

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Edward Rosenthal

TITLE Expressions of Messianic Fulfillment
in American Reform Judaism

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

1. May circulate ☒) Not necessary
) for Ph.D.
2. Is restricted ☐ for ____ years.) thesis

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

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

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

3-2-87
Date

David Foreman
Signature of Author

Library
Record

Microfilmed _____
Date _____

Signature of Library Staff Member

EXPRESSIONS OF MESSIANIC FULFILLMENT IN AMERICAN REFORM
JUDAISM

Edward Rosenthal

Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements
for Ordination. 1987.

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion

Referee, Dr. Jakob J. Petuchowski

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to those people who have assisted me while this thesis was being written. First, I would like to thank my advisor, teacher and rabbi, Dr. Jakob J. Petuchowski. Rabbi Eliezer said: "warm thyself by the fire of the wise." For four years I have been warmed by the fire of Dr. Petuchowski. He has taught me Torah and allowed me the unique honor and privilege of Shimush Hackamin. His teachings and guidance will remain with me all of my life.

I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to Dr. Robert Friedenberg. Without his help, patience and concern I would not have been able to complete this thesis. He took the time to teach me that which I should already have known and showed me that, "Gam Zoh Torah, this too is Torah."

In the words of Ben Sirah: "Some friends are loyal when it suits them, but desert you in time of trouble. Some friends turn into enemies and shame you by making the quarrel public. Another sits at your table but is nowhere to be found in your time of need.....A faithful friend is a secure shelter; whoever finds one has found a treasure. A faithful friend is beyond price; his worth is more than money can

buy." I owe more than thanks to my best friends Gary and Jocelyn Robuck, in whom I have found a treasure, for their patience and understanding in my many hours of absence while writing this thesis.

Finally, in order to prove that Ain Mukdam, VeAin Meuhar in acknowledgments as well as in Torah, I offer my deepest and most sincere thanks to my parents. They have been supportive and patient throughout this endeavor. I am truly unable to properly express my gratitude and love for them. It is said: "honor your father and mother, even as you honor the Holy One blessed be He; for all three were partners in your creation." Long life, health and happiness to you both.

E.R.

DIGEST/INTRODUCTION

"And it shall come to pass in the end of days,
 That the mountain of the Lord's house shall be
 established as the top of the mountains,
 And shall be exalted above the hills;
 and all nations shall flow unto it.
 And many peoples shall go and say:
 'Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the
 Lord,
 To the house of the God of Jacob;
 He will teach us of His ways,
 And we will walk in His paths.'
 For out of Zion shall go forth the law,
 And the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.
 He shall judge between the nations,
 And shall decide for many peoples;
 They shall beat their swords into plowshares,
 And their spears into pruning hooks;
 Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
 Neither shall they wage war anymore."
 (Isaiah 2:1-4)

What will be in the end of days? When will it come?
 What will transpire? These are questions which Judaism has
 been asking since the United Kingdom was divided into those
 of Judah and Israel in 928 B.C.E., and still asks even today.

There are many different traditions which accompany the
 traditional belief in Messianic fulfillment. It was not
 until the advent of Reform Judaism, however, that there was a
 clear break from those traditional views.

"Expressions of Messianic Fulfillment in American Reform
 Judaism" examines the evolution of this aspect of Reform in

America, using Reform prayerbooks and the writings of leading Reform thinkers. Since this was a major break from Traditional Judaism, the first chapter deals with the traditional beliefs concerning the Messiah and the advent of the Messianic Age.

The second chapter discusses the views of Isaac Mayer Wise. His unique form of patriotism and how it manifested itself with respect to the question of Messianic fulfillment will be addressed, as well as how he viewed Minhag America as a way to serve the entire American Jewish Community.

Chapter Three presents the views of David Einhorn as expressed through his prayerbook Olath Tamid. The uniquely inspiring words of Einhorn's oratory replaced many traditional prayers. The new prayers which Einhorn wrote emphasized the unique character of Israel and attempted to show that each individual had a role in Israel's Mission to bring about the Messianic Age.

The fourth chapter deals with The Central Conference of American Rabbis, Kaufmann Kohler and the development of the Union Prayerbook. The influence of David Einhorn is felt in the Union Prayerbook, to a great extent through the work of his son-in-law and disciple Kaufmann Kohler. This chapter will examine the effects of a unified prayerbook on a growing Reform Jewish Community in America, and the influences which shaped that prayerbook. Subsequent revisions and the reasons

for such will also be discussed.

Chapter Five examines the New Union Prayerbook: The Gates of Prayer. With the advent of the Modern Age, reality forced the Reform Jewish Community to reevaluate the concept of Israels Mission. The Gates of Prayer reflects a new conceptualization of the Mission. The changing principles of the Movement will also be discussed in light of its development.

The conclusion is a brief summary of the expressions of Messianic fulfillment found in these liturgies. It also looks to what the future might hold for the concept of Israels Mission, and what role, if any, we still have in bringing about the Messianic Age.

CHAPTER ONE

"A Redeemer shall come to Zion and to those in Jacob who turn from transgression, says the Lord." (Isaiah 59:20)

"I believe with perfect faith in the Messiah's coming. And even if he be delayed, I will await him." (Maimonides' 13 Principles of Faith)

The hope for a Redeemer or Messiah to come and save Israel has long been a part of Judaism. Yet the Hebrew word Mashiah (the Anglisized form of which is Messiah) is an interesting word which must be investigated, in order to be completely understood. Literally, the word Mashiah means "one who is anointed."¹ In the Tanakh this word is used to refer to Aaron and his descendants, the High Priests of Israel, who were initiated into their role through the process of anointing as described in Lev. 8:12:

"And he (Moses) poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head and anointed him, to sanctify him."

In Leviticus 4:2-5, the High Priest is twice referred to as the "Anointed" using the word Mashiah:

"Speak unto the children of Israel saying: If any one shall sin through error, in any of the things which the Lord hath commanded not to be done, and shall do any one of them: If the anointed Priest, , shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people, then let him offer for his sin, which he hath sinned, a young bullock without blemish unto the Lord for a sin offering. And he shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tent of meeting before the Lord; and he shall

lay his hand upon the head of the bullock, and kill the bullock before the Lord. And the anointed Priest, *הַכֹּהֵן הַמְשֻׁחַ* (ha-kohen ha-meshuach), shall take of the blood of the bullock, and bring it to the tent of meeting."

In verse 16 of this same chapter, again the High Priest is referred to as *הַכֹּהֵן הַמְשֻׁחַ* (ha-kohen ha-meshuach), the anointed Priest, and again in chapter 6 verse 15.

When the monarchical system was established, following the years in the wilderness and the time of the Judges, the term Mashiah was used in reference to the kings of Israel. Like the High Priest, one received the title Mashiah because the ceremony of coronation entailed the pouring of oil over the head, thus becoming the "Anointed of the Lord." A description of the anointing of David is found in First Samuel 16:11-13, in which Samuel anointed him to be King over Israel:

"And Samuel said unto Jesse: 'Are here all thy children?' And he said: 'There remaineth yet the youngest, and, behold, he keepeth the sheep.' And Samuel said unto Jesse: 'Send and fetch him; for we will not sit down till he come hither.' And he sent, and brought him in. Now he was ruddy, and withal of beautiful eyes, and goodly to look upon. And the Lord said: 'Arise, anoint him; for this is he.' Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David from that day forward."

Thus, David was referred to as the "Anointed of the Lord," as were all the kings of Israel.

The personage of the "Anointed of the Lord" had a special relationship with God. In Second Samuel 19:22, this particular relationship is shown more clearly. In this verse, we are told that the one who curses the "Lord's Anointed" is deserving of death. Psalms 18, 20, and 28 also show a relationship of a special nature between God and His anointed one.

Following the period of the United Monarchy, the personage or character of the Mashiah became more confusing. No longer was it possible to identify this person as having been anointed with oil. No longer was the Mashiah a person living at the present time. Indeed, when Deutero-Isaiah refers to Cyrus in Isaiah 45:1, as the Lord's "Anointed," it is no longer possible even to identify the Mashiah as a Jew.

Once the Monarchy divided, and the political climate in Palestine was no longer at its optimum, people began to look to the future for a hope of what was yet to come. This future hope led to the belief that one would come and restore the unity that was once Israel. Isaiah was the first to express this hope for the future. As one from the tribe of Judah, naturally, Isaiah believed that the one who would bring about this period of peace and unity would come from the offspring of David:

"And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, And a twig shall grow forth out of his roots. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest

upon him * Isaiah 11:1.

Following the Babylonian exile in 587 B.C.E., the character of the Mashiah took a drastic turn. Futuristic hope became the focal point of the Messianic concept based upon the prophecies of the exilic prophets Ezekiel, Daniel, and Duetero-Isaiah. Two of the prophecies of Ezekiel are tremendously significant to the development of the Messianic idea in traditional Judaism; they are his prophecy concerning the apocalyptic war of Gog and Magog, and his vision of the dry bones. In addition, Duetero-Isaiah spoke at length about someone he called the "Servant of the Lord," who was to play a significant role in the process of Messianic fulfillment.

The personage of the "Servant of the Lord" is a confusing issue. There are two dominant interpretations of the "Servant."² The first interpretation claims that the "Servant" is an individual. This interpretation is accepted by Christians who believe that the "Suffering Servant of the Lord" was Jesus of Nazareth.

The second interpretation claims that the "Servant" represents a collective group. That is to say, according to the second method of interpretation, the "Suffering Servant of the Lord" is the People Israel. Any personal elements found in the descriptions of the "Servant" are merely allegorical according to the collective method of

interpretation. To give credence to the collective interpretation, in several places the text refers explicitly to Israel as the "Servant":

Isaiah 41:8-10 "But Thou, Israel, My Servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham My friend; Thou whom I have taken hold of from the ends of the earth, And called thee from the uttermost parts thereof, and said unto thee: 'Thou art My servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away'; Fear thou not, for I am with thee."

Isaiah 44:1-2 "Yet now hear, O Jacob My Servant, And Israel whom I have chosen; Thus saith the Lord that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, who will help thee: Fear not, O Jacob My servant, and thou, Jeshurun, whom I have chosen."

Other such references can be found in Isaiah 44:21, 44:4 and 49:1. As shall be shown in subsequent chapters, the character of the "Suffering Servant of the Lord," interpreted as the collective body of the People Israel, is the cornerstone upon which the early Reform Jews based much of their Messianic beliefs.

To a great extent, the Prophets of the Babylonian exile served to create the basis for the concept of the Messianic Age in the Rabbinic Period. According to Gershom Scholem, there are two tendencies which heavily influenced the development of the Messianic concept in Rabbinic Judaism: the "restorative" tendency and the "utopian" tendency. The restorative tendency looks backwards to a period in time which was considered to have been ideal, with the hope of recreating the circumstances surrounding that period. The

utopian factor looks forward with a vision of future hope, for the establishment of a utopia that has never previously existed. "Both tendencies are deeply intertwined and yet at the same time of a contradictory nature; the Messianic idea (in Rabbinic Judaism) crystallizes only out of the two of them together."³ Neither of these tendencies is ever missing from the Rabbinic concept of Messianism, what varies is the proportion to which each is manifested.

Through the prophecies of Daniel, Ezekiel, and Isaiah, the Rabbinic concept of the sequence of cataclysmic events leading to the Messianic Age solidified. This period is described in Mishnah Sotah 9:15 as the footsteps of the Messiah. In the Babylonian Talmud (Ketubot 112b), it is referred to as The birth pangs of the Messiah.

Based upon those prophecies, the following is the sequence of events leading to the establishment of God's Kingdom of peace on earth for Rabbinic Judaism: 1) A period of great physical and moral crisis, during which Elijah will return and reconcile the hearts of Israel with God and each other, thus paving the way for repentance leading to redemption and the reunion of the people Israel. 2) All exiled Jews will be gathered and brought back to the land of Israel at the sound of the heavenly shofar. 3) A great battle between Israel and the nations will take place in the Middle East (the basis for this belief is found in the book of Ezekiel.) 4) The Messiah will come from the House of

David to usher in the era of peace and Brotherhood. He will also bring to an end the war about which Ezekiel spoke, and pave the way for God's Kingdom on earth. 5) The dead will be resurrected, in order that all Israel might partake of and rejoice in the Kingdom of the Messiah. Those who have died throughout the ages will physically be resurrected, and brought back to Israel. 6) Jerusalem and the Temple will be rebuilt as an everlasting structure and the seat of the Messianic Kingdom. 7) Finally, the Temple sacrifices will be reestablished and, once again, God will dwell among His people.

Following the destruction of the first and second Temples, out of necessity, "prayer replaced the sacrifices."⁴ Yet, while "the sacrifice could only be offered by the Priest; prayer was expected of everyone."⁵ Thus, since Rabbinic concepts and beliefs constitute the foundation of Jewish prayer until the the 19th century, it should not be surprising that the worship service offered an ideal forum through which to express Rabbinic longings for Messianic fulfillment.

The Messianic hope is longed for continually, and nowhere is it more prominent than in the traditional weekday Shemoneh Esreh of the Ashkenazic rite. Indeed, it is possible to trace the sequence of events leading to the Messianic Age through the Tefillah, excluding the period of great physical and moral crisis as well as the battle between

Israel and the nations. Thus we read in the weekday Shemoneh Esreh a petition to gather the exiles:

"Sound the great shofar for our freedom, raise the banner to gather our exiles and gather us together from the four corners of the earth."6

We also find the petition for the House of David in the Ashkenazic weekday Shemoneh Esreh:

"The offspring of Your servant David may You speedily cause to flourish, and enhance his pride through Your salvation, for we hope for Your salvation all day long."7

For Rabbinic Judaism the resurrection of the dead is of such importance that its place in the liturgy is not restricted to the weekday service but rather is part of the daily Shemoneh Esreh recited on Shabbat and festivals also. Thus, traditional Jews praise God daily for his ability to raise the dead;

"You are eternally mighty O Lord, You are the one who gives life to the dead; you are abundantly able to save. He sustains the living with kindness, gives life to the dead with abundant mercy, supports the fallen, heals the sick, releases the captive and keeps His faith with those who sleep in the dust. Who is like You, O Master of mighty deeds, and who is comparable to You? O King Who causes death and restores life and makes salvation sprout! And You are faithful to give life to the dead. Blessed are You, O Lord, who gives life to the dead."8

There is also found a petition for the restoration of Jerusalem and the rebuilding of the Temple in the weekday

Shemoneh Esreh;

"And to Jerusalem, Your city, may You return in compassion, and may You rest within it as You have spoken. May You rebuild it soon and in our days as an eternal structure and may You speedily establish the throne of David within it."⁹

The culmination of Messianic fulfillment is also expressed in the weekday Tefillah. Following the petitions for the ingathering of the exiles, the restoration of the house of David, the resurrection of the dead, and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Temple, the traditional liturgy asks for the reestablishment of the sacrificial cult and pleads with God to once again dwell among His people:

"Be favorable, O Lord, our God, toward Your people Israel and their prayer and restore the service to the Holy of Holies of Your Temple. The fire-offering of Israel and their prayer accept with love and favor, and may the service of Your people Israel always be favorable to You. May our eyes behold Your return to Zion in compassion. Blessed are You, O Lord, Who restores His presence to Zion."¹⁰

Indeed, the traditional liturgy is replete with many expressions of Messianic hope. Yet, nowhere in the liturgy is the hope for the establishment of God's Kingdom expressed more poignantly than in the prayer which is repeated more than any other on the lips of traditional Jews, the Kaddish:

"Glorified and sanctified be God's great name throughout the world which He has created according to His will. May He establish His Kingdom in your lifetime and during your days, and within the life of the entire House of Israel,

speedily and soon, and say Amen."11

Throughout the liturgy longings are expressed for the different facets of the Messianic hope. Scattered throughout are individual pleas to gather the exiles, to rebuild the Temple, to reestablish the Davidic line, and to return the sacrificial cult to the rebuilt Temple. Yet these pleas would seem to be based upon a concept of Messianic fulfillment akin to that expressed in the book of Daniel. According to Daniel, the Messianic Age will miraculously appear at its appointed time in history. There is nothing, according to this view, which can stop or delay its coming. Human beings will have no part in bringing it about; it will just happen as has been predetermined by God.

There is, however, another concept based on Scripture which gives human beings a very active role in bringing about the Messianic Era. According to this concept, through the observance of Mitzvot, rectifying social injustice, and striving to live a more moral and ethical life, it is possible for Man to speed the coming of the Messianic Kingdom. This concept binds God and Man together in a partnership. If human beings live and act in accordance with God's will, then, and only then, will God send the Messiah.12

In 1885, at the Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference, Reform Judaism broke away from these traditional conceptions of the coming of the Messianic Era. The Pittsburgh

Platform stated that Reform Judaism saw "in the modern era of universal culture of heart and intellect, the approaching of the realization of Israel's great Messianic hope for the establishment of the Kingdom of truth, justice and peace among all men."¹³ For this to have been in consonance with the traditional concept, the Pittsburgh Platform should have said; the approaching of the realization of Israel's great Messianic hope for the establishment of the Divine Kingdom of truth, justice and peace. Thus for all practical purposes Reform Judaism broke the partnership between God and Man. No longer was the coming of the Messianic Era a cooperative venture. Reform Judaism forced it to become an either/or situation. Either God brought it about miraculously, as described by Daniel, or Man would bring it about. The two were no longer working together.

In the following chapters, we will examine just how "Israel's great Messianic hope" was expressed in the various American Reform liturgies. While Reform broke from the traditional concepts of the Messiah and the Messianic Era, there is one thing which has not changed -- the future hope as expressed in the Aleynu. While the Reform liturgy has changed the concepts behind many of the traditional prayers, such as changing "Who gives life to the dead" to "Who gives life to all", and "bring a Redeemer" to "bring redemption, the concept expressed in the Aleynu has not changed in any of the various liturgies. The hope for the future remains the same between Traditional and Reform Judaism.

"We therefore hope, O Lord our God, soon to behold Thy majestic glory, when the abominations shall be removed from the earth, and the false gods exterminated; when the world shall be perfected under the reign of the Almighty, and all Mankind will call upon Thy name, and all the wicked of the earth will be turned to Thee. May all the inhabitants of the world realize and know that to Thee every knee must bend and every tongue swear loyalty. May they bend the knee and prostrate themselves before Thee, O Lord our God, and give honor to Thy glorious name; may they all accept the yoke of Thy Kingdom, and do Thou reign over them speedily and forever. For the Kingdom is Thine, and to all eternity, Thou wilt reign in glory, as it is written in Thy Torah: 'The Lord shall reign forever and ever.' And it is said: the Lord shall be King over all the earth; on that day the Lord shall be One and His name shall be One."¹⁴

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

- 1) Webster's New World Dictionary. New York, World Publishing Co. 1959. p.924.
- 2) Isaac Avishur, "Isaiah" in Encyclopedia Judaica. Volume IX, Col.61-66.
- 3) Gershom Scholem, The Messianic Idea in Judaism. New York, Schocken. 1971. pp.5f.
- 4) Eliezer Berkowitz, "From Temple to Synagogue and Back", in Jacob J. Petuchowski, Understanding Jewish Prayer. New York, Ktav. 1972. p.139.
- 5) Ibid.
- 6) Nosson Scherman, ed., trans., Siddur Ahavat Shalom. New York, Mesorah Publications Ltd., 1984. p.107.
- 7) Ibid. p.109.
- 8) Ibid. pp.99f.
- 9) Ibid. p.109.
- 10) Ibid. p.111.
- 11) Philip Birnbaum, ed., Daily Prayer Book. New York, Hebrew Publishing Co., 1949. p.70.
- 12) For more information see Jacob J. Petuchowski. "Man's Part in Bringing About the Messianic Age", Ideas, Vol.2, No.2-3 (Winter-Spring 1970). pp.69-73.
- 13) Authentic report of the proceedings of the Rabbinical Conference held at Pittsburgh, Nov. 16,17,18,1885, "Jewish Reformer" for Jan. 15, 1886, p.4. in David Philipson, The Reform Movement In Judaism. New York, Macmillan Co. 1907. p.492.
- 14) Birnbaum, pp.136f.

CHAPTER TWO

MINHAG AMERICA

"The religion of the future will be Judaism in its pure and denationalized form. However the prejudiced world may protest, in theology it must finally become Jewish. There is no other way left to conciliate reason and faith..... the hour of redemption for mankind must come, the Messiah must be sent to redeem them. Here in America the salvation of mankind must originate."¹

The great builder and organizer of Reform Judaism in America, Isaac Mayer Wise, had a vision of what the future of Judaism would be. As the founder of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (1873), the Hebrew Union College (1875) and the Central Conference of American Rabbis (1889), Wise's contributions to the Reform Jewish Community were unquestionably the most significant and tangible of any of its leaders. Indeed from the time he arrived in the United States until his death in 1900, Wise worked to unify the Jews of America into a single community. He saw America as the place where the Messianic Mission of Israel could be realized.

In an effort to unify American Jews, Wise produced a prayerbook which he felt expressed the religious and liturgical needs of an enlightened form of Judaism, as was found or was capable of existing in the United States. One of the major weaknesses to be found in the American structure, according to Wise, was that while the people

believed and preached one doctrine, their prayers reflected another. This type of hypocrisy was unacceptable to Wise; so he set about creating an American prayerbook which met the needs of American Jews. Many congregations were still clinging to prayer rituals which they had brought with them from other countries: Minhag Ashkenaz, Minhag S'farad, Minhag Polen, to name a few, and Wise felt it time to provide a native ritual which was indigenous to America. Based upon reason, enlightenment, and a deep sense of Klal Yisrael, Minhag America came to fruition. In his Reminiscences, Wise explained the principles upon which his prayerbook was established:

"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 from among the people. 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 and persecution, and the accompanying cry for vengeance were untrue and immoral as far as American Jews were concerned. The Cabalistic portions which had crept into the prayerbook, and the obstinate adherence to the doctrine of the bodily resurrection, were regarded as unjustified....We determined further that as little change as possible should be made in the order of the prayers and in the typical prayers."2

Indeed, with reference to Messianic fulfillment, Wise changed a great deal of the prayerbook. Staying true to the principles which are at the base of Minhag America, much of the traditional order of the prayers remained the same. It was the content of the prayers which was different. Some of

the best examples of such changes are to be found in the weekday Amidah. No longer did the Avot mention a redeemer who would come for the sake of God's great name, but rather it spoke of redemption: "who rememberest the covenant of the ancestors and bringest redemption to their descendants on account of His great name in love."³ The Gevurot has changed from "Praised be Thou, O Lord, who resurrects the dead" to "Praised be Thou, O God, who grantest perpetual life to the dead."⁴ While, as was previously stated, Wise believed the Cabalistic doctrine of the resurrection of the dead to be unjustified, the Hebrew of the Gevurot in Minhag America does include Mehayeh Ha Metim. In addition, the burial service contains not only Mehayeh Ha Metim but also the English is a direct translation: "Praised art Thou, O God, who reviveth the dead."⁵

The following changes in the weekday Amidah begin to show a clearer sense of Wise's image of Messianic fulfillment. Tekah BeShofar Gadol which in the traditional liturgy speaks of our freedom, and gathering our exiles, changes in Minhag America to read, "Let resound the great trumpet for the liberty of all nations; lift up the banner to unite them in the covenant of peace, and bring them nigh unto Thee in truth."⁶ It was unthinkable for Wise to include a prayer which asked God to sound a Shofar for our freedom. As citizens of the United States of America, the land of the free and the home of the brave, we enjoy more freedom than anywhere else on earth. How could American Jews think of

themselves as living in exile? So instead of sounding the horn for our freedom, let the horn be sounded for the liberty of all nations. Instead of raising the banner to gather our exiles, lift up the banner to unite them (all nations) in the covenant of peace. The traditional form was no longer pertinent to Jewish life in America according to Wise. The Jews in America were already free, and had no desire to be gathered together in Eretz Yisrael.

The traditional petition, Hashivah Shoftenu, which asks for the restoration of our judges and counselors as they were in the beginning, was changed radically when Wise said Hoshivah, appoint our judges and counselors as in the beginning. This gives an indication of the belief which Wise had concerning divine revelation. Wise considered the Torah to have been given at Sinai, and the Talmud to be the combined accumulation of human interpretation of it. It was Wise's belief that each generation had the right, indeed the obligation, to reinterpret the Talmud in such a manner as was relevant and fitting for itself. Throughout his life in America, Wise had wanted to convene a synod made up of Rabbinic, and in later years, lay representatives to reinterpret Scripture; to make it consonant with American life. Wise thought of such a synod as "a method of regularizing change, of giving to reinterpretations of the law a Halackik sanction, of pursuing in broad outline the processes of classical Rabbinic days."⁷ Thus, to "appoint our judges as at first and our counselors as in the

beginning" takes on new meaning. Wise wanted his reforms approved on the basis of Jewish tradition, and not be perceived merely as individual choices made at random. The importance of this will become clearer as we examine more completely Wise's belief concerning Messianic fulfillment.

During the weekday liturgy Et Tsemah David reads as follows: "Let the offspring of Thy servants speedily sprout, and increase their strength, by Thy salvation; for we wait daily for Thy salvation."⁸ In this case, Wise has completely removed the hope for a personal Messiah who will come from the House of David. Instead, the hope is for the offspring of God's servants to increase in strength and in numbers. Certainly, God's servants in this case refers to none other than the Jews. Wise had no need of a King Messiah who was to come from the House of David. As was the case concerning Tekah Beshofar, Wise felt that in a democracy such as the United States there was neither the need nor the desire for the Jews to return to a monarchical system, such as would be imposed by a Kingly Messiah.

There are other changes to the prayerbook which Wise felt were necessary in order to be in consonance with the Jewish life in America. However, unless one understands the basis upon which Wise made these changes, they themselves are meaningless. Thus, it is essential to examine Wise's belief in the Mission of Israel and the Messiah.

In 1850, Wise travelled to Charleston, South Carolina for rest and relaxation. During his stay in Charleston, Wise had attended a debate at the side of Rabbi G. Poznanski of Beth Elohim in Charleston, against Rabbi Morris Jacob Raphall, one of the leading Orthodox rabbis in the country. According to Wise, "The debate was a kind of Pilpul in a new form, but without basis. No especial acumen was displayed. Raphall was being worsted, for Poznanski was a skilled dialectician, and remained calm; while Raphall grew excited, and declaimed violently. Finally Raphall grew angry, and glowed with holy zeal. Instead of arguing, he began to catechise. He asked the public, and finally myself personally: 'do you believe in the personal Messiah? Do you believe in the bodily resurrection?' I have never refused to answer a direct question; therefore I answered Raphall's question with a loud and decisive No! This ended the drama. Raphall seized his books, rushed angrily out of the hall, followed by his whole party. He had apparently given up the fight."²

If Isaac Mayer Wise did not believe in a personal Messiah, then what was to be for him the vehicle for Messianic fulfillment? In a series of sermons delivered at K.K. Bene Jeshurun in Cincinnati, and printed in the American Israelite beginning in December of 1881, Wise traced the origin and history of the Messianic Idea in Judaism. Indeed, Wise could have ended after the first sermon, for in it he tells his views of what the Messiah is, and what the Messiah

is not. His final sermon, "Unity of Mankind on the Moral and Intellectual Basis"10, expounds upon the Mission of Israel and the role of the individual in it. The other sermons are historical examinations of the Messianic Idea: "The Three Messianic Ideas in the Prophets"11, "New Cosmopolitan Thoughts in the Ancient Israel"12, "The Personal Messiah Unknown in Palestine"13, "The Messiahship of Jesus was of Foreign Origin"14, "The Martyrdom of Jesus and the Suffering Messiah"15, "The Political Messiah in Palestine"16, "The Suffering Messiah Among the Hebrews"17.

In the first of this series, entitled "No King by the Grace of God and No Personal Messiah in the Mosaic Dispensation,"18 Wise showed that the Torah makes no mention of a king, in the sense of a monarchical ruler to be set over the people of Israel. Wise does take note of Deut. 17:14-20 which speaks of a king, but "it is the people's own free will, in this case, which makes the king, and not the special grace of God"19." On this point, Wise is emphatic in his opposition to the notion of a personal Messiah. After expounding scriptural references, Wise stated: "It must be admitted that the idea of a personal Messiah is not, was not and could not possibly be in the Mosaic dispensation."20

In addition, Wise also presented in this first sermon his belief concerning the Messiah:

"Permit me now, ladies and gentlemen, to rise to an explanation. When I came to these United States it was my belief that this country with its institutions, is the only Messiah which my religion teaches, and I did teach and proclaim

this my belief as loudly as I could." "Having discovered first by reading and then by personal experience that this country, with its constitution and its institutions, is built upon the same unity idea, the same moral idea of freedom, equality and equal justice to all, and the same intellectual idea of education, progress and advancement toward universal enlightenment, and of the fraternization of the human family on this basis; I saw in this country the further actualization of the original idea, the spread and triumph of the principle, the morning dawn of all good men's hopes and I believe and declare that my Messiah had come with the Constitution of the United States and the growth of this people in power, wealth and happiness; and I still believe and still declare, as a religious Jew according to the Law of Moses, that I need no Messiah besides freedom, equality and justice to govern all, no promised land besides this country, no hope of mankind besides happiness to each and all, happiness here and hereafter attained under the baldachin of freedom."²¹

Having stated that his Messiah came with the Constitution of the United States and democratic freedom, and expressing his rejection of the concept of a Kingly Messiah, the liturgical reforms found in Minhag America can be more completely understood. Any references to a personal Messiah in the role of a king, prince, or any such monarchical position found in the traditional liturgy, was inconsistent with the way of life in Democratic America. In Wise's opinion, no self-respecting citizen of a free democracy could pray with any sincerity for the establishment of a monarchical system in any form.

Wise asserted that he needed no promised land besides America. Thus, any mention of a desire to return to Eretz Yisrael had no place in an enlightened American liturgy. It

is true that in America all are free to leave at any time. If there was a sincere desire to return to Palestine, then any Jew in America, at any time, could leave and return to the Holy Land. In 1858, Wise stated that "our Orthodox brethren can not induce five hundred persons in this country to pray sincerely for their return to Palestine."²² Indeed, if there was no sincere desire to return to Palestine under the Kingship of the Messiah, there could be no desire to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem, and reinstate the sacrificial cult. If such prayers could not be uttered with sincerity, then they had no place in Wise's prayerbook.

It is clear, therefore, that the reforms which Wise introduced to his Minhag America were very much in keeping with his views of Theology and Messianic fulfillment, as one would expect. Yet nowhere in this prayerbook are found flowering orations referring to the world fulfilled in the Messianic Age; nowhere is the individual instructed in his or her role in bringing redemption to the world. Why did such a brilliant and gifted orator and leader confine himself to the parameters of the traditional Siddur? Certainly those reforms which Wise added to the liturgy are of the utmost significance, but as a true reformer, why did he feel the need to restrain his fervor while constructing a new prayer ritual? Why, if the Messiah had already come in the form of the Constitution of the United States, did Wise quote Isaiah 59:20 in the weekday Torah service?²³ Why, in Tekah Beshofar Gadol, when speaking of liberty and peace, is there no

mention of the Messiah, Democracy, and America?

The answers can be found in Wise's view of American Jewry. It was his dream to unite the Jewish Community of America into one homogenous group. Thus, by following the parameters set out by the Traditional Siddur, Wise was able to construct a prayerbook which was similar to the Traditional ritual while at the same time in consonance with contemporary beliefs. Every reform which Wise proposed was based upon and grounded in Scripture. Thus, he was prepared to meet the Orthodox on their own terms; hoping that they would form a union of American Jewry. This dream of uniting the community is also reflected in the three institutions which Wise founded: The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, The Hebrew Union College, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis. None of these names contain the word "Reform". Indeed, the intention behind the establishment of these institutions was to serve a single Jewish Community.

It becomes necessary at this point to question why, if the Messiah had already come in the form of Democracy and the Constitution of the United States, did Wise feel the need to establish major Jewish institutions? Would it not be possible for the Messiah, in whatever form it manifested itself, to bring about the Messianic Age? The answer for Isaac Mayer Wise was no. The freedom and equality which the United States provided for an individual was only the

beginning. It was therefore necessary for the Jews to teach the rest of America God's truth as given to Israel. Indeed, Wise hoped and believed that by the twentieth century, Reform Judaism would be the religion of all intelligent, enlightened people in America. Thus, Israel's Mission was to disseminate the true teachings of Judaism throughout America. This is expressed during the morning service for Festivals in Minhag America: "Thou hast chosen us from among the nations, hast vouchsafed to sanctify us with Thy commandments, and hast brought us near, our King, to Thy service, to promulgate among the nations Thy great and holy name, which Thou hast called over us²⁴." Certainly such a task needed some form of organization. This fact led to the establishment of the organizations of American Reform Judaism.

The original intention was not for these to be strictly Reform institutions. Circumstances, however, made Wise's dream of a united American Jewry an impossibility. There was too much distrust and animosity between the various factions for it to succeed. Considering the fact that Wise's united Jewry dream failed, and acknowledging that such organizations were to play major roles in the facilitation of Israel's Messianic Mission, was the vision of the great builder of American Reform a failure?

An analogy might be drawn to the Apostle Paul who preached that Jesus would return in his lifetime. Needless to say, that did not take place. Can it be said then that

Paul was a failure? If the number of Christians in the world is any indication, it would appear that Paul was not a failure. So too, might it be said of the vision of Isaac Mayer Wise. One might say that, because in our time we have not seen the end result of what Wise wanted to achieve through Minhag America and his institutions, that he did not succeed in what was for him his greatest task. Yet it can also be said that he did not fail. While his dream of a united American Jewish Community has not yet come to fruition, and while it is already the twentieth century and not all intelligent, enlightened people in America are Reform Jews, the present day is not the end of time. Certainly Wise did say that Democracy was the Messiah, but never did he say publicly when the fulfilled Messianic Age would arrive. As was discussed in chapter One, the traditional belief holds that the Messiah will come in order to usher in the period of peace and Brotherhood. Thus, by expressing his belief that the Messiah had already come, Wise was still consistent with regard to the traditional order of events leading to Messianic fulfillment. In reference to this question, time alone will tell if Wise was a success or a failure.

It was the belief of Isaac Mayer Wise that he expressed Messianic fulfillment in Minhag America in a way which could be acceptable to all Jews if they were sincere and honest with themselves. The desire for a Messianic Monarchy, a return to Eretz Yisrael, and reestablishment of the sacrificial cult were contrary to his belief in true

Messianic fulfillment. Freedom, justice, equality for all, tradition, reason and unity, on the other hand, are the expressions of that fulfillment found in Minhag America.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

- 1) Dina Wilansky, Sinai To Cincinnati. New York, Renaissance Book Company. 1937. p.29.
- 2) Isaac Mayer Wise, Reminiscences. Cincinnati, Leo Wise and Company, 1901. pp.343-344.
- 3) Isaac Mayer Wise, Minhag America. Cincinnati, Bloch and Company Publishers, 1864. p.23.
- 4) Ibid. p.24.
- 5) Ibid. p.133.
- 6) Minhag America 1864. p.26.
- 7) James G. Heller, Isaac Mayer Wise. New York, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1965. p.572.
- 8) Minhag America. p.26.
- 9) Reminiscences p.148.
- 10) American Israelite. Vol. 28, March 10, 1882. p.292.
- 11) Ibid. Vol. 28, Dec. 30, 1881. p.212.
- 12) Ibid. Vol. 28, Jan. 6, 1882. p.220.
- 13) Ibid. Vol. 28, Jan. 13, 1882. p.228.
- 14) Ibid. Vol.28, Jan. 20, 1882. p.236.
- 15) Ibid. Vol.28, Jan. 27, 1882. p.244.
- 16) Ibid. Vol. 28, Feb. 3, 1882. p.252.
- 17) Ibid. Vol. 28, Feb. 17, 1882. p.268.
- 18) Ibid. Vol. 28, Dec. 23, 1881. p.206.
- 19) Ibid.
- 20) Ibid.
- 21) Ibid.
- 22) Ibid. Vol. 5, Oct. 5, 1858. p.116.
- 23) Minhag America. p.35.
- 24) Isaac Mayer Wise, Minhag America. Cincinnati, Bloch and Company, Publishers. 1872. p.163.

CHAPTER THREE

OLATH TAMID

"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, despise 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."¹

The words of David Einhorn were filled with that fire which lit up the birth-hour of Israel. Imbued with a vision and uncompromising principles, his influence is still felt in American Reform Judaism. Through his prayer book, Olath Tamid, Einhorn brought his Messianic fervor to America. In this chapter we will examine Einhorn's views concerning the Messianic Age, the concept of the Chosen People and its Mission, and how these ideas were expressed in his liturgy.

Yet in order to understand the words of Einhorn's prayerbook, it is necessary to understand something of the man. At the age of 10, Einhorn's mother -a widow- sent him to study at the Yeshivah in Fuerth, the city in which the family lived. When he was only 17 years of age he received his Rabbinic diploma. During his studies at the Yeshivah, Einhorn distinguished himself as one of the finest pupils of

the Rosh Yeshivah, Rabbi Wolf Hamburger. However, while studying there, Einhorn secretly took private lessons in the classics and mathematics. In his desire for, and pursuit of truth, Einhorn was diligent. He went from the Yeshivah to the universities of Erlangen, Wuerzburg and Munich in order to study those subjects which the Yeshivah considered heresy. Upon returning from his studies in Munich, "Einhorn was no longer an adherent of Rabbinic Orthodoxy, but an all the more ardent and intense believer in Judaism."2

For ten years following his university stay, Einhorn was plagued by denunciations and attacks upon his character. Most of these attacks were perpetrated by his former teacher, Wolf Hamburger. It was not until 1842 that Einhorn was invited to become the Rabbi of the small Jewish community in Hoppstaedten, and there he remained until 1847. Throughout this entire period, Einhorn was establishing himself as one of the leaders of the Reform Movement in Europe. He was continually at the center of conflicts between the Orthodox and the Reformers. He stood firmly, and compromised neither his principles nor his belief in Reform.

In 1847, Einhorn accepted the position of Chief-Rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. His tenure at this position was, as seemed characteristic for Einhorn, wrought with conflict and controversy between the Orthodox and the Reform. Realizing that his position was being undermined by the Government, which sided with the Conservatives against Reform, in 1851

Einhorn accepted an invitation to serve as the Rabbi to the Reform congregation of Pesht. However, two brief months after Einhorn began in his new role as Rabbi in Pesht, the Government closed the Temple. Once again, David Einhorn was forced out of a position by his opponents.

As he proved in the past under similar circumstances, Einhorn was not disheartened. He remained in Pesht for an additional four years. During that time he worked to formulate a system of Jewish theology consistent with Reform, and different from any thus far presented by others. "We wish to know what Judaism is, not what it is not" he stated. "The mere critical attitude helped in purging Judaism of its impure elements, but failed to offer a true remedy for its recovery. We must leave the atmosphere of mere negation, and find the vitalizing principles of a positive faith."³ This system proved to be a powerful force leading to the success of Olat Tamid in America. For it was this principle which showed that Einhorn, while considered to have been radical in his approach to Reform, was none the less a constructive, rather than a destructive Reformer. Four years later in 1855, at the invitation of Har Sinai Congregation of Baltimore, Einhorn came to America.

In America, Einhorn saw the opportunity for the full realization of his ideals of Reform Judaism. According to Kaufman Kohler, "Here he hoped to rear a Reform Judaism freed of its obstructions and useless scaffoldings, glorious in its

simple yet sublime truth. A renowned scholar, an accomplished Reform theologian, he came with a message not heard before. He spoke, not as a preacher, the popular leader, or the philosopher, but as a prophet of Reform Judaism in the language and in the spirit of Germany, the fatherland of Reform."⁴

Indeed, for Einhorn, if Reform Judaism in America were truly to survive, it needed to retain its original German character. He felt that German should have been the working language of American Reform. So firm was this conviction that when Einhorn produces Olath Tamid, he wrote it in German. This American prayerbook in German first appeared in Baltimore, at Har Sinai Congregation in 1856, but not until 1858 did it appear in its completed form. It proved to be very popular among German speaking communities throughout America, but since it was not written in English, it was not readily accessible to the rest of the American Reform congregations.

A cry rose from the non-German speaking congregations for a translation of Olath Tamid into English. In his preface to the 1872 translation, Einhorn wrote; "The favorable reception which my Olath Tamid has met with, going through three editions, encourages me to issue it in English translation, with some emendations, suggested mainly by Dr. Felsenthal of Chicago. May it contribute, in its new garb, to the edification of my English-speaking brethren in faith,

and meet with as friendly a reception as was accorded it in the old!"⁵ Unfortunately, this translation proved to be a failure. The reason for the failure, according to Kaufman Kohler, was "the translator lacked the heart and the fervor of a religious soul"⁶. In 1896 a translation by Dr. Emil G. Hirsch was published, which Kohler described as "brilliant."⁷

Hirsch said of Einhorn's prayer book;

"Jewish to the core, deeply convinced of the glorious responsibility incumbent upon Israel for the rearing of the temple of humanity, Einhorn in his ritual has given us, in truth, an epitome of the aspirations and beliefs of modern Judaism which, while conscious of the glories of its past, is at the same time keenly alive to its duty to the larger future of a united mankind....Einhorn's Prayer-Book escaped the danger of lapsing into counterfeit Unitarianism and artificial emotionalism. It stands on the solid rock of Jewish thought and experience, and draws thence its power unexcelled to inspire."⁸

Indeed, it is the ability to draw upon the glory and the pain of the past, while looking forward and hoping in the future, which added authenticity to Olath Tamid.

However, to understand Einhorn's liturgical expressions of Messianic fulfillment, it is necessary to return to the German Rabbinical Conference of 1845, at Frankfort-am-Main. It was at that conference that the basis of Einhorn's theological system concerning the Messianic Era came to light. His words at the conference served as the foundation for the expressions of Messianic fulfillment found in Olath

Tamid.

When the question was raised as to whether the Messianic idea should be expressed in the liturgy to the exclusion of all other political aspirations, Einhorn, who was the first speaker on this issue, said:

"For the Talmudic Jew, the Messianic hope is inseparable from the whole ceremonial law, on the full observance of which his salvation depends. Only the sacrificial cult in a restored Temple and State would work atonement for him; hence his wonderful abiding hope in the restitution of its former glory. Our views have entirely changed. We no longer believe in the atoning power of sacrifice and priesthood connected with the holy land. We stand upon the ground of prophetic Judaism which aims at a universal worship of God by righteousness. Israel's political overthrow, formerly bewailed as a misfortune, in reality is its forward move toward its larger destiny. Prayer took the place of sacrifice. From Israel's midst the word of God was to be carried to all parts of the earth, and new religious systems were to aid in this great work. The Talmud moves in a circle, whereas we today believe in Progress.....The Messianic idea expresses, in my opinion, the hope of both earthly and heavenly salvation. There is nothing objectionable therein. The belief in Israel's election also contains nothing that is repugnant. On the contrary, it should be retained in the service as expressing the claim of an undeniable privilege."⁹

Indeed, for David Einhorn, the Messianic idea, Israel's Mission, and the status of Israel as God's Chosen People are all inseparable. Olath Tamid is replete with references to the Chosen People and the Mission of Israel. The mission "to proclaim the words of Thy law to all the nations of the earth,"¹⁰ and "to mediate atonement for all the rest of mankind which...is to be blessed through the progeny of

Abraham, and will one day cordially join Thy people, and flock to Thy holy mountain."¹¹ The Mission of Israel, and the role which the Jews are to play in bringing about the Messianic Age, figure very prominently in the make-up of Olath Tamid.

As was discussed in Chapter One, the collective interpretation of the "Suffering Servant of the Lord", as expressed by Deutero-Isaiah, views the people Israel as that servant. It was the collective interpretation to which Einhorn adhered. For David Einhorn, the Messianic Mission of the Jewish People was the very lifeblood of his belief. He saw Israel as the Messiah which would bring redemption to all the world.

Yet Einhorn always believed in the concept of constructive reform. The historical experience of Israel was of utmost importance to him. For it was through the collective past which brought Israel to its present position, namely, God's messenger to the world. Thus, he never turned his back on the past, but rather incorporated it into his system to show the progression of Judaism. That is to say, how Israel progressed from a particularistic people, offering sacrifices to God in their own land and their own Temple, to a universal faith for all peoples, establishing a temple for all the world to worship God in peace, brotherhood, and love.

This belief in the historical experience of Israel has manifested itself in Olath Tamid in a way which is a distinctive characteristic of the prayerbook. There could be no foundation for the Mission of Israel without the historical evidence. Thus, when Einhorn spoke of the Messianic Mission of Israel in his prayerbook, it was almost always coupled with a reference to Israel's past. Indeed, the Tisha BeAv service is as much a recounting of the destruction of the Temple, and the pain and sorrow experienced by our ancestors, as it is an inspiration to Jews for understanding their role in bringing about the Messianic Age. The service for Pessah refers to Israel's redemption from slavery in Egypt in order to inspire modern Israel to work for the redemption of the whole world; to "proclaim the light and the liberty of Thy salvation unto all that dwell on this earth!"¹² For the services of Shabbat, Purim, Pessah, Shabhuath, Sukkoth, Hannukah and Shmini-Atzereth, there is no mention of the Messianic Mission of Israel without some recollection of Israel's historical experience as well.

Thus, having established the historical foundations of Israel's chosen role as messenger to the world, as well as their history of suffering and persecution, Einhorn readily referred to Israel as the "Suffering Messiah". Indeed, such references to Israel as the Messiah or the Anointed are to be found throughout Olath Tamid. In the Sabbath morning service it reads: "Exalt the horn of Thine anointed, that Thy praise and Thy glory sound through all the lands."¹³ This motif is

also found in the afternoon service for Yom Kippur; "Not as a sinner, burdened with the penalty of his iniquity, did Israel go forth into the wider world, but his was the Mission of the Suffering Messiah."14

The "Suffering Messiah", however, would have no purpose or reason to exist without a mission. Thus, it should not be surprising that the Mission of Israel is referred to throughout Olath Tamid: "Kindle Thou in Israel ever anew the zeal and the understanding for his high mission,"15 "Renew within us the zeal for our obligations as members of Thy priestly community,"16 "His (Israel's) dispersion among the nations was the gateway to his Messianic destiny."17

"The Suffering Messiah", the "Mission" and the Messianic Kingdom on earth reach the pinnacle of inspiration during the services for the High Holy Days. Everything which has been spoken of in this chapter occurs in a far more concentrated form during these services. Certainly there is the historical connection, but a much greater emphasis is placed on the role of Israel in bringing about the Messianic Age:

"Let us never become slack in the effort to spread ever more deeply and broadly the foundations of humanity's temple, that also by our help the great day be brought ever nearer and nearer when Thou alone shalt be known as the Ruler, Thy Kingdom be heralded by the trumpet's triumphant notes, and justice and righteousness will prevail everywhere among men."18

There is a major difference, characteristically,

between the bulk of Olath Tamid and the services for Rosh HaShanah and Yom Kippur. While the bulk generally refers to the Mission of Israel in the third person usage, the High Holy Day services speak of the Mission in the first person plural: we, us, ours. Indeed, the culmination of this difference is found during the Neilah service, at which time the charge is placed in the first person singular and each individual accepts his or her responsibility in the process of bringing about the Messianic Age;

"Conscious of my responsibility as a member of Israel's household, I will in the privacy of my home as well as in the highways of public life, no less than in Thy sanctuary, by word and deed, endeavor to glorify Thy name; so that I, too, shall contribute toward bringing on the glad day when all tongues shall praise Thee, and all the sons of earth serve Thee in union and peace, and Thy testimony, the delight of my heart, shall have become the heritage of all mankind."¹⁹

If one were to summarize the way in which David Einhorn has expressed the idea of Messianic fulfillment in Olath Tamid, it undoubtedly must be described as inspirational. Yet it is not enough to say that these expressions are inspirational alone, for Einhorn has uniquely personalized the Mission of Israel for each individual. Through his prayerbook, David Einhorn has placed the responsibility for the fulfillment of Israel's Mission upon the collective body of the Jewish people, as well as upon each individual Jew. He has given the individual a share in the redemption of the world, and has shown that every Jew can help bring about the Messianic Age.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

- 1) David Einhorn, Emil G. Hirsch, trans., Olath Tamid Book of Prayers. 1896. pp.144-145.
- 2) Kaufmann Kohler, David Einhorn, The Uncompromising Champion of Reform Judaism. A Biographical Essay Written for the One Hundreth Anniversary of His Birth. 1909. p.6.
- 3) Ibid. pp.30-31.
- 4) Ibid. p.32.
- 5) David Einhorn, Bernard Felsenthal, trans., Olath Tamid Book of Prayers. New York, Eugene Thalmessinger. 1872. p.iv.
- 6) Kaufmann Kohler, David Einhorn The Uncompromising Champion of Reform Judaism. p.41.
- 7) Ibid. p.41.
- 8) David Einhorn, Emil G. Hirsch, trans., Olath Tamid Book of Prayers. 1896. pp.iii-iv.
- 9) Kaufmann Kohler, David Einhorn The Uncompromising Champion Of Reform Judaism. p.13.
- 10) David Einhorn, Emil G. Hirsch, trans., Olath Tamid Book Of Prayers. p.16.
- 11) David Einhorn, Bernard Felsenthal, trans., Olath Tamid Book of Prayers. New York, Eugene Thalmessinger. 1872. p.308.
- 12) David Einhorn, Emil G. Hirsch, trans., Olath Tamid Book of Prayers. 1896. p.54
- 13) Ibid. p.16
- 14) Ibid. p.198.
- 15) Ibid. p.45.
- 16) Ibid. p.139.
- 17) Ibid. Morning Service for Rosh HaShanah. p.38.
- 18) Ibid. p.55.
- 19) Ibid. Afternoon Service for Yom Kippur. p.259.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE UNION PRAYERBOOK

"Judaism points to God's Kingdom on Earth as the goal and hope of Mankind, to a world in which all Men and nations shall turn away from idolatry and wickedness, falsehood and violence and become united in their recognition of the sovereignty of God, the Holy One, as proclaimed by Israel, His servant and herald, the Messiah of the nations."¹

As the American Jewish Community increased in number, so too did the number of individual liturgies increase. The prayerbooks of I. M. Wise and David Einhorn have already been examined, yet there were many more in common practice around the country. Among them the liturgy of the Reverend Dr. L. Merzbacher, which was accepted by Temple Emanuel of New York in 1854, Abodath Israel by B. Szold and M. Jastrow and Hadar Hattefillah by A. Huebsch, as well as many others prepared by individual rabbis for the private use of their own synagogues. In 1890, recognizing the need for an official prayerbook to unify the American Reform Community, Isaac Mayer Wise, the acting president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, called for the development of a uniformed ritual of worship. He stated that "the united rabbis of America have undoubtedly the right and the duty to produce a uniform form of worship for all our houses of worship."² Thus, it was at the meeting of the C.C.A.R. in Baltimore in 1891, that the question of a unifying prayerbook was first raised.

In response to Wise's call for a unifying prayerbook came four resolutions in Baltimore. In his resolution, Rabbi S. H. Sonneschein was the first to use the term "Union Prayerbook" which then became the standard for the Committee on Rituals, that had been established at the conference. This Committee, made up of ten men, was to "submit to the next annual meeting the material for such a uniform ritual for public and domestic worship."³ The guidelines had been set before the Committee in a way which specified that "this ritual embody the oldest and essential elements and best parts of our traditional worship, by adhering as much as possible to the sacred language and living historic missions of Israel."⁴

The guidelines set down for the Committee to follow seemed to clearly reflect the hopes of Isaac Mayer Wise, with respect to his concept of a unifying prayerbook. We have already seen the conservative approach which Wise utilized with Minhag America in an effort to create a prayerbook which would be acceptable to a large Jewish community. Thus, with respect to the Union Prayerbook, it was Wise's hope that Hebrew would be prevalent, and that the vernacular would not encroach upon its sanctity.

At the second meeting of the conference in Baltimore in 1891, a report was submitted by the Ritual Committee concerning the plan for a union prayerbook. At this point

the situation becomes somewhat confusing. When the report was to be submitted, the chairman of the Ritual Committee, Dr. Sonneschein, was not in attendance, and a "substitute report which the Committee had prepared" was submitted by David Philipson.⁵ Since the Committee prepared the report, however, it is unclear just exactly what it was substituted for.

At the 1892 convention in New York, it was suggested that the prayerbook prepared by the Committee on Ritual be used at the Sabbath evening worship service. This was the first indication that such a prayerbook existed, and the suggestion to use it was not received favorably by the entire conference. It was at this convention that the internal struggles concerning the prayerbook came to light. One camp was made up of Isaac M. Wise and his followers, who wanted a more traditional type of prayerbook. The other camp was made up of Kaufmann Kohler and the followers of David Einhorn.

The edition of the prayerbook spoken of at the 1892 convention was established according to the desires of Isaac Mayer Wise. It is probably for this reason that it was not favorably accepted. There is no doubt then that Kohler and his followers would take up the gauntlet to fight this prayerbook in an effort to achieve one which would be in harmony with their views. Indeed, Kohler had stated officially during this convention that he was in favor of such a prayerbook that would serve to unite American Reform

Jews, but only "on the basis that (it) comes nearest to and is a continuance of Dr. Einhorn's work".⁶ That is to say, either the Union Prayerbook would be Einhorn's, or it would not be acceptable for Kohler. Yet in 1892 the Kohler-Einhornian camp was not strong enough to sway the Conference.

By 1893 however, Kohler and his followers had achieved a greater degree of influence in the Conference. They were able to effect a revision of part I of the Union Prayerbook, which had not even been in circulation a year, and in addition, completely stopped the acceptance of part II which was to follow the pattern of part I. Yet the true influence which Kohler and his camp of Einhornians could assert became apparent the following year at the convention of 1894, in Atlantic City.

It was at this convention the Union Prayerbook part II, as presented by the Ritual Committee, was ratified and adopted by the Central Conference of American Rabbis. By this time, however, Kohler's followers made up the majority of the Ritual Committee. It should not be surprising then that the Union Prayerbook bears a striking resemblance to Olath Tamid. Indeed, during the proceedings, at which time the acceptance of the prayerbook was being discussed, one member of the Conference asked for the underlying principles which guided the Committee in framing this liturgy. It was Kaufmann Kohler who responded to the request by saying, "in

the new Ritual, Einhorn and Wise dwell together in the historical past and the living present.*7 It is somewhat ironic that Kohler, who in 1892 did not want to be part of the Committee to formulate a worship ritual, in 1894 was propounding the principles upon which that ritual of worship was founded.

Following the acceptance of part II, the revision of part I took place. Originally, part II was to follow the pattern of part I, but after part II was accepted the revisions of part I followed the pattern of part II. Thus we find that both part I and part II follow the pattern of Einhorn's Olath Tamid, and a victory for the Einhorn camp had been won. So complete was this victory that those copies of the 1892 edition of the Union Prayerbook which followed the pattern of Minhag America were recalled when the revised part I was issued. Indeed, when the 1895 edition of part I was published there was no mention on the cover page that it was a revision, or even that there had been a previous copyright.

The sons-in-law of David Einhorn, Kaufmann Kohler and Emil G. Hirsch, had succeeded in establishing a Reform liturgy which was in consonance with their beliefs of what Reform embodied for American Jews. They were assisted in their work by David Philipson. In his account of how the Union Prayerbook came to be, Philipson wrote: "At the meeting of the Central Conference of American Rabbis held in

Baltimore in 1891, the subject of a Union Prayer-Book was first broached. A ritual committee was appointed that labored for three years, and at the meeting in Atlantic City in July, 1894, the book as submitted by the committee was ratified."8 Philipson made no mention of the 1892 edition, nor the tireless work which went into it. Thus, the fate of the 1892 edition was sealed. It was to be a ritual for American Reform Jews delegated to the liturgy shelves of the library, not to the pews of American synagogues as Wise had hoped.

In a biographical essay on the one hundreth anniversary of the birth of David Einhorn, Kaufmann Kohler wrote:

"I for my part can not help saying that it (the Union Prayerbook) was an adoption by organized American Reform Judaism of Einhorn's views when in 1894 the second volume of the Union Prayerbook, based upon Einhorn's ritual as submitted by the writer, was adopted by the Conference in Atlantic City under the presidency of Isaac M. Wise....The first volume, worked out by Dr. Gottheil and the writer, with the assistance of Rabbi Maurice Harris, appeared the following year. Whatever shortcomings the Union Prayerbook, now in use in one hundred and fifty congregations of the land, may have, owing to the fact that it lacks the fire of genius and the uniqueness of style of its model, Einhorn's spirit will ever live in it and ever quicken anew the religious consciousness and devotion of the worshipers who use it, as no other ritual-- aside from Dr. Hirsch's translation--can."9

Indeed, it was probably the hope of Kohler and Hirsch that the Conference adopt Olat Tamid as the official Union Prayerbook, but so long as Isaac M. Wise was still alive this was not possible.

As has been discussed in Chapter Two, it was the dream of Isaac Mayer Wise to unify the American Jewish Community. Thus, it should be noted that when the Conference adopted the Union Prayerbook, which was based upon the model of Einhorn's Olath Tamid, in the spirit of unity, Wise was prepared to give up his own prayerbook, Minhag America, so as not to create dissension among the ranks of America's Reform congregations.

Having established the model upon which the Union Prayerbook was based, it would stand to reason that its expressions of Messianic fulfillment should follow the same lines as its prototype. Indeed, the signature of David Einhorn is emblazoned throughout this prayerbook. There is, however, one characteristic of Einhorn which is conspicuous in its absence. Throughout the entire Union Prayerbook, nowhere is Israel mentioned as the Messiah. The morning service for Shavuot refers to Israel as the "anointed ones", but this is the only example of such a reference.¹⁰

Certainly Kohler, at the helm of the Union Prayerbook, would have found nothing disagreeable in referring to Israel as the Messiah. In his book Jewish Theology, Kohler referred to Israel as the "Messiah of the Nations". In one case, he referred to the Jewish people as "the Servant of the Lord, the suffering Messiah of the nations, who offered his life as an atoning sacrifice for humanity and furnished his blood as

the cement with which to build the divine kingdom of truth and justice."¹¹ Thus, one is forced to ask: if Kohler believed Israel to be the suffering Messiah to redeem the nations, why was this belief tempered to such a degree in the Union Prayerbook that it is not even to be found in it?

There are several possible answers to this question. As was discussed earlier, perhaps Kohler had hoped that the soon to be published translation by Hirsch of Olath Tamid would be accepted by the Conference. It would stand to reason therefore, that if the Union Prayerbook were too similar to Olath Tamid, then there would be no reason for the Conference to adopt Hirsch's translation. While this proposition does seem plausible, it does not seem likely that Kohler and Hirsch would have devoted the time and energy which they did to a prayerbook that they would try to supplant the following year. The answer to the proposed question then must be as follows. While Kohler asserted tremendous influence over the Ritual Committee, indeed over the Conference at large, the followers of Isaac Mayer Wise were not willing to move completely to a prayerbook which was so blatantly Einhornian in nature. Thus, certain characteristics which are so clearly influenced by Einhorn, such as the one in question, were not in consonance with what the rest of either the Ritual Committee or the Conference felt was necessary in order to establish a prayerbook which would unify the Reform Movement.

There are, however, other motives that Einhorn used which do appear in the Union Prayerbook. In comparing the Yom Kippur services of Olath Tamid and the UPB, their similarities are apparent. Einhorn's liturgy read: "Not as a sinner, burdened with the penalty of his iniquity, did Israel go forth into the wider world, but his was the mission of the suffering Messiah."¹² The reproof of the notion that Israel was punished for their sins stayed in the Union Prayerbook but the use of the term Messiah, as describing Israel, was removed. Instead, Israel is referred to as the teacher to the world: "Not as an accursed sinner, but as a teacher of Thy truth did Israel wander through the centuries, to kindle everywhere the flame of a pure faith and lead the nations to a reconciliation with Thee, their common Father."¹³ "It dawned upon them like the rising of a new day, that their separation from their ancestral homes and their dispersion over the earth, far from being a punishment only was in the hand of God a means of blessing to all mankind."¹⁴ Thus, by slightly compromising the uncompromising belief of David Einhorn concerning Israel as the Messiah, Kohler was able to keep the flavor of Olath Tamid while still producing a prayerbook which was acceptable to the rest of the Conference.

Another of these motives is that of the establishment of God's true sanctuary and achieving atonement by means of the teachings from Sinai. Einhorn's Yom Kippur liturgy read: "At last, Thy true sanctuary will arise, spanning the wide limits

of the earth, and at this, Thy true and only altar, atonement will be wrought not by the sevenfold sprinkling of blood but by the sevenfold rays of Siani's sun."¹⁵ Tempered somewhat, this theme also appears in the Union Prayerbook: "Then shall a sanctuary be reared in which reconciliation and atonement shall be made by the seven fold brightness of the sun of truth that first arose on Sinai's mount."¹⁶

The concept of reconciliation is new to the Union Prayerbook. Two examples have been given thusfar which speak of reconciliation, but the question of what form this reconciliation will take must be addressed. Will it be a reconciliation between peoples which will end all hatred and war, or will it be a reconciliation between humans and God? It seems that both types of reconciliations are present. The first reference seems to speak of a reconciliation between peoples being brought about by the teachings of the Torah. Another such reference reads: "Surely, that great day of universal reconciliation, so fervently prayed for, shall come, as surely as none of Thy words return empty, unless they have done that for which Thou didst send them."¹⁷ Other such references speak clearly of a reconciliation of Mankind to God: "Enlighten all that call themselves by Thy name with the knowledge that the sanctuary and stone which erst crowned Zion's hill was but a gate, through which Israel should step out into the world, to reconcile all Mankind unto Thee."¹⁸ We therefore see a hope for reconciliation between all Mankind, as well as a reconciliation between human beings and

God. What this reconciliation entails exactly can be found in the predominant characteristic of the Union Prayerbook.

The predominant characteristic to be found among the expressions of Messianic fulfillment in the Union Prayerbook is that of the Mission of Israel. Since Kaufmann Kohler was the driving force behind the Union Prayerbook, it is important to examine his concept of the Mission of Israel. According to Kohler, there were two concepts of Messianic fulfillment in Judaism. The first was that which expressed a hope for the establishment of a universal Kingdom of God. This was to be brought about by Israel spreading the truth of God's law among the heathens. This belief, according to Kohler, was prevalent prior to the exile from Palestine. The second concept hoped for the establishment of a national theocracy. This belief took form following the exile of the Jews from Palestine.

As proof of this, Kohler pointed to various texts. To prove the first case, Kohler cited Jonah, Ruth and Job as examples. According to Kohler, Job had no conception whatsoever of any type of nationalistic God. For Job, God was "the highest ideal of morality as it lives and grows in the human heart."¹⁹ Kohler pointed to Abraham as the prototype of the wandering Missionary who set out to teach the truth of the One God to the heathens.

The second concept of Messianic fulfillment comes from

the prophecies of Daniel and Ezekiel. This view puts the burden of its fulfillment squarely on God. "Such a purely nationalistic conception of the rulership of God does not admit the thought of a mission or its corollary, the conversion of the heathen."20

Remembering the terrible persecution which they experienced once the Christian Church became identified with Rome, any type of missionary efforts were considered to be too dangerous, and were discouraged as much as possible. Thus the hope arose of a miraculous intervention by God in order to bring about the Messianic Age. Due to the missionary efforts of the Church, the idea of the Mission of Israel took a different course. According to Kohler, "not conversion but conviction, by teaching and example is the historic task of Judaism....It is not the creed but the deed which tells. Not the confession but the conduct, with moral principles which govern it, counts."21 Unfortunately, because of the harsh oppression which was inflicted upon the Jews, they lost sight of their Mission to the world. Instead, they isolated themselves and spent their lives studying and practicing the law. This, in effect, placed the Jews under the divine authority of God and in a sense fulfilled the hope for a theocracy ruled by the God of Israel.

Yet Kohler set out to teach that which Reform Judaism realized in connection with the Mission of Israel.

"The leaders of Reform, imbued with the prophetic spirit, felt it to be their imperative duty to search out the fundamental ideas of the priestly law of holiness, and accordingly, they learned how to separate the kernel from the shell. In opposition to the Orthodox tendency to worship the letter, they insisted on the fact that Israel's separation from the world- which it is ultimately to win for the divine truth- cannot itself be its end and aim, and that blind obedience to the law does not constitute true piety. Only the fundamental idea, that Israel as the 'first-born' among the nations has been elected as a priest-people, must remain our imperishable truth, a truth to which the centuries of history bear witness by showing that it has given its life-blood as a ransom for humanity, and is ever bringing new sacrifices for its cause. Only because it has kept itself distinct as a priest-people among the nations could it carry out its great task in history; and only if it remains conscious of its priestly calling and therefore maintains itself as the people of God, can it fulfill its mission."22

With these words Kohler raised the banner of the Mission of Israel. Not by separating ourselves from the rest of the world and not by strict obedience to the letter of the law, but by being a part of the world and by our conduct, guided by the morals and ethics set forth in our ancient teachings will the Messianic Age be brought.

At this point we return to the Union Prayerbook to see how the Mission of Israel is expressed in its pages. Not surprisingly, the expressions of Messianic fulfillment found in the UPB refer to the Mission of Israel, and what will be once the Mission will have reached its fruition. It is in accordance with what Kohler described in Jewish Theology. That is to say, Israel is the keeper of God's truth, and must spread that truth and teach it to the other peoples of the

world. "The truths revealed to Israel are becoming the possession of an ever greater number of men. May the time not be far distant when all the children of the earth will be of Thy kingdom and recognize Thee as their Father and God."23 "Thou hast called us as the teachers of Thy law; Thou hast chosen us for a holy mission unto mankind."24 "Then were they (Israel) consecrated to carry the revealed truth even unto the furthest parts of the earth seeking to win Thy children for Thy truth and to bring them under Thy dominion."25

Israel is to teach, by example, with understanding for those whose ways are different, but with determination to believe the truth of His own ways. "Almighty and Merciful God! Thou hast called Israel to Thy service and found him worthy to be Thy witness to the peoples of the earth. Give us grace to fulfill this Mission with zeal tempered by wisdom and guided by due respect for other men's faith. May our lives prove the strength of our own belief in the truths we proclaim. May our bearing towards our neighbors, our faithfulness in every sphere of duty, our compassion with the suffering and our patience under trial, show that He whose law we obey is indeed the God of all goodness, the Father of all men."26

Certainly, the goal of all this toil to spread the truth of God's teachings to the rest of the world is the establishment of a Kingdom of peace, understanding and cooperation between all peoples. Were the Union Prayerbook not to include references to the rewards for the work, it

would not have been complete. Thus, there are several references to what will be achieved once Israel has fulfilled it's Mission: "Gather all Thy children around Thy banner of truth that Thy praise may resound from one end of the earth to the other and that through Israel the entire human family may be blessed with truth and peace."27

While the influence of Einhorn is keenly felt in the liturgy for Yom Kippur, the Union Prayerbook is somewhat more descriptive than Olath Tamid with respect to Messianic fulfillment following the completion of Israel's Mission. There is a sense of hope for those peoples who have not yet seen the light of Sinai, which is not to be found in other prayerbooks. This hope is best expressed in the afternoon service for Yom Kippur: "May superstition, falsehood and malice everywhere vanish. May Thine all redeeming love be revealed to those who still grope in the darkness of ignorance and error, and the knowledge of Thy truth shed its rays into deluded minds and clouded hearts. May Thy house become a house of prayer for all nations."28 Coupled with the hope for the ignorant and misguided people of the world, comes the hope for what will be once Israel's Mission is completed: "We pray that the time may come when strife shall no more set nation against nation; when every one shall sit in peace beneath his own vine and fig tree and none shall disturb them; when swords shall be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks; when nation shall not lift sword against nation and they shall learn war no more."29 It is

appropriate that the Yom Kippur liturgy should culminate in the Neilah service with the hope that all people should hearken to the words of the Shemah. That all people shall have finally seen the light which shone forth on Sinai. "Then joy shall thrill all hearts and from one end of the earth to the other shall echo the gladsome cry; Hear O Israel, hear all Mankind, the Eternal, our God, the Eternal is One!"30

Having examined the expressions of Messianic fulfillment in the Union Prayerbook of 1894 and 1895, as well as those people who influenced its final form, it is possible to dispense with the same type of examination for the Revised Editions of 1918 (part I) and 1920 (part II) and the Newly Revised Edition of 1940 (part I) and 1945 (part II). Instead, what should be addressed is the reason why the Union Prayerbook must be revised roughly every twenty years. Perhaps a brief examination of one such revision from beginning to end will help point to the reasons for such changes.

While the hope for all to hearken to the Shemah is found in the Neilah service of all editions, certain changes to the beginning of that paragraph reflect a different type of revision. For example, what read in 1894 as: "Thou alone, knowest when this work of atonement shall be completed; when the day shall dawn in which the light of Thy truth, brighter than that of the visible sun, shall encircle the whole

earth,"³¹ in 1920 read: "Thou alone knowest when our Mission shall be fulfilled; when the day shall dawn on which the light of Thy truth shall illumine the whole earth."³² Certainly the difference between atonement and the fulfillment of Israel's Mission are very distinct, yet in 1945 this same passage read as follows; "Thou alone knowest when this work of reconciliation shall be fulfilled; when the day shall dawn on which the light of Thy truth shall illumine the whole earth."³³ The question of what is entailed in the use of the terms reconciliation and atonement has already been discussed. That both of these characteristics are part of the Mission of Israel is clear. Thus, one must ask why the revision from one aspect of the Mission to a reference to the entire Mission, and then another revision which returns to a particular aspect?

In response to the question of why the Union Prayerbook needed to be revised so often, a further examination will point to the reason. When one looks to those portions of the liturgy which were clearly influenced by the followers of Isaac M. Wise back in 1894, namely, those passages which remained traditional in their style, but changed to be in consonance with Reform beliefs, very little revision took place within these passages. This is illustrated in the U'Vekhen ten pohekha on page 165 of the 1894 edition, whose Hebrew did not change through any of the revisions. The English revisions, were of preference rather than principle; for example, "the Eternal" was revised to read "the Lord".

The same is true with respect to other prayers which do not address the issue of Messianic fulfillment, such as the V'Ahavtah, which through all editions, neither the Hebrew nor the English was revised. Therefore, we find that the portions of the Union Prayerbook which were closely related to the traditional liturgy were not the subject of revision to such an extent as were those passages which were not based in tradition.

In his article entitled "In Defense of Kevah", Rabbi Herbert Bronstein addressed the issue of Kevah and Kavanah in the Union Prayerbook. According to Bronstein, "The Union Prayerbook of 1894 represents an overemphasis on Kavanah. It represents the expression of a specific group, facing a specific challenge in its immediate sociological and religious situation."³⁴ It is this overemphasis on Kavanah which necessitated the subsequent revisions following the 1894/95 editions.

With respect to the overemphasis on Kavanah regarding Messianic fulfillment, Bronstein wrote: "The Union Prayerbook is marked by a Messianic optimism, by certain assumptions about the nature of man, by an "all's-well-with-the-world" attitude characteristic of the outlook of a particular group in the century which took no account of the events and realities of the twentieth century as it emerged."³⁵ That is to say, while the expressions of Messianic fulfillment of 1894 might have been inspirational, they inspired a

particular group of people, at a particular time in history. It was not designed to, nor was it able to accept or even adapt to the realities of the world, such as was presented by Kishinev and most certainly not the Holocaust. If the 1945 revision to the Neilah service (concerning reconciliation as previously discussed) is an example of how the Union Prayerbook responded to the Holocaust, it failed. The "all's-well-with-the-world" attitude was obsolete, and it proved to be unable to adapt to the realities of the modern world.

Having examined the expressions of Messianic fulfillment of the Union Prayerbook we have found that like Olath Tamid upon which it was based, its expressions were indeed inspirational yet lacked the unique personalization which was found in Einhorn's liturgy. Certainly its inability to adapt to the circumstances of the world was one of the Union Prayerbook's major shortcomings. Had Olath Tamid been adopted by the Conference or even been in wide-spread usage into the Twentieth Century, it too would have faced the same problems which the challenged the Union Prayerbook. At this point one must ask the question: What would have been the fate of the Union Prayerbook had it followed the direction laid down by Isaac Mayer Wise? Certainly a prayerbook, such as Minhag America, whose expression of Messianic fulfillment was found in the hope of freedom, justice and equality for all in this blessed land of America, could have adapted to the realities of oppression, persecution and murder against

the Jews in Europe. Indeed, a Union Prayerbook with that as its prototype might have served as a beacon to those Jews fleeing persecution to America. Yet, history has taken its course and the answer to this question can never be known.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

- 1) Kaufmann Kohler, Jewish Theology: Systematically and Historically Considered. New York, Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1968 (first published in 1918). p.332.
- 2) Lou H. Silberman, "The Union Prayerbook: A Study in Liturgical Development", in C.C.A.R., Retrospect and Prospect. New York, C.C.A.R., 1965. p.47.
- 3) Ibid.
- 4) Ibid.
- 5) Ibid. P.49.
- 6) Ibid. P.52.
- 7) Ibid. P.57.
- 8) David Philipson, The Reform Movement In Judaism. New York, Macmillan Co. 1907. P.499.
- 9) Kaufmann Kohler, David Einhorn, The Uncompromising Champion of Reform Judaism. A Biographical Essay Written for the One Hundredth Anniversary of His Birth. 1909. PP.41&42.
- 10) Central Conference of American Rabbis, The Union Prayerbook:Part I. Cincinnati, C.C.A.R., 1895. P.188.
- 11) Jewish Theology. P.376.
- 12) David Einhorn, Emil G. Hirsch, trans., Olath Tamid: Book of Prayers. 1896. P.198.
- 13) Central Conference of American Rabbis, The Union Prayerbook:Part II. Cincinnati, C.C.A.R., 1894. P.239.
- 14) Ibid. P.238.
- 15) Olath Tamid. P.201.
- 16) The Union Prayerbook:Part II. P.239.
- 17) The Union Prayerbook:Part II. P.333.
- 18) Ibid. P.332.
- 19) Jewish Theology. PP.336-338.
- 20) Ibid. P.335.

- 21) Ibid. PP.339&340.
- 22) Ibid. PP.352&353.
- 23) The Union Prayerbook:Part I. P.189.
- 24) Ibid. P.58.
- 25) The Union Prayerbook:Part II. P.74.
- 26) The Union Prayerbook:Part I. PP.38&39.
- 27) The Union Prayerbook:Part II. P.152.
- 28) Ibid. P.233.
- 29) Ibid.
- 30) Ibid. P.333.
- 31) Ibid. P.332.
- 32) Central Conference of American Rabbis, The Union Prayerbook:Part II. C.C.A.R., Cincinnati. 1920.
P.349.
- 33) Central Conference of American Rabbis, The Union Prayerbook:Part II. C.C.A.R., Cincinnati. 1945.
P.345.
- 34) Herbert Bronstein, "In Defense of Kevah", C.C.A.R. Journal, Vol.14, No.1 (January, 1967). PP.77-89.
- 35) Ibid. P.80.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE GATES OF PRAYER

"I believe with perfect faith in the Messiah's coming. And even if he be delayed, I will await him."1

Having examined the evolution of the expressions of Messianic fulfillment found in American Reform liturgy and those factors which influenced them, it is somewhat disconcerting to find the above passage no less than three times in the Gates of Prayer. Indeed, such a statement would have been deemed unacceptable for any previous American Reform liturgy. Thus, one must ask: What happened to allow such a statement to be included in the official prayerbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis? While this might appear to be a simple question, in actuality it is very complex.

What allowed the aforementioned passage to be included is the same factor which allowed Mehayeh Hametim (another unacceptable expression of Messianic fulfillment to the early Reformers) to be translated as "Praised be the God whose gift is life, whose cleansing rains let parched men and women flower toward the sun."2 That is to say, the principles and beliefs which guided the early leaders of American Reform Judaism are lacking in this prayerbook. Such a statement

is not intended to be pejorative nor to suggest that there are no longer any principles to be found in Reform Judaism, but rather that the movement and the principles which guide it have changed and evolved with time.

Indeed the evolution and development of the Reform movement can be traced through three distinct phases. These phases are: 1)Aesthetic Reforms, 2)Ideological Developments and 3)Organizational Developments. The first phase of aesthetic reforms was characterized by a service in which the liturgy was abbreviated, and the sermon was preached in the vernacular. Other reforms included choral singing with organ accompaniment and changing much of the Hebrew of the service to the vernacular. The reasons for such reforms was to bring a sense of decorum to the service which, prior to the emancipation, followed the customs of Orthodoxy and reflected the ancient customs of its Eastern origins.

The second phase of ideological development saw a tremendous influence on the part of rabbis as opposed to the lay influence of the aesthetic phase. The rabbis who influenced this phase were well trained. They worked to develop the principles which are often associated with Reform Judaism. This phase showed a liturgy which was not merely an abbreviated Orthodox service, but rather a service which changed those portions of the liturgy that were offensive to their views of what the principles of liberal Judaism should be, and harmonized those sections to meet

their needs.

The third phase in the development of Reform Judaism is that of the organizational developments. It is this stage in which we Reform Jews find ourselves today. It is characterized by strong organizations and institutions. It is these institutions which serve the Reform movement and provide it with rabbis, educators, administrators and other professionals. It is also these institutions which provide educational materials, set policy, and in the case of the Gates of Prayer, produced a liturgy.

In and of itself, there is nothing questionable about this phase of organizational development. Yet it is necessary to understand this move in Reform Judaism before examining the Gates of Prayer. If one were to examine this prayerbook alongside of the earlier prayerbook of American Reform, there would appear to be major conflicts with respect to the principles and beliefs concerning the expressions of Messianic fulfillment. However, when the developmental changes are considered, it becomes apparent that the principles which guide the movement have changed. During the stage of ideological developments, the guiding principles were in the area of belief and practice. Today, however, the guiding principles are to serve the needs of the movement and those who are a part of it. Thus, what appear to be contradictions throughout the prayerbook in actually are not contradictions at all. They merely demonstrate the different

avenues which the movement has followed in order to best serve the needs of its constituents. Therefore it is necessary to examine the expressions of Messianic fulfillment found in the Gates of Prayer with an understanding of the developmental changes which have affected the movement itself.

Concerning the Messianic idea, there were several beliefs which could not be accepted by the early Reformers. These beliefs, as discussed in chapter One, were: 1) the coming of Elijah to announce the arrival of the Messiah, 2) the ingathering of the exiles, 3) a personal Messiah from the house of David, 4) the resurrection of the dead, 5) the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem, and 6) the reinstatement of the sacrificial cult. Of these beliefs, only the rebuilding of the Temple, and reinstatement of the sacrificial cult are not found in any service in the Gates of Prayer. However it is expressed in the traditional song for Hannukah, Maoz Tzur, found on p.758. The others will be examined, in addition to expressions of Messianic fulfillment which are new to American Reform.

For purposes of practicality, the characters of Elijah the Prophet and the Messiah will be discussed together. The following are those references as they appear in the Gates of Prayer. In previous American Reform liturgies, when a particular passage appeared in all necessary services, such as Mehayeih HaKol as opposed to Mehayeih HaMetim, it denoted a

principle which was consistent with Reform belief. In the Gates of Prayer, there are two services for Havdalah. Both of these services speak of Elijah using the same words. In both cases, neither service translates the passage:

וְיָבֹא עִלֵּינוּ מְהֵרָה אֵלֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׁלַח אֶת מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת אֶלְיָהוּ

וְיָבֹא עִלֵּינוּ מְהֵרָה אֵלֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׁלַח אֶת מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת אֶלְיָהוּ. "3 A literal translation speaks of Elijah the Prophet, saying, "May he come to us speedily in our days, with the Messiah, the son of David." The afternoon service for Shabbat and Yom Tov contains the passage which is found in the traditional service for this time:

וְיָבֹא עִלֵּינוּ מְהֵרָה אֵלֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׁלַח אֶת מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת אֶלְיָהוּ. "4 The literal translation of this passage is: "And a Redeemer will come to Zion and to those in Jacob who turn to God". The Gates of Prayer, in this case, translated Redeemer as redemption: "To Zion redemption will come, to those in Jacob who turn to God."

The traditional blessing which follows the reading of the Haftarah is another example of a translation which does not follow the Hebrew. While the Hebrew text reads:

יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׁלַח אֶת מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת אֶלְיָהוּ וְיָבֹא עִלֵּינוּ מְהֵרָה אֵלֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׁלַח אֶת מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת אֶלְיָהוּ. "5 the English translation reads: "Lord our God, bring us the joy of Your kingdom: let our dream of Elijah and David bear fruit. Speedily let redemption come to gladden our hearts". A true and literal translation of this blessing would be: "Gladden us O Lord, our God, with Elijah the Prophet, Your servant, and with the kingdom of the house of David, your anointed one, may he come speedily and cause our heart to exult."

With reference to these passages, it is clear that there are inconsistencies in their usage. Either the passages are not translated at all or their translation is changed in such a way as to alter, on a fundamental level, their meaning. While these, for the most part, would not have been deemed acceptable to the early Reformers, if considered in light of the organizational development of Reform Judaism, their inclusion can be understood.

Those prayers which come from the traditional liturgy and are included in Gates of Prayer satisfy the needs of the traditional wing of Reform. By including a translation which is not literal or by not choosing to translate the passage at all, those who are less traditional are not offended. However, there is one flaw in this approach. It presupposes that those who are less traditional are not able to read the Hebrew. Such is not always the case. Thus, a new issue has been raised: How literally should the liturgy be understood?

To the early Reformers the liturgy had to reflect their beliefs and therefore needed to be consistent with those beliefs. Thus, they took their liturgy very seriously and very literally. The use of metaphor was not acceptable. Today however, metaphor plays an important role in the liturgy of Reform Judaism. Indeed, virtually all of the passages discussed could be read metaphorically.

Another example of a passage which can be read metaphorically is the Maimonidean principle of faith which speaks of the coming of the Messiah. This passage appears three times and each time is accompanied by a literal translation. However, of the three times which it appears in the prayerbook, only once is it found as part of a service. The others are found in the section of hymns and songs and also in the supplement under the heading of "Redemption". The service in which this passage is found is for Yom HaShoah. Certainly this passage's literal meaning is not in consonance with the beliefs of Reform Judaism. Yet when read within its historical context, it is a statement about the millions of Jews who went to their death with this declaration of faith on their lips.

Concerning the issue of resurrection of the dead, the only liturgical problem appears in the passage cited earlier in this chapter which contains the Hatimah, Mehayeh Hametim. The inclusion of this passage is troubling because it is clearly contradictory to anything that Reform Judaism has expressed concerning the resurrection of the dead. In an attempt to explain the use of this Hatimah, the Gates of Understanding states that it is present "because of its interpretive use."⁶ That is to say, it is to be read metaphorically. This however, raises a fundamental question about Reform liturgy. If any passage may be read in that manner, pragmatically there should never have been a need to

change the liturgy in the first place.

None of the previously mentioned readings are new liturgical inclusions. They have all been part of the traditional liturgy at one time or another. While these passages were not written by anyone representing the C.C.A.R., their place in the Reform liturgy was decided upon by editors representing that organization. The inclusion of these passages could then be based on esthetics or tradition or any number of reasons but they do necessarily need to reflect the positions of the Conference.

There is one such inclusion which is not found in the traditional liturgy which because of its place in the Reform prayerbook should represent the C.C.A.R.'s position on the state of exile. It is found in the supplement to the service for Yom HaAtsmaut. It refers to the present status of exile and reads as follows: "And yet, even now, Exile persists, no less real than before: for still our enemies plot to destroy us, still they hack at our roots."⁷ The problem which arises from this is that the Hebrew text speaks of an idea of exile which is very much in keeping with the beliefs of the early Reformers. It is the English paraphrase of Rabbi Chaim Stern which makes the above statements. Why, if the Hebrew text presents an acceptable statement, was the need felt to deviate from it? Had this been a Scriptural passage or even a passage from the traditional liturgy, it might be argued that it could be read

metaphorically; however, it is not. As the principal editor of the Gates of Prayer, it would seem that Rabbi Stern has made an interesting statement about the state of exile for Jews throughout the world, as well as in the United States. Indeed, with this statement, Rabbi Stern has moved the C.C.A.R. a long way from the beliefs of its founder, who felt that America was a blessed land of freedom for all people.

While previous American Reform prayerbooks have placed a special emphasis on the Mission of Israel, as expressed in article #5 of the Pittsburgh Platform, Gates of Prayer has changed the terminology, if not the concept. What was previously referred to as the Mission of Israel is now known as Tikun Olam.

The concept of Tikun Olam is based on the phrase found in the Aleynu which reads: "Letaken Olam B'Malkhut Shadai," "And the world will be perfected under the sovereignty of the Almighty." Its place was established within Reform Judaism in article #8 of the Pittsburgh Platform:

"In full accordance with the spirit of Mosaic legislation, which strives to regulate the relation between rich and poor, we deem it our duty to participate in the great task of modern times, to solve, on the basis of justice and righteousness, the problems presented by the contrasts and evils of the present organization of society."8

What is found in the Gates of Prayer is an emphasis on Tikun Olam as the major expression of Messianic fulfillment for American Reform Judaism. As was discussed in Chapter

Four, the major flaw in the Union Prayerbook was its inability to adapt to the realities of the modern world. In its attempt to adjust to reality, the Gates of Prayer demythologized the traditional concepts of Messianic fulfillment and the Mission of Israel. What it achieved was Tikun Olam, otherwise known as Social Action.

In many cases, Tikun Olam is paired with an expression of God's strength, power and love. An example of this can be found in a responsive reading for a weekday morning service:

*Your might, O God is everlasting;
 Help us to use our strength for good and not for evil.
 You are the Source of life and blessing;
 Help us to choose life for ourselves and our children.
 You are the Support of the falling;
 Help us to lift up the fallen.
 You are the Author of freedom;
 Help us to set free the captive.
 You are our Hope in death as in life;
 Help us to keep faith with those who sleep in the dust.
 Your might, O God, is everlasting;
 Help us to use our strength for good.*9

While this passage calls for action in order to perfect the world, it acknowledges that the source of such actions comes from God. Interestingly, a similar passage found in the following weekday service reads as follows:

*O fill our minds with knowledge and our hearts with wisdom;
 Praised be the Mind that unifies all creation.
 Remind us of the best that is in us;
 Praised be the Will that gives us power to choose our way.

Help us to feel the anguish of the afflicted and oppressed;
 Praised be the Heart that inspires in us a vision of justice and love.
 Make us bring knowledge and skill to help the infirm;
 Praised be the Power that brings healing to the sick."10

God's strength, power and love are not to be found in this passage. Indeed, God is not found in this passage! Certainly, it could be argued that the "Mind that unifies", the "Will that gives power", the "Heart that inspires" and the "Power that brings healing" are all images of God. Yet there is no way of knowing from the text itself who or what is the object of the praises uttered in this prayer. Indeed, the "Mind", "Will", "Heart" and "Power" could all refer to those qualities in human beings which can effect change and improvement.

In these two passages, the concept of Tikun Olam has been expressed. Yet, at the source they are very different from each other. In the first text the source is certainly God. God is that force which helps and inspires human beings to work in order to bring about the perfection of the world. In the second text, however, it is not clear whether the power to perfect the world comes from God or Man.

This conflict is found throughout the Gates of Prayer. On one hand, we find that we are the vehicles which God uses to perfect the world:

"God of eternal might, through us send help to the falling, healing to the sick, freedom to the captive."11

"Grant peace to our world, goodness and blessing, mercy and compassion, life and love. Inspire us to banish for ever hatred, war, and bloodshed. Help us to establish for ever one human family doing Your will in love and peace."12

While, on the other hand, there are parts of this liturgy which attribute no portion of the world's perfection to God:

"When will redemption come? When we master the violence that fills our world. When we look upon others as we would have them look upon us. When we grant to every person the rights we claim for ourselves."13

"We live in two worlds: the one that is, and the one that might be. Nothing is ordained for us: neither delight nor defeat, neither peace nor war. Life flows, and we must freely choose. We can, if we will, change the world that is, into the world that may come to be."14

Clearly such divergent statements reflect the stage of organizational development of Reform Judaism. Such conflicting statements, however, are not without consequence. Before discussing the effects of these conflicting passages, it is necessary to examine another aspect of Messianic fulfillment, namely, the early Reform concept of the Mission of Israel.

While Tikun Olam has taken over as the dominant expression of Messianic fulfillment in the Gates of Prayer, the Mission of Israel has not been replaced completely. Indeed, it can be found in three and a half pages in the readings for "special themes," following nature, loneliness,

quest and several other topics."¹⁵ The readings in this section do reflect the traditional Reform belief that the Mission is the dissemination of God's truth through the Torah to the peoples of the world, in order to bring all people to God. However, in other areas of this prayerbook, the Mission has lost its connection with God and the Torah. In the service for Tishah BeAv and Yom HaShoah, the Mission has become entwined with Israel's suffering, but with no mention of Israel as the suffering servant.

"Our Mission involves other peoples. Jews do not live alone. As a result of what the world has done to us, it may find a way to save itself. By now it must admit that we do have in our possession the key to survival. We have not survived centuries of atrocities for nothing. This is what I think we are trying to prove to ourselves, desperately, because it is desperately needed: in a world of absurdity, we must invent reason; we must create beauty out of nothingness. And because there is murder in this world- and we are the first ones to know it- and we know how hopeless our battle may appear, we have to fight murder and absurdity, and give meaning to the battle, if not to our hope. This is not a lesson; this is not an answer. It is only a question."¹⁶

This passage makes no mention of what we have in our possession which is the key to survival. There is no mention as to whether that key to survival is the Torah, our faith in God and the ultimate good to be found in the world, or whether it is just such a tenacious lust for life and greed that a Jew will do anything in order to live. This reading does not teach us about our Mission and our responsibility, but merely by its own volition, poses a question.

Certainly the second paragraph of the Aleynu, found in both its traditional form as well as its classical Reform appearance, expresses a Messianic hope which is in keeping with liberal Judaism. Aside from this, there is very little from earlier Reform prayerbooks which has influenced the expressions of Messianic fulfillment found in the Gates of Prayer.

Having examined the evolutionary development of the Reform movement, and how its present phase of organizational development has influenced the wide variety of Messianic expressions found in the Gates of Prayer, it is necessary to observe those factors which were instrumental in its formulation. In 1967, David Polish set forth what he felt should be the principles of a new prayerbook to be published by the C.C.A.R.. In his article "Where Do We Go From Here?" Polish set down ten principles which should guide the liturgy committee of the Conference. The principles which Polish presented, interestingly enough, contained no mention of any beliefs. Certainly, Polish referred to tradition as well as the needs of the individual. In addition, the principles dictated from where the material for the prayerbook should come and also the feeling that new works should be commissioned for it. The principles, however, do not reflect any attitudes toward the concept of God or the Mission of Israel. This fact exemplifies the stage of organizational development.

There is one of these principles set down by Polish which does address the issue of theology. Principle number Two reads as follows:

"The prayer book must be, not a theology of our people, but the theologies of the people. More specifically, it is doubtful whether the people are at all theologically articulate, but many are theologically receptive, and in all honesty, we owe them the same spectrum of belief that our own Conference represents."17

While this statement is a perfect example of the effects of organizational development, what it achieved in effect was a prayerbook which set down many theological beliefs and offered nothing concrete by which to express the beliefs of the Reform movement.

The result of this prayerbook was described very effectively by Dr. Jakob Petuchowski, who wrote in a review of the Gates of Prayer:

"There was a time, not too long ago, when one of the stereotypes about Orthodox, Reform and Conservative Judaism in this country represented Orthodoxy and Reform as championing clearly defined positions, with Conservative Judaism serving as a kind of catch-all for a vast variety of defined and undefined religious points of view. However, it no longer applies today. Whatever may or may not have happened to Conservative Judaism in the meantime, it is clear that Reform Judaism itself has now become the most heterogeneous grouping within American Judaism."18

Thus, after reading the principles of David Polish for the Gates of Prayer and the description of its influence upon Reform Judaism by Dr. Petuchowski, the effects of

organizational development on the Reform movement become clear. In an effort to accommodate the beliefs of all Reform Jews, the Gates of Prayer has included not only diverse, but also contradictory statements concerning Messianic fulfillment and other topics as well. While it may have been a noble gesture to attempt to please all of the various factions in Reform, it was simplistic and somewhat foolhardy to think that such an endeavor could be achieved. As Polish said, "it is doubtful whether the people are at all theologically literate". Yet for those who are "theologically literate," the diversity and contradictions of Gates of Prayer, in many cases, are viewed as hypocritical. Thus, these people are alienated from the official prayerbook of their movement, instead of being made to feel that their spiritual needs are being satisfied by means of a sincere prayerbook for communal and individual worship.

In defense of the diversity and contradiction found in the Gates of Prayer, its introduction makes the following statement:

"We are a diversified people. Within our Reform community are proponents of many viewpoints. There is disagreement among us on many issues. It is our hope that Gates of Prayer will unite us all in worship. We do not assume that all controversy is harmful; we do not presume to judge which controversy is not 'for the sake of Heaven'; still less do we wish to stifle the expression of views sincerely held. Therefore in this prayerbook we have followed the principle that there are many paths to heaven's gates, that this prayer and that one, this service and that one, may both have the

power to lead us to the living God."¹⁹

This statement offers insight into the difficulties which have been shown to exist in the Gates of Prayer. It tells us, for example, that one of the guiding principles upon which this prayerbook was established is the validity of many diverse practices and beliefs.

The statement also tells us that it was the hope of the C.C.A.R. for Gates of Prayer to unite the American Reform community in worship. It is important to ascertain exactly what is meant by unity. If to be united in worship means to have the entire community read from the same prayerbook, then the Gates of Prayer has succeeded in its goal. If, however, to be united in worship means to be of one heart and soul in worship, to believe in that which those with whom one worships believe, then in this case the Gates of Prayer has fallen short. For if on any given Shabbat, congregation A worships from service number one and congregation B worships from service number six, the only factor which they share in common is that they read from the same book and pay dues to the same umbrella organization. This is not unity.

In 1894, when the Union Prayerbook was adopted by the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Isaac Mayer Wise, in the spirit of unity, accepted it without question or hesitation. The reason for his action was because he so believed in unifying the American Reform community that he

was willing to accept another worship ritual, rather than his own Minhag America, in order to serve the overall community. Although the Union Prayerbook presented a different theological approach than Wise believed, and although its attitudes concerning Messianic fulfillment differed from his own, he was more concerned with the whole than with his own theological needs. The editors of the Gates of Prayer were not able to see unity in the same light as Isaac Mayer Wise. For them unity meant reading from the same prayerbook whether it contained one theological approach or many.

Therefore, with respect to the expressions of Messianic fulfillment, the Gates of Prayer represents a collage of many different Messianic beliefs. Those doctrines of traditional Judaism which early Reform did not find compatible with the modern world and were removed from the liturgy are found in it. So, too, are found expressions which would have met with approval from the early Reformers as well as concepts of which they would never have dreamed.

What then is presented by such an array of expressions of Messianic redemption? The result is, if a Reform Jew in America today is confused about what Judaism believes concerning anything having to do with the Messiah, the Messianic Age or any type of future redemption, he or she must look to a source other than the prayerbook of the Reform movement. Should that person sincerely search the Reform liturgy for help or for an answer to the question of

Messianic fulfillment, what would be found is contradiction, confusion and no clear stand on what the Reform movement believes.

It is interesting to note that, while the liturgy of Reform Judaism does not express the beliefs of the movement, those beliefs have been expressed in other forums. On June 24th, 1976, at its meeting in San Francisco, the Central Conference of American Rabbis adopted a Centenary Perspective. This perspective laid down the beliefs of the Reform movement. Concerning Messianic fulfillment article six of the document read as follows:

"When we speak of the Mission of Israel, we share the special vision of our ancestors, who conceived of themselves as set apart both by promise and by hope toward the goal of perfecting the world under the kingdom of God. Thus we affirm the meaningfulness of history, not as the endless rise and fall of the tides of power, but the working out of moral truth in the laboratory of space and time. Our survival is testimony to that vision. Our role in history has been multiple; suffering servant, surviving witness, faithful teacher, holy nation, whose constant aim has been the righting of wrong, and bringing ever nearer the Messianic goal of a just and peaceful world."20

This document purposes to express, as did the platforms of Pittsburgh and Columbus, what the Reform Movement believes and represents. If this is true, can it be said with respect to Messianic fulfillment, that the official prayerbook of the Reform Movement also expresses those beliefs? The answer to this question is unequivocally, No! Certainly, in part the views expressed by the Centenary Perspective are to be found

in the Gates of Prayer. However, those views are found alongside of views which are both contradictory and contrary to other beliefs set forth in the perspective.

What, then, can be concluded concerning the expressions of Messianic fulfillment found in the Gates of Prayer? If one is searching for the inspiration of Olath Tamid, it will not be found. If one is searching for the sense of unity of Minhag America, it will not be found. If one is searching for the uncompromising voice of belief and conviction, it will not be found in the Gates of Prayer. What, then, can be found? One will find a collection of expressions of Messianic fulfillment which are neither inspirational nor provocative, which do not call out for belief or conviction but instead create only questions. The rise of the stage of organizational development in American Reform Judaism has produced many noteworthy institutions and organizations. The drawback to such developments, however, is that the principles which were the foundation of the Reform movement have been obscured. As Dr. Petuchowski noted, Reform is no longer the champion of a clearly defined position. "It is clear that Reform Judaism itself has now become the most heterogeneous grouping within American Judaism". The expressions of Messianic fulfillment found in the Gates of Prayer exemplify this fact.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

- 1) Central Conference of American Rabbis, Chaim Stern, Editor, Gates Of Prayer: The New Union Prayerbook. New York, C.C.A.R. 1975. PP.575, 707, 753.
- 2) Ibid. P.256.
- 3) Ibid. P.634 & 641.
- 4) Ibid. P.557.
- 5) Ibid.
- 6) Hoffman, Lawrence A., ed., Gates Of Understanding. New York, C.C.A.R., U.A.H.C. 1977, p.218.
- 7) Gates of Prayer. P.609.
- 8) Authentic report of the proceedings of the Rabbinical Conference held at Pittsburgh, Nov.16,17,&18, 1885. "Jewish Reformer" for Jan. 15, 1886, p.4., in David Philipson, The Reform Movement In Judaism. New York, Macmillan Co. 1907. p.492.
- 9) Ibid. P.89.
- 10) Ibid. P.99.
- 11) Ibid. P.186.
- 12) Ibid. P.187.
- 13) Ibid. P.211.
- 14) Ibid. PP.216&217.
- 15) Ibid. PP.703-706.
- 16) Ibid. PP.588&589.
- 17) David Polish, "Where Do We Go From Here", C.C.A.R. Journal, Vol.14, No.1, (January, 1967). P.69.
- 18) Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Bookbinder To The Rescue", Conservative Judaism. Vol. 30, No.1, Fall 1975. P.6.
- 19) Gates of Prayer, PP.xi & xii.
- 20) Eugene Borowitz, Reform Judaism Today: What We Believe. New York, Behrman House, Inc., 1977. P.166.

CONCLUSION

"And a Heavenly voice issued forth and said: 'The opinions of these and the opinions of those are both the words of the living God'."

Bab. Tal. Eruvin 13b

Having traced the evolution and development of expressions of Messianic fulfillment through various American Reform liturgies, it is obvious that there has never been a consensus of belief throughout the movement. Yet, considering the liturgies of Wise, Einhorn, the Union Prayerbook and the Gates of Prayer, it is clear that each of these reflects a particular stage in the development of American Reform Judaism. The three stages of development, namely: aesthetic reforms, ideological developments and organizational developments, all can be found in these prayerbooks.

While these liturgies were produced following the first period of aesthetic reform, each bears the mark of those reforms. That is to say, the liturgy had been abbreviated with much of the service in the vernacular and the services were designed with an eye for proper decorum in the synagogue. By the time David Einhorn began to write Olat Tamid, the second phase of development had already begun.

Since Olath Tamid and Minhag America were both products of the phase of ideological developments, each professed beliefs which were consistent throughout the prayerbook. The expressions of Messianic fulfillment found in them reflected the beliefs of their respective editors. While Olath Tamid reflected Einhorn's radical reform and Minhag America reflected Wise's conservatism, each was in consonance with the concept of Reform.

The Union Prayerbook arose at the end of that period, and represented the beginning of the period of organizational development. Certainly the Union Prayerbook carried with it the integrity of a single ideology and theology; yet, its goal to unify the American Reform community, through a single worship ritual, was not necessarily in keeping with the concepts of the previous stage of development. During the phase of ideological development it was the responsibility of the individual to affiliate with a synagogue which represented his or her particular religious beliefs. By producing a union prayerbook, such responsibility was taken away from the individual. The theology of the movement was reflected in its prayerbook.

Recognizing that a single theology could produce either a Reform type of Orthodoxy or dissatisfaction with the Movement, the C.C.A.R. produced the Gates of Prayer. This prayerbook is a perfect reflection of the phase of

organizational development. The amalgamation of several ideologies and theologies is designed to reflect the needs of those who are affiliated with the movement. Thus, a member of the Reform Movement need not search out a synagogue which reflects his or her personal beliefs because it has produced a prayerbook which can meet the needs of almost any individual in any synagogue.

In light of the evolution of the Reform Movement, the beliefs and principles which guided the early Reformers with respect to the question of the Messianic Era would seem to have been set aside, for the time being, for the principles of organization and unity. If the principles of early Reform Judaism are not of the utmost concern to modern Reform, in the Post-Holocaust Era in which we live, the question of Messianic fulfillment and the Mission of Israel might be one of the more expendable principles.

Yet, such need not be the case. Indeed, it would stand to reason, that following the Holocaust and the reality which is presented by the modern world, principles such as those which guided the early Reformers could serve our Movement well. Having completed this study of various liturgical expressions of Messianic belief, it seems clear that when a liturgy is produced which follows a single theological approach with consistent principles guiding it, the worshiper, generally speaking, has a more solid sense of his or her own beliefs. That is to say, liturgy which is

produced by a committee seems to have far too many factors and agendas which influence its outcome.

Perhaps the time has come for a blending of the phases of ideological development and organizational development. The Reform movement can still maintain its organizations and institutions but perhaps the responsibility for beliefs and principles should be given back to the individuals and the synagogues in such a way that will not be confusing or appear hypocritical. Messianic fulfillment and the Mission of Israel, once leading beliefs and principles in the Reform movement have become almost an afterthought. The texts examined in the early American Reform prayerbooks offered great hope to their constituents. That hope has all but been removed from today's liturgy.

While the expressions of Messianic fulfillment found in the prayerbooks examined vary greatly, each is equally valid and authentic. They reflect both sociological and theological concerns of their times. This study has shown how the influx of immigrants can affect a prayerbook as well as how a country which accepts immigrants can influence a prayerbook. It has also shown a wide degree of theological beliefs and Messianic hopes. We have seen the universalism and hope of David Einhorn, as well as, Isaac Mayer Wise's patriotism and his concern for Jewish unity and continuity. It has also shown how the Union Prayerbook tempered the radicalism of Einhorn, as well as, the conglomeration of

several beliefs in the Gates of Prayer. Thus, with respect to expressions of Messianic fulfillment, the Reform movement has stayed true to its name and to its principles: "The opinion of these and the opinions of those are all the words of the living God."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akselrad, Sidney. Studies Of Conservative And Reform Judaism In The United States. H.U.C.-J.I.R. Rabbinic Thesis, 1947.
- Birnbaum, Philip ed., Daily Prayerbook. New York, Hebrew Publishing Co., 1949.
- Birnbaum, Philip. ed., High Holy Days Prayerbook. New York, Hebrew Publishing Company. 1951.
- Blau, Joseph L. Modern Varieties Of Judaism. New York, Columbia University Press. 1966.
- Borowitz, Eugene. Reform Judaism Today: What We Believe. New York, Behrman House, Inc., 1977.
- Bronstein, Herbert. "In Defense Of Kevah" in C.C.A.R. Journal. Vol.14, No.1, January, 1967. pp.77-85.
- Central Conference of American Rabbis. Jewish Prayer Book. Chicago, Illinois. 1892.
- Central Conference of American Rabbis. The Union Prayerbook: Part I. New York, C.C.A.R. 1895.
- Central Conference of American Rabbis. The Union Prayerbook: Part I, Revised Edition. Cincinnati, C.C.A.R., 1918.
- Central Conference of American Rabbis. The Union Prayerbook: Part I, Newly Revised Edition. New York, C.C.A.R. 1940.
- Central Conference of American Rabbis, Stern, Chaim. ed. Gates Of Prayer: The New Union Prayerbook. New York, C.C.A.R. 1975.
- Central Conference of American Rabbis. The Union Prayerbook: Part II. Cincinnati, C.C.A.R. 1894.
- Central Conference of American Rabbis. The Union Prayerbook: Part II, Revised Edition. Cincinnati, C.C.A.R. 1920.
- Central Conference of American Rabbis. The Union Prayerbook: Part II, Newly Revised. Cincinnati, C.C.A.R. 1945.
- Central Conference of American Rabbis, Stern, Chaim. ed. The Gates Of Repentance. New York, C.C.A.R. 1978.
- Cohon, Samuel S. Jewish Theology. Assen, Vangorcum. 1971.
- Cohon, Samuel S. What We Jews Believe. Assen, Vangorcum. 1971.

- Einhorn, David. Felsenthal, Bernard., trans., Olath Tamid: Book Of Prayers. New York, Eugene Thalmessinger. 1872.
- Einhorn, David. Hirsch, Emil G., ed., trans., Olath Tamid: Book Of Prayers. 1896.
- Encyclopedia Judaica: Volumes 9,11&14. Jerusalem, Macmillan & Keter Publishing House. 1972.
- Friedland, Eric L. The Historical And Theological Development Of The Non-Orthodox Prayerbooks In The United States. Ph.D. Dissertation, Brandeis University, 1967.
- Goldman, Alex J. Giants Of Faith. New York, The Citadel Press. 1965.
- Heller, James G. Isaac Mayer Wise. New York, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1965.
- Hoffman, Lawrence. ed. Gates Of Understanding. New York, C.C.A.R. & U.A.H.C., 1977.
- Jacobs, Isaac. American Reform Judaism: An Appreciation. Melbourne, Ford and Son. 1912.
- Jewish Encyclopedia: Volumes 8&10. New York and London, Funk and Wagnalls Company. 1905.
- Kahn, Robert I. "The Pros And Cons Of The Union Prayerbook" in C.C.A.R. Journal. Vol. 14, No.1, January, 1967. pp.19-23.
- Kohler, Kaufmann.~ David Einhorn, The Uncompromising Champion Of Reform Judaism. A Biographical Essay Written for the One Hundreth Anniversary of His Birth. 1909.
- Kohler, Kaufmann. Guide For Instruction In Judaism. New York, Philip Cowen Publishers, 1898.
- Kohler, Kaufmann. Jewish Theology: Systematically And Historically Considered. New York, Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1968 (first published in 1918).
- Korn, Bertram Wallace. ed. Retrospect And Prospect. New York, Central Conference of American Rabbis. 1965.
- Mattuck, Israel I. The Essentials Of Liberal Judaism. London, George Routledge and Sons, 1947.
- Mecklenburger, Ralph. Theologies Of Isaac Mayer Wise And Kaufmann Kohler. H.U.C.-J.I.R. Rabbinic Thesis, 1972.
- Perilman, Nathan A. "The Union Prayerbook" in

- C.C.A.R. Journal. Vol.14, No.1, January, 1967.
pp.24-27.
- Petuchowski, Jakob J. "Bookbinder To The Rescue"
in Conservative Judaism. Vol 30, No.1, Fall 1975.
pp.7-15.
- Petuchowski, Jakob J. Understanding Jewish Prayer.
New York, Ktav. 1972.
- Philipson, David. The Reform Movement In Judaism. New York,
Macmillan Co. 1907.
- Polish, David. "Where do We Go From Here?" in
C.C.A.R. Journal. Vol.14, No.1, January, 1967.
pp.69-76.
- Scherman, Nosson. ed., trans., Siddur Ahavat Sholom.
New York, Messorah Publications Ltd., 1984.
- Scholem, Gershom. The Messianic Idea In Judaism.
New York, Schocken. 1971.
- Schwartzman, Sylvan D. Reform Judaism Then And Now.
New York, U.A.H.C. 1971
- Silver, Daniel Jeremy. "On The Union Prayerbook"
in C.C.A.R. Journal. Vol.14, No.1, January, 1967.
pp.11-19.
- Stern, Chaim & Rayner, John D. Service Of The Heart.
Great Britain, Stephen Austin and Sons Ltd. 1967.
- Webster's New World Dictionary. New York, World Publishing
Co. 1959.
- Wilansky, Dina. Sinai To Cincinnati. New York, Renaissance
Book Co. 1937.
- Wise, Isaac Mayer. Judaism: Its Doctrines And Duties.
Cincinnati, The American Israelite. 1872.
- Wise, Isaac Mayer. Minhag America. Cincinnati, Bloch and
Company Publishers, 1864.
- Wise, Isaac Mayer. Minhag America. Cincinnati, Bloch and
Company Publishers, 1872.
- Wise, Isaac Mayer. Reminiscences. Cincinnati, Leo Wise
and Company, 1901.
- Wise, Isaac Mayer. The Essence Of Judaism: For Teachers
And Pupils And For Self-Instruction. Cincinnati, Bloch
and Company. 1861.