

Confrontations over the Establishment of Synagogues in Workers' Quarters in *Eretz Israel* in the Second and Third Decades of the Twentieth Century

Reuven Gafni

During the second and third decades of the twentieth century, a number of confrontations took place over the issue of establishing synagogues in urban quarters and in communal settlements of various types. This article focuses on confrontations that took place in three worker's quarters founded during those years: the Borochoh Quarter in Givatayim; Kiryat Hayyim near Haifa; and Beit Hakerem in Jerusalem.

The article studies the development of each of these confrontations: the first initiative to establish a synagogue, the objection of some of the local residents, the intervention of external, national forces in the various confrontations and finally, the way in which these confrontations were resolved.

In the author's examination of these confrontations, a number of differences between the different cases are stressed including the actual subjects of the confrontation: the location of the planned synagogue, the funding for its establishment and the funding of its functional expenditures during its first years. These differences were due to a number of factors: the nature of the personalities involved, the influence of neighboring localities and the ability of each side to draft support from among important personalities within the neighborhood and from the established leadership of the Jewish settlement. In turn, these personalities made their own contribution both to the argument and to the solutions which were offered in each case.

In addition, the article will consider why, in the end, all the confrontations were resolved in favor of establishing a synagogue, even though the original supporters of the synagogue seem to have been in the minority. The article will also compare the nature of these confrontations in urban communities to similar confrontations which took place during the same period, in agricultural communal settlements in the Jezreel Valley.

perfect faith". Our scholars, as well as many learned men, have claimed that a scrupulous comparison between this version and the Rambam's reveals differences in emphasis and even substantial disparities. This article reviews those disparities, demonstrates the various ways in which the rabbinic world reacted to this phenomenon, and suggests an entirely new approach. The author presents a longer version found in manuscript form from which, it is his opinion, the prayer book's version was abridged. In light of the comparison, he suggests the principles that guided the anonymous author of the prayer book's version. Moreover, he demonstrates that this version continues to be dynamic; many changes have been introduced and are still being introduced to this very day. The article concludes with a discussion of the Sephardic version of the declaration of faith.

The Hajaji Synagogue in San'a and the Leadership of R. Me'ir Zubeiri

Aharon Gaimani

The Hajaji Synagogue was one of San'a's smaller synagogues. This article describes a crisis in the synagogue's life that took place in the fifth decade of the twentieth century, several years before the community immigrated to Israel in Operation "On Eagles' Wings". The leaders of San'a's community turned to R. Me'ir Zubeiri, who was a member of one of the larger synagogues, to take over the leadership of the Hajaji Synagogue and solve its problems.

The article focuses on documents that reveal the agreement reached between R. Zubeiri and the synagogue members. Their willingness to accept R. Zubeiri's leadership was an important factor in his success. The documents portray the spiritual and physical reconstruction of the synagogue, the library of the synagogue, and the holy Torah scrolls which were reputed to have affected miracles. All these aspects reflect the cultural life of the members of the synagogue and communal life.

R. Zubeiri served in this capacity for two years. In this short period, all the synagogue's debts were repaid and the period ended with a financial surplus.

great affinity to the Bible in style and language. They include quotes from the Bible of various lengths: complete chapters or verses, clearly defined or not, and, occasionally, combinations or single words. At times, a biblical expression serves as inspiration for the language used in a blessing and it is incorporated with some change, such as the expression *נאזר בגבורה* (Ps. 65:7) "who is girded with might" which inspired the conclusion of the blessing *אזר ישראל בגבורה* "Who girds Israel with might". There is a clear tendency to employ relatively rare biblical words in blessings, such as *צאצאים* (offspring).

Stylistically, the blessings tend to employ poetics familiar to readers of the Bible and of poetry, in general: parallelism, double entendre (using a word to refer to two of its distinct meanings, such as *שאר* to mean both "flesh" and "relatives" in the blessing for the circumcision), and emblematical allusions (a technique known to us from liturgical poetry), wherein instead of referring to a person by his name he is referred to by an attribute (such as *ידיד* "friend" in the circumcision blessing, denoting one of the nation's ancestors). Series of blessings also exhibit poetic features, such as the concluding form "Who crowns Israel with glory" (*עוטר ישראל בתפארה*), which was formulated in a pattern identical to that of the conclusion "Who girds Israel with might" (*אזר ישראל בגבורה*) and which rhymes with it, both in terms of its concluding syllables and its internal form.

To sum up, the sages composed two distinct literary oeuvres: the rabbinic literature of the study hall (halakhic and aggadic works) and the blessings meant for communicating with the Holy One, blessed be He. The former oeuvre, intended for everyday life, was composed in the language of everyday life, including words adopted from other languages. The latter, intended for prayer to God, incorporated the loftiness of the Bible and, in particular, that of its poetry – both its vocabulary and poetics – and it is free of foreign language.

The Influence of Ideological Changes on the Text of the Declaration of Faith (*אני מאמין*)

Eli Gurfinkel

The prayer books of the Ashkenazi communities contain a version of the declaration of faith that Maimonides (Rambam) initiated - the "Thirteen Articles of Faith", each one commencing with the words: "I believe with a

Abstracts of Hebrew Articles

The Text of the *Amidah* in the Siddur of R. Shlomo b. Natan and the Question of the Provenance of the Siddur

Uri Erlich

The siddur of twelfth century sage R. Shlomo b. Natan is the most comprehensive siddur in our possession from the period immediately following the geonic era. Found in many eastern communities, hundreds of its fragments were discovered in the Genizah.

As far as the text of the *Amidah* is concerned, we can not rely on the published edition as part of that edition is based on a late MS found in the Vatican which is considerably different than the original version. The text of the *Amidah* must be based on the testimony of Genizah fragments.

This article presents a complete text of the *Amidah* from the Genizah and compares this to the text contained in other Genizah fragments. Based on these materials, the article discusses unique expressions found in this siddur and the siddur's relationship with other prayer customs.

In conclusion, findings are presented that show connections both between this siddur and the siddur of Aram Zovah (Aleppo) and between this siddur and Persian custom. It is suggested that the siddur's provenance may be somewhere in this geographical area.

The Formula of Blessings Ordained by the Sages

Moshe Bar-Asher

This study is devoted to the language and style of the blessings established by the sages (mainly, the tannaim and amoraim). In contrast to the halakhic and aggadic literature of the sages that was primarily written in the various languages known to the sages, the blessings were composed in only one language.

The blessings are written exclusively in Hebrew and contain only one foreign word, *legions* (לגיונים/לגיונות); not a single additional foreign word (from Aramaic, Greek, Latin or any other language) may be found. In addition, and this is a crucial underlying principle, the blessings show a

the current Haggadah does not entirely obscure our view of its original format, in which a parallel midrash served to gloss the entire scriptural passage. Scholars have already observed that this type of exegesis, which weaves verses from different places in the Torah into a cohesive whole, is prominent in the early midrashic strata beginning with the Second Temple period literature. Such a phenomenon is also attested to by the Dead Sea scrolls.³⁵ The discovery of this hermeneutic methodology within our Haggadah sheds new light on both the core Haggadah and its later formulations, and reveals the richness of the midrashic world of the rabbis.

35 See Kahana, *Sifre Zuta on Deuteronomy*, p. 420, and the literature cited in his n. 2 (including the appendix to Henschke, "The *Midrash*", p. 51, where I added to this definition of "*midrash*" tSot 7:17, ed. Lieberman, p. 197; I later suggested another reading of the Tosefta that I preferred in my article: "'How 'the King's Portion'?" – On the Methods of Editing the *Mishna*" [Hebrew], *Sidra* 16 [2000], pp. 26–28).

**

The analyses offered in this article, *in toto*, constitute an assessment of the nature of the Haggadah's exegesis: its extant form is a stylistic conglomerate that incorporates midrashim composed in different ways; but the substance of

instead of the obligation to simply recite the verses (as is Karaite practice; see the Karaite Haggadah: *Seder ha-Haggadah ... ke-Minhag ha-Karaim* [Pressburg, 1869]; *Karaite Passover Haggadah*, ed. Yoseif Yaron, trans. H.A. Qanai [US, 2001])? The "fugitive Aramean" passage was initially part of the firstfruit ceremony (Deut. 26:5), and mBik (3:6) prescribes: "He reads [*ve-kore*] from 'my father was a fugitive Aramean' until he concludes the entire section". For the *Seder* night, in contrast, the Mishnah mandates: "and he expounds [*ve-doresh*] from 'My father was a fugitive Aramean' until he finishes the entire section" (mPes 10:4; see above, n. 1). On the one hand, there is the obligation of "*midrash*", while, on the other, this consists simply of a return to the scriptural verses themselves. The simple explanation for this seeming contradiction apparently lies in the commandment to "tell [*le-saper*]" of the Exodus, as "in every generation a person is obligated to regard himself as if he went forth from Egypt". This commandment encourages its adherents to expand the narrative as much as possible, for "the more one tells of the Exodus, the more he is deserving of praise". This ceremony does not mandate a fixed recitation, as in the rite of the firstfruit, for the mere reading of verses is insufficient; rather, this ceremony is a narrative – and naturally expansive – occasion, without limitations. Thus the midrashic genre, of an open, innovative, and expansive nature, is eminently suitable given the commandment's scriptural foundation. Since every Israelite is obligated to perform this act of *midrash*, the midrash chosen is not the sophisticated exegesis of the *beit midrash*, but the coupling of the verses in the passage with their scriptural parallels. On the one hand, this maintains the accepting and expansive nature of the *midrash*, since the coupling of verses allows for a number of possibilities, while, on the other, it does not require its practitioners to be learned. Israel Jacob Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv, 2000), pp. 102–3, regards the obligation of *midrash* and the fact that it is satisfied by merely paralleling the verses as a response to the Christian exegesis aimed at revealing the verses' allegoric Christian significance; in response, the rabbis constructed an exegesis that appears "as a forced echo and a pale response", aimed at denying the Christian allegory and keeping the narrative within a realistic context, by confirming the meaning of the verses through their scriptural parallels. It is questionable, however, whether "a forced echo and a pale response" are the correct strategy for polemics, even if this was the intent. At any rate, the explanation of the exegetical format is to be found in immanent considerations. Also relevant here is the prevalence in the Second Temple period literature of a similar format of verse coupling (see below, the next note), which would obviate the need for an explanation based on the Jewish-Christian polemic.

mora' gadol". In combining the different midrashic methods, the redactor placed the "revelation of the *Shekhinah*" in contiguity with the parallel verse already functioning there as a parallel midrash. However, this addition meant that the verse now appeared to be a proof text for the expansion of the explicative midrash, thereby leading to incongruity; initially, Deut. 4:34 did not support the meaning offered for "*mora*"" but was only a parallel midrash.

To sum up, the exegesis in the extant Haggadah contains traces of the parallel midrash genre, in which citing verses that parallel the "fugitive Aramean" verses is all that is required. This midrashic methodology is not limited to the first three verses of the passage (Deut. 26:5-7); the exegesis of the fourth and last verse (Deut. 26:8), which at first seems to be solely explicative in nature, actually embraces the parallel midrash genre as well. Not only did the midrash provide parallel verses for specific phrases in the second half of Deut. 26:8 (such as for "by a mighty hand"), it also provided the first part of the verse ("The Lord brought us forth from Egypt") with an appropriate parallel verse: "to go and take for Himself one nation from the midst of another [...] as the Lord your God did for you in Egypt before your very eyes" (Deut. 4:34). Thus, the extant exposition of the Haggadah is comprised of different midrashic techniques strewn throughout it, and our analysis reveals the parallel midrash for the entire "fugitive Aramean" passage.³³

Indeed, the parallel midrash genre, which found the citation of Scripture sufficient, was undoubtedly best suited to enable even the least educated Israelite to fulfill the obligation of *midrash* (exegesis) incumbent on him, for he would have found the expositions of the sages of the *beit midrash* inaccessible to him.³⁴

33 Emphasis should be placed on the discovery in *Sifre Zuta on Deuteronomy*, ed. Kahana, p. 422, of a parallel midrash glossing the fifth verse of the "fugitive Aramean" passage (26:9), as well: "'He brought us to this place' – as it is written (Deut. 26:3), 'that I have entered the land'". Kahana further notes (p. 423) that this supports the hypothesis of D. Z. Hoffmann and his school that the early Haggadah also expounded this verse.

34 See Goldschmidt, *The Passover Haggadah*, p. 40; Henschke, "The Midrash", p. 36 and n. 10. This uncomplicated explanation of the exposition's character is nonetheless somewhat lacking: if the midrash merely matches the parallel verses, in keeping with every Israelite's requirement "*li-drosh*", why was the obligation of exegesis imposed here,

This mixture of midrashic methodologies, then, resolves the difficulty posed by the midrash of "*u-ve-mora' gadol*". Deut. 26:8, in its entirety, is the subject of an explicative midrash. Given that the preceding verses were the subject of the parallel midrashic technique, one would expect Deut. 26:8 to receive similar treatment.³² Most likely, the verse cited to elucidate "*u-ve-mora' gadol*" was originally the parallel midrash not just of "*u-ve-mora' gadol*" but of this entire verse, since all five motifs in Deut. 26:8 ("[1] a mighty hand, [2] by an outstretched arm and [3] awesome power, and by [4] signs and [5] portents") have parallels in that verse (Deut. 4:34): "Or has God ventured to go and take for Himself one nation from the midst of another by prodigious acts, by signs and portents, by war, by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm and awesome power, as the Lord your God did for you in Egypt before your very eyes?" This midrash expands the end of the "fugitive Aramean" passage as follows: "'by a mighty hand, by an outstretched arm and awesome power, and by signs and portents' – as it is said, 'Or has God ventured [...] by prodigious acts, by signs and portents, by war, by a mighty and an outstretched arm and awesome power'. Thus, Deut. 4:34 was not cited to prove that "*u-ve-mora' gadol*" refers to the revelation of the *Shekhinah*, but solely to present the parallel expressions.

Along with the parallel midrash, Deut. 26:8 is also expounded by means of an explicative midrash that delineates the specific meaning of each expression, including the revelation of the *Shekhinah* as the meaning of "*u-ve-*

plight": the first, as in our Haggadah; and the second: "'and saw our plight' [...] this refers to the subjugation, as it is said: 'I have surely seen the plight of My people in Egypt.'" Here, as well, the interpretation "this refers to the subjugation" is not supported by the apparent proof text, instead the verse that I suggested as a parallel midrash for "and saw our plight" is cited in *Midrash Tannaim*.

- 32 My article ("The *Midrash*") examines the parallel midrash for the first three verses, but not the fourth; see the summary table, p. 52. Urbach, review article, pp. 145–46, proposed as the parallel midrash for the fourth verse Exod. 12:12: "For that night I will go thought the land of Egypt and strike down every firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and I will mete out punishments to all the gods of Egypt, I the Lord". This verse, however, is absent from the early versions of the Haggadah (see above, n. 28) and does not parallel the terms in Deut. 26:8 ("mighty hand", "an outstretched arm", "awesome power", "signs and portents"). It only corresponds to the verse's basic theme and this only partially: it lacks the crucial motif of the Exodus. Thus it is different than the other parallel midrashim in the Haggadah.

ve-mora'] – this refers to the revelation of the *Shekhinah*", but this text merely repeats the wording *mora* that it is meant to explicate, thus failing to corroborate the "revelation of the *Shekhinah*" interpretation.

E. E. Urbach already resolved similar difficulties that arise throughout the "Aramean" exegesis by proposing that two midrashic genres had been intermingled.³⁰ The Haggadah's midrashic expansion makes pronounced use of a type of exegesis that is nothing more than the citation of parallel scriptural verses, a mode adopted by all the second verse's expositions in this section. The first exposition reads: "'The Egyptians dealt harshly with us' (Deut. 26:6) – as it is said (Exod. 1:1): 'Let us deal shrewdly with them'", The exegete adds no explanation of his own, but merely draws a parallel between two verses. Along with this midrashic methodology, we also find explanatory exposition, such as: "'He went down to Egypt' (Deut. 26:5) – compelled by the [divine] word". In some instances, however, the two types of midrash are mixed together and become one, thus hampering our understanding of the extant text, as in: "'and our oppression' (Deut. 26:7) – this refers to its severity, as it is said (Exod. 3:9): 'Moreover, I have seen how the Egyptians oppress them'", "Moreover, I have seen" does not constitute proof for the interpretation of "this refers to its severity"; rather, this text is comprised of the two types of midrashic methodology found in the Haggadah, the explicative and the parallel. The explicative midrash states simply: "'And our oppression' – this refers to its severity", and no more; while the parallel exegesis, is merely citing a parallel verse: "'and our oppression' – as it is said: 'Moreover, I have seen how the Egyptians oppress them'", These separate exegeses were combined, thus creating the incongruity. Our hypothesis concerning the exegesis of "and our oppression" was confirmed by the discovery of *Sifre Zuta on Deuteronomy*, where this exposition appears exactly as we surmised: "And our oppression' – as it is said: 'Moreover, I have seen [...]'".³¹

30 See Urbach, review article, pp. 145–46; Henschke, "The *Midrash*", pp. 48–50.

31 *Sifre Zuta on Deuteronomy*, p. 419; see the comments by Kahana, p. 91, p. 420. Note should be taken of my reconstruction ("The *Midrash*", p. 48) of the parallel expansion of (Deut. 26:7) "and saw our plight": "As it is said (Exod. 3:7): 'I have surely seen the plight of My people in Egypt.'" It is noteworthy that *Midrash Tannaim* ad loc, p. 173 (from *Midrash ha-Gadol* ad loc., p. 587) offered two interpretations for "and saw our

– not by an angel [...]", is accompanied by the proof text: "As it is said (Exod. 12:12): 'For that night I will go through the land of Egypt and strike down every firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and I will mete out punishments to all the gods of Egypt, I the Lord'. In light of this proof text demonstrating that the preceding exposition clearly focuses upon the plagues of Egypt, the assumption that the rest of the exposition continues in this vein is a logical one to make.

This proof text, however, is absent from the early versions of the Haggadah.²⁸ Furthermore, this opening exposition of the verse, which is included in the Land of Israel Haggadah, can shed no light on the second exposition which follows it, since the second exposition is clearly autonomous – given that it is not even found in the Land of Israel Haggadahs; this is also clearly true of the relationship of the second exposition to the different view expressed by the "*davar aher*". At any rate, the focus of these expositions (those preceding and succeeding our midrash) upon the plagues of Egypt led to our exposition being misunderstood. Such a misunderstanding also makes sense, since our reading of the midrash essentially denigrates the Israelites and, therefore, is hardly fitting for the festive atmosphere of *Seder* night. Understanding this text as referring to the plagues visited upon the Egyptians, not upon the Israelites, was clearly more congenial to the spirit of the night.²⁹

4. The Reconstruction of the Parallel Exegesis on the Last Verse in the Midrash of the Haggadah

Although the analysis set forth in the preceding section resolves most of the difficulties with this midrash, one problem (mentioned above, in section 1) remains: the proof text Deut. 4:34: "and awesome power [*u-ve-mora'im gedolim*]" is brought in support of the exposition: "'and awesome power [*u-*

28 See Goldschmidt, *The Passover Haggadah*, p. 44 n. 60; Rovner, "A New Version", p. 427 (see also, p. 432).

29 Such a step was also taken by those who read "my father was a fugitive Aramean" as referring to Laban, rejecting the parallel midrashic understanding that the verse speaks of the forefathers of Israel (see my article, "The *Midrash*", pp. 50–51). For them, as well, it was more congenial to apply the unflattering "Aramean" appellation to Laban, and not to their own forefathers.

tannaitic midrashim took this one step further: annihilation was not merely a looming threat, it actually took place: a tremendous number of Israelites died during the three days of darkness for having spurned the tidings of the exodus from Egypt.²⁴ This exposition in the Haggadah therefore harmonizes with an early and widely known tradition.²⁵

This, then, is the fundamental difference between the two expositions: the second, which appears in both the extant Haggadah and the Land of Israel Haggadahs, understands the verse to be referring to the ten plagues, so that the mighty hand and all that accompany it refer to what was done to the Egyptians, while the first exposition focuses upon the Israelites.²⁶ Notwithstanding how obvious it seems, given our explanation of its contents, this new understanding of the exposition is obscured by the material preceding and succeeding it: the "*davar aher*" exposition, succeeding it, relates the verse to the ten plagues, to which the extant Haggadahs add R. Judah's acrostic of "דצ"ך עד"ש באח"ב", which also addresses the plagues of Egypt.²⁷ The exposition preceding it: "'The Lord brought us forth from Egypt'

allusion in the Torah was finally made explicit in Ezekiel. See the references given by Margulies.

24 See *Mekhila*, *Petihata to Va-Yehi*, pp. 77–78 and the parallels noted ad loc. (on this passage and the parallels, see Israel Ta-Shma, "On the Clarification of a Vague Passage in *Mekhila*" [Hebrew], *Shanah be-Shanah* 42 [2002], pp. 69–72). In this context, Jer. 31:1 should be mentioned: "The people escaped from the sword found favor in the wilderness" – the Israelites, who went forth from Egypt, are the people who escaped from the sword; although the verse probably refers to the Egyptians' swords, we nevertheless find the motif of the sword in Egypt relating solely to Israel.

25 And it draws a connection, in terms of contents, between the identical exegeses in the Haggadah and in *Sifre on Numbers*: each speaks of the pestilence and the sword that God is liable to inflict upon Israel, whether in the past, when they were in Egypt, as the continuation of Ezek. 20 relates; or in the future, when He will impose His rule upon them, as the prophet foretells. If there was a partial transfer from one of the parallels to the other, it was of contents.

26 The gist of this was addressed by *Midrash ha-Gadol*, in the following formulation: "'And with portents' – this refers to the plagues" (above, n. 8). This implies that, until this point, no mention was made of the plagues, thus forcing us to conclude that pestilence, the sword, and the staff do not relate to the plagues.

27 Most of the Land of Israel Haggadahs lack this passage. See Safrai and Safrai, *Haggadah of the Sages*, p. 144.

The *Orhot Hayyim's* approach also explains the first two exegeses, concerning the pestilence and the sword. Exodus 5:3 patently connects the two topics: "They answered, 'The God of the Hebrews has manifested Himself to us. Let us go, we pray, a distance of three days into the wilderness to sacrifice to the Lord our God, lest He strike us with pestilence or sword'", This verse evidently means that the Israelites are liable to be struck by pestilence or sword, if they do not go forth from Egypt to serve the Lord.²² This verse becomes the basis for our midrash: it is doubtful whether the Israelites would have gone forth from Egypt of their own free will; rather, the Lord brought them forth, by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm: "'By a mighty hand' – this refers to the pestilence", with which they would have been stricken had they not gone forth; and "'by an outstretched arm' – this refers to the sword", with which God threatened them in order to cause them to leave Egypt. The entire midrash continues in this same vein: with the awesome power, signs, and portents that happened to Israel, to ensure their redemption from Egypt.

Moses and Aaron's fear that the Israelites' refusal to serve the Lord and sever their connection with Egypt was liable to end in their annihilation, is expressly stated by Ezekiel (20:8): "Then I resolved to pour out My fury upon them, to vent all My anger upon them there, in the land of Egypt".²³ The

commentaries ad loc; R. Jonah Ibn Janah, *Sefer ha-Rikmah*, ed. M. Wilensky (Jerusalem, 1964), p. 102. And in the Samuel scroll (4QSam^a) from Qumran: "נגלה נגליתי" – without the ה (Frank M. Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4: XII: 1–2 Samuel* [Oxford, 2005], p. 39 l. 23). As for the rendition in *Targum Jonathan*: "משעבדין לבית פרעה" when they were subject to the House of Pharaoh", cf. the Samuel scroll: "עבדים לבית פרעה".

22 Amoraic *midreshei aggadah* explain that this refers to Pharaoh; it should have been written: "lest He strike you", but it was changed out of respect for royalty (see Menahem M. Kasher, *Torah Shelemah*, vol. 9 [New York, 1954], p. 217, para. 30). The *Targumim*, however, render this in accord with the simple meaning of the verse. See also R. Joseph Bekhor Shor, *Hizkuni*, R. Isaac Abrabanel ad loc.

23 See *Mekhilta, Pisha* para. 5, pp. 15–16: "The Israelites were inundated by idolatry in Egypt [...] it was difficult for them to part from idolatry, as it is said (Ezek. 20:7): 'And I said to them [...].'" See *Lev. Rabbah* 7 (beginning), ed. Mordecai Margulies (Jerusalem, 1972), p. 147: "For close to nine hundred years the hatred between Israel and their Father in heaven was in abeyance, from when they went forth from Egypt until the time of Ezekiel". The midrash continues by quoting a verse from Ezekiel. The somewhat veiled

The wording of the exegesis "'and by signs' – this is the staff" itself proves this. For as noted above, the exegete's language is problematic if he assumes the signs are the plagues of Egypt because the staff itself does not constitute the signs; it was simply the means to effect them. However, if the exegete assumes the signs in question are meant for the Israelites, than the wording of the midrash suits its message: the staff actually is the sign.

The preceding expansion: "'and awesome power' – this refers to the revelation of the *Shekhinah*", clearly has the same exegetical orientation. The exposition does not mean that the *Shekhinah* was revealed to the Egyptians; here, too, the subject is the Israelites, to whom – or to whose representatives, Moses and Aaron – the Divine Presence was revealed in Egypt.²⁰ Scripture explicitly depicts this (1 Sam. 2:27): "A man of God came to Eli and said to him, 'Thus said the Lord: Lo I revealed Myself [*ha-nigloh nigleti*] to your father's house in Egypt [*Targum Jonathan*: ... when they were subject] to the House of Pharaoh'", This revelation was to Eli's father's house, and not to Pharaoh.²¹

20 Safrai and Safrai, *Haggadah of the Sages*, p. 142, observe that the phrase "the revelation of the *Shekhinah* [*giluy Shekhinah*]" only appears in rabbinic literature in this exegesis; however, it does exist in proximate formulations that are instructive for our purposes. Concerning (Exod. 12:1) "The Lord said to Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt", the beginning of *Mekhilta* (ed. Horovitz-Rabin, p. 3) discusses whether "the *Shekhinah* is revealed [*Shekhinah niglet*] outside the Land of Israel"; thus, the midrash has no doubt that the *Shekhinah* was revealed in Egypt to Moses and Aaron, not to the Egyptians. And, likewise, *Sifre Zuta* on Num. 10:35 (ed. Horovitz, p. 267): "When Israel were enslaved in Egypt, the *Shekhinah* was revealed to Moses [*niglet Shekhinah al Mosheh*] only within suffering and from within the bush"; and in *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Simeon bar Yohai* on Exod. 3:8 (ed. Epstein-Melamed, p. 3): "When I was revealed [*(khe-)she-nigleti*] to you at the bush, I concealed your face, so as not to gaze upon My Presence [*Shekhinah*]". This additional revelation of the *Shekhinah* to Moses entailed signs and the staff. We obviously should note another aspect of the *Shekhinah*'s revelation, namely, God making Himself known to the Israelites in Egypt by a new name (Exod. 6:3): "I appeared [*va-era*] to Abraham [...] but I did not make myself known to them by My name the Lord". See too, *Exod. Rabbah* on this topic (6:4; ed. Avigdor Shinan [*Midrash Shemot Rabbah. Chapters I–XIV* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1984)], p. 188): "Several times I was revealed [*nigleti*] to Abraham. [...]"

21 In light of the verse's subject and context, even if the letter *heh*, which functions as a prefix in the wording *ha-nigleh*, is understood to be the interrogative participle, it does not call into question the revelation, as is clear from *Targum Jonathan*, as well; see the

of an explanation elucidating the other elements of the midrash and explaining its relationship to the “*davar aher*” exposition.

3. A Proposed Resolution: an Explication of the Exegesis and Its History

The meaning of our exegesis in its entirety was first touched upon by R. Aaron ha-Kohen, the author of *Orhot Hayyim*, in his commentary¹⁷ on the last exegesis: “and portents” – this refers to the blood”. *Orhot Hayyim* suggests that the exegete is not referring to the plague visited upon the Egyptians, but to the signs that Moses was commanded to perform for the Israelites, so that they would believe in him and in his tidings: “And if they are not convinced by both these signs and still do not heed you, take some water from the Nile and pour it on the dry land, and it – the water that you take from the Nile – will turn to blood on the dry ground” (Exod. 4:9).¹⁸ This insight, then, provides us with the key for unlocking the other elements of the exegesis, which we will examine in reverse order, from the last to the first.

The midrash preceded “and portents” – this refers to the blood” with “and by signs” – this is the staff”; we have already expressed surprise at the connection between the signs and the staff, for the staff was only involved in a few of the plagues. Here as well, however, the exegete is not referring to the plagues visited on the Egyptians, but to the portents meant for Israel: the casting down of the staff and its transformation into a serpent, and its return to the form of a staff after it was grasped by the tail. Indeed, the proof text cited by the exegete: “And take with you this staff, with which you shall perform the signs” (Exod. 4:17), speaks of the signs to be performed for the Israelite audience, before Moses had even been commanded to perform the plagues in Egypt and informed of the part his staff would play in them.¹⁹

17 R. Aaron ha-Kohen, *Orhot Hayyim* (Florence, 1750), p. 83b.

18 The fact that the exegete makes no mention of the additional sign, the *tsara'at* on Moses' hand fits in perfectly with both the proof text for the staff (“And take with you this staff, with which you shall perform the signs” – as the staff was not involved in the sign of the *tsara'at*) and the Haggadah's predisposition to totally exclude Moses.

19 This apparently was the intent of one commentary on the Haggadah: “It says (Exod. 4:3): ‘Cast it on the ground’, and he cast it on the ground’, and it says (v. 8): ‘And if they do not believe you ... they will believe the second sign’” (“*Perush Kadmon*”, Katzenelenbogen, *Torat Hayyim*, pp. 116–17. On the general nature of this commentary, see the editor's introduction, pp. 8–9).

How, then, did the exegete support the three interpretations that were linked to the verses in Ezekiel? Although in light of the exegete's silence we cannot provide a definitive answer, it should be recalled that pestilence, the sword, and famine are three recurring motifs in the prophecies of Ezekiel¹⁶ and are three of the "four of My terrible punishments" (Ezek. 14:21); their association with Ezek. 20 is therefore quite understandable. Moreover, these explanations by *Sifre* of the general phraseology in Ezekiel might have been based on a scriptural parallelism familiar to the exegetes:

Ezek. 20:33

As I live – declares the Lord God
–with a strong hand (בְּיָד חֲזָקָה),
and with an outstretched arm
(וּבְזְרוֹעַ נְטוּיָה),
and with overflowing fury (וּבְחֵמָה) I
will reign over you

Jer. 21:5, 7

And I Myself will battle against you
with an outstretched hand (בְּיָד
נְטוּיָה) and mighty arm
(וּבְזְרוֹעַ חֲזָקָה),
with anger and rage (וּבְחֵמָה) and
great wrath.

And then – declares the Lord – I will
deliver [...] those in this city who
survive the pestilence, the
sword, and the famine into the
hands of King Nebuchadrezzar

The pestilence-sword-famine threesome, in this order, appears in Jeremiah in relation to the phrases "outstretched hand", "mighty arm", and "great wrath" (the likes of which appear in Ezekiel); this may be the source of the midrashic attribution of this fearsome trio to Ezekiel.

In any event, the exegesis in the Haggadah may not be regarded as the result of a routine transfer of material from *Sifre*. Instead, this midrash must be understood within the context of the Haggadah itself, and at the very least this understanding must take into account the intent of the redactors of this extant exposition. Furthermore, the redactors' intent in the glosses of "pestilence" and "sword" can only be properly examined within the context

421 n. 12 stated, *kemah shene'emar* appears in *Sifre* on Numbers only in *Be-Ha'alotekha*; and J. N. Epstein, *Prolegomena ad Litteras Tannaiticas* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1957), pp. 597–600, argues that this came from a separate midrashic source.

16 See Ezek. 5:12, 17; 6:11–12; 7:15; 12:16; 14:21.

and stone'. As I live, declares the Lord God, I will reign over you with a strong hand, and with an outstretched arm, and with overflowing fury" (Ezek. 20:32-33). "With a strong hand" – this refers to the pestilence, as it is said (Exod. 9:3): "then the hand of the Lord will strike your livestock in the fields"; "and with an outstretched arm" – this refers to the sword, as it is said (1 Chron. 21:16): "with a drawn sword in his hand directed against Jerusalem"; "and with overflowing fury" – this refers to famine.

These scholars propose that the redactor of the Haggadah transferred the first two exegeses from their source, which glossed the passage in Ezekiel, and applied them to the parallel phrases in the text from Deuteronomy, thus creating their apparent incongruity in the Haggadah passage cited above.¹³

Not only does this approach fail to resolve the tremendous difficulties we encountered in the continuation of the Haggadah's exegesis; it is highly improbable that the midrash appears in *Sifre* in its original form. The *Sifre*'s lack of consistency is striking: while *Sifre* brings proof texts for the explications of "this refers to the pestilence" and "this refers to the sword", no such scriptural support is cited for the third explanation: "this refers to the famine". The latter explanation has no proof text and no parallel in the Haggadah. It appears, therefore, that the three midrashic explanations in *Sifre* were originally expounded without scriptural support, a format common to this type of exposition,¹⁴ and one which still exists in the case of the third. The *Sifre*'s students, however, who were accustomed to the exegeses of the Haggadah, interpolated the proofs they found therein,¹⁵ and in so doing left the third explanation patently bereft of scriptural proof.

13 Goldschmidt, *The Passover Haggadah*, p. 46; Safrai and Safrai, *Haggadah of the Sages*, p. 141.

14 And it is present in the embryonic form of the Haggadah's exegeses; see E. E. Urbach, review of Goldschmidt, *The Passover Haggadah, Its Sources and History* (Hebrew) *Kirjath Sepher* 36 (1961), p. 146 (= Urbach, *Studies in Judaica* [Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1998], p. 746); my article, "The Midrash", p. 49 and n. 47. See below.

15 The influence of the Haggadah is noticeable in one of the textual versions of *Sifre* in another matter, as well: ed. Horovitz of *Sifre* ad loc. has the wording "as it is said [*kemah shene'emar*]", based on MS London (while the other manuscripts and the editio princeps read only "*shene'emar*"), and is probably inspired by the similar language in the Haggadah. As M. I. Kahana, *Sifre Zuta on Deuteronomy* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 2002), p.

with the signs is tenuous, especially since the staff was involved in only a few of the plagues.¹¹ Moreover, the wording "'and by signs' – this is the staff" is surprising, since the staff itself did not comprise the signs, but was rather only the instrument through which they appeared.¹²

2. The Plague and Sword Expositions: Transferred from *Sifre* on Numbers?

Scholars sought to resolve the difficulties in the exposition's first two paragraphs by turning to the parallel in *Sifre* on Numbers, para. 115 (ed. Horovitz, p. 128):

"And what you have in mind shall never come to pass, when you say, 'We will be like the nations, like the families of the lands, worshiping wood

portents, war, a mighty hand, and an outstretched arm, and therefore it cannot be used to specifically deduce the meaning of "*mora'im*". Cf. Goldschmidt, *The Passover Haggadah*, p. 46: "This interpretation is forced". Here as well, the enormity of the difficulty is made evident by the *Midrash ha-Gadol's* adaptation of this exposition (see above, n. 8): "'And awesome power' – this refers to the revelation of the *Shekhinah*, 'and Israel saw the great work' (Exod. 14:31)". This problem apparently led *Midrash ha-Gadol* to replace the verse that supports this interpretation with another one. *Midrash ha-Gadol* probably based this adaptation on *Sifre on Deuteronomy*, para. 357, p. 431: "'and for all the awesome power [*ha-mora' ha-gadol*]' (Deut. 34:12) – this is the splitting of the Red Sea". Although not cited in or mentioned in connection with the Haggadah, since this exposition also contains the wording "*mora' gadol*" and is applied to the miracle at the Red Sea, *Midrash ha-Gadol* could take the logical step of adapting the exegesis of the Haggadah, thus freeing the latter of its difficulties. However, even assuming that this exposition in *Midrash ha-Gadol* is based on *Mekhilta* on Deuteronomy (see above, n. 8), the problematic nature of the midrashic expansion in the Haggadah nonetheless remains since the verse "and Israel saw the great work" does not appear in any of the versions of the Haggadah.

- 11 The common resolution offered by the Haggadah's commentaries is based on an amoraic *midrash aggadah* that the letters ער"ך צ"ן ש באח"ב were inscribed on the staff, which, *ipso facto*, then played a part in all the plagues (see, e.g., Katzenelenbogen, *Torat Hayyim*, p. 116). The difficulty here is patent; see Goldschmidt, *The Passover Haggadah*, p. 46; cf. Safrai and Safrai, *Haggadah of the Sages*, pp. 142–43.
- 12 See, e.g., the commentary on the Haggadah by Rashbaz (R. Simeon ben Zemah Duran), *Yavin Shemu'ah* (Leghorn, 1770) ad loc.: "He called the staff 'signs', for the signs were performed with it". The difficulty is evident in this commentary, but Duran offers no possible resolution.

sword, a term that is not mentioned anywhere in the biblical description of the plagues?⁹ The derivation of *mora* from *mareh* (i.e., sight: "the revelation of the *Shekhinah*") instead of from *yirah*, awe, is unsupported by the proof text that merely repeats the wording of "*mora*".¹⁰ As for the staff, the connection

the Haggadah's exposition, for all of its extant versions mention blood, not plagues.

- 9 See, e.g., *Shibbolei ha-Leket*, p. 90: "And what plague of the sword did we find in Egypt?" He bases his answer on an amoraic exegesis of the verse (Ps. 136:10): "Who struck Egypt through their firstborn", wherein the threatened firstborn struck their fathers so that they would release the Hebrews, and thereby obviate the need for the plague of the firstborn; this understanding of the Haggadah's intent is common among the commentators (see, e.g., the commentaries by the *Rishonim* [early authorities] collected by Mordekhai Leib Katzenelenbogen, *Haggadah shel Pesah Torat Hayyim* [Jerusalem, 1998], pp. 102–3). As was already noted by Safrai and Safrai, *Haggadah of the Sages*, p. 141 n. 13: "It could hardly be assumed that the tannaitic *midrashim* and the author of the Haggadah referred to this late aggadah, and it is highly doubtful that this aggadah suits the exposition that the Lord brought forth the Israelites 'by an outstretched arm - this refers to the sword.'" In terms of its content, this exegesis does not need the sword, which is absent from its Aramaic sources (*Pesikta de-Rav Kahana*, "*Vayehi ba-Hatsi ha-Laylah*" [Exod. 12:29: "In the middle of the night"]", ed. Mandelbaum, p. 129; *Pesikta Rabbati*, "*Vayehi ba-Hatsi ha-Laylah*", ed. Friedmann [Ish-Shalom], 88a), and appears only in its Hebrew version (*Tanhuma, Bo*, ed. Buber, 18; *Midrash Tehillim*, 136:10, ed. Buber, 260b). The sword's addition may very well have been influenced by the Haggadah's commentary, without which there would be no need for the sword. In his glosses on *Midrash Tannaim* on Deut. 26:5, p. 173 n. 9), R. David Zvi Hoffmann offered a novel solution for why pestilence and the sword were mentioned: since the text states, before these expositions, that God Himself brought forth the Israelites from Egypt, the exegete mentions the plague of pestilence and the sword [= the plague of the firstborn], which were performed by God Himself. In addition to Hoffmann's problematic identification of the sword with the plague of the firstborn, two further objections may be raised to using his interpretation to resolve the Haggadah's difficulty: first, the plague of *a'rov* (harmful creatures) was also performed directly by God, but is not included here; second, his interpretation is consistent with the version of *Midrash Tannaim*, which omits the blood (see above, the preceding note), but not to that of the Haggadah where pestilence, the sword, and blood are mentioned. His explanation, therefore, adds nothing to our understanding of the Haggadah.
- 10 The commentaries on the Haggadah often turn to the end of the verse: "[that] the Lord wrought in Egypt, against Pharaoh and all his household before your eyes" to find a connection to sight, the last Hebrew word (*le-einekha*) meaning "before your eyes" (see, e.g., Katzenelenbogen, *Torat Hayyim*, pp. 113–14). However, "before your eyes" modifies the entire verse, which (in addition to *mora'im*) includes wondrous acts, signs and

by signs" denotes two; "and portents" denotes two. These are the ten plagues that the Omnipresent brought upon the Egyptians in Egypt.⁶

The exegesis of "*davar aher*", which is the only exposition in the Land of Israel Haggadahs, is quite unremarkable: the Bible's description of the manner in which the Israelites were brought forth from Egypt refers to the ten plagues; and even though the count of ten in this verse is midrashic, the very reference to the plagues of Egypt corresponds with the simple meaning of Scripture.⁷ The first exegesis, in contrast, is puzzling, from start to finish: what makes the plagues of pestilence and blood unique, setting them apart from the other plagues, so that they are specifically mentioned, at the beginning and at the end of the exposition?⁸ And of what relevance here is the

6 The listing of the ten plagues, which follows in the extant Haggadahs, appears in only some of the Land of Israel versions; see Goldschmidt, *The Passover Haggadah*, p. 46; Safrai and Safrai, *Haggadah of the Sages*, p. 143; Rovner, "A New Version", p. 427.

7 See, e.g., Deut. 6:21–22: "We were slaves to Pharaoh in Egypt and the Lord freed us from Egypt with a mighty hand. The Lord wrought marvelous and destructive signs and portents in Egypt, against Pharaoh and all his household before our eyes".

8 See, e.g., the commentary by R. Zedekiah ben Abraham, author of *Shibbolei ha-Leket*, on the Haggadah: "My brother R. Benjamin [...] wrote: Why are the plague of blood and the plague of pestilence mentioned, of all the ten plagues?" (Yaakov Shemuel Spiegel [ed.], *Seder Hovat Lel Shimurim: Lel ha-Seder u-Ferush ha-Haggadah ... be-Sefer Shibbolei ha-Leket* [Lod, 1998], p. 92); see his forced explanation, which is built on numerological interpretations and serves merely to emphasize the difficulty in resolving the problem. Many commentators explained pestilence's uniqueness by resorting to the amoraic aggadic exegesis that pestilence accompanied each of the plagues (see Safrai and Safrai, *Haggadah of the Sages*, pp. 40–41). The redactor of the Haggadah, however, chose to cite the well-known verse on the plague of pestilence; so it is difficult to argue that he is referring to pestilence's unique quality of accompanying all the plagues as this approach is nowhere to be found in the Haggadah. Moreover, if pestilence is mentioned only because it accompanied all the plagues, how are we to explain the mention of the blood? Another version of our exegesis in *Midrash Tannaim* on Deut. 26:5 (p. 173): "'And with portents' – this refers to the plagues: 'I will set portents in the sky and on earth; blood and fire and pillars of smoke'", resolves the problem by having plagues take the place of blood. The author of *Midrash ha-Gadol* on Deut. 26:5, p. 588, which was the source for *Midrash Tannaim*, probably exchanged blood for plagues thus once again implicitly attesting to the immense difficulty posed by the mention of blood (see also below, n. 10). However, even if we were to assume that the author of *Midrash ha-Gadol* took this original exegesis from the lost *Mekhilta* on Deuteronomy, this still does not contribute to our understanding of

wording "*davar aher*"⁴; in contrast, the Land of Israel versions contain only the second exposition.⁵ Our discussion will focus on the first exegesis and its relation to the second. Notwithstanding its focus on the exegesis of the passage's last verse, our discussion will also shed light on the way the Haggadah's midrashic exposition is formed in its entirety.

1. "By a Mighty Hand": The First Exegesis and Its Difficulties

We read in the Haggadah:

"By a mighty hand" – this refers to the pestilence, as it is said (Exod. 9:3): "then the hand of the Lord will strike your livestock in the fields – the horses, the asses, the camels, the cattle, and the sheep – with a very severe pestilence";

"by an outstretched [*netuyah*] arm" – this refers to the sword, as it is said (1 Chron. 21:16): "with a drawn sword in his hand directed [*netuyah*] against Jerusalem";

"and awesome power [*u-ve-mora gadol*]" – this refers to the revelation of the *Shekhinah*, as it is said (Deut. 4:34): "Or has God ventured to go and take for Himself one nation from the midst of another by prodigious acts, by signs and portents, by war, by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm and awesome power [*u-ve-mora'im gedolim*], as the Lord your God did for you in Egypt before your very eyes?";

"and by signs" – this is the staff, as it is said (Exod. 4:17): "And take with you this staff, with which you shall perform the signs";

"and portents" – this refers to the blood, as it is said (Joel 3:3): "I will set portents in the sky and on earth; blood and fire and pillars of smoke".

Davar aher [another explanation]: "by a mighty hand" denotes two; "by an outstretched arm" denotes two; "and awesome power" denotes two; "and

4 On this term, see my article, "On the Relationship between Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Halakhic *Midrashim*" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 68:2 (1999): p. 198 n. 48.

5 See Safrai and Safrai, *Haggadah of the Sages*, p. 143; Rovner, p. 427.

"By a Mighty Hand": An Explication of the Exegesis of the Passover Haggadah

David Henshke

The Passover Haggadah centers around the exegesis of the passage beginning (Deut. 26:5) "My father was a fugitive Aramean".¹ The extant Haggadah contains a series of expositions of the passage's verses, and we also possess additional tannaitic exegeses of some verses.² The early Land of Israel versions of the Haggadah expound only half the verses, but all contain exegesis of the passage's last verse, which is the focus of our discussion: "The Lord brought us forth from Egypt by a mighty hand, by an outstretched arm and awesome power, and by signs and portents" (v. 8).³ This verse is further distinguished by being the only one for which the extant Haggadah offers two different exegeses, separated, as is usual in such cases, by the

- 1 See mPes 10:4: "He begins with the disgrace and ends with the praise, and he expounds from 'My father was a fugitive Aramean' until he finishes the entire section". On this sentence's conclusion in the Mishnah's version, see the references in my article, "The *Midrash* of the Passover *Haggadah*" (Hebrew), *Sidra* 4 (1988), p. 33 n. 1. On the question of the relationship between the two parts of the sentence, see *idem*, pp. 33–39. On the need for this type of exegesis and its nature see below, n. 34.
- 2 See *Sifre on Deuteronomy*, 311, ed. Finkelstein, p. 319; *Sifre Zuta on Deuteronomy*, ed. Kahana, pp. 415–19; *Midrash Tannaim* on Deut. 26:5–8, ed. Hoffmann, pp. 172–73 (taken from *Midrash ha-Gadol* ad loc., ed. Fisch, pp. 587–88).
- 3 See Ernst Daniel Goldschmidt, *The Passover Haggadah, Its Sources and History* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1960), p. 34 n. 18; Shemuel and Ze'ev Safrai, *Haggadah of the Sages* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1998), p. 130; Jay Rovner, "A New Version of the Eres Israel Haggadah Liturgy and the Evolution of the Eres Israel *Miqra' Bikkurim* Midrash", *Jewish Quarterly Review* 92:3, 4 (2002): p. 427. For the bibliographical details of the versions of the Land of Israel Haggadah, see Rovner, p. 425 n. 24.

Daliah Marks examines the prayer book of the Reform movement in Israel, comparing it to the prayer book of the Reform movement in other countries, showing how the unique status of Israel has made its impact on the Reform prayer book.

The synagogue is also a place for reading the Torah and studying it. Its function as a place for the communal reading of the Torah may antedate its use as a place of prayer. An ancient tradition requires the translation into Aramaic, the vernacular of the times, of the Torah reading. This, in turn, became an individual requirement to read each verse of the Torah twice and include its Aramaic translation. The history of this requirement is discussed by Chayyim Talbi.

Finally, we may note that the synagogue has been a site of polemics ever since R. Gamliel included a blessing against the *minim* as part of the liturgy. In a more positive sense, the siddur includes a statement of belief (אני מאמין) that is roughly based on the thirteen principles of Maimonides. However, scholars have noted that there are differences between Maimonides' version and the formulation of these beliefs in the siddur. Eli Gurfinkel discovered a manuscript which served as an intermediary between Maimonides' version and that of the siddur. Gurfinkel provides us with a detailed survey of each principle showing how it was transmitted and understood.

Finally, I wish to thank those who helped so much in the publication of this volume. Meshulam Gotlieb ably edited the English section. My deep thanks to those who completed the work, Ms. Margalit Avisar, director of Bar-Ilan University Press, and Ms. Anne Lamdan for her devoted labor, which contributed so much to improving the volume and saved us from so many errors.

Finally, I wish to thank Mr. Shuki Golan, general manager of Machon Lander, for participating in the publication of this volume. Machon Lander held a seminar in the summer of 2009 which was devoted to synagogue life and it is hoped that this seminar will be an annual event. It is my hope that the presentations at the seminar will serve as a basis for more regular appearances of *Kenishta*.

Joseph Tabory

deeply into debt was on the verge of breaking up, when the greater community and a strong man, R. Meir Zubeiri, intervened and saved the synagogue. R. Zubeiri employed various methods to raise funds for the synagogue, but selling honors was not one of them. This method of fund raising is discussed by Ron Kleinman, who provides a lot of information about various aspects of this feature of synagogue life, exploring the different approaches adopted in various communities at different times for raising money in this way.

The main purpose of the synagogue is, of course, to serve as a house of prayer. Ancient prayer terms are discussed in articles by Moshe Bar-Asher and Menahem Kister. Bar-Asher discusses the formula established by the sages for a "proper" blessing. He points out that the style of blessings is different from that of ordinary conversation. One of the two main distinguishing characteristics of the blessings style is the emphasis placed on using Hebrew and the concomitant refusal to use words and terms borrowed from other languages common to the area. The other characteristic is the blessings' tremendous affinity for biblical Hebrew, rather than for the spoken Hebrew of the times.

Menahem Kister continues his examination of terms used in prayers considered of late origin and shows their roots in Second Temple literature, Qumran scrolls and apocryphal works. In his article, he discusses the use of the response "Blessed is He, Blessed is His Name, Blessed is He on His royal throne" (ברוך הוא, ברוך שמו, ברוך הוא על כסא מלכותו) and the invitation to guests extended at the beginning of the Passover Seder: "all who are hungry, come and take part".

Kister's article directs our attention to the Passover Haggadah as part of Jewish liturgy – even though the Haggadah is mainly read in a domestic ceremony. Its more direct connection with the synagogue is the custom of reading the Haggadah in the synagogue on the Shabbat before Passover. David Henshke contributes an article devoted to the Haggadah in which he offers a novel interpretation of a midrashic text from the Haggadah.

To return to the realm of the siddur itself, we find two articles that, taken together, emphasize the lengthy history of Jewish prayer. Uri Erlich presents the text of the amidah found in the prayer book of R. Shlomo b. Natan and we learn from this article that this prayer book was one of the more well-known ones in the Cairo Genizah period. Looking at a very different world of prayer,

Introduction

This volume is the fourth in a series of studies on the world of the synagogue. This volume, like its predecessors, reflects the rich variety of life in the synagogue and in the research of synagogue life. From a chronological standpoint, the articles cover a period of about two thousand years, from prayer texts in Qumran until the most recent liturgical developments in the State of Israel. The study of recent developments also covers a wide variety of fields, ranging from multi-ethnic Orthodox communities to the Reform movement in Israel.

Reuven Gafni's article refers to the "building" of a synagogue as a verb, not as a noun. He discusses the building of synagogues in urban neighborhoods belonging to workers. The original title of this article, "Not to be Taken for Granted", expressed wonder at the fact that those who designed these neighbourhoods thought it was possible, and even preferable, to fashion a Jewish urban community which would not have a synagogue. In time, synagogues were built in these communities and Gafni portrays the struggles and disputes surrounding their construction. It is well-known that rural communities in Israel were built by people whose life style did not require a synagogue and who even considered synagogues an anathema. Nevertheless with the passing of the years, many of these communities also constructed synagogues, even though regular prayer services were not and are not necessarily conducted in them.

Articles by Nissim Leon, Aharon Gaimani, and Ron Kleinman, focus on life in the synagogue. Nissim Leon presents us with a sociological and historical analysis of the ethnic synagogue in the State of Israel, during the first sixty years of its existence. The author shows how the "Oriental" synagogue, originally founded on an ethnic basis has been transformed into a synagogue founded on an ideological one. The article discusses "Oriental" synagogues but those conversant with "Ashkenazi" synagogues will perceive that a similar metamorphosis has occurred in these communities.

Aharon Gaimani describes how a synagogue in Yemen that had gone

Nissim Leon	Ethnicity, Ultra-Orthodoxy, and Gender in the Multiple-Ethnic Synagogue in Israel	191
Dalia Marx	Ideological, Theological and Literary Aspects of the Israeli Reform Liturgy	221
Menahem Kister	Ancient Ritual Formulae and their Permutations	263
Ron S. Kleinman	Selling <i>Aliyot</i> (Calls to the Torah) and <i>Mitzvot</i> (Honors) in the Synagogue: The Custom, Its Evolution and the Rationale Behind It	279
	Abstract of English Article	341

CONTENTS

English Section

	Introduction	7
David Henshke	"By a Mighty Hand": An Explication of the Exegesis of the Passover Haggadah	11
	Abstracts of Hebrew Articles	29

Hebrew Section

	Introduction	7
Uri Erlich	The Text of the <i>Amidah</i> in the Siddur of R. Shlomo b. Natan and the Question of the Provenance of the Siddur	9
Moshe Bar-Asher	The Formula of Blessings Ordained by the Sages	27
Eli Gurfinkel	The Influence of Ideological Changes on the Text of the Declaration of Faith (אני מאמין)	51
Aharon Gaimani	The Hajaji Synagogue in San'a and the Leadership of R. Me'ir Zubeiri	113
Reuven Gafni	Confrontations over the Establishment of Synagogues in Workers' Quarters in <i>Eretz Israel</i> in the Second and Third Decades of the Twentieth Century	137
Chayim Talbi	Towards a History of the Weekly Reading of the Torah: Reading the Text Twice and the Translation Once	155

Editorial Board

D. Adan-Bayewitz, B. Bar-Tikvah, E. Hazan, D. Sperber, Y. Spiegel

Published with the assistance of:

The Zoltán and Lya Gaspar Chair for Talmudic Studies

The Naftal-Yoffe Center for the Study and Dissemination of Oral Law

'Beit Shalom', Kyoto Japan

M. Egulsky Endowment Fund

ISBN 978-965-226-395-7

©

Copyright Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan

All rights reserved, including those of translation.

No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Israel – 2010

'Graphit' Press Ltd., Jerusalem

KENISHTA

STUDIES OF THE SYNAGOGUE WORLD

4

Edited by

Joseph Tabory



BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY PRESS
RAMAT-GAN



LANDER INSTITUTE
ACADEMIC CENTER, JERUSALEM

KENISHTA


Studies of the Synagogue World


4

KENISHTA

Studies of the Synagogue World

4

 **BAR-ILAN**
UNIVERSITY PRESS

 **LANDER INSTITUTE**
ACADEMIC CENTER, JERUSALEM