

The Haftarat of Etz Hayim

Exploring the Historical Interplay of Customs, Humashim, and Halakhah

David E. S. Stein

In many North American synagogues, the bestselling new *humash* titled *Etz Hayim* (RA and USCJ, 2001) is replacing the familiar volume edited by the first graduate of JTS, R. Joseph H. Hertz (*The Pentateuch and Haftarot*, Soncino Press, 1937; 1960). As readers may notice, the two books' selection and presentation of haftarat occasionally differ.¹ Questions may then arise: How can one account for those differences? What do they mean?

This article answers those questions systematically.² Proceeding in order of the ritual calendar (starting after *Simhat Torah*), I focus first on seven differences in haftarat with regard to the rite of 'Ashkenazim, an ethnic group that comprises about 7/8 of the Jews alive today. Four cases involve variants in the specified biblical verses; for these, I investigate whether each selection was indeed used in the Diaspora during the "traditional period" (1500–1800 C.E.) and thus can be considered a traditional haftarah.³ As evidence of pre-modern practice, I consider both the attestations by rabbis (drawn from both halakhic literature and compilations of local customs)⁴ and popular designations of haftarat (taken from *humashim* and works of a similar nature).⁵ The other three cases involve a difference in the haftarah's placement or styling, for which I proceed to explore the underlying editorial logic in both books. Second, I briefly treat the far more varied traditions of smaller Jewish ethnic groups besides 'Ashkenazim.⁶ Finally, with the data in hand, I look for overall patterns and draw conclusions.

In the process of comparing the two books, I spotlight the remarkable range of pre-modern haftarah

customs. I also touch on the history of interactions between *halakhah* and *humashim*. And I explore the impact of *humashim* on perceptions of Jewish tradition.

POINTS OF DIVERGENCE ('ASHKENAZIM)

1. Va-yishlah

The first difference in haftarat for 'Ashkenazim involves the eighth haftarah, associated with *parashat Va-yishlah*. Where Hertz (p. 135) had presented Hosea 11:7–12:12 as the proper selection,⁷ *Etz Hayim* (p. 221) instead offers a wholly different passage, Obadiah 1:1–21.

At first glance, this a striking discrepancy. Yet the historical record suggests that some 'Ashkenazim have long read Hosea 11:7–12:12 on this occasion;⁸ and at the same time, other 'Ashkenazim have for centuries recited Obadiah.⁹ Moreover, an author in Vilna at the start of the modern period wrote that "we recite" a longer passage, Hosea 11:7–13:4.¹⁰

For their part, *humashim* have presented a mixed picture ever since the invention of printing. Some have designated Hosea 11:7–12:12, while others designated Obadiah.¹¹ Indeed, a few have presented both selections—occasionally with confusing directions, such as a 1925 European *humash* that presented 11:7–12:12 under the title "*Haftarat Va-yishlah*, [for 'Ashkenazim]" together with a rubric that stated, "But the 'Ashkenazim recite Obadiah 1:1–21 . . ."¹² Furthermore, some books have specified a different passage altogether, namely, Hosea 12:13–14:10.¹³

On this occasion, both *Etz Hayim* and Hertz stand on solid historical ground, yet traditional Jewish practice seems to have been more varied than either book alone indicates.

2. Va-yakhel

Although Hertz followed a publishing convention of placing one haftarah after every *parashah*, *Etz Hayim* disregards that convention under certain circumstances. The first such situation occurs near the end of Exodus, with *parashat Va-yakhel*. In Hertz, its haftarah appeared predictably just after the Torah portion (p. 382). However, in *Etz Hayim*, the same haftarah appears after the next Torah portion, *Pekudei*. (At the end of *Va-yakhel* a footnote directs the reader: “For the *haftarah* for this Torah portion, see selections starting on p. 573.”)

In its placement of haftarot, *Etz Hayim* editors adopt a different convention whenever Torah portions may be joined for public reading on the same *Shabbat*.¹⁴ Senior editor R. David Lieber explains in the introduction that “in the case of a *parashah* that in some years is read together with the following *parashah*, its associated haftarah has been placed after that following *parashah*, so that the position of a haftarah never interrupts the flow of Torah reading” (p. xviii).¹⁵ Thus, for example, in years when *Va-yakhel* and *Pekudei* are read together, readers of *Etz Hayim* can follow the public reading without colliding with the haftarah for *Va-yakhel*, which in Hertz has stood in the middle of the fourth *aliyah*.

In this case, each of the two books has its own approach to arrangement; and each approach has its own logic. Despite the differences in placement, the actual haftarah selections—and their intended pattern of use—are identical.

3. Pesah, First Day

The next occasion in the ritual calendar when a difference in haftarot is noticeable is on the first day of the festival of *Pesah*. The Hertz *humash* (p. 1009) designated Joshua 5:2–6:1 as the haftarah.¹⁶ To this passage, *Etz Hayim* (p. 1299) adds two elements—an initial piece, Joshua 3:5–7, plus a final verse, 6:27.

As in our first case, each version of this haftarah represents longstanding practice.¹⁷ For the traditional period, halakhic evidence suggests that some *'Ashkenazim* recited Joshua 3:5–7 while others did not. Likewise, some *humashim* of that era included it, and others omitted it.¹⁸

Regarding the 6:27 coda, although I have not found it mentioned by pre-modern *'Ashkenazim*,¹⁹ it did appear in traditional-period *humashim* as the practice of “a few communities.”²⁰

Meanwhile, some *humashim*, going back to the earliest editions, mention that “a few” *'Ashkenazim* recite Joshua 4:6–9 plus 4:24–6:1, a selection that is slightly different from what appears in *Etz Hayim* or Hertz.²¹

Like the earlier cases, both *Etz Hayim* and Hertz present a traditional haftarah here, yet the historical picture seems to have been a bit more varied than either book displays.

4. 'Aḥarei Mot and Kedoshim

In most years, the next occasion for which *Etz Hayim* differs from Hertz involves the set of haftarot read together with the two central portions of Leviticus, *'Aḥarei Mot* and *Kedoshim*. For those two *parashiyyot*, Hertz (pp. 494, 509) offered one haftarah apiece without fanfare, Ezekiel 22:1–19 and Amos 9:7–15, respectively. In contrast, in *Etz Hayim* (pp. 705, 709) the same two passages appear in reverse order, with numbered titles for “*Aḥarei Mot / K'doshim*” (“Haftarah 1” = Amos 9; “Haftarah 2” = Ezekiel 22). A rubric in *Etz Hayim* explains (p. 705): “Some traditions recite [Amos 9:7–15] with *Aḥarei Mot* and [Ezekiel 22:1–19] with *K'doshim*; others reverse the order of these haftarot.”

Here the difference between the books may be more apparent than real. For in truth, it's rather artificial to speak in terms of “the haftarah for *'Aḥarei Mot*” and “the haftarah for *Kedoshim*”; the nominal situation—in which both *parashiyyot* are read separately and no overriding occasions coincide—is quite uncommon. In the 65 years since the first edition of Hertz was published (1936), this situation has occurred only five times (1943, 1946, 1970, 1973, and 1997), and we will not encounter it again until 2024.²²

I have not found attestations in the traditional period to support the presentation in Hertz.²³ On the con-

trary, reciting Amos 9:7–15 with *'Aḥarei Mot* is attested as the traditional practice in various parts of Europe.²⁴

On the other hand, five hundred years' worth of *ḥumashim* have almost always styled Ezekiel 22 as “the haftarah for *'Aḥarei Mot*,” although Amos 9 has often been mentioned as a variant custom.²⁵ However, according to traditional (and many modern) *ḥumashim*, *'Ashkenazim* end their recitation of Ezekiel 22 with verse 16 rather than 19.²⁶ Meanwhile, as the haftarah for *'Aḥarei Mot*, one haftarah commentary from Galicia presented Ezekiel 20:2–20,²⁷ which is also a variant selection for *Kedoshim* in traditional *ḥumashim*.²⁸

For this admittedly rare case, I find grounds to conclude that the two *ḥumashim* in our spotlight both present a traditional haftarah. Even though *Etz Hayim* here acknowledges variant haftarah practices (something that both books generally avoided²⁹), our two *ḥumashim* again understate the traditional ritual diversity among *'Ashkenazim*.

5. Admonition and Consolation

Another obvious distinction shows up after *parashat Pinhas*, in ten *Shabbat* haftarat that coincide with the reading of the latter part of Numbers as well as nearly all of Deuteronomy. Here what differs are not the selections themselves but rather how they are styled. To begin with, Hertz presented Jeremiah 1:1–2:3 under the title “*Haftarah Mattos*” (p. 710). The same selection in *Etz Hayim* (p. 968) is titled *Haftarah Ri'shonah de-Puranuta*, the “First Haftarah of Admonition”; the name “Haftarah for *Mattot*” appears also, but only in English and as a secondary title.

Both books preface their commentary on this passage by noting that it is the first of three special haftarat that precede the fast of *Tish'ah be-'Av*. (Hertz translates the rabbinic designation as “Haftorahs of Rebuke.”) Then *Etz Hayim* explains that the traditional rules for selecting a haftarah have changed at this juncture, “initiating a period during which the haftarat relate thematically to the religious calendar, not to the *parashiyot*.” The latter point is worth emphasis. For in practice, reciting Jeremiah 1:1–2:3 in leap years coincides not with *Mattot* but rather with the preceding Torah portion, *Pinhas*. The styling used by *Etz Hayim* easily allows for that shift—so that on such occasions,

readers are less likely to wonder why the congregation is reading the “wrong” haftarah.

For the next nine haftarat, each book maintains its characteristic styling: Hertz names them after the Torah portions they accompany; *Etz Hayim* labels them as being part of the liturgical season (Haftarat of Admonition, followed by Haftarat of Consolation), noting only secondarily the Torah portions with which they coincide.³⁰

During the past eight hundred years at least, rabbinic writers throughout Europe have consistently designated all of these haftarat according to the liturgical season, although the reported order within the series sometimes differed here and there.³¹ Indeed, to them these special haftarat were the outstanding feature of the season.

Meanwhile, most (if not all) traditional and modern *ḥumashim* have referred to these ten haftarat as Hertz did—according to *parashah*. Surely their editors were aware of the classic rabbinic sense of a liturgical season; for the sake of simplicity in presentation, they chose to continue the convention wherein “each *parashah* has its haftarah.”

In short, in its styling of these ten haftarat, Hertz followed a traditional publishing convention. For its part, *Etz Hayim* is unconventional from the standpoint of publishing, yet more traditional in terms of halakhic literature.³²

6. Shabbat Shuvah

For the *Shabbat* before *Yom Kippur* (“*Shabbat Shuvah*”), Hertz placed the prophetic reading after *Va-yeilekh* (p. 891). However, on that *Shabbat*, the Torah portion actually read most often is not *Va-yeilekh* but rather the next portion, *Ha'azinu*. Why did Hertz locate this haftarah with its less common *parashah*? Presumably in order to preserve the book's convention of presenting one haftarah per *parashah* (for each rite, as needed). According to that familiar pattern, a “slot” for this haftarah was available after *Va-yeilekh* but not after *Ha'azinu*, which is also associated with another haftarah—for the less frequent years when a *Shabbat* falls during the three days between *Yom Kippur* and *Sukkot*.

In contrast, *Etz Hayim* places its selection for this *Shabbat* among haftarat for the Days of Awe (p.

1234). This location reflects the fact that on the *Shabbat* before *Yom Kippur*, the core of the haftarah (Hosea 14:2–10) is the same regardless of Torah portion; that is, the haftarah’s content, phrases, and tone are all related mainly to the liturgical season.³³

As for the verses that comprise this haftarah, Hertz presented a series of three passages: Hosea 14:2–10, Micah 7:18–20, and Joel 2:15–27. In contrast, *Etz Hayim* reverses the order of the latter two pieces while going to unusual lengths to recognize variant traditions. Its heading specifies an alternating practice: Hosea+Micah with *Va-Yeilekh*, and Hosea+Joel with *Ha’azinu*; at the same time, its rubric mentions two static patterns (i.e., regardless of *parashah*): Hosea+Joel; and Hosea+Joel+Micah.

Let us examine the historical authenticity of each of these four apparent variants, starting with the simplest—namely, reciting Hosea+Joel every year. Some *Ashkenazim* followed this approach in the traditional period in Europe.³⁴ Aside from *Etz Hayim*, I have not found any diaspora *humashim* (traditional or modern) that explicitly mention this approach.³⁵

Second, let us consider the most complex variant: the alternating codas featured in the heading of *Etz Hayim*. This schema³⁶ appears to have been the traditional practice in Frankfurt³⁷ and in some congregations in Prague.³⁸ As for traditional liturgical works, the Amsterdam *humash* of 1726 specified this very pattern,³⁹ but not all such books were so clear.⁴⁰ In the modern period, many *humashim* have included the schema of alternating codas, typically styled as the custom of Frankfurt.⁴¹

Our third apparent variant, the Hosea+Micah+Joel format in Hertz, appears to have been devised in the traditional period as a concise way to represent the Frankfurt-Prague custom just discussed.⁴² It was probably the logical result of combining known editorial practices.⁴³ Once it appeared, it became a publishing convention of its own, reproduced for centuries by some (but not all) editors.⁴⁴ While this format succinctly provides for the alternating-coda pattern, it is also ambiguous; unless readers are aware of the custom of alternating codas (and similar variants among *Sefaradim*), they can infer instead that both codas are to be recited in the order presented. In the case of our Hertz *humash*, I would argue that the alternating-coda

pattern was intended, because the original five-volume edition of the same book (1936) clearly specified the custom of alternating one coda at a time.⁴⁵ The simplest explanation for Hertz’s dramatic change in format in 1937 was the need to condense five volumes into one, saving space wherever possible.⁴⁶

The last variant custom mentioned in *Etz Hayim* is to recite both codas every year, but in reverse order from that presented in Hertz: Hosea+Joel+Micah.⁴⁷ For the Diaspora,⁴⁸ I have found one early modern, secondhand attestation for reciting all three passages in this order.⁴⁹ As for diaspora *humashim*, the earliest work I know of that presents the codas in this order appeared only in 1996.⁵⁰

Although *Etz Hayim* goes out of its way to present variant customs for this haftarah, the actual diversity of traditional selections on this *Shabbat* was probably even greater, in four respects. First, as on most occasions, the haftarah starting and stopping points have varied from locale to locale; thus, some traditional and modern *humashim* have begun the Joel coda with verse 11 rather than 15.⁵¹

Second, we are told that an early 18th-century congregation in Prague recited a slightly different pattern: Hosea+Joel 2:15–27 on Sabbaths with *Ha’azinu*, and Hosea+Micah+Joel 2:15+Joel 2:27 with *Va-yeilekh*.⁵²

Third, the highly compact format that appears in Hertz (which I have taken to be a traditional format) took on a life of its own as a haftarah for *Shabbat Shuvah*, regardless of Torah portion, at least among modern publishers.⁵³ Many of them have named Hosea+Micah+Joel as the exclusive haftarah for this occasion—ironically precluding the alternating-coda approach that this format originally embodied.⁵⁴ Whether this custom dates from the traditional period, however, is uncertain.

Finally, a more dramatic alternating-haftarah schema also appears to have been followed by some *Ashkenazim*: In most years (coinciding with *Ha’azinu*), the haftarah recited was the now-familiar Hosea+Joel. However, in those years (coinciding with *Va-yeilekh*) when (in the following week) a bonus *Shabbat* would fall between *Yom Kippur* and *Sukkot*, the haftarah was Isaiah 55:6–56:8,⁵⁵ and the following haftarah (coinciding with *Ha’azinu*) was Hosea+Joel.⁵⁶ This approach was attested in the medieval pe-

riod⁵⁷ although I have not found similar evidence in the traditional or modern periods. At any rate, it has been presented in many *humashim* for the past three centuries.⁵⁸

To sum up: Despite its different format, the haftarah in Hertz accords with the approach spelled out in the heading of *Etz Hayim*. Apparently both this featured (alternating-coda) schema and the Hosea+Joel (only) variant were indeed traditional customs. Similar evidence for the Hosea+Joel+Micah variant is less clear. Meanwhile, the ambiguous Hertz format can be (mis)taken for a Hosea+Micah+Joel variant that is known from other modern *humashim*. Finally, other traditional customs existed for this occasion that are not mentioned in either Hertz or *Etz Hayim*.

7. Ve-zo't ha-Berakhah

The second (1960) edition of the Hertz *humash* (p. 984) presented Joshua 1:1–18 as the haftarah for the “Feast of Tabernacles—Rejoicing of the Law,” that is, *Simhat Torah*, with a commentary by Rev. Dr. Abraham Cohen. Apparently Soncino’s editors did not realize that the first edition (1937) had already printed Rabbi Hertz’s commentary for the same haftarah (p. 918), labeling the passage “*Haftarah Vezoth Ha-Berachah*.” (That *parashah*, the last one in the Torah, is never read in synagogues on *Shabbat* but rather only on the festival of *Simhat Torah*.) In other words, in the second edition, this haftarah appeared twice—with two different commentaries!

Etz Hayim presents the same prophetic passage as did Hertz. However, because the newer *humash* is not bound to the same one-haftarah-for-each-*parashah* convention, it locates the passage only among its haftarat for holidays (p. 1266); it offers no haftarah for *parashat Ve-zo't ha-Berakhah* per se.⁵⁹ This arrangement is consistent with its commentary’s view that the prophetic passage is linked more to the holiday’s featured events (the completion and renewal of public Torah reading) than to the Torah passage.⁶⁰

The needless duplication in Hertz illustrates the confusion that can arise even among editors when using simplifying conventions to present complex ritual practices.

POINTS OF DIVERGENCE (AMONG THE RITES)

In recognition of the ritual practices of the minority of Jews who are not *'Ashkenazim*, both Hertz and *Etz Hayim* sometimes include alternative haftarat that are labeled for *Sefaradim*. Regarding those selections, the two books are nearly identical, with only four slight differences being apparent: the starting point for *Beshallah*,⁶¹ and the stopping points for *Pesah*, *Behar*, and *Simhat Torah*.⁶²

Both *Etz Hayim* and Hertz (like all other published works that designate haftarat for popular use) vastly simplify reality by leaving out other regional rabbinic traditions.⁶³ A reader might never notice the omission, because contemporary discourse typically uses the term *Sefaradim* broadly to mean “all Jews who are not *'Ashkenazim*.”⁶⁴ Yet traditional Judaism also comprised other liturgical rites, including Romanian (also called Eastern Roman, or Greek/Balkan), Italian (Western Roman), Yemenite, and more. Nearly all those rites remain in use today, and they include many distinctive haftarat of ancient pedigree.⁶⁵

How might taking into account those smaller rites impact our perception of Jewish ritual uniformity regarding haftarat? Consider in *Etz Hayim* the full set of 42 weekly Torah portions that are echoed by a corresponding haftarah: The haftarah recited by *Sefaradim* and *'Ashkenazim* are identical for 27 of those Sabbaths (64%); and they are either the same or overlapping (with a different stopping point, for example) for at most 37 (88%). Does this mean that traditional rabbinic Jews largely shared the same haftarat? No. For if we include in our purview just three more rites—Romanian, Italian, and Yemenite—we find that Jews in the traditional period were reciting identical haftarat for no more than 1 *parashah*; and the passages were either the same or overlapping for at most 9 (21%).⁶⁶

Likewise with regard to the 39 haftarat located in the back of *Etz Hayim* (for holidays and special times). Taken at face value, the designations in *Etz Hayim* seem to suggest that the haftarah traditionally recited by *Sefaradim* and *Ashkenazim* was identical for 33 (85%); and they were either the same or overlapping for all 39 (100%). In actual fact, with the three additional rites included, Jews traditionally shared only 1 haftarah in common. When we define uniformity more loosely (allowing for overlapping passages), the rites

agreed on roughly half of their haftarah selections on these occasions.⁶⁷

In short, on any given haftarah-reading occasion in the traditional period, the prophetic recitation by Jews looked more like a mixed bouquet than like a single flower.

DISCUSSION

Dynamic Diversity

Thus far we have considered the haftarat traditionally recited on certain given occasions. However, an additional type of historical variance does not show up readily in this manner. For it often happens that two or more haftarah-reading occasions coincide, presenting Jews with a choice of competing haftarat. For example, when two Torah portions are periodically combined, which *parashah*'s haftarah takes precedence? And which occasion's haftarah takes precedence when *Shabbat Shekalim* falls on the day before *Ro'sh Hodesh Nisan*? For hundreds of years during the gaonic and medieval periods, halakhic literature examined such questions in detail. Local authorities and communities devised rules of priority. Not surprisingly, these rules frequently disagreed with those of authorities and congregations elsewhere. In short, traditional haftarah selection was also dynamically diverse.

Since 1500, the priority-setting rules have differed from each other in two main ways:

1. *Within a given rite.* For example, on *Shabbat ha-Gadol* (the Sabbath before *Pesah*), some congregations of *'Ashkenazim* recite the nominal haftarah for the occasion only if the holiday will begin that very night; other *'Ashkenazim* recite that haftarah only if *Pesah* will *not* begin that night; and still others recite it regardless.
2. *Among the rites.* For example, with *parashat Pinhas* during ordinary (that is, non-leap) years, those who followed prevailing Yemenite custom recite a passage that matches the Torah portion, while other rites are reciting the First Haftarah of Admonition.

Such divergence in practice is not usually apparent

from perusing a *humash*. Few of them go into that kind of detail. Thus, differing local customs often look identical on paper.

Diversity's Origin

The diversity of pre-modern haftarat stands in striking contrast to the popular view of Jewish tradition as having been uniform. Yet the variety has long been noted by careful observers, who have sought an explanation: How did it first sprout and then blossom? Contemporary historians, who so far have only addressed isolated aspects of this question, concur with the famous Rabbi Joseph Caro of Safed; in his 1574 commentary on Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, he pointed to an era roughly fourteen hundred years before his own day:

It appears that they [i.e., the rabbis of the Mishnah] did not have at that time fixed haftarat selections like we do today; rather, every synagogue reader would [on the spot] select a haftarah that seemed to be related to the Torah portion. And in our time, the consequence is that there are divergent customs regarding what to read as a haftarah.⁶⁸

That is, the idea of reading aloud selections from the Prophets must have become popular long before any attempts at standardization.

Originally, scholars say, haftarat were devised for special occasions like holidays. Such selections soon became relatively fixed, for ancient written sources treat them as part of proper holiday observance commanded in the Torah and elaborated in oral tradition. (Even so, they only specified a passage's essential verse, not its opening and closing points.) Later, they chose other haftarat to introduce homilies on the weekly Torah portion. However, for centuries such passages were chosen locally within a milieu that prized liturgical creativity.⁶⁹

In those earlier times, what constituted a proper haftarah selection? The answer from ancient and gaonic historical records is quite simple: an excerpt from the Prophets, at least one verse long.⁷⁰ And if it were chosen to accord with the Torah portion (rather than to highlight a special occasion), the passage needed to "resemble" the Torah portion in terms of wording, topic, or motif.⁷¹ Obviously, numerous passages could meet these qualifications. Thus over the

centuries, diverse sets of haftarat became customary among various communities.⁷²

Haftarat Variance in Pre-modern Halakhah

What did pre-modern rabbinic authorities make of the wide-ranging diversity of haftarat among them? Generally they treated haftarah selection as a matter of local custom rather than of “law” per se.⁷³ And they were well aware that local customs evolved over time. Space does not permit a full treatment of the question, but let me cite some examples of pluralism (that is, respect for local custom) among gaonic, medieval, and traditional halakhists with regard to haftarat:

- Circa 1050, R. Isaac b. Judah of Mainz (Rashi’s teacher) discussed variant haftarah selections and then cited the talmudic dictum *minhag mevattel halakhah* (“custom overrides pronouncements”).⁷⁴ [*Seifer ha-Pardes*, Ehrenreich edn., p. 353]

- Circa 1150, an anonymous responsum from the School of Rashi addressed how it came to be that certain customary haftarat are at odds with what is stated in the Talmud; the author concluded, “The reading of haftarat is not a matter of ‘forbidden’ or ‘permitted’: what is customary is customary.” [*Seifer ha-Pardes*, Ehrenreich edn., p. 352–3]

- Circa 1170, R. Abraham b. Isaac of Narbonne (Provence) recorded observations and recommendations on haftarat by rabbis from earlier times and places. Then he presented a contrasting approach, introduced simply with “Nowadays, we do the following . . .” [*Seifer ha-’Eshkol*, 68a, p. 182 in Albeck edn.]

- In 1178, R. Moses Maimonides of Fostat (Egypt) described variant customs about which he had knowledge; he matter-of-factly listed “what most of the people do” and also “what our community does,” which with regard to Haftarat of Consolation were not the same. [*Mishneh Torah, Seider Tefillot Kol ha-Shanah*, end, vs. *Hilkhot Tefillah* § 13.19]

- In 1287, R. Jacob b. Judah of London also detailed several variant customs with regard to Haftarat of Admonition, Haftarat of Consolation, and Haftarat of Repentance: “Some recite X; some recite Y; some recite Z.” He did not attempt to prescribe practice. He concluded by acknowledging the validity of all such customs, quoting the talmudic proverb “Each river

takes its own course” (BT *Hullin* 18b, 57a). [*Ez Hayyim*, p. 55]

- In 1555 and again in 1563, R. Joseph Caro of Safed recorded variant patterns for haftarat near *Yom Kippur*, noting his favorite approach. Yet he ruled that established local custom superceded his opinion. [*Beit Yosef and Shulhan Arukh*]⁷⁵

- In 1564, Rabbi Issachar Susan of Safed reviewed the widely variant practices among rites for the occasional “bonus” *Shabbat* after *Yom Kippur*. Although he expressed a theoretical preference, he too summed up the situation with the proverb “Each river takes its own course.” [*Tikkun Yissakhar* 83a]⁷⁶

- Circa 1800, R. Hayyim Mordecai Margolioth of Dubno surveyed answers to the question of which (and how many) codas should be added to Hosea 14:2–10 on the *Shabbat* before *Yom Kippur*; he concluded, “It all goes according to [local] custom.” [*Sha’arei Teshuvah*, OH § 428.8]⁷⁷

Diversity’s Evolution

The start of the traditional period coincided with the inauguration of printing. This new technology dramatically altered the development of Jewish liturgy. Printed liturgical works in general offered readers a fraction of the options historically practiced by adherents of each rite. Readers, in turn, found the availability and relatively low cost of printed books fairly irresistible, even if the latter failed to represent their local customs accurately. This created pressure for Jewish prayers to become more uniform.⁷⁸

The same dynamic seems to have operated with regard to haftarat, which is after all a subset of the liturgy. For example, during the medieval period, recorders of local customs had noted that (taken together) European congregations recited at least four different permutations of distinct haftarat on the three Sabbaths nearest the High Holy Days. (Apparently all communities were reciting Hosea 14:2ff., but not necessarily on the *Shabbat* before *Yom Kippur*. Rather, some recited it a week earlier—before *Rosh ha-Shanah*, while others recited it on the occasional *Shabbat* after *Yom Kippur* and before *Sukkot*.) But in the traditional period, printed *humashim* seem to have specified one or—at most—two permutations. The diffusion of printed *humashim* may explain why after

1500 I found attestations of only one permutation of haftarat in halakhic literature.

Modernity, however, provided a contradictory influence on the evolution of haftarat. For by the year 1800, religious authority began to weaken significantly in the lands where *'Ashkenazim* lived. Jewish affiliation there became increasingly voluntary. This growing religious “free market” prompted the formation of modern Jewish denominations—a sort of brand-name competition for Jewish hearts and minds. Increasingly, congregations in both old and new locales chose haftarat based on their denominational affiliation rather than ancestral custom.

By virtue of its existence, a denomination creates pressure for uniformity of ritual practice within it, while also manifesting distinctiveness from the practices of the “competition.” This institutional agenda is typically couched in ideological terms. For example, denominational stands toward kabbalah have influenced the choices of haftarat that they promulgate. Pedagogic and aesthetic considerations have also played a role.

In the late 18th century, the first modern denomination, Hasidism, adopted the so-called *Sefarad* rite. This distinctive form of worship included haftarat as specified by the 16th-century kabbalist R. Isaac Luria of Safed. Some of those haftarat were local innovations in that they differed from what had been customary in communities where Hasidism took hold.

Beginning in the early part of the 19th century, reformers in Western Europe and America made attempts to introduce a triennial cycle for Torah reading, based loosely on ancient Levantine practice. As reform-oriented denominations developed, some versions of their revised lectionary included new haftarat, in order to offer a matching haftarah for each Torah reading in all three years of the cycle. They recommended more “edifying” alternatives in some cases. They also adapted ancient Babylonian practice by drawing some haftarat from the third part of the Bible, *Ketuvim* (Writings). Current official lists of the Reform Synagogues of Great Britain (RSGB), the Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues (ULPS), and the American Reform movement include these selections and patterns.⁷⁹

The 20th century also saw other denomination-based changes in haftarah practice. A 1923 responsum by the Orthodox rabbi Moshe Feinstein “clarified” which coda to read with the haftarah for the *Shabbat* before *Yom Kippur*—promulgating a new decision rule that would in some cases change the practice from an 18th-century pattern.⁸⁰ Finally, in the latter part of the 20th century, some Orthodox and Conservative congregations instituted a special haftarah for Israel Independence Day, while both the RSGB and the ULPS instituted a special haftarah for the *Shabbat* prior to Israel Independence Day, called *Shabbat 'Azma'ut*.⁸¹

The Interplay of Autonomous Traditions

In examining the points of divergence between Hertz and *Etz Hayim*, the designations in *humashim* often seemed to be at odds with the testimony in the compendia of rabbinic lore. One wonders what to make of patterns in *humashim* that do not seem to be attested in rabbinic literature. For example, we saw that for the Sabbaths near Yom Kippur, an alternating-haftarah schema has been presented in many *humashim* for the past three centuries, yet in my limited search I could not find it attested in traditional or modern rabbinic lore. By contrast, I can name a dozen traditional authors who did attest to the static-haftarah schema reproduced in *Etz Hayim* and Hertz. Has the alternating-haftarah schema perhaps been a publishing tradition only—an artifact of certain books, rather than a living tradition in synagogues?

It seems safe to say that *humashim* possess their own traditions and conventions apart from those found in halakhic literature. This should not be surprising, because “the *humash*” and “the code” are characterized by distinct interests. The editor of a *humash* is concerned with the visual display of information, a factor that is rarely in the mind of the halakhist. Whereas the latter most wants a compilation of customs to be accurate and precisely worded, the former also wonders how to compose directions that can be quickly grasped and easily carried out. Furthermore, each genre tends to pay the most attention to its own kind. Halakhists comment upon, and restate, each other’s work; meanwhile, *humash* editors look to earlier models as well as the current competition in the

market. And in both genres, certain conventions are useful because they reduce the need for explanation; readers already know what to expect.

Already five hundred years ago, editors of printed *humashim* faced a dilemma when they designated haftarat: Given a range of customs, how would it be best to represent them? Should a *humash* be succinct at the cost of omitting some readers' ritual practices? Should it tacitly include those customs yet risk their being misunderstood? Should it be comprehensive at the risk of being unwieldy—with directions for navigating multiple options that are each of interest to only some readers?

A particular challenge has been posed by the variety in haftarah customs among 'Ashkenazim on the Sabbaths near Yom Kippur, where the diversity is unusually large and complex. Some editors have met that challenge better than others. Unfortunately, sometimes the presentation has been self-contradictory on its face. For example, in addition to Hosea 14:2ff. (and its codas) as the haftarah "for *Shabbat Shuvah*," some works have also designated Isaiah 55:6ff. "for *Va-yeilekh*."⁸² (So which selection should be recited when *Va-yeilekh* is read on *Shabbat Shuvah*? If not the latter, then why is it included?) Still worse, some other editors—including expert researchers—have misrepresented Jewish tradition by conflating historically distinct customs.⁸³ (Perhaps those publishing errors have by now spawned new haftarah customs. If so, it wouldn't be the first time that a *humash* changed traditional practice, as we saw above.)

Halakhists and *humash* editors have long been aware of each other's work. Halakhists have recorded their critiques of what they see in *humashim*,⁸⁴ and *humashim* have sometimes changed their presentations as a result.⁸⁵ Conversely, halakhists have been known to use *humashim* in an effort to determine the proper ritual practice.⁸⁶ Even though their traditions have been autonomous, the influence has been mutual.

The most profound (and, to my knowledge, heretofore unrecognized) case of this interaction between halakhists and liturgical publishers actually dates from prior to the invention of printing. It centers around an early homiletic work, *Pesikta' de-Rav Kahana'* (land of Israel, c. 400s), which provides the earliest known evidence for a liturgical season that features

special haftarat from before *Tish'ah be-'Av* through *Yom Kippur*.

The *Pesikta'* consists of a compelling series of mid-rashic sermons that each take as their starting point a passage from the lectionary. Based on the passages that each homily cited from the Prophets, readers recognized that they could reconstruct which haftarat had been recited in the author's ancient synagogue—and in which order. Some readers (in the Levant, in Babylonia, and in Europe) were moved to adopt the season of special haftarat reflected in the *Pesikta'*. Therefore they coined a mnemonic by stringing together the first letter of the name (which was usually the first word or two) of each haftarah in the series. Gaonic and medieval halakhists who discussed haftarat would typically write "We follow the *Pesikta'*" before giving that mnemonic.

With regard to haftarat near *Yom Kippur*, reliance on the *Pesikta'* cascaded into divergent practices. First of all, the *Pesikta'* was itself an ambiguous guide; its literary framework may have presumed either the normal calendrical situation (in which *Ha'azinu* is read before *Yom Kippur*) or the more unusual situation wherein a bonus Shabbat falls between *Yom Kippur* and *Sukkot* (i.e., in which *Ha'azinu* is read after *Yom Kippur*). As this was a matter open to interpretation, some readers (of course) read the *Pesikta'* one way, while others read it the other way.

Moreover, when European communities lacked access to a manuscript of the actual *Pesikta'*, local authorities relied on the mnemonic in halakhic literature. However, that mnemonic also turned out to be ambiguous—doubly so. In the series, the letter representing each of the last two entries was a *shin*, which meant that the intended order of those two selections was not specified. And later readers of the literature knew of three plausible haftarat whose names started with that letter. Thus medieval readers could take those two *shins* variously as standing for *Sos 'Asis* (Isaiah 61:10ff.) or *Shuvah Yisra'el* (Hosea 14:2ff.) or *Shirat David* (2 Sam. 22)—in various arrangements.

At the same time, a parallel tradition called for reciting Isaiah 55:6–56:8 (Hebrew name: *Dirshu*) on the Shabbat before *Yom Kippur*. As an ancestral custom with much to commend it, this too was added to the mix. All told, gaonic-era European authorities reported

at least six permutations for the *Shabbat* haftarat around the Days of Awe.

European copyists (that is, the “publishers” in the days before printing presses) must have interpreted the *Pesikta*’ in light of the local haftarah customs with which they were familiar. For they proceeded helpfully to “correct” and supplement the manuscripts of the *Pesikta*’. By the year 1200, divergent versions were in circulation—containing differing chapters placed in differing order.⁸⁷ For example, the homily based on Hosea 14:2ff. was sometimes placed before the one for *Ro’sh ha-Shanah*, sometimes after. And just before the *Yom Kippur* homily, some versions incorporated a homily (apparently lifted from Midrash *Tanhuma*’) based on Isaiah 55:6ff. (Authorities who had access to the latter versions cited a haftarah mnemonic that contained 12 letters rather than the original 11, with an added letter *dalet* for *Dirshu*.)

Strangely, in the later Middle Ages, manuscripts of the *Pesikta* were no longer copied. By 1700, people had ceased to read it; by 1830 it was considered lost.

What caused the demise of such an oft-cited book? My guess is that the huge divergence of the *Pesikta*’s “published” versions eventually discredited it as a reliable work of Jewish lore. Ironically, the book’s earlier popularity as an authoritative text (in interaction with local customs) seems to have led to its own undoing.

In short, medieval authorities had agreed that “we follow the *Pesikta*’”—not realizing that their intended order and selections of haftarat often were at odds. Little wonder that by the dawn of the traditional period, the rite of *’Ashkenazim* included dramatically different schemas regarding the haftarat for Sabbaths near *Yom Kippur*!

Divergence among Contemporary Humashim

Like the medieval halakhists, contemporary Jews who wish to know what is the “customary” haftarah for a given occasion tend to consult a work designed for liturgical use, typically a *humash*. While such works today are more stable than the *Pesikta*’ *de-Rav Kahana*’, it is a little-known fact that they disagree with each other regarding more than 1 in 10 “traditional” haftarat. For occasions where diverse practices have historically existed, nearly every traditional vari-

ant appears in at least one contemporary work—but no one variant appears in all of them.

As an example, let us contrast *Etz Hayim* and Hertz with the venerable *Ktav tikkun* (2nd edn., 1969). For *’Ashkenazim* regarding *haftarat Va-yishlah* (where the two *humashim* disagree) as well as for *Sefaradim* regarding the *Shabbat* before *Yom Kippur* (where the two *humashim* agree), the *tikkun* designates traditional selections not mentioned in the other two books. If you want to know which haftarah to read for certain occasions, the answer you get may depend on which authority you consult. And the more books you open, the more confused you may become.

Essentially all of the selections in both *Etz Hayim* and Hertz can be found somewhere among pre-modern works. Generally, each contemporary *humash* can marshal evidence from the past to support its assertions. Most of the present-day divergence has its origin in much older variance among customs and authorities. (Typographical errors, as well as the occasional confluations regarding Sabbaths near *Yom Kippur*, account for the small remaining variance.) Thus there is little scientific basis for considering any contemporary *humash* as more “authentic” than another.

Humashim: Consider the Source

As we have seen, even the agreement among contemporary works can be illusory. For they present the traditional rites of *’Ashkenazim* and *Sefaradim* as more internally uniform than was historically the case.⁸⁸ Furthermore, on many occasions, rites with relatively few adherents today have traditionally recited entirely different passages from what contemporary books show. And even when traditional congregations were nominally reading the same passage, local customs varied as to the precise starting or stopping point. Moreover, whenever two or more haftarah-reading occasions coincide, not all communities have resolved the conflict in the same way.

Publishers cannot make *humashim* without making trade-offs. They want their books be both useful and affordable. Given the enormous diversity in Judaism of haftarah selections (and their dynamic application), any compilation of haftarat that tried to be comprehensive would be overwhelmingly complex, if not pro-

hibitively expensive. To illustrate this point, consider the 11 Torah portions of Exodus: representing the rites of 'Ashkenazim and Sefaradim (satisfying 90% of potential buyers) requires 13 haftarah selections; to account also for the Romanian rite (satisfying at most another few percent of potential buyers) requires an additional 8 selections. Ironically, the smaller rites are omitted not because their haftarat are much the same as those of 'Ashkenazim, but rather because their haftarat are too different.⁸⁹

Generally speaking, usability comes at the expense of historical and cultural accuracy. To the extent that the book is intended to be used liturgically, such accuracy is less important. Thus the haftarah selections in works of a liturgical nature are, in part, the products of art and artifice—suggestive of the panoply of what Jews do.⁹⁰

An analogy may be in order. Consider the commonplace notion that the Torah is not a historical work, despite the authoritative voice of its narrator and the realistic flavor of some of its stories. Much more “really happened” in ancient Israel than is reflected in the Torah, and (according to the disciplines of archaeology and history) not everything in the Torah “really happened” in a literal, straightforward sense. In much the same way, although a *humash* contains authoritative-sounding headings for its haftarat, it portrays a simplified, “usable” past. Its rubric’s pronouncement that “‘Ashkenazim start here” is not the statement of a historian.⁹¹

Furthermore, some published works are created with denominational interests in mind. Indeed, R. Hertz edited his *humash* in his capacity as Chief Rabbi, an office charged with “authorising” ritual practice throughout the British Empire (or rather, for those congregations within the realm that chose to recognize his authority). Likewise, *Etz Hayim* is a product of denominational institutions that seek a certain uniformity of ritual practice among constituent congregations. (Paradoxically, “denominational interest” also includes presenting oneself as universal and therefore welcoming of variant ancestral customs, and allowing local congregations some flexibility. This seems to be what has allowed a limited recognition of liturgical diversity in *Etz Hayim*, as exemplified by the inclusion of selected haftarat of “Sefaradim.”)

CONCLUSION

This article has focused on haftarat in the volume sponsored by the Conservative movement, *Etz Hayim*, especially in comparison with the classic edition of R. Hertz. We learned that *Etz Hayim* departs at times from a few conventions of *humash* publishing, such as the notion that each *parashah* should be followed by one haftarah, which in turn takes its name from that *parashah*.

Meanwhile, *Etz Hayim* has held fast to other conventions, such as by typically presenting only one or two of the haftarah selections recited by Jews on a given occasion. Of the books in print today, neither *Etz Hayim*, Hertz, nor any other follows the traditional, normative list of haftarat selections. Why not? Because contrary to conventional wisdom, no standard, universal list of haftarat has ever existed.

Taken at face value, the typical *humash* implies that all Jews have traditionally read the same (or overlapping) passage on about 90 percent of haftarah-reading occasions. But in truth, on 90 percent of such occasions, rabbinic Jews circa 1500–1800 were reading significantly different selections from each other—often drawing from different biblical books altogether. And on many dates, differing rules of priority increased the diversity of local practice even more. Traditionally for haftarah selections, variety has been the rule rather than the exception.

Many such varied practices continue to this day, while new options have arisen. Variance in traditional times was attenuated as local Jewish customs faded away, partly under the influence of printed *humashim*. More recently, the variance has been amplified by the modern denominational drive for differentiation.

In the context of local variation, publishers of *humashim* have necessarily presented selections that can best be described as “representative” or “characteristic.” Haftarah selections of contemporary *humashim* such as *Etz Hayim* do portray traditional Jewish practice, although the picture that they paint is not a complete one. A *humash* is designed for liturgical use, and therefore it must meet constraints of cost, size, ease of use, and denominational differentiation. It may not be reliable as a historical source.

We have seen that the introduction to *Etz Hayim* had good reason to note frankly that its haftarah pas-

sages were selected “from among the much larger variety of haftarat selections among traditional Jews, for the sake of simplicity and of promoting uniformity in Conservative synagogues” (p. xviii). As with all *humashim*, the meaning of its haftarah presentation is grasped best when both historical diversity and the nature of liturgical publications are taken into account.

David E. S. Stein, a Reconstructionist rabbi and a member of USCJ affiliate Mishkon Tephilo (Venice, CA), served as an editor and proofreader not only for the production of *Etz Hayim* but also for *The JPS Bible Commentary: Haftarat* (2002) and *The JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh* (1999). He wrote the acclaimed preface in the latter book. The opinions expressed in this article are those of the author alone, who thanks The Jewish Publication Society for its financial support of an early part of this research.

Notes

1. Unless otherwise noted, when I refer herein to “Hertz” I mean the second edition’s 1967 printing, typical of what is found in congregational pews; and I call it “Hertz” so as to differentiate it from another *humash* by the same publisher: *The Soncino Chumash*, ed. A. Cohen (London: Soncino Press, 1947). I take as given the selection and presentation of haftarat in the first one-volume edition of Rabbi Hertz’s *humash* (1937). I do not know how such decisions were made; for convenience in discussion I assume that he himself was responsible. Soncino Press’s editors added the haftarat for festivals and fast days only in the second (1960) edition, i.e., after R. Hertz’s death in 1946.
As for *Etz Hayim*, all selection, arrangement, and styling of haftarat follow an unpublished 1998 ruling of the Conservative movement’s Committee on Jewish Law and Standards (CJLS), except as noted below.
2. I became involved with *Etz Hayim* as production editor and chief production proofreader in 2000. I was not told why the CJLS made the choices that it had (see note 1); rather, I took its selections of haftarat as a given. Based on my own ongoing research on the history of the haftarah, in my professional capacity I independently assessed the CJLS choices and then implemented them. That effort forms the core of this article. All translations herein from Hebrew or Aramaic are my own.
3. Because *Etz Hayim* is addressed to a diaspora audience, Israeli *humashim* are irrelevant to the extent that they report haftarah customs only for the land of Israel, which may differ from diaspora customs.
This article treats Jewish history in terms of the following periods: 600–1200 C.E. = “gaonic”; 1200–1500 = “medieval”; 1500–1800 = “traditional”; and after 1800 = “modern.” Space does not permit me to recount the history of haftarat throughout all of these periods. As a datum, the first printed *humashim* that included haftarat were issued circa 1490 in Italy and Spain. Unless otherwise noted, when speaking herein of past haftarah selections, those of the “traditional” period are intended.
4. Rabbinic sources must be treated critically when used as historical evidence for tracing customs. What appears at first glance to be a firsthand description of ritual practice may actually be the restatement of an earlier rabbi’s account, or a secondhand (and thus more likely to be distorted) description, or a theoretical prescription.
5. For simplicity, this article uses “*humash*” as the exemplar for all published works designed for ritual use that designate haftarat. When I use this term I am including also the following types of literature: Rabbinic Bible, *tikkun* for Torah reading, compilation of haftarat (with or without commentary), footnotes or a table of haftarat in a Bible or *siddur*, and ritual calendar. In short, I mean all works that designate haftarat in an authoritative-sounding manner and with little or no discussion—e.g., on the nature of the evidence in favor of the claim, citation of references, or consideration of variant customs.
6. Among rabbinic Jews, the rites coalesced circa 1200–1500, as outlying regions to varying degrees drew upon the diverse legacy of denominations (gaonates) based in the Middle East during the earlier, gaonic era; see note 72 (below) and Ismar Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1993), pp. 271–285. Since the late 1800s, 85–90 percent of Jews are *Ashkenazim*. However, five hundred years ago, when the first printed Jewish books were published, the picture was quite different: Only one fifth of all Jews were *Ashkenazim*, and about half were *Sefaradim*, while other rites together accounted for the remaining third of Jewry. The proportion of Jews adhering to the various rites has changed so dramatically due to differing regional rates of factors such as natural increase, wars, persecutions, migrations, and adoption of innovations in public health and industrial technology.
Of nonrabbinic Jews who customarily do not read haftarat at all, the largest and best-known group is the *Beta’ Yisra’el* (Ethiopian Jews); their ritual practice is not otherwise considered in this article.

7. According to an anonymous reviewer of this article, the 1996 printing of Hertz's *humash* notes that "Some congregations read . . . Obadiah" (pp. 135, 137). However, the printings at least through 1987—that is, nearly all copies of this *humash* in synagogues—designate Obadiah solely as a Sephardic selection.
8. *Customs of the Old Berlin Synagogue* (1827), as cited in Nathan Fried, "Haftarah," *Enziklopedyah Talmudit* [Hebrew], vol. 10 (Jerusalem, 1961), appendix tables, col. 701ff. Although this is an early modern source, because of its nature it can safely be taken as reflective of traditional practice.

Attempts to present a comprehensive picture of ritual practice regarding haftarat are more rare than wild California condors. After three years of research in this field, Fried's article is the only work I have found that attempts to identify all authentic haftarah traditions (even within only one rite). I have relied heavily on Fried's citations, checking them where possible and comparing them for consistency with three dozen published works—*humashim*, Rabbinic Bibles, *tikkunim*, books of haftarat, tables of haftarat that appear in Bibles, and ritual calendars. For this article, Fried collated the rabbinic, annual-cycle haftarat from seventy disparate books and manuscripts; his tables are unmatched as a record of diversity. Unfortunately, they are marred by occasional typos, flaws in organization, and lacunae, and by a cryptic bibliography. The article is highly detailed yet concise; it does not lend itself to liturgical guidance.
9. R. Elijah b. Solomon Zalman ("Vilna Gaon"), c. 1770, *Bi'ur ha-Gra* OH § 428, as cited in *Hayyei Adam* (see next note).
10. R. Abraham b. Jehiel Michal Danzig, *Hayyei Adam* § 118.17, end (Vilna, 1810; repr. NY: Hebrew Publishing Co., n.d.).
11. In his appendix tables, Fried lists the Obadiah haftarah as the general custom among 'Ashkenazim "according to *humashim*," while "the Venice *humash* of 1524, of 1551, and others" named Hosea 11–12 as listed among the "variant customs in Ashkenaz." And Obadiah was the designated passage in the haftarah commentary of R. Jonathan Eybeschütz of Altona (c. 1760), *Ahavat Yehonatan* (Warsaw, 1874). This split has continued among modern *humashim*: some specify Hosea 11:7–12:12 while many give Obadiah.
12. Issued in Vienna by R. Josef Schlesinger, a prominent liturgical publisher. The rubric cited two halakhic authors.
13. According to Fried, this third custom is a variant in traditional *humashim*. R. Mordecai b. Abraham Jaffe of Prague and Grodno (c. 1590) also attested to this designation in the *humashim* of his day, *Levush ha-Hur* § 669. In modern times, Wolf Heidenheim's *Seider ha-Haftarat* (Frankfurt, 1819) and the *Ktav tikkun*, 2nd edn. only (NY, 1969), both stated somewhat confusingly, "Here [Hosea 12:13] the 'Ashkenazim begin haftarat *Vayishlah* [through 14:10], but in Frankfurt and in most of 'Ashkenaz [Germany?] they recite Obadiah 1:1ff."
14. This nuanced pattern of placement (rather than after every *parashah*, or at the end of the book) was first suggested by R. Judah Kogen of the CJLS; it became the working consensus of key members of the production crew in consultation with various officials and project participants.
15. Rabbinic Jews have long combined and separated Torah portions in an elaborate, oscillating annual pattern in order that certain Torah portions (based on the seven-day cycle of *Shabbat*) coincide with certain holidays (based on a lunar calendar). This pattern, now well over a thousand years old, has evolved somewhat over time. Until about four hundred years ago, Jews followed several such patterns synchronously. See Norman Bloom, "The Torah Reading Cycle: Past and Present," *Journal of Jewish Music and Liturgy* XVIII (1995–1996), pp. 37–59.
16. Hertz's heading also mentions 6:27, but an English footnote on p. 1011 designates that verse as Sephardic practice only.
17. A *braita* in the Talmud of Babylonia (*Megillah* 31a) specified as this haftarah "the Passover at Gilgal," leaving open the precise starting and stopping points. Both the presence and absence of the passage from Joshua 3, and recitation of 6:27 as a coda, are documented in gaonic sources of more than a thousand years ago; see Fried, 10:11, nn. 190–196.
18. I have not found attestations from the traditional period; however, it seems safe to assume that customary starting points for this haftarah carried over from the medieval period. (Because they were seen as part of the proper observance of the holiday in the Mishnah and Talmud, the haftarat for holidays have always been relatively more stable than those for *Shabbat*.) Inclusion of Joshua 3:5–7 is mentioned in Central European lore books such as *Minhagim Tirnau* (c. 1400) and *Seifer Maharil* (c. 1400), while other medieval works mentioned starting at 5:2, including 'Arba'ah *Turim* ("Tur") OH § 488.3 (c. 1330); see also Fried, 10:11–12, nn. 189–196. Where the *Shulhan Arukh* mentioned reciting Joshua 5:2ff. (OH § 488.3), R. Isserles of Cracow (1578) did not gloss otherwise, but we can argue only tentatively from silence. (By contrast, in the modern period, R. Israel Meir ha-Kohen Poupko of Belorussia [c. 1900] mentioned Joshua 3:5–7, stating: "Thus is the custom now," *Mishnah Berurah* 488.3.10.) As for traditional *humashim* and the

- like, R. Jacob b. Isaac Ashkenazi of Janow Lubelski (Poland) (c. 1590) commented on Joshua 3:7 on this haftarah in his Yiddish commentary *Tze'edah U-Re'edah*, whereas Eybeschütz (c. 1760) started his commentary with 5:2. In the table of haftarat in the Amsterdam Bibles of the late 17th century, Joshua 3:5–7 was included. (Fried did not address how *humashim* handled Josh. 3:5–7.) Among modern *humashim*, some include it while others do not, which would seem to confirm that the same was true during the earlier period.
19. R. Jacob b. Asher of Worms (and later Toledo) (c. 1330) had written provocatively, “Recite from Josh. 5:2 until 6:27” (*Tur* OH § 488), yet none of the classic commentaries on his work addressed that unusually long selection.
 20. Fried, appendix table. Many modern *humashim* have included the 6:27 coda as a matter of course, while others have omitted it (including the Conservative movement’s own *Siddur Sim Shalom* [1986; 1998])—which helps confirm that the same was true during the earlier period.
 21. Fried, appendix table.
 22. For the more common situations, in *Etz Hayim* an intricate selection formula (p. 705) takes into account the conjunction of other events in the Jewish calendar. By contrast, because Hertz nowhere stated which of this pair of haftarat the ‘Ashkenazim read in the most common situations (such as when the two *parashiyot* are joined), we cannot divine his intention in most years.
 23. There is, however, a hint of this custom from the gaonic period, in *Seifer ha-Pardes* (of the School of Rashi), which noted in passing that Amos 9 “has always been recited every year with *Kedoshim*” in the German communities of Speyer, Worms, and Mainz (Ehrenreich edn., p. 353).
 24. Amos 9 was already linked with ‘*Aharei Mot* in medieval sources such as *Seifer ha-Minhagim* by Abraham Klausner of Vienna (c. 1400; p. 74), one of the foundational texts for the rite of ‘Ashkenazim. Fried adduces it as the reported custom of three long-established communities: Frankfurt-am-Main, Leszno, and Posen. Traditional rabbis who stated that this was their local custom included: Moses Isserles of Cracow (1578), *Darkhei Mosheh* § 428.5 and *Mappat ha-Shulhan* OH § 428.8; Mordecai b. Abraham Jaffe of Prague and Posen (c. 1590), *Levush ha-Hur* 493; and Joel Sirkes of Lublin (c. 1620), *Bayit Hadash* on the *Tur*, OH § 428, end.
 25. Fried, appendix tables. Rabbi Isserles noted that the *humashim* of his day presented the opposite order from actual local practice; see previous note. The widely reproduced Amsterdam Bibles of the late 17th century designated Ezekiel 22 as the haftarah for ‘*Aharei Mot*. Among modern works, some label the passages as found in Hertz, while others (typically those whose editors are likely to be more influenced by the codes than by publishing convention) reverse those two selections. Note that Israeli publications should not be taken as representative of diaspora practice, because the particular custom of ‘Ashkenazim in the land of Israel has been to designate Ezekiel 22 as *haftarat Aharei Mot*, and Amos 9 as *haftarat Kedoshim*, in explicit contrast to what is stated in the traditional diaspora codes (R. Yehiel Michal b. Aaron Tykocinski, *Seifer Eretz Yisrael* [1955], as quoted in Jacob Gelis, *Minhagei Eretz Yisrael* [Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1968], p. 74.).
 26. Fried, appendix tables (for traditional works). On this question I am not aware of attestations regarding local custom in the traditional period. Ending at verse 16 was, however, attested by R. Jacob b. Judah of London (1287) as the early medieval practice of western Europe, *Ez Hayyim, Hilkhote Keri’at ha-Torah*, ch. 4, p. 54 (note that the passage is incorrectly identified by the editor of the 1962 printed edn.). The first Ktav *tikkun* (1946) described it as the custom of Frankfurt, although it is not mentioned in the work of Wolf Heidenheim, *Seider Ha-Haftarat Le-Khol Shabbatot Ha-Shanah* [Va-yikra] (Rödelheim/Frankfurt: Heidenheim, 1819), nor in *Die Haftoroth: überjert und erläutert von Dr. Mendel Hirsch* (Frankfurt: Hofmann, 1st edn, 1896; and 2nd edn., 1913). (Meanwhile, the shorter selection appears to be a particular custom of ‘Ashkenazim in the land of Israel, judging from the table of haftarat in Aron Dothan’s Bible [Tel Aviv: Adi, 1973], Mordecai Breuer’s *Torat Hayyim humash* [Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1986], and *Tikkun Kore’im “Simanim”* [Jerusalem: Tavei Hokhmah, 1996].)
 27. R. Solomon b. Israel of Zolkiew, *Tiferet Ha-Kodesh* (Prague, 1713), vol. 2. That he was writing for an audience of ‘Ashkenazim seems to be confirmed by the fact that he commented on an explicitly Ashkenazic selection for *parashat Va-yeilekh* (see “Shabbat Shuvah,” below).
 28. Fried, citing “the Venice *humash* of 1524, of 1551, and others.” Note that both selections from Ezekiel start with similar language—and therefore if a rabbinic author was not careful in his wording (while citing the starting words of the passage), his intended designation may be ambiguous.
 29. The only other place in *Etz Hayim* where variant practices are mentioned is the haftarah for *Shabbat Shuvah*; see “Shabbat Shuvah,” below. For *haftarat Be-shallah* (p. 281), the Hertz edition did include a Hebrew footnote stating that “some” begin the haftarah at 5:1 rather than 4:4. However, because I can otherwise find historical

evidence that *Sefaradim* (but not *'Ashkenazim*) have recited the shorter version, this laconic footnote is best understood as a reference to Sephardic practice only.

30. Furthermore, in *Etz Hayim*, the subheading “Relation of the Haftarah to the *Parashah*” has been used consistently up to this point; but with these ten haftarot (as with the haftarat for special occasions in the back of the book), the subheading used is “Relation of the Haftarah to the Calendar.”
31. *Tur* (c. 1330), OH § 428. For other sources see citations by Fried, 10:19–21.
32. During the preparation of *Etz Hayim*, the CJLS did not rule on the styling of these ten haftarot but rather left that choice to the production editors, who saw educational value in spotlighting the traditional rabbinic characterization.
33. The CJLS did not rule on the location of the haftarah for *Shabbat Shuvah* but rather left that choice to the production editors. (Placement of that selection among the haftarot for the Days of Awe, rather than with Deuteronomy, is also a feature of *The Book of Haftarah for the Sabbaths and Holidays* [NY: Shilo, 1959].)
34. Although I have found scant direct evidence in the traditional period itself, this conclusion is supported by interpolation from evidence before and after that period. In the medieval period, this approach had been spelled out by R. Zalman of St. Goar, *Seifer Maharil* (Warsaw, 1874), p. 42, in the name of his teacher R. Jacob b. Moses Moellin of Mainz (“the Maharil,” c. 1400), who headed the communities of Germany, Austria, and Bohemia. The Maharil’s wording was restated without comment in 1584 by R. Moses Mat of Belz, *Matteih Mosheh* § 833 (ed. Knoblowicz; Jerusalem: 2nd edn., 1978). In the modern period, it was clearly attested in Brody (Ukraine) by R. Ephraim Zalman Margolioth (c. 1800), *Matteih Efraim* § 602.40 (repr. Jerusalem: Lewin-Epstein, 1966), and also in Vilna (Lithuania) both by R. Danzig, *Hayyei Adam* § 118.17 (1810), and by R. Bezalel b. Moses ha-Kohen (c. 1860), as quoted by *Seifer Shulhan Ha-Keri’ah* (1864; 1882), which was cited in turn by Abraham Eliezer Hirshovitz of Kovno, *Ozar Kol Minhagei Yeshurun* § 71.40 (Lwow, 4th edn., 1930). Rabbi Judah D. Eisenstein of New York cited the second edition of Hirshovitz (1899) when he described this practice as “our custom” in *Ozar Dinim U-Minhagim* (NY, 1917), s.v. haftarah.
35. Hosea+Joel (only) also became a local custom of the land of Israel, according to R. Tykocinski, *Seifer Eretz Yisrael* [1955], as excerpted in *Minhagei Eretz Yisrael*, p. 181. The custom in the land of Israel may result from the *aliyah* of the *Perushim* from Vilna in the early

1800s, for they customarily read their haftarot from a Prophets scroll rather than a book (Tykocinski, excerpted in Gelis, p. 109). (In the Twelve, the Joel passage is relatively close to the end of Hosea, so that reading from Joel avoids keeping everyone waiting while the scroll is rolled forward to Micah. Cf. the responsum of R. Feinstein, n. 80.) The local custom explains why this haftarah schema is the only option for *'Ashkenazim* in modern *humashim* there: Koren *humash* (Jerusalem: Koren, 1967); *Torat Hayyim humash* (1986); and S. R. Hirsch *humash* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Isaac Breuer Institute, 1988), which went out of its way to excise Micah from a Heidenheim haftarat edition (see discussion of Frankfurt custom, below). Similarly, Dothan’s Bible (1973) highlights the Hosea+Joel (only) approach.

36. Authorities couched the alternating-coda schema in various ways. As we have seen, some cast it as a function of the *parashah*, which is the most succinct approach, albeit the least related to the underlying dynamic. Others (such as *Tur* OH § 428, end) wrote in terms of which day of the week that *Rosh ha-Shanah* would fall in a given year. And still others (such as R. Issachar Susan of Safed, 1564) framed it in terms of whether or not a “bonus” *Shabbat* would fall between *Yom Kippur* and *Sukkot* (*Tikkun Yissakhar* 83a; as quoted in E. Z. Melamed, *L’gilguleihen shel haftarot ‘ahadot* [On the Metamorphosis of Several Haftarat], *Tarbiz* 24:1 [Oct. 1954], p. 79). In practice, all three manners of expression amount to the same thing.

Why were codas added to this haftarah? In order to obviate the negative conclusion of Hosea (which is otherwise a stirring passage for the penitential season): “Sinners stumble on . . . the paths of the LORD” (14:10). Therefore some leaders supplemented Hosea with another few verses from Micah or Joel—that is, by skipping ahead to another place within the Twelve—so as to end the haftarah on a note of hope. (About ten percent of traditional haftarat include an added coda; the long-ago, anonymous creators of haftarat generally sought to end on a note of hope.) Either added passage could serve this purpose, as pointed out by R. Ezekiel Landau (see n. 40) and reiterated by R. Feinstein (see n. 80).

On the other hand, centuries earlier, the author of *Seifer Maharil* (p. 42) had surmised that Joel 2:15–27 [13 verses] was added to the 9 verses of the Hosea passage in order to achieve the nominal minimum of 21 verses for a haftarah as mentioned in halakhic discussions. This explanation seems secondary, for it begs the question of the Micah coda’s origin—which is only 3 verses long—and also this case meets the halakhic grounds for permitting a short haftarah; see *Hayyei Adam* § 118.17.

When were these codas created? They can be traced back a thousand years in Babylonia and the Levant. For the use of Joel as a coda, Fried cites Arthur Marmorstein, “*Seider Parashiyot Mi-Ymei Ha-Ge'onim*,” *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, vol. lxxviii, Mitteilungen zur Geschichte und Literatur aus der Geniza, IV, pp. 150–160. In the traditional period, the only rite that recited the Joel coda is that of 'Ashkenazim, with the lone addition of Jews in Algiers (Fried, appendix table). That the coda from Micah also dates from gaonic times can be safely inferred from the fact that at least five widely scattered traditional rites know of it. (On the traditional rites as indirect evidence of earlier practice within the gaonates, see Elbogen [above, note 6]; see also Louis Finkelstein, “The Prophetic Readings According to the Palestinian, Byzantine, and Karaite Rites,” *HUCA XVII* [1942–3], pp. 423–6.)

How did such an alternating pattern arise? Two kinds of evidence suggest that the two codas were created independently. First, in gaonic and medieval sources, the added passages from Micah and Joel are not mentioned together (if mentioned at all). Second, each coda is highly correlated only with certain rites, as just stated. Apparently, each of the Middle Eastern gaonates officially adopted one coda—as different responses to the same need. Europe then inherited both practices, although there the Joel influence appears to have been much stronger. At some point, European Jews faced an apparent conflict between ancestral customs of Hosea+Micah versus Hosea+Joel. Some Europeans harmonized the two customs in classic fashion by interpreting them as if meant for parallel yet different circumstances on the *Shabbat* before *Yom Kippur*. (R. Landau similarly surmised that, regarding which coda to recite when, two originally independent customs must have become fused; see n. 40. He and other halakhists have pointed to R. David Abudarham's liturgical reference work [Seville, 1340] as influential in promoting the Micah coda in Europe. But it should be noted that 'Ashkenazim ignored other of R. Abudarham's recommendations for this haftarah. It seems more likely the Micah coda made inroads into Europe centuries earlier.)

Precisely when this resolution took place I do not know. Prior to the invention of printing, more than a dozen rabbinic authors discussed this haftarah, none of whom mentioned the practice of reciting both codas (either alternately or together). Presumably the early publishers of *humashim*—out of respect for both traditions—presented readers with two codas, which may have inaugurated the custom unintentionally.

37. Modern, Frankfurt-based *humashim* alerted me to the possibility of an alternating-coda schema there (see n. 42). Although I have found no halakhic sources from Frankfurt that explicitly mention such a schema, it does seem to explain paradoxes in the sketchy attestations available to me. In a year when the Torah portion was *Ha'azinu* (1818), Solomon Zalman Geiger reported the recitation of Hosea+Joel, *Divrei Kehillot: ha-modi'a minhagei tefillot k"k Frankfurt al ha-Mayn ve-she'ar kehillot ashkenaz ha-holekhet ahareha* (Frankfurt, 1862). For years in which *Va-yeilekh* is recited, we can apply the words of an unpublished manuscript of R. Judah Michael Bing's *Koah Yehudah* (c. 1750), as quoted by Zvi Leitner in his *Minhagei Frankfurt* (Jerusalem, 1981), p. 44 [Hebrew section]: “Joel 2:15ff. is not read, nor is Joel 2:14 [and preceding vv.]” On the other hand, in an earlier generation, R. Joseph Kosman seemed to specify the Joel coda in all years, *Noheig Ka-Zon Yosef* (Frankfurt/Hanau, 1718; repr. Tel Aviv, 1968), *Shabbat Teshuvah* § 2. That we should expect consistency over time (rather than an evolving custom) in Frankfurt is suggested by that community's proud preservation of distinctive medieval customs despite the larger Ashkenazic trend toward ritual homogenization. Therefore I surmise that R. Kosman, who did not indicate his sources with much care, was making a generic statement here (repeating Maharil) rather than specifying a Frankfurt custom per se. (This occasion was not addressed in the classic compilation of Frankfurt customs, *Yosef Ometz*, completed in 1630.)
38. In the traditional period, Prague was a teeming Jewish center with roughly a dozen synagogues; they probably did not all observe the same ritual customs. R. Mordecai Jaffe (c. 1590), who spent many years in Prague, reported Hosea+Joel in years when the Torah portion is *Ha'azinu* (so the context of his discussion makes clear), *Levush Ha-Hur* § 603. More than a century later, R. Elijah b. Benjamin Wolf Shapira (c. 1710), *av bet din* of Prague, glossed that when the Torah portion is *Va-yeilekh*, “there are some who contest” the haftarah custom; *Eliyah Rabbah* on the *Levush* § 603.2 (Sulzbach, 1757). The context implies not only that he was referring to variation in the coda (i.e., something other than Joel), but also that in the more usual situation (coinciding with *Ha'azinu*), Joel 2:15–27 was a noncontroversial coda, so far as he knew. On Prague, see nn. 40, 42.
39. As cited by Melamed, p. 82, supplement to n. 47.
40. In Prague circa 1790, R. Ezekiel Landau observed that “in *humashim* sometimes one coda is called for and sometimes the other.” Some of them were so vague that he could only speculate as to the original intent of “the early *humashim*.” It appears that R. Landau lacked con-

confidence in the authenticity of the relevant custom in his day. For rather than report current custom like other observers, he instead reviewed the literature (both halakhah and *humashim*). Only then did he commend the schema of alternating codas, justifying it on the basis of thematic and verbal similarities between each *parashah* and a coda. Rabbi Landau's opinion gained wide currency because of his eminence (chief rabbi of Bohemia and highly respected throughout Jewish Europe) and because he mentioned it in what later became a standard commentary on the *Shulhan Arukh—Dagul Me-Revavah* (Prague, 1794), OH § 428.8. (Cf. R. Feinstein [see below], who found this approach unsatisfactory.) He was aware of the variant custom reported earlier in his city (see notes 38, 42). That he did not refer to the Maharil's Joel-only treatment of the subject (nearly three centuries earlier) suggests that in R. Landau's community the Micah coda had meanwhile become a firmly established custom.

41. I take it as strong evidence of traditional practice that the alternating-coda pattern is described as local custom in two modern works issuing from Frankfurt: Heidenheim's *Seider Ha-Haftarot [Devarim]* (1821) and Mendel Hirsch's *Die Haftoroth* (1896; 1913). The same practice appears in the name of "Frankfurt" in many modern works. Others have presented it in the name of R. Landau of Prague (see previous note): the Shilo book of haftarat (1959); *T'rumath Tzvi* [S. R. Hirsch Pentateuch] with haftarat ed. A. J. Rosenberg (NY: Judaica Press, 1990). And still others have anonymously specified the alternating-coda pattern: Ch. M. Brecher, "Haftorah Calendar for 1944–1949" (NY: Ktav, 1944); J.H. Hertz *humash* [Hungarian] (Budapest: Society for Hungarian Judaica, 1942).
42. In addition to Hertz, many works present these passages from Hosea, Micah, and Joel under the heading of *Va-yeilekh* or *Shabbat Shuvah*—and without explanation. Examples include: *'Orim Gedolim humash* (Vilna: Romm, 1912); *Mikraot Gedolot* (Vienna: Jos. Schlesinger, 1925); *Tikkun La-Kore'im* (NY: Ktav, 1st edn. 1946); *The Soncino Chumash* (1947); *Mikra'ot Gedolot* (Munich: Vaad Hatzalah, 1947 [fac. of a prewar edition]); Philip Birnbaum *humash* (NY: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1983)—which excised the alternating-coda directions from a Heidenheim haftarah edition; and Shraga Silverstein, ed., *The Rashi Chumash* (NY: Targum/Feldheim, 1997). Apparently a *humash* with this format was used in R. Feinstein's synagogue in 1923, giving rise to his responsum (see "Discussion"). Given that so many modern works of diverse provenance display this format—and that other works explicitly specify reciting

both codas—see below), it seems to be older than the present era.

Furthermore, the presumed presence of this format in traditional *humashim* would account for a practice circa 1710 that involved reading the passages in this same order. Here is the testimony in *Elijah Rabbah* § 603.2 regarding when the Torah portion was *Va-yeilekh*: "And I found among the haftarah customs here in Prague that they recite *Shuvah Yisrael* [Hosea 14:2–10] and finish with *yemei kedem* [Micah 7:18–20] and [then] say *tik'u shofar* [Joel 2:15] and finish with *lo' yevoshu 'ami le-'olam* [Joel 2:27]." (This may mean that one of Prague's synagogues finished with token verses—first and last—from the Joel coda that they otherwise read without Micah when the Torah portion was *Ha'azinu*. Reciting only the first and last verses of a passage is a strategy known from other situations where two haftarah-reading occasions coincide; it reflects another classic approach to harmonizing conflicts in tradition.) What is remarkable here is the order of the passages, for it is not the order in which they appear in the Bible. (In Hebrew Bibles, the three prophets are treated as part of the same book—*Trei 'Asar*, "the Twelve [Minor Prophets]," in which Joel's prophecies precede those of Micah.) Moreover, this order conflicts with a talmudic rule that one should not skip backward to a prior prophet within the Twelve (BT Meg. 24a; for the classic interpretation see Rashi; Tos. *Yoma* 70a, s.v. "*u-bilvad*"; R. Joseph Caro, *Kesef Mishnah on Hilkhot Tefillah* [Prayer Lore] § 12.13; *Mishnah B'rurah*, OH § 144.2.9), which was repeated in standard restatements of Jewish lore: *Mishneh Torah*, *Hilkhot Tefillah* § 12.13; *Shulhan Arukh* OH § 144.1 (end). It seems safe to say that one would not have thought to recite the haftarah's passages in an "unnatural" and "illegal" progression unless a *humash* at the time had excerpted those passages and placed them conveniently in that order.

43. I surmise that a *humash* editor who followed two unremarkable conventions—thrifty compactness, plus one-haftarah-per-*parashah* placement (for *'Ashkenazim*)—was led to locate both codas together, not intending for them to be recited together in practice. For in poorer times than our own, many publishers strenuously avoided reprinting biblical passages in an effort to reduce both cost and size. Thus, rather than repeating Hosea 14:2–10 after *Ha'azinu*, an editor thought of simply appending its Joel coda to the previous "*Va-yeilekh*" haftarah. By proceeding in the order of Torah portions, Micah (the coda read with *Va-yeilekh*) would logically be placed before Joel (the coda read with *Ha'azinu*). Finally, that editor adopted a third convention that is common to many *humashim*—explanatory parsimony.

(Many publishers have avoided spelling out alternatives that would require complex rubrics, probably for a variety of reasons; see the discussion regarding simplicity, below.)

Another factor to consider is a custom of *Sefaradim* (perhaps the prevailing one at the time) as reported in some *humashim*, which called for reciting Hosea+Micah with *Va-yeilekh* but not with *Ha'azinu*. This custom added to an editor's incentive both to locate this haftarah with *Va-yeilekh* (rather than *Ha'azinu*) and to place Micah before Joel. Originally it may even have been the stronger incentive, for until near the end of the traditional period, more Jews were *Sefaradim* than *'Ashkenazim*.

44. See note 42.
45. In Hertz's *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs: Deuteronomy* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1936), a large Hebrew heading prior to Micah 7:18–20 stated, "On *Shabbat Va-Yeilekh* we add . . ." (p. 556). Following that passage, a large heading prior to Joel 2:15–27 stated, "On *Shabbat Ha'azinu* we add . . ." (p. 558). To print the biblical text, the one-volume edition in 1937 used the same Hebrew plates; nothing changed here except that both the white space between passages and the rubrics disappeared.
46. As previously noted, this format can be read as if the recitation of both codas together was intended. Doubtless some Hertz readers have done so over the years. See discussion in text, below.
47. In pointed contrast to Hertz, *Etz Hayim* displays its codas in biblical order. The CJLS insisted that biblical order be followed so as to preclude the Hosea+Micah+Joel custom, which it viewed as an error (R. David Fine, personal communication, 7/27/00).
48. Hosea+Joel+Micah has been a variant custom of *'Ashkenazim* within the land of Israel, according to *T'rumath Tzvi humash*, p. 921; although this custom is not mentioned in *Minhagei Eretz Yisrael*, it is the only variant for *'Ashkenazim* mentioned in Dothan's Bible besides Hosea+Joel (only). Dothan's omission of the alternating-coda and the alternating-haftarah schemes is best explained as an exclusive focus on land-of-Israel customs. (Hosea+Joel+Micah is consistent both with the local custom of reciting the haftarah from a Prophets scroll rather than from a book, and with a tendency in the Levant to reconcile two competing customs by adopting both practices.)
49. In *Sha'arei Efraim* § 9.28 (Dubno, 1820; also quoted in his brother's *Sha'arei Teshuvah* OH § 428.8), R. Ephraim Zalman Margolioth of Brody wrote in passing that "some also add Micah 7:18ff." after Hosea+Joel. However, in his *Matteih Efraim* § 602.40 (c. 1800) he made this same statement only after attesting to Hosea+Joel (only), which implies that Hosea+Joel+Micah should be treated as a secondhand report.
50. The Artscroll/Stone *humash*, whose rubric cautiously stated that "Customs vary regarding how many of the following paragraphs are read and in what order." Presenting the two codas in biblical order may be a recent innovation in *humash* publishing, consistent with the strong influence of Israel on contemporary diaspora liturgy, and consistent with a general postmodern tendency to give less weight to custom in the face of what has been recorded in the name of halakhic masters. On the latter trend, see Haym Soloveitchik, "Rupture and Reconstruction: The Transformation of Contemporary Orthodoxy," *Tradition* 28:4 (1994), pp. 64–130.
51. Traditional: Fried, appendix tables. Modern works include *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'im 32 Perushim* (Warsaw: Lebensohn, 1861); cf. Dothan's Bible (1973) and the *T'rumath Tzvi humash* (1990).
52. See notes 38 and 42.
53. I established above (nn. 42, 43) that the format of placing passages from both Micah and Joel immediately after Hosea 14:2–10 must have been devised to represent the alternating-coda schema. Presumably the Hosea+Micah+Joel custom then sprang to life from (mis)taking a laconic *humash*'s format at face value. (Although such a haftarah is longer than those of the alternating-coda approach, it is attractive because it is easier to describe, execute, and recall—for it does not change from year to year.) Thus, what began as a concise way to display information has given rise to a technically "illegal" practice. (Nevertheless, once a custom has arisen, it can claim self-justifying authenticity, as we shall see.) See also the secondhand reports in: *Otzar Dinim U-Minhagim* (1917; 1938), s.v. *Shabbat Shuvah*, haftarah; and Dothan's Bible (1973). Ironically, one editor recently commended Hosea+Micah+Joel to readers as "the prevailing custom" (*T'rumath Tzvi*, p. 921), although it would be difficult to gauge with scientific rigor just how widespread it has become.
54. Works that unambiguously designate Hosea+Micah+Joel (both codas) include: *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'im 32 Perushim* (1861); *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'im 50 'Aтарot* (Europe, post-1880 [Reprinted by Books Export Enterprises, Israel, n.d.]); Fred Reiss, *The Standard Guide to the Jewish and Civil Calendars* (W. Orange, NJ: Behrman House, 1986), p. vii; table of scriptural readings, *The JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1999; 2000; see below, n. 90). At least one source presents Hosea+Micah+Joel twice—first titled *Va-yeilekh* and then titled *Shabbat Shuvah*—implying that both co-

das should always be recited together: *Tikkun Kore'im* "Simanim" (Jerusalem: Tavei Hokhmah, 1996).

This Hosea+Micah+Joel selection has appeared in official publications of three denominations (see discussion below): Gunther Plaut, *The Torah: A Modern Commentary* (NY: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1981), re *Shabbat Shuvah* (but cf. the alternating-coda schema in Gunther Plaut and Chaim Stern, *The Haftarah Commentary* [NY: UAHC, 1996]); *Kol Hane-shamah: Shabbat Va-Hagim* (Wyncote, PA: Jewish Reconstructionist Federation, 1994); R. Reuven Silverman, ed., "Calendar of Torah and Haftarah Readings, 5758–5760 (1997–2000)" (London: Reform Synagogues of Great Britain, 1997).

55. In this alternating-haftarah schema, the name *Shabbat Shuvah* would not be appropriate for the *Shabbat* before *Yom Kippur*, because the haftarah recited is not always the one that begins, "Shuvah . . ." (Hosea 14:2). A more accurate title would be *Shabbat Teshuvah*—the Sabbath of Repentance. Both names appear in medieval and traditional halakhic literature, often interchangeably. Elbogen (whose opinion was repeated in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 14:572) asserted (incorrectly, I believe) that *Shabbat Teshuvah* is in error. Meanwhile, it may be that euphony has unconsciously played a role in the adoption of one schema versus the other, considering (in the dialect of 'Ashkenazim) the relative ease and alliteration of the name *Shabbos Shuvah*.
 56. In this alternating-haftarah schema, the haftarah consisting of 2 Samuel 22:1–51, which both Hertz (p. 904) and *Etz Hayim* (p. 1196) offer as the "haftarah for *Ha'azinu*," is never recited on that occasion.
 57. This alternating-haftarah schema was the favored approach of R. Jacob b. Asher (c. 1330), who was a communal leader in Worms before moving to Spain; *Tur* OH § 428. His book was studied by R. David Abudarham of Seville (1340), who commended this arrangement and cited in support, "I have heard that this is the custom in France and Provence," *Seifer Abudarham, seider ha-parashiyot ve-ha-haftarat*, Horowitz edn., p. 163.
 58. The alternating-haftarah schema was the sole approach designated "for 'Ashkenazim" in: the Amsterdam Bibles of the late 1600s; R. Solomon b. Israel of Zolkiew, *Tiferet Ha-Kodesh* [haftarah commentary] (Prague, 1713), vol. 2; Amsterdam *humash*, 1726 (cited by Melamed, p. 82 n. 47); *Torah Or humash* (Livorno, 1849; cited by Melamed, p. 79); and in *Torah Ha-Ketav Ve-Ha-Kabbalah* (Konigsberg, 1852). It was also presented as "for 'Ashkenazim"—as opposed to "for Frankfurt"—in works such as: Amsterdam *humash* (1726) (per Melamed, p. 82); Heidenheim's collected haftarat [Deut.] (Frankfurt, 1821); A. Goldberg's *humash* (Berlin, 1865); Mendel Hirsch's *Die Hapthoroth* (1896); and a large number of 20th-century *humashim*.
- How did this relatively complex schema come about? We noted earlier (n. 36) that medieval European Jews inherited divergent customs from the earlier gaonates, and that they resorted to various ways of reconciling them. Regarding the *Shabbat* before *Yom Kippur*, a defensible harmonizing approach was to alternate not merely the coda but the entire haftarah. (Those who recited only Hosea 14:2ff. on that *Shabbat* interpreted the tradition of reciting Isaiah 55:6–56:8 as meant only for the Fast of Gedaliah, earlier in the week; see *Beit Yosef* OH § 428, end.)
59. The placement of this haftarah among the holiday haftarat—and not with Deuteronomy—was not a CJLS decision but rather my own proposal (approved by the senior editor), as the logical consequence of the considerations mentioned here. Such was also the placement in the Shilo book of haftarat (1959).
 60. *Etz Hayim* goes so far as to assert that the haftarah "bears no thematic or even liturgic relation to the end of Deuteronomy" (p. 1266). (That wording unduly discounts the obvious verbal links: Deuteronomy 34:9 states that the Israelites heeded Joshua after Moses' death; and Joshua 1:1 begins by mentioning the death of Moses.) Moreover, the Torah passage for this holiday actually ends with Genesis 2:3 (not Deuteronomy 34:12), which underscores that the publishing practice of associating this haftarah with the end of Deuteronomy is a forced fit.
 61. Hertz was ambiguous on this score; see note 29.
 62. The Hertz *humash* is not internally consistent with regard to *Simhat Torah*. Footnotes dating from the first edition (p. 919) said that *Sefaradim* stop at verse 9; those notes were absent from the second version of the haftarah added in 1960 (p. 984ff.).
 63. The few books in print that do present haftarat of the lesser-known rites do so only in a token manner, when the ritual practices of those rites happen to coincide with those of 'Ashkenazim or *Sefaradim*. Furthermore, Karaites (adherents to a longstanding type of nonrabbinic Judaism) traditionally recite haftarah selections that sometimes differ from those in all of the rabbinic rites; the haftarat of Karaites—who have their own internally variant customs—are mentioned neither in modern or contemporary rabbinic *humashim*, nor in Fried's article on haftarat, nor in any other single published source that I know of. Omission of nonrabbinic practice is yet another way that the "standard" sources understate the historical diversity of Jewish ritual practice.

64. The dual ('*Ashkenazim/Sefaradim*) construction of the official chief rabbinate of the State of Israel is a high-profile case in point. However, the glossary in *Etz Hayim* defines *Sefaradim* in the more narrow sense as related to Iberian origin.
65. In the U.S. and Canada alone, some Jewish congregations preserve the following rites: Romanian, Boukharian, Afghani, Iraqi/Indian, Syrian, Spanish-Portuguese, Maghrebi, and Moroccan. With the exception of the highly distinctive Romanian rite, most of their haftarat today match the rite of *Sefaradim* (in its narrow, Judeo-Spanish, sense), with some differences in application (R. Herbert Dobrinsky, Yeshiva University; personal communication, 6/7/99). Meanwhile, Italian-rite congregations exist only outside North America—in Italy, Israel, and elsewhere. Yemenite congregations (which read some unique haftarat) are presently centered in Israel.
66. These statistics are based on the nominal selections for each rite as reported in Fried's appendix tables; they conservatively ignore local variation within each rite (of the sort identified repeatedly in the first part of this article). For the smaller rites, regional aggregation is less of a factor, as is the role of an editor's simply repeating what past editors have done. Therefore their *humashim* can be taken as a more reliable indication of actual custom.
67. Based on data in Fried's article and tables, including local variation.
68. *Kesef Mishnah* (commentary to Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*), *Hilkhot Tefillah* (Prayer Lore) § 12.12. Cf. *Seifer Ha-'Eshkol*, Albeck edn., 1:171.
69. See, for example, Elbogen § 26.1–6.
70. Elbogen § 26.6. Halakhic literature does contain opinions "requiring" much longer excerpts, but fragments from the Cairo Geniza show that the theoretical guideline was disregarded in some cases for many centuries.
71. Sometimes haftarat were chosen to highlight coincident special occasions, such as a nearby holiday or a local wedding, rather than to accord with the Torah portion.
72. About 800 years ago, *Seifer ha-Pardes* (of the School of Rashi) quoted a responsum (Ehrenreich edn., pp. 352–353) on how it came to be that certain customary haftarat are at odds with what is stated in the Talmud; the answer, which seems historically accurate, was that the present practice probably arose under the aegis of "the *Savora'im*, presidents of the Central Governing Councils (*ra'shei yeshivot*)," that is, in the gaonic period. (In the terminology of that era, the denominational president—*ro'sh yeshiva*—was styled as *ha-ga'on*: "his excellency." Modern scholars took the name of the "gaonic" era from this custom.) Indeed, a full accounting for the diversity of haftarat must trace their evolution through that period, when all rabbinic Jews belonged to a congregation affiliated with one of three self-governing, far-flung denominations (gaonates): two centered in Babylonia and one centered in the Levantine. These denominations consisted of a federation of dues-paying local congregations, with a Central Governing Council that (among other things) fostered liturgical uniformity among member congregations. By and large, affiliated congregations were free to adhere to their own variant customs. However, whenever a congregation asked the central body for direction, it was then expected to follow its denomination's nominal practice in that regard. It can be safely assumed that each denomination had an official list of haftarat as part of its standard liturgy, and that those official lists differed from each other. Historical reconstruction of such lists is incomplete.
73. Compendia of Jewish lore rarely designated haftarat for ordinary Sabbaths (although they did tend to discuss the prevailing haftarah selections for holidays and special occasions—for in those cases they had to square their practice with statements in the Talmud). Often they identified each haftarah by only a key phrase (usually in the starting verse) and did not specify the end point, thus allowing for variation in length.
74. Here the proverb's sense should probably be taken as metaphorical, because generally it applies only to civil law.
75. Deferral to local custom was R. Caro's intent regarding all aspects of Jewish lore discussed in his books (*Encyclopaedia Judaica* 5:197).
76. Quoted in Melamed, p. 79.
77. This opinion was also quoted circa 1900 as the final note (without further comment) in *Mishnah Berurah* § 428.23.
78. Printing's influence on liturgy in general is discussed in: Abraham Millgram, *Jewish Worship* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1971), pp. 546–7; Elbogen, p. 284; and Jakob Petuchowski, "Some Laws of Jewish Liturgical Development," *Studies in Modern Theology and Prayer* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1998), pp. 163–5.
79. "Calendar of Torah and Haftarah Readings, 5758–5760 (1997–2000)," ed. R. Reuven Silverman, RSGB (1997); "ULPS Lectionary 5759 & 5760: A Guide to Recommended Shabbat Torah & Haftarah Readings," ed. R. David Hulbert; "Scriptural Readings for the Sabbath," ed. Solomon Freehof, in *The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship*, newly rev. edn., pt. I (NY: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1940); "A Table of Scriptural Readings," ed. A. Stanley Dreyfus, in *Shaarei Binah/*

Gates of Understanding (NY: UAHC, 1977); Gunther Plaut's *humash* (1981); and Gunther Plaut and Chaim Stern, *The Haftarah Commentary* (NY: UAHC, 1996).

Over the years, the American Reform movement (UAHC/CCAR) has produced several overlapping designations of haftarat. The four most recent versions, which are cited above, overlap a great deal. Unlike their British counterparts, none of them is tied explicitly to a "triennial" Torah-reading cycle. The 1977 version seems to be the most inclusive, listing several alternatives for any given occasion, with some selections taken from *Ketuvim*. The 1996 *Haftarah Commentary* features traditional selections yet also includes a number of modern, "alternative" selections published for the first time in liturgical format—that is, biblical passages in Hebrew and translation (albeit in the back of the book, and without either guidance for intended use or commentary).

In the summer of 1999 I conducted an e-mail survey of current Reform haftarah-reading practice via the HUC–JIR alumni listserv, with the kind cooperation of Dr. Richard Sarason of HUC–JIR. I received 26 responses. I also spoke with Rabbis Stanley Dreyfus and Gunther Plaut about their editing of haftarah designations. I concluded that all four of the above versions appear to be "in force," in the sense that they are each consulted by some congregational rabbis and cantors, and in that earlier versions have not been officially superseded by later ones. The modern selections in *The Haftarah Commentary* do not seem to have received much attention, even from those who prefer not to recite certain traditional selections. Meanwhile, the mostly traditional haftarat in R. Plaut's *humash* receive strong institutional backing (via the popular *bat/bar mizvah* study booklets excerpted from it, and via the Women of Reform Judaism's annual Art Calendar). Reciting traditional (as opposed to modern) haftarah selections now appears to be prevailing, but not universal, practice in American Reform Judaism.

80. Resp. 'Iggeret Mosheh #174.
 81. Furthermore, by the end of the 20th century, a few rabbis and congregations—both affiliated with denominations and unaffiliated—had locally designated their own new haftarat for certain occasions, in order to avoid passages newly regarded as unsatisfactory from various perspectives. A few of their selections are drawn from outside the Hebrew Bible.
 82. The cryptic tables in JPS Bible translations (1917, 1955, 1985) and the table by the editors of *Encyclopaedia Judaica* [s.v. "Torah, Reading of"] 15:1249 (1971) belong in this category, as does Gunther Plaut's *humash* (1981). Similarly, it was not unheard of for a 19th-century Ashkenazic *humash* to state, at the end of *parashat Va-*
- yeilekh*, "As the haftarah, recite *Shuvah* [Hosea 14:2ff.]" while the collected haftarat in the back of the same book designated Isaiah 55:6ff.—or vice versa. Likewise, compare the codas mentioned in two entries in Eisenstein's *Ozar Dinim U-Minhagim* (NY: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1917), s.v. *Shabbat Shuvah* and *haftarah*. And the A. Harkavy *humash* (Hebrew Publishing Co., 1928) specified two schemas for 'Ashkenazim (alternating-haftarah and alternating-coda), while an appended "Permanent Haftarah Calendar" by B. Alperin specified a third schema (Hosea+Joel only).
 83. Even the otherwise admirable article and tables in *Encyklopedyah Talmudit* (see note 8, above) fail us for the Sabbaths near *Yom Kippur*; they conflate the various patterns among 'Ashkenazim, rendering his work useless for distinguishing the competing schemas. Liturgically oriented works that seem to have conflated the patterns known from attested traditional practice or from the most careful *humashim* include: *Netivot Shalom humash* (Pest: Löwy's Sohn, 1861); Julius Dessauer *humash* (Budapest: Jos. Schlesinger, 1917); *Seider Ha-Haftarat* (table) appended to a Letteris Bible (NY: Hebrew Publishing Co., n.d.); Harduf *humash* (Willowdale, Ontario: D. M. Harduf, 1983); Plaut and Stern's haftarah commentary (1996) (see esp. the impossible introduction on p. 510); and *The Illustrated Torah* (Jerusalem: The Studio in Old Jaffa/Gefen, 2000). What appears in these publications can be accounted for by a mix of three factors: misunderstanding of the works consulted as authorities, ignorance of the scope of historical diversity, and inattention to presentation details.
 84. For example, *Levush*, *Mappat ha-Shulhan*, and 'Iggeret Moshe, op. cit.
 85. For example, *Mikra'ot Gedolot* (Vienna: Jos. Schlesinger, 1925), and the *T'rumath Tzvi* and Artscroll *humashim*, op. cit.
 86. For example, *Dagul Me-Revavah*, op. cit.
 87. See the scientific edition edited by Bernard Mandelbaum (NY: JTS, 1962). Some well-meaning copyist(s) also expanded the book to include homilies that addressed the second days of holidays (observed only in the Diaspora).
 88. Haftarah customs within each of the two largest rites were even more diverse historically than is shown by a comparison between *Etz Hayim* and Hertz. Traditionally, for example, most selections labeled in *Etz Hayim* as being for *Sefaradim* were recited by some *Ashkenazim* as well. The larger traditional diversity of haftarah selections is further illustrated by an early error in *Etz Hayim* regarding the intermediate Shabbat during Pesah. In the first two printings, the introduction to this haftarah stated

(p. 1307), “Two images give the prophecy a dramatic focus. The first is that of sheep. . . . The other image is . . . of dry bones.” However, the haftarah text that followed mentions no sheep—only the dry bones! It turns out that at least two customs have co-existed among *Ashkenazim*, where one variant begins two verses before the other: Ezekiel 36:37–37:14, and 37:1–14. (Both variants were mentioned in the geonic-era *Siddur Rashi*; and both have been named in many modern *humashim*, although only the latter variant is formally named in Hertz and in *Etz Hayim*.) In preparing his manuscript of haftarah commentary, Prof. Fishbane relied upon a source that designated the longer variant. Meanwhile, the CJLS chose to adopt the shorter and more commonly cited custom. Unfortunately, sheep are mentioned only in 36:37–38, the two verses excluded from the CJLS reckoning. During production of *Etz Hayim*, the editor missed the discrepancy in the introductory paragraph, which was then overlooked by the proofreader and pre-publication reviewers. The moral: When printing *haftarot*, variant customs are an occupational hazard; let the publisher beware.

89. Similarly, including all contemporary variants would reduce the overall attractiveness (and marketability) of the book. For example, consider the eight occasions for each of which rabbinic Jews of all rites traditionally read roughly the same (i.e., at least overlapping) haftarah passages: To cover the actual practice on those occasions today, a publisher would need to add at least four times as many *new* passages. Constraints of cost and size argue against being so inclusive.
90. For *Shabbat Shuvah*, I myself selected the designation Hosea+Micah+Joel that appears in *The JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh* (1999; 2000), which I intended only as a typical selection that is easily expressed in tabular format. Meanwhile, actual *humashim* have always contained more variant readings than meet the eye, because these are not labeled as such. For example, although *Etz Hayim* does not (like some other *humashim*) specify Hosea 12:13–14:10 with *Va-yishlah* or Isaiah 55:6–56:8 on the *Shabbat* before *Yom Kippur*, those who follow such customs can find those passages elsewhere in the book—labeled for other occasions.
91. To historians of liturgy: A promising direction for further historical research would be to explore the vast and still largely uncharted territory of Cairo Geniza fragments and responsa literature.