Tamid* a higher purpose to which the ancient temple was sacrificed. "The one temple in Jerusalem sank into the dust," Einhorn writes, "in order that countless temples might arise to Thy honor and glory all over the wide surface of the globe." [93] This statement defends the idea that both Israel and Diaspora are legitimate places of Jewish worship. Indeed it

places synagogues everywhere among the holiest of ancient sites of worship. For they are our modern temples in which *Olat Tamid* is the new sacrifice. Einhorn ultimately paints a poetic picture of *Tisha B'Av* in a more poetic way, describing how the glories of the Jerusalem Temple had to give way to a new model of worship. He wrote:

> The old priestly dignity was taken away and the old sacrificial worship ceased, but in their stead the whole community, in accordance with its original distinction, became a priest and was called upon to offer up those sacrifices which are more acceptable in Thy sight than thousands of rivers of oil, the sacrifices of active love to God and man, the sacrifices of pure and pious conduct, which, even in extremity and death will not deviate from the path of truth, sacrifices of an unparalleled allegiance to God with which the centuries have become vocal. The true and real sanctuary, Thy imperishable testimony, remained ours, untouched and undimmed. It assumed a new glory and emerged purer and in increased splendor from the flames. [94]

From this liturgical poetry, one can gain access to the deep and penetrating optimism that characterized Einhorn's philosophy. In the wake of Jerusalem's destruction, he held that humanity itself must provide the holiness that worship in God's Temple once did. "Pure and pious conduct," "active love," "sacrifices of unparalleled allegiance – the very inclusion of such ideals in the context of describing modern man after Jerusalem's destruction, can be seen as evidence of Einhorn's belief in the power of humanity to overcome tragedy. He believes that if we want to perpetuate the holiness once provided in the Jerusalem temple, human beings will have to prove their priestliness through holy conduct untouched by the flames that razed Jerusalem.

---

[93] Einhorn, David, Olat Tamid, 1896, p. 144.
[94] Ibid., p. 144.

But what role can the people Israel specifically play in this vision of Tisha B'Av? To this Einhorn offers his most radical emendation of all: Israel plays the pivotal role of martyr and sufferer for the sake of the final redemption.

Einhorn writes:

> The flames which consumed Zion, lit up the birth-hour of Israel as the suffering Messiah of all mankind. Freed from the bonds of his childhood, in martyr heroism, Israel had to pilgrim through the whole earth, a man of sorrows, without form or comeliness, despised and rejected of men, to deliver by his very fetters his own tormentors, by his wounds to bring healing to those who inflicted them. When at last his great sacrifice of atonement is completely wrought, he will find his reward in seeing all men gather into one brotherhood, doing God's service in love to man.[95]

In responding to this involved interpretation of Einhorn, which essentially delineates *Tisha B'Av* as a reconceived birthday celebration for the messiah, Lawrence Hoffman comments on Einhorn's "sweeping monumental majesty" [96] in liturgical reform. He contrasts this with the dearth of such "majesty" in the reforms of Isaac Mayer Wise.

Hoffman explains Einhorn's method. "By adapting a vision of the prophet Isaiah, Einhorn arrived at an extended metaphor of Israel as suffering servant, destined to carry the torch of God's truth to all humanity, and thus to usher in the messianic age. With remarkable audacity, he drummed home his heroic claim loudest on the Ninth of Av." Now the Ninth of Av was no longer a fast day but a day of hope, the Temple's destruction being part of God's plan to scatter Jews and their message to the furthest reaches of the globe. [97]

---

[95] Ibid., p. 145.
[96] Hoffman, Lawrence, Beyond the Text: A Holistic Approach to Liturgy, 1987, p.119.
[97] Ibid., 119

Einhorn's reformation of the liturgy of *Tisha B'Av* reveals his truly precious and enduring contribution to Jewish liturgy. He used the power of modern interpretation to find a hopeful response to the degrading pain of Jewish history. His path of radical emendation, as applied to the message and framework of *Tisha B'Av*, served as an optimistic appendage to the Reform liturgy of the late nineteenth century. Matching the convictions of the Reform Jews for whom the prayer book was intended, Einhorn's *Olat Tamid* reaffirmed the Diaspora as a new "Sinai and Zion of all the world" [98] and a place where the Jew fulfills his primary duty of bringing blessing to the nations.

[98] Einhorn, David, Olat Tamid, 1896, p. 146.

As one reviews the unique place of *Olat Tamid*, it is easy to be struck by the willingness of David Einhorn to radically alter Jewish liturgy to express his ideals. In the choices he made, Einhorn seemed unfazed by the controversy his reforms might engender in the Jewish community at-large. Ultimately, his bold path of radical emendation carried a significant influence over future prayer-book editors, who prepared the CCAR's Union Prayer Book in 1895. The key to Einhorn's path of radical emendation was that "he gave [the prayers] completely new form in which the ideas, feelings and aspirations of the nineteenth century found expression. [99]

In Einhorn's radical emendations, he demonstrates his belief that the nineteenth century was a true watershed for the Jews. For he felt that with the advent of modernity, the Jewish community should no longer pray for a return to idyllic history in Zion's ancient temple. Rather we should come to see our historic role as the "suffering Messiah of all mankind" and our destiny to use our "wounds to bring healing to those who inflicted them" and bring forward the day when all "gather into one brotherhood." [100] These were bold declarations Einhorn made in his new liturgy for Tisha B'Av. For Einhorn truly believed that his era was the time for Israel to begin assuming its universalistic messianic destiny over against its particularistic past.

---

[99] Elbogen, Ismar, Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History, 1994, p. 326.
[100] Einhorn, David, Olat Tamid, 1896, p. 146.

Yet Friedland's research bears out that Einhorn did not limit this image to his emendations to the Tisha B'Av liturgy. For instance, his *ya'aleh v'ya'avo*, a festival edition to the *Avodah* prayer, is "set off...from others is his unique application of the epithet Messiah to Israel: *ve-zikhron kol amkha beit yisrael meshihekha*- which comports with Einhorn's understanding of Israel's vocation."[101] Lawrence Hoffman agrees with Friedland's assessment. Hoffman points to structural aspects of *Olat Tamid* that ultimately helped make it a model for the next generation of Reform prayer books. The structure of *Olat Tamid*, he says, "reinforced the worshippers' self-image....The very title, *Olat Tamid*, the prominence and typographical layout of the priestly benediction, the inclusion of cultic Torah readings on holidays- all these underlined the worshipper's sense of being a unique people whose survival as God's kingdom of priests and a holy nation was mandated by heaven and guaranteed by history." [102]

Einhorn's son-in-law, Kaufman Kohler, later spoke of Einhorn's strong-handed approach to reforming the liturgy. He said that Einhorn had not merely revised the traditional Jewish framework of the prayer service. Kohler felt his father-in-law's true accomplishment was that he uniquely "stepped forth with a prayer book all made of one piece, all conceived and written in the spirit of reform."[103] So it was certainly a triumph for Einhorn when *Olat Tamid* and its radical liturgical emendation won over more adherents than the *Minhag America* proposed by Isaac Mayer Wise.

The two men, Einhorn and Wise, had battled for half a century to influence American Jewry in a historic period of self-definition. Jakob Petuchowski felt the

---

[101] Friedland, Eric, History of Non-Orthodox Prayer Books, 1967, p. 62.
[102] Hoffman, Language of Survival in American Reform Liturgy, *CCAR Journal*: 1977, p. 94
[103] Kohler, Kaufmann, ed., David Einhorn Memorial Volume, (New York: 1911), p. 441.

differences between the two could not have been more pronounced. They "differed in their very concept of Reform's constituency. Wise's primary aim...was the unification of all American Jews... Einhorn, on the contrary, was so uncompromising in his espousal of radical reform, he wanted to see Reform confined to German-speaking cultural elite." [104]

These differences between Einhorn and Wise in their conception of American Jewry could easily be read between the lines of their proposed *siddurim*. As has been demonstrated, neither of them disguised the ideological aspects of their liturgies. So the fact that Einhorn's liturgy mainly directed itself to the "German-speaking cultural elite" ultimately came to play a key factor in determining its victory over *Minhag America*. When the Union Prayer Book was published in 1895, Einhorn's *Olat Tamid* was selected as its chosen model. For it appeared that the CCAR planned to use its new *siddur* as a means to reach out mainly to the German Jews currently part of American Jewish life. They wanted to redefine Judaism as the inheritance of German Jewish ideology.

The major historical factor that prompted this CCAR effort to redefine American Judaism through the Union Prayer Book was the new wave of Jewish immigrants arriving in America. This time the new influx of immigrants was not from Germany as it had been a generation before. Rather the massive wave of immigration in the late nineteenth century was arriving from Eastern Europe, where Jews had not been significantly affected by the spirit of Reform or its universalist leanings.

Lawrence Hoffman indicates the resettlement of Eastern Europeans "threw into question the very self-image of Reform: a religious approach for Jewish moderns." [105]

---

[104] Petuchowski, Jakob, J., "Abraham Geiger and Samuel Holdheim: Their Differences in Germany and Repercussions in America," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 1977, p. 156.
[105] .Hoffman, Lawrence, Beyond the Text, 1987, p. 63.

The concern was raised by many that the nationalistic and ethnic-minded Eastern European Jews might reverse Judaism's path of integration in American religious life. Perhaps Judaism would come to be identified as a specious or foreign element within America, rather than part of its national fabric! David Philipson gave voice to such fears in his 1892 CCAR Yearbook essay, "Judaism and the Republican Form of Government." Philipson warned American Jewish leadership that "the great immigration of Jews into this country at present caused by the expulsion from Russia carries with it a great danger to Judaism... unless proper steps are taken at once." He then went about describing what he felt was "dangerous" about the arrival of the new Eastern European immigrants.

> These people, as in the case in New York, are apt to settle together in the same districts and a foreign element is likely to grow up not in sympathy with republican institutions nor understanding republican ideas. Now Judaism wants no little Russia, no little Poland, no little Austria, no nationality here whatsoever except Americans. [106]

The antipathy expressed by leaders such as Philipson toward the "little Russia" that might potentially emerge exerted a significant influence, for Jewish leadership was goaded into a formal redefinition of Judaism that would directly challenge immigrant Jews. David Ellenson writes of how the "leadership of American Reform Jewry reacted quickly to the coming of these Eastern European masses.... These leaders wanted to articulate their position on and interpretation of Judaism as a universal religion in contradistinction to the predominantly ethnic view of Judaism expressed by Eastern European Jews." [107] The first step Reform Jewish leadership took in redefining Judaism for American Jews was the ratification of the 1885 CCAR Pittsburgh Platform.

---

[106] Philipson, David, "Judaism and the Republican Form of Government," *CCAR Yearbook*, (Cincinnati, OH: Bloch and Co., 1892), p.5

[107] Ellenson, David, Between Tradition and Culture, 1994, p. 201

Rabbi Kaufmann Kohler, one of the platform's chief architects, addressed his colleagues in the CCAR, stating that their proposed new platform should be clear about what Reform Judaism supported and what it opposed. Kohler said: "We can no longer be blind to the fact that Mosaic-Rabbinical Judaism, based upon the Law and Tradition, has actually and irrevocably lost its hold upon the modern Jew." Kohler supported a platform that would seek to negate the Mosaic-Rabbinical law regardless of whether or not the majority of Jews had "justificatory reasons" for denying the authority of these laws. [108]

In Kohler's presentation it became clear he was advocating a platform that primarily defined Reform through negative rather than positive assertions. The platform turned out to be just as Kohler had planned. It described a Reform Judaism not oriented to ritual, not willing to accept traditional ideas rooted in liturgy, and decidedly non-nationalistic. Elbogen recalls: "The laymen did not get much out of the platform; they did not learn what to believe and what to do, but only what not to believe and not to do." [109] A. Stanley Dreyfus agrees, stating the Pittsburgh Platform was distinguished by what it negated. Dreyfus said a close analysis of the platform "reveals what American Jews were afraid of... not being seen as a true part of the American society." [110]

The Platform's fifth plank appeared to voice such a fear, as it declared:

> We recognize in the modern era of universal culture of heart and intellect the approach of the realization of Israel's great Messianic hope for the establishment of the kingdom of truth, justice and peace among all men. We consider ourselves no longer a nation but a religious community, and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine, nor a sacrificial worship under the administration of the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish state. [111]

---

[108] Plaut, Gunther W., Growth of Reform Judaism, 1965, p. 32-33.
[109] Elbogen, Ismar, A Century of Jewish Life, (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1945), p. 344.
[110] Interview with A. Stanley Dreyfus, 9 Prospect Park W, Brooklyn, NY, December 9, 2000
[111] Plaut, Gunther, W., Growth of Reform Judaism, 1965, p. 34.

It would seem as though this declaration could have been written by David Einhorn a generation earlier. For one could recognize Einhorn's abiding influence in the vision of modernity as the time of "Israel's great Messianic hope." But one could also see that the platform was also explicitly opposing any advocacy of Jewish nationalism on a political, ideological or theological level. David Philipson amplified this statement in 1892 when he wrote: "There is no such thing as a Jewish nation or a Hebrew people; the Jewish nation ceased to exist eighteen hundred years ago...The Jew in this country is distinct in his religion only; he is one with his neighbors in all else." [112]

It was with these values in mind, the denial of nationalism and propagation of universalism, that the CCAR chose to publish the Union Prayer Book using Einhorn's *Olat Tamid* as its primary source text. For the UPB would have more in common with *Olat Tamid* than the traditional *siddur.* It was thus clear that the CCAR leadership was attempting to create a liturgical self-portrait to lock out any new immigrants from bringing ethnicity and nationalism to American Jewish life.

Yet Hoffman contends that the immigration of Eastern European Jewry did a favor for Reformers. For only "the presence of a real alternative necessitated a clear statement of self-definition." [113] In other words, only given the competition of a serious alternative worship, was American Jewry willing to vest authority in a single *siddur.* The new *siddur* would "declare, in liturgical terms what its compilers did not stand for, as well as what they did." UPB thus revealed Reform as a "continuation of central European Jewish liberalism...It was religious, not nationalistic; universalist... not particularist.

---

[112] Philipson, David, "Judaism and Republican Form of Government,[] 1892, p. 54.)
[113] Hoffman, Lawrence, Beyond the Text, 1987, p. 67

It emphasized reason, ethics, evolution and optimism." [114] In order to express such values in their liturgical self-portrait, the authors of UPB had to be highly aggressive in their approach to liturgical reform. So the primary method they chose in reforming the prayer book was the pathway of excision. They did not once follow the pathway of "echoing tradition," at least in the arena of Zionistic or Israel-related liturgy.

For example, the UPB editors could have chosen to "echo tradition" in their presentation of *Ahava Rabbah* in the *Shema* and its Blessings. But instead they excised *V'havienu* from *Ahava Rabbah* just as Wise and Einhorn had. Yet, Ellenson notes that in offering its rendition of the prayers, "the UPB displays a prominent feature- an unbridled universalism virtually totally bereft of Jewish particularity." [115] Stanley Dreyfus feels that these decisions of the UPB editors were indicative of a pattern within American Jewry. The 1895 American Jews, he believes, were "of a mind to dispense with many of the traditional practices that had set them apart and sustained them during their age-old struggle for survival, practices that now seemed to hinder their integration into American society...Thus they undertook to assimilate the style of Jewish worship to the pattern of the dominant culture. [116]

Apparently praying the Zionist elements of *Ahava Rabbah* qualified as a "practice that now hindered their integration" in America. When it was excised from their liturgy, it sent the message that *V'havienu* no longer expressed the truth of modern Jews. This was very much in line with Einhorn's liturgical reform. So they followed many of Einhorn's

---

[114] Ibid., p. 67.
[115] Ellenson, David, Between Tradition and Culture, 1994, p. 199
[116] Dreyfus, A. Stanley, "The Gates Liturgies: Reform Judaism Reforms Its Worship," in Changing Face of Jewish and Christian Worship, Bradshaw Paul, and Hoffman, Lawrence, Eds., (South Bend, IN: Notre Dame University Press: 1991), p. 144.

other directions in their preparation of UPB. David Ellenson notes that the Union Prayer Book resembled *Olat Tamid* in many key characteristics of Reform worship: "lack of Hebrew, the brevity of its service, its general approach to liturgy... the book opens... from left to right, and it is written almost entirely in the vernacular." [117]

But even more in line with Einhorn, the editors of Union Prayer Book saw fit to radically emend other aspects of the liturgy. In the 1895 publication, "Changes are made not only to eliminate unnecessary repetitions, nor simply to be theologically consistent... but in order to clear the way for modern readings and meditations. While the traditional order of the service is retained, traditional prayers are purposefully transformed to give them a more modern application." [118] In the Tisha B'Av liturgy, for example, voice was given to a concern over the Jews who had longed for Zion since the destruction of Jerusalem. The new *siddur* spoke of the age-old hope for a homeland in Israel.

> While they hoped and longed to return to their home and to see the temple restored as a sign of God's pardon and favor; alas, the night of the exile grew ever darker and the sufferings and the persecutions increased. Ever louder became their wailing and lamentations and they cried: Why O Lord, did Thou cast us off. [119]

The question of why God "cast off" ancient Israel in the Temple's destruction was answered in UPB with the same ideology Einhorn had offered in *Olat Tamid*. God chose the Jews to suffer as a people destined to set an example for all humanity. Their experiences of dispersion from Jerusalem, UPB teaches, were intended to merely burn Israel "like the thorn-bush on Sinai which burned, but was not consumed."

---

[117] Ellenson, David. Between Tradition and Culture, 1994, p. 198.
[118] Ibid., p. 198.
[119] Seder Tefilot Yisrael: Union Prayer Book, (Cincinnati: OH: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1895), p. 283-284.

Israel indeed had a future role to play in UPB's envisioned redemption. For the editors of UPB borrowed Einhorn's imagery of Israel as a healer of humanity. Yet they did not go quite as far as Einhorn who called Israel the messiah of humankind. Nevertheless, Reform worshippers using UPB were instructed that "out of [Israel's] wounds flowed the balm of healing for mankind...His death did give life, the darkness of his imprisonment brought light to the Gentiles." [120] The mission of Israel, in the preferred prophetic terminology of UPB, was to be an *Or la-goyim,* a light to all the nations.

But another place in which the editors of Union Prayer Book sought to transform Jewish liturgy was in their reforms to the *Amidah.* The UPB editors had seen the technique of Einhorn and previous generations of Reformers relative to the *Amidah.* It had become a critical place in which to emend the particularistic nationalism of Jewish liturgy with an abiding universal outlook. A. Stanley Dreyfus claims that the UPB editors used these reforms to the *Amidah* to "extract from their reading of the liturgical tradition the all-time essence of Judaism and to cut away the accretions"[121]

The "accretions" in the *Amidah,* Dreyfus says, "were also called orientialisms and it wasn't a compliment. For Jews did not want to be seen as exotic for their beliefs or to attract attention in their differences. Jews could not afford to be seen as a spectacle." Seeking to avoid prayers seen as "exotic," the *Amidah* petitions concerning Jerusalem and restoration of the temple were excised entirely. Also, the UPB editors so radically emended many other *Amidah* petitions so they were hardly recognizable as antecedents of prior forms of traditional liturgy. For example, the petition calling for "ingathering of exiles" was entirely re-written to explicitly deny the existence of a modern *golah.*

---

[120] Ibid., p. 284.

The newly emended prayer in UPB no longer served to advocate for Jews as a nation. It borrowed only the idea of "freedom's sound" from the traditional tenth *Amidah* blessing. Yet otherwise it bore no resemblance to the tradition. It read:

> Grant O Lord, that the sound of freedom be heard throughout all lands, and all nations enjoy the blessings of true liberty; let the reign of wickedness vanish like smoke and all dwellers on earth recognize Thee alone as their King, and all Thy children be united in a covenant of peace and love. [122]

But the new universalized version of this benediction was not really all that new. The UPB editors had borrowed the methods of several prior Reformers in their work on the *Amidah*. Einhorn could be heard in its continued call for "freedom's sound to be heard in all lands." Wise's vision of a redemptive *brit shalom* enacted by all peoples of the earth was found in the UPB blessing. Also, the editors of UPB structurally followed the path of several earlier Reform prayer books in that this prayer wasn't the *tenth* benediction at all. It was the *third* among five radically emended *Amidah* blessings. This massive abbreviation of the central prayer in the daily worship service could be seen as a signal to the worshipper. Only the essential meditations of the *shemoneh esreh* (eighteen) needed to be retained in a modern American prayer book.

But more than anything else, the UPB's emendations to the *kibbutz galuyot* blessing were intended to serve a denial of the entire concept of *galut* ("exile") for American Jews. To the editors of Union Prayer Book, nothing could have been further from the truth than to have ascribed themselves as living in *galut*. For the very term *galut* connoted a range of concerns totally foreign to the religious language of American Jews.

---

[121] Interview with A. Stanley Dreyfus, 9 Prospect West, Brooklyn, New York, December 19, 2000

[122] Seder Tefilot Yisrael: Union Prayer Book, 1895, p. 275.

Yitzchak Baer explains that *golah* "embraces a whole world of facts and ideas...political servitude...the longing for liberation and reunion, sin and repentance and atonement." [123] One may also find *galut* shared in the Bible in its most horrific terms in Deuteronomy 28:65: *U'va-goyim ha-hem lo targia v'lo yih'yeh manoach l'khaf raglekha v'natan adonai sham lev ragaz v'khilyon eynayim V'da'avon nefesh.* ("Yet even among those nations you shall find no peace, nor shall your foot find a place to rest. The Eternal will give you there an anguished heart and eyes that pine and a despondent spirit.")

Modern historian Melvin Urofsky adds more explicitly to the connotations of the *galut* as expressed not only in the bible and liturgy, but through the vicissitudes of Jewish history. The term *galut,* Urofsky argues, conveys an "ominous and dreadful pattern":

> Fleeing from persecution, Jews would find haven in some new country, welcomed by the local monarch... After a few generations of relative peace and prosperity, the passions and prejudices of Jew hatred would rise again, fed by the jealousy of the poor and the ignorant, and fanned by the ambitions of new groups of would-be merchants or the enmity of the church. Eventually the inevitable edict came: 'The Jews must leave- now' or 'The Jews must convert- or die'... It is little wonder that throughout these centuries Jews spoke of themselves as living in *galut*, in exile, and considered their misery and persecution a result of their having broken faith with God. After all, God warned their forefathers that if they defied his will, they would be driven out of the land... into a life of terror and hardship. They prayed for redemption but recognized God's justice. Yet they appealed to his mercy." [124]

The Reformers editing Union Prayer Book looked to these definitions of *galut* and to the traditional *Amidah* benediction calling for all *galuyot* ("exiles") to be reassembled in Israel. They interpreted *galut* in a literal way rather than an echo of the spiritual meaning implied by the prophetic teachings of Judaism.

---

[123] Baer, Yitzchak, Galut, (New York: Schocken Books, 1947, p. 9.
[124] Urofsky, Melvin, American Zionism from Herzl to the Holocaust, (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1975)

Seeing their liturgy as ":truth-telling," the notion of praying for a personal ingathering of all *galuyot* was totally inconsistent with their sense of "truth." They asked: How could American Jews still view themselves as in exile? The answer was: they couldn't. After all, the hearts of American Jews were not "anguished" nor were their spirits "despondent" as depicted in Deuteronomy's "exile." America had been a good place for Jews to settle and assimilate into the larger culture. So the UPB editors saw no reason not to radically emend the liturgy by replacing the prayer for *kibbutz galuyot* with a new blessing praying for the unity and freedom of all humankind. Modern-day America, it seemed to these Reformers, was the nation that gave Jews greater freedom than any nation in history. So they felt that their new American prayer book ought to at least acknowledge the unprecedented level of freedom attained in America.

Howard Sachar explains the perspective on freedom of the Reform leadership:

> Life in America was characterized by...freedom. They were free from the ecclesiastical-feudal tradition of Jew hatred which prevailed in the Old World, and which sputtered anew from time to time... They were free, too, from blind reaction on the Russian model, from the medieval Judeophobia of the Orthodox Church, and the...clumsy autocracy represented by czarist cameralism. There had been ugly episodes... but rarely did Christians react to... Jewish neighbors in terms of cold vindictive malice. [125]

One might say that the new blessings inserted within the Union Prayer Book showed faith in America's freedom. For America was now seen as a place worthy of receiving the instruction Jeremiah offered to the exiled Babylonian community In Jeremiah 29:4, the Babylonian exiles were instructed, *b'nu vatim v'shevu v'niteu ganot v'eechlu et piryan.* ("Build houses and live in them. Plant gardens and eat their fruit.")

Jeremiah continues: *V'dirshu et shalom ha-ir asher higleiti etchem shamah*

---

[125] Sachar, Howard, M., The Course of Modern Jewish History: New Revised Edition, (New York: Random

v'hitpalilu va'edah el adonai ki va'shlomah yih'yeh lachem shalom. ("Seek the welfare of the city to which I have exiled you and pray to God on its behalf; for in its peace will you find peace.") The Union Prayer Book, in its approach to the Israel-related blessings, thus can be seen as a renewed call of Jeremiah 29. Worshippers were being reminded that America was the only nation for which to show allegiance. In their American communities, they should "build houses" and "eat fruit" of the gardens. For only America merited their nationalist loyalty. As David Philipson had written for the CCAR in 1892, "We are Americans and Jews. Americans in nationality, Jews in religion; our aim is to see that the two never come into conflict." [126]

House, 1990), p. 200.
[126] Philipson, David. "Judaism and the Republican Form of Government," 1894, p. 54.)

As the Union Prayer Book sought to reflect the "truth" of American Reform radicalism, it served the Reform movement as the dominant liturgy of the twentieth century. From the prayer book's inception, many liberal congregations adhered closely to UPB as a worship manual and as an instruction on the essential themes of Jewish prayer. Now perhaps the UPB's lengthy success could be attributed to the aggressive approach it took on the paths of liturgical reform, stressing radical excisions and emendations. Or perhaps ideological ties to the new Einhorn-style prayer book made UPB such a success. David Ellenson shows that the UPB's adoption as American Reform's official liturgy "was an unmistakable triumph for the Einhorn wing... and signaled the end of Isaac Mayer Wise's more moderate position." [127]

Finally, it is possible that the success of UPB was achieved simply as a surpassing of its initial expectations. When the Union Prayer Book was first presented to the CCAR for approval, Reform leadership had already seen *Minhag America's* failure to be adopted universally. So UPB editors voiced a more reasonable goal for its usage than that proposed by Isaac Mayer Wise. Instead of seeking an outcome where every congregation in America used the new *siddur*, the UPB editors called for the day to come "when this ritual will be used *in every city of the Union*." [128] In other words, after seeing the compromises that would have to be enacted for universal usage, the UPB editors aimed to have the *siddur* used in every American city as a way to express the unity and "internal bonds" that tie American Jews together.

[127] Ellenson, David. Between Tradition and Culture. 1994, p. 197.
[128] "Proceedings of the Sixth Annual CCAR Convention - Rochester, NY 1895, *CCAR Yearbook* (Cincinnati, OH: Bloch and Co., 1896)

Yet during its tenure as the official Reform liturgy, there were challenges raised to UPB, and two formal revisions were made, one in 1924 and again in 1940. These revisions were the result of changing demography in the Reform community and the integration of Eastern European Jews into American congregational life. In the years after the 1924 revision, several significant leaders within Reform spoke up to raise concerns about the UPB. They differed as to the suggestions made but all agreed that the movement should continue reforming its *siddur* to create a prayer book more reflective of Reform's self-image. The issue of Zionist liturgy was among the major concerns raised.

Solomon Freehof tried to summarize the range of issues shared with him regarding the first Union Prayer Book. "Many of our members," he said, "feel that the prayer book is woefully weak in its emphasis on practical social idealism. Others believe that its philosophy and theology are vague and shifty... Some believe that the prayer book is not Jewish enough in style, that it needs more Hebrew and a closer loyalty to historic liturgical reforms in order to bind our Reform congregations closer to the world community of Israel." [129] Specifically, the concerns that Freehof had voiced about "closer loyalty to historic liturgical reforms" may have had to do with the UPB's relative free hand at emending the central rubrics of Jewish prayer. It appeared to Freehof and others that the UPB had gone far astray from the community in its universalization of every particularistic prayer. Samuel Cohon, for instance, discussed how Reform "under the influence of German rationalism...[was] content to reduce Judaism to drab ethical monotheism, ignoring much of its colorful life and historical associations." [130]

---

[129] Freehof, Solomon, "The Union Prayer Book In the Evolution of Liturgy," *CCAR Yearbook 40:* (1930), p. 252.
[130] Cohon, Samuel S., "Religious Ideas of a Union Prayer Book," *CCAR Yearbook 40*, (1930), p. 278-279.

Israel Bettan particularly assailed the approach of UPB editors in their insertion of explicitly anti-Zionist liturgy into the prayer book. He fought against the UPB's general approach to liturgical reform, stating that its editors regarded "their ritual as a treatise, a tract, a pamphlet for wholesale propaganda." [131] In particular Bettan objected to the "propaganda" he saw in UPB's full-throated rejection of Zionism as an expression of modern Judaism. He noted the instance in the 1895 UPB when it stated: "Though we cherish and revere the place where stood the cradle of our people...our longings and aspirations reach toward a higher goal." Bettan begged CCAR leadership to reconsider this use of such anti-Zionist rhetoric, believing it was designed to exclude those who found Jewish nationalism appealing to their personal sense of Jewish religious "truth."

> No one will deny us the right to interpret out Judaism as to dispense with the hope of a renewed national autonomy. We need not be wedded to the vision of a restored Zion. We may well ignore it in our liturgy and discourse from the pulpit on the reasonableness of our stand. But surely, we are not ready to deny religious fellowship to those who join us in worship but still cling to a hope that was also their fathers! [132]

Bettan did not deny the right of Reform to ignore the Israel-related liturgy of the traditional prayer book. He in fact affirmed that such an approach was appropriate. But he strongly objected to times when the liturgy explicitly rejected those who might maintain a nationalist hope for "the place...where stood the cradle of our people." In other words, he opposed the use of the new liturgy as a means to "box out" particular Jews from ably participating in the life of Reform worship.

---

[131] Bettan, Israel. "The Function of the Prayer Book," *CCAR Yearbook 40*, (1930) p. 263.
[132] Ibid., p. 264.

All this criticism suggests significant concern was aroused by the decision to employ liturgical emendation so as to reject those who carry Zionist hopes. One of the critical factors in all of this was the emerging involvement of Eastern European Jews in the congregations of American Reform. For Bettan must have seen how the integration of Eastern European Jews was bringing a new ideological bent to the community.

As Mark Washofsky explains, the "Jews of Eastern European ancestry...held a much more positive attitude toward the concepts of Jewish ethnicity and nationalism than did Reform Jews of German background." [133] Washofsky describes how in the 1920's and 1930's "Reform rabbis began to speak more openly of the unbreakable bond between the 'faith of Israel' and the 'people of Israel'" and so "the portrait of Judaism as a belief system devoid of all national attachments lost much of its appeal." [134]

Elbogen points to additional factors that influenced the position of American Reform in the 1920's and 1930's relative to Zionist theology and liturgy. These included the "new anti-Semitism in Europe... the building up of Palestine and ...[and] the change in the composition of the membership of the Reform movement." [135] Elbogen suggests that all of these factors contributed to a climate in which the Reform movement inched closer to allowing a form of Zionism to be expressed as part of its public message.

In 1937 the Columbus Platform of Reform Judaism was passed by the

---

[133] Washofsky, Mark and Hirt-Manheimer, Aron, Eds., Jewish Living: A Guide to Contemporary Reform Practice, (New York: UAHC Press, 2000), p. 285

[134] Ibid., p. 285.

CCAR which essentially reversed the Pittsburgh Platform in terms of American Jewish obligations to Zion. The Columbus Platform explicitly states:

> In the rehabilitation of Palestine, the land hallowed by memories and hopes, we behold the promise of renewed life for many of our brethren. We affirm the obligation of all Jewry to aid in its upbuilding as a Jewish homeland by endeavoring to make it not only a haven of refuge for the oppressed but also a center of Jewish culture and spiritual life.

In this short plank of their 1937 Platform, the CCAR had expressed the two best known aims of modern Zionism: Israel as a refuge for endangered Jews and Israel as a cultural-spiritual center of Jewish life. But the CCAR had also used the value-laden religious language of "obligation of all Jewry" to call upon Jews to personally involve themselves in the efforts to build up Palestine. If Zionism was now a meaningful "obligation" within American Reform, it could penetrate other parts of Reform religious life as well.

It is noteworthy that the UAHC followed up the CCAR's Columbus Platform with its own resolution concerning support for Palestine. But the Union's resolution went even further, in religious terminology, describing Palestine as evidence of God's presence in history. The UAHC resolution stated: "We see the hand of Providence in the opening of the Gates of Palestine for the Jewish people at a time when a large portion of Jewry is so desperately in need of a friendly shelter and a home where a spiritual, cultural center may be developed in accordance with Jewish ideals."[136]

Stanley Dreyfus explains that at this point in history the Reform leadership

---

[135] Elbogen, Ismar, Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History, 1994, p. 328.

came to see that the "diminution of ceremonialism" of which editing out Zionism had been a part, "was not accomplishing its goals." [137] In other words, Reform worshippers now felt a stronger connection to Israel so rituals and liturgies reflecting the "truth" of modern Reform Zionism could make a comeback. The Columbus Platform and the UAHC Pro-Zionist Resolution helped to test the waters in the Reform movement for the reclaiming of Zionist liturgy. Since these platforms were accepted by much of the Reform movement, the editors of the 1940 revised edition of Union Prayer Book inserted into one of its Shabbat services a newly composed prayer reflecting Reform Zionist hopes:

> O Lord our God, we turn to Thee in hope as did our fathers. May Thy mercy descend upon our people in all their habitations. Extend Thy protection and help unto our brothers who struggle in lands of darkness as victims of oppression and persecution...Uphold also the hands of our brothers who toil to rebuild Zion. In their pilgrimage among the nations, Thy people have always turned in love to the land where Israel was born, where our prophets taught their imperishable message of justice and brotherhood and where our psalmists sang their deathless songs of love for Thee and of They love for us and all humanity. Ever enshrined in the hearts of Israel was the hope that Zion might be restored, not for their own pride or vain glory, but as a living witness to the truth of Thy word which shall lead the nations to the reign of peace. Grant us strength that with Thy help we may bring a new light to shine upon Zion. Imbue us who live in lands of freedom with a sense of Israel's spiritual unity that we may share joyously in the work of redemption so that from Zion shall go forth the law and the word of God from Jerusalem. [138]

This new prayer in the UPB conveyed several ideological points. First, in its preamble and postscript, the prayer showed due honor to Jews praying in "all habitations." The ideas being expressed were Reform's "spiritual unity" and

---

[136] Plaut, Gunther W. and Meyer, Michael A., The Reform Judaism Reader, 2001, p. 138-139.
[137] Interview with A. Stanley Dreyfus, 9 Prospect Park West, Brooklyn, NY, December 19, 2000.
[138] Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship: Seder Tefilot Yisrael, Newly Revised Edition, (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1940), p. 68-69.

special kinship with Zion. Such a context was helpful in light of the particularism expressed in the middle of the prayer when blessing was specifically asked of God for brethren in the Jewish homeland. But the blessing's most distinctive attribute was that it followed the path of "echoing tradition," specifically emphasizing traditional liturgical values relative to Israel. These values included:

1. *Ahavat Tzion* ("love of Zion") expressed through the assertion: "Thy people have always turned in love to the land where Israel was born."
2. *Or lagoyim*: ("light to the nations") as in "Zion restored...as a living witness to the truth of Thy word which shall lead thy nations to the reign of peace."
3. *Or Chadash*: ("new light" on Zion) as in "grant us strength that with Thy help we may bring a new light to shine upon Zion."

In seeing that UPB editors included these traditional values in their 1940 revision, one might posit that such values were meant only as metaphorical assertions of Zionism. But this is belied by the way this prayer directs God's blessing specifically to "our brothers in Palestine." No prior Jewish prayer ever mentioned an entity called Palestine! So if echoing traditional Zionist values weren't enough, the UPB even more radically referred to Israel via the political-national nomenclature of "Palestine" rather than the religious nomenclature of "Zion." Thus one might say that radicalism in the Reform movement's liturgical reform continued in the new UPB. Only now it was expressed in the way that Zionism was "echoed" rather than how Reform excised or emended it. This was a clear victory for Zionists. But lest we make too much of this, Dreyfus reminds us that the blessing was "relegated to the service read only on the fifth Sabbath of the month!" [139]

[139] Dreyfus, A. Stanley, "The Gates Liturgies: Reform Judaism Reforms Its Worship," 1991, p. 145-146.

It wasn't until 1975 and the newest Reform liturgy that Zionist prayers and ideologies were given prominent placement in the Reform *siddur*. In *Sha'arei Tefilah*: Gates of Prayer, edited by Rabbi Chaim Stern, the method of "reclaiming Zionism" was often used to express modern convictions of Reform Judaism. It was no surprise to see Zionist liturgy in the movement's new liturgy, for several factors made the inclusion of a the Zionist liturgy possible.

First, the defining principle of the Gates of Prayer had been a commitment to the pluralism that Reform leaders felt characterized Reform. David Ellenson describes how "pluralism itself was enshrined" in the Gates of Prayer. "On the weekdays, for example, there are at least five services among which to choose, and on Friday night, ten alternative services are offered...Moreover these services run the gamut from the 'classical *siddur*'...to a service identified as 'Equivocal,' in which the word "God' is omitted." [140] So the way in which Zionistic liturgy was offered in the GOP corresponded to the way that any number of once-controversial liturgies were admitted to the book. For instance, there were four different *Aleinu* texts included in the *Gates of Prayer*. Some of them could be linked to the traditional particularistic version of the *Aleinu* while others reflected new modern universalistic compositions. Likewise, there were services in which one could find Reform Zionism prominently expressed and there were other services where the congregation could choose to read a non-Zionist more classical Reform liturgy.

[140] Ellenson, David, Between Tradition and Culture, 1994, p. 203.

The second major factor influencing Gates of Prayer's reintroduction of Zionist liturgies into the Reform prayer book was that the editors of GOP saw the Reform movement as more accepting of traditional forms and rituals of worship than ever before. In other words, Zionist traditions came back into Reform worship as part of the general "return to tradition" being embraced by many Reform synagogues across the country. Eric Friedland clarifies the GOP's intention to reach out to third-generation American Jews who were "not nearly so obsessed with flight from Jewish identity" as were the first generation who stubbornly clung to the UPB's narrow definition of Judaism as merely a religious outlook. Friedland explains the differences between the mindset of third-generation American Jews and their grandparents:

> Without having vanished completely, the craving for acceptance does not prey on the mind as an overriding or compulsive goal, and the assimilatory drive and pathetic apishness of yesteryear have lost much of their edge. Maturity means recovery of roots and self-acceptance, and in numerous ways, Reform has come of age. Tradition, then, becomes a viable option, and acts, time and again, as a principal ingredient in new forms of Jewish expression. [141]

Finally and perhaps most important to the approach of Gates of Prayer to Zionist liturgy, one must understand that GOP was the first American Reform prayer book published after the pivotal twentieth-century experiences of world Jewry: the Holocaust and the establishment of the modern State of Israel. Stanley Dreyfus explained that the "enormity of the Holocaust on the one hand, and, on the other, the establishment of the State of Israel, brought a reawakening of faith and commitment and for Reform Jewry, mandated a complete revision of the liturgy."[142]

---

[141] Friedland, Eric, "Gates of Prayer in Historical-Critical Perspective," in Were Our Mouths Filled With Song: Studies in Liberal Jewish Liturgy, 1997, p. 232.
[142] Dreyfus, A. Stanley, "The Gates Liturgies: Reform Judaism Reforms its Worship," 1991, p. 146.

Chaim Stern in his introduction to the Gates of Prayer, demurs from referring to the *siddur* as a "complete revision." As to the Holocaust and State of Israel, he says, "these events loom large in our consciousness" and humbly offers that "we have attempted a response" [143] to them.

Yet it is worth noting that, in light of the re-prioritization of Jewish communities after the Holocaust and the establishment of the Jewish State, many Jews suggested radical new ideological and theological positions incorporating God's role in modern Jewish history. The CCAR itself ultimately found meaning in the idea of "the rebirth of Israel from the ashes of the *Sho'ah* [as] a symbol of hope against despair, of redemption against devastation." [144] So when it developed new liturgies featuring the idea of the "rebirth of Israel from the ashes of the *Sho'ah*," it focused a liturgical spotlight on the survival of Judaism as a modern path of redemption.

For example, after the publication of GOP, Shubert Spero theorized that: "rhythms and patterns are obliterated with the Holocaust and the rebirth of the State of Israel. The former remains impenetrable mystery... *Hestair Panim* (the hiding of the face). [But] seen in conjunction with the establishment of the State...both events may be seen as revelatory in the sense of the *leading* God."[145] Spero cites Deuteronomy 1:6 as an example of God *leading* his people to Israel. He finds that the post-Holocaust resettlement of millions of Jews to be the fulfillment of God's biblical promise.

Lawrence Hoffman explains what the CCAR leadership may have considered to

---

[143] Stern, Chaim, "Introduction," *Sha'arei Tefilah*: Gates of Prayer (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis), p. xii.

[144] Ellenson, David, "Envisioning Israel in the Liturgies of North American Liberal Judaism" in Gal, Alon, Ed., Envisioning Israel: Changing Ideals and Images of North American Jews, (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1996), p. 139.

be religiously valuable in presenting its conception of the Holocaust and the State of Israel in Gates of Prayer. He believes that his generation was "blessed in sharing the miraculous rebirth of the State of Israel. The idea that God's presence returns to Zion after centuries of the Land's virtual demise, reflects the reality of our love for Zion. But Zionism within Reform ideology differs from secular Zionism in that, for us, any state – even a Jewish one – is incomplete without the guiding hand of God." [146]

Now it is unclear whether the publication of Gates of Prayer served to directly influence those who inferred religious meaning from the Holocaust and the State of Israel. But certainly the links between traditional Zionistic liturgy and modern history were made evident in GOP. In Gates of Understanding, a companion guide, Chaim Stern and Stanley Dreyfus state that such a linkage was intended. "The martyrdom of European Jewry under the Nazis," they write, "has given a renewed impetus to the commemoration of Israel's sufferings generally." [147]

Ellenson notes that this linkage resulted in the re-integration of a Tisha B'Av service. "It had been omitted from the ...the Gates of Prayer's predecessor precisely because...that liturgy did not regard the destruction of the Temple and subsequent dispersion of the Jewish people as an occasion for lament. [But] the power of the Holocaust as a guiding myth for American Jewry was such that this assessment was reversed."[148] Uniquely, the Tisha B'Av service also includes Yom Ha-Shoah, as it incorporates not just the Temple's destruction but the recent losses of the Holocaust.

---

[145] Spero, Shubert, "Religious Meaning of the State of Israel," *Forum on the Jewish People, Zionism and Israel*, (Jerusalem: World Zionist Organization, 1976, p. 74.
[146] Hoffman, Lawrence, A., Gates of Understanding 2: Appreciating the Days of Awe, (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1984), p. 22-23.
[147] Stern, Chaim and Dreyfus, Stanley, "Notes to *Sha'arei Tefilah*" in Gates of Understanding, 1977, p. 246.

Another prominent aspect of the GOP's approach to Zionistic liturgy was its reclamation of Zionism within its blessings and petitionary prayers. Indeed, no new excisions were made to the Zionist liturgy in GOP that hadn't been applied to earlier Reform prayer-books. Rather the GOP editors "reclaimed" Zionist prayers in GOP such as *Av Harachamim* and *Ki Mi Tzion* within the Torah service. One finds the prominent inclusion of these nationalistic petitions in the first Torah service, beginning on page 417. The GOP version read: *Av harachamim, heitiva vir'tzon'cha et tzion, Tivneh chomot yerushalayim*. Only we note that the translation of *Av Ha-rakhamim* slightly mutes the petitionary aspect of the Hebrew edition of the prayer. It reads: "Source of mercy, let Your goodness be a blessing to Zion; let Jerusalem be rebuilt." God is hereby requested to merely allow God's goodness to be a blessing to Zion. Even more notably, the translation asks God to simply allow Jerusalem to be rebuilt, perhaps by human hands, rather than God directly bringing about the rebuilt Jerusalem.

This method of reclaiming Zionist traditions in Hebrew prayers but translating them to effect modern ideology was the most common pathway taken by GOP editors. For example, the GOP *Amidah* tenth benediction reads: *T'ka bashofar gadol l'cherutenu, V'sa nes lifdot asukenu, V'kol d'ror yishma b'arba kanfot ha'aretz. Baruch atah adonai, podeh ashukim.* This version of the tenth *Amidah* benediction is borrowed from Chaim Stern's work in co-editing the British prayer books of the Union of Liberal Progressive Synagogues. He and co-editor John Rayner explain the traditions they intended to echo in this version of the benediction.

---

[148] Ellenson, David, "Envisioning Israel in the Liturgies of North American Liberal Judaism," 1996, p. 141.

"The phrase 'let the song of liberty be heard'..." they write, "is based on Leviticus 25:10 which was first utilized in this context by R. Manuel Joel in his *Israelitisches Gebetbuch*, Breslau, 1872." [149] But as we saw, the imagery of a *kol d'ror*, a "voice of liberty," prayed for throughout the earth, harks back to the version of this blessing in the ninth-century prayer book Seder Rav Amram. For Amram had already used the phrase: *v'kara dror l'kabtzenu yachad me'arba kanfot ha'aretz.* ("Proclaim liberty to gather us together from the four corners of the earth.") One does not find the *V'kara dror* phrase even in the traditional Ashkenazi text of this benediction. So the GOP's version, though maintaining the ban on traditional imagery of *galut* as it related to Jews out of Zion, nevertheless resuscitated a traditional image of the sound of "liberty" as part of an emended universalized prayer.

Additionally the Gates of Prayer editors used the *Havinenu*, a traditional digest of the *Amidah*, as a place to include Zionist liturgical imagery of God gathering Israel from around the world for reunification and rebuilding of Zion and Jerusalem. The *Havinenu* is structurally presented in GOP in three separate stanzas that include Hebrew, translation and responsive reading. [150] The first stanza of the *Havinenu* contains no nationalist petitions. But in the second stanza we find *Un'futzotenu me'arba kanfot ha'aretz t'kabetz*. The GOP editors translate this as "Gather our exiles from earth's four corners." One would have expected a more particularistic euphemism for "exiles" such as "outcasts," which would be consistent with the methods of earlier reforms. But GOP does not do what is expected of it here! It allows a theology of exile to find its way back.

---

[149] Siddur Lev Chadash, Stern, Chaim and Rayner, John, Eds., (London, England: Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, 1995), p. 473.
[150] Sha'arei Tefilah: Gates of Prayer, Stern, Chaim, Ed., 1975, p. 109.

In the third stanza of GOP's *Havinenu*, the explicit reaffirmation of traditional Zionist liturgy continues. The blessing is listed as follows: *V'yism'chu tzadikim b'vinyan irekha, U'vitzmichat keren y'shu'atekha.* ("Let the righteous rejoice in the building of your city and the flowering of your redemption.") This blessing combined with the second stanza amount, it would seem, to a reiteration of the traditional *Amidah* petitions for *Kibbutz Galuyot* and *Boneh Yerushalayim*. Reading the prayers as literal "truth" for the Reform worshipper, one might say that members of the Reform movement now agreed with Zionistic notions of their role relative to Israel. But Rabbi Stern defies the presumption of literal truth that Reform has since Germany placed on its liturgy. Stern explains, "One of the things we run into is that words have different meanings to different people. In the minds and hearts of the people who read certain prayers in Poland and Russia it may well have meant returning from exile...For them, wherever they lived was *Galut* because they were persecuted. But when I say this word... I don't have to see it that way, certainly not exclusively. One does not have to take all of the statements in the prayer book literally." [151]

Rabbi Stern further explains that the "redemption of which we speak in the [GOP] weekday service is a redemption not exhausted by the State of Israel...First of all, because the State of Israel is hardly a redemption... At most it is the *reishit tz'michut g'ulatenu*, the beginning of our redemption... [But also] to the liturgy of Gates of Prayer, the State is not eternal. No sovereignty lasts forever. So exile is still possible even after

[151] Interview with Rabbi Chaim Stern, Temple Beth El, Chappaqua, NY, November 17, 2000

the beginning of statehood. By this I mean not only people outside the state but those inside the state. They remain exiles from God, from themselves, and one another." [152]

Finally the GOP presentation of the *Avodah* benediction in the *Amidah* revived the "long-suppressed *v'tekhezenah* with its entreaty for the return of the Shekhinah to Zion" [153] and the traditional *chatimah* describing God as *ha'machazir sh'chinato l'tzion*. ("One who restores the divine presence to Zion.") The last Reform prayer book before GOP to use this *chatimah* to the seventeenth *Amidah* benediction was the original *Minhag America* of Isaac Mayer Wise. Since then most Reform prayer books had followed the custom of the 1841 Hamburg *Gebetbuch,* substituting the phrase *She'otcha l'vadecha b'yirah na'avod* ("whom alone we serve in reverence.") [154]

But just as Wise had chosen to include the traditional *chatimah* to this blessing to appeal for a unified consensus of all American Jews, so also did the rabbis advising the publication of Gates of Prayer favor Jewish unity as their goal. They strongly suggested to editors the effect that including *ha'machazir sh'chinato l'tzion* would have on the perception of Reform in the wider Jewish community. Chaim Stern recalls that it was primarily the issue of *k'lal yisrael* ("unity of the Jewish community") that guided the decision. He recently said, "We took the magic of the sentimental text because we felt at the time that it would please a great deal of people by using that phrase... We were told it would mean a lot to Conservative Jews and especially their rabbis. And they would praise

---

[152] Interview with Rabbi Chaim Stern, Temple Beth El, Chappaqua, NY, November 17, 2000.
[153] Friedland, Eric, Were Our Mouths Filled With Song: Studies in Liberal Liturgy, 1997, p. 233.
[154] This alternate *chatimah* for the *Avodah* blessing is recorded in the *Yerushalmi Sotah 7:6*...[and] featured in the priestly benediction on the festivals. See Israel Abraham's Companion to the Authorized Daily Prayer Book (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode Publishers, 1932) for further background.

us and thank God we are getting closer to them and *K'lal Yisrael* was being preserved, as we returned to tradition." [155]

But upon more updated self-reflection, Stern feels that the committee made the wrong choice in reviving the *ha'machazir sh'chinato l'tzion* text for the daily *Amidah*. He now feels that, "looking back, those were not real rewards.... And today I would not willingly include *Ha'machazir sh'chinato l'tzion*...We have to be who we are and not what someone would like us to be. [After all] we have a text that was the classic text of the period before the destruction of the temple. When the temple was destroyed our forebears concluded that the *Sh'china* had gone into exile... But do we as Reform Jews really care about the destruction of the temple? If anything, we affirm it did us a favor. So liturgically why would we want to use a text that is post-destruction which only prays for a return to the circumstances as they were before the Temple's destruction? So there is no justification for using *ha'machazir sh'chinato l'tzion.* [156]

Rabbi Stern's misgivings about including the traditional Zionist *chatimah* can be already seen in the way he translates the *chatimah* in GOP, "Blessed is the Lord, whose presence gives life to Zion and all Israel." Ellenson describes the effect of this translation. He states that it significantly mutes both "the particularity of the prayer as well as its nationalistic overtones." [157] Rabbi Stern is even more critical of the translation, feeling it was "dishonest" and it misguided the worshipper into believing that the presented English meaning could be extracted from the Hebrew. This was one of the difficult issues faced on the pathways of liturgical reform followed by Gates of Prayer.

---

[155] Interview with Rabbi Chaim Stern, Temple Beth El, Chappaqua, NY, November 17, 2000
[156] Interview with Rabbi Chaim Stern, Temple Beth El, Chappaqua, NY, November 17, 2000
[157] Ellenson, David, "Envisioning Israel in the Liturgies of North American Liberal Judaism," 1996, p. 144.

Afterword

This close analysis of Israel-related liturgy has indeed been fruitful. For in each chapter we have shown seeds planted in one generation of Reform history were sown by the next generation of prayer book editors. We need not review the findings of each chapter to recount this generational linkage. But we should note that the first reformers in Germany established the ideal of worship as an extension of the truth-oriented relationship of Israel and God.

This theory of prayer as Israel's "true speaking" with God was not created by Reform de novo. Indeed, such a philosophy has roots in traditional Jewish sources, such as the Babylonian Talmud in *Taanit 8a:* "No prayer is acceptable unless, when we extend our hands in prayer, our very souls are in the palm of our hands." Perhaps this source was an inspiration to early reformers. It certainly seems to have guided the way in which reformers such as David Einhorn pursued their radical liturgical reform, with his "soul in the palm of [his] hands." We have seen as well, that Einhorn's long-ranging pursuit of a meaningful and unique Reform liturgy had profound effects on the next generation of Reform prayer book editors who created the Union Prayer Book.

But we must also understand that German Reform Jews, fresh from a political and national emancipation, sought to thoroughly emancipate their liturgy as well. They were seeking to free their prayer from anachronistic beliefs that no longer seemed true to modern Jews. This meant that the Reform prayer-book editors who developed methods to actualize the emancipation of the liturgy were actually developing the means by which to define Reform Judaism as a new Jewish movement.

Reform has since come to be known by many as the "headlights" of the Jewish community at large. This is because many issues that Reform shines the spotlight on have later come to affect other branches of the Jewish community as well. The issue of Zionistic liturgy in the prayer book as a question of "truth" and "integrity" was certainly one of the issues where Reform's spotlight early in Europe helped to shape the response of all modern Jewish prayer books.

Were there additional time for research and space for presentation, this thesis would have discussed with some depth the slightly different paths of liturgical reform adopted by the Conservative Movement. In its twentieth century liturgies in America, it Conservative Judaism generally favored the pathway of "echoing tradition" almost to the exclusion of the pathway of excision. As Jules Harlow, editor of *Siddur Sim Shalom* has written, "The work of editing prayer books generates tension between tradition and change. Discussions of new prayer books generally emphasize change. Therefore it is important to stress the great blessing of continuity [as] there is far more continuity than change in Conservative-movement prayer books." [158]

I am content if this thesis clarifies the methods by which Reformers modified Jewish liturgy, in light of the particular controversy over Zionism. We have seen how successive generations of prayer-book editors excised, emended, echoed tradition and even reclaimed Zionism. It remains to be seen what future prayer books will do.

[158] Harlow, Jules. Jules Harlow, "Revising the Liturgy for Conservative Jews," 1991, p. 130.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Baer, Seligmann, ed., Birnbaum, Philip, ed., *Ha-Siddur Ha-shalem*: Daily Prayer Book, New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, 1977)

Einhorn, David, ed., *Olat Tamid*: Book of Prayers for Jewish Congregations, New Translation by Dr. Emil Hirsch after the German Original, Chicago,1896

Goldschmidt, Daniel, ed., *Seder Rav Amram Gaon*, (Jerusalem, 1971)

Hedegard, David, *Seder Rav Amram Gaon:* Hebrew Text with Critical Apparatus Translation with Notes and Introduction, (Motala, Sweden: Brodern Borgstroms, 1951)

Wise, Isaac M., ed., *Minhag America*: The Daily Prayers, Part I, (Cincinnati: Bloch and Company, 1857)

Mazor, Yehoram, ed., *Ha-Avodah* Shebalev: Siddur Tefilot L--ymot Ha Chol, le-shabbatot ule-Mo'adei ha-Shanah,., (Jerusalem: Ha-tenuah l'yahadut mitkademet b'yisrael, 1991)

Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship: *Seder Tefilot Yisrael*, (Cincinnati: OH: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1895)

Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship: *Seder Tefilot Yisrael*, Newly Revised Edition, (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1940)

Avodat Ha-Lev: Service of the Heart - Weekday, Sabbath and Festival Services and Prayers for Home and Synagogue, Stern, Chaim and Rayner, John, Eds., (London, England: Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, 1967

Sha'arei Tefilah: The New Union Prayerbook - Gates of Prayer, Stern, Chaim, Ed., (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1975)

Siddur Lev Chadash: Services and Prayers for Weekdays and Sabbaths, Festivals and Various Occasions, Stern, Chaim and Rayner, John, Eds., (London, England: Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, 1995)

Siddur Sim Shalom: A Prayerbook for Shabbat, Festivals and Weekdays, Harlow, Jules, Ed., (New York: The Rabbinical Assembly and the United Synagogue of America, 1985)

Ha-Siddur Va-Ani Tefilati: Seder Ha-Tefilot Liy'mei Chol, Shabbat U'Moed. (Jerusalem: Tenuah Ha-Masortit, 1999)

Secondary Sources

Abrahams, Israel, Companion to the Authorized Daily Prayer Book: Historical and Explanatory Notes, Additional Matter (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode Publishers, 1932)

Avineri, Shlomo, The Making of Modern Zionism: The Intellectual Orgins of the Jewish State, (New York: Basic Books, 1981)

Baer, Yitzchak, Galut, (New York: Schocken Books, 1947)

Borowitz, Eugene, Liberal Judaism (New York: UAHC Press, 1990)

Buber, Martin, On Zion: The History of an Idea, (New York: Schocken Books, 1973, First Syracuse University Press Edition, 1997)

Elbogen, Ismar, A Century of Jewish Life, (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1945)

Elbogen, Ismar, Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History Trans. Scheindlin, Raymond, (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1994)

Ellenson, David, Between Tradition and Culture: The Dialectics of Modern Jewish Religion and Identity, (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1994)

Emet Ve-Emunah: Statement of Principles of Conservative Judaism, (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1988

Friedland, Eric, L. Historical and Theological Development of the Non-Orthodox Prayerbooks of the United States, (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1967)

Friedland, Eric, Were Our Mouths Filled With Song: Studies in Liberal Jewish Liturgy (Cincinnati: HUC Press, 1997)

Gal, Alon, Envisioning Israel: The Changing Ideals and Images of North American Jews (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1996)

Hoffman, Lawrence, A. Canonization of Synaogue Service, (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979)

Hoffman, Lawrence, A., Ed., Gates of Understanding, (New York: UAHC/CCAR, 1977)

Hoffman, Lawrence, A., Beyond the Text: A Holistic Approach to Liturgy, (Bloomington, IN: Indianapolis University Press, 1987)

Hoffman, Lawrence, A., Ed., Minhag Ami: Shema and its Blessings, (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 1997)

Hoffman, Lawrence, A., Ed., Minhag Ami: My People's Prayer Book- The Amidah, (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 1999)

Hoffman, Lawrence, A., Ed., Minhag Ami: Seder Kriat Hatorah, (Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights Publishing, 2000)

Hoffman, Lawrence, A., Ed., The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986)

Holtz, Barry, Finding Our Way: Jewish Texts and Lives We Lead (New York: Schocken Books, 1990)

Idelsohn, A.Z., Jewish Liturgy and its Development, (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1932)

Jacob, Walter and Zemer, Moshe, Israel and the Diaspora in Jewish Law: Essays and Responsa, (Pittsburgh, PA: Freehof Institute of Progressive Halakhah, 1997)

Katz, Jacob, Jewish Emancipation and Self-Emancipation, (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1986

Katz, Jacob, Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973)

Kohler, Kaufmann, ed., David Einhorn Memorial Volume, (New York: 1911)

Mahler, Raphael, A History of Modern Jewry: 1780-1815, (New York: Schocken Books, 1971)

Marcus, Jacob R., Memoirs of American Jews, (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955)

May, Max B., Isaac Mayer Wise: The Founder of American Judaism, (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1916)

Meyer, Michael A. and Plaut, Gunther W., eds., The Reform Judaism Reader: North American Documents (New York: UAHC Press, 2001)

Petuchowski, Jakob, Guide to the Prayer Book, (Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Jewish Institute of Religion, 1967)

Petuchowki, Jakob, Prayer-Book Reform in Europe (New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1968)

Plaut, Gunther W., Growth of Reform Judaism: American and European Sources until 1948, (New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1965)

Plaut, Gunther, W., Rise of Reform Judaism: A Sourcebook of its European Origins, (New York: World Union for Progressive Judaism, 1963)

Prior, Michael, Zionism and the State of Israel, (London, England: Routledge Press, 1999)

Reif, Stefan, C., Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity and Islam, (New York: Continuum Publishing Company, 1999)

Sachar, Howard, The Course of Modern Jewish History, (New York: Random House, 1990)

Temkin, Sefton, Isaac Mayer Wise: Shaping American Judaism, (Oxford, England: Littmann Library, Oxford University Press, 1992)

Trepp, Leo, ed., A History of the Jewish Experience, (West Orange, NJ: Behrman House, 1962)

Urofsky, Melvin, American Zionism from Herzl to the Holocaust, (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1975)

Urofsky, Melvin, We Are One: American Jewry and Israel, (New York: Anchor/Doubleday Press, 1978)

Washofsky, Mark and Hirt-Manheimer, Aron, Eds., Jewish Living: A Guide to Contemporary Reform Practice, (New York: UAHC Press, 2000)

Wise, Isaac M., Reminiscences, trans. by David Philipson, (Cincinnati: Arno Press, 1901)

Articles

Bettan, Israel, "The Function of the Prayer Book," *CCAR Yearbook 40*, (1930)

Cohon, Samuel S., "Religious Ideas of a Union Prayer Book," *CCAR Yearbook 40*, (1930)

Dreyfus, A. Stanley, "The Gates Liturgies: Reform Judaism Reforms Its Worship," in Changing Face of Jewish and Christian Worship, Bradshaw Paul, and Hoffman, Lawrence, Eds., (South Bend, IN: Notre Dame University Press: 1991

Dulzin, Aryeh L., "Reform Judaism and Zionism," *Forum on the Jewish People, Zionism and Israel*, (Jerusalem: World Zionist Organization, Spring 1975)

Ellenson, David, "A New Rite from Israel: Reflections on Siddur Va'ani Tefilati of the Masorati Conservative Movement," *Studies in Contemporary Jewry*, (Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999), pgs. 151-166.

Ellenson, David, "The Israelitisches Gebetbucher of Ambraham Geiger and Manuel Joel: A Study in Nineteenth Century German-Jewish Communal Liturgy and Religion," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 1999

Ellenson, David, "Prayers for Rain in the *Siddurim* of Abraham Geiger and Isaac Mayer Wise: An Exploration into a Dimension of the Relationship Between Reform Jewish Thought and Liturgical Practice," in Festchrift for Rabbi A. Stanley Dreyfus Bachman, Andrew, and Bronstein, Daniel, Eds., (Pittsburgh, PA: Rodef Shalom Press, Date T.B.A.)

Ellenson, David, "Reform Zionism Today: A Consideration of First Principles," *Journal of Reform Zionism*: Volume 2 (Azra, March 1995)

Freehof, Solomon, "The Union Prayer Book In the Evolution of Liturgy," *CCAR Yearbook 40:* (1930)

Hamburger, Wolfgang, "Abraham Geiger's Reforms: Ideas and Limitations," *CCAR Journal*, Volume XXII, Issue #88 (New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, Winter 1975)

Harlow, Jules "Revising the Liturgy for Conservative Jews" in Changing Face of Jewish and Christian Worship in North America, Paul F. Bradshaw and Lawrence A. Hoffman, Eds., (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991)

Hoffman, Language of Survival in American Reform Liturgy, *CCAR Journal*: 1977

Petuchowski, Jakob, J. "Abraham Geiger and Samuel Holdheim: Their Differences in Germany and Repercussions in America," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book XXII* (1977)

Petuchowski, Jakob, J., "Reform Prayer Out of Zion," *CCAR Journal* 15, (June 1968)

Philipson, David, "Judaism and the Republican Form of Government," *CCAR Yearbook*, (Cincinnati, OH: Bloch and Co., 1892

Philipson, David, "The Religion of the Prayerbook," *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy* I (1919)

Silberman, Lou, "The Union Prayer Book: A Study in Liturgical Development" in Korn, Bertram Wallace, ed., Retrospect and Prospect, (NY: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1965)

Spero, Shubert, "Religious Meaning of the State of Israel," *Forum on the Jewish People, Zionism and Israel* (Jerusalem: World Zionist Organization, 1976)

"Proceedings of the Sixth Annual CCAR Convention - Rochester, NY 1895, *CCAR Yearbook* (Cincinnati, OH: Bloch and Co., 1896)

CCAR Yearbook, Volume 6, (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: CCAR, 1896)

Interviews

Interview with A. Stanley Dreyfus, 9 Prospect Park W, Brooklyn, NY, December 9, 2000

Interview with Rabbi Chaim Stern, Temple Beth El, Chappaqua, 220 S. Bedford Road, Chappaqua, NY, November 17, 2000