

Studies in Judaism

**Studies in
Jewish Prayer**

Tzvee Zahavy

*For my wife Bernice,
as a small token of my gratitude
for her beauty, her constant love, and her inspiration.*

Acknowledgements

The American Council of Learned Societies awarded me a substantial fellowship in support of research leading to this volume. The National Endowment for the Humanities awarded me a Summer Stipend in 1988 for related research. I thank also my students at the University of Minnesota. Several served as research assistants and contributed in many small but significant ways to this venture.

I recognize my debt to my Talmud teachers at Yeshiva University's Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary. I had the treasured privilege of studying the Babylonian Talmud as an undergraduate with Rabbi Gershom Yankelwitz and Rabbi Aharon Lichtenstein and of receiving postgraduate instruction for four years in both the Talmud and Shulkhan Arukh from HaRav Joseph B. Soloveitchik.

I gratefully acknowledge the indelible influence on these studies of the work of my teacher and friend, Professor Jacob Neusner, the founding pillar of academic Jewish studies in the United States. He has shown us all how to analyze late antique rabbinism in contemporary terms through his own lucid and systematic work on the Mishnah, the Tosefta, the Talmud of the Land of Israel, the Babylonian Talmud, and the Midrash, and in his ongoing work on the remaining evidence of rabbinic Judaism.

I dedicate this book with great affection to my wife, Bernice. She read my words and offered criticism to every draft of this book. When I needed motivation, she reminded me of the value of learning and the importance of scholarship. She inspired me to complete this volume and see it through to publication. I am indeed lucky to have a wife with such exceptional beauty and taste, learning and judgment.

*Tzvee Zahavy
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota USA*

Contents

	Acknowledgements	
I.	Methods for the Analysis of Early Jewish Prayer.....	1
II.	The Beginnings of Rabbinic Prayer: Textual Evidence.....	11
	A. The Formative age: Berakhot Before 70.....	
	B. The Age of Internal Conflicts, Self-definition and Transition: Berakhot at Yavneh.....	
	C. The Age of Standardization and Systematization: Berakhot at Usha.....	
	D. The Mishnah-Redactor's Unified Theory of Prayer and Blessings	
	E. The World of Early Rabbinic Prayer.....	
III.	The Synagogue in Mishnah, Tosefta and the Talmud of the Land of Israel.....	40
IV.	The Scribal Influence on Prayer: The <i>Shema`</i>	79
V.	Priestly and Patriarchal Influences on Prayer: The Eighteen Blessings.....	87
VI.	From Temple to Synagogue: The Hallel in Early Rabbinic Judaism.....	95
VII.	The Psychology of Early Rabbinic Prayer	103
VIII.	A Rabbinic Compendium on Prayer: The Editorial Structure of the Talmud of the Land of Israel Tractate Berakhot.....	113

Chapter I

Methods for the Analysis of Early Jewish Prayer

In the past decade there has been renewed scholarly interest in the development of Jewish prayer in its most formative period, from 200 B.C.E. to 200 C.E. Current researchers are applying diverse social scientific and historical methods to the study of the ancient world in general, and specifically to the development of Judaic culture, enabling us to engage in a more complex and fruitful historical mode of reconstructing the emergence of Judaic liturgy and ritual in late antiquity.

The most original of the contemporary investigators have emphasized the need for interdisciplinary perspectives in this area and have developed new modes of social scientific and aesthetic criticism of Jewish liturgy.¹ This represents a third and diverse stage in the critical analysis of Jewish liturgical development. Scholarship early in this past century took a mainly reductionistic historical approach to Jewish prayer. That work is now outdated. The more recent form-critical method dominated the second phase of research. That mode of scholarship has proven unproductive.²

I briefly summarize some of the shortcomings of early reconstructions of liturgical development in these previous stages. Then I consider the advantages of interdisciplinary studies of Jewish prayer. In subsequent chapters I propose a fresh analysis of the crucial phases of the institutionalization of the core prayers of classical rabbinic liturgy that I hope modestly illustrates the advantages of advancing methods of analysis.

As a critique of earlier research, I outline nine methodological premises.

1. Many early reconstructions of liturgical development were often theological or

¹See L. A. Hoffman, *Beyond the Text*, Indiana, 1987, especially his introductory discussion of the history of the study of Jewish liturgy. Also see my "A New Approach to Early Jewish Prayer," in *Judaism: the Next Ten Years*, ed. B. Bokser, Chico, 1980, pp. 45-60 and S. C. Reif, "Jewish Liturgical Research: Past, Present and Future," in the *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 34 (1983), pp. 161-70.

²See Hoffman, *ibid.*, and R. S. Sarason, "On the use of method in the modern study of Jewish liturgy," in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, ed. W. S. Green, Missoula, 1978, pp. 97-172.

apologetic.³ No doubt the ideology of Jewish ritual was significant in its time of origin and continued to have theological impact as it was modified and interpreted in later epochs. Research in this area must nevertheless avoid theological-apologetic explanations of Judaic institutions and take care not to impute any unique or timeless value to the philosophical content of Judaic ritual.

2. Rabbinism was a new Judaic system that took shape after the destruction of the Temple in the first century. Its world views and ways of life represent distinct configurations in the history of Judaism, discontinuous in many ways with prior Israelite systems in Hellenistic Israel and the diaspora. Most scholarly works of early this century, and among them many attempted reconstructions of liturgical development, did not differentiate rabbinic Judaism as a new system of the post destruction era.

Research that sees Judaism as a single linear progression from Moses or Ezra through the classical age of rabbinism rests on a subtle form of historicistic apologetics. Scholars with theological intent incline, for instance, to posit the early origin of synagogue or the antiquity of certain prayers in the absence of evidence or in spite of abundant proof to the contrary.⁴

3. The Jews of first- to third-century Israel, the most formative interval of liturgical growth, lived under imperial Roman rule and within social configurations dominated by local leaders, often rabbis or other holy men. Their circumstance made them repress aspirations of national political sovereignty. Their cultural output, including the formation of liturgical rituals, must be understood as a facet of this context. Many early reconstructions of liturgical development were based on deficient models of the social and political realities of the times.⁵

4. The main creative forces of rabbinic religious development derived from internal conflict and competition among the leaders of factions within Judaism. Among those who called themselves "rabbis" we assume were scribes, priests, members of the patriarchal house and others seeking "leadership," that is to say, dominance and control, over local communal life.

S. Talmon has developed a more advanced social scientific approach to liturgical development for Qumran. Some of his basic premises are informative, as the following summary statement illustrates:

³Examples of apologetics abound and need not detain us. See for instance Sarason's discussion of the work of Zwi Karl, *Approaches*, pp. 122-24. Popular works on Jewish liturgy have obvious apologetic purposes, cf. D. Holisher, *The Synagogue and Its People*, New York, 1955, Evelyn Garfiel, *Service of the Heart*, New Jersey, 1958, A. Millgram, *Jewish Worship*, Philadelphia, 1971. These represent works of great devotion and erudition but avowedly have no critical agenda.

⁴Nearly all major works in the discipline lack a consciousness of systemic shifts in Judaism. A. Z. Idelson, *Jewish Liturgy and its Development*, New York, 1932, and I. Elbogen, *Prayer in Israel in its Historical Development (Hebrew)*, Tel Aviv, 1972, are examples.

⁵Examples of inadequate models of social and political life [Pharisee, Sadducee, Essene; plebeians, patricians] are common in the work of writers like Finkelstein. See Sarason, *ibid.*, and Hoffman, p. 8 and p. 184, n.16.

In order to compensate the loss of the sacrificial cult, and by reason of the group-centered ideology, the Covenanters especially promoted deindividualized, stereotyped forms of prayer that could be adapted without further qualification to communal devotion. Their egalitarian principles, the right of each member to scrutinize the deeds of his fellow, the hierarchical structure of the community, and the resulting system of close supervision of the lower-ranking by their superiors were conducive to the development of worship patterns fixed in time, openly observable, and removed from the sphere of subjective *ad hoc* decisions with their concomitant individualized forms of expression.⁶

We rarely find succinct, neutral assessments like this one in early reconstructions of liturgical development since they mainly misunderstood the internal dynamics, and especially the role of prayer, within Jewish culture and society in the first three centuries C.E.⁷

5. The artificial church-sect distinction of religious organizational life must be rejected as an inappropriate model for the description of the setting of late antique Judaism. We cannot simply attribute the dynamics of ritual development to reactions to heresies against normative practice and thought. Many early reconstructions of liturgical development clung to the notion that prayers often developed within a normative Judaism specifically to oppose sectarian heresies.

This supposition misled historians of Jewish liturgy to sort out variant traditions and locate the *Urtext*, which they associated with the imagined normative tradition, and deviant versions, which in some cases they connected to diverse heretical settings.⁸

6. We ought to assume that the primary targets of negative speech and action in ritual were those leaders closest in competition for allegiance of the populace at large. It is wrong to postulate readily that external challenges to the faith led to the formation of major components of Judaic rituals. Only where we find no likely candidate internal to the religion should we consider external competing systems of religion as targets of ritual polemic. Some early reconstructions of liturgical development placed too much emphasis on liturgy as a rebuttal to external forces such as early Christianity and Persian dualism.⁹

⁶S. Talmon, *The World of Qumran from Within*, Jerusalem, 1989, p. 239.

⁷Examples of misunderstood internal dynamics include those who did not see Roman imperial domination as crucial; those who did not consider the distinction among priestly, scribal and patriarchal interests; and those who did not recognize conflict as central to Judaism.

⁸Hoffman, *op. cit.*, p. 4. In their references to liturgy many Israeli writers of earlier in this century such as G. Alon and E. E. Urbach and some American historians like S. Zeitlin frequently employ the model of "normative versus heretical" doctrine and practice.

⁹K. Kohler, *The Origins of the Synagogue and Church*, New York, 1929, believed liturgy reacted to Persian dualism; I. Elbogen thought the Amidah prayer for the restoration of the Davidic line was a polemic of the Exilarch in Babylonia; see the discussion in Sarason, *op. cit.*, p.

Hoffman describes the assumptions of the historicist approach:

The "original" prayer and subsequent additions to it all were explained as arising in response to various events and periods, as if prayer must always be a rational response to political persecution, a reaction to a foreign ideology, a blow against heresy, or an organism's response to the thousand and one other data that constitute a nation-folk's history.¹⁰

7. Both Hoffman and Sarason characterize how the philological approach dominated Jewish liturgical research and stood behind the work of the earlier historians and the form critics. Philologists did not claim to do Jewish history but did make many historical claims. Proponents of this text-based approach did not articulate a coherent model of social or historical circumstances for prayer and drew hasty and at times incomprehensible conclusions based mainly on unfounded assumptions.

8. Form-criticism, based on a model for relating religious ritual to social institutions, replaced philology as a dominant paradigm for research. A shortcoming of the form-critical approach was that it did not correlate these collective establishments to appropriate evidence of their existence or translate them into generalizable and comprehensible categories for the history of religion.

One of the most prominent historians of Jewish liturgy, Joseph Heinemann forcefully promoted this creative and provocative methodological model for the study of early rabbinic liturgy based on distinctions of social settings.¹¹ However, despite the breadth and depth of his studies, he based his form-critical theories on questionable assumptions.

Heinemann assumed that prayer was spread through adoption in one or another *sitz im leben* in early rabbinism. He associated prayers with the Bet Midrash or study hall, the Synagogue, the Law Court, and the Temple. Each of these was a complex and controversial institutional construct in its own right, a point to which Heinemann did not pay sufficient attention. He erred in his basic assumptions that these were uniform and mature institutions in the first and second centuries. His theory accordingly was built upon precarious foundations without establishing firm basis of support and lacks persuasiveness.

Hoffman's critique on this issue is milder, "Heinemann may at times have insufficient evidence to postulate details about the functioning of a given social

108, 110.

¹⁰*Op. cit.*, p. 5.

¹¹See *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns*, Berlin and New York, 1977. In addition to the shortcomings I describe, he moreover misinterprets some of the prayers themselves, missing the main distinction between national and political ideology on the one hand, and the enunciation of scribal ideals on the other. Much of the evidence he assembled must be analyzed more aggressively within the historical and social spectrum. Others have posited infiltration of political forces into the early formation of the liturgy. See for instance, C. Roth, "Melekh HaOlam: Zealot influence in the Liturgy," *Journal for Jewish Studies* 11 (1960), pp. 173-75. Also see the work of L. Finkelstein, "The Development of the Amidah," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 16 (1925-6), pp. 142-69, regarding Zealot influence on the Amidah, discussed below.

institution, the workings of which he takes for granted in his etiology of a given prayer."¹² The speculative and arbitrary bases of liturgical form criticism rendered it a somewhat sterile methodology, unable to lead others to additional insights based on its assertions and conclusions.

9. Other facets of Heinemann's basic theory are counterintuitive as, for example, "At first many different forms of the same basic prayer grew up in a somewhat haphazard fashion, and that only afterwards, gradually in the course of time, did the rabbis impose their legal norms on this vast body of material."¹³ Heinemann does not provide firm enough evidence to establish a historical basis for a loose populist process of development of prayer. Heinemann furthermore neglected the essential role of the leadership of the elite in propagating liturgy to serve their political and social interests. He too often employed the unspecified passive voice to describe the growth of liturgical ritual.

Other scholars both early and recent have lapsed often into the habit of describing liturgical growth as a kind of spontaneous generation. "Liturgy developed . . .," said Stefan Reif in an article. Sarason declared, "The Eighteen Benedictions did not all come into being . . ." At greater length Hoffman posits, "Worship is a category of human experience with rules of its own, and . . . these rules function in their own way to result in the formation of a liturgy."¹⁴

Considering these nine areas of weakness in the study of Jewish prayer we must take a fresh look at some basic issues. We ought not reject form criticism and return to the simple empirico-positivism of the past. We need to carry forward its basic idea that liturgy grows out of social and political institutional life. Fortunately, in the past few years Lee Levine has published an interdisciplinary study that represents one solid and sustained exercise in delineating the social ramifications of institutional structures in rabbinic culture.¹⁵ Together with Saldarini's recent inquiry and the extensive critical studies of Jacob Neusner that relate the major corpora of rabbinic literature to the social world of late antique Judaism, we now have firmer underpinnings for a revisit to the complex formative world of classic Judaic liturgy.¹⁶ The time has come to renegotiate aspects of the historical analysis of the growth of Jewish prayer in light of the current deeper and more complex understandings of the political and social circumstances of Judaism in Israel in late antiquity.

New analysis must be devoid of theological-apologetic intent. It must recognize the systemic discontinuities of rabbinism in Judaic history. It must take account of the relative influence of local and national forces over internal Jewish life and the role of

¹² *Beyond the Text*, p. 8.

¹³ *Prayer in the Talmud*, p. 7.

¹⁴ Reif, "Research," p. 162; Sarason, "On the Use," p. 101; Hoffman, *Beyond the Text*, p. 8.

¹⁵ Lee Levine, *The Rabbinic Class of Roman Palestine in Late Antiquity*, New York and Jerusalem, 1989. This study deals mainly with the third and fourth centuries but its methodology demonstrates what may be done with several types of evidence for the earlier and later periods as well.

¹⁶ A. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees*, Wilmington, 1988. J. Neusner's representative synthetic work for this period is *Judaism: the Evidence of the Mishnah*, Chicago, 1981.

religious ritual in those relationships. It must take seriously the effects of conflict on religious institutional change. It must broaden its view of religion and social life beyond the paradigm of norm against heresy. It must resist the temptation to posit changes in Judaism based on reactions to conditions outside the defined boundaries of the group's identity.

These stated desiderata serve as crucial, though often implicit grounding for my analysis, especially in chapters IV and V below where I engage in a discussion of the institutionalization of the main components of rabbinic liturgy. Those chapters take a topical approach to the political and social ramifications of the *Shema`* and Amidah in the first and second centuries.

In chapter III, I examine the evidence in the major corpora, Mishnah, Tosefta and Yerushalmi, of rabbinic involvement in the synagogues of Israel in the first to third centuries. In chapter II, I focus on Berakhot, a specific tractate in Mishnah and Tosefta, to draw out of that evidence a panorama of the evolution of rabbinic beliefs and activities related to its main agenda: prayer, the meal rituals and blessings.

In preparation for that exercise let me discuss the difficulties of using the evidence of Mishnah and Tosefta tractate Berakhot for an account of the history of early Jewish prayer.¹⁷

We face a variety of snares when we come to study traditional religious texts, such as the tractates Berakhot in Mishnah (M.) and Tosefta (T.). Since these are the first segments of authoritative rabbinic documents that were brought to their final form in Israel in the early part of the third century they are distant from us in space, time and culture. Ostensibly these legal and anecdotal statements represent valuable sets of data pertaining to some dimensions of the historical and intellectual life of the Jews of Israel of the first through third centuries. They appear to inform us of what some leading rabbis of that time thought about the world in which they lived, their philosophical concepts, their ideas and concerns on a variety of subjects.¹⁸

But these are not simple texts. Rabbis of the third century edited them with great care to exclude the materials they found objectionable and to include only those very few teachings that for theological or political reasons they wished to propound. They did not tell us outright what if any comprehensive social or philosophical viewpoints underlie these texts. I do hope in this essay and in future studies to intuit and reconstruct some semblance of the rabbinic outlooks, even some dimensions of the ethics and metaphysics of the Judaic leadership that taught their disciples that in these documents were elements of the oral Torah given to Moses on Mount Sinai.

The tractates of Berakhot in M. and T. dwell mainly on the subjects of prayer and blessings and of mealtime commensality. As far as we know, some followers of the

¹⁷In general in this volume I follow many of the methods established in Jacob Neusner's studies of Mishnah and Tosefta and epitomized in his *Judaism*. I share many of the presuppositions of that work. However, on many specifics I seek angles of vision divergent from Neusner's. At times I take a more credulous approach to attributions of the texts. In some cases I seek a more reductive explanation for opinions and prescriptions.

¹⁸See my book *The Mishnaic Law of Blessings and Prayers: Tractate Berakhot*, Brown Judaic Studies: Scholars Press, Atlanta, 1987, for a systematic explanation of each pericope in M. and T. Berakhot.

rabbis adhered to these rules. Some did not. They cared enough about the rules to dispute, debate, catalogue and canonize them. Non-rabbinic Jews probably rejected or neglected most of the religious practices described in these short collections.

The rules deal with rituals, words and actions understood and accepted by a defined collective. What made these mannerisms and poetic declarations matter to the Jews of the rabbinic persuasion was their place within the political and social realities and relationships, amidst the complex struggle for leadership, dominance and control of the religious institutions and structures of an important religious community in Israel in that era.

Before I return to the historical motives of the rabbis, let me sketch out some basic background of this formative epoch. The age of early rabbinism spans three generations from the first through the third centuries C.E. Our texts contain declarations ascribed to rabbis of three generations prior to the age of the authoritative publication of the texts. A salient feature of the literary character of rabbinic teachings is the preservation of regulations in the traditional attributive form of discourse, in the name of a rabbi: "Rabbi X says" [followed by a ruling] or [a ruling followed by] "the words of Rabbi Y."

The rabbis named in Mishnah and Tosefta Berakhot lived in three somewhat disjointed periods in Jewish history. The latest, the Ushan masters, flourished mainly in the Lower Galilee in the middle to late second century after the defeat of the Bar Kokhba rebels in 135, and before the seat of rabbinic learning moved a short distance south to Bet Shearim at the end of the second century. That war severed many of their ties to the preceding generation, the Yavnean rabbis. In their centers on the coastal plain and elsewhere, these earlier masters thrived in a period of great turbulence from the traumatic destruction of the second Temple in Jerusalem in 70, the late first century, to the time of the equally disruptive Bar Kokhba war. The texts in Berakhot attribute several traditions to even earlier masters, the Houses of Hillel and Shammai, who were active in the early to middle first century in Jerusalem while the Temple was still standing.

The problem, to reiterate, is that because of the paucity of preserved teachings of each of these groups of masters, scattered selectively throughout the chapters of M. and T. in the process of redaction, I must proceed in stages to regain a historical perspective on the emergence of rabbinism.

Accordingly, in chapter II, I separate these strands of traditions attributed to masters of three generations and reassemble, reorganize and analyze them to get a better perspective on the contours of the gradual but distinct history and development of early Jewish prayer in the generations prior to the final closure of the Mishnaic corpus and in the era of redaction.

Let me make a few observations on my critical procedures. Wherever there is a warrant, I raise the issue of the authenticity of the attributions. In a few cases there is reason to question the attribution of a ruling to a given master, as for instance where a ruling on a matter of concern to a later authority is anachronistically attributed to an earlier master. But, the overwhelming majority of attributions stand at face value. I assume that the assigned rulings reflect the views of the rabbi to whom they are attributed, or at the very least to his school of immediate disciples or contemporaries. I give special attention to those ideas in earlier materials that are developed or refined

further in traditions ascribed to masters in later generations. That form of attestation provides an additional argument for the earlier existence and authenticity of the attribution of a teaching.

Those are some elements in my approach to using rabbinic evidence. Let me briefly describe now the main topics of the tractate. At the time of the formation of M. in the early third century, three major components made up the rabbinic system of blessings and prayers: the recitation in the morning and evening of the *Shema`* with its blessings before and after; the recitation three times each day of the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings; the recitation of blessings before and after eating a meal.

Each of these elements of the system has a distinct history. Evidence reveals that the formal ritual of reciting the *Shema`* goes back to the period before 70 C.E. when the Temple was standing in Jerusalem. From the data we observe that the institution of the recitation of the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings may be traced back to Yavnean times, the turbulent period between the wars of 70 and 135. Based on our sources we infer further that the structured system of blessings before and after the meal developed most dramatically in the late second century in the time of the Ushan masters. I show that class and professional interests motivated the concern of those groups within rabbinism who sponsored these diverse religious practices.

By the third century I find postulated in tractate Berakhot *as a whole statement* a more fully articulated theory and theology. M.'s ultimate framers enunciated in the substantive selection and organization of early rabbinic rules for liturgical recitations, their clear, structured early rabbinic definition of a system of prayer and blessings, and a theology of practical value for the individual Jew and of hope for the Jewish people.

Chapter II

The Beginnings of Rabbinic Prayer: Textual Evidence

A. The Formative Age: Berakhot before 70

Before the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, scholars posit that three major social forces influenced the nascent formation of rabbinic Judaism: the priestly and aristocratic class, members of the scribal profession, and individuals within the class of householders who owned land and made substantive contributions to the economy of Judea and later to the Galilee and the Coastal Plain.

Neusner has argued that the early third century rabbinic compilations, Mishnah and Tosefta, including tractate Berakhot, derive from an amalgam of the interests of these three forces.¹⁹ Neusner says, "There are these two social groups, not categorically symmetrical with one another, the priestly caste and the scribal profession, for whom the Mishnah makes self-evident statements. . . . We must notice that the Mishnah, for its part, speaks for the program of topics important to the priests. It takes up the persona of the scribes, speaking through their voice and in their manner."²⁰

Neusner rounds out this picture of the social components that speak through Mishnah with a third group, the class of householders, the audience for the document, the real and potential adherents at large of the religious system of the rabbis. This group he calls, "the basic productive unit of society, around which other economic activity is perceived to function."²¹

Mishnah, in Neusner's view, turns out to be a cogent system uniting the concerns and styles of discourse of its three constituents: scribes, priests and householders. The work of the ultimate redactor is so effective that "the Mishnah coalesces."²² Not surprisingly, one of its main themes is the problem of mixtures. Having artificially combined the disparate views of competing social groups into one statement, the

¹⁹ See Jacob Neusner, *Judaism: the Evidence of the Mishnah*, especially pages 232-56.

²⁰ *Judaism*, p. 233.

²¹ *Judaism*, p. 236.

²² *Judaism*, p. 237.

framers of Mishnah return repeatedly to their "prevailing motif" says Neusner, "the joining together of categories which are distinct."²³

Thus, the rabbinic philosophers who framed Mishnah created in that book an artificial world where opposing forces come together as parts of a whole. These intellectuals shared with us little concerning what they deemed important about the real issues of village social structures or national politics. They instead gave us a stylized book that alternates between anonymous statements of unanimous assent and attributed rules cast within disputes or debates.

One "proof" that Mishnah's redactor's successfully camouflaged the social conflict between its constituent groups from its readers is evident in the very way Neusner himself chooses to describe the contributions of various factions to the composite. He speaks plainly, without any hint that he has chosen euphemisms, of "The Gift of the Scribes,"²⁴ "The Gift of the Priests,"²⁵ and "The Gift of the Householders."²⁶ Apparently Mishnah's seamless synthesis remains intact even under modern critical scrutiny. The centuries of internecine struggle that produced the cultural components of the system of Mishnah recede into the deep background of its ultimately successful interweaving of traditional laws, anecdotes, and interpretations originally spawned by varied and conflicting historical and social contexts.

Unfortunately these texts provide us with exceedingly limited direct evidence about the origins and early development of Jewish prayer. The only explicitly attributed materials of any significance in the tractate for reconstructing the history of rabbinism before 70, when the Temple in Jerusalem was still standing, are the few lemmas ascribed to the Houses of Hillel and Shammai. These rules address but few liturgical subjects: the recitation of the *Shema`* and the recitation of "blessings" on Sabbaths and festivals.

On this basis, the establishment of the recitation of the *Shema`* as a popular scribal rite may be traced to the time of the Houses of Hillel and Shammai, wisdom fellowships commonly thought of as the immediate precursors of some rabbinic associations of the late first century and thereafter. Diverse evidence of rabbinic traditions such as M. Ber. 1:3 associates rules and practices for reciting the *Shema`* with the Houses and so supports this supposition.

Early Christian evidence also associates the *Shema`* with a group of scribes. The scriptural verses of the *Shema`* appear in phylacteries found at Qumran. I discuss these matters further in chapter IV.

Both the inclusions and exclusions of the contents of the standard text of the rabbinic liturgy clearly help us define its focus and original intent. The primary motifs of the national cult in Jerusalem are noticeably missing from both the *Shema`* and from the frame of blessings that surrounds it.²⁷ Such ideas and institutions as the

²³ *Judaism*, p. 238.

²⁴ *Judaism*, pp. 241 ff.

²⁵ *Judaism*, pp. 248 ff.

²⁶ *Judaism*, pp. 250 ff.

²⁷ Even if we place the formalization of these blessings late in the second century, these expressions undoubtedly evoke the main themes of the earliest formulations of the *Shema`*.

Temple, the priesthood, Jerusalem, and Davidic lineage, all prominent motifs in the Amidah, the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings, are of no concern to the framers of the *Shema`*.

Conspicuously, the Houses do not debate the rules for the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings. I believe this glaring omission, with other positive warrants, strongly suggests that this liturgy became institutionalized within rabbinism no earlier than the end of the first century. On this I shall have more to say below.

Most of the remaining traditions attributed to the Houses in our tractates of M. and T. relate not surprisingly in some way to rituals and blessings of the meal or of the Sabbath, or to purity laws. Extensive recent research has shown that these topics dominate the interests of the rabbi-pharisees of the era before 70.²⁸ Let us look more closely at the early references to the *Shema`*. M. 1:3A-F suggests that the accepted and proper ritual for the recitation of the *Shema`* is patterned on a Hillelite conception. Apparently, the entire first chapter of Mishnah Berakhot is based on an understanding attributed to the Hillelites. They said that the *Shema`* must be recited twice each day, morning and evening.

The recitation of the *Shema`*, according to the rule ascribed to the Hillelites, formed a main component of the rabbinic daily liturgy. Later Yavnean rabbis accepted the Hillelite opinion of the nature of the ritual and explicitly built their conception of prayer around it. They went as far as to promulgate a tradition to ridicule those who accepted the competing Shammaite view of the nature of the liturgy. M. Ber. 1:3 reports that Tarfon, a later Yavnean master, who followed the Shammaite mode of practice, placed his life in jeopardy. He is portrayed as stating that he emulated the convention prescribed for the ritual by the Shammaites and by that placed himself in danger of attack by bandits. The rabbis accordingly told him, "Fittingly, you have yourself to blame [for what might have befallen you]. For you violated the words of the House of Hillel (M. 1:3H)."

A second pericope attributed to the Houses deals with the number of blessings recited in the Sabbath liturgy. In T. 3:13 the Houses dispute the number of blessings that one recites in the prayer of the New Year's day that coincides with the Sabbath and the procedure for reciting the prayer for the Festival that coincides with the Sabbath. The opinions are that one recites ten, nine, eight or seven blessings depending on the circumstance and authority. Noticeably, none of the alternatives suggests a liturgy of eighteen blessings.

One may question whether these disputes in T. are of any historical value, or are artificial and anachronistic units. On the one hand, a gloss to the unit, attributed to Rabbi, signifies that these pericopae may have been formulated at a late date. On the other hand, there is no reason to doubt that special prayers were recited on the Sabbaths, Festivals, and New Year's days during Temple times, even if a more formalized requirement of regular *daily* recitation was widely instituted only after 70 C.E. At most then, these disputes in Tosefta reflect an early interest of the Houses in the regulation of liturgies for the special days of the year and they were revised at the time of the redaction of T. to reflect the practices of this later period.

²⁸Jacob Neusner, *Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees Before 70 C.E.*, Vols. III, Leiden, 1972.

The bulk of the Houses' materials in Berakhot, concentrated in chapter eight of M. and its corresponding units in T., present rules for the Sabbath and Festival dinner and other regulations that may apply to any dinner. The order of blessings a person must recite for the Prayer of Sanctification for the Sabbath day, and over the wine that one drinks at that occasion, is the subject of the first unit.²⁹

Next, the Houses dispute the order of blessings for the Prayer of Division that was recited at the meal at the conclusion of the Sabbath.³⁰ These disputes presuppose that blessings were recited on periodic occasions, to sanctify the Sabbath at its start, and to divide it from the remainder of the week, at its conclusion.

Traditions ascribed to rabbis of later generations take for granted that a Jew must recite blessings before eating any foods. Surprisingly, only one early rule takes for granted that a person had to recite blessings before eating any fare at a meal. Two other units supply rules for the Prayer of Division service, which one could recite even apart from the meal.³¹ Another dispute concerning a ritual practice at the meal deals with the use of spiced oil, a custom not developed any further in rules ascribed to subsequent generations.³²

As I just suggested, we should not construe the references to blessings recited at a meal as evidence of an early first century practice of reciting blessings before consuming any foodstuff. The only food blessing mentioned in Berakhot ascribed to an authority who flourished before Ushan times is the blessing over wine debated in the Houses' disputes in M. Berakhot chapter eight. The Yavnean master, Tarfon, speaks of a blessing over water in M. 6:8, although this likely refers to a blessing recited *after* drinking. The absence of sustained ascription to early rabbis of rules on these subjects supports the view that the concept and practice of a full-fledged system of food blessings, recited before eating, was institutionalized at the earliest by the Ushan rabbis, a century later.

A few traditions ascribed to pre-70 authorities do refer to the blessings recited after a meal, not necessarily to the Sabbath meal. Two of these deal with the special circumstances following the meal: what to do if one forgot to recite the meal blessing after eating, and what one does to recite the meal blessing over one cup of wine obtained after the meal.³³

Three other pre-70 units speak to concerns of purity at the meal: how one keeps his table and the utensils of his meal, the cup or the napkin clean, or how one avoids rendering unclean scraps of food left over from the meal.³⁴ Questions like these relating to rules of purity are less relevant in later generations once the whole system of ritual cleanness loses its pertinence after the destruction of the Temple.

One final Houses-unit transmits to us a fragment of a tradition pertaining to the meal. M. 6:5 attributes a cryptic gloss to the Shammaites ("Not even a potted dish"). Even in its full context, its meaning is difficult to ascertain and its import for our

²⁹ Cf. M. 8:1 and T. 5:25.

³⁰ M. 8:5 and T. 5:30.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² T. 5:29.

³³ M. 8:7-8.

³⁴ M. 8:2 and T. 5:26, M. 8:3 and T. 5:27, M. 8:4 and T. 5:28.

understanding of the general character of this stratum of traditions relating to the meal and to blessings and prayers is therefore accordingly limited.

To sum up, the sayings in Berakhot attributed to the Houses reveal their interest in expected pharisaic-rabbinic concerns. They take up rules for the fellowship dinner and for the Sabbath meal in particular and rules for ritual purity at the table. The Sabbath Prayers of Sanctification and Division are associated with these masters, as is the blessing one recites over wine and the blessings recited at the end of the meal.

The regular recitation of the *Shema`* is closely associated with the Houses in the first century. Finally, there is a possible association of the Houses with liturgies for Sabbaths, festivals, and the New Year, though I suggested the connection of these rituals with the early masters may be anachronistic.

Several rules and subjects first mentioned here at this earliest stratum of the law are further developed and expanded in later periods as we shall see below in greater detail. At Yavneh, the rabbis developed formulaic recitations for inaugurating and concluding the Sabbath and festivals, and for liturgical insertions into the prayers recited at those times. At Usha, the rabbis created a full-fledged system of blessings to be recited by the Jew before eating any foods or drinking liquids. Such complex innovations of later authorities are built on simple prior notions associated with earlier masters such as the pre-70 convention that one recites a blessing before partaking of the wine at the dinner.

Although I have described the Jewish masters of the Houses of Hillel and Shammai as "rabbi-pharisees," their main concerns stem from a scribal agenda: the use of standardized prayers and blessings in the village, in the household at the table, and in the everyday life of the Jew. I now propose to show how such seemingly modest innovations in the first century serve as the firm basis for the more lavish articulation of rabbinic ritual in the subsequent generations.

B. The Age of Internal Conflicts, Self-definition and Transition: Berakhot at Yavneh

The Yavneans of 70-135 were less notable as systematizers of religious practices than their Ushan successors would be in the next period, 135-200. They had to be more creative as innovators of new and modified religious institutions, to come to grips with the demise of the Temple and its rites and with military and economic threats to their very existence. Yet they refused to submit completely to the limitations of external domination within the Roman Empire.

In the midst of their turmoil, Yavneans built the recitation of the *Shema`* into a regular daily liturgy. They evolved through conflict and its resolution a requirement to recite daily the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings. Yavneans began to modify and institutionalize the formerly pharisaic fellowship meal into a rabbinic ritual. But for all that they did achieve, they remained preoccupied with maintaining their cultural independence and social vitality against the tremendous pressures of the forces around them. The Ushans, in the subsequent period of relative calm, ultimately undertook to create a system out of the powerful but disjointed components of rabbinic life left to them by their more charismatic Yavnean teachers.

Direct and unambiguous accounts tell us that in the time of Yavnean sages major

rifts occurred within rabbinism over liturgical issues. The Talmud reports that the rabbis overthrew the Patriarch Gamaliel II because of a dispute over the obligation to recite the Evening Prayer. Eleazar ben Azariah replaced him as interim Patriarch, and a faction forced the rabbinic "academy" to open to a broader constituency.³⁵ Reforms of many different issues were enacted "On that day," that is, on the occasion of the rebellion against Patriarchal domination and the shift in power that ensued.³⁶

The narrative concerning the deposition of Gamaliel deserves attention because, as I said, it centers on the struggle between first-century factions over the imposition of a liturgical ritual as obligatory. According to this narrative, Gamaliel was deposed from the Patriarchate because he ruled that the rabbis should recite the Amidah at night. Goldenberg alludes to political motives for the turmoil, but does not associate such conflict with the legislation of liturgical reform:

The Patriarchal regime was just beginning to consolidate its power. The rabbinic conclave in general must have resented this. At least two rival groups, the priests and Yohanan's circle, are likely to have had aspirations of their own. The stakes in the struggle -- control over the remnant of Jewish autonomy in Palestine -- were large.³⁷

This observation does not account for the connection between politics and public prayers. This conflict exhibits how liturgy is a primary means of exercising influence, dominance and control over a community of the faithful. In chapter IV we review the two versions of this deposition-narrative.

Liturgical development closely mirrors political and social growth of rabbinism throughout its formative years in several discernable stages. During the initial transition after the destruction of the Temple, from about 70-90 C.E., the priests promulgated the Amidah to reinforce their authority and the scribes promoted the *Shema`*. At this time it would have been natural for the scribes to claim the *Shema`* was once part of the Temple Service, as we shall see.

In the second phase of development, from about 90-155 C.E., the Patriarchate sponsored the Amidah to counter a growing scribal faction within the rabbinic movement. Scribes countered by rallying popular support, deposed Gamaliel, and effectuated a lasting compromise. Both liturgies were adopted in tandem and made obligatory rabbinic rituals.

The rabbis in succeeding years further consolidated the compromise. This led in the era from about 155-220 C.E. to the shaping of the composite rabbinic service that survives down to the present day. The leadership within rabbinism amalgamated the *Shema`* and Amidah into a compound liturgy with varied rules and prescribed mannerisms.

Some specific results of this process of internal conflict were lasting liturgical

³⁵B. Ber. 27b-28a, y. Ber. 4:1.

³⁶See J. N. Epstein, *Prolegomena ad Literas Tannaiticus*, Jerusalem, 1957, pp. 422-25. Epstein is skeptical about whether to give credence to those sources associating many of the decisions with "that day."

³⁷Robert Goldenberg, "The Deposition of Rabban Gamaliel II," in *Persons and Institutions in Early Rabbinic Judaism*, Missoula, 1977, pp. 37-38.

innovations such as the revision of the *Shema`* to include the theme of Kingship. As a permanent social outcome of the era the priests were relegated to figurehead status in rabbinic communities. Politically, the Patriarch continued to observe the conventional boundaries of his authority established after the deposition and was excluded from internal rabbinic affairs.

In effect the scribal faction came to dominate the local communities of rabbinic Jews in the aftermath of the major crises of the internal rabbinic power struggle. This historical evolution fully divorced rabbinic ritual from national political power structures.

Let me review some evidence of how in a short span of sixty-five years, between the end of first war in 70 C.E. and the defeat in the second rebellion in 135 C.E., the rabbis transformed and constricted many aspects of Judaism. Whereas at the outset of this era Jewish religious life centered on special meals in the home and the national cultic procedures of the Temple, by the close of this era it had changed. The rabbinic system of religious practices limited its practical regulatory focus to the major aspects of the life of the late antique Jew, in the town or village and its related personal experiences.

Naturally, the dominant concerns of the rabbis at Yavneh, such as they were, reflected some primary issues of late antique religion and society in general within an imperialist Roman setting. A primary issue at the outset of the Yavnean age was, in a word, local survival. The rabbinic leadership struggled to assert some authority against the forces of foreign political domination. Rabbinic Jews, like many other subservient subordinate populations, were essentially powerless and accordingly indigent. Day after day the people had to struggle against the elemental forces of nature for rudimentary sustenance.

The rabbis turned their attention where they could. They espoused the view that through their knowledge and religious virtuosity a Jew could help fend off the powers of nature, protect persons from the harm of the elements and of the unknown, of sickness, and of the dangers that lurked throughout the world inside the village.³⁸

The rabbis in the age of Yavneh afforded the Jews means to control the immediate vicissitudes of nature. Through their teachings and practices, through the rabbinic Torah, and mainly through prayer, the masters of this time postulated that they could for instance bring rain, or stop the rain. They could avert the dangers of the natural world or the likelihood of attack by bandits or other potential human enemies. They offered the people a way to cure their diseases, or at least to foretell the outcome of sicknesses. In the Yavnean period after the fall of the Temple, the rabbi who employed prayer and engaged in the study of Torah evolved by the necessity of the context in which he thrived into the local holy man par excellence of Judaic life.

As the rabbis took control of more of the religious life of the Jews they advanced the transfer of the locus of holiness from its former center, the Temple in Jerusalem, to the domain of the rabbis, their places of congregation, and to the study hall where the rabbis taught their disciples the Torah. An isolated ruling in M. Berakhot 4:2 clearly

³⁸ On the spirit of the age in general see, P. Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity*, London, 1971. A more intense examination of the imperial setting is to be found in Richard Horsely, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine*, San Francisco, 1987.

reflects this major shift in religious authority from the Temple to the study hall and from priestly rituals of sacrifice to rabbinic practices of prayer:

A. R. Nehuniah b. Haqanah used to recite a short prayer when he entered the study hall and when he exited.

B. They said to him, "What is the nature of this prayer?"

C. He said to them, "When I enter I pray that I will cause no offense and when I exit I give thanks for my portion."

Nehuniah's prayer asks for protection lest the student or teacher make an error in studying, misinterpret the tradition and by that improperly unleash the forces of the holy. In the view of this Yavnean tradition, the study hall was the primary precinct of the sacred. One employed special prayers to defend himself from any spiritual or physical danger he might face as he would enter and exit this location.

A related source reports that the rabbis of the time also relied on prayer to protect and preserve them from more explicit tangible dangers they faced when they entered the study hall to congregate. To the governing Roman forces, a congregation of religious leaders was a potentially seditious mob and could have constituted an overt threat to the authority of Roman rule. When the rabbis called together crowds of followers, guards monitored them to restrain the temptation to activism. A pericope in T. 2:13 shows how prayer had the kind of power that afforded religious leaders the ability to strengthen social solidarity and mount a challenge against external control:

E. Said R. Meir, "Once we were sitting in the House of Study in front of R. Aqiba and we were reciting the *Shema* to ourselves [i.e. silently]

F. "because a quaestor [a Roman guard] was sitting in the doorway."

G. They said to him, "One cannot derive a precedent [of law] from [an incident in] a time of danger."

Other traditions ascribed to Yavneans reflect the tenor of the imperial situation of these late antique times in Judaic circles. The attitude to prayers conveyed in the materials reflects a fundamental concern with the need for protection against both danger from natural forces and threats from within society itself. Some of the materials explain directly how via rabbinic practices one may protect himself. According to the explicit ruling in M. 4:4, a person recites a short prayer in a place of danger for protection from physical harm.

B. R. Joshua says, "One who goes through a dangerous place should recite a short prayer, [an abstract of eighteen].

C. "And he should say, `God save your people Israel. In all their crises let their needs come before you. Blessed art Thou, O Lord who hears our prayers and supplications.'"

A tradition in M. 9:4 proposes that prayers serve to protect a person from the dangers of the wilderness beyond the civilization of the village, and a concise liturgy serves to express one's thanks for returning safely to home after a dangerous journey

abroad.

- A. One who enters a town recites two prayers, one upon his arrival and one upon his departure.
- B. B. Azzai says, "[He recites] four [prayers], two upon his arrival and two upon his departure.
- C. "He gives thanks for the past and cries out for the future."

For the rabbinic Jew of the village, brief prayers protected a person from less ominous hazards. In their towns the heat and vapors of a bathhouse could cleanse and even cure, but also when out of control could cause injury or death. According to T. 6:17 a visit to this place merited the recitation of special formulae.

Within the range of rabbinic circles variation existed in the type and intensity of sanctity and power ascribed to the holy rabbis. When a great virtuoso in prayer, according to one tradition, was engaged in recitation he was protected from harm. Prayer prevented Haninah ben Dosa from the injury of a potentially lethal bite of a poisonous lizard. A story narrates how Ben Dosa was protected and the lizard died after biting him. "Woe to the person who is bitten by the lizard. Woe to the lizard which bit R. Haninah Ben Dosa," T. 3:20 reports.

Haninah also had the power through prayer to peer into the future. His recitations served as a kind of omen for the destiny of a sick person, as M. 5:5 indicates. By virtue of his prayer for the sick, Haninah could tell, "who would live and who would die."

For the Yavneans then, prayer had the power to protect the individual in the village. Through prayer a master also might gain the power of precognition of the future and a better perception of a person's present state.³⁹

Out of this understanding of the power of prayer in the life of the Jew, the Yavnean rabbis began to transform the practice of reciting prayers into a regular daily institution. Evidence suggests, as we saw, that Jews were reciting the *Shema`* even before the Temple was destroyed. Yavnean masters further ritualized this practice.

Formalization of the most prominent rabbinic liturgy of prayer, the liturgy of eighteen blessings, took hold as we argued earlier in the era of Yavneh. We see this process articulated indirectly in our sources in M. and T. Berakhot, as I shall show later.

Several late rabbinic traditions in the Talmud make this point more explicit. Consider the following [B. Meg. 17b]:

- A. When did the Prayer [of Eighteen Blessings originate]?
- B. It was taught: Simeon of Paqoli established the order of the [Prayer of] Eighteen Blessings before R. Gamaliel at Yavneh.
- C. [The Talmud continues with an apparently contradictory tradition:] Said R. Yohanan, and it was also stated as a Tannaitic teaching:
- D. It was taught: One hundred and twenty elders, and among them [were] several prophets, ordained the order of the [Prayer of] Eighteen Blessings.

³⁹ Additional Yavnean traditions emphasizing the centrality of prayer are found in T. Ber. 3:3-4.

The Talmud subsequently harmonizes the two conflicting traditions [B. Meg. 18a]:

- A. If "One hundred and twenty elders, and among them [were] several prophets, ordained the order of the Eighteen Blessings," why then did Simeon of Paqoli have to establish [the order of the Prayer also]?
- B. [Because the Jews] forgot the [blessings of the Prayer] and he came and established them again.

This tradition and other evidence indicate that the later Talmudic authorities believed that Yavnean rabbis sought to institute the regular standardized liturgy of the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings. I earlier surmised that this came about after serious struggle and conflict between rabbinic factions.

In the evidence of Mishnah we find several signs that some rabbis of the period resisted the formalization and institutionalization of prayer, claiming that regularization, *qeba`*, diminished the power of the liturgy. R. Eliezer says in M. 4:4, "One who fixes [the recitation of] his prayer, his prayer is not supplication."

This brief remark reflects the fluidity, the instability and the effervescence of the time. While some authorities sought to establish the best means to formalize prayer as a daily ritual, to further various motives, others resisted, seeking to maintain the more impromptu character of prayer.

Yavnean masters such as Gamaliel, Joshua and Aqiba developed rules and practices for the recitation of new prayers as we see for instance in M. 4:4-5. Rabbis of this era also further extended the existing practice of reciting the *Shema`* as a regular liturgy twice daily. Yavneans ruled in M. 1:2 on the proper times for the recitation of the *Shema`*.

In the context of their rules for the standardization of this liturgy, the Yavnean attitude toward prayer was that the proper recitation of the *Shema`* affords protection to an individual and, the converse of this claim, one who recites the wrong way, risks exposure to danger. Tarfon faced danger when he followed the Shammaite ritual for the recitation of the *Shema`* in the passage at M. 1:3G-H.⁴⁰

The Yavnean sources clearly show that the recitation of both prayers and the *Shema`* in accord with the directives of the rabbis will protect a villager from danger and from harm. Needless to say, the rabbis maintained that the power of the words of the prayers derived from God, the ultimate source of protection. God was the source of immediate safety and the fountain of final redemption, for the Jew of the towns. They were more imprecise about their promises of national salvation. After all, the religious leaders of this age witnessed the defeat of their people in two tragic wars fought by those who strove to gain freedom from Roman rule, under the banner of leaders who believed they could hasten the coming of the age of the messiah for the Jewish people.

The texts do make a link between the recitation of the *Shema`* and the quest for

⁴⁰There is a further hint of the protective powers of the recitation of the *Shema`* in T. 1:4. One might see the reference in that pericope to the 'destroyers' as an indication of a potential source of harm. But this is far from certain since the term is obscure.

redemption in several Yavnean traditions in Berakhot. But the connection remains vague at best. In M. 1:5, the rabbis direct that the exodus from Egypt be mentioned in the *Shema*. This suggestion of the bond between the liturgy and ultimate redemption is carried forward in T. 1:10-15, linking the recitation of the *Shema* with the messianic age.

I have argued that the Yavnean masters were preoccupied with the dangers lurking around the village, and accordingly with providing the Jews of the time with the means to withstand them. Their rules regarding the recitation of the liturgy pay little attention to the internal state of mind of the person who recites the liturgy. The Yavnean rules for reciting the *Shema*, for instance, mainly focus on external aspects of the recitation.⁴¹

In this era of transition under Roman domination the rabbis sought to establish some stability and shelter in their local communities by means of prayer and ritual. Not surprisingly Yavnean rulings provide us with no coherent attitudes toward public prayer, merely several isolated, independent rules.

Two of these rules are preserved in the name of the Ushan tradent Judah, who is associated with a particular Ushan attitude toward public prayer. The later Ushans legislated more openly and confidently on all aspects of public prayer, as we shall discuss below. Judah's traditions about the practices of the Yavneans primarily serve to express his own Ushan interests. Hence this further limits their value for reconstructing the development of rules for prayer at Yavneh.

One of these traditions at T. 3:5 about Aqiba claims that he prayed differently in public and in private, underlining the virtuosity of Aqiba in prayer. In M. 4:7, Eleazar ben Azariah says that the Additional Service on festivals and new moons is to be recited only with the congregation of the village. Although we presume that this means one may say the liturgy only in a public setting, reference to the congregation of the village elsewhere in our tractate or in rabbinic literature has been suppressed. As a result this isolated tradition is of limited value to us in reconstructing a broader picture of the dynamics of the development of the phenomena of public Jewish prayer in this period.

We may say the same of the institution of the synagogue. One of the few explicit references to the synagogue in our early material, M. 7:3, alludes to the practices of reciting prayer in the synagogue. The call to prayer was fixed in the synagogue, Aqiba said, regardless of how many people were there. Lacking a fuller context of several traditions on the same subject, this pericope is of restricted value in the reconstruction of the history of the Yavnean ideas and practices relating to prayer and the synagogue.

To recapitulate, Yavneans emphasized that prayer can protect the Jews. They instituted regular daily prayers. They did not completely formulate a system of regular public prayer. Their views on the matter and rules for the synagogue are either lacking or suppressed.

Finally, I see several secondary trends in the development of liturgical ritual in this era. Yavnean materials rule that some rituals, formerly associated solely with the table fellowship, may be integrated into the regular recitation of prayers. So, for

⁴¹See M. 2:3. The tradition concerning Gamaliel's wedding, M. 2:5, is an exception.

example, the Prayer of Division, the recitation of formulae for the close of the Sabbath, or the Prayer of Sanctification, blessings for the inauguration of the Sabbath, may be recited as part of the regular prayer liturgy.⁴²

Yavneans propose that another short liturgy, the prayer for rain, which may have been recited previously as a separate rite, also may be integrated into the regular recitation of the Prayer of Eighteen.⁴³

Based on these examples, we may conclude that once Yavneans more firmly established the daily recitation of prayer as a recurring ritual, it dominated the liturgical life of the Jews and began to absorb into it other, formerly independent practices.

The Yavnean traditions convey a sense of the late antique quality of rabbinic notions of prayer in this period under imperial domination. The rabbis of this era emphasized that prayer can protect a person from dangers, be they natural danger, or the dangers inside or outside the village. In this period the rabbis acknowledged the power of the recitation of formal prayers. At Yavneh we find accordingly the beginnings of the formalization of regular daily liturgies of new prayers, and most prominently, the establishment of the recitation of the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings as a routine religious obligation.

As rabbinic ritual matured, the fellowship meal became an occasion of note for recitation of prayers and blessings. Yet from the traditions taken as a whole, it appears that the Yavneans placed the fellowship meal at the periphery of their concerns; it never became a dominant issue of religious life.⁴⁴

Linked to Yavneans are a few questions on the subject: How many individuals constitute a minimum for a collective meal, and what formula of invitation does one use to call the group together to recite the blessings after the meal (M. 7:3)?

Our materials associate Yavnean names with only a few rules regarding the blessings for foods and other rules for the meal. A Yavnean is associated with a ruling regarding the traditional blessing over wine. Ben Zoma explains in T. 4:12 one of M.'s rules about the recitation of the blessing over the wine that one drinks during the meal. This wine-blessing is associated, in a tradition concerning the recitation of the blessing (M. 8:1), with the earlier masters of the first century, the Houses of Hillel and Shammai. A Yavnean master merely carries forward a previously articulated issue.

Another tradition about wine ascribed to Yavneans discusses the nature of the substance itself. If one tastes it before one dilutes it to its normal strength for drinking, must he recite a blessing?⁴⁵

Yavneans are also associated with concerns for recitation of blessings after a meal. Indeed one issue is what foods make up a meal as we see in M. 6:8:

⁴²M. 5:2, T. 3:10, T. 3:11.

⁴³See M. 5:2 above, T. 3:9.

⁴⁴Naturally, it could also be that the conceptions developed at Usha and fostered by the redactors of M. and T. so dominated in the selection of prior rulings for inclusion in M. and T., as even to preclude the mention of Yavnean apperceptions of modes of practicing commensality. Whatever the reason, only the most basic issues of the fellowship meal are associated with Yavnean names.

⁴⁵M. 7:5D, T. 4:3A-E.

- A. "If one ate figs or grapes or pomegranates [as the main dish of his meal] he recites over them [after eating] three blessings," the words of Rabban Gamaliel.
- B. And sages say, "[He recites] one blessing [embodying three]."
- C. R. Aqiba says, "Even if one ate cooked vegetables and that was [the main dish of] his meal, he recites over them [after eating] three blessings."
- D. One who drinks water to quench his thirst says, "For all came into being by his word."
- E. R. Tarfon says he says, "Creator of many souls and their needs."

The sense from this tradition and other material ascribed to masters of this age taken together is that Yavneans took interest in the blessings one recites at the conclusion of the meal (see T. 1:7). But they have no strong systematic conception of a formal fellowship meal. Their laws, and Aqiba's regarding vegetables in particular, apply more to the setting of the average villager, rather than to a patrician or member of the upper-class, to the basic subsistence consumption of a society on the edge of survival, not to the concerns of national leadership.

If the Yavneans addressed themselves to the concerns of those who were overwhelmed by their struggle to survive, and thus dealt with the aspects of daily life that buffeted their existence, as we suspect, then that explains why they did not have the motivation or the luxury to develop a detailed etiquette for the comfortable institution of the formal fellowship meal.

The Yavneans could not fully articulate some of the institutions within their group because they had directed their rulings to the villager whose energies went to fend off the daily pressures of external imperial rulership. Several sources like T. 2:6 on different subjects suggest that Yavneans gave priority to external political events over religious obligations. We are told by Meir, in T. 2:13, that one may in fact alter the performance of a ritual to avoid severe persecution, to survive against countervailing pressures.

Although this stance may have been a practical response to external political and social domination, at least one short lemma in our tractate shows that other attitudes might have been prevalent among the Yavnean masters. One should give his soul for the commandments, Ben Azzai remarks at T. 6:7.

In sum, the repertoire of Yavnean traditions provides us with strong evidence of some concerns of the era. These second century masters were preoccupied with survival in an imperial world, with a struggle against the elements of nature and the forces of political dominance. In their rules concerning prayers we saw repeated concerns for protection for the villager from local danger and from harm.

There emerged in this era some tendencies to formalize and regularize prayer. But, in general, the institution appears to have remained fluid and effervescent, reflecting the conflicting internal forces within rabbinic life of the time and the external pressures faced by followers of the rabbis.

Finally, in their rules concerning the fellowship meal and blessings for foods the Yavneans also do not far advance the formalization of these practices. One view has rabbis at Yavneh consider even cooked vegetables, even dates, as substance enough

to constitute the main food for a collective meal.⁴⁶

As I next discuss, from the rulings ascribed to the masters of the generation at Usha, a different picture emerges. The rabbis of that age take a dissimilar approach to defining the meal. Under more flexible historical conditions, they develop an apparently original fully developed system of blessings to be recited before one eats any foods. They systematize the life of the rabbinic Jew through rigorously delineating and applying a scheme of ritual, especially of prayers, to daily life.

C. The Age of Standardization and Systematization: Berakhot at Usha

The period following the unsuccessful Bar Kokhba revolt brought relative political and social stability to the Jewish centers of learning, then located mainly in Usha in the Lower Galilee. Unlike the previous two generations from 70 to 135 marked by wars and rebellions, this period returned rabbinic social and cultural life to a more serene routine with few major disruptions for an entire generation and for several more to follow.

One of the fruits of peace and stability was the significant stabilization and restraint of the intellectual and social life of rabbinism at Usha resulting in part in rabbinic work on the organization, systematization and development of the Jewish laws that emerged out of the turbulence of the prior two generations.

At Usha the rabbinic masters gathered, arranged and canonized their teachings and the received instruction from the masters of the past. They systematically assembled in formulaic compilations those rules and regulations, stories and anecdotes that best expressed their understanding of themselves and of the world. The canonical tractates of Mishnah and Tosefta emerged in the generation that followed the Ushan era, as a direct result of their contributions toward the organization of rabbinic knowledge.

Just as their work reveals an intense interest in the structure and organization of ideas and traditions of past teachers, their materials reflect their desire to systematize.

From the numerous rules attributed to Ushans one gets an even more unmistakable impression that this period was a time of structuring, building and organizing within rabbinic society at large.

Let me illustrate this with a few remarks in the Ushan materials related to prayer and correlative rituals that manifest the idea of rank and hierarchy within the social order.

A tradition attributed to Meir, a leading Ushan, best conveys the temper of the process of transformation of rabbinic traditions on prayer from a corpus of scattered rabbinic rules into a system of liturgical regulations:

R. Meir used to say, "There is no person in Israel who does not perform one hundred commandments each day [and recite blessings for them]. One recites the *Shema* and recites blessings before and after it. One eats his bread and recites blessings before

⁴⁶M. 6:8, T. 4:15.

and after. And one recites the Prayer of Eighteen blessings three times. And one performs all the other commandments and recites blessings over them [T. 6:24F-G]."

In the view of this Ushan master, all a person's prayers, meals and other religious obligations comprise *parts of a larger system*.

The recitation of variations of liturgical formulae, the blessings, associated with each religious event connects these disparate phenomena. Within this conception many rabbinic practices of prayer and blessings form part of a distinctive and coherent religious system of liturgy.

Further examination of the materials in our texts attributed to the Ushan masters illustrates how they reflect contention within Jewish life in the late second century for control over the community of the faithful through two major realms of religious activity: public prayer and table fellowship.

The struggle for political and social dominance over communal activity, such as liturgical practice, may be evident in a pericope attributed to an Ushan rabbi that deals with the proper recitation of the *Shema`*. The text reads:

Rabbi Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "Not all who wish to take [the liberty to recite] the name [of God in the *Shema`* and its blessings] may do so [M. 2:8]."

This statement implies that those who wish to invoke God's name in prayer may do so only in accord with the regulations of the rabbis who alone sanction the recitation of prayers in Judaic life. Another tradition underlines an additional social ramification of liturgical recitations: "From a man's blessings one can tell whether he is a boor or a disciple of the sages [T. 1:6]."

According to this brief unattributed lemma on liturgical formulae, reciting the correct or incorrect words signifies one's social status, i.e., that one belongs within one defined group or another. An Ushan lemma makes another closely related point. One must recite each day three blessings that reinforce the social distinctions of the group: Blessed art Thou O Lord our God who did not make me . . . a Gentile, a boor, or a woman (T. 6:18). Through blessings then, one may express some basic rabbinic notions of social stratification and division.

Several Ushan regulations governing the recitation of the *Shema`* and of the Prayer of Eighteen communicate directly or obliquely how these rabbis sought to establish their dominance in their fraternity within the study hall, the unquestioned domain of the sages, and over the synagogue, the popular province of the common folk, and in this way to control public prayer.⁴⁷

Besides the more direct social aspects, Ushans showed further interest in the

⁴⁷On the basis of relevant literary and material evidence one must conclude that the rabbis ordinarily were not the dominant figures in the governance of the synagogues in Israel in the first through third centuries. In face of this the rabbis attempted to maintain their authority over prayer and by promulgating their dicta they sought to weaken the authority of other forces governing the hierarchy of the synagogues.

regulation of other particulars of the liturgy. They extended the regulations of the time for the *Shema`* enunciated earlier by the Houses and developed at Yavneh. Simeon, for instance, points out an anomaly in the rules governing the times of the recitation of the *Shema`*, "Sometimes one recites the *Shema`* [twice in one night] (T. 1:1)."

Judah tells a story about two Yavnean masters who recited the *Shema`* late in the morning in T. 1:2. Interestingly, Judah's story portrayed the rabbis reciting the *Shema`*, "On the road." Although in several traditions we find Ushan regulations for the time of recitation, they ordinarily evince little concern with rules regarding the place of recitation. One can recite on the road, or in any location for that matter [that is not unclean]. The overt implication of several Ushan rulings is that one need not enter a specific place, e.g., a synagogue, to recite one's prayers.

Previously I discussed the friction and compromise among Yavneans leading to the acceptance of a requirement for reciting the Prayer of Eighteen three times each day. Ushans, according to the data, then established the more specific timetable for the daily recitation of this liturgy. Judah glossed the primary Mishnaic pericope on this subject in M 4:1, "The Morning Prayer [may be recited] until midday. R. Judah says, 'Until the fourth hour, etc.'" This unit most likely was formulated at the time it was glossed, in Usha. Other evidence at T. 3:12 suggests that the masters of Usha sought to regulate the form of the prayers.

The Ushans introduced several new conceptions in their formulation of the requirements for the performance of the rituals by expanding and further regulating the existing religious practices of prayer. Analogy between prayer and Temple law was one such idea developed at Usha, as I outlined above. Another primary Ushan interest was the role of a person's intentions while reciting prayer.

Because it is difficult to define directly in a few words the nature of the concentration needed to perform properly this ritual, the rabbinic prescription specifies how, during the recitation, one must alter his relationship to the external distractions of the world around him, so that he may properly direct his internal consciousness.

Judah in T. 2:2 said that one who recites the *Shema`* must have the proper frame of mind. Judah and Meir debated in M. 2:1-2 the definition of the frame of mind that one must have for reciting the *Shema`*. They agreed that one must limit his social discourse during the recitation. But they disagreed over the means of doing this.

Judah and Meir disagreed concerning the propriety of extending or returning a greeting while reciting the *Shema`*. According to both rabbis one may vary his level of concentration during one's recitation. Meir said that between paragraphs one may relax his concentration and extend a normal greeting out of respect as in ordinary discourse. But while in the midst of reciting a paragraph, one may not lapse into an ordinary state of mind to extend or respond to a greeting unless he fears the consequences of ignoring some important person close by.

Judah was more lenient. While reciting a paragraph one may certainly extend a greeting to a person of authority whom he fears and one may respond even to a person deserving respect. Between sections of the *Shema`*, one may exchange common greetings. He may greet a person he respects and answer the greeting of any ordinary person.

Both rabbis agreed that one's concentration on the recitation of the *Shema`*

establishes a state of mind that requires a person to modify his relation to other people nearby. Their dispute concerned the intensity of this change in ordinary social interaction necessary during the heightened consciousness of the recitation of the *Shema`*.

In a more subtle way, another tradition reflects Judah's concern with the need for a person to direct his intention during the performance of a ritual. Those who attend a funeral may or may not participate in the recitation of the *Shema`*. It all depends on the extent of their involvement in the rites of the funeral. Onlookers who are not directly engaged in the procedures of the funeral may be able to concentrate and therefore may recite. Participants involved directly in the funeral are presumed by T. 2:11 to be too distracted to recite properly the *Shema`*.

Another Ushan, Abba Saul, provided a scriptural basis from Ps. 10:17 for the general requirement that one must concentrate for the recitation of the Prayer. The only prayer that God hears, said this master at T. 3:4, is one that an individual who concentrates recites.

Related to the concept of intention is the idea of meditation, that is of "silent recitation" of prayer. This notion is associated with Ushans at M. 3:4. Judah's gloss in M. linked this unit with the Ushan era. T. 2:12 more directly linked this notion to Yose. Meditation is a subtle process. It is a daring idea to think that one may concentrate on a text without reciting it to fulfill the requirement of the religious obligation to pray.

So the traditions attributed to Ushans show two ways the masters of this era regulated the actual performance of the rituals of prayers. They controlled the timetable for recitation and they legislated regarding the kind of intention or concentration needed for an individual's recitation of the prayers.

In other ways too, the rabbis of this period sought to exercise their supervision of the institutions of the recitation of prayers in private and, formally, in public. As cited above, one Ushan unit made the simple point that all recitations of blessings and prayers must be sanctioned by the rabbis: "Rabban Simeon B. Gamaliel says, 'Not all who wish to take [the liberty to recite] the name may do so (M. 2:8).'" Certain rules in particular, were directed toward the regulation of more formal gatherings for public prayer. In T. 1:9 Judah indicated how the participants in the public service must recite the blessings that followed the *Shema`* liturgy along with the leaders of the service.

In another unit, T. 3:5, Judah conveyed an anecdote about the way Aqiba would restrain himself to conform to the conventions of public prayer. The message of that pericope was that Aqiba, virtuoso of the rabbis, conformed to the rules of conduct for public prayer by not bowing too much. The ordinary rabbinic Jew then surely must follow the regulations of the rabbis for ceremonial public prayer.

In M. 4:7, Judah proposed a compromise between the views of Eleazar b. Azariah and sages on the public recitation of the Additional Service. The basic notion that an individual may indeed recite on behalf of the congregation or group was implied elsewhere in sources associated with Judah (T. 2:12). He said that one who was unclean by virtue of a rabbinic decree may not recite the liturgy. He by that limited the role of such an individual in the public recitation of prayer.

Even within the systematic treatment of Ushan legislation, several major issues remain vague. From our data we cannot tell whether at Usha the recitation of the *Shema`* was to be practiced as a public liturgical ritual of the community, or a private

rite of individuals, or both.

One rule refers to the recitation of the *Shema`* in the synagogue. The rule itself is anonymous and its reference to the *Shema`* is only implicit from the context of the rule: "One who entered the synagogue and found that [the congregation] had [already] recited half [of the *Shema`*] and he completed it with them . . . (T. 2:4)." But in general the Ushan regulations in M. do not consider any distinction between the public or private recitation of the *Shema`*, as we see at M. 2:3. Such issues cannot be resolved based on the limited sources we have.

Ushans contributed to the tightening formalization of the literal content of prayer. One unit attributes to Yose an interest in the formulation of the liturgy: "If one did not mention the covenant in the blessing of the land [i.e., the third blessing in the grace after meals], they make him begin [the recitation] again (T. 3:9)."

In their rulings for the food and meal blessings Ushan masters maintained a similar scope of activity and interest. Through their rulings the Ushans solidified and extended rabbinic dominance over two major areas of the life of their community: the institution of collective public prayer, as shown, and the practice of commensality, that is, the collective fellowship meal.

Besides the many rules they promulgated for reciting liturgies and prayers, the Ushans created an intricate system of blessings to be recited before eating any foods. The rabbis justified the idea of requiring preliminary food blessings in a creative anonymous rabbinic tradition as follows:

One may not taste anything until he recites a blessing. For it says, "The Earth and all therein is the Lord's (Ps. 24:1)." One who derives benefit from the world without first reciting a blessing has committed a sacrilege. [It is as if he ate sanctified Temple produce.] [One may not derive any benefit] until [he fulfills all the obligations] that permit him [to derive benefit, i.e., recites the proper blessings] [T. 4:1].

The analogy of food blessings with Temple taboo served as a strong polemical basis for the legitimacy of these rituals. Through the blessings-system the rabbis could regulate the consumption of foods and by that the institutions of the commensal meal or the table fellowship, much as the priests in the Temple could exercise their dominance over the production and distribution of foods in a past era when the Temple in Jerusalem was standing. So to foster this analogy the rabbis promulgated their bold dictum: One who eats any foods without following the rules of the rabbis commits a sin as severe as the ancient transgression of sacrilege against the priest and their Temple property.

Accordingly, by requiring all Jews to recite the rabbinic blessings before eating, to follow the rabbinic rules of commensality, rabbis could directly govern a main affair of the daily life of every Jew.

The first Ushan unit of the tractate more subtly illustrates this connection. In T. 1:1, Meir paralleled the time for reciting the *Shema`* with the time for eating the Sabbath fellowship meal. Recall also that the earlier Yavneans in M. 1:1 had explicitly compared the timetable for the *Shema`* with the schedule of the Temple.

Other Ushan statements regarding the system of food blessings expressed a basic categorization of the natural world and of the edible produce of a second century cultural context [M. 6:1], reminiscent of the systematic priestly taxonomies of earlier ages.

The regulation of membership in the table fellowship, control of the institution of the meal, was an ongoing Ushan concern. In M. 7:2 Judah ruled on the minimum one must eat to be included in the quorum for the recitation of the blessings after eating the meal.

The Ushan conception was that the fellowship dinner was a formal full-course affair, not a meal of just vegetables or dates.⁴⁸ In this context advice on table etiquette was appropriate.⁴⁹ Simply by propounding rules of etiquette, the rabbis could not fully regulate, guide or control a complex institution like the collective meal. Much more is involved in governing this complex institution. The pharisaic leaders, for instance, regulated the table fellowship of their era by promulgating purity laws for foods and agricultural taboos, especially the laws of tithes for produce.⁵⁰

The rabbis of Usha did not reaffirm these rules as a means of directing the obligations of the collective meal in their era. There was no Temple, no active priesthood. So there was no gain in extending the rules of purity and uncleanness to the Jews of the second century and no way to justify the system of agricultural offerings and tithes.

Accordingly, the Ushan rabbis exercised control over the fellowship meal of their time by establishing a system of blessings to be recited before and after eating foods both at the formal dinner and, by extension, even outside the formal structures of the fellowship meal. As noted earlier, these authorities proclaimed that the whole world and all its contents were sacred. To eat from the fruit of the land was a sacrilege unless one performed the proper religious actions. For the rabbinic Jew of the late second century, the rituals that permitted a person to consume the foods of the earth were not the sacrifices of animals at the Temple, or the offerings of meal, or the separation from one's produce the gifts for the priests and levites. The Jew had to recite the proper formal blessing before eating and then could benefit from the produce of the land.

The rabbis provided little additional justification to gain support for their innovations. The few Biblical precedents for such ideas or practices are limited to at best remote hints of the practice of reciting blessings at a meal, such as in Deut. 8:10, "And you shall eat, and you shall be satisfied, and you shall bless the Lord"

The Temple, the locus of holiness in the world of the Jew in Israel, had been destroyed more than a generation earlier. The Yavneans learned through tragedy and trauma that the Temple would not be rebuilt in their times. The rabbis at Usha knew in their historical experiences only of a life of piety without a centralized place of holiness. Out of necessity, they refined and developed the pharisaic and early

⁴⁸This is a sharp contrast to the conception of the meal underlying the story in which Aqiba and the rabbis are portrayed eating dates in Jericho (T. 4:15).

⁴⁹T. 4:14. Other anonymous units on the formal etiquette of the dinner may be associated with the Ushan stratum of traditions, including T. 4:8-9, T. 5:5-6, M. 6:6-7.

⁵⁰See J. Neusner, *Pharisees*, vol. 3, *passim*.

rabbinic notion that holiness centered on the household and that sacrality focused at the table of the ordinary villager.

Liturgy thus understood had some undeniably "rabbinic" facets. By the late second century, the rabbis were, more than anything else, a group of sages whose major concern was the study and formulation of their traditions. Accordingly one of their major preoccupations was the mastery and recitation of the traditions that later became the basis for the canonical documents of M. and T., highly formulaic documents made up of short lemmas in formalized diction. The recitation of blessings composed of brief, fixed formulae to express their conceptions of religious order and meaning at the formal setting of the dinner was definitely a ritual that reflected elements of the basic character of rabbinic culture.

Admittedly the primary notion that one recites a blessing over a food was not an original conception of the Ushan masters. As shown above, the Houses of Hillel and Shammai in their first century rules speak of the blessings over wine and refer to the recitation of other formulae (viz., chapter eight of M.). Rules concerning the recitation of the blessings after the meal were ascribed to Yavneans. Indeed, the Yavneans are said to have developed the formal daily prayer liturgy comprising eighteen formulaic blessings.

But in the era when rabbinism was centered at Usha the rabbis developed their complex system of blessings to be recited by the Jew before eating any food. As we have shown, this deceptively simple taxonomy of foods and their blessings of M. 6:1 enunciates the essence of the rabbinic scheme of blessings and makes a powerful statement.⁵¹ To eat of any food, the sancta of the earth, one must first carry out one's religious obligation, recitation of the formula of the appropriate rabbinic blessing.

Within the development of this system of religious practice at Usha, there emerged the dominant system of blessings expressed in the pericopae of Mishnah Berakhot. Rabbis of the era proposed other expanded categories and formulae, as indicated by rulings attributed to Judah, Meir and Yose in T. 4:4-5.

The establishment of a system of different blessings for various foods, and of the requirement to recite these blessings before eating any food, gave rise to a complex set of real and potential questions. For instance, when one ate more than one kind of food at the same meal, did one recite a blessing over each food? Did one recite a blessing over one food before one recited a blessing over another food? In other words, was there a hierarchy or rules for precedence within the system of food blessings? If so, by what criteria did one establish the rank and order of importance of foods?

Ushan units responded to these issues. Judah suggested that one may seek guidance regarding the issue of priority from a familiar source, Scripture. The seven types of foods mentioned in Deuteronomy 8:8 take precedence over other foods (M. 6:4). Another means of establishing hierarchy among foods, based on the quality of the food, was suggested elsewhere.⁵²

Within the framework of the meal, the consensus was that one does not need to recite a blessing over each food one eats. One recites a blessing over the primary

⁵¹On the basis of Judah's gloss we may associate that entire tradition with the Ushan period.

⁵²See T. 4:15, Judah's version of the dispute between Gamaliel and sages.

food of the meal, usually bread, and other foods are exempt. Certain special foods, like salted relishes or desert cakes, were exceptions to this practice.⁵³ One recited a separate set of blessings for these items.

The complexity of the rules created a whole host of problems for the rabbis to solve. The nature of the principles makes it essential for the rabbis to establish a detailed set of governing priorities to guide the implementation of the system of blessings in the everyday life of the rabbinic Jew. Through this system of blessings the rabbis could guide the institution of the table fellowship, and to regulate the consumption of all foods.

This naturally engendered the circumstances in which the rabbi played a central and indispensable role. He was consulted to solve any new enigmas generated by the principles that govern the system of rules for reciting the food blessings. No one else had the expertise to make the decisions. So, by means of this system of blessings, the rabbis made themselves essential to the daily life of the Jew.

In the final analysis I have contended that one great contribution of the masters of the Ushan period was their successful systematization of rules and regulations for disparate phenomena, for the basic rituals and concepts of rabbinic Judaism. The Ushans took the scattered traditions of a group of charismatic holy men [the Yavneans] and transformed the independent rules of individual teachers into a systematic tradition, a Torah. The Ushans believed that all religious obligations were parts of the same Torah, and all were to be governed under the authority of the rabbis.

Meir accounted for this succinctly, as illustrated above (T. 6:24-5): Each day a person recites one hundred blessings. The *Shema`*, the mealtime blessings, the recitation of the prayers are indeed, in Meir's view, all part of the same system as those basic scriptural obligations of the adult male Israelite, i.e., wearing tefillin and fringes, and placing a mezuzah on his doorpost.

Such thoughts left open issues of precedence within the system. Consider the impact of the *Shema`* and its blessings on the theology of early rabbinic Judaism. The ritual of the recitation of the *Shema`* expressed a powerful basic underlying theological message. Scriptural obligations of each Jew [such as the use of tefillin, mezuzah and *sisit*] were parts of the same system as the rabbinic practices obligatory for the individual and practiced in fellowship with other Jews [the recitation of the *Shema`*, the recitation of other blessings and prayers, the meals in the home].

Once the Ushans had established the notion of a system of religious obligations for the Jew, the inevitable issue to be raised was the question of priorities. When there is a clash between two commandments, which one took precedence? Some examples of this process of clarification of priorities are to be found in traditions ascribed to Ushans. One matter at T. 2:6 was: Do scribes stop writing their sacred scrolls to recite the *Shema`* and the prayer? Another concern at T. 5:1-4 was: What takes priority, prayer in the study hall or the Sabbath eve meal?

Furthermore, may one who is unclean by virtue of a rabbinic form of uncleanness still fulfill the obligations established on the authority of the rabbis? May one still

⁵³ See T. 4:14, T. 5:12.

recite the blessings of the meal and of the *Shema*?⁵⁴ A related question: Do social responsibilities take precedence over the requirements of religious obligations? Must one halt the processes of public administration for the recitation of the *Shema* and the Prayer (T. 2:6)? Ushan rulings closed and settled some issues, left others open-ended and allowed for multiple responses to some. These options established at Usha paved the way for the fuller Talmudic analysis of generations to come.

To close this review of the Ushan contributions, consider the precepts for several miscellaneous practices associated with them. One must recite blessings for unusual natural events, when visiting national shrines or other special places, and for good or bad fortune. Through rules such as these requiring the recitation of blessings at various occasions, the rabbis consolidated even popular, personal, occasional prayers into their system of worship and religious practice.⁵⁵

In sum, the data in Berakhot demonstrate that Usha was a period in which the rabbis advanced their control over their followers through regulation of religious practice. They are credited with rulings concerning the control of the time of prayer. Their materials show interests in governing the intention of the individual during recitation of prayer. They made statements that indicated their concern with the public recitation of prayer.

In these traditions we find little to suggest that Ushans legislated rules for the synagogue. A conclusion one may draw from this lack of evidence is that rabbis did not have much influence over synagogue practice. It may be that the synagogue was yet to be sufficiently institutionalized in Israel by the end of the second century. Or it may be that rabbis simply could not manage and direct the ritual processes of that institution. By contrast, they did seek to direct the institution of the common dinner.

We do find that they issued rulings concerning blessings recited at fellowship meals. Other rules effectively attempted to link a person's status within the rabbinic group with one's virtuosity in rabbinic religious practice and mastery of rabbinic thought.

Above all, the Ushans saw all religious obligations, based on both rabbinic and scriptural authority, as parts of a larger system. One may say that at Usha we find the beginnings of the idea of a "halakhah" or integrated system of laws that governs all life's activities. The creativity of the Ushans in this regard undoubtedly paved the way for the formation of the canon of the Mishnah in the next generation and thereby for the genesis of the Talmuds of the generations thereafter and the forms of Judaism associated with those corpora.

D. The Mishnah-Redactor's Unified Theory of Prayer and Blessings

M. Berakhot appears on the surface to be a somewhat disjointed tractate comprising disparate units on a variety of loosely related topics. Its laws deal with the recitation of the *Shema*, the recitation of the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings, blessings to be recited before one eats foods, the common recitation of blessings after the meal, other rules for the dinner, and blessings for other occasions.

⁵⁴See M. 3:4, and T. 2:13.

⁵⁵See M. 9:1-2, T. 6:2A-C, T. 6:6C-D.

On a basic level one common concern lends coherence to the diverse laws and rules of the tractate, the unifying principle that a person must recite one or more formulaic blessings in each instance of religious ritual mentioned in the tractate.⁵⁶ Hence the title: "Berakhot," "Blessings."

The requirement to recite a common formula connects a variety of clearly distinct religious rituals and personal or social occasions. Superficially, the various rules of the tractate and their subjects cohere.

Accordingly, M. rules that before and after the daily recitations of the biblical verses that constitute the *Shema`*, one recites blessings. For daily prayers, one recites a liturgy of eighteen blessings. At meals, one recites blessings before and after eating any foods. In times of danger, or when one obtains new clothes, or when one hears good news, or when one comes into a town from a trip abroad, or in a number of other instances, one recites blessings.

On further investigation we discover that M.'s redactors actually wove together a carefully selected group of formulaic rules on related topics to construct and articulate a fully developed and more coherent theory of prayer to define carefully the nature of many aspects of its larger concern--the nature of rabbinic liturgy and ritual, in particular the recitation of the standardized literary formulae of rabbinic prayer.

A principal assumption of M. Berakhot is the notion that blessings are performative utterances--words that a person recites to do something of religious significance--either to transform ordinary activities into special moments of ritual, or take on an independent ritual life themselves. Blessings before and after eating, for example, alter for the person who recites them the nature of the act of eating. They transform the meal from a mere biological act of eating to a moment of ritual sanctity.

The *Shema`*-liturgies, for one who recites them early in the morning and at night, serve to frame the activities of everyday life in sanctity. Blessings spoken before and after the *Shema`* frame the recitation of biblical verses with an outline of rabbinic actions and words and provide an interpretive framework for the traditional recitation of Scriptural selections.

Likewise those who perform other liturgical rituals such as the *Qiddush*, the Prayer of Sanctification at the beginning of the Sabbath, and the *Habdalah*, the Prayer of Division at the end of the Sabbath, frame with sanctity both the meals of the inauguration and conclusion of the Sabbath and the Sabbath day itself. In sum, by reciting the proper words a person can transform ordinary actions or periods of time into holy occasions, says Mishnah.⁵⁷

Mishnah also teaches that blessings may take on an independent existence, apart from other rituals. The recitation of the Prayer of Eighteen, for example, constitutes an

⁵⁶Here a blessing means a fixed array of words that first invokes God's name and then closes with an appropriate formula for the specific application of the blessing. Several examples help illustrate the use of blessings in the rabbinic system. Before reciting the evening *Shema`* one recites a short liturgy that concludes with a blessing, "Blessed art thou O Lord Our God, King of the Universe who brings the evening." Before eating fruit one must recite, "Blessed art thou . . . who creates the fruit of the tree." At the conclusion of the Sabbath one recites a liturgy that takes the form of a blessing: "Blessed art thou . . . who divides the sacred from the profane . . ."

⁵⁷See S. J. Tambiah, "The Magical Power of Words," in *Man*, vol. 3, 1968, pp. 175-208, and John R. Searle, *Speech Acts*, Cambridge, 1969, for the theoretical basis of such issues.

autonomous ritual, with its own religious significance. Other blessings by themselves may sanctify time or action and may protect an individual from harm or may express an individual's thanksgiving for God's protection and grace.

Curiously, within this tractate one finds few restrictions on the location acceptable for reciting prayers and blessings. Contrary to our expectations, the institution of the synagogue does not serve as a central setting in this compilation for the recitation of the liturgies and prayers of the late antique Israelite. The laws themselves govern actions that may be performed throughout the village, in houses, streets, marketplaces, groves, or vineyards, near latrines, in bathhouses, and in synagogues and study halls as well.

We may conclude accordingly that the rabbis believed that an ordinary householder who recites prayers with proper intention and action transforms his locale, wherever that may be, into a place of sanctity. One brings the sacred into one's house and village by reciting the right words, with the correct intentions, at the proper time, under the appropriate circumstances.

The redactor begins the tractate appropriately with laws for the recitation of the *Shema*. The central components of the *Shema*, verses from Deuteronomy, distinctly affirm the obligations of the individual Israelite in the village. One must love God, take God's words into one's heart, and teach one's children. The verses of the *Shema* in Scripture speak of places and times in the domain of the ordinary life of each person, from the doorpost of one's house to the village gates. The biblical passage alludes to the span of the typical day, from rising in the morning to retiring at night. The main obligations set forth in this section of Scripture relate to the normal existence of the individual householder. Each adult male must wear on his person tefillin and fringes. On the doorposts of each family's house there must be a mezuzah.

The *Shema*-ritual is paradigmatic of rabbinic religious practice. Mishnah Berakhot as its main task imbeds a distinctive message in the basic rules for this and several other major rituals of rabbinic daily life. Words become effective sacred utterances of speech, i.e., prayers and blessings, only when properly uttered according to the principles the rabbis set forth.

Taken as a whole *the tractate then goes on systematically to define rabbinic prayer*. Through its substantive selection and organization of early rabbinic rules for liturgical recitations, it enunciates a clear, structured early rabbinic doctrine of prayer utilizing three broad major concepts and numerous subsidiary ideas. M.'s primary distinctions are:

(1) There are two types of prayers. The first, independent, primary prayers and blessings, constitute the main elements of a ritual. The other kind, dependent secondary prayers and blessings, serve as subsidiary adjuncts to other rituals.

(2) Texts of prayers often either are framed by accompanying materials or serve as frames for other rituals.

(3) Prayers comprise at least two elements: a verbal and a mental component, i.e., an act of recitation and a state of concentration.

To understand the first part of M.'s definition, consider how M. broadly organizes the material in this tractate. In the first half, chapters one through five, M. deals with those prayers that stand on their own as independent rituals--the daily liturgies of rabbinic Judaism. Throughout the first five chapters M. presents rules that regulate

the rituals of the recitation of the texts of the *Shema`* and of the blessings that constitute the Prayer of Eighteen.

In the second part, chapters six through nine, M. takes up the rules for those prayers and blessings that serve as secondary elements of other rituals, first turning to regulations for the recitation of those blessings accompanying the meal. In actuality, the meals themselves are the focal rituals. The blessings merely frame the meal and establish it as a ritual occasion. Berakhot's laws propose that only through the recitation of the correct formulae before and after the meal can one define a situation of eating as a fellowship dinner (chapters six and seven).

The concluding section, chapter nine, spells out other secondary prayers and blessings--those one recites for special events. One says certain formulae to give thanks to God for deliverance from danger, to request protection from harm, or to recognize the national or historical importance of a place or the significance of an unusual natural event (chapter nine). These blessings have no function if they are recited detached from the events with which Mishnah connects them.

So, in the redactor's view the two related but distinct kinds of prayers are those independent prayers, such as the *Shema`* or the Prayer of Eighteen, which one recites apart from any other focal event or ritual, and those dependent blessings recited over foods or at various times, that are adjuncts to other actions.

Mishnah's second implicit interpretive concept is the idea that rituals need to be formally framed or demarcated. The rabbinic meal is one example of a ritual framed by the recitation of blessings before and after. They transform acts of consuming food, which they surround, into sacred occasions of ritual (cf. M. chapters six and seven). Likewise, the rabbinic blessings recited before and after the scriptural passages of the *Shema`* (see M. 1:4) serve to frame the recitation of these verses from the Torah, and transform the act from mere speech or study into liturgy. For M. rituals may be framed through the recitation of the formulae of prayers or blessings, and some prayers themselves may be framed by other liturgical devices.

Visible, but less urgent concerns of this tractate of Mishnah are such notions that prayers and other rituals may be differentiated from ordinary activities through a variety of "frames," not just through the recitation of other preliminary and concluding formulae texts. Physical signals such as posture, tone of voice, demeanor, dress, or the use of special objects, serve a similar purpose. In addition the physical locale or the social context of a prayer or another ritual may set it off from the profane endeavors of everyday life.⁵⁸

The third fundamental notion of M.'s definition of prayer, *the definition of the needed intention for reciting blessings and prayers*, inheres in a few choice rules governing the recitation of the liturgies. For an individual to recite the *Shema`* properly, M. requires that one achieve a certain level of concentration that shuts out some of the ordinary interactions of social life (M. 2:1). Likewise for the correct recitation of the Prayer of Eighteen, one must completely close out the distractions of the physical world and turn his attention inward, to prayer (M. 5:1). In addition Mishnah emphasizes that special positive forms of intention or concentration must

⁵⁸ See Erving Goffman, *Frame Analysis*, New York, 1974, for a full analysis of social framing.

accompany the recitation of prayers.⁵⁹

The rules of the tractate offer several subsidiary notions of prayers and blessings. In Mishnah's view, the *Shema`* and the Prayer of Eighteen play a role in demarcating the structure of daily life. The *Shema`* marks the beginning and end of every day (M. 1:1-3). The blessings that frame the *Shema`* express many rabbinic beliefs concerning the nature of the daily cycle of life and the importance and purpose of a person's daily endeavors.

The liturgical texts (blessings) that frame the morning *Shema`* mention God's role in the creation of light and darkness and in renewing each day his acts of creation of the world. They refer to the basic rabbinic beliefs in the revelation of the Torah, in redemption, and salvation. The blessings surrounding the evening *Shema`* refer to God's role in bringing the darkness of night, his love for his people Israel, his promise for the redemption of the people. In this liturgy one asks for God's protection through the night to come.

In a similar fashion, each Jew recites the blessings of the Prayer of Eighteen and invokes many important beliefs of rabbinism to mark the cycle of each passing day, morning, afternoon, and night.

Several rules in this tractate add conceptions subsidiary to the fundamental notion requiring intention or concentration for the recitation of prayers. For example, M. recognizes that the social realities of the pressures of a person's daily life may affect an individual's ability to concentrate for prayer. M. exempts from the obligation to recite the *Shema`* a newlywed who cannot properly concentrate because of emotional distractions (M. 2:5). Likewise the text recognizes the limitations of a mourner's ability to achieve the proper frame of mind for prayer because of grief (M. 3:1-2).

M. further rules that a craftsman may recite the *Shema`* while atop a tree (M. 2:4), but an ordinary householder should not because he cannot properly concentrate while high above the ground. This provides an additional derivative notion of how one must alter his awareness to make special efforts to concentrate during the recitation of the *Shema`* and the Prayer of Eighteen.

Other rulings, also subsidiary to the main ideas of the tractate, exclude certain classes, i.e., women, slaves and minors, individuals who suffered a pollution, and those who stand unclothed or near waste materials (M. 3:3-6), from participation in the rituals of prayer. M. also specifies how the level of a person's voice and the correct pronunciation of the words of liturgies contribute to the proper execution of the ritual. In addition, one's posture and bodily orientation are all factors in defining and properly framing liturgical recitations (M. 2:4-6, 1:3).

As I said earlier, the second half of the tractate develops ideas concerning those secondary prayers that accompany other rituals --the blessings one recites before and after eating and the blessings for other special events. M.'s simple system of those blessings to be recited before eating any foods represents a taxonomy of foods that distinguishes separate categories for bread and wine, for fruits, for vegetables, and

⁵⁹See my study "Concentration for Prayer in the Mishnah and the Talmud," *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism*, ed. J. Neusner, Lanham, MD, 1987, and chapter VII below for a discussion of intention, concentration and distraction.

for all other foods (M. 6:1-3). Besides its outline of the system of food blessings, M. spells out a second important substantive concept, that one must make exceedingly sparing use of these blessings presumably because they invoke the name of God (M. 6:4-7).

To review, these are the chief concerns of M.'s third-century rabbinic definition of prayer in the tractate:

The distinction of independent from dependent prayers.

Effective means to frame the texts of prayers to separate them from ordinary speech.

Employing blessings to bracket the rituals of prayer and of the fellowship meal.

Various other modes of framing the act of prayer with physical signals, such as voice, posture and orientation.

The nature of the effective and defective mental processes associated with prayer.

The relationship between real social structures and situations, and the theoretical demands of the recitation of prayers.

Utilization of blessings to support conceptions of taxonomic structures of natural produce.

Economical use of the formulae of blessings recited in the context of the meal.

E. The World of Early Rabbinic Prayer

The rabbinic Jew of the early third century led a complex double life. Aside from those ordinary responsibilities of the occupation that earned him his sustenance, he sought to fulfill many rabbinic religious obligations of daily being. Each day, for example, he was expected to dedicate some time to study the written Torah with the rabbinic interpretations, and the oral Torah of the rabbis. He was required to eat his meals according to rabbinic precepts, and to recite the daily rabbinic prayers. In addition, in their seasons, he had to prepare for and observe the feasts and fasts of the Jewish calendar according to rabbinic regulations.

For the rabbinic Jew, all these activities contributed to a distinctive style of existence and to a special understanding of the role of the individual Jew in the world. Through the texts in tractate Berakhot of Mishnah and Tosefta one gains some insight into several prominent ideas that represent the timbre of rabbinic Judaism during this formative period of late antiquity.

One supposition of the rabbis who organized M. Berakhot was that a person did not have to go to a specific locale to recite prayers. The Jew did not need to attend a synagogue, or go to a special building, or a designated area of the town or village. A person could pray in the street, in the house, on the road, or in the orchard. The rabbis taught that a person who prayed did not have to enter a special sacred room. Wherever one happened to recite prayers, those four cubits around a person became a sacred precinct because the individual Israelite constituted the primary locus of the sacred in the world.

Some specific concerns of the tractate relate to and rest implicitly on this notion that the Jew himself defines the place best suited for prayers. The editors of Mishnah assembled in Berakhot rules that govern the ways in which the individual Jew, engaged in the recitation of prayers and blessings, may relate to and interact with others around him and other proper modes of behavior during prayer.

They provide, as I discuss elsewhere for instance, those laws that deal with certain activities that distract a person from carrying out religious obligations. Other rules govern the ways in which an individual relates to the physical context of prayer, the places where a person may recite the formulae of prayers or blessings.

Behind the rules governing the special forms of concentration one must engage in during the recitation of liturgy lies the basic theological conception of early rabbinism that a Jew relates to God primarily as an individual under rabbinic authority and not through any other corporate or institutional structures. Based on this notion, the rabbis rule that the Jew does not need to go to the synagogue to pray, or to the assembly hall to recite the *Shema* or to a special chamber to eat a meal and recite the blessings over the dinner. One may do all these things outside formal physical institutional structures and within rabbinic guidelines. Each *rabbinic* Jew can define the places of holiness in his world by following the regulations laid out by the masters.

Though ample evidence suggests that the collective performance of rituals in designated places was sometimes encouraged and common in late antique rabbinism, Mishnah, as we see it, does not concern itself with the obligations of the collective or the regulations for the precincts of public ritual. Mishnah is a document directed at articulating the obligations of each individual Israelite, a law code for a rabbinic Jew, independent of a fixed institutional place.

The orientation conveyed through the rules of that law code contrasts sharply with other possible Judaic conceptions. For instance, Mishnah plays down somewhat the power of the Scriptural idea that the Jew lives out daily existence as a member of a nation, a participant in a large corporate culture. It instead emphasizes the centrality of the context of the immediate community of the Jew, the neighborhood of the individual, for religious life and daily existence. This reflects, to be sure, the character of late antique life in general, that sought above all to make sense of and govern the face to face relations between members of small communities that dotted the landscape of the Near East in this era.⁶⁰

By late antique times, the Jew had learned from history that the existence of a religious system based on collective national public ritual was precarious. Twice in less than a century, the Jews witnessed the defeat of their centralized political leadership at the hands of stronger military authorities. If the destruction of the Temple and the defeat of Bar Kokhba taught the Jews any lessons at all, it taught them that they could not rely on the power of a centralized cult or a charismatic military leader to protect their nation. It is not surprising that the rabbis turned inward to emphasize the ultimate importance of the religious life of the individual Jew.

The rabbinic model of prayer emphasized the centrality of the person over the

⁶⁰Cf. Peter Brown, *The Making of Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass., 1978 and *The World of Late Antiquity*, London, 1971.

immediacy of a national institution; it reflected a personal-locative approach to the spiritual life of late antiquity. The rabbis chose consciously not to build on the institutional-locative model of religious life.

A rabbinic view of history taught that after the destruction of the national religious cult of the Temple in Jerusalem by the Romans, the religion that center on it crumbled. By contrast, the rabbinic system of religious observances would flourish despite the fate of national religious locales or institutions. The personal-locative mode of rabbinic Judaic practice could serve as the basis for an effective religious system in one larger cultural context or another. And when the economic and social life of Israel declined in the third and fourth centuries C.E. and the demographic and religious center of Judaism moved elsewhere, the rabbis could carry with them and implement with minor modification, first to Babylonia and later, in the middle ages, to Europe, a system of prayer and religion based primarily on their sense of reality and meaning and their innovative generative conceptions. The system of rabbinic spirituality was readily transplantable. It was possible to uproot, replant and watch it grow in more fertile cultural soils.

As we have seen, with the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem Judaism faced potential extinction. In the late antique period after the failure of the two revolts of 70 and 135, the rabbis established a system of religion that conveyed through its design, via its regulations, a definitive approach to the locus of the sacred in the religious life of the Jew. A single hill or building or city was not again to be the locus of holiness for the Jew. The center of religion shifted to the individual rabbinic Jew and his fellows, the community of study, worship and table fellowship. This basic model of religious life formed the ballast of rabbinic Judaism that kept it afloat in the turbulent sea of history through the next two millennia.

The core of Jewish spirituality was made portable. Wherever the individual Jew could go, he could carry out the central religious obligations of rabbinic life. As the rabbinic system of prayer and blessings flourished for many subsequent centuries, when in those later epochs of history material and demographic patterns permitted, the rabbis moved many elements of the rituals of prayer into an institutionalized synagogue context. But even then the crux of the rabbinic model remained intact to govern the nature of Jewish worship. Only after the complete reformation of Judaism in the nineteenth century did the worship of the Jew become grounded more in the synagogue, and did the institution begin to overshadow the primary rabbinic conceptions of the rituals of prayer that we have outlined herein.

Chapter III

The Synagogue in Mishnah, Tosefta and the Talmud of the Land of Israel

Our evidence constrains what we can know of rabbinic Jews at prayer. Unfortunately we have no way of producing a full-fledged anthropological study of synagogue life for late antique Judaism.⁶¹ The primary external testimonies from antiquity that refer to Jews at prayer are few. Some are apparently unsympathetic to Judaism.⁶² Others are anecdotal.⁶³

To utilize any of the episodic literary evidence of composing a picture of late antique rabbinic Jews at prayer, we need to establish the contextual meaning of each relevant pericope whether in early rabbinic, Qumran, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, or early Christian literature. Then may we establish the outlines of our knowledge based on the literary testimonies. We must exercise caution in using literary traditions and be alert for both the *tendenz* of the original source and the possibility of scribal alteration in transmission of the document.

Material remains of the period are another potential source of primary evidence on the nature of early Jewish prayer. As evidences these data are in some ways more reliable than literary traditions. The discovery and analysis of ritual objects used in prayer and of many synagogue sites provide us with a form of eyewitness evidence of Jewish prayer in late antiquity.

Unfortunately it is difficult for us to elicit direct answers to critical questions from these mute witnesses. Synagogue stones and structure rarely can tell us who prayed within their walls. Phylacteries and scrolls cannot disclose to us who used them. It is not easy to determine whether those who left us these remains were members of early rabbinic society, or among the Jews who ignored the authority of the rabbis. We

⁶¹Compare S. C. Heilman, *Synagogue Life*, Chicago, 1976, a micro-social and anthropologically oriented study of modern American Orthodox synagogue ritual and interaction.

⁶²See, e.g., Matt. 6:1-18, 22-25; Luke 18:9-14.

⁶³E.g., T. Ber. 1:2, 1:4; M. Ber. 1:3. Also cf. the Qumran Literature, Manual of Discipline (IQS1), Damascus Document (CDC 6), and scattered references in Ben Sirah. For a general summary see C. W. F. Smith, "Prayer," in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Nashville, 1962, vol. 3, pp. 857-67.

cannot figure out with any certainty whether the Jews who worshipped in ancient synagogues recited those texts of classical prayer that interest historians and theologians. We cannot readily ascertain exactly when and if the early rabbis propounded all those conceptions of prayer and society that later rabbinic tractates preserve for us.

The material evidence alone cannot answer these questions. It serves a different agenda of inquiry, generated by the evidence itself and not imposed from without.

An example of recent research on synagogue remains illustrates this point. In an art historical study of Palestinian synagogue art and architecture, M. J. Chiat assembles a corpus of relevant data, and argues based on this evidence that it is essential to categorize synagogues for architectural analysis by geopolitical locale within Palestine.⁶⁴ Chiat emphasizes the value of associating sites by region rather than by a hypothetical country-wide system of classification. Her compilation shows significant distinction in architectural design from one region to another in various districts of Palestine.

She rejects, therefore, based on her study, the formerly prevalent theory of three epochs in Pan-Palestinian synagogue architecture--early, transitional and late--corresponding to the rise of Palestinian rabbinism (2nd-3rd centuries), its development (late third through fifth centuries), and its decline (5th-8th centuries).⁶⁵ She shows, for instance, significant variation in architectural form and decoration in the territories of Tiberias, Sepphoris, Scythopolis and Tetracomia in the Northern Region of Palestine.

This concurs well with M. Smith's observation of first-century Palestine that

the different parts of the country were so different, such gulfs of feeling and practice separated Idumea, Caesarea and Galilee that . . . [with regard to the local religion of the average people] there was probably no more agreement between them than between any one of them and a similar area in Diaspora.⁶⁶

Chiat concludes further regarding the Palestinian synagogue that

There was no overriding authority, or normative, accepted liturgy, which would dictate the form this building was to take. Rather it appears that each (regional) Jewish community tackled the problem individually by drawing on the resources available within their immediate area.⁶⁷

Variations in architecture confirm the regional divisions of late antique Palestine, she concludes.

⁶⁴ *A Corpus of Synagogue Art and Architecture in Roman and Byzantine Palestine*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1979. Published by Brown Judaic Studies as *A Handbook of Synagogue Architecture*.

⁶⁵ Avi-Yonah as cited and discussed by Chiat in her conclusions.

⁶⁶ M. Smith, "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century," in *Israel: Its Role in Civilization*, ed. Moshe Davis, New York, 1956, p. 81, and cited by Chiat.

⁶⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 782.

Chiat's inquiry proposes, as it should, a solution to an art historical issue generated by the corpus of evidence that she seeks to interpret. It may be appropriate to address a secondary set of issues to these data, those questions that I mentioned above about prayer in general. Some might argue that by extending Chiat's results, for instance, it would be plausible to assume that prayers recited and the manner of praying in the various Palestinian synagogues varied from one locale to another.

Analogously, one might conclude that it is unlikely that a unitary liturgy for first, second, or third-century Palestine existed. The pattern of regional development of design and decoration then perhaps could be extended to synagogue life in general in Roman Palestine. Consequently, synagogue remains may provide information regarding patterns and types of style and decoration and their development and suggest broader conclusions as well. The art historical methods used, for instance, in the above study may indirectly inform us concerning the synagogue's function for prayer or another purpose though these may not be appropriate primary avenues of inquiry for this set of data.

Recent research on diaspora synagogues, however, suggests that the synagogue evidence may be more exhaustively exploited for the reconstruction of the function and life of the synagogue. A. T. Kraabel, in his study of the "Social System of Six Diaspora Synagogues,"⁶⁸ draws inferences from the synagogues' designs about the social significance of the buildings in their respective settings. More important for our present concerns, he suggests that from the evidence one may confidently hypothesize what may have been the nature of the liturgical activity inside the structures. He observes that from the evidence of "four sites one might assume that scriptures dominate the religious life of the community." Teaching, he further remarks, was an important activity of the synagogue. Based on the remains, we can know about the functionaries of the institutions, including the synagogue staff of officers, priests and communal leaders.

Now these general conclusions and observations do not represent the limits of our knowledge of the function of the ancient synagogue in Judaic life. It remains to be seen how the results of further sound, conservative, art-historical and archeological research on the one hand, and the conclusions of critical analysis of literary traditions on the other, will advance our understanding of early rabbinic prayer and other related phenomena of nascent rabbinic Judaism.⁶⁹

The two primary sets of data: literary traditions of prayer-texts and archeological remains of late antique synagogues must be combined with a sensitive study of other literary traditions relevant to the study of early rabbinic liturgy and the synagogue. These include, in particular, legal and narrative traditions about prayer and blessings in Mishnah, Tosefta, the Talmudim and Midrashim.⁷⁰

Past scholars have viewed the rabbinic legal dicta in mainly one dimension. They

⁶⁸ Kraabel's discussion of structures of Sardis, Priene, Dura Europus, Delos, Ostia, and Stobi in *Ancient Synagogues: The Current State of Research*, ed. J. Guttmann, Missoula, 1981, pp. 79-91.

⁶⁹ Cf. J. Neusner, "The Symbolism of Ancient Judaism: The Evidence of the Synagogue," in Guttmann. An illustration of an early uncritical attempt at synthesizing a variety of evidences can be found in S. Krauss, *Synagogale Altertümer*, Berlin, 1922; reprinted, Hildesheim, 1966.

⁷⁰ Most appear as expected in tractate Berakhot of M., T., B., and Y.

assumed that the most dominant purpose and function of these statements was to regulate the liturgical practice of late antique Jews. The study of these materials was of interest because it showed the practical range of actions that Jews performed or were supposed to perform. Those who took this basically positivist view frequently sought to compare the laws of prayer with the evidences of prayer-texts⁷¹ (most of which derive from that self-same literary source of rabbinic traditions) or with material evidences of the period.

Y. Yadin's brief monograph, *Tefillin from Qumran* (XQ phyl 1-4), represents a sophisticated example of an attempt to correlate legal literary traditions with material remains and exemplifies the limits of such studies.⁷² He examines the remains of the capsule of a head tefillin⁷³ containing four folded slips. His conclusions show how, in many aspects, the construction of the capsule and the scribal techniques of the slips of biblical citations reflect "rabbinic traditions" while, in some respects, the technology of this head tefillin diverges from the "Halakhah." Without justification, Yadin assumes in this work that rabbinic law served as the sole normative basis for Pan-Judean piety.⁷⁴ Yet his study nonetheless shows how the combined mastery of literary and material evidence may lead to fructifying hypotheses and, possibly, open new avenues for further exploration of significant religious phenomena.⁷⁵

To reiterate, material evidences may be relevant to the context of early Jewish prayer, but must be subjected to scholarly analysis first by specialists in the methods of archeological and art historical study. I suggest that the general conclusions of such research at least about the regionalism of the decor and design of the synagogues in Roman Palestine may be extended plausibly to other aspects of liturgical activity.

Also it has been shown that the material evidence of synagogue remains may provide general but direct information concerning some social functions associated with the structure. Finally, by way of one illustration, I have suggested that one employ caution in any attempt to link material relics of ancient Judean prayer with rabbinic legal traditions.

The subject of the synagogue provides a good illustration of the difficulty of correlating material and textual evidence.

The Synagogue and the Rabbis in Late Antique Israel: the Evidence of Mishnah, Tosefta and Yerushalmi

There is little doubt that in the first through third centuries, the rabbis in Israel

⁷¹Cf. Heinemann, Elbogen, and most others including H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, Munich, 1928.

⁷²*Tefillin from Qumran*, Jerusalem, 1969.

⁷³Wearing tefillin is an ancient Israelite ritual act. The assumption that tefillin are to be associated with rituals of praying is a projection back to the first century based on firmer knowledge of later practice. See M. Shavuot 3:8, 3:11 for mention, at least of a formal rabbinic ritual of wearing tefillin.

⁷⁴Remarks on this supposition may be found in J. Neusner, "The Demise of Normative Judaism," in *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, Leiden, 1975.

⁷⁵See Yadin, *Tefillin*, pp. 34-35.

participated in collective prayer and dealt with aspects of synagogue ritual and maintenance. I have shown yet in the preceding chapter that the synagogue was not a dominant concern of the literature of the rabbis in this formative period of Judaism. The primary evidence from this age in Mishnah and Tosefta, especially in its agenda in Tractate Berakhot, pays no serious attention to the complex subject of the synagogue. Even the few direct references to the synagogue in these corpora, for the most part, address the subject in a cursory fashion, with indifference for the important aspects of synagogue construction, upkeep and governance. The data presuppose moreover that the rabbis in the early period of their creative leadership did not focus their religious practices exclusively in the synagogue and probably had little control over the development of the institution.

In the preceding chapter we saw that Tractate Berakhot was not built around any central conception related to the synagogue. What might another model and its corresponding option to M. Berakhot have been like? In this sketching a hypothetical contrasting design of a tractate for the regulation of prayer and blessings, consider that the locus of the rituals of prayer and blessings was not the individual but, alternatively, a specific place, the synagogue, and that the framer of the hypothetical code constructed a scheme of rules to govern the recitation of prayer centered on it.

What would it contain? It would need to set forth rules to govern the construction of a synagogue building. It would have to specify what location in the village or city was appropriate for a synagogue site. It might regulate the architectural design or orientation of the building. The structure might have to sit in a certain orientation, so that it somehow faced Jerusalem or so the worshippers could turn in that direction during prayer. Rules for the building materials used in the construction, such as the kind of bricks and mortar to be used, would not be out of place.⁷⁶

Further regulations might govern the use of decorations or accouterments of the synagogue. What figures could appear in the synagogue, if any? What was the proper formula for dedicatory inscriptions that blessed the donors who materially supported the construction and furnished the building? How was the ark that held the Torah scrolls to be constructed? What was to be the height, the location, or the size of the Bimah--the table for the reading of the Torah?

In addition our hypothetical tractate might provide rules for attendance at synagogue services, regulations to govern comportment and decorum in the building,⁷⁷ or explain a code of dress for those who came to services. Other laws might instruct one in the proper modes of participating in the services or deal with particular questions, such as what one does when one comes to services late, after the congregation had begun reciting the liturgy.⁷⁸

⁷⁶M. Meg., chapter 3 may seem to, but really does not serve as an example of such laws. It uses the example of the synagogue structure to illustrate rules for another subject. From the references to the synagogue in M. and T., assembled below, it is apparent that the materials are widely scattered throughout the corpora. Still, the framers of M., and accordingly of T., had the raw material for the construction of at least a brief sub-tractate on the synagogue at their disposal. Nonetheless they chose to frame their conceptions of the locus of prayer in a different way.

⁷⁷Cf. M. Ber. 9:5.

⁷⁸Cf. T. Ber. 2:9.

Another chapter of traditions could conceivably deal with the hierarchy of the synagogue administration. Who was responsible for the upkeep of the building? How was the administrator of the synagogue selected? Related questions such as who could serve as prayer leader, and laws for the office of the hazzan might be relevant at that point.⁷⁹ Other pertinent issues like the procedure for beginning the service with the call to prayer, or the steps to be taken if a leader of the prayer failed in his tasks, also would appear in this chapter.⁸⁰

In reality, this institution-centered conception of framing rules for prayer remains hypothetical. Whereas allusions to several of its concerns are scattered throughout our texts and developed in later rabbinic materials, we have no tractate, not even a substantial chapter or segment of traditions that centers its attention on the institution of the synagogue. The synagogue is not the generative locus of rabbinic prayer.

This hypothetical contrastive illustration helps us see more clearly that our existing rabbinic model in Mishnah envisions prayer as a ritual of the literate recitation of specified formulae at proper intervals of the day, week and year. It emphasizes, as we have said, first, as its central organizing interest the obligations of the rabbinized individual.

It would not have been difficult for the Tannaitic framers of Mishnah to find within Jewish textual traditions an institutional-locative model for collective ritual. They needed simply to turn to the latter parts of the biblical book of Exodus and many sections of Leviticus for a detailed example of such a model. These passages in the Torah described the construction and use of the Tabernacle. Other materials in the prophets detailed the cultic regulations of the Temple in Jerusalem. Indeed a whole order of M. itself, *Tohorot*, presents a system of laws to govern the rituals of the Temple cult. The rabbis could easily have attempted to replicate the rules for this mode of worship of the Temple in their own system of regulations for prayer.

They rejected this as a model for prayer and piety. True, we do find an occasional reference to the Temple calendar or timetable as a support of rabbinic rule of practice.⁸¹ And without doubt, the rabbis spoke of, and studied, the regulations for the cultic Temple-centered worship of ancient Israel. In the very prayers that they recited and promoted, the rabbis spoke of their yearning for the restoration of the days of yore and of the Temple, the priesthood, the sacrificial order. But therein lies one great incongruity of rabbinic Judaism. Though they purported in their prayers to seek a return to the old order, the rabbis actively fostered new and very different modes of religious practice. Rabbinic prayer rests on another model, a divergent understanding of ritual forms of worship. Rabbinic worship mirrors rabbinic values in a late antique cultural setting of rabbinic Judaism.

The rabbis placed the highest value on the obligation of each Jew to study Torah. They emphasized the importance of discipleship, study of students with their master. In the view of the rabbis, study was the religious practice par excellence. One could carry out his obligation to study in almost any location, on his own if he was a master,

⁷⁹ Cf. M. Ber. 5:4.

⁸⁰ Cf. M. Ber. 7:3 and 5:4.

⁸¹ E.g. M. Ber. 1:1, T. Ber. 4:1.

or if not, he could study anywhere with his rabbi and fellow disciples. The rabbinic Jew did not need to enter a special building to engage in the central ritual of his religious system. He could study the formal content of rabbinic tradition anywhere.⁸²

Likewise, the rabbis developed the regulations for the parallel religious obligations of prayer and the fellowship meal, rituals they viewed as occasions of religious action centered on the individual rabbi and the small group. The Jew could pray wherever he happened to be at the time of prayer. The locus remained fluid.

Gradually, the texts of rabbinic prayer took on more rigid formulaic literary structure. The gradual standardization of the Amidah, a prayer made up of eighteen blessings, an example of the eventual formulaic character of rabbinic liturgy, illustrates how the rabbinic system used formal structures of language instead of structured physical or institutional loci.

In some ways then, the rabbinic mode of worship mirrored a characteristic feature of late antique society. As Peter Brown says, this was a time of face to face contact, of the establishment of the importance of small groups for fellowship in many endeavors of daily life and the rise of holy men and small cults throughout the Roman Empire in the aftermath of the demise of large national cultural and religious institutions.⁸³ The individual-locative model of rabbinic ritual observance conformed well to the spirit of this age.

The rabbinic emphasis that an individual must specially direct his inner consciousness for prayer, pay attention to his recitation according to specified models, also reflected aspects of the spirit of late antiquity. The prayer of the rabbis was a literate, individualistic, concentrative model of liturgical recitation and, like study, was meaningless unless accompanied by the proper frame of mind, by the appropriate forms of cognition and perception.

To this point I have dealt with the positive systematic statements of rabbinic corpora on prayer. Next I turn to the scattered references to the synagogue in rabbinic literature in an attempt to piece together from them other dimensions of the development of Jewish spirituality and social realities in late antiquity.

Material evidence suggests that synagogues were not prevalent institutions of ancient Israel until the late third century. However limited or pervasive the early impact of the institution of the synagogue in the second and third centuries, it appears that other social classes or professional groups controlled them.

I have suggested that this was a deliberate choice guided by the internal dynamics of rabbinic reflection. Others might argue that the rabbis were not actively involved in the affairs of the synagogue because of their material situation. As a scholarly class, the rabbis generally could not amass the wealth that was necessary for supporting the construction and maintenance of the physical structures of the synagogues.

Whatever the cause, the effect was that the rabbis developed a model of early Jewish prayer that, while it does not exclude synagogue prayer as an alternative, basically ignores and de-emphasizes the role of this institution in the spiritual life of

⁸²This does not preclude the use and existence of special structures for study. We know that the study hall was a real institution of several eras of rabbinic development.

⁸³P. Brown, *The Making of Late Antiquity*, *passim*.

the Jew. By effectively sanctioning the detachment of the rituals of worship from the confines of an institutional edifice, the rabbis greatly modified the nature of Judaism. They transformed the central phenomena of the ritual life of their religious system by making it independent of a physical locus.

Accordingly the relationship between rabbis and synagogues was not simple. There is little doubt that rabbinic Jews prayed in synagogues and participated in their ongoing activities. But how much did they use and control the synagogues of Israel during the first through third centuries? I believe it is of value to explore to what specifics the rabbis refer when they deal with the synagogue in their rulings and how this helps us get a better perspective on the religious and social setting of late antique Israel.

Thirty-four sources concerning the synagogue in Mishnah and Tosefta mention the term "synagogue." The texts refer to eight different kinds of activities in the synagogue.

1. **A locale for prayer and related rituals:** Sources mention the sounding the shofar on the New Year, waving the lulab on Sukkot, reading the Scroll of Esther on Purim, reciting the Hallel on Passover eve, reciting the Priestly Blessings, reciting the Prayer of Eighteen, reciting the *Shema*, and the call to prayer.
2. **A place of study:** this includes reading the Torah for routine study, public reading of the Torah, reading Torah on fast days, reading Torah on Sabbaths, reciting blessings over Torah, protocol for Torah readers.
3. **A repository** for communal charity funds.
4. **A locale for legal decisions**, a place for holding trials.
5. **A public assembly hall.**⁸⁴
6. **Living quarters** attached to the institution.⁸⁵
7. **As a public institution** to be administered:
 - a. Sale or abandonment of synagogue and furnishings
 - b. Necessity for residents of city to build
 - c. Obligation of individual to attend
 - d. Decorum in the building
 - e. Donations to synagogue
 - f. Role of synagogue officials
 - g. Seating in synagogue

⁸⁴Evidence cited by L. I. Levine, "Ancient Synagogues--A historical Introduction," in *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, Jerusalem, 1981, p. 3, indicates that sacred meals were held in synagogues. Lacking in this speculative assertion is the definition of a sacred repast.

⁸⁵Levine adds that there is evidence of synagogue officials residing in the building.

- h. Direction of doors; location of synagogue
- i. Eulogy in synagogue
- j. The synagogue in Alexandria

Some scholars have argued that the sources represented by this brief catalogue confirm the conclusion that, "By the middle of the first century, the synagogue represented the central Jewish institution in any given community."⁸⁶ This is a prevalent view of the role of the synagogue in religious life in ancient Israel and it is problematic on several accounts.

We simply have little material confirmation of the proliferation of first or second century synagogues. The earliest evidence of widespread synagogue construction and use dates from the third and fourth centuries. Even that later archaeological evidence reveals a greater concentration of synagogues in the Galilee, fewer in Samaria and Judea.

Those who claim synagogue centrality make no attempt to define their terms. What constitutes a "Jewish institution," how do we know if it is "central," or how we could compare one institution in a given community to another? Can we base our discussion on a better account of the demonstrably composite character of communal organization in late antique Israel and variations from one region and one community to another? The search for simple structure and uniform patterns, it seems to me, rests on the premise that a centralized elite with theologically based authority governed scattered and diverse social and physical structures. This supposition defies both historical intuition and most of our evidence.

I think it urgent to recognize the distinctions between rabbinic and non-rabbinic authority structures and social divisions internal to the Jewish life of the era and look more critically at the data.

Some writers have begun to do this. Martin Cohen resolves some of the confusion arising from the interpretation of the sources by making clear the distinction between the two major connotations of the term "synagogue": (1) physical structure used solely for prayer and sanctioned activities; (2) a congregation of persons gathered for regular religious ritual. He argues,

Separate structures or permanent rooms are . . . not inferable from Talmudic records of a synagogue within the Temple or from the large number of synagogues (394 according to the Babylonian Talmud and 480 according to the Jerusalem Talmud) in existence at the time of the Temple in 70 C.E. Because of their flexibility the three terms (i.e., *beit ha-keneset*, *beit ha-tefillah* and *beit ha-midrash*) effectively may focus on the congregation rather than its home. This is the case with *synagogue* in the Gospels and the *Acts of the Apostles*.⁸⁷

The early rabbinic sources often use "synagogue" in the first sense, as a permanent

⁸⁶ See Levine, p. 3.

⁸⁷ Martin A. Cohen, "Synagogue: History and Tradition," in M. Eliade, ed., *Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 14, New York, 1987, p. 210.

building within the village. Sometimes, however, an ambiguity remains. When they mention the synagogue as a place of prayer and study, they may allude either to a fixed physical structure or to an ad hoc congregate entity.

The Hebrew *byt kn* seems to connote a physical structure or enclosure, a "House of Assembly" rather than a "gathering place" or "assembly." The use of *byt* need not be so restrictive, as we see in several common rabbinic usages. For instance *byt dyn* means a court session or panel of judges, with no necessary implication of place or structure. Similarly *byt hll*, *byt šm`y*, the House of Hillel or of Shammai, imply an association of scholars, not a place. Likewise in Biblical usage we find *byt ysr`l*, the House of Israel (Ezek. 28:25, Jer. 3:40). The phrase *byt mšth* denotes a gathering for a festive feast. A reference to *byt N* designates a school session, not a building (M. Ket. 2:10) and similarly *byt rbn* (b. Ber. 5a). The term *byt škynh* implies the concentrated presence of the divine (Numbers Rabbah 7). It is not difficult to justify that the label *byt kn* signals an association rather than fixed location. For this purpose *kn* might have sufficed. One could speculate that the common adoption of the designation *byt kn* summoned up for those who used it the recollection of the *byt hmqdš*, the Temple in Jerusalem, an important justification of its authority and association with classical Israelite modes of sanctity.

Let us examine each rabbinic source to consider how the term may be understood and what function the synagogue plays in each pericope and its context. We follow the chronological order of the documents, Mishnah first, followed by those in Tosefta, concluding with the references from Yerushalmi.

The sources in Mishnah that mention the synagogue:

1. M. Ber. 7:3

Said R. Aqiba, "What do we find concerning the [form of the call to recite the prayer service in the] synagogue? Whether there are many or few [in the congregation] one says, `Bless the Lord.'" [In the context of the Mishnah in Berakhot this implies by analogy that there should be no change of the call to recite the meal blessing regardless of the number of persons at the meal.]

R. Ishmael says, "Bless the Lord who is blessed."

Aqiba's saying, that the short formula recited before the beginning of the recitation of the prayer service in the synagogue does not depend on the number of persons present in the synagogue, is cited in chapter seven of Berakhot to support a notion concerning the recitation of prayers at a fellowship meal. The formula for the invitation to recite the blessings after the meal also should not vary according to the size of the gathering, M. says.

Rabbinic sayings rarely shy away from actively dictating proper behavior. I find it curious then that the ruling uses descriptive rather than prescriptive language, i.e., "What do we find . . .?" This tradition links the fellowship meal with the institution of prayer in the synagogue in the early era when the center of rabbinic authority was situated at Yavneh. It suggests that rabbis were familiar with and participated in

synagogue prayer but makes no impression that they directed the conduct of public prayer in the synagogue. Other ambiguities remain as well. The term synagogue here may mean either the congregation, the structure, or both. The statements do not clarify the context of when the call to prayer is recited in the synagogue. The first reference then has limited historical value.

2. M. Bik. 1:4

The following bring the first fruits offering but do not recite [the declaration that accompanies it]:

The proselyte brings [the first fruit offering] but does not recite [the declaration that accompanies it] because he cannot say [that part of the declaration that proclaims that the land was given to his forefathers because he is a convert, i.e.,] "The land which the Lord promised our forefathers he would give us (Deut. 26:3)."

But a person whose mother [only] was an Israelite [and his father was a gentile] may [nonetheless] bring [the first fruits offering] and recite [the declaration that accompanies it, though it refers to his "fathers"].

And when [a proselyte] prays alone he says [the phrase], "God of the fathers of Israel" [rather than "God of our fathers" in the first blessing of the liturgy of eighteen blessings].

And when he [prays] *in the synagogue* he says, "God of your fathers" [rather than "God of our fathers"].

And a person whose mother [only] was an Israelite [and his father was a gentile] may [nonetheless] say, "God of our fathers" [though his father was not an Israelite].

This unit assumes the synagogue is a setting for the recitation of public prayer. It also assumes that private prayer is a normal activity. It contrasts the variant formulae of a proselyte in a private recitation of the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings with what should be said in a public recitation in the synagogue. The pericope does not clearly articulate whether the synagogue is a building or a gathering. It is hard to date it to a specific generation or master and therefore provides little information of historical value.

3. M. R. H. 3:7

And likewise [some Mss omit] one who was passing behind a synagogue or one whose house was near a synagogue and he heard the sound of the shofar [on the New Year festival] or the sound of the [reading of] the Scroll of Esther [on Purim, though he did not have in mind to approach the synagogue to hear the shofar or the megillah and by that fulfill his obligation,] if he had intention [then to fulfill his obligation through hearing these sounds], he fulfilled his obligation.

And if he did not have intention [to fulfill his obligation], he did not fulfill his obligation.

[Because] though both [the one who had intention and the one who did not have intention] heard the same sound, one had intention [to fulfill his obligation, and therefore did so] and the other did not have intention to fulfill his obligation [and therefore did not].

This unit's synagogue may be a permanent structure and the setting for the public performance of the rituals of special festival days: blowing the shofar on the New Year and reading the scroll of Esther on Purim. It makes no reference to daily prayer in the synagogue.

Mishnah's point is that intention links a person to the public performance of a ritual. One passing outside behind the synagogue has participated in the services inside if he directs his intention to the sounds of the ritual. One becomes a "participant" by virtue of thoughts alone even when physically removed from the setting of the ritual.

M. articulates this situation to convey its theory of a person's participation in collective rituals. It is unlikely therefore that the situation of the unit--a person passing outside the synagogue--suggests any real social conflict such as a preference of individuals consciously to avoid entering synagogue buildings. The unit does give evidence of rabbinic concern to define a valid means of participation in synagogue ritual. It does not portray for us a picture of a stable physical and social institution under rabbinic authority.

4. M. Suk. 3:13

If the first day of the [Sukkot] festival fell on the Sabbath, all the people [would] bring their *lulabim* to the *synagogue* [Friday eve before the commencement of the Sabbath].

On the morrow they would awaken and come [to the synagogue]. Each person would identify his [*lulab*] and take hold of it [to fulfill the commandment to take hold of the *lulab* on Sukkot and to wave the *lulab* while reciting the Hallel].

[They acted in this manner] because the sages enunciated [the following principle]: a person may not fulfill his obligation [to take hold of the *lulab*] on the first day of the [Sukkot] festival with a *lulab* belonging to his fellow.

But on the remaining days of the festival a person may fulfill his obligation [to take hold of the *lulab*] with a *lulab* belonging to his fellow [and so need not bring his *lulab* to the synagogue prior to the Sabbath because he may use one there belonging to another person].

M. associates attendance at the synagogue, a fixed gathering place, with special holiday services as in the preceding unit. The rule emphasizes the importance of using the *lulab* in the synagogue on Sukkot. One must bring it to the synagogue because one may not fulfill his obligation with a borrowed *lulab* on the first day of the festival. The synagogue is incidental to M.'s main concern, use of the *lulab*. Rabbis apparently had authority over the selection of a proper ritual object if not over the conduct of the service where it was used in the synagogue.

5. M. Meg. 3:1-3

Residents of a city who sold a street of the city may purchase with the funds [acquired from this sale] a synagogue.

[If they sold] a synagogue, they may purchase [with the funds] an ark [for storing Torah scrolls].

[If they sold] an ark, they may purchase [with the funds] covers [for Torah scrolls].

[If they sold] covers, they may purchase [with the funds] scrolls [of the Prophets or Writings].

[If they sold] scrolls, they may purchase [with the funds] a Torah scroll.

But if they sold a Torah scroll, they may not purchase [with the funds] scrolls [but only another Torah].

[If they sold] scrolls, they may not purchase [with the funds] covers.

[If they sold] covers, they may not purchase [with the funds] an ark.

[If they sold] an ark, they may not purchase [with the funds] a synagogue.

[If they sold] a synagogue, they may not purchase [with the funds] a street.

And the same [rule applies] to any of the surplus funds [remaining after the funds have been spent to purchase an article of greater or equal sanctity]

...

"They may only sell a synagogue on the condition that if they wish they may buy it back [i.e., a conditional sale]," the words of R. Meir.

And sages say, "They may sell [a synagogue] permanently [without any condition for any use] except these four purposes: to be used as a bathhouse, a tannery, a ritual bath, or a water closet [since these uses demean the place]."

R. Judah says, "They may sell [a synagogue] for use as a courtyard [i.e., as a plot of land without concern for its future use] and the buyer may use it for any purpose he wishes."

And further said R. Judah, "In an abandoned synagogue they may not deliver a eulogy, and they may not make rope, and they may not spread traps, and they may not set out fruit to dry on its roof, and they may not use it as a shortcut,

"Because Scripture states, 'And when I shall make desolate your sanctuaries . . .' (Lev. 26:31)--[this phrase implies that sacred places] retain their sanctity [and they are called] 'sanctuaries' even when they are desolate [i.e., abandoned]."

If grass grew [in an abandoned synagogue] they do not remove it because [when one sees grass growing in an abandoned synagogue it provokes] anguish [and the people will wish to rebuild it].

This collection of rules comprises a brief essay composed at Usha or thereafter on the disposition of the funds or properties from the sale or abandonment of a synagogue. In these rules the synagogue is a permanent property with specific sanctity. Yet there remains an ambiguity because this makes reference to the recitation of public prayer in the city square outside any synagogue building.

3:1 tells us that a synagogue and its objects are consecrated according to a hierarchy of sanctity. The street of a city, that is, a large open square for public gathering, is sacred because prayer is recited there [at least on fast days and perhaps throughout the year in some regions], an allusion to the notion of the synagogue-congregation outside a permanent structure.

The Torah scroll ranks highest on the spectrum of sanctity. When they sell sacred objects or places, they may use the proceeds of such a sale for the purchase of items only of greater or equivalent sanctity. M. leaves open the obvious issue: Who does the selling? Who controls the funds and accordingly "owns" the synagogue or its objects?

M. implies that the sanctity of a synagogue or sacred object continues to inhere even in the funds they receive from its sale. Even if we do not go that far as to say that the sanctity is transferred to the funds, the principle of the pericope is that those in charge have an obligation to use the funds from such a sale for the purchase of a sacred object or place of equal or greater sanctity.

3:2 deals with the legal nature of the sale of a synagogue building or its former site, hence the formal transfer of synagogue ownership. The issue is whether they have the right in the first place to sell a synagogue and thus remove the sanctity from

the location. Meir does not permit the permanent sale of a synagogue but suggests a remedy to avoid this prohibition. Sages and Judah disagree over the extent to that one must inquire into the future intended use of the site.

3:3 says that an abandoned synagogue maintains some sanctity. Hence one may not perform there some activities that may show disrespect for the site. The Ushan masters in this unit provide rulings governing the transfer of a synagogue and for insuring propriety on its site, even if it is not in active use. By the late second century, the rabbis show more of an active involvement in a more formal institution. They legislated to perpetuate the sanctity of the synagogue. Even so, this pericope refers only to the disposition of the synagogue. From it we infer little about the role of rabbis in the construction, maintenance and governance of the institution.

6. M. Ned. 5:5

And what is an object that belongs to the city [that a person may not derive benefit from if he swears off benefit from his fellow in a city]: for instance the [public] street, or the bathhouse, or the synagogue, or the ark, or the scrolls.

M.'s concern is the meaning of a person's vows. The synagogue and its objects are mentioned only as examples of collective public property. I do not read anything into the fact that M. mentions the synagogue and scrolls as examples of objects from which one might forswear benefit. It depicts the synagogue here as a permanent public place. Still we cannot pinpoint the date of the pericope nor infer from it any data of value regarding the relation between synagogues and the rabbis.⁸⁸

7. M. Ned. 9:2

And R. Eliezer said further, "They may let a person out of his vow on account of some new situation [arising after he makes the vow] . . .

"[For example:] If one said, 'This building is forbidden to me,' and it [subsequently] became a synagogue and he said, 'Had I known that it would become a synagogue I never would have sworn [off its benefit].'"

R. Eliezer permits [them to let him out of his vow in such a case] and the sages forbid.

The synagogue is incidental to the main point of the unit, how changing circumstances affect a vow. For one Yavnean rabbi the obligation to attend a synagogue was a usual, necessary activity. A person would regret making a vow that would bar him from going into a synagogue building. According to Eliezer, one could therefore be released from a vow that prevented him from attending a synagogue.

⁸⁸Mention in a rabbinic pericope such as this one of a setting or place or suggestion or a rule of behavior or etiquette in a given context implies nothing about whether rabbis had authority there. No one I know of argues on the basis of the rabbinic regulations for how to act in a bathhouse or latrine, that rabbis governed their construction or maintenance.

That sages demur raises again an ambiguity in the relation between rabbis and synagogues. Less ambiguous, this unit assumes the synagogue is a permanent building.

8. M. Shavuot 4:10

One who stood up in the synagogue and announced, "I utter an oath against you [members of the congregation]. If any of you can offer testimony on my behalf you must come forward and testify on my behalf."

Behold, [the rule is if anyone there could testify on his behalf he nevertheless is] free from the obligation [to come forward because the claimant's oath was not directed at any specific individuals].

The synagogue serves here only as the setting for a public proclamation. The term implies membership in a collective group and says nothing more about a permanent place of worship.

9. M. Neg. 13:12

[Concerning the leper] who came into a synagogue, they build around him a barrier [at least] ten handbreadths high and four cubits square [to contain his uncleanness in that place]. He must enter [the synagogue] first, and leave it last [so that he does not contaminate others in the building].

As in the previous, the synagogue serves as an illustration of a public place where a leper might join others. Here the term refers to a fixed structure under a permanent roof.

Summary of Mishnaic sources:

Two sources present Yavneans, early authorities, in connection with the synagogue. Two traditions give some substantive evidence about rabbinic involvement in regulating synagogue practice. Number one suggests rabbis of the Yavnean period proposed regulations for the forms of prayer in the synagogue, not for its maintenance or governance.

Number five exhibits an Ushan concern with the regulation of the use of synagogue sites. These rules assume that such sites have some sanctity to start with, and that the holiness remains in the place in some way after the sale or abandonment of the structure. This conceptualization contributes little to an understanding of the realia of the construction of synagogues or further to clarify the political and social role of the synagogue in the life of the late antique Jew. Based on this pericope we can say the rabbis took some general interest in the maintenance of synagogues as ongoing religious institutions.

The remaining traditions use the synagogue as a convenient illustration of a public place of gathering [e.g., 6, 9]. In several instances [1, 2, 8] the term may refer to a congregation without implying any connection to a permanent building. The

synagogue is depicted as a gathering for public prayer [2] especially on the New Year, Purim [3] and Sukkot [4]. One unit expresses an obligation for a Jew to attend the synagogue [7].

The sources in Tosefta that mention the synagogue:

Besides the nine units in M., twenty-four more items in T. mention the term synagogue and provide additional insights into the relationship between the rabbis and the synagogues of late antique Israel.

1. T. Ber. 2:4

One who entered a synagogue and found that they [the congregation] had already recited half [of the *Shema`*] and he finished [reciting it] with them, he should not begin [after that] and recite it from its beginning until that place [at which he found them reciting when he entered]. Rather he should begin [reciting] from the beginning and finish to the end.

And so too concerning the recitation of the Hallel, and the Prayer [of Eighteen Blessings], and the Scroll of Esther.

If a person comes late and joins the congregation in the recitation of the liturgy, he must thereafter recite the first part that he missed and continue reciting all the way through the liturgy based on the principle that one should not recite the verses of the liturgy "backwards," i.e., in an incorrect order.

This pericope therefore does not directly regulate synagogue practice. It uses the setting of the synagogue as a convenient illustration of the rule (cf. M. 2:3) regarding the recitation of the sections of the liturgy in their proper sequence. Nevertheless, this is a direct reference to the recitation in the synagogue of the primary prayers of the regular liturgy, the *Shema`* and the Prayer of Eighteen.

2. T. Ter. 1:10 (T. B. B. 8:14)

Guardians of [orphans] . . . may not [use their estates to] redeem prisoners [held for ransom] or to distribute charity to the poor in the synagogue [because] these are matters for which the Torah fixed no limit [on the amount of money that can be spent for them. Hence there is a danger that the guardian may expend for these purposes the entire estate.]

Incidental to the main point of the rule concerning the responsibilities of the guardian to be judicious in supervision of the orphan's estate, we are told that charity was dispensed in the synagogue.

3. T. Ter. 2:13

Said R. Judah: An incident occurred concerning Sagavyon, the head of the synagogue of Achziv who purchased produce of the [fruit that grew in

the] fourth year in a vineyard of a gentile in Syria, and he had already paid him for it.

He came and asked R. Gamaliel who was passing from place to place [whether he had acted correctly].

[Gamaliel] said to him, "Wait until I consider these laws [and I shall give you an answer]." [From this he deduced that it was permissible.]

He said to him, "Based on this incident is there any proof [that the law follows R. Judah]?"

For [Gamaliel] sent [a reply] to him via a secret messenger: "What you did is done. But do not do it again."

In this pericope a synagogue official consults the Yavnean patriarch on a matter of agricultural law. Gamaliel's abstention from ruling insinuates that he lacked the desire to challenge the authority of the head of the synagogue. Later at Usha, the rabbis interpreted his subservience as a superficial gesture and proposed that he expressed his authority behind the scenes.

The administrator Sagavyon is not called rabbi. The later rabbis claim he consulted them on matters of agricultural law after the fact. The account implies that rabbis and synagogue officials struggled over the leadership of some northwestern communities during the Yavnean era.

The recently recovered Rehob inscription on the mosaic floor of a synagogue in the north in the Beit Shean valley deals at length with many agricultural taboos. This material evidence reinforces the present Toseftan tradition relating the regulation of agricultural laws in northwestern Israel with the administrator of a synagogue.⁸⁹

4. T. M. R. 2:20

[Concerning] a synagogue or a house of study (*Beit hatalmud*): if therein there is an apartment, one may not eat a snack [from untithed produce that was brought into the building].

But if not [i.e., if there is no apartment attached to the structure], one may eat a snack from [the produce brought into a synagogue. The principle is that once one has brought produce into a house from the field, it becomes liable to tithes and one may not eat even a snack from it until he separates tithes from it.]

T. alludes to the possibility that some, but not all, synagogues may have had living quarters attached to them. Archaeological evidence bears this out.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Cf. J. Sussman, "The Inscription in the Synagogue at Rehob," in *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, ed. L. I. Levine, Jerusalem, 1981, pp. 146-53.

⁹⁰ Cf. Levine, "Ancient Synagogues," p. 4.

5. T. Bik. 2:8

[When bringing the first fruits to Jerusalem] the hazanim and all the [officials of the] synagogue [V: the hazanim of the synagogue] would go up [to Jerusalem] with them [i.e., with the residents of the town].

T. mentions the role of officials of the synagogue in the procedures for bringing the first fruits to Jerusalem. In this material the synagogue may be a congregation of persons or may be a permanent structure.

6. T. Shab. 16:22

And so R. Simeon B. Eleazar used to say, "[The House of Shammai say], 'They do not distribute charity to the poor in the synagogue [on the Sabbath] and not even [to pay] for the marriage of an orphan boy or girl.

"`And they do not negotiate a reconciliation between a husband and his wife [on the Sabbath].

"`And they do not pray for a sick person [on the Sabbath].'

"And the House of Hillel permit."

The important point here for our concern is the mention of the distribution of charity in the synagogue. In this material the synagogue may be a congregation of persons or may be a permanent structure.

7. T. Pes. 10:8

Residents of a city who do not have [among them] anyone who can recite for them the Hallel [at the Passover seder] go to a synagogue and recite the first paragraph [with the congregation] and go [back to their seder and eat and drink and go back and forth [to the synagogue to recite the remaining sections of the Hallel throughout the evening] and [by that] finish [reciting the Hallel] until the end.

But if they cannot do this [i.e., go back and forth] they may finish reciting it at once [in the synagogue].

T. associates the synagogue with the recitation of Hallel on the eve of the seder. In this source the synagogue may be a congregation of persons or may be a permanent structure.

8. T. Yoma 4:18

[The High Priest] used to recite eight blessings on that day [of Atonement]:

[A blessing] concerning the Torah, after the fashion that they recite [over the Torah] in the synagogue . . .

T. refers to the recitation of blessings at the reading of the Torah in the synagogue. In this material the synagogue may be a congregation of persons or may be a permanent structure.

9. T. Suk. 2:10

Said R. Eleazar b. R. Sadoq, "The residents of Jerusalem used to do the following: Each would enter the synagogue with his *lulab* in his hand.

"[If] he would stand to translate [the Torah portion] or to go before the ark [to lead the prayers, he would do so] with his *lulab* in his hand.

"[If he went] to read from the Torah or to raise his hands [to recite the priestly blessing] he would put it down on the ground.

"He would go out of the synagogue with his *lulab* in his hand. He would go to console mourners with his *lulab* in his hand. He would go to visit the sick with his *lulab* in his hand.

"[If] he would go into the house of study he would give [the *lulab*] to his servant or to his agent to return it to his house."

Use of the *lulab* on Sukkot is associated elsewhere with the synagogue [M. Suk 3:13]. Also mentioned as part of the service are: the reading of the Torah and its translation, and the recitation of the priestly blessing.

T. depicts the house of study and synagogue as wholly distinct physical structures.

10. T. Suk. 4:5-6

4:5. Said R. Joshua b. Hananiah, "All during the days of the celebration at the place of the water drawing [on the intermediate days of Sukkot] we did not sleep. Rather we arose early [to offer in the Temple] the daily morning sacrifice,

"And from there we went to the synagogue,

"And from there we went to the study hall,

"And from there we went to [recite in the synagogue] the additional prayer,

"And from there [we went to offer] the additional sacrifice,

"From there [we went] to eat and drink,

"From there [we went to recite in the synagogue] the afternoon prayer.

"From there [we went] to [offer] the daily evening sacrifice,

"From there we went to the celebration at the place of the water drawing."⁹¹

⁹¹V has a slightly different version:

4:5. Said R. Joshua b. Hananiah, "All during the days of the celebration at the place of the water drawing [on the intermediate days of Sukkot] we did not sleep. Rather we arose early [to offer in the Temple] the daily morning sacrifice,

4:6. Said R. Judah. "Whoever has never seen the double colonnade [of the basilica synagogue] of Alexandria in Egypt has never seen Israel's glory in his entire life."

It was a kind of large basilica, one colonnade inside another.

Sometimes there were twice as many people there as the number that went forth from Egypt.

Now there were seventy one golden thrones set up there, one for each of the seventy one elders, each worth twenty five talents of gold.

[There was] a wooden platform in the middle [of the synagogue]. The hazzan of the synagogue stood on it with flags in his hand.

When they began to read [from the Torah] he would wave a flag so the people [who could not hear the service because of the noise of the crowd] would know to answer, "Amen."

For each and every blessing he would wave a flag so the people would know to answer, "Amen."

And they did not sit [in the synagogue] mixed together. Rather the goldsmiths sat by themselves, the silversmiths sat by themselves, the weavers by themselves, the bronze workers by themselves, and the blacksmiths by themselves.

So that when a traveller came along, he could find his fellow craftsmen, and on that basis could gain a livelihood.

This pericope purports to describe the simple realia of procedures of the time prior to the destruction of the Temple. It conveys some idealized notions about the early Yavneans participating in the rites of the Temple and the rituals of the synagogue.

Joshua, a levite, describes his practice during the time of the Temple. He speaks of his and his fellow levites' active role in the water drawing ceremony and in the Temple offerings and in the ritual of the synagogue. Whether realistic or anachronistic, the description of his early participation in synagogue rites even in the time of the Temple, helps to support any later claims by the levites to leadership positions in synagogue administration.

The unit speaks of two early synagogue structures, one associated with the Temple in Jerusalem and the other in Alexandria. Reference to a synagogue associated with the Temple bolsters the legitimacy of the perpetuation of the institution of the synagogue in post-Temple times.

The description of Alexandrian synagogue practice supports the authenticity of the basilica design in synagogue construction, sustains the propriety of ornate decoration, of mass attendance at the synagogue and of distinct seating areas for individuals engaged in different trades. Through the transmission of such materials,

"And from there we went to the synagogue,

"And from there [we went to offer] the additional sacrifice,

"From there [we went] to eat and drink,

"And from there we went to the study hall,

"From there [we went] to [offer] the daily evening sacrifice,

"From there we went to the celebration at the place of the water drawing."

rabbinic tradition served indirectly to legitimate some elements of synagogue convention.

11. T. Suk. 4:11-12

. . . The hazzan of the synagogue went up [to sound the shofar to announce the beginning of the Sabbath] on the top of the highest roof in town

This unit mentions the administrative office, the hazzan of the synagogue, but tells us nothing about the synagogue itself.

12. T. R. H. 3:6

A shepherd who drove his flock behind a synagogue, and likewise a sick person who was stretched out behind a synagogue [on the New Year festival],

If he directed his intention [to the sound of the shofar to fulfill the commandment to hear the shofar] he fulfilled his obligation.

And if not, he did not fulfill his obligation.

If [a person passing behind a synagogue, cf. M. R. H. 3:7] heard the sound of a shofar [on the New Year festival] or the sound of the [recitation of the] scroll of Esther [on the Purim festival],

If he directed his intention, he fulfilled his obligation.

And if he did not direct his intention, he did not fulfill his obligation.

[Because] though both heard [the same sounds], one had intention and the other did not have intention.

The one who had intention fulfilled his obligation.

And the one who did not have intention did not fulfill his obligation.

For everything is determined by a person's intention.

As Scripture states, "Thou wilt strengthen their heart [i.e., to concentrate] thou wilt incline thine ear [i.e., to hear their prayer] (Ps. 10:17)" [cf. T. Ber. 3:4].

And [Scripture further] states, "Give, my son, thy heart unto me, and let thy eyes watch my ways (Prov. 23:26)."⁹²

⁹²V has a slightly different version: T. 2:7:

A shepherd who drove his flock behind a synagogue, and likewise a sick person who was stretched out behind a synagogue [on the New Year festival],

And he whose house was near a synagogue and he heard the sound of the shofar [on the New Year] or the sound of the [reading on Purim of the] scroll of Esther,

If he directed his intention [to the sound of the shofar or the scroll in order to fulfill the commandment to hear it] he fulfilled his obligation.

And if not, he did not fulfill his obligation.

[Because] even though both [the one who had and the one who did not have intention] heard the same sound, one had intention [to fulfill his obligation] and the other did not [and therefore did not fulfill his obligation. Cf. M. R. H. 3:7].

For everything is determined by a person's intention.

T. provides an additional illustration of the principle of M. R. H. 3:7, then restates M.'s rule, and concludes by providing scriptural support for the law. The mention of the synagogue is only incidental to the unit, as explained above in the discussion of M. R. H. 3:7.

13. T. Ta'an. 2:4

On Mondays and Thursdays individuals observe public fasts.

On these days the courts sit in session in the cities.

And on these days the people sit in session in the synagogues and read [the Torah in public].

And on these days they interrupt [the regular schedule] to read the Scroll of Esther . . .

On public fast days they enter the synagogues and read [the special Torah-portion for a fast day] unlike on a private fast day.

[V adds: On public fast days they bring the ark out into the street of the city, unlike on a private fast day.]

On public fast days they recite the Prayer of twenty four blessings, unlike on a private fast day.

On public fast days the priests raise their hands [to recite the blessing for the people in the synagogue] four times during the day, unlike on a private fast day.

On a public fast they do not postpone [the observance of the day] because of a [minor] festival mentioned in the Scroll of Fasts, unlike on a private fast day [that they would postpone for such a festival].

The pericope assumes that people gathered in synagogues [i.e., permanent places of worship] on Mondays and Thursdays to read from the Torah. Also of note is the mention of the removal of the ark to the public square during the prayers on a public fast day.

14. T. Ta'an. 4:4

With the morning prayer and with the additional prayer, [the members of the Ma'amad] enter the synagogues and recite [together the appropriate scriptural portion, cf. M. Ta'an. 3:4].

And [with] the afternoon prayer they recite [their portion] by heart.
[=M. Ta'an. 4:3]

R. Judah says, "The individual may not recite it by heart."

R. Judah says, "They enter the synagogues and recite it *the same way*

As Scripture states, "Thou wilt strengthen their heart [i.e., to concentrate] thou wilt incline thine ear [i.e., to hear their prayer] (Ps. 10:17)" [cf. T. Ber. 3:4].

And [Scripture further] states, "Give, my son, thy heart unto me, and let thy eyes watch my ways (Prov. 23:26)."

they recite the Shema` [i.e., responsively]." [=M. Ta`an. 4:3]

The context of this pericope is the recitation of the Torah portions by the men of the Ma`amad at their appointed times. T. assumes that members of the Ma`amad gathered in the synagogue of their town and recited their passages according to customary practice.

15. T. Meg. 2:5

Said R. Simeon b. Eleazar, "An incident concerning R. Meir who read the scroll of Esther [on Purim] in the synagogue of Tibe`on while sitting.

"And the members of the synagogue were sitting [while he read].

"And when he finished he gave it to another and [that person] recited the blessing over it."

The ruling associates the reading of the megillah on Purim with the synagogue, as we saw above, M. R. H. 3:7.

16. T. Meg. 3:1-7 [V: 2:12-18]

3:1. R. [V: Menahem b. R.] Yose says, "The members of the synagogue (lit. congregation) may not buy a street [with money they receive from the sale of the synagogue building, cf. M. Meg. 3:1]."

Said R. Judah, "In what case [does the rule that one may not use a synagogue for other purposes (M. 3:2) apply]? [Only] in an instance where the administrators of that city made a stipulation [when they sold the building that it be used only for a synagogue]. But where the administrators of the city did not make such a stipulation, [the buyers] may use [the synagogue] for whatever purpose they wish."⁹³

3:2. One who makes an ark or covers [for Torah scrolls]: up to the time they are used on high [i.e., in the synagogue], they may be used for an ordinary purpose.

Once they are used on high, they may not be used for an ordinary purpose [any longer].

Utensils that have been used on high, may not be used for an ordinary purpose.

But a person may lend covers for use for a Torah scroll, and take them back [and use them for] covers for other scrolls [of lesser sanctity].

One may switch [covers] from one scroll to another. But they may not use them for other purposes.

3:3. One who makes a menorah [candelabrum] or a lamp for a synagogue, until the [synagogue's] rights of ownership is removed from it, one may not use it

⁹³But cf. S. Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-fshuta*, on this passage for an alternative explanation.

for another purpose.

Once [the synagogue's] rights of ownership is removed from it, one may use it for another purpose.

3:4. If an individual pledged charity for the poor of his own city, they give it to the poor of his own city.

[If he pledged it for the benefit of the poor of] another city, they give it to the poor of his own city.

If administrators [public officials] pledged charity for the poor of their own city, they give it to the poor of their own city.

[If administrators pledged charity for the poor of] another city, they give it to the poor of that city.

One who pledged [funds for] charity, [even] before the administrators took possession of them, are only permitted to use them for another purpose with their consent.

3:5. [If] a gentile designated a beam [as a donation] to a synagogue, and on it is inscribed, "For the name [of God],"

They investigate [the circumstance of the donation].

If they find that he [the donor] says, "I pledged [the beam] for the Holy [i.e., to be a sacred object]," they store it away [and do not use it].

[If they find that he says,] "I pledged the beam for the sake of the synagogue," they then cut off the where the name [is inscribed] and store it [the sliver with the name on it] away, and they use [the beam] for any legitimate purpose.

A sacred utensil [lit., a vessel made for ritual use], until it is used for sacred purposes, it may be used for ordinary purposes.

Once it has been used for sacred purposes, it may no longer be used for ordinary purposes.

Utensils that were originally made for ordinary use, they may not be used for sacred purposes.

Stones and beams that were originally hewn for ordinary use, may not be used for building on the Temple Mount.

Stones of the Temple court that became damaged [and were replaced] may not be redeemed [and used for ordinary purposes]. But they must be stored away.

3:6. Said R. Judah, "An incident concerning R. Eleazar b. R. Sadoq who purchased the synagogue of the Alexandrines in Jerusalem, and he used it for all his needs [i.e., treated it as an ordinary place].

"They did not forbid him to do so. But they did not permit it to be called by its original name [i.e., to be referred to as a synagogue]."

3:7. In synagogues they are not permitted to act frivolously.

They may not enter them in sunny weather because the sun; or in cold weather because the cold; or in rainy weather because the rain.

They may not eat in them, or sleep in them, or promenade in them, or make merry in them.

But they may recite [from the Torah], and study [the Mishnah], and expound [the Midrash] in them, and they may deliver a public eulogy in them.

Said R. Judah, "In what case [do these rules apply]? To synagogues in active use. But abandoned synagogues they must leave alone and *they must allow grass to grow in them because [when people see the grass growing it will provoke] anguish [and they will wish to rebuild them].*" [=M. Meg. 3:3]

This chapter deals at length with rules for the synagogue, adding to the materials in M. Meg. 3:1-3 that we saw above. It opens at T. 3:1 with versions of two rules of M. Then it moves on to regulations governing the use of the ark or scroll covers, objects used in the synagogue. The point of 3:2 is that once they are used in the synagogue, such objects may not be used for ordinary purposes.

3:3 gives a rule for the synagogue lamp or candelabrum. T. does not attribute any inherent sanctity to this object. But in the time the synagogue owns it, one may not use it outside the synagogue.

The next unit changes the subject from rules for the synagogue to regulations governing the distribution of charity. Elsewhere [e.g., T. Shab. 17:22, T. Ter. 1:10] we saw that the synagogue was a public place associated with the distribution of charity. Hence these rules are appropriate to the present context, a collection of laws for the synagogue.

Rules for donations for the construction of a synagogue follow in 3:5. The pericope repeats the general principle stated earlier at 3:2, that once an object is used for sacred purposes, it may not be put to ordinary use. This subunit 3:2-5 ends with illustrations that apply this principle to the maintenance of the Temple.

Of interest in 3:5 is the notion that a gentile might donate materials for the construction of a synagogue. Also of note is the reference in the next independent supplementary unit, 3:6, to the synagogue of the Alexandrines in Jerusalem. The story about Judah is consistent with the ruling attributed to him in M. Meg. 3:2 and may have generated that legal tradition. The point is that, according to Judah, after a synagogue is sold it does not retain its sanctity.

The first part of the last pericope is reminiscent of M. Ber. 9:5 with its similar rules for proper behavior on the Temple mount. T. then summarizes the actions one may perform inside a synagogue. Besides prayer, which it does not need to mention, one may study or recite a eulogy in a synagogue building. T. ends attributing directly to Judah another version of the end of M. 3:3, the rule for an abandoned synagogue.

17. T. Meg. 4:11-13 [V: 3:11-13]

4:11. [This pericope deals with the rules for the reading of the Torah in the synagogue.] . . . All may be counted in the quorum of seven [who are called to read from the Torah on the Sabbath], even a child, even a woman.

They do not bring a woman up to recite in public.

4:12. Members of a synagogue who have [among them] only one person who

can read from the Torah [they do the following]: [that person] stands and reads and sits, stands and reads and sits, even up to seven times [i.e., even on the Sabbath when they must read seven portions from the Torah].

4:13. In a synagogue of foreigners [who do not speak Hebrew], if they have [among them some] who can read [the Hebrew text] they begin [reading the Torah by calling a person who speaks] Hebrew and they conclude [reading the Torah by calling a person who speaks] Hebrew. [Since they do not need to recite blessings over the intervening portions they may call a person who does not speak Hebrew.]

And if they have [among them] only one person who can read Hebrew, they call only one person [to read from the Torah].

The first unit, in 4:11, establishes the context of this group of rules, who may be called to read from the Torah if they do not have seven competent adult males in the synagogue. T. allows children or women to fill the quorum. Then, in a contradictory gloss, T. negates the right of the woman to be called to the Torah.

In 4:12 and 4:13 T. deals with the situation of a synagogue without enough competent readers. The rule sets this entire chapter of rules for the recitation of the Torah into the context of the synagogue.

18. T. Meg. 4:21-23 [V: 3:21-23]

4:21. [The reading of] a child may be translated by an adult. But it is not respectful for [the reading of] an adult to be translated by a child. For Scripture states, "And Aaron your brother will serve as your spokesman" (Ex. 7:1) [implying that only a peer may translate for a person].

[V: The hazzan of the synagogue may not read until others call him to do so.]

The head of the synagogue may not read until others call him to do so. Because a person must not embarrass himself [by calling himself for an honor].

[If] the hazzan stands to read [the Torah], another person stands beside him at the time he reads [from the Torah].

How did the elders used to sit [in the synagogue]? Facing the congregation, with their backs to the Holy [i.e., to the place of the Temple in the East].

And when they would set down the ark [in the synagogue, they would place it] facing the congregation, with its back to the Holy.

And when the priests would raise their hands [to recite the priestly blessings, they would stand] facing the congregation, with their backs to the Holy.

But [during the recitation of the prayers] the hazzan of the synagogue would face the Holy and the congregation would face the Holy. Because Scripture states, "And the congregation gathered unto the entrance of the Tent of Meeting (Lev. 8:4)."

4:22. The entrances to synagogues may only open to the East. For so we find concerning the Tabernacle its entrance faced East. Because Scripture says, "But those that encamped before the Tabernacle toward the East, before the Tent of Meeting toward the East (Num. 3:38)."

4:23. The entrance [of a synagogue] may only open toward [V: They may build it only on] the highest part of a city [i.e., looking uphill] because Scripture says, "From the top of busy streets she will call to the entrance of her gates (Prov. 1:21)."

In this unit's rules for the reading of the Torah in the synagogue, note the references to the seating of the elders in the synagogue, the placement of the ark, and the recitation of the priestly blessings. Also of interest is the discussion of the orientation of the entrance of a synagogue, a subject of recent research into ancient synagogue architecture.⁹⁴

19. T. Sot. 6:2-3

6:2. Expounded R. Aqiba, "When the Israelites came up out of the sea, the holy spirit rested upon them and they sang a song like a child who recites the Hallel in his school. [His tutor recites a phrase] and he repeats each phrase after him.

"Moses would say, 'I shall sing to the Lord (Ex. 15:1),' and Israel would say, 'I shall sing to the Lord (Ex. 15:1).'"

6:3. "Moses would say, 'My strength and my song is the Lord (Ex. 15:2),' and Israel would say, 'My strength and my song is the Lord (Ex. 15:2).'"

R. Eliezer the son of R. Yose the Galilean says, "[They recited it] as an adult would recite the Hallel in the synagogue, answering [each verse read by the leader] with the [same] refrain.

"Moses would say, 'I shall sing to the Lord,' and the Israelites would say, 'I shall sing to the Lord.'

"Moses would say, 'My strength and my song is the Lord (Ex. 15:2),' and the Israelites would say, 'My strength and my song is the Lord.'" [V: 'I shall sing to the Lord.']

[V: "Moses would say, 'The Lord is a man of war (Ex. 15:3)' and the Israelites would say, 'I shall sing to the Lord.']

R. Nehemiah says, "[They recited the song at the sea like] people who recite the *Shema* [in the synagogue].

"As Scripture said, 'And they said, saying (Ex. 15:1).' This teaches us that Moses began [reciting a verse] first and the Israelites answered him, completing [the next stich].

"Moses would say, 'Then Moses sang,' and the Israelites would say, 'I

⁹⁴ See Chiat, *passim*.

shall sing to the Lord.'

"Moses would say, 'My strength and my song is the Lord (Ex. 15:2),' and the Israelites would say, 'This is my God and I will glorify him.'

"Moses would say, 'The Lord is a man of war', and the Israelites would say, 'The Lord is his name.'"

The pericope describes three kinds of responsive reading. In the schoolhouse style, there is a repetition of each phrase. In the synagogue style for the recitation of the Hallel, according to R. Eliezer, the son of R. Yose the Galilean, and V's version, there is repetition of a single constant refrain. In the style used for the responsive recitation of the *Shema* in the synagogue, there is alternating responsive recitation of the verses.⁹⁵ The latter two congregational prayer alternatives were employed at various times in the development of public liturgy.

20. T. B. Q. 11:3

One [on his deathbed] who says, "Give two hundred dinars to the synagogue," or "Give a Torah scroll to the synagogue," [after his death] they must give it [from his estate] to the synagogue that he regularly attended.

If there were two [synagogues in the city] that he regularly attended, they must give [the donation as he directed] to both of them . . .

The synagogue in this unit is understood to be a public institution that sometimes received bequests from the estates of individuals. The synagogue here is a permanent physical institution.

21. T. B. M. 11:23

The residents of a city [have the right] to impose upon one another [a form of taxation to raise funds] to build a synagogue, and to purchase a Torah scroll and [scrolls of the] prophets.

This unit emphasizes the civic responsibility of building a synagogue in a city and providing for its furnishings. The synagogue here is a permanent physical institution.

22. T. Ohal. 4:2

Said R. Judah, "Six matters did R. Aqiba declare unclean, and then he reversed himself.

"An incident: They brought buckets of bones from Kefar Tabya, and they left them in the open air of the synagogue in Lod [for examination for a decision on whether they can cause contamination] . . ."

⁹⁵ On this basis of this reference it has been assumed that this was the standard procedure for the recitation of the *Shema* in early rabbinic times. The difficult rabbinic idiom, *pwr^lal Shema*, is sometimes assumed to refer to this style of recitation.

The reference to the open air of the synagogue suggests that though there may have been a permanent location for the synagogue and its services, in places like Lod, with mild climatic demands, it may not have included a roofed structure. The pericope also underscores the use of the synagogue as a place for rendering legal decisions.

23. T. Neg. 6:3

A synagogue, and a woman's house, and a house owned by partners, lo, these are susceptible to uncleanness by virtue of a plague.

The synagogue, an example of collective property susceptible to uncleanness, is seen as a permanent physical structure.

24. T. Neg. 7:11

[A leper] who entered a synagogue--they build for him a partition [and] he enters [the synagogue] first and leaves last [so as not to contaminate others by virtue of uncleanness transmitted through a tent].

The synagogue is used as an example of an enclosed place of public assembly that even lepers might attend. [Cf. M. Neg. 13:12, discussed above.]

25. T. Toh. 8:10

An incident: A person forgot and left his utensils in a synagogue. [The principle of law is that utensils left out in public property are deemed to remain clean.]

The incident came [for a ruling] before the sages, and they declared [the utensils] clean because a synagogue is not considered fully [in the category of] private property.

Neusner translates: "For it is not wholly property of the *`am ha'ares*" [*The Tosefta*, vol. VI, New York, 1979, p. 290]. Status of synagogue property is at issue.

Summary of the Sources in Mishnah and Tosefta:

The thirty-four sources in Mishnah and Tosefta that mention the term synagogue refer to several kinds of activities in the synagogue as follows:

1. Prayer and related rituals.
 - a. Sounding the shofar on the New Year
M. R. H. 3:7; T. R. H. 3:6
 - b. Waving the *lulab* on Sukkot
M. Suk. 3:13; T. Suk. 2:10
 - c. Reading the Scroll of Esther on Purim

- M. R. H. 3:7; T. Meg. 2:5
 - d. Reciting the Hallel on Passover eve
 - T. Pes. 10:8
 - e. Reciting the Priestly Blessings
 - T. Suk. 2:10 [on Sukkot]; T. Meg. 4:21
 - f. Reciting the Prayer of Eighteen
 - M. Bik. 1:4
 - g. Reciting the *Shema`*
 - T. Ber. 2:4; T. Sot. 6:3; [T. Ta`an. 4:4]
 - h. The call to prayer
 - M. Ber. 7:3
- 2. Study; Reading Torah.
 - a. Routine study
 - T. Meg. 3:7
 - b. Public reading of the Torah
 - T. Suk. 2:10; T. Suk. 4:6
 - c. Reading Torah on fast days
 - T. Ta`an. 2:4
 - d. Reading Torah on Sabbaths
 - T. Meg. 4:11-13
 - e. Reciting blessings over Torah
 - T. Yoma 4:18
 - f. Protocol for Torah readers
 - T. Meg. 4:21-23
- 3. Repository for communal charity funds.
 - T. Ter. 1:10; T. Shab. 16:22; T. Meg. 3:4
- 4. Locale for legal decisions.
 - T. Ohal. 4:2
 - [T. Ter. 2:13: regulation of agricultural laws]
- 5. Public assembly hall.
 - M. Ned. 5:5; M. Shavuot 4:10; M. Neg. 13:12; T. Neg. 6:3; T. Neg. 7:11; T. Toh. 8:10
- 6. Living quarters.
 - T. M. R. 2:20
- 7. Special rules for administration of Synagogue.
 - a. Sale or abandonment of synagogue and furnishings
 - M. Meg. 3:1-3; T. Meg. 3:1-7
 - b. Residents of city must build
 - T. B. M. 11:23
 - c. Obligation of individual to attend

- M. Ned. 9:2; T. Suk. 4:5-6 [implicit]
- d. Decorum
T. Meg. 3:7
- e. Donations to synagogue
T. Meg. 3:3-5; T. B. Q. 11:3
- f. Role of synagogue officials
T. Bik. 2:8; T. Suk. 4:11-12; T. Ta'an. 4:4
- g. Seating in synagogue
T. Meg. 4:21
- h. Direction of doors; location of synagogue
T. Meg. 4:22-23
- i. Eulogy in synagogue
T. Meg. 3:7
- j. The synagogue in Alexandria
T. Meg. 3:7

Sources Concerning the Synagogue in Yerushalmi:

Forty-seven pericopae mention the synagogue in Yerushalmi. We provide a short summary description of the function of the synagogue in the unit. Then the relevant language of each source is presented in concise form. A summary follows the catalogue. I give the page location in *editio princeps*, Daniel Bomberg, *The Palestinian Talmud*, Venice, 1523-24.

1. Y. Ber. 2/1: Daily prayer in the synagogue
If so why do they recite [the evening *Shema`*] in the synagogue?
Said R. Yose, "They do not recite it in the synagogue to fulfill their obligation [to recite the *Shema`* at the proper time]."
2. Y. Ber. 2/3: Priestly blessing in synagogue
Said R. Huna, "One who saw the Priests in the synagogue [reciting] the first blessing [of the priestly blessings]."
3. Y. Ber. 2/4: Daily prayer in the synagogue
We learned: One who recited the *Shema`* in the synagogue in the morning fulfilled his obligation.
4. Y. Ber. 3/4: Seasonal prayer in synagogue
For said R. Yohanan, "[Concerning the recitation of the] Hallel--if one heard it recited in the synagogue, he fulfilled his obligation."
5. Y. Ber. 6/1: Priestly blessing [See also Y. Ber. 9/4, Y. Nazir 56/1]
Any priest who stands in the synagogue and does not raise his hands to recite the priestly blessings violates a positive precept [of the Torah].
6. Y. Ber. 6/2: Synagogue etiquette

Said R. Samuel bar Abduma, "One who enters a synagogue and finds them"

7. Y. Ber. 6/4: Synagogue etiquette

Said R. Joshua b. Levi, "Whoever spits in the synagogue. . . ."

8. Y. Ber. 8/2: Synagogue etiquette

Said R. Tanhum bar Haninah, "A person must designate for himself a [regular] place in the synagogue to pray."

9. Y. Ber. 8/4 [2]: Synagogue etiquette, Theology of synagogue practice

R. Huna said, "Whoever does not go to the synagogue in this world . . . will not enter the synagogue in the world to come."

10. Y. Ber. 8/4: Synagogue etiquette

Huna said, "One who prays behind the synagogue is called an evil person."

11. Y. Ber. 8/4: Theology of synagogue practice

R. Pinhas in the name of R. Hoshaiiah, "One who prays in a synagogue is like one who offers a pure meal offering [in the Temple]."

12. Y. Ber. 9/1: Theology of synagogue practice

Said R. Yohanan, "It is like a signed covenant that one who toils over his learning in a synagogue will not soon forget it."

13. Y. Ber. 9/1: Synagogue etiquette

R. Hisda said, "One who enters a synagogue must go in past the [entrance way of the] two doors."

14. Y. Ber. 9/1: Synagogue etiquette

R. Huna said, "One who goes to synagogue must hurry [to get there]."

15. Y. Ber. (12)13/1: Theology of synagogue practice

A person enters the synagogue and stands behind the pillar and prays quietly and the Holy One Blessed be He. . . .

16. Y. Demai 23/2: Charity distribution

In the Seventh Year . . . they do not distribute charity to the poor in the synagogue.

17. Y. Shev. 35/3: Synagogue etiquette

It was taught in the name of R. Meir, "Whoever knows how to answer Amen [at the right times] in the synagogue. . . ."

18. Y. Bik. 65/3: Public building

And they laid them in the synagogue.

19. Y. Shab. 11/1: Seasonal prayer [See also Y. Pes. 37/3; Y. Shek. 47/2]
From what R. Yohanan said concerning the recitation of Hallel, if one heard it recited in the synagogue he fulfilled his obligation.
20. Y. Pes. 36/2: Special liturgies: mourners [See also Y. Sanh. 23/4]
These are the blessings of the mourners, that they recite in the synagogue.
21. Y. Sukkah 53/4: Seasonal prayer
They said concerning R. Aqiba that he entered the synagogue carrying an etrog on his shoulders.
22. Y. Sukkah 54/1: Seasonal prayer
And it was taught there: Thus was the custom in Jerusalem--a person would go to the synagogue with his *lulab* in his hand.
23. Y. Meg. 70/2: Theology of the synagogue service
It was taught: Ten [kinds of persons] may abandon their work to go to the synagogue.
24. Y. Meg. 73/2: Development of the rite
Subsequent to this the public was accustomed to recite it in the synagogue.
25. Y. Meg. 73/4: Governance of synagogues
May one sell a synagogue to buy a study hall?
26. Y. Meg. 73/4: Obligation to attend
Let us deduce the matter from the following. If one said, "I vow not to enter this house," and the house became a synagogue.
27. Y. Meg. 73/4: Governance of synagogues
It was taught that once R. Eleazar b. R. Zadok bought a synagogue from Alexandrines and used it for all his purposes.
28. Y. Meg. 73/4: Governance of synagogues
All the vessels of a synagogue are [holy] like the synagogue [building] itself. The benches and chairs [of the synagogue are holy] like the synagogue itself.
29. Y. Meg. 73/4: Governance of synagogues [See also Y. Ned. 41/3]
This applies if it was built for the purposes of a synagogue. But if it was built as a courtyard and he sanctified it, what is its status?

30. Y. Meg. 73/4: Governance of synagogues
What is the law concerning [one who wishes to] take stones from one synagogue to build up another synagogue?
31. Y. Meg. 73/4: Ownership of synagogue [See also Y. Meg. 74/1]
R. Samuel bar Nahman in the name of R. Jonathan, "What you say applies to [the case of] a private synagogue."
32. Y. Meg. 74/1: Governance of synagogues
One who makes a lamp or a candelabrum for the synagogue, until the name of the donor is forgotten one may not. . . .
33. Y. Meg. 74/1: Governance of synagogues
Accordingly, Antoninus made a candelabrum for the synagogue.
34. Y. Meg. 74/1: Governance of synagogues
Rabbi heard and said, "Blessed be God who moved [that man's] heart to make a candelabrum for the synagogue."
35. Y. Meg. 74/1: Ownership of synagogue [See also Y. Ned. 41/3]
We hold in accord with the opinion of R. Meir who said they only sell a synagogue on the condition [that they may buy it back].
36. Y. Meg. 74/3: Synagogue etiquette
And lo it was taught: Once R. Meir recited it while sitting in the synagogue at Tivin.
37. Y. Ta`an. 67/1: Synagogue etiquette
I never left a person in the synagogue and went away.
38. Y. Ta`an. 67/1: Synagogue etiquette
He said to them, "In all my life no one has gotten to the synagogue before me."
39. Y. Mo`ed Qatan 82/2: Synagogue etiquette
A mourner on the first Sabbath does not go the synagogue.
A mourner . . . on the second Sabbath may go to the synagogue but he does not sit in his regular place.
R. Simeon says, "A mourner on the first Sabbath may go to the synagogue but does not sit in his regular place."
40. Y. Yeb. 3/1: Story
I remember that his mother used to bring the dough to the synagogue.
41. Y. Sotah 16/3: Setting for an example of a case
Said R. Yose b R. Bun, "If he said to her, `Do not go into the

synagogue,' and she goes in. . . ."

42. Y. Sot. 20/3: Seasonal prayer

A prominent person recites the Hallel in the synagogue and they recite [responsively] after him the first part.

43. Y. Ned. 41/3: Obligation to attend

We may deduce from this that if one said, 'May I be forbidden to enter this building,' and it [subsequently] became a synagogue, I would have thought . . .

44. Y. Git. 43/2: Obligation to organize a synagogue

If there is no synagogue in that place, they gather ten people together. If there is no . . . in the synagogue.

45. Y. Shek. 47/1: Story

He said, "I would be surprised if this synagogue were not a place of idolatry."

46. Y. Shek. 47/1: Story

Said to him Rabbi, "This happened in the synagogue at Tarsin."

47. Y. Sanh. 28/3: Story

I remember that my father would recite for me this verse in the synagogue.

Summary of the Sources Concerning the Synagogue in Yerushalmi:

The sources in Yerushalmi that mention the term *synagogue* refer to several kinds of activities in the synagogue. Note the points of tangency and divergence between the concerns of Mishnah and Tosefta, as outlined above, and the interests of Yerushalmi.

I. Prayer and related rituals

- a. Sounding the shofar on the New Year: no new items.
- b. Waving the *lulab* on Sukkot:
 - Y. Sukkah 53/4: Seasonal prayer, *etrog*
 - Y. Sukkah 54/1: Seasonal prayer, *lulab*
- c. Reading the Scroll of Esther on Purim: no new items.
- d. Reciting the Hallel:
 - Y. Ber. 3/4: Seasonal prayer in synagogue
 - Y. Shab. 11/1: Seasonal prayer [See also Y. Pes. 37/3; Y. Shek. 47/2]
 - Y. Sot. 20/3: Seasonal prayer
- e. Reciting the Priestly Blessings:
 - Y. Ber. 2/3: Priestly blessing in synagogue
 - Y. Ber. 6/1: Priestly blessing [See also Y. Ber. 9/4, Y. Nazir 56/1]
- f. Reciting the Prayer of Eighteen: no new items.

- g. Reciting the *Shema`*:
 - Y. Ber. 2/1: Daily prayer in the synagogue
 - Y. Ber. 2/4: Daily prayer in the synagogue
- h. The call to prayer: no new items.
- Other:
 - Y. Pes. 36/2: Special liturgies: mourners [See also Y. Sanh. 23/4]
 - Y. Meg. 73/2: Development of the rite
- 2. Study; Reading Torah
 - a. Routine study:
 - Y. Ber. 9/1: Learning done in synagogue is long-lasting
 - b. Public reading of the Torah: no new items.
 - c. Reading Torah on fast days: no new items.
 - d. Reading Torah on Sabbaths: no new items.
 - e. Reciting blessings over Torah: no new items.
 - f. Protocol for Torah readers: no new items.
- 3. Repository for communal charity funds
 - Y. Demai 23/2: Charity distribution
- 4. Locale for legal decisions: no new items.
- 5. Public assembly hall
 - Y. Bik. 65/3: Public building
 - Y. Sot. 16/3: setting for an example of a case.
- 6. Living quarters: no new items.
- 7. Special rules for administration of Synagogue
 - a. Sale or abandonment of synagogue and furnishings
 - Y. Meg. 73/4: Governance of synagogues [5 parts] [See also Y. Ned. 41/3]: selling and buying a synagogue. Status of synagogue courtyard and vessels.
 - Y. Meg. 74/1: Governance of synagogues [3]: status of vessels of synagogue
 - New aspects:
 - Y. Meg. 73/4: Ownership of synagogue [See also Y. Meg. 74/1]: private synagogue
 - Y. Meg. 74/1: Ownership of synagogue [See also Y. Ned. 41/3]: private synagogue
 - b. Residents of city must build
 - Y. Git. 43/2: theology, must build
 - c. Obligation of individual to attend
 - Y. Ber. 8/4: Obligation to go in to synagogue
 - Y. Ber. 8/4: One who goes is like one who offers in Temple.
 - d. Decorum: some fresh materials related to this concern take up various issues of synagogue etiquette:
 - Y. Ber. 6/2: Entering synagogue during prayer
 - Y. Ber. 6/4: Spitting in synagogue
 - Y. Ber. 9/1: Hurry to synagogue; enter past doorway
 - Y. Ber. 9/4, Y. Nazir 56/1: Priest must bless
 - Y. Shev. 35/3: Answer Amen at right time
 - Y. Ta`an. 67/1: Going away from synagogue; getting to synagogue early

- Y. Mo`ed Qatan 82/2: Mourner on Sabbath in synagogue
- Y. Ber. (12)13/1: God hears quiet prayers
- e. Donations to synagogue: no new items
- f. Role of synagogue officials: no new items
- g. Seating in synagogue
 - Y. Ber. 8/2: Regular place to pray
 - Y. Meg. 74/3: Sitting and reciting
- h. Direction of doors; location of synagogue: no new items
- i. Eulogy in synagogue: no new items
- j. The synagogue in Alexandria: no new items
- 8. Stories mentioning the synagogue in Y.:
 - Y. Yeb. 3/1: Story, mother brought dough to synagogue.
 - Y. Shek. 47/1: Story [2], bad synagogue, synagogue at Tarsin.
 - Y. Sanh. 28/3: Story, father recited verse in synagogue.

These sources reflect the sum of evidence from the Talmud of the Land of Israel from the third through fifth centuries. There is a broadening of interest in synagogue procedures and some theological exploration of the significance of synagogues. The limited scope of the sources taken as a whole suggests in my opinion the limitation of rabbinic control and interest in synagogue administration even down through the fifth century.

Those who claim more than the data permit distort the history of rabbinism. Rabbinic activity focused more on prayer and the requirements to recite prayers than on the management and supervision of the synagogue. This was the case from the outset of the rabbinic age. In chapters IV and V we turn to the earliest instances of the rabbinic struggle to legislate liturgical rituals.

Chapter IV

The Scribal Influence on Prayer: the *Shema`*

The Formation of the *Shema`* and Amidah as the Core of Rabbinic liturgy

Prayer services do not emerge spontaneously or arbitrarily in a vacuum. They are the public pronouncements of the central values and concepts of the religious leaders who initially propounded them and are social rituals that often emerge out of intense conflict and hard-fought compromise.

Specific historical, social and political conditions contributed to the distinct origin of two major rabbinic services. In the crucial transitional period after the destruction of the Temple, the *Shema`* emerged as the primary ritual of the scribal profession and its proponents. The Amidah (i.e., the "Standing Prayer," known also as the *Tefillah*, and as the "Prayer of Eighteen Blessings," actually comprised of nineteen blessings in later rabbinic Judaism) at this formative time was a ritual sponsored mainly by the patriarchal families and their priestly adherents.

Compromises between the factions of post-70 Judaism later led to the adoption of the two liturgies in tandem at the primary core of public Jewish prayer. But this came about only after intense struggles among competing groups for social and political dominance over the Jewish community at large and concomitantly for the primacy of their respective liturgies.

It is indisputable that the development of classical Judaic liturgy was a communal affair. The synagogues and other gathering places for public ceremony of Israel and the diaspora were places of regular public gathering, where factions of late antique Judaism met and where community leaders competed for the support of the Jewish citizens of the villages of the Hellenistic Mediterranean world. The political, social and even economic dimensions of the religious life of the synagogues were crucial to the formation of nascent rabbinic Judaism.

Growth of Religious Ritual through Conflict

We are now more aware of the influence of conflict and differentiation internal to rabbinism in its historical development. Rabbinic traditions tersely report aspects of

what must have been bitter and prolonged political battles over liturgical compromise in an early formative stage. Talmudic sources recount that Gamaliel II of Yavneh was deposed from the Patriarchate at the turn of the second century because of a dispute over the regulation of prayers.⁹⁶ Other incidents reported in early rabbinic compilations suggest that prayer had much more than merely spiritual and theological ramifications for late antique rabbinism and that diversity and conflict characterize the formulation of its liturgy.⁹⁷

Additional evidence reinforces the association of liturgy and conflict. New Testament pericopae depict confrontations between Jesus or Paul and the Jews of various synagogues.⁹⁸ Richard Horsely's recent research into early Christianity⁹⁹ explains that, "In traditional historical societies there was no separation of life into different areas such as `religion' and `politics' and `economics.'" He remarks regarding the Gospels that, "The intensity and variety of conflict that runs through the gospel tradition is still overwhelming. The situation in which Jesus heals and preaches is pervaded by conflict, some of it explicit, much of it implicit in stories and sayings."¹⁰⁰ Rabbinism in this era must be viewed in the same manner.

Once established as standard within a given community, prayers are not easily changed because their rituals must be accountable on a regular basis to a community of pious devotees. They reflect even after centuries of use strikingly disparate characteristics and identities. And because most services resisted change, early Jewish prayers thereby preserve for us useful historical seams through which we may penetrate back into the development of the community of formative Judaism in the first centuries of the common era. As Heiler says of institutionalized prayer in general, "The prayer formula is stereotyped and strictly obligatory; the wording is inviolable, sacrosanct; no worshipper may dare to alter the words in the slightest degree, any more than he would think of making a change in ritual acts of sacrifice, expiation, or consecration."¹⁰¹ While we know that changes occur and variations exist, liturgy is basically one of the most conservative of all cultural commodities.

Given these suppositions let us consider, in this and the next chapter, the contents, motifs and forms of the standard formulation we possess of the two main liturgies, the *Shema`* and the Amidah. Through examination of components of early Jewish liturgy at their origin and in the nascent stages of their development one

⁹⁶B. Ber. 27b-28a, Y. Ber. 4:1, and see my *The Traditions of Eleazar ben Azariah*, pp. 146-59.

⁹⁷Confrontations involving prayer include those instances related in M., such as the castigation of Tarfon in M. Ber. 1:3 for not reciting the *Shema`* in the proper posture (bowing in public ritual may have been suggestive of the priestly rite of the Temple on the Day of Atonement); the suspicion that Aqiba and Eleazar b. Azariah were not reciting the morning *Shema`* (T. Ber. 1:2); the reference to Roman concern over the recitation of the *Shema`* in Aqiba's house of study (T. Ber. 2:13); and the tradition that Aqiba, a martyr of the Bar Kokhba war, recited the *Shema`* at the time of his death (B. Ber. 61b).

⁹⁸See for instance, Luke 4:16, Acts 9:2, 20; 13:5, 14; 14:1; 16:13; 17:1, 10-11, 17; 18:4, 19; 19:8.

⁹⁹*Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*, San Francisco, 1987. See also A. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees*, Wilmington, 1988, pp. 163-73.

¹⁰⁰*Op. cit.*, pp. 152, 156.

¹⁰¹F. Heiler, *Prayer*, New York, 1958, p. 58.

deduces a progression in liturgical formulation summarized in three phases:

1. The *Shema`* became the primary rite of the scribal brotherhoods, propounding the essential scribal themes. In this perspective the exodus motif in the *Shema`* functioned as a polemic of scribal triumphalism.

2. In chapter V we show that the Amidah, by contrast, originated as the main liturgy of the deposed priestly aristocracy and was adopted by the patriarchate as a central ritual. Priestly and aristocratic themes were central to the Amidah. In this perspective the kingship-motif served as a justification of priestly and patriarchal authority as post-destruction client rulers of the community implicitly for Rome, and explicitly for God.

3. Later, as the rabbinic leadership amalgamated its social forces in the post-deposition era and in the wake of the defeats of the apocalyptic aristocracy in the Bar Kokhba revolt, they merged the formerly distinct liturgical rituals in a single service.

The Scribes and their *Shema`*

Before we deal with the first phase, the institutionalization of the *Shema`* in Israel in the first and early second centuries, a few words are in order regarding the social definition of the scribes in Israel. Matthew Black says the scribes "represented a distinctive class in the community. They practiced their legal profession throughout Palestine (and as certainly in the dispersion)."¹⁰² Saldarini's fresh and more complex definition proposes, "Scribes do not seem to be a coherent social group with a set membership, but rather a class of literate individuals drawn from many parts of society who filled many social roles and were attached to all parts of society from the village to the palace and Temple."¹⁰³ We take note primarily of the struggle of the scribal faction within rabbinism for recognition in the composite social world of Hellenistic Israel.

This social group promulgated its liturgy to advance its ideas and influence. The *Shema`* expressly emphasizes several dominant theological themes [e.g., love of God; unity of God; centrality of Torah] and gives priority to these ideas out of a rich repertoire of other available biblical motifs.

The scribes' support of this prayer derives from their social realities. Saldarini discusses the overlapping roles of scribes who served in the Temple and were involved in the wisdom and apocalyptic movements of the time. Scribes, he says, served both in the village as copyists, teachers and low level functionaries, and in middle level bureaucratic official capacities in the government structures in Jerusalem and the Galilee.¹⁰⁴ It is likely that the scribal faction most active in rabbinic society derived its livelihood as teachers of the law and from the accompanying need for copies of the Torah, and on the widespread use of phylacteries, mezuzot and other

¹⁰²"Scribe," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Nashville, 1962, vol. 4, pp. 246-48.

¹⁰³Saldarini, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

¹⁰⁴See Saldarini, *op. cit.*, pp. 241-97 for a full discussion of the social roles of scribes in Jewish society.

required religious articles. The verses of the *Shema`* stated plainly that Torah-study and the observance of selected commandments were among the highest values in Israelite life.

The period of origin of the *Shema`* as a popular scribal rite may be traced to the time of the Houses of Hillel and Shammai, wisdom fellowships commonly thought of as the immediate precursors of some rabbinic associations of the late first century and after that. Several rabbinic traditions associate rules and practices for reciting the *Shema`* with the Houses.¹⁰⁵ Early Christian evidence in Mark 12:29-30 depicts Jesus reciting the first two verses of the *Shema`* in the context of a debate with a group of scribes, and as an opponent of the Temple hierarchy.¹⁰⁶ The scriptural verses of the *Shema`* appear in the earliest phylacteries found at Qumran.¹⁰⁷ Of course, some values promoted by the *Shema`* may be located even further back in Israelite history in the wisdom movements of the Hellenistic age.¹⁰⁸ Israelite sages and scribes commonly emphasized Torah and commandments as primary motifs of religious life.¹⁰⁹

In formative rabbinic Judaism the liturgy figured prominently in daily ritual life. Both the inclusions and exclusions of the contents of the standard rabbinic text of this liturgy clearly define its focus and original intent. The primary motifs of the national cult in Jerusalem are noticeably *missing* from both the *Shema`* and from the frame of blessings that surrounds it.¹¹⁰ Such ideas and institutions as the Temple, the priesthood, Jerusalem, and Davidic lineage, all prominent motifs in the Amidah, are not primary concerns of the framers of the *Shema`*.

Conspicuous evidence of revision in the *Shema`* shows that some disagreement arose over time among various subsequent sponsors of the liturgy. Mention of the patriarchal motif of kingship was added, intruding after the first biblical verse¹¹¹ and in the framing blessings. M. Ber. 1:5 cites a dispute over the legitimacy of mentioning the exodus in the evening *Shema`*. Rabbinic pericopae indicate that there was significant disagreement over some main themes of the *Shema`*-liturgy.¹¹² It is fair to

¹⁰⁵ See, e.g., M. Ber. 1:3.

¹⁰⁶ Regarding the role of scribes in the Gospel traditions, see Saldarini, pp. 159-66.

¹⁰⁷ See Y. Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran*, Jerusalem, 1969.

¹⁰⁸ The Nash Papyrus, c. 150 B.C.E., from Fayyum, contains the decalogue and the first two verses of the *Shema`*.

¹⁰⁹ See James Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, Atlanta, 1981, pp. 27 ff. for a discussion of some aspects of the sage as a member of a professional class. Crenshaw briefly reflects on the exodus motif in the Wisdom of Solomon. Also see his prolegomenon to *Studies in Old Testament Wisdom*, New York, 1977, where he deals with the importance of the theme of creation in the wisdom circles. I. Elbogen claims that the *Shema`* and its benedictions constituted the earliest form of the "synagogue service." See *Studien zur Geschichte des jüdischen Gottesdienstes*, Berlin, 1907, pp. 38-44.

¹¹⁰ Even if we place the formalization of these blessings late in the second century, these expressions undoubtedly evoke the main themes of the earliest formulations of the *Shema`*, see below.

¹¹¹ "Blessed be the name of his glorious Kingdom for ever and ever," and cf. T. Ber. 1:10.

¹¹² See the discussion in T. Ber. 1:10 of whether reference to sovereignty (a patriarchal theme) must be removed when reference to the exodus (a scribal motif) is inserted in the *Shema`*. The pericope makes good sense when understood as an encoded dispute of political or social dimensions, rather than as a strictly theological debate.

conclude that such materials probably reflect divisions between the local scribal brotherhoods, who sought independent authority over their adherents, and the national priestly-aristocratic leadership, who likely served as part of the client governance of Israel on behalf of imperial Rome and accordingly advocated other values.¹¹³

Admittedly the case for the origination of the *Shema`* in a scribal social context appears to be contravened by an oft-cited Mishnah pericope (M. Tamid 5:1) that projects the recitation of the *Shema`* back to the priests in the Temple in Jerusalem. One might argue that this evidence is secondary at best and may be suspected as a means to link artificially the *Shema`* with ancient priestly authority. Priests in the Temple could hardly have been expected to sponsor and perpetuate a liturgy with the limited range of content and themes of the *Shema`*.¹¹⁴ It would be natural for a group sponsoring its own liturgical rite to seek legitimacy by establishing *post factum* a fictitious account of the antiquity and broad authority of the ritual. But this pericope is not a simple projection of a later ritual back to an earlier context. It conveys a confusing picture of an unfamiliar melange of liturgies, supporting the supposition that we have there an authentic tradition. Fictitious or not, the Mishnah describes at best a variant precursor to the ritual "recitation of the *Shema`*" that later historical and social forces adapted and adopted as a primary liturgical institution.¹¹⁵

A more subtle and possibly contrived association with the Temple is present in the first pericope of Mishnah. M. Ber. 1:1 goes out of its way to link the *Shema`* with the Temple and with the sons of Rabban Gamaliel the Patriarch.¹¹⁶ Other rabbinic evidence more firmly attests to the scribal provenance of the *Shema`*, outside the control of the Temple hierarchy. So, for instance, a Tosefta passage in Berakhot rules that scribes only interrupt their professional duties when the time comes for the recitation of their main liturgy, the *Shema`*. Tosefta adds, they need not stop their tasks to recite the prayer of the Patriarchal aristocracy, the Amidah.¹¹⁷

Scribal values are conspicuous in the selected content of the texts of the *Shema`*. As I suggested, the blessings that became standard in later rabbinism for framing the *Shema`* may have been established as late as the second century.¹¹⁸ Still, they continue to focus on the scribal agendum and omit direct mention of major Israelite

¹¹³ See Martin Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judea*, Cambridge, 1987, and *State and Society in Roman Galilee, A.D. 132-212*, Oxford, 1983, *passim*.

¹¹⁴ Josephus provides a more obvious exaggeration by associating the *Shema`* with Moses in *Antiquities*, IV, vii, 13, and he avers it was part of the daily morning service in the Jerusalem Temple.

¹¹⁵ My thanks to Professor Israel Knoll, Hebrew University for helping me clarify this point.

¹¹⁶ In M. Berakhot 1:1. Gamaliel's children defy him by making reference to the *Shema`*. By proposing to regulate their liturgy, Gamaliel asserts his authority over his rebellious sons:

G. Once [Gamaliel's] sons came from the banquet hall.

H. And they said to him, "We have not [yet] recited the *Shema`*."

I. He said to them, "If the day has not yet broken, you are obligated to recite [the *Shema`*]."

Political conflict and social circumstances help explain the artificiality and awkwardness of this anecdote as part of this initial pericope of the Mishnah.

¹¹⁷ T. Ber. 2:6.

¹¹⁸ See my *Mishnaic Law of Blessings and Prayers*, pp. 20-28.

themes: the Temple, the Priests, Jerusalem, David, and the related concepts within these constellations of discourse, crucial to the fostering of priestly and aristocratic ideals. The framing-blessings do make prominent reference to several subjects: cosmic motifs, suggesting the mystical dimensions of religious discourse; the exodus and the promise of future redemption; and the Torah and the commandments, the value of the study of Torah, all essential thematic concerns of the scribal factions in post-70 Israel, as follows.

The standard blessings before the morning *Shema`* refer to cosmic-mystical dimensions of the world, mention the love of God, and refer to the return to the Land of Israel, but interestingly, not to Jerusalem.¹¹⁹ The blessing recited in the morning, after the scriptural passages of the *Shema`* mentions the cosmic dimension and refers to the exodus and the ultimate messianic redemption. The mention of the kingship of God appears only as a theme subsidiary to the exodus.

The blessings before the scriptural passages in the evening reiterate the cosmic references and rehearse the value of Torah study. After the passages the blessing in the evening returns to the theme of the exodus, to a generalized statement of redemption and to references to God as protector of Israel, apropos of the dangers of the night. This scribal liturgy builds its dramatic tension toward a promise of messianic redemption, in alternation with reiteration of the miracles of the exodus from Egypt.

The Scribes and the Seder

The invocation of the exodus may have conjured a broader ritual complex, namely the seder, through which participants reenacted the exodus in the long-standing Israelite springtime ritual. Scribal political interests had much to gain by persistently recalling this theme. The rabbinic Passover, observed with a seder, was essentially a banquet for Torah study. It previously was the most popular of Israelite festivals, celebrated through the cultic offering and feast of the Paschal lamb. As the festival evolved it became a primary means of annually reinforcing scribal social solidarity. The scribes promoted the seder as a ritual occasion to substitute for the sacrifice, and a vital way to promote their political and social aims.

Prior to the emergence of rabbinic Judaism, and later within rabbinism, these scribal factions renovated the festival and transformed the feast into an occasion for Torah-study and a deft means of usurping the authority for controlling ritual formerly claimed to be exclusively in the domain of the priesthood.¹²⁰ Those who recognized the seder as the authentic means to celebrate Passover participated in the annual ritual, which must have been a humiliation for the priests and their allies and avowed successors, the patriarchal houses. These constituencies felt the loss of the Temple and its sacrificial cult most acutely at the time of the Passover festival.

¹¹⁹This distinction may be too subtle. But consider that as an articulation of their political views, some modern anti-Zionist spokesmen employ the phrase "Land of Israel" rather than "State of Israel" in referring to modern Israel.

¹²⁰See B. M. Bokser, *The Origins of the Seder*, Berkeley, 1984. In parallel developments, the early Christians appropriated the Seder in their own way.

The rabbinic-scribal seder was blatantly anti-cultic. Instead of describing the Paschal sacrifice and its rite, the crux of the ritual was a recitation of questions and answers and rabbinic midrashim on the ten plagues and on various historical scriptural verses.¹²¹ The seder mentions the Paschal offering only reluctantly in the context of a statement ascribed to the Patriarch Rabban Gamaliel. The passage arbitrarily insists that it be mentioned along with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. "Rabban Gamaliel said, `Anyone who has not said these three things on Passover has not fulfilled his obligation: Paschal Offering, Matzo, and Bitter Herbs.'" Note well that the unit concludes, "The Paschal Offering -- on account of God having passed over the houses of our ancestors in Egypt . . ." and not because the Paschal Offering brought to the Temple by generations of Israelite families from all corners of the Land.¹²² This attitude persists as undertone throughout the fellowship ritual.¹²³

Another suggestive component of early traditions associated with the seder suggests the close linkage between the scribes, seder and the *Shema`*. A passage describes the arrival of the students in the morning after the seder who find that the rabbis have been discussing the exodus from Egypt throughout the night and declare, "Masters, the time has come for the morning recitation of the *Shema`*." They make no mention of the recitation of the Amidah. This omission may be simply dismissed by assuming that the rabbis first would have recited the *Shema`*, and after that, the Amidah. But if we take this anecdote at its simple face value, the students remind their masters of the *Shema`*, the rite of the scribes, not the Amidah, the

¹²¹For a discussion see L. A. Hoffman, *Beyond the Text*, Indiana, 1987, pp. 86-102.

¹²²E. D. Goldschmidt in *The Passover Haggadah*, Jerusalem, 1977, p. 51, n. 1, cites Alon's view that this passage be attributed to Gamaliel II at Yavneh, and refers to alternative opinions on its interpretation.

¹²³The folk song, the *Chad Gadya*, appended to conclude the seder, though it may be a later addition, may be viewed as a cynical reference to the Paschal Offering, mocking the two zuzim, the monetary interest that the priests had in the sacrifice, and reinforcing their indignity in the wake of the destruction of the Temple.

priestly ritual.¹²⁴ Let us turn now to the case of the Amidah.

¹²⁴ A version in T. Pes. 10:12 has Rabban Gamaliel and the sages dealing with the laws of Passover all through the night. See Goldschmidt, pp. 19-21. Also consider the role of Eleazar in the deposition narrative. In the main action of the story, Eleazar b. Azariah, a priest descended from a scribe, and himself an aristocrat, takes the place of Gamaliel after he is overthrown. Eleazar, despite his aristocratic pedigree, elsewhere in rabbinic traditions upholds a value of the scribal agendum, avowing that he understands why the exodus must be mentioned at night. Eleazar thereby accepted and promoted practices of the scribes (M. Ber. 1:5), as reflected in the next passage in the Haggadah, Eleazar b. Azariah's statement on mentioning the exodus from Egypt at night.

Chapter V

Priestly and Patriarchal Influences on Prayer: The Eighteen Blessings

The literary form and substantive thematic content of the Amidah contrasts strikingly with the *Shema*. Throughout it represents those themes most apt for reinforcing the primacy of the priestly aristocracy. It contains within it the priestly blessing. Elias Bickermann in fact labeled the Amidah, the "Civic Prayer for Jerusalem."¹²⁵

I find Bickermann's position on the meaning and origin of the institutionalized Amidah more attractive than other theories because it appeals to the content and themes of the liturgy and because it posits a simpler origin-process for the prayer. Let me therefore begin with that hypothesis and scrutinize the evidence considering social and political ramifications of the promulgation of the liturgy in the first century after the destruction of the Temple.

First, to review, out of the actual nineteen blessings of the Amidah, seven contain national or political themes that may be associated with priestly or patriarchal interests, i.e., numbers five, ten, eleven, fourteen, fifteen, seventeen and nineteen, as follows:

¹²⁵ *Harvard Theological Review* 55 (1962), pp. 163-85. My purpose here is not to review all the theories of the origin of the Amidah. The better known views include that of Leopold Zunz who employed a problematic monolinear sequential historical model of the development of the Amidah, somewhat arbitrarily tracing its composite development to several distinct eras. For a critical assessment of Zunz's position see R. Sarason, "On the use of method in the modern study of Jewish liturgy," in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, pp. 101 ff. Kaufman Kohler attributed its origin to other forces. See "The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions with a translation of the corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions," in *Hebrew Union College Annual* 1 (1924), pp. 387-425. Louis Finkelstein hypothesized yet another trajectory of development in "The Development of the Amidah," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 16 (1925-6), pp. 142-69. As we discussed above, Joseph Heinemann maintained an alternative position. See "Prayers of the Beth Midrash Origin," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 5 (1960), pp. 264-80, and *Prayer in the Talmud*, New York, 1977, *passim*.

1. Shield of Abraham, patriarchs
2. God's powers;¹²⁶ resurrection of the dead
3. Holiness of God, God's name
4. Knowledge [no explicit mention here of Torah]
5. Repentance [a cultic theme; mention of Torah with Service]
6. Forgiveness
7. Redemption
8. Healing
9. Yearly sustenance
10. Liberation and ingathering of exiles [national motif]
11. Restoration of judges [political motif]¹²⁷
12. Slanderers, enemies, apostates
13. Righteous [reference to the "remnant of the scribes"]
14. Jerusalem [priestly theme]
15. Davidic salvation [priestly and patriarchal theme]¹²⁸
16. Hear prayer [followed immediately by prayer for restoration of cult]
17. Restore the cult; return presence to Zion
18. Thanksgiving
19. Peace; priestly blessing

Bickermann suggested that the last three blessings (17-19) were parts of the "High Priest's prayer," recited in the Temple and were added as a unit to an earlier prayer that concluded with the present fifteenth blessing.¹²⁹ Blessings 4-7 "form a group centered on the idea of sin," says Bickermann. "They enlarge upon the appeal to God's forgiveness made by the High Priest on the Atonement Day. The Sixth Benediction more or less repeats this pontifical prayer."¹³⁰

He further speculates that the first, eighth, ninth, fourteenth and the sixteenth blessings form a single prayer invoking the patriarchs, and concerning health, prosperity, Jerusalem, and an appeal for the acceptance of the prayer. Bickermann argues that this group parallels similar Greek Hellenistic prayers recited for the well-being, the health, peace and prosperity, of the polis. On this basis he concludes that

the original Tefillah was the Civic Prayer for Jerusalem. Both, the Greeks and the Jews, asked for health and food. But while the Greek also prayed for peace or salvation of the city, the covenanted Jew expressed the same idea by

¹²⁶Frederic Manns, *La Prière d'Israël à L'heure de Jésus*, Jerusalem, 1986, p. 146, n. 6, citing Urbach, sees in this expression (*gibbor* -- hero) an anti-Roman sentiment, implicitly demeaning the cult of the emperor.

¹²⁷Manns suggests this blessing responds to the actual loss of juridical power prior to the destruction of the Temple. See his study, p. 149.

¹²⁸The Genizah version conflates this blessing with the preceding. See S. Schechter, "Genizah Specimens," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 10 (1898), pp. 656-57 and J. Mann, "Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of the Service," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 2 (1925), pp. 306-8 and cf. pp. 295-97.

¹²⁹*Op. cit.*, pp. 167-68.

¹³⁰*Op. cit.*, p. 172.

supplicating the Deity to have mercy on Jerusalem.¹³¹

This prayer was recited, says Bickermann, in the Temple "by the people after the libation rite of the continuous sacrifice (Tamid). The prayer was post-exilic, and is first attested ca. 200 B.C. It was first said on the festival days only, but became a part of the daily sacrificial service after 145 B.C."¹³²

Bickermann errs, I believe, in locating the initial official adoption of the full-blown liturgy in the second century B.C. This is too early. For we have ample data that factions among the rabbis in the first and early second centuries C.E. contended over its legitimacy. As our evidence shows, based in part on Bickermann's analysis, this prayer formed the core of the priestly liturgy sponsored by the patriarchate after the destruction of the Temple. In the aftermath of the internal political crisis that led to the deposition of Gamaliel, the prayer was accepted by the scribal factions, and the patriarch agreed to foster the official sanction of the *Shema`* liturgy with minor modifications. Together these prayers made up the composite liturgy that reflected a qualified compromise between priests, patriarchal aristocrats and scribe/rabbis.

We support this line of argument with several added points of importance regarding the Amidah. First, in the Amidah the thirteenth blessing refers to the "remnant of the scribes." Bickermann calls the allusion obscure, and cites Liebermann who adds that it must be "very old." This phrase could in fact depict a facet of the conflict between the two mainly distinct social divisions who sponsored competing prayers as they strove for dominance over the populace in the post-destruction era. This terminology may be a negative reference to the adherents of the scribal brotherhoods, and a prayer for "mercy" for those who follow that "decadent scribal group."¹³³

Bickermann focused our attention on the agendum of the liturgy. Prominently absent from the blessings of the Amidah are references to creation, to other aspects of the cosmic/mystical dimension of the world, and to the exodus. Torah is mentioned but only with *avodah*, the sacrificial Temple cult, in the fifth blessing. We may safely say that this liturgy does not propound vital elements of a scribal agendum.

This understanding of the dynamic of the definitive first century stage of liturgical institutionalization helps us put prior phases into perspective. So for example in T. Ber. 3:13 the Houses of Hillel and Shammai dispute the number of blessings to be recited for the New Year or festival that coincided with the Sabbath. The numbers alone are given and they descend from ten to seven, leaving us to decide to what blessings the Houses refer. One might argue that this unit is a fictionalized projection of later practice to an earlier age. If so we might object that the dispute does not reflect an expected simple picture of later practice by earlier masters. Therefore the disputes likely are not artificial. Even so, little can be deduced from the tradition regarding the Houses' relationship to the early use of the Amidah on the

¹³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 176.

¹³² *Op. cit.*, p. 185.

¹³³ This is reminiscent of the polemics of our own day. Some Orthodox spokesmen refer for example to Conservative Jews as "dead bark" or "at best, idolaters."

Sabbath and festivals.¹³⁴ As Petuchowski sums up, the most we can say is, "Public worship on Sabbaths and festivals antedated public worship on weekdays, and an Order of Seven Benedictions for Sabbaths and festivals was in existence before the Order of Eighteen Benedictions for weekdays was devised at Yavneh."¹³⁵

In further support of Bickermann's assertions, internal rabbinic evidence suggests that the Amidah was a priestly rite, later taken over by the patriarchate as its own ritual. The relevant Talmudic source suggests that there were dual traditions of the origin of the Amidah.

One source attributed the authorship to the Men of the Great Assembly, an institution about which we have little definite evidence. We can presume that this tradition seeks to associate the Amidah with a public body attached to the Temple in Jerusalem. Another text links the Amidah to the later Simeon Hapaqoli under the supervision of Gamaliel the patriarch at Yavneh.¹³⁶ This unit leaves little doubt that patriarchal sympathizers sought to subsume the Amidah as their own authorized liturgy. No comparable patriarchal oriented tradition exists regarding the origin of the *Shema*.¹³⁷

Based on our evidence we can go further than to say that the Amidah and *Shema* were prototype liturgies of competing social factions. We also can trace to a particular period the joint institutionalization of these prayers as permanent fixtures of rabbinic worship.

Rabbinic texts preserve evidence of the main conflict and compromise that lead to the "canonization" of the core of rabbinic liturgy. The deposition narrative, which I discussed earlier in this volume (chapter II), centers on the struggle between first-century factions over the imposition of a liturgical ritual as obligatory. According to this narrative, Gamaliel was deposed from the Patriarchate because he insisted that the rabbis recite the Amidah at night.

We have two versions of this deposition-narrative that vary on some substantive details. In the version of the narrative in Y. Ber. 4:1, the action begins in the Beit Va`ad (Gathering Hall) and continues in the Yeshivah. In the main action of the story, Eleazar b. Azariah, a priest descended from a scribe, and himself an aristocrat, replaces Gamaliel after he is overthrown.

Eleazar served as the interim Patriarch as the scribes usurped control from the

¹³⁴ See my *History of the Mishnaic Law of Blessings and Prayers*, pp. 70-72.

¹³⁵ See J. J. Petuchowski, "The Liturgy of the Synagogue: History, Structure and Contents," in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, vol. iv, Chico, 1983, p. 16.

¹³⁶ B. Meg. 17b-18a; see my *Mishnaic Law*, pp. 57-58. Also see I. Schiffer, "The Men of the Great Assembly," in *Persons and Institutions in Early Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 237-76. Also consider M. Ber. 4:3, the dispute between Gamaliel and Joshua over the formalization of the Prayer and T. Ber. 3:12, which draws specific parallels between the times for the Prayer and the sacrifices of the Temple.

¹³⁷ To make the picture even more complex, evidence also exists that the text of the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings may draw upon earlier formulae, e.g. from Ben Sirah, who appears to have been sympathetic to both scribal and priestly interests. See J. J. Petuchowski, "The Liturgy," pp. 7-11. Note also that S. Talmon has convincingly argued on the basis of evidence in the Thanksgiving Psalm and the Psalm of Appointed Times that the Covenanters at Qumran recited daily prayers with some parallels to the rabbinic Amidah. See his *The World of Qumran*, pp. 200-43.

Patriarchal aristocracy. He was described as a priest who supported the ideals of the scribes, a pragmatic political figure. Aqiva, who was rejected as the compromise candidate for the Patriarchate, is portrayed as lacking the practical ability to mediate between factions as an active politician. Tradition tells us that this political extremist supported the messianic rebellion of Bar Kokhba and suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Romans.¹³⁸

The Bavli-version (Ber. 27b-28a) of the deposition narrative contains several additions. First it locates all the action in the rabbinic study hall. It depicts a guard of shield bearers supporting the Patriarch. In Bavli, the reform of the patriarchal court is effectuated by packing the membership of the house of study, by "adding benches." The deposition in Bavli's version was followed by a reconciliation in which Gamaliel reclaimed the patriarchate, bowing to the new realities and the change in the balance of power in rabbinic leadership. As part of this process the patriarch visited the scribe's house and suffered debasing humiliation, counterbalancing Gamaliel's earlier humiliation of Joshua.¹³⁹ Once the deal was cut to restore Gamaliel, Eleazar was informed in priestly metaphor to yield his position back to the legitimate heir.

The deposition-narrative compresses into stylized rabbinic form an account of events that probably stretched over a sustained period of social unrest and instability within rabbinic society itself.¹⁴⁰ Naturally, the underlying struggle for dominance within the nascent rabbinic community ought to be interpreted ultimately in light of all pertinent political, social and economic consequences of the conflict. Nevertheless we must not ignore that the traditions we have report the leadership of ancient Israel fought bitterly over liturgy. Prayer had powerful real and potential impact within the community of the faithful. Various other sources show historical tension in the development of the *Shema`* and Amidah.¹⁴¹

Accordingly it makes no sense to assume that the account of conflict over a liturgical issue was just a peripheral means of reporting a broader conflict. Goldenberg dismisses the ostensible issue of liturgical reform as an excuse for the turmoil,

¹³⁸ Eleazar, despite his aristocratic pedigree, elsewhere in rabbinic traditions upholds a value of the scribal agenda, avowing that he understands why the exodus must be mentioned at night. Eleazar thereby accepted and promoted practices of the scribes (M. Ber. 1:5). His statement takes on a dual application. The rabbis applied it as justification for both the mention of the exodus in the evening *Shema`* and inserted the same tradition in the seder to warrant the retelling of the exodus in the evening, and accordingly to justify the seder ritual itself.

¹³⁹ In a touch of irony, M. Ber. 1:1 starts the primary rabbinic legal compendium by linking the *Shema`* with the Temple and continues with Gamaliel's sons mocking him by telling him, as an excuse for their late return home from the "banquet hall," that they did not recite the *Shema`*. Instead of chastising them, Gamaliel is portrayed as reciting a ruling to them permitting them to recite the liturgy. Echoes of division and transition reverberate in this and other compressed narrative references to the liturgy.

¹⁴⁰ In Bavli's version of the deposition narrative the anonymous student responsible for the destabilization of the status quo to begin with is Simeon b. Yohai, the mystic apocalyptic -- a force of provocation and instability in that era.

¹⁴¹ We see that M. Ber. 4:3, for example, gives us a dispute between Gamaliel and Joshua over the formalization of the Amidah. As I mentioned, T. Ber. 3:12 makes an explicit comparison between the Amidah and the rituals of the Jerusalem Temple.

referring to the "striking triviality of the dispute over the evening prayer."¹⁴² However, there is reason enough to believe that the pivotal issue over which the Patriarch was deposed is just as stated, the question of whether the recitation of the evening prayer of eighteen blessings was optional or compulsory. Institutionalization of the performance of the Amidah-ritual at night must have been seen as a move to displace the *Shema`* from its place of liturgical primacy. It was in short a direct challenge to the authority of the scribal factions within rabbinism.¹⁴³

Goldenberg fails to take one more step to acknowledge that promulgation of public prayers, the stated issue of the conflict he discusses, was one primary means of exercising influence, dominance and control over a community of the faithful.

The Politics of Piety

To summarize, I have posited that liturgies within rabbinic Judaism arise out of competing social circumstances. I have argued that the scribes promoted the *Shema`* with particular motifs, such as the exodus,¹⁴⁴ to foster their authority over Israelite society. Others seeking dominance employed their forms of liturgy to compete with the scribes for prominence in the community and leadership of the Jewish people.

What Stefan Reif has written regarding the general characteristic of Jewish liturgy applies here, "The essence of Jewish liturgy is that it carries within it all these competing tendencies and successfully absorbs them all."¹⁴⁵ Our reconstruction examined the development of two major liturgical rituals of early rabbinism as they progressed through several probable stages. During the initial transition after the destruction of the Temple, from about 70-90 C.E., the priests promulgated the Amidah to reinforce their authority and the scribes promoted the *Shema`*. At this time it would have been natural for the scribes to associate the *Shema`* with the Temple Service. In the second phase of development, from about 90-155 C.E., the patriarchate sponsored the Amidah to counter a growing scribal faction within the rabbinic movement. Scribes countered by rallying popular support, deposed Gamaliel, and effectuated a lasting compromise. Both liturgies were adopted in tandem and made obligatory rabbinic rituals.

The rabbis in the era from about 155-220 C.E. consolidated the compromise that led to the shape of the composite rabbinic service that survives down to the present day. The leadership within rabbinism amalgamated *Shema`* and Amidah into a compound liturgy with varied rules and prescribed mannerisms. As probable results of this process of internal conflict the *Shema`* was revised to include the theme of

¹⁴²Robert Goldenberg, "The Deposition of Rabban Gamaliel II," in *Persons and Institutions in Early Rabbinic Judaism*, Missoula, 1977, p. 37.

¹⁴³Goldenberg, p. 38

¹⁴⁴Regarding a dispute over the dominance of the theme of sovereignty over the exodus as a liturgical subject, see T. Ber. 1:10.

¹⁴⁵From his forthcoming chapter, "The Early Liturgy of the Synagogue," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, which summarizes the state of scholarship in the area. Also see his articles "Some Liturgical Issues in the Talmudic Sources," *Studia Liturgica* (1982-83), pp. 188-206, and his "Jewish Liturgical Research: Past, Present, Future," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 34 (1983), pp. 161-70.

kingship. In this era the priests were relegated to figurehead status in rabbinic communities. The Patriarch continued to observe the conventional boundaries of his authority established after the deposition and was excluded from most internal rabbinic affairs. In effect the scribal faction triumphed in the internal rabbinic power struggle and they severed rabbinic ritual from meaningful national political structures.

Chapter VI

From Temple to Synagogue: The Hallel in Early Rabbinic Judaism

In this chapter I present several sources relating to the Hallel service as an example of the larger corpus of Amoraic and Tannaitic materials that deal with the origins, development and meanings of rabbinic liturgy. Some of these sources are theological, conveying mainly conceptual data, philosophical, ideological or theological information. Other sources are primarily historical, bearing facts that we may utilize to trace the growth and development of Jewish prayer in the early period of its formative canonization.

I have argued thus far that Jewish prayer was a prominent component of Judaic belief and practice in the time of the Talmud. To evaluate properly the foundations of this facet of Jewish culture in late antiquity we must account carefully for many diverse factors and influences, tightly control and isolate the variables in our research, to insure more definitive results.

As I have noted in chapter I, philological-historical problems are the first of several major methodological hurdles we encounter in the study of prayer. These dominated the work of scholars from the early period in the critical study of Jewish liturgy down to the present. To establish an accurate text of ancient prayers and the earliest versions of the liturgy is a complex and important task. However, because manuscript evidence is limited and incomplete, progress in this area of scholarship has been arduous.

Scholarship has progressed gradually from strict philology to include form criticism and other modes of analysis. Even so, little headway has been made describing the more substantial aspects of the formation and development of the system of rabbinic prayer and the major components of rabbinic piety in the all-important period of the classical rabbinic age.

Thus from the prolific early period of liturgical scholarship, which gave us the studies of Zunz, to the recent generation, which yielded the work of Heinemann, many crucial elements and important texts relating to early versions of prayer were recovered and analyzed. More currently, engaging hypotheses based on formal criteria were advanced concerning the origins of prayers. But the field as a whole has generated only sporadic exhaustive or systematic judgments about the nature and

meanings of Jewish prayer within the life and mind of early rabbinic culture.

Those aspects of the study of early Jewish prayer that extend beyond philology can be more thoroughly understood through an interdisciplinary approach to early Jewish prayer, as we have argued in chapter I and elsewhere.¹⁴⁶ Also prominently needed is the complete investigation of the essential themes of the rabbinic tractates on prayer in Mishnah and Tosefta and the Talmudim.

Some argue that all further analysis of these matters depends on the groundwork of the philologists and lexicographers. In fact, the metaphorical contention that the foundation and groundwork of such scholarship must precede the building of any edifices of research is not altogether pertinent. Research need not wait for the philological foundations to set before building upon them. To illustrate more specifically how one may examine the historical and theological facets of early rabbinic practice, let me turn to an appropriate example.

The early history of the Hallel liturgy in rabbinic Judaism presents an engaging and compliant site for analysis. The main text of the prayer is canonical, Psalms 113-118, and thus offers few if any problems of philological reconstruction of early or late versions. By rabbinic times the text was invariant, having been set fast in the canon of Tanakh in the Israelite age, or at the latest, from Hellenistic times. Therefore for the Hallel service we may handily bypass some classical initial issues of liturgical research and move forward to other areas.

First then we categorize the rabbinic statements concerning the Hallel according to their historical and textual contexts, and according to their intended meanings. The data inform us about many aspects of the conception in rabbinic circles of the meanings of seasonal ritual, and some components of the actual practice of the rites in early rabbinic times. The major rabbinic sources regarding the Hallel liturgy fall into one of three categories:

- A. Philosophical, ideological or theological statements about the importance of the Hallel. Stories, exegeses and homilies.
- B. Historical statements about the origins and uses of the Hallel.
- C. Laws, customs and rules of etiquette for the reading of the Hallel.

The bulk of the relevant early rabbinic materials contains material from the first category, that is, philosophical, ideological or theological statements about the Hallel. We review these first.

The Hallel was recited on Sukkot, Passover, Shavuot, Hanukkah, and new moons. The Talmud expresses an interest in the difference between the recitation of the Hallel on Sukkot and on Passover. Only the so-called Half-Hallel was recited on the last six days of Passover. Verses 1-11 in chapters 115 and 118 were omitted. Several reasons were suggested to explain this variation in the ritual of the recitation of the service. One Talmudic explanation conveys an overt homiletical message. After the Israelites crossed the Red Sea, the Egyptians drowned. One cannot justify singing prayers of thanksgiving and praise at an occasion commemorating past events connected with

¹⁴⁶Tzvee Zahavy, "A New Approach to Early Jewish Prayer," in B. Bokser, ed., *Judaism: the Next Ten Years*, Brown Judaic Studies 21, Scholars Press, Chico, 1980, pp. 45-60.

tragic death, with any instance of God's creatures perishing in the sea.

The Talmud bases its second justification of this liturgical variation on a more narrow historical viewpoint. It invokes the theme of the relationship between the Temple service and the liturgy, a major comparison throughout the rabbinic theology of prayer. The Full-Hallel was recited on all the days of Sukkot, but the Half-Hallel was recited on the last days of Passover because of the nature of Temple ritual. On Passover the sacrifice each day for the festival was not independent of that of the preceding day. Since the Temple service required no new variation in offering, the liturgy did not necessitate a new recitation of the complete Hallel.¹⁴⁷

The rabbis advance more purely theological explanations of practice of reciting the liturgy at the seder. On that occasion, the participants split up the recitation of the Hallel. One reason proposed for the convention to recite the first part of the Hallel in the *maggid* section of the seder is that it deals with exodus and, accordingly, must be said at the time of the study of the story of the exodus in that segment of the Haggadah.¹⁴⁸

The early rabbinic sources also explain why they did not recite the Hallel on several important festival days. The reasons correlate with the major theological aspects of the celebrations. Hallel is not said on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, for example, because of the solemnity of judgment associated with the days. The Talmud attributes to R. Abahu a homiletical story in which the angels asked God why the Jews were not saying Shirah (Song) on Rosh Hashanah. He answered that it is not possible that Israel should recite Shirah while he sits on the seat of judgment with the books of the living and the dead open before him, judging each individual for the coming year.¹⁴⁹

According to the same composite source, Hallel was not recited on Shabbat nor on the new moon, based on more technical theological explanations. The Shabbat was not called "an appointed time." The new moon was not fully sanctified as a festival day nor was the prohibition against labor consigned to it.

However, on Hanukkah, Hallel was recited because of the centrality of the miracle to the festival, though it was neither sanctified through the prohibition of labor, nor was it called "an appointed time." These intricate justifications helped ensconce the apparently inconsistent customs.

The Talmud explains that the Hallel liturgy was not recited on Purim because the events celebrated by that festival took place outside the Land of Israel, yet another *post-factum* defense of common practice. Though inconsistent with this principle, on Passover they recited the Hallel though its events also took place outside the land. This protocol was based on the principle that before the conquest of the land an event's locale was not a determinative factor in associating with it liturgical rituals.¹⁵⁰

In the talmudic passage, Nahman offers a dexterous variation of the explanation for omitting the Hallel on Purim. He says that the reading of the Megillah is also a form of praise that stands in for the recitation of the Hallel.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. b. Arak. 10a-b.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. *Encyclopedia Talmudit*, s.v. "Hallel," pp. 398-99.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. b. Arak. 10a-b.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. y. Pes. 10:6.

Another explanation, attributed to Rava, focuses on the extent of the redemption as the determinative criterion for deciding whether one recites this liturgy. Even after the victory that Purim celebrated, the Jews remained subject to the Persian government. They could sing Hallel only when they celebrated a victory that made them independent, that is servants of no other king but the Lord alone.

The early rabbinic theological discussion of the Hallel associates it with the idea of messianic redemption. One source in the Talmud Yerushalmi explains why one must recite the psalms of the service in their proper order. To justify the sequence, this text suggests that Psalms 114-118 refer first to the events of the past and then to those of the coming messianic age: the generations of yore, the days of the messiah, the war of Gog and Magog, and the future age.¹⁵¹

Besides these pericopae with mainly theological, ideological or philosophical import, several the rabbinic sources regarding the Hallel fall into the second category of the data, historical-theological statements about the origins and uses of the Hallel. Because of the paucity and nature of the sources, the recovery and reconstruction of the development of this liturgy across historical eras is difficult. A further problem we confront in analyzing these texts is that those modern scholars who have dealt with the history of the Hallel service either have treated these statements as literal historical facts, or mainly ignored them and based their theories on speculation.

For example, Zeitlin's attempt at reconstructing the background of the Hallel lacks firm basis in the sources.¹⁵² He speculated that the Hallel was recited during the time of the Temple on the first day of Passover at the seder and on Sukkot and Hanukkah. Later, he said, it was added to the Shavuot service as a substitute for the pilgrimage Psalms (120-134) originally recited with the bringing of the first fruits to the Temple.

Babylonian Jews, he claimed, initiated the practice of reciting the Hallel on the remaining days of Passover and on the new moon. These later practices were differentiated from the earlier by the omission of verses 1-11 from Psalms 115 and 116. As b. Ta'an. 28b points out, he said, the practice was confined to Babylonia and later spread throughout the world of the synagogue.

This arbitrary diffusionist theory of the growth of the liturgy dangles by a mere thread on the rabbinic sources. As such, it does not significantly advance our knowledge of rabbinic practice or theology, or our understanding of the nature of individual rabbinic sources or compilations.

For the most part modern scholarship on the subject ignores the prominent fact that the rabbinic sources that speak to the issue of the historical origins of the Hallel do so with fundamental theological lessons in mind. A major source concerning the institution of the Hallel service provides several alternative homiletical answers. Attributed to R. Eleazar is the view that Moses and Israel first recited it at the sea after the exodus from Egypt. Notably in this prevailing view, the Hallel denotes an occasion of national redemption. Following this line of thought, the Talmud adds several other statements scanning appropriate occasions for the recitation of Hallel in Israel's history, from the conquest of the land under Joshua, to the victories over

¹⁵¹ Cf. y. Meg. 2:1.

¹⁵² Solomon Zeitlin, "Hallel; a Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Liturgy," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 53 (1962-3), pp. 22-29.

Sisera, Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar and Haman. The source concludes, "And the Sages said that the prophets ordained that it be recited at every occasion of trial and every triumph over misfortune."¹⁵³

The fundamental rabbinic theological premise about the meaning and history of the Hallel here is that the primary purpose of the recitation of the Hallel is to commemorate regular festivals of the yearly cycle (the Hallel for festivals). Besides that, the liturgy may be recited as special thanksgiving for the salvation of Israel from trial, redemptions of past epochs linked directly with the triumphs of ancient Israel, the paradigmatic saving experiences of Israelite history.

Let me turn finally to the third category of the evidence, the laws, customs and rules of etiquette for the reading of the Hallel. As one would expect, a major element of the early rabbinic discussion about the Hallel deals with precepts for the recitation of the service. These issues addressed include the proper appurtenances to be used with the ritual, such as the *lulab* on Sukkot, and the times and places for recitation, including the synagogue and the home.¹⁵⁴

One custom mentioned was not to recite the Hallel on Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur or Purim or in a house of mourning.¹⁵⁵ Hallel was not recited in a house of mourning because it was not deemed appropriate to sing praises of thanksgiving in a solemn setting.

We also understood earlier that there were two variations in the duration of the regular recitation, the Half- and the Full-Hallel. The Half-Hallel was recited on the new moon and on last days of Passover.¹⁵⁶ The Talmud lists the eighteen other days (twenty-one in the diaspora) on which one recites the whole Hallel.¹⁵⁷

One important stage in the development of protocols for the liturgy of the Hallel service may be culled from the story in Ta'an. 28b. Rab came to Babylonia and saw that the Jews there were reciting the Hallel on the new moon. At first, he wanted to stop them because the new moon is not an appropriate time for the recitation of this liturgy. But when he saw that they were skipping, that is, reciting the Half-Hallel, he did not interfere. He remarked, according to the source, that we may deduce from this that such was their ancestral custom, and under the circumstances, it should not be criticized. Differences in local custom were manifestly common in the Amoraic period.

The misuse and overuse of the liturgy was another concern. A person may not recite Hallel every day, according to one source. R. Yose said that he wanted to be among those who completed the recitation of the Hallel each day. Presumably this meant that he wanted to thank God for the miracles of each day. But the pericope informs us that Mar said one who completes the recitation of the Hallel each day is likened to a blasphemer. As Rashi indicates, constant recitation devalues and ridicules the service. Therefore, to rationalize Yose's statement, the Talmud suggests that perhaps he meant he wanted to be among those who complete the recitation of the "Hallel" of the Pesuke DeZimra, the Psalms of the preliminary morning service that

¹⁵³ Cf. b. Pes. 117a.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. *Encyclopedia Talmudit*, op. cit., pp. 408-19.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. b. Arak. 10b, b. Meg. 14a.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. b. Arak. 10a-b, b. Ber. 14a, b. Ta'an. 28b, b. Meg. 10b.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. b. Arak. 10a-b.

contain the words, "Hallelu."¹⁵⁸

We have surveyed the main traditions relating to the Hallel. In light of our selection of materials and our analysis, let me return to review elements of productive approaches for the study of early Jewish liturgy. One area of scholarship in the study of Jewish liturgy that remains most likely to bring results remains within the range of textual analysis. The main data relating to the development of Jewish prayer in late antiquity are, of course, found in the derivative and composite literature of the rabbis, the Mishnah, Tosefta, two Talmuds and the Midrashim. Even in their present form, proper analysis can lead to significant results.

The types of evidence found in these corpora must be separated into several categories for the proper scholarly analysis of the development of Judaic liturgy to proceed. Within the larger context of the field, the rabbinic materials regarding prayer fall themselves into several categories.

The value of the stories, exegeses and other outright homiletical sources is evident. Rules regarding customs for reciting prayers are not only extensions of historical and social institutions. Laws in rabbinic literature express a meta-system of the theological ideas of early rabbinic prayer as a primary rite of the religious group.

With the limited available evidence we cannot locate the precise origin of prayers or trace every step in the evolution of the liturgy. We cannot reconstruct the spectrum of real-life synagogue practices over the span of more than three centuries. But we can show how some rabbinic statements on the subject of praying and prayers make direct and sometimes subtle, symbolic and significant metaphysical statements.¹⁵⁹

As is evident from this critical-historical analysis of the rabbinic conceptions of one prayer in their major compilations, the complete picture of the development of any liturgical phenomenon of the history of Judaism emerges not as a single seamless fabric shaped into an integrated narrative description. Rather it incorporates a series of related problems, investigated by diverse methods, and brought together to address urgent concerns.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. b. Shab. 118b.

¹⁵⁹ In addition, in other instances, where we have sufficient attributed data, we can identify how individual creativity affects the course of ideational development and accordingly show how ideas of one generation generate further conceptual creativity at later times.

Chapter VII

The Psychology of Early Rabbinic Prayer

One central notion in the philosophical system of the Mishnah, the seminal third century rabbinic law code, is that the human will establishes the division between the sacred and the profane in the world. As Neusner puts it, "Man by his word and will initiates the processes which force things to find their rightful place on one side or the other of the frontier, the definitive category, holiness. That is the substance of the Judaism of the Mishnah."¹⁶⁰

Neusner makes this broad observation at the conclusion of his full-scale study of the corpus of the Mishnaic code. He qualifies his remarks by adding that there remains much work to be done in defining the meaning of phrases like "man's will" and other related terms, which he himself employs throughout his monograph. He says, ". . . The definition of what we mean when we speak of will, let alone attitude, intention, purpose, hope, and despair, should not be thought obvious or easy to locate." Nevertheless he remarks intuitively, "So far as I can see, what the Mishnah wishes to say by a range of words, such as *kavvanah* (intention); *rasson* (will or desire); the very common word choice, *mahshabah* (thought, attitude, or intention)—these are references to the diverse sides of a very large but single thing: mind and heart."

Neusner does not further dissect and examine these categories of emotion, intuition, or internal consciousness interspersed throughout Mishnah's systematic classification of early rabbinic law. He does agree though that we must attempt better to define these concepts within their contexts to speak more objectively and analytically about the philosophical underpinnings that dominated early rabbinic Judaism.

The first and best known reference to intention in rabbinic literature is in Mishnah's rules on the recitation of prayers in tractate Berakhot. That idea is known as *kavvanah* or "intention" in ritual performances. It denotes the state of mind of the

¹⁶⁰See Neusner, *Judaism: the Evidence of Mishnah*, p. 282. Throughout I refer to the effective performance of the rituals of reciting prayers according to designated and accepted practice within the religious system of classical rabbinic Judaism.

person engaged in a special mode of consciousness for religious ritual. Our present aim is to explain in terms of the contemporary psychology of consciousness what the early rabbis meant when they used this concept and how they understood the change of subjective intention during prayer.¹⁶¹

There are two main aspects to *kavvanah*. First, it denotes a specific concentrative state of mind characterized by a heightened experience of factuality, more receptive to holistic images and associations. Second, it presupposes a modification in the relation between an individual and his immediate physical and social context.

On the first issue, the evidence implies that the modified state of consciousness for rabbinic prayer, denoted by the term *kavvanah*, differs in logic and character from usual thinking. Sayings in Mishnah suggest that when one properly modifies one's consciousness for prayer that person moves into an intuitive mental attitude other than that associated with normal awareness. In this state one becomes more sensitive to impressions and to the merging of images.¹⁶²

A special receptive mode of consciousness is appropriate to the recitation of the traditional rabbinic prayers. The blessings recited before and after the biblical verses of the *Shema`*, for instance, allude to images and ideas from the broad spectrum of symbols in the world views of rabbinic Judaism. When reciting this prayer, the participant in the ritual must shift rapidly from speaking of the story of the creation of the world to mention of the conception of the end of time, within a few short paragraphs of liturgy. He must jump from a reference to the earth, to a description of the heavens above within a few sentences, and from lamenting suffering and destruction to proclaiming the expectation of eternal redemption within a few pages.¹⁶³ A more pliant mode of consciousness better accommodates the sweeping scope of such liturgy.

Within this frame of mind the participant senses an increased feeling of factuality and truth.¹⁶⁴ Participation in the rituals of prayer helps to foster this attitude. The praying-person assumes the ability to see the 'true meaning' of the wide sweep of history and destiny through the texts of the liturgy in the experience of praying. The experiential awareness encountered in this transformed disposition is a basic component of *kavvanah*.

The second component bears with it relational implications. Several rabbinic laws also address the ways in which the individual engaged in prayer may interact with the world during the recitation of the *Shema`* and the Prayer of Eighteen. They ordain that an individual achieve a state of concentrative meditation to limit normal awareness of external stimuli to filter out some forms of communication with the world

¹⁶¹ Our analysis is based mainly on ideas drawn from the psychology of consciousness in the social sciences. For works of relevance, see the section of bibliographic notes at the end of this chapter.

¹⁶² See Robert Ornstein, *The Psychology of Consciousness*, New York, 1977, and *The Nature of Human Consciousness*, San Francisco, 1973.

¹⁶³ Cf. e.g. the Morning Service in the standard Jewish liturgy, J. H. Hertz, *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, New York, 1948, pp. 108-28.

¹⁶⁴ Charles Tart, "States of Consciousness and State Specific Sciences," in Ornstein, *Nature*, pp. 41-60.

to undo "the normal construction of consciousness."¹⁶⁵ *Kavvanah* then sets the limits between a person engaged in contemplation and his immediate material contextual surroundings.

The first main text that mentions the idea of *kavvanah*, M. Ber. 2:1, discusses the procedure for reciting the *Shema`*, the primary prayer of the rabbinic liturgy. This unit says that if one was reciting from the Torah [at the verse Deut. 6:4] and the time came for the recitation of the *Shema`*, "If he has intention [to do so] he fulfilled his obligation [to recite the *Shema`*]. And if he did not [have intention to do so], he did not fulfill his obligation." The context of the first rule, M. Ber. chapter two, is a set of diverse and loosely related regulations for the recitation of the basic Judaic liturgy, the *Shema`*.¹⁶⁶

The second source, in M. Ber. 5:1, rules that one may recite the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings only with "a solemn frame of mind." It informs us that, "The early saints used to tarry a while and then pray so that they could direct their thoughts to God."

In the Hebrew text, the connection between the two units is more apparent. Both the terms, "have intention," in 2:1 and "direct their thoughts," in 5:1, draw on the same root *kwn*, which implies direction, usually of thought or intent, here referring to the internal state of mind of an individual engaged in reciting prayers. Because of the complex interaction between thought and action, between mind and heart encompassed in them, the mere translation of the above rulings into English is not sufficient. They require elucidation.

The first pericope in M. Ber. chapter two presents a basic idea: A nonverbal component must accompany prayer. M.'s editor then goes beyond this general statement to define and specify the features of the necessary concentration, especially the relational dimension of one's state of awareness during the recitation.

M.'s laws (in 2:2) explain that to concentrate properly on prayer, one must shut down some forms of cognition and shift to new modes of thought. To recite the *Shema`* one must limit awareness, turn attention away from ordinary communication and thinking. M. tells us that there is a dispute between two Ushan rabbis over the proper procedure for interrupting the recitation of the *Shema`*.¹⁶⁷

In deceptively simple detail, M. presents the character of and a technique for closing down one's consciousness while reciting the *Shema`*. Meir and Judah dispute

¹⁶⁵See Ornstein, *Psychology*, p. 185.

¹⁶⁶The *Shema`*, centered on the recitation of three biblical passages: Deut. 6:4-9, Deut. 11:13-21, and Num. 15:37-41, has no substantive connection to states of mind. These passages are framed fore and aft by rabbinic prayers that make no reference to *kavvanah*. See Hertz, pp. 116-26.

¹⁶⁷The passage continues: D. "At the breaks [between the paragraphs of the *Shema`*] one may extend a greeting [to his associate] out of respect, and respond [to a greeting which was extended to him]."

E. "And in the middle [of reciting a paragraph] one may extend a greeting out of fear and respond," the words of R. Meir.

F. R. Judah says, "In the middle [of a paragraph] one may extend a greeting out of fear and respond out of respect.

G. "At the breaks [between the paragraphs] one may greet out of respect and respond to the greetings of any man."

over the degree of concentration one must have while reciting each paragraph and between each paragraph. Despite their disagreement over the intensity of necessary mentation, they agree on the basic principle. One must transform or modulate one's consciousness of the outside world, turn one's attention to an internal realm.¹⁶⁸ In the basic rabbinic idiom, one must avoid greeting one's associate and instead be conscious only of the experience of reciting the words of the *Shema`*.

M.'s subsequent rules demand that one enter a special mode of thought combined with the articulation of words, the recitation of the liturgy. Within the tractate, M. makes the point that the ritual requires a form of concentrative recitation.¹⁶⁹ Yose in Mishnah is certain that one must recite the texts aloud. In addition one has to pronounce them distinctly and in order. Therefore, the *Shema`*-liturgy must be accompanied by a kind of concentration that filters out some elements of everyday consciousness, while focusing on the recitation of the prescribed text.

Accordingly, in rabbinic prayer one does shift away from the normal courses of concentration, but does not abandon mental contact with the physical world or with conventional logical thought. These forces retreat into the background. In the foreground of the mind the energy of the poetic and intuitive world of symbol and image dominates consciousness.¹⁷⁰

Like poetry, liturgy's references conjure up a mythic picture and trigger a familiar series of ideas. The creation of the world, day and night, the Torah, revelation, man's duties, redemption, slavery in Egypt, the messiah and many other concepts may be present.¹⁷¹

With the presence of a modified consciousness, during the recitation and meditation of the *Shema`*, in a matter of minutes, one evokes many major components of the symbolic system of rabbinic Judaism, and its images, and reactivates its myths with key words and phrases, allusions and references.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Ornstein, *Psychology*, p. 178 and *passim*, and A. Deikman, "Bimodal Consciousness," in Ornstein, *Nature*, pp. 67-86.

¹⁶⁹ After it digresses for a few lines to provide a definition of the term "breaks in the *Shema`*," M. 2:3 continues with:

A. One who recites the *Shema`* but did not articulate it aloud, fulfills his obligation.

B. R. Yose says, "He did not fulfill his obligation."

C. If he recited but was not careful about [the pronunciation of] the letters [of each word] --

D. R. Yose says, "He fulfilled his obligation."

E. And R. Judah says, "He did not fulfill his obligation."

F. One who recites it backwards does not fulfill his obligation.

G. One who recited and erred must return to the place where he erred [and repeat the recitation].

¹⁷⁰ Liturgy draws on the familiar symbols of the narratives, myths, beliefs, ideas and world views of the religious system of rabbinic Judaism to evoke powerful images, rarely presenting the views of a theological system in a structured deductive order. The texts of a liturgy usually offer no systematic theology, nor even a complete account of a familiar story, narrative or myth, but generally string together important related phrases, flashing before the participant familiar slogans.

¹⁷¹ These often appear in diverse and expressive liturgy, like that which frames the recitation of the *Shema`*, day and evening.

¹⁷² Attempts to engage in the exegesis of texts of prayer, to seek out their meaning, are fraught with difficulties, precisely because of this inherent nature of liturgy. Law, narrative, even myth, are

So, we find it difficult to describe or study these expressive texts of one plane of analysis with the analytical methods of another level of cognition. We can say with assurance only that the texts of rabbinic prayers serve as the objects and ideas for concentration and contemplation, for the expression of thought, according to the conventions of the syntax and logic of the heightened state of awareness of the praying-person.

These major insights enable us to explore productively related issues in rabbinic prayer. We might argue for instance that the fixed and familiar forms and the repetitive nature of liturgy, even its frequent chant or song, precipitate the process of transformation and modulation of consciousness from one state to another. The expected and formalized character of ritual recitation may aid in inducing an altered state of prayerful awareness and help a person move past regular consciousness.¹⁷³

To review, the rabbis define prayer as a particular type of ritual in which the participant straddles the boundaries between intellectual cognition and intuitive consciousness. On the one hand, reciting rabbinic prayer frees a person of some formal limitations of ordinary, deductive and sequential thought. But on the other hand, the prescriptive rabbinic rules for the actions of the ritual require that one maintain some contact with the logical structures of ordinary reality. The ritual takes place in a heightened state of intuitive awareness linked to a controlled engagement with ordinary consciousness.¹⁷⁴

Mishnah logically turns next to consider three invasions of consciousness that can disrupt the attention that one needs for prayer and must be eliminated or suppressed so that one may concentrate on the ritual. They are, fear, love or lust, and grief. M. focuses on two special cases, the fear of heights and the heightened emotional state of the new bridegroom. M. 2:4 says that craftsmen may recite the

more readily receptive to explanation through various forms of deductive analysis, straightforward intellectual examination. But prayer, to some degree like poetry, uses a different syntax, a different idiom, a different logic out of a more intuitive, holistic world of awareness and communication.

¹⁷³This suggestion is speculative and perhaps reductionistic. Only a more rigorous study of the function of the rituals of recitation of prayers in altering awareness will clarify this issue. In this regard, in a most suggestive illustration J. E. Bogen ["The Other Side of the Brain: An Appositional Model," in Ornstein, *Nature*, pp. 101-25] recounts the following case of an individual who suffered severe aphasia, presumably as a result of damage to the left hemisphere of the brain:

Survival of musical ability in spite of severe aphasia has long been known. Perhaps the earliest recorded example was the description by Dalin in 1745: ". . . he had an attack of a violent illness which resulted in the paralysis of the entire right side of the body and complete loss of speech. . . . He can sing certain hymns, which he had learned before he became ill, as clearly and distinctly as any healthy person. However, it should be noted that at the beginning of the hymn he has to be helped a little by some other person singing with him. Similarly, with the same type of help, he can recite certain prayers without singing, but with a certain rhythm and in a high-pitched, shouting tone. Yet this man is dumb, cannot say a single word except 'yes' and has to communicate by making signs with his hands."

¹⁷⁴The state of mind for this form of prayer is different from that of trance or deep meditation and distinct from that of free association or overwhelming emotion. Yet, as we have pointed out, it is not merely an exercise in straightforward deductive logical thinking, in storytelling or myth-making, or even in contemplation.

Shema` while atop a tree or atop a scaffold, something that they are not permitted to do for the recitation of the Prayer.¹⁷⁵ We presume that the householder who is unaccustomed to heights may not recite even the *Shema`* while elevated. This unit recognizes a distinction in degrees of concentration for different liturgies. The *Shema`* requires one level of concentration. The Prayer calls for a more intense level of thought, a different state of consciousness. In the words of the Mishnah, even the craftsman must come down from the tree to recite the Prayer.

M. 2:5 rules that a bridegroom is exempt from the recitation of the *Shema`* from the first night after his wedding until the Sabbath following the wedding, if he did not yet consummate the marriage. M.'s references to the emotional distraction of the newlywed are clear. The psychological stress of the new status is sufficient disruption to free one from the obligation to recite the *Shema`*. M. however also recognizes the relative nature of this kind of distraction and allows for leeway in this area. M. permits those exceptional persons who can control their emotions to recite. M. 2:8 says that if a bridegroom wishes to recite the *Shema`* on the first night after his wedding he may do so.

Grief is the third type of internal invasion of consciousness and concentration addressed in the succeeding section of M.'s rules at 3:1. M. recognizes that grief is more than just the state of mind of the isolated individual. It sees grief as a contagious social phenomenon that affects not only the bereaved mourner but also the participants in a funeral, the pallbearers and onlookers as well. A person whose deceased relative is not yet buried is exempt from the obligations to recite the *Shema`* and to wear tefillin.¹⁷⁶ Those who are most directly involved in a funeral share the greatest intensity of the grief. Their sorrow disrupts their concentration because grief is an independent state of consciousness. M. differentiates between the levels of consciousness required for different liturgies. Those who are less directly involved in the burial proceedings may recite the *Shema`* but not the Prayer. Even a less-intense participation in these activities creates a sense of sadness, a state of distraction, sufficient to disrupt the deeper concentration required for the recitation of the Prayer.¹⁷⁷

M. 5:1 specifies a special mode of concentration for the recitation the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings. For the Prayer one must enter a deeper realm of consciousness, "A solemn frame of mind." One must strictly limit one's awareness of the external world, and concentrate more deeply for the Prayer than for the *Shema`*. One should move so far into an altered mode of awareness that even the natural danger of a serpent's sting, or the social danger of ignoring the greeting of a king, will not distract

¹⁷⁵The "Prayer" is a reference to the standard liturgy of nineteen blessings, the Amidah, Hertz, pp. 130-56.

¹⁷⁶Phylacteries of the head and upper arm in later times are usually connected with prayer.

¹⁷⁷After these rules in Berakhot, M. gives a brief appendix that does not directly continue the previous interest in the modes of concentration required for the recitation of the *Shema`* (M. 3:3-6). The next issue is the obligation to recite prayer for persons in a lower social status, or those who have suffered some pollution, those who are unclothed or those who stand near waste materials. These laws turn to aspects of the social and physical dimensions of prayer--not relevant to our present concerns.

him from his recitation.¹⁷⁸ M. says, "Even if a king extends a greeting to [one who is praying], he should not respond. Even if a serpent is poised to strike at his heel, he should not interrupt."

Early rabbinic psychology of prayer may be summed up as follows. Prayer is a ritual of speech accompanied by a shift of consciousness from ordinary awareness to a different and more intuitive mode of thought. These rituals entail both a substantive change in one's mode of consciousness and a modulation of a person's awareness of the immediate external context, accompanied by the recitation of standardized liturgical texts. This textual component anchors the ritual in the spheres of intellectual thought, myth, story and world view.¹⁷⁹

In addition the rabbinic materials recognize a fine distinction between two levels of concentration. The first level is defined by a limitation on social intercourse during the recitation of the *Shema`* liturgy. At a second level of mentation during the recitation of the Prayer of Eighteen, one must further cut off consciousness from one's immediate surroundings and focus attention on the internal intuitive images of the liturgy.

Our understanding of the relational definitions in rabbinic literature of the state of consciousness associated with prayer, and the inherent nature of the frame of mind of the person who prays, thus are aided by employing terms of current conceptions of modes of awareness related to states of activity in the human brain.¹⁸⁰ Through this medium we better define the concept of *kavvanah* or "intention" associated with rabbinic prayer and the relationship between "mind" and "heart" in its inner life.

Sources Consulted: Two penetrating essays on psychological aspects of Jewish laws and practices of prayer are P. Bindler, "A Psychological Analysis of Kavvanah in Prayer," in *Proceedings of the Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists*, ed. F. Rosner, 3/4 (1976), Jerusalem, pp. 133-43 and "Meditative Prayer and Rabbinic Perspectives on the Psychology of Consciousness: Environmental, Physiological and Attentional Variables," in *Journal of Psychology and Judaism*, 4 (1980), pp. 228-48. Neither of these articles exploits recent research into bimodal consciousness and differing modes of awareness. Both tend to be less than systematic and

¹⁷⁸The standard commentaries to M. all agree that this ruling is not to be taken literally as a practical basis for actual law. It is a mode of expressing a definition about the level of consciousness needed for praying.

¹⁷⁹These rabbinic materials do not consider in any detail pure meditation, trance, free associative prayer or ecstatic emotionalism. There may have been advocates within rabbinism of free prayer not anchored in fixed formula. M. does not sanction such an attitude. At most one pericope alludes to this alternative: "R. Eliezer says, 'One who fixes his prayer, his prayer is not supplication (M. 4:4).'"

¹⁸⁰I emphasize that this work is not an attempt to reduce praying to a psychological state. Rather it is a descriptive analysis of the phenomenon of prayer that utilizes certain conceptual insights in the process of translation and analysis. It should be noted that philosophers criticize this approach to consciousness on the grounds that it is a form of reductive Materialism, which they refer to as a "central-state theory" that identifies mental states and activities with states and activities of the brain. I do not herewith propose either to defend this theory or to accept it as proven. Rather I suggest that whether consciousness is a material state of the brain or not, the conceptual distinctions utilized in psychological research serve as valuable vehicles for describing and clarifying the states of mind associated with prayer. See J. A. Shaffer, "Philosophy of Mind," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 15th ed., Chicago, 1974, vol. 12, p. 230.

somewhat apologetic.

Also of interest are: R. Prell-Foldes, "The Reinvention of Reflexivity in Jewish Prayer; the Self and the Community in Modernity," in *Semiotica*, 30 (1980), pp. 73-96; W. T. Wheelock, "The Problem of Ritual Language: From Information to Situation," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 50 (1982), pp. 49-71; my, *The Mishnaic Law of Blessings and Prayers: Tractate Berakhot*, and my study, "Kavvanah for Prayer in the Mishnah and the Talmud," in *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism*, Lanham, 1987.

Concerning states of consciousness and religious ritual I consulted the following works:

On the study of consciousness: For a synthesis of research in the area in the past two decades in the fields of psychology see R. E. Ornstein, *The Psychology of Consciousness*.

On the origin of the idea of realms of consciousness: The notion of the existence of distinct realms of human consciousness may, in part, be traced back to William James. See especially "The Stream of Consciousness," in Ornstein, *Nature*, p. 157 where James says, "Our state of mind is never precisely the same."

On other states and religious experience: For an empirical attempt to identify and describe states of awareness, see in particular the work of Charles Tart, "States of Consciousness and State Specific Sciences," in Ornstein, *Nature*, pp. 41-60, who argues that to investigate an altered state of consciousness one must experience that state of consciousness. He also speaks of the complexity of investigations in light of the sense of a person in such a state that he directly experiences 'truth' and that his observations seem perfectly 'real'. Tart says about the analysis of religious experience: "Spiritual and mystical experiences are primary phenomena of various ASC's (i.e., altered states of consciousness): because of such experiences, untold numbers of both the noblest and most horrible acts of which people are capable have been committed. Yet in all the time that Western science has existed, no concerted attempt has been made to understand these ASC phenomena in scientific terms (59)."

On altered modes of awareness and the activity and functions of different parts of the brain, see, e.g., J. E. Bogen, "The Other Side of the Brain: An Appositional Model," in Ornstein, *Nature*, pp. 101-125. On scientific evidence of bimodal consciousness based on split brain research, see A. Deikman, "Bimodal Consciousness," in Ornstein, *Nature*, pp. 67-86. He distinguishes the action mode from the receptive mode of thought. He refers to experimental studies of meditation to develop his notion of 'deautomatization', the process of removing oneself from ordinary consciousness. On the abilities and functions of the two hemispheres of the human brain, see, e.g., M. S. Gazzaniga, "The Split Brain in Man," in Ornstein, *Nature*, pp. 87-100. Some postulate that the center of what some call verbal or intellectual ability (often called in the literature deductive reasoning) is on the left side of the brain (in right-handed persons) and that the seat of intuitive, holistic, artistic capacities rests separately in the right side of the brain. See also Bogen, pp. 101-25. Terms like 'intuitive', 'intellectual', etc., cannot be fully explained in this context.

On distinct regions of consciousness, one in which verbal, deductive cognition dominates and the other in which intuitive, holistic thought prevails, see Deikman, 119-20, who collects nineteen different ways of expressing the duality of mind, the dichotomy of consciousness out of scientific, social scientific, humanistic and religious writings. Some argue that different sets of logical assumptions govern normal consciousness on the one hand, and altered states of perception on the other hand. See *op. cit.*, Tart, and Ornstein.

Chapter VIII

A Rabbinic Compendium on Prayer: The Editorial Structure of the Talmud of the Land of Israel Tractate Berakhot

We have seen in the chapters above how rabbis innovated and instituted prayers and regulations for liturgy in the first and second centuries. Now we ask how did they organize their interests in prayer in the next and more derivative period, the third through fifth centuries.

From the publication of the Mishnah in about 220 C.E. to the close of the Talmud of the Land of Israel in the fifth century, rabbinism in Israel dealt mainly with a received heritage of text ritual and belief. Berakhot is the first of the tractates of the Talmud of the Land of Israel (known also as Yerushalmi). Like the remaining volumes of this compilation, it is organized around its namesake, tractate Berakhot in Mishnah.¹⁸¹ More than three fifths of the Talmud's materials in the tractate engage in citation and explanation of Mishnah, or legal speculation and reflection primary to Mishnah, or harmonization of two or more passages of Mishnah or of a Mishnah-passage with a rule from Tosefta. Accordingly, to understand the redactional structure of that tractate one must focus attention on the agenda of M. Ber. I have spelled that out above in chapter II.

A review of the tractate's main subject matter and underlying issues gives us some insight into the specific interests of the individual rules of the tractate. Let us summarize the laws of the compilation in order. The tractate in Mishnah begins with the rules for the recitation of the *Shema* and unfolds in seven major divisions as follows:

¹⁸¹ See my introduction and my translation and explanation in *The Talmud of the Land of Israel: Berakhot*, Chicago, 1989.

I. Rules for the recitation of the *Shema`* and its blessings (1:1-5)

- 1:1** Dispute regarding the time for the recitation of the *Shema`* at night.
- 1:2** Dispute regarding the recitation of the *Shema`* in the morning.
- 1:3** Houses' dispute over the exegesis of Deut. 6:7. Scriptural basis for reciting evening and morning.
- 1:4** The rabbinic blessings that frame the *Shema`*. General rules regarding forms of blessings.
- 1:5** Scriptural basis for reciting the last verse of the *Shema`* at night.

II. Concentration during the recitation. Social status and the recitation of the *Shema`* (2:1-3:6)

- 2:1-2** Intention needed for reciting. Distractions from reciting. The basis for the order of the paragraphs.
- 2:3** One who erred in reciting.
- 2:4** Special rule for craftsmen. May recite atop a tree. It is no distraction for them.
- 2:5-7** Bridegroom exempt from the *Shema`*. He is distracted. Gamaliel's practice and two more units about Gamaliel.
- 2:8** Bridegroom has the option to recite.

- 3:1-2** Those involved in a funeral are exempt from the *Shema`*.
- 3:3** Women, slaves and minors are exempt from the *Shema`*. Their other obligations.
- 3:4** One for whom the rabbis declared uncleanness (because of a bodily discharge) may not recite the rabbinic blessings before and after the *Shema`* and before the meal.
- 3:5** Related rules: Prayer-obligation of one who remembered he was unclean. Reciting the *Shema`* while unclothed. Prayer near human wastes.
- 3:6** Others who are unclean from a discharge must dip in a pool before they can recite the *Shema`*.

III. Rules for the recitation of the Prayer of Eighteen Blessings (4:1-5:5)

- 4:1** The times of day to recite the Prayer.
- 4:2** Special Prayers for a study hall.
- 4:3** Dispute regarding the Prayer of Eighteen.
- 4:4** Fixing Prayer. Short Prayer to be said in a place of danger.
- 4:5** Direction to face when praying.
- 4:6** One who prays when travelling.
- 4:7** The Additional Prayer.

- 5:1** The frame of mind needed for Prayer.
- 5:2** Insertions in the Prayer.
- 5:3** Rules for one who makes errors in praying.
- 5:4** The priestly blessing during Prayer.
- 5:5** Prayer recitation as an omen.

IV. Rules for food blessings and the blessings of the meal and dinner (6:1-8)**6:1** The basic taxonomy of categories of foods and their respective blessings.**6:2** Reciting the wrong blessing.**6:3** Blessings over non-agricultural or defective foods.**6:4** Priorities of foods for reciting blessings.**6:5** Reciting a blessing over one food exempts another from the need for a blessing.**6:6** One person's blessing exempts another person from the obligation to recite a blessing.**6:7** Primary and secondary foods in the meal.**6:8** The blessings recited after eating. The blessing for drinking water.**V. The invitation to recite the blessings after a meal (7:1-5)****7:1-2** The call to recite the blessings after the meal. Who may be counted in the necessary quorum.**7:3** The formula of the invitation.**7:4-5** How a group may separate or combine for the invitation. The blessing over wine.**VI. Dinner rituals (8:1-8)****8:1** Houses' disputes regarding the dinner. The order of blessings in the Sabbath Prayer of Sanctification (Qiddush).**8:2** The order of washing and mixing the cup at dinner.**8:3** Placement of the napkin at the dinner.**8:4** Cleaning and washing after the dinner.**8:5** The order of blessings in the Prayer of Division (Habdalah) after the Sabbath.**8:6** The blessings over light and spices after the meal.**8:7** Rule for one who forgot to recite the blessings after the meal.**8:8** Blessings on wine and meal after dinner.**VII. Other blessings and miscellaneous matters (9:1-5)****9:1** Blessings for shrines and former places of idolatry.**9:2** Blessings for astronomical, geological and meteorological phenomena.**9:3** Blessings to recite when acquiring new possessions or for hearing good or bad news. Vain Prayers.**9:4** Prayers to recite upon entering a new town.**9:5** Blessings to recite for good and bad events. Proper behavior at the Temple Mount. The rabbis ordained the invocation of God's name.

To sum up, I and II cover three main areas: the nature of the obligation to recite the *Shema`* morning and evening (1:1-5); intention that is needed for reciting the *Shema`* and the kinds of distractions that disrupt the recitation of the *Shema`* (2:1-3:2);

individuals who are not obliged to recite the *Shema* or its blessings (3:3-6).

III turns to the second daily liturgy, the Prayer, and deals with: the times (4:1) and forms of the Prayer (4:3-4), one's orientation during Prayer (4:5-6), the Additional Prayer (4:7). Interpolations into this Mishnaic unit deal with the short special Prayer for the study hall and for places of danger (4:2, 4:4). It turns then to the frame of mind one needs for the Prayer (5:1) and to other regulations.

IV deals with food blessings (6:1-7), V with the blessings after the meal (6:8, 7:1-5) and VI with meal regulations (8:1-8). VII concludes with special blessings.

As a whole the tractate does not have substantive conceptual internal coherence. Its unity grows out of the perspective of the editor who brought together a variety of subjects that share one practice: the recitation of the rabbinic blessing formula in each of these instances of daily activity.

Overview of Yerushalmi Berakhot

As I pointed out, the Talmud tractate Y. Ber. is organized around the text of Mishnah. The mishnaic code serves as the bridge that joins in one volume many diverse materials in our talmudic compilation. To appreciate the complete structure of this lengthy and complicated composite collection of rabbinic teachings, one must observe how the units of the tractate relate to Mishnah and to each other. In what follows I give a detailed overview of the tractate showing how the redactor assembled the building blocks of tradition to construct from them this complex tractate of Talmud.

Tractate Berakhot of the Talmud of the Land of Israel is composed, as I said, of several kinds of materials. More than three fifths of the tractate's 360 distinct units are related to Mishnah in one way or another. Of the remaining materials, about nineteen percent (sixty-eight items) are linked to a preceding unit of Yerushalmi. The remaining independent materials comprising some eight percent (twenty-nine) of the units lack a direct context in our tractate.

Let me be more precise about those items in some way related to Mishnah. About one third of the units either directly explain a word, phrase or term in the Mishnah-pericope, or provide some scriptural basis for the law or subject matter of Mishnah, or extend or explain Mishnah's primary legal or narrative focus. In the synopsis that follows we label these units type A or type B, as explained below. These items constitute about thirty-five percent of the total number of units in the tractate (128 out of 360).

A few additional units (fifteen) compare or contrast Mishnah's legal or narrative principle with another source, either elsewhere in Mishnah, or with an independent tradition (about four percent of the units). These items usually bring up and resolve contradictions of law or fact. We refer to these materials below by the label, type C. Materials related to the Mishnah in a looser, more general fashion, we call type D.

Together, four types of units may be linked to Mishnah (types A-D) and two kinds of units are independent of Mishnah (types E-F). Type E materials are not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Completely independent units with no connection to the context of the discussion are listed under the heading, type F.

About one quarter of the units of the tractate (eighty-six in number) cite and usually comment or expand upon a pericope of Tosefta. Naturally many of these also are related to Mishnah, since some two thirds of Tosefta's units are either comments on or expansions of Mishnah's law or narrative. Some few of these units are independent of Mishnah. We label these units, type T.

As we go through the units in order, the contours of the redactional structure of the tractate emerge. Most frequently we observe an expected pattern--the citation of Mishnah, followed by a unit of type A or B, an explanation of or comment on Mishnah. Materials related to the Mishnah in a looser, more general fashion, type D, often will follow these initial direct comments. Independent materials, types E and F, where they appear at all, generally come next. Citations of Tosefta may appear at any point, but frequently follow Mishnah directly. Naturally, variations of this redactional order appear throughout the tractate as is clear from the synopsis.

Categories of the Units of the Tractate

To recapitulate, we have identified seven types of units within our tractate, correlated closely to the kinds of broad divisions of materials identified by Jacob Neusner in his taxonomic analysis of the pericopae of Yerushalmi. It will be useful to review these correspondences before going on to the unit-by-unit summary of the tractate.

Type A: Explains Mishnah's words, phrases, terms or provides some scriptural basis for Mishnah. In *The Talmud of the Land of Israel*, volume 35, Introduction: Taxonomy (Chicago, 1983), pp. 9-12, Neusner refers to this type of pericope as "Mishnah exegesis."

Type B: Extends or explains Mishnah's primary legal or narrative focus. Neusner calls this "legal speculation and reflection primary to Mishnah."

Type C: Compares or contrasts Mishnah's primary legal principle or narrative theme with another source. Neusner calls this "harmonization of distinct laws of the Mishnah." In several cases the Talmud harmonizes Mishnah with Tosefta or a Baraita.

Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah or to an authority named in Mishnah. These are reflections or speculations secondary to Mishnah. They usually fall between Neusner's two broad categories--"legal speculation and reflection primary to Mishnah" and "anthology, relevant to Mishnah only in theme."

Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. This and the category that follows coincide with what Neusner calls "legal speculation and reflection independent of Mishnah."

Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Legal or non-legal speculation and reflection independent of Mishnah and Tosefta.

Type T: Cites Tosefta with or without explanation or discussion. This category

naturally coincides with Neusner's "Tosefta: citation and exegesis." These materials frequently are categorized also by one of the other designations.

Any individual unit may fall into more than one of the categories listed above. This occurs frequently for Tosefta citations, that serve, in about forty instances of eighty-six units, also as speculations primary to Mishnah. Sometimes a unit begins as one type, perhaps as Mishnah exegesis, and continues by extending the primary legal focus of the text. Other possibilities also may be found in the outline of the tractate that follows.

Synopsis of the organization of the tractate's units

1:1 Mishnah specifies the period for the recitation of the evening *Shema`*. It focuses on the issue of reciting the *Shema`* too early in the evening.

I. Type A; Type T: Cites Tosefta. Compares Mishnah's legal principle regarding the time one may begin to recite the evening *Shema`* with Tosefta's rule on the same issue. The two opinions given in these materials appear to contradict one another. The unit harmonizes them. Also may be Type C.

II. Type B: Directly extends Mishnah's primary legal focus by citing a teaching that rules that reciting the evening *Shema`* before the appointed time is not effective. The Talmud harmonizes this rule with the synagogue practice of reciting before sundown. It explains that one does not fulfill his obligation to recite the *Shema`* by saying it early in the synagogue. That recitation serves another purpose.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah, the proper time for the recitation of the *Shema`*. It asks about a person who had a doubt whether he recited the *Shema`*.

IV. Type B; Type T: Related to Mishnah's primary legal focus. Cites Tosefta with discussion. When stars are visible in the sky it is night. Discusses at length the number and kind of stars referred to in this ruling.

V-VII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud, concerning definitions of the twilight period, the transition between day and night, and criteria for defining the time of the start of the day.

VIII-IX. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. The correct position for one's feet during Prayer. The responses recited by the congregation during the priestly blessing.

X. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud--the definition of the start of day (VII, above). A discussion of the stages of dawn and a story.

XI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud.

Discusses the distance the sun travels through the firmament, an aspect of cosmology discussed in the preceding unit.

XII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Extends discussion into the subjects of mythic cosmology and cosmological distances.

XIII. Type T; Type A: Cites Tosefta. Explains Mishnah's reference to "the first watch." Explains Tosefta and provides some scriptural basis for it. An excursus (Type B) on King David's Prayer follows.

XIV. Type A; Type B: Explains why the law accords with sages' opinion in Mishnah. Discusses Mishnah's primary legal focus, procedures for reciting the *Shema`*.

XV. Type A; Type T: Explains that Simeon's opinion in Tosefta accords with Gamaliel's in M.

XVI. Type B: Cites material related to Mishnah's primary narrative focus in a lengthy unit.

XVII-XVIII. Type A: Discusses different versions of Mishnah's text. Directly explains Mishnah's primary legal focus.

1:2 Mishnah specifies the period for the recitation of the morning *Shema`* and focuses on the issue of reciting it too late in the morning.

I. Type A; Type T: Provides some scriptural basis for Mishnah. Cites and expands Tosefta. Shows that Mishnah and Tosefta agree on the law (Type C).

II. Type T: Cites Tosefta and provides a scriptural basis for it. Cites additional Toseftan material.

III. Type A: Comments on and discusses Mishnah.

IV. Type C: Contrasts current Mishnah's primary legal principle with another rule found elsewhere in Mishnah. At issue is the nature of the activities that one must interrupt for Prayer and for the *Shema`*.

V. Type E: A discussion regarding priorities in the performance of religious obligations.

1:3 A House's dispute regarding the interpretation of the Deuteronomy 6:7: rules for reciting the *Shema`*.

I. Type A; Type T: Cites Tosefta's comment on Mishnah.

II. Type T: Cites Tosefta without comment.

III. Type D: Related to the narrative concerning Tarfon in Mishnah. Discussion of the relative importance of laws based on Scripture compared with those based only on other sources of authority.

IV. Type D: A unit regarding the authority of Hillelite traditions.

1:4 Rules for the blessings that frame the scriptural passages of the *Shema`*.
Rules for the formulae of blessings in general.

I. Type A: Provides scriptural basis for Mishnah.

II. Type B: Explains an aspect of Mishnah's primary legal focus. Rationales for reciting passages of the *Shema`*. Lengthy excursus on the *Shema`* itself.

III. Type C: Compares Mishnah's primary legal principle with another source. Cites M. Tamid 5:1. Comments upon it. Shows our Mishnah does not conflict with it. Also digresses regarding the daily recitation of the story of Balak and Baalam.

IV. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. The blessings in the recitation of the *Shema`* can serve in the place of the recitation of the daily blessings for the study of Torah.

V. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. More rules for the recitation of the *Shema`*.

VI. Type T: Cites Tosefta and discusses it.

VII. Type T: Cites Tosefta and discusses it.

VIII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud (VII). Mentions bowing and discusses words of Prayer that are recited in an undertone during the reader's recitation of the Prayer of Eighteen.

IX. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud (VII). Precedents and scriptural passages regarding bowing in Prayer.

X. Type T: Cites and discusses Tosefta with regard to the formula of blessings.

XI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Further rules for blessings.

1:5 Concerning the mention of the exodus in the recitation of the *Shema`*.

I. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary narrative focus. Develops further the reference

to Eleazar's age.

II. Type C: Contrasts Mishnah's primary legal principle or narrative theme with another source.

III. Type D: Discusses the practice of reciting the third paragraph of the *Shema`*.

IV. Type T: Cites Tosefta with discussion of what to mention in the blessing following the *Shema`*.

V. Type E: Other insertions in prayers.

VI-VIII. Type T: A paraphrase and reorganization of T. 1:10-13.

2:1 One must have the right intention to fulfill one's obligation to recite the *Shema`*. Interruptions during recitation.

I. Type D: Based on an inference from a rule in Mishnah. Discussion of the necessity of reciting the blessings of the *Shema`* to fulfill one's obligation. Incidental to this discussion, cites T.

II. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah, procedures for the recitation of the *Shema`*.

III. Type B; Type E: Extends Mishnah's primary concern, interruptions during the recitation of the *Shema`*. Continues with a discussion of interruptions in the performance of rituals.

IV. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary concern with interruptions and continues with additional discussion regarding extending a greeting to one's teacher and attributing teachings to one's teacher.

V. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud, the last concern above, the merit of attributing a teaching to its author.

VI. Type A: Explains M. 2:1D-E.

2:2 Defines the "breaks in the *Shema`*" and explains the order of the paragraphs of the *Shema`*.

I. Type A: Provides scriptural basis for Mishnah.

II. Type B: Extends Mishnah's concern with the order of procedures for reciting the *Shema`* and for other ritual obligations.

III. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud.

Discussion of rules for wearing tefillin, last concern of preceding unit.

IV. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Blessing for tefillin. Proper time for wearing tefillin.

V. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Women are exempt from the obligation to wear tefillin.

VI. Type T: Cites Tosefta with discussion concerning recitation of *Shema`*, Prayer, tefillin in a bathhouse.

VII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Further rules regarding the performance of rituals in a bathhouse and near waste matter.

VIII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Rules for tefillin, continues concern of the preceding.

IX. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Rules for behavior in a cemetery. Attributed to authority cited in the preceding unit (*Zeira*).

X. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Loosely linked to concerns of units VII-IX. Three miscellaneous traditions of Idi b. R. Simeon and related materials.

2:3 One must recite the *Shema`* aloud, distinctly, and in order.

I. Type A: Discussion of the opinions in Mishnah.

II. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus concerning the *Shema`* to other rituals.

III. Type B: Explains Mishnah's rule. Gives examples of words in the *Shema`* and in other instances that may be mispronounced.

IV. Types A; T; B: Gives scriptural basis for M. 2:3F. Cites and discusses Tosefta.

V. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Just as Mishnah shows that there is a logic to the order of the *Shema`*, this lengthy unit shows that there is also a logic to the order of the Prayer.

VI. Type E: Digression on the name of the Messiah.

VII. Type D: Continues section V.

VIII. Type B: Explains Mishnah's reference to error in recitation. Gives examples of lapses in concentration and of means for achieving the proper state of mind for prayer.

2:4 Craftsmen may recite the *Shema`* (but not the Prayer) from atop a tree or scaffold.

I. Type A; Type T: Explains Mishnah by citing and discussing Tosefta.

II. Type T: Cites Tosefta with discussion.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Other actions that may affect one's ability to concentrate on the *Shema`* or on the Prayer.

IV. Type C: Compares or contrasts Mishnah's primary legal principle with another source. Discusses whether concentration on the *Shema`* precludes other forms of concentration such as concentration of the priest when carrying the water of the sin offering.

2:5 A bridegroom is exempt from the obligation of reciting the *Shema`*. Gamaliel did recite.

I. Type C; Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Infers from Mishnah that intercourse is permitted on the Sabbath. Discussion of that topic.

II. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Carries forward concerns mentioned in the preceding. Discussion of whether one may have intercourse a second time with one's newlywed wife on the Sabbath and related issues.

2:6 When Gamaliel was a mourner he bathed.

I. Type B: Discusses Mishnah's law that mourners may bathe.

II. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah, whether student accepts condolences for his teacher. Account of some eulogies of prominent rabbis.

III. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Stories of what happened when some rabbis came to Israel.

2:7 Gamaliel accepted condolences for his slave.

I. Type B: Extends Mishnah's main interest.

II. Type D: Adds material related to the theme of condolences. Examples of some rabbinic eulogies.

III. Type F: Independent stories regarding rabbis who came from Babylonia to Israel and caused trouble.

2:8 A bridegroom may recite the *Shema`*. Simeon b. Gamaliel says no.

I. Type B: Explains rationale for Mishnah's rule that one may perform certain actions even if not obligated. Discusses other related cases.

II. Type B: A story that cites our Mishnah's rule.

3:1 Before the burial of the deceased, mourners are exempt from reciting the *Shema`* and from wearing tefillin. Some persons involved in the funeral also are exempt.

I. Type B: Extends Mishnah's concern with the laws for mourners wearing tefillin.

II. Type A; Type B: Provides scriptural basis for Mishnah. Extends Mishnah's rules about the obligations of a mourner.

III. Type D: Indirectly related to a theme of Mishnah. Use of beds in a mourner's house.

IV. Type D: Indirectly related. Customs for a mourner's meal.

V. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Customs for drinking wine in a mourner's house.

VI. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Circumstances for which a priest may deliberately render himself unclean.

VII. Type F; Type T: Continuation of preceding topic with a citation of Tosefta.

VIII. Type F: Continues independent themes of VI-VII.

IX. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Further customs for funeral. Followed by type F: Independent unit with no apparent link to context. Miscellaneous story.

3:2 Mourners may recite the *Shema`* if there is time after the funeral. Some persons who come to console the mourners are exempt from the recitation of the *Shema`*.

I. Type C: Contrasts Mishnah's primary legal principle with another source. Resolves apparent contradiction between Mishnah and a second tradition.

II. Type C; Type T: Cites Tosefta. Resolves an apparent contradiction between

Mishnah and Tosefta.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah: if there is enough time left to recite. Discussion of rules for one who enters a synagogue while the congregation is in the midst of reciting the Prayer.

IV. Type C; Type T: Cites Tosefta. Resolves an apparent contradiction between Mishnah and Tosefta and M. San. 2:1.

3:3 Obligations of women, slaves and minors.

I. Type A: Provides scriptural basis for the rules of Mishnah.

II. Type B; Type C: Explains Mishnah's exemption of women by citing an independent source elsewhere in M. and discussing it.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. One who is exempt from an obligation cannot free others from that obligation.

IV. Types D and F: Starts with material related to M. Continues with an independent unit. No apparent link to context. Comparisons between pairs of ritual objects.

V. Type T: Cites and discusses Tosefta.

3:4 One who is unclean by virtue of a bodily discharge may not recite the blessings before or after the *Shema`* or before the meal. Judah permits.

I. Type A: Explains Mishnah's law. Continues with type T: Cites and discusses relevant Tosefta and other relevant materials.

II. Type A: Introduces a lemma as a comment on M.'s rule.

III. Type E: Discussion of immersion practices.

IV. Type T: Cites passages related to the subject of immersing after an emission.

V. Type E: Some immersions are not compulsory.

VI. Type E: Stories to discourage too much diligence in observing some rules regarding immersions.

3:5 Rules for reciting the *Shema`* and Prayer when unclean because of bodily discharge, when nude, or when near waste matter.

I. Type T; Type B: Explains M.'s rule and develops its primary legal focus.

II. Type A: Direct comment on M.

III. Type T; type C: Cites Tosefta, a related rule, and contrasts it with M.

IV. Type T; Type B: Cites Tosefta and extends M.'s primary legal focus.

V. Type T: Cites Tosefta and discusses it. Keeping a chamber pot in one's house.

VI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud, where to put an object in a bedroom. Rules for keeping scrolls in one's house and related materials regarding treatment of Torah scrolls and tefillin.

VII. Type T: Cites Tosefta and discusses it. Related materials.

3:6 A *zab* or *niddah* who discharged semen must dip in a pool. Judah exempts.

I. Type B: Explains at length Judah's rule.

4:1 The times for reciting the daily Prayers. Judah gives alternatives.

I. Type A: Provides a scriptural basis for Mishnah. Source for prayer in general.

II. Type T: Cites Tosefta. Discusses the proper way to pray.

III. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Extends Tosefta's concern in the last unit with the proper manner for Prayer.

IV. Type A: Provides a scriptural basis for Mishnah. Gives alternative bases for the system of three daily Prayers.

V. Type A: Provides a scriptural basis for Judah's rule in Mishnah regarding the morning Prayer.

VI. Type A: Provides a scriptural basis for Sages' rules in Mishnah regarding the morning Prayer.

VII. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Establishing priorities for the recitation of Prayers: Afternoon vs. Additional Prayer.

VIII. Type A: Provides a scriptural basis for Judah's rule in Mishnah regarding the Afternoon Prayer.

IX. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Customs of the rabbis regarding the Afternoon Prayer.

X. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Basis for the Closing Prayer on the Day of Atonement and other material on the Closing Prayer.

XI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Modification of the Prayer service on a Sabbath that coincides with another holy day.

XII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Torah reading for the new moon that coincides with various special days.

XIII. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Rules for reciting the Evening Prayer before its regular time.

XIV. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Whether the obligation to recite the Evening Prayer is optional or compulsory.

XV. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. The story of the deposition of Gamaliel from the Patriarchate because of a dispute over the nature of the obligation to recite the Evening Prayer.

4:2 Nehuniah's short Prayer for the study hall.

I. Type A: Provides the text of Nehuniah's Prayer.

II. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Other texts of special Prayers.

III. Type A: Comments on Mishnah.

4:3 Rules for reciting the Prayer of Eighteen.

I. Type A; Type T: Provides a scriptural basis for the subject of Mishnah, the Prayer of Eighteen. Continues with alternative bases for the Prayer. Cites relevant Tosefta. Discusses related issues.

II. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Scriptural basis for the Prayer of Seven Blessings recited on the Sabbath.

III. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Scriptural basis for the Prayer of Nine Blessings on the New Year.

IV. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Scriptural basis for the Prayer of Twenty-four Blessings on a fast day.

V. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Rules for reciting Prayer on a fast day.

VI. Type A: Discusses Joshua's reference in Mishnah to the "Abstract of Eighteen."

4:4 Eliezer says one should not fix his Prayer. Special short Prayer to recite in a dangerous place.

I. Type A: Discusses Eliezer's rule.

II. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Customs for praying.

III. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Rules for one who forgot whether he already prayed.

IV. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Rules for one who said the weekday Prayer on the Sabbath.

V. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. Rule and story regarding a place of danger.

VI. Type B; Type T: Discusses Joshua's short Prayer. Cites relevant Tosefta.

VII. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Rule for asking for individual needs in Prayer.

VIII. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. A person should pray in a designated place.

IX. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. A person should face a wall to pray.

4:5-6 Rule for the recitation of Prayer by one who was riding on an animal or in a boat.

I. Type T: Cites Tosefta and discusses it.

II. Type B; Type T: Direction one should face to pray. Cites relevant Tosefta.

III. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. One must face Jerusalem to pray and miscellaneous materials regarding Jerusalem.

IV. Type A: Explains a term in Mishnah.

V. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Traditions regarding Jerusalem and the Temple.

VI. Type A: Explains a word in Mishnah.

4:7 Dispute regarding the recitation of the Additional Prayer.

- I. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. The law for reciting the Additional Prayer. Related materials.
- II. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. More on the Additional Prayer.
- III. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Further traditions attributed to Rab regarding Prayer. Related stories.
- IV. Type B: Explains and extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. Provides a rationale for Judah's rule.

5:1 Concentration is necessary for Prayer.

- I. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. Circumstances that distract one from Prayer.
- II. Type T: Cites Tosefta and discusses it.
- III. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Extends the preceding unit.
- IV. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. The discussion of certain legal decisions does not distract one from Prayer.
- V. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. A verse often linked with Prayer.
- VI. Type A: Scriptural basis for Mishnah.
- VII. Type B: Extends Mishnah's interest. One must sit before praying.
- VIII. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. The importance of praying in a synagogue. Rules for praying in a synagogue.
- IX. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Prayer to say after having a bad dream.
- X. Type A; Type T: Comment on Mishnah. Citation of relevant Tosefta. Story about respecting a king.
- XI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Other stories about respecting a king. A governor greets the rabbis.

XII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Story: a demon greets the rabbis.

XIII. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Rabbis become absorbed in the study of Torah.

XIV. Type A; Type T: Definition of the term "serpent" referred to in Mishnah. Citation of relevant Tosefta and related materials.

5:2 Special insertions in the Prayer to mention the wonders of rain, the request for rain, the Prayer of Division.

I. Type B: Explains Mishnah's rule regarding the insertion in the recitation of the Prayer of the phrase regarding the wonders of rain. Expands upon it with discussion of resurrection.

II. Type D; Type T: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Rule for a person who erred in inserting into the recitation of the Prayer of the request for rain. Cites relevant Tosefta.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Additional materials on the request in the Prayer for rain on a fast day.

IV. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. Discussion of Mishnah's ruling regarding the insertion of the Prayer of Division.

V. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. Law accords with Eliezer's view in Mishnah.

VI. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. Discussion of opinions in Mishnah regarding the insertion of the Prayer of Division formula.

VII. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Various traditions regarding the formula for the Prayer of Division.

VIII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. One may perform labor Saturday night only after reciting the Prayer of Division. (Related to VI above.)

IX. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. One who forgot to recite the Prayer of Division Saturday night may do so throughout the week. (Another tradition of Eleazar b. Antigonus, VIII above.)

X. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Another tradition attributed to Zeira. The same formula of the Prayer of Division is

recited after a mid-week festival.

XI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Some miscellaneous traditions regarding the Prayer of Division.

5:3 They remove a leader of Prayer who inserts one of two heretical formulae or repeats a phrase. They replace a leader who errs.

I. Type B: Discussion of the first formula referred to in Mishnah.

II. Type B: Limits the rule of Mishnah about repeating a phrase to the case of public Prayer.

III. Type B: Where to resume the service after they replace the leader.

IV. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Story about one who erred by skipping a blessing.

V. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Rule for one who omits the mention of the new moon.

VI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. One who was reading the Torah and had to be removed. Related rules.

VII. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. A person may show some reticence when asked to lead the Prayers. Related story.

VIII. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Discussion of a case of one who had to be removed while leading the service.

5:4 Leader of the Prayer does not respond to the priestly blessing. If the leader is the only priest present, he may turn to bless the congregations if he is confident that he will not become confused.

I. Type T: Cites Tosefta Meg. 3:27 to explain Mishnah.

II. Type D: Related loosely to a theme of Mishnah. The perquisites of the priesthood.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. The priest is obliged to bless the people. Related traditions regarding the priestly blessing.

5:5 Error in the public recitation of the Prayer is a bad sign. Haninah b. Dosa's recitation of prayer for the sick was an omen.

I. Type A: A brief comment on Mishnah.

II. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Story about Haninah.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. The value of fluent Prayer.

6:1 Blessings over produce.

I. Type A; Type T: Cites Tosefta to explain the purpose of blessings over produce.

II. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Story and discussion of basis for reciting blessings over all commandments.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Discusses the minimum quantity of produce that requires a blessing.

IV. Type T: Cites and comments on Tosefta.

V. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. The blessing over olive oil.

VI. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. The blessings over cooked vegetables.

VII. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. Blessings over pickled and cooked vegetables.

VIII. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. The formula for the blessing over bread.

IX. Type B: Extends Mishnah's primary legal focus. The formula for the blessing over wine.

X. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Interruption between reciting the blessing and eating the food.

XI. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Minimum amount of bread that requires a blessing (cf. III above).

XII. Type T; Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Table etiquette. Order that people eat at dinner.

XIII. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Inconsequential interruptions between reciting the blessing and eating (cf. X above). Two related rulings (attributed to Huna).

XIV. Type T; Type B: Cites Tosefta. Blessings one recites before eating wheat cakes or rice cakes.

XV. Type T; Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Blessings recited after eating rice cakes, after meat or eggs. Citation of relevant T.

XVI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Blessings for grain cereal.

XVII. Type T; Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. The formula for one blessing that is an abstract of three. Cites relevant Tosefta.

XVIII. Type T: Cites Tosefta and comments on it. The priority of blessings recited over different breadstuffs.

XIX. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Blessings over special varieties of vegetables.

6:2 Reciting the wrong blessing over one's food.

I. Type B: Explains Mishnah's categories.

II. Type T: Cites and comments on Tosefta regarding the change of the formula of a blessing.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Story that supports the practice of reciting one blessing over several categories of foods.

6:3 Other blessings over foods.

I. Type B: Extends Mishnah.

6:4 Priorities for reciting the blessings for the seven kinds of foods of the Land of Israel. Judah vs. sages.

I. Type B: Explains the dispute in Mishnah.

II. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Further discussion of cases of priorities for blessings among foods.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Priorities for reciting a blessing among the seven kinds of foods.

6:5 Blessings one recites before a dinner exempt food eaten after a dinner from a blessing. Blessing over one food exempts another from the need of a blessing.

I. Type C: Cites an independent source that contradicts Mishnah. Resolves the contradiction.

II. Type D; Type T: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Special foods that require their own set of blessings. Cites relevant Tosefta.

III. Type B: Discusses the House of Shammai's rule in Mishnah.

6:6 Procedures for reciting blessings at a dinner.

I. Type A; Type T: Defines the context of Mishnah's rules. Cites passage from Tosefta regarding dinner etiquette.

II. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Procedures for eating in a sukkah at the end of the festival.

III. Type T: Cites Tosefta and further materials on dinner etiquette.

IV. Type B: Discusses Mishnah's ruling regarding procedures for reciting blessings and the formula for the blessing over incense.

V. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Blessings over other fragrant substances.

6:7 Blessings to be recited over primary and secondary types of food eaten at same meal.

I. Type A: Explains Mishnah's case and discusses related issues.

6:8 Blessings recited after a meal. Blessings recited for drinking water.

I. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Under some circumstances one repeats the blessing for the same food.

II. Type B: Discusses the kind of water referred to in Mishnah's ruling.

7:1 Rules for extending the invitation to recite the blessings after the meal. Who may be counted in the quorum.

I. Type C: Contrasts two rules in Mishnah. Shows they are not repetitious.

II. Type B: Discusses Mishnah's rulings.

III. Type B: Extends Mishnah's rules to other cases.

IV. Type B; Type T: Procedure for leaving a group of three at a meal. Discussion of the blessings after the meal. Related Tosefta. Scriptural basis for the meal blessings.

V. Type F: Independent unit. Gives scriptural basis for blessing recited before and after Torah study. Compares obligations to recite blessings for the meal and for Torah study.

VI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Further comparison of rules for blessings for meal and for Torah study.

VII. Type B: Comments on and discusses Mishnah's rule.

7:2 Women, slaves and minors may not be counted in the quorum for meal blessings. Minimum one must eat to be counted in the quorum.

I. Type B; Type T: Extends Mishnah. Under some circumstances one may count a minor. Cites Tosefta.

II. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Persons who ate only vegetables may be counted in the quorum.

III. Type D; Type T: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Persons who ate only vegetables may not recite blessings on behalf of others who ate bread. Story and citation of Tosefta and discussion.

7:3 Formula for the call to recite the blessings after eating the meal.

I. Type B; type T: Story relevant to Mishnah's theme. A related Tosefta citation.

II. Type D: Further discussion of Mishnah's issue regarding the call to recite the blessings after the meal.

III. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. A servant may recite the blessing over wine in the presence of his master.

IV. Type A: Comment on Mishnah.

V. Type B: Extends Mishnah's concerns. Provides scriptural basis that ten constitute the minimum number for a congregation.

VI. Type B: Explains Yose's view in Mishnah.

VII. Type B: Explains Aqiba's view in Mishnah.

VIII. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Scripture alludes to the practice of reciting blessings. The Men of the Great Assembly ordained the formulae for prayer.

7:4 Those who ate together may not separate to recite the meal blessings.

I. Type T; Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Special additions to the meal blessing and to the Prayer. Cites and discusses Tosefta.

II. Type T; Type B: Cites and discusses Tosefta. Extends concern of Mishnah.

7:5 Groups may combine to recite the blessing after the meal. Rule for the blessing over wine.

I. Type B: Explains Mishnah's case.

II. Type B: Expands on Mishnah.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Rules for the cup of wine that is used for a blessing.

IV. Type T: Cites Tosefta regarding the cup of wine used for Prayer of Sanctification.

V. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Additions to the blessings after the meal.

VI. Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context. Posture during the recitation of the meal blessing.

8:1 Disputes between the Houses regarding the dinner. The order of blessings over the day (Prayer of Sanctification) and over the wine.

I. Type T: Cites Tosefta to explain Mishnah.

II. Type B: Extends Mishnah's dispute to the practice of reciting blessings after the Sabbath.

III. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. We deduce from Mishnah that wine is necessary for the recitation of the Prayer of Sanctification. The Prayer of Division may be recited without wine.

IV. Type B; Type T: Extended discussion of Houses' positions. Cites relevant Tosefta.

V. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Procedures for reciting the Prayer of Division between Sabbath and festival day.

8:2 Order for washing and for mixing the cup of wine at dinner.

I. Type T; Type C: Cites Tosefta to explain Mishnah. Harmonizes present ruling with materials in M. Kelim.

II. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. How far one must go to get water to wash.

III. Type T: Related Tosefta regarding washing is cited and explained. Story.

IV. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Customs for washing one's hands for a meal.

V. Type T; Type D: Procedures for washing one's hands and for reciting the meal blessing.

8:3 Placement of the napkin at the dinner.

I. Type A: Explains what kind of table Mishnah refers to.

II. Type T: Cites Tosefta to explain Mishnah. Discusses further.

III. Type C: Compares one House's dispute in Mishnah with another and harmonizes them.

8:4 Order for cleaning the house and washing hands.

I. Type T: Cites Tosefta to explain Mishnah.

8:5 Order for the blessings at the conclusion of the Sabbath. Blessing recited over the light.

I. Type T: Cites Tosefta to explain Mishnah. Further comment on Tosefta.

II. Type T: Cites Tosefta to augment Mishnah. Additional related materials.

III. Type B: Discusses the implication of Mishnah's rule.

IV. Type T: Cites Tosefta. Discussion. Related traditions.

V. Type T: Concludes discussion of Tosefta passage.

8:6 May not recite blessings over light or spices of gentiles, the dead, or of idolatry. One recites the blessing over a light after making use of its illumination.

I. Type C: Cites a rule that contradicts Mishnah. Resolves contradiction.

II. Type T: Cites Tosefta to augment Mishnah. Additional related materials on kinds of lights one may use.

III. Type T: Cites Tosefta to augment Mishnah. Discussion of use of gentile's light.

IV. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Special cases of forbidden spices.

V. Type A: Explains Mishnah.

VI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Exegetical digression regarding light and creation.

VII. Type A: Explains a term in Mishnah.

VIII. Type B: Explains Mishnah's law.

8:7 Dispute regarding one who forgot to recite the meal blessings.

I. Type B: Explains Mishnah's dispute.

II. Type A: Explains Mishnah's rule.

8:8 Dispute regarding those who obtain one cup of wine after the meal. One may not answer "Amen" to a Samaritan who recites a blessing unless one hears the whole blessing.

I. Type B: Gives the rationale of the Hillelites' rule in Mishnah.

II. Type B: Discusses the implications of Mishnah and related issues.

III. Type D: Related rules regarding the recitation of "Amen."

9:1 One recites a blessing at a national shrine, where a miracle took place.

I. Type B: Discusses whether this law applies to personal shrines or tribal shrines, a question related to central concern of Mishnah.

II. Type D: The five blessings one says on a visit to Babylonia.

III. Type D: Formulaic terms that should be included in a blessing.

IV. Type D: Scriptural basis to justify the use of standardized liturgies.

V. Type T: Cites T. 6:20. Discusses the meaning of invoking different divine names in one's blessings. (Related to III above.)

VI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the mention of heresy in the preceding unit of the Talmud. Long independent unit about heretical exegeses.

VII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the point made at the end of the preceding unit of the Talmud. God is near to man.

VIII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Parables about God hearing Prayer and the incident concerning Rab and Severus.

IX. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Pinhas' parables about God protecting his subjects.

X. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Exegesis about God's dominion. Story of God hearing the Prayer of the Jews in times of peril.

XI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. God is a constant friend.

XII. Type A; Type T: Explains Mishnah 9:1B. Cites T. 6:2 regarding the meaning of a "place from which idolatry was uprooted."

XIII. Type T: Tosefta extends Mishnah.

XIV. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud. Continues the exegesis of the verse mentioned at the end of unit XII.

XV. Type D: Relates to the idea of Mishnah. Verses one recites when passing idolatry.

XVI. Type T: Cites Tosefta concerning blessings one recites when seeing unusual persons. Story of Gamaliel who recited a blessing when he saw a beautiful gentile woman.

XVII. Type D: Blessing one recites upon hearing a cock crow. Related materials.

XVIII. Type T: Blessing one recites when seeing crowds of people. Ben Zoma's words of wisdom.

9:2 Blessings one recites on seeing astronomical, meteorological or geological wonders.

I. Type B: The dangers of earthquakes. Briefly extends the interest of Mishnah.

II. Type D: Related to Mishnah's theme. The dangers of comets. Samuel's expertise in astronomy.

III. Type D: Related to a theme in Mishnah. The cause of earthquakes.

IV. Type E: Loosely connected to a preceding unit of the Talmud. The uses of insects

for curing.

V. Type B: Extends Mishnah. Blessings one says during storms.

VI. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Rules for reciting a blessing after hearing thunder while indisposed or unclothed.

VII. Type A: Explains the term "winds" in Mishnah.

VIII. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. More on "winds."

IX. Type A: Explains a rule in Mishnah.

X. Type D: Relates to a concept in Mishnah.

XI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah. More material attributed to Simeon Qamatraya (X).

XII. Type B: Extends Mishnah. Rules for blessings for other astronomical features such as the new moon.

XIII. Type E: Not related to Mishnah. Linked to preceding material on the new moon. Blessings in the liturgy for the new moon.

XIV. Type T: Cites Tosefta. Blessing to be said in a cemetery. Additional related materials.

XV. Type T: Cites Tosefta. Blessings upon seeing a rainbow. Related material.

XVI. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but linked to the preceding unit. Simeon bar Yohai's powers.

XVII. Type B: Expands on Mishnah's theme. The blessing for rain. The amount of water that must fall before one recites the blessing.

XVIII. Type B: The blessing one recites over rainfall.

XIX. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but additional material on rainfall (XVII). Exegeses.

XX. Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah. Blessings over good and evil.

9:3 Blessings one recites over new clothes. Vain prayers.

I. Type B: Explains Mishnah's rule about reciting a blessing over new clothes.

II. Type T: Cites Tosefta concerning the blessing one recites over the performance of various ritual actions.

III. Type E: Not related to Mishnah but to the preceding unit of the Talmud. Deals with the time at which one must recite the blessings over the performance of the commandments.

IV. Type B; Type E: Explains Mishnah's rule that one may not pray for a male child. Gives related material on that subject.

V. Type B: Expands on Mishnah. The prayer that one may say when hearing cries in the village.

9:4 One prays when entering and leaving a village.

I. Type B; Type T: Texts from Tosefta of the prayers mentioned in the Mishnah. Concerns Ben Azzai's prayers. Further explanation of Mishnah's laws.

II. Type D; Type T: Prayers for going to an outhouse and bathhouse. Extends the concerns of Mishnah.

9:5 One must recite a blessing over a bad occurrence. Rules for behavior on the Temple Mount. Use of God's name in blessings.

I. Type A; Type D: Several bases in Scripture for the rules of Mishnah 9:5A.

II. Type D: Related to the theme in Mishnah on the importance of the love of God. The seven kinds of pietists.

III. Type D: Related to Mishnah 9:5D. Story of Aqiba's martyrdom.

IV. Type D: Related to the theme in Mishnah concerning the rules for the Temple Mount.

V. Type T: Cites Tosefta to explain Mishnah.

VI. Type T: Cites Tosefta to augment Mishnah.

VII. Type D: Related to Mishnah's theme concerning greeting one's fellow in the name of God.

VIII. Type B: Explains Mishnah.

IX. Type T: Cites Tosefta. Hillel's statement about Torah study and related materials.

X. Type T: Cites Tosefta. Every Jew recited one hundred blessings each day and is

surrounded by commandments.

Summary of the Tractate's Units

The following summary shows how the seven types of units are distributed through the tractate. Where a unit falls into more than one category I generally include it in the one list that I judge appropriate to its primary function. Because of their special character I entered about forty Type T units in that category and on another list. And in a handful of other cases I had to put particularly complex units into two categories.

Type A: Provides a scriptural basis for Mishnah. Explains Mishnah's words, phrases, terms (47):	4:5-6 VI
	5:1 VI
	5:1 X
1:1 I	5:1 XIV
1:1 XIII	5:5 I
1:1 XV	
1:1 XVII-XVIII	6:1 I
1:2 I	6:6 I
1:2 III	6:7 I
1:3 I	
1:4 I	7:3 IV
2:1 VI	8:3 I
2:2 I	8:6 V
2:3 I	8:6 VII
2:3 IV	8:7 II
2:4 I	
	9:1 XII
3:1 II	9:2 VII
3:3 I	9:2 IX
3:4 I-II	9:5 I
3:5 II	
	Type B: Extends or explains Mishnah's primary legal or narrative focus (81):
4:1 I	1:1 II
4:1 IV	1:1 IV
4:1 V	1:1 XIV
4:1 VI	1:1 XVI
4:1 VIII	1:4 II
4:2 I	1:5 I
4:2 III	
4:3 I	2:1 III
4:3 VI	2:1 IV
4:4 I	
4:5-6 IV	

2:2 II	8:1 II
2:3 II	8:1 IV
2:3 III-IV	8:5 III
2:3 VIII	8:6 VIII
2:6 I	8:7 I
2:7 I	8:8 I-II
2:8 I-II	
	9:1 I
3:1 I	9:2 I
3:1 II	9:2 V
3:3 II	9:2 XII
3:5 I	9:2 XVII-XVIII
3:5 IV	9:3 I
3:6 I	9:3 IV
	9:3 V
4:4 V-VI	9:4 I
4:5-6 II	9:5 VIII
4:7 I	
4:7 IV	Type C: Compares or contrasts Mishnah's primary legal principle or narrative theme with another source (15):
5:1 I	(1:1 I)
5:1 IV	1:2 IV
5:1 VII	1:4 III
5:2 I	1:5 II
5:2 IV	
5:2 V-VI	2:4 IV
5:3 I-III	2:5 I
6:1 V-IX	3:2 I
6:1 XIV	3:2 II
6:2 I	3:2 IV
6:3 I	3:3 II
6:4 I	3:5 III
6:5 III	
6:6 IV	6:5 I
6:8 II	
7:1 II	7:1 I
7:1 III-IV	
7:1 VII	
7:2 I	8:2 I
7:3 I	8:3 III
7:3 V-VII	8:6 I
7:4 II	
7:5 I-II	

Type D: Related to a theme of Mishnah

or to an authority named in Mishnah	7:5 III
(71):	
1:1 III	8:1 III
1:3 III	8:2 II
1:3 IV	8:2 IV
1:4 IV	8:2 V
1:5 III	8:6 IV
	8:8 III
2:1 I	
2:1 II	9:1 II-IV
2:3 V	9:1 XV
2:3 VII	9:1 XVII
2:4 III	9:2 II
2:5 I	9:2 III
2:6 II	9:2 VI
2:7 II	9:2 VIII
	9:2 X
3:1 III	9:2 XX
3:1 IV	9:4 II
3:1 IX	9:5 I-II
3:2 III	9:5 III-IV
3:3 III-IV	9:5 VII
4:1 VII	
4:1 IX	Type E: Not related to Mishnah but
4:1 XIII	linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud
4:1 XIV	(68):
	1:1 V
5:2 II-III	1:1 VI-VII
5:2 VII	1:1 X
5:3 IV-V	1:1 XI-XII
5:3 VII-VIII	1:2 V
5:4 II-III	1:4 V
5:5 II-III	1:4 VIII
	1:4 IX
6:1 III	1:4 XI
6:1 X-XI	1:5 V
6:1 XIII	
6:1 XIX	2:1 III
6:2 III	2:1 V
6:4 II-III	2:2 III
6:5 II	2:2 IV
6:6 V	2:2 V
	2:2 VII
7:2 II-III	2:2 VIII
7:3 II	2:2 IX

2:2 X	2:7 III
2:3 VI	
2:5 II	3:1 VI-IX
	3:3 IV
3:1 V	
3:4 III	4:4 II-IV
3:4 V	4:4 VII-IX
3:5 VI	4:5-6 V
4:1 III	5:1 V
4:1 X	5:1 VIII-IX
4:1 XI	5:1 XIII
4:1 XII	
4:1 XV	6:1 XII
4:2 II	6:6 II
4:3 II-V	6:8 I
4:5-6 III	
4:7 II-III	7:1 V
	7:3 III
5:1 III	7:3 VIII
5:1 XI-XII	7:4 I
5:2 VIII-XI	7:5 V-VI
5:3 VI	
	Type T: Cites Tosefta to explain Mishnah, to augment it, or to add new material with or without discussion (86):
6:1 II	1:1 I
6:1 XV-XVII	1:1 IV
	1:1 XIII
7:1 VI	1:1 XV
	1:2 I
8:1 V	1:2 II
8:6 VI	1:3 I
	1:3 II
9:1 VI-XI	1:4 VI
9:1 XIV	1:4 VII
9:2 IV	1:4 X
9:2 XI	1:5 IV
9:2 XIII	1:5 VI-VIII
9:2 XVI	
9:2 XIX	
9:3 III-IV	
	2:2 VI
Type F: Independent unit. No apparent link to context (29):	2:3 IV
	2:3 VIII
1:1 VIII-IX	2:4 I
	2:4 II
2:6 III	

3:1 VII	8:2 V
3:2 II	8:3 II
3:2 IV	8:4 I
3:3 V	8:5 I-II
3:4 I	8:5 IV-V
3:4 IV	8:6 II-III
3:5 I	
3:5 III	9:1 V
3:5 IV	9:1 XII
3:5 V	9:1 XIII
3:5 VII	9:1 XVI
	9:1 XVIII
4:1 II	9:2 XIV
4:3 I	9:2 XV
4:4 VI	9:3 II
4:5-6 I-II	9:4 I-II
	9:5 V-VI
	9:5 IX-X
5:1 II	
5:1 X	
5:1 XIV	
5:2 II	
5:4 I	
6:1 I	
6:1 IV	
6:1 XII	
6:1 XIV	
6:1 XV	
6:1 XVII	
6:1 XVIII	
6:2 II	
6:5 II	
6:6 I	
6:6 III	
7:1 IV	
7:2 I	
7:2 III	
7:3 I	
7:4 I-II	
7:5 IV	
8:1 I	
8:1 IV	
8:2 I	
8:2 III	

From these charts we can better see several important characteristics of the redactional organization of the tractate. Not surprisingly, more than half, that is twenty-four type A units that explain Mishnah's words, phrases, terms or provide some scriptural basis for Mishnah, immediately follow the Mishnah pericopae cited in the text of the Talmud.

A smaller percentage, thirty-six (forty-four percent), of the type B units that extend or explain Mishnah's primary legal or narrative focus, directly follow the Mishnah passage in the Talmud.

Unexpectedly, three fifths, nine of fifteen, of the type C materials that compare or contrast Mishnah's primary legal principle or narrative theme with another source appear as units I or II following a Mishnaic source in Yerushalmi. Bear in mind that this number remains a small sample of the materials of the entire tractate.

As expected, fewer of the type D items related to a theme of Mishnah or to an authority named in Mishnah, follow directly after a Mishnah pericope. By definition, these units have a looser relationship to the Tannaitic texts of Mishnah. Only twenty-five percent, eighteen of seventy-one of these pericopae, follow as the first or second section after a Mishnah text.

None of the type E materials appears directly after a Mishnah citation. We would expect this to be the case because this category of sixty-eight units is carefully defined to include those discussions not related to Mishnah but linked to a preceding unit of the Talmud.

Only four of the items we placed into category type F follow Mishnah citations. These are the twenty-nine independent units with no apparent link to context. We should not expect them to be juxtaposed immediately after a Mishnah text.

About forty percent of the eighty-six type T units that cite Tosefta do occupy position I or II in the organization of the various subdivisions of the tractate. This of course reflects the character of Tosefta itself. Most Toseftan materials themselves serve as direct commentary to words, phrases or laws of Mishnah or supplements to the interests of Mishnah. It is no surprise that thirty-five of the units that cite Tosefta appear in a redactional position in Yerushalmi mainly reserved for commentary and direct expansion of Mishnah.

Number of position I or II Units	Percentage
A: 24 of 47	51%
B: 36 of 81	44%
C: 9 of 15	60%
D: 18 of 71	25%
E: 4 of 68	6%
F: 4 of 29	14%
T: 35 of 86	40% (about 40 units also counted in categories above)
Total: 130 of 397	33%

This schematic classification and presentation of the units of the tractate through our summary and charts shows some broad choices made by the editors of these texts. We have seen that the organization of the tractate carefully follows logical patterns of redaction.

This explains the redactional pattern of the often involved flow of Talmudic discussion and analysis at the surface of discourse within Tractate Berakhot of the Talmud of the Land of Israel, one of the earliest rabbinic compendia on the subjects of prayers, blessings and rituals of the meal.

We can be certain of one definite result of this redactional analysis of the tractate. Unlike the prior innovative corpora, Mishnah and Tosefta Berakhot, of the earlier formative age, this rabbinic material in Yerushalmi was concerned primarily with the interests and agenda of preceding authorities, ages and editors, such as those of Mishnah and Tosefta themselves. Less than a fifth of the material could be classified as independent. Within that we find few sustained theological discussions or original descriptions or prescriptions of ritual. With the diminishing originality of prayer went a lessening of the immediate political and social meanings imbedded in the rituals. So it was in the Talmudic age and so it would be for the remainder of the history of rabbinic Judaism down to the modern age. New meanings had to be found in received texts and rituals after the era of origins came to a close.

Bibliography

- Academy of the Hebrew Language. *The Book of Ben Sira. The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language and Shrine of the Book, 1973
- J. M. Allegro, ed. *Qumran Cave 4, Part I. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Vol. 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968
- G. Alon. *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Period*, Trans. G. Levi, from Hebrew, 1957-58. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1980
- Amram Gaon. *Seder Rab Amram Ga'on*, ed. D. S. Goldschmidt. Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook (Hebrew), 1971
- D. T. Ariel. "Coins from the Synagogue at Horvat Kanef-Preliminary Report." *Israel Numismatic Society Journal*. 4 (1980): 59-62
- N. Avigad. *Beth She'arim: Report on the Excavations during 1953-58*, vol. 3. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1971
- N. Avigad. *Beth She'arim, volume 3: Catacombs 12-23*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1976
- N. Avigad. "The 'Galilean' Synagogue and Its Predecessors." *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, ed. L. I. Levine. 42-44. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981
- N. Avigad and B. Mazar. "Beth She'arim." *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. Vol. I, 229-47. Jerusalem: Massada, 1975
- M. Avi-Yonah. "Ancient Synagogues." *Ariel*. 32 (Hebrew)(1973): 29-43
- M. Avi-Yonah. "Ancient Synagogues." *Qadmoniot 'Arsenu*, eds. S. Yeivin and M. Avi-Yonah. Vol. 2, 220-36. Tel-Aviv: Hakibbutz Hame'uhad (Hebrew), 1959
- M. Avi-Yonah. *Art in Ancient Palestine*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1981
- M. Avi-Yonah. "Goodenough's Evaluation of Dura: A Critique." *The Dura-Europos Synagogue: A Re-Evaluation (1932-1972)*, ed. J. Gutmann. 117-35. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1973
- M. Avi-Yonah. *The Holy Land*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1977
- M. Avi-Yonah. *The Jews of Palestine*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1976; New York: reprint Schocken Books, 1984
- M. Avi-Yonah. "Synagogue Architecture in the Classical Period." *Jewish Art*, ed. C. Roth. 157-90. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961
- W. Bacher. "Le siège de Moïse," *Revue des études juives*. 34 (1897): 299-301
- Y. F. Baer. *Israel among the Nations*. Jerusalem: Bialik (Hebrew), 1955
- Y. F. Baer. *Seder Abodat Yisra'el*. Tel-Aviv: Or-Torah (Hebrew), 1956-57
- C. Bailey, ed. and trans. *Epicurus: the Extant Remains, with Short Critical Apparatus, Translation and Note*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1926
- M. Baillet, ed. *Qumran Grotte 4, Part III*. "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert." Vol. 7. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982
- M. Baillet. "Un recueil liturgique de Qumran, grotte 4: 'Les Paroles des Luminaires'." *Revue Biblique*. 68 (1961): 195-250, plates 24-28
- M. Baillet; J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux. *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. Vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962
- D. Barthelemy and J.T. Milik. *Qumran Cave I*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955
- J. M. Baumgarten. "Art in the Synagogue: Some Talmudic Views." *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture*, ed. J. Gutmann. 79-89. New York: KTAV, 1975
- E. Bickerman. "The Altars of the Gentiles: A Note on the Jewish 'ius sacrum'." *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité*. 5 (1958): 137-6
- E. Bickerman. "The Civic Prayer for Jerusalem." *Harvard Theological Review*. 55 (1962): 163-85
- P. Billerbeck. "Ein Synagogengottesdienst in Jesu Tagen." *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentlichen*

- Wissenschaft*. 55 (1964): 143-61
- P. Bindler. "Meditative Prayer and Rabbinic Perspectives on the Psychology of Consciousness: Environmental, Physiological and Attentional Variables." *Journal of Psychology and Judaism*. 4/4 (1980): 228-248
- P. Bindler. "A Psychological Analysis of Kavvanah in Prayer." F. Rosner, ed. *Proceedings of the Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists*. 3/4 (1976): 133-143
- B. M. Bokser. *The Origins of the Seder*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1984
- B. M. Bokser. *Philo's Description of Jewish Practices*. Protocol of the Thirtieth Colloquy. Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1977
- M. Bregman. "Circular Proems and Proems Beginning with the Formula 'Zo hi shene'emra bu'eah haq-qodesh'." *Studies in Aggadah, Targum and Jewish Liturgy in Memory of Joseph Heinemann*, eds. J. J. Petuchowski and E. Fleischer. 34-41. Jerusalem: Magnes and Hebrew Union College (Hebrew), 1981
- B. Brooten. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue*. Brown Judaic Studies 36. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1982
- P. Brown. *The Cult of the Saints*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1981
- P. Brown. *The Making of Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard, 1978
- P. Brown. *The World of Late Antiquity. AD 150-750*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1971
- S. Buber, ed. *Midrash Leqah Tob, Genesis*, Vol. 1, Reprint. Jerusalem: S. Monson, 1960
- E. F. Campbell. "Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods." *Symposia Celebrating the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Schools of Oriental Research (1900-1975)*, ed. F. M. Cross. 159-67. Cambridge, Mass.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1979
- D. Chen. "Design of the Ancient Synagogues in Galilea." *Liber Annuus*. 28 (1978): 193-202; 30 (1980): 225-58
- M. J. S. Chiat. *Handbook of Synagogue Architecture*. Brown Judaic Studies 29. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1982
- M. A. Cohen. "Synagogue: History and Tradition." M. Eliade, ed. *Encyclopedia of Religion*. Volume 14. New York: Macmillan, 1987: 210
- N. Cohen. "The Nature of Shim'on Hapakuli's Act." *Tarbiz*. 25 (Hebrew)(1983): 547-55
- S. J. D. Cohen. "Patriarchs and Scholars." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*. 48 (1981): 57-85
- S. J. D. Cohen. "The Temple and the Synagogue." *The Temple in Antiquity*, ed. T. Madsen. 151-74. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1984
- J. J. Collins. *Between Athens and Jerusalem*. New York: Crossroad, 1983
- V. Corbo. *Corfarnao I. Gli edifici della Citta*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing, 1975
- V. Corbo. "Edifici antichi sotto la sinagoga di Cafarnao." *Studia Hierosolymitana*. I (1976): 158-76
- V. Corbo. "Resti della sinagoga del primo secolo a Cafarnao." *Studia Hierosolymitana*. 3 (1982): 313-57
- V. Corbo. "Sotto la sinagoga di Cafarnao un'insula della citta." *Liber Annuus*. 27 (1977): 156-72
- J. Crenshaw. *Old Testament Wisdom*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1981
- J. Crenshaw. *Studies in Old Testament Wisdom*. New York: KTAV, 1977
- F. M. Cross. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1961
- F. M. Cross. "The Early History of the Qumran Community." *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, eds. D.N. Freedman and J.C. Greenfield. 70-89. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971
- F. W. Deichmann. *Einführung in die christliche Archäologie*. Darmstadt, W. Ger.: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983
- P. E. Dion. "Synagogues et temples dans l'Égypte hellénistique." *Science et Esprit*. 29 (1977): 45-

75

- W. Dittenberger, ed.. *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, 2 vols.. Leipzig, W. Ger.: S. Hirzel, 1903-5
- M. Dothan. *Hammath Tiberias: Early Synagogues*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983
- H. J. W. Drijvers. *The Religion of Palmyra*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1976
- K. M. D. Dunbabin. "The Victorious Charioteer on Mosaics and Related Monuments." *American Journal of Archaeology*. 86 (1982): 69-89
- A. Dupont-Sommer. "Contribution a l'exegese du Manuel de Discipline X I-8." *Vetus Testamentum*. 3 (1952): 229-43
- I. Elbogen. *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Third ed.. Frankfurt/Main: J. Kaufmann, 1931
- I. Elbogen. *Ha-tefilla Be-yisra'el Be-hipathuta Ha-historit*. Tel-Aviv: Dvir (Hebrew), 1972
- I. Elbogen. "Studies in Jewish Liturgy." *Jewish Quarterly Review* (old series). 18 (1906): 587-99
- J. N. Epstein. *Prolegomena ad Literas Tannaiticus*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1957
- J. N. Epstein and E. Z. Melamed, eds.. *Mekhilta d'Rabbi Sim'on b. Jochai*. Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim, 1955
- L. Finkelstein. "The Development of the Amidah." *Jewish Quarterly Review* (new series). 16 (1925-26): 1-4, 127-70.
- L. Finkelstein. "La Kedouscha et les benedictions du Schema." *Revue des études juives*. 92 (1932): 1-26
- L. Finkelstein. "The Origin and Development of the Qedusha." *Perspectives on Jews and Judaism, Essays in Honor of Wolfe Kelman*, ed. A. Chiel. 61-78. New York: The Rabbinical Assembly, 1978
- L. Finkelstein, ed.. *Sifré on Deuteronomy*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1969
- L. Finkelstein. "The Prayer of King David According to the Chronicles." *Eretz Israel*. 14 (1978): 110-16 (Hebrew)
- H. Fischel. *Rabbinic Literature and Greco-Roman Philosophy: A Study of Epicurea and Rhetorica in Early Midrashic Writings*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1973
- M. Fisher. "The Corinthian Capitals of the Capernaum Synagogue-A Late Roman Architectural Feature in Eretz-Israel." *Eretz Israel*. 17 (1984): 305-11
- J. Fitzmeyer. "Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D.." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. 32 (1970): 501-31
- E. Fleischer. "The Diffusion of the Qedusha of the 'Amidah and the Yozer in the Palestinian Jewish Ritual." *Tarbiz*. 38 (Hebrew)(1969): 255-84
- E. Fleischer. *Eretz-Israel Prayer and Prayer Rituals as Portrayed in the Geniza Documents*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988
- E. Fleischer. *Hebrew Liturgical Poetry in the Middle Ages*. Jerusalem: Keter (Hebrew), 1975
- E. Fleischer. "The Influence of Choral Elements on the Formation and Development of the Piyyut Genres." *Yubal*. 3 (Hebrew)(1974): 18-48
- E. Fleischer. "Remarks Concerning Early Palestinian Uses in the Reading of the Law and the Prophets." *Sefunot* (new series). 16 (Hebrew)(1980): 25-47
- E. Fleischer. "Studies in the Problems Relating to the Liturgical Function of the Types of Early Piyyut." *Tarbiz*. 40 (Hebrew)(1970): 41-63
- E. Fleischer. "Towards a Clarification of the Expression 'Poreis 'Al Shema'." *Tarbiz*. 41 (Hebrew)-(1972): 132-44
- E. Fleischer. *The Yozer - Its Emergence and Development*. Jerusalem: Magnes (Hebrew), 1985
- G. Foerster. "Architectural Models of the Greco-Roman Period and the Origin of the 'Galilean' Synagogue." *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, ed. L.I. Levine, 45-48. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981
- G. Foerster. *Galilean Synagogues and Their Relation to Hellenistic and Roman Art and Architecture*. Part 1, Ph.D. dissertation. Jerusalem: Hebrew University (Hebrew), 1972
- G. Foerster. "Synagogue Inscriptions and Their Relations to Liturgical Versions." *Cathedra*. 19

- (Hebrew)(1981): 11-40
- G. Foerster. "The Synagogues in Galilee." *The Lands of Galilee*, eds. A. Shmueli, A. Sofer, and N. Kliot, Vol. 1, 231-56. Jerusalem: Defense Ministry (Hebrew), 1983
- G. Foerster. "The Synagogues at Masada and Herodion." *Journal of Jewish Art*. 3-4 (1977): 6-11
- G. Foerster. "The Synagogues at Masada and Herodium." *Eretz Israel*. 2 (1973): 224-28
- G. Foerster. "The Synagogues at Masada and Herodium." *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, ed. Lee I. Levine. 24-29. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981
- H. Freedman, trans. *Midrash Rabbah: Genesis*. London and New York: Soncino, 1939
- P. J. B. Frey, ed.. *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum*. Rome: Pontificio Instituto di Archeologia Christiana, 1936-52
- M. Friedman, ed. *Pesikta Rabbati*. Vienna: Kaiser, 1880
- E. Garfiel. *Service of the Heart*. New Jersey: Yoseloff, 1958
- B. Gartner. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University, 1965
- M. Ginsburger. "La chaire de Moise." *Revue des études juives*. 90 (1931): 161-65
- L. Ginzberg. *A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud*, Vol. 1. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary (Hebrew), 1941
- L. Ginzberg. *Genizah Studies in Memory of Doctor Solomon Schechter*. 2 Vols.. Reprint. New York: Hermon (Hebrew), 1969
- J. Goldin. *The Song at the Sea*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1971
- B. Goldman. "A Dura-Europos Dipinto and Syrian Frontality." *Oriens Antiquus* 24. 1985
- E. Goffman. *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper, 1974
- R. Goldenberg. "The Deposition of Rabban Gamaliel II." *Persons and Institutions in Early Rabbinic Judaism*. Missoula: Scholars, 1977
- E. D. Goldschmidt. *The Passover Haggadah*. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1977
- E. R. Goodenough. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, 13 Vols.. New York: Pantheon, 1953-68
- M. Goodman. *The Ruling Class of Judea*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1987
- M. Goodman. *State and Society in Roman Galilee, A.D. 132-212*. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Allanheld, 1983
- B. Grossfeld. *A Bibliography of Targum Literature*. 2 Vols.. Cincinnati, Ohio: Hebrew Union College, 1972-77
- A. Grabar. *Martyrium, Recherches sur le Culte des Reliques et l'Art Chretien Antique*. 2 Vols.. Paris: College de France, 1946
- M. Greenberg. *Biblical Prose Prayer*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1984
- M. Greenberg. "On the Refinement of the Conception of Prayer in Hebrew Scriptures." *AJS Review*. 1 (1976): 57-92
- M. Greenberg. "Prayer." *Encyclopedia Biblica*, ed. B. Mazar, Vol. 8. 896-922. Jerusalem: Bialik (Hebrew), 1982
- D. E. Groh. "Galilee and the Eastern Roman Empire in Late Antiquity." *Explor*. 3 (1977): 78-93
- I. Gruenwald. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1980
- A. Guilding. *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1960
- S. Gutman. "The Synagogue at Gamla." *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, ed. Lee I. Levine. 30-34. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981
- J. Guttman. *Ancient Synagogues: The State of Research*. Missoula: Scholars, 1981
- J. Gutmann. "Deuteronomy: Religious Reformation or Iconoclastic Revolution?" *The Image and the Word: Confrontations in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, ed. J. Gutmann. 5-25. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1977
- J. Gutmann. "Early Synagogue and Jewish Catacomb Art and its Relation to Christian Art." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, eds. H. Temporini and W. Haase, Part 2, Vol. 21.2. 1313-42. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984
- J. Gutmann. "The Illustrated Midrash in the Dura Synagogue Paintings: A New Dimension for the

- Study of Judaism." *American Academy of Jewish Research Proceedings*. 50 (1983): 92-104
- J. Gutmann. *The Jewish Sanctuary*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1984
- J. Gutmann. "The Origin of the Synagogue." *Archaeologischer Anzeiger*. 87 (1972): 36-40
- J. Gutmann. "Programmatic Painting in the Dura Synagogue." *The Dura-Europos Synagogue: A Re-Evaluation (1932-1972)*, ed. J. Gutmann. 137-54. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1973
- J. Gutmann. "The 'Second Commandment' and the Image in Judaism." *No Graven Images: Studies in Art and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. J. Gutmann. xiii-xxx, 3-16. New York: KTAV, 1971
- A. M. Habermann. "The Phylacteries in Antiquity." *Eretz Israel*. 3 (Hebrew)(1954): 174-77
- R. Hachlili. "The Niche and the Ark in Ancient Synagogues." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. 223 (1976): 43-53
- R. Hachlili. *Ancient Jewish Art and Archaeology in the Land of Israel*. Leiden: Brill, 1988
- M. Hadas. *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Dropsie College, 1953
- M. Haran. "Priest, Temple and Worship." *Tarbiz*. 48 (Hebrew)(1979): 175-85
- D. Hedegard, ed.. *Seder R. Amram Gaon*, Part 1. Lund: P. Lindstedt (Hebrew), 1951
- F. Heiler. *Prayer. A Study in the History and Psychology of Religion*. New York: Oxford U. Press, 1958
- S. C. Heilman. *Synagogue Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1976
- J. Heinemann. "Chapters of Doubtful Authenticity in Leviticus Rabba." *Tarbiz*. 37 (Hebrew)(1968): 339-45
- J. Heinemann. *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns*, Trans. R. Sarason, from Hebrew, 1966. New York: de Gruyter, 1977
- J. Heinemann. "Prayers of the Beth Midrash Origin." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 5 (1960): 264-280
- J. Heinemann. "Profile of a Midrash: The Art of Composition in Leviticus Rabba." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. 39 (1971): 141-50
- J. Heinemann. "The Structure and Division of Genesis Rabba." *Bar Ilan*. 9 (Hebrew)(1972): 279-89
- J. Heinemann. *Studies in Jewish Liturgy*, ed. A. Shinan. Jerusalem: Magnes (Hebrew), 1981
- J. Heinemann. "The Triennial Lectionary Cycle." *Journal of Jewish Studies*. 19 (1968): 41-48
- J. Heinemann. "The 'Triennial' Cycle and the Calendar." *Tarbiz*. 33 (Hebrew)(1964): 362-82
- J. Heinemann and J. J. Petuchowski. *Literature of the Synagogue*. New York: Behrman, 1975
- M. Hengel. "Proseuche und Synagoge." *Synagogue, Studies in Origin, Archeology and Architecture*, ed. J. Gutmann. 27-54. New York: KTAV, 1975
- M. Hengel. "Proseuche und Synagoge." *Tradition und Glaube: . . . Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn*. 157-84. Göttingen, W.Ger.: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971
- M. Hengel. "Die Synagogeninschrift von Stobi." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 57: 145-83. 1966
- M. D. Herr. "The Calendar." *The Jewish People in the First Century*, eds. S. Safrai and M. Stern, Vol. 2. 834-64. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1976
- J. H. Hertz. *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book*. New York: Bloch, 1948
- S. B. Hoenig. "The Ancient City-Square: The Forerunner of the Synagogue." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, eds. H. Temporini and W. Haase, Part 2, Vol. 19.1. 448-76. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1979
- L. A. Hoffman. *Beyond the Text*. Indiana: Indiana University, 1987
- D. Holisher. *The Synagogue and Its People*. New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1955
- S. Holm-Nielsen. "Thanksgiving Psalms." *Encyclopedia Judaica*, ed. C. Roth, Vol. 5. Columns 1045-48. Jerusalem: Keter, 1971
- C. Hopkins. "The Christian Church." *The Excavations at Dura Europos, 5th Season*, ed. M. Rostovtzeff. 238-53. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1934
- H. S. Horowitz and I. A. Rabin, eds.. *Mechilta d'Rabbi Ishmael*. Jerusalem: Bet Tora Shelema, 1960
- R. Horsely. *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987

- W. Hubner. *Zodiacus Christianus--Jüdisch-christliche Adaptationen des Tierkreises von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Königstein/Ts.: A. Haim, 1983
- F. Huttenmeister and G. Reeg. *Die antiken Synagogen in Israel*, 2 Vols. Beihefte zum Tubinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, No. 12/1. Wiesbaden, W. Ger.: Reichert, 1977
- A. Z. Idelson. *Jewish Liturgy and its Development*. New York: Schocken, 1932
- Z. Ilan and I. Damati. "Notes and News. Kh. Marus, 1983 and 1984." *Israel Exploration Journal*. 34 (1984): 265-68
- J. Israelstam, trans.. *Midrash Rabbah: Leviticus*. London and New York: Soncino, 1939
- N. Johnson. *Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1948
- A. R. Johnson. *The Cultic Prophet and Israel's Psalmody*. Cardiff, U.K.: University of Wales, 1979
- J. Juster. *Les juifs dans l'empire romain*, Vol. 1, Reprint. New York: Burt Franklin, 1914
- G. Kaibel. *Epigrammata graeca*, Reprint. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1965
- A. Kasher, A. Oppenheimer, U. Rappaport, eds. *Synagogues in Antiquity*. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi (Hebrew), 1987
- A. Kasher, G. Fuks, U. Rappaport, eds. *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel*. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi (Hebrew), 1987
- F. G. Kenyon. *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932
- R. Kimelman. "Birkat Ha-Minim and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity." *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, eds. E.P. Sanders et al., Vol. 2. 226-44. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1981
- R. Kimelman. "While Saying the *Shema`*." *Conservative Judaism*. 23/2: 37-43. 1969
- R. Kimelman. "While Saying the *Shema`*." *Shanah BeShanah*, ed. A. Pitchenik. 254-60. Jerusalem: Hekal Šelomo (Hebrew), 1981
- B. Kittel. *The Hymns of Qumran*. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1981
- A. Kloner. "Ancient Synagogues in Israel: An Archaeological Survey." *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, ed. L.I. Levine. 11-19. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981
- I. Knohl. "A Parasha Concerned with Accepting the Kingdom of Heaven." *Tarbiz*. 53 (Hebrew)(1984): 11-21
- K. Kohler. "The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions with a translation of the corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 1 (1924): 387-425
- K. Kohler. *The Origins of the Synagogue and Church*. New York: Macmillan, 1929
- A. T. Kraabel. "New Evidence of the Samaritan Diaspora has been Found in Delos." *Biblical Archaeologist*. 47 (1984): 44-46
- A. T. Kraabel. "The Diaspora Synagogue: Archeological and Epigraphic Evidence since Sukenik." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, eds. H. Temporini and W. Haase, Part 2. 477-510. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1979
- A. T. Kraabel. "Ancient Synagogues." *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Supp. Vol. 16, 436-39. Palatine, Ill.: J. Heraty, 1974
- A. T. Kraabel. "The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions." *Journal of Jewish Studies*. 33 (1982): 445-464
- A. T. Kraabel. "Social Systems of Six Diaspora Synagogues." *Ancient Synagogues: The State of Research*, ed., J. Gutmann. Brown Judaic Studies 22. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1981
- A. T. Kraabel. "Synagoga Caeca: Systematic Distortion in Gentile Interpretations of Evidence for Judaism in the Early Christian Period." *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*, eds. J. Neusner and E.S. Frerichs. 219-246. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1985
- C. H. Kraeling. *The Christian Building. The Excavations at Dura Europos, Final Report*. VIII, Part II. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1967

- C. H. Kraeling. *The Excavations at Dura Europos - The Synagogue*, Reprint. New York: KTAV, 1979
- S. Krauss. "The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers." *Jewish Quarterly Review*. 5: 122-57; 6 (1893-1894): 82-99, 225-61
- S. Krauss. *Synagogale Altertümer*. Berlin/Vienna: Benjamin Harz, 1922; Reprint. Hildesheim, W. Ger.: Olms, 1966
- F. Landsberger. "The House of the People." *Hebrew Union College Annual*. 22 (1949): 149-55
- F. Landsberger. "The Sacred Direction in Synagogue and Church." *Hebrew Union College Annual*. 28 (1957): 181-203
- N. R. M. de Lange. *Origen and the Jews*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University, 1976
- S. M. Lehrman, trans.. *Midrash Rabbah: Exodus*. London and New York: Soncino, 1939
- S. Leiman. *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence*. Hamden, Eng.: Archon, 1976
- H. J. Leon. *The Jews of Ancient Rome*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960
- E. Lerle. "Liturgische Reformen des Synagogengottesdienstes als Antwort auf die Judenchristliche Mission des ersten Jahrhunderts." *Novum Testamentum*. 10 (1968): 31-42
- M. B. Lerner. "New Homilies for the Ninth of Ab." *Samuel Belkin Memorial Volume*, eds. M. Karmeli and H. Lif. 84-107. New York: Yeshiva University (Hebrew), 1981
- P. Levartoff. "Worship in the First Century." *Liturgy and Worship*, ed. W. K. L. Clarke. 60-71. London: SPCK, 1932
- I. Levi. "Les dix-huit benedictions et les Psaumes de Salomon." *Revue des études juives*. 32 (1896): 161-78
- L. I. Levine. *The Rabbinic Class of Roman Palestine in Late Antiquity*. New York and Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1989
- L. I. Levine, ed. *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Phila.: ASOR, 1987
- L. I. Levine. "Ancient Synagogues-A Historical Introduction." *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, ed. L.I. Levine. 1-10. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981
- L. I. Levine, ed. *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981
- L. I. Levine. "Excavations at the Synagogue of Horvat `Ammudim." *Israel Exploration Journal*. 32 (1982): 1-12
- L. I. Levine. "The Jewish Patriarch (Nasi) in Third Century Palestine." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, eds. W. Haase and H. Temporini, Part 2, Vol. 19.2. 649-88. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1979
- L. I. Levine. "The Roman Period from the Conquest of Pompeii to the End of the Second Temple Period." *The History of Eretz Israel*, ed. M. Stern, Vol. 4. 9-281. Jerusalem: Keter (Hebrew), 1984
- J. Licht. *Megillat Ha-Hodayot*. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik (Hebrew), 1957
- S. Lieberman. *The Tosefta - Zera'im*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1955
- S. Lieberman. "Hazzanut Yannai." *Sinai*. 4 (Hebrew)(1939): 221-40
- S. Lieberman. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the First Century B.C.E. - IV Century C.E.*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950
- S. Lieberman, ed.. *Midrash Debarim Rabbah*. Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1964
- S. Lieberman, ed.. *Tosefta Ki-fshutah*. 8 Vols.. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1955-73
- S. Lieberman. *The Tosefta - Mo'ed*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962
- L. Liebreich. "The Benediction Immediately Preceding and the One following the Recital of the Shema." *Revue des études juives*. 125 (1966): 151-65
- L. Liebreich. "The Impact of Nehemiah 9: 5-37 on the Liturgy of the Synagogue." *Hebrew Union College Annual*. 32 (1961): 227-37
- L. Liebreich. "The Sabbath in the Prayerbook." *Do'ar Jubilee Volume in Honor of its Thirtieth Anniversary*, ed. M. Ribolov. 255-62. New York: Ha-Histadrut Ha-Ivrit of America

- (Hebrew), 1952
- B. Lifshitz. *Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives*. Paris: Gabalda, 1967
- B. Lifshitz. "Prolegomenon to the reprint of J.B. Frey." *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*, Vol. 1. New York: KTAV, 1975
- J. Lightstone. *The Commerce of the Sacred*. Brown Judaic Studies 59. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1984
- A. Linder. *Roman Imperial Legislation on the Jews*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities (Hebrew), 1983
- A. Linder. "Roman Rule and the Jews during the Period of Constantine." *Tarbiz*. 44 (Hebrew)(1975): 95-143
- S. Loffreda. *Cafarna'o II. La Ceramica*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing, 1974
- S. Loffreda. "The Late Chronology of the Synagogue of Capernaum." *Israel Exploration Journal*. 23 (1973): 37-42
- S. Loffreda. "Potsherds from a Sealed Level of the Synagogue at Capharnaum." *Liber Annuus*. 29 (1979): 215-20
- L. Low. "Der synagogale Ritus." *Monatschrift der Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*. 33 (1984): 97 ff.
- Z. Ma'oz. *Jewish Settlements and Synagogues in the Golan*, 2nd ed.. Jerusalem: Society for the Preservation of Nature, 1980
- J. Mann. *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, Vols. 1 and 2. New York: KTAV, 1971, 1966
- J. Mann. "Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service." *Hebrew Union College Annual*. 2 (1925): 269-338
- F. Manns. *La Prière d'Israël a L'heure de Jésus*. Jerusalem: Franciscan, 1986
- H. D. Mantel. *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965
- M. Margolioth, ed.. *Sefer Ha-Razim*. Jerusalem: Yedi'ot Achronot, 1966
- M. Margulies. *Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah*, 5 Vols.. Jerusalem: American Academy of Jewish Research, 1953-60
- A. Marmorstein. "The Oldest Form of the Eighteen Benedictions." *Jewish Quarterly Review*. 34 (1943-44):137-59
- H. G. May. "Synagogues in Palestine." *The Biblical Archaeologist*. 7 (1944): 1-20
- B. Mazur. *Studies on Jewry in Greece*. Athens: Hestia, 1935
- E. M. Meyers. "Ancient Gush Halav (Giscale), Palestinian Synagogues, and the Eastern Diaspora." *Ancient Synagogues: The State of Research*, ed. J. Gutmann, Brown Judaic Studies 22. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1981
- E. M. Meyers. "Ancient Synagogues in Galilee: Their Religious and Cultural Setting." *Biblical Archaeologist*. 43 (1980): 97-108
- E. M. Meyers. "The Ark of Nabratein." *Qadmoniot*. 15 (Hebrew)(1982): 77-81
- E. M. Meyers. "Galilean Regionalism as a Factor in Historical Reconstruction." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. 221 (1976): 93-101
- E. M. Meyers. "Galilean Regionalism: A Reappraisal." *Approaches to the Study of Ancient Judaism*, ed. W.S. Green. Brown Judaic Studies 32. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1985
- E. M. Meyers. "Synagogue Architecture." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. K. Crim, Supp. Vol.. 842-44. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1976
- E. M. Meyers; A. T. Kraabel; and J. F. Strange. *Ancient Synagogue Excavations at Khirbet Shema', Upper Galilee, Israel 1970-1972*. Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 42. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1976
- E. M. Meyers and C. L. Meyers. "The Ark in Art: A Ceramic Rendering of the Torah Shrine from Nabratein." *Eretz Israel*. 16 (1982): 176-85
- E. M. Meyers and C. L. Meyers. "Remains of an Ancient Synagogue Ark in Galilee." *Biblical Archaeology Review*. 6 (1981): 24-40
- E. M. Meyers; J. F. Strange; and D. E. Groh. "The Meiron Excavation Project: Archeological

- Survey in Galilee and Golan, 1976." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. 230 (1978): 1-24
- E. M. Meyers; J. F. Strange; and C. L. Meyers. "The Ark of Nabratein-A First Glance." *Biblical Archeologist*. 44 (1981): 237-43
- E. M. Meyers; J. F. Strange; and C. L. Meyers. *Excavations at Ancient Meiron, Upper Galilee, Israel, 1971-71, 1974-75, 1977*. Cambridge, Mass.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1981
- E. M. Meyers; J. F. Strange; and C. L. Meyers. "Preliminary Report on the 1977 and 1978 Seasons at Gush Halav (el-Jish)." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. 233 (1979): 33-58
- E. M. Meyers; J. F. Strange; and C. L. Meyers. "Preliminary Report on the 1980 Excavations at en-Nabratein, Israel." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. 244 (1982): 1-25
- E. M. Meyers; J. F. Strange; and C. L. Meyers. "Second Preliminary Report on the 1981 Excavations at en-Nabratein, Israel." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. 246 (1982): 35-54
- E. M. Meyers; J. F. Strange; and C. L. Meyers. *Second Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Ancient Meiron*. Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 43. 73-103. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1978
- J. T. Milik, ed.. *Qumran Grotte 4, Part II. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, Vol. 6. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977
- A. Millgram. *Jewish Worship*. Philadelphia: JPS, 1971
- A. Mirsky. "From Midrash to Piyyut to Jewish Poetry." *Lešonenu*. 32 (1967-68): 129-39 (Hebrew)
- A. Mirsky. "History of Rhyme." *Moznaim*. 6 (Hebrew)(1958): 450-58
- A. Mirsky. "The Source of the Prayer 'Yoser'." *Hanoch Albeck Jubilee Volume*. 324-30. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook (Hebrew), 1963
- A. Mirsky. *Yosse ben Yosse Poems*. Jerusalem: Bialik (Hebrew), 1977
- A. Momigliano. *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University, 1975
- G. F. Moore. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927
- J. Naveh. *On Mosaic and Stone: The Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Ancient Synagogues*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society (Hebrew), 1978
- E. Netzer. "The Herodian Triclinia-A Prototype for the "Galilean Type" Synagogues." *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, ed. L.I. Levine. 49-51. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981
- J. Neusner. *The Academic Study of Judaism*. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1982
- J. Neusner. *Aphrahat and Judaism*. Studia Post-Biblica 19. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1971
- J. Neusner. *Early Rabbinic Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1975
- J. Neusner. *Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees Before 70 C.E.*. Vols. I-III. Leiden: Brill, 1972
- J. Neusner, ed. *Take Judaism, for Example*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1983
- J. Neusner, ed. *The Study of Ancient Judaism. I. Mishnah, Midrash, Siddur*. New York: KTAV, 1981
- J. Neusner. *Judaism: the Evidence of the Mishnah*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1981
- J. Neusner. "The Symbolism of Ancient Judaism: The Evidence of the Synagogue." *Ancient Synagogues: The State of Research*. 7-17, Brown Judaic Studies 22. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1981
- C. Newsom. "4Q Serek Sirof `Olat Hassabbat (The Qumran Angelic Liturgy)," Dissertation abstract. *Harvard Theological Review*. 75 (1982): 132
- C. Newsom, and Y. Yadin. "The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice." *Israel Exploration Journal*. 34 (1984): 77-88

- R. Ornstein, ed. *The Nature of Human Consciousness*. San Francisco: Freeman, 1973
- R. Ornstein. *The Psychology of Consciousness*. New York: Harcourt, 1977
- A. Ovadia. *Corpus of the Byzantine Churches in the Holyland*. Bonn, W. Ger.: P. Honstein, 1970
- J. J. Petuchowski. "The Liturgy of the Synagogue: History, Structure and Contents." *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*. Vol. iv. Chico, 1983
- R. Prell-Foldes. "The Reinvention of Reflexivity in Jewish Prayer; the Self and the Community in Modernity." *Semiotica*. 30: 295-7
- Rabbenu Shlomoh. *Siddur of R. Solomon ben Samson of Garmaise (Worms) Including the Siddur of the Hasidé Ashkenaz*, ed. M. Hershler. Jerusalem: Hemed (Hebrew), 1971
- J. Rabinowitz, trans.. *Midrash Rabbah: Deuteronomy*. London and New York: Soncino, 1939
- A. M. Rabello. "The Legal Condition of the Jews in the Roman Empire." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. W. Haase, Part 2, Vol. 13. 662-762. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1980
- Z. M. Rabinovitz. *The Liturgical Poems of Rabbi Yannai*. Jerusalem: Bialik (Hebrew), 1985
- Y. Raphael. *Sefer Hamanhig-Rulings and Customs, R. Abraham ben Nathan of Lunel*. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1978
- S. Reif. "Jewish Liturgical Research: Past, Present, Future." *Journal of Jewish Studies*. 34 (1983): 161-70
- S. Reif. "The Early Liturgy of the Synagogue." *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (forthcoming)
- S. Reif. "Some Liturgical Issues in the Talmudic Sources." *Studia Liturgica* (1982-83): 188-206
- S. Reif. "Jewish Liturgical Research: Past, Present and Future." *Journal of Jewish Studies*. XXXIV/2 (1983): 161-170
- I. Renov. "The Seat of Moses." *Israel Exploration Journal*. 5 (1955): 262-67
- M. Rostovtzeff. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1941
- C. Roth. "The 'Chair of Moses' and its Survivals." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*. 81 (1949): 100-11
- L. Roth-Gerson. *The Greek Inscriptions from the Synagogues in Eretz-Israel*. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi (Hebrew), 1987
- Sa'adyah Gaon. *Siddur Rab Sa'adyah Gaon*. eds. I. Davidson, S. Assaf, and B. I. Joel. Jerusalem: R. Mass (Hebrew), 1970
- S. Safrai. "Education and the Study of Torah." *The Jewish People in the First Century*, eds. S. Safrai and M. Stern, Vol. 2. 945-70. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1976
- S. Safrai. *The Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education Culture (Hebrew), 1983
- S. Safrai. "Was There a Women's Gallery in the Synagogue?" *Tarbiz*. 32 (Hebrew)(1963): 329-38
- Z. Safrai. "Communal Functions of the Synagogue in Eretz Israel during the Mishnaic and Talmudic Periods." *Festschrift for M. Wizer*, ed. S. Schmidt. 230-48. : Yabneh (Hebrew), 1981
- Z. Safrai, ed. *The Ancient Synagogue Selected Studies*. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center (Hebrew), 1986
- A. Saldarini. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees*. Wilmington: Glazier, 1988
- S. J. Saller. *Second Revised Catalogue of the Ancient Synagogues of the Holy Land*. Jerusalem: Franciscan, 1972
- J. A. Sanders. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1967
- J. A. Sanders, ed.. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave II. Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, Vol. 4. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965
- R. S. Sarason. "The Petihtot in Leviticus Rabba: 'Oral Homilies' or Redactional Constructions?" *Journal of Jewish Studies*. 33 (1982): 557-67.
- E. W. Saunders. "Christian Synagogues and Jewish Christianity in Galilee." *Explor*. 3 (1977): 70-78
- S. Schechter. "Genizah Specimens." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 10 (1898): 656-7
- I. Schiffer. "The Men of the Great Assembly." *Persons and Institutions in Early Rabbinic Judaism*. Missoula: Scholars, 1977: 237-276

- L. H. Schiffman. "Communal Meals at Qumran." *Revue de Qumran*. 10 (1979): 45-56
- L. H. Schiffman. "The Eschatological Community of the Serekh Ha-'Edah." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*. 51 (1984): 105-29
- L. H. Schiffman. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1985
- L. H. Schiffman. "Merkavah Speculation at Qumran: The 4Q Serekh Shirot 'Olat Ha-Shabbat." *Mystics, Philosophers, and Politicians: Essays in Jewish Intellectual History in Honor of Alexander Altmann*, eds. J. Reinharz and D. Swetschinski. Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies 5. 15-47. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1982
- L. H. Schiffman. *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code*. Brown Judaic Studies 33. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1983
- L. H. Schiffman. *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism*. Hoboken, N.J.: KTAV, 1985
- J. Schirmann. "Hebrew Liturgical Poetry and Christian Hymnology." *Jewish Quarterly Review*. 44 (1953-54): 123-61
- G. Scholem. *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkavah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965
- W. Schrage. "Synagogue" (Greek). *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 798-852. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1971
- E. Schürer. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, eds. G. Vermes and F. Millar; Rev. Ed., Vol. 2. Edinburgh, Scotland: Clarke, 1979
- M. Schwabe. "Greek Inscriptions." *Sefer Yerushalayim (The Book of Jerusalem)*, ed. M. Avi-Yonah. 362-65. Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, Vol. 1: Bialik and Dvir (Hebrew), 1956
- B. Schwank. "Qualis erat forma synagogarum Novi Testamenti?" *Verbum Domini*. 33 (1955): 267-78
- A. Seager. "The Architecture of the Dura and Sardis Synagogues." *The Dura Europos Synagogue*, ed. J. Gutmann. 79-116. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1973
- A. Seager. "The Building History of the Sardis Synagogue." *American Journal of Archeology*. 76 (1972): 425-35
- A. Seager. "The Synagogue at Sardis." *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*, ed. L.I. Levine. 178-84. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981
- J. Searle. *Speech Acts*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1969
- A. Segal. *Two Powers in Heaven*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1977
- M. S. Segal. *The Complete Book of Ben Sira. (Sefer Ben Sira Ha-Salem)*. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik (Hebrew), 1971-72
- A. Shinan. *The 'Aggada in the Aramaic Targums to the Pentateuch*. Jerusalem: Makor (Hebrew), 1979
- A. Shinan. "The 'Aggadic Literature: Written Tradition and Transmission." *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Folklore*. 1 (Hebrew)(1981): 44-60
- A. Shinan, ed. *Midrash Shemot Rabbah, Chapters 1-14*. Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv: Dvir (Hebrew), 1984
- A. Shinan. "On the Question of Beliefs and Concepts in the Targums." *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought*. 2 (Hebrew)(1982): 7-32
- M. Simon. *Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1967
- P. Skehan. "Jubilees and the Qumran Psalter" (IIQPsa). *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. 37 (1975): 343-47
- P. Skehan. "A Liturgical Complex in IIQ Psa." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. 35 (1973): 195-205
- E. M. Smallwood. *The Jews Under Roman Rule*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 20, Corrected reprint. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1981
- C. W. F. Smith. "Prayer." *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Nashville, 1962. Vol. 3: 857-67
- M. Smith. "Helios in Palestine." *Eretz Israel*. 16 (1982): 199-214
- M. Smith. "Goodenough's Jewish Symbols in Retrospect." *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture*, ed. J. Gutmann. 194-209. New York: KTAV, 1975

- M. Smith. *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971
- M. Smith. "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century." M. Davis, ed. *Israel: Its Role in Civilization*. New York, 1956
- H. L. Strack. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. New York: Atheneum, 1969
- H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck. *Kommentär Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*. Munich: Beck, 1928
- J. F. Strange. "Capernaum." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Supp. Vol., ed. K. Crim. 140-41. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1976
- J. Strugnell. "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran-4A Serek Sirot 'Olat Hassabbat." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*. 7 (1959): 318-45
- E. L. Sukenik. *The Ancient Synagogue of Beth Alpha*. London: Oxford University Press, 1932
- E. L. Sukenik. *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece*. London: Oxford University Press, 1934
- E. L. Sukenik. *Osar Ha-Megillot Ha-Genuzot*. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik and the Hebrew University (Hebrew), 1954-55
- R. Sweet. "A Pair of Double Acrostics in Akkadian." *Orientalia* (new series). 38 (1969): 459-60
- S. Tal. *The Persian Jewish Prayer Book*. Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute (Hebrew), 1980
- S. Talmon. "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert." *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin, Scripta Hierosolymitana 4. 162-99. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958
- S. Talmon. "The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel in the Light of the Qumran Literature." *Qumran: sa piété, sa théologie, et son milieu*, ed. M. Delcor. 265-84. Paris: Duculot, 1978
- S. Talmon. "'Mahazor' Ha-Berakot shel Kat Midbar Yehuda." *Tarbiz*. 35 (Hebrew)(1958-59): 214-34
- S. Talmon. "The 'Manual of Benedictions' of the Sect of the Judaean Desert." *Revue de Qumran*. 2 (1959-60): 475-500
- S. Talmon. "Mizmorim Hisoniyim Ba-Lason Ha-Ibrit Mi-Qumran." *Tarbiz*. 35 (Hebrew)(1965-66): 214-34
- S. Talmon. *The World of Qumran from Within*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989
- S. J. Tambiah. "The Magical Power of Words." *Man*. 3 (1968): 175-208
- V. Tcherikover. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, eds. A. Fuks and M. Stern; 3 Vols.. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957-64
- J. Teixidor. *The Pantheon of Palmyra*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1979
- J. Théodor and C. Albeck, eds. *Midrash Bereshit Rabba*. Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1965
- Y. Tsafirir. *Archaeology and Art*. Eretz Israel from the Destruction of the Second Temple to the Muslim Conquest, Vol. 2. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi (Hebrew), 1984
- Y. Tsafirir. "On the Architectural Origins of the Ancient Galilean Synagogues-A Reconsideration." *Cathedra*. 20 (Hebrew)(1981): 29-46
- Y. Tsafirir and Y. Hirschfeld. "The Church and Mosaics at Horvat Berachot, Israel." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. 33 (1979): 305-8
- E. Urbach. *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*. 2 Vols.. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1979
- E. Urbach. "The Status of the Decalogue in Worship and in Prayer." *The Decalogue Through the Generations*, ed. B.Z. Segal. 173-91. Jerusalem: Magnes (Hebrew), 1985
- A. S. van der Woude. "Fragmente einer Rolle der Lieder für das Sabbatopfer aus Hohle XI von Qumran (IIQ SirSabb)." *Von Kanaan bis Kerala, Festschrift für J.P.M. van der Ploeg*, eds. W.C. Delsam, et al. 311-35. Butzon and Bercker, Kevelaer: Neudirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982
- G. Vermes. "Pre-Mishnaic Jewish Worship and the Phylacteries from the Dead Sea." *Vetus Testamentum*. 9 (1959): 65-72
- H. Vincent. *Jerusalem de l'ancien Testament*, Vol. 1. Paris: Gabalda, 1954

- M. Weinfeld. "The Heavenly Praise in Unison." *Meqor Hajjim, Festschrift fur Georg Molia zum 75. Geburtstag*. 427-33. Graz: Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt, 1983
- M. Weinfeld. "'Iqbot shel Qedušat Yoser U-Pesuke de-Zimra Be-Megillot Qumran U-be-Seper Ben Sira.'" *Tarbiz*. 45 (Hebrew)(1975-76): 15-26
- M. Weinfeld. "The Prayers for Knowledge, Repentance and Forgiveness in the 'Eighteen Benedictions' - Qumran Parallels, Biblical Antecedents and Basic Characteristics." *Tarbiz*. 48 (Hebrew)(1979): 186-200
- M. Weinfeld. "Sabbath, Temple and Enthronement of the Lord - The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis I: 1-23." *Alter Orient und Altes Testament*. Vol. 212, 501-12. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon and Bercker, 1981
- M. Weinfeld. "Sumerian Literature and the Book of Psalms," Part 2. *Beth Ha-miqra*. 7 (1974): 136-41
- M. Weinfeld. "Traces of Qedusat yoser and pesuke de-Zimra in the Qumran Literature and in Ben Sira." *Tarbiz*. 45 (Hebrew)(1975-76): 15-26
- E. Werner. *The Sacred Bridge*. New York: Schocken, 1959; Vol. 2. New York: KTAV, 1984
- W. Wheelock. "The Problem of Ritual Language: From Information to Situation." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. 50 (1982): 49-71
- N. Wieder. "The Controversy about the Liturgical Composition 'Yismah Moshe' -Opposition and Defence." *Studies in Aggadah, Targum and Jewish Liturgy in Memory of Joseph Heinemann*, eds. J.J. Petuchowski and E. Fleischer. 75-99. Jerusalem: Magnes (Hebrew), 1981
- A. Yaari. *Toldot Hag Simchat Torah*. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook (Hebrew), 1964
- Y. Yadin. *Masada*. New York: Random House, 1966
- Y. Yadin. "Masada." *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, Vol. 3, eds. M. Avi-Yonah and E. Stern. 793-816. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977
- Y. Yadin. *Tefillin from Qumran*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Shrine of the Book, 1969
- Y. Yadin. "Tefillin (Phylacteries) from Qumran (XQ Phyl 1-4)." *Eretz Israel*. 9 (1969): 60-85
- Y. Yadin. *The Temple Scroll*, 3 Vols.. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University, Shrine of the Book, 1983
- J. Yahalom. "Rhyme in the Early Piyyut." *Hasifrut*. 2/4 (Hebrew)(1971): 762-66
- J. Yahalom. "Synagogue Inscriptions in Palestine - A Stylistic Classification." *Immanuel*. 10 (1980): 47-56
- J. Yahalom. *Poetic Language in Early Piyyut*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1985
- Z. Yeivin. "Excavations at Khorazin." *Eretz Israel*. 2 (Hebrew)(1973): 144-57
- A. D. York. "The Targum in the Synagogue and in the School." *Journal of the Study of Judaism*. 10 (1979): 75-86
- T. Zahavy. *The Traditions of Eleazar ben Azariah*. Missoula: Scholars, 1977
- T. Zahavy. *The Mishnaic Law of Blessings and Prayers: Tractate Berakhot*. Brown Judaic Studies: Scholars Press, Atlanta, 1987
- T. Zahavy. *The Talmud of the Land of Israel: Vol. 1, Berakhot*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1989
- T. Zahavy. "A New Approach to Early Jewish Prayer." *Judaism: the Next Ten Years*. ed. B. Bokser. Chico: Scholars, 1980: 45-60
- T. Zahavy. "Kavvanah for Prayer in the Mishnah and the Talmud." *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1987
- T. Zahavy, "Tosefta Tractate Berakhot." *The Tosefta Translated from the Hebrew. First Division. Zera'im*. Ed. J. Neusner. New York: KTAV, 1986
- S. Zeitlin. "Hallel: An Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Liturgy." *Jewish Quarterly Review*. 53 (1962-3): 22-29
- S. Zeitlin. "The Origin of the Synagogue." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*. 2 (1930-31): 69-81

- S. Zeitlin. "The Tefillah, the Shemoneh Esreh: An Historical Study of the First Canonization of the Hebrew Liturgy." *Jewish Quarterly Review*. 54 (1964): 230-31
- M. S. Zuckerman, ed. *Tosephta*. Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1963
- M. Zulai. *Piyyute Yannai*. Berlin: Schocken, 1938
- L. Zunz. *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik (Hebrew), 1947