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ABSTRACT: A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF THE MA'AMADOT INSTITUTION AND THE TERMS ma'amad AND ma'amadot IN THE RABBINIC TRADITION by Moshe Dov Shualy

This study examines the ma'amadot, the first public worship institution in local communities as described in rabbinic literature. I systematically examine every instance of the terms ma'amad/ot in the rabbinic sources and then explore the ma'amadot in context of comparative religious practices in antiquity. Scholars identified the ma'amadot as the forerunner of the synagogue and the first form of local daily public worship. Whereas up to now the ma'amadot were understood as dependent on the Temple cult, this study demonstrates that the rabbinic texts, tannaitic and amoraic, define the local daily recital of the creation story from a Torah scroll to be the vital ritual of the institution. Moreover, the tannaitic sources do not associate prayer at all with ma'amadot practices, only in the amoraic corpus is prayer added to ma'amadot ritual. By Geonic times, daily Torah reading was abolished in rabbinic Judaism; among Karaites it was the essential element in their daily liturgy.

Comparative cultural analysis showed that the general outward forms of the ma'amadot rituals are to be found in the most prominent religious practices in both the ancient Near East and the classical world. Like the ma'amadot, these institutions utilized creation myths and ritual drama for the self-definition of their respective indigenous cultures. The ma'amadot employs universal forms of public worship but with distinct Jewish objects and texts to delineate a Judaism that is uniquely monotheistic and inseparably bonded to the Torah scroll.
What are the origins and nature of daily public worship in Judaism? The Bible prescribes that a daily cult offering, the tamid, be presented twice each day at the Temple. No provisions are made, however, for local daily public worship. After 70 the Temple cult ceased, of course. The rabbinic sources, especially Mishnah and Tosefta, are the first legal authorities to mandate the ma'amadot institution, the first daily public worship practices in local communities in Judaism.

The morning ma'amadot assembly was required to read the Genesis passages from the Torah scroll itself, the afternoon reading was done from memory. Significantly, the ma'amadot assemblies were linked to the daily cult and were to take place at the time when the tamid was offered at the Temple.

This study examines the ma'amadot institution as depicted in the rabbinic sources by analyzing every
instance of the terms ma'amad, ma'amadot and their variants. In addition, the rabbinic evidence is reassessed in the context of comparative religions in the Near East and the Greco-Roman world.

Although scholars have identified the ma'amadot institution as the forerunner of the synagogue, this is the first systematic study of the subject. While the analysis in this study is preliminary, both the rabbinic and comparative evidence is striking. The rabbinic data helps explain the function and operation of the ma'amadot, comparative religions provide a context for its main liturgical features.

The most significant rabbinic texts analyzed were the Mishnah and Tosefta, yet the data examined in Amoraic and Geonic sources help explain the development and transformation of the ma'amadot institution from the pre-70 era to post-talmudic Judaism. This study asserts that ma'amadot practices were conducted during the Second Temple era and continued after its fall until it was prohibited by Geonic authorities in response to Karaite practices.

Thus we explain why ma'amadot practices are no longer observed by the public although Tannaitic and Amoraic authorities require their continued observance. Moreover, unlike all other scholars who explain the ma'amadot in terms of the Temple cult, we interpret the rabbinic evidence to confirm that the ma'amadot were established to
provide a setting in each community for daily public worship.

The context of comparative religions corroborated that the functional and operational elements in the ma'amadot institution were as effective as those practices that were to be found in some of the most successful forms of public worship in antiquity. Most analogous to the ma'amadot institution, broadly speaking, were the Babylonian Akitu festival and the variety of Mystery religion practices which served to provide a distinct self-definition to its religious communities.

* * * * * *
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To transliterate, I reproduce the consonants of the Semitic words by using capital letters of the Roman alphabet. The following symbols are used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>א</th>
<th>ב</th>
<th>ג</th>
<th>ד</th>
<th>ה</th>
<th>ו</th>
<th>ז</th>
<th>ח</th>
<th>י</th>
<th>ז</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ל</th>
<th>מ</th>
<th>נ</th>
<th>ס</th>
<th>י</th>
<th>ק</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also make use of a second system, transcription, which attempts to reproduce the vowel structure as well as

---

'The transliteration and transcription system is based on the system used by Baruch M. Bokser in The Origins of the Seder, (Berkeley: University of California, 1984), p. xvii.
the consonants. These appear in lower case and are underlined.

I am not consistent in the indication of alef at the beginning of words. Where a name has a fixed or standard usage in English, I have mostly used the English form, but I am not fully consistent in this matter.
INTRODUCTION

This introduction will explain the circumstances under which this dissertation was written, its methodology, and the readers who were involved in helping it along to completion. I studied with Dr. Zeitlin when I entered the field of Rabbinics in graduate school at The Dropsie College, and it was he who first introduced me to the ma'amadot institution and its relative significance in early Jewish history. Professor Solomon Zeitlin administered my Ph.D. comprehensive examination. Unfortunately, Dr. Zeitlin died the following year before I had the opportunity to present a proposal or choose a doctoral topic.

I continued my graduate studies with Dr. Sidney B. Hoenig, Dr. Zeitlin's successor, but it was only when Dr. Baruch M. Bokser arrived at our institution that I proceeded securely with my doctoral dissertation. Although my topic proposal for a general study of the ma'amadot institution was previously accepted by the school faculty, both the emphasis and methodology of my dissertation had to be re-established, a task which would have been impossible without Dr. Bokser's careful, committed, patient and generous assistance. The
methodology Dr. Bokser and I agreed on is described in detail in chapter two below.

I completed two drafts of the dissertation manuscript on the ma‘amadot institution under Dr. Bokser’s guidance. The first was carefully read by him, line by line, and he made numerous suggestions for improvement. I proceeded to address all of his comments, and completed a second draft of the work. Tragically, on the day I was to send the manuscript to Dr. Bokser, he died prematurely at the age of forty-four. Attending his funeral in New York on Friday, July 13, 1990, it became clear how terribly he will missed by his family, students, and the community at large.

At this juncture I was fortunate to have Dr. Sol Cohen agree to read my dissertation, although its methodology and approach were established by Dr. Bokser. Dr. Cohen was most patient, and with scholarly care he proceeded to read my manuscript, making numerous suggestions, corrections and refinements to my thesis. The title of the dissertation was established as, "A Preliminary Study of the ma‘amadot Institution and the Terms ma‘amad and ma‘amadot in the Rabbinic Tradition," representing its substance and thrust.

In summary, this dissertation reflects the scholarly interests begun with Dr. Zeitlin, especially his conviction of the importance of the ma‘amadot institution
in early rabbinic Judaism. The methodology and approach in this work were established by Dr. Bokser and reflect his approach. These form the bases of this manuscript. Dr. Cohen provided one last thorough reading, improving many aspects of its presentation. Thanks are also due to Drs. David Goldenberg and Leivy Smolar. I am indebted to them all.

I am grateful for having the privilege of studying with Dr. Solomon Zeitlin, learning to apply a systematic methodology from Dr. Baruch Bokser, and appreciating the thorough, meticulous steps required to complete an acceptable scholarly document from Dr. Sol Cohen. Their love of a learning tradition is a continuing inspiration and a blessing.
The Talmud credits the ma'amadot\(^1\) with determining the fate of heaven and earth.\(^2\) Modern scholarship identified it as the forerunner of the synagogue, and the first documented organization for daily public ritual in local Jewish communities which incorporated the Torah reading of the creation narrative in Genesis (1-2:3) twice a day.\(^3\) Yet there is not one systematic study of the

\(^1\)The term ma'amad and its plural ma'amadot appear nearly one hundred times in Tannaitic and Amoraic sources, see their list at the end of this chapter below. The term ma'amadot denotes both the institution and the various daily assemblies in local communities, and thus is used in singular and plural forms depending on the context.

\(^2\)Taanit 27b; Megillah 31b.

\(^3\)Moses Rosenmann, Der Ursprung Der Synagoge (Berlin: Mayer & Mullen, 1907), pp. 19-32; Ismar Elbogen, Hatefilah belIsrael, trans. Joshua Amir (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1972), p. 4
topic although the origin and function of the ma'amadot have been subjected to a host of interpretations over the past one hundred years. Very little direct evidence can be elicited from Rabbinic sources. Whenever the ma'amadot are mentioned in Rabbinic texts, there is no explicit context available that scholars can analyze to discover the historical framework and background of the ma'amadot. Moreover, previous scholars assume that Rabbinic sources can be directly read for historical information without first assessing the rhetorical didactic features of the text and hence the ways in which these references are used by the texts. Nor is it possible to draw any support from a Biblical text since the term ma'amadot is not mentioned

at all in the Bible nor is the institution alluded to in any way.\textsuperscript{4}

The ma'amadot is described in Rabbinic literature, most importantly tractate Taanit in the Mishnah and Tosefta, as an institution with two parts. Israelites\textsuperscript{5} were required to attend every tamid offering at the Temple and correspondingly, a ma'amadot assembly engaged in reading the Creation narrative of Genesis (1-2:3) in every community.

Scholars have frequently depended on the reference to the ma'amadot in Mishnah Taanit 4:2, where the Tannaitic basis for the ma'amadot is couched; as if the founding of

\textsuperscript{4}Joseph Blenkinsopp mistakenly identifies the founding of the ma'amadot institution with an attestation in the Bible ("The Interpretation and the Tendency to Sectarianism: An Aspect of Second Temple History," 2:6, in Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, 3 vols. ed. E. P. Sanders, A. I. Baumgarten, Alan Mendelson, [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981]). In footnote 26 (Ibid. p. 301) Blenkinsopp differentiates between mishmarot, priestly and Levitical courses, and ma'amadot, Israelite courses; a distinction which he should have retained in the body of his article. Although both Mishnah and Tosefta associate mishmarot with ma'amadot and the sources portray the mishmarot as established during the Biblical period, citing Biblical prooftexts in support, they certainly do not claim a Biblical basis for establishing the ma'amadot.

\textsuperscript{5}Throughout this study the term Israelites is used, rather than the term Jews which is too inclusive, to denote those Jews who are to be contrasted from Levites and priests since the ma'amadot institution focuses on the distinction among these groups. The latter two had special ritual functions both in the Temple and in everyday life in the Jewish community, some of which are still operative today. See Menahem Haran, "Priests and Priesthood," ET, 1974, 13:1069-86.
the institution was a response to a Biblical injunction. Other scholars have used the term "democratization" to explain the ma'amadot in the context of the Temple cult to portray an institution designed to affect all the people, not only the priestly class.

The little research that does exist has not led to strong conclusions. For example, the argument based on a simple reading of Taanit 4:2 is specious. The reasoning links the Biblical tamid with the ma'amadot in the following manner. Numbers 28:2 requires that daily

---


M. Rosenmann is the first to suggest that the ma'amadot are the forerunner of the Synagogue as we know it today.

See p. 8 below.
offerings be presented in the Temple. Tannaitic sources interpret Numbers 28:2 to include two additional requirements as well. Tannaitic sources assume, and Amoraic authorities explicitly state, that the tamid was to be publicly funded. Since the tamid came from public funds it belonged to the congregation of Israel. Logic dictates, assuming that a donor must oversee his offering, that an Israeliite representation attend the tamid cult.

Although public funds from all Jews could be raised to support the daily offering, it was quite impossible to fulfill the second injunction that all Israelites be present at the offering of the tamid. Since the Mishnah insisted that the donor of an offering attend its cultic presentation at the altar, it was pointless to conclude that all Israel would or could be present on the Temple grounds. As a result, this argument reasons, the ma'amadot were established so that through Israeliite representatives at the Temple all Israelites would fulfill the Biblical requirement.

In addition, the research into the roots of the ma'amadot, which suggests that their origin is to be

---

8Taanit 4:2; Taaniyot 3:2; Sifre Numbers 142; Menahot 65a; y. Pesahim 4:1,30c.
explained on the basis of the **tamid**, is problematic.\(^9\)

There are no explicit instructions in the Bible that require Israelites to attend the daily offering of the **tamid**. The connection between the **ma'amadot** and the **tamid** offering is a product of a double exegesis, the exegesis of the Tannaim and the exegesis of the scholars, which tries to explain the institution of the Tannaim on a basis which the Mishnah itself does not reveal.\(^{10}\)

To discern the true reason for which the Tannaim founded the

---

\(^9\)A representative author is Ismar Elbogen who argued that the **ma'amadot** were instituted to actively engage everyone in the Temple cult, and the **tamid** was to be a collective offering funded by the public treasury. Consequently, the **ma'amadot** were established to express the idea of collectivity as well as to offer everyone the opportunity to participate in worship. Elbogen limits his argument to this brief single point by paraphrasing the Tannaitic sources (Hatefilah beIsrael, pp. 180-81).

\(^{10}\)For a list of scholars who interpret the **ma'amadot** as a product of a Biblical injunction see note 6 above. Dr. Bokser maintained that Taanit 4:2 had its own agenda and reason, yet to be discerned, for establishing the institution. He identified the "explanation" found in this Mishnah as a "rhetorical didactic" literary device commonly used in Rabbinic sources. Often, when Scripture is cited as proof for enacting legislation, there is another, more practical motive for that law. The following is a selective listing of literature considering the relationship between Biblical texts and Rabbinic legislation: H. Albeck, "Hahalakhot vehaderashot" [Laws and exegesis] Alexander Marx Jubilee (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1950), <Heb>. pp. 1-8; J. N. Epstein, Introduction, p. 501; Isaac Halevy, Dorot rishonim [Early generation] 6 vols. (Frankfurt: Golde, 1906), I:3:292; E. E. Urbach, Haderashah keyesod haHalakhah ube'ayat haSoferim [Exegesis as the basis for legislation and the question of the Soferim] Tarbiz 27:173; Solomon Zeitlin, "The Halaka" JQR 27:173.
ma'amadot it will be necessary at first to critically evaluate the sources, since the Mishnah and Tosefta often use rhetorical didactic "explanations" which are deceptively simple.

Another thesis assumes that the ma'amadot were established to modify the social order. The key logic here is that the origins of the ma'amadot are to be discovered in their purpose. This view would be strengthened by identifying a period of reform during which one can reasonably assume that the ma'amadot were established. In a strong sense, the wide divergence of the specific theories dealing with this thesis attests to an incomplete and inadequate approach.

Louis Finkelstein's imaginative theory is that the ma'amadot was a byproduct of the reforms of Hezekiah, which attempted to preserve the centralization of the cult. Though Finkelstein may provide a functional setting for the ma'amadot, the theory is invalid. The entire argument, as proposed by Finkelstein, is based on a unique interpretation of the term mishmarot in Taanit 4:2. Finkelstein wrote, "In the Mishnah under consideration, the word mishmarot cannot possibly signify anything else but geographical areas... Why does Mishnah Ta'anit use the

---

term in the unique sense of geographical area? Because the Mishnah under consideration was composed before the exile."^12

Finkelstein was also unique in coupling the establishment of the mishmarot to the ma'amadot by maintaining that both institutions had been established for the same reason by the same authority.^13 The Biblical data does not support Finkelstein's view. Mishmarot are mentioned numerous times in the Bible, but never in connection with ma'amadot. The Bible never uses the term ma'amadot, and though we know little of the First Temple period, there is no evidence that the ma'amadot institution is known there by a different term. II Chronicles 31:2 attests that Hezekiah reestablished priests and Levites in the rededicated Temple but the text does not state that Israelites were integrated into the Temple cult.^14

---

^12Ibid. pp. 51-52. See remarks to Taanit 4:2 below.

^13L. Finkelstein, Prophets, p. 70. He proposes that the mishmarot were first established during Hezekiah's reign. But see H. Albeck, Introduction to the Mishnah (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1954), <Heb.>, p. 31; J. Liver, History of the Priests, pp. 33-52.

^14II Chronicles 31:2. There is a tradition (y. Pesahim 4:1, 30c) cited by R. Avin (350 C.E.) attributed to R. Shimon b. Elazar (200 C.E.) that II Chronicles 29:28 demonstrates through exegesis that Israelites are to be present at tamid offerings. This is not historical proof to establish the origin of the ma'amadot (see R. Tanhuma's <350 C.E.> alternative exegesis).
Moreover, II Chronicles 31:3 reports that Hezekiah provided all the Temple offerings for the entire year. Taanit 4:2, on the other hand, holds the whole nation responsible for funding the tamid. Other Rabbinic sources also refute Finkelstein's view. Hezekiah wins broad praise for various achievements in aggadic passages, without a hint of establishing the ma'amadot or incorporating Israelites into the Temple cult. Finkelstein's interpretation of the origin of the ma'amadot has no textual basis, therefore, and stands as a product of his personal exegesis.

Save Finkelstein, scholarly theories about the ma'amadot date their origins in the Second Temple period. Each theory ties the establishment of the institution to an ideological, doctrinal issue.

Still another group of theories is indebted to the analysis of Solomon Zeitlin. According to Zeitlin, the ma'amadot were established by the Pharisees in order to involve the nation in the Temple cult and resolve doctrinal positions which were disputed by the Sadducees. Zeitlin's ideas were elaborated by his students.

---


In Zeitlin's scholarship, the text of a Rabbinic source is not accepted at face value. In the question of the origin of the ma'amadot Zeitlin found the Talmud's explanation lacking. Zeitlin wrote,

An institution that continues over a long period, influencing the history of a people does not come to be by the whim or caprice of the leaders. Religious, social and economic forces are the creators of institutions. When institutions are established the sages interpret biblical passages to sanction them.\(^\text{17}\)

Zeitlin's theory offers additional reasons for establishing the ma'amadot. Zeitlin maintained that the Sages specifically sought to "democratize" the tamid offerings and the entire Temple cult in general by instituting public rituals in each community that were linked to and corresponded with the Temple cult.

Zeitlin's theory accords the ma'amadot a major role in the direction and development of Judean society and its institutions. Before 70, Zeitlin said, the ma'amadot transformed "secular" town meetings into "religious" gatherings. After 70, the ma'amadot served as the nucleus for the Synagogue.\(^\text{18}\)


Zeitlin integrated the ma'amadot into an elaborate setting of social development, but the specific terms he employs to describe the institution raise some questions. According to Zeitlin, the purpose of the ma'amadot was to "democratize" the Temple cult. Although applying the term "democracy" to Second Temple institutions is an anachronism, Zeitlin meant that the Sages sought wide public participation in their institutions. The Sages never promulgated "democracy" per se; Torah was their ultimate standard and "nomocracy" its ideal government.¹⁹

Moreover, recent scholarship has convincingly argued, according to Dr. Bokser, that the "Pharisees were simply one of several sects, each with limited membership, competing for the attention of the unaffiliated majority...[the Pharisees] 'had no real hold either on the government or on the masses of the people'."²⁰ Although, strictly speaking, Judaism did not have formal theologies or philosophies, any analysis of the Sages in the Rabbinic sources should also be an examination of strategies for

---

¹⁹See the comments of E. Rivkin and J. Guttmann below in this chapter.

self definition and the struggle for dominance over competing sects, theologies or religions. Rabbinic sources can not be treated as established statements of historical fact of Rabbinic supremacy. They need to be evaluated in their cultural and social context.

Zeitlin's theory focuses exclusively on the Temple cult. Unexplained by Zeitlin are the reasons for establishing the daily Torah recitals and for choosing particular textual passages. Zeitlin also suggested that in addition to reciting passages from Genesis at ma'amadot gatherings, there were also readings from "the Pentateuch dealing with the daily sacrifices." Zeitlin maintained this theory although neither Tannaitic nor Amoraic sources associate the recital of any other Scriptural passages with the ma'amadot assemblies. As to Zeitlin's claim

---

21Idem, "The Tefillah," JQR 39:313. It is intimated that readings from the Prophets concluded the ma'amadot Torah recital (ibid. pp. 233, 237). Zeitlin also suggests that prayer was featured during ma'amadot assemblies ("The Origin of the Synagogue," p. 78; idem, The Rise and Fall, 1:430).

22Although Taanit 4:3 may refer to additional Torah readings, the Mishnah is quite clear in setting the Creation passage as the central if not exclusive reading for the ma'amadot. The first source to list additional Scriptural passages recited at ma'amadot gatherings is post-Talmudic [Rabbenu Hananel (d. 1055)]. He states (b. Taanit 27b-28b) that passages related to offerings were recited before the Genesis passages. He attributes this tradition to his teachers. S. Lieberman also observes that Talmudic sources limit the recitation at the ma'amadot assemblies only to passages from Genesis. He conjectures that R. Hananel's tradition was contained in
that the ma'amadot transformed the local "secular" town meetings to religious gatherings, there were no "secular" public meetings in the ancient world. Every assembly in antiquity had a distinct religious character.

Sidney B. Hoenig was Zeitlin's most important student. Whereas Zeitlin argued that the ma'amadot met in the synagogues, Hoenig maintained that the ma'amadot had for the most part met in the village square, not only in "Synagogues." Hoenig interprets the establishment of the ma'amadot mostly as a product of the conflict between the Sadducees and the Pharisees. In Hoenig's opinion, the ma'amadot were intended to strengthen the authority of the Sages in their dispute with the Sadducees. As Hoenig and others maintained, the Sages enacted and created institutions for the purpose of establishing their authority, especially over the Sadducees. Hoenig's position is that the ma'amadot included all Jews in the

the Tosefta, reflecting a post-70 practice (TK, 5:1103-4). See R. Gershom (960-1028) for an alternate interpretation of the same text.


support of the tamid and thereby seriously challenged the exclusive claims of the Sadducees.

The "Zeitlin School" portrays the Sadducees as preserving their power by confining worship to the Jerusalem Temple and by insisting that the Temple cult was the only legitimate means of worship, and by restricting participation in the Temple cult to the priests. The Sages, however, aimed at inclusion of all the Jews in the cult through the ma'amadot. Ellis Rivkin reformulates Hoenig's view and notes that the Sages did not establish the ma'amadot solely as idealistic means for democratizing worship. Rather than speak of the Sages as "democratizing" the Temple cult, Rivkin maintains that they intentionally were attacking "the cultic monopoly of the Aaronides" by instituting the ma'amadot. 25

Joseph Guttmann considers another aspect and describes the conflict between the Sages and the Sadducees as a "class struggle." Guttmann maintains that the Sages were engaged in a power struggle and were moved by the "revolutionary notion that a scholarly class should determine the nature of Judaism." 26

---

26J. Guttmann, The Synagogue, p. 75-76.
Leo Landman wrote that the ma'amadot developed in two stages.\textsuperscript{27} The institution "existed from the time of the Restoration" when all "public sacrifices (except the tamid) were to be funded by the community." This required Israelite representation at the Temple. The Torah was read in individual communities.\textsuperscript{28}

Later, during the Hasmonean period, the ma'amadot expanded when the authority of the Sages was on the rise. Eventually the Sages were "to rule then that the tamid, like all community sacrifices, was to be funded from the community. With this change, the community required representation as well."\textsuperscript{29} Landman's presentation is incomplete and ignores the function of Torah recitals altogether.

Joseph Heinemann is unique among scholars who maintain, for various reasons, that the rationale for the ma'amadot was its association with the Temple cult particularly the tamid offering. According to Heinemann, the central feature of the ma'amadot was the public reading from the Torah.\textsuperscript{30} The public Torah reading was to


\textsuperscript{28}Ibid. p. 324; n. 34.

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid. p. 324.

\textsuperscript{30}J. Heinemann, Prayer in the Period of the Tannaim, pp. 174-75.
convey an educational message regarding two religious doctrines.

The first doctrine taught that the Jerusalem Temple was not the exclusive, actual abode of God, and although the Creator of the universe was worshipped at the Temple, He is everywhere and not limited to the material of a main Temple and minor sanctuaries. This teaching countered a simplistic and popular perception which saw in the Temple the actual seat of God. The second tenet, poetically described, taught that the Jews alone recognize God's kingship, worshiping Him in His Temple in Jerusalem. Moreover, the God worshipped in Jerusalem is indeed the Creator, Who should be acknowledged universally; were it not for the Jews - heaven and earth would not be sustained. 31

Heinemann describes additional practices as part of the ma'amadot ritual without support from the sources. Heinemann saw the 'alenu prayer as a natural part of the ma'amadot practices as its contents were "the most fitting

31 Heinemann, Prayer in the Period of the Tannaim, pp. 174-75. Heinemann claims that added support for this theory can be found in the 'alenu liturgy which he identifies as the concluding prayer at ma'amadot gatherings. This prayer contains a summary of the lessons conveyed by the Torah passages recited by ma'amadot members, the prayer served as a "midrash" to the Creation passage.
conclusion to the Torah readings on Creation."\(^{32}\) Although his suggestion is plausible, the Tannaitic sources exclude prayers from the \textit{ma'amadot} ritual. Amoraic sources imply that ordinarily additional religious obligations could not be fulfilled at the \textit{ma'amadot} while its members were exempt from a variety of obligations; moreover, Heinemann himself admits, "These ideas [that the \textit{ma'amadot} were to convey] are not self-evident and do not emerge with sufficient clarity from the Creation narrative by itself. It was necessary to explain and express them clearly after the [Torah] reading."\(^{33}\) The nature of the \textit{ma'amadot} Torah reading still awaits a comprehensive treatment and interpretation.

To summarize, scholars offered a variety of theories on the origin and impact of the \textit{ma'amadot}. All theories, with one exception, linked the \textit{ma'amadot}’s founding and function with the Temple cult. One hypothesis associates the institution with the centralization of the cult during the First Temple. Several scholars postulate further that the cultic background was a battleground for the

\(^{32}\)Ibid. p. 174.

\(^{33}\)The \textit{shema} could not be recited with either members of the \textit{mishmar} or the \textit{ma'amad} because the time was inappropriate (y. Berakhot 1:5,3c; b. Yoma 20b). Members of the \textit{mishmar} and the \textit{ma'amad} were also exempt from donning \textit{tefillin} and reciting the \textit{shmonet esreh} (b. Zevahim 19a).
resolution of doctrinal issues between various factions, such as the Pharisees and Sadducees. Still others view the ma'amadot as an instrument of education for the entire community.

Only one theory focuses briefly on the daily Torah reading of the creation narrative which was established to teach that the Temple by itself was not the sole abode of God and that Israelites were an integral part of creation.

S. Safrai summarized current scholarship when describing Israelites' role in the Temple. 34

The participation of the Israelites in the ritual of the sacrifices was by deputations (ma'amad). The Mishnah states: 'What are the deputations? In that it is written: 'Command the children of Israel and say unto to them: my obligation, my food' how can a man's offering be offered while he does not stand by it? Therefore the First Prophets ordained twenty four-courses, and for every course there was a deputation in Jerusalem made-up of priests, Levites and Israelites.' The idea here is that communal sacrifices were not the concern of the officiating priests but of the entire nation, for 'the individual does not volunteer a communal offering' and the priests represented the people. The division into deputations was based upon the geographical constitution of the twenty-four districts; the terms deputation and district were interchangeable in talmudic literature. The men of deputations stood beside the priests during their ministrations and, after the completion of the sacrifices, gathered for the daily reading of the Torah and for the prescribed prayers. Throughout most of their week they fasted. We are unable to determine how each deputation was composed.

Several of Safrai's assertions above are incorrect.

1. The association of deputations with twenty-four geographical districts is inaccurate and neither is the term ma'amad interchangeable with geographical districts. There is only one citation of the term that has been interpreted as geography, an analysis of Mishnah Bikkurim 3:2 establishes that ma'amad denotes an assembly not geography.

2. Safrai totally ignores local community meetings. He considers the Temple cult exclusively.

3. The Torah reading is presented as secondary to the Temple offerings, a view not confirmed in the Rabbinic sources.

4. Safrai presents Israelites as thoroughly subordinated to priests even though the sources attest an equivalency between the groups.

5. Prayer is associated with ma'amadot assemblies only in Amoraic sources. Tannaitic texts consistently avoid associations of prayer with the ma'amadot, only Torah reading of the Creation narrative is featured.

6. Fasting in relation to ma'amadot activities can be understood only as a post-70 practice.

7. Much can be determined about the composition of the ma'amadot since the Rabbinic sources depict a distinct portrait of the institution even if we cannot provide every detail about it.
In conclusion, the scholarship to date on the ma'amadot presents several problems, primarily there is a lack of a comprehensive study of the subject. Moreover, most scholars approached the sources as if text is mere history, i.e. the sources describe actual history. The Mishnah especially, the best example in Rabbinic literature, is framed by its editors in accordance with their agenda of responding to the catastrophes of 70 and 135. Rhetorical-didactic statements, a common element in Mishnaic exposition, must be defined and accounted for as such rather than be accepted as statements of historical fact.

Current scholarship on the ma'amadot, likewise, does not properly qualify its pre-70 depiction of the ma'amadot and assumes that the Pharisees had too much power. Hence, the ma'amadot still await a systematic study.

Our methodology addresses the above issues directly. First, this study examines every instance of ma'amadot in Rabbinic literature as it appears in individual Tannaitic, Amoraic, and Geonic sources. We also explore the shift in treatment of the institution within and across the sources. These observations, as will be seen, pertain to the history of the development of Jewish liturgy and the changing nature of the synagogue, and their relation to the Torah scroll. We will also compare the Rabbinic evidence with antecedents and
parallels in the Mesopotamian and Greco-Roman world to find a cultural context for the *ma'amadot* institution.

The preliminary conclusions are:

1. Rabbinic sources throughout place at the nucleus of the *ma'amadot* institution the Torah scroll and the recitation of its Creation narrative.

2. The changing perceptions and successive portrayals of the *ma'amadot* corroborate the centrality of the Torah scroll and its Creation narrative while adding elements such as priestly blessings, fasting, and prayer.

3. A review of extra-rabbinic comparative ritual practices revealed striking similarities to religious phenomena in antiquity and the classic worlds. These religious forms have been generally identified as ritual-drama, instruments for establishing and changing the self-definition of a culture. We will see that while the *ma'amadot* institution has in common ritual forms utilized by other cultures, Judaism has adopted and adapted these forms to express a unique statement of self-definition through its use of the Torah scroll and its creation narrative.
TABLE 1—Ma'amad/ot in Tannaitic and Amoraic Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mishnah</th>
<th>Bavli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bikkurim 3:2</td>
<td>42. Taanayot 4:1,67b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Taanit 2:7</td>
<td>43. Taanayot 4:2,67d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Taanit 4:1</td>
<td>44. Megillah 4:4,75a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Taanit 4:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Taanit 4:3</td>
<td>45. Berakhot 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Taanit 4:4</td>
<td>46. Shabbat 24a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Taanit 4:5</td>
<td>47. Pesahim 82a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Megillah 4:3</td>
<td>50. Yoma 53a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ketubot 2:10</td>
<td>51. Yoma 87b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Baba Batra 6:7</td>
<td>52. Taanit 17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tamid 5:6</td>
<td>53. Taanit 22b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Pesahim 3:15</td>
<td>54. Taanit 26b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rosh Hashanah 2:17</td>
<td>55. Taanit 27a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Taanayot 2:3</td>
<td>56. Taanit 28a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Taanayot 3:1</td>
<td>57. Taanit 28b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Taanayot 3:2</td>
<td>58. Megillah 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Taanayot 3:3</td>
<td>59. Megillah 26a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Taanayot 3:4</td>
<td>60. Megillah 26b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Gittin 4:13</td>
<td>63. Megillah 31b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Baba Batra 9:2</td>
<td>64. Moed Katan 14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Shevuot 2:5</td>
<td>65. Ketubot 28b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Shevuot 5:5</td>
<td>66. Ketubot 84a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Shevuot 6:4</td>
<td>67. Sotah 37a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Avodah Zarah 4:11</td>
<td>68. Gittin 13a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Kelim (BM) 7:6</td>
<td>69. Gittin 13b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Kelim (BM) 7:7</td>
<td>70. Gittin 14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71. Gittin 67b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72. Kiddushin 48a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73. Baba Mesia 54a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74. Baba Mesia 78b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75. Baba Mesia 106b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76. Baba Batra 100b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77. Baba Batra 144a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78. Baba Batra 148a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79. Baba Batra 149a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80. Shevuot 47b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81. Zevahim 9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82. Bekhorot 52b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83. Arakhin 4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84. Niddah 52b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85. Avot deR. Nathan B39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86. Ekhah Rabbati 1:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87. Soferim 17:1; 4-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tosefta</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Pesahim 3:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rosh Hashanah 2:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Taanayot 2:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Taanayot 3:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Taanayot 3:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Taanayot 3:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Taanayot 3:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Megillah 3:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Ketubot 3:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Gittin 4:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Baba Batra 9:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Shevuot 2:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Shevuot 5:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Shevuot 6:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Avodah Zarah 4:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Kelim (BM) 7:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Kelim (BM) 7:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Midrashe Halakhah                   |                                    |
| 31. Sifra Sav 4/40                  |                                    |
| 32. Emor 3/89                       |                                    |
| 33. Sifrei Numbers 9-15             |                                    |
| 34. Numbers 114-123                 |                                    |
| 35. Deuteronomy 220-253             |                                    |
| 36. Deuteronomy 240-271             |                                    |

| Yerushalmi                          |                                    |
| 37. Berakhot 1:5,3c                 |                                    |
| 38. Berakhot 4:1,7c                 |                                    |
| 39. Pesahim 4:1,30c                 |                                    |
| 40. Shekalim 5:1,48d                |                                    |
| 41. Taanayot 2:2,67d                |                                    |
CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGICAL

CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

"The question of methodology is of absolute, [and] fundamental importance to scholarly endeavor." Sarason emphasizes that methodological considerations are even more relevant in the study of Jewish liturgy because of the gaps in the data, the element of subjectivity in interpreting the facts, the reliance on hypothetical constructions and on the model of development by which the data is stratified. Ideally, "the method flows from the data themselves and is sufficiently responsive to adjustment and correction [not] imposed unto the data and [which] forces them into a pre-conceived mold. The final

---

court of appeal for any method is the nature of the data in question.\textsuperscript{2}

This study first and foremost examines the primary rabbinic sources which will define the issues, the evidence of these sources will then be interpreted by examining relevant comparative cultural data in antiquity. Both rabbinic and comparative sources will be utilized to contribute to the field of Jewish liturgy regarding the history of the synagogue's major features and the nature of post-70 liturgical practices.

Contributions to the above two areas are of special interest since some scholars maintain that nothing can be added to these subjects. Sarason lists three primary issues in Jewish liturgy: the origin of the synagogue, the history of post-70 liturgy, and the Geonic period in Babylonia. Sarason emphatically maintains that the first two issues cannot be resolved with any greater clarity.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 108.

\textsuperscript{3}"Were we to know how and for what purpose and under what leadership the synagogue originated, we would be better able to employ an appropriate historical model to describe its early development and the early development of the liturgy. The problem is all the more enticing since, almost certainly, it never can be solved; there are no data available. Further work on this problem must, then, inevitably prove to be futile...Again, these are questions [on post-70 liturgy] which probably never will be answered to our complete satisfaction because the data are sparse, ambiguous, and relatively late" (R. Sarason, "The Modern Study of Jewish Liturgy," 1:163).
We maintain, however, that the evidence in rabbinic sources provides quite a distinct portrait of the ma'amadot with the most comprehensive treatment in the Mishnah and Tosefta. Our study will demonstrate that Tannaitic and Amoraic sources contain a wealth of data which can yield considerable insight into the nature of ancient Judaism if systematically analyzed, especially when the rabbinic data is balanced with a comparative study.

Sarason's evaluation of recent developments in the study of Jewish liturgy promoted the role of the historian of religions as an effective approach, ("admittedly one perspective among many," for the study of the field.  

The historical and phenomenological study of Jewish liturgy yields insight into the worldview and ethos of rabbinic Judaism, that is to say, into the way that the authors and editors of the literature construed around them such that certain sectors of (in this case, "liturgical") activities were deemed appropriate responses to reality-so-construed, while others were not. Liturgical rules and texts lay out one portion of the cosmic grid...as "mapping out" one part of a larger picture of the world, in which there are homologies among the parts. Scholars in the pursuit of a fully-ramified contextual understanding of these sources must do no less.

In this chapter we will first present general methodological strategies for studying the rabbinic and

---

non-rabbinic evidence to be followed by a more detailed examination of each issue. Scholars agree that the ma'amadot institution is important for a variety of reasons. The review of that scholarship also identified methodological problems, mostly a lack of a systematic analysis of the sources, which led to our approach. Our methodological strategy is thus the first careful interpretation of all the references to the terms ma'amad and ma'amadot in rabbinic literature, the primary source for the ma'amadot, and an examination of its extra-rabbinic context. Both Jewish and non-Jewish religious phenomena will provide that context and will include the following elements: a review of liturgical practices attested in Genizah sources, an analysis of the symbolism of the sacred portal in synagogue art, Karaite Torah reading and liturgical practices, the significance of creation narratives, the nature of ritual-drama in transforming worship patterns, and the striking similarities between the Babylonian Akitu festival, Mystery religions and the ma'amadot institution.

First, each reference to the term ma'amad in Tannaitic and Amoraic sources will be examined individually with a review of the subject in Geonic
texts. All such references, explicit and implicit, will be appraised as they appear in their respective rabbinic genres: Mishnah, Tosefta, Halakhic Midrashim, Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds. Such an approach will reveal the various literary and historical agendas of the respective rabbinic sources. These sources will be analyzed by discerning their literary traits: redactional formulas, rhetorical-didactic style, pre- or post-70, attributed, anonymous or disputed traditions.

Another advantage of the above approach is that it will provide a total view of each tractate’s presentation of the ma’amadot institution and the shifts in perception of the institution throughout and within rabbinic sources. The ability to map and analyze shifts in the portrayal of the ma’amadot in the sources can then become the basis for constructing a preliminary historical model of the institution.

Although only rabbinic texts discuss the ma’amadot, extra-rabbinic sources will also be examined to provide a

---

5 The reason that Geonic material is analyzed although it is relatively late material, is that there are some explicit references to reading from the creation passages in the Torah and some possible references to the ma’amadot institution which should be examined.

6 The above method analyzes all instances of the term ma’amad including those which are unrelated to the ma’amadot institution. This approach allows us to be thorough and systematic without prejudging the data.
context for the Jewish sources. The rabbinic witnnesses are selective in their testimony, theirs is not a comprehensive history of Judaism. As will be shown, there are striking and insightful parallels to be found in Jewish and non-Jewish comparative religious phenomena.

Ezra Fleischer, for instance, details some extraordinary liturgical practices in the tradition of Eretz Israel relating to the Torah scroll and readings from the same as attested in Genizah material which are totally absent in classical rabbinic sources. Similarly, evidence in Geonic sources also hints at the evolution of liturgical practices in rabbinic Judaism which become fully meaningful only when viewed in context of Karaite history.

Non-Jewish comparative evidence presents equally striking and instructive insights into the ma'amadot phenomena. For instance, there is a striking antecedent to the ma'amadot which has never before been examined. On the Akitu festival, the Babylonian New Year, the Babylonian version of the creation myth was publicly recited from its sacred scripture, the first such recorded instance.

---

7Ezra Fleischer, Eretz Israel Prayer and Prayer Rituals: As Portrayed in the Geniza Documents, (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), chapters 4-7, [Hebrew].
As Jonathan Z. Smith noted in his studies of the history of religions, "[The historian] strives to celebrate the diversity of manners, the variety of species, the opacity of things...[he] is obliged to approach his subject obliquely...He must circumambulate the spot several times...Map is not territory."  

To review, rabbinic sources will provide information in three areas: the ma'amadot's traits and characteristics; the centrality of the Torah scroll and its creation narrative; and the basis for a developmental model.

Extra-rabbinic sources will provide a context for the evidence in rabbinic sources, they will identify features unique to the ma'amadot while disclosing elements which were shared with the religious world of antiquity. This evidence will show that Judaism incorporated into the ma'amadot the classic ritual-drama elements of the religions of the Near-East culture complex to express its self-definition. These vital ritual features are found in the most renowned religious phenomena of Antiquity, the Babylonian Akitu festival and Mystery religions, and include: a most sacred object, procession with the object,

---

a creation myth and its public recitation, and individual participation in the ritual-drama.\footnote{This issue will be treated in detail in chapter eleven below.}

**Methodology regarding rabbinic sources.**

The following discussion elaborates on the various methodological concerns that need to be articulated for proper analysis of the rabbinic sources. A discussion of various terms relating to the *ma'amatot*; the centrality of Mishnah and Tosefta in our study; the criteria for analyzing the rabbinic sources with a focus on the pre-post-70 issue; Torah reading vs. prayer; and the Torah scroll as a sacred object.

1. Terminology
   
   a. The term *ma'amad*.

   Every instance of the term *ma'amad* in Tannaitic, Amoraic and Geonic literature is examined individually, especially Mishnah and Tosefta. This includes explicit and implied references since rabbinic sources are compact, often implying their subject without stating it. The term *ma'amad*, not *ma'amadot*, denotes at times references other than the *ma'amadot* institution and needs to be properly identified.

   b. The *ma'amadot* institution.
The term *ma'amadot* always denotes an "institution" of public worship which included reading of the Biblical creation narrative.\(^{10}\) The sources, especially Tannaitic, provide a variety of rules for operating the *ma'amadot* as a system of public worship. These practical rules need to be distinguished from elaborate rhetorical-didactic treatment of the *ma'amadot* "institution" which the sources use to "explain" its origins and purposes.\(^{11}\)


Of all the terms above which relate to the *ma'amadot* institution and are found in rabbinic literature, only *ma'amad/ma'amadot* became the dominant and prevalent term to denote the daily Torah reading institution. An examination of the above terms, we will study their appearance in biblical sources and examine which terms appear in mss. and which in printed editions, can provide us with an insight to the dominance of *ma'amad/ma'amadot*.

Each of the terms above has an individual shading yet they all occupy one semantic field. Although the term *ma'amadot* is most often used to denote the institution, the presence of *'omed, 'ammud, 'ammudim* shows that the name

\(^{10}\)The only exception, which can be explained, is in Amoraic literature (Baba Batra 100b) where the term denotes an assembly gathered for funerary practices.

\(^{11}\)The entire structure of Taanit 4:2 and Taaniyot 3:2 relate to the *ma'amadot* as a distinctly established institution.
of the institution was not solidly fixed but its vital ritual was. The basic ritual of the institution, recital of the creation narrative, remained its essential, unaltered nucleus while its name and peripheral rites were flexible and diversified.

Although the term ma'amadot does not appear once in the Bible, ma'amad, however, commonly denotes in Scripture an official post in the Temple or in the royal court. 12 Thus the Tannaitic use of the term ma'amadot to denote a new "ma'amadot" institution while adding credibility and stature which it drew from the use of the term ma'amad in the Bible. 13

Supporting evidence of the Tannaitic cognizance of the Biblical usage of ma'amad can be seen in the fact that all five ma'amad denotations in the Mishnah fall well within the Bible's semantic range of its root $error$. 12

The prefix מ, a common Mishnaic Hebrew addition to verbal stems, denotes a nounal form. 14 Mishnaic Hebrew, in contrast to Biblical Hebrew, prefers the verb 'amad to the verb qum, and uses it in its nominal form to denote an

---


13Despite Blenkinsopp's erroneous notion to the contrary ("The Interpretation and the Tendency to Secterianism," p. 6).

14A. Bendavid, Hebrew, 2:443-45.
institution totally unknown in the Bible.\textsuperscript{15} This novel use of \textit{ma'amad} in the Mishnah, relative to the Bible, effectively bestows credibility to the new institution it connotes by automatically evoking its Biblical counterparts in royal and Temple offices (compare Taaniyot 3:2).\textsuperscript{16}

\textit{Omed} is a late biblical form denoting "standing place" and in the Jerusalem Talmud it refers only to that assembly in the Temple which oversaw the tamid offering.\textsuperscript{17} Although this term too, has the connotation of formal office, rabbinic sources prefer the terms \textit{ma'amad/ot}. In conjunction with the term \textit{omed} the Yerushalmi beraitot employ the term \textit{ammud} four times, twice as many as the former term.

\textit{Ammud}, the gattul form of \textit{amad},\textsuperscript{18} denotes literally the object or person that is set in a particular place.


\textsuperscript{16}The assumption made here, and Dr. Bokser agreed, is that there is no evidence in the Bible for the \textit{ma'amadot} institution just as there is no use of that term in Scripture.

\textsuperscript{17}The term appears twice in Rabbinic texts, both in the Jerusalem Talmud (y. Pesahim 4:1,30c; y. Taaniyot 4:2,67d) see the detailed discussion in the chapter on the Yerushalmi.

The term appears in Taanit 4:2 in the Kaufmann ms. and four times in the Jerusalem Talmud. In each instance the various sources associate 'amund as depicting Israelites passively attending tamid offerings at the Temple. Yet the name for the daily Torah reading institution is ma'amad or ma'amadot even in the Kaufmann ms. 19

The choice of ma'amad/ma'amadot as the foremost term denoting the daily Torah reading institution can be explained as follows. Only the term ma'amad/ot is most typical of Mishnaic Hebrew over its cognate forms, denoting a new institution while connoting an established official status evoked in its antecedent use in the Bible.

d. Mishmar and ma'amad, mishmarot and ma'amadot.

The above terms are commonly associated with each other. Various scholars have attempted, but were frustrated, to distinctly define these terms especially as to their composition. 20 Each term was to apply exclusively to either priests, Levites or Israelites or to a fixed combination thereof. The sources, however, are flexible in corresponding the above terms to various groups yet they are used coherently. The following

---

19 Although Malter sees no difference between 'amund and ma'amad (Masekhet Taanit, p. 120) the Rabbinic sources show a careful and distinct usage of these terms.

20 Albeck, Mishnah, 2:341; Malter, Masekhet Taanit, p. 120; idem, The Treatise Taanit, pp. 210-11 note 230.
hypothesis suggests a relation of mishmar/mishmarot to ma’amad/ma’amadot.

In related rabbinic texts we will see that mishmar and mishmarot denote priestly (and Levitical) courses which were organized by clan to serve at the Temple in specific rotation through the year. Likewise, ma’amad and ma’amadot denote the institution which was designed to gather Israelites in their local communities to read the creation story daily.

Linking priestly courses and Israelite groups in the ma’amadot sets a dramatic equivalence between two disparate groups. Whereas priestly clans are very strictly defined, Israelite courses are freely designated. Membership to priestly mishmarot is exclusively a biological function but membership to the ma’amadot is purely voluntary (underscoring another theme of voluntarism in tractate Taanit - wood offering). The very structure of the ma’amadot promotes equivalence between mishmarot and ma’amadot, (especially in Taanit 4:2 and Taaniyot 3:2-3), Israelite units are mirror images of the priestly groupings with the exception of their respective requirements for membership.
Whereas priestly courses had well known and established names, the names for the ma'amadot courses is a problematic which received no discussion in the literature. Priestly clans were taken from family names which are enumerated in the Bible. The twenty four Israelite ma'amadot could not account for themselves as did the priests, they had no similarly distinguished lineages.

We suggest that Israelite ma'amadot took on the same names as the priestly mishmarot. Israelite courses were "attached" to the priestly courses, their rotation followed the one established by the mishmarot. An Israelite who belonged to a ma'amad also belonged to a mishmar with a distinct name of its own. This helps explain the observation that, "When the time of the mishmar came, its priests and Levites went up to Jerusalem. And the Israelites in that mishmar gathered in their towns and recited the creation passage."  

2. Centrality of Mishnah and importance of Tosefta.

The Mishnah plays the most significant role among the sources for the study of the ma'amadot for several

---

21 The names of priestly mishmarot were called out regularly in rotation of their service in some synagogues as late as the thirteenth century, see the section on epigraphic and documentary sources in chapter ten below.

22 Taanit 4:2; Taaniyot 3:2.
reasons. While the Mishnah is the earliest rabbinic document it is also the most thoroughly and comprehensively edited and carefully framed text. Above all, the Mishnah presents the most comprehensive and integrated information on the ma'adamot.

The Mishnah, as well as other sources, will be studied on its own merits as a single literary document, an approach which had first been exercised by Maimonides but has not been regularly utilized again until recently.\(^\text{23}\)

Tosefta is next in importance to our study although it is not as thorough in its treatment of the ma'adamot as is Mishnah. Tosefta's structure parallels Mishnah's while complementing and supplementing its information. When these two Tannaitic sources are treated as essentially one document they yield a distinct and detailed portrait of the ma'adamot institution.

3. Criteria for analyzing rabbinic sources.

There are several accepted criteria for analyzing the more than one hundred references to ma'amad in rabbinic traditions. These criteria will reveal distinct literary

patterns, especially Mishnah and Tosefta, which otherwise would not be as positively discernable.

The data of the rabbinic evidence can thus be "mapped out" to be particularly helpful in establishing the structural and functional components of the ma'amadot and in tracing patterns of its development as an institution.

Five specific criteria will be utilized in the analysis of the Tannaitic traditions. The five criteria are: A. Attributed vs. anonymous traditions. B. Disputed vs. uncontended traditions. The above two items are self explanatory, whereas the following three will be explained below. C. Pre- vs. post-70 traditions. D. Ma'amadot institution vs. general statements. E. Core vs. secondary traditions. These five factors are closely related and will group the seemingly diverse ma'amadot statements into distinct patterns demonstrating a detailed, meticulously redactional process by the editors of the Mishnah.

A. Attributed vs. anonymous traditions.

B. Disputed vs. uncontended statements.

C. Pre- vs. post-70 C.E. traditions.

The question of dating Tannaitic traditions is a sensitive issue requiring careful consideration especially in the pre-70 era. Neusner, for instance, explained that the redactional process of the Mishnah does not permit
differentiation among its layers and thus requires that certain analytical criteria be satisfied before accepting the dates of traditions.\textsuperscript{24}

A single redactional theory governed the formation of both the tractates and their subunits. That theory posited that the appropriate way for organizing and laying out the materials was to take up a theme and unpack its principal constituents, then to take up each of these constituents and unpack its generative logic. So the principal of organization throughout, from the perspective of ultimate redaction, was logical [not temporal]... All units of thought in the Mishnah made intelligible statements.\textsuperscript{25}

He divides the Mishnah’s traditions into three periods: pre-70, 70 to 120 C.E., 120 to 180 C.E.

The historical model developed here is mainly based on rabbinic texts, the exclusive sources of information on the ma'amadot. Strictly speaking, the earliest sources are Tannaitic texts edited at the beginning of the third century. Still, we may infer, on the basis of internal evidence, data relating to pre-200 and even pre-70 if we carefully assess the Tannaitic evidence. If we can demonstrate, as Dr. Bokser repeatedly maintained, that the Yavnean masters have assumed certain religious features to be ongoing practices, then we may postulate evidence relating to pre-70 settings. There is in fact evidence

\textsuperscript{24}Neusner lists five detailed criteria to ascertain dating (Mishnah, pp. 18-21).

\textsuperscript{25}J. Neusner, Mishnah, pp. 16-17.
that the Yavnean masters did indeed assume aspects of the ma‘amadot as carrying on from the pre-70 era.\textsuperscript{26} In addition, extra-rabbinic sources, such as I Maccabees, will be utilized to corroborate rabbinic evidence as to pre-70 settings.

D. Institution vs. general statements
distinguish between usages dealing with the single dominant ma‘amadot institution and other usages employing the term but unrelated to that one concern.

E. Core vs. secondary traditions distinguish between core elements vital to ma‘amadot rituals (Torah recital) and secondary statements pertaining to derivative and peripheral issues (additional rites: prayer, priestly blessing, fasting, grooming).

4. Torah reading and prayer.

As numerous scholars have pointed out, reading from the Torah scroll in public is a distinct activity from the public recitation of prayer. These same scholars, however, associate prayer with the ma‘amadot indiscriminately. Yet Tannaitic texts do not associate prayer at the ma‘amadot at all, only Amoraic sources do. Moreover, rabbinic tradition makes very clear the difference between prayer and Torah reading. Distinct nouns and verbs distinguish Torah reading from prayer,

\textsuperscript{26}Taanit 4:4; 2:7; Tosefta Taaniyot 2:3.
each using its individual objects and rituals. In context of public worship the verb qara' designates reading passages from the Bible exclusively and never denotes praying, although a variety of biblical passages have been incorporated into prayer services. Rabbinic sources denote prayer by using specific technical terms such as tefilah, 'over lifne hatevah, yored lifne hatevah and shemoneh 'esreh, which never designate reading from the Torah scroll.

5. The Torah scroll as a sacred object.

Both the Mishnah and Tosefta place the Torah scroll at the heart of the ma'amadot ritual. The sanctity of the Torah scroll and its functions as a physical object require amplification. We assert that, among other aims, the ma'amadot institution helped establish the Torah scroll as a most sacred physical object in each local Jewish community. Whereas the sanctity of the Torah scroll post-70 is generally accepted, there is scant evidence that the scroll was a sacred object in the pre-70 era; its pre-70 status needs to be determined. The existing evidence, limited though it is, does indicate that the Torah scroll was in fact a "sacred" object during the Second Temple period.

N. Sarna explains that biblical books were considered holy despite the paucity of application of the term
"sacred" to Scriptures. Although Sarna notes that the expression gadosh is found only twice with reference to the Torah scroll before the Temple's fall, these are still credible witnesses. Moreover, the term "writings" is commonly used in the sources to denote Scripture and they invariably assume that the term "sacred" should be associated with it.

Similarly, Sid Leiman holds that the Bible was "canonized" in the Hasmonean period which certainly would make the Torah a unique object for ritual purposes, even "sacred." Even more definitive evidence can be found in I Maccabees which reports that Antiochus IV persecuted those Jews who possessed Torah scrolls and followed its commandments, seeking the annihilation of the people and their scroll. This historical datum is evidence that the Torah scroll as an object was well distributed in Judea and was considered sacred among Jews.

Methodology regarding extra-rabbinic sources

A methodological assumption in this study is that religious phenomena of antiquity can serve the basis for a

---

27 Nahum Sarna, "Bible," EI, 4:816-17.

28 Sid Z. Leiman, The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture, (Hamden: Archon Books, 1976), p. 131. Even if we do not follow Leiman's position, the Pentateuch was certainly canonized well before 70 according to all scholars.
better understanding of the ma'amadot in Judaism. 29

Striking similarities were found in contemporary religions during the Second Temple and the early rabbinic period. As we shall demonstrate, at the heart of the ma'amadot ritual is the daily reading from the creation narrative in Genesis which has a striking antecedent in antiquity. The creation epic, Enuma Elish, was read on the most important Mesopotamian festival, the Babylonian New Year - Akitu. By reviewing the nature of Akitu, for instance, we may explain functional aspects of the ma'amadot not explicated in the rabbinic sources.

29 The deep affinity of Judaism to the ancient Near East is maintained by the Bible, physical and cultural anthropologists, linguists and scholars of literature and religion. Moreover, the later cultural developments in the Greco-Roman period further enhance our insight into Judaism at the end of the Second Temple period. See Harry L. Shapiro, "Physical Anthropology," EJ, 1:41-50; Thorkild Jacobsen, "Mesopotamia," EJ, 16:1505k-1505j. Jacobsen's assessment is very much to the point attempted in this preliminary study.

It is not surprising that the first of all literatures developing in such variety and richness, should have left its imprint on neighboring and later cultures. A great deal of cautious comparative work is still to be done, however, before the nature and extent of that influence can be reliably assessed. On the whole, one would expect little direct borrowing of finished literary works, but rather acquaintance with literary motifs, which have been interpreted and treated in terms of the borrowing culture by its own poets and writers. An example of such a motif is the...already Sumerian - concept of a universal history leading from the creation of man to the founding of the first cities...may underlie the similar biblical concept and presentation (Ibid. p. 1505aa).
The following related issues will serve as comparative contexts to better understand the ma'amadot's cultural framework in Judaism.

1. Evidence from the Genizah.

There is evidence of liturgical practices among Jews relating to the Torah reading during Geonic times which has continued from the Talmudic period. Various Genizah documents attest to ritual practices, unknown in traditional rabbinic sources, which help explain the centrality of the Torah in ma'amadot practices as described in rabbinic sources. Two liturgical practices are of interest and confirm a long-standing history between public worship and the Torah scroll.

A. A most extraordinary, previously unattested, "and certainly profoundly impressive" ceremony was the daily procession through the synagogue with the Torah scroll without opening it and without reading from it. This unique ritual was practiced by the community from Eretz-Israel in Cairo.

B. Special Torah readings, above the normally scheduled ones, are attested in classic sources which were

---

31 Ibid., pp. 275-91.
not recorded in traditionally available rabbinic sources.\textsuperscript{32}

2. The sacred portal in synagogue art.

Bernard Goldman identified the sacred portal motif, a common and primary ingredient in synagogue art, as the symbol of salvation and transformation. The sacred portal was also the ubiquitous artistic salvific metaphor throughout the Ancient Near-East and in the Classical religious world especially in Mystery religions.\textsuperscript{33} Goldman’s study demonstrated that Judaism borrowed artistic and cultural conventions to express its singular identity.

3. Creation epics.

The biblical creation narrative was at the heart of the ma'\textsuperscript{a}madot institution according to the rabbinic sources. Importantly, the creation epic played a major role in non-rabbinic religious groups both Jewish, Karaite, and non-Jewish, Near East and Mystery religions. The creation narrative features prominently in all periods of Judaism: biblical, Second Temple, and rabbinic.

The role of the creation epic in biblical Judaism is critical in defining it as strictly monotheistic according

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., p. 223.

to Sarna's analysis of Genesis as shown in chapter eleven below.

During the Second Temple era, the role of the creation narrative among the varieties of non-"normative" Judaism is extensively attested.\textsuperscript{34} Scholars identified the creation narrative as a salient feature which uniquely identifies the theology of its host community be they Alexandrian Judaism as represented by Philo, Palestinian Judaism as represented by Ben-Sira, apocryphal, psuedoepigraphal, Gnostic or Qumran sources. The creation narrative is important in "normative" Judaism and other religions as can be deduced from its presence in the Bible, and throughout the sacred and philosophical literature in antiquity.\textsuperscript{35}

There are notable and fundamental differences between rabbinic Judaism and their contemporary religious communities. Whereas the various religious and


\textsuperscript{35}Martin Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), pp. 1:70, 153-75, 189, 194f., 218, 223; 2:68, 154, 173. These represent a selective reference to the topic, for a more complete listing see above 2:300.
philosophical movements mentioned above have extensive and articulated creation theologies, rabbinic Judaism insists on silence regarding the public expounding of creation and yet it allows select individuals to pursue these esoteric doctrines.\textsuperscript{36} This difference draws the emphasis rabbinic Judaism places on the sacred texts and the Torah scroll per se rather than expounding exegetical amplifications on a very "exciting" subject.

A special place for the creation narrative in rabbinic Judaism has recently been argued by Howard Eilberg-Schwartz who maintains that Genesis predicates Mishnaic theology. Accordingly, the creation narrative in Genesis grounded the distinct character of rabbinic Judaism; it established the Mishnah's theory of classification and ultimately portrayed humanity as an agent of God.\textsuperscript{37} The importance of our study of the \textit{ma'amadot} is underscored by the fact that Eilberg-Schwartz does not once mention the \textit{ma'amadot} as utilizing the creation narrative in daily worship, and also uses the notion of agency,\textsuperscript{38} which would greatly support his hypothesis.

\textsuperscript{36} Hagigah 2:1; Albeck, \textit{Mishnah}, 2:510-11.


\textsuperscript{38} Taaniyot 3:2.
4. The ma'amadot as ritual-drama.

Scholars have commonly applied the model of ritual-drama to explain patterns of public worship as instruments for defining and changing the self-identity of cultures and religious communities. By examining the ma'amadot institution as ritual-drama we are better able to explain its functional and structural features, deduce its impact on the Jewish community and set it in context of the religious world of Antiquity.

Certain scholars have stated that the biblical creation narrative had no ritual function in Judaism, while others claimed that the Torah service is without dramatic substance. Both positions are wrong, the first view contradicts basic rabbinic facts and the second opinion misjudges the cultural context of the Torah service. The rabbinic sources explicitly place the creation narrative at the center of ma'amadot practices.

See the detailed treatment of the subject in chapter 11 below discussing Nahum Sarna's Understanding Genesis and Shalom M. Paul's "Creation," in EJ. Bernard Goldman (The Sacred Portal, p. 39) notes the following, "The absence of any dramatic ceremony in the service - a sacrifice or offering up to a cult object, or the performance of a mystery ritual - suggests that the orientation of the congregation within the building was of no importance. There was no need to focus the attention on an object or part of the hall, no need to establish an audience-actor relationship. By contrast, the Catholic Mass is a dramatic ritual, the visual as well as the spiritual focus of the congregation is on the altar where the profound mystery of the Eucharist is performed."
Scholars have often described the majestic drama of the Torah ritual be it the weekday, Sabbath, festival or Kol Nidre service on the eve of Yom Kippur.  

5. The Babylonian Akitu Festival and Mystery religions.

There are striking similarities between the Babylonian Akitu New Year festival, Mystery religions and the ma'amadot. We will show that the ma'amadot possessed the external forms of these widely practiced contemporary religious institutions while maintaining a unique Jewish identity.

There are several elements corresponding between the ma'amadot and the two comparative religious phenomena cited above. Several elements are common to the Akitu and the ma'amadot: public recitation of the creation stories from sacred texts, a public procession with the most sacred objects which are brought out from a sacred enclosure, and a stage upon which the ritual-drama takes place. Involvement of the individual person in the

---

40. I. Elbogen, Hatzefillah BeIsrael, pp. 131; 147-52; 116; E. Fleischer, Eretz Israel Prayer, p. 275.

41. J. Heinemann notes, citing several authorities, that ritual processions were a universal phenomena in the ancient Near East (Prayer in the Period of the Tannaim, pp. 93-95). Moreover, regarding the procession in which the Torah scroll was brought into the city square, Heinemann feels strongly that this activity was ceremonial and ritually imposing (Ibid., p. 97; similarly E. Fleischer, Eretz Israel Prayer, p. 275).
ritual-drama is the most striking common feature to the Mystery religions. Whereas the Akitu involved exclusively the priesthood and the king, Mystery religions focused on the individual, initiating him into its religious world through direct participation as is the case in any Torah reading ceremony in Judaism.

To summarize, our methodology draws from two fields: rabbinics and comparative religions. The evidence in the rabbinic sources is the most vital element in this study of the ma'amadot. The comparative study is an interpretive and preliminary context for the ma'amadot in Judaism which is attained by examining similar elements in contemporary cultures.

The rabbinic data will show the Torah scroll and its creation narrative are at the core of the ma'amadot and by their function, were designed to broadly impact the local community. The comparative evidence will show that contemporary cultures utilized similar ritual-drama elements which are also found in the ma'amadot.

Ultimately this study seeks to combine the analytical components with an interpretive framework to produce a preliminary historical model to better understand the evidence in rabbinic sources regarding the ma'amadot. Jonathan Smith's observation expresses some of the elements which this study seeks to behold.
In the West we live in a post-Kantian world in which man is defined as a world-creating being and culture is understood as a symbolic process of self-construction... What we study when we study religion is one mode of constructing worlds of meaning, worlds within which men find themselves and which they choose to dwell. What we study is the passion and drama of man discovering the truth of what it is to be human. History is the framework within whose perimeter those human expressions, activities and intentionalities that we call "religious" occur. Religion is the quest, within the bounds of the human, historical condition, for the power to manipulate and negotiate one 'situation' so as to have 'space' in which to meaningfully dwell. It is the power to relate one's domain to the plurality of environmental and social spheres in such a way as to guarantee the conviction that one's existence 'matters'. Religion is the distinctive mode of human creativity, a creativity which both discovers limits and creates limits for humane existence. What we study when we study religion is the variety of attempts to map, construct and inhabit such positions of power through the use of myths, rituals and experiences of transformation. 42

CHAPTER THREE

THE ma'amadot

IN THE MISHNAH:

ANALYSIS OF

INDIVIDUAL MISHNAHS

Introduction

The Mishnah draws from a variety of sources which exhibit diverse literary traits; these have been integrated into the single document we now possess.¹ Yet the Mishnah is the most carefully redacted, edited and preserved of all rabbinic sources, serving the foundation of Talmudic Judaism. Despite the divergence of traditions and linguistic qualities, one may speak of the Mishnah as a comprehensive whole carefully distilled to an organic singularity. Thus the Mishnah provides us with the most

important evidence on the ma'amatot and also serves the
ground for our thesis.

Although certain scholars study the Mishnah in tandem
with other and later rabbinic sources, in this study the
Mishnah will be studied first independently, on its own
terms as a free-standing document.\(^2\) Afterwards the
Mishnah will be compared to other Tannaitic sources
especially the Tosefta, and finally the Tannaitic texts
will be contrasted with the agenda set in the Amoraic
discourse.

The study of the ma'amatot in the Mishnah will focus
first on the individual datum of ma'amad, and then on the
overall patterns and shifting treatments of the subject
within the Mishnah.\(^3\) In this chapter I assemble, assess
and define all the data relating to the ma'amatot
institute in the Mishnah and examine each explicit or
implied reference to the terms ma'amat/ot since some
Mishnahs use ma'amad to denote something other than the
ma'amadot institution. As will be seen, this approach

---

\(^2\) Dr. Bokser followed a methodology noted in J.
Neusner's "The Modern Study of the Mishnah," but see other
approaches, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive,
in Joel H. Zaiman, "The Traditional Study of the Mishnah,"

\(^3\) The English text for the Mishnah is by Philip
Blackman, Mishnayoth, 7 vols. 2nd ed. (Gateshead: Judaica
will show that the data related to the ma'amadot in the Mishnah is highly organized and carefully crafted while being complex and variegated as it reflects, in our interpretation, a response to different and critical periods in Jewish history.

Other methodological approaches followed here, by Dr. Bokser’s direction, insist that each Mishnah be examined individually without citing later Mishnahs. Moreover, later sources, the Talmuds or Rishonim, are not to be included in the discourse of an individual Mishnah. Similarly, this study assumes, with Dr. Bokser’s approval, that there were ma'amadot assemblies after 70 and that in the pre-70 era there were priestly blessings at ma'amadot gatherings which consisted of Torah readings but not prayers.

The methodology of analyzing the Mishnah as an independent document with its own philosophical and theological agenda has been reaffirmed by certain recent scholarship, although strictly speaking rabbinic Judaism does not have an explicitly articulated philosophy or theology. Our methodology in approaching the evidence in the Mishnah is elucidated if we substitute the term ma'amadot for "intention" in the following observation although our study examines the Mishnah in addition to all other rabbinic sources relevant to our subject.
While it is true that the Mishnah speaks in legal idiom, the Mishnah is also a religious document, which makes certain theological claims about the divine will, and the nature of the divine-human relationship etc. Consequently, mishnaic law and theology must be treated as integrally related to one another. This study also departs from previous studies in one important respect. It accepts as its point of departure Neusner's insight, adopted from New Testament studies, that rabbinic documents can be studied as a system of thought independent of other rabbinic works (Neusner, "New Solution"). For this reason, this study focuses on the idea of intention in a single rabbinic document, the Mishnah. Other studies of intention, by contrast, tend to homogenize the rabbinic sources, ignoring the fact that they were written over a period of 500 years. While other rabbinic works are useful in helping to elucidate the meaning of particular passages in other works, it is important in my judgement to first treat each document in its own terms, and only then compare that work with another.4

Mishnah Bikkurim 3:2 projecting to a pre-70 era, describes the bringing of first fruit offerings (bikkurim) from all parts of the Land of Israel to the Jerusalem Temple. The term ma'amad here appears twice. In each instance it denotes an assembly of people. Individuals, bearing fruit offerings from smaller towns (ayarot shel ma'amad) gathered in the main square (reho'ah shel 'ir) of their city (ir shel ma'amad). On the following morning they traveled to Jerusalem in orderly procession.
How do they take up the first-fruits? -

All the smaller towns [=ha‘ayarot shebama‘amad] of the Maamad assembled in the town of the Maamad [=‘ir shel ma‘amad]6 and lodged for the night in the street of the town [=reovah shel ‘ir]7 and did not enter the houses;8

---


6 Some texts read ‘ayarot shebama‘amad, others read ‘ayarot shebama‘amad, each has been used to provide a different explanation for the Mishnah. See the detailed discussion in the remarks following this Mishnah.


8 Tosefta Bikkurim 2:8 explains why groups from surrounding towns of assembly stayed in the city square rather than go into houses. Pilgrims remained ritually pure on their journey to the Temple. Since a person may be defiled for seven days by merely entering a house with a corpse in it (even underneath it, Parah 3:2) they all stayed in the open (Hanokh Albeck, Mishnah, 6 vols., {Tel Aviv: Bialik, 1957, 5th printing 1978}, [Heb.], 1:318). In addition to being pure when entering the Temple there is an additional requirement for priests, Levites and Israelites to be clean during their period of service. (Distinction is made between impurity and uncleanness when entering the Temple, Saul Lieberman, "Palestine in 3rd and 4th Centuries," in Texts and Studies, [New York: KTAV, 1974], pp. 168-69 note 33).

Another possible reason for keeping the pilgrims together in the city square is to help create, maintain and reinforce a collective awareness associated with their journey to the Temple. Visiting various homes would emphasize inherent social distinctions of wealth apparent in the bikkurim groups as seen in the same tractate. "The wealthy bring their produce offerings in baskets of silver..."
and early in the morning the leader would say,
Arise, and let us go up unto Zion unto the House
of the Eternal our God."

Remarks on Bikkurim 3:2

The terms 'ir [shel ma'amad] and 'ayarot [shel ma'amad]
describe communities of relative size; 'ir is a city and
'ayarot is a town.\(^9\) The prevailing view is that 'ayarot
shebema'amad are towns within a larger geographical
district (=ma'amad) and 'ir shel ma'amad corresponds to the
capital city of that district. In both cases, the wider
geographical district is termed ma'amad.\(^11\)

and gold and the poor bring them in baskets of peeled
willow branches and the [latter] baskets with the bikkurim
are given to the priests (Bikkurim 3:8)."

\(^9\) Jeremiah 31:5.

\(^10\) There are intermediate size communities, large towns
= 'ayarot gedolot and villages = kefarim, whose size is
determined on the basis of whether they maintain persons
idle from labor = batlanim, who are available for rituals
requiring a quorum (Megillah 1:1-2; see also Sanhedrin
1:4). For changes in terms for geographical areas see
Abba Bendavid, Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew, 2
vols. (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1967), 1:180-82. (See also P.
Chertoff, "Hever Ir and Asarah Batlanim," JQR (1943)
34:87-98; S. B. Hoenig, "Historical Inquiries," JQR (1957)
48:123).

\(^11\) H. Albeck, Mishnah, 1:318; ma'amad as a specific
geographical district has two usages, secular and sacred
(Samuel Klein, Eretz Yehudah, [Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1939], pp.
People in the First Century, 2 vols. eds. S. Safrai and M.
Stern, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 2:873; idem,
"Relations between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel,"
ibid., 1:190; M. Avi-Yonah, "Historical Geography of
Some scholars go as far as to draw up a map dividing the Land of Israel into twenty-four regions with specific ma'amad cities to correspond to the twenty four Israelite ma'amadot which in turn corresponded to the twenty four priestly mishmarot. When a particular mishmar served at the Temple for a week, its corresponding Israelite ma'amad served at a ma'amad city performing their rites also for that one week.

This explanation relies especially on the interpretation of the phrase 'ayarot shebema'amad as towns within a specific geographical region. Although the phrase shebema'amad connotes a geographical district, this reading is not the only possible reading nor even the likeliest. Even if the term shebema'amad is part of the Mishnah's language as such, it still does not denote


regions. Shebema'amad appears nowhere else in rabbinic literature. Decisive for its interpretation is, therefore, the term’s narrow context. Clearly it means something other than a geographical district.\textsuperscript{13} Ma'amad denotes, rather, an assembly or gathering. Lower critical evidence together with linguistic study supports this conclusion.

The conclusion that ma'amad denotes a geographical region is based on a mistaken correlation of priestly mishmarot and Israelite ma'amadot with geographical regions. This comparison overlooks basic differences between these three categories. Priests are divided into twenty-four well documented and established clans - divisional groups determined by family, mishmarot. Israelite ma'amadot are also divided into twenty-four discrete groups, with some minor differences. The Land of Israel never had an established, ongoing division of twenty-four regions. Populations of cities and towns always changed with the land's many shifting political fortunes.

The Mishnah testifies that the lineage of each priest was closely monitored and guarded by courts; no priest

\textsuperscript{13}The term pelekh found in the parallel source in Tosefta Bikkurim 2:5 more appropriately denotes geographical regions as is corroborated by numerous such usages.
could serve at the Temple without clearing his personal status with the Temple court first (Midot 5:4). These twenty-four family units also followed a well established rotational service at the Temple (Sukkah 5:7).

Though there were twenty-four discrete Israelite ma'amadot corresponding to mishmarot (Taanit 4:2), their composition was different. Membership in mishmarot is strictly by lineage, membership in ma'amadot is open to all Israelites. Israelites do not document their lineage as extensively, nor examine their personal life as strictly as do the priests. Whereas priests served in a system of family rotation, Israelites served freely as individuals. There is no corresponding division of the land, otherwise documented, into twenty-four regions tied with either mishmarot or ma'amadot.\(^\text{14}\)

In the Oxford manuscript 366 the Mishnah and the Gemara read "ayarot shel ma'amad\(^\text{15}\). The Kaufmann manuscript reads Sh\(\text{HM}^{\text{MD}}\) with a small B superscribed above

\(^{14}\)The land was divided into three major areas and nine subdivisions (Shviit 9:2).

\(^{15}\)N. Sacks, The Mishnah, 2:428. The Oxford ms. contains Mishnah and Gemara for tractate Berakhot, Mishnah for order Zeraim with Mishnah and Gemara for order Moed. The ms. is written in square Sephardic script and remained for a long time in Egypt. It is dated to the mid 1200's (ibid. 1:68-69). The reading shel ma'amad in the Oxford ms. is probably unaltered. It is not likely that the Mishnah text was changed to fit the Gemara since shel ma'amad does not enter the Gemara’s discourse.
the ShM, indicating that the B, as a "copyist's correction," may not necessarily be original to the text. Thus the interpretation requiring shebe in our Mishnah, and describing towns within a geographical area, is hot supported by all texts. The usage shel ma'amad denotes towns of a ma'amad, i.e. towns sponsoring gatherings to bring bikkurim to Jerusalem.

Towns with small assemblies (=ayarot shel ma'amad) proceed to a city which itself has a bikkurim assembly (=ir shel ma'amad) wherein all gathered and continued to the Temple.\(^\text{16}\)

There is also a linguistic basis to show that the phrase in this Mishnah maybe shel ma'amad rather than shebema'amad. The L and B are interchanged in numerous Mishnah passages, causing many misunderstandings from the

\(^{16}\)This Mishnah alludes to an organized and regulated bikkurim procession as seen in the term (=memuneh) given the person appointed to lead the entire assembly. The Mishnah uses this term repeatedly for appointments to the most important official positions in Judea, as well as to lesser appointments by courts of law. Note also the reception given the towns' and cities' representatives upon their arrival in Jerusalem. Incoming groups would be greeted by officials from the capital closest to them in social standing. Such a pattern is also seen in the affected Biblical names given to officials greeting bikkurim processions (Bikkurim 3:3-4) even though such titles were not in use during this period (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 1:416). See the striking similarity in Menahot 10:3 where towns of the area gather for the excessively dramatic Omer reaping (vekol ha'ayarot hasmukhot lesam mitkansot lesham kde sheyehe niktzar be'esek gadol).
Talmudic period onwards.  Epstein isolates three general rules of interchange between ב and ל.

Rules two and three by analogy bear directly on the case at hand since_SB... and_SL... like_B... and_L... are inseperable prefixes, and function grammatically in similar fashion to them.

The use of ל... instead of ב... is typical of early rabbinic Hebrew of the Land of Israel in general, and of those Mishnah mss. identified as deriving from the Land of Israel in particular Lieberman explains that it is common to change the ל to ב in accordance with Babylonian

---

17 There is a long list of these interchanges in Jacob N. Epstein, Introduction to Tannaitic Literature, 2 vols. (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1957), [Heb.], 2:110-29, especially item 3 pp. 1115-19. Epstein records various interchanges between ל and ב but gives at first the impression that he considers only cases of ב replacing ל because he entitles this section "ל instead of ב."

18 The three rules are: ל replacing ב, mutual interchanges, and interchanges of ל and ב after active and passive verbs. In his discussion of the third rule Epstein cites our Mishnah (mitkansot le'ır {be'ır}; nikhnasim labatim {babatim}) but neither of these interchanges is significant for our discussion.

In another list of cases cited by Epstein (ibid. p. 1128) the preposition ב, ב (and bahen, bahem) is interchanged with the possessive ו or ה (and lahen, lahem). Most of these cases are associated with 'absence' or 'presence.' These instances further support the argument of this study showing the prepositions in question in instances where they indicate not only place but possession. The latter parallel the use of sel ma'amad in our Mishnah.

usage, and that mss. from the Land of Israel are likely to retain the original L. This fact makes Oxford 366 particularly significant.

Another argument in favor of shel rather than shebe... is the fact that the phrase 'ir shel ... is used similarly elsewhere. In Eruvin 5:6 the Mishnah speaks of a city belonging to one person which later becomes the public property ('ir shel yahid ven'asets shel rabim).  

'Ayarot shebema'amad is unique to this Mishnah. Thus it appears that we are without a linguistic context (i.e., parallels) to clarify its meaning. The phrase 'ir shel does, however, occur elsewhere in rabbinic texts. The antecedents used are similar enough to be helpful in establishing the correct interpretation of the phrase in question. Therefore these occurances of 'ir shel constitute legitimate parallels for the clarification of our Mishnah. Since these parallels are possessive in nature, our Mishnah should be taken in the possessive sense.

By extension 'ayarot shel ma'amad and 'ir shel ma'amad should also be interpreted possessively denoting only cities and towns that have bikkurim assemblies going to

---

20The baraita to Avot (6:9) relates a statement by a person saying that he comes from a city of scholars and scribes, me'ir gedolah shel hakhamim vesofarim ani. This usage also demonstrates that the phrase 'ir shel ... denotes a possible possessive trait for a city.
Jerusalem. Accordingly, the term ma'amad in this Mishnah denotes an assembly, not a geographical district.
As part of the procedure outlined in tractate Taanit for obligatory communal fasts, Mishnah (2:6) diminishes the degree of fasting for priests. Mishnah 2:7 continues to detail general rules observed by priestly courses during their week of service at the Temple. Priests are forbidden to drink wine either by day or night depending on their proximity to actual service. Those in service have the most restrictions.

The Mishnah concludes with general grooming regulations, forbidding the cutting of hair and the laundering of clothes during the week of service. These rules are applied to 'anshe mishmar who are priests and to 'anshe ma'amad who apparently are Israelites. Though Israelite ma'amad members are distinguished from priestly mishmarot personnel, they nonetheless fall under the same Temple restrictions as do priests.

Taanit 2:7 is the first Mishnah reference to an Israelite ma'amad, and also includes its members as a regular part of the Temple’s personnel. Our Mishnah also

---

According to the Mishnah priests observe lesser degrees of fasting either because cultic activity requires physical strength, or because the time of Temple service is a festive occasion for them (H. Albeck, *Mishnah*, 2:493).

The Bible states this prohibition in general terms (Leviticus 10:9).
states membership rules for the ma'amad, and makes the ma'amadot equivalent to the mishmarot. Whereas the priestly mishmar is well attested in the Bible, the Israelite ma'amad is totally extra Biblical. Their inclusion with priestly courses and in Temple settings is an entirely new development without parallel or antecedent.²³

²³Dr. Cohen noted that if Chronicles is read carefully then an antecedent may be found. After reviewing the evidence in Chronicles and closely reviewing BDB (p. 1038), I did note that the root 'MD is associated with establishing and fixing the priestly and Levitical courses at the Temple. Likewise, I found an instance of Israelites standing [=omdim] in presence of the Temple cult while the priests and Levites carried on with their respective duties (II Chron. 2:6). But this reference is a singular situation, not an antecedent to a daily institutional organization. Every other reference to priests and Levites functioning at the Temple pointedly excludes Israelites from cultic activities or a mandated presence at the service.
Members of the priests of the Guard (ʼanshe mishmar) were permitted to drink wine during the night, but not during the day, whereas members of the subsection neither during the day nor during the night.

The members of the priests of the Guard and men of the lay division (ʼanshe ma'amad) were forbidden to cut their hair or to wash their clothes; however, on a Thursday, they were permitted out of respect due to the Sabbath.

Tannaitic sources divide priests into twenty four fixed courses (mishmarot) officiating in the Temple based on family clans whose names are well known and attested. Its component units are individual family households (=bet-ʼav). There maybe six bate ʼavot per mishmar each serving a day and all on Sabbath or seven bate ʼavot per mishmar each performing one day (Jacob Licht, "mishmarot," EJ, 12:89-93; Daniel Sperber, "Mishmarot," EJ, 12:89-93; Jacob Liver, Chapters in the History of the Priests and the Levites, (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1968), (Heb.); S. Klein, Eretz HaGalil, pp. 62-68).

The mishmar's help is not required, since night offerings are forbidden.

They must always be available for service.

Such a ruling is designed to have participants groomed in advance of their service week. The preposition m is found in many sources corroborating the reading in our Mishnah and has been noted as an "unsual expression," (Henry Malter, The Treatise Taanit, [New York: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1930], <Heb.> p. 55). This particular form has been identified as an earlier grammatical form (J.N. Epstein, Mishnah, 2:1264).
Remarks on Taanit 2:7

Although Taanit 2:7 makes the ma'amadot equivalent to mishmarot, they are far from equal. Only priests and Levites are eligible for membership in the mishmarot. Membership in the ma'amad is open to all Israelites, they are required only to be well groomed and neatly dressed.²⁸

By these easy steps an ordinary Israelite could attain a status equivalent to the aristocratic priest. The ma'amadot would gain status by assigning their members the same restrictions that mishmarot members observed. According to the rhetorical-didactic design of the Mishnah we observe a unique social development. The Bible does not require Israelites to be involved in cultic practices. In fact, cultic activity is strictly delegated and guarded by priests. The restrictions cited in Taanit 2:7 apply to both those present at the Temple and those associated with mishmar and ma'amad courses throughout the land.²⁹

²⁸Joseph observed the same requirements when he was brought before Pharoah from the dungeon (Genesis 41:14; Genesis Rabbah 89:11). The Bible may be the antecedent reason for the Tannaitic requirements for members of the mishmar and ma'amad to cut their hair and wear fresh clothes. The requirements set for appearing before an earthly king should certainly apply when one appears before God at the Temple.

²⁹The rules cited in the above Mishnah apply to varying degrees after 70 C.E. (Tosefta Taaniyot 2:3; 3:6).
Mishnah Taanit chapter four treats the ma'amadot with most systematic detail, more than any other rabbinic source. As we shall see, chapter four provides all the necessary elements for operating the ma'amadot institution at the local level; even the Mishnah's close parallel, the Tosefta, lacks such functional detail.

Taanit chapter four is a carefully crafted literary unit, in addition to systematically detailed operational data, the Mishnah also suggests an etiological "reason" for establishing the ma'amadot institution. The text is framed so as to imply an association between the ma'amadot and the tamid offering, as if the ma'amadot institution came to be because of the Temple cult. A careful evaluation of the sources, especially the Mishnah, will show that the focus of the ma'amadot is, above all, the daily Torah reading; the connection with the daily cult as the reason for the institution is spurious and misleading.

Most commentators associate the ma'amadot with prayer despite the fact that the Mishnah does not once relate prayer to ma'amadot rites. Moreover, the Mishnah

---

30 Dr. Cohen questions how one can have priestly blessing during ma'amadot services if there is no tefilah. Although he agrees that, "in the strictest sense it [Mishnah] refers to the gri'ah," yet he insists that "when there was a ma'amad it was with the tefilah." In support, Dr. Cohen cites Taanit 4:4, "there was no ma'amad on shahrit." The citation from Taanit 4:4 is not sufficient
studiously avoids even the suggestion that prayer was part of the ma'amadot activities, its choice of verbs describing various rites insists on those which are related to public reading from Scripture only. This fact is especially striking because Taanit 2:2-5 explicitly associates public fasts with prayer yet avoids any such reference wherever ma'amadot are noted in the Mishnah.\(^{31}\)

The following table briefly outlines the topic of the ma'amadot and its organization in Taanit chapter four.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mishnah 1 - Introductory (formulaic) presentation of the subject of the ma'amadot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Evidence that the reference is to ma'amad prayer especially when there is other mention of prayer terminology evident elsewhere in Taanit. Similarly, the general associations made with ma'amadot meetings, as in Taanit 4:2, are with the Temple cult especially the tamid, in which the morning offering is identified as shahrit. Likewise, the detail in Taanit regarding the ma'amadot ritual centers on the Torah reading from Genesis, Taanit 4:3, no provisions are made for prayer. We find that there were priestly blessings at the Temple without prayer, its association with the cult was secondary (Heinemann, Prayer, p. 78). There is sufficient justification to assume that priestly blessings were bestowed in a setting where there was formal public Torah reading (with quorum, Megillah 4:3) without prayer. In sum, the evidence in the Mishnah, indeed of all Tannaitic literature, is that prayer was not mandated at the ma'amadot assemblies; Torah reading was the only vital prerequisite.

\(^{31}\)Taanit 2:2 records the following expressions: 'amdu batefilah, moridin lifne hatevah, and shemoneh 'esreh with public fasts whereas only the verb gore' is associated with activities of the ma'amadot.
Mishnah 2 - An "explanation" (rhetorical-didactic device) of the ma'amadot institution, its association with the tamid offering.

Mishnah 3 - Essential information for operating the ma'amadot assemblies at the local level. Details of the Torah reading from Genesis are enumerated.

Mishnah 4 - General listing of instances for exemptions of ma'amadot services.

Mishnah 5 - Additional exemptions (already noted in 4:4) of ma'amadot gathering, imbedded in a general list regarding Wood-offerings.

The above table of the ma'amadot in chapter four is in agreement with the view of most scholars that tractate Taanit treats the subject of the ma'amadot as an integral part of its overall topic of public fasts after which it is named.

A classic commentator describes, in his own fashion, the literary unity of tractate Taanit as follows. The editor of the Mishnah details in the first three chapters

---

rules concerning degrees of fasting and lists their prayers. In chapter four the Mishnah’s editor relates the priestly blessings associated with three fasts: public fasts, ma'amadot, and Yom Kippur. Chapter four, notes Meiri, has a tripartite division: times for priestly blessings, an explanation of the mishmarot and the ma'amadot and their prayers, concluding with a discussion of the Wood-offering. The end of chapter four according to Meiri, lists four minor fasts and describes their practices.

Contrary to scholarly consensus and without providing justification, Neusner holds that the subject of the ma'amadot is among several "rather curious appendices" in tractate Taanit. Similarly, and also without sufficient evidence, Neusner finds the subject of Wood-offering as appended to Taanit. In addition to the thematic unity noted above, we find Mishnah Taanit to be a validation of Jewish legal authority. Tractate Taanit empowers various local judicial authorities to determine the nature of communal ritual observation be they public fasts, ma'amadot assemblies or Wood-offering commemorations.

Elsewhere, however, Neusner provides a basis for a general understanding of the ma'amadot. When Neusner

---

assesses the literary structure of the Mishnah's order of Moed he proposes that "The underlying and generative theory of the system [of the Mishnaic Division of Appointed Times] is that the village is the mirror image of the Temple." According to Neusner, the goal of Judaism in the post-70 era was to provide a setting for the community with the efficacy and salvific power of the former Temple. Thus the "village," which is understood as any local Jewish community without the Temple, was made to be a "mirror image" of the Temple. The ma'amadot, likewise, are interpreted here as if their ritual duties at the local level were designed to be in the beholder's mind "the mirror image of the Temple" in their efficacy and salvific potential.

---

Taanit 4:1

Taanit 4:1 introduces a series of Mishnahs in chapter four which outline the nature of the ma'amadot institution. Mishnah 4:1 relates that priests bless the assembled at ma'amadot gatherings, among other occasions, four times daily.

Taanit 4:1

At three periods in the year the priests lift up their hands four times during the year—

- at the Morning Service,
- at the Additional Service,
- at the Afternoon Service,
- and at the Concluding Service—

on public fast days,
on days of the Lay Divisions [=ma'amadot],
and on the Day of Atonement.

---

35The word bashanah [=in the year] is missing from four mss. (H. Malter, Masekeht Ta'anit, p. 120 [Oxford 366; Munich 140, 141; Cambridge 1009; Finci Mishnah codex in JTS, see Malter’s introduction p. 19]). Malter determines, after various considerations, that the phrase is appropriate in the text. We shall find below additional internal evidence supporting Malter’s conclusion, the phrase is a common literary device in the Mishnah.

36According to the sources, priests bless only congregations which contain a minimum of ten persons (Megillah 4:3). Priests recite the same biblical passage (Numbers 6:22-26) in the Temple and elsewhere but with minor changes. At the Temple they raise their hands straight up above their heads, utter the blessings without breaks, and pronounce God’s name as it is written (tetragramaton). Outside the Temple, priests hold their hands straight out in front, recite the blessing in three parts and pronounce God’s name as a cipher (Tamid 5:1; 7:2; Sotah 7:6).
Remarks on Taanit 4:1

Mishnah Taanit 4:1 utilizes a variety of standard literary formulas to introduce chapter four which includes the most important information on the ma'amadot institution. The framers of the Mishnah cast their data in standard literary devices that are found in numerous other Mishnahs, even as they result in ambiguities which elicited a variety of emendations and explanations from the Babylonian Talmud through current research.\(^{37}\) We


In a former draft, I refuted Gartner's analysis point by point, showing that his interpretation and reconstruction of this Mishnah was a flawed and arbitrary conjecture. Dr. Bokser felt that such a detailed treatment in the body of the text was not warranted. Dr. Cohen, however, asked for a more extensive presentation of Gartner's thesis. The following is a summary of Gartner's treatment of Taanit 4:1, chapter four of six chapters in his dissertation, and a brief critique of his thesis.

Gartner notes that Taanit 4:1 is composed of various strata, its present form includes pre-70 elements but reflects post-70 developments. Throughout its history, Gartner associates, without justification, ma'amadot assemblies with prayer. Gartner assumes, without offering sufficient evidence, that there was a pre-70 "original Mishnah," and he proceeds to reconstruct it into the current post-70 Mishnah. According to Gartner, the "original Mishnah" read, "Priests lift their hands during shahr, hatzot, minnah, and ne'ilah." After 70, presumably Rabbi, added the following: "During three periods in the year," at the opening of Taanit 4:1, and, "during public fasts, and ma'amadot, and Yom Kippur" at the end of the Mishnah.

A convincing argument for this literary reconstruction, according to Gartner, is the observation
shall see, however, that in context of the tractate, Mishnah 4:1 is a fitting introduction to Taanit chapter four.

The overall formula defining our Mishnah is: On [x] times a year [x] happens [x] times a day. The Mishnah regularly uses various elements of this general formula in other passages. The phrase bepraqim [=periods of time] is found most frequently, eight times, to introduce a

that the Mishnah could otherwise simply state its data in a much more direct way. "On public fasts, ma'amadot, and Yom Kippur, the priests lift their hands four times a day, on shahrit, musaf, minnah, and ne'ilat she'arim." However, as we noted above, with ample evidence, the structure of Taanit 4:1 follows a well established literary pattern utilized time and again in the Mishnah. Moreover, Gartner makes a sweeping, and unwarranted, generalization between the ma'amadot to public fasts and Yom Kippur, focusing on their common elements to the exclusion of their critical differences. In his attention to the priestly blessings, Gartner does not once mention the nature of the ma'amadot Torah reading.

The following summary maps Gartner’s conclusions of Taanit 4:1.
Pre-70:  
a. Priestly blessings took place only in the morning with the tamid offering.  
b. The ma'amadot met four times a day, though priestly blessings were given only in the morning.  
c. Public fasts and Yom Kippur met for three daily services without priestly blessings.  

Post-70  
a. All ma'amadot assemblies received four priestly blessings a day.  
b. On public fasts and Yom Kippur there were also four services daily with priestly blessings at each gathering.

Besides Gartner’s division of ma'amadot practices to pre- and post-70 eras, his study of the ma'amadot institution suffers from sweeping generalizations and a lack of a systematic examination of this particular subject.
Mishnah. The Mishnah often combines the formula "on [x] beprakim," to introduce a topic. Thus the phrase "On [x] times (three or four)" is found six times throughout the Mishnah, and the phrase, "On [x] times a year" is used four times out of the eight in the Mishnah. Taanit 4:1 hence follows a well established redactional practice to introduce its upcoming subject on the ma'amadot institution. The introductory character of this Mishnah helps explain its place as the first set of data in the chapter.

Our Mishnah relates that priests blessed the assembled at ma'amadot meetings, as well as public fasts and Yom Kippur, four times a day without attributing the authority of this tradition. As a result of the formulaic casting of its data, the Mishnah is ambiguous and raises several questions as to its message. There is a problem as to how many times a day ma'amadot assemblies were to gather for their services. At first it would seem that the ma'amadot met four times a day, but Taanit 4:2, containing the most vital data on the institution, notes that the ma'amadot gathered in correspondence to the tamid offering which took place only twice a day.

---

38 Terumot 4:6; Shekalim 3:1; Sukah 5:7; Rosh Hashanah 1:2; Gittin 3:8; Avot 5:9; Hulin 5:3-4.
What was the nature of the priestly blessings in the context of the ma'amadot services? Did the priestly blessings play an essential or optional role at ma'amadot services? Taanit 4:1 would seem to indicate that that is the case but Taanit 4:2 asserts that Torah reading only is the essential activity at ma'amadot services. The first question must wait but the second and third can be answered here.

There are several issues concerning the priestly blessings in context of the ma'amadot services: at the Temple, within the local communities, pre- and post-70. At the Temple the priestly blessing was given within the setting of a pre-existing custom of Temple practice.  

39This issue will be dealt with in Taanit 4:2, see also the table at the end of Taanit 4:4 and the discussion of Tosefta Taaniyot 3:1 below. Different totals for daily ma'amadot gatherings are tallied on the basis of Taanit 4:1. Most maintain that there were four daily meetings (Gartner, "Ta'anit," p. 100). Epstein and Albeck offer two opposing interpretations (J.N. Epstein, Mishnah, 2:631-32; H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:495; see also H. Malter, The Treatise Ta'anit, [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1928; reprint 1967] p.407 note 391, p. 399 note 377). There is also an ambiguity as to the nature of rituals practiced at ma'amadot gatherings, "during the ma'amadot there is no actual musaf but an additional prayer" (S. Lieberman, TK, 5:1101; David Halivni, Sources and Traditions, [Jerusalem: JTS, 1975], [Heb.] pp. 458-59, note 5). "Regarding the forms of the prayers of the ma'amad members we know nothing," (J. Heinemann, Prayer, p.80).

40Priestly blessings at the Temple were bestowed after the burning of incense, they were not part of the tamid offering nor were they ever considered to be of the same value or level; the cult, strictly speaking, was
The addition that the ma'amadot wrought upon the Temple cult was the passive attendance of Israelites to the ongoing tamid offerings. Israelites did not actively participate in the Temple cult, neither was there recital of the creation narrative from Genesis; the only official Torah reading at the Temple was on Yom Kippur by the high priest.41

There is no clear picture as to the nature and times of priestly blessings at ma'amadot services. Albeck examines the issues carefully and investigates the various possibilities but reaches no definite conclusions.42 The plain reading of the Mishnah, according to Albeck, indicates that the assembled "prayed" four times a day and received priestly blessings at each service. Other sources indicate, however, that there were no priestly blessings on Friday, [Saturday], and Sunday, depending on whether fasting is to be factored into the discourse.

Although priestly blessings at the ma'amadot gatherings derive from priestly blessings at the Temple, exclusively centered on the animal offerings (J. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 79).

41 J. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 83.

42 H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:495-96. Albeck routinely writes of prayer at ma'amadot services, yet there is not one such reference to prayer in Tannaitic sources; only Amoraic traditions associate prayer with ma'amadot assemblies.
they are different from each other. Mishmar priests performing the cult blessed the assembled during the cult service whereas mishmar priests not involved with the daily offering blessed the assembled at the ma'amadot gatherings.

Taanit 4:1 provides priests with a prominent role at the ma'amadot gatherings as well as at public fasts and Yom Kippur. Still, we conclude that priestly blessings at ma'amadot assemblies were a desirable addition but not an essential element of its service; if priests were absent at any of the three occasions listed in Taanit 4:1 then the respective rituals proceeded without them.

Although the Mishnah associates ma'amadot with public fasts and Yom Kippur, as it does elsewhere (Megillah 3:4), the ma'amadot is the most distinctive of the three. In the pre-70 era, assuming ma'amadot assemblies were held, priests would be featured at daily gatherings in local communities while the tamid was offered at the Temple. In

43 For more on priestly blessings during the tamid offerings see H. Albeck, Mishnah, 3:388; S. B. Hoenig, "Tefilot haKohanim belishkat hagazit," in Haqut 'Ivrit beAmerica, 3 vols. ed. M. Zohori, (Tel Aviv: Yavneh, 1972-74), 3:42. Some maintain that blessings took place during the 'amidah repetitions (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:341). Different priestly blessings are noted in I. Elbogen, Hatefilah beIsrael, pp. 54-57; J. Heinemann, Prayer, pp. 72, 78.

the post-70 era, and this study maintains that ma'amadot meetings continued for some time after the fall of the 2nd Temple, the Mishnah, through the ma'amadot, would restore priests to daily ritual activities in a public setting after the traumatic rupture of their daily cultic practice after 70. Moreover, in addition to continuing public, daily ritual activities for priests in every community, Taanit 4:1 would also keep the elaborate courses of the priestly mishmarot operational after 70.

Whereas scholars note most often that fasting is the common element among public fasts, ma'amadot and Yom Kippur, the outstanding feature, as far as public ritual is concerned, is the Torah reading associated with each. The Torah scroll is accorded special treatment in each instance. The Torah recital, the selected passages to be read, and the details for its setting were instituted by the Sages, they are not prescribed in Scriptures. Moreover, Yom Kippur and the ma'amadot have in common another unusual feature, the oral recitation of Torah portions.

45Megillah 3:6; Yoma 7:1.

46On public fasts the Torah scroll was taken into the city square, and ashes were placed on its ark (Taanit 2:1). On Yom Kippur the Torah recital was distinguished by being set in a Temple court different than where the offerings took place, and the most illustrious members of the community were handed the Torah scroll as it was passed on to the high priest for reading (Yoma 7:1).
In sum, Taanit 4:1 introduces chapter four, whose main topic is the ma'amadot institution, utilizing a variety of standard literary formulas. The Mishnah presents its data as an anonymous tradition that is not disputed (whereas its parallel, Tosefta Taaniyot 3:1, will show this Mishnah to be an attributed tradition which is disputed). The Mishnah thus presents an image of the ma'amadot as a long-standing institution with uniform practices. It would seem at first that the focus of the Mishnah is on the priests who are prominently featured, enhancing their status both in pre- and post-70, by incorporating their blessings at the ma'amadot gatherings. Ultimately, however, the true subject is the ma'amadot assemblies themselves since it is they who serve the context and setting for the priestly blessings; it is the ma'amadot which are the first ever mandated daily meetings in every local community which is the extraordinary development in Judaism.
Taanit 4:2

Taanit 4:2 is the first Mishnah to address explicitly the nature and rationale of the ma'amadot institution. From the opening phrase, a rhetorical question on the nature of the ma'amadot, to its concluding comment, relating that Jews gathered daily for Torah reading, the Mishnah focuses exclusively on the ma'amadot institution.

The editors of Taanit 4:2 carefully crafted its literary usage and structural organization to present data relating directly to the ma'amadot institution. The Mishnah sets out to inform on two subjects; it "explains" the origins of the ma'amadot and to defines its two areas of operation. Whereas the "explanation" of the ma'amadot incorporates intricate literary and rhetorical didactic devices, the Mishnah sets forth the function of the institution in simple, direct statements. Taanit 4:2 informs us, most importantly, that there were two separate areas of ma'amadot practices at two different locations, one at the Temple, the other at local communities. While the ma'amad at the Temple is quite well "explained," there is not even an attempt to provide a rationale for the local ma'amadot practices.

Taanit 4:2 also "explains" the ma'amadot by linking it to the tamid offering. Since the daily offering was determined to be a collective offering, and a donor must
oversee his offering, Israelites were thus required to attend each *tamid* presentation. At the Temple, while priests and Levites were actively involved in the cult, select Israelites, representing all Israel, were required to attend passively the daily offering. Without explaining the next crucial element, the Mishnah notes that at the time each *tamid* was presented at the Temple, Israelites were to gather in their local communities and recite the creation narrative.

The Mishnah alerts the reader that a momentous subject is to be introduced; its opening phrase, *'elu hen hama'amadot*, heralds this presentation. Taanit 4:2 distinctly portrays the first mandated public worship in Judaism through its depiction of the *ma'amadot* institution. This Mishnah’s portrayal of the *ma'amadot* presents an institution with traits which run contrary to certain commonly held perceptions.

1. This is the first mandated instance in Judaism for daily public ritual meeting at each local community.

2. Herein is the first and only requirement for a daily Torah reading.

3. Although Taanit 4:1 notes four daily *ma'amadot* meetings per day, Taanit 4:2, however, maintains that there were only two *ma'amadot* gatherings per day. Mishnah 4:2 establishes a correspondence between the daily
offerings and the local Torah readings, and since there were only two ma'amarot at the Temple, there were thus only two Torah readings per day at the local ma'amad.

4. Only the creation narrative from Genesis was recited at the local ma'amadot gatherings. There are no provisions to readings related to the tamid offering, although the ma'amadot are "explained" as being predicated on the daily offering. Neither are there any provisions for additional readings related to the Temple cult, which is also seemingly set as the focus for ma'amadot activities.

5. In the Temple the focus is on the cult, and on the ritual activity of the priests and Levites as per biblical prescription. Israelites at the Temple ma'amad were only to passively attend the tamid offering. There were no mandated Torah readings from Genesis at the Temple.47

6. Outside the Temple, where the most widespread effect and activity of the ma'amadot took place, the vital practice of the institution consisted of the twice daily Torah reading. The creation narrative from Genesis is the essential and exclusive text of local ma'amadot assemblies.

47"We thus find in the Temple reading from the Torah - with the blessings-prayers following it - on one day in the year alone [=Yom Kippur; emphasis by Heinemann]" (J. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 83).
7. There is no mention of prayer whatsoever. Even priestly blessings, which are expressly mandated in Taanit 4:1 are optional. If no priests were present at ma'amadot gatherings then the ma'amad ritual continued without priestly blessings. Under no circumstances, however, can there be ma'amadot assemblies without Torah reading.

In addition, we have deduced the following from Taanit 4:2, some of these will be presented more fully in the remarks to this Mishnah.

1. Israelite ma'amadot courses corresponded to the priestly mishmarot, and their names matched those of their priestly counterparts.

2. Every city had its own complement of twenty-four Israelite ma'amadot even if they did not send representatives to Jerusalem.

3. The ma'amadot were established to have Jews gather every week, all year round, for daily Torah reading, unlike the priestly mishmar which met, at the Temple or the local ma'amad, only for one week every six months.

4. The ultimate purpose of the ma'amadot is to be found in the new daily local worship patterns which sought to include every Jew and incorporated Torah reading of creation.
Taanit 4:2

These are the Lay Divisions (=ma'amadot):48

in that it said,49

Command the children of Israel and say unto
them, My offering my food......50

- how can one’s offering be presented while he
does not stand by it?51

48 The opening statement is read as interrogative (J.
N. Epstein, Mishnah, 1:430 note 1; 2:1131-32; 2:631-32; H.
Albeck, Mishnah, 2:341). In any case, the literary device
is clearly a rhetorical question.

49 J. N. Epstein notes that the phrase lefi shne'emar
is missing from several mss. (Mishnah in Yerushalmi,
Parma, Kaufmann, Loewe) yet does include a biblical proof-
text. He concludes that the earlier a Mishnah, the more
its language is influenced by biblical usage, some usage
may take on the form of a Halakhic-midrash (Mishnah
2:1129-32). In addition to the use of a midrashic element
a quote from Scripture, and a vital linkage to the tamid
cult in the Temple, we also find the Mishnah calling upon
the "Former Prophets" as an earlier and established
authority related in some way to the foundation of the
ma'amadot institution. All these elements add up to
project an image for the ma'amadot as a long-standing,
well authenticated, and authoritative institution.

50 Numbers 28:2.

51 The rule, presented as rhetorical question, is
problematic; it seems to have no bearing on our issue. If
we assume that the requirement is to provide the laying of
the hands on the animal (Leviticus 1:4), then this rule is
not applicable to the tamid offering which is a collective
offering. The laying of the hands [=semikhah], applies to
individual offerings only (Menahot 5:7; 9:7). Moreover,
the issue at hand can not be the "laying of hands" because
the Tosefta explains that ma'amadot representatives prove
that a man’s agent is like himself. Menahot 9:8, however,
explicitly forbids agents from performing semikhah for
their masters, and Menahot 9:9 forbids one to perform
semikhah for his partners, they each have to do the ritual
individually. Albeck thus notes that this rule follows
from the Scriptural reference "be punctilious [=tishmeru]
in presenting to Me [the tamid]" (Num. 28:2). How can all
Israel "guard" the tamid if they are not overseeing it?
and for every Division (=mishmar) there was a Section (=ma'amad) in Jerusalem of priests, Levites, and of Israelites.

(Mishnah 2:341). In any case, this rule is unusual and appears to have been constructed for the purpose of developing the argument in this Mishnah to justify Israelite presence at the Temple ma'amad.

52David and Samuel cited in I Chron. 9:22-24 (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:341). In this Mishnah only founders of the mishmarot are identified, the ma'amadot founders are anonymous (L. Landman, "The Origin of the Synagogue," p. 319). The Tosefta identifies the ma'amadot founders as "Prophets of Jerusalem" (Lieberman, TK, 5:1102, 11. 8-9). Finkelstein, on the other hand, goes to some length to emend our Mishnah accordingly, claiming that the ma'amadot were established during the First Temple (L. Finkelstein, New Light from the Prophets, pp.14-18; 59; 128 note 2. For an evaluation of his position see Chapter 1 above).

53The Mishnah uses the term tignu for the establishment of the ma'amadot, a term which S. Zeitlin found to be of significance when utilized in Tannaitic sources. Writing on the legal term takkana on two different occasions ("The Halaka: Introduction to Tannaitic Jurisprudence," JQR, 39 [1948], 25-26; Studies in the Early History of Judaism, 4 vols. [New York: Ktav, 1978], 4:xxii-xxiii), Zeitlin notes in his later writing, A takkana is a kind of amendment of an earlier law, either Pentateuchal or early halaka, introduced by the sages or by the head of the Bet Din for the purpose of harmonizing law and life. It was invoked for the benefit of the people, and was always lenient in tendency. A takkana cannot be reversed, and it is universal. The takkanot recorded in Tannaitic literature either appeared under the name of the head of the Bet Din or attributed to a greater authority of former days and must have support from either a Pentateuchal verse or a halaka. Other verbs associated with establishing the ma'amadot in Tannaitic sources are, yasad, ʿasah, ʿamdu, and gavʿu, all except the first have the denotation of establishing new legislation.
When the time came for a Division [=mishmar] to go up, the priests and Levites thereof went up to Jerusalem, while the Israelites of the same Division [=mishmar] assembled in their own towns and read the Chapter on the Creation.\(^\text{54}\)

---

\(^{54}\) Genesis 1:1-2:3.
Remarks on Taanit 4:2

We shall examine three aspects of Taanit 4:2, its language and structure, its "explanation" of the ma'amadot, and the operational nature of the institution both at the Temple and in local communities.

We will see that the Mishnah utilizes standard formulas and forms to set forth its data, especially its "explanation" of the ma'amadot. Although this explanation is neither historical nor complete, it does serve the purpose of the Mishnah - to confer authority, efficacy and acceptability upon the ma'amadot institution. The Mishnah explains only the ma'amadot at the Temple, why Israelite representatives needed to attend each tamid offering. There is no attempt at all to explain the ma'amadot’s vital element, the daily Torah reading in each community. While its rationale remains completely obscure, the practical rules for daily Torah reading are most explicit. Likewise, we will see that contrary to the Mishnah's delineation and the common perception among scholars, the vital and most impactful element of the ma'amadot institution is the daily Torah reading from Genesis, not the passive attendance of Israelites at the tamid offering.

As we saw in Taanit 4:1, Mishnah 4:2 continues to use well established forms and formulas to cast its data. The
following key introductory phrases are found in several hundred Mishnahs: 'elu hen, lefi shene'emar, and vekhi he'akh. The use of literary conventions suggests that the framers of the Mishnah sought to project the ma'amadot as being well established, based upon Scriptural basis grounded in midrashic logic, and associated with authority figures from the Bible.

Taanit 4:2 informs us that there were two kinds of ma'amad: at the Temple and at local communities. At the Temple Israelites were required to attend passively the tamid offering, only priests and Levites had active cultic roles, there was no requirement to read the Torah at the Temple. In local communities Jews, primarily Israelites, gathered twice daily, in correspondence to the tamid offering, to read from Genesis.

The structure of the Mishnah and its internal logic establish a double equivalency, between the Israelite ma'amad and the priestly mishmar, and between the Torah reading and the tamid offering. The Mishnah compares several diverse elements despite their fundamental differences. The ma'amad at the Temple represents the first time that Israelites are an essential element of the daily cult contrasting with the well established priestly

---

and Levitical mishmarot. This is a radical departure from the Temple cult as depicted in the Bible which forbids Israelites from setting foot in the priestly precinct. Yet the Mishnah requires the presence of Israelites just as the Bible demands priests and Levites to perform the cult.\footnote{Although the Bible notes in numerous places (e.g. Leviticus 9:5, 23) that Israelites attended cultic practices at the Tabernacle/Temple, these instances are individual cases. The ma'amadot, on the other hand, are an institutional change requiring daily attendance by Israelites at the Temple.}

The correspondence between the ma'amad assembly at the tamid and ma'amad gatherings at local communities, although unexplained, associates Torah reading with Temple offerings. Such an equivalence is similarly defined on Yom Kippur when the high priest recited from the Torah in the Temple.\footnote{Yoma 7:1-3. The whole of Mishnah Yoma 7:2 sets a striking equivalency between the Torah reading to the Yom Kippur cult [umle'ekht shnehen shavah ke'ekhat]. Although Albeck notes that part of the equivalency recorded in the Mishnah regards the time of the activity, the Talmud notes that seeing the high priest read the Torah was a comparable commandment to seeing cultic activities (Yoma 70a). The Talmud also notes the public's active and demonstrative involvement with their individual Torah scrolls at that setting.} The above two Torah recitals were instituted by the Sages, they were not biblically mandated, yet both Torah readings were linked in rabbinic texts to offerings prescribed in the Bible. In both cases the Torah was recited while animal offerings were
presented, and in both there was a reading from the scroll itself and a recitation from memory.58

The primacy of the ma'amad at the local level over the ma'amad at the tamid both pre- and post-70 is demonstrated in several ways, assuming as we do that ma'amadot assemblies spanned that time period. In the pre-70 era, the local ma'amad would have by far the greater impact over individuals and communities. At the local ma'amad, many more persons could actively participate in the ritual activities, learn to read, and get to know the biblical creation story. The very pattern of daily public worship would be transformed, indeed, it thus came into being. After 70, the only form of the ma'amadot that existed was the Torah reading in local towns.

Although Taanit 4:2 posits the ma'amad at the Temple as a counterpoint to the ma'amad in the local town, the two are rather dissimilar and have but a tenuous link between them. Following the Mishnah's own logic, the local Torah readings of Genesis were quite unnecessary and are certainly unexplained. Why is there a need for any corresponding rituals in local communities, the ma'amad at

58 Although the Talmud provides different rationales explaining why a certain passage from the Torah (Numbers 29:7-11) was recited from memory, the fact remains that there was an oral reading at the Temple on Yom Kippur (Yoma 69b-70a).
the Temple is perfectly explained and sufficient? Why is Torah reading the prescribed ritual for the local ma'amadot rather than burning incense, reciting psalmody or prayer which is closer in character to Temple activities? And why read the creation story in Genesis; it would be far more fitting to read Numbers 28 or portions relating to the cult?!

Why then is the local Torah reading instituted for the ma'amadot? Simply stated, the Mishnah does not tell us and we do not know. On the basis of the evidence in the Mishnah, however, we conclude that, by explaining only the ma'amad at the Temple, the editors succeeded in having the newly established Torah reading be perceived as associated, equivalent and efficacious as the tamid.

Although we can state categorically that the Mishnah holds the Torah readings to be the vital element of the ma'amadot, we can only infer an explanation why this is so. We deduce the reason for establishing the ma'amadot in the issues important to the Mishnah. The rationale is to be found in the very elements that the ma'amadot set in place at the local community, and by the "explanation" of the institution that the Mishnah presents in its discourse.

The Mishnah sought to establish daily ritual observances in every community. These observances,
centered on Torah reading of the creation story, would establish the Torah scroll in local communities, promote literacy, and disseminate the biblical creation story from text and memory.9

Moreover, the Mishnah's linkage of the Torah reading to the tamid offering establishes strong associations between the two. To "explain" the ma'amadot as a product of the biblical imperative for daily offering, and requiring that the Torah reading be at the same time that the tamid is presented, suggests that the local Torah reading is to be perceived as "equivalent" to cultic practice and that every person is obligated to participate in these rituals. The end result is that the ma'amadot is actively promoted so that most every Jew would want to participate in its ritual, and such assemblies should occur at every community.

The ma'amadot institution focuses on the Israelite, the ordinary Jew in his local community, rather than on

9We can see in Tannaitic literature, in a variety of settings, a resolute determination that Jews should know how to read and commit to memory certain biblical passages (Bikkurim 3:7; Sukkah 3:10). In Sukkah, the Mishnah goes so far as to castigate those who lack such skills (utehi lo me'erah). In Bikkurim, the Mishnah notes that the Temple ritual of reciting the farmers' confession (Deut. 26:3) was changed from individual recital to collective reading. At first, those who could not read were prompted, but this was changed because the illiterate farmers were embarrassed and they simply stopped coming with their offerings.
the priest, Levite or the Temple cult. Although the term ma'amad and mishmar are not explicitly and conclusively defined, they are effectively interchangeable, the vital role of the Israelite in indisputable.

Taanit 4:2 also provides us with the basis for determining the system of ma'amadot gatherings in different local communities. According to our interpretation, ma'amadot assemblies gathered each week of the year in each local community rather than just one week every six months, as most scholars maintain. The current consensus establishes a strict, but unnecessary and unproven, correspondence between the priestly mishmar and the Israelite ma'amad; just as priests were to serve only one week every six months at the Temple so would

---

60 H. Malter, for instance, argues that the local gathering of ma'amadot assemblies should be termed mishmar (The Treatise Ta'anit, pp. 210, note 230; 330, note 318; 442, note 397). This term would apply, apparently, even if the assembly consisted only of Israelites. For a more detailed discussion of these terms see "Mishmar and ma'amad, mishmarot and ma'amadot," in chapter three above.

61 When I first explained this interpretation of ma'amadot assemblies to Dr. Bokser, he felt it to be sufficiently significant to merit an appendix, hence Appendix A below, in addition to its presentation within the text itself.
Israelites meet in various, but unspecified towns, one week every six months.

In fact, the thrust of the Mishnah is to open the local ma'amadot assemblies as much as possible. Taanit 4:2 appears to encourage every town to have a full complement of twenty-four ma'amadot courses to meet throughout the year. As each priestly mishmar would ascend to Jerusalem, the corresponding ma'amad in each town would gather for Torah reading; thus, there was daily Torah reading each day in every local community all year long.

The strict linkage between the priestly mishmar and the Israelite ma'amad is not warranted, their differences cast these courses in different roles. The Mishnah "explains" that the Bible obligates all Israel to provide for the tamid, thus all Israel is to attend its very offering. Practically, however, only representatives of the Israelites could accompany the daily cult. In contrast, the corresponding reading of the Torah could be done on a much greater scale, many more Israelites can be actively involved in this practice.

---

Some scholars maintain, without evidence, that each ma'amad had a corresponding geographical district and city. For a detailed examination of the issue see the analysis of Bikkurim 3:2 above.
At the Temple, the number of priests who could actively join in the cult was limited for practical and physical reasons. There were not enough jobs to go around for every priest to partake in the cult. Individual functions had to be dispensed by lottery each day for the select fortunate few. No such functional limitations applied to the daily Torah reading ritual. On the contrary, the Mishnah shows every indication that it would like to have as many Israelites as possible involved in the ma'amadot Torah reading which were designed to be attainable, practical and desirable.

Membership in the mishmar and ma'amad also supports our thesis. Whereas Israelites were quite free to join any ma'amad, the status of priests was strictly a function of biology and their membership to a specific mishmar was likewise predetermined. Moreover, a priest could belong only to one specific mishmar, but an Israelite, if he wished to shoulder the responsibility, could volunteer to all twenty-four ma'amadot. We thus deduce, contrary to current consensus, that the local ma'amadot met every week throughout the year for daily Torah reading, not just one week every six months.

We shall now examine the nature of the Mishnah's "explanation" of the ma'amadot institution. Taanit 4:2

---

63 Tamid 1:2; 3:1; 5:2.
seems at first to "explain" the whole of the ma'amadot institution, at the Temple and at the local level. This first impression is reinforced by the Mishnah's opening phrase, "What is the nature of the ma'amadot?" It is assumed that the Mishnah will deal the entire institution. Yet, when the Mishnah is carefully reviewed, we discover that only the ma'amad at the Temple is satisfactorily "explained," the rationale for the local Torah reading is not considered at all. The Mishnah is in effect saying that "explaining" the ma'amadot at the Temple is sufficient to provide the basis for daily Torah readings of Genesis.

The "explanation" of the ma'amad at the Temple includes several uncommon elements: a Scriptural verse, a midrashic deduction, an unusual cultic rule, and a ruling by the "Early Prophets." Simply stated, the Sages insisted that there be a ma'amad based on their "simple" logical deduction of Numbers 28:2. If it is premised that a person must oversee his own offering, and that the community qua person must provide all tamid offerings, then representatives of the community must be personally present at these offerings.

The Mishnah explains the lesser part of the ma'amadot, the attendance of Israelites at the Temple, and even that explanation is not complete. Taanit 4:2 uses a
midrashic device combined with an enigmatic rule to bestow antiquity, credibility and legitimacy to the whole of the ma'amadot.

The outline below shows the logical progression in Mishnah 4:2 for explaining the ma'amadot institution.

I. The ma'amad at the Temple. ("explanation")
   A. Scriptural prooftexts (Num. 28:2). All Israel is to provide for the tamid.
   B. A rarely cited cultic rule. Every person must accompany his offering.
   C. Ma'amad established in Jerusalem. Israelites or their representatives must attend tamid offerings.

II. The ma'amad in the local community. (function)
   A. Mishmarot go to Jerusalem. Priests and Levites go to the Temple for a week of service.
   B. The ma'amadot gather in local communities. Israelites in their local communities gather daily to recite the creation narrative.

---

64 And some Israelites (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:495).

65 This group included priests and Levites who did not go up to Jerusalem (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:341). In short, all Jews were welcome to participate.
The Taanit 4:2 deftly presents its "explanation" for the ma'amadot, its various elements are creatively fused giving the impression that an adequate and convincing accounting for the whole of the institution has indeed been provided. But upon examination we find that the Mishnah subtle artifice to create its portrait of the ma'amadot.

The Mishnah fully succeeded in drawing attention to the minor aspect of the ma'amadot, the tamid offering, and away from its central issue, the Torah reading. Every commentator reviewing the ma'amadot follows the Mishnah's association with the Temple cult. Only two scholars, J. N. Epstein and J. Heinemann, noted that the Torah reading is at the heart of the ma'amadot institution, and no one remarked that the Mishnah explains only the tamid without its silence regarding the daily reading of the creation story.

The framers of the Mishnah felt compelled to construct an elaborate justification for the ma'amadot. The lynchpin of the argument is based on a unique application of a cultic law, transferring it from one context to another. The law requires that an individual donor presenting an offering must accompany it, however, this rule does not apply to public offerings such as the
The Mishnah's editor implicates the didactic rhetorical nature of the rule by introducing it as a tentative interrogation rather than a declarative assertion.

In sum, Taanit 4:2 establishes a distinct portrayal of the nature of the ma'amadot institution. The primary element is the local Torah reading and the individual Israelite [=Jew]. Although the Mishnah "explains" only the ma'amad at the Temple, it confers legitimacy and efficacy for the daily Torah readings. Most importantly, Taanit 4:2 sets forth new patterns of public worship at the local community. For the first time daily public rituals are mandated which are to incorporate Torah readings from Genesis.

---

66A baraita states, "A person offering is not presented except if he oversees it" (b. Sota 8a). This passage explains only the presence of those clearly required to personally attend their offering for ritual purposes (errant wife, leprous woman). This ruling is not meant to be a general decision. We find further support that the above rule does not apply to the tamid offering from the midrash. Sifre Numbers Pinhas 142, draws the same conclusion as our Mishnah but bases its conclusion on a simple grammatical understanding of Numbers 28:2 (tishmeru is plural, thus priests, Levites and Israelites are oversee the tamid). Sifre knows nothing of a general principle requiring a donor to personally attend his offering (1. Finkelstein, Light from the Prophets, pp. 55, 128-29, note 1).
Taanit 4:3

Taanit 4:3 contains the operational engine for the ma'amadot institution. The Mishnah lists in detail the exact Torah portions that are to be recited each day and how they should be read. With regards to the ma'amadot, Mishnah 4:3 is truly unique; not even the Tosefta, which closely parallels the Mishnah, contains this vital information.

Mishnah 4:3 alludes to three aspects of ma'amadot practices: fasting, public Torah recital, and exemptions of ma'amadot assemblies. Most scholars maintain that the reference to fasting is not found in Mishnah mss. or in the Yerushalmi Talmud, it is attested only in printed editions of the Mishnah and is therefore treated as a later gloss.  

Three areas of Torah recital are detailed: the specific portions recited daily; the numbers of persons assigned to each passage, and when relevant passages were recited from a Torah scroll and when from memory. The Mishnah assigns two paragraphs to be recited at each ma'amadot gathering from Sunday through Friday but none for Saturday. Daily recital begins with the last paragraph of the previous day.

---

Three persons were to recite the Torah at each ma'amad meeting. The number of readers per paragraph depended on its length. Identical passages were recited at morning and afternoon assemblies, morning assemblies were recited from a Torah scroll and afternoon recitation was oral.

The Mishnah organizes the daily Torah readings into small units, from eight to twelve verses a day, making them pragmatic on two counts. The practical nature of these readings is deduced from their careful organization in the Mishnah. The modest Torah reading units allows for a fairly quick reading which is consonant with a concern for the public's time and reaction. Similarly, the small segments of text are ideal for educational purposes

---

68See the ma'amadot Torah recital tables below.

69The Mishnah requires public ritual reading from Scripture, be it from the Pentatech, Prophets or Writings, to be from a scroll. Ritual reading from memory was not allowed (Megillah 4:4; 2:1). The Mishnah concedes exceptions to this practice only at the ma'amadot and Yom Kippur Torah readings (the High Priest recited from memory Numbers 29:7-11 at the Temple [Yoma 7:1]). The shema' and the ma'amadot texts are the only passages from Scripture that are recited twice daily but they differ in that the shema' is not recited from a Torah scroll even in the presence of ten persons as noted in Megillah 4:3 (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:342;502-503; others, however, hold that the shema' was read from a scroll on certain occasions [Louis Finkelstein, "The Meaning of the Word PRS," JOR 32 (1942):389, note 7; S. Lieberman agrees with Finkelstein, TK 5:1207]).

70Taanit 2:9.
allowing students to easily master their reading assignments and to commit the respective passages to memory.

The Mishnah concludes by exempting ma'amadot gatherings on Friday afternoon in honor of the Sabbath. Taanit 4:4 begins a list of ma'amadot exemptions which are continued in Taanit 4:4-5.
And the members of the Lay Division [=′anshe hama'amad] used to fast four days in the week, from the second day until the fifth day,

but they did not fast on the eve of the Sabbath because of the honor due to the Sabbath, nor on the first day of the week in order that they should not go from rest and enjoyment to weariness and fasting and so be in danger of death. 71

On the first day they read from In the beginning ... to ... and let there be a firmament;

on the second day from Let there be a firmament ... to ... and let the water be gathered together;

on the third day from Let the water be gathered together ... to ... and let there be lights;

on the fourth day from Let there be lights ... to ... let the waters produce abundantly;

on the fifth day from Let the waters produce abundantly ... to ... and let the earth bring forth;

on the sixth day from Let the earth bring forth ... to ... And the heaven and the earth ...... were finished. 72

71The section in the Mishnah relating the fasting by ma'amad members is missing from the mss. and the Jerusalem Talmud and thus is identified as a gloss (H. Albeck Mishnah, 2:341-42).

72The Mishnah identifies the passages in the Bible recited daily at ma'amadot assemblies by the key words at the opening of each paragraph. There is no reference to a universal division of the text in Genesis into numbered verses. The last part of the Mishnah does, however, imply that there are three readers per Torah "ma'amadot text unit," and a division of the Torah text into paragraphs and verses. Elsewhre, Megillah 4:4, the Mishnah requires that each Torah reader recite no less than three verses. This requirement can not be met for ma'amadot Torah readings on Sunday and Monday because there are only eight eight verses for three readers. First generation Amoraic
If it were a long portion two men read it, and a short one was read by one man,

during the **Morning Service** and **Additional Service**;\(^{73}\)
but during the **Afternoon Service** they assembled and
recited it by heart just as people recited the
**Shema**.\(^{74}\)

On the eve of the Sabbath, at the **Afternoon Service**, they did not assemble because of the honor due to the Sabbath.

---

authorities provide perplexing solutions, either repeat
the verse, or worse, split a verse in two.

\(^{73}\)Text alternatives are **bemusaf** or **vebemusaf** (mss.
fragments at JTS, and Talmud mss.). Epstein argues for
retaining the **waw** because this is the text upon which a
relevant Talmudic text is based (**Mishnah**, 1:416, note 6).
Malter prefers the version without the **waw** since the
Talmudic discourse by itself is generally an insufficient
basis to determine the Mishnah’s text (**Masekhet Taanit**, p.
121, note 8).

\(^{74}\)Albeck maintains that the Mishnah indicates that the
**shema** was recited by memory (**Mishnah**, 2:342). Support
for this position can be found in the Mishnah’s usage of
the phrase **'al pihen**; the cognate expression **be'al peh**
denotes each time in the Mishnah that passages from the
Bible were read by heart and not from a scroll (**Yoma** 7:1;
**Megillah** 2:1; **Sotah** 7:7).
Remarks on Taanit 4:3

Taanit 4:3 develops logically from the previous two Mishnahs both in its progression of content and its carefully crafted literary exposition of data as it introduces vital operational facts of the ma'amadot. The Mishnah relates three topics: fasting, Torah reading, and exemptions for ma'amadot assemblies.

The Mishnah attests that ma'amadot members fasted four days a week. This passage is missing in all Mishnah mss. and the Jerusalem Talmud, which leads commentators to conclude that the passage is a later addition.\(^7\) We can further show that this passage is a post-70 development of the Tannaitic period when fasting became associated with the ma'amadot for the first time, assuming that the ma'amadot continued after the Temple’s fall.

There are cogent grounds to support the position that ma'amadot members did not fast before 70.\(^8\) Mostly these

\(^7\)H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:341-42; H. Malter suggests that the author is an unknown Amora, and he omits the passage entirely from his eclectic text (Masekhet Taanit, p. 121).

\(^8\)A common baraita forbids a person to fast when presenting an offering (y. Pesahim 4:1, 30b; y. Hagigah 2:4, 78a; Megillat Taanit, Li. 332). Fasting is inappropriate since donating an offering is a privilege and a festive occasion (t. Taaniyot 2:3). Moreover, the tamid offering is associated with festivity during the first eight days in Nisan in commemoration of the establishment of the tamid as a public offering to be publicly funded. During this period too, fasting was prohibited (Menahot 65a; Megillat Taanit, Li. 323).
are related to the fact that to be associated with bringing an offering was a cause for celebration, festivity, resting from ordinary labor, and refraining from expressions of sadness such as eulogies and fasting. Conversely, after 70, Tannaitic sources attest that expressions of melancholy were exhibited especially with regard to the disrupted Temple cult. Thus in the post-70 era ma'amadot members would be engaged with fasting to express their mourning for the cessation of the tamid offerings.

Taanit 4:3 is clear without being explicit that there were no ma'amadot assemblies on the Sabbath. One, however, would expect ma'amadot Torah recitals even on the Sabbath since the institution is predicated on the tamid offerings which are presented every day of the year. Yet our Mishnah lists no Torah passages for the Sabbath even as it provides exact instructions for each day of the

Similarly, Taanit 4:2 exempts from fasting those associated with the Temple cult even if the entire community is ordered to fast by the court's order (see also y. Taanit 2:12, 65d). Another Baraita also associated the abolition of the mishmarot with fasting (Midrash Ekhah, 1:56, Buber 87-88).

Tosefta Taaniyot 3:6 provides a context for our Mishnah, relating that fasting was prohibited for those associated with the Wood Offerings before 70 but was allowed afterward because it is a time of mourning. The logic for prohibiting fasting for the pre-70 era and permitting it in the post-70 is also supported by ms. De Rossi 117, Megillat Taanit, Li. 332.
week. Moreover, if the Mishnah cancels *ma'amad* assemblies on Friday afternoon in honor of the Sabbath then certainly there is to be no *ma'amad* gathering on the Sabbath itself.

It it clear then that the Mishnah does not allow for *ma'amadot* gatherings on the Sabbath, but the reasons for this policy can only be deduced. A practical reason can be suggested, the Mishnah follows a selective and distinct approach for the *ma'amadot*: Jews are to assemble daily only when there would be no other public gatherings scheduled such as would be found on the Sabbath and major holidays. Such an approach keeps the mutual exclusivity of various public rituals, a common practice in rabbinic Judaism.

The Mishnah is altogether explicit as to which Torah passages are to be recited, and when and how the *ma'amadot* are to carry out these activities. Only the creation story is assigned to the *ma'amadot* Torah reading, Tannaitic sources allow for no other Torah texts to be read although some passages, other than Genesis, are more appropriate. Quite surprising is the Mishnah’s disregard of the *tamid* Torah portion (Numbers 28) which would have been the seemingly ideal and first choice for *ma'amadot* daily Torah reading especially since Taanit 4:2 predicates
the ma'amadot institution on the tamid. Whereas the daily cult "explains" the ma'amadot, the Genesis narrative has nothing in common with the tamid nor is the creation passage choice explained in any way.

The choice of Genesis 1-2:3 over Numbers 28 for the ma'amadot is a critical and decisive statement of the Mishnah's priorities. The Mishnah turns away from the theology of cult and Temple to a ritual drama of worshipping the Creator and His creation through Scripture. This liturgical and theological strategy and orientation would be desirable and effective in providing an effective and viable public worship system while the Temple operated pre-70. Moreover, the ma'amadot would be fulfilling an even more crucial role after 70, assuming as we do that the institution continued to flourish after the cult's cessation.

The Torah reading at the ma'amadot assemblies is repeated several times and thus becomes a text designed for reinforcing an educational instrument promoting the theological positions carried in the creation narrative. Special attention is given to this twice daily public reading of the Genesis passage. Moreover, the repetition

78 Various rabbinic authorities and contemporary scholars, Rabenu Hananel was the first, attest that readings relating to the cult from the Torah were read at ma'amadot assemblies even though neither Tannaitic nor Amoraic sources allow for such readings.
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is doubly reinforced, each of the ma'amadot Torah paragraphs is recited four times a week since each day's Torah reading repeats the previous day's last paragraph.\textsuperscript{79}

The Mishnah compares the ma'amadot Torah reading to the shema' reading, but there are differences between the two. Although the shema' with the ma'amadot Torah reading are recited twice daily, the implication is that the shema' is a Biblical precept\textsuperscript{80} but the ma'amadot Torah readings are clearly a later enactment. The Mishnah presents the shema' as a reading to be recited from memory whereas the reading from Genesis is done from the Torah scroll in the morning and always with quorum. Whereas the shema' readings are always fixed, consisting of the same three Pentateuchal passages, the ma'amadot Torah readings change everyday. Finally, the shema' teaches important theological lessons, but the creation narrative is extraordinarily rich and cosmic in its statement of the nature of Judaism. Moreover, in the dissemination of the biblical creation theology through the ma'amadot ritual, literacy from the Torah scroll is promoted and local

\textsuperscript{79}See the ma'amadot Torah recital diagrams at the end of the remarks to this Mishnah. The last paragraph regarding the Sabbath is recited again on the Sabbath in a setting other than the ma'amadot, only the first paragraph is read twice.

\textsuperscript{80}See Berakhot 21a for other views; however, Tamid 5:1 attests that the shema' was recited at the Temple with all its three portions from the Pentateuch.
communities are provided with a setting for daily public worship centered on the Torah scroll for the first time.

Taanit 4:3 lists a musaf assembly for the ma’amadot which is problematic since Taanit 4:2, in explaining the origin and rationale of the institution, notes only two daily ma’amadot gatherings. Taanit 4:1 (and 4:4), on the other hand, attest to four ma’amadot gatherings daily. The musaf offering and its cult are always associated with a festive and joyous occasion. Since Taanit 4:3 exempts ma’amadot assemblies even on Friday afternoon, and surely for Saturday, it follows that there were no ma’amadot meetings on festivals and thus there would not be ma’amadot meetings for musaf.

The nature of the ma’amadot meeting for musaf is disputed by scholars.\(^8\) Moreover, our Mishnah says nothing about a ma’amadot ne’ilah assembly which is mentioned in Taanit 4:1 and 4:4.\(^9\)

We resolve the matter by determining that Taanit 4:2 accurately portrays the ma’amadot which met twice daily in correspondance to the tamid offering to which it was linked. Taanit 4:2 explicitly limits ma’amadot meetings

---

\(^8\) S. Lieberman, TK, 5:1109-11.

\(^9\) Some scholars explain our Mishnah that there were no Torah recitals during ma’amadot assemblies on ne’ilah, others suggest that the Torah reading was done from memory (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:496).
to correspond to weekday *tamid* times, and these are the vital *ma'amadot* assemblies; the assemblies at *musaf* are secondary in importance and were added to the *ma'amadot* assemblies associated with the *tamid*. Tannaitic sources attest that in some communities there were as many as four *ma'amadot* meetings daily.

The three tables below illustrate, in different ways, the relationships among various elements of the Torah readings: the names of the paragraphs, the division of the seven paragraphs for each day, and the number of readers per paragraph.
### MA'AMADOT TORAH RECITALS

#### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Chapter: Verse</th>
<th>Number Verses per Paragraph</th>
<th>Readers per Paragraph</th>
<th>Total Verses Recited per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>1:1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bere'shit</td>
<td>1:6-8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yehi raki'a</td>
<td>1:9-13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yikavu hamayim</td>
<td>1:14-19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yehi me'orot</td>
<td>1:20-23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yishresu hamayim</td>
<td>1:24-31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tose' ha'ares</td>
<td>2:1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vayakhulu hashamayim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Sun 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Mon 2 &amp; 3</th>
<th>Tue 3 &amp; 4</th>
<th>Wed 4 &amp; 5</th>
<th>Thu 5 &amp; 6</th>
<th>Fri 6 &amp; 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 or 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Verses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>9-13</th>
<th>14-19</th>
<th>20-23</th>
<th>24-31</th>
<th>1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verses per Paragraph</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers per Paragraph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Verses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY readers verses</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>5=8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY readers verses</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>6=11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY readers verses</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>4=10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY readers verses</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>3=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY readers verses</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>3=11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mishnah 4:4 continues the previous Mishnah's listing of ma'amad assembly exemptions. Each of the ma'amad exemptions in this Mishnah is associated with one of three festive ritual occasions, hallel recital, musaf offerings or wood offerings. Taanit 4:4 records the only traditions in the Mishnah regarding the ma'amadot that are both attributed and disputed. The Yavnean masters in the Mishnah seek to establish the correct number and types of ma'amadot assemblies on the special days cited above.

Moreover, the commentators also dispute the type of ritual and the locale of the ma'amadot assemblies. Because the Mishnah contains numerous variables, there is a wide range of interpretations as to the plain meaning of Taanit 4:4. 83

83 See the table of interpretations to this Mishnah at the end of the section on remarks to Taanit 4:4 below.
Taanit 4:4

On any day when Hallel is recited there is no Lay Division Service [=ma'amad] in the morning;\(^8^4\) when an additional offering was brought there was none in the Concluding Service;\(^8^5\) when a wood-offering was brought there was none during the Afternoon Service.

This is the view of R. Akiba.

Ben Azzai said to him, R. Joshua taught thus:

when an additional offering was brought there none during the Afternoon Service,
but when wood-offering was brought there was none at the Concluding Service.\(^8^6\)

R. Akiba retracted and taught in accordance with the opinion of ben Azzai.

---

\(^8^4\)This reference to the hallel recital is associated with Hannukah since there is no musaf offering on that festival. Strictly speaking, musaf offerings are presented on Biblical mandate only.

\(^8^5\)The Lowe ms. replaces minhah with ne'ilah in each instance in the Mishnah above (see the difference between J. N. Epstein and S. Lieberman on the Talmud’s version in its discourse, S. Lieberman TK, 5:1104-09).

\(^8^6\)The wood offering has an involved background. Certain families, enumerated in the following Mishnah, volunteered to provide wood as fuel for the altar during the period of Nehemiah (10:35). The royal house contributed these provisions previously. These families kept providing wood on their established dates even after the Temple was financially secure. Even after 70, the donor families continued to celebrate these times.

The wood served two functions, as fuel for the outer altar and as a voluntary offering the wood itself was served with salt on the altar. Its bearers were required to refrain from fasting, attending a memorial service, or doing any labor detracting from the festive occasion during their period of offering. They also had to stay overnight in Jerusalem (S. Safrai, Encyclopedia Migrait, 7:253-55. Idem. Pilgrimage at the Second Temple, pp. 220-24, 238-39).
Remarks on Taanit 4:4

Mishnah 4:4 continues Mishnah 4:3's discussion, providing two schedules for added cancellations of ma'amad gatherings. Each schedule includes instances of a festive nature (hallel, musaf, wood offering).

The material requires two levels of analysis.87 The

87These two levels of analysis derive from the treatment given the Mishnah by its two major commentators, S. Lieberman (TK, 5:1104-111) and J. N. Epstein (Introduction, 1:126-27; 2:714). I examine Lieberman's detailed conclusions below.

The following is Lieberman's summary (TK, 5:1109) of his lengthy analysis of the diverse sources related to our Mishnah including mss. as well as Amoraic (attesting to opposing Tannaitic traditions), Gaonic and later authorities.

a. When the Mishnah states, "There is no ma'amad," that denotes that there is no ma'amadot Torah reading. Lieberman adds in parentheses that the community does not, however, omit the ma'amadot prayers.

b. There were no ma'amadot assemblies at all on Sabbaths, holidays and their intermediate days.

c. The phrase, "On the day when there is a musaf offering," applies only to a New Moon, and on such a day only one afternoon ma'amad assembly is cancelled (either minhah or ne'ilah), but the ma'amad assembly at musaf still takes place.

d. On days when there is no musaf, there is a dispute between R. Meir and the Sages as to whether a ma'amad is included with the additional prayer (tefilah nosefet).

e. On the first day of Tevet, which is not only a New Moon but also a day of Hannukah, the community recites hallel and presents a musaf offering, and the assigned family brings a wood offering. According to R. Meir, who treats this day as though it were a festival, one cancels all ma'amadot assemblies. R. Yosi (the Sages), in contradistinction, treats this day as a minor festival, and therefore he retains the ma'amad assembly on musaf, although omitting all other ma'amadot assemblies.

f. On the first of Nisan, there is no ma'amad assembly during minhah or ne'ilah. There are, none the less, ma'amadot assemblies on sahrit and musaf.
first level addresses the general question of the principle underlying the exemption of ma'amadot assemblies. The second involves the clarifying of the shifting pattern of practices suggested in the actual wording of the text. The reasons offered for exempting ma'amad assemblies are: To allow time for added ritual obligations occurring on a holiday; and to reinforce rabbinical enactments.

Previously the Mishnah (4:3) stated that the reason for cancelling ma'amadot gatherings on Friday afternoon was to honor the Sabbath. This could mean either that

Although Epstein and Lieberman have done eminent service to the study of Taanit 4:4 by their collecting, summarizing and textually analyzing the post-Tannaitic interpretations of this Mishnah, however, they have neglected an overall historical interpretation. D. Halivni also notes and follows Lieberman's lengthy analysis (Sources and Traditions, p. 459 note 6).

Lieberman, in particular is guilty of interjecting post-Tannaitic elements into the Tannaitic sources, and generally of not clearly distinguishing between historical periods in utilizing his diverse material, especially when the Mishnah attests to states in flux. Conclusions a and d above illustrate the first failing in that they interject the element of prayer (tefilah) into the text, an element not present at all in the Tannaitic sources in association with the ma'amadot. The second failing is clearly shown in his wholesale incorporation of diverse ma'amadot elements (prayer, fasts, Torah reading) into an homogenized view of the institution.

88 This is contra the notion that, "A coherent set of principles underlying the particular rulings is difficult to discern, and the problem appears to be primarily logistical," (William Scott Green, The Traditions of Joshua Ben Hananyah [Leiden: Brill, 1981], p. 124).
extra time was required to do errands that honor the Sabbath, or that the Sages intended to enhance the Sabbath (and festivals) by cancelling the ma'amad before the holiday. Festive days associated with enactments by the Sages would have benefit particularly from reinforcement.

Albeck explains that ma'amad gatherings were cancelled on Friday afternoon (mipne kevod hashabat) because of a logistical concern, so that people may prepare for the Sabbath. This phrase denotes in every other instance related to the ma'amadot, inherent respect and honor for festive occasions associated with the institution. Thus it should also have this meaning in Mishnah 4:4 in addition to concerns with logistics (see also Taanit 2:7). The overall concern of the Sages was rather to bestow additional honor on the Sabbath, and the relevant festive days.

Furthermore, the list cited in Mishnah 4:4 consists in its entirety of enactments of the Sages, for the most part bitterly disputed, and therefore in particular need of enhancement. The cancellation of ma'amad gatherings

89H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:342. Note especially the use of this phrase within the nearer context (Taanit 4:3). The phrase appears three times in the Mishnah in association with the ma'amadot: Taanit 2:7; 4:3. See also Taanit 1:7.

90The Torah requires a musaf offering on the New Moon (Numbers 28:11-16), but the determination of the particular day was made by the Sages (Rosh Hashannah 1:3-
here too honors each of the three festive occasions listed.

Mishnah 4:4 also explicitly attests to shifting patterns of ma'amadot practice. Our Mishnah is consistent with Taanit 4:1 in that it lists four times when ma'amadot members gather (shahrit, musaf, minhah, ne'ilah), but disagrees with Taanit 4:2 which implies, that there were only two daily ma'amad meetings corresponding to the tamid offerings (shahrit, minhah).

The Mishnah does not distinguish between pre- and post-70, but all commentators assume that it describes a post-70 situation. The Tannaim, however, dispute only two individual occasions on which the ma'amad meeting is exempted (minhah, ne'ilah). They are unanimous in cancelling ma'amad meetings on sahrit (and musaf). The first to mention musaf and ne'ilah as ma'amadot meetings

---

91 Mishnah 4:4 makes no mention as to whether there is a ma'amad gathering corresponding to a musaf offering, and the implication is that there were no such gathering on that period. Albeck cites the Gemara as the authority for explaining that, "On musaf there was no ne'ilah," assumes that there were no ma'amad assemblies at musaf and minhah either (Mishnah 4:342). Lieberman ascribes the citation strictly to a scribal "slip," while maintaining that there were ma'amad gatherings during musaf despite traditions that attest to different practices (TK 5:1109-11; 1109 note 30).
times are the Yavnean authorities. The Mishnah text itself is unclear as to exactly what ma'amadot meetings and which aspect of them it intends to cancel. An entire array of interpretations have been suggested and some of the diversity is detailed in the table below. I will show that diverse elements of the Mishnah suggest a discernable pattern of shifting practices over a period of time. The Mishnah presents the differences between R. Akiba and ben Azzai as a debate and not as a dispute. There are those who suggest that R. Akiba's reversal is due to R. Joshua's superior authority over traditions of the Temple cult.

---

92 This methodology finds support in Tosefta passages directly related to the ma'amadot. In Tosefta Taaniyot 2:3; 3:6, we find shifting patterns of ritual practice resulting directly from the Temple's fall. Each case involves a dispute similar to that which our Mishnah describes, and as such they provide an effective model for interpreting our Mishnah. See the analysis of the passages in the Tosefta section of this study.

93 Below are the traditions of ma'amad assembly exemptions in Mishnah 4:4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>shahrit</th>
<th>minhah</th>
<th>ne'ilah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R. Akiba</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hallel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musaf</td>
<td></td>
<td>[L:X]</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood offering</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>[L:X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R. Joshua</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[L:X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood offering</td>
<td></td>
<td>[L:X]</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L: = Lowe ms.

This position contains some unwarranted assumptions: First, that there was an actual dispute between R. Akiba and R. Joshua, and second that the dispute regards worship practices during the Temple period. I will show both that the difference between these Tannaim reflects autonomous post-70 liturgical practices, and that the various traditions reflect shifting rites rather than fixed positions. The Mishnah as a whole (see the table below), is composed of elements that are pre- and post-70.\(^{95}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS IN TAANIT 4:4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannukah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shahrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II musaf offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minhah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Wood offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne'ila(^h)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The incongruent element in this list is the Wood Offering together with its associated ne'ila\(^h\). Hannukah and New Moons are public and universal festive days. Any ma'amadot rulings relating to these festive days affects everyone in the country. The Wood Offering, however, is a

\(^{95}\)The table follows the Lowe ms.
private affair, and it affects individual families only; and likewise any of its related *ma'amadot* rulings.  

The first two units in the Mishnah comprise a set depicting the *ma'amadot* in a pre-70 setting. As implied in Taanit 4:2, the *ma'amadot* met twice a day in correspondence to the *tamid* offerings on *shahrit* and *minhah*. The Sages enacted Hannukah and determined the proper day for the New Moon, and as a result desired to give them added accord by cancelling the *ma'amad* service of either *shahrit* or *minhah*.  

The cancelled *ma'amad* meetings on Friday afternoon, New Moon *minhah*, and Hannukah *sahrit*, bestow on their associated festivals a greater measure of respect. One can discern two units in the Mishnah. One lists all pre-70 exemptions of *ma'amadot* meetings that affect the entire community. A second smaller unit exempts *ma'amad* meetings at *ne'ilah* on days that have a Wood Offering. This material affects only a handful of families during the course of the year. Traditions dealing with *ne'ilah* and

---

96 Albeck notes that some individuals not related to the family bringing wood-offerings may join in their festivities (*Mishnah*, 2:497), still, these would be a small number in contrast to rules which apply to all Jews.  

97 The following interpretation was presented to Dr. Bokser who agreed with it.  

98 Sanhedrin 11:3.
Wood Offerings are always attributed to and disputed by Yavnean masters.

R. Akiba’s traditions on exemptions of ma’amadot meetings reflect the pattern of the above units. He continues to exempt ma’amad meetings at minhah on days with a musaf offering. R. Akiba’s position, as described in the Mishnah, is explained to represent but one of the pre-70 among several autonomous units of worship traditions. Public worship became increasingly diverse in the post-70 period. Wood Offerings with ne’ilaḥ are then for the first time associated with the ma’amadot.

Practical considerations appear to underlie R. Joshua’s position. As a result of this tradition, many more people attended monthly ma’amad meetings at minhah. New Moons occur more frequently and affect everyone, whereas Wood Offerings occur but a few times a year and affect only a few families. It is better for one family to miss a few minhah services, than for the entire nation to miss such public meetings twelve times a year.

---

99 See Taanit 4:1 above. The most accurate liturgical patterns during Tannaitic and Amoraic periods contain numerous divergent parallel practices rather than a monolithic paradigm (J. Heinemann, Prayer in the Period of the Tannaim, pp. 29-51).

100 R. Joshua’s tendency is to make worship more accessible to ordinary persons, as can be seen in his ruling to allow the recital of the shema’i till late in the morning (Berakhot 1:2).
Akiba's position tends to standardize diverse liturgical practices,\textsuperscript{101} yet he returns to teach in accordance with R. Joshua's position.

The terms used in the discourse help to explain its setting, especially since attributed traditions corroborated by other passages are more reliable for historical analysis.\textsuperscript{102} The Mishnah uses a distinct phrase to describe R. Akiba's agreement with R. Joshua's position: hazar lishnot keben Azai. The term hazar denotes a voluntary change of legal opinion, the Mishnah often uses it in this manner.\textsuperscript{103} In numerous other Mishnaic disputes between R. Akiba and R. Joshua, each maintains his particular position.\textsuperscript{104} Here R. Akiba changes his position to R. Joshua for the practical reasons listed above.

When two Tannaim maintain differing positions in the Mishnah the results vary. The Mishnah utilizes the verb hodah to denote a Tanna who admits his legal opinion to be

\textsuperscript{101}Berakhot 4:3.


\textsuperscript{103}Eduyot 1:12; 5:7; Hallah 4:7; Yebamot 15:2 (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 3:67); Kelim 9:2; Ohalot 5:3-4.

\textsuperscript{104}C. Y. Kasovsky, Thesarus Mishnae, 2:835-37.
inaccurate or misstated. If there is an attempt to establish a particular version of the Halakhah, the following expression may be used, *legayem 'et divre R. Yehoshua*.  

---

105 Peah 3:2; Eduyot 2:6, 8; Hulin 2:4; 9:4; Negaim 5:2; Nidah 2:3.

106 Yebamot 2:13; likewise with R. Akiba in Yebamot 8:4.
### INTERPRETATIONS OF TAANIT 4:4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Jerusalem</th>
<th>no shahrit</th>
<th>no minhah</th>
<th>no musaf</th>
<th>yes minhah</th>
<th>yes ne'ilah</th>
<th>no ne'ilah</th>
<th>yes musaf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country wide</td>
<td>yes shahrit</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>meetings</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| II | Jerusalem | no shahrit | no minhah | no musaf | no minhah | yes | ne'ilah | no musaf |
|    | Country wide | no shahrit | all | meetings | all | meetings |           |          |

| III | Jerusalem & Country wide | Torah recitals on no prayer | Torah recitals on no prayer |          |           |          |          |          |

| IV | Jerusalem & Country wide | no musaf | no minhah | no ne'ilah |          |          |           |          |

| V | one rule for all cases | ma'amad gathers only at the Temple and country wide but not in Jerusalem |          |           |          |           |           |          |

---

107A summary of these views are in H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:496-97, see also S. Lieberman, TK 5:1104-11, and B.M. Lewin, Osar HaGeonim, Taanit, p. 36. The various opinions are as follows, I- Rashi, Bartonura, Mekhit Shelomo, HaMeiri, Geonim; II- Ritba, Reshash; III- Rabad; IV- Maimonides; V- Rid.
Mishnah 4:5 concludes the discussion of ma'amadot exemptions begun in Taanit 4:3. It specifies the dates and names the families\textsuperscript{108} associated with the Wood Offerings, and concludes by rounding out the list of ma'amad cancellations with the first day in Tevet as containing all the elements listed in Taanit 4:4. Since the first of Tevet falls on Hannukah, a day requiring the recital of hallel, is a New Moon, a day which requires a musaf offering, and is a Wood Offering day, there can be no ma'amad gathering at all.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{108}Both priestly and Israelites families donated wood as altar fuel and as an offering in its own right. As this was a festive occasion for them, they did not attend a ma'amad gathering (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:497).

\textsuperscript{109}H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:343. A similar rationale applies to the first day in the month of Nisan as listed in Tosefta Taaniyot 3:4. Albeck (ibid. p. 497) offers two possible reasons for cancelling ma'amad meetings on days with Wood Offerings without favoring either. The first reason is logistical. Since these families were preoccupied with presenting the wood they had no time for a ma'amad gathering. The second reason reflects the fact that a Wood Offering day is a festive day and, as we explained in Taanit 4:4 above, requires the greater accord achieved by cancelling a ma'amad meeting (see also Tosefta Taaniyot 3:6 and 2:3).
There were nine occasions on which the priests and the people brought wood-offerings:  

on the first of Nisan, by the family of Arach of the tribe of Judah;  
on the twentieth of Tammuz, by the family of David of the tribe of Judah;  
on the fifth of Ab, by the family of Parosh, from the tribe of Judah;  
on the seventh of the same month, by the family of Jonadab son of Rechab;  
on the tenth thereof, by the family of Senaah from the tribe of Benjamin;  
on the fifteenth thereof, by the family of Zattu of the tribe of Judah and with them priests and Levites, and all who are uncertain of their tribal descent and the family of Pestle-deceivers and the family of the Dry-fig-pressers;  
on the twentieth thereof, by the family of Pahath-Moab from the tribe of Judah;  
on the twentieth of Elul, by the family of Adin of the tribe Judah;  
on the first of Teveth, by the family of Parosh for the second time.  

On the first of Teveth, there were no Lay Division Service [=ma'amad] at all, since on that day Hallel was read and an additional offering and a wood-offering were brought.

---

110Albeck interprets "nine" as nine individual instances listed in the Mishnah (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:343) while Epstein interprets it to mean the ninth of Av (J. N. Epstein, Tannaim, 221-22).
Mishnah 3:4 lists two groups of special Torah readings, which on specific occasions postpone the regular Torah readings. One cycle is a continuous and consecutive reading of the Torah, while the other is pericopel in nature, designating select Torah passages to be recited on specific holidays. The first group of special Torah reading includes Sabbaths before Purim and Passover; the second group includes the Torah recitals of the ma'amadot.

When the first day of the month of Adar falls on a Sabbath they read the Section of Shekalim; if it falls during the week, they read it earlier on the preceding one and they interrupt to the next Sabbath.

As gorin is a participle, its subject is not immediately apparent. The context in chapter three, especially Mishnah six, suggests that it should be the third person i.e. the congregants. First generation Amoraim disagree on the identity of the passage of shekalim. Rav maintains that it is Numbers 28, while Samuel indicates that it is Exodus 30:11-16 (b. Megillah 29b).

The day is the last Sabbath in the month of Shevat.

A regularly scheduled Torah passage is preempted by a passage listed in the Mishnah (Taanit 4:1).

Shekalim (Exodus 30:11-16) is recited on the last Sabbath of the month of Shevat. There are no special Torah passages recited on the first Sabbath in the month of Adar. On the second Sabbath of Adar before Purim, zakhor (Deuteronomy 25:17-19) is recited (associating Amalek with Haman, H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:501).
On the second one, Remember;\(^{115}\)
on the third one, The Red Heiffer;\(^{116}\)
on the fourth one, This month shall be unto you;\(^{117}\)
on the fifth one, they revert to the regular order.

For all they break off:
on the first days of the months,
on the Festival of Dedication,
and on Purim,
on fast days,
and at the Lay Guards [=ma'amadot].\(^{118}\)

\(^{115}\)Deuteronomy 25:17-19. The referent to "second, third, fourth" in Mishnah 3:4 varies according to differing interpretations. The ordinal number may denote a Sabbath or a special Torah recital designated for that Sabbath (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:501).

\(^{116}\)Numbers 19:1-22. See also Parah 1:1. The passage in Scriptures explains the purification rite for persons who have become impure through contact with a corpse. The reading also reminds its audience of the need for ritual purity to participate in the Passover rites.

\(^{117}\)Exodus 19:1-20.

\(^{118}\)The interruption of the regular Torah reading cycle by the ma'amadot readings refers only to Monday and Thursday since there were no ma'amadot Torah recitals on Sabbath. For more detail see pp. 35-36 above.

The Mishnah above groups the days into two sets. One comprises New Moons, Hannukah and Purim, the second includes Public Fasts, ma'amadot and the Day of Atonement. Elbogen chooses to delete the phrase "ma'amadot uleyom hakipurim," from the Mishnah (hatefilah beIsrael, p. 427 note 44). He reasons that were this Mishnah correct as it stands there could never be a normal Torah reading since ma'amadot recitals take place every day of the year. Elbogen's reasoning is not convincing on several accounts. First, the phrase appears in every manuscript (even Elbogen acknowledges the fact). Second, the identical phrase appears elsewhere in the Mishnah (Taanit 4:1). Third, his reasoning is not consistent with the sources which indicate that the ma'amadot did not meet regularly in all communities at all times (b. Megillah 26a).
and on the Day of Atonement.

Remarks on Megillah 3:4

The Mishnah depicts the ma‘amadot Torah reading as part of an overall Torah reading cycle established throughout the year. The ma‘amadot Torah recitals interrupt the regular Torah reading pattern and validate its importance. In addition, the ma‘amadot Torah recital is seen to be correlated with Tannaitic liturgical practice overall. The ma‘amadot Torah recitals are none

L. Ginzberg maintains that yom hakipurim belongs in the Mishnah but he emends the text to read "lema‘amadot vlemo‘adot veleyom hakipurim" (A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud, 3:138-39).

Albeck identifies the phrase "uleyom hakipurim," as a gloss because of the difficulty in explaining the phrase (Mishnah, 2:363, 502). Instead, he emends the text to read "ma‘amadot veleyom hakipurim." Albeck also provides a reconstruction showing how the version in our Mishnah came to be. The emended version "ma‘amadot veleyom hakipurim," was corrupted to "ma‘amadot veleyom hakipurim," which makes no sense, and was then changed to our version on the basis of Taanit 4:1. Albeck’s emendation includes festivals not mentioned in the Mishnah as interrupting the regular Torah reading cycle. Yet the following Mishnah lists them individually. The emendation rests only on a post Talmudic variant.

There are good reasons to accept the Mishnah’s version because public fasts, ma‘amadot, and the Day of Atonement have in common several features. Torah recital (more than fasting- Rashi, Ran) is the dominant common denominator of Public Fasts, ma‘amadot and the Day of Atonement (Taanit 2:1). Each of these Torah recitals is ordained by the Sages; the Bible does not require such readings. In each instance, the public participates in the Torah ritual (even on the Day of Atonement at the Temple- b. Yoma 70a). All the above Torah recitals take place in the public domain.
the less seen as an episodic practice in comparison with
the regular Torah reading maintained by all Jewish
communities.

The Mishnah portrays two Torah recital cycles, a
regular and a special cycle that preempted the former at
specific times. The ma'amadot Torah recitals are grouped
with the irregular cycle, interrupting Monday and Thursday
(but not Sabbath)\textsuperscript{119} Torah recitals. In place of the
usual reading, four special Torah passages are recited on
the Sabbath, in anticipation of a coming holiday. The
post-Tannaitic practice included both the special four
Torah passages and the texts assigned in the regular
cycle.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{119}Taanit 4:3, see S. Lieberman, TK, 5:1109.

\textsuperscript{120}Certain post Tannaitic authorities interpret the
term "interrupt," to refer to the usually assigned
portions from the Prophets. In their view, the special
portions assigned were substitutes for the regular
Prophetic and not the Torah readings. There were varied
public Torah reading practices and a diversity of
liturgical observances in general (D. Halivni, Sources and
Traditions, 2:517; L. Ginzberg, Commentary on the
Palestinian Talmud, 3:132-40; M. B. Schwartz, "Torah
Reading," p. 142; b. Megillah 31a-b).

Jewish communities in Israel maintained individual
Torah reading patterns which were similar but not
identical (I. Elbogen, Hatefilah beIsrael, p. 122; H.
Albeck, Mishnah, 2:351). There are instances when formal
legislation confirmed the Torah reading practices which
were established among the people (Ibid. 2:350; Megillah
3:6).
Mishnah 3:6 implies two types of Torah reading cycles. As noted above, the regular cycle is a continuous and consecutive reading of the Torah, while the other reading cycle is pericopal in nature, designating select Torah passages to be recited on specific holidays. Our Mishnah continues to detail the Torah passages that interrupt the regular Torah reading cycle. Mishnah 3:4 states in general terms that special occasions take precedence over the regular reading. These special occasions are either Biblical or rabbinic in origin. Mishnah 3:5 specifies the Torah passages to all the Biblical holidays, and our Mishnah lists the passages assigned to be read on all days Rabinically instituted. Mishnah 3:6 rounds out its discussion of the special cycle with directions of returning to the regular Torah reading cycle. It enumerates that on Sabbath afternoons and on Monday and Thursday mornings Torah portions pick up where the previous Sabbath morning’s readings left off. The congregation continues on the following Sabbath morning from the place they stopped, even though they are repeating passages they already recited on Sabbath afternoon, Monday and Thursday mornings. The Mishnah concludes with a Scriptural exegesis demonstrating that
Torah portions depicting special occasions should be recited on those appointed times.
Megillah 3:6

On the Festival of Dedication, The Princes;\textsuperscript{121}
on Purim, And then came Amalek;\textsuperscript{122}
on the first days of the months, And on the first
days of your months;\textsuperscript{123}
and at the Lay Divisions [\textsuperscript{=ma'amadot}], from The Story
of Creation;\textsuperscript{124}
on fast days, The Blessings and the Curses -\textsuperscript{125}
they must not interrupt in the reading of The
Curses, but one person only reads them all;
and on Monday and Thursday and on the Sabbath at the
Afternoon Service they read in the regular order, but
it is not taken into account.

As it is said,
\begin{quote}
And Moses declared the appointed seasons of
the Eternal unto the children of Israel -
\end{quote}
their prescribed law is that every one of them
shall be read in its due season.

\textsuperscript{121}Numbers 7:12-89. This portion shows Israelite
chieftains participating in the Tabernacle’s dedication, a
natural parallel to the Temple’s rededication on Hannukah.

\textsuperscript{122}Exodus 17:8-16.

\textsuperscript{123}Numbers 28:11-15.

\textsuperscript{124}Genesis 1:1-2:3.

\textsuperscript{125}Leviticus 26:3-47; Deuteronomy 28 (H. Albeck,
Mishnah, 2:364). Different fast days may require other
Torah passages (Rashi and Maimonides).

\textsuperscript{126}Leviticus 23:44.
Remarks on Megillah 3:6

The Mishnayot in Megillah 3:4-6 constitute a coherent unit describing the interaction between two types of Torah reading cycles, with the ma'amadot an integral part of the special Torah cycle. The ma'amadot Torah reading is a natural part of a special set of Torah readings which are recited by rabbinic enactments. The Mishnah integrates this reading into its overall liturgical system. Just as each of the Torah passages assigned to the other days in the special cycle has a strong thematic association with its corresponding day, so there is an appropriate affinity between the ma'amadot and the Creation story. This affinity helps explain the nature of the institution.

127 See the comments to Megillah 3:6 explaining the choice of Torah reading for each of the special occasions cited in the Mishnah.
Megillah 4:3

The terms ma'amad and moshav denote public eulogy rituals performed on public domain (city square) and are listed sixth among ten instances requiring a quorum of ten adults. The first five instances have their regular times. The last five occur at random as the occasion arises.

For more detail on the city-square as a location of ma'amad eulogy see S.B. Hoenig, "Historical Inquiries," pp. 136-37; idem, "City-Square and Synagogue," pp. 455-60.
Megillah 4:3

They may not recite the Shema,¹²⁹
nor may anyone step before the Ark,
nor may they lift up their hands,
nor may they read the Law,
or the portion from the Prophets,
nor may they observe the funeral halts [=ma‘amad umoshav],
nor recite the Mourners’ Benediction or the Mourners’ Consolation,¹³⁰
or the Newly-Wed Benediction,
nor mention the Name of God in the Grace After Meals when less than ten are present.

Also for lands, nine and a priest are required, and similarly for a person.

¹²⁹Diverse modes of worship are detailed in H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:502-03.

¹³⁰Some of these rites are also performed in the public square (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:365, 503).
Mishnah 2:10 examines the validity of testimony in ten cases based on an adult’s memory of events occurring in his youth. The first eight instances are valid testimony, the last two are unacceptable. The tenth case regards testimony of a ma'amad and misped, both associated with public funerary rites. The Mishnah tells us to discount testimony by a person claiming to remember that in his youth such a ritual was performed for a particular person.
And these when they grow up are believed when they testify of what they had seen while they were young.

- 'This was my father's handwriting,'
or, 'This is my brother's handwriting,'
(or,) 'I remember of so-and-so when she went out in the virginal bridal litter with her hair down,'\(^{131}\)
or, 'So-and-so went out of school to immerse himself to eat of the priest's due,'
or, 'He used to share with us at the threshing floor,'
or, 'This place is an unclean field,'\(^{132}\)
or, 'Thus far we used to come on the Sabbath.'

But no man is to be believed when he says, 'So-and-so had a right of way in this place,'
or, 'So-and-so had a stopping-spot and a mourning-spot [=ma'amad umisped] in this place.'

\(^{131}\)H. Albeck (Mishnah, 3:92, 346) notes references for opinions on these expressions. Some suggest the term hinuma denotes a curtained litter for a virginal bride (M. Jastrow, Dictionary, 1:348), others define it as the song which accompanied the bride.

\(^{132}\)If a grave is plowed over, then a field with a diameter of one hundred cubits with the grave as its center becomes impure, a place where priests are forbidden to tread. Such a field is termed bet haperas.
Baba Batra 6:7

The term *ma'amad* in this Mishnah denotes public funeral rites performed on public domain. The text delineates minimal dimensions for the area upon which one may conduct such rites.

Baba Batra 6:7

If there were a public path passing through one’s field, and he took it [for himself] and gave them [another pathway] at the side [of the field], what he has given he has given but what he took for himself is not his.

A private path is four cubits [wide];
a public thoroughfare is sixteen cubits [wide];
the king’s highway has no limit;
the road to a grave has no limit;
the [funeral] halting-place [=hama'amad], according to the judges of Sepphoris, is to be a four *kabs*’ area.\(^3\)

---

\(^{3}\)The total area is approximately seventy five by fifty feet.
Mishnah 5:6 relates in narrative style characteristic of the entire tractate that part of the daily tamid offering ritual in which a loud instrument [=drum] signalled three groups to proceed with their task at the Temple. Upon hearing the sound, priests assembled prostrating themselves at the Temple’s Inner Hall [=hekhal], Levites gathered for ritual song at the Temple’s court [=azarah], and the ro’sh hama’amad [=leader of the assembled] assigned the impure individuals to stand at the Temple’s East Gate. The identity of the ro’sh hama’amad is unclear.
When [the priests]\textsuperscript{134} arrived [in the area] between the Porch and the Altar, one of them took the

\textsuperscript{134}Two priests were assigned to perform two rituals. One offers incense (Tamid 5:4), while the other carries a pan filled with burning coals (Tamid 5:5).
tympanum and hurled it between the Porch and the Altar.

P. Blackman notes, "It was an ancient drum-like instrument, a musical instrument producing a drumming sound, shovel-shaped (hence its Hebrew name; it served the purpose of a signal-gong. Not to be confused with the magrefah in [Tamid] 3:8" (Mishnayoth, 5:491). The following analysis was reviewed by Dr. Bokser and approved.

There is no common scholarly consensus as to the identification of this object. It is either an actual shovel or a musical instrument, a type of drum shaped like a shovel. Its exact shape is also disputed by first generation Amoraim, though all agree that it was a drum type instrument (Rav and Samuel in y. Sukkah 5:6, 55d).

The evidence at M. Tamid 5:6 and 3:8 (and of course 2:1) suggests that we deal here with a real shovel. At M. 5:6 the shovel is not 'played', but thrown between the porch and the altar." (R. S. Sarason, quoted and incorporated by J. Neusner, History of Holy Things, 5:161, note 14). Others find neither the above evidence nor its accompanying argument convincing. Albeck contends that the object in question is a coal rake rather than a shovel (Mishnah, 5:428). Mishnah 5:6 describes a type of drum shaped like a rake (M. Jastrow, Dictionary, 2:730; H. Albeck, Mishnah, 5:300). Another authority questions whether throwing a coal rake to the ground would be sufficient to cause the loud sound described in the Mishnah (B. Bayer, s.v. "Organ," EJ, 12:1453; ibid., s.v. "Music," EJ, 12:566). The verb vezorkah denotes hurtling, so that the Mishnah means to describe the drum itself as being thrown about to produce the sound (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 5:306).

These are difficult explanations. The sound produced by the drum was very loud, yet one priest alone could produce this effect. To produce as loud a noise as the Mishnah attests, the instrument in question would have had to have been of some size. Hurtling such an instrument within the Temple would not be practical. A possible solution may be hinted at in a baraita (b. Arakhin 11a), which states that a magrefah's handle was designed to come off. The instrument would then be a type of gong with a removable handle serving as a drum hammer. Sound would be produced by hurtling the drum stick, which protruded like a handle, from the drum. As a result of openings below the drum, the instrument appeared rake-like.
[and] in Jerusalem no man could hear the voice of his fellow because the [loud] noise of the tympanum.

It served three objects:

a priest hearing the sound thereof knew that his brethren the priests had come in to prostrate themselves, and he came running;

and when a Levite heard the sound thereof he knew that his fellow Levites had entered to sing,\(^{136}\) and he also came on the run;

and the chief of the Post \(=\text{ro'\text{'}sh hama'\text{'}amad}\)^{137} on hearing the sound of it] made the [ritually] unclean [members of the courses]\(^{138}\) stand by the East Gate.\(^{139}\)

\(^{136}\)Described in Tamid 7:3.

\(^{137}\)Different individuals are identified as ro'\text{'}sh hama'\text{'}amad. This person could be either the director of the ma'\text{'}amad Torah recitals. Tamid 5:1 uses the term memuneh to describe this individual (Rashi). Memuneh is a generic term applicable to priest and lay alike. He could also be head of the priestly clan \(=\text{ro'\text{'}sh bet 'av}\) visiting Jerusalem which would of course exclude Israelites. Another interpretation excluding Israelites is to see here a reference to the head of the priests living in Jerusalem (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:496).

\(^{138}\)The Mishnah does not specify which impure persons nor does it give reasons for placing them at the East Gate. (These may be impure priests of the clan on duty [Rashi b. Pesahim 82b] or they may be recovered lepers in need of ritual purification through sprinkling with their guilt offering [Maimonides Tamid 5:6]. The reason for setting these individuals out may be either to embarrass impure priests or to remove suspicion of avoiding priestly duty from them [R. Joseph, Rava, b. Pesahim 82b]).

\(^{139}\)This is either the Gate of Shushan, i.e., the main entry into the Temple, or the Gate of Nicanor which were closer to the priestly precincts (H. Albeck, Mishnah, 5:306; 3:381).
Remarks on Tamid 5:6

The identity of the ro’sh hama’amad is not clear.\textsuperscript{140} As a result, it is not certain whether this functionary had any direct relation to the ma’amadot of Taanit 4. If it could be proven that ro’sh hama’amad was related to that institution, then its definition could be wide enough to include Israelites. Such a broad interpretation would seemingly be supported by the structure of Tamid 5:6. The Mishnah lists three categories of persons as responding to the sound of the magrefah. They are priests, Levites, and the ro’sh hama’amad, which in view of the structure of Taanit 4:2 could be read as Israelites.

Tamid 5:6, however, differs from Taanit 4:2 in one significant way. It does not include a listing of Israelite functions corresponding to those of the other orders of priests, Levites, and Israelites. Thus, there is no indication that ro’sh hama’amad is an Israelite. Also, tractate Tamid ignores all ma’amad functions be they Torah recital or Israelite attendance at the tamid offering.\textsuperscript{141} While priests are prostrating and Levites

\textsuperscript{140} The following analysis was reviewed and approved by Dr. Bokser.

\textsuperscript{141} Tractate Tamid narrates as an eyewitness, without disputes and with few citations, the daily tamid offering ritual at the Temple. Although some suggest an early date, 70 C.E. for its editing, others point to the period of Usha, 140 C.E. [J. Neusner, \textit{A History of the Mishnaic Law of Holy Things}, 6 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 6:33,
are singing, the text does not tell us that ro’sh hama’amad assembles Israelites whose presence is required to either witness the proceedings or to engage in Torah reading.\footnote{142}{Some identify ro’sh hama’amad as an Israelite (Rashi), reflecting the possibility of allowing an Israelite to move impure individuals to the East Gate. Priests may have insisted in this case too, on retaining their prerogative to perform such Temple ritual even though an Israelite was eligible and available.\footnote{143}{Other commentators insist that only a priest was to perform functions of a ro’sh hama’amad. If the above views are to be synthesized then it may be that the law would allow an Israelite to perform as ro’sh hama’amad but priests did in }


\footnote{142}{Such activity is related by no cognate term such as ro’sh hamishmar, rosh bet ‘ay, or memuneh. (Equivalence and interchangability of mishmar and ma’amad are noted in H. Malter, Tractate Taanit, pp. 210-11, note 230.)}

\footnote{143}{Leading the scapegoat on Yom Kippur from the Temple to its execution place may be carried out by an Israelite yet priests insisted on performing this function themselves (Yoma 6:3). A similar situation is seen in gathering of the ‘omer sheaves from regions close to Jerusalem over those further away though they were eligible (Menahot 8:1; 10:9; Yoma 2:7).}
fact serve this function. On basis of previous usages of the term ma'amad, the current denotation is an assembly and not the ma'amadot institution we examined in detail.

\[144\text{See the analysis of Bikkurim 3:2 above.}\]
CHAPTER FOUR

Ma'amarot IN THE MISHNAH:
SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

The Mishnah is the foremost source for assessing the ma'amadot and as we have noted, the data in the Mishnah stands on its own without reference to other Rabbinic works. The Mishnah draws a masterful portrait of the ma'amadot as a self-contained public daily worship in local communities at which the creation narrative was read from a Torah scroll. The Mishnah exhibits high literary unity and careful organization of its data. Taanit 4 is the most relevant chapter while Megillah 3 adds Torah reading data.

The findings in the Mishnah define distinct patterns in the overall data gathered. Diverse sources and traditions suggest a process of development of the ma'amadot from an early pre-70 era (assumptions of Yavnean
tradents) through 200 C.E. The Mishnah focuses on the Torah service: the Torah scroll is needed at every morning reading of its creation narrative. Post-70 traditions attest to a proliferation of rituals and a diversity of practices accruing round the Torah reading, a pattern, as we shall see, expanded in the Tosefta and further articulated in the Talmuds.

**Summary**

The Mishnah portrays the ma'amadot as Israelites attending the tamid offerings and actively participating at twice daily public Torah reading in local communities. The Mishnah establishes an equivalence between Torah reading and Temple cult, Israelite ma'amad and priestly mishmar. In the summary below we will assess the ma'amadot's major features: Torah reading, creation story, overall design of the Torah reading practices and the Mishnah's implied philosophy and theology in its depiction of the ma'amadot although, strictly speaking, Judaism has neither an articulated philosophy nor theology. Above all, the Mishnah's presentation of the ma'amadot demonstrates a highly organized, carefully crafted and edited text.

**Torah reading** - The Mishnah's prime concern above all activities at ma'amadot gatherings is the daily Torah
reading from Genesis. The centrality of the Torah reading is established by the fact that the most detailed item in the Mishnah is the exact and minute regulations regarding the readings from creation (far more than fasting, priestly blessings or grooming). Torah reading is the engine at the heart of ma'amadot practices according to the Mishnah.

**Creation** - The creation narrative is prominently featured in the Torah reading. The Mishnah is unique among all Rabbinic sources in providing extensive and detailed instructions for the Torah reading. The Mishnah deliberately chose the subject of creation for the ma'amadot ritual excluding other logical choices (Numbers 28) and yet pointedly does not explain its choice. Most surprising is the Mishnah’s preference of the creation narrative over the tamid passage which is used to explain the ma'amadot. The Mishnah’s surprising choice of Scriptural texts results in a new theological emphasis, there is a turning away from Temple and cult while embracing creation and Creator.

Implicitly the Mishnah equates Torah reading to the cult and in some respects even surpasses it especially

---

'Mishnah Taanit is replete with references to prayer, all aspects of it, yet there is not a single association of prayer with the ma'amadot (see especially Taanit chapter two).
after 70 since this practice can continue even after the fall of the Temple. Torah reading in local communities is bolstered eventhough the Mishnah provides no rationale for the Torah service. The ma'amatot by its design were set to create a framework for sacred activity, a context for self-definition for each local community - a forerunner of the synagogue.

The design of ma'amadot Torah reading practices - The Mishnah gives no reason for the purpose of Torah reading which is a stark contrast to its complex and elaborate rationale for the ma'amadot at the Temple. When, however, one focuses on the diverse rules for Torah reading in the Mishnah there emerges an overall design for public ritual drama which is eminently practical, educationally sound, efficient and effective. Unlike the Mishnah's explanation of the ma'amad at the Temple which is primarily rhetorical and didactic, the deduced rationale for the local ma'amadot Torah reading is pragmatic, realistic and servicable. The commanding traits of the ma'amadot Torah readings do combine to make a purposeful and powerful whole. Their traits are: frequency of Torah reading, repetitions of Torah passages, brief passages to be read, assigning reading from a Torah scroll and from memory.

1. The Torah readings of creation are to be performed twice a day (a minimum) in correspondence to the
tamid offerings. The focus on daily Torah reading and the scroll is a pivotal development in the history of Jewish public worship especially as it relates to the evolution of the synagogue and its liturgy.\(^2\) The ma'amadot also facilitated the presence of a Torah scroll in each community, integrated it into daily public ritual and encouraged the participation of every individual. This introduced each community to the most sacred object in Judaism certainly after 70 and arguably before 70 too.\(^3\)

2. Repetitions of text. Repetition of Torah passages is built into the system of the ma'amadot Torah readings, it is the primary operational principle at all levels. The same Torah portions are recited in the morning and afternoon. Each passage gets read four times

\(^2\)See the various articles in Lee I Levine ed., The Synagogue in Late Antiquity, especially his own article, "The Second Temple Synagogue: The Formative Years," pp. 7-32. Although these positions can be debated, I am following Dr. Bokser’s methodology who felt that this approach best explains the evidence.

\(^3\)Some scholars maintain that Hebrew scripture were considered sacred before 70. Sid Z. Leiman argues that the Hebrew Bible was canonized long before 70 and thus was certainly considered sacred (The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture; "Inspiration and Canonicity: Reflections on the Formation of the Biblical Canon"). Shalom M. Paul’s article notes that only few sources refer explicitly to Hebrew scriptures as "sacred" per say, yet we hold that the evidence shows that Scripture was considered "sacred" well before 70 ("Bible," EI, 4:816). Maccabees I also provides historical evidence of the prominence of the Torah scrolls as they were targeted by Antiochus IV for destruction along with those who observed its laws.
in a week. The same section, Genesis 1-2:3, is repeated week after week throughout the year. This comprehensive repetition pattern reflects a design to inculcate the creation narrative to ma'amadot participants and establish a thorough familiarity with the Torah scroll through daily ritual.

3. Brevity of Torah passages. The Torah passages read at ma'amadot meetings is extremely brief, between eight and twelve verses. This is an efficient design educationally and pragmatically. Brief passages require a minimal sacrifice of time and make for successful broad participation by a general audience who was likely to be preoccupied and busy during the week. Short passages also lend themselves very nicely to mastery by those who wished to learn the creation narrative and participate in ma'amadot activities within a very short time period.

4. Torah readings from scroll and memory. The Mishnah’s requirement that the Torah passages be recited from a Torah scroll in the morning and from memory in the afternoon also demonstrates sound educational and public ritual design. The Torah scroll insures that one learns to read, a skill that is highly regarded in Judaism. The scroll also serves as a sancta accessible daily to each local community providing a tangible object for self-definition just as various idols served to identify other
contemporary religious communities. Memorization of the creation story insures another measure of internalizing the what amounts to the strictly monotheistic credo of Judaism and thus help to reinforce the identity of the individual Jew.

5. Availability of ma'amadot services. The Mishnah’s depiction of local ma'amadot services and its internal logic suggest that ma'amadot services were to be performed every week in every community. The ma'amadot were to be accessible to all. The Mishnah’s rationale for the ma'amad at the Temple assumes that it would be proper and desirable for Israelites to meet when the tamid was offered. Moreover, the restrictions that limited priests from serving all at once at the Temple did not apply to Israelites reading the creation narrative in their local communities.

6. Prominence of ma'amadot assemblies. According to the Mishnah, ma'amadot were to meet in the town square for outreach purposes. By the Mishnah’s design ma'amadot practices were to draw maximum public attention, encouraging wide exposure and inclusive participation.

7. The name ma'amad, ma'amadot. As noted above (chapter 2) the Mishnah’s choice of name effectively bestows upon the ma'amadot a credibility and respectability that the Bible associates with ma'amad. In
the Bible numerous official positions related to Temple and monarchy were defined by the ma'aman, albeit neither the term ma'amadot nor any hint of the institution is found in Scripture. The evidence in the Mishnah depicts the ma'amadot as an institution founded by the Sages well before 70.
Analysis

This section provides a detailed and specific analysis of the Mishnah's usage of the term *ma'amad* presented with tabulation of the data. Five analytical criteria described in chapter two above will also be applied to the Mishnah's text to discern overall patterns. A review of two major features of the *ma'amadot*, public ritual and Torah reading, will conclude this section.

The Mishnah, as well as other Rabbinic sources, employs the plural form *ma'amadot* only to denote the institution under examination. The singular form *ma'amad* denotes a variety of settings, depending on the context, but usually refers to the *ma'amadot*.

The Mishnah is mainly concerned with the *ma'amadot* institution, nearly three quarters of its usage is devoted to the *ma'amadot*. The *ma'amadot* traditions in the Mishnah combine to make a coherent set of practical, operational instructions directed for effective functioning of the institution. To present the *ma'amadot* as an established institution the Mishnah's traditions are presented as mostly anonymous and undisputed, a picture which is quite different in the Tosefta.

At the heart of the *ma'amadot* functions is the daily Torah reading. The greatest detail and attention is given to this ritual and occupies the dominant portion in the
Mishnah’s treatment of ma'amadot. Over 40% of all statements in the Mishnah detail aspects of the ma'amadot Torah reading.

The following analysis maps the Mishnah’s usage of the term ma'amad and defines distinct literary patterns regarding the ma'amadot institution. These patterns will be even more clearly etched when contrasted with the Tosefta texts.⁴

Strictly speaking the Mishnah explicitly cites the term ma'amad/ma'amadot only fifteen times.⁵ There are, however, several passages that assume this term although it is not specifically stated.⁶

The term ma'amad appears in thirteen Mishnayot scattered over six tractates in five orders of the Mishnah. The data on the ma'amadot is concentrated in tractate Taanit 4:1-5. Total ma'amad usages (16) can be grouped into five categories listed by frequency: public

⁴The Mishnah presents a more uniform ma'amadot institution than does the Tosefta. Statements that are anonymous in the Mishnah turn to be but an individual’s Tanna position in the Tosefta.

⁵See the table below for a complete listing of individual Mishnayot citing the term.

⁶Taanit 4:3 and especially Taanit 4:4 contain entire clauses that imply the term ma'amadot without explicitly stating it. Thus, depending on the individual analysis, whether looking at explicit usage or specific traditions which imply the institution, different numbers are utilized.
Torah recital (5 times); public assembly ritual (4 times), Temple ritual (3 times); public eulogy (3 times); and demographic district (once). Three categories (Torah recital, public assembly ritual, Temple ritual) relate specifically to technical aspects of the *ma'amadot* institution, and two (demographic districts, public eulogy) denote an assembly in general.⁷

Three items (assembly, Temple ritual, Torah recital) relate to aspects of a distinct institution *ma'amadot*. These three components can be further separated into nine individual features which will be analyzed in greater detail later when compared with the data in the Tosefta.

1. Cutting hair, laundering garments of *ma'amad* representatives.
2. Priests blessing *ma'amad* assemblies.
3. Israelite presence at *tamid* offerings.
4. Israelite daily recital of creation in Genesis countrywide.
5. Fasting by *ma'amad* members.
6. Public assembly ritual by *ma'amad* members.
7. Additional <=musaf> Torah readings at *ma'amad* assemblies.
8. Exemptions of *ma'amad* meetings.
9. Constituency of *ma'amad* assemblies.

The table below is a schematic of the above analysis and provides summaries of the data relating to the *ma'amadot* institution at the bottom. The tradition in each Mishnah is identified by the appropriate category of usage.

⁷See the table above for the relevant Mishnayot and their corresponding remarks.
### ma'amad USAGES IN THE MISHNAH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MISHNAH sources</td>
<td>Geographic Districts</td>
<td>Temple Ritual</td>
<td>Public Assembly Ritual</td>
<td>Public Torah Recital</td>
<td>Public Eulogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikkurim 3:2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 2:7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 4:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 4:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 4:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 4:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X or(^8)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 4:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megillah 3:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megillah 3:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megillah 4:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketubot 2:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baba Batra 6:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamid 5:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS MISHNAH 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAGES 16</td>
<td>1 - 6%</td>
<td>3 - 19%</td>
<td>4 - 25%</td>
<td>5 - 31%</td>
<td>3 19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ma'amadot**

| ELEMENTS | Totals= 12 items = 75% |
| ITEMS 2-4 | ******** ******** ******** |

---

The analysis below utilizes five criteria to examine the traditions in the Mishnah relating to the ma'amadot. This analysis reveals distinct literary patterns and demonstrates how seemingly diverse traditions in the Mishnah are carefully chosen and crafted editorially to comprise a structured set of texts that describe a complex and dynamic institution.

A. Attributed vs. Anonymous Traditions.

Two thirds of the ma'amadot statements in the Mishnah are anonymous. The text attributes only a third to specific Rabbinic authorities. The table below (under part B) shows that all attributed and disputed statements describe aspects of the ma'amadot institution. All attributed and undisputed statements relate to other (non ma'amadot) more general topics. A ma'amadot attribution is always followed with a dispute, but no dispute accompanies general usage. Attributions are listed by tractate and subject matter. The Mishnah's framers were determined to present the ma'amadot as an established institution, to be perceived as accepted by all without contention.

B. Disputed vs. Uncontended Statements.

The Mishnah presents all its traditions about the ma'amadot as anonymous and undisputed with one exception, Taanit 4:4. The exception is significant in that the dispute relates to a minor aspect of the ma'amadot.
(exemptions on certain days) and the attribution is to Yavnean masters indicating a universal acceptance of the major and basic character of the ma'amadot institution. The exception of Taanit 4:4 proves the rule that the Mishnah is intent on presenting the ma'amadot as an established and universally accepted institution.

Attributed ma'amad Traditions in the Mishnah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAGE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTION</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISPUTE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. GENERAL</td>
<td>Judges of Sepphoris</td>
<td>public eulogy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baba Batra 6:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. ma'amadot INSTITUTION</td>
<td>R. Akiba</td>
<td>added Torah reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Taanit 4:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ben Azai; R. Joshua</td>
<td>ma'amad Torah reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Taanit 4:4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Pre-70 vs. Post-70 Statements.

Assumptions held by Yavnean masters in Tannaitic sources may reflect pre-70 settings. Taanit 4:4 is such a Mishnah, it only attributes ma'amadot traditions which are also disputed, its tradents are Yavnean masters and their discussion assumes that the ma'amadot institution has been operational for some time prior. Thus Taanit 4:4 corroborates Taanit 4:2 attestation that ma'amadot assemblies met when priestly and Levitical courses served in Jerusalem.
D. Institution vs. General Usage

Most occurrences of the term ma'amad in the Mishnah relate to the ma'amadot institution. The Mishnah employs ma'amad only three times in a more general setting, all associated with diverse funerary practices.

E. Core vs. Secondary Practices

Core practices are those ma'amadot traditions with essential instruction for daily worship of the ma'amadot, mostly Torah reading data. The remaining traditions relate to rites that are not vital for the ma'amadot operations. Core ma'amadot traditions are anonymous, undisputed, and project pre-70 settings. Secondary statements overall are attributed, disputed, and portray post-70 practices. (The dispute in

---

9See Taanit 2:3 for additional practices associated with pre-70 ma'amadot rituals, and see various beraitot in y. Taaniyot 4:1, 67b; y. Berakhot 1:5, 30c; Yoma 37b; Shabbat 24a. Lee Levine notes that, "the inescapable conclusion [is] that the reading of the Torah and its accompanying rituals constituted the main, and at least in Israel, exclusive function of synagogue worship" (Lee I. Levine, ed., The Synagogue in Late Antiquity, p. 15). However, Levine also explains that practically, as opposed to that which was sanctioned by the religious authorities, a full spectrum of liturgical practices were followed by individual communities. "[I]t was driven home by speaker after speaker that in any given generation the range and variety of expression connected with the synagogue was stunning" (Ibid. p. 4). See also the additional practices that Joseph Heinemann associates with ma'amadot rituals (Prayer in the Period of the Tannaim and Amoraim, p. 175). Although Heinemann persuasively notes that there were additional practices such as Targum to explain the text and the recital of 'alenu, he provides no more than deductive reasoning, moreover, the Mishnah pointedly avoids these elements from ma'amadot rituals.
Taanit 4:4 attests to secondary practices, the exemption of certain ma'amadot assemblies).

Conclusion

The Mishnah by itself would be sufficient to give us a comprehensive, systematic and practical view of the ma'amadot institution. In addition to providing a mythic rhetorical didactic rationale for the ma'amadot at the Temple, the Mishnah also provides the most detailed and applied instructions to operate the ma'amadot as a public worship institution that meets every day of the week throughout the year centering on daily Torah reading.

The data in the Mishnah is carefully edited and well organized. Still, in order to effectively assess the Mishnah's explanation of the ma'amadot we must ignore the given rationale, it is not an historical explanation, and instead look at the functional elements in the Mishnah. We must consider those elements that the Mishnah promoted in the institution, likewise, we must determine which aspects of the ma'amadot would have the greatest impact on the community at large by examining the design characteristics of the institution.

The Mishnah's design for the ma'amadot as an institution of local worship shows exceptional care in constructing its features to make for a productive and efficient organization.
If the ma'amadot were practiced during the Tannaitic period according to the Mishnah's depiction then there is every reason to believe that it would have been an outstanding success. The ma'amadot as depicted in the Mishnah, therefore, is the ideal candidate as the forerunner of the synagogue and its ritual.
CHAPTER FIVE

Ma'amad IN THE TOSEFTA

Introduction

Along with the Mishnah, the Tosefta is the most important Rabbinic source for the ma'amadot. The Tosefta provides a context for better understanding the issues and agenda of the Mishnah's editors. Although the ma'amadot are treated differently in the Tosefta than the Mishnah, the former assumes the latter.

The Tosefta's structure is a response to the data in the Mishnah. Tosefta either explains, complements, or disagrees with the data in the Mishnah. The data in the T. confirms the M. without repeating its information. Analysis demonstrates that formulaic connective tissue expertly integrated diverse sources into a single text. Tosefta's text stripped of its formulaic transitions reveals textual units that provide the basis for deducing developmental stages for the ma'amadot institution.
As we did with the evidence in Mishnah, every passage relating to ma'amar in the Tosefta will be examined here, whether explicit or implied. In the next chapter we will analyze the Mishnah and Tosefta as a literary unit. The Tosefta texts used in analysis is based on Saul Lieberman's The Tosefta and Zuckerman's edition for order Toharot. The English translation utilized in this chapter are J. Neusner's translation of the Tosefta.¹

Lieberman's comments are often the departure point. Although Lieberman's approach is vital for Tosefta's study, his interpretation of the ma'amadot repeatedly compresses history, levels the sources, and injects issues not cited by the Tannaim.² For example, Lieberman maintains that throughout the ma'amadot were always associated with prayer.

Tannaitic sources, without exception, associate only the verb gorin, always associated with Torah reading, with the ma'amadot. The verbs pili, yored lifne hatevah, shemoneh 'esreh are not once related to ma'amadot rituals. Tosefta uses these various expressions to denote prayer but it studiously avoids these in context of the


² See the detailed review of S. Lieberman's own six page analysis of the number and type of ma'amadot assemblies (TK, 5:1104-09) in the analysis of Mishnah Taanit 4:4 above.
ma'amadot. For example, T. Rosh Hashanah 2:17 uses ma'amad, mitpalel and yarad in the same passage but each term is exclusively associated with public prayer never with ma'amadot. Despite the clear exclusivity of Torah reading at ma'amadot assemblies, Lieberman, among others, factors prayer routinely into Tannaitic ma'amadot activities. His analysis does not distinguish between pre and post-70 eras, rather he assumes universal ma'amadot ritual practices over time and geography, a picture contradicted by the sources.
The Tosefta uses *ma'amad* to denote memorial services and provides rules for their use. Only communities whose custom included such rites are to continue them. In any case, these rites must be performed seven times.³

T. Pesahim 3:15

A. Where they are accustomed to carry out the ceremony of *ma'amad umoshav* standing and taking a seat [on the return trip from burying a dead person], they do so.

B. Where they are not accustomed not to do so, they do not do so.

C. The ceremony of standing and taking a seat is carried out no fewer than seven times.

³For related aspects of these rites see Lieberman, *TK*, 5:533-34; Albeck, *Mishnah*, 2:503; 3:96. The terms *ma'amad umoshav* are associated with the greetings exchanged at these rites.
Ma'amad denotes presence of a group. Tosefta relates a dispute between Shammaites and Hillelites as to the correct number and order of benedictions recited when Rosh Hashanah falls on Sabbath. The Hillelites support their case by citing a precedent witnessed by both factions. In that case benedictions were recited according to the Hillelite view in presence (=ma'amad) of the Shammaite elders without protest from them.

T. Rosh Hashanah 2:17

A. The festival day of the New Year which coincides on the Sabbath -

B. The House of Shammai says, "One prays ten [blessings]."

C. And the House of Hillel say, "One prays nine."

D. A festival day which coincides with the Sabbath -

E. The House of Shammai say, "One prays eight, and says [the blessings] for the Sabbath by itself and that for the festival for itself, beginning with the one for the Sabbath."

F. And the House of Hillel say, "One prays seven, beginning with that of the Sabbath and concluding with that for the Sabbath, and says the sanctification of the day in the middle."
G. Said the house of Hillel to the house of Shammasi, "Now was it not in presence [=ma'amad] of all of you, O elders of the House of Shammasi, that Honi the Younger\(^4\) went down [before the ark on a festival which coincided with the Sabbath] and said seven, and everyone said to him, 'May it be a source of pleasure to you.'"

H. Said to them the House of Shammasi, "It was because it was a time for cutting short."\(^5\)

I. Said to them the House of Hillel, "If it was a time for cutting short, he should have cut them all short."\(^6\)

---

\(^4\)Tentatively identified by S. Lieberman, TK 5:1062.

\(^5\)It is preferable to shorten each benediction rather than omit any one blessing when there is not enough time to recite the entire prayer (Ibid.).

\(^6\)Rather than drop the eighth benediction altogether.
Tosefta Taaniyot 2:3

Ma'amad denotes Israelites attending tamid offerings at the Temple. This term is later extended to Israelites elsewhere associated with tamid activities. Both priests and Levites of the attending mishmar and Israelites at the ma'amad are not to cut their hair nor launder their clothes. Tosefta, unlike Mishnah, distinguishes between pre- and post-70 for observing the above restrictions.

T. Taaniyot 2:3

A. The members of the father's house [are] not permitted to drink wine either by day or by night [during the time of their service] [M. Ta. 2:7A],

B. because they are perpetually engaged in the sacrificial service.  

C. Members of the priestly watch and members of the public presence (ma'amad) and prohibited to get a haircut and to wash their clothes [M. Ta. 2:7B],

D. whether this is after the destruction of the Temple or before the destruction of the Temple.

E. R. Yose⁹ says, "After the destruction of the Temple, they are permitted to do so,

F. "because this is a cause of mourning for them."

---

⁷This restriction may have applied also to Levites, see Nehemiah 13:30 and II Chronicles 30:16.

⁸S. Lieberman, TK, 5:1028.

⁹R. Yose is tentatively identified as Yose b. Meshullam (see I.M. Ta-Shma, "Yose Ben Meshullam," EJ, 16:855-56).
Remarks on T. Taaniyot 2:3

According to the Tosefta ma'amadot practices existed before 70 and were continued after 70. Our Tosefta adds detail, an historical context and a reason for similar restrictions found in Mishnah Taanit 2:3. The dispute in the Tosefta is determined on a pre- post-70 era. The dispute also hinges on the reason for the restrictions and confirms that service for mishmar and ma'amad members was a joyous occasion for all (with ramification on the fasting practices in M. Taanit 4:3).

The post-70 era is a focal point for ritual changes associated with the ma'amadot. R. Yose relaxes restrictions for his good reasons but the result is a paradoxical situation. The same activity, cutting hair and laundering clothes, depending on the specific context, signifies opposing states of mind. Generally, one in mourning is forbidden to cut his hair or launder his clothes but here ma'amad members do these activities to symbolize their mourning the Temple's fall.

---

10 Contrary to J. Rosenthal, "The Beginning of Jewish Prayer," Bitzaron (1959) 40:140-47, especially p. 146. Let it be duly noted, Rosenthal is the only scholar maintaining in print that the ma'amadot existed only in the pre-70 era. Throughout the writing of this dissertation I held that the ma'amadot continued their practices, albeit in different form over time, till the Geonic period; Dr. Bokser agreed with position always.
While both M. and T. prohibit wine drinking only to ministering priests and Levites, ma'amad members are equated with mishmar members regarding grooming rules associated with Temple service thus raising the status of Israelites.
Tosefta Taaniyot 3:1

T. Taaniyot 3:1 is a parallel of M. Taanit 4:1 and as such we can see that although the term ma'amad is not explicitly mentioned in the Tosefta passage it is clearly implied. The Tosefta is slightly different than the Mishnah but it provides a tradent to the anonymous tradition in M. Taanit 4:1's ruling requiring priestly blessings at ma'amadot assemblies four times a day. Moreover, the Tosefta also adds a dissenting view with Scriptural prooftexts that priestly blessings take place only twice a day.

T. Taaniyot 3:1

A. "On three occasions in the year priests raise their hands [in the priestly benediction] four times a day: at the dawn prayer, at noon, at the afternoon prayer and at the closing of the gates," the words of R. Meir [M. Ta. 4:1A-B].

B. And the Sages say, "At the afternoon prayer and at the closing of the gates there was no raising of the hands,

C. "since it says, ...to stand and minister in the name of the Lord him and his sons forever (Deut. 18:5)."

\[\text{The words that are not underlined are not the exact expression found in the Mishnah. Moreover, the Tosefta (nor the Mishnah) does not use a term for prayer in association with any ma'amadot activities. Thus, Neusner's translation, wherever he uses the term prayer in connection with the ma'amadot rituals, assumes that prayers were part of the ma'amadot services. This assumption has not been proved for the Tannaitic period, nor, I maintain, can it be shown that the Tannaitic sources mandated prayer for ma'amadot activities.}\]
D. "Scripture deems his sons comparable to him. Just as he is appointed, with the raising of the hands in the morning, so his sons are appointed, with the raising of the hands in the morning."
Remarks on T. Taaniyot 3:1

We will address three features of the Tosefta:

Different names than the Mishnah for the ma'amadot assemblies. Attribution of the Mishnah's and Tosefta's traditions while recording a dispute on the issue.

The Mishnah employs the following terms to designate ma'amadot assemblies, shahrit, musaf, minhah and ne'ilat she'arim, whereas the T. chooses shahar, hasot, minhah and ne'ilalah. Lieberman proposes a complex solution that theorizes various additional prayers [musaf tefilah] to explain the disparate terminology. This approach, however, inserts concepts taken from Amoraic sources and is not supported at all by Tannaitic texts. The verb pll is not associated once with the ma'amadot in any Tannaitic source, but are explicitly linked in the Talmud especially the Yerushalmi.

His explanation further complicates matters by introducing other terms into the discourse that are not employed in Tannaitic literature such "additional prayers." Neither the term prayer (=tefilah), certainly not additional prayer (=musaf tefilah) is associated with the ma'amadot. Plainly, there is a need for a description of those elements (prayer, Torah recital, priestly

---

12S. Lieberman. TK, 5:1101-02.
blessings, fasting) as they appear only in the Tannaitic sources.

The multiplicity of terms in the Mishnah and Tosefta is further evidence by the Tannaim of extensive diversity of ritual ma'amadot practices especially in the post-70 era. Although such a diversity cannot be excluded in pre-70, it is only after 70 that these issues are established disputes in Tannaitic sources.

Tosefta attributes the tradition in the Mishnah to R. Meir and attests to opposing practices. If one were to assume that the sources reflect an historical reality then R. Meir’s followers would meet four times daily and include priestly blessings at each session. There are several advantages to this view which expands the role of the priest. Either the editors of the Tosefta did not feel the need to exclude priests or, more likely, priests added both prestige to ma'amadot meetings and also provided them with a prominent daily forum after 70. The ma'amadot would be an exceptional opportunity to keep the system of priestly mishmarot operational in addition to involving Israelite ma'amadot. The Sages, however, objected to such extensive priestly involvement. The Tosefta’s editors included biblical prooftexts arguing that priests blessed the assembled no more than twice a day in the pre-70 era and should do no more afterwards.
The data in this Tosefta suggests a developmental history of ma'amadot. Although both Mishnah and Tosefta mention priestly blessings, these are still secondary and nonvital to the essential Torah readings. This pericope is the first time, post-135, that priestly blessings are explicitly mandated.

All traditions relating to priestly blessings agree to priestly blessings at ma'amadot assemblies, the dispute is to the number of times per day. While Tosefta elaborates in detail about priestly blessings, unlike the Mishnah, it says nothing about Torah reading specifics, which preoccupies the Mishnah. This is evidence that the Tosefta, certainly in this case, is geared to the Mishnah.

We propose to lay out the data as follows:

**Pre-70** - Even the priestly blessing during the tamid offerings were incidental to ma'amadot Torah reading.¹³

**Post-70** - Priestly blessings were integrated into ma'amadot rituals, they were given a role in daily local practices. Though we are unclear of the Yavneans treatment of the priests in regard to the ma'amadot we hypothesize that some authorities sought to expand the priests' role whereas others wished to keep it limited.

---

¹³See the detailed analysis of Mishnah 4:1 above where I gather support and evidence for this position.
Post-135 - Positions are crystallized as traditions in the Mishnah and Tosefta. Priestly blessings are established as part of ma'amadot practices expressed as two trends. One maximizes priestly involvement (R. Meir) while the other restrains it to former levels (Sages).

This data is relevant to the history of priestly benediction and is correlated to its part of established synagogue prayer. Similarly, there is an implication to the transference of Temple rites to non-Temple settings. Strictly on the basis of our issues, we see a definite position to keep ma'amadot practice as non-Temple especially since the Torah reading is from Genesis and related to the cult although both Mishnah and Tosefta explain the ma'amadot in terms of the daily offering.
Tosefta Taaniyot 3:2

Tosefta 3:2, like Mishnah Taanit 4:2, uses the same literary devices, midrashic argument based on Biblical prooftexts, to explain the ma‘amadot as linked to the tamid offering while adding some detail of its own.
T. Taaniyot 3:2

A. Eight priestly watches did Moses set up for the priesthood, and eight for the Levites.

B. When David and Samuel, the seer, arose, they divided the priesthood into twenty-four watches, and the Levites into twenty-four watches.

C. as it is said, [All these, who were chosen as gatekeepers at the thresh-holds, were two hundred and twelve. They were enrolled by genealogies in their villages.] David and Samuel the seer established them in their office of trust (I Chron. 9:22).

D. This refers to the watches of the priesthood and the Levites.

E. The prophets in Jerusalem went and organized twenty-four delegations ("amudim"), corresponding to the twenty-four priestly and levitical watches,

F. since it says, Command the children of Israel, and say to them My obligation, my food for my offerings made of fire, of a sweet savor to me, shall you observe to offer me in their due season (Num. 28:2).

G. It is not possible to say that this applies to all Israelites.

H. But it teaches that a person’s agent is equivalent to the person himself [so that the delegation (ma’amad) serves as a surrogate for that part of the community represented in the offering of a given watch].

\[14\]The correct transliteration should be 'ammudim since this is a qattul form of the root 'amad. In printed editions ma'amadot (Lieberman, TK, 2:337).
Remarks on T. Taaniyot 3:2

Tosefta 3:2 relates only part of the ma'amadot, the lesser part, the Israelite ma'amad at the Temple where Israelites were but passive observers at the daily offering. The ma'amadot are exclusively associated here with the tamid offering, implying that this is the only reason for its establishment.

Tosefta, unlike Mishnah, also details the development of the priestly and Levitical mishmarot. Tosefta as well as Mishnah equate ma'amadot with mishmarot noting that both were an evolving legislative product. The verb 'amad is twice utilized here to denote legislation.¹⁵

The first section [A3] on the mishmarot ends with a typical transition/concluding phrase, 'elu mishmarot kehunah uLeviyah. This dovetails perfectly into the Mishnah's (Taanit 4:2) opening phrase, 'elu hen, which is used nearly fifty times in the Mishnah to introduce an explanation or a list of items.

Tosefta continues with an accounting of the ma'amadot patterned after the Mishnah's model while adding a clarifying detail. After citing Numbers 28:2 as prooftext, making the ma'amadot dependent on the tamid

---

¹⁵The active verb form of 'amad used to denote a legal authorities exercising their prerogatives is found repeatedly in Tannaitic sources, among them Sotah 8:6; Baba Kama 4:4; Avot 1:1.
offering, Tosefta explains that all Israel cannot oversee the daily offering and that is why the ma‘amadot were established.

Lieberman prefers the term 'ammudim, which is in the London manuscript and several places in the Y.,\textsuperscript{16} to ma‘amadot cited in the printed editions and the M. as the correct citation. Malter, however, finds no difference in the two terms and prefers ma‘amadot instead.\textsuperscript{17} The term 'ammudim has linguistic connotations that set it in sharp contrast to ma‘amadot.

The linguistic choice in the Tosefta and Mishnah to name the ma‘amadot institution may reflect a nuance of their respective positions, ma‘amadot in the Mishnah are considerably more dynamic than in the Tosefta. In the Mishnah the ma‘amadot are actively engaged in daily Torah reading throughout their local communities, in the Tosefta Israelites are relegated only to passive attendance at the Temple without a hint of their major role in their respective habitats.

'Ammodim is the gattul nounal form suggesting that Israelites were a passive element, as they were at the

\textsuperscript{16}Lieberman, TK, 5:1102.

\textsuperscript{17}H. Malter, Masekhet Ta‘anit, p. 120.
tamid offering in the Temple. Ma'amad, however, is not nearly as passive, rather it is a noun denoting an institution with substantial status drawn from Biblical antecedents given to the term ma'amad. These two Tannaitic traditions may reflect diverse views of the ma'amadot either as passive and subordinate to priest and Temple or as dynamic and dominant in the local community.

18 See the detailed discussion of these terms in chapter two, especially section c, above.
Tosefta 3:3 parallels the second half of M. Taanit 4:2 providing detail lacking in the Mishnah and adding supplemental information. Like the Mishnah, Tosefta alludes to the Israelite assembly as "belonging to that [priestly] mishmar" gathering in their local communities to read from the creation narrative in Genesis. Although the Tosefta associates Israelites with mishmar, as does the Mishnah, Israelite gatherings is often identify with ma'amad. Likewise, we interpret the evidence in both the Mishnah and Tosefta that the critical ritual activity of the Israelite ma'amad is Torah reading.

Tosefta adds detail lacking in its Mishnah parallel. Tosefta speaks of Israelites who can not go up to Jerusalem for the ma'amad and that members of the ma'amad refrain from labor during their week of service. It also adds a related tradition which is attributed relating to the importance of Levites, their musical instruments and Israelites to the service.
T. Taaniyot 3:3

A. [When] the time of a given watch had come, its priests and Levites go up to Jerusalem.

B. And the Israelites of that watch who cannot go up to Jerusalem gather together in their towns and study the Scriptures pertaining to the works of creation [M. Ta. 4:2E-F]

C. They refrain from labor that entire week.

D. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "Priests, Levites, musical instruments, and the people as well are indispensable to the cult."

---

19Genesis 1:1-2:3. Neusner in his English translation of Tosefta Taaniyot (p. 274) renders gorin as study although he notes later, Taaniyot 3:4F, that the assembled read the Scripture. Neusner's translation in this passage is misleading. His interpretation is faulty since gorin is the technical term used exclusively for reading passages from the Torah, and as is clear from the Mishnah's context, the reading is a very formal public reading of Genesis 1:1-2:3.
Remarks on T. Taaniyot 3:3

As we explained in the Tosefta's parallel, M. Taanit 4:2, the phrase, "and Israelites in that mishmar" provides us with insight into the relation of ma'amad to mishmar. The sources are clear that priests and Levites were grouped into mishmarot and Israelites were organized into ma'amadot, although these were applied to both groups. We concluded that Israelite ma'amadot were organized and named after priestly mishmarot. Since priestly mishmarot were named after their well established family clans going back to early Biblical times and Israelites had no such established lineage to name their ma'amadot, the ma'amadot were named after the mishmarot.

Tosefta, in full agreement with Mishnah, depicts the heart of the ma'amadot ritual, daily Torah reading of Genesis. The Tosefta, however, does not provide the necessary detail to operate the ma'amadot Torah readings, the information that is found in full detail in the Mishnah. Lieberman cites evidence from commentators that this restriction did not apply universally (TK, 5:1104-105). Lieberman concludes that there was a version of the Tosefta that included readings from cultic depictions in the Torah as part of the ma'amadot ritual. Lieberman further notes without providing an explanation, that Maimonides did not include this tradition in his sources although R. Hananel is the first to cite this practice. We explain, in chapter ten below, that these facts are a result of the Karaite practice of including cultic Torah readings into their daily liturgy. As a result of the
creation epic as the one indispensable element of ma'amadot practices.

The phrase, "Those [Israelites] who can not go to Jerusalem gather in their cities and read from Genesis" is not found in the Mishnah and requires an accounting. Lieberman provides two possibilities: they were either too old to go to Jerusalem or they were too far to make the trek.21 Another possibility is that members of the ma'amad did not want to go either for ideological or other considerations.

The datum that members of the mishmar and ma'amad are to refrain from labor for the week of service is also not found in the Mishnah. The sources comment that participants in these services were celebrating a festive occasion as those who brought offerings.22 There is a possible relation, noted in the literature, between this rule of the ma'amadot and the phenomena of the "ten idlers" (= 'asarah batlanim).23

Tosefta also adds one more item not cited in the Mishnah stating that priests, Levites, their musical

sectarian Karaite rituals, Rabbinic authorities refrained and repressed these same practices in their own communities.

21 Lieberman, TK, 5:1103.
22 Qeren 'orah, 27b.
instruments and Israelites are required to fulfill cultic functions. This tradition is attributed to a tradent who maintains that musical instruments are required too unlike another position who holds that the required music is provided through song and not instruments.²⁴
The Tosefta follows the same pattern in the Mishnah but again offers a complementary context. While the Tosefta provides attribution to traditions in the Mishnah and cites dissenting opinions, it confirms and corroborates the data in the Mishnah about the ma'amadot.
T. Taaniyot 3:4

A. On the first day of Nisan there is no service for the afternoon and for the closing of the gates,

B. for on that day there are the offering of the additional sacrifice and the wood-offering [cf. M. Ta. 4:4D-G].

C. "In the case of a long pericope, they read it by two, and in case of a brief one, by one person [M. Ta. 4:3K],

D. "at dawn and at the additional service," the words of R. Meir.

E. And sages say, "On any day on which there is an additional offering, they read [the Works of Creation] at the additional prayer, and on any day on which there is no additional offering, they do not read [the Works of Creation] at the additional prayer."

F. At dawn and at the additional service they gather together in the synagogues and read [the Scriptures of the Works of Creation].

G. And at the afternoon service they come together and recite it by heart [M. Ta. 4:3L].

H. R. Judah says, "An individual does not pronounce the Scriptures by heart. But they come together in the synagogues and pronounce the Scriptures as they pronounce the Shema’" [M. Ta. 4:3L].

---

25Neusner’s introducing into the translation the term "prayer" is unwarranted by the Tannaitic sources. See our comments to T. Taaniyot 3:1 above.
Remarks

Here is another instance where a source does not explicitly cite the term ma'amadot yet it is clearly implied as can be seen from its parallels in the Mishnah. Tosefta relates two issues, a dispute about exemptions of ma'amadot assemblies, paralleled in Mishnah and the proper location for ma'amadot assemblies a datum also not mentioned in Mishnah.

The main issue in this Halakhah is what ma'amadot assemblies took place and which exemptions were followed. The matter is complicated by the fact both Mishnah and Tosefta imply various possibilities which were multiplied by commentators and scholars. M. Taanit 4:2 and T. Taaniyot 3:3 hold that ma'amadot meetings occurred twice a day (tamid) whereas M. Taanit 4:1, 4 and T. Taaniyot 3:1 suggest four meetings a day. We have explained the evidence depicting a developmental model of the ma'amadot, at first there were only two and then, after 70 most commonly, various meetings were added to the original two.

Lieberman, commenting on this issue, insists on harmonizing and homogenizing all ma'amadot traditions (Tannaitic, Amoraic and beyond) so that ma'amadot meetings always employed only one set of uniform ritual practices throughout its history despite considerable diversity of sources and variants. Lieberman expends considerable
energy to develop a model explaining a system of ma'amadot meetings and exemptions but his efforts force Amoraic ritual elements into Tannaitic discourse (prayer) contrary to the literary evidence while ignoring a developmental dimension of the institution. Tosefta 3:4 also alludes to additional assemblies at which there was a Torah reading from Genesis [gorin bo musaf]. None of the commentators which Lieberman cites hold that this additional Torah reading for the ma'amadot was anything else but the creation narrative.

In conclusion, whatever the solution to the ma'amadot problem it will be resolved by flattening the textual data into a homogeneous mass. We thus hypothesize that the complex literary evidence depicts an evolving institution with a core of common practices (related to Torah reading) with a variety of attendant rituals that accrue with time.

Tosefta 3:4 may well be the first explicit bridge between ma'amadot and the synagogue. Tannaitic sources in the Mishnah are attributed with a tradition that ma'amadot members would "gather in their cities [=niknasin le'arehen]." The Tosefta, however, maintains that "they gather to their synagogues [=niknasin lebate kenesiyot],"

---

26 See remarks to Taaniyot 3:3 above.
27 S. Lieberman, TK, 1109-111.
28 M. Taanit 4:2; T. Taaniyot 3:2.
and is used twice to define the place for ma’amadot assemblies. We see a ritual drama performed first in the city square and then moved into buildings.\(^{29}\) In addition to commenting on the changing fortunes of the Jewish community and the decline of public expression of their culture, this Halakhah ties ma’amadot with the synagogue.

**Tosefta Megillah 3:14**

Ma’amad and moshav denote public memorial rites.\(^{30}\)

T. Megillah 3:14

A. They do not carry on the [mourning rite of] standing and sitting [en route home from the accompanying a corpse to the grave] among less than ten people [M. Meg. 4:3F],

B. and they do not carry on the rite of standing and sitting less than seven times.

\(^{29}\)S. B. Hoenig, "Historical Inquiries," p.135, note 45.

\(^{30}\)See T. Pesahim 3:15 above.
Tosefta Ketubot 3:3

Tosefta 3:3 determines the circumstances which may qualify for evidence in testimony before a court. Ma'amad denotes a person's immediate setting as he observes a certain event. Therefore a woman or minor may testify about the origin of a bee swarm only if their testimony is gathered in that setting. Their testimony may then be used to settle a dispute between two field owners over the bees. ma'amad denotes the mental presence one has of his surrounding. The implication is that women and minors may not be trusted either because their credibility is limited or that they be threatened or intimidated by those stronger than them.

T. Ketubot 3:3

3:3 ...

J. Said R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, "A woman or a minor is believed to say, 'From here this stream went forth.'"

K. Under what circumstances?

L. When they gave testimony on the spot [about their home-town].

M. But if they went forth and came back, they are not believed,

N. for they may have stated matters only because of enticement or fear.
Tosefta Gittin 4:13

*ma'amad* denotes the presence of a group of ten receiving orders to deliver a writ of divorce to a wife. The Tosefta instructs that the husband's phrasing determines whether one or ten persons must deliver the writ. "Carry" without further specification requires but one person to deliver the divorce writ; "You all carry," obliges all present to observe handing the writ to the wife.

Tosefta Gittin 4:13

A. [If] he said to ten men, "Give a writ of divorce to me wife."

B. one of them takes it in behalf of all of them.

C. [If he then said,] "All of you take it,

D. one of them hands it over in the presence [=ma'amad] of all of them.

E. Therefore if one of them died, lo, this is an invalid writ of divorce [M. Git. 7:7G-I].
In this halakhah the term *ma'amad* denotes presence of an individual conducting a business transaction.

T. Baba Batra 9:2

A. He who sells a field belonging to his fellow in the presence [*ma'amad*] of his fellow has done nothing whatsoever.  

B. [If, however, the owner] wrote, "I shall confirm what he doe after him," his words are confirmed.
ma'amad denotes presence of persons, witnesses in two cases of monetary disputes. Tosefta 2:5 defines two kinds of testimony needed to collect damages in court. In one the plaintiff claims that witnesses saw an actual loan. In the second, the plaintiff claims that witnesses observed the defendant admit his debt. If the testimony is valid the defendant is liable.

T. Shevuot 2:5

G. Testimony concerning property is confirmed on the basis of what one has seen without knowing it, or what one has known without directly seeing it.

H. And what is the case of evidence based on seeing without direct knowledge?

I. "Give me two hundred zuz which I have in your possession!"
   "You don’t have such money in my possession!"
   "Did I not count out for you exactly that sum in the presence [ma'amad] of Mr. So-and-so and Mr. Such-and-such?"
   "Let them state so and I’ll pay you"—this is evidence based on what people have seen without knowing the meaning of what they have seen.

J. And what is the case of evidence on knowledge without one’s directly seeing it?

K. "Give me two hundred zuz which I have in your possession!"
   "You don’t have such money in my possession!"
   "Did you not admit to me in the presence of Mr. So-and-so and Mr. Such-and-such?"
   "Let them say so and I’ll pay it out to you"—this is evidence based on what people have seen without knowing the meaning of what their having seen [the incident itself].
Tosefta Shevuot 5:3

The term *ma'amad* denotes presence of persons, in this instance, a court deciding a money claim where the defendant denies any debt. The verdict depends on the number of witnesses, one or two, testifying for a debt less than claimed. If two, the defendant pays the amount testified (half the claim) and is absolved of an oath; if one testifies then he takes an oath for the entire amount claimed and is free from any payment.

T. Shevuot 5:3

A. If the plaintiff was claiming a *maneh* in the presence [*ma'amad*] of a court,

B. and the defendant denied it,

C. and two witnesses came and gave testimony that he owes him fifty *zuz*,

D. lo, this one pays [fifty *zuz*] and is exempt from the requirement of taking an oath.

E. But if there was only a single witness who was giving evidence against him,

F. lo, this one takes an oath covering the whole amount.

---

31 *maneh* = 4 gold dinars = 100 *zuz* (E. Z. Melamed, *Eshnav haTalmud* [The Talmud Window], [Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1976], p. 88).
Ma'amad denotes presence of a person. A store keeper is to be present during the administration of an oath to a plaintiff. Three parties, two suits and a single defendant, who is a father, employer and customer, are involved. The three plaintiffs [=son, employee and merchant] claim they are to be paid by the defendant. Two, son and employee, claim they were not paid nor did they collect from the merchant. The merchant is also seeking to collect from his customer [father, employer] for payments to the son and the laborer. The plaintiffs [son, employer] take an oath in presence of the merchant, who likewise takes an oath, and the defendant pays all claims. 32

T. Shevuot 6:4

A. A storekeeper concerning what is written in his book [M. Sheb.7:5A] -

B. and not what is sold on terms have they stated the rule.

C. For if one may claim, "You have written [the debt] in this page, it has been erased in that page."

D. But if he said, "Give my son two seahs of wheat," "Give my worker a change for a sela."

E. and he says, "I already gave it to him."

F. and they say, "We never got it"—

G. he takes an oath and collects what is owing to him, and they take an oath and collect what they claim [M. Sheb. 7:5C-F].

H. Rabbi says, "I say that workers take an oath only in presence [=ma'amad] of the storekeeper."

I. He said to the storekeeper, "Give me produce for a denar," and he gave it to him.

J. He said to him, "Give me the denar."

K. and he said to him, "I already gave it to you, and you put it in the till"—

L. let the householder take an oath [M. Sheb. 7:6A-E].
In this halakhah, the term ma'amad denotes presence of a person. If a Jew, priest, Levite or Israelite, is present while a gentile bakes bread or curdles cheese then these foods are fit.

K. A loaf of bread which a gentile baked, not in the presence [=ma'amad] of an Israelite,

L. and cheese which a gentile curdled, not in the presence of an Israelite, are prohibited.
The term ma'amad may denote either a base of an object so that it may support it and stand on it. The term in this context may also denote the durability of material objects which determines their susceptibility to impurity. Utensils must be durable before becoming impure. Coating a bird’s eggshell makes them durable and susceptible to contract impurity.

T. Kelim B.M. 7:6

A. The plated egg of the chicken is clean, because it is only plated so as to preserve it [=ma'amad].

B. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says in the name of R. Meir, "Also the plated egg of the chicken [which] holds anything at all is susceptible to uncleanness."

C. And the wing of a vulture and the egg of the ostrich are mentioned only with [reference to] existing [conditions].

---

33 Utensils must be durable and usable before becoming impure (Kelim 3:3). Mishnah uses a different phrase, the term gayam (Kelim 11:8; 13:7; 16:2).
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Tosefta Kelim B.M. 7:7

A. He who makes utensils from something which will last [=ma’amad] - it is unclean. If he makes from something which will not last [=ma’amad] - it is clean.
CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

OF ma'acamadot IN

THE MISHNAH AND TOSEFTA

Introduction

The Mishnah and Tosefta are a unique and most important combined source for the study of the ma'acamadot institution. They are a text and context for each other providing a literary gestalt as a result of their editorial process. "[T]he Mishnah and Tosefta constitute a single literature-Lieberman demonstrates this virtually on every page of his work-and cannot be studied except in relationship to one another."¹

For a systematic understanding of the ma'amadot we examined thus far every instance of ma'amad separately in the Mishnah and Tosefta, and also evaluated the institution in the Mishnah. We now examine the entire data in the Mishnah and Tosefta [=M&T] for an overall view and a clarification of their respective agendas. The combined data will also provide a basis for a developmental model of the ma'amadot.

The importance of studying the Mishnah by itself has been especially underscored as a vital methodological approach in modern scholarship. Neusner, for one, concludes emphatically, "all analytical and critical work in rabbinical literature must begin in the study of specific documents, their formal traits, redactional preferences, and substantive interests."²

A summary section below will review aspects of the ma'amadot in Mishnah, Tosefta, and M&T. This section will also preview the analysis that follows.

The analysis section following the summary presents numerous lists and tables to make apparent the patterns imbedded in the M&T. We will demonstrate that the combined data on the ma'amadot in the M&T represents

---

highly organized and carefully edited texts that are complementary to one another and provide a distinct portrait of the institution.

We will conclude by proposing an hypothesis, a narrative depiction of the development of the ma'amadot from hypothetical pre-70 to the beginning of the Amoraic era. We assume that the Tannaitic sources record pre-70 practices though the documents themselves were edited after 200 c.e. Likewise, we assume that the ma'amadot continued their rituals, changed from their pre-70 norms, till after the Talmudic era.

Summary

The Mishnah’s primary concern is the ma'amadot institution. The greatest consideration within the ma'amadot is assigned to a detailed account of the ma'amadot Torah recitals of Genesis, its most vital ritual. The Mishnah presents its ma'amadot traditions as mostly anonymous and undisputed. Ultimately the Mishnah’s text stands on its own as a coherent whole, providing instructions for full daily public worship easily operable in local communities.

The Tosefta complements Mishnah’s treatment of ma'amad in two ways: Tosefta in numerous instances attributes to R. Meir what the Mishnah presents as anonymous traditions. Tosefta, far more than the Mishnah, employs ma'amad to
denote various topics other than the *ma''amadot* institution. The traditions relating to the *ma'adamot* in Tosefta are mostly attributed and disputed, which may suggest diversity of practices after 70.

*Ma'amad* in the Mishnah and Tosefta are treated as a single literary unit (=Mishnah/Tosefta) because of their affinity, interrelatedness and textual cohesiveness. The combined data is mapped as an entity revealing two distinct literary patterns that are complementary.

Both Mishnah and Tosefta claim antiquity for the *ma'adamot* institution linking it to the *tamid* offerings through Biblical prooftext (Num. 28). Moreover, the two sources agree in their mandate for daily Torah reading (Genesis) in local communities and therein lies at the liturgical heart of the institution. There is no similar requirement for prayer in the Tannaitic sources in association with the *ma'adamot*.

The importance and exclusivity of Torah reading at the *ma'adamot* meetings is consonant with the nature of the synagogue during the Second Temple era. Recent scholarship on the development of the synagogue and its practices has concluded that Torah reading is central in the life of local Jewish communities, an assessment that
is corroborated by other witnesses to the Tannaitic period.³

The following accounts projections of the ma'amadot in the Mishnah, Tosefta and in both these sources.

The Mishnah projects the ma'amadot as a long and well established institution that remained essentially unchanged from its hypothetical pre-70 origins with "the former prophets." The Mishnah presents its data as anonymous and undisputed traditions with diversity of practices after 70 (Taanit 4:4). Mishnah uses a Biblical textproof (Num. 28) to explain its founding which links it with the tamid offering.

The Tosefta parallels and complements the Mishnah, Tosefta too claims a supposed pre-70 history related to the "prophets of Jerusalem." Tosefta also uses Num. 28 as proof text which explains and links the ma'amadot to the tamid. Tosefta, unlike Mishnah, depicts a diversified liturgical practice in the post-70 era relating its traditions with attributions and disputations. While Tosefta lacks the detailed instructions for daily Torah reading found in Mishnah, it is agreed that this practice is the vital element of the ma'amadot institution.

Mishnah and Tosefta present a coherent and complementary portrait of the ma'amadot. Both hypothesize that the institution was established well before 70 and link it through a Biblical prooftext to daily tamid offerings and priestly courses. This may have been done to accord antiquity and prestige to the ma'amadot while equating (or even setting as superior) daily Torah reading with the Temple cult. Both M&T agree that the creation narrative in Genesis is the central liturgical practice even as other rites accrue, with disputations, around this core element. Even with a proliferation of various rituals associated with post-70 ma'amadot (fasting, prohibition of cutting hair or washing clothes, priestly blessings, additional Torah reading) there is a distinct exclusion of prayer from ma'amadot rituals. Even where the Tannaitic sources uses the term ma'amad (not in reference with the ma'amadot institution) in the same context with prayer, it none the less avoids associating prayer with the ma'amadot institution.⁴

⁴In T. Rosh Hashanah 2:17 ma'amad denotes presence but the context relates to prayer; see Table 6 below.
Analysis

To start, a grammatical note on Tannaitic and Biblical usages of ma'amad and ma'amadot. The term ma'amadot exclusively denotes the institution under investigation in Mishnah and Tosefta⁵ whereas the term ma'amad often denotes the institution but is also associated with other concerns. All seven ma'amad contexts utilized in M&T⁶ are well within the Bible's semantic range of its root c MD as seen in Table 1 below. The construct ma'amad in the Bible (6 times, no plural ma'amadot form) denotes office or official function in service of the monarchy or the Temple.⁷ Each of the denotations in Tannaitic sources has an antecedent in Biblical usage except the ma'amadot which is a uniquely post-Biblical invention.

The table below shows the categories of ma'amad usages in the Mishnah and the Tosefta, and their previous use in the Bible. This table demonstrates the general usage in the Bible, not antecedents.

---

⁵The only exception in entire Rabbinic literature is a citation by fifth generation Babylonian Amoraim who make reference to ma'amadot as a memorial service (Baba Batra 100b).

⁶See Table 1 and 4 below.

TABLE 1
Ma'amad in Mishnah, Tosefta and Bible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAGES</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ACTIVITY RELATED TO ma'amadot</th>
<th>RELATED USE IN THE BIBLE 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 763, 1d 764, 1e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Torah Reading</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nehemiah 9:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assembly Ritual</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>See #1 above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Ritual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>p. 763, 1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Eulogy 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eccl. 12:5; Jer. 48:38; Amos 5:16; Micah 1:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence/Duration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 764, 3d-f,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21 - 58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 There is no reference to the ma'amadot institution in the Bible, nor to a formal ma'amad meeting as described in rabbinic texts. In this table we review the semantic field of the term ma'amad for a better appreciation of its rabbinic application.

9 References are in BDB, Lexicon.

10 Although in this category the term ma'amad is not found, Tannaitic usage employs ma'amad with mourning. The associations are not incidental, in Micah 1:11 sfd is associated with 'md, in the other references mourners carry their sadness publicly in the streets and the city-square.
The prefix מ, a common Mishnaic Hebrew addition to verbal stems, is a nominal form denoting the person, place, time, or instrument of the action.11 Robert Polzin describes 'amad "an automatic," preferred usage over verb gum in Mishnaic Hebrew in contrast to Biblical Hebrew.12 Y. Kutscher further theorizes that this phenomenon resulted from a rejection of Aramaic influence through a linguistic process he terms "reverse calque."13 Kutscher explains that resistance to linguistic influence of a competitor produces an affinity to forms unrelated to those available from the competition. In our case, although gum was quite adequate linguistically, indicating both transitive and intransitive states, because it was Aramaic it was unacceptable. Instead use was made of the Hebrew 'amad.

In M&T ma'amad is primarily associated with an institution totally unknown in Biblical texts. Despite a novel use of ma'amad in M&T, it remains within range of usage found in the Bible where the term is associated

11A. Bendavid, Hebrew, 2:443-45 see also chapter two, section one, above on the discussion of ma'amad terminology.


mostly with royal and Temple offices. The new institution in M&T benefits from this association found in the Bible (T. Taaniyot 3:2).

The term 'ammudim used in T. Taaniyot 3:2 (with parallels in Y.) is a qattul nounal form yet it retains a passive. Ma'ammed, however, is a noun with a more dynamic connotation and a measure of an independent office.

The term ma'amad appears exactly thirty three times in the Mishnah and Tosefta and is implied in several more cases for a total of nearly thirty eight instances. In some passages the institution is clearly implied without being explicitly stated. The term ma'amad appears in thirty Mishnayot and Halakhot among sixteen tractates in all six orders of Mishnah and Tosefta. Nearly three fourths of the citations are in order Moed, mostly in tractate Taanit. Table 2 below shows the distribution of ma'amad in Mishnayot and Halakhot by respective orders and tractates. The critical data about the ma'amadot is in the Mishnah although there are more citations in the Tosefta.
Mishnah and Tosefta have different relative interests in the ma'amadot as indicated in their respective usage of ma'amad. Despite these differences there is an overall literary balance between the treatment of its two major topics: the ma'amadot institution [=technical] and other various topics [=general]. Table 3 below shows how Mishnah and Tosefta, separately and together, distribute their usage of ma'amad. Although Tosefta has more total usage than Mishnah, the significant information is in the latter (col. B). Mishnah is twice as interested in ma'amadot while Tosefta is twice as concerned with general usage (cols. C, E). Overall, there is an editorial balance of the diverse elements in M&T (cols. C, E).
Next we will evaluate the range of ma'amad usages in the Mishnah and Tosefta as they are mapped out in Table 4 below. Total ma'amad usages (38) are grouped into seven categories listed by frequency - presence of person/s, public assembly ritual, public Torah recital (8 each); Temple ritual (6 times); public eulogy (5 times); existence/durability (twice); and demographic district (once).

Three items (assembly, Temple ritual, Torah recital items 2, 3, 4 in Table 4 below) project aspects of a single ma'amadot institution. The ma'amadot is the dominant single concern by far in Mishnah/Tosefta appearing more than twice than any topic (57% vs. 24%, 11%, 5% and 3% for other denotations).
Table 4 also shows the concentration of ma'amadot data in their respective tractates. Mishnah is clearly providing much attention to Torah reading. Tosefta, meanwhile, has a major focus of ma'amad associated with divorce and finance.
TABLE 4 - MA'AMAD USAGES IN MISHNAH AND TOSEFTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Temple</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Existence</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Ritual</th>
<th>Assembly</th>
<th>Torah</th>
<th>Eulogy</th>
<th>Person/s</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Ritual Recital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MISHNAH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikkurim 3:2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 2:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 4:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 4:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 4:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 4:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taanit 4:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megillah 3:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megillah 3:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megillah 4:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketubot 2:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Batra 5:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tosefta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisha 3:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Hashan 2:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taaniyot 2:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taaniyot 3:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taaniyot 3:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taaniyot 3:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taaniyot 3:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megillah 3:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketubot 3:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gittin 4:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Batra 9:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shevuot 2:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shevuot 5:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shevuot 6:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Zarah 4:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelim BM 7:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelim BM 7:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS*    |        |        |        |        |          |           |           |        |          |       |        |          |          |               |
| Mishnahot/Usages |          |        |        |        |          |           |           |        |          |       |        |          |          |               |
| Halakhot 30 | 37 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 16% | 8 | 22% | 7 | 19% | 4 | 11% | 9 | 24% | 2 | 5% |
| Mishnah 13 | 16 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 19% | 4 | 25% | 5 | 31% | 3 | 19% | 0 | 0 |    |
| Tosefta 17 | 21 | 0 |    | 3 | 14% | 4 | 19% | 2 | 10% | 1 | 5% | 9 | 43% | 2 | 10% |

Elements (2-4) treat ma'amadot as a single institution  
Mishnah: 12  57%  75%  
Tosefta: 9  43%  43%  
M/T: 21  57%  
M+T MorT

Examining the three ma'amadot categories of data in M&T as a whole (items 2, 3, 4 in Table 4), we find that there are eleven individual elements that comprise the institution. These elements are listed below by order of appearance.

1. Cutting hair, laundering garments of ma'amad representatives.
2. Priests blessing ma'amad assemblies.
3. Israelite presence at tamid offerings.
4. Israelite daily recital of Genesis countrywide.
5. Fasting by ma'amad members.
6. Public assembly ritual by ma'amad members.
8. Cancellations of ma'amad meetings.
9. Abstaining from work by ma'amad members.
10. Constituency of ma'amadot assemblies.
11. Location of afternoon ma'amad assemblies.

All ma'amad usages in the M&T are examined along the criteria listed below. The categories below list first obvious traits of the text, the first three are indisputable aspects of the Tannaitic traditions. The last two, items D and E, are not quite as obvious and are subject to interpretation.

A. Attributed vs. anonymous statements.
B. Disputed vs. undisputed statements.
C. Technical vs. general statements distinguish between usages dealing with the single dominant ma'amadot institution and other usages employing the term but unrelated to that one concern.
D. Pre- vs. post-70 traditions.
E. Core vs. secondary statements differ between core elements necessary for ma'amadot rituals (Torah recital) and secondary statements pertaining to derivative issues (priestly blessings, fasting, exemptions, grooming).
We shall see that the data in M&T possesses an exceptional degree of editorial organization which is demonstrated when M&T is subjected to analysis utilizing the above criteria. M&T traditions can be divided into two groups of text each with distinct traits in categories A through E. First, we shall examine items A-C and the D-E.

The first three criteria comprise two well-defined groups, not one shares any trait with the other. Table 5 without exception defines all traditions that are attributed, general [non ma'amadot] and undisputed in one group; all attributed, ma'amadot related and disputed traditions are in another group.

A. Attributed vs. anonymous statements.

Approximately a third of all traditions in M&T are attributed. Table 5 below examines all attributed ma'amad statements with striking definite patterns evident in M&T texts. All attributed and disputed statements relate to ma'amadot (technical) and all attributed undisputed statements relate to all other topics. Ma'amadot attribution is always followed with a dispute but not one dispute accompanies general usage. Attributions are listed by tractate and subject matter, Mishnah preceding Tosefta. Nearly half the attributed traditions are ascribed to R. Meir and his circle, which appear as anonymous ruling in the Mishnah.
B. Disputed vs. undisputed statements.

Disputed and undisputed statements are closely related to other criteria of analysis. As seen in Table 5 below all disputed ma'amad statements are associated with the ma'amadot institution. As with the pattern set by attributed/anonymous statements Mishnah presents more uniform features in anonymous/undisputed statements while Tosefta complements Mishnah with attributed/disputed statements.

C. Technical [=ma'amadot] vs. general texts.

The ma'amadot institution is the single most dominant category treated in M&T with its own set of rules. See items A and B above for more detail.

D. Pre-70 vs. post-70 statements.

While it is easy to identify certain M&T ma'amadot texts relating post-70 settings\textsuperscript{15} other traditions are not as simply dated. Although the issue of "dating traditions" is debated in the literature,\textsuperscript{16} we may, nonetheless, propose a developmental model for the institution.

We will analyze two categories of traditions relating to the ma'amadot. The first relates M&T traditions that are anonymous, undisputed, and projected as pre-70 concerns.

\textsuperscript{15}T. Taaniyot 2:3; 3:6. Other attributed passages in M&T are likewise identifiable by their tradents as post-70.

\textsuperscript{16}See chapter four above.
These traditions attest to vital elements of the ma'amadot. The second are attributed and disputed traditions which depict a post-70 setting.

E. Core vs. secondary ma'amadot rites.

The analysis so far (A-D) has shown that ma'amadot traditions in M&T are divided into two sets of traditions, sharing the above four distinct traits. Traditions relating vital ma'amadot practices are labeled as core elements synonymous with a set that is anonymous and undisputed and projected as pre-70. Secondary statements are non-vital ma'amadot practices synonymous with attributed, disputed and post-70 traditions such as exemptions ma'amadot assemblies. Thus while Torah reading rules is core data the exemptions of Torah reading on a few occasions is secondary data because it does not affect major operations of the ma'amadot.

Table 5 below shows a definite pattern between two sets of M&T traditions. The first criterion of analysis tabulates all attributed traditions related to the term ma'amad. The second criterion divides those traditions associated with the ma'amadot institution [B] and those unrelated to the institution [A]. The last criterion records whether these traditions are disputed.

The first set includes all traditions not related to the ma'amadot institution, they are all attributed but do
not record a single dispute. The second set includes all traditions relating to the *ma'amadot* which are attributed, disputed and record post-70 settings.
TABLE 5
Attributed ma'amad Passages in Mishnah/Tosefta

Attributed/disputed/ma'amadot
vs.
Attributed/undisputed/general

I. Tabulation
A. General [=non ma'amadot institution] Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Dispute</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judges of Sepphoris</td>
<td>Public eulogy</td>
<td>M. B. Batra 6:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses of Shammai &amp; Hillel, Honi the Young</td>
<td>Presence of persons</td>
<td>T. R. Hashanah 2:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Yohanan ben Beroqa</td>
<td>Presence of persons</td>
<td>T. Ket. 3:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Nathan: Nahum haMadi</td>
<td>Presence of persons</td>
<td>T. B. Batra 9:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbi</td>
<td>Presence of persons</td>
<td>T. Shev. 6:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Technical [=ma’amadot institution] usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTION</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>DISPUTE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 R. Akiba</td>
<td>Additional Torah reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M. Taanit 4:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ben Azai; R. Joshua</td>
<td>ma’amad Torah reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M. Taanit 4:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 R. Yose</td>
<td>ma’amad grooming, washing &amp; fasting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T. Taaniyot 2:3, 3:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 R. Meir</td>
<td>Priestly blessings ma’amad Torah reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T. Taaniyot 3:1, 3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 R. Simon ben Eleazar</td>
<td>ma’amad constituency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T. Taaniyot 3:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 R. Meir</td>
<td>Additional Torah reading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T. Taaniyot 3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 R. Yehudah</td>
<td>Location of ma’amad assembly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T. Taaniyot 3:4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Analysis of above tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ma’amad USAGE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTED</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DISPUTED</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- General - non ma’amadot institution</td>
<td>5 of 17</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- technical - ma’amadot institution</td>
<td>7 of 21</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>12 of 38 (44% of R. Meir’s circle)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prayer and ma'amadot Assemblies

Neither Mishnah nor Tosefta associate prayer with ma'amadot ritual even once, although they have ample opportunity to do so. In fact, M&T studiously avoids such associations even as they detail extensively aspects of prayer with public fasts (Taanit 2, Taaniyot 1). While scholars admit they know very little or nothing of the nature of prayer at ma'amadot meetings, all have, nonetheless, made the assumption that prayer was in fact part of the institution. 17

Two reasons help explain this mistaken perception, names for prayer times used for ma'amadot gatherings and the Talmuds' deductions that prayer was part of the institution's liturgy. 18 As Table 6 below shows, M&T uses many terms to identify ma'amadot assemblies that indicate times for prayer.

M&T utilize only one operative verb fifteen times explicitly and exclusively to describe the activities at

17J. Heinemann, Prayer, p. 80. Lee I. Levine, who does not mention the ma'amadot once by name though alluding to it, also concludes that Torah reading was the and exclusive Second Temple synagogue ritual ("The Second Temple Synagogue," p. 15, 21).

18Only the Talmud associates prayer with the ma'amadot. Both the Yerushalmi (Taaniyot 4:1, 67b) and the Bavli (Taanit 26b) Talmud deduce that prayer was part of the ma'amadot liturgy. In light of the exclusive characterization in M&T, ma'amadot rituals without prayer, we conclude that prayer later became associated with the institution.
ma'amadot gatherings - gordin, a verb which is strictly applied to reading portions from the Bible. Verbs that indicate prayer are not used even once, verbs such as mitpalel, yarad lifne, 'avar lifne.

The editors of the M&T certainly knew of these respective verbs but clearly kept them separate. In one source (T. R.H. 2:17) the term ma'amad, not related to the institution, is found in the same passage with five verbs indicating prayer explicitly, yet no such reference is associated with the ma'amadot institution.

19 Taanit 4:2 (1); 4:3 (3); Megillah 3:4 (1); 3:6 (1); T. Taaniyot 3:3 (1); 3:4 (8). There are numerous additional implied references in M&T in support of this position.
### TABLE 6

Ma’amad and terms of assembly/prayer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MISHNAH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Taanit 4:1</td>
<td>Priests bless assembled</td>
<td>shahrit, musaf minhah, ne’ilot she’arim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Taanit 4:2</td>
<td>Temple assemblies + Torah recital</td>
<td>shahrit, minhah+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Taanit 4:3</td>
<td>macamad Torah recitals</td>
<td>shahrit, musaf, minhah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Taanit 4:5</td>
<td>Assemblies cancelled</td>
<td>hallel, musaf+ wood offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOSEFTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Taaniy. 3:1</td>
<td>Priests bless assembled</td>
<td>shahar, hasot, minhah, ne’ilah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Taaniy. 3:2</td>
<td>Temple assemblies</td>
<td>shahrit, minhah+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Taaniy. 3:3a</td>
<td>Daily Torah recital cancelled</td>
<td>shahrit, minhah+ musaf offering, wood offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Taaniy. 3:4</td>
<td>Assemblies cancelled</td>
<td>minhah, ne’ilah, musaf offering, wood offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Taaniy. 3:4</td>
<td>Daily Torah recitals</td>
<td>shahrit, musaf, minhah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+These are implied in the context.
Quite possibly other practices accrued to the central feature of Torah reading such as shema' reading, additional Torah reading, Targum, 'alenu, Midrash, Torah blessings, study, tefillin, etc. But these practices are neither sanctioned, required nor imagined by Tannaitic sources. Again, nowhere is prayer associated with ma'amadot gatherings by any Tannaitic authorities.

Torah recital at ma'amadot Assemblies

Both Mishnah and Tosefta are in agreement that the central activity of the ma'amadot is the daily reading from Genesis. Torah reading took place twice a day corresponding to the tamid offerings, shahrit and minhah. Although there is reference to additional Torah readings (T. Taaniyot 3:4), these are unspecified, disputed, projected as post-70 and take place only occasionally. It is clear from the Mishnah (Taanit 4:3 and Megillah 3:6) that the Torah readings of Genesis were the only regularly mandated and are intended to be read all week long.

An analysis of the ma'amadot Torah reading traditions in Mishnah and Tosefta, as seen in Table 7 below, shows that these traditions may also be evenly divided into two groups.

---

20J. Heinemann, Prayer, pp. 174-75.
One set includes traditions that are anonymous, undisputed, core rules and projected as pre-70.\textsuperscript{21} The other set includes traditions that are attributed, disputed, secondary rules.

### TABLE 7

Ma'amadot and Torah Recital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Dispute</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISHNAH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Taanit 4:2</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>pre-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Taanit 4:3b</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>pre-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Taanit 4:3c</td>
<td>R.Meir</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Usha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Taanit 4:4a</td>
<td>R.Akiba</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yavneh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Taanit 4:4b</td>
<td>b.Azai, R.Joshua</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yavneh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Taanit 4:5</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>pre-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Megillah 3:4</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>pre-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Megillah 3:6</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>pre-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOSEFTA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Taaniy. 3:3a</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>pre-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Taaniy. 3:3b</td>
<td>R.Simon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Usha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b.Elazar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Taaniy. 3:4a</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>pre-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Taaniy. 3:4b</td>
<td>R.Meir</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Usha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Taaniy. 3:4c</td>
<td>Sages</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Usha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Taaniy. 3:4d</td>
<td>R.Yehudah (b.Illai)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Usha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lists below synthesizes these two groups with their corresponding regulations.

\textsuperscript{21}See the detailed discussion above in this chapter on these issues.
Ma'amadot Torah Recitals in Two Sets

Group I- Anonymous/Undisputed/Core statements/\(^\text{22}\) projected as pre-70

1. Israelites are to recite twice daily from Genesis, corresponding to tamid offerings.
2. Detailed outline of daily Scripture recital.
3. Instructions for the mode of Torah recital.
4. Exemptions of ma'amad Torah recital.
5. Priority of ma'amad Torah recital over other scheduled recitals.
6. Listing ma'amad Torah recitals among other passages to be recited.

Group II- Attributed/Disputed/Secondary statements/post-70\(^\text{23}\)

2. Usha- Providing an additional (=musaf) Torah recital beyond those already practicing (shahrit, minhah)
3. Usha- Further additions (R.Meir) and exemptions (Sages) for ma'amad Torah recital.
5. Sepphoris- Requirement for priests, Levites and Israelites to be present at daily ma'amad meetings (R. Shimon b. Elazar).

Diversity of opinion is found only from the Yavnean period with R. Joshua onwards, with most traditions

\(^{22}\)The sources are as follows, 1-Taanit 4:2; 2,3-Taanit 4:3b; 4-Taanit 4:3c, 4:5; 5-Megillah 3:4; 6-Megillah 3:6.

\(^{23}\)These are the sources, 1-Taanit 4:4; 2-Taanit 4:3c, T. Taaniyot 3:4b; 3-T. Taaniyot 3:4; 4-T. Taaniyot 4:4; 5-T. Taaniyot 3:3b.
attributed to R. Meir and his disciples (75%). The post-70 variety of legal opinions are projected to depict a fluid and diverse public worship (priestly blessings, fasting, personal grooming, and other unspecified Torah recitals). In all presentations, the Torah recitals are the prominent feature of the ma'amadot. The ma'amadot Torah reading, as seen in the sources, have been extraordinarily successful in accomplishing a variety of goals as changing circumstances demanded. Ultimately, even its banishment from public practice (during Geonic times) will also serve a purpose of distinguishing rabbinic Judaism from Karaite practices which co-opted the daily Torah readings as their main feature of its daily liturgy.24

Hypothesis

On the basis of the above analysis we propose a model of the ma'amadot as an evolving institution, projecting to a pre-70 setting to the start of the Amoraic epoch.

Pre-70 ma'amadot assemblies

The Mishnah and Tosefta suggest hypothetically that the ma'amadot institution was established during the Second Temple period and its focus was on the Torah scroll and the creation narrative in Genesis. The institution was

---

24 These issues are discussed in detail in chapter, section B1 below.
meticulously designed to influence local communities and ordinary Israelites on a daily basis. Although the ma'amadot were explained and linked to the tamid offerings, this connection is not historical but incidental except that it bolstered the status of the Torah reading. Those attending the daily offerings were few in number, passive observers who were not required to read the Torah. After 70, of course, there could be no ma'amadot representatives at tamid offerings. The importance of the post-70 ma'amadot assemblies in the local communities would be even more deeply felt, both because of its direct link with the Temple cult and for its forum for continued daily public worship.

No fasting was associated with the ma'amadot before 70 since attending the institution's assemblies was considered a festive event which required celebration instead. Members of the ma'amad were required to groom themselves appropriately, launder their clothes and trim their hair. Although priestly blessings at the ma'amad in the Temple was part and parcel of the cult, it was incidental and optional practice throughout the land. Ma'amadot assemblies were not required to have priests in attendance and only priests may minister their blessings.

There were no additional ma'amadot meetings besides those mandated during weekdays (no musaf ma'amadot assemblies). Even on Friday afternoon, and especially on
Sabbath, there were no ma'amadot meetings, neither were there meetings on holidays. Abstention from labor was a practice associated with the ma'amadot but was not an indispensible, mandatory aspect of the institution.

The constituency of these assemblies was mostly of Israelites although priests and Levites could also attend. Ma'amadot assemblies met in the city-square, a statement of the community’s self-definition. Some ma'amadot assemblies, however, may very well have been in buildings (synagogues = assembly houses), especially in the larger cities and in the diaspora. The above Rabbinic projections thus sets the stage for the ma'amadot as the precedent and antecedent of the synagogue.

Post-70 ma'amadot assemblies

The most certain and critical data about the ma'amadot is to be found in the post-70 era whatever the hypothetical nature of the ma'amadot pre-70. The destruction of the Temple witnessed a response to crisis in every aspect of Jewish life. According to the M&T’s presentation, the most apparent development regarding the ma'amadot is a proliferation of practices and a diversity of opinions. The state of affairs for the ma'amadot after 70 saw a fluid
transition of practices and traditions which continued long after the Tannaitic period.\textsuperscript{25}

Some traditions increased ritual aspects of ma'amadot practices yet adapting ritual to their own needs. In some circles the number of daily meetings, priestly blessings, and Torah reading increased to four meetings a day.\textsuperscript{26} Additional Torah readings are alluded to on certain times,\textsuperscript{27} and fasting was also introduced. The pattern of canceling ma'amadot meetings became a matter of numerous individual positions. Abstention from labor may have become more prominent depending on the community's fortunes.

Priests were given an established role in ma'amadot ritual helping to preserve the mishmarot by giving them a format for daily ritual drama. The institution served an extraordinary opportunity to preserve the organization of the mishmarot. The rotational order of the priestly families as they served for a week each six months would be successfully preserved and ultimately incorporated into the

\textsuperscript{25}The fluid state is reflected in M. Taanit 4:4.

\textsuperscript{26}The circle of R. Meir and his disciples emerge as a group maximizing ma'amadot activities which is in consonance with other Rabbinic traditions about that Tanna (see the literature on kehillah kadisha deYerushalaim).

\textsuperscript{27}Vegorin bo musaf (T. Taaniyot 3:4).
religious life of local communities for some time after 200.28

The location of the ma'amadot also shifted. Whereas at first sources depict the city square as the center for ma'amadot and other community ritual drama (Bikkurim, Passover), post-70 traditions single out explicitly the synagogue as the place where the institution's rites occurred. Here we may well have the synagogue's antecedent and forerunner.

28 There is extensive epigraphical evidence that the rotation of mismarot was announced each Sabbath at the synagogue as late as tenth century (E. E Urbach, "Mismarot uma'amadot," Tarbiz, (1963):3-4:326-27; T. Kahana, "The Priests According to Their Courses," Tarbiz, (1979):1-2:9-29.)
CHAPTER SEVEN

Ma'amad

IN

HALAKHIC MIDRASHIM

Introduction

The term $ma'amad$ appear six times in Halakhic Midrashim denoting presence of a group but without relation to the $ma'amadot$ institution. The linguistic usage and bibliical exegesis found in these Tannaitic midrashim, nonetheless, shed light on the link between the Bible and the Mishnah and Tosefta showing that, in their way, "Mishnaic law is derived from Scriptures and not logic alone."¹

The Midrashim interject the term $ma'amad$ into their discourse as they explain biblical texts or apply it to a

¹B. M. Bokser, "Recent Developments," p. 30.
setting. By examining the linguistic associations made in these Midrashim, especially to the Biblical 'edah and 'anshe 'ir, we will be able to provide a semantic field for the term ma'amad.

We will find ma'amad to be a term utilized with greater frequency in rabbinic sources, expressing social consciousness and self representation. All denotations are associated with authoritative ritual drama both in their biblical settings and Tannaitic applications. We will also see that the Tannaitic Midrashim foreshadow editorial strategies regarding the ma'amadot, mostly in the Tosefta and less so in the Mishnah.
Sifra Sav 40:4 [Leviticus 8:3]

The term ma'amad denotes presence of an assembly [= 'edah], a public assembly of an appointed group, observing installation of priests at the newly established Tabernacle.

Sifra Sav 40:4

A. "And the entire assembly [= 'edah] gather [= haghel]" (Leviticus 8:3).

B. [This means that you are to] perform [= priest installation rituals] in presence [= ma'amad] of the entire assembly [= 'edah].

C. Thus they [= community] will be accustomed to treat the priesthood with sanctity.

Remarks

Sifra provides both instruction and adds an explanation of the verse in Leviticus. Midrash associates 'edah with ma'amad in the setting of a ritual drama that, hopefully, will encourage the entire community to hold the priesthood in high regard, establishing a relationship between ritual and the change of public values.
The operative terms in Leviticus and Sifra are 'edah, gahal and ma'amad. Robert Gordis notes that the Biblical terms possess special meaning.²

[I]t seems clear from a detailed study of the Biblical usage of both terms [edah/kahal], that edah is the original technical term for 'assembly' while kahal means 'the people' as a collective unit. [Etymologically edah (stem Y'D) is a] 'public assembly specifically convened.' This nuance of conscious meeting is lacking in the root kahal...edah is the authentic term for the 'public assembly' in ancient Israel...[it is] the supreme arbiter in all phases of the national life...concerned with political, judicial, economic and military affairs.

Sifra Emor 19:3 (Leviticus 24:14)

The term ma'amad denotes the presence of a public assembly [='edah] gathered by appointment, for a convict's execution.

Sifra

A. "And he shall be stoned by the entire assembly [= 'edah] (Leviticus 24:14).

B1. Does the entire assembly stone him?
B2. [=Of course not!]

C1. If so why is it said, "the (entire) assembly?"
C2. These are the witnesses [stoning the offender] in presence [=ma'amad] of the entire assembly.

Remarks

Sifra solves an apparent Scriptural contradiction. Leviticus requires that the entire assembly stone the offender, but Deuteronomy 17:7 requires the prosecuting witnesses to strike him first, and then to be stoned by the entire people. The solution is for the indicting witnesses to stone the convict in presence [=ma'amad] of the assembly. Three groups are to stone the condemned: witnesses, appointed assembly and the entire people respectively. Though the entire people are instructed to stone the convict, it is unlikely for all people to assemble at each stoning. Instead, an assembly
representing the entire people gathers on their behalf for
the execution. The prosecuting witnesses execute the
offender in presence of the assembly in their presence and
on their behalf, and ultimately on behalf of the entire
people.

The social context for ma’amad projected in Tannaitic
texts is parallel to biblical models, presenting a society
integrated by reciprocal relationships of agency and
representation. The departure point with a concern for
the implausibility for all people to carry out an
ordinance is common to the Midrash and other rabbinic
sources. The Midrash here, and in Sifre Numbers and
Deuteronomy, anticipates the phrasing in the Tosefta
(Taaniyot 3:2) and the Yerushalmi (Taaniyot 4:2, 67d).
Sifre Numbers Naso 9 (Numbers 5:16)

The term ro’sh hama’amad denotes an individual, head of a public assembly at the Temple, placing the impure at the East Gate. See Tamid 5:6 above where this statement is examined in detail.

Sifre

A. And the priest [=ro’sh hama’amad] shall set her [=errant wife] before God" (Numbers 5:16).

B. At the Gates of Nicanor.

C. Hence they [=Sages] said [=mika’n ’amru], "Ro’sh hama’amad set the impure at the Gates of Nicanor."

Remarks

Sifre identifies a location "before God" in Scripture as the Gates of Nicanor. Lemma [C] opening with the phrase, "hence they said," indicates a quote from an earlier source. Linking lemma and Midrash is the stem ‘amad in causative form. This verbal form is particularly

---

3 Their exact Temple location is uncertain. For a summary of issues and bibliography see U. Rappaport, "Nicanor’s Gate," EJ 12:1133-35.

4 The source may be Mishnah or an earlier source common to Mishnah and Midrash (J.N. Epstein, Mishnah, 2:728-42; D. Halivni, "Some People Bring Bikkurim," Bar-Ilan Annual, 7-8 (1970):73-79.
suited for the exegesis Midrash provides it. But the exact function of lemma (C) and its parallel (M. Tamid 5:6) are not easily discerned. Rosh hama’amad most likely is a technical term, but its context is debated.

---

5 Post-exilic Bible texts employ most all (94%) hiph‘il amad forms denoting establishing/confirming new social orders. By contrast to total amad usage in the Bible, post-exilic books use the qal form only 29% whereas they employ 77% of total hiph‘il forms.
The term *ma'amad* denotes the presence of a public assembly [=*‘edah*] gathered by appointment for a convict's execution. This is the most extensive definition for *ma'amad* in the Midrash.

Sifre Shalah 114

A. "And God said to Moses, 'Surely the man shall die, pelted shall he be with stones by the entire assembly [=*‘edah*] outside the camp" (Numbers 15:35).


C1. You say, "[=The ‘entire assembly’ does not mean that the entire assembly stones the convict, rather it means] in the presence of the entire assembly."

Perhaps "entire assembly" is to be understood literally?

C2. Thus it [=Scripture] teaches, "The hands of the witnesses shall strike him [=convict] first to kill him" (Deuteronomy 17:7).

C3a. Thus what is taught by stating "the entire assembly"?

C3b. In presence of the entire assembly.

Remarks

Sifre above deals with exegetical problems also dealt by Sifra Emor 19:3, namely, how does the entire community fulfill a biblical order when it is not practical to do
so. This Midrash passage, more than any other, associates 'edah and ma'amad in a way that closely resembles the Tannaitic discourse on the ma'amadot institution, especially T. Taaniyot 3:2. Both the textual problem, its solution and use of the term ma'amad demonstrate a similar mind set and approaches to text.

Sifre Deuteronomy Ki Tese 220 (Deuteronomy 21:21)

The term ma'amad denotes presence of city folk ['anshe 'ir] for a convict's execution.

Sifre Deut. Ki Tese

A. "And he [=rebellious son] shall be stoned by all his city's people with stones and he shall die (Deuteronomy 21:21)."

B1a. And do all his city folk pelt him?
B1b [No.]
B2 Rather [witnesses strike the convict] in presence [=ma'amad] of all his city folk.

Remarks

Sifre elucidates textual problems⁶ whereby all the city's people were to stone the offender, an impractical

---

⁶Based on alternate manuscript readings, see Sifre Ki Tese 240 below (Finkelstein, Sifre Deuteronomy, p. 271).
and unlikely rule. Midrash also solved a requirement for
witnesses to strike the convict rather than city folk.

Reaffirmed are principles of agency and collective
representation on a model that was further developed in
Tannaitic sources. A community’s agents performing in
presence and on behalf of a select public assembly
gathered by appointement, discharges functions required by
Scripture of each society member.

Sifre Deuteronomy Ki Tese 240 (Deuteronomy 22:12)
The term ma’amad denotes presence of city folk
[=‘anshe ‘ir], assembled at a convict’s execution. See
comments to Sifre Deut. 220 above for more detail.

Sifre Deut. 240

A. "And they [city people] shall stone her [=errant
wife], all her city’s people and she shall die" (Deuteronomy 22:21).

Bl.a. And do all her city’s people stone her?
Bl.b. [No.]

B2. Rather [witnesses strike the convict] in
presence [=ma’amad] of all her city’s people.

7Such population centers contained a minimum of
several hundred persons up to several thousand
inhabitants. See Y. Cohen, Perakim betoldot tegufat
haTannaim [Issues in the period of the Tannaim],
(Jerusalem: Department of Education and Culture, 1978),

8The word all [=Kol] is missing in Deuteronomy.
Analysis of ma'amad in Halakhic Midrashim

The table below summarizes and maps ma'amad usage in Halakhic Midrashim. The Midrashim associate ma'amad with two terms in particular, 'edah and 'anshe 'ir. Insight into these terms as they were used in the Bible will help us to understand what the Tannaitic editors sought to have ma'amad perceived to be.

The distribution of the verb 'amad in the Bible will also be instructive, especially distribution patterns between causative and passive forms, including changes in denotation of the verb from pre- to post-exilic books.

TABLE 1

MIDRASH ASSOCIATIONS OF ma'amad WITH 'EDAH AND 'ANSHE 'IR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Biblical association</th>
<th>Biblical context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sifra Sav 40:4</td>
<td>'edah</td>
<td>installation of priests in presence of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sifra Emor 19:3</td>
<td>'edah</td>
<td>witnesses stone blasphemer in presence of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sifre N. Naso 9</td>
<td>ro'sh hama'amad</td>
<td>sets errant wife at Nicanor Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sifre N. Shalah 114</td>
<td>'edah</td>
<td>witnesses stone Sabbath violator before community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sifre D. Ki Tese 220</td>
<td>'anshe 'ir</td>
<td>witnesses stone rebellious son in presence of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sifre D. Ki Tese 240</td>
<td>'anshe 'ir</td>
<td>witnesses stone adulteress in presence of community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Midrash associates 5 of 6 Tannaitic ma'amad with biblical 'edah and 'anshe 'ir. This usage has several common elements. Each instance is in the context of a public assembly in executive session which includes: an authority conducting assembly proceedings; a public assembly gathered by appointment; representatives acting on behalf and in presence of the assembly.

The nouns 'edah and 'anshe 'ir as public assemblies provide settings for Tannaitic ma'amad.

'Edah denotes a congregation, an appointed assembly, acting concertedly,9 "not the social population but the institutionalized body of Israel, that is a given group acting on its behalf."10

The term 'edah is most prominent from Exodus through Judges.11 With rise of the monarchy, "the specific connotation of the edah as the tribal assembly was

9BDB, Lexicon, p. 417.

10M. Weinfeld, "Congregation," EJ, 5:893-96; ma'amad as a representative public assembly is implied in M. Taanit 4:2 and explicit in T. Taaniyot 3:2, "rather it [=Scripture] teaches that a man's agent is the same as he [=sender]."

11Septuagint translates 'edah as "synagogue" denoting a communal assembly in session at the city-square (S.B. Hoenig, Great Sanhedrin, pp. 158-59; idem., "Historical Inquiries," p. 137).
gradually lost."\[12\] Lacking entirely in post-exilic Ezra and Nehemiah, the term appears but once in Chronicles (II 5:6). 'Edah is also entirely lacking in Mishnah and Tosefta.\[13\]

'Edah's absence is only in canonical books. Qumran texts associate 'edah with ma'amad.\[14\] Qumran makes repeated use 'edah in diverse constructs to refer to its own community as the ideal biblical society versus other Judeans.\[15\] At the same time, we find ma'amad often in Qumran texts although there is, of course, no association to the ma'amadot institution.

\[12\]M. Weinfield, "Congregation," EJ, 5:896. "[D]espite the centralized character of the united kingdom at the period of David and Solomon, and despite the well-rooted royal tradition in the separate states of Judah and Israel, the sovereignty of the people-as expressed in its institutions-did not cease, but continued to express itself- though in changed forms- until the fall of the two states and even thereafter." H. Tadmor, "'The People' and the Kingship in Israel," Jewish Societies Through the Ages, eds. H.H. Ben Sasson and S. Ettinger, (New York: Schocken, 1969), p. 48.


Instead of 'edah, post-exilic books use the verb 'amad in the causative hiph'il. As Table 2 below shows this verb form is associated with new social orders and collective behavior. Ninety two percent of causative 'amad in Bible denoting establishing/confirming new social orders appear in post-exilic texts.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Orders Established</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Priests for idols</td>
<td>I Kings 12:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Eunuchs</td>
<td>Esther 4:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People; masses</td>
<td>Daniel 11:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervision</td>
<td>Esther 3:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People into divisions</td>
<td>Nehem 4:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prophets</td>
<td>Nehem 6:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mismarot in Jerusalem</td>
<td>Nehem 7:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Laws</td>
<td>Nehem 10:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Watch guards</td>
<td>Nehem 13:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Levitical singers</td>
<td>I Chron 15:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Davidic rule</td>
<td>I Chron 17:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Levites</td>
<td>II Chron 19:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Idols</td>
<td>II Chron 33:19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a further difference in denotaions of the term 'amad in the causative form in pre-exilic books than in post-exilic texts. Pre-exilic employ the hiph'il form to denote a concrete, physical "make stand" usage. Post-exilic relate to a more abstract usage of establishing new social orders.
Table 3 below maps the distributions of 'amad in hiph'il in the Bible. Post-exilic texts use the causative 'amad three times as much as pre-exilic books. This is the first instance (compared to qal forms which is a reciprocal usage) that post-exilic biblical texts employ greater numerical frequency than pre-exilic books.

Pre-exilic text use over eighty percent of hiph'il verb form most to denote a concrete setting. The reverse is strikingly true of post-exilic texts, which use eighty percent of the same verb form to denote establishing new social orders. Overall, ninety four percent of hiph'il 'amad is in post-exilic denoting establishing new aspects to society.

TABLE 3

Hiph'il of 'Amad Distribution in Bible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>&quot;Make stand&quot; %</td>
<td>&quot;Establish&quot; %</td>
<td>% of Concrete</td>
<td>% of Abstract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Exilic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Exilic</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The stem of the noun 'edah is Y'D and denotes appoint, mo'ed, a cognate, signifies appointed time, place or meeting. 16 Ma'amad is associated with public assemblies which continue to carry collective policy even after the Return, especially as no monarchy competed for the same power base. 17

'Edah corresponds to equivalent legal/technical terms in Tannaitic sources. Biblical 'edah is similar to the Tannaitic bet din, "the court." 'Edah's meeting place 'ohel mo'ed, "tent of assembly," 18 is bet ha'ava'ad in Tannaitic texts. 19

---

16 BDB, Lexicon, p. 417. The identically written term 'edah has another stem 'WD, and meaning. As a noun it denotes testimony and witness, of things and testimonies, "always of laws as divine testimonies or solemn charges" (Ibid. pp. 729-30).

17 Phoenician town assemblies were, "powerful oligarchies ... councils of elders who acted as a supervisory board in trade transactions. The basis of life was business, which automatically limited tyrannical methods." (G. Herm, The Phoenicians, p. 135 in J. MacDonald, "Assembly?" p. 520 note 31). Israelite urbanization is typical and sets a pattern for Judean society. "The elders ... became the established authority in the Israelite city (I Sam. 11:3) ... Urban life produced new criteria for the selection of elders, economic power replacing hereditary status." (B. Porten, "History," EJ 8:611).


19 BDB, Lexicon, p. 418. The term zikne (judges in Deuteronomy 16:16) in the Bible is associated with sha'ar, also linked to rehov ha'ir (Esther 4:6), translated as bet din in Mishnaic Hebrew (A. Bendavid, Hebrew, 1:334, 356).
Midrash also associates ma'amad with 'anshe 'ir, a city's public assembly. Both city and assembly are significant elements of Judean society since its earliest history. "[T]he city with its inhabitants became a new component of the tribal system, to which a person could be related in the same way that he was related to a clan or a household... There are numerous examples of this concept in the early chapters of I Chronicles."  

'Ir [=city], denotes a modest community also, "many localities called cities ('arim)...numbered no more than 1,000 persons and consisted principally of farmers who had

---


banned together to live behind city walls for protection against raiders."\(^{22}\)

Public assemblies in Judea was representative of contemporary social practice, "state- and city assemblies were quite normal throughout the Near East in Ugaritic times."\(^{23}\)

The terms city and elders are associated both in Bible (=zikne 'ir)\(^{24}\) and Mesopotamian texts (alum u shibutum).\(^{25}\) The term city is likewise synonymous with its inhabitants and citizenry.\(^{26}\)

The association of ma'amad with city assemblies provides a context for the Tannaitic term as part of a pervasive cultural structure in context of the whole Mesopotamian historical spectrum with respect to the citizens' assemblies...the evidence from the latest periods (and later) is just as


\(^{24}\)Deuteronomy 19, 22, 31. Zaken/zikne are automatically translated as bet din in Mishnaic Hebrew (A. Bendavid, Hebrew, 1:344).

\(^{25}\)J. MacDonald, "Assembly?" p. 515.

\(^{26}\)Ibid. p. 518; BDB, Lexicon, p. 746.
typical and plentiful. We see the Assembly in different roles, always decision making, always with a degree of democratic authority, dealing with a wide range of situations and topics, both in a legislative role...and in an executive role in which the larger body, mainly citizens could decide on many matters, including the making of decisions in times of military threats, drought, serious cases of litigation, land use and so on.27

While ma'amad is distinctly utilized in Midrash and Mishnah/Tosefta there are similarities between these Tannaitic sources. Both lexically and exegetically ma'amad in Halakhic Midrashim denotes public assemblies gathered for executive sessions. There is no reference to the ma'amadot. More importantly, the Midrash defines the term ma'amad with technical terms in the Bible which have extensive and established antecedents in the world of antiquity. This legacy is bestowed indirectly on the ma'amad and ma'amadot in the Mishnah and Tosefta.

Mishnah and Tosefta, on the other hand, are primarily concerned with the nature and history of the ma'amadot institution without reference to prooftexts with one exception. Both these genres are similar in that they depend on Scripture as a departure point for their discourse. Halakhic Midrashim also anticipate some of the editorial approaches found in the Tosefta and less so in the Mishnah.

---

27J. MacDonald, "Assembly?" p. 519.
CHAPTER EIGHT

MA'AMAD

IN THE

JERUSALEM TALMUD

Introduction

The Yerushalmi has almost an exclusive interest in the ma'amadot institution, 98% of its references relate to the ma'amadot. As done with the Mishnah and Tosefta, the Yerushalmi will be studied as an independent text even as it depends on the Mishnah for its point of departure. Each instance where the term appears, either explicitly or by inference, will be examined individually. Below is a

---

brief summary of the findings on the ma'amad in the Yerushalmi.

The Yerushulami amplifies its understanding of the Tannaitic sources in the light of its own contemporary reality. In addition, Yerushalmi also preserves traditions relating to Temple practices. Its major interest (68%) in the ma'amadot is in Temple related rituals rather than Torah reading of Genesis which is at the heart of the institution in Mishnah and Tosefta.

Yerushalmi presents the ma'amadot institution as a liturgical reality during the Amoraic period in Israel with its own unique features. Likewise, Yerushalmi portrays ma'amadot practices as being in continual flux since Tannaitic times as seen in its bewilderment of Mishnaic ruling for the liturgy of the institution.

The Yerushalmi reports the following ma'amadot practices: for the first time in Rabbinic sources prayer is presented as a fixed feature of the institution, whereas priestly blessings and fasting are confirmed as ongoing practices.
Ma''amad, used in the construct form 'anshe ma'amad, denotes members of the ma'amadot assembly. Yerushalmi informs that ma'amad members, gathered for Torah recital, who remained for the morning Shema recital after its due hours did not fulfill their duty.

Berakhot 1:5, 3c

[A] It is taught,
He who recites [=Shema] with 'anshe ma'amad has not discharged [his obligation] since they would tarry.²

[B] R. Zera said in the name of R. Ami,³ In the days of R. Yohanan⁴ we would go out [into the city-square] to the Fast, and we recited Shema after three hours. And he [R. Yohanan] did not object to us.

²M. Berakhot 1:2 details time limits for Shema recital. This coincides with sunrise according to a stricter opinion. A more lenient opinion holds that it may be recited "till three hours" approximately till 9:00 A.M. if 6 A.M. is the beginning of the day and depending on the season of the year.


R. Yose and R. Aha went out to the Fast. The congregation gathered and recited Shema after three hours. R. Aha wanted to protest against them.

Said R. Yosef,

But they already recited it [Shema] in its time. Do we not recite [Shema] but to rise to prayer [tefillah-rabbinic text] from the midst of Torah text?!

Said [R. Aha],

Because of the common folk [Shema is not to be recited beyond its time limits]. So that they may not say,

They are reciting it in its prescribed time.

Remarks

Sugya [A]-[C] opens with an anonymous baraita [A] stating a general legal dicta. The baraita states that ma'amad members joined by others in reciting Shema have


6All story variants include the same essential elements see B. Ratner, Ahawath Zion weJerusholaim [Love of Zion and Jerusalem], (Wilna: Rom, 1901), tractate Berakhot p. 25.

7Baraita [A] is also seen as an editorial/ scribal gloss concluding a preceding baraita that reciting Shema with anshe mishmar is inadequate as they rise too early, see L. Ginzberg, A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud, 4 vols., (New York: JTS, 1941), 1:173. Each baraita stands independently providing distinct information on mishmar and ma'amad members, both terms appear in a combined form in b. Yoma 37b. There is no need to compress an already compact Yerushalmi.
not fulfilled their obligation. A series of independent, parallel and attributed narratives follow, illustrating concretely a similar treatment of public worship by the Sages.

In each instance the public recites Shema beyond its time limits without serious consequence, despite objection to such laxity. The assembly gathers on its own to satisfy their need for public worship, quite ready to continue with the ritual without any help. The role of the Sages is limited to protesting an ongoing ritual. The groups' tardiness is seen here as a result of the assembly's own pace.

The law (Berakhot 1:1-2) states limits for reciting Shema without exception. Yet Rabbinic authorities apply the law differently to individuals than to the collective. It is moderated to facilitate the self-improvement of society rather than manipulate improvement. The variable is the fixed law and the constant is a concern with public

---

8[B-C] are in Galilean Aramaic, the latter includes a dialogue [C.2] in late Mishnaic Hebrew [=MH2].

9This is so despite negative side effects which may explain Mishnah [Berakhot 1:2], "He who reads forthwith [beyond Shema recital limits] has not lost [merit]. [It is] as an individual reciting Torah."

10Another suggestion is that 'anson ma'amad were late reciting Shema because "they were either carrying water or chopping wood for the cult" (L. Ginzberg, A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud, 1:79-80).
perception. The ma'amad assembly, like fast days, is allowed practices serving no prescribed ritual function (even conflicts with it) yet such practices are silently promoted by the Sages for an unspecified extra-legal social purpose. It is more important that the community practice its public ritual beyond strict Halakhic requirement than even disrupt the ongoing practice. An expanded form of this baraita is found in a parallel passage in Yoma 7b, and is compared there.
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38. Berakhot 4:1, 7c

Ma'amad in the baraita below, as in M. Taanit 4:1, denotes a ma'amadot public assembly. Here they gather for ritual observance including priestly blessings.11

Berakhot 4:1, 7c

[A] When is the time for ne'ilah?

[B] The Masters of Caesaria12 said, It is disputed by Rav13 and R. Yohanan.14 Rav said, At the close of heavenly gates. And R. Yohanan said, At the close of the Temple's gates.

[C] Said Rav Yudan Anturdaya,15 That which we studied supports Rabbi Yohanan, On three occasions the priests raise their hands four times during the day,

11The baraita/Mishnah supports a Palestinian position, ne'ilah is during daytime including priestly blessings (L. Ginzberg, A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud, 3:87). See y. on Taanit 4:1.


13His name is Abba ben Aivu, leading third century Babylonian Amora, founder of the Sura academy (M. Beer, "Rav," EJ, 13:1576-79).

14Ratner notes that the RaN notes the Amora Samuel instead of R. Yohanan (B. Ratner, Zion & Jerusalem, Berakhot, pp. 97-98), but Ginzberg maintains that the disputants are R. Yohanan and Rav (L. Ginzberg, A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud, 3:87).

on shahrit, on musaf, and on minhah
and on ne'ilat she'arim during Fasts
and during ma'amadot and on the Day
of Atonement.
You have [a basis to] say,
Heavenly gates are shut during the
day!

Remarks

The Yerushalmi records various traditions over
generations of Amoraim as to what the ne'ilah service was,
especially as to when it was held. A citation in a
Yerushalmi text is of a tradition or view without
implication whether or not practiced in Amoraic times.
The Yerushalmi, however, projects a picture of diverse
ma'amadot rituals and liturgies over generations of
Talmudic authorities. Such a portrait of diverse ritual
practices is consonant with other ritual observances
throughout the Jewish community, diversity within limits
is the norm rather than the exception. It would appear
that ma'amadot ritual practices remained varied with a
uniform core of rites.
39. **Pesahim 4:1, 30c**

The Yerushalmi, while relating aspects of personal agency to perform the rites of the Paschal lamb, also informs us of the founding of the *ma'amadot* since the same pericope touches on both topics. The term *'omed*, cognate of *ma'amad*, denotes a post staffed by individual/s so designated and also denotes the *ma'amadot* institution. Here the staff represents at the Temple all three segments of Judean society (as in M. Taanit 4:2).

**Pesahim 4:1, 30c**

[I] [Personal agency]

[A] It is written,

There you shall slaughter the Paschal [offering] in the evening (Deut. 16:6).

I have but [to say] he [the donor himself must slaughter Paschal offering]. His agent whence [is he also allowed to do the cult]?

The teaching states,

And you shall cook and you shall eat (Deut. 16:7).

What is to be taught by,

There you shall slaughter the Paschal [offering] at evening (Deut. 16:6)?

---

16 The noun *'omed* is used extensively in the Bible denoting official posts. The term *'ammud*, which is found in the Tosefta denoting the *ma'amadot* institution, is used in the Bible only to denote physical objects - pillars. The stem *'amad* with the definite article (ha'omdim/ot) is used exclusively in the Bible to denote various person/s (priests, Levites, Israelites, officials, ministers, etc.) in attendance at some official, religious post or function.
The law does not prohibit that you should be preoccupied with your labor while your offering is being presented.

But they [Sages] did forbid [donors] from performing labor.

[B] Such is taught to them [about] all persons [stating] that there should be upon them wood [fuel for Temple] and first fruits [bikkurim].

He who says, "Behold, it is upon me [to provide] wood for the alter, and twigs for the pyre [ma'arakhah]," is forbidden to mourn, and to fast and from doing labor that same day.

[Behold the Paschal lamb is an offering of all Israel (requiring cessation from work all day)? It is different. Since only an offering ('olah) presented in the morning is still an offering.

What about the daily offering (tamid)?] 17

[II] [Mishmarot and ma'amadot]

[A] Said Rav Yonah,1 The daily offerings [temidin] are the offerings of all Israel.

[B] If all Israel will go up to Jerusalem, it is not written but, Three times a year shall your male present himself (Deut. 16:16).

[C] If all Israel are sitting and being idle, it is written, And you shall gather your grain (Deut. 11:14). Who gathers the grain?

[D] Thus the former prophets established twenty four mishmarot. On each mishmar and mishmar there was an 'omed in Jerusalem of priests and Levites and of Israel.

---

17Emended according to S. Lieberman, HaYerushalmi Kifshuto, (Jerusalem: HaDarom, 1934), 1:428.
Remarks

This is the only reference in Rabbinic sources using this form to denote the ma'amadot institution, 18 denoting the same entity as ma'amad or 'ammud. 3 Though omed appears but once in Rabbinic literature it is utilized most frequently in the Bible over its two cognates (ma'amad and 'ammud). All forms of the term ma'amad are utilized to indicate an assembly representing all segments of Judean society. The entire passage of Pesahim 4:1, 30c (#3-#4) is found in y. Taaniyot 4:2, 67d and is treated there in detail.

Passage [II] fits well in its context despite a lack of smooth transitions and remedial emendations, 19 retaining thematic and contextual unity. Its unifying theme, the principle that a man's agent is like himself, is utilized to explain both an established practice by the


19 J. L. Fishman, Sefer Yihuse Tannaim veAmora'im, pp.7-8; B. Ratner, Zion & Jerusalem, Pesahim, pp.53-55; S. Lieberman, Hayyehushalmi Kifshuto, p. 428. Passage [#3 II] is seen as incompletely edited rather than being completely spurious (ibid.).
Paschal offering as well as the extra-Biblical ma'amadot attending the daily tamid.\footnote{Explicit in T. Taaniyot 3:2, implicit in M. Taanit 4:2.}

\textbf{Pesahim 4:1, 30c}

The term 'ammud, cognate of ma'amad denotes a ma'amadot assembly gathered for a collective function (see item #3 above).

 Pesahim 4:1, 30c

It is taught,

Twenty four 'elef\footnote{"The basic meaning of 'eleph is family or tribe, but it also means the military unit which the family or tribe sets up" (H. Tadmor, "'The People' and the Kingship in Ancient Israel," p. 52).} 'ammud are from Jerusalem.
And half an 'ammud is from Jericho.

Even Jericho could discharge an entire 'ammud. But to extend honor to Jerusalem she would discharge only half an 'ammud:

the priests to cultic service
and the Levites to sing
and Israel represent themselves that they are standing in for all Israel.

Remarks

Baraita [#4-#7] follows the previous pericope duplicated in y. Taanit 4:2, 67d, still retaining a common
literary denominator with the present discourse (see Remarks #3 above). The theme of agency and representation is affirmed in both settings as related to *ma'amadot*. For a detailed examination see *y. Taanit* 4:2, 67d below.
40. Shekalim 5:1, 48d

The term denotes presence of Israelite representatives at the Temple’s daily offerings, and relates to the Mishnah’s description of Israelites overseeing the *tamid* offering. 
Y. attests how the Israelites presence was incorporated into the cultic drama at the Temple.

Shekalim 5:1, 48d

Gabini the crier\(^\text{22}\) who did announce in the Temple, what did he say?

Rise priests to cultic service [=’avodah] and Levites to their platform [dukhan] and Israel to their ma’amad.

Remarks

The Talmud identifies the function of Gabini the crier in the Mishnah. New details of Temple ritual are added presenting Israelites incorporated in the cult as a well announced and established practice. Israelites are made equivalent in their function and technical terms are provided for them (’avodah, dukhan, ma’amad) with priests and Levites by the public utterance. See the parallel passage in Yoma 20b for more detail.

The term *ma'amad* is employed in construct form to denote members of a public assembly. Used opposite to *'anshe mishmar*, it denotes those attending the Temple's daily offering. The Talmud sets restrictions and privileges for both groups.

**Taaniyot 2:2, 65d**

A. For what reason are the *'anshe ma'amad* allowed to drink water on nights but not during days?

So that if the cult becomes too difficult on *'anshe mishmar* then *'anshe ma'amad* will join them.

B. [Why are] members of the clan not [to drink wine] during the day and not during the night?

Because they are to be available steadily at the cult.

**Remarks**

The anonymous opening passage [#9] in MH2, is ambiguous with diverse mss. readings and has been the source of diverse interpretations. Many interpret the baraita to explain why Mishnah (Taanit 2:6) forbids

---

23*"Anshe mishmar"* in Genizah fragments (L. Ginzberg, *Yerushalmi Fragments*, p.178).

24*"Wine"* in Genizah (ibid.), and so from internal evidence.

25*"'Anshe ma'amad"* in Genizah (ibid.).
priests to drink wine at night if ma'amad is a gloss of mishmar.\(^{26}\)

A less reductive alternative, has the baraita in the Talmud cite an independent tradition relating to 'anshe ma'amad (Israelites) appropriately complementing Mishnah's treatment of 'anshe mishmar.\(^{27}\) Memra [9] provides added detail to the Mishnah/Tosefta, informing that Israelites are active cultic personnel (Yoma 2:7) and are thus prohibited from daytime wine drinking.

At first Israelites may drink wine at all times, later a prohibition was enacted in case they are to join the priests with the cult. The wine restriction places 'anshe ma'amad in the same general level with 'anshe mishmar. Several legal restrictions (cutting hair, laundering clothes, prayer & ritual exemptions, fasting, eulogizing or engaging in labor) already apply to both mishmar and ma'amad groups.\(^{28}\)

\(^{26}\) A partial list is in B. Ratner, Zion & Jerusalem, Taanit, p. 78. The Genizah variants contain both mishmar and ma'amad (L. Ginzberg, Yerushalmi Fragments, pp. 178-79). These terms are interchangeable and can be identified by the individual case if internal evidence permits.

\(^{27}\) A similar pattern is found in the inefficacy of reciting Shema with either mishmar or ma'amad members but for different reasons, see y. Berakhot 1:5, 30c.

\(^{28}\) Here is another instance where fasting can be shown to be a post-70 element. Fasting by either mishmar or ma'amad would make any wine restrictions not relevant. Dr. Cohen noted that fasting is a rabbinic prohibition
42. Taaniyot 4:1, 67b

Yerushalmi defines activities of the ma'amadot institution adding elements that are not found in Tannaitic literature (prayer). It defines Mishnah Taanit 4:1 by adding again Toseftan and various Amoraic traditions. These traditions project a state of continual flux and diversity regarding ma'amadot practices.

Taaniyot 4:1, 67b

[A.1]
What is to be learned from it [M. Taanit 4:1]?

[A.2]
You learn from it three things, they fast during ma'amadot and that they pray [=mitpalelin] four [times], and there is no priestly blessing at night but only during the day.

[B]
And let him raise his hands without praying?

[It is stated,]
We have found prayer without priestly blessing, but we have not found priestly blessings without prayer.

[C]
It is taught,
These [above baraita] are the teachings of R. Meir.

R. Zeirah said in the name of R. Yohanan, In 'eruvin and Public Fasts everyone followed the custom of R. Meir.

whereas the Bible prohibits the drinking of wine.
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R. Jacob bar Aha said in the name of R. Yohanan,
Even regarding the scroll of Esther everyone followed the custom of R. Meir.

Remarks

Yerushalmi responds to several elements in Mishnah that are unclear, unknown or at variance with its own current liturgical practices. Yerushalmi is also aware of a selective editorial process in the Mishnah, namely that Rabbi selected R. Meir’s tradition as the anonymous standard. Furthermore, Yerushalmi perceives that specific ritual considerations determine the specific Tannaitic expression. Three practices [A.2], stated as an Amoraic memra in MH2 introduced by Galilean Aramaic [A.1], require fasting, four daytime prayer rituals including priestly blessings as part of ma’amadot activities.

As noted above, Yerushalmi adds prayer as a ma’amadot element though it is not found in Mishnah or Tosefta. If we were to find an historical setting for this Talmudic

---

29 At the turn of the fourth century Palestinian Amora, he was a student of R. Yohanan, active in Galilee and transmitting Halakhic traditions of early generations (S. Safrai, "Jacob ben Aha," EJ, 9:1214).

30 Gartner notes that in this instance the Yerushalmi is more accurate, certain and conclusive than the Bavli in explaining this Mishnah and describing its Palestinian setting (S.J. Gartner, "Studies in Tractate Ta’anit-Palestinian Talmud," pp.33-35).
tradition then it may well be that prayer was included in R. Meir’s circle when observing ma’amadot practices. This practice, however, was not acknowledged by the Tannaitic sources nor was it universally accepted by other Tannaitic authorities. The deductive discourse also supports the position that there was neither a prior nor current universal tradition for fasting, prayer or priestly blessings associated with the ma'amadot institution.  

31 The technical term shema' minah alludes to a conclusion the Talmud draws from a Mishnah/baraita (E.Z. Melamed, Eshnav haTalmud, 2nd ed., (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1976), p. 56.
43. Taaniyot 4:2, 67d

Yerushalmi confirms M. Taanit 4:2, that the heart of the ma'amadot institution is the daily Torah readings of Genesis in local communities, despite the many rituals accrued to the creation epic.

Taanit 4:2, 67d

[A] He [Tanna] need not but [state], "These are the ma'amadot" [means that] they [Israelites] assemble in their cities and recite the "Acts of Creation."

[B] [Why does he begin with a detailed account of the ma'amadot in association with Temple cult?]

He [Tanna] came to open [his account] from the start of the [ma'amadot] accounting.

Remarks

The Mishnah relates two features of the institution without indicating their relation or priority. These are, Israeliite presence and representation at the daily Temple offerings, and daily Torah recital in public. Yerushalmi seeks to establish a relationship between these two elements, because strictly speaking, there is no connection between the tamid and the readings from Genesis.32

32B. Ratner, Zion & Jerusalem, Taanit, pp. 94-95.
There are reasons to favor the tamid offering and Israelite representation at the Temple over the daily Torah reading. Both Mishnah and Tosefta feature the tamid offering prominently as the reason for the ma'amadot. Torah recital is dependent on tamid offerings on two accounts. The very institution is, by Tannaitic accounts, but a compromise for providing that all Israel be at the Temple for each tamid. Moreover, Torah recitals are set to correspond to the tamid offerings.

The Talmud, however, explicitly rules Torah recital to be the foremost ma'amadot feature. It provides an insight into the Mishnah's and Tosefta's redaction. The reason the tamid is associated with the daily Torah reading is but to provide a "beginning," an explanation for the Torah reading and thus "the Tanna has returned to the origins of the entire affair." Simply stated, one could do better to establish prominence to the Torah scroll and its strictly monotheistic worldview than to link it to a solidly established religious symbolism and practices such as the daily Temple cult.

Public Torah recitals [B] are closely associated with presence of Israelites at the daily offerings [A] despite it being nonessential to the ma'amadot which would be quite well suited as a form of public worship after the catastrophe of 70. The tamid serves as context and
pretext to the ma'amadot. Instituting Israelites at the Temple was an opening stratagem in establishing daily public Torah recitals countrywide.

43. Taaniyot 4:2, 67d

Yerushalmi amplifies on the representative nature of ma'amadot at the Temple and by extension throughout the country and after 70. The term 'ammod [D], cognate of ma'amad, denotes a post with persons in attendance. Here priests, Levites and Israelites tend the daily offerings.

Taaniyot 4:2, 67d

[A] Said Rav Yonah,33 These daily offerings [=temidin] are the offerings of all Israel.

[The implication is that all Israel is to oversee its offering.]

[B] If all Israel will go up to Jerusalem, is it not written but, three times a year shall your male present himself (Deut. 16:16).

[C] If all Israel are sitting and being idle, it is written, And you shall gather your grain (Deut. 11:14).

33Fourth century Palestinian Amora, associate of Rav Yose who were heads of the Tiberian Sanhedrin. A student of R. Yohanan preferring Tosefta's formulations over Mishnah's (S. Safrai, "Jonah," EJ, 10:177-78).
Who will harvest the grain?

[D] Thus the early prophets established twenty four mishmarot.

On each mishmar and mishmar there was an 'ammud in Jerusalem of:
priests and Levites and of Israel.

Remarks
The structure of the above pericope is in consonance with R. Yonah's methodology for generating Talmudic discourse by responding to issues raised in Tosefta. Items [B] and [C] are direct responses to Toseftan comments (T. Taaniyot 3:2) not found in the Mishnah.

The Tosefta first explains that, "those who could not go up to Jerusalem" are to gather in their cities and recite from Genesis. Tosefta also notes that Israelites associated with the serving mishmar are "to abstain from labor that entire week." R. Yonah provides prooftexts explaining that Israelites are not required to go to Jerusalem every day because Scripture requires one to visit the Temple only three times a year. Neither can one abstain from work all week long, says R. Yonah, since Scripture demands that an Israelite work.

According to R. Yonah's logic, with a consideration to realia, it would be easier to attend ma'amadot assemblies as it would be more practical since participants would not lose income and they could possibly
be "substituted" by individuals who volunteered to remain idle.  

43a. Taaniyot 4:2, 67d

The term 'āmmud, cognate of ma'amad, denotes a ma'amadot assembly. In the baraita below the assembled are priests, Levites and Israelites gathered for daily offerings at the Temple.

---

34Mishnah Taanit is replete with references to individuals [=yehidim], fasting in advance and on behalf of their community (Taanit 1:4; 1:6). Individuals interceding on behalf of the community is also attested (M. Taanit 3:8). Most public ritual required ten persons as was the case at ma'amadot functions (Megillah 4:3, see on the origin of lasarah batlanim, Megillah 3:1 and compare with Z. Kaplan, "Batlanim," EJ, 4:325).
Taaniyot 4:2, 67d

It is taught,

A. Four and twenty 'elef 'ammud is from Jerusalem.

B. And half an 'ammud is from Jericho.

C. Even Jericho could put forth an entire 'ammud.

D. But to express honor for Jerusalem it would put forth but half an 'ammud:

priests to their cult and the
Levites to their singing and
Israel represent themselves
as emissaries of all Israel.

Remarks

The word "'elef" in the baraita is problematic since it is commonly rendered as "one thousand" leading to improbable demographics. The Babylonian parallel (Taanit 27a) reads:

Our Masters taught,
Twenty and four mishmarot were in the Land of Israel.
And twelve in Jericho.

Their number is greater (24 mishmarot become 36)?
Rather state,
And twelve of them (mishmarot) are in Jericho.
When it came time for the mishmar to go up:
half a mishmar goes up to Jerusalem, and
half a mishmar goes up to Jericho
in order to provide water and food

35M. Taanit 4:2; T. Taaniyot 3:3.
Three solutions have been offered, the solution that 'elef denotes "one thousand" is unacceptable demographically. Ratner advocates that 'elef is a faulty reading, a gloss. Lieberman and Klein's most persuasive solution explains that 'elef is part of a verse from the Bible used in a quote. L. Ginzberg argues that the number twelve in Bavli is a gloss, mistaken from one half of twenty four, and that 'elef is a faulty reading of an abbreviation. According to Ginzberg the baraita contracted the phrase "one 'ammud," from "'ehad" to "'alef." Therefore, following the Aramaic syntax which the Amoraim spoke wherein the number precedes the noun, "'ehad 'ammud" was abbreviated "'alef 'ammud" and then corrupted to mean "a thousand 'ammud."

Ginzberg is insightful to view the number twelve in the Bavli as a gloss. But his theory about 'elef is not supported by the texts. The baraita is in Hebrew not

37S. Lieberman, HaYerushalmi Kifshuto, p.428; B. Ratner, Zion & Jerusalem, Taanit, pp. 94-95.
Aramaic, and although the Amoraim spoke Aramaic they knew Hebrew well enough not to mix numbers especially as no other baraita mixes its numbers in mid-stream on basis of Aramaic syntax.

The baraita adds detail to M. Taanit 4:2. The twenty four 'ammod/ma'amad in Jerusalem were half staffed by representatives coming from Jericho with provisions. Jericho is depicted as populated with enough individuals to provide all the manpower necessary for the cult.39

The impact of the baraita is to present Israelites as breaking new ground, attaining status equivalent to priests and Levites. The distinction among the groups is not totally erased, the text clearly portrays Israelites as "mere" passive bystanders, however, their presence is now required if the cult is to be performed properly. The new Israelites status is potent symbolism incorporating all Israel as a religious community.

39This region is long established as an exclusive domain of aristocracy and wealth (N. Avigad, "Jericho," EJ, 9:1368-70; compare b. Menahot 65a).
Ma‘amad denotes a public assembly for memorial services.

Megillah 4:4, 75a

They are not to perform ma‘amad and moshav.⁴⁰

"Rise ['imdu] dear ones; sit [shevu] dear ones" seven times.

Remarks

The passage, in MH2, comments on the Mishnah, explaining the etiology of the ritual’s name. It derives from greetings announced at the start and finish of all seven stations where the memorial service was performed. This information is unavailable elsewhere.⁴¹

⁴⁰M. Megillah 4:3.

⁴¹For more detail on this usage see Baba Batra 100b.
Summary

Table 1 below summarizes and maps the data in the Yerushalmi related to the ma'amadot. As noted above, 98% of Yerushalmi's data relates to the ma'amadot, most of which discuss rituals related to the Temple. The Yerushalmi amplifies its understanding of the Tannaitic sources in light of its contemporary reality. Most importantly, prayer is now for the first time a fixed feature of the ma'amadot. In addition, priestly blessings, fasting and prohibition of labor are also presented as parts of the ma'amadot.

TABLE 1

Summary of ma'amad usage in the Yerushalmi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temple</th>
<th>Priestly bless</th>
<th>Shema recital</th>
<th>Torah recital</th>
<th>fasting</th>
<th>Prayer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>PARALLEL</td>
<td>ATTRIBUTION</td>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reciting Shema w/ 'anshe ma'amad is too late</td>
<td>b. Yoma 7b</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>general rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On 3 times priests bless 4 times a day</td>
<td>Taanit 4:1</td>
<td>Yudan Anturdaya</td>
<td>prescriptive rule on added ma'amads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>For every mishmar an 'omed [=ma'amad] in Jerusalem</td>
<td>Taanit 4:2 y.Taaniyot 4:2,67d</td>
<td>R. Yonah</td>
<td>Describing Temple courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24 'ammud in Jerusalem 1/2 'ammud of Jericho</td>
<td>y.Taaniyot 4:2,67d b.Taanit 27a</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Mode of supplying Temple staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gabini in Temple</td>
<td>b.Yoma 20b</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Temple description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>'Anshe ma'amad don't drink wine by day</td>
<td>Taanit 2:6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Temple rules for ma'amad members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ma'amadot include: fasting, 4 services &amp; priestly blessings</td>
<td>Taanit 4:2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>deductive on added ma'amad rituals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ma'amadot are: local daily Torah readings</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Definition of ma'amadot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>For each mishmar there was an 'ammud in Jerusalem</td>
<td>Taanit 4:2 y.Pesahim 4:1,30c</td>
<td>R. Yonah</td>
<td>Description of Temple courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>24 'ammud in Jerusalem 1/2 'ammud of Jericho</td>
<td>y.Taaniyot 4:2,67d b.Taanit 27a</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Mode of supplying Temple staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Funerary ma'amad</td>
<td>b.B.B. 100b</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Rules for mourning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

We will examine every citation of Ma'amarad in the Bavli even where the Talmud cites a Mishnah text without explicitly using the term in the Talmud's text. The reason is that the Talmud in any case is shedding light on the Mishnah's usage and provides another context for the institution.

 Mostly, the Bavli uses the Mishnah as a point of departure, amplifying, explaining or even emending the Mishnah's text, a practice more common in the Yerushalmi. Like the Yerushalmi, the Bavli attests an active and
practical interest in the ma'amadot. Since the individual Mishnayot and Toseftan halakhot were treated in detail, consult with the respective Tannaitic sources for a full analysis of the Bavli texts.

The Bavli demonstrates that although ma'amadot was well known in the community, there was also a fluidity and diversity of the peripheral ma'amadot practices. Yet the Bavli always remains faithful to the basic structure of the institution as described in the Mishnah and Tosefta. Of the numerous additional practices the Bavli adds to the core ma'amadot element, Torah reading of Genesis, prayer is the most striking since it is expressly lacking in the Mishnah and Tosefta.
b. Berakhot 9b

The term *ma‘amad* denotes presence of a group without any connection to the *ma‘amadot* institution. In this case the reference is to a group of Rabbinic teachers and students.

b. Berakhot 9b

Said Rabbi 'Il‘a' to ‘Ula’,

When you get there [from Israel to Babylonia] ask as to the welfare of Rav Beruna my brother in the presence [=bema‘amad] of the entire group since he is an important man and takes joy in performing commandments. Once he joined the prayers of salvation to the Silent ‘Amidah and he did not stop smiling all day long.
The Talmud explores aspects of liturgical detail on various holidays and special occasions including when ma'amadot assemblies were observed. Here again, there is an explicit association of the ma'amadot practices with regularly observed prayers.

b. Shabbat 24a

A. It was asked of them [to the Rabbinic authorities by their students]:
   - What is the rule to mention the New Moon during Grace after Meal?
   [There are two sides to the question.] If you would like to argue that on Hanukkah which is a [festival ordained] by the Rabbis it is not necessary [to make special mention of the festival], but the New Moon which is ordained in the Bible it is necessary. Or you might argue: since there is no prohibition of doing labor [on the New Moon] we do not make mention?

B. Rav said: [You make] mention.

Rabbi Hanina said: He does not mention.

C. Said Rav Zerika: Maintain [the position] of Rav that is in your hand because there is [a baraita] of Rabbi Oshaya supporting him. Since Rabbi Oshaya has taught:

   Days on which a Musaf offering is presented, such as the New Moon and the middle days of festivals [Sukkot, Passover], on 'arvit, and shahrit and minhah he prays shemoneh esreḥ and recites concerning the appropriate occasion [at the section] of the cult. If he did not recite it, they make him repeat it. On those [days] there is no recitation of Kiddush over a cup [of

wine], and there is a mention [of the festival] at Grace after Meals. Days on which there is no Musaf offering, such as Monday and Thursday and Monday, and Fast Days and ma'amadot.

"Monday and Thursday [and Monday]? What was done on them [that they are mentioned]? However, [the reference is to] Monday and Thursday and Monday of Fast Days, and ma'amadot.

On 'arvit, and shahrit and minhah he prays shemoneh esreh and recites concerning the appropriate occasion [at the section] of He Who hears prayer.

And if he did not recite [concerning the special occasion] they do not require him to repaat it.

And they do not have [recitation of] Kiddush over the cup [of wine], and they do not have a commemoration [of those days] at Grace after Meals.

Remarks

The Talmud projects the ma'amadot as well integrated into daily liturgical life of the Jewish community. Moreover, the Amoraic sources cite baraitot indicating that the ma'amadot were part and parcel of liturgical life cycle in the local community. According to the traditions of R. Oshaya, of the Tannaitic era, the community incorporated aspects of the ma'amadot rituals into the daily liturgy. Again, we observe the accretion of liturgical elements around the core ma'amadot practice of Torah reading.
The Talmud cites Mishnah Tamid 5:6 where the term *ro’sh hama’amad* appears, there is no explicit usage in the pericope. Still, the passage is of importance because it provides an Amoraic context for *ma’amad*. The Talmud proposes reasons for the Mishnah’s ruling that *ro’sh hama’amad* set the impure in front of the East Gate of the Temple and illustrates differences between the reasons.

Third generation Babylonian Amoraim, according to tradition, explain that the reason was either to embarrass the priests or to remove suspicion from them. Negatively, the priests would be embarrassed since they did not maintain themselves pure or positively, they would not be suspected of refraining from the Temple cult because of loss from work. The Talmud provides instances that support the negative reason in the case of priests of leisure and rope weavers. A priest of leisure, who can afford to be idle, will not be suspected of loss of work, and a rope weaver, likewise, will not give up his low paying work for the opportunity to serve in the Temple. Therefore, priests were set in the East Gate to embarrass them for not remaining ritually pure.

The analysis of Tamid 5:6 concludes that the term *ro’sh hama’amad* bears no relation to the *ma’amadot*

---

2See the analysis of Tamid 5:6 above for more detail.
institutions. The tradition attributed to Rashi also identifies this individual as a person who specifically is in charge of this function and no more.

b. Yoma 20b

The Babylonian Talmud quotes a baraita in the Jerusalem Talmud (Shekalim 5:1, 48d)\(^3\) which utilizes the term *ma'amad* associating Israelites in conjunction with the Temple practice. The Bavli corroborates the baraita cited in the Jerusalem Talmud integrating Israelites into the Temple cult at their *ma'amad* station alongside with the priests and Levites. Tractate Yoma recounts two different interpretations, by first generation Amoraim, of the statement in the Mishnah (Yoma 1:8) that the Temple court was filled before the *gever* called forth.

One interpretation explains that *gever* was a person who was the Temple crier, the other defines the term as a rooster which crowed at dawn. The Talmud provides both positions with support from beraitot.

---

\(^3\)For more detail see the analysis of y. Shekalim above.
b Yoma 20b

There is a tradition in accordance with Rav [gever = person] and there is a tradition in agreement with Rabbi Shela.

The tradition in accordance with Rav:

Gabini the Crier, what does he say? "Rise priests to your cult work, and Levites to your postion, and Israelites to your stations [ma'amadkhem]!" And his voice was heard nearly three hundred parsecs.

b. Yoma 37b

The Talmud cites a baraita attesting that mishmar and ma'amad members, and possibly other, recited the shema' during their time of service.¹ Neither groups recited the shema' at the correct time, it was read either too early or too late. Mishmar members read it too early while ma'amad members recited it too late. The baraita itself states a regulation that reciting shema' with either group does not fulfill one's duty. The baraita is portraying a pre-70 setting when the priests were preparing for the demanding cult activities.

¹See the analysis of y. Berakhot 1:5, 30c above for more detail.
b. Yoma 37b

They asked a question [citing a baraita]:
He who recites shema' with members of the mishmar and members of the ma'amad has not filled his obligation because members of the mishmar are too early and members of the ma'amad tarry.

Remarks

The baraita attests that other liturgical practices were associated with the ma'amadot vital ritual, Torah reading. Since there is a halakhic precedent which provides liturgical exemptions to members of the mishmar and ma'amad (b. Zevahim 19a) they may, likewise, have been exempted from discharging their obligation of an exactly timed reading of the shema'. This baraita reinforces the liturgically exclusive image of the ma'amadot in the Mishnah. Although provisions maybe made to encourage more activity at ma'amadot assembly, the Tannaitic and Amoraic sources maintain a ritual exclusivity of the Torah reading.

Elsewhere in the Talmud we find the ma'amadot associated with shemoneh esreh as an integral part of its ritual, yet here we find the legal authority reject attempts to have ordinary Israelites from greater

---

5 A baraita in b. Zevahim 19a exempts members of the mismar and ma'amad from reciting the sema' or donning tefilin.

6 Y. Taaniyot 4:1, 67b; b. Taanit 26b.
involvement in the ma'amadot liturgy. The present baraita is in harmony with the more strict view for reciting the morning shema' (Berakhot 1:2) and probably presents a pre-70 setting because according to the more lenient position of R. Joshua this baraita is pointless.
b. Yoma 53a

The Talmud relates a tradition detailing how the priests, Levites and Israelites at their ma'amad left their stations at the end of their service of the cult at the Temple. Each group is associated with its specific station with its appropriate name. All of the above groups did not walk away from the Temple with their faces fully turned away from the Sanctuary. Rather, they turned sideways and step while still facing the Holy of Holies. The baraita concludes that a student should do likewise when departing from his teacher.

b. Yoma 53a

A. And, likewise, priests at their service, Levites at their platform and Israelites at their station [=ma'amadot], when they departed [from their stations] they did not turn their faces [entirely] but set they faced sideways and depart.

B. And, similarly, a student departing from his teacher should not turn his face [fully] and leave. Rather, he should set his face sideways and retreat.

b. Yoma 87b

The Talmud cites Mishnah Taanit 4:1 relating the number of times the priests blessed the assembled on various occasions including the ma'amadot. For more detail see the Mishnah’s analysis above.
b. Taanit 17a

Although the Talmud quotes the Mishnah without explicitly using the term *ma'amad*, its discussion sheds light on the institution as perceived by authorities at the end of the second century. The Talmud provides a reason, attributed to a first generation Amora, for Mishnah Taanit 2:7 and Tosefta Taaniyot 2:3 forbidding members of the *mishmar* and *ma'amad* (Israelites) from laundering their clothes or cutting their hair on the week of their service. On Thursday they were permitted to do so in honor of the Sabbath. The reason was to insure that the attendees come already groomed and clean to their week of service by forbidding them the right to do so during their time of duty. These provisions also demonstrate a desire to establish new hygienic standards in the community.

b. Taanit 17a

A. Members of the *mishmar* and members of the *ma'amad* are forbidden to cut their hair and to launder their clothes. And on Thursday they are allowed in honor of the Sabbath [Taanit 2:7].

B. Rabbah bar bar Hannah said in the name of Rabbi Yohanan,
   In order that they should not enter their stations looking neglected.
The Talmud cites a baraita stating that on a year with much rainfall members of the mishmar sent a message to members of the ma'amad to look out for their brethren in the diaspora that their homes should not be their graves. Presumably, too much rain in Babylonia could cause flooding. Most scholars understand the term mishmar to apply to priests and Levites and ma'amad members to denote Israelites. Malter, however, holds that the term mishmar applies only to Israelites in Jerusalem.7

b. Taanit 22b

The same is also taught in a baraita:

On a year that there is much rainfall, members of the mishmar send [a notice] to members of the ma'amad, "Lookout for your brethren in the diaspora so that their houses should not become their graves!"

Remarks

This baraita, without reference to ma'amad members or to the diaspora, appears in the Jerusalem Talmud Yoma 5:3, 42c, as the prayer the High Priest delivered when entering the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur. This tradition in the Yerushalmi is attributed to the Masters of Caesaria.

7 Malter, The Treatise Ta'anit, pp. 330-31, note 318. Malter's analysis is inconsistent and unreliable in this matter, see especially his note 230 on pp. 210-11; Malter by his own admission is inconclusive about the matter see pp. 422-23, note 397.
The baraita above poses some questions. Why would mishmar members not pray for Jews in the diaspora, and what special power did ma'amad members have to avert the mortal danger? We find a solution in tractate Soferim (17:4) and Ekhah Rabbati (Buber 88-87). These sources enumerate the benefits of the mishmarot after the Temple’s fall; they fast and pray to protect various groups from specific dangers.

The Talmud portrays an active, independent liturgical life in the diaspora which received dire warning messages "too much rain." According to the Yerushalmi residents of the Sharon valley also faced such danger. We thus assume that there were ma'amadot assemblies in Babylonia who sought the protection for various groups while providing protection for the entire population from excessive rain. The priestly and Levitical mishmar in Israel sent to the local ma'amadot groups in Babylonia to seek protection from floods. The message to the ma'amadot derives from the High Priest’s prayer in the Holy of Holies. Ascribing the ma'amadot with the ability to avert disaster bolstered and reinforced the institution’s status in the community.
b. Taanit 26b

The Talmud seeks to explain certain difficulties in Mishnah 4:1 by emending the text. Mishnah Taanit 4:1 instructs priests to bless the congregation four times on days which include ma'amadot assemblies. The Babylonian Talmud, in agreement with the Yerushalmi, explains that priestly blessing can only be offered with prayer [=shemoneh 'esreh] and these occur four times a day when there is ma'amadot activity. The entire pericope depicts a wide range of liturgical practices associated with the institution by different communities in different lands.

b. Taanit 26b

"Fast Days and ma'amadot [priests bless the assembled four times including musaf] (Taanit 4:1)."

-Is there a musaf on those days?

-The Mishnah's editor has omitted text from the Mishnah, and this is the correct reading:

At three periods in the year the priests bless the assembled as long as they pray, and some of them are four times daily: shahrit, musaf, minnah, and ne'ilah. The following are the three periods: Public Fasts, ma'amadot, and Yom Kippur.

Said Rav Nahman in the name Rabbah bar Avuah: This tradition is Rabbi Meir's.

---

The bold text is the Amoraic addition to the Mishnah.
Remarks

The Talmud’s text is difficult primarily as it concerns the question of its relation to realia. Does the discourse reflect an actual state of liturgical practices or are we confronting purely a literary concern? The position maintained here is that for the most part the Rabbinic sources relate to ongoing liturgical practices. Supportive evidence in the Babylonian Talmud can be found in the pericope of Shabbat 24a which was discussed above.

The Talmud’s puzzling over a ruling in the Mishnah attests that the ma’amadot rituals underwent considerable change in its details over time and over land. The pericope details a complex and lively spectrum of practice, custom and law regarding the liturgical practices of the ma’amadot. Moreover, the Talmud informs the reader that at some point there is a tacit, silent objection to certain ma’amadot assemblies. This is expressed by R. Yohanan’s observation that the people’s custom followed R. Meir’s teaching. The alternative are noted in the parallel Toseftan sources. As a result, we are not to instruct according to R. Meir’s ruling but if they did as he instructs then they are not to be interrupted.
b. Taanit 27a

The Talmud seeks to resolve a difficulty in Mishnah Taanit 4:1 which explains the ma'amonot to be the result of a biblical injunction for the tamid offerings. The Talmud emends the Mishnah by reading the entire Mishnah as one literary unit. Presumably, the tamid issue explains why the Torah was read every day.

The Amoraic editors appreciated that the ma'amonot were established for a specific purpose which remained hidden from them because they only looked as far as the tamid offering. As we explained in the exposition in chapter two and of Mishnah Taanit 4:2, the main purpose of the ma'amonot was to promote Torah readings and establish the Torah as the focal point for nearly all public liturgical activity.

b. Taanit 27a

"These are the ma'amonot: Since it says (Numbers 28:2) [Taanit 4:2]."

–What does he [Mishnah’s editor] mean to instruct us?

–This is what he means to inform us.
"These are the ma'amadot" tells us the reason why the ma'amadot institution was established. [The Talmud then quotes text from Taanit 4:2].
b. Taanit 27b

The Talmud relates a twofold elaboration on the Mishnah’s requirement that Isralites meet and recite the creation narrative. The Talmudic discourse forges another link associating the ma’amadot Torah reading of Genesis with tamid offering. The Talmud editors are appreciative of the ma’amadot and its activities which are supportive of the institution in these texts.

The pericope explicitly attributes the ultimate value for the ma’amadot; they sustain heaven and earth! The second part provides a Scriptural prooftext and details a dialogue between God and Abraham that to retain their inheritance they must have the means of atonement, either through the Temple cult or through Torah reading of the offering texts (but not the creation story).

Although the Talmud promotes additional Torah reading of the cultic texts it retains a distinct separation between the cult and the ma’amadot ritual of reading Genesis.
b. Taanit 27b

A. "And Israelites of that mishmar gather in their cities and recite from the deeds of creation (Taanit 4:2)."

What is the basis for this ruling?

Rav Jacob bar Aha said in the name of Rav Asi:9

If it were not for the ma'amadot heaven and earth would not exist.

[As Scripture says, "As surely as I have established My covenant with day and night—the laws of heaven and earth—(Jeremiah 33:25)]

Since Scripture says,

"And he [Abraham] said, 'O Lord God, how shall I know that I am to possess it [the land]?'

-He answered, 'Bring Me a three-year-old heifer [Genesis 15:8-9]."'

-Abraham said to God, "Master of the World, perhaps, God forbid, Israel will sin against you and you will punish them as You did to the generation of the Flood and the Dispersion?

-He [God] said to him, "no!"

-He said before Him, "Master of the world, How will I know [the means of atonement]"

-He said, "Bring me [an offering] a three year old heifer."

-He said, "Master of the world, this is well when the Temple is in existence. What will be of them when the is no longer existing?

-He [God] said to him, "I have already established for the [correct] order of the [Temple] offerings. As long as they read in them

---

9Megillah 31a attributes this passage to R. Asi. Bracketed sections are from b. Megillah 31a.
I consider that [as credit] upon them and I forgive them all their sins!" 

Remarks

The Yerushalmi (Taaniyot 4:2, 68a) cites the same tradents but states that animal offerings instead of ma'amadot are credited with maintaining the existence of the world. The problem in the Yerushalmi is that at the time of that statement there was neither a Temple nor offerings. The pericope in the Bavli explains the Yerushalmi's tradition stating that reciting the Torah passages regarding cultic practices was equivalent to bringing actual offerings.

The Mishnah and Tosefta, however, distinctly refuse to make that association. The ma'amadot Torah readings, from the Tannaitic sources including the Bavli and Yerushalmi on through tractate Soferim exclusively assign only the creation passages as proper Torah reading. Here is evidence that some felt that reciting the cult passages in the Bible has some equivalence to the actual cult.

We conclude again, the ma'amadot Torah reading were decidedly not meant to be a substitute to the tamid offering. Not one source lists the reading of Numbers 28 as appropriate ma'amadot Torah reading despite the obvious fact that this is the very prooftext used by both Mishnah and Tosefta to "explain" the institution.
This passage may be a source for the later tradition that the cultic Torah passages were also read at the ma'amadot despite the fact that it never won overt approval by Rabbinic authorities. The Bavli here speaks of an "order of offerings" indicating further that there was a concerted effort to systematize such practices.

The tradition cited is attributed to a third generation Amora who valued the ma'amadot ritual as integral to survival of the universe. Again, the extensive diversity of ma'amadot practices is once demonstrated in the above pericope.

b. Taanit 27b

The Talmud continues to provide more detail on the ma'amadot institution. The text relates a baraita\textsuperscript{10} that members of the mishmar prayed for their brothers' offering, and members of the ma'amad fasted four days in the synagogue to assist special groups. After the baraita bans fasting on Friday and Sunday the Talmud offers three reasons for the prohibition.

\textsuperscript{10}See the parallels in y. Taaniyot 4:4, 68b; Ekhah Rabbati 1; Soferim 17.
b. Taanit 27b

Our Rabbis have taught,

Members of the mishmar pray for the offerings of their brethren.

Members of the ma'amad enter the synagogue and remain to fast for four days a week.

Monday for those sailing the seas.

Tuesday for those travelling the desert.

Wednesday for children not to suffer from diphteria.

Thursday for pregnant and nursing women, pregnant should not abort and nursing should raise their children [properly].

Friday they did not fast in honor of the Sabbath.

And certainly they do so on the Sabbath itself [they did not fast].

Sunday what was the reason for not [fasting]?

R. Yohanan said,
"Because of the Christians."

Rabbi Shmuel bar Nahmani said,
"Because it is the third day of creation."

Resh Lakish said,
"Because of the extra soul."

There is a tradition by Resh Lakish,
"Man is given an extra soul on Friday night and on Saturday night it is taken away. As it says in Scripture, "and on the seventh day He ceased from work and was refreshed (Exodus 31:17)." As soon as He rested [at the end of Sabbath], woe! the soul is lost."
b. Taanit 27b

The Talmud explores details of the Mishnah’s ruling regarding the method of reading the Torah passages of creation during ma'amadot assemblies. The Amoraic editors cite a baraita, quoted elsewhere,\(^{11}\) providing even greater detail than the Mishnah as to how the verses of the creation narrative should be divided up. The Talmud posits a problem resulting from a contradiction with Mishnah Megillah 4:4 requiring to read no less than three verses in the Torah. It appears that some portions of the ma'amadot Torah reading do not have three verses for each reader. The solutions, proposed by first generation Amoraim, have a reader either repeat a verse or split a verse in two.

\(^{11}\)B. Megillah 22a; y. Taaniyot 4:3, 68b; and Soferim 21 with minor changes.
b. Taanit 27b

A. We have learned, "'In the beginning' (Genesis 1:1-5) [was divided] by two [readers]. The portion 'Let there be a firmament' (Genesis 1:6-8) by one."

B. It is indeed proper for "'Let there be firmaments' by one" since these are three verses. But "'In the beginning' by two"? These are but five verses and the Mishnah states, "He who recites from the Torah is not to read less than three verses."

C. Rav said:
   [The reader] skips [to the last verse and repeats it].

   Samuel said:
   [The reader] splits [the verse in two].

---

12 Megillah 4:3; Soferim 11:1; and see also Baba Kama 82a.
b. Taanit 28a

The Talmud clarifies an obscure statement in the Mishnah that at the Musaf 'ma'amadot assembly the Torah reading is from the scroll but at the Minhah assembly the reading from creation is done from memory. The Talmud resolves the matter by citing Tosefta Taaniyot 4:4.

b. Taanit 28a

"At shahrit and at musaf and at minnah they read from memory [Taanit 4:2]."

It was asked of them [the scholars], "How did he [the Tanna] say? '[Either] at shahrit and at musaf they read from the scroll, and at minnah they read it from memory as if reciting the shema'? Or this is what he taught, 'at shahrit they read from the scroll, and at musaf and at minnah they recite it from memory as if reciting shema'?"

Come, hear! It is taught:

At shahrit and at musaf they enter the synagogue and recite it [creation texts] as they do the entire year.

And during minnah an individual recited from memory.

Said Rabbi Yose: Is an individual then allowed to recite Torah text from memory in public?

But rather, they all enter and recite it from memory as if reciting shema'.
This passage provides an explanation, which has been used previously regarding the ma'amadot (Megillah 17b), for Mishnah Taanit 4:1. The reason that ma'amadot assemblies are cancelled at different times is that one is ordained in the Bible and the other was instituted by the Sages. Thus, musaf, ordained in the Bible, displaces only a ma'amadot meeting at minhah because it requires no reinforcement. The Wood Offering, ordained by the Sages, requires bolstering and preempts both ma'amadot assemblies at minhah and ne'ilah.

b. Taanit 28a

What is the difference between the two?

These are ordained in the Bible and these are ordained by the Sages.
b. Taanit 28a-b

This pericope has two parts, attributed to fifth generation Amoraim, which essentially brings to light two beraitot related to ma'amadot practices. R. Yose maintains a practice regarding the replacement of ma'amadot assemblies recorded neither by the Mishnah or Tosefta, and cites the Tosefta on the matter of the first of Nisan.

b. Taanit 28a-b

A. There is [a tradition of] R. Yose in agreement with you. It is stated, "R. Yose says, 'every day on which there is a musaf there is a ma'amadot assembly.'"...

B. And you should also teach, "On the first of Nisan there was no ma'amad since it contains hallel and a musaf offering and a Wood Offering.

Remarks

This particular passage, both in the Mishnah and the Talmud, suffers from a diversity of versions and interpretations. The basic issue turns on which events cancel ma'amadot assemblies. See the discussion on Taanit 4:4 for more detail.
b. Megillah 3a

The Talmud cites a baraita attributed to first generation Amoraim requiring Israelites to disregard their ma'amadot assemblies and gather instead for Megillah reading. Israelites and their ma'amadot assemblies are contrasted with priests at their cult service and Levites at their platform. The Amoraic sources portray the ma'amadot, however they may have been conducted, as integrated into community life. The ma'amadot assembly, according to the Bavli, was a separate group from the main, major communal events such as the Megillah reading.

b. Megillah 3a

There is a tradition that Rav Judah said in the name of Rav,

Priests in their service,

and Levites at their platform

and Israelites at their ma'amad -

they all cease their cultic work and come to hear the Megillah reading.

Indeed there is such a tradition,

Priests in their service,

and Levites at their platform

and Israelites at their ma'amad -

they all cease their cultic work and come to hear the Megillah reading.

\[13\text{This baraita appears with some changes in b. Arakhin 4:1; y. Megillah 2:4, 87b.}\]
b. Megillah 26a

The Talmud explains the reference in Mishnah Megillah 4:1 establishing that the city square has a measure of sanctity because ma'amadot assemblies take place in them. This source, attributed to first generation Amoraim and earlier, attests that the ma'amadot met in the city square whereas in the Tosefta (Taaniyot 3:4; b. Taanit 28a) it stated that the ma'amadot met in synagogues.

The pericope is instructive because it shows that while there is dispute as to the sanctity of the city square, there is agreement that ma'amadot gatherings did take place. The baraita also defines the ma'amadot in terms of prayer rather Torah reading. The ma'amadot are depicted as a fixed but sometimes infrequent feature in various communities.

A. Rabbah bar bar Hannah said in the name of Rabbi Yohanan, "This ruling is according to Rabbi Menahem bar Yose the final editor [=Stumta'ah]." But the Sages say, 'the square has no measure of sanctity.'

B. And R. Menahem bar Yose, what is his reason? Since the people pray in it on Fast Days and ma'amadot. And our Rabbis? Since this occurs infrequently [it does not impart holiness].

\[^{14}\text{J. N. Epstein, Introduction to Tannaitic Literature, 1:172-79.}\]
b. Megillah 26a

The Talmud explains Megillah 4:1 by stating that the community's leadership is free to perform any transaction regarding the synagogue building if it is done in the presence [=ma'amad] of the populace. The Talmud then relates an application of this ruling.

b. Megillah 26a

A. Said Rava,
"The above was taught only when the city's leadership did not sell in the presence [=ma'amad] of the city folk. But if the city's leaders sold it in the presence of the city folk then they may drink beer with its money."

B. Ravina owned a hovel of a synagogue. He came before Rav Ashi and asked him,
"What is the rule to plant over it?"

He answered him,
"Go and purchase it from the city's leaders in presence of the city folk and plant over it."
The Talmud cites another baraita explaining that a community has the freedom to dispense with monies from the sale of sacred items in any way if the leaders have so agreed with their community in their presence.

The above applies when the leaders of the city did not set a condition in the presence of the city folk.

But if the leaders of the city set conditions in the presence of the city folk then they are allowed even to retain an official.

The pericope below cites Mishnah Megillah 3:4 to settle a dispute as to which is the correct order for reciting portions from the Torah or prophets. The Talmud remains inconclusive since the Mishnah may be explained according to both positions.

We have learned,
"We interrupt [for all special occasions]: for New Moons, for Hanukkah, and for Purim, for Fast Days and for ma'adamot and for Yom Kippur (Megillah 3:4)."
b. Megillah 31b

See the analysis of this pericope in b. Taanit 27b above.

b. Moed Katan 14a

The Talmud cites Mishnah Taanit 2:7 to explain the prohibition for pilgrims to launder their clothes and cut their hair on pilgrim festivals. Accordingly, members of the mishmar and ma'amad as well as pilgrims are prohibited from personal grooming so that they come already clean and neat to their appointments. See the analysis on Taanit 2:7 for more detail.

b. Ketubot 28b

The Talmud cites a baraita wherein ma'amad is associated with memorial rites.¹⁵

The Sages have learned,
"A young child is...not trusted when stating that a certain individual had certain memorial services [=ma'amad umisped] in this place."

¹⁵The pericope is similar to Tosefta Ketubot 3:3 discussed above.
b. Ketubot 84a

The Talmud cites a baraita, also quoted in b. Baba Batra 100b, that the sale of a place for a memorial service [=ma'amad] can be annulled if there is embarrassment to the family.

b. Ketubot 84a

As it has been learned in a baraita, "He who sells his burial place and the path of his burial place, his place for memorial services [=ma'amado umekom hespedo], [Then] his family may come and inter him against his wishes because of embarrassment to the family."

b. Sotah 37a

The Talmud quotes a biblical verse (Psalm 69:3) where ma'amad denotes a secure foothold.

b. Sotah 37a

Rabbi Judah said, "The case was not so but thus...Nahshon ben Aminadav jumped first into the waters...as it says in the Writings, 'Deliver me, O God, for the waters have reached my neck; I am sinking into the slimy deep and find no foothold [=ma'amad]."
The Talmud cites various traditions, attributed to first generation Amoraim, where the ma'amad denotes presence of persons. In this context, the presence of three persons constitutes a binding forum for a financial transaction.

b. Gittin 13a-b; 14a

A. As Rav Huna said in the name of Rav, "[If a person claims] 'I have a maneh [sum of money] you owe me, give it to a certain other person.' If this was said in the presence [=ma'amad] of those three persons then the person is now the owner."

B. As Rav Huna said in the name of Rav, "[If a person claims] 'I have a maneh [sum of money] you owe me, give it to a certain other person.' If this was said in the presence [=ma'amad] of those three persons then the person is now the owner."

C. Samuel said in the name of Levi, "'You owe me on a loan give it to another person.' If this was said in presence [=ma'amad] of those three then he acquired the debt."

D. As Rav Huna said in the name of Rav, "[If a person claims] 'I have a maneh [sum of money] you owe me, give it to a certain other person.' If this was said in the presence [=ma'amad] of those three persons then the person is now the owner."
b. Gittin 67b

The Talmud quotes a tradition stating that the presence [=ma'amad] of certain persons is needed when proceeding with a divorce.

b. Gittin 67b

The Sages have learned,

"If a person says to ten others, 'Write a divorce and give it to my wife.'"

Then [it is enough for] one writes for the others.

'All of you write.'

Then one writes in the presence [=ma'amad] of all gathered.

'Deliver a divorce writ to my wife.'

Then one delivers for the others.

'All of you deliver [a divorce].'"
b. Kiddushin 48a

This pericope is analyzed at its other citation in b. Gittin 13a above.

b. Baba Metzia 58a

The Talmud employs ma'amad to denote presence. The context is a legal process requiring persons to take an oath in presence of the community and its officials to settle financial claims.

Rabbah said,
"They [agents] take an oath to the city folk in the presence [=ma'amad] of its officials [and collect their dues]."
The Talmud cites a baraita, a shorter parallel in Tosefta Megillah 1:5, where ma'amad denotes presence. A poor man is allowed to use as he wishes charity collected for one specific purpose if he set such conditions in presence of the city folk.

As it taught, "Rabbi Eliezer says, 'The charity collection for Purim is for Purim [only].'

'And the poor man is prohibited to take [even] a shoe lace from it except if he has thus set the conditions in the presence [=ma'amad] of the city folk.'

These are the teaching of Rabbi Jacob in the name of Rabbi Meir."

This pericope is analyzed in b. Baba Metzia 78b above.
b. Baba Batra 100b

The pericope defines four aspects of memorial rites associated with term ma'amad. The term denotes a specific geographical location used for related practices and the rites themselves. Three beraitot provide related rules and an instance is recorded where an Amora provided his wife with these rites. Selling the area of the ma'amad is conditional. No less than seven ma'amadot rites can be performed. A description of the ma'amad rites is given, and a report of such a practice is attested.

b. Baba Batra 100b

A. As it has been learned in a baraita, "He who sells his burial place and the path of his burial place, his place for memorial services [=ma'amado umekom hespedo], his family may come and inter him against his wishes because of embarrassment to the family." 17

B. The Sages have learned, "One does not diminish from seven memorial rites [=ma'amadot umoshavot] for a deceased as it is stated, "Utter futility!-said Koheleth- Utter futility! All is futile! (Ecclesiastes 1:2).

C. Rav Aha son of Rava said to Rav Ashi, "How should this be done?"

16 This is the first and only instance where ma'amadot denotes something other than the institution we are studying.

17 This baraita is also cited in b. Ketubot 84a.
He said to him,  
"As it taught,  
'Rav Judah said,  
'At first, in Judea, they  
would not diminish from seven  
[sets] rites [=ma'amadot  
umoshavot] for the deceased.  
[And they would announce]  
'Rise dear ones. Sit dear  
onees.'"

D. The sister of Rami bar Papa was married to Rav Avia. When she passed away he provided for a memorial service [=ma'amad umoshav].

b. Baba Batra 144a; 148a

These passages are analyzed at b. Gittin 13a above.

b. Baba Batra 149a

The Talmud uses ma'amad again to denote presence. In this context, the presence of three persons can determine the outcome of a financial claim.

b. Baba Batra 149a

If in the presence [=ma'amad] of the three of us; if he [were to] send for me I would not go.
The term ma’amad denotes the presence of a person.

Rava said, "The workers take an oath to the employer in presence [=ma’amad] of the store owner so that they might be embarrassed by him."

The Talmud cites a baraita relating that Israelites at their ma’amad station were exempt from prayer and tefillin. They must, however, do the ma’amadot’s vital activity—Torah reading. This source helps establish a hierarchy of ma’amadot rituals: Torah reading, priestly blessings, clean clothes and trimmed hair, fasting, prayer, tefillin, and shema’.

They asked from a baraita, "Priests at their cult service, and Levites at their platform and Israelites at their ma’amad are exempt from prayer and [donning] tefillin.

See the analysis of b. Baba Batra 52b above where this pericope is first stated.
b. Arakhin 4:1

See the analysis of b Megillah 3a above where this passage is first quoted.

b. Niddah 52b

In this pericope ma'amad denotes presence in the setting of a legal testimony given in Yavneh in the presence of the assembled. As this testimony was not challenged the tradition is assumed to be authoritative and binding.

b. Niddah 52b

Did not Ben Shalkot testify in the presence [ma'amad] of all of you in Yavneh that until there is substantial hair growth [a woman may refuse childhood marriage to until puberty] and you said nothing to him!?
CHAPTER TEN

MISCELLANEOUS SOURCES

Introduction

Several rabbinic and non-rabbinic sources relate to the ma'amadot institution and will be reviewed in this chapter. The rabbinic sources, examined first, include the following: Avot deRabbi Nathan; Ekhah Rabbati; Tractate Soferim; various Geonica material; epigraphic and diverse documentary material. The non-rabbinic material includes: Qumran usage of the term ma'amad; Karaite liturgy; and a fragment attributed to Theophrastus.

While Avot deRabbi Nathan merely cites M. Tamid 5:6, Ekhah Rabbati and Soferim present new material. Both sources attest to contemporary ma'amadot practices, to a wide diversity of their rituals while remaining faithful to the basic structure of the institution as defined in the Mishnah and Tosefta.

The Geonic sources are not explicitly related to the ma'amadot, they mostly relate to daily public Torah
reading of the creation narrative. I interpreted this material as related to the ma'amadot institution especially when viewed in context of the Karaite evidence, Dr. Bokser agreed with my assessment. Our explanation holds that in response to Karaite practices the Geonic authorities abolished the public practice of ma'amadot rituals, the daily reading of the Torah and the daily reading of the creation story. Karaite liturgical documents show that the Karaites adopted the ma'amadot ritual (daily public reading of the creation narrative) as the vital part of their daily worship, it came to identify their community. Rabbinic authorities had to abolish its public practice among its followers to clearly identify their authority and community of rabbinic Judaism. These legal positions of the Gaonate thus attests to ongoing liturgical practices related to the ma'amadot.

Epigraphic inscriptions from as far as Yemen and other documentary sources further corroborate the widespread practice of ma'amadot rituals while painting a picture of diverse liturgical traditions in local communities. Qumran sources show the "popularity" and dynamism of the term ma'amad during the pre-70 era. The fragment attributed to Theophrastus has been explained, without sufficient support, as related to the ma'amadot.
I. RABBINIC SOURCES

Avot deRabbi Nathan version B:39
See the discussion of M. Tamid 5:6 in chapter three above where this passage first appears.

Ekhah Rabbati 1:54

The term mishmarot appears in this text instead of ma'amadot but the two are interchangeable in this context. Most commentators do explain this passage as relating to ma'amadot members. Although there is a longer parallel of this text in Soferim, the midrash adds a unique detail. Ekhah Rabbati records a baraita explaining that the mishmarot/ma'amadot were useful after 70 only in that they would fast four days a week on behalf of different needy groups.

Ekhah Rabbati 1:54

"For these do I mourn." [Lamentations 1:16]

... R. Joshua b. Levi said,

"[This] relates to the cessation of the mishmarot!"

What then did the mishmarot do?

---

What benefit does the community reap from the mishmarot [now that they no longer serve at the Temple cult]?
On Monday they would fast for seafarers. "And God said, "Let there be an expanse in the midst of the water, that it may separate water from water." [Genesis 1:6]

On Tuesday fast for road travelers.

On Wednesday they would fast for infants lest they should contract diptheria and die.

On Thursday they fasted for pregnant that they should not abort and for the nursing mothers that their children should not die.

...As was taught by R. Hiya bar Abba, "...but they do not fast on Friday or Sunday in honor of the Sabbath."[M. Taanit 4:3]

Remarks

There are several parallels between this pericope and the Mishnah’s tradition related to members of the ma’amad. The mishmar fasted the same four days as the ma’amad did. The days of exemptions, Friday and Sunday, are the same as well as the stated reason for these exemptions. Although in Ekhah R. the term mishmarot appears in all mss., in the Soferim parallel, the term is ma’amadot. The reference here as well as in Soferim includes Israelite members of the ma’amad.

The telling passage is the opening inquiry as to the function of the mishmarot after 70. The ma’amadot would have served an ideal institution to integrate priests and their priestly courses into the community’s daily ritual.²

²See the remarks to tractate Soferim below.
Fasting according to the pericope was associated with the ma‘amadot only after 70.

**Tractate Soferim 17:4**

Soferim relates fasting practices of ma‘amadot members from Monday through Thursday and explains why there is no fasting on Friday and Sunday. M. Taanit 4:4 lists Friday as a day not to fast, in honor of Sabbath; Soferim adds Sunday as another such day but the reason is not clear.

Soferim 17:4

Members of the mishmar would fast every day.

On Monday they would fast for seafarers. "And God said, 'Let there be an expanse in the midst of the water, that it may separate water from water.'" [Genesis 1:6].

On Tuesday fast for road travelers. As it says, "And God said, 'Let the water below the sky gathered into one area, that the dry land may appear.'" [Genesis 1:9].

---

On Wednesday they would fast for infants that they should contract diphtheria and die.
   As it says,
   "And God said, 'Let there be lights in the expanse of the sky to separate day from night.'" [Genesis 1:14].

On Thursday they fasted for pregnant that they should not abort and for the nursing mothers that their children should not die.
   As it says,
   "And God said, 'Let the waters bring forth swarms of living creatures, and birds that fly above the earth.'" [Genesis 1:20].

On Friday and on Sunday they would not fast in honor of the Sabbath.

And there are those who say,
   "On Friday evening at twilight an additional soul is bestowed upon the Jew, and after Sabbath they take it away from him."

Another reason: Because of the Christians [=nasrim].

So that they should not say,
   "Because we celebrate on Sunday they fast on it."

But the Sages say,
   "During the time of the ma'amadot they were not fearful of the enmity of the non-Jew.

---

4The biblical text reads me'ert written rather than me'eorot, thus the difference between heavenly lights and an accursed disease.

The real reason is because of 'And he rested' - woe is to the soul.\(^6\)

Remarks

This pericope is clearly depicting ma'amatot practices even though it begins with a statement related to the members of the mishmar. Both the mss. and the text itself support this proposition. Most mss. read some term related to ma'amadot for 'anshe mishmar, concluding with "during the time of the ma'amadot there was no fear." This passage also lists a prooftext for each of the four fast days from the ma'amadot creation texts appropriate for their day.

Soferim has the most "layered" text in its "historical" discourse. The editor retained the tradition about the "Christians" despite contradiction from "the Sages." Higger maintains that the passage belongs in chapter twenty one but was mistakenly copied here because the topic in both relates to fasts.\(^7\)

This pericope, however, properly belongs in this chapter since it relates to the same topic, aspects of Torah reading. The vital information in section four

\(^6\)The exegesis is a play on the word vayinafash, and He rested, to vay 'al nefesh, woe for the [lost] soul [taken away on Sunday].

\(^7\)M. Higger, Soferim, p. 28.
notes the ma'amadot Torah reading which was later augmented by the details of fasting, that we explain as a post-70 development.

Higger notes that the version in Soferim follows the Yerushalmi (Taaniyot 4:4, 68b) rather than the Bavli (Taanit 26a-27b). The Yerushalmi version lacks detail and does not explicitly employ the term ma'amadot. The Bavli version is also similar to Soferim but lacks the datum of enmity from gentiles and the prooftexts for individual fast days.

The explanation by R. Yohanan⁸ that there was no fasting on Sunday for fear of the Christians [=nazrim] raised questions from commentators, especially in light of Soferim noting that at that time there was no such fear. Various alternative readings to "Christians" are offered.⁹ The consensus based on Soferim is that the passage relates Jewish-Christians.

Reuven Kimelman concludes after reviewing the pericope,

In light of the Syrian Christian material which points to a group of Jewish Christian who fast on

---

⁸As in the Bavli tradition (Taanit 27b).

⁹M. Higger, Soferim, p.301. Nozrim is read as nozarim denoting those born rather than Christians which would then better explain the following phrase by R. Shmuel bar Nahmani in the Bavli. The Meiri offers another solution whereby Sunday is a Babylonian festival rather than Christian (ibid.).
Sunday and the fact that The Apostolic Constitution also opposed Sunday fasting, it is not unlikely that R. Yohanan's comment about not fasting on Sunday was concerned with distinguishing between the Jews and the Nazoreans, who were known to be ascetically inclined.\(^\text{10}\)

**Tractate Soferim 17:1, 5-6**

These passages repeat the dicta in M. Megillah 3:4, 6, and see their detailed treatment in chapter three above. Soferim 17:6 explains that ma'amarot Torah reading could not take place on Sabbath.

These passages demonstrate three conclusions. Even at such a late date, after editing the Yerushalmi, the rabbinic document exclusively prescribes the creation passage for ma'amarot Torah reading. Likewise, Soferim attests that the ma'amarot institution was well known in the community both in Israel and Babylonia.\(^\text{11}\) Moreover, the ma'amarot was projected as possessing numerous peripheral practices demonstrated clearly in the discourse of Soferim 17:6.

\(^{10}\)R. Kimelman, "Birkat HaMinim," p. 243.

\(^{11}\)M. Higger, *Soferim*, pp. 78-81.
Geonic Literature

Introduction

Geonic literature attests a notable development in ma'amadot practices among its numerous traditions relating to the subject. Most striking is the Geonic prohibition on public reading of ma'amadot Torah reading. Moreover, there is a general movement to limit daily Torah reading in reaction to Karaite practices which centered on the Torah as an object and as a source of daily liturgy.

We will summarize relevant sources for their perception of the ma'amadot in post-Talmudic era. The following sources are briefly reviewed: Geonic traditions to the Talmud, Genizah fragments citing a Gaon’s response, epigraphic and documentary citations.
Various Geonic authorities commented on tractate Taanit providing consequential data.\(^{12}\)

The sages have already explained the \textit{ma'amadot}. Just as there are twenty four priestly courses so are there twenty four Levitical courses and there are also Israelites who \textit{volunteer}, and these are \textit{mishmarot} that are called \textit{ma'amadot} corresponding to each priestly course, Israelites are called \textit{ma'amad}. And on the week corresponding the \textit{mishmar} of their \textit{ma'amad}, every day they assemble in their cities and read the creation narrative and observe four fasts on that week... And during each prayer the \textit{ma'amad} was to recount the offering since it is for the sake of the offering that the \textit{ma'amadot} were established, to attend over it... Thus you are instructed -the primary purpose of the \textit{ma'amad} is to recite the cult offering and with the reciting of the offering they would read from the creation narrative.

The opening logic ties priestly, Levitical and Israelite groupings. Later, however, the passage is clear to define Israelite members as volunteers and not by family. The identity of a \textit{ma'amad} is dependent on the \textit{mishmar}, and Israelite membership to the \textit{ma'amadot} is linked to the \textit{mishmarot}.

Prayer becomes the general setting for the \textit{ma'amadot} assemblies. The Geonic sources place the creation narrative...
passage as an afterthought and placing more emphasis on the Torah portions relating to the cult. In contrast, Mishnah, Tosefta, Yerushalmi and Bavli, even Soferim depict the creation narrative the fundamental ritual and purpose of the ma'amadot.

Another reference relates Ben Baboi's [=Mar Yehudai] account that the Jews of Israel had to "sing ma'amadot" clandestinely because the authorities [=Edom] prohibited them to pray. The "Ishmaelites" returned to the Jews the rights of public worship, and it is forbidden to "recite a thing which was not legislated by the Sages and at its appropriate time."\(^{13}\)

E. E. Urbach maintains, and we are in agreement with his assessment, that the response by Hai Gaon as to why there are no Torah reading at musaf on Sabbath related to contemporary practices and that ma'amadot liturgies continued in a changed form.\(^{14}\)


\(^{14}\)E. E. Urbach, "Mishmarot uma'amadot," *Tarbiz*, (1973) 42:325; 313-27. Although Urbach presents a detailed presentation in his article, Dr. Cohen holds that, "Hai Gaon does not address himself to current ma'amadot assemblies! Urbach is reading into the teshuvah material which is not there!"
1. And he [=Gaon] responded: If you are provoking the former authorities [for abolishing Torah reading, know that] otherwise the argument can be continued forever.

2. They might say, 'Why has the reading of the ten commandments been abolished [it should be continued] as was done in the Temple?'

3. And another will say, 'Why have they abolished the acts of creation since they used to [read it] during the ma'amadot assemblies?'

4. And another will say, 'Why are we not reading every day in the Torah scroll or even on Monday and Thursday the tamid passage [Numbers 28].'

5. We are to follow the institutions established by those greater than us in wisdom and number, and we are not to change.

Hai Gaon cites the cessation of the reading of creation passages at ma'amadot assemblies as an example of readings of the Torah which were ended by earlier Rabbis. Rabbinic authorities specifically objected to daily Torah reading from Genesis effectively changing the ma'amadot institution as presented in Tannaitic osources. Moreover, daily Torah reading of any sort (ma'amadot, tamid, ten commandments), was abolished even in a pre-Geonic era, and in each case it was in response to some sectarian group.

---

The circle has come fully around, ma'amadot assemblies are serving yet another purpose for rabbinic Judaism as it set parameters for its self-definition. Geonic authorities, in order to differentiate rabbinic Judaism from Karaite influence, abolished ma'amadot practices despite their popularity.
The question whether R. Amram's Seder has any relevant material to the ma'amadot depends on the assessment of the evidence. The standard scholarly edition of the Seder is Goldschmidt's edition, and that edition has no references to the ma'amadot. On the basis of Goldschmidt's edition we may doubt whether Rav Amram had any concerns with the ma'amadot. There are, however, other editions of Amram's Seder which do include an extensive liturgy for the ma'amadot and various comments regarding its practice. In these editions R. Amram's Seder contains "Seder ma'amadot," listing an expanded selection of readings in Scripture from the Prophets, Writings and biblical passages depicting cultic practices at the Temple.

Scholars are generally agreed that the present Amram's Seder is not the one he wrote, many interpolations were added both to the liturgy text and to the instructions regarding the liturgy. Some even claim that he did not write it at all, rather, they hold, that students in Amram's circle produced

16I. Elbogen, Prayer in Israel, pp. 269-70. Elbogen notes that the Seder has many later additions and lists various liabilities of the text as reflecting Amram's own original text.


it. The striking datum, in the mss. that have this information, is Amram's list of the ma'amadot Torah reading and a prohibition of conducting this same liturgy as a public service. Yet Amram allows, even gently urging individuals to recite the ma'amadot liturgy for themselves.

Although even today there is still difficulty in determining the authentic elements in R. Amram's Seder, we can see clearly that rabbinic Judaism was concerned and involved with a variety of ma'amadot liturgical practices, corroborating the overall depiction of the ma'amadot by various Geonic authorities.¹⁹

¹⁹I. Elbogen, Prayer in Israel, pp. 269-70. See the extensive listing of mss. Urbach cites with liturgical material for ma'amadot services ("mishmarot uma'amadot," Tarbiz, (1973) 42:313-27.
Introduction

In this section we will summarize recent scholarship on epigraphic lists of the twenty four priestly courses which had some relation to Israelites and public liturgy. The documentary evidence is a review of a selection of post-Talmudic sources relating to the ma'amadot which including various piyyutim asking for the return of the priestly courses.

Epigraphic materials

R. Degen published an inscription found in a mosque listing the priestly courses on a column identified as part of a former synagogue. Degen concludes that priestly courses were inscribed in select synagogues in Israel and the diaspora, and that these courses were also called out in synagogue every Sabbath.

We suggest several reasons to explain this practice. Such a routine would keep priestly and Levitical mishmarot lists active. And if as we have argued, Israelite ma'amadot were named after priestly mishmarot then we may be witnessing

---

ma'amadot being called every Sabbath rather than just priests. The lists would also promote volunteerism both physical (ma'amad supplied from Jericho) and spiritual (being available for ma'amadot ritual practices which may require fasting, refraining from labor, reading Torah).

E. E. Urbach amplified Degen's article, providing details of the find, and proceeded with a more extensive review of priestly courses and the treatment of ma'amadot in various post-Talmudic documents. Urbach notes that in addition to inscriptions and piyyutim, there is reference in two Genizah fragments that the priestly course for the week was called out every Sabbath and was followed by learning a Mishnah chapter from tractate Shabbat since there are twenty four chapters corresponding to twenty four priestly courses.

In the second part of his article Urbach proceeds with the ma'amadot in post-Talmudic times up to the end of the nineteenth century. He begins with the order for the ma'amadot found in Seder R. Amram (see above) and continues with a description of numerous references in manuscripts and printed editions all who treat the institution individually. His presentation demonstrates that the ma'amadot left an indelible imprint on Jewish liturgy but this practice never

---

recovered its former status and was remained a liturgy recited by individuals on a voluntary basis.

T. Kahana likewise reviewed the priestly courses and their various locales which changed with the fortunes of the Jewish community. In addition to providing an extensive list of Piyutim listing the mishmarot, Kahana also agrees that these lists were kept alive and current in Israel and the diaspora for quite some time. Kahana concludes that in addition to announcing the priestly course for the week they also included the biblical passages from the ma'amadot liturgy as described in Tannaitic texts, adding that the original reason for establishing the institution was lost. Likewise, the practice of citing the priestly courses was widespread in Jewish communities.

N. Aloni review of Genizah fragments recounts that individuals were identified by the mishmar they belonged to in writing condolences to honor a deceased. This may well

---


23 Ibid., p. 16-17, note 45.

24 Nehemiah Aloni, "Genizah Fragments of Priestly Courses and Service," Tarbiz, (1978) 48:222-30. See also the recent scholarship on Genizah sources by Ezra Fleischer (Eretz-Israel Prayer and Prayer Rituals as Portrayed in the Genzia Documents, chs. 4-7) who finds an extraordinary diversity of public worship among Jewish communities of the Geonic period, some of which was reviewed in chapter two above.
apply to Israelites since we maintain that Israelite \textit{ma'amadot} took their name from priestly \textit{mishmarot}.
II. NON-RABBINIC SOURCES

Introduction

Three non-rabbinic sources have been associated with either ma'amad or the ma'amadot institution. We review Jewish sources first: Qumran documents; Karaite liturgy and a fragment attributed to Theophrastus.

Qumran documents employ the term ma'amad often without mentioning the ma'amadot institution explicitly or implicitly. Qumran usage is closer to rabbinic sources since both use the word more frequently and accord ma'amad a new denotation of new social class status.  

Karaite Liturgy

The Karaites have constructed and centered their worship and literature on the Torah and its text, unlike rabbinic Judaism whose daily liturgy centers mostly on Tannaitic and pre-Tannaitic compositions. The ma'amadot Torah reading liturgy was ideal for Karaitic purposes. Indeed, 'Anan,

---

25 See the discussion by Yigal Yadin, The War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness, 2nd ed., (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1957), 181-90; 264-66. Although Lawrence Schiffman first associates the Rabbinic 'anshe ma'amad with the Qumran Temple Scroll (The Halakhah at Qumran, [Leiden; Brill, 1975, p. 78], he later remarked, "my use of the Rabbinic term 'anshe ma'amad for the Qumran institution was somewhat imprecise" (Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls, [Boston: Brown University, 1983], p. 187, note 162).
founder and leader of Karaites, set down a daily service program which featured the Genesis reading defined in M. Taanit 4:3 and included the *tamid* passage (Numbers 28). Although other Karaites did not follow strictly his liturgy, it was well known and influential.

In addition, 'Anan's liturgy is effectively similar to the *ma'amadot* practices since it involved priests, Levites and Israelites. Priests and Levites were called 'anshe mishmar and Israelites were called 'anshe ma'amad. Priests blessed the assembly meeting, and Levites sang at every assembly.

**Theophrastus fragment**

A text fragment attributed to Theophrastus (372 - 287 B.C.E.), recounts the following daily Jewish religious practices: sacrifices, philosophical discussions, star-gazing, fasting and prayer. Three scholars who examined this passage evaluate it individually.

Jacob Bernays was first to identify the fragment's setting as *ma'amadot* assemblies since fasting is found in both practices. Guttman and Stern think that the *ma'amadot* are not related to Theophrastus.

---


Y. Guttman maintains that ma'amadot are not related to Theophrastus. Guttman concludes that Theophrastus found in Judaism profound wisdom and philosophy, as he found in other oriental religions.

M. Stern also concludes that Theophrastus most likely did not know of the ma'amadot. Stern notes that "though Theophrastus does not explicitly mention the Jewish belief in one God, he must have known this fact, and that it may have been the main reason why he thought of the Jewish religion as a philosophical one."  


29 Menachem Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, 3 vols., (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976), 1:8-12.

30 Ibid. p. 11.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE MA'AMADOT:
SELF-DEFINITION THROUGH
RITUAL DRAMA

Introduction

After examining the sources related to the ma'amadot, mainly rabbinic sources (Tannaitic, Amoraic, Geonic) and a handful of non-rabbinic allusions (Qumran, Karaite, Theophrastus), we aspire for a greater cultural backdrop for the institution. Various striking comparative religious practices in antiquity and late antiquity will provide that wider context.

The most fitting paradigm for the ma'amadot is ritual-drama. Ritual-Drama has been a particularly effective construct in analyzing and comparing religious phenomena throughout world cultures. A comparative study
will help explain the particular structure of the ma'amatot institution and answer critical questions such as why especially the Tannaitic sources insisted that the creation narrative be read daily rather than Scriptural passages relating to the cult (tamid).

The comparative data will examine two surprisingly relevant religious practices one in ancient Mesopotamia, the Babylonian New Year festival (Akitu), and Mystery religions prevalent in the Greco-Roman world of late antiquity.

The main purpose of the ma'amatot was to establish daily ritual drama gatherings in all local Jewish communities, promote daily Torah readings, inculcate the creation narrative and institute the Torah as the focal point for nearly all public liturgical activities. Arguably before 70 and certainly after 70, the ma'amatot ritual served as the nucleus for the synagogue and its service.

In sum, we propose that the ma'amatot represented a program which possessed all the essential elements to transform the religious orientation of the Jewish community. Our thesis is that the ma'amatot was established primarily to reinforce a particular definition of the Jewish community by promoting new daily worship patterns bonding a people to the Torah scroll and its text.
elevating them to the prime and central position in the liturgy. The elements found in the ma'amadot were designed to provide self-definition through ritual-drama for the Jewish community. The ma'amadot can best be understood in the perspective of antecedent and contemporary rituals such as the Babylonian Akitu festival and Mystery religions. Indeed, these comparative religious phenomena corroborate our hypothesis since they too have been recognized as defining their respective religious communities through ritual drama.
Lawrence A. Hoffman recently offered insightful comments that are helpful in framing our approach to the ma'amadot. Hoffman argues that in addition to the text-centered philological approaches of L. Zunz and the form-criticism employed by Joseph Heinemann, there is a need to "go beyond the text."

Hoffman holds that the study of liturgical theology must include,¹

'the sociology of knowledge, the philosophy of language, the anthropology of ritual, the psychology of belief, the theory of actions...phenomenology and social anthropology.'...I want only to shout as loudly as I may in favor of taking such things seriously as liturgies, that is, as acted-out rituals involving prescribed texts, actions, timing, persons, and things, all coming together in a shared statement of communal identity by those who live with, through, and by them. If we learn to see the liturgy as transcending words, even great words, we inherit a window on the past and the present alike, in which the image on the other side of the glass may look remarkably like ourselves...

Clearly...without these [textual] data we could say nothing at all of the communities who once composed them. But equally clearly, it is the obligation of others in the scholarly community to take the next step and postulate pictures of those communities...

[I]t is immediately clear that we have an entire ritual [Public Fast ritual described in Taanit 2] being described here, not just a textual recension. Rituals have been studied by anthropologists with field experience the world over. What would an anthropologist say about our description? Is this

ritual classifiable by type or identifiable according to the social structure that gives rise to it. And would it then tell us something that these worshippers shared with other religionists in places and times that differ from what we have here, but whose situation and aspirations remain the same? Or knowing a common typology that is applicable across religious lines, might we then see the reverse, that is, how Jewish ritual here differed from others, such as the uniqueness of Jewish experience in Palestine at the turn of the century becomes evident?

Hoffman argues further that ritual drama leads to "'the system of signification that dominates the way [its originators] carved up experience.'" The creators of ritual drama produce "constructions of reality" which the investigators then examine to "sort out the structures of signification."²

Despite raised levels of ambiguity Hoffman would rather work with a more inclusive methodology because the rewards are greater.

At times, we shall discover that this sort of investigation is not amenable to the same rigorous proofs that the science of textual analysis demands, because the rules of the textual game permit us to limit the scope of its inquiry in advance to that range of topics about which such certainty is a priori demonstrable. Unfortunately, items of cultural signification are not on that list; were we to insist on an equal degree of confirmation here, we should have to abandon our task at the outset.³

In addition to the standard philological methodology, our thesis also seeks to be "an attempt to ask new

²Idem. p. 15.

³Idem. p. 17.
questions of our material, so as to go beyond that material: to proceed to the worshipping community that lives beyond the text."

Comparative analysis

The broad characteristics of ritual drama, which apply to the ma'amadot, are clear both in the Akitu festival, the major Babylonian liturgical drama whose centerpiece was the Babylonian creation epic, Enuma Elish. Likewise with the Mystery religions which will reviewed later. The parallels to the ma'amadot are striking.

The ma'amadot, Akitu and Mystery religions share elements of drama and myth which set them in the same genre of religious activity. Their agenda is self-definition: to establish a particular deity as the dominant, supreme divinity; to validate a version of creation and eternity (death and resurrection); to devise a drama involving an individual in a liturgical activity associated with a religious object.

The Babylonian Akitu festival and the Enuma Elish creation epic were prevalent throughout Mesopotamia. The Enuma Elish was disseminated by the Akitu festival, the

---

Biblical creation story by the ma'amadot. Although the content and world view of each creation story is different, they were both intended as part of a public ritual drama.

The Enuma Elish was, "the myth that sustained Babylonian civilization, that buttressed its societal norms and its organizational structure...[when the myth was recited] and dramatically presented." The recitation of the Enuma Elish during the ritual of the Babylonian New Year had a profound impact, "the priests recited...the myth of Creation; and the recitation did something; it brought about a change in the situation which the ritual was enacting." Akitu was the chief festival in Babylon and is the only festival referred to by the Babylonian Chronicles (747-223 B.C.E.). "The Babylonian Akitu was not of strictly local interest. It was the one festival for which the king [Babylonian, Assyrian or Persian] was expected to participate and its significance was, therefore, nation-wide [associated with] momentous happenings in general, be they religious, political, or military...[although it was not] essential to the

---

5N. M. Sarna, Understanding Genesis, p. 7.

recognition of the monarch [practically all kings participated in the festival].”

The Akitu festival is without peer in the world of antiquity as the festival which made the Enuma Elish the best known creation myth throughout the fertile crescent for well over a thousand years and at its end was contemporaneous with the Second Temple period for hundreds of years. Both the Akitu drama and the Enuma Elish myth display a distinct hierarchy of authority. During the drama the priest dominated the king and in the myth Marduk rules over all other gods.

[T]he king...went through a humiliating ritual...The rite began when the high priest removed the king’s royal insignia, such as the scepter and his sword, and placed them before the image of Marduk. The high priest then pulled the king’s ears, and forced him to bow before the god and recite a negative confession, stressing the fact that he has not mistreated Babylon and its people in any way. At this point, the high priest returned the royal insignia to the king and then struck him in the face. If the king’s eyes filled with tears, it was a sign that Marduk was pleased with him...On the eighth day the king "took Marduk by the hand" and...Marduk’s sovereignty was solemnly proclaimed by the priests attending the assembling deities...Its rites and rituals were so impressive that they were echoed by most of the ancient world for several millennia.9


8There is a similar hierarchy described in Deuteronomy 17:18-20; 31 and Sotah 7:8.

The Enuma Elish myth primarily glorifies Marduk as the supreme god of the Babylonian pantheon.

The myth was a means of exalting the great Marduk. It is notable that in the course of the drama Marduk takes over the functions and powers of the other deities. He reigned supreme. The cult of Marduk tended toward monotheism. Marduk was addressed as Bel, the supreme Lord. But his worship always included a host of other deities and spirits. This branch of Semitic culture did not introduce a strict monotheism exclusive of other, lesser gods.

Ritual drama utilizing creation myths was such a successful vehicle to pattern and retain cultural identity that successive societies in Mesopotamia modified and used some combination of a creation myth with drama to validate their society and its worldview and, "to bring it into line with the story and significance" so that their reigning chief deity replaced the former supreme deity.

Again its [Enuma Elish] roots are deep in the Sumerian period, and again it has been re-shaped by the later Semites. Its hero was almost certainly originally Enlil, the Sumerian god of Nippur, but when the myth was translated and adapted at the time of the Babylonian first dynasty the opportunity was taken to substitute the Babylonian Marduk for Enlil, and the epic, incorporated in the Babylonian New Year Festival, became the main justification for the supremacy of Babylon. A similar process took place a thousand years later when Assyria became the supreme

---


power of the area, and Assur was substituted for Marduk in the official dogma. 12

Creation epics functioned as the key myths in Mystery religions. Their central deities, Marduk, Baal, Osiris, Tammuz, Apis and others, played central roles in ritual myths of their respective mystery religions which, "resemble each other sufficiently to warrant being classified and discussed together." 13

At the spring festival the vegetation aspect of Marduk's nature was manifested. The dying and rising god symbolized, as did Osiris [in Egypt and Baal in Canaan], the renewal of life in agriculture and the assurance of fertility. The god acquired the traits of Tammuz, who was husband and son to the goddess Ishtar. (The latter, under the name of Astarte, was to play a part in the Greek and Hellenistic cult of the Mother Goddess). 14

Enuma Elish, writes S. H. Hooke, is the poem that became, "a ritual myth, possessing magical potency, and playing a vital part in the Babylonian New Year Festival in connexion with the dramatic representation of the death and resurrection of the god." 15

Later Mystery religions in Late Antiquity adapted these myths for their own purposes.

---


15 S. H. Hooke, Middle Eastern Mythology, p. 46.
The object of the mystery cults was to secure salvation...by what may broadly be called sacramental means. By taking part in prescribed rites the worshipper became united with God, was enabled in this life to enjoy mystical communion with him, and further was assured of immortality beyond death. This process rested upon the experiences (generally including the death and resurrection) of a Savior-God, the Lord of his devotees. The myth[s]...which seem(s) often to have been cultically represented...in many of these religions...were now given an individual application and effect...[to an initiand who] was incorporated into the divine action of the myth, and so achieved life by virtue of the resurrection of the god.\textsuperscript{16}

The rites of Mystery religions, according to Meyer, incorporated three types of sacred observances: \textit{legomena}, "things recited," \textit{deiknymena}, "things shown," and \textit{dromena}, "things performed."...[T]hese three categories of communication...may be employed to describe the rites of other...religions as well...The \textit{legomena} may have been recitations of the \textit{hieros logos} (the "sacred account" that provided the mythological foundation for the celebration of the mysteries)...the \textit{deiknymena}...were replete with visual images...scenes carved or painted [that] often gave a concise picture of [its religious] themes...the initiates also saw sacred objects that were previously hidden from sight...The \textit{dromena}...actors produced and the audience witnessed a theatrical performance in which the \textit{hieroi logoi} of the mystery religion came to life in liturgical drama.\textsuperscript{17}


\textsuperscript{17}Marvin Meyer ed., \textit{The Ancient Mysteries}, pp. 10-13. Meyer agrees with Aristotle regarding these rites by focusing on the effect of the liturgy and drama on the participant. "[I]nitiates into the mysteries do not learn anything...but rather have an experience...and are put in a certain state of mind...\textit{legomena}, \textit{deiknymena}, and \textit{dromena} [were] not classroom education, but an eye-opening experience that transcended earthy realities and mundane learning...[the initiates] claimed to have tasted death and life and to have been touched by the divine. United
We find these three elements employed in the ma'amadot assemblies. The legomena was the Genesis 1-2:3, the sacred account; the deiknymena was the Torah Scroll, the sacred object and the dromena was the act of reading from the Torah which united the reader with God.

The structure of the ma'amadot is likewise similar to that of Akitu and its descendant liturgies. There is, similarly, a correlation between the ma'amadot and the religious beliefs of the larger civilization. Another striking example is the Baal creation epic in Ugaritic society which is suggestive as to the relation and function of the biblical creation narrative for the ma'amadot.

The value to the community [of the Baal epic], and especially to its priestly and political leadership, of possessing such a composite [Baal creation] myth is apparent. It would serve as a guide to ritual activity, as a work of theological reference, and as a credo of Baalistic religion. Above all, it would provide divine legitimation of the customs and rituals of the Ugaritic community, a constant assurance that what was done in the temple and the royal court was in accordance with the structure of reality. Herein would lie the utility of the myth. Only if the activity of the community harmonized with divinely established reality would its continuing prosperity be assured. A document of such significance to the state would appropriately be kept in the archives of the palace.

The Baal epic does not issue from primitive, sex-ridden, and superstition-bound minds. It is a sophisticated, realistic understanding of the nature

with one or another of the deities of the mystery religions...they beheld the light, and their life was renewed (Ibid)."
of things in pluralistic terms. Its comprehensiveness, utility, and inner consistency made it a viable alternative to the monotheistic, historically-oriented faith of Israel, similarly capable of claiming the allegiance and sustaining the intellectual, religious, and political life of human beings and their societies. It is not at all surprising that the religion which the epic represents proved so stubborn, and, one is tempted to say, so worthy an antagonist of Israel's religion.  

Without forcing the issue, the evidence thus far supports the position that the ma'amadot and its components, the Torah Scroll and the reading of the biblical creation narrative are analogous ritual drama phenomena. Nevertheless, there is scholarly opinion (Sarna, Paul) which denies any liturgical role for creation in Judaism. Other scholars (James, Hooke) do find a function for the creation story in Jewish ritual drama but their specific theories for their application are far-fetched and without support.

While Nahum Sarna holds that the Enuma Elish was "the creation myth that sustained Babylonian civilization," he maintains that the Biblical creation epic had no ritual drama influence in Judaism. Nahum Sarna and Shalom Paul deny any role whatever to the creation narrative in Jewish

---


19 N. M. Sarna, Understanding Genesis, p. 7.
ritual. Shalom M. Paul states unequivocally, "the biblical story [of Creation] is non-cultic...it plays no ritual role whatever in the religion of Israel." Nahum M. Sarna also insists that the creation story in Genesis has no ritual function.

The biblical Creation account is non-political and non-cultic...[it] has no political role...It does not seek to validate national ideals or institutions. Moreover, it fulfills no cultic function. The inextricable tie between myth and ritual, the mimetic enactment of the cosmogony in the form and ritual drama, which is an essential characteristic of the pagan religions, finds no counterpart in the Israelite cult.

E. O. James correctly maintains that the biblical creation story was indeed utilized in some cultic fashion but his belief that it was applied to the Jewish New Year as it has throughout the fertile crescent is without any foundation.

"[T]he Genesis narrative was similarly sung in the temple at Jerusalem when the enthronement of Yahweh as the Creator was celebrated at the Annual Festival...Therefore, it would be indeed surprising if the opening scene of the great panorama were not commemorated and enacted in the rites, liturgies and festivals that constitute the key to the process in

---


which the meaning of the history of Israel was unfolded, and at each stage made efficacious by a fresh out/pouring of re/creative activity.22

S. H. Hooke also holds, with justification, that the creation epic in Genesis played some cultic role in Judaism. But his position that the biblical creation narrative was used during the Jewish New Year and was a gross cultural borrowing from the Babylonian antecedent is without foundation.

[T]he Hebrew New Year Festival had features in common with the Babylonian festival, and that the enthronement of Yahweh and the celebration of his mighty acts formed a central feature of the ritual...Moreover, we know that the Hebrew New Year Festival was celebrated for seven days, a fact which provides an intelligible explanation for the arrangement of the acts of Creation in a series of seven periods. Hence it is suggested that the sections of the J account of Creation were read by the priests at the New Year Festival, and that Gen. 1-24a constituted a liturgy of creation which was chanted by the priests on that occasion.23

Roland de Vaux evaluated these positions and rightfully dismissed them.24

In Babylon, a New Year feast (Akitu) was celebrated during the first twelve days of the month of Nisan (the beginning of the spring year). The feast commemorated the renewal of creation and the kingship

---

22E. O. James, Myth and Ritual in the Ancient Near East, pp. 169-70.

23S. H. Hooke, Middle Eastern Mythology, pp. 120-21. Hooke explores in detail the extensive influences of Mesopotamian creation myths on "Hebrew Mythology" on pp. 105-21.

of Marduk. The epic of creation, of Marduk's struggle against chaos, was recited and re-enacted, and the god himself was acclaimed with the words 'Marduk is King!' The same elements, it is claimed, are found in Egypt; we may presume that they existed in Canaan, and we may therefore conclude that a similar drama was enacted at Jerusalem on the feast of Tents at the beginning (or the end) of the (autumnal) year... In spite of the authority of the scholars who put forward these theories, and in spite of the erudition with which they defend them, one cannot help expressing very serious doubts as to whether the theories are true.

There is a fundamental methodological error present in all the theories of the James/Hooke school. These theories build a one-to-one correspondence of wholesale cultural borrowing from Babylonian culture to Judaism. They first establish a series of parallels between Babylonian and Jewish cultural elements and then insist that they are all tied together in the same way. While there is a measure of literary similarity in the creation narratives in the Bible and the Enuma Elish, they are conceptually and qualitatively different. The New Year festivals have analogues themes of crowning their respective gods supreme, decreeing the fates for the year, purification, confession and affirming the dominant role of the priest. As a result of the many points of correspondence, they argue, these elements were used in the same cultural pattern.

Judaism's borrowing from Babylonian culture, however, would be selective and purposeful. Adamson Hoebel notes,
Every spreading trait or complex, as it moves from one society to another, must face the test of its acceptability in the culture of the receivers; and if it is accepted, it is invariably reworked in form, use, meaning, or function. No people take an alien trait without altering it to some degree...The compatibility of a new way with the basic postulates and derived corollaries underlying the receiving culture is of vital importance.  

Sarna and Paul have failed to fully assess the role of the biblical narrative in Judaism, they leave the impression that it never had a significant function in the liturgical life among Jews. We have shown, on the other hand, that all rabbinic sources attest that the creation clearly played a major role in Judaism. The biblical creation story was utilized in ritual drama in Judaism, according to our interpretation, to promote its monotheistic views, and to imprint its distinct self-definition on the community. James and Hooke are quite mistaken in placing the Jewish creation narrative in the midst of a far fetched New Year festival. They are correct, however, in maintaining that the Genesis myth played a major role in Judaism.

To be sure, the Babylonian and Jewish creation texts share many similarities, specific details and general categories of narrative development.

It is clear that the imagery of the [Biblical creation] unit derives from a common tradition in a

---

large cultural context. Particularly v. 2 projects images that were at home in the mythological heritage of Babylon and Canaan...[and the] Egyptian tradition (the Memphis creation tradition)...Indeed, even the conclusion with its goal in the rest of God may pick up significant cultural parallels (so Schmidt, pp. 154-59).

Yet Biblical texts depart radically from pagan cosmogony and theogony. S. M. Paul illustrates the qualitative distinctiveness of Biblical theology which stands in stark contrast to comparative theologies in the Hellenistic period.

In Genesis there is a total rejection of all mythology. The overriding conception of a single, omnipotent, creator predominates. Cosmogony is not linked to theogony. The preexistence of God is assumed—it is not linked to the genesis of the universe. There is no suggestion of any primordial battle or internecine war which eventually led to the creation of the universe. The one God is above the whole of nature, which He Himself created by His own absolute will. The primeval water, earth, sky, and luminaries are not pictured as deities or as parts of disembodied deities, but are all parts of the manifold works of the Creator. Man, in turn, is not conceived as an afterthought, as in Enuma Elish, but rather as the pinnacle of creation. Man is appointed ruler of the animal and vegetable kingdoms; he is not merely the menial of the gods.

Coates argues that the Biblical creation narrative is unique as a literary genre despite its underlying idiom of Near Eastern mythology.

---

26George W. Coats, Genesis, p. 46.

The generic character of parallel mythology is not reproduced in the narrative itself... It develops no plot, there is no arc of tension, no resolution of crisis... It sets out doctrine (so, von Rad, Genesis, 63) and teaches a particular world view. But it does not approach that task philosophically, as if the doctrine could be established by logical argument. It sets out its teaching in the form of history... As a report, this unit can communicate its teaching in terms of event and relate all subsequent events to the power of its position. All orders of creation derive from God. All events of creation derive from this primary event. 28

Indeed, the argument of Morton Smith is that the major social and religious transformation of the Second Temple period was a change from syncretic to monotheistic assemblies, brought about through a "liturgical revolution." This position becomes plausible in light of the monotheistic character of Genesis. Smith writes:

Although the cult of Yahweh is the principal concern of the Old Testament, it may not have been the principle religious concern of the Israelites... Syncretism was dominant in the cult of Yahweh in Jerusalem to the very last days of the first temple... This proves that the cult of Yahweh was not conceived as exclusive by the priests of his principal temple... This liturgical and, especially, homiletical work of the levites (Nehemiah 8) must have been of great importance in winning over the peasantry, first of Judea and then of northern Palestine... Accordingly, it is plausible to suppose that the levites played a leading part in the liturgical revolution which did most to separate Palestinian Judaism from the syncretic forms of the cult of Yahweh the substitution of synagogue worship for sacrifice... The spread of the village synagogues probably killed

---

28George W. Coats, Genesis, p. 47.
off the village high places in northern Palestine as it did in Judea.  

In sum, the nature of ritual drama, the structure of the Babylonian Akitu festival, the centrality of Enuma Elish, the points in common with Mystery religions, help explain the structure and function of the ma'amadot in context of comparative religions. The ma'amadot's overall structure has much in common with other ritual drama phenomena in the ancient world. We determined that the ma'amadot used a universal ritual idiom to provide a unique statement of self-definition by employing the biblical creation narrative.

The Temple cult was quite similar to other cultic practices but the biblical creation narrative was unique among creation myths of antiquity. The ma'amadot's theology represents a move away from cult and Temple and toward creation and Creator a far more universal concern. The critical theological differences among creation myths and the clear monotheism of the biblical creation narrative makes its selection as the biblical text for the ma'amadot a promotion for faith in a unique God. Although both

---

Mishnah and Tosefta pin their explanation of the ma'amadot on the biblical text relating to the tamid they require only the recitation of the creation passage.

The decision to recite the creation passages at the ma'amadot, not the passages relating to the tamid offering (Numbers 28:2), was deliberate and evoked the unique character of monotheistic Judaism. The biblical worldview inherent in its text was conveyed to its audience by means of ritual drama and by reciting the sacred text at ma'amadot meetings.

Moreover, beyond the text the Torah scroll is a physical object of great import. Especially after 70, and arguably before too, the Torah scroll as an object was inseparably linked to the creation narrative in Genesis. A Torah scroll was present every morning when the creation story was recited at ma'amadot meetings. Clearly the ma'amadot Torah ritual was designed to make Jews become deeply identified with the Torah scroll as a physical object.

The Jewish community identified itself with the Torah scroll, viewed it as a symbol of their deity and presented themselves to the pagan world with the Torah in their arms.

---

30 See the analysis of Taanit 4:2 above which provides a detailed discussion of the issues.

31 Taanit 4:3.
When a Jewish and Greek delegation from Alexandria came before Trajan to settle one of the many feuds that regularly flared between them, each group brought with them its "god," the Greeks Sarapis and the Jews, a Torah scroll.  

For pagans, Sarapis [=Osorapis] was a syncretic god in a Hellenistic cult combining the Egyptian savior-god Osiris and Apis the bull-god although it lost the bull shape of Apis. The Sarapis cult, with strong elements of a mystery religion, is dated to the beginning of the Ptolemaic era and was intended mostly for Greeks in Egypt.

[Sarapis] was identified with Zeus, a healing-god, a saviour-god, a father figure, whose kindly, bearded features are familiar from many representations, and who formed an object of love and devotion to meet the needs of a changed scene... Apis was supposedly transformed into Osiris after death, thus gaining the kind of divine immortality which was open to the human devotees of Osiris. The cult center of Osorapis was at Memphis in Lower Egypt. The liturgy of the new worship of Sarapis was a combination of Egyptian and Greek, the popularity of the god grew quite rapidly. By the end of the first century A.D. it became officially recognized in Rome. The ritual was chiefly concerned with the three figures of Osiris (Sarapis),

---


Isis, and Horus their son, but the dominant member of
the triad was the goddess.  

The exclusive identification of Jews with the Torah
scroll (and possibly its use in a liturgical setting) and
their strong rejection of idolatry can be arguably
established as early as pre-Hasmonean times despite
scholars who hold otherwise.  

The decrees of Antiochus IV
against Judaism singled out the Torah scroll for
destruction, and both its owners and adherents of its
teachings were victims of persecution; Jews, likewise, went
to their death rather than worship idols and ultimately
would kill those who would introduce such practices into
their community.

J. A. Goldstein points out that the Torah was
considered a subversive book, probably since it forbids
idolatry, and that subversive books were commonly targeted
in antiquity by authorities who felt threatened by such
works. By the rise of the Hasmoneans both Jews and their
pagan neighbors identified Judaism with the Torah scroll as

---

35 Ninian Smart, The Religious Experience of Mankind,

36 "There is little evidence that the Torah had a
liturgical function before the first century of the common
era...[but] there is ample support for the claim that the
Torah was used liturgically in the Palestinian synagogues
after 70 CE" (Gary Porton, "Midrash: Palestinian Jews and
the Hebrew Bible in the Greco-Roman Period," <i>ANRW</i>, p.
117).
a physical object and a code of law, an association that remained fixed throughout Jewish history.37

As we noted, the ma'amadot would be an ideal institution for daily worship after 70 but it would arguably also be a successful model for local worship after the centralization of the cult during the pre-70 era. The ritual-drama at ma'amadot assemblies is suggestive as to how the centralization of the cult became possible. Without alternative worship in local communities, any attempts at centralizing the cult in Jerusalem may well have been doomed to fail.

37 "[T]he identification ‘Book - people of the Book,’ was already present in the Holy Land in Roman times. The habit of burning the Jew with his Book indicates the close association of these two items in the mind of the Romans, an association of later times as well. Referring to the identification of the Hebrews with the Talmud during the Middle Ages, Rafael Cansinos-Assens (1883-1964), remarked that "Never was there seen such a close association between a people and her book." (Jose' Faur, Golden Doves with Silver Dots, [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986], p. 6).

The following observation is ahistorical yet insightful. "For the Hebrews, the Book is their national symbol: it is the Book. Thus, the Hebrews themselves become the symbol of the Book. This total absolute identification creates the Book. "Book/people" results in a reciprocal relationship: the people affect the Book and the book affects the people. Thus the Book is not merely a book - a literary instance; rather, it is a literary genre - a mode conditioning the reader's attitude towards the text...The special "Book/people" relationship is manifest in the rabbinic institution for the 'public reading' (geri' a be-sibbur) of the Tora...The Book and derasha ["generating new perceptions and meanings"] include Creation. In the mind of the Hebrews the Universe is represented as the writing or active speech of God." (Fauer, Golden Doves, pp. xx-xxi).
Nahum M. Sarna, among others, pointed out the spiritual vacuum resulting from the centralization of the cult. But his suggestion that incense offering, oblation, and especially psalmody were sufficient "to overcome with relative ease the great crisis" of the absence of the cult is inadequate.

Rabbinic sources portray the ma'amadot to be a better solution as a format for daily worship certainly after 70 and arguably pre-70 too although it may not be an historical reality. Daily Torah reading is a better model than some of the alternatives examined below for explaining the transition to a cultless religion.

Setting Torah reading equivalent to the cult is the didactic rhetorical function of the Mishnah - to create such precedents. Hence the ma'amadot as a pre-70 institution may be a rabbinic reworking of the ma'amadot or a total imaginative creation to justify a post-70 setting. But the Mishnah's depiction of the ma'amadot pre-70 provides a workable setting, lay persons would be allowed access to sacred objects and be permitted direct participation in a ritual made equivalent to animal offerings. The ma'amadot theology is also ideal, it

---

emphasizes creation, Creator and man as His partner which is a distinct turning away from cult, Temple and priest.

Before centralization Israelites were accustomed to participate in every aspect of the cult in the high places (bamot) outside the Temple,\textsuperscript{39} whereas centralization reduced lay persons to mere observers. The Mishnah’s projection of pre-70 would now provide for a ma'amadot Torah ritual with potential benefits to exceed those Israelites enjoyed before centralization.

The ma'amadot Torah service would have yielded greater levels of involvement and personal fulfillment. Three times as many persons, at least, were involved in a Torah recital than in an animal offering.\textsuperscript{40} Far more individuals were likely to take part in the former since it is economically more feasible: it cost less to read a Torah passage than to offer an animal. Reciting the creation narrative in public was both intellectually challenging and dramatically engaging since the person had to know how to read from the Torah scroll and be able to perform this function before an audience.

\textsuperscript{39} Zevahim 14:10. This is not an attempt to reconstruct history on the basis of halakhah, rather, the above examines relevant issues for which the ma'amadot provides insight.

\textsuperscript{40} Taanit 4:3; H. Albeck, Mishnah, 2:342.
The Torah recital also fulfilled a basic need for a direct encounter with the divine. Baruch A. Levine explains that the purpose of "grandiose efforts devoted to temple building, and to maintenance of elaborate cults" was to fill man's need for the proximity and the benefits of having the deities in their community. The centralization of the cult deprived local Jewish communities of a distinct divine presence. Although prayer may have served a similar function, it would not have nearly the impact without a sacred object which would be used on a daily basis.

Centering the cult of the ma'amadot around the Torah elegantly solved the problem of providing "the potent presence...[which is] the presence of God [and is] synonymous with material blessings and protection afforded by his power...the actual cause of [the people's] victory and the success of their ventures, the basis of their peace and well being."\(^{41}\)

Local altars were constructed and offerings were presented "as an effort to attract the deity to the place of sacrifice; to invite him to pay a visit."\(^{42}\) Levine has argued that the removal of local altars induced an anxiety

---


\(^{42}\)Ibid. p. 79.
and a need for "the potent presence" which continued to influence post-biblical Judaism as well.\textsuperscript{43} The \textit{ma'amadot} would fill that need.

Baruch Levine also notes the potential value of Torah reading vis-a-vis the cult in another context.

What the cult sought to do, in a sense, was to render permanent the epic relationship of God and Israel, and thus to assure the regular availability of divine power. The cult was to routinize the singular. Whereas prophets warned the people not to rely on past indications of favor as an assurance of victory, the cultic spokesmen instituted epic recitation for the very purpose of promoting faith in God's continuously protecting power.\textsuperscript{44} (Emphasis added.)

Linking the Torah reading to the Temple cult certainly bolstered the local \textit{ma'amadot}'s status for those who required such associations but the \textit{tamid} offering never dominated the Torah reading.

In conclusion, comparative religious phenomena helped to explain certain features of the \textit{ma'amadot} that could not have been elucidated from the rabbinic sources alone. We now understand that those who designed the \textit{ma'amadot} utilized successful universal idioms of ritual drama to provide a distinct self-definition to their own community. We find similar essential features in the \textit{ma'amadot} as there are in the Akitu and Mystery religions which were the

\textsuperscript{43}Ibid. p. 87.

\textsuperscript{44}Baruch A. Levine, "On the Presence of God in Biblical Religion," p.76.
foremost religious forms of their day. The Sages’ blueprint for the ma’amadot was designed for success, its effectiveness can be understood as the success we find in the tried and proven ritual drama forms in comparative religions.

We have seen how the Babylonian New Year, the state’s religious ritual drama, utilized its creation narrative to validate its cultural, social and religious hierarchy. The ma’amadot similarly employed the recital of the biblical creation narrative to communicate its uniquely Jewish message and validate its own civilization.

Mystery religions were especially successful in late antiquity because it was, unlike Akitu, an initiatory and participatory religious phenomena which claimed to secure salvation for its members. The ma’amadot too, were designed to actively involve its participants in Torah reading of the creation narrative for the same reason. The ma’amadot aimed to redefine their religious community and secure their salvation.
CHAPTER TWELVE

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In this chapter we will first review the evidence gathered from both rabbinic and non-rabbinic sources plus insights garnered from comparative data. After reviewing our work we will state concluding remarks concerning our study.

In our review we will summarize the eleven chapters presented thus far. Here we will synthesize our review and reconstruct with the help of some recent scholarship four historical periods relating to the ma'amadot: pre-70, post-70 till 200, 200-500, and post 500 through the Geonic era. We will show that the ma'amadot was an evolving institution having a somewhat different character in each period while retaining its basic traits.

The basic facts of the institution as determined from the rabbinic sources are: In the Tannaitic sources depict
the ma'amadot as designed to meet twice daily in each local community, its main activity was daily reading of the creation narrative in Genesis, and the Torah scroll had to be present in the morning. Peripheral practices included priestly blessings, grooming, and fasting. The Amoraic sources are the first to associate prayer with the ma'amadot and present it as a standard feature of the institution, although the Tannaitic sources studiously avoided any such affiliation. Ultimately, the Geonic authorities will prohibit public daily reading from the Torah scroll including the creation passages, the heart of ma'amadot practices.¹

Review

In chapter one we examined the scholarship to date on the ma'amadot and found it wanting. Mostly, scholars followed the model in Tannaitic sources uncritically, they viewed the ma'amadot to be a function of the tamid offering, ignoring its vital ritual - the daily Torah reading of creation. Without exception, scholars identified prayer as an integral element of the ma'amadot

¹See the discussion in chapter ten above regarding the Geonic and Karite material on the subject.
whereas Tannaitic sources make it clear that they did not make any such identification.

This observation points up to the common problem of the scholarly treatment of the ma'amarot. Scholars compress all ma'amarot practices into a singular monolithic institution with one set of ritual practices that were supposedly observed from its inception onwards.

Our systematic study of the rabbinic sources showed otherwise. Although the rabbinic sources present a unified portrait of the ma'amarot, each rabbinic source treated the topic individually. Moreover, the sources clearly depict an evolving institution with changing practices and purposes. Still, numerous scholars identified the ma'amarot as the forerunner of the synagogue but did not substantiate their claim. Our study confirms and supports this assertion.

In chapter two we mapped our approach and expectations. We first gathered all references, explicit and implicit, related to the ma'amarot and then examined each in order of its appearance in their respective historical periods from the Mishnah through the Geonic responsa. We also examined relevant non-rabbinic sources, some of these sources were instructive, others were assessed not to have any significance to the ma'amarot. Most importantly, each rabbinic source was first examined
individually and only later compared and integrated with other rabbinic documents.

In chapters three and four we gathered and analyzed the most comprehensive data on the ma'amadot as presented in the Mishnah. This Tannaitic source draws a distinct and comprehensive portrait of the ma'amadot: it defines, provides instructions for its operations and suggests an "explanation" for its origins.

The Mishnah defines the ma'amadot as Israelites passively attending every tamid offering while Israelites gather twice daily in local communities for recitation of the creation narrative in Genesis. The most relevant and detailed instructions for Torah reading are in the Mishnah. Its data is so comprehensive as to be sufficient for operating ma'amadot practices, no other rabbinic source provides such systematic and relevant data.

The "explanation" of the ma'amadot's creation is tied to the tamid offering. Yet this midrashic "explanation" is obviously a didactic rhetorical literary device. The Tannaitic sources are not intent on providing an explicit historical reason for establishing the ma'amadot institution. Based on the sources, we deduced the ma'amadot's true power and impact by assessing its effective function as a real and working institution, rather than hold on to the midrashic "explanation." Thus
the institution’s significance is to be found in its daily meetings at local communities for Torah reading both in the pre- and post-70 eras.

The Mishnah’s depiction of the ma’amadot was the most comprehensive of all, and at the heart of the ma’amadot services was the daily Torah reading. The Mishnah’s association of cult to Torah reading only bolstered the status and effectiveness of the Torah reading. After careful review, the data in the Mishnah was judged to be meticulously crafted and edited into its text. Without doubt, the most important source for the ma’amadot is the Mishnah.

In chapter five we examined the evidence in the Tosefta which both supplemented and complemented the Mishnah, but was always its starting point. Tosefta is parallel to the Mishnah in most regards, both present a comprehensive, plausible and viable institution. Moreover, both provide the same "explanation" for the origin of the ma’amadot (a product of the tamid), they cite a biblical verse as textproof for founding the ma’amadot (Numbers 28), and tie its ritual to the daily cult at the Temple.

The most obvious difference from the Mishnah is the Tosefta’s absence of detailed instructions regarding Torah reading. This suggests that there was virtual unanimity
among rabbinic authorities as to the Torah reading from Genesis at ma'amadot rituals as the central and foremost practice.

Tosefta adds consequential data to the Mishnah. Whereas the Mishnah presents most of its data as anonymous and undisputed, the Tosefta demonstrates that most traditions in the Mishnah are attributed to R. Meir and are disputed by his colleagues.²

In chapter six we analyzed the evidence in the Mishnah and Tosefta since they can be viewed productively as a single literary Tannaitic unit. The most distinct traits of Mishnah and Tosefta is their agreement on the nature of the ma'amadot. It is an institution designed to provide for daily ritual meetings at local communities. Significantly, these meetings relate to daily Torah reading, not prayer. Both sources agree that prayer is not an element of the ma'amadot, both sources studiously avoid any association of prayer with ma'amadot ritual, a very deliberate and purposeful aspect of their presentation of data.

In chapter seven we reviewed the sparse evidence in halakhic Midrashim. There is no reference to the ma'amadot in this Tannaitic branch of literature although there are a handful of references to the term ma'amad.

Since Scripture is always the Midrashim’s starting point, the range and quality of its discussion regarding the ma'amadot is fairly limited. For the most part, halakhic Midrashim enlighten our view with their linguistic usages of the term ma'amad and frequently look back to biblical settings for its discourse.

In chapter eight we surveyed the Yerushalmi’s treatment of the ma'amadot. The most important addition found in this Talmud is its inclusion of prayer to the ma'amadot ritual. As much as Mishnah and Tosefta steadfastly refused to affiliate prayer with the ma'amadot, the Yerushalmi incorporates it into the institution. Most of the Yerushalmi’s discourse correlates ma'amadot activities at the Temple.

In chapter nine we reviewed the Bavli’s discussion of the ma'amadot. Like the Yerushalmi, the Bavli’s main addition to the Tannaitic material is the incorporation of prayer to ma'amadot practices. The Babylonian Talmud also responds to issues in the Mishnah, its point of departure, and appears puzzled at times with the Mishnah’s presentation of its data, adding to the Mishnah elements from its own contemporary setting.

In chapter ten we reviewed miscellaneous sources, rabbinic and non-rabbinic, related to the ma'amadot. We examined briefly: the linguistic traits of ma'amad in
Qumran documents, Karaite liturgical practices which co-opted elements of *maʿamadot* liturgy, Geonic responsa prohibiting public daily Torah reading especially of the creation narrative, practices associated most strongly with *maʿamadot* rituals, and a fragment attributed to Theophrastus which one scholar unconvincingly relates to *maʿamadot* practices.

In chapter eleven we sought to provide the *maʿamadot* with a greater cultural framework by examining related comparative phenomena in antiquity. Two religious institutions in the ancient world provided dramatic insight to the *maʿamadot* because of their similarities. Both the Babylonian New Year festival (Akitu) and Mystery religions provided contexts for the *maʿamadot* practices.

Scholars have defined the Akitu and Mystery religions as ritual drama while evaluating their traits and impact on their respective cultures. We found that the *maʿamadot* lend themselves to this paradigm when comparing its aspects with cross-cultural religious phenomena.

Comparative analysis suggested that the *maʿamadot* utilized the idiom of the most prevalent institutional elements among the best known and successful forms of public ritual drama to communicate its own ideals and redefine its own religious community.
Synthesis

In this section we will provide a synthesis of the data gathered in an historical framework. We will review our evidence in a framework of four periods: pre-70, post-70 till 200, 200 to 500, and the post 500 era till the close of the Geonic period.

Pre-70

We have no specific and direct information of the ma'amadot pre-70 only Tannaitic projections and deductions from assumptions in the Mishnah and Tosefta made by Yavnean masters. Although the Mishnah projects the ma'amadot to a pre-70 era, its "explanation" is rhetorical didactic in nature, not historical. We, however, assessed the ma'amadot purpose by examinig its function and impact on the Jewsih community.

There is additional basis to consider aspects of ma'amadot practices to have been carried out in the pre-70

3"Since both literary and archeological material relating to the synagogue in late antiquity, that is, the post-70 C.E. era, is rich and abundant, there has been a tendency among some to assume that what was true of the second to fourth centuries probably held true, in some form or another, for the pre-70 period as well. If the synagogue emerged sometime during the course of the Second Temple era, then surely, it is argued, by the first century C.E. the basic forms characteristic of the later synagogue would have already been crystalized and developed. Such an assumption, however, is unwarranted" (Lee I. Levine, "The Second Temple Synagogue," p. 8).
era. As noted above, when Yavnean masters assume certain elements in their discourse, as they do in Taanit 4:4, we may deduce that the ma'amadot did in fact gather to perform their rituals during the Second Temple period.

Lee Levine also holds that it is reasonable to maintain that ma'amadot practices (although he does not name them explicitly) were conducted in the pre-70 era. "From later sources, which nevertheless may reflect practices from the Second Temple era as well, we learn that prayers for rain were offered in the town square and a Torah reading ceremony was conducted there while the local priestly course served in Jerusalem."  

Moreover, the ma'amadot institution with its requirement for daily Torah reading, would best explain the prevalence of the Torah scroll in local communities during the Second Temple period. I Maccabees relates that during the persecutions of Antiochus IV the Torah scroll was singled out for annihilation along with its followers.

Sid Leiman provides further support, he maintains that the closing of the biblical canon took place about the mid-second century B.C.  Even if the entire Bible was not canonized at such an early date, the scholarly

---


consensus is that the Pentateuch was certainly well established by then. The ma'amadot would best facilitate the process whereby the Torah scroll would be a commonly available sacred object and symbol, providing the basis for a distinct religious community.

The biblical canon was shaped by a community; it would then contribute to the shaping of that community. What scripture did for the Jews was more than what the Jews did for scripture. If Jews have survived to this very day as Jews, it is precisely because scripture provided a framework for Jewish survival. Throughout Jewish history, normative self-definition was very much bound up with scripture and how it was perceived. It is not simply the phenomenon of being a people of the book, however, that is distinctive. Jewish sectarians, and the various Christian and Islamic religious communities through the ages, would make the same claim. Ultimately, the critical differences go back to a more fundamental question: sources of authority. Who determines [prophecy, biblical status, etc.]...The most potent factor in normative self-definition rests in answers to these questions.6

We add to the above that the process of shaping a community requires ritual drama, a book by itself even when canonized still needs to be integrated into the life of a community. The ma'amadot Torah reading practices would be an ideal vehicle for such a process, perhaps pre-70, certainly post-70.

---

Post 70 - 200 C.E.

The strongest historical evidence for the ma‘amadot comes from rabbinic sources of the Tannaitic period. It is a period when the need for daily public worship would be most severely needed. The ma‘amadot provided such a format, its ritual was centered around the Torah scroll and linked to the daily cult which added prestige to the institution. Similarly, we learn that priests were also integrated into ma‘amadot practices although their involvement was not critical for the proper functioning of the institution as described in the rabbinic sources. Yet the ma‘amadot would provide a means to perpetuate the priestly mishmarot system.

The most significant practice of the ma‘amadot was the daily Torah reading. Prayer is not associated once in Tannaitic sources. The ultimate focus of the ma‘amadot is the creation narrative.

Recent scholarship has found additional significance for the creation narrative claiming that it has had an enormous impact on Mishnaic Judaism altogether. Without subscribing to his overall thesis, we agree that the creation story holds an influence that has been fully

Curiously, Eilberg-Schwartz does not mention the ma‘amadot even once in his entire work eventhough the Mishnah’s evidence regarding this subject would greatly corroborate his observations.
Eilberg-Schwartz has recently postulated that the creation narrative played a major role in the character of the Mishnah itself, thus on rabbinic Judaism, and its view of man as an agent of God.

Eilberg-Schwartz maintains that the biblical creation narrative leads to Mishnaic theology, the creation story predicates the Mishnah's theory of classification.

One of the central tasks in creation was classifying the world and giving things names... Upon categorizing the world, God named each of the things that was created. This myth anticipates the Mishnah in an important respect. It conceives of classification as instrumental in determining the character of the world. In this account, the divine act of classification is what gives the world its texture. As I argued previously, the Mishnah also conceives of classification as playing a fundamental role in determining the character of reality... In the Mishnah, as in Genesis 1, classification is an aspect of creation. Consequently, human acts of categorization, like God's, have the power to change the basic character of reality. When humans classify their world, therefore, they carry forward the divine act of creation... the biblical stories of creation are at the core mishnaic theology.  

Moreover, according to Eilberg-Schwartz man is given powers to change reality as does God. In this sense the very creation of the ma'amadot is seen as a basis to provide the local community with a time and space to come

---

"Howard Eilberg-Schwartz, *The Human Will in Judaism*, pp. 103-108. Although Eilberg-Schwartz's assumptions are not supported, "the world was not named by G-d in order to classify it." He independently argues for the importance of the creation narrative in rabbinic literature."
together in a sacred setting on a daily basis - the ideal expression of the power to create.

The capacity to think or, more specifically, the ability to formulate intentions and plans, makes human beings like God. This idea provides the point of departure for everything the Mishnah says about human intention. From the Sages’ standpoint, "being created in God's image" means being able to exercise one's mind in the same way that God exercises the divine will... Most significantly, they ascribe to human intention the same characteristics that the priestly writer attributes to God's will in the Biblical story of creation (Gen 1:-2:4).

This story serves as a paradigm for the Mishnah's theory of intention in two respects. To begin with, the sages ascribe the same sorts of power to human intention that the biblical writer imputes to God's will. In the biblical account God wills the world into existence. Likewise, in the mishnaic system, human beings have the power to transform the character of objects around them.... In the system of the Mishnah, therefore, the thoughts and intentions of human beings have the effect of restructuring the very character of reality.9

Eilberg-Schwartz closes with the observation that the Mishnah's theology and philosophy are ultimately linked to the historical and social setting of Judaism in the Tannaitic period. In particular, Eilberg-Schwartz follows a modified view of Durkheim's theory that a people's system of classification is directly related to the organization of its society whereas Kant and Levi-Strauss argue that the tendency to classify is an inherent property of the human mind. "The Mishnah, therefore, represents the attempt by a new social group [sages] to

---

9 Ibid., p. 182-83.
appropriate the priestly world view [cult, Temple], and make it into a meaningful system for all sectors of Israelite society.\textsuperscript{10}

In his very final remarks Eilberg-Schwartz draws the development of Mishnah's theology to a fairly specific time in history.

The theory at hand also fits well with what we know about larger trends in the period at hand. Between the second century B.C.E. and the first century C.E., there is a growing shift away from a Temple-centered Judaism, and consequently away from a priestly definition of Judaism. Three developments during this period attest to this trend. First the development of the synagogue signals a new attitude toward worship and the cult. The synagogue represented the possibility of worshipping God outside the confines of Jerusalem and without recourse to the Temple cult or the priestly class. Archeological and literary evidence now places the origin of the synagogue in the second century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{11}

Even if we accept the conservative view that the synagogue was established only after 70 we may well argue that the ma'amadot be defined as the vehicle which helped establish the daily ritual and thus the synagogue itself. Tosefta Taaniyot 3:4 is the first rabbinic source to explicitly (twice in the same Halakhah) locate the observation of ma'amadot practices within the synagogue after 70.

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 197.

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 199.
The most important Amoraic addition to ma'amadot practices is prayer. This is a doubly important addition because the Tannaitic sources go to great lengths to disassociate the ma'amadot from prayer. The ma'amadot themselves are assumed to be functioning and well established even as there is leeway for individual community practices. The trend in the Talmuds follows the tendency observed in Tannaitic sources which is for assorted practices to accrue around the Torah service.

Post-500

The Geonic authorities legislated against public daily Torah reading, in particular, the creation narrative that is the ma'amadot's vital practice. This prohibition was maintained despite some reluctance by others who wanted to continue its practice. The legislation of the Geonic authorities is explained in the context of sectarian, Karaite, practices. The Karaite community focused on the Torah scroll and made the reading of the creation narrative the central part of their daily liturgy to the exclusion of other rabbinic liturgical practices. The considerable status of the ma'amadot in rabbinic Judaism can be seen in the reluctance of the Geonic authorities to ban ma'amadot practices outright.
Individuals were still allowed to recite the *ma'amadot* liturgy, the public, however, was forbidden from the practice of *ma'amadot* rituals.

Even the extinction of *ma'amadot* public practices provided self-definition for rabbinic Judaism’s religious community just as the creation of daily *ma'amadot* practices effectively granted self-definition for a Judaism that was vitally bound to the Torah. The *ma'amadot* institution no longer exists as a public liturgy but its essence lives on as the heart and mind of the synagogue and its ritual.
Two models describe the rotation of Israelite ma'amadot assemblies in local communities. The prevailing view, maintained by all commentators and scholars, had Israelites meet one week every six months, corresponding to priestly and Levitical courses. No one could serve longer than a week. According to the view applied here, Israelites met every week throughout the year in local communities for ma'amadot rituals.

We maintain that Israelites were also divided into twenty-four courses but their correspondence to the
priestly courses was not identical. Any Israelite could join the ma'amadot. Ma'amad membership was voluntary not biological. An Israelite could volunteer for all twenty-four courses, no priest or Levite could do the same.

If Israelites were identical to priests then their attendance patterns in local communities would be the same, but they are not. Priests and Levites belonged to their mishmar through an elaborate lineage, an Israelite's ma'amad had no independent identity by name. Unlike the mishmarot who were named after well known founders of the priestly clans, the ma'amadot had no comparable way to name their ma'amad courses. We suggest that the ma'amadot borrowed their names from the priestly mishmarot. In any case, Israelite ma'amadot were supposed to track priestly mishmarot.

The language of the Mishnah and Tosefta (and certainly that of the Geonim) also seem to lend themselves to the prevailing interpretation which does not, however, withstand closer scrutiny. Both sources set up in language and structure an equivalence and correspondence (but not an identity) between Israelites and their counterparts priests and Levites. M. Taanit 4:4 states:

---

1B. M. Lewin, Ozar heGeonim, 5:34-35 and chapter eleven above.
1. For every mishmar in Jerusalem there was a ma'amad of priests, Levites and Israelites.

2. When a mishmar was to serve, its priests and Levites went up to Jerusalem. And Israelites of that mishmar gather in their cities and recite the acts of creation.

T. Taaniyot 3:2-3 states:

1. The prophets of Jerusalem established twenty-four 'ammudim corresponding to twenty four priestly and Levitical mishmarot.

2. When a mishmar was to serve, its priests and Levites went up to Jerusalem. And Israelites of that mishmar, who can not go up to Jerusalem, gather in their cities and recite the acts of creation.

The prevailing notion is not supported by the Tannaitic sources for several reasons. Neither Mishnah nor Tosefta make the Israelite ma'amad identical to the priestly mishmar. Priests and Levites belonged to a fixed mishmar, Israelites had a "free floating" membership, they were free to belong to any ma'amad and as many ma'amadot as they liked.

Linking the ma'amadot to the tamid also supports the current view. Since the tamid was a daily offering it was appropriate that as many Israelites as possible were to gather at ma'amadot assemblies "if they could not go up to
Jerusalem." As a result we would then expect that the Torah reading should be done maximally. The ma'amadot according to the Mishnah's logic would meet every day in every city, every Israelite had an obligation.

Moreover, whereas priests had to be divided because of physical limitations (too many priests not enough jobs) Israelites were limited only by their willingness to join. Educationally too, it is quite impractical to teach a reading skill one week over a half year. The evidence suggests that local ma'amadot met every day of the year not just a week out of twenty six.
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