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numbers and importance of the Jewish communities in Hagenbach and the neighboring villages. The various communities lived under the protection of the country gentry and formed an association to provide common rabbinic leadership and to represent their shared interests before the governmental authorities. The local *Memorbuch, an important historical document, records that a synagogue and cemetery were consecrated in 1737. In 1813 an independent rabbinate was established, with its seat in Hagenbach, embracing 14 other small communities. In 1867 the community (totaling 126 persons) was united with that of *Baisersdorf, while in 1894 both were included in the rabbinate of Bamberg. The Jewish population numbered 88 in 1900 and only 24 in 1933. The community was not reestablished after World War II.
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INTRODUCTION

The *Haggadah is based on the *seder service prescribed by the Mishnah (PES. 10), which had apparently been conducted in the form of a banquet. The observance of the precepts at the *seder—the eating of the pesah (the *paschal sacrifice), *mazah (“unleavened bread”), and *maror (“bitter herbs”); the drinking of *arba kosot (“four cups of wine”); and the recital of the story of the exodus from Egypt (the narrative of the *Haggadah) were integrated into this banquet celebration. Essentially, the *Haggadah is an account of the Egyptian bondage, a thanksgiving to God for the redemption, and, in Temple times, a thanksgiving for the acquisition of the Land of Israel. After the destruction of the Second Temple, the latter was replaced by a prayer for the ultimate redemption. The purpose of the *Haggadah (“Ve-haggadta le-vinkha”...“And thou shalt tell thy son,” EX. 13:8), one of the central commandments of the day, is represented by the narrative itself. Not written by any particular author, or group of authors, the *Haggadah is not a “literary composition” in the accepted sense of the term. Its narrative is a collection of excerpts from the Bible, Mishnah, and Midrash, interpolated with the ritual performances: the *Kiddush, the benedictions recited on the performance of precepts, and for food, *Grace after Meals, and the *Hallel. Gradually, stories, psalms, and songs were added. Many recensions of the *Haggadah, differing from one another to a greater or lesser degree, have been preserved in various manuscripts, mostly dating from the 13th to the 15th century, and also in fragments from the Cairo *Genizah. Some halakhic works also contain the text of, and commentaries on, the *Haggadah (see below: Manuscripts and Editions). In keeping with its compulsory character and the varied nature of its sources, the literary or logical nexus between the different sections of the *Haggadah is not always discernible. The quotations, derived from a multiplicity of sources, have mostly been adapted to the needs of the *seder service.

COMPONENT PARTS

(1) The *Kiddush. It is not specific to the *seder service but is prescribed for all the festivals. (2) *Ha Lachma Anya (“This is the bread of affliction”) are the opening words of a declaration in Aramaic, designating the *mazah as the bread of affliction and inviting the needy to join the meal. It ends with “This year we are here, next year may we be in the Land of Israel. This year we are slaves, next year we may be free men” (figure 1). There seems to be no clear connection between the three statements of the declaration. It appears to be a folk composition which was added to the *seder liturgy after the destruction of the Temple. (3) *Mah Nishtannah (“How is this night different”), popularly known as “the four questions,” is according to the Mishnah (PES. 10:4) apparently a formula with which the father can instruct his son. This formula passed through a number of stages till it assumed the forms which are to be found in the different recensions that are in use today. (4) *Avadim Hayinu (“We were bondmen”) is an introduction to the formal narration of the exodus from Egypt, based on the views of Samuel (PES. 116a). Passages of unknown origin supplement the narration stressing its importance. (5) *Ma’aseh be-Rabbi Ell’ezar...Amar Rabbi Elazar (“It is told of R. Eleizer...” R. Eleazar b. Azariah said”) is a story concerning the leading *tannaim, followed by a discussion between them, whose purpose it is to emphasize the importance of the narration. While the story is preserved only in the *Haggadah, the debate is cited in the Mishnah (Ber. 1:5) and in halakhic Midrashim (Sif. Deut. 130; Mekh., Psicha 16). (6) The *bara’at of the Four Sons, also preserved in a halakhic Midrash (Mekh., Psicha 18) and in the Talmud (TJ, PES. 10:4, 37d), but in a recension differing considerably from *Haggadot in use today, incorporates all the biblical verses enjoining the narration of the exodus (Deut. 6:20; EX. 12:6; 13:8; 13:14). It adapts them to four different types of “sons”: the wise, the wicked, the simple, and the disinterested, who should be instructed according to the halakhah “that according to the understanding of the son the father instructs him” (PES. 10:4). (7) *Yakhol me-Rosh Hodesh (“It might be thought that [this exposition should begin] from the New Moon [of Nisan]”) is a tannaitic commentary on Exodus 13:8 (Mekh., Psicha 17), adding exegetical proof that the narration of the exodus story is obligatory on the eve of Passover. (8) *Mi-Tehillah Ovedei Avodah Zarah Hayu Avoteinu (“In the beginning, our fathers worshiped idols”) is an introduction to the narration of the exodus story based on Ra, as opposed to Samuel’s view (see above *Avadim Hayinu). (9) A halakhic Midrash on Arami oved avi (Deut. 26:5–8)—“An Aramean would have destroyed my father” (usually rendered: “A wandering Aramean was my father”) which, according to the Mishnah (PES. 10:4), everyone is obliged “to expound.” This commentary, also preserved in the Midrashim based on the
TEXTUAL ELABORATIONS

A tendency, however, existed to elaborate on the text of the Haggadah with midrashic and poetic sections. These additions are neither obligatory nor universally accepted: e.g., the tannaitic exposition Ani Adonai ve-lo Aher ("I the Lord and no other); Maḥzor Vitry, 293) and an interpretation of ve-natan lanu et mammonam ("and gave us their substance"; the sidur of Saadia Gaon, 143), the latter is derived from the Mekhilta de-R. Simeon b. Yoḥai, and was adapted to the seder ritual. Similarly, certain benedictions were expanded through the interpolation of pіyutim (e.g., in the sidur of Saadia Gaon, 144). Among oriental communities it is customary to recite in the first part of the seder service the hymn "And ye shall say: This is the offering of the Passover." In later times, hymns and roundelays were gradually incorporated into the Haggadah, and sung at the end of the seder: *Az Rov Nissim ("Of old, Thou didst Perform most Miracles at Night!"; from a kerovah by *Yannai); Omez Gevurotekha ("The Strength of Thy Might"); from a kerovah by R. Eleazar *Kallir; *Ki Lo Na'eh ("For to Him Is it Becoming"; by an anonymous paytan); and Hasal Seder Pesah ("Accomplished is the Order of the Passover"; from a kerovah by R. Joseph Tov *Eliarn *Bonilis). Other hymns introduced are just folk songs composed for the entertainment of children, e.g., *Addir Hu ("Strong is He"); *Eḥad Mi Tode’a ("Who Knows One?"); *Had Gadya ("One Only Kid"). In other communities different pіyutim have been adopted: e.g., "On Passover in Egypt my Captives went forth Free"; "From the House of Iniquity, Seat of my Strifes" or "Home of my Medanite captors" (both are in the Maḥzor Carpentras); or "Who Wrought Wonders in Egypt" (Maḥzor Romania, Constantinople, 1510). In northern France it was customary to sing at the end of the seder "The Lovers Sing with Ringing Voice" (Maḥzor Vitry, 298).

COMMENTARIES

Textual difficulties in the Haggadah called for the annotation of the text. The earliest commentaries were written in a talmudic style and can be found in the halakhic works of the school of Rashi: and his discipels (e.g., in Maḥzor Vitry; Ha-Orah, ed. by S. Buber, 1905; Siddur Rashī, ed. by S. Buber and J. Freimann, 1911; Ha-Pardes, ed. by D. Ehrenreich, 1824). The commentary attributed to R. *Samuel b. Meir is written in the same style. A more comprehensive and profound exposition is found in Shibbolei ha-Leket by R. Zelekiah b. Abraham *Anav (13th century; ed. by S. Buber, 1886), in which are incorporated some annotations by Isaia di *Trani, as well as interesting novellae, by the author's brother. The two important commentaries composed in the 14th century were by R. *Aaron b. Jacob hi-Kohen of Lune (in Orhot Hayyim; it also appeared in *Kol bo) and by R. David b. Joseph *Abudarham (in his commentary on the prayer book; Venice, 1566). These early commentators merely annotated the text. They were not concerned with the investigation of the historical aspect of the Haggadah and did not refer to the sources of its different texts. This simple explanatory type of commentary came to a close in the 15th century with Afikoman by R. Simeon b. *Zemah *Durian, which until that time was the only commentary published as a separate book. After the 15th century, the commentators

RITUAL ACTS

The text of the Haggadah is also divided according to the prescribed ritualistic acts of the seder service. Each textual section is headed by a descriptive phrase which, in some rites, is chanted as a separate litany. The sections are: kaddish (the Kiddush; figure 2), u-reḥaz ("washing" of the hands), karpass (eating the "herbs" dipped in salt-water), yahaz ("dividing" the middle maẓẓah), maggid (the "narration"), ṭeḥillah ("washing" the hands for the meal), mozi-maẓẓah (the "benediction" over the maẓẓah), maḥor (eating the "bitter herbs"), korekh (eating "bitter herbs with maẓẓah"), shulhan arukh (the "meal"), zaḥum (eating of the fɪkkan—"the last maẓẓah"), barekh ("Grace after Meals"), hallot (recitation of the second part of Hallel), and nirẓah (the closing formula). This Passover Haggadah and seder ritual follows the practice of the Pumbedita and Sura academies of Babylonia and was adopted by all the Jewish communities in the Diaspora. It completely superseded the ancient Palestinian recension which differed from it in certain respects (such as the omission of sections 4–7 listed above.

Sifrei (Sif. Deut. 26:5 (301), especially Mid. Lek. Tov, and Mid. Hag., id loc.), is a haphazard selection of aggadic interpretations. In the seder ritual, it is prefaced with "Blessed be He who observes His promise... Go and learn what Laban the Aramean sought..." a passage not found in the Midrashim and apparently composed in the post-Talmudic period. (10) Commentaries of the tannaim on the miracle of the plagues and the division of the Red Sea during the exodus from Egypt are recited. In most Jewish communities these have been seen as a continuation of the preceding Midrash; their source is the Mekhilta (Va-Yehi be-Shallah 6). (11) Kammah Ma'alei Tovot la-Makom Aleinu ("How many goodly favors has the Almighty bestowed upon us") is a poem in two versions which is preserved only in the Passover Haggadah. The poem was composed during the Second Temple period and seems to have no direct connection with the seder service. (12) The Mishnah of Rabban Gamaliel. It explains the significance of the Passover sacrifice, the unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs. Taken from the Mishnah (Pes. 10:5), it was rewritten (in a question-and-answer form) during the post-Talmudic period. (13) Be-Khol Dor va-Dor ("In every single generation") is a passage from the Mishnah (Pes. 10:5), or from an expanded Mishnah (baraita), which had been supplemented by a statement of Rava (Pes. 116b). (14) The first two chapters of Hallel are recited, as prescribed in the Mishnah following Bet Hillel (Pes. 10:6). (15) The benediction for redemption "Who redeemed us" is based on the ruling of R. Tarfon and R. Akiva in the Mishnah. After observing the commandments to eat unleavened bread and bitter herbs, the meal is eaten, followed by Grace after Meals. (According to the opinion of scholars such as Elbogen, Ginberg, and Finkelstein, etc. it is obvious from the text of the Mah Nishannah that at some stage in the development of the seder service this part of the ritual followed rathe: than preceded the meal.) The company then continues with the second part of the Haggadah. (16) Shefokh Hamakah ("Pour out Thy wrath") is a collection of verses whose theme is a supplication for vengeance on the nations that have oppressed Israel. The custom to recite these verses is attested since medieval times; their number and order differ according to the various rites. (17) The last part of the Hallel is recited, as specified in the Mishnah (Pes. 10:7). (18) Yehalelukha Adonai Eloheinu al Kol Ma'asekeh ("All Thy works shall praise Thee") is a benediction of praise ("Birkat ha-Shir") in accordance with R. Judah's view (Pes. 118a). (19) The Great Hallel (Ps. 136). Its recital became obligatory at a later date. (It is based on the baraita of R. Tarfon (ibid.) (20) Nishmat Kol Ha'ei ("The breath of all that lives"), another version of the Birkat ha-Shir ("Benediction over the Song") is recited, in accordance with the view of R. Johanan (ibid.).
included material of their own in their expositions, both as an elaboration on the narrative and as a discussion of philosophical and theological concepts. R. Isaac *Abravanel in Zevah Pesah (Venice, 1545; figure 3) poses 100 questions which he answers at length. With reference to the verse "Know thou of a surety ..." (Gen. 15: 13), he asks: "What benefit have we derived from the exodus from Egypt, in view of the fact that we are once again in exile?" In his reply he discusses the significance of the exile and the ways of Providence at great length, without establishing any direct connection with the text. The commentary thus becomes a separate discourse. Subsequent commentators, who followed his style, mostly annotated in an aggadic vein, while a few gave mystical interpretations, e.g., R. *Eliezer Ashkenazi in Ma'asei Adonai (Venice, 1583); R. *Judah Loew b. Bezalel (the Maharal) of Prague in Gevurot Adonai (Cracow, 1582), in which he also expounds halakhic matters; and the kabbalists R. Moses *Alshekh and R. Isaiah *Horowitz. The best known later commentators are: R. Jacob *Emden, R. *Elijah b. Solomon Zalman of Vilna, R. Jacob of Dubno, Jacob b. Jacob Moses *Lorberbaum (of Lissa), and Moses *Soler (Schreiber) who wove their homiletic compositions round and into the Passover *Haggadah. R. Hayyim Joseph David *Azulai (18th century), known for his critical approach, also follows the above method in his commentaries on the *Haggadah, though occasionally the critical view is discernible. Only in the 19th century did scholars begin to analyze the text, to clarify its sources, and to determine the original wording. This method was adopted by H. *Edelman, E. *Landshuth, D. *Cassel, M. Friedmann, and D. *Goldschmidt, whose commentaries were published in articles or in book form.

MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS
Through the generations the Passover *Haggadah has been one of the most popular works—perhaps the most popular—in Jewish religious literature. Many recensions, differing from one another to a greater or lesser degree, have been preserved in various manuscripts mostly dating from the 13th to the 15th century, and also in fragments from the Cairo Genizah. These manuscripts originate from all countries in which Jews have lived. Some halakhic works also contain the text of and commentaries on the *Haggadah. Others are found in daily or festival prayer books; the majority, however, are separate works for use on the eve of Passover only. These manuscripts have not yet been adequately investigated; only a selected few, particularly the illuminated copies, have engaged the attention of scholars. In the seventh or eighth century the *Haggadah was apparently compiled as a separate work by the *geonim. The oldest extant version however is in the prayer book (siddur) of Saadia Gaon (10th century; ed. by I. Davidson, S. Assaf and B. I. Joel, 1941); other early versions are found in Maimonides' Mishneh Torah (12th century) and in Mahzor Vitry (11th century). Since the 15th century, the *Haggadah has had more than 2,700 editions, either with or without commentaries. Later editions have included as many as 200 commentaries. The Haggadah has been translated into vernaculars used by Jews, e.g., Yiddish, Ladino, Judeo-Greek, Judeo-Arabic (in its various dialects), and Judeo-Persian, which are often printed together with the Haggadah. Oral vernacular renderings are traditional in those communities which have no printed literature in their spoken idiom (e.g., in modern Aramaic). The *Haggadah has been rendered into a number of languages, and the translation, whether with or without commentary, is often included in the editions. "Emended" editions, which do not give the traditional but a substitute version, are customary in certain communities, e.g., the *Haggadah of S. *Maybaum (1891), Caesar *Seligmann (Frankfort, 1913), Guggenheim (Offenbach, 1927), the *Central Conference of American Rabbis (from 1905 onward), the Union of Liberal and Progressive
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קוק פ"הוי - כותב ונ下一篇ו

א. הט申請ה המודרנית.\\nב. היבשת המודרנית.\\nכ. היבשת מנובלה.\\nד. היבשת מנובלי.\\n
ה. הט申請ה המודרנית.

ף. שמות המודרנית.\\nב. מיתוג המודרני.\\nכ. מיתוג המודרני.\\nד. מיתוג המודרני.\\n
ה. שמות המודרני.
הנה ה上级 מפותך כי,аНא יבנינו על מה ולקום, הכרך שברבר
המקס סימילי´s ה上级bracht וה椪ך התעלמה ממילא וה上级ברה中间 דייוווסי וה上级ברהパー
וכות התישעה שבחרותת תבית ידועה עריכת פאוץ לשלוח בלה
׳ואהנה׳. זוהי הבנה לbeginTransaction עליון שידור לקודש שלהם
״ברש״, ששמו השומרון של מקור השם אחד ה上级raham
יתמרו שיגזרו עליון קפה חותמה של מיסים
וזאתו הרוסנות על עליון פגיעה בפי ארמונות
׳ברש׳, יש בעלי ויתום של מיסים
׳ברש׳, יש בעליبخמה של מיסים
׳ברש׳, יש בעלי ברית של מיסים
ב. ה上级יבכו, actualizar שמה ונרשמה עליון ה上级ברב
ביתאיים, actualizar שמה ונרשמה עליון ה上级ברב
ב. ה上级יבכו, aktualisiert שמה ונרשמה עליון ה上级ברב
לא ידעתי מה נועש בווטרה, אך לא הצלחתי核实 אתindrיה...

לא ידעתי מה נועש בווטרה, אך לא הצלחתי核实 אתindrיה...
לא נוכל לקרוא את התוכן של התמונה זו.
םוסח שיחיו דאכוי אתי אקילום אלא ניבית את המשה.

אלא דוע אלא ערבא גאת קדישמ דוד ויהי.

אלא דוע ערבא גאת קדישמ דוד וייהי.

אלא דוע ערבא גאת קדישמ דוד וייהי.

אלא דוע ערבא גאת קדישמ דוד וייהי.

אלא דוע ערבא גאת קדישמ דוד וייהי.
עַל פֶּרֶפֶּה נַעֲלוּת הַשָּׁמֶן אֲלֵי הָפָלָקָה
וְהָקָפָרָה מִנָּהּ לָוָהֵן כַּלָּוּרָה.
אָזֶה בֶּֽדֶּרֶךְ כְּהַבֹּלָטָה
שֶׁהָזֶה בֶּֽדֶּרֶךְ הַבְּרָפָהּ הַכְּפָּרָהּ.
מִפְּתַח לָוָהֵן נַעֲלוּת הַשָּׁמֶן
וְהָפָלָקָה מִנָּהּ לָוָהֵן כַּלָּוּרָה.
בֶּֽדֶּרֶךְ הַבְּרָפָהּ הַכְּפָּרָהּ.
וְהָפָלָקָה מִנָּהּ לָוָהֵן כַּלָּוּרָה.
מִפְּתַח לָוָהֵן נַעֲלוּת הַשָּׁמֶן
וְהָפָלָקָה מִנָּהּ לָוָהֵן כַּלָּוּרָה.
בֶּֽדֶּרֶךְ הַבְּרָפָהּ הַכְּפָּרָהּ.
וְהָפָלָקָה מִנָּהּ לָוָהֵן כַּלָּוּרָה.
מִפְּתַח לָוָהֵן נַעֲלוּת הַשָּׁמֶן
וְהָפָלָקָה מִנָּהּ לָוָהֵן כַּלָּוּרָה.
בֶּֽדֶּרֶךְ הַבְּרָפָהּ הַכְּפָּרָהּ.
וְהָפָלָקָה מִנָּהּ לָוָהֵן כַּלָּוּרָ�ה.
מִפְּתַח לָוָהֵן נַעֲלוּת הַשָּׁמֶן
וְהָפָלָקָה מִנָּהּ לָוָהֵן כַּלָּוּרָה.
בֶּֽדֶּרֶךְ הַבְּרָפָהּ הַכְּפָּרָהּ.
וְהָפָלָקָה מִנָּהּ לָוָהֵן כַּלָּוּרָה.
מִפְּתַח לָוָהֵן נַעֲלוּת הַשָּׁמֶן
וְהָפָלָקָה מִנָּהּ לָוָהֵן כַּלָּוּרָה.
is unnecessary. The narrative which briefly relates is expounded in extensive detail later in the Haggadah in the paragraphs beginning with יצאו ידיהם, Go and learn. There, each detail of the descent to Egypt, the servitude, the affliction, and the miracles of the Exodus are described and explained at length. What does עבדים ולпись the beginning of the Haggadah add to the lengthy narration that comes later?

3) What is the reason for the injunction, בכל המגמות, Therefore, even if we were all wise... we would nevertheless be obligated to recount the story of the departure from Egypt? What purpose does relating the story serve for those who already know it?

4) What is the reason for the word "and" in the phrase בכל המגמות, And even if we were all wise? The word "and" denotes an addition to a previous idea. For example, had the Haggadah previously mentioned that every person is required to recount the story of the Exodus, then the phrase "and even if we were all wise..." would have been appropriate. However, this phrase is the first mention of any obligation! The statement should instead read: Even if we were all wise, without the unnecessary conjunction "and".1

5) Many commentators have questioned the insertion of the paragraph Said Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah, in the Haggadah. Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah said, in the name of Ben Zoma, that the daily obligation for every Jew to mention the Exodus from Egypt applies at nighttime as well.

---

1. The addition of the word "and" is not insignificant. Tosafos in Menachos 40b, s.v. Techeles, infers significant Halachic ramifications from the addition of the word "and" in a similar phrase "and even...".

---

Overview

"There can be no answer without a question."
(Introduction to Medrash Haggadah)

Some Questions

1) The compiler of the Haggadah should have placed the paragraph עבדים ולпись, We were slaves unto Pharaoh in Egypt, after the paragraph Said Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah, in the name of Ben Zoma, that the daily obligation for every Jew to mention the Exodus from Egypt applies at nighttime as well.

This question is strengthened when we look at the conclusion of the second paragraph, מתחילה ובסיום, and Yaakov and his children went down to Egypt. These words would have served as an ideal transition to the paragraph Said Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah, We were slaves unto Pharaoh in Egypt, had the compiler of the Haggadah placed the paragraphs in chronological order.

2) The opening paragraph of the Haggadah, from עבדים ולпись, Therefore, even if we were all wise,
no connection with either the preceding or following paragraphs.

Moreover, it would have been appropriate after the paragraph, "וכל מראת יום ח研发投入 המאור in front of you, for these are two of the three features which Rabban Gamliel instructs us to discuss.

Rabban Gamliel says that whoever does not explain the following three things at the Pesach festival has not fulfilled his obligation, namely: Pesach, matzah, and maror. From where does Rabban Gamliel learn his rule? 3

3. Tosafos in Pesachim 116a, s.v. Vamarin, suggests that Rabban Gamliel derives his directive from the verse, And you shall say, "This is the Pesach offering to God..." (Exodus 12:27), which implies an obligation to verbally declare the reason for the Pesach offering. Rabban Gamliel, says Tosafos, derives the obligation to similarly declare the reasons for matzah and maror from their association (נשא) with the word "Pesach" in other verses. This answer for the source of Rabban Gamliel's law is very problematic.

First, how can Rabban Gamliel derive an obligation to recite specific phrases on Pesach night from a verse which has nothing to do with Pesach night? The verse, And you shall say, is the response to the question of the son who asks, "What is this service to you?" It does not mention Pesach. Nor does it mention any obligation to recite the response if the son does not ask, as Rabban Gamliel requires. Nor does it say that one who does not recite this statement about the Pesach offering has not fulfilled his obligation of relating the story of the Exodus, as Rabban Gamliel states.

Second, this verse is not even the source for the obligation to relate the story of the Exodus on Passover. Rather, the source for that is the verse, וַיִּקְרָא אֵלֶּיהָ אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר, And you shall relate to your child on that day saying... (Exodus 13:8). But in that verse, there is no command to recite the phrases of Pesach, matzah, and maror.

Third, even if Rabban Gamliel does derive his principle from the verse, And you shall say, it would suffice to recite, The Matzah which we eat..., without

as daytime (his opinion is the law, and we fulfill this law every night when we recite the Shema). Obviously, this dictum applies to every night of the year, not just the night of Pesach. Why, then, is it included in the Haggadah? What relevance does it have to Pesach more than any other night? 4

6) Why did the compiler of the Haggadah insert the paragraph, One might think that the obligation to recount the story of the departure from Egypt begins from the first day of the month of Nissan, between the paragraphs המתרגומ אוברי עבדיו רזה (the Four Sons) and כלנו ראבדנו ביבי? The paragraph expounds the reason for the timing of the obligation to recount in detail the story of the Exodus on Pesach night and not earlier. This discussion has no connection with either the preceding or following paragraphs.

7) Why did the compiler of the Haggadah place the paragraph, Rabban Gamliel used to say, between the paragraphs כלכלא דן דירומ והכסף אומתתו The statement of Rabban Gamliel, that one must recite specific statements about the Pesach offering, matzah, and maror, has

2. The commentators have suggested that Pesach night indeed differs from all other nights, for on Pesach there is an additional mitzvah to elaborate upon the story of the Exodus. Their suggestion, however, does not answer the question. The mitzvah to elaborate is not an obligation, but merely a meritorious deed. The Haggadah itself states that this elaboration — one of the unique features of Pesach night — is only a commendable addition to the year-round obligation to mention the Exodus at night. The obligation to recount the story of the Exodus remains the same on Pesach night as on every other night. Therefore, the question remains, how does the night of Pesach differ from all other nights with regard to the obligation to mention the Exodus?
problem is that this concept has already been presented at the beginning of the Haggadah! In the paragraph we read, And if the Holy One, Blessed be He, had not taken our fathers out of Egypt, then we, our children, and our children’s children would still have been subjected to Pharaoh in Egypt.

Why is this concept stated twice, and why is there such a lengthy interruption between the two statements?

11) Why did the compiler of the Haggadah place Hallel, the verses of praise and thanksgiving to God, after the paragraph билל דór וו́ור? Is there any reason behind the proximity of these paragraphs?

12) Why is this book called the Haggadah?

The word הַגָּדָה, Haggadah, comes from the verb הָלַל, which means to tell. A more appropriate verb would have been לָלַל, to relate or to recount, which appears in many places, such as in the verse, In order that you relate (לָלַל) in the ears of your children (Exodus 10:2), as well as in the Haggadah itself, We would nevertheless be obligated to recount (לָלַל)... and, They were relating (לָלַל) the story of the departure from Egypt....

Therefore, this book should have been named סְפָרָר, Sippur, and not הַגָּדָה, Haggadah.

These questions — and many others — paint the picture of a jumbled text compiled in no meaningful order, a clutter

4. If the Haggadah repeats this concept in order to cite the verses which verify the source for this obligation (Shemos 15:8 and Devarim 6:23), then the compiler of the Haggadah should have quoted them earlier in the Haggadah the first time this concept appears. On the other hand, if the appropriate place in the Haggadah to mention this concept is here, near the conclusion of the Haggadah, then why mention it all in the beginning?

9) Why did the compiler of the Haggadah place the paragraph, билל דór וו́ור, In every single generation, after the paragraph, רבך גַּמַּלְיָא רֹאֲם אֲמָר, Rabban Gamliel used to say? One paragraph has no connection with the other. билל דór וו́ור discusses the obligation for every person to consider himself as if he personally left Egypt, whereas רבך גַּמַּלְיָא רֹאֲם אֲמָר discusses the obligation to recite the three specific phrases of Pesach, matzah, and maror.

Furthermore, the compiler of the Haggadah should have placed רבך גַּמַּלְיָא רֹאֲם אֲמָר before билל דór וו́ור, because the paragraphs which precede רבך גַּמַּלְיָא רֹאֲם אֲמָר list the abundant acts of kindness God performed for the Jewish people, and they mention the obligation to praise and thank God for His benevolence. Therefore, it would have been appropriate to place билל דór וו́ור — which discusses the obligation for every person to view himself as if he personally received God’s acts of kindness — immediately after the list of those acts!

10) The above-mentioned paragraph states, билל דór וו́ור, In every single generation one is obligated to look upon himself as if he personally had gone forth out of Egypt. The specific word “this”: This matzah which we eat... Why does Rabban Gamliel require the word “this” in each of the three phrases about Pesach, matzah, and maror?

Fourth, again assuming that Rabban Gamliel derives his principle from the verse, And you shall say, he should only require that the Pesach offering be explained, for that is the only feature mentioned in this verse; matzah and maror are not mentioned. Although Tosafos asserts that these two are derived from their association with the word "Pesach" elsewhere, this needs explanation. Furthermore, even if they are derived from "Pesach", there should be no obligation to recite them at a time when there is no Pesach offering.
gadah, or what we commonly call the Maggid section. Since this section is where we fulfill the mitzvah to recount the story of the Exodus, it is upon this section that our discussion is focused.

Step Two. The source for the obligation to recount the story of the Exodus is the verse (Exodus 13:8):

And you shall relate to your child on that day, saying: 'It is because of this that HaShem acted for me when I came forth out of Egypt.'

Although there are other verses in the Torah which command us to recount the story of the Exodus, this is the only verse which requires us to tell the story regardless of whether or not we are prompted by a child's question. The other verses command us to tell the story only if a child asks about the Exodus. Since the commandment of this verse, however, applies whether or not a child asks, it serves as the source for the mitzvah of Pesach night for every Jew to tell the story of the Exodus from Egypt.

Step Three. Since this verse is the source for the mitzvah to recount the Exodus and, therefore, the basis for the Haggadah, the compiler of the Haggadah composed its content and order to correspond to the phrases in the verse itself.

Step Four. This "Source Verse" has six parts:
1. ותדעו לכם — And you shall relate to your child
2. בימיםこれらの — On that day
3. אמר — Saying
4.这是因为 — It is because of this
5. והיה לי לברות — Hashem acted for me

of unconnected paragraphs in confusing disarray. The lack of coherence glares at us so blatantly that we become accustomed to the confusion, and after just a few hours of it each year we return the Haggadah to the shelves with faith that at least the person who put it together knew what he was talking about.

Of course, it is inconceivable that one of the most important books of Jewish observance would follow no meticulous order, or at least no order which the ordinary reader could not discern, follow, and learn from. What is the order behind the Haggadah of Pesach, and what did our Sages intend to teach with it?

Let us begin with the basics.

Step One. On the first night of Pesach, every Jew is required to perform five mitzvos. Two are required by the Torah: (1) To eat matzah (Shemos 12:18); (2) To recount the story of the Exodus from Egypt (Shemos 13:8). The other three are rabbinical ordinances: (1) To drink four cups of wine; (2) To eat maror; (3) To recite Hallel, the psalms of praise.

Because of their status as Torah commandments, the mitzvah to eat matzah and the mitzvah to recount the story of the Exodus stand out as the central motifs of the Pesach Seder. We fulfill the mitzvah to eat matzah, of course, by eating matzah. We drink wine, eat maror, and recite the passages of Hallel to fulfill the three rabbinical mitzvos of the evening. But how do we fulfill the mitzvah to recount the story of the Exodus?

For this mitzvah we have the Haggadah. Although we commonly refer to the entire book as the Haggadah, the term Haggadah technically refers to the middle part of the Hag-
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We were slaves unto Pharaoh in Egypt, and Hashem our God took us out from there with a strong hand and an outstretched arm.

Aside from these few words, however, nothing else in this paragraph, or in the following eight paragraphs, even slightly resembles a narrated story. We find no story until we come to the paragraph (nine paragraphs later). But now we are left with a question. If רדס וחיינ not telling us part of the story, then what is it telling us? The answer has profound implications.

The sentence רדס וחיונ, פֶּרֶה בְּמִצְוָה וְיִשָּׂאֵנִי לְעָדָה לְבֵנְךָ, We were slaves unto Pharaoh in Egypt, and Hashem our God took us out there with a strong band and an outstretched arm is not the beginning of the story of the Exodus, but is the declaration of the fundamental reason why we are all obligated to recount the Exodus story.

The first eight paragraphs, beginning with רדס וחיונ, and concluding with רדס וחיונ, were placed at the beginning of the Haggadah to correspond with הוהיה לברך, the first phrase of the Source Verse. Each paragraph contributes an essential element to describe the words הוהיה לברך, And you shall relate to your child.

When we read the paragraph of רדס וחיונ, it sounds like the beginning of the story. Indeed, many commentators on the Haggadah maintain that the paragraph רדס וחיונ is a narrative account, the first episode in the saga of our slavery in Egypt.

Here, however, if we step back and view רדס וחיונ in the broad perspective of the entirety of the Haggadah, we will see that it is, in fact, not part of the story of the Exodus.

This common misinterpretation arises from the innuendo of the first twelve words of רדס וחיונ, which certainly do sound like a story:

6. It is so widely accepted to be a narration that the custom has evolved to preface the recitation of רדס וחיונ by saying, "The answer to the four questions of Mah Nishtana is as follows...".
Exempt from telling the story of the Exodus, he would leave his children ignorant of the significance of their past, and unaware of their purpose for the present and their responsibilities for the future. By requiring every person to recount the Exodus, regardless of his knowledge, the Torah circumvents this problem. The continued consciousness of our collective history and the responsibilities and privileges that it bore is guaranteed.

We now understand the paragraph רדש ויזא רדש ויזא. The sole but critical purpose of רדש ויזא רדש ויזא is to inform us that the obligation to tell the story of the Exodus falls upon every Jew, even if he already knows it and has no need to retell it. For it is not only for his sake that he must tell it, but for the sake of all following generations, therefore says: רדש ויזא רדש ויזא.

We were slaves to an oppressive king and to an oppressive nation. Only God, through His miraculous Divine providence, took us out from there. Had God not delivered us, we, our children, and our children's children would still have been subjected to Pharaoh in Egypt. All subsequent generations would have been born into the oppression of Egypt. Therefore, since all later generations were also included in the redemption, they are also obligated to praise and thank God for the deliverance from slavery to freedom. In order to ensure that they will be aware of their privileged responsibility, we are all obligated to recount the Exodus and even if we were all wise. For that is the failsafe mechanism to keep alive the events of the Exodus in the mind and heart of the Jewish people.

Our questions begin to disappear.
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we are reminded that it is God's omnipotently open hand which gives us everything we need. This renewed recognition inspires us to strengthen our love, awe, and service for God.

This is certainly an appropriate explanation for the obligation to recount the Exodus. But still — there seems to be something more to this mitzvah, for if its purpose was solely to enhance our devotion to God, then why are the wise, holy, righteous Jews, who are constantly cognizant of God's greatness, obligated to recount the Exodus? There must be some greater purpose behind this mitzvah. It is this purpose which will give us profound insight into the mitzvah of recounting the Exodus.

Indeed, recounting the events of the Exodus is not solely for our own spiritual benefit. But it is also for our children's: For when we recount the Exodus, we not only ensure that we do not forget what God did for us, but we also guarantee that our children and future generations will recall the Exodus and realize that their lives, too, were fundamentally affected by that awesome event; and they will, as a consequence, acknowledge their personal responsibility to praise and thank the Almighty.

To ensure this perennial awareness of what God did for His people, every Jew is commanded to tell and elaborate upon the events of the Exodus, regardless of his wisdom and knowledge; for it is not only for his benefit, but for the benefit of the future generations of the Jewish people.

If particular individuals had been exempted from this obligation, it would have been conceivable for the Exodus to be forgotten. Any Jew acquainted with history would exempt himself by justifying that he already knows the historical events.
logically that every one of us must recount it, and even if we were all wise... we would nevertheless be obligated to recount the story of the Exodus from Egypt.

The Torah itself subtly implied this reason for the obligation when it phrased the command, נֹצְרָת לְבָנֵךְ, And you shall tell your child..., using the verb “tell” and emphasizing telling your child. If the purpose was for us and not for our children, the command would be phrased, זָכָר, And you shall remember....

The Sages, following the Torah’s lead that the purpose of telling the story of the Exodus is not only for us but for our children, introduced additional customs for the sake of the children, such as removing the Seder plate before the meal begins, and having the children snatch away the Afikoman. These customs were introduced to attract the attention and interest of the children and to encourage their questions, thereby assisting us to instill in them the awareness of the Exodus.

In conclusion, נַעֲדוֹת לָבֵנֵךְ is not the beginning of a story, but a pedagogical statement giving the reason why we are obligated to recount the Exodus even if we are all wise. The inclusion of נַעֲדוֹת לָבֵנֵךְ here is based on the words נועדות לבנים, the first words in the verse נועדות לבנים ביבא חיות אברם, which encapsulates the essence of נועדות לבנים, And you shall relate to your child: the purpose for recounting the Exodus is for our children to be aware of what God did for us and for them.

The seven paragraphs that follow are also based on the words נועדות לבנים:

The story of מַעַשַׁת בִּרְכֵי אָלָיוֹרִי is an example of telling the story even if we were all wise. Five of the greatest Tannaim, Rabbi Eliezer,
the section which corresponds to the next words, on that day, and which describes the proper time for this obligation.

The Haggadah derives from the words בֵּית הַחֲדָשִׁים, that the obligation of הַצְּרִי לְךָ — telling about the Exodus — must be fulfilled on that day, the day when matzah and maror are in front of you — that is, the Fifteenth of Nissan.

Therefore, following the order of words in the Source Verse, the Haggadah begins with You shall relate to your child on that day, this is certainly the fitting place for the paragraph כי אם מרצים חרח. This answers our sixth question.

The Third Section
— Saying

We now come to the third section of the Haggadah, which corresponds to the third phrase, לְאָמֵר, in the Source Verse. We have seen that the compiler of the Haggadah established the order of the Haggadah based upon the sequence of words in the Source Verse, תֵּדָע תֵּדָע תֵּדָע (Shemos 13:9). We have seen that he placed the description of the obligation to recount the Exodus first, corresponding to the words תֵּדָע תֵּדָע. Next, he placed the details of when to fulfill this obligation, corresponding to the next words in the verse, וּבֵית הַחֲדָשִׁים. Likewise, the third section corresponds to the third phrase, לְאָמֵר, and contains the actual saying of the story of the Exodus.

Not only was the compiler of the Haggadah consistent with the order of words in the Source Verse, but he also achieved a logical progression by first introducing the obligation to recount the Exodus (תֵּדָע תֵּדָע), then instructing when to fulfill

Rabbi Yehoshua, Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, Rabbi Akiva, and Rabbi Tarfon, eminent sages whose minds were immersed in the depths of every realm of Torah, nevertheless elaborated upon the Exodus story throughout the night. They knew that the purpose of the obligation was not solely for the individual, but for ensuing generations — תֵּדָע תֵּדָע. This is also an important addition to this part of the Haggadah. Although there is an obligation to mention the Exodus every night of the year, the obligation on Pesach night is different. Every other night one is required merely to mention the Exodus to himself, whereas on Pesach night he must tell the story to someone else, and even if there is no one else present, he must tell the story to himself in order to safeguard against it ever being forgotten.

The paragraphs dealing with the Four Sons follow, depicting the responses to the questions of the four types of children. These paragraphs appropriately appear in the section of the Haggadah which corresponds to: And you shall relate to your child. The response to the last son, the son who does not know how to ask, is the very verse which is the source for the obligation to tell the story of the Exodus; וּבֵית הַחֲדָשִׁים. The Haggadah then offers the appropriate ending to this section of the Haggadah.

The Second Section
— On That Day

After the section which corresponds to the words תֵּדָע תֵּדָע and which describes the obligation to recount the Exodus, comes
the Exodus — as the third section of the Haggadah. It appropriately corresponds to the third phrase of the Source Verse upon which the Haggadah is based: the phrase אֶלְעָרִי, in the verse הָאָדָם עַל יָדָיו, וְלֹא הָאָדָם תְּנַחֵם, וּלְאָדָם מַעֲמַר. והנה התוכנית לְכָל בִּיטָה חוֹדוֹת לַאֱלֹהִים בִּימֵי מִצְרַיִם זה הוא זו בִּיטָה בְּכָל מַעֲמַר.

The Fourth Section — _Because of This_  

בְּעֵבֶר זָה בָּאָר — _Because of This_  

The fourth section corresponds to the fourth phrase, בְּעֵבֶר זָה בָּאָר, it is _because of this_, in the Source Verse. With this simple assumption we can answer the seventh and eighth questions.

Rabban Gamliel's rule that one must explain the Pesach, matzah, and maror, corresponds to the phrase בְּעֵבֶר זָה, which is why the compiler of the Haggadah placed the paragraph of Rabban Gamliel at this point in the Haggadah.

Rabban Gamliel's rule states that if one does not explain these three objects — Pesach (the Paschal offering), matzah, and maror, then one has not fulfilled the obligation to recount the Exodus. What is the source for this rule? His source is none other than the phrase to which this section of the Haggadah corresponds — בְּעֵבֶר זָה.

How does Rabban Gamliel derive from these words the obligation to recite the explanation of the Pesach offering, matzah, and maror?

Rabban Gamliel reads the verse וְנָתַן וְנָתַן differently from the common reading. The common reading is,

And you shall relate to your child on that day, saying: "It is because of this that Hashem acted for me when I came forth out of Egypt".

this obligation (יִשָּׂא חוֹדוֹת), and then including the actual fulfillment of the obligation (לְאָדָם).

This section of the Haggadah starts with the paragraph וכְָל הַמְּלֹא מַעֲמַר ואֵלֹהִים עַבְדָּה וּרְוִי. Here, the Haggadah begins its analysis of the verses in Devarim 26:5-8 which describe the history of the Exodus. Each word of these verses depicts a particular component of the Exodus story so that together these four verses encapsulate the essence of our experience — the suffering of slavery, the relief of redemption, and the awesome miracles and wonders which God wrought for our sake. The Haggadah cites each verse and shows how the details of the Exodus are inherent in each word.

Following the elucidation of the verses comes the paragraphs וכן אלָחַנִית כְָלָה וַסְָמָת בְּמִלָּהָה וְסְפָּרָּה. These paragraphs list the bountiful kindnesses God bestowed upon us when He brought us forth from Egypt, when He guided us through the wilderness, and when He escorted us into the Holy Land. They were placed at the conclusion of the recounting of the story of the Exodus because they include additional accounts of God's benevolence which were not mentioned in the verses which the Haggadah cited, such as God's enriching us with the wealth of Egypt, the splitting of the Sea, the provision of our needs in the wilderness, and additional acts of kindness which the Exodus led to, including the giving of the Sabbath, the receiving of the Torah, the entry into the land of Israel, and the building of the Holy Temple.

In conclusion, the compiler of the Haggadah placed this section — beginning with מַעֲמַר, וּרְוִי, ending with כְָלָה, and containing the actual telling of the story of
our fathers in Egypt"). This obligation is part and parcel of the obligation to recount the Exodus, as is evident by its presence in the verse which commands us to recount the Exodus.

This also explains why we must say “This matzah,” and “This moror”, for “this” is the language of the verse, לְעֵברָה זֶה—because.

The Fifth Section

—Hashem Acted for Me

After the section of the Haggadah based on the phrase לְעֵברָה זֶה, we come to the section based on the next words in the verse, הִשְׂרָיו וְגָּוָה. These words are the source for the obligation for each person to consider himself as if he personally had been redeemed from Egypt. Therefore, the compiler of the Haggadah placed the paragraph לְעֵברָה זֶה, which discusses this obligation, at this point in the Haggadah following the order of the verse. This answers our ninth question.

This paragraph states, In every single generation one is obligated to look upon himself as if he personally had gone forth out of Egypt. The paragraph continues to prove this obligation from the words לְעֵברָה זֶה, Hashem acted for me, in the Source Verse.

We asked that the idea of viewing oneself as having personally left Egypt already appeared at the beginning of the

6. We do not say “This Paschal lamb” because we no longer have the Pesach sacrifice to which we could point and say “This Paschal lamb”. Since the destruction of the second Holy Temple, the text was changed from “This Paschal lamb which we eat” to “The Paschal lamb that our fathers used to eat at the time when the Holy Temple was still standing”.

Rabban Gamliel, however, translates the verse as follows: And you shall relate to your child on that day, saying: “This is because of what Hashem acted for me when I came forth out of Egypt.”

Rabban Gamliel translates לְעֵברָה זֶה as this is because or the reason for this is, which is indeed an accurate, simple translation of the words לְעֵברָה זֶה. The difference between the common way of reading the verse and Rabban Gamliel’s way is whether the word לְעֵברָה, this, is the subject or the object of the subordinate clause. Rabban Gamliel learns that it is the subject (“this thing is because”) and not the object (“because of this thing”). To illustrate, it is as if the phrase reads לְעֵברָה זֶה instead of עַל הַגּוֹיִם, and as if the verse reads, לְעֵברָה וְגָּוָה, instead of הִשְׂרָיו וְגָּוָה. לְעֵברָה זֶה, Hashem acted for me, in the Source Verse.

What does “this” refer to? “This” is the object on the table to which one can point and say, “This is because...”, referring to the Pesach offering, the matzah, and the maror.

To summarize, Rabban Gamliel’s rule is clearly written in the verse itself: And you shall relate to your child on that day, saying: “This [the Pesach offering, matzah, and maror] is because of what Hashem acted for me when I came forth out of Egypt.” Consequently, in order to fulfill the obligation of relating the story of the Exodus to one’s child, one must also relate the reason for the Pesach offering (Because the Holy One, blessed be He, passed over the houses of our fathers in Egypt), the reason for the matzah (Because the dough of our fathers did not have time to become leavened), and the reason for the maror (Because the Egyptians embittered the lites of
The Malbim Haggadah

When Israel went forth from Egypt, echoing the words upon which its inclusion in the Haggadah is based, תרבויות מצריות. This answers our eleventh question.

And our final question — why is this book called the Haggadah — has long since disappeared. Since the book's foundation from beginning to end is based on the words of the verse והודות לכלך, it is obvious that the most fitting title for this book is the first word of that verse, תודה.

In Conclusion

With a single, clear, simple answer, we have discovered an overwhelmingly logical and organized order in the Haggadah. The order of the Haggadah is the order of words in the verse which stands as the source for one of the Pesach Seder's, and, indeed, one of the entire year's, most important mitzvos:

תודה לכלך
בשם הוהא
לאמר
שברד זיו
עשות וו ל
בראשית מצריות

And you shall relate to your child on that day, saying: It is because of this that Hashem acted for me when I came forth out of Egypt.

The Argument between Rav and Shmuel

The Mishnah in Pesachim (116a) teaches that our narration of the Exodus story on Pesach night must begin with the shameful parts of our history, to be followed by praises of God Who raised us from our shameful state.

The two Talmudic sages Rav and Shmuel disagree what

Haggadah in ובדים ויהו, We were slaves... And if the Holy One, Blessed be He, had not taken our fathers out of Egypt, then we, our children, and our children's children would still have been subjugated to Pharaoh in Egypt. We already explained that the purpose of that statement is to explain why every individual is obligated to recount the Exodus even if we were all wise. It does not come to express the idea that one must view oneself as having personally left Egypt. For that comes the fifth section of the Haggadah, the paragraph בכל ורא ויהו, which corresponds to the phrase לי, Hashem acted for me — the fifth phrase in the Source Verse, תודה.

The Sixth Section

— When I came forth from Egypt

The sixth section of the Haggadah begins with the paragraph לכן, Therefore we are obliged to give thanks, an introduction to the recital of Hallel, the psalms of praise to God for the miracles of the redemption from Egypt.

This paragraph states that we are obligated to thank God with abundant expressions of praise and exaltation for all the acts of kindness He bestowed and continually bestows upon us. This paragraph ends with the imperative, עליהו, Praise God!, an appropriate introduction to Hallel.

The recitation of Hallel was placed at the end of the Haggadah because it corresponds to the phrase ובאתי מצריות, when I came forth out of Egypt, the sixth and final phrase of the Source Verse. The Hallel of the Seder commemorates the miracles of the redemption from Egypt and gratefully declares,
immediately following the account of the argument of Rav and Shmuel, the Talmud records an incident in which Rav Nachman started his recitation with אברכים והני — just as Shmuel ruled. However, if we follow Shmuel’s opinion because Rav Nachman did, then we are faced with another problem — why did Rav Nachman himself follow Shmuel’s opinion?

Even if we suppose that Rav Nachman read both Shmuel’s paragraph and Rav’s paragraph, then the first question we asked returns: following the chronological and natural order of the content of the paragraphs, Rav Nachman should have read Rav’s paragraph first.

Moreover, the actual ruling of the Halachic authorities itself is enigmatic. They rule that we follow both views by reading both paragraphs. How does this ruling follow both opinions, though, since the argument itself was which paragraph to start with; the ruling that we read both, beginning with אברכים והני, effectively follows Shmuel’s opinion, and not Rav’s!

3) Both the opinion of Rav and the opinion of Shmuel pose problems. Does Rav, who states that we begin the Haggadah with מתחלנו אברכים והני, also hold that we omit all of the preceding paragraphs, or that we should insert them elsewhere in the Haggadah? It is difficult to conceive how Rav could omit so many essential paragraphs, considerably shortening the Haggadah. On the other hand, if Rav does not omit them from the Haggadah, where does he insert them?

Similarly, we can ask whether Shmuel, who states that אברכים והני, holds that we omit מתחלנו אברכים והני, or whether we include it after עבדים והני (like the text of our Haggadah). If the latter is...

"shameful" refers to in the Mishnah. Rav explains that “shameful” refers to the paragraph מותרת עבדים והני, which discusses our shameful ancestry prior to Avraham. Shmuel, on the other hand, explains that “shameful” refers to the paragraph שלדים וטוענים, which discusses our shameful degradation in Egypt.

The Questions

1) The argument regarding the connotation of “shameful” is straightforward. What practical ramifications, however, does this argument bear on the text of the Haggadah? Does Shmuel maintain that we do not recite the paragraph מותרת עבדים והני at all, and does Rav maintain that we do not recite the paragraph שלדים וטוענים? If so, then according to each opinion, there would be no question regarding the chronological order of the two paragraphs (see our first question in the Overview), because there would only be one paragraph. However, according to the Halachic ruling that we read both paragraphs, the question remains, why do we read מותרת עבדים והני before שלדים וטוענים? this order contradicts both the chronological sequence of events as well as the logical progression of the content of the paragraphs.

2) In practice, when we read the Haggadah we follow the view of Shmuel and commence with מתחלנו אברכים והני. In Talmudic law, however, there is a rule that in any dispute between Rav and Shmuel concerning a non-monetary matter, we follow the opinion of Rav. Why, then, in the Haggadah, do we follow Shmuel’s opinion?

One possibility is that we adopt Shmuel’s ruling because...
part...”, the Talmud does not ask, “With what part does one begin?” Instead, it asks, “What is the ‘shameful’ part?”

There was never any question how the Haggadah starts. Everyone agrees to the order of the Haggadah as based on the Biblical verse. Rav agrees that the Haggadah starts with ערביס ינוו as the order of words in the “Source Verse” requires. Rather, they argue which part of the Haggadah was the Mishnah referring to when it said, “One begins with the shameful part”. Does the Mishnah mean the beginning of the Haggadah, or does it mean the beginning of the section which tells the story of the Exodus?

This is the question which Rav and Shmuel come to answer. Rav answers that “shameful” refers to the beginning of the third section of the Haggadah, the most important section, for it contains the telling of the story of the Exodus (מותרלד שבידינו ערביס ינוו). The preceding sections are all introductory. Shmuel, however, learns the Mishnah literally, and answers that “shameful” refers to the very beginning of the Haggadah (ערביס ינוו), and not the beginning of the third section.

Therefore, when Rav Nachman opened with ערביס ינוו, he was not ruling like Shmuel, for even Rav agrees that the Haggadah opens with ערביס ינוו.

The Origin of the Haggadah
Who wrote the Haggadah?

We usually allude to the author of the Haggadah in vague terms such as the Ba’al HaHaggadah. But who is this anony-

true, then the only point of dissent between Rav and Shmuel is when, and not whether, we read מתפלל ערביס ינוו

Once we know that the order of the Haggadah is based on the verse (see Overview), and we understand that every passage was purposefully placed in its particular place, we can understand the argument between Rav and Shmuel.

The Mishnah in Pesacchim (116a) states that we must begin the Haggadah with the shameful part of Jewish history and conclude with the praises of God. The Mishnah does not say what the “shameful” part of Jewish history is; this is the subject of the dispute between Rav and Shmuel. Rav explains that “shameful” refers to our shameful ancestry of idol worshippers, described in the paragraph מתפלל ערביס ינוו, שמעל קדש. Shmuel maintains that it refers to our shameful oppression in Egypt, ערביס ינוו.

If the order of the Haggadah is so precise, and every section in its exact place, then how do Rav and Shmuel disagree how the Haggadah starts? If the order of the Haggadah follows the verse, as we have shown, and the verse dictates that each section must be in its appropriate place, without any omissions or changes in the order, then how can Rav disrupt this clarity by starting the Haggadah with מתפלל ערביס ינוו, the section based on the third, not the first, part of the verse? Is Rav not aware that the Haggadah has a basic order which cannot be altered?

Upon closer examination of the words of the Talmud, we will discover that Rav and Shmuel were not at all arguing about the order of passages in the Haggadah.

When the Mishnah states, “One begins with the shameful
However, the latest time for the origin of the Haggadah remains unknown. According to most commentators on the Talmud, the Haggadah was still not in existence in the time of Rav and Shmuel. According to those commentators, when Rav and Shmuel argued the Mishnah's meaning of the word "shameful" (the Mishnah states that the recounting of the Exodus on Pesach night must begin with the "shameful" aspects of Jewish history), they were arguing which paragraph comes first in the Haggadah. If that is true, then even in the time of Rav and Shmuel (circa 230 C.E.), the Haggadah had not yet been formalized, or else they would not have argued how it should begin.

The Haggadah was, however, apparently organized by the time of Rav Nachman, for certain statements that he made imply that his Haggadah was identical to ours.

Who was Rav Nachman and when did he live? This is the subject of a dispute between Rashi and Tosafos. Tosafos (Bava Basra 46b, s.v. Shalach) states that when the name "Rav Nachman" appears undorned, it refers to Rav Nachman bar Yaakov (circa 280 C.E.), who was a student of Rav and Shmuel. According to Rashi, the name "Rav Nachman" refers to Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak (circa 370 C.E.), who was a student of Rava. According to this opinion, the Haggadah was not written until the end of the period of the Talmudic sages.

According to our explanation of the order of the Haggadah, the Haggadah was written much earlier. We explained that Rav and Shmuel were not arguing which paragraph should begin the Haggadah. The Haggadah had already been formalized, and Rav and Shmuel each held in their hands the same text of

mous Ba'al HaHaggadah?

The commonly accepted assumption ascribes the compilation of the Haggadah to sometime during the Mishnaic or Talmudic periods (circa 3610/150 B.C.E. to 4210/450 C.E.). Of course, from the time of the Exodus (2448/1312 B.C.E.) the Jews have celebrated Pesach and have fulfilled the commandment of, And you shall tell your child..., as well as the other commandments of Pesach. However, the need for the formalization of the Haggadah for the benefit of ensuing generations arose only later in the history of the Jewish people. The actual compiler and the time of organization of the Haggadah is uncertain.

According to our assumption, however, we can deduce a precise time for the composition of the Haggadah as it appears before us, and we may even be able to suggest its author.

The latest Tanna (sage who lived during the period of the oral transmission of the law, the time of the Mishnah) mentioned in the Haggadah is Rabbi Yehudah, who is cited in the statement, Rabbi Yehudah made a mnemonic [for the ten plagues]. When the name of Rabbi Yehudah appears with no surname, it refers to Rabbi Yehudah bar (the son of) Rabbi Ela'ay (circa 160 B.C.E.), who was the teacher of Rabbeinu HaKadosh (Rabbeinu Yehudah HaNasi, commonly called Rabbbi), the redactor of the Mishnah and the prestigious leader of Babylonian Jewry.

Therefore, the Haggadah could not have been written earlier than the time of Rabbeinu HaKadosh; otherwise, the writer could not have quoted Rabbi Yehudah, who would have lived later.
time of the writing of the Haggadah was precisely during the lifetime of Rabbeinu HaKadosh, then it is not unlikely that the compiler of the Haggadah was none other than the great leader of Jewry himself, the preserver of the Oral Law for all ensuing generations, the holy and renowned sage of the Mishnah, Rabbeinu HaKadosh.

Thanks to Rabbi Asher Balanson, Rabbi Yitzchok Lebovits, Rabbi Label Lopiansky, Rabbi Joseph Pearlman, Rabbi Daniel Taub, Rabbi Meir Tribits, Mrs. Corinne Fishman, Yechezkel Anis, Yechiel Greenbaum, Ian Jaeger, Daniel Taub, and to the many other individuals whose helpfulness contributed to the translation and research.

the Haggadah. Rather, they argued where in the existing Haggadah appears the “shameful” part of Jewish history mentioned in the Mishnah. Rav held that “shameful” refers to מתחילה עבדו מצודר וזו עד עתידינו. Although that is not the beginning of the Haggadah, it is the beginning of this specific section. This is how Rav interpreted the Mishnah, “We must begin with the shameful part.”

Shmuel, on the other hand, held that the Mishnah was referring to the beginning of the entire Haggadah, the paragraph עבדו מצודר. But they both agree to the actual text and order of the Haggadah.

We can, therefore, suggest that the Haggadah had been formalized no later than the time of Rav and Shmuel. Furthermore, Rav and Shmuel were students of Rabbeinu HaKadosh (Shmuel was also his physician). We mentioned above that the Haggadah could not have been written before the time of Rabbeinu HaKadosh because it cites his teacher, Rabbi Ye- hudah.

It follows that the time of the writing of the Haggadah concurred exactly with the time that Rabbeinu HaKadosh lived and the time that the Mishnah, the Oral Law, was committed to writing (circa 180 B.C.E.). In addition, the literary style of the Haggadah is very similar to the style of the Mishnah. Furthermore, no teachings of any Talmudic sages (who lived after the redaction of the Mishnah) are mentioned in the Haggadah, albeit there exist many teachings of the Talmudic sages relating to the verses cited in the Haggadah.

These factors suggest that the Haggadah was written during the time that the Mishnah was committed to writing. And if the