

# CONSERVATIVE JUDAISM

---

VOL. II

OCTOBER, 1945 - HESHVAN, 5706

No. 1

---

## A Jewish Prayer Book for the Modern Age\*

By ROBERT GORDIS

### I

WHEN Solomon Schechter declared, "at a time when all Jews prayed, one prayer book sufficed their needs. Now when far less Jews pray, more and more prayer books are required," he was delivering himself not of an epigram but of an acute historical observation. The prayer book became a problem for Jews when Judaism as a whole became a problem. Hence the issues involved can be understood only in terms of this larger framework of Jewish life.

Prior to the Emancipation, the *nushaot* or variants in traditional prayer-books were principally matters of local "minhag"; even the Hasidic controversy introduced variations without significant differences. The spiritual climate of the prayer book in all its forms was basically the same, exactly as the social, economic and cultural character of the scattered Jewish communities varied only in the slightest degree.

When the Jews of Western Europe were granted civic and political equality, however hesitatingly, and new economic opportunities opened before them, a far-reaching spiritual revolution was set in motion. As they entered Western culture, they began to desert traditional Jewish life. One of the first consequences was that the prayer book, the classic expression of traditional Judaism, became increasingly unpalatable even to those Jews who retained a sense of attachment to the Jewish group. There were, of course, thousands of Jews who regarded themselves as enlightened and advanced, for whom Jewish values and practices could not be made relevant under any circumstances, for whom the game was

---

\* This paper was presented at the forty-fifth Annual Convention of the Rabbinical Assembly of America on June 27, 1945.

not worth the candle. Through conversion and intermarriage they and their descendants cut the links that bound them to Judaism. Only subsequent developments made it all too tragically clear that they had not succeeded in divorcing their destiny from their Jewish origins.

Many other Western Jews, however, found it impossible to dissociate themselves completely from their Jewish heritage, for a variety of reasons. In some instances, this reluctance had no theoretic basis, but stemmed from a deeply human desire not to hurt pious parents and grandparents. In others it was a sense of *noblesse oblige*, a conviction that self-respect forbade deserting the sinking ship of Judaism merely out of a desire to further one's own interests. For many more it was a genuine love for Jewish life, however unconscious and even shame-faced, in a world that doted upon novel intellectual fashions every day. Finally, for many Jews it was the lash of antisemitism which reminded them of their Jewish background. For all these groups, Judaism remained part of their heritage, but none of them were prepared to surrender their hard-won place in Western society or the enlarged vistas of modern culture. For them the problem of adjusting their Judaism to modern life arose.

"Adjustment" is a sonorous term that effectively disguises a process not altogether happy. All too often it resembles the Procrustean bed of Greek mythology or the *mitat sedom* of Jewish legend. For the hospitable Sodomite, it will be remembered, fitted every wayfarer to the bed he had prepared by lopping off his limbs if they protruded or stretching him on the rack if his frame was too short. Generally the modern adjustment to Judaism followed this procedure—an amputation of the rich and variegated character of Jewish life or the stretching of one phase of Judaism out of all proportion to its place in the organic whole. By and large, adjustment meant reduction both in intensity as well as in extent, so that Judaism was reduced to the modest dimensions of a decorous near-Protestant cult.

Similar criticisms of the Reform movement have been made before. However it has usually been overlooked that these strictures notwithstanding, Reform was an expression of the Jewish will to survive and that its protagonists, however mistaken, were actuated by a genuine desire to preserve their heritage. Those who lacked that impulse found quicker and easier ways to escape their Jewish background. When this is recognized, it follows naturally that Reform has positive achievements of no mean order to its credit. Within its ranks, which originally included moderate as well as extreme views, were men like Abraham Geiger whose brilliant re-interpretations of Jewish values and emphasis on development in Judaism are still significant; Leopold Zunz, the father of the science of Judaism who favored necessary modifications,<sup>(1)</sup> and Leopold Löw, whose contributions to the problem of change in Jewish law are still valuable today. Even the patent errors and inadequacies of Reform Judaism have high pedagogic value. If we today strive to avoid them, it is in large measure because

(1) For Zunz's views on the Hamburg Prayerbook cf. Elbogen, I. *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Leipzig, 1913, p. 415.

of the previous experience of "classical" Reform Judaism, which serves both as an example and a warning. Obviously, for us to repeat them would be the height of folly, but only because others have paid the price of experience.

Moreover, the contribution of Reform, used in the broadest sense, is by no means purely negative. Much of its achievement is today common property for all the modern schools in Judaism, Orthodoxy and Conservatism as well as Reform. It seems to us undeniable that Reform fulfilled a function which needed to be done. The emphasis upon decorum in worship, the elimination of many superstitious accretions in observance, the introduction of the sermon in the vernacular, the elimination of such abuses as the selling of honors in the synagogue, the reduction of the *piyyut*, the sanctity of which derived in large measure from its incomprehensibility, were each of them bitterly opposed as representing an affront to tradition. This in spite of the fact that for centuries leading rabbinic authorities had attacked some of these abuses to no avail. Even the production of properly printed prayer books, free from scribal errors and grammatical monstrosities, was an achievement of the modern trend in Judaism. These and similar changes do not seem radical today, appearing rather as part of the natural adjustment of Judaism to the modern age.

Other changes were not so easily or universally accepted. The introduction of choral singing by females or mixed voices aroused widespread objections among traditionally minded elements. The organ in particular became the symbol of both moderate and extreme Reform in Europe. On the other hand, family pews and bare-headed worship made practically no headway on the Continent. As a result, these characteristic practices of American Conservatism and Reform respectively remained virtually unknown in Germany, France, Italy and England.

## II

It is against this background that the efforts to modernize the traditional prayer book must be viewed. The motives that impelled a revision of the liturgy were both conscious and unconscious—that is to say, some were reasons and others were rationalizations. Among the conscious factors was a desire to reduce the length of the service by curtailing less important elements like the *Pesuke deZimrah* and the *Piyyutim*. Closely related was the wish to make the service more intelligible by supplementing the Hebrew prayers or replacing them by prayers in the vernacular. Time revealed that this trend, like many other tendencies in Reform, had a dangerous spiral tendency. Once set into motion, the trend continued to gain momentum, so that beginning with comparatively minor inroads of the vernacular, it finally drove Hebrew almost completely out of the service. It was a prophetic recognition of this peril that led Frankel to withdraw from the Brunswick Rabbinical Conference of 1844, when the assembly voted to retain Hebrew only out of deference to the sentiments of the older generation.

While prayers in the vernacular were urged on the grounds that they added greater meaningfulness to the service, in practice they created a new and unexpected complication. Hebrew prayers chanted in the traditional manner could be repeated at almost every occasion without producing a sense of monotony in the worshipper. In the first instance, the traditional congregant was an active participant in the ritual instead of being a member of a silent audience. The mass chanting and swaying might not be very decorous by Western standards. It had the virtue, however, of being alive. The old psychological principle of "no impression without expression" embodied in Jewish prayer made the experience emotionally vibrant and satisfying. Second, the characteristic musical modes and Scriptural cantillations, which differ with the varying occasions of the year, served to create a distinct mood appropriate to the day and added variety and interest, even when the text remained the same.

All these unconsciously acquired resources were swept into the discard by Reform. The penalty was swift. As the different traditional modes and Scriptural cantillations were abandoned or circumscribed and were replaced by responsive and unison readings in the vernacular, the monotony of the service became marked.<sup>(2)</sup> This new problem was now met by the device of varying the text of the prayers. Thus Samuel Holdheim's German Reform Prayerbook of 1856 contained nine cycles, the American Union Prayer Book contains five services for the Sabbaths of the month (obviously not the Jewish month!), as well as five additional services for special Sabbaths. The English Reform Prayer Book prepared by Rabbi Israel Mattuck of London has no less than thirty distinct services. Nevertheless, the frequently voiced complaint that the Reform service is cold and uninspiring and the congregation inert and unresponsive gives grounds for doubting that the problem has been adequately met.

The objections noted above dealt with the language, the form and the length of the service, problems in which the laity were interested, at least during the period of transition. On the other hand, modifications were also urged in the contents of the prayer book on dogmatic grounds. As Elbogen has acutely noted, these changes were of moment to theologically trained rabbis, but did not concern the laity much. Such features of the traditional liturgy as the resurrection, the personal Messiah, the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty, the re-introduction of animal sacrifices, the restoration of the Jewish people to Palestine, the concept of the Chosen People, and the distinction between Israel and the nations, were opposed on the ground that they were not in harmony with the advanced religious ideas of the modern age. Elbogen, himself a leader of moderate German Reform, made a devastating comment on the motives behind much of this agitation when he noted that it was motivated by political considerations. He points out that Western Jews did not hesitate to trim their religious ideals and were quite willing to sever the link binding their destiny to their brothers elsewhere in the world, in order to render unassailable, as they thought, their political rights and economic

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 425.

opportunities as citizens.<sup>(3)</sup> That identical tendencies have appeared in contemporary American-Jewish life is evidence of the truth of Koheleth's words, "There is nothing new under the sun," or, to cite a more recent philosopher, George Santayana, "He who does not know the past is doomed to repeat it."

In the name of universalism, Reform leaders raised a hue and cry against Jewish "particularism," quite unaware of the fact that the dichotomy between these two polar forces has no objective reality in Hebrew thought. Actually, it is an invention of German theologians and their disciples, who sought a method for preserving the Bible, while condemning the people that had created it. Now this passionate advocacy of universalism and exorciation of nationalism by Reform spokesmen was strictly limited to the Jewish scene. Nowhere did the accredited leaders of "modern" Judaism cry out against the aggressive and militaristic nationalism of Germany, France, England and Italy which plunged nineteenth century Europe into war after war and brought civilization to the brink of extinction twice in the twentieth. On the contrary, it is hard to find anywhere more fervent preachers of patriotism and boundless loyalty to the state than among those Jewish apostles of "universalism."

There is another proof that practical considerations rather than philosophical ideals were at the roots of the objections to the traditional liturgy. It lies in the procedure adopted by Reform with regard to the passages dealing with the re-introduction of sacrifices and the restoration to Zion. Elsewhere prayer book editors had had no difficulty in excising or modifying the traditional text, preserving what they thought worthwhile and eliminating the rest. But it did not occur to them to make a distinction between these two ideas, which are often linked in the traditional prayer book, to be sure, but are by no means inseparable. Reiterating that no modern person could pray for the restoration of sacrifices, they proceeded to eliminate with these prayers all petitions for the restoration of the Jewish homeland. The conclusion is inescapable that the objection to sacrifices served as a cloak for eliminating the hope of a reestablishment of Israel in its ancestral home.

It is noteworthy that only in two instances was it recognized that these two ideas were not necessarily interdependent, both times within Conservative ranks.<sup>(4)</sup> Zechariah Frankel stated that he favored the elimination of the petition for the restoration of sacrifices but not the deletion of the Messianic hope. Unfor-

(3) Ibid, p. 422f: "Es war eine Fortsetzung dieses Irrtums, wenn die Gemeinde von den politischen Verhältnissen Deutschlands ihren Ausgang nahm, sich auf die deutschen Glaubensgenossen beschränken wollte; der Gegensatz von religiöser und vaterländischer Gesinnung hatte keine innere Berechtigung, eine wirklich religiöse Reform musste für alle Juden anwendbar sein. Und endlich war es eine Verkennung der Wirklichkeit, wenn die Gemeinde die Erfüllung des messianischen Berufes des Judentums für sich allein in Anspruch nahm; dieses Streben verfolgte die gesamte Judenheit, freilich auf dem Boden des geschichtlichen Judentums, nicht auf dem des freien Menschentums, wie die Wortführer der Genossenschaft verkündeten."

Cf. also pp. 390 and 405 where he wisely notes that political prejudices must be fought on political grounds, and that the belief in the Messiah was no real basis for denying political equality to Jews, as Macaulay had noted.

(4) Cf. JE, art. "Prayerbook," vol. 10, p. 178b; Elbogen, op. cit. p. 432.

unately, here, as in so many other respects, Frankel contented himself with negative criticism rather than with positive action. In England, the West-London Synagogue whose minister was Morris Joseph, the author of "Judaism as Life and Creed," actually proceeded to delete the passages dealing with sacrifices but retained the prayers for the restoration to Zion.

To revert to the main theme, all these objections to the language, length, form and content of the traditional liturgy were so far-reaching that they necessitated a radical transformation of the Siddur and the Mahzor. In Germany, Reform was unable or unwilling to break so violently with tradition, and so it produced a prayer book which made some adjustments along these lines, but later reintroduced many traditional features.<sup>(5)</sup> In America, where there was little Jewish learning among the laity and no deeply rooted tradition of practice, Reform was able to follow its logic to its consequences or go to extremes—the phrase used depends on the point of view! The natural consequence was the creation of the Union Prayer Book which bears only a slight resemblance to the traditional liturgy.

As a result, the Prayer Book became one of the most important dividing lines between the traditional and the anti-traditional elements. Since Reform had made a modification of the prayer book one of its cardinal planks, the adherents of traditional Judaism made the retention of the original a matter of principle. Frequently recourse was had to the rabbinic (Tos. Ber. 4;5 ed. Zuckermann, p. 9) **כל המשנה ממטבע שטבעו חכמים בברכות לא יצא** "R. Jose said, 'Whoever deviates from the form established by the Sages for the blessings has not fulfilled his religious duty.'" It was generally overlooked that this statement refers only to the **ברכות הנהנין**, as is clear from the text itself, as well as from the context in which it is cited in the Talmud (Babli, Berahot, 40b; Yerushalmi, Berahot vi, 2).<sup>(6)</sup> The very genuine problems of a Jewish prayer book in the modern age were ignored merely because the solution of Reform was found inadequate.

As in so many other aspects of Judaism, there was a need of a synthesis of the old and the new, the traditional and the contemporary. That the difficulties are tremendous, even without the problem of adjustment, is graphically indicated by two very sound judgments on the art of translation expressed in the Talmud. One declares: **אין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו** (Shab. 63a and often). "The literal meaning of a text cannot be disregarded," and the other **המתרגם פסוק כצורתו** "Whoever translates a text literally falsifies it." Yet, complex as is the task of making traditional Judaism vital and creative in the modern world, we cannot desist from it—for nothing less is the historical mission of our movement.

(5) Cf. the M. Levin revision of the Berlin prayerbook 1885 and the Prayerbook edited by I. Elbogen.

(6) In the Vilna Yerushalmi, the citation reads: **כל המשנה על המטבע שטבעו חכמים לא יצא** **למשנה**. The omission of **ברכות** does not affect the meaning. The passage is cited in connection with the Mishnah dealing with the blessings over fruits and vegetables. Rabbi Solomon Serillio, ad loc. specifically notes this limitation in his commentary on this passage in the Yerushalmi: **שטבעו חכמים בברכות — בברכות ההנייה דאי בתפלה האמר בפרק קמא דע"ז דאם בא לומר בתפלתו מעין כל ברכה וברכה כסדר יום הכפורים יצא**

## III

The slow gestation of Conservative Judaism and the lack of clarity in its outlook during its early stages is reflected in its approach to the Prayer Book. Historically, it was the "left-wing" of modern traditional Judaism which first emerged on the American scene. The close relationship of this group to Reform is to be seen in its procedure with the Prayer Book. Two of its great leaders, Marcus Jastrow and Benjamin Szold, produced the "Jastrow Prayer-Book" which is still used in some of our congregations. These great scholars and lovers of traditional Judaism, one of whom, at least, was a pioneer of the Zionist ideal in America, produced a prayer book that can only be described as mildly Reform. The reason is surely to be sought in the conditions of the time. These pioneers saw the rising tide of extreme Reform which seemed to sweep everything before it. They doubtless believed that only some kind of modified Reform had the faintest chance of success in America.

This consideration would seem to explain why their work is more radical in many respects than "Minhag Amerika,"<sup>(7)</sup> the prayer book of Isaac M. Wise, the builder of Reform Judaism in America. Wise's strength lay far more in his zeal for unity and organizational skill than in his philosophic depth and consistency. In fact, his desire for unity in American Israel had led him to subscribe to the statement of principles adopted at Cleveland in 1855, in which the Talmudic legislation was accepted as binding!

At all events, the Jastrow Prayer Book eliminates all references to a restoration to Zion and reduces the *Pesuke DeZimrah* very drastically. It does not hesitate to paraphrase the Hebrew original in a manner which bears only the slightest relationship to the traditional text, a procedure Geiger had adopted in 1854 in his prayer book. Its traditional character resides largely in its retention of the Hebrew language and the basic structure of the service, as against the Reform prayer books, which were rapidly reducing the use of the sacred tongue to the vanishing point.<sup>(8)</sup>

Another Conservative prayer book of the "left-wing" was produced by B. A. Elzas. Elzas, himself a Reform rabbi, based his work on the *Union Prayer Book*, the *Olat Tamid* of Einhorn and the *Jastrow Prayer Book*, which had all preceded him. Like most pioneering works, his ritual abounds in inconsistencies. Thus the phrase, *mikol ha'amin* is eliminated in the Hebrew of the Kiddush, but, strangely enough, is included in the parallel English version as well as in the blessings over the Torah. Elzas was, however, a Biblical scholar of considerable originality. His first-hand knowledge led him to many felicities in translation.

(7) Thus Wise retains the traditional text in a) מתי המלוך ציון in the Kedushah, where Szold reads על כל העולם (b) מתי המלוך על כל העולם which Szold deletes, c) in ובא לציון גואל in ובא לציון גואל where Szold reads ונתחזקה (d) וי שאותך לדרך ביראה נעבוד where Szold reads ומביא גואל (e) in וי שאותך לדרך ביראה נעבוד where Szold omits: ופדה כנאמר יהודה וישראל

(8) On the prayer-book see the valuable studies of Rabbi Moshe Davis, notably his Hebrew paper "Benjamin Szold and Marcus Jastrow" in the *Sefer Hashanah L'Yehude Amerika*, 5702 (1942) pp. 427-39, and the comparative tables which appear only in the off-prints of this paper. Rabbi Davis' forthcoming volume "The Development of Historical Judaism in America" will be a significant contribution to American-Jewish religious history.

He recognized that the word "shem" in Biblical Hebrew often means "essence" and therefore need not be translated into English.<sup>(9)</sup> In fact, a literal rendering only leads to complications. Thus, Elzas correctly translates ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו הטוב שמך ועד. לעולם ועד. as "Blessed is His glorious kingdom forever and ever," and ולך נאה להודות as "the All-good, to whom alone all praises are due."

In appearance and spirit these "left-wing" Conservative prayer books show a marked affinity with Reform from which they stem. Similarly "right-wing" Conservative congregations, which derived from Orthodoxy, retained the traditional prayer book unchanged, except for omissions of some technical passages like במה מדליקין and פטום הקטרת. Thus far, the contributions of our movement to the Jewish liturgy have lain principally in better printed editions, more attractive English versions and the use of supplementary material.

The "Friday Evening Service" by Rabbis Israel H. Levinthal and Israel Goldfarb have been widely used and deservedly popular. Rabbi Jacob Bosniak's convenient editions of the daily, Sabbath and Festival service have also found a large public. Rabbi Solomon Goldman has issued "Prayers and Meditations" in which the traditional text is enriched by a large number of responsive readings and other prayers drawn from all branches of Hebrew literature as well as by a very elaborate hymnal prepared by Harry Coopersmith. Rabbi Morris Silverman's Sabbath and Junior Prayer Books as well as his excellent High Holy Day Prayer Book, which had the benefit of the counsel and aid of many of his colleagues, have been adopted by many congregations.

In addition, several of our colleagues have produced liturgies for special occasions. Rabbi Louis Feinberg's edition of the "Selihot for the First Night" is beautifully poetic and infinitely superior to the editions generally current. The Reconstructionist group has issued the very attractive "New Haggadah" containing many changes, omissions and additions. The traditional Haggadah translated by Maurice Samuel is enriched by a superb introduction by Rabbi Louis Finkelstein.

More recently, Rabbi Sidney Guthman in collaboration with Cantor Robert Segal, has published a Friday Evening Service in which the material of the traditional liturgy is divided into several distinct services. The Reconstructionist Prayer Book which has appeared within the past few months is a tribute to the creative originality of its authors, in spite of its patent weaknesses.

These works, though often drawing upon the collective experience of our colleagues, were issued on individual responsibility. The only collective enterprise in the field has been the United Synagogue Mahzor for the Pilgrimage Festivals, which is, without question, the most attractive traditional prayer book yet issued. The volume is distinguished by a sharp reduction in the extent of the *piyyut*, the addition of several supplementary prayers, many felicities in translation and a beautiful setting of the Hebrew prayers, particularly the Psalms, in a manner calculated to reveal the poetic beauty of the original.

(9) Thus Ps. 124:8 עזרנו בשם ה' and Ps. 121:2 עזרנו מעם ה' are identical in meaning.



## IV

This method of approach would have sufficed, if the traditional prayer book as it stands, without change or interpretation, were adequate from our point of view. As our movement has grown and developed, however, most of us have been led to recognize that, unsatisfactory as the Reform modifications of the prayer book are, the traditional Siddur and Mahzor need to be reconsidered from the standpoint of both principles and techniques.

This goal might have long remained unrealized were it not for the fortunate circumstance that Rabbi Morris Silverman of Hartford, Connecticut, who had been working in the field for many years, had prepared a manuscript for a Sabbath and Festival Prayer Book containing a new English translation, much supplementary material and original prayers. In his work he had drawn upon the counsel and aid of many of his colleagues and of several distinguished scholars, notably Professors Louis Ginzberg and H. L. Ginsberg of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, who are naturally not responsible for its final form.

In the Fall of 1944, the Rabbinical Assembly and the United Synagogue agreed to adopt Rabbi Silverman's manuscript as the basis for a prayer book to be issued jointly by them. A Commission was created by the two bodies with complete authority to revise, supplement, and edit the material. This Joint Prayer Book Commission consisted of the following rabbis: Robert Gordis, Chairman; Morris Silverman, Editor; Max Arzt, Secretary; Simon Greenberg, Jacob Kohn, Israel H. Levinthal, Louis M. Levitsky, Abraham A. Neuman, Elias L. Solomon. This Sabbath and Festival Prayer Book is being issued on the collective responsibility of the Joint Prayer Book Commission.

The procedure adopted by the Commission was as follows: The members of the Commission met at frequent intervals, for the study of the Hebrew text and the English version in the light of previous efforts in the field, the best available scholarship and our own approach to Jewish tradition. Individual members undertook research on special points and the preparation of supplementary notes. In addition, a sub-committee met between plenary sessions of the Commission for intensive consideration of special problems.

In the course of the concentrated, day-by-day labors of the Prayer Book Commission, certain fundamental principles evolved. It is for others to judge of the degree of success the Commission has achieved. But these principles, I believe, are significant for our approach to the problem of the Jewish liturgy, as well as for the philosophy of Conservative Judaism, as a whole. They must, it seems to us, constitute the basis of a Jewish prayer book in the modern age. It is, therefore, of more than academic interest to set forth these guiding principles:

A. *CONTINUITY WITH TRADITION.* Important as tradition is for every faith and culture, it is infinitely more significant for Judaism and the Jewish people. This is true, not only because, as Ranke declared, Jews are

the most historical of peoples, but also because of the limitless centrifugal forces that threaten Jewish survival, and against which loyalty to tradition is the strongest bulwark. This continuity has "horizontal" as well as "vertical" aspects, that is to say, there must be a strong sense of association, not only with the generations gone before, but with our brothers the world over, whom Schechter called "Catholic Israel." Nor is it merely a matter of the retention of the words that is involved. Generally, the spirit of the Jewish service inheres far more in the Hebrew language, in the traditional melodies, and in the well-known and well-loved customs—one is almost tempted to say—in the easy familiarity that our ancestors displayed in the house of God, which, unfortunately, degenerates so easily into mere lack of decorum among their descendants!

This emphasis upon continuity is not mere ancestor-worship on our part. As Israel Zangwill declared, ours is not a religious generation. Whatever other virtues we may possess, we lack that genius for religious expression which is so beautifully exemplified in the traditional prayer book. This consideration cannot free us from the obligation to strive perpetually after fresh and creative devotional forms. But it should prevent us from rashly laying hands on the product of the piety of earlier generations.

A striking illustration of the superiority of traditional religious thought over our modern conceptions lies in the awareness of evil. Modern prayer books of all types tend to minimize and soft-pedal the existence of evil in the world. Sin, wickedness and evil-doers have all but disappeared from their pages. In this respect they reflect the melioristic, comfortable philosophy of the nineteenth century, which looked forward to a painless and automatic progress guaranteed to end in the millenium. This absence of the recognition of evil gives to most modern prayer books an air of unreality and saccharine sweetness. This attitude reaches its apogee in the most important new cult of our century, Christian Science, which denies evil completely.

In the case of Jewish prayer books, political considerations, as noted above, played an important part in the process. It was completely overlooked that the political emancipation of Western Jewry was not synonymous with the Messianic Age, but merely the first step toward liberation. It was not even suspected that civic equality is a mockery unless it includes the right of spiritual self-determination, the maintenance of group loyalty in law and in life.

By the elimination of "disturbing" passages, modern redactors sacrificed the manliness of the old prayer book, which expressed the conviction that evil must be recognized, fought and conquered. A specific example is afforded by the *shfokh hamotekha*, which both the Union Haggadah as well as the Reconstructionist version have eliminated. Only a few years ago it seemed blind obscurantism, if not worse, to pray for the destruction of "nations who do not know God and kingdoms that do not call upon His name, who destroy Jacob and devastate his habitation." It has unfortunately turned out to be one of the basic realities of the life of our generation. Few sections of the liturgy are more truly geared to

our day, when our civilization is threatened by a new barbarism rooted in paganism, a menace which our great military victory has by no means removed. Even if such passages were merely historical reminiscence, the sense of continuity would dictate their retention. Alas that they qualify as current events!

Finally, Professor Kaplan has properly pleaded with us time and again not to underestimate the changes in thought which separate the modern from earlier periods. It is equally important not to overestimate these differences. Frequently, when we penetrate the spirit of traditional literature and reckon with the genius of the Hebrew language, we discover that the gulf is by no means as wide as seemed originally to be the case.

For all these reasons the sense of continuity with a living tradition in time and space must be a fundamental principle in a Jewish prayer book for the modern age.

*B. RELEVANCE TO THE NEEDS AND IDEALS OF OUR GENERATION* is the second criterion. A prayer book is not a museum piece. It must express our own aspirations, rather than merely those of our ancestors, however much we may revere them. As the traditional phrase, *אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו* indicates, He must be "our God" rather than only "the God of our fathers." This problem of relevance has two aspects. These are modern ideals that are expressed inadequately or too briefly in the traditional liturgy. This lack can be met by supplementing the accepted service and thus incidentally stimulating creativity in the liturgy. The more difficult aspect of the problem of relevance lies in the undeniable fact that there are passages in the traditional prayer book that do not seem to express our convictions and hopes. Such passages must be carefully studied and dealt with through a variety of procedures, as will be noted presently.

*C. INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY*, the third criterion for a modern Jewish prayerbook, demands that we do not shrink from this obligation, however onerous it be. Moreover, we cannot take refuge in the procedure frequently adopted by some editors, of printing a traditional Hebrew text and a parallel English version that has practically nothing in common with the original. This has been done most recently in the revised edition of the Union Prayerbook, which reintroduces the Kol Nidre.

## V

These basic principles, continuity with tradition, relevance to the modern age, and intellectual integrity, are obviously not easy to harmonize. The extent to which one or another principle ought to prevail in a given instance will naturally be the subject of differences of opinion.

The touchstone of their validity lies in their application to the most crucial issue—those traditional passages that do not seem to square with modern attitudes. These passages pose different issues which must be met in varying ways:

1. In many cases, apparent divergences of outlook disappear when the true intent of the prayer book is grasped and its mode of expression is understood. The doctrine of the *Chosen People*, which is so prominent in Jewish tradition, is a case in point. Undeniably this idea has been vulgarized in many circles, so that it is often confused with the myth of racial superiority and the doctrine of national chauvinism. But the remedy does not lie in eliminating it from the Prayer Book. For that means surrendering to the vulgar distortions of the concept, and incidentally, perpetrating an injustice upon the prophets and sages of Israel who understood it aright.

Moreover, we today affirm the election of Israel because it is historically true. The great religions of Christianity and Islam, the modern humanitarian ideals and the principles of democracy are all rooted in the Hebrew Bible. They testify to the central role that Israel has played in the religious and ethical development of Western man.

Not only is the doctrine in accord with objective truth; its reaffirmation today is required on psychological grounds. It may be true that a normal people living under normal conditions needs no rationale for survival beyond the instinct for self-preservation, which stems from the fact that it is alive. But that is not likely to suffice in the case of Israel, and for obvious reasons. Jewish survival is hazardous, demanding untold sacrifice. Moreover, modern Jews have the belief—even if it be an illusion—that escape from the Jewish group is possible, at least for themselves individually. If our generation is to accept Jewish fellowship and loyalty to Judaism willingly and joyously, accepting the disabilities of Jewish life and rejecting the temptation to desert, it requires a sense of consecration—a conviction that the Jewish people has played and yet will play a noble and significant role in the world. Many of our finest young people have inherited a profound idealism, a “Messianic complex,” if you will. They must be taught to feel that Jewish loyalty is nothing petty and insular, but that on the contrary, it ministers to the progress of humanity. The doctrine of the Chosen People is therefore a psychological necessity as well as a historical truth, an indispensable factor for Jewish survival today.

Moreover, when the ideal is studied in classic Jewish thought, it becomes clear that the prayer book has properly interpreted it by linking it invariably with the great instruments of Jewish living, the Torah and the Mitzvot. This has often been overlooked by modern editors, who failed to note, or draw the proper conclusions from the fact, that the prayer book is written in a classical Hebrew, midway between Biblical and Mishnaic style. It therefore follows the syntax of classic Hebrew, which uses coordinate structure where Indo-European tongues would use subordinate clauses. This fact, well-known to all competent Semitists, is clearly expressed in a recent paper by Professor Theophile J. Meek:<sup>(10)</sup>

(10) Cf. his paper, “The Syntax of the Sentence in Hebrew” in *Journal of Biblical Literature* Vol. 64, March 1945, pp. 1-13. The quotations are on pages 2 and 3.

“The Hebrew language is a more primitive, less complex, language than our own, and where we use grammatical subordination in our sentence and structure, Hebrew is more likely to use grammatical coordination . . . At other times they introduce a grammatically coordinate clause, which, however, is logically subordinate (that is, subordinate in meaning) and has to be so translated into English, because a true translation must reproduce the idiom of one language, not in literal terms, but in the idiom of the other language.”

To cite one instance out of many, Biblical Hebrew will say, **בצלו המדתי וישבתי** (Song of Songs 2:3) which must be translated into English, “In his shadow have I desired to dwell.” Similarly, the *Berakah Ahronah* says, **אשר רצית והנחלת לאבותינו** which means, “which Thou didst desire to cause our ancestors to inherit.” This same characteristic of Hebrew syntax occurs in the Blessing over the Torah; **אשר בחר בנו מכל העמים ונתן לנו את תורתו** which means for us, as it has for all the thinking generations of Israel, “who has chosen us from among the peoples by giving us His Torah.” Similarly **אשר נתן לנו תורת אמת וחיי עולם נטע בתוכנו** means “Who has given us the Torah of Truth, thus planting (or, and thus has planted) in us the seed of eternal life.” Other instances are to be found in the Kiddush and the Amidah; **אשר בחרתנו מכל העמים אהבת אותנו ורצית בנו ורוממתנו מכל הלשונות; וקדשתנו במצוותיך וגו** In every instance, the Prayer Book associates the election of Israel not with any inherent personal or group superiority, but with the higher responsibilities which come to the Jew as the custodian of Torah and the devotee of the Jewish way of life. This is no modern reinterpretation, merely an instance of the correct understanding of the letter and the spirit of tradition.

2. There are other instances where our attitudes now vary from older concepts. In many cases, it is possible to reinterpret traditional phrases in order to express our own convictions. There is no need for us to fall prey to the genetic fallacy. Words may mean for us more than they originally meant. Thus the word *‘abodah* “religious worship,” which our ancestors equated with the sacrificial system in the Temple, may quite properly mean for us the entire system of public religious observance, even the re-establishment of a great religious center on Mount Zion without the reintroduction of sacrifices. We are therefore not called upon to eliminate such phrases as **השב את העבודה לדביר ביתך** because in the consciousness of Israel the idea of the spiritual restoration to Zion remains one of undeniable power. The mode of worship we envisage differs from that of those who look forward to animal sacrifices. But the phrase here cited says nothing of that, and it can therefore continue to speak for us with sincerity and force.

The same connotation of *‘abodah* exists in the Festival Musaf prayer **והשב כהנים לעבודתם ולויים לשירם ולזמרם וגו**. etc. There our rendering voices our aspiration for the restoration of Temple worship on Mount Zion with Kohanim pronouncing the Priestly benediction and Levites offering song and psalmody as elements in the historical continuity of Israel’s religion.

The phrase **מחיה המתים**, rendered "who calls the dead to everlasting life" is linguistically sound and expresses our faith in immortality. That it originally meant "physical resurrection" and may still mean so for others does not invalidate our interpretation. It may be added that the older rendering is itself a re-interpretation of a Biblical idiom, which usually meant "to restore to health those near death," as in I Sam. 2:6: **ה' ממית ומחיה מוריד שאול ויעל**. Words are symbols and it is of the nature of symbols to represent more than one idea or conception.

3. With all our striving for intellectual integrity, it must always be remembered that the prayer book is couched in poetry and not in prose and must therefore be approached with warm emotion and not with cold intellectual detachment. Thus, the emphasis in the prayer book upon the Messiah need not mean for us the belief in a personal redeemer. The Messiah remains for us the vivid and infinitely moving symbol of the Messianic hope. To have deleted the references to the Messiah would have meant to surrender one of the most picturesque elements of Jewish belief, culture, music and art. Similarly, the petitions of the prayer book for the restoration of the House of David is felt and is regarded by most modern Jews as poetry. There are no Davidic pretenders alive today! The new Palestine is by common consent not stubbornly wedded to ancient religious tradition. Yet the modern Halutz sings with fervor and sincerity not only the old **אליהו הנביא** with its reference to **משיח בן דוד**, but countless modern melodies like, *Yerushalayim* with its closing plea **יבוא המשיח יבוא**, and **מתי יבוא המשיח**. To have eliminated all such passages from the prayer book would have meant the impoverishment of the Jewish spirit. The prayer book, like all poetry and truth, has things in it too exalted for literalness.

4. There will naturally be instances, however, where legitimate reinterpretation is impossible because the traditional formulation cannot be made to serve our needs. Such pre-eminently are the passages dealing concretely with sacrifices, which are central to the Musaf service. Passages like *'ezehu mekoman* and *pittum ha-ketoret* can be dropped without injuring the rubric of the service, but the elimination of the Musaf service as a whole means destroying the entire structure of the traditional liturgy. Moreover, it would mean sacrificing other important ideas contained in it which ought to be preserved, and if possible even more vividly expressed. We have noted above that Reform utilized its objection to animal sacrifices as a convenient method of eliminating prayers for the restoration of Zion. We surely cannot afford to throw out the baby with the bath!

What procedure are we to adopt? A step in the right direction was made in one edition of the United Synagogue Mahzor, which changed the phrases **נעשה ונקריב** from the future to the past **עשו והקריבו**. It thus made **ומפני הטאינו** express what untold numbers of modern Jews have found in it—a recollection of the ancient glory of Jerusalem and the Temple. But prayer must be more than historical reminiscence. Imbedded in the Musaf service are several other ideas and implications of value. Primarily, there is, of course, the hope for the restoration of Palestine as the homeland of the Jewish people. But that is not all.

Also implied in the prayer is the stress upon sacrifice as essential for the fulfillment of our ideals. Then, too, we cherish the hope that Palestine will again become significant not only for Israel, but for the spiritual life of mankind as a whole. Finally, the recollection of the sacrificial system is characteristic of the spirit of Judaism. As Israel Abrahams wrote, "This is the virtue of a historical religion, that the traces of history are never obliterated . . . The lower did not perish in the birth of the higher, but persisted."<sup>(11)</sup> Animal sacrifices were a legitimate stage in the evolution of Judaism and religion generally. For all these reasons the deletion of the Musaf, no less than its retention unchanged, would violate the basic principles of a Jewish prayer book for the modern age.

The Prayer Book Commission accordingly decided upon the following procedure with *שבת תכנת* and *ומפני הטאינו*. The phrases *נעשה ונקריב* were changed to read *עשו והקריבו* and *'avotenu* was added to supply a needed subject; the mere change of tense is inadequate. The word *ותצונו* was changed to *ותצוים* and *'alenu* was dropped from the phrase *כמו שכתבת עלינו בתורתך*, since we do not look forward to the restoration of animal sacrifice in the future. Thus the essential traditional structure of the Musaf was maintained as a reminiscence of Israel's glorious past. The ideas we wished to stress were then expressed by a *Bakashah* preceding the *שבת תכנת* and the *ומפני הטאינו* which it was the privilege of the writer to compose with the counsel of his colleagues. Both for the sake of variety and in order to interpret the distinctive spirit of the Sabbath and the different Festivals, two distinct *bakashot* have been included.

The text for the Sabbath is as follows:

אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו יעלה לפניך זכרון אבותינו בעמדם לפניך בחצרות קדשך. מה רבה אהבתם לך בהביאם לפניך את קרבנות חובותיהם. אנא ה' אלהינו האצל עלינו מרוחם רוח דעת ויראת ה'. כן נזכה למלא חובותינו לבנין ארצך ולחידוש בית חיינו ויתברכו בנו כל משפחות האדמה.

"Our God and God of our fathers, may there ever rise before Thee the remembrance of our ancestors as they appeared in Thy sacred Temple. How deep was their love for Thee as they brought Thee their offerings each Sabbath day. Grant us the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord that lived in their hearts. May we, in their spirit of sacrificial devotion, fulfill our duty toward the rebuilding of Thy Holy Land, the fountain of our eternal life. Thus may we ever be a blessing to all the peoples of the earth."

The text for the Festivals reads:

אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו זכר נא את צדקת אבותינו בעלותם מימים ימימה להראות לפניך בירושלים עיר קדשך. מה רבה שמחת לבכם בהביאם לפניך את קרבנות חובותיהם. אנא ה' אלהינו האצל עלינו מאמונתם כך וששונם בעולמך, מאהבתם לתורתך ושאיפתם לחרות ולצדק. כן נזכה למלא חובותינו לבנין ארצך ולחידוש בית חיינו ולעבדך ביראה כימי עולם.

(11) I. Abrahams, *Permanent Values in Judaism*, pp. 14, 23.

“Our God and God of our fathers, remember the merit of our ancestors who from year to year appeared before Thee in Jerusalem, Thy Holy City. How deep was their rejoicing as they brought their offerings to Thy sacred altar. Imbue our hearts, O Lord our God with their faith in Thee and their joy in Thy world, their love for Thy Torah and their yearning for freedom and justice. May we, in their spirit of sacrificial devotion, fulfill our duty toward the rebuilding of Thy Holy Land, the fountain of our eternal life. Thus may we serve Thee in reverence as in days of yore.”

It will be noted that the effort has been made to follow the traditional style of the prayer book without making it a mere echo of older and more familiar passages. It is our hope that this *bakashah* in Hebrew or English will be utilized for private devotion like the congregational Modim, or be read publicly by the rabbi and perhaps ultimately become part of the Amidah like *Tal* or *Geshem*. We hope it is not an unworthy attempt to create that modern *piyyut* to which we have been looking forward.

In *Retzeh*, which is itself a modification of the ancient prayer utilized by the officiating priests in the Temple, the words *Ve'ishei Yisrael* could not be reinterpreted. When these two words are deleted, the prayer becomes a fervent plea for restoration of the center of our faith to Jerusalem.

Another section of the prayer book where re-interpretation did not suffice is to be found in the preliminary blessings, *שלא עשני גוי, עבד, אשה* (j. Berakhot 9:1, 63b, ed. Vilna; Tosefta Berakhot 7:18, p. 16 ed. Zuckermann). As their position near the prayers and blessings dealing with the Torah indicates, they express the sense of privilege that the male Jew felt in being able to fulfill the Torah and the Mitzvot, which were not obligatory in equal measure for non-Jews, slaves and women. These blessings have been the source of widespread misunderstanding because they phrase negatively what is stated elsewhere far more effectively in the positive, in such prayers as in *והערב נא אדני אלהינו את דברי תורתך בפינו* or *אשרינו מה טוב חלקנו ומה נעים גורלנו ומה יפה ירושתנו*

The negative formulation of these Preliminary Blessings caused Jewish leadership much concern through the ages. The censor had already compelled a change in the Talmudic passage (B. Menahot 43b) to read the *שעשני ישראל* instead of *שלא עשני גוי*. While older Talmudic editions and commentators, like Asheri and Tur, still read the blessing in the negative form, which is undoubtedly the original, it is noteworthy that the Gaon of Vilna accepted this changed reading.<sup>(12)</sup> Similarly, the blessing *שלא עשני עבד* has a variant *שלא עשני בור*. Particularly interesting is the attempt of Rabbi Judah Mintz to explain homiletically why the blessings are put in the negative rather than in the positive form.

(12) In his *Commentary on Orah Hayyim* 46:4 where he cites the Talmud, Tur and Asheri On the entire subject, cf. the commentaries *Tikkun Tefillah* and *Anaf Yoseph* in *Otzar Hatefillot* (Vilna 1928), pp. 123f, and Israel Abrahams, *Companion to the Authorized Daily Prayerbook* (London, 1931), pp. XVII.



Supported by this trend of tradition, the Prayer Book Commission decided to rephrase the blessings in the positive, **שעשני אדם, ישראל, בן חורין**. The theme of **שעשני אדם** is more than a rewriting of the traditional text. It expresses a sense of thanksgiving to Almighty God for having made us human. We are grateful for being sentient and conscious creatures, rather than animals, in spite of the tragedies and frustrations that inevitably inhere in our human estate. It is noteworthy that these Preliminary Blessings parallel the categories of the noble statement in *Yalkut Shimeoni*, Judges, sec. 42; "I call heaven and earth to witness that whether one be Gentile or Jew, man or woman, slave or free, the Divine spirit rests on each in accordance with his deeds."

5. In a few instances, the problem of the traditional elements of the liturgy disappeared, not by changing or reinterpreting the text, but by supplementing it. Thus, *Yekum Purkan* with its prayer for the welfare of the scholars is in the best tradition of Judaism. The reference to Palestine and Babylonia gives it an archaic flavor, which does not render it irrelevant. All that was required was the addition of the phrase **ודי בכל ארעה גלותנא** "and in all the lands of our dispersion."

Similarly in *Sim Shalom*, it was felt that a more universal note would be desirable, but not through the device of a paraphrase that would not be in keeping with the original. The *Siddur of Saadya* here proved to be of great service. For Saadya's expanded text of this prayer includes **שים שלום בעולם** (ed. Davidson-Asaph-Joel, Jerusalem, 1941, p. 19). The Prayer Book Commission therefore has modified our passage to read:

**שים שלום טובה וברכה בעולם חן וחסד ורחמים עלינו ועל כל ישראל עמך.**  
In the *Mi Sheberakh*, we read **וכל העוסקים בצרכי צבור ובבנין ארץ ישראל באמונה** since the rebuilding of Eretz Yisrael is for us a cardinal mitzvah in Judaism.

6. The creative approach to tradition means not only the surrender of outworn material and the reinterpretation of what can still be made viable, but also the supplementing and enrichment of the prayer book by new material. Consequently a large number of supplementary prayers, both for unison and congregational reading and suitable for special occasions throughout the year have been included. This material both in prose and verse draws upon all the fundamental elements of Israel's life and thought, and, in accordance with our principle, is selected from Jewish authors of all periods. This material, we trust, will be utilized successfully to enrich public worship and make it more meaningful, besides creating variety and heightened interest in the service.

Thus, the endeavor to maintain the principles of the continuity of tradition, relevance to the modern age and intellectual integrity have led us to a deeper understanding of the prayer book. The results include more adequate renderings, legitimate paraphrases in terms of the modern outlook, a small number of changes and deletions in the traditional text, and a good deal of supplementary material drawn from our rich literature.

## VI

While the content and ideas of the prayer book are naturally the first concern, the forms of expression, both in the Hebrew original and in the English version are scarcely less important. Here, too, certain principles and techniques emerged in the course of the work.

7. Obviously a modern prayer book should contain as accurate a text as possible and here S. Baer's *Abodat Yisrael* has generally been followed. The excellent innovation of the United Synagogue Mahzor of printing poetry in verse form has been gratefully adopted and extended. The sections of the service, as well as necessary directions, have been indicated for the guidance of congregations and individuals.

8. The spirit and structure of English and Hebrew are generally dissimilar, and each must be adhered to. Reference has already been made to the characteristic use in Hebrew of coordinate rather than subordinate clauses. This is not all. Hebrew is an Oriental language abounding in imagery. The use of many synonyms, which was stimulated by Biblical parallelism, is a characteristic feature, in such prayers as *אמת ויציב* and *יעלה ויבוא*. To eliminate some of these synonyms in the Hebrew, as is done by the Jastrow Prayer Book, Elzas, and the Reconstructionist Prayer Book, means to commit the literary sin of judging Hebrew style by Western standards. To translate them all, as in most English versions, violates the spirit of English. Obviously a briefer formulation is required in the English, in accordance with the genius of the language. Equally obviously, the Hebrew text requires no change.

In general the reader deserves an idiomatic English version, exactly as the worshipper requires an idiomatic Hebrew text. Hence long phrases may be shortened, the word order may be varied and parataxis may be recast in hypotactic form. The changes of person that are characteristic of Biblical literature and hence are frequent in the Prayer Book should be brought into harmony with one another in the English. For the requirements of an attractive English version are that it be clear, succinct and true to the vigor of the original.

9. A comment is in order on the treatment of the Biblical passages in the Prayer Book. Of late a kind of "English Biblatry" has developed among American Jews. The Jewish Publication Society version, excellent as it is, is already a quarter of a century old, and its authors would have been the first to agree that Biblical studies have made progress during that time. This growth of understanding should be registered in Jewish life and thought and nowhere more effectively than in the prayer book, which is pre-eminently the possession of the people. The Masoretic text, which has been hallowed through centuries, should not be emended in a work intended for popular use, but the English version offers an excellent opportunity for new and better interpretations, especially where the accepted view is manifestly unsatisfactory and the tacit change is slight, if any.

Thus Psalm 29 is a magnificent description of a storm in which the thunder, "the voice of the Lord," is heard over the sea, the mountains, the desert and the forests. In v. 9 יחולל אילות (*'ayalot*) is usually rendered "The voice of the Lord makes the hinds travail," an interpretation, which even if sound biologically, is surely not calculated to add to the intelligibility of this magnificent Psalm. It is clear that all that is required is a slight modification of the Hebrew vocalization to read יחולל אילות ויחשף יערות (*'eilot*) and translate the passage, "The voice of the Lord makes the oak trees dance and strips the forests bare."

In Psalm 147:17 the phrase *lifnei karato mi ya'amod* is generally rendered "before his cold who can stand?" However the parallelism with משליך קרחו כפתים and the plural suffix in the next clause ישלח דברו וימסם indicates that *mi* is either an apocopated form or a variant for *mayyim*. At all events, the passage is to be translated: "He casts forth ice like morsels; before his frost, the waters congeal. He sends forth His word and melts them; He blows His wind and the waters flow again."

Psalm 116 is a great hymn of thanksgiving for deliverance from death. Verse 15: יקר בעיני אדני המותה לחסידיו, as generally rendered by all modern exegetes, is exceedingly inappropriate to the context, however stimulating to homiletic ingenuity. "Precious in the eyes of the Lord is the death of his saints" is practically the reverse of what we should expect. The key lies in *yakar* which is an Aramaism meaning "heavy, burdensome, grievous." Thus Gen. 48:10 יקרן מסיבו is translated by Onkelos and the Jerusalem Targum יקרן מסיבו and הכבד לב by the same root (Ex. 7:14; 8:11,28 etc.) Our verse is to be rendered: "Grievous in the eyes of the Lord is the death of his saints!" This natural and appropriate rendering is the view of Rashi, Ibn Ezra and Kimhi ad. loc. Both the idiom in the passage and its idea are paralleled in such Rabbinic utterances as כך אמר הקב"ה קשה בעיני לומר לצדיקים שימותו (Yalkut Shimeoni, ad loc.) and קשה לפני הקב"ה בשעה שבניהם של צדיקים מסתלקין בחיי אביהם (Yalkut Shimeoni on Lev. 10:2).

In Num. 10:36 ישראל אלפי רבבות אומר שובה ה' רבבות אלפי ישראל the usual rendering "return, O Lord" is inappropriate, since the Ark is already at rest. The verb *shubh* in Biblical Hebrew possesses the meaning "halt, rest, dwell, be at peace," as in such passages as Isa. 30:15: בשובה ונחת תושעון בהשקט ובבטחה תהיה גבורתכם This meaning suits our passage admirably: "When the Ark rested, Moses said; 'Mayest Thou dwell, O Lord, among the myriads of the families of Israel!'"<sup>(13)</sup>

In two Biblical passages, Ps. 116:19; 135:9; both of which occur in the prayer book, the form בתוככי occurs—which is rendered "in the midst of thee,"

(13) Cf. A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, ad. loc. and the writer's study "Some Hitherto Unrecognized Meanings of the verb *Shubh*" in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 1933, vol. 52, pp. 153-61. It may be added that the above rendering construes ישראל אלפי רבבות אלפי as an *accusative loci*. It is quite possible that the phrase is in apposition with the Divine name and is an epithet for God, who is identified with the myriads of Israel. Cf. Elisha's designation of Elijah as אבי רכב ישראל ופרשיו (2K 2:12). On this identification of God and people, cf. Krochmal's famous study of גוים ואלהיו in *Moreh Nebukhe Hazeman*, ch. 7.

on the assumption that we have an archaic second person feminine suffix. The parallelism however of **בתוככי ירושלים** with **בחצרות בית אדני** and of **בתוככי מצרים** with **בפרעה ובכל עבדיו**, as well as the entire context, makes it clear that no direct address to Jerusalem and Egypt is here intended. It is evident that the form is a construct and is to be translated simply as "in the midst of Jerusalem (or Egypt)."<sup>(14)</sup>

In a responsive reading based on Ps. 15, we have rendered verse 3 as "He speaks no slander against his enemy, nor doeth evil to his fellowman, nor bears shame for mistreating his kinsman."

10. Finally, practical utility has been taken into account at many points. The Minhah and Maariv services for week days have been added to make it convenient to use this prayer book both at the inauguration and the conclusion of the Sabbath and Festivals. Hymns both in Hebrew and in English have been added for the further enrichment of the service. Being a repository of a rich, religious culture, the Jewish prayer book cannot be understood or appreciated by alphabets. Some knowledge of background is essential. This is supplied by brief introductory notes at important points of the service as well as by titles for some prayers. Where a subject requires somewhat more extensive treatment, supplementary notes have been added. These themes include the Shema, the Preliminary Blessings, Sacrifices in Judaism, the Chosen People and the Messiah idea in Israel.

Countless other innovations that will aid, we hope, in the effective use of the prayer book have been introduced in content, form and arrangement. These cannot be detailed here. Through the indices of themes, sources and occasions, given in the volume, it will be easy to make fruitful use of the supplementary material.

Acutely conscious of our limitations, we yet venture to hope that this prayer book will advance the great cause of spiritual revival in Israel. Our keynote was sounded by Rabbi Kook of blessed memory in his great words: **הישן יתחדש החדש יתקדש**. "the old must be renewed and the new become sacred." For the privilege of sharing in this enterprise, we are humbly thankful to Almighty God.

<sup>(14)</sup> The form is a reduplicated form with suffixed Yod, which may be explained in one of two ways. Probably, it is a remnant of the old genitive case, the so-called paragogic Yod, which occurs in participles like **מושיבי מוקימי משפילי** (Ps. 113: 5, 6, 9 and often), in other substantives **מאמא ומאמא** Isa. 1:21, in particles like **זולתי מני בלתי** אפסי (in the formula **אני ואפסי עוד** Isa. 47:8,10) and in proper names like **גבריאל מלכיצדק**. It should then be vocalized *béthökhêkhi*. On the other hand, it may be an example of the "plural" form of prepositions, particularly characteristic of those space and time, like **תחתיו (תחתיו) עדי, (עדי) עלי, (על) אחרי (על) עלי, (על) בין, (בין) תחת** (תחתיו) **סביו (סביו) עדי, (עדי) עלי, (על) אחרי (על) עלי, (על) בין, (בין) תחת** (תחתיו)

In that event, the word should be vocalized *béthökhêkhe*. On the grammatical phenomena here cited see Gesenius Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 25 ed., sec. 90, 3a and 103,3.