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**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>Ashkenazi Haggadah as represented in Guggenheimer’s The Scholar’s Haggadah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bab.</td>
<td>Babylonian Talmud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZI</td>
<td>Ben Zvi Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJP</td>
<td>Early Judeo-Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUC</td>
<td>Klau Library, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>The Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>Judeo-Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFJ</td>
<td>(the) Kaifeng Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH</td>
<td>(the) Kaifeng Haggadah/Haggadoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms (pl. MSS)</td>
<td>Manuscript/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLI</td>
<td>National Library of Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Neo-Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>Judeo-Persian Haggadah contained within the earliest known Persian Prayer Book, JTS 4522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Sephardic Haggadah as represented in Guggenheimer’s The Scholar’s Haggadah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCHM</td>
<td>Unpublished Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Hebrew Union College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yer.</td>
<td>Jerusalem Talmud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YH</td>
<td>Yemenite Haggadah as represented in Guggenheimer’s The Scholar’s Haggadah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### JUDEO-PERSIAN FONTS CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>ص</td>
<td>ص</td>
<td>ن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>ب</td>
<td>ض</td>
<td>ض</td>
<td>ن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>ن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>ت</td>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>Not represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>ج</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>Not represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>ن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>خ</td>
<td>ک</td>
<td>ک</td>
<td>ن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>د</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>ن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>ز</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>ن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>ز</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>ن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>ش</td>
<td>ش</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>ن</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th>Examples from Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>پدران</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>آ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ی</td>
<td>تدیر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ه</td>
<td>ابراشته</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>موج</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ی</td>
<td>ای</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphabets</td>
<td>Transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>א</td>
<td>ālep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב</td>
<td>bêt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>gimel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>dālet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>hé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י</td>
<td>wāw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>zayin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>hêt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ס</td>
<td>tēt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>yôd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>kāp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>lāmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>mêm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ס</td>
<td>nūn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ע</td>
<td>sāmek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>פ</td>
<td>‘ayin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צ</td>
<td>pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>qôp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ר</td>
<td>rēš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ש</td>
<td>šin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>tāw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Using ב as a dummy consonant for all except furtive patah.
INTRODUCTION

Passover Haggadah

Throughout the Jewish Diaspora, the Haggadah is recited in the home on the first two nights of the annual festival of Passover, beginning on the fifteenth of the Jewish month of Nisan. The Hebrew term הָדָגַּה (haggādāh), ‘telling,’ recounts the Israelites’ exodus from Egypt and commemorates God’s hand in freeing His people from bondage. As the narrative goes, Pharaoh’s refusal to let the Israelites go free results in God smiting the Egyptians’ first-born. Pharaoh finally relents and the Israelites find freedom from slavery.

The religious service called seder, ‘order,’ refers to the specific order of recitation of the Passover liturgy, the performance of rituals and the consumption of ceremonial food such as unleavened bread, bitter herbs and four cups of wine. So central to their history and liturgy is this narrative that it is incumbent on Jews to remember the Exodus every Passover and reflect upon its relevance to their lives. In earlier times, works were written in manuscript form copied by scribes; in this way, they were passed from generation to generation. Since the advent of the printing press, thousands of Haggadah editions have been published and each year, new renditions are produced.

The historical origins of the seder have been traced to the first century CE and rituals such as reclining while eating, observed in Greco-Roman banquets, are preserved to the present day. The text of the Haggadah is comprised of passages from the Hebrew Bible as well as rabbinic legal and homiletic excerpts from Mishnah, Tosefta, Mekilta, Sifre and the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds. The earliest sources, disseminated orally from sometime before the destruction of the Second Temple in the first century CE until the sixth century, emphasized ritual and offered little detail regarding the text. Only once rabbinic sources were committed to writing in the eighth century was there more information about the text and instructions as to performance of rituals.

In general terms, Haggadoth currently used in various communities are characterized by textual uniformity. Important to note, however, is that over the course of centuries, as Jews acculturated into diaspora
introduction

communities, gradual variations developed with respect to prayers, hymns and instruction for rituals. The earliest basis for differences were from the Eretz Israel and Babylonian centers of learning. The Haggadah version found in the prayer books of R. Amram Gaon and R. Saadiah Gaon, heads of the Babylonian community, came to be observed by the majority of Jews.

As Babylonia was replaced by Central and Northern Europe (Ashkenaz) and Spain and North Africa (Sephard) as a center of learning, further variances developed. With the invention of the printing press, however, the tendency was toward uniformity; consequently, traditions that had diverged into branches were once again aligned. Today, scholars designate the Haggadoth of Ashkenazic, Sephardic and Yemenite Jews as the three main versions and the most distinguishing features are observed in ritual.

In recent years, published historical and comparative studies have helped to highlight the development of traditions in major communities, namely Ashkenazic, Sephardic and Yemenite. They include Heinrich Guggenheimer’s *The Scholar’s Haggadah*, Shmuel with Ze’ev Safrai’s *Hagadat Hazal*,¹ Menahem Kasher’s *Haggadah Shlemah*² and Joseph Tabor’s *JPS Commentary*. For the purpose of the present study, they were used to compare other versions of the Passover Haggadoth with the two manuscripts belonging to the Kaifeng community. Manuscripts of Judeo-Persian (hereafter JP) Haggadah and JP translations or commentaries of Haggadoth consulted to examine variants include The Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS) 4522;³ National Library of Israel, (NLI) 8° 3199 and 8° 1383 and the Ben Zvi Institute’s (BZI) 4598 as well as the published Haggadoth of Shimon Hakham (in Judeo-Tajik, second edition, Jerusalem, 1963/64) and Hayim Moreh (Tehran, 1933/34).

¹ Shmuel Safrai, with Ze’ev Safrai, eds., *חספִלעַעַגְדַה: לַעַעַגְדַה שְׁלֵם* (Jerusalem: Karta, 1998).
³ Abbreviated PH, this manuscript was the source for the comparative charts of our study as well the annotated translation unless otherwise stated. It appears in the earliest extant Judeo-Persian prayer book, most likely in use until the beginning of the seventeenth century. A facsimile of the Ms was published together with valuable Introduction and notes in Shlomoh Tal, *נספח העפילא על יהודי פריס* (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute, 1980).
Jews in Kaifeng

Jews have visited and stayed in China for more than a millennium. There were already references to Jews arriving in China during the Tang Dynasty (618–907) by Arab traders. Abu-Zaid’s mention of a massacre of Muslims, Christians and Jews in Canton in 878/9 confirms the presence of Jews in China at that time. By the Mongolian Yuan Dynasty (1279/80–1368), there were references to Zhuhu, ‘Jews,’ usually along with Muslims, in various cities in China. For example, there were Jews in Hangchow, Ningpo and Beijing. Eventually these ancient Jewish communities disappeared. Only the Kaifeng Community survived until it came into contact with Europeans and left behind material culture for us to study. There were probably Chinese Jews in other Chinese cities as well but in our study we only address the Chinese Jews in Kaifeng.4

Kaifeng was one of the capitals of ancient China; for this reason, many foreigners arrived in the city for diplomatic and commercial purposes. According to their 1489 inscription, the Kaifeng Jews (hereafter, KFJ) were allowed to settle in Kaifeng by an emperor of the Song Dynasty (960–1126). Apparently, they were traders because they mentioned that they came bearing western clothing. According to the same inscription, they built a synagogue in 1163. We know from their liturgical texts that KFJ observed all the usual Jewish festivals including the Sabbath, Day of Atonement, New Year, Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacle, Hannukah, Purim, and the Ninth of Av.

In 1605, a Chinese Jew, Ai T’ien, sought out the Jesuit priest Matteo Ricci in Peking (present day Beijing) because he heard that Ricci believed in one God and was not a Muslim. Ai wrongly concluded that Ricci was a Jew. In 1642, during the rebellion of Li Tzu-Cheng, the City was flooded and the synagogue, destroyed. It was subsequently rebuilt and thirteen new Torah scrolls were produced and placed in the newly rebuilt synagogue; an inscription was made to commemorate the occasion in 1663. This was probably the peak of the Community’s success in Chinese society.

From 1644–1911, China was ruled by the Ching Dynasty which, from 1723 onwards, became hostile towards foreigners. Thereafter, Jews in

---

Kaifeng were isolated from other Jewish communities in the Diaspora. Today, a small number of Chinese Jews remain in Kaifeng. Assimilation contributed to the Community’s eventual dissolution, a gradual process noted from the seventeenth century by visitors. When two Chinese Protestant delegates finally made contact with KFJ in 1850, they were almost completely assimilated.

Study of the Kaifeng Jews

The sources available for studying KFJ may be categorized into four divisions: stone inscriptions of 1489, 1512, 1663, 1679 and other Chinese inscriptions from their synagogue dated mostly between 1656 and 1688, extant Hebrew manuscripts, reports of visitors to the Community, and the Chinese local gazetteers. The Hebrew writings of the Jews of Kaifeng include a Chinese-Hebrew Memorial Book, scrolls of the Pentateuch, sections of the Pentateuch and liturgical texts, including two copies of their Passover Haggadah.

A sizable body of contemporary literature on KFJ exists. Noteworthy general works that offer good discussions of their origins, history and culture include Bishop William White’s Chinese Jews: A Compilation of Matters Relating to the Jews of Kai-feng Fu, Donald Leslie’s Survival of the Chinese Jews: The Jewish Community of Kaifeng and Michael Pollak’s Mandarins, Jews and Missionaries: The Jewish Experience in the Chinese Empire. Xu Xin’s The Jews of Kaifeng, China: History, Culture, and Religion and Legends of the Chinese Jews of Kaifeng are also easily accessible to the English-speaking readership. An anthology of studies by Chinese scholars has been collected and translated into English by Sidney Shapiro (1984). The collection of essays in two volumes (both published in 1971) by Hyman Kublin should also be mentioned. Those who wish to check the extensive work produced in this field should consult the bibliographies compiled by Rudolf Loewenthal (1939, 1946), Michael Pollak (1993) and Donald Leslie (1998).

Despite the sizable body of literature written by contemporary authors on KFJ, relatively few studies are devoted to the Hebrew manuscripts, which in addition to the two Haggadoth that are the subject of the present study, include sections of the Pentateuch, hymns and liturgy. Notable

---

in this regard is Michael Pollak's study, *Torah Scrolls of the Chinese Jews* (1975) now available on the internet and the *Chinese-Hebrew Memorial Book* by Donald Leslie (1984). There are only three works specifically devoted to the Kaifeng Haggadah (hereafter, KH); they include a facsimile of HUC Ms 927 with introductory comments by Cecil Roth and B.D. Drenger (1967), unpublished notes made by Israel Lehman (n.d.), and an unpublished master’s thesis submitted to the Hebrew Union College, New York, by Mark Loeb (1975).

Our textual study focuses on the Community’s Haggadah, analyzing all the languages represented—Hebrew, Chinese and Judeo-Persian. Its purpose is to gain an understanding of the Kaifeng Jews’ liturgy as represented in their Passover Haggadah. Our analysis of content and order of service suggests adherence to an early Babylonian rite.

The most obvious indication of a connection with the Persian rite is the fact that Judeo-Persian is used for instructional notes (in the body of the text as well as in the margins), the blessing of redemption and the translation of the Hebrew hymn (beginning with page 56) that follows. Textual analysis of KH also shows commonality between it and the Yemenite and the early Persian versions. They share features addressed in the Hebrew transcription of KH and discussion of the order of service. Most of the parallels with respect to content and vocalization between the Chinese and the Yemenite texts also correspond to the Judeo-Persian. In addition, there are instances where the Persian and Chinese share the same variants not found in the Yemenite. Moreover, our study found significant uniformity of JP vocabulary and features of language when comparing KH to JP Haggadoth and Haggadah commentaries or translations ranging from the fourteenth to the early twentieth century CE. It may be reasonably concluded that these manuscripts were likely written in the vernacular Jewish language specific to the tradition with which the Community identified. KH adheres to a Persian scribal tradition of faithfully copying the text; therefore, at least with respect to Passover, there is a direct connection between KH and the Persian Passover rite. We suggest that the JP found in KH is part of a scribal tradition that endured in Persian-speaking communities into modernity.
Physical Description

The two extant Kaifeng Haggadoth labeled HUC Ms 927 and HUC Ms 931 are housed along with fifty-seven other manuscripts in the Klau Library of the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati. They were purchased in 1851 from the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews. Both manuscripts are approximately 7.5” × 6.5” in length and width respectively. The scripts are rather large in relation to the size of the pages, perhaps in order to facilitate reading. Furthermore, there was a deliberate attempt to keep the number of lines on each page to seven. This also meant that the script had to be rather large. The difference in script style between the manuscripts is notable. HUC Ms 927 shares characteristics of Chinese script whereas HUC Ms 931 more closely resembles the Near Eastern square type.

The outer boards or end papers are identical for both manuscripts; they appear to have been sewn by conservators in London, though signs of original thread remain. The original pages are made up of several folds of paper. HUC Ms 927 is relatively rough to the touch while HUC Ms 931 is smoother and more porous. Original pages of both manuscripts are also marked by lines impressed in them to facilitate even, equidistant lines of text. The script is written underneath each line. Pages deemed in London to be too fragile (HUC Ms 927 from beginning of text to page 20, and pages 54–96, and HUC Ms 931 page 1 and pages 98–99) seem to have been mounted onto new paper. Both manuscripts show signs of water damage and both have darkened top and bottom edges from handling.

The first page in the present version of HUC Ms 927 is missing; it begins with page two of the Haggadah service. This page does not appear to be the original but a later addition. Unlike the other pages that follow, it is not vocalized. The script is also different; for example, the א is less elaborate than that of the following pages, where it is written almost like the number ‘3.’ Furthermore, the tendency to lengthen the horizontal stroke of the last letters to conform to an invisible left margin is much
more pronounced here than in the other pages. The pen used to write appears to be wedge-like with the result that the letters have come out broad in the horizontal strokes and thinner in the vertical strokes. Indeed we learn from Father Gabriel Brotier that they used sharpened bamboo, like quill pens, for writing. The pen used to write the rest of HUC Ms 927 is like a marker pen, with the result that the strokes are evenly broad. They look like Chinese calligraphy written with a Chinese ink brush, although, in this case, the words are Hebrew. Finally, this page is more like pages 48–52 of HUC Ms 931 (also later additions) than the rest of HUC Ms 927.

Two methods of numbering pages are found in HUC Ms 927. The first type is Arabic numerals on every page, presumably added by an individual at a later date. They follow the sequence of pages as found in the present form of the manuscript. The other method of numbering is in Hebrew. The Hebrew numbers are written on every other page. The Hebrew numbers ת, נ and ט (with numeric values 7, 8, 9 respectively) are found on the top corner of pages 10, 12 and 14 (according to the Arabic numbers). These page numbers are all on the top right side of the manuscript when it is opened. Presumably the numbers from ת (1) to ט (9) were originally written on the top right corner of the pages. If we calculate backward from these numbers, however, we find that there are not enough pages in the present form of the manuscript for it to go back to ת (1). Indeed three pages are missing from HUC Ms 927—a page before page 1 and two pages between pages 8 and 9.

Page number י (i.e., 10) is faded and cannot be seen clearly. We would expect ת (11) on the top right corner of the next page and indeed in that location there is a Hebrew number seemingly blotted out. Instead ת is written on the left page. From this point onwards, all the left pages are numbered in sequence until ת (31). Thereafter, no more Hebrew numbers are found. It cannot be verified whether the scribe stopped at ת or finished numbering the book, only to have them fade away over time. From what can be seen now, it appears that the scribe never finished numbering the pages.

---

It is not clear why page א was written on the left page nor why the numbers were subsequently written on the left pages. It may have been an attempt to correct numberings on the right side of the book from י to , i.e., י, , , , , etc. Perhaps the scribe who had numbered the pages in this manner was not familiar with Hebrew numerals. A subsequent scribe who made amendments may have decided to desist from crossing out the mistakes on the first two pages after י, i.e., כ and ל and putting the correct numberings next to the crossed-out mistakes. Instead of crossing out the wrong numbers, the correct numbers were written on the left pages. Since only alternate pages were numbered, it did not matter whether they were written on the right or left pages as long as they were in sequence.

Most likely, the Arabic and Hebrew numberings were both later additions. The Arabic numbers were just as unnecessary as the Hebrew; they were put in by an individual who was comfortable with Arabic numbers and needed them for easy reference. The sequential order of the pages was originally marked by writing the first word of the following page on the lower left corner of the pages on the right. This method of marking the order is found throughout with the exception of four pages. Presumably, these four pages were also marked in this way; however, the text has faded away with time. The reason the marking was made on the pages on the right has to do with the fact that unlike English, the Hebrew script is read from right to left. Manuscript pages open to the right instead of to the left; therefore, the pages on the right were the backs of the sheets of paper. They wrote the first word of the next sheet of paper on the lower left corner for reference.

It is possible that HUC Ms 927 was not used after it came into its present form. The missing page י (i.e., page 6) meant that the left page of י (which should have been on the reverse side of the י page) is now the left page of י instead. The last line, which straddles the two pages, reads, “You have given to us, O LORD our God, Sabbaths for rest, festive days to rejoice, pilgrimage and seasons for gladness . . . their enemies in the sea . . .” The missing page, found in HUC Ms 931, continues with, “(You have given us) this day of rest, this good day of holy assembly, this day of the festival of unleavened bread, the season of our liberation, (You have given us) in love a remembrance of the Exodus from Egypt.” It is the continuation we expect from comparison with other Haggadoth. Since the numberings are correct despite the missing pages, the manuscript must have originally had all the pages. The Hebrew numbering was written in before the pages were lost. Page י (pages 8–9 in Arabic numbers) does
show a split in the binding where a page could be missing. The most economical explanation is that HUC Ms 927 had all the pages but some were lost after the Community stopped using the manuscript in their Passover celebration.

The Hebrew numbering of HUC Ms 931 is much less complicated. Unlike HUC Ms 927, the Hebrew numbers are indicated on all pages. For pages on the right, they are placed on the lower left hand corner, usually to the left of the last word of the last sentence. In pages on the left of the manuscript, they appear on the lower right corner, slightly below and to the left of the first word of the last line. Although a few cannot be seen, they appear to be numbered from א (1) to ו (100). א and ו are confused on pages 18 and 19, 28 and 29, 38 and 39, 58 and 59, 68 and 69, 88 and 89, 98 and 99.

Like HUC Ms 927, the sequence of the pages in HUC Ms 931 was also marked by Arabic numbers and the first word of the facing page on the lower left hand corner. Although it is intact, pages 78 and 79 (according to the Arabic numbers), containing the JP translation of the Hebrew text, are out of sequence. The correct sequence (77, 79, 78 and 80) is preserved in HUC Ms 927. The fact that the first words of subsequent pages, written at the bottom of the pages, are in the correct sequence indicates that this mistake was not present in the original form of HUC Ms 931. The misplacement likely occurred at a later stage of the history of the manuscript, perhaps when the manuscript was bound into its present form by an individual who could not read the JP.

The text of HUC Ms 931 has sustained more water damage than HUC Ms 927. Exposure to water caused the ink to fade and words to be imprinted on the opposite facing pages. Water damage may have occurred during floods that inundated Kaifeng. Efforts were made to continue using the manuscript by darkening parts that faded and replacing a few missing pages (pages 48–52). Also worth noting is that the Hebrew words on pages 52 to 56 are not vocalized. With regard to pages 77 to 79, the imprinted words follow the sequence of pages in the original form, indicating that the pages in the manuscript were in the correct sequence before they sustained water damage. Like Drenger, we chose to publish the facsimile of HUC Ms 927 due to its relative clarity and legibility.

\[2 \text{ instead of \( \overline{\text{נ}} \) are used to signify the numerical value 100.}\]
The pointed and unpointed sections of the two KH manuscripts are largely the same. A substantial portion towards the conclusion lacks pointing for at least two possible reasons. It may be that originally they were fully pointed but as the Community read less and less of the Haggadah text, the need for pointing diminished. It could be that by the time HUC Ms 931 and HUC Ms 927 were produced, only the beginning portions of the Haggadah were pointed because they were the only portions read in the service. More likely, the manuscripts were originally unpointed. There was no need to vocalize the text because an oral tradition had been passed on with it. We learn from their exchange with Father Jean Domenge, a visiting Jesuit priest, that scholars from the West visited them and taught Kaifeng scribes how to point the Pentateuch and, presumably, the liturgical texts as well. They learned enough about pointing to put vowels in the Haggadoth. However, because they were not fully familiar with the system of pointing taught to them, they only pointed a little more than half of the text. Inconsistent pointing in HUC Ms 927 and HUC Ms 931 is likely one result of a half-hearted effort to vocalize texts.

It appears from HUC Ms 927 that the script and the pointing were not written down at the same time—while the script is evenly dark, the pointing is lighter in many sections. If the scribe was writing down the pointing at the same time as the script, we would expect both the script and pointing to be equally dark or light. The disparity in color suggests that the scribe either wrote all the scripts first and then added the pointing or, less likely, he wrote down the text section by section and then added the pointing after each section was completed. The same can be discerned in HUC Ms 931 although it is only apparent upon careful observation of the text.

**Dating**

The script of the two manuscripts is sufficiently distinct to suggest they were not written by the same scribe; as such, their dates of composition must be dealt with separately. Furthermore, their unique vocalization shows that they were produced locally rather than brought over from abroad. Since they do not have colophons that indicate their date of

---

3 A sizable portion of passages from the Torah are pointed.
composition, approximate dates must be inferred from comparison with dated Kaifeng Hebrew manuscripts in the Klau Library of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.

Israel Lehman, curator of manuscripts of the HUC from 1968–1978, produced an eight-volume unpublished work in which he documented the manuscripts of the archives. In his entries, he dated HUC Ms 927 to the seventeenth and HUC Ms 931 to the eighteenth century. He described the script of HUC Ms 927 as “Persian Hebrew semi-square characters” and noted that HUC Ms 931 script on pages 48–52 was different from the rest of the manuscript. Lehman identified the script in these pages as “Chinese Hebrew square characters” and the remainder as “Ashkenazi square characters.” He did not mention that they were very likely replacements. The paper appears newer than those in the other pages. The textual quality is also different, the ink being darker and clearer. These were likely pages that a later scribe darkened to render them legible.

**HUC Ms 931**

We will leave pages 48–51 aside for the moment and concentrate on the rest of the Haggadah. The script is beautifully and neatly written. Per Lehman’s description, the letters are “square characters”; some, e.g., ו, י, ל, and ת, are somewhat angular in corners while others, e.g., כ, ה, ו, are rounded. The words are well spaced. There is a slight tendency to elongate the horizontal stroke of some letters towards the end of some lines, apparently to justify the line to an invisible left margin. There is also a tendency for the letters to tilt slightly to the left. When compared with other Kaifeng Hebrew manuscripts, the script of HUC Ms 931 is closest to that of HUC Mss 951 and 981. The following is a table showing some words they have in common.

---

4 Unpublished Catalog of the Hebrew Manuscript in the Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion Library, ad loc. Hereafter cited as UCHM. In a private correspondence, Lehman’s colleague and friend, David Weisberg, suggested that when colophons were unavailable, Lehman used his extensive knowledge of orthography to arrive at approximate dates. Based on his notes, Lehman also took script into account.

5 Cecil Roth did mention that some pages were replacements in his introduction to the published facsimile.

6 C.f., HUC Ms 932, 12–14; HUC Ms 934, 1, 4; HUC Ms 955, 10, 16, 20.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUC Ms 981</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(page 4, line 2)</td>
<td>(page 1, line 2)</td>
<td>(page 16, line 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 1, line 3)</td>
<td>(page 2, line 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 1, line 3)</td>
<td>(page 4, line 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 8, line 2)</td>
<td>(page 2, line 3)</td>
<td>(page 8, line 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 2, line 4)</td>
<td>(page 3, line 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 2, line 5)</td>
<td>(page 2, line 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 10, line 5)</td>
<td>(page 4, line 2)</td>
<td>(page 2, line 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 7, line 5)</td>
<td>(page 4, line 3)</td>
<td>(page 12, line 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUC Ms 981</td>
<td>HUC Ms 931</td>
<td>HUC Ms 951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 8, line 5)</td>
<td>(page 4, line 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 5, line 2)</td>
<td>(page 5, line 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 3, line 2)</td>
<td>(page 5, line 7)</td>
<td>(page 11, line 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 6, line 3)</td>
<td>(page 5, line 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 6, line 6)</td>
<td>(page 6, line 7)</td>
<td>(page 4, line 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Page 8, line 7)</td>
<td>(page 9, line 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 8, line 4)</td>
<td>(page 11, line 5)</td>
<td>(page 34, line 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 4, line 9)</td>
<td>(page 13, line 5)</td>
<td>(page 2, line 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUC Ms 981</td>
<td>HUC Ms 931</td>
<td>HUC Ms 951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 5, line 4)</td>
<td>(page 13, line 5)</td>
<td>(page 5, line 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 4, line 6)</td>
<td>(page 18, line 7)</td>
<td>(page 3, line 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 4, line 6)</td>
<td>(page 27, line 1)</td>
<td>(page 3, line 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 2, line 2)</td>
<td>(page 29, line 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 1, line 3)</td>
<td>(page 37, line 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 10, line 5)</td>
<td>(page 39, line 4)</td>
<td>(page 12, line 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 1, line 2)</td>
<td>(page 39, line 6)</td>
<td>(page 11, line 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scripts are similar enough to suggest that they might have been written by the same scribe. This is significant because the dates of composition for HUC MSS 951 (1619–1620) and 981 (1619–1621) are known from their colophons. They place the origin of HUC Ms 931 before 1642, when Kaifeng was almost destroyed by a flood and the synagogue of KFJ was destroyed along with most of their religious texts. KFJ rebuilt their synagogue and restored their religious texts. The 1663 inscription is a witness to the dedication of their new synagogue, where thirteen Torah scrolls were placed.

A pre-1642 dating is consistent with the condition of HUC Ms 931. Pages 47 and 53–99 have suffered extensive water damage. A great deal of effort was exerted to restore the manuscript. Many words were rewritten to make them legible. Pages 48 to 52 were new pages added later, presumably to replace those that were too badly damaged to be restored. Thus, HUC Ms 931 bears the marks of a manuscript that was saved from a flood and restored.

We can also establish the terminus ad quem of HUC Ms 931 by comparing it to HUC Ms 962.

---

7 Lehman, UCHM, ad loc.
The script of HUC Ms 962 is very similar to HUC Ms 931, but much more prominent in HUC Ms 962 is the tendency to elongate horizontal strokes. The elongation of horizontal strokes is very prominent in texts that Lehman dated to as late as the eighteenth century. Even more importantly, HUC Ms 962 has not suffered water damage. This is obvious from a comparison of the papers of both manuscripts. Unlike HUC Ms 931, the script of HUC Ms 962 is dark and clear. Lehman identified the script of HUC Ms 962 as Chinese Hebrew square characters and dated the
booklet to the seventeenth century. A mid to late seventeenth century dating is plausible as the manuscript was likely a replacement of Torah portions written after the 1642 flood. The elongation of horizontal strokes and its lack of water damage indicate that HUC Ms 962 was produced later than the original version of HUC Ms 931.

**HUC Ms 927**

As mentioned earlier, the first page of the manuscript is obviously a later addition. We will address its date later. The script of the remainder of HUC Ms 927 is closest to that of HUC Ms 925, pages 11–26 and pages 29–45. According to Lehman the scripts in these pages are Persian Hebrew semi-square characters and they should be dated to the seventeenth century. This is the same plausible conclusion he came to regarding HUC Ms 927 (except for the first page) and its approximate date. It should be noted that pages 1–10 and 27–28 of HUC Ms 925 are later additions, while pages 46 to the end of this manuscript are illegible. Lehman dated pages 1–10 and 27 to the eighteenth century.

The similarities with respect to scripts dated to the seventeenth century in both MSS are unequivocal. Neither HUC Ms 927 nor HUC Ms 925 elongates the horizontal strokes of certain letters. Also, unlike most of the other MSS, where the horizontal strokes tend to be thicker than the vertical strokes, the strokes in these two MSS tend to be more or less of equal thickness. Both appear to have been written with a Chinese ink brush. The ב is written with an exaggerated long vertical stroke, not infrequently with a slight curve to the left at the apex but without the prominent characteristic ‘hook’ at the top as in the other MSS. The horizontal stroke of the י slants upwards while the whole consonant leans to the left.

---

8 Lehman, UCHM, ad loc.
9 Lehman, UCHM, ad loc.
10 Ibid.
A major difference between the two manuscripts is that the paper used for HUC Ms 925 is of a creme hue, similar to that used for HUC Ms 931. The paper used for HUC Ms 927, like that of HUC MSS 951 and 981, is darker.

The script on page 1 in HUC Ms 925 is similar to the script on pages 1–10, 27–28 of HUC Ms 925 and pages 48–52 of HUC Ms 931. The elongation of the horizontal strokes of some consonants is prominent in
these texts. The use of a quill-like writing instrument meant that the script tends to have broad horizontal and narrow vertical strokes. In fact, the scripts are so alike that they may well be written by the same scribe.
Another manuscript with script similar to those of the above texts is HUC Ms 926. It was compiled to list the deceased members of the Community after the flood of 1642. Leslie, following Laufer, dated HUC Ms 926 sometime between 1660 and 1670.  

Lehman also labeled the script of HUC Ms 926 as Chinese Hebrew square.\textsuperscript{12} All the characteristics mentioned above are found in HUC Ms 926; however, it was written by a different scribe. The left vertical stroke of \( \text{ת} \) in HUC Ms 926 is straight rather than wavy. The left side of consonants like \( \text{א} \) and \( \text{מ} \) are written well below the invisible bottom margin, at times giving the impression that the consonants are tilted to one side. Since HUC Ms 926 is dated to about 1660–1670, page 1 of HUC Ms 927, pages 1–10, 27–30 of HUC Ms 925 and pages 48–52 of HUC Ms 931 should be dated to the later part of the seventeenth century or, as suggested by Lehman, to the eighteenth century.

**Relationship**

HUC MSS 931 and 927 are most likely from the same textual and liturgical tradition. There are many instances where they are similar to each other in contrast to other Haggadoth. The Chinese negative particle is found in the margin on pages 82, 86, 90 and 96 of HUC Ms 931. The same particle is found in the exact corresponding pages in HUC Ms 927.\textsuperscript{13} They are also practically identical in their JP text and marginal notes, including page 79 in HUC Ms 927 and page 82 in HUC Ms 931. In addition, KH have the same instances of phonetic transcription, as in \textit{שאהארומ} instead of \textit{יֵרוֹאְמשֵׁאָה} on their second page.\textsuperscript{14} Sometimes, they have verb forms that differ from all others; e.g., \textit{Niphal} instead of \textit{Piel},\textsuperscript{15} consecutive imperfect instead of perfect,\textsuperscript{16} or \textit{Piel} imperfect instead of an infinitive construct.\textsuperscript{17} The length and order of the liturgy is also somewhat different from the other traditions.\textsuperscript{18} Finally, they share the same pointed and unpointed sections, as well as many unique vocalizations that appear to be local developments.

It is possible that one manuscript was copied from the other or that both were copies made from other texts. There is no way to know for certain. What we can be sure of is that whereas HUC Ms 931 was badly damaged by water and underwent extensive restoration, this was not true

\textsuperscript{12} Lehman, UCHM, ad loc.
\textsuperscript{13} On pages 79, 83, 87, and 93.
\textsuperscript{14} “Haggadah Text,” footnote 8.
\textsuperscript{15} “Haggadah Text,” footnote 453.
\textsuperscript{16} “Haggadah Text,” footnote 491.
\textsuperscript{17} “Haggadah Text,” footnote 501.
\textsuperscript{18} See "Chapter Five: Order of The Service."
of HUC Ms 927. Thus one can not plausibly argue that HUC Ms 931 was produced to replace HUC Ms 927. HUC Ms 927 is still highly legible even today; this was the reason it was chosen as the text for the 1967 as well as the present published facsimile edition of KH. It is more plausible to argue that HUC Ms 927 was produced to replace HUC Ms 931 than vice versa. Furthermore, in many cases when the Haggadoth differ, HUC Ms 931 has the expected forms. This also suggests that HUC Ms 931 was not copied from HUC Ms 927.

The more likely possibility is that both manuscripts were copied from one or more Haggadoth. There are a few instances in which this appears to be the best explanation for the divergences between HUC Ms 927 and HUC Ms 931. For example, there is an extra שֵׁהָשֶׁת written at the end of the first line on page 5 in HUC Ms 931. This word is not found in the corresponding page, page 4, in HUC Ms 927. The reverse happens on the first lines of page 56 in HUC Ms 927 and page 59 in HUC Ms 931. In this case, HUC Ms 927 has an extraneous הַזָּמֵׂה which is not found in HUC Ms 931. Furthermore, three unintelligible strokes found on the first line of page 57 in HUC Ms 927 are not found in the corresponding page in HUC Ms 931. The sôp pâsûq that is written as an ‘I’ in HUC Ms 927 is written correctly in HUC Ms 931. In addition HUC Ms 927 has instead of בֵּשֵׁי, as attested in HUC Ms 931. On the other hand, the archaic verb נַזְיָד is written as two separate words in HUC Ms 931 but retained as one word in HUC Ms 927. Also, HUC Ms 931 has instead of בְּהֵי, but the expected form is found in HUC Ms 927. In one instance HUC Ms 927 and HUC Ms 931 retain part of the expected spelling, i.e., הַזָּמֵׂה and הַזָּמֵׂה respectively. In summary, if one of the manuscripts was copied from the other we would expect the manuscripts to have the same readings in these cases. These differences suggest that they were copied from another text/s.

It stands to reason that the Community would have more than two Haggadoth, especially since at the height of their presence KFJ numbered a few thousand. Domenge mentioned that KFJ had qualms about keeping

20 “Haggadah Text,” footnote 42.
21 “Haggadah Text,” footnote 436.
22 “Haggadah Text,” footnote 442.
23 “Haggadah Text,” footnote 447.
25 “Haggadah Text,” footnote 467.
26 “Haggadah Text,” footnote 369.
the Bible or any book in Hebrew at home. Only a few prominent individuals in the Community had a Bible in their possession. It would not be too far a stretch to consider that this would be true of the Passover Haggadah as well. Gozani mentioned that they kept a large collection of booklets comprised of Torah portions and other prayer books in a number of ancient chests in their synagogue. Therefore, it was likely that they had more than two Haggadoth between them and they kept them in their synagogue and copied other manuscripts from them.

28 *Juifs de Chine*, 139–140 [French], 147 [English].
29 *Juifs de Chine*, 86 [French], 99 [English].
CHAPTER TWO

THE COMMUNITY’S KNOWLEDGE OF
HEBREW AS REFLECTED IN ITS HAGGADAH

Introduction

It is probable that the initial groups of Jews who arrived in China knew Hebrew because they brought with them Torah scrolls and Hebrew liturgical texts; however, by the nineteenth century KFJ had lost their knowledge of Hebrew.\(^1\) The discussion here concerns their degree of Hebrew knowledge in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, the timeframe determined by the sources at hand.

Evidence is mainly drawn from KH but portions of letters (mostly unpublished until two decades ago) from Jesuits missionaries, Gozani and Domenge, will also be cited to shed further light on the matter. To facilitate the readers’ review of the examples provided most are cited from the facsimile of HUC Ms 927. The topic will be treated in two parts, namely internal and external evidence in support of and against whether KFJ understood Hebrew and the extent of their knowledge.

Internal Evidence

We begin with evidence that suggests KFJ understood Hebrew. The use of the Chinese negative particle \textit{bù} (不), ‘no, not, don’t,’ found in HUC Ms 927 on pages 79, 83, 87 (twice), and 93, is one instance which appears to demonstrate that the scribe understood what he was reading. The same Chinese word was written in the corresponding pages in HUC Ms 931 (pages 82, 86, 90 and 96). Since in the first instance it was written next to \textit{ונלאל} (‘not to us’), it was initially thought that it was to explain the word ש; however the next few times that the word occurs, it is not written next to a negative Hebrew particle. Rather it is found at the beginning

of the sections on Psalms 115, 116, 117, and 118, part of the Hallel, ‘praise,’ recited towards the end of the Passover Haggadah. The fact that the negative particle is written exactly at the beginning of the Psalms is further indication that the scribe could read the Hebrew. Furthermore, the prescription was issued after the Jews had settled in Kaifeng rather than transmitted from the West.

Another convincing argument in favor of KFJ knowing Hebrew is that the text of HUC Ms 927 was emended. There were many errors in the copying of the text. By ‘error’ we do not mean textual or grammatical divergences in comparison with other Haggadoth but rather errors as perceived by later scribes of HUC Ms 927. Either the scribe himself or someone else corrected the errors usually by inserting consonants and words that were mistakenly left out, as found on page 20 of HUC Ms 927. The first word of this page should be יודיה (yôdēyaʾ) found in HUC Ms 931. One of the ways the sequence of pages was marked was by writing the first word of the following page on the bottom left hand corner of the previous page. The term יודיה (yôdēyaʾ) was written on the bottom left hand corner of page 19 so we expect it to be the first word of page 20. However it is missing from the main text of page 20 in HUC Ms 927, although the rest of the page was copied correctly. The scribe noticed this error and wrote the word on the right margin next to where this word should appear.

Such corrections, quite numerous, offer some clues as to the degree of Hebrew knowledge possessed by KFJ. First, someone proficient in Hebrew took the trouble to check the copy of the Haggadah. Second, the concern about correct spelling and missing words indicates that at least the scribes who copied and checked the Haggadah understood what was written and intended to read it in their Passover service. If the Community kept the manuscripts in their synagogue without using them, they would not be concerned about correct spelling and missing words; therefore, they must have been using the text in their Passover celebration.

The same kind of argument can be made with regard to HUC Ms 931. Its text has been immersed in water, most likely due to the flood of 1642. Many pages, in particular the second half of the book, have watermarks and faded ink. Furthermore, the words of many pages are imprinted on the opposite facing pages, rendering the text quite unintelligible in certain places. Pages 48–52, in particular, were apparently too badly damaged to be of use and were replaced. Unlike the original pages of 48–52, the rest of the Haggadah is intelligible except that the ink in quite a number of pages has faded to the point where a scribe had to darken the
words. Since not all the words were darkened, darker words are found alongside fainter ones throughout. If the intent behind saving HUC Ms 931 was to merely preserve it in a chest in the synagogue, pages 48–52 would not have been restored. The effort to darken consonants and vowels in the manuscript was likely motivated by the practical consideration of rendering it legible for use. The effort at restoration suggests that they were reading HUC Ms 931 in their Passover celebration. The very fact that KFJ copied the Haggadoth and kept them in their synagogue indicates that they used them during Passover in the same manner that such manuscripts were used in other parts of the Jewish Diaspora.

An argument against the theory can also be made using internal evidence to suggest a lack of knowledge of Hebrew on the part of both scribes and the congregation. The Hebrew vocalization represented in the Haggadoth may be an indication that KFJ either were not familiar with Tiberian punctuation or did not follow the Tiberian Hebrew with which we are acquainted. It could also be that they pronounced Hebrew differently and vocalized the texts according to their unique pronunciation. Vocalization will be treated in the next chapter and will not be discussed here. Their unique vocalization does not necessarily prove that they did not know Hebrew, nor would not knowing how to vocalize Hebrew properly demonstrate a lack of understanding of what they were reading. These factors reflected two different levels of Hebrew competency not contingent upon one another.

Another instance that may show that the Haggadoth were not used with understanding has to do with missing pages in HUC Ms 927, one preceding the first page and another after the eighth page. The last sentence of page 8 does not flow into the first sentence of the following page; it reads, “You have given to us, O LORD our God, Sabbaths for rest, festive days to rejoice, pilgrimage and seasons for gladness” while the first sentence of next page begins with, “their enemies in the sea.” Not only has the narrative voice changed from the first person plural to the third (i.e., “us” to “their”), the sentence formed by joining these two clauses together does not make sense. The missing page, found in HUC Ms 931, continues with, “(You have given us) this day of rest, this good day of holy assembly, this day of the festival of unleavened bread, the season of our liberation, (You have given us) in love a remembrance of the Exodus from Egypt.” This is the continuation expected from comparison with other Haggadoth. This begs the question of whether they were still reading their Haggadah and, assuming so, whether they understood the text. It also calls into question the competency of the copying scribe.
Important to note is that HUC Ms 927 originally had all its pages. In its present form, it has three numbering systems. One of these is Hebrew numbering; enough of them are preserved to show that HUC Ms 927 originally had all the pages, including those currently missing. Apart from Hebrew numbers, the first word of the following page is written on the lower left hand corner opening to the right. The word written on the lower left hand corner of page 8 is the first word of the missing page found in HUC Ms 931; thus it is reasonable to assume that the scribe who copied HUC Ms 927 did not make a mistake. Furthermore, since HUC Ms 927 originally had all the missing pages it could have been used with understanding. The missing pages were likely lost only after the Haggadah had ceased to be used.

Apart from missing pages, there are also cases of phonetic transcription. On page 21 of HUC Ms 927 the word יָלָה 'to/for him' is wrongly written as אֹל 'not, no.' These two words sound the same (i.e., lô and lôʾ respectively); therefore those present at the recital of the Haggadah, presuming they understood what was being read, would not recognize the error in the text. This is not the only instance that such a mistake was made; on page 66 יָנָע is written for יָשָנ. Again, the two words sound the same when read aloud; thus, listeners would not pick up the mistake from the reading. The most likely explanation for mistakes of this nature is that the scribe did not consult the master copy for every letter and word. He might have read the whole line and then written it down from memory or it was dictated to him. The temptation to write from memory, and thus get the job done faster, was explicitly prohibited for scribes copying the Torah precisely to ensure that mistakes like the above would not occur.2

HUC Ms 931 presents us with another problem. Although it is intact, pages 77–79 are out of sequence. The correct sequence should be pages 77, 79, 78 and 80. Since pages 78 and 79 are two sides of the same piece of paper, they were most likely mistakenly misplaced in the binding process. The correct sequence is preserved in HUC Ms 927. It could be argued that the incorrect ordering of the pages betrays a lack of Hebrew knowledge. Furthermore, it could also call into question whether listeners understood what they were hearing. More plausible is that the

---

2 This was likely the reason why there were so many mistakes in some of their Torah Scrolls. Pollak (The Torah Scrolls of the Chinese Jews, 46, 111) rightly pointed out that had these scrolls been copied purely from dictation, as suggested by Schiller-Szinessy, there should be many more mistakes. On the other hand, many of the mistakes appear to be aural in nature.
original form of HUC Ms 931 did not have out of sequence pages. In fact, the first words of the following pages, written at the bottom of the previous pages, are in correct sequence. Furthermore, as mentioned above, the words of many pages are imprinted on the opposite facing pages. With regard to pages 77 to 79, the imprinted words correspond to the sequence of pages in the original form of the book, indicating that the pages in the book were in correct sequence before sustaining water damage. Presumably, the book was disassembled to be dried. The mistake was made when it was rebound into its present form. The Haggadah could still be used as long as the reader read the pages in correct sequence. Since only two pages written on a single piece of paper were affected, an effort to once again disassemble it to correct the error was not made.

External Evidence

The conclusion drawn from internal evidence agrees with the information gleaned from the letters of Gozani and Domenge. Much of the information given in their letters is presented in a historical framework by Michael Pollak and will not be repeated here. Pollak concludes that KFJ knew more Hebrew than was credited to them by the missionaries; our analysis of the Community’s surviving Passover Haggadoth supports his conclusion.

In discussing the letters, it should be noted that Gozani, by his own admission, did not know Hebrew whereas Domenge knew it well. This should inform our assessment of their views. In a letter dated 5 November, 1704, Gozani described how he tested the Kaifeng Jews’ Hebrew. He found the Hebrew names of the books at the end of his Bible and copied them on a piece of paper. The leader of the synagogue read them and told him they were the books of his Holy Scriptures. They compared the Hebrew Bible of the Jews with Gozani’s Bible and found them to be in agreement, indicating that the Jews could read Hebrew Scriptures with understanding. In another letter dated 25 August, 1712, Gozani wrote, “They use truly Hebrew letters, which they learn to read from boyhood, and many even to write, as I have seen with my own eyes, both reading

---
4 Pollak, Mandarin, Jews and Missionaries, 103, 108.
5 Juifs de Chine, 100 (English), 88 (French).
and writing; and whenever they write they use points to indicate vowels.” Although Gozani did not know Hebrew, he recognized the words to be Hebrew and the points for indicating vowels. It should also be noted that while he was not sure whether the books he saw in Kaifeng were written in Hebrew in 1704, he was quite sure the second time that they were “truly Hebrew letters.” He presumably learned Hebrew in the intervening eight years.

It is clear from the above that Gozani thought KFJ knew Hebrew. The argument that they must have understood Hebrew is further strengthened by the note that Gozani made in the margin of his 1712 letter. In it he commented, “They do not print any book in Chinese about their sacred mysteries; but they have only one small book printed in Chinese in which they give a brief account of their sect, for the Mandarins in times of persecution.” The observation is substantiated by the fact we do not have anything that the Jews wrote about their faith in Chinese nor are there any extant translations to Chinese of any portion of their Scriptures. Even the small book explaining their faith, mentioned by Gozani, is lost to us. Since they apparently did not translate their liturgy or Scripture into Chinese, they must have understood Hebrew in order to practice their faith. By the time of Gozani they had already been in China for about 700 years. It is unlikely that the Jews of Kaifeng managed to make copies of Scriptures and liturgy and practice their faith all those centuries without knowing Hebrew when they had no translation of their religious texts in Chinese.

In a letter dated 20 December 1724, Domenge explained that according to the Kaifeng Jews, they had had ongoing contact with Jewish scholars from the West; however they had stopped coming for about 200 years. Furthermore, the Community had lost its tu-ching-pen, ‘guide for studying the Bible.’ As a result, no one applied himself to the study of the Hebrew Bible by this time. Domenge thought that the tu-ching-pen was a

---

6 Juifs de Chine, 59 (English), 56 (French).
7 Juifs de Chine, 99 (English), 85–86 (French).
8 Juifs de Chine, 60 (English), 57 (French).
9 The time of their arrival in China is a much debated issue. See, for example, Pollak, Mandarins, Jews, and Missionaries, 255–273; Xu Xin, The Jews of Kaifeng, 17–27; or the various articles found in S. Shapiro, Jews in Old China (New York: Hippocrene Books, 1984; expanded edition, 2001). We think that their 1489 inscription, which states that they arrived in China during the Song Dynasty (960–1279), is the most likely to be true. It seems that the later the inscription, the earlier the claim of their arrival in China!
grammar book. Another possibility is that it was a *masorah*. In a letter dated 25 October, 1723, Domenge said that the Jews read the Song of Moses in his presence on 3 October, 1722. Perhaps he had grown familiar with their pronunciation since he did not reiterate how awful it was. He did, however, mention that according to KFJ, scholars from the West taught them to point the Scriptures. They did not know who these scholars were or precisely when they visited, except that it was long ago. Domenge himself speculated that the scholars were disciples of Jacob ben Naphtali because their pointing was different from the pointing of the Amsterdam Bible.

Domenge also mentioned that most Jews of Kaifeng did not know how to write Hebrew. Some declined to write while others wrote it poorly. He presented a copy of Hebrew script that the chief of the synagogue wrote in the presence of Gozani. The words are as follows:

```
מֵברֵכַת שֵׁם חָיָה אָלֵוהַת אֲלָמָד
ברוּ לוֹ האָלוֹהַת [יְדֵה] אֶשׁ כְּרַתַּהְוַה [עִקְרַת]
```

Blessed be his name, because my Lord, our God, is one;
Blessed be [the LORD], the name of his kingdom forever and ever.

Apart from the unique vocalization, also seen in their manuscripts, some of the consonants were written incorrectly. For example, the fourth word of the first line should be יִנְדֵא. The synagogue leader himself explained that the second word of the second line (which is in parenthesis because he was not willing to write it) is the same as the fourth word of the first line. What he meant was that they were both pronounced the same way, i.e., *Adonai*. He was willing to write יִנְדֵא (my lord) but not the Tetragrammaton, which was also pronounced as ‘*Adonai*’ by them. Even given consideration for the fact that the leader of the synagogue was an old man, and probably could not see clearly what he was writing,

---

10 *Juifs de Chine*, 188–189 (English), 183 (French).
11 A sort of notebook of the Masorites (scribes) who copied the Bible. In this book they presumably made notes about the text they were copying. Examples include the number of times a certain word occurs, the forms in which it occurs etc.
12 *Juifs de Chine*, 166–167 (English), 161–162 (French); so also, 189 (English), 183 (French).
13 To write Hebrew here means to write from memory in contrast to copying the Hebrew text.
14 *Juifs de Chine*, 149 (English), 142 (French).
15 *Juifs de Chine*, 157 (English), 156 (French). There is a facsimile of the words at the back of the book (Domenge 6, PL. XI Lecture de la Bible).
16 It is a Jewish tradition not to write or pronounce the Tetragrammaton.
the Hebrew words he wrote do tell us that he could not write Hebrew well. Gozani’s account is consistent with observations made by Domenge regarding their lack of writing skills in Hebrew.

Conclusion

From internal evidence gleaned from the Haggadoth and recorded observations of the two Catholic priests, we may deduce that KFJ were still using their Haggadoth and Hebrew Scriptures in the early eighteenth century. They had in their possession a tu-ching-pen to assist them in reading the Bible, which had since been lost in a flood or fire. At this time they also had a Pentateuch with supralinear pointing, suggesting that their textual tradition was not exclusively Tiberian in origin, despite the fact that the pointings of extant manuscripts have Tiberian vocalization. In the early eighteenth century, they still observed the tradition of reading Hebrew Scriptures and Haggadoth although their pronunciation was heavily influenced by Chinese. It also appears that they understood what they were reading. On the other hand, the sample of Hebrew writing and the report given by Domenge indicate that they were not necessarily proficient in writing the language.
CHAPTER THREE

HEBREW IN THE KAIFENG HAGGADAH

Phonology

The vocalization of KH follows Masoretic tradition in the majority of instances. Nevertheless, there are a significant number of cases where it appears inconsistent. Some spirants and stops are indicated while others are not. Sometimes the long and short /e/ vowels are indicated as expected while, at other times, they are not. The same applies to the /a/ vowels, although to a lesser extent. It could be that in some instances vocalization is inconsistent due to scribal error; however, two trends emerge upon closer examination of the variations.

In many instances where the vocalization differs from that of other Haggadoth it is similar to the vocalization of the JP Haggadah (marked in the charts below as PH). Since a substantial portion of KH is in Judeo-Persian, it is reasonable to deduce that these variations were influenced by PH. There are too many differences between KH and PH, however, for the former to be a straightforward copy of the latter. Variance can be noted in the order, length and content of the service as well as a portion of the vocalization. In some instances, KH is straddled between PH and other Haggadoth with respect to vocalization, as seen in the following examples:

Chart 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>דבכלל</td>
<td>דבכלל</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>בפל כליא</td>
<td>בפל כליא</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>קמער כמער</td>
<td>קמער כמער</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>במערמ רמערי</td>
<td>במערמ רמערי</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The numberings here and in the following charts refer to the numbering of the footnotes in “Haggadah Text.”
The possibility that their pointing might have been affected by a system that did not conform strictly to the Tiberian system finds support in a letter written by Domenge, dated 20 December, 1725. In it he mentioned something that puzzled him. He said that Father Gaubil had seen a Pentateuch whose points were written above the words. Since he had not seen any supralinearly pointed Hebrew Bible, he did not know what to make of it.\footnote{Juifs de Chine, 196 (English), 191 (French).} We now know that other than the Tiberian, there were also Palestinian and Babylonian systems of vocalization with supralinear pointing.\footnote{Angel Sáenz-Badillos, A History of the Hebrew Language (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 86–104.} The textual and grammatical traditions of the KFJ were not solely informed by Tiberian tradition. The ‘mistakes’ we see in their Haggadoth may also be due to a combination of different textual and grammatical traditions.\footnote{A similar conclusion regarding the Torah scrolls was made by Michael Pollak in The Torah Scrolls of the Chinese Jews: The History, Significance and Present Whereabouts of the Sifre Torah of the Defunct Jewish Community of Kaifeng (Dallas, Texas: Bridwell Library, 1975), 90.}

The unique vocalizations of KH are not as haphazard as they first appear. Although by no means systematic, they could be grouped together under categories of similar patterns. Variations appear to be developments that arose locally, after KFJ had been in China for several centuries, isolated from other Jewish communities. In a lengthy letter written from Kaifeng in August, 1721, Domenge gave many details regarding the Hebrew of KFJ. He noted that although their script was similar to European Jews, their pronunciation was different. One characteristic, which shocked Domenge, was their nasalizing of *hu* to *hum*, *hem*, or *houm*. For example, they pronounced *Mattiyahu* (Mattathiah) as *Man-ti-yo-hum*. Domenge explained that it was due to loss of contact with their Western kinsmen and their Chinese upbringing.\footnote{Joseph Dehergne and Donald Leslie, Juifs de Chine, 127 (English), 113 (French).} In a letter dated to 1722, he again mentioned the Community’s Hebrew pronunciation, noting that Hebrew was pronounced with a Chinese accent using the four tones of Mandarin (i.e., *Putonghua*). The Chinese Jews told Domenge they had not had a teacher from the West to teach them for a very long time and they had lost the book that taught them how to read their Scriptures.\footnote{Juifs de Chine, 148 (English), 141–142 (French).}

For this reason, it should be a fruitful exercise to compare the variations with what is known of Chinese pronunciation to see if, and to what extent, they were influenced by Chinese.
Influence of the Judeo-Persian Haggadah

Of all the Haggadoth consulted, KH shares the most similarities with PH. The following is a catalog of the instances where KH agrees with PH in contrast to the other Haggadoth.

Textual or Orthographical Similarities

Chart 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>נטוע נטוע</td>
<td>נטוע נטוע</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>קומ קומ קומ קומ</td>
<td>קומ קומ קומ קומ</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>נשת נשת נשת נשת</td>
<td>נשת נשת נשת נשת</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>יהושע יהושע יהושע יהושע</td>
<td>יהושע יהושע יהושע יהושע</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>אנכלי אנכלי אנכלי אנכלי</td>
<td>אנכלי אנכלי אנכלי אנכלי</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>לפרטת לפרטת לפרטת לפרטת</td>
<td>לפרטת לפרטת לפרטת לפרטת</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>לא ול לא ול לא ול</td>
<td>לא ול לא ול לא ול</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>כלכל כלכל כלכל</td>
<td>כלכל כלכל כלכל</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>możינב możינב możינב możינב</td>
<td>możינב możינב możינב możינב</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>זה זה זה זה</td>
<td>זה (SH) or זה (AH). PH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>השכינה השכינה השכינה השכינה</td>
<td>השכינה השכינה השכינה השכינה</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>זה זה זה זה</td>
<td>זה (SH) or זה (AH). PH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>וכיב וכיב וכיב וכיב</td>
<td>וכיב וכיב וכיב וכיב</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>אנ אנ אנ אנ</td>
<td>אנ (SH) or אנ (AH). PH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>ולחבדת ולחבדת ולחבדת ולחבדת</td>
<td>ולחבדת ולחבדת ולחבדת ולחבדת</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>בין 이루어 בין 이루어 בין 이루어 בין 이루어</td>
<td>בין 이루어 בין 이루어 בין 이루어 בין 이루어</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>כלש כלש כלש כלש</td>
<td>כלש כלש כלש כלש</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>משה משה משה משה</td>
<td>משה משה משה משה</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>ראשא ראשא ראשא ראשא</td>
<td>ראשא ראשא ראשא ראשא</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>שבטי שבטי שבטי שבטי</td>
<td>שבטי שבטי שבטי שבטי</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>י-league י-league י-league י-league</td>
<td>י-league י-league י-league י-league</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>השואל השואל השואל השואל</td>
<td>השואל השואל השואל השואל</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>ישלד ישלד ישלד ישלד</td>
<td>ישלד ישלד ישלד ישלד</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>אליאודי אליאודי אליאודי אליאודי</td>
<td>אליאודי אליאודי אליאודי אליאודי</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>שמסים שמסים שמסים שמסים</td>
<td>שמסים שמסים שמסים שמסים</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>פאל פאל פאל פאל</td>
<td>פאל פאל פאל פאל</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KH shares many textual and orthographical similarities with PH. The number and nature of these similarities discount the possibility of coincidence. They point to a common, although not identical, textual tradition.
Furtive Pataḥ Upgraded to a Full Vowel or Not Indicated

Chart 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>קָרִים קַרְבָּנָיו קַרְבָּנָיו</td>
<td>קָרִים קַרְבָּנָיו קַרְבָּנָיו</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>יָחָשׁ יָחָשׁ יָחָשׁ</td>
<td>יָחָשׁ יָחָשׁ יָחָשׁ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>יָדָע יָדָע יָדָע</td>
<td>יָדָע יָדָע יָדָע</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>שֶּׁלְּתָה שֶּּלְּתָה שֶּּלְּתָה</td>
<td>שֶּּלְּתָה שֶּּלְּתָה שֶּּלְּתָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה</td>
<td>בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה</td>
<td>בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>לַשְׁבָּח לַשְׁבָּח לַשְׁבָּח לַשְׁבָּח</td>
<td>לַשְׁבָּח לַשְׁבָּח לַשְׁבָּח לַשְׁבָּח</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה</td>
<td>בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה בָּרָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two instances in which furtive pataḥ is indicated (הלשנה and נפרדת). In another instance, KH preserved a part of the expected form: לַשְׁבָּח (HUC Ms 927), instead of לַשְׁבָּח. The name is found on page 28 of HUC Ms 931 and page 25 of HUC Ms 927. Although it was written without the furtive pataḥ, the transliteration of the name in Chinese sources reads Yo-shu-wo. It appears that the furtive pataḥ was either pronounced as such or was restored to a full vowel in the oral tradition.

The Lack of Dāgēš to Indicate Doubling or Plosive Pronunciation

Chart 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>בָּנָה בָּנָה</td>
<td>בָּנָה בָּנָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>בָּשָׁמִים בָּשָׁמִים בָּשָׁמִים</td>
<td>בָּשָׁמִים בָּשָׁמִים בָּשָׁמִים</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>הִלָּלוֹת הִלָּלוֹת הִלָּלוֹת</td>
<td>הִלָּלוֹת הִלָּלוֹת הִלָּלוֹת</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>אֶשָּׂא אֶשָּׂא אֶשָּׂא</td>
<td>אֶשָּׂא אֶשָּׂא אֶשָּׂא</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>מְכָשְׁב מְכָשְׁב מְכָשְׁב</td>
<td>מְכָשְׁב מְכָשְׁב מְכָשְׁב</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>הוֹרִים הוֹרִים הוֹרִים הוֹרִים</td>
<td>הוֹרִים הוֹרִים הוֹרִים הוֹרִים</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 “Haggadah Text,” footnote 248.
8 “Haggadah Text,” footnote 324.
9 “Haggadah Text,” footnote 369.
The main difference between this set of examples and those listed in Charts 15–17 is that whereas the examples listed under that section differ from PH, this list conforms to it. Furthermore, this set does not conform to the rules discussed in that section. For example, following the examples discussed beginning with Chart 15, we would expect a dāgēš in the ק of חַקֶאָו and דֹקִיַו because they are stressed. This was not the case because the vocalization in these instances was affected by PH.

Sĕgōl Instead of Şerê and Vice Versa

Chart 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>מָרָאָה</td>
<td>מָרָאָה</td>
<td>מָרָאָה</td>
<td>מָרָאָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>יִשְׁרָאֵל</td>
<td>יִשְׁרָאֵל</td>
<td>יִשְׁרָאֵל</td>
<td>יִשְׁרָאֵל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>אַבְרָהִמָי</td>
<td>אַבְרָהִמָי</td>
<td>אַבְרָהִמָי</td>
<td>אַבְרָהִמָי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>נוֹרְאֵה</td>
<td>נוֹרְאֵה</td>
<td>נוֹרְאֵה</td>
<td>נוֹרְאֵה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>בָּרָדְבָּד</td>
<td>בָּרָדְבָּד</td>
<td>בָּרָדְבָּד</td>
<td>בָּרָדְבָּד</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as we will see below in Chart 18, the presence of a şerê might indicate a stressed syllable. Conversely, the reduction of a şerê to a sĕgōl might have been due to the fact that a syllable was not stressed as seen in Chart 19. These do not apply to the above examples like מָרָאָה and יִשְׁרָאֵל. Furthermore, the examples in this set conform to PH in contrast to the other Haggadoth. In those examples, KH differs from both PH and the other Haggadoth. Therefore, we suspect that the vocalization of the above examples was influenced by PH rather than a local development.
Qāmeš Instead of Pataḥ and Vice Versa

Chart 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>בָּמִשְׁרָים</td>
<td>בָּמִשְׁרָים</td>
<td>פַּתְּחָ</td>
<td>אחרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>בָּאָחְבּ</td>
<td>בָּאָחְבּ</td>
<td>פַּתְּחָ</td>
<td>אחרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>מַצְּרֵימֵ</td>
<td>מַצְּרֵימֵ</td>
<td>פַּתְּחָ</td>
<td>אחרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>מָסְרָ</td>
<td>מָסְרָ</td>
<td>פַּתְּחָ</td>
<td>אחרים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to Chart 4 above, KH sometimes follows PH in using qāmeš instead of pataḥ in contrast to other Haggadoth.

Similar Vocalization after Taking into Consideration KH’s Unique Characteristics

Chart 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>שֵׁרָה</td>
<td>שֵׁרָה</td>
<td>לְשַׁרְתָּ</td>
<td>אחרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>לְוָדיִית</td>
<td>לְוָדיִית</td>
<td>לְוָדיִית</td>
<td>אחרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>בְּאָחְמָא</td>
<td>בְּאָחְמָא</td>
<td>אַבְּאָחְא</td>
<td>אחר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>לַעַלָּדֵא</td>
<td>לַעַלָּדֵא</td>
<td>לְעַלָּדֵא</td>
<td>אחר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>לַעַלָּדֵא</td>
<td>לַעַלָּדֵא</td>
<td>לְעַלָּדֵא</td>
<td>אחר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>הֶדַּקֵּק</td>
<td>הֶדַּקֵּק</td>
<td>הֶדַּקֵּק</td>
<td>אחר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>דָּוָר</td>
<td>דָּוָר</td>
<td>דָּוָר</td>
<td>אחר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>לֶבְּבַר</td>
<td>לֶבְּבַר</td>
<td>לֶבְּבַר</td>
<td>אחר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some instances, KH and PH are similar when KH’s unique characteristics are taken into consideration. For example, a dāgēš was added to לְבֵר, דָּוָר, הֶדַּקֵּק, לַעַלָּדֵא, אַבְּאָחְא, זָנַּיִדִּית, and לְשַׁרְתָּ in KH to indicate a stressed syllable. Also, the reduction of long to short /e/ in the last syllable of תֶרָשַׁה was meant to indicate a stress in the penultimate syllable. Since these developments were unique to Kaifeng, they are not found in PH.

Influence of Chinese Pronunciation and Other Developments

The Chinese language influenced the vocalization of KH; therefore, a rudimentary understanding of Chinese pronunciation would help us
understand the way KFJ pronounced Hebrew. Chinese\textsuperscript{11} is not an alphabetical language. Chinese scripts are symbols of concepts and thoughts. Each word may have one or more pronunciations depending on the context in which it is found. New words can be formed by combining two or more words into one. In such cases, one of the words usually functions as the guide to pronunciation.

As an example, consider the word 門 (mén), ‘door.’ It could be combined with a variation of the radical for ‘human’ (人) to form a new word 們 (mén or, men), which indicates plurality when combined with a pronoun. Thus, 他 (tā) means ‘he,’ while 他們 (tā mén) means, ‘they.’ In the combination of the words 人 (human) with 門 (door), 門 tells us how to pronounce the new word while 人 tells us that the meaning of the new word has to do with human beings. We could also combine the word 門 with the word 心 (xīn), ‘heart.’ The resulting word is 悶 (mèn), ‘depressed, bored.’ In this case, too, the word 門 tells us how to pronounce the new word while the word 心 tells us that the meaning of the new word has to do with one’s heart or emotion.

Unlike English, Chinese is not a phonetic language. Words are not formed by joining syllables together. Even when a word is used as a guide to pronunciation, it has an independent meaning. The most common Chinese syllables, according to the transliteration system used in China called Hanyu Pinyin, ‘Chinese Transliteration,’ are as follows:\textsuperscript{12}

/a, ai, an, ang, ao/
/ba, bai, ban, bang, bao, bei, ben, beng, bi, bian, biao, bie, bin, bing, bo, bu/
/ca, cai, can, cang, cao, ce, cen, ceng, cha, chai, chan, chang, chao, che,
  chen, cheng, chi, chong, chou, chu, chua, chuai, chuan, chuang, chui,
  chun, chuo, ci, cong, cou, cu, cuan, cui, cun, cuo/
/da, dai, dan, dang, dao, de, dei, den, deng, di, dia, dian, diao, die, ding,
  diu, dong, dou, du, duan, dui, dun, duo/
/e, ei, en, eng, et/
/fa, fan, fang, fei, fen, feng, fo, fou, fu/

\textsuperscript{11} I.e., Mandarin. Putonghua means ‘common language’ and it is the term used to indicate modern Chinese used on Mainland China. Chinese of the pre-modern period was written in a semi-poetic form, which used elliptical grammatical structures and words that may be uncommon nowadays. In the early twentieth century, Chinese language underwent a change that made the sentences more prose-like. In addition, the scripts of modern Chinese have also been simplified (i.e., simplified Chinese scripts) from the more complex scripts of pre-Communist China (i.e., traditional Chinese scripts). Traditional scripts are still being used in Hong Kong and Taiwan.

\textsuperscript{12} 葉立群、黃成穏編: 《朗文中文高級新辭》(香港: 朗文出版社, 1996), 頁1337–1368.
Each syllable may be further differentiated by four different tones. Not uncommonly, up to a dozen or so Chinese words (symbols) may be pronounced similarly. For example, three different words are listed under the first tone of the /ao/ syllable while eighteen different words are listed under its second tone. Furthermore, it could be seen from the above that diphthongs like /ai/, /ao/, /ei/, /iai/, /iao/, /ie/, /iou/, /ua/, and /uo/ abound. In addition, there are many syllables ending in a nasal /n/ or /ng/. In fact, closed syllables (i.e., syllables consisting of consonant, vowel, and consonant) end with /n/ or /ng/ only. The rest of the syllables are open (i.e., consisting of a consonant and a vowel only).

Although China has had one written language for more than two thousand years, it is pronounced differently in different regions of the country. Furthermore, Kaifeng was a very important city in ancient China. Many peoples passed through and lived in it, influencing the spoken language.
with their native dialects. Even today, natives of Henan province speak Chinese with an accent that differs somewhat from natives of Beijing. Therefore, we could never be certain of the exact pronunciation of the Chinese Jews at Kaifeng. This is not necessarily a problem since the arguments proposed below do not require an exact reconstruction of the pronunciation; unless the pronunciation among KFJ differed wildly from the way it is pronounced today, it would not affect the main points proposed below. Furthermore, ancient transliteration as well as examples of Hebrew and modern Chinese pronunciation act as cross references for the discussion.

We can see how these factors influenced the Kaifeng Jews’ pronunciation of Hebrew from the way biblical names were pronounced. In a memoir written around 1770, P. Gabriel Brotier noted the way these Chinese Jews pronounced Hebrew. They were as follows.¹³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Names</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Transliteration by Gabriel Brotier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haftarah</td>
<td>הָרָטְפַה</td>
<td>ha¯p˙tārāh Ha-fu-ta-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>וּהָיְﬠַשְׁי</td>
<td>yěša’yāhû Yi-ssu-hai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>וּהָיְמְרִי</td>
<td>yirmĕyāhû Ya-mi-li-yo-hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>הנָוֹי</td>
<td>yônāh Yüeh-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>מִכָא</td>
<td>mî¯kāh Mi-k’ai-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>נוּחָמ</td>
<td>nahûm Na-hung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>חָבַאְקָע</td>
<td>hˇ a¯baqqûq Ha-pa-ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>זֶכַּרְיָה</td>
<td>zě¯karyāh Sa-chia-li-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>ʿתֵסֶר</td>
<td>ʿestēr Is-se-tha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordecai</td>
<td>מְרַכְּבֵי</td>
<td>mordôkā Mo-to-kai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Brotier did not give us the Chinese words, we can not make too fine an argument from the data. Nevertheless, some conclusions can be drawn from it. As expected, the syllables were mainly open. In order to pronounce a closed syllable in Hebrew, they used two separate, open syllables. In the case of ha¯p˙tārāh, they used /ha-fu/ to represent the first syllable of the Hebrew word. Similarly, the /kar/ syllable in zềkaryāh was pronounced as /chia-li/. This fact is also clearly seen with ʿestēr, where the first closed syllable was pronounced as two open syllables (/is-se/).

Instead of using two syllables to represent a closed one, they sometimes enunciated closed syllables as open by leaving out the syllable's closing consonant altogether. For example, they ignored the ר which closed the last syllable of רֵתְּסֶא and the first syllable in mordְּką and opted, instead, to pronounce the names as issetha and motokai respectively. In the same way, they ignored the doubling of ק in the second syllable of the name hàbaqqâq and pronounced the name with three open syllables, i.e., hapako’ instead of hapakek’o.

As is the case with many native Chinese speakers even today, the consonant /r/ was pronounced as a /l/. Thus the /rah/ syllable in haptârâh was pronounced as /la/. Likewise, the רֶֹּֽש (ך) in zêkaryâh was pronounced as a /l/. Brotier probably made a mistake with regard to the name Jeremiah. It is more likely they pronounced the name as yalimiyoho instead of yamiliyohu, i.e., pronouncing the first syllable of the name (/yir/) as /yali/.

The above points are supported by the representation of biblical names in the Community’s 1489 stone inscription (Chart 9),14 1512 inscription (Chart 10)15 and as reported in the journal of Chiang Jung-Chi (Chart 11),16 respectively.

**Chart 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hanyu Pinyin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>סָהָרְבַא</td>
<td>ʿabrâhâm</td>
<td>阿無羅漢</td>
<td>āwúluóhàn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>לֵיאָרְֹשִי</td>
<td>yiśrāʾēl</td>
<td>一賜樂業</td>
<td>yîcîlèyè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>אָדָֹם</td>
<td>ʿādām</td>
<td>阿耽</td>
<td>ādān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>מָוְֹשֶׁה</td>
<td>mōšeh</td>
<td>也攝</td>
<td>miēshè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>נֵוְַרֲא</td>
<td>ʿezrâ</td>
<td>蒟子剌</td>
<td>āizîlà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>לְֹוֵי</td>
<td>lēwî</td>
<td>列微</td>
<td>lièwēi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hanyu Pinyin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>אָדָם</td>
<td>ʿādām</td>
<td>阿耽</td>
<td>ādān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>נֹוְָה</td>
<td>nōah</td>
<td>女媧</td>
<td>nûwô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>אָבְרֹהָֹם</td>
<td>ʿabrâhâm</td>
<td>阿無羅漢</td>
<td>āwúluóhàn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abram 2</td>
<td>אֶבְרֹם</td>
<td>ʿabrâm</td>
<td>羅漢</td>
<td>luôhàn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>יִיוָשִׁא</td>
<td>yîshāq</td>
<td>或以思哈</td>
<td>yîshāhè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>יָאָמְֵיקֶּב</td>
<td>yaʾāqôb</td>
<td>雅呵獗勿</td>
<td>yâhējûwû</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 White, Chinese Jews, 2: 8, 9, 11 (English), 35, 37 (Chinese).
15 White, Chinese Jews, 2: 46 (English), 53 (Chinese).
16 White, Chinese Jews, 1: 125.
In instances in which the Chinese words are available we can be somewhat more certain of their pronunciation. In the case of Abraham, the first syllable (/ˈaːb/) was articulated as two syllables (/ā-wú/) because the closed syllable /ˈaːb/ was not attested in Chinese. Therefore, KFJ needed two open syllables to represent it. Likewise, the first syllables of the words Israel (/ˈyiʃ/) and Isaac (/ˈyiʃ/) have been separated into two (/yī-cì/ and /yĭ-sī/). Consistent with the above, the first closed syllable of ʾezrā was represented by two open syllables (/ăi-zĭ/) while the rēš (־) of the final syllable was pronounced as a /l/. Furthermore, according to the 1512 inscription, the hāṭēp pataḥ was pronounced; it is reflected in the Chinese pronunciation of names such as Jacob and Aaron.

Another interesting phenomenon observed in the 1512 inscription is the indication of a person by the last two syllables of his name. This is seen in the shortening of āwūluōhàn to luōhàn, yāhējuēwù to juēwù, āālián to ālián, and yuēshūwō to shūwō. Another version of the shortening of Abraham to Abram is found in the journal of Chiang Jung-Chi, i.e., from āwūluōhàn to āluō. In this case, the first and third syllables are used instead of the last two.

Chinese names usually consist of two or three words. The first word is usually the family name. If the name has three words in total, the second word may indicate the person’s generation; all the children of a clan of a certain generation may have that word as the second word of their name. The last word of the series is the name given to the particular person. It is very common to call a person by the second and third words of his name. In essence, the 1512 inscription was treating the biblical names as
Chinese names. It might indicate the Kaifeng Jews’ level of assimilation and/or an effort to contextualize biblical names to Chinese culture.

We have noted that closed syllables ended with /n/ or /ng/ only. This was certainly the case with the closed syllables listed above. Since there was no /ham/ syllable in Chinese, they pronounced the final syllable of ʿabrāhām as /hàn/ and the final syllable of ʿādām as /dān/. They were also using diphthongs where we would not expect so in English. For example, /luó/ in āwūluóhàn, /miē/ in miēshè, /āi/ in āizīlā, and /liē/ and /wēi/ in lièwēi. In the 1663 inscription, Moses was pronounced as mòshè (默舍) much closer to the Hebrew mōšeh (מֹשֶׁה) than miēshè listed in the 1489 inscription.

For the sake of further comparison, we can look at how these names are pronounced in modern Chinese.

Chart 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hanyu Pinyin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>以賽亞</td>
<td>yīsài yà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>耶利米</td>
<td>yēlǐmì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>約拿</td>
<td>yuēnà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>彌迦</td>
<td>mǐjiā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahum</td>
<td>那鴻</td>
<td>nāhóng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>哈巴谷</td>
<td>hàbāgǔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechariah</td>
<td>撒迦利亞</td>
<td>sājiālìyà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordecai</td>
<td>末底改</td>
<td>mòdǐgǎi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>撒迦亞</td>
<td>nuóyà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>亞伯蘭</td>
<td>yàbólán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>亞伯拉罕</td>
<td>yàbólāhàn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>以色列</td>
<td>yīsèliè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>亞當</td>
<td>yādāng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>摩西</td>
<td>móxī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>以斯拉</td>
<td>yīsīlā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>利未</td>
<td>lìwēi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The modern Chinese pronunciation of Abraham is yàbólāhàn. In conformity with the observations made above /ab/ has been divided into two syllables, the rēš (ר) is pronounced as a /l/ and the final syllable is /hàn/ instead of /ham/. The modern pronunciation of Abram differs from the ancient pronunciation in that it conforms more to phonetic representation. The modern pronunciation of the name Israel is yīsèliè (以 色 列).

---

17 White, Chinese Jews, 2: 58 (English), 80 (Chinese).
The first syllable is again broken down into two but the middle syllable of the name (/rā/) is fused with the last /ēl/ to form a diphthong (/liè/). Here, too, the rēš (ר) in the middle syllable is pronounced as a /l/. The modern pronunciation of Adam is yădàng ((亞當). The nasal /dān/ of ancient Kaifeng has been replaced by another nasal syllable (/dàng/) in modern Chinese. Finally, the first closed syllable of the name Ezra (ʾezrā) is also pronounced as two open syllables (/yĭ-sī/) in modern Chinese.

While there are only a few clear instances where closed syllables were treated as open in the Kaifeng names, many more examples can be cited in the modern Chinese pronunciation of Hebrew names.

**Chart 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Names</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hanyu Pinyin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>לֶבָה</td>
<td>hā¯bel</td>
<td>亞伯</td>
<td>yăbó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebal</td>
<td>לָביֵﬠ</td>
<td>ʾê¯bāl</td>
<td>以巴</td>
<td>yībā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagar</td>
<td>רָגָה</td>
<td>hāgār</td>
<td>夏甲</td>
<td>xiàjiá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>יָאָקֹב</td>
<td>yaʾaqōb</td>
<td>雅各</td>
<td>yăgè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>רָהֶל</td>
<td>rāhēl</td>
<td>拉結</td>
<td>lājié</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>דָוִד</td>
<td>dāwī¯d</td>
<td>大衛</td>
<td>dàwèi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above examples, the ל of לֶבָה and לָביֵﬠ, ר of רָגָה, י of יָאָקֹב, ל of רָהֶל, and ד of דָוִד are left out with the result that the final syllable of these names ends in an open instead of a closed syllable. Original final closed syllables are not the only ones pronounced as open. Medial closed syllables are also pronounced as open, as the following examples show.

**Chart 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Names</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Hanyu Pinyin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absalom</td>
<td>אַבּוֹלֵם</td>
<td>ʾabšalôm</td>
<td>押沙龍</td>
<td>yăshálóng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgal</td>
<td>גִלְגָּל</td>
<td>gilgāl</td>
<td>吉甲</td>
<td>jíjiā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermon</td>
<td>הֶרְמוֹן</td>
<td>hermôn</td>
<td>黑門</td>
<td>hēimén</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>יַרדֶנֶן</td>
<td>yardēn</td>
<td>約但</td>
<td>yuēdàn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidron</td>
<td>קִדרֹנֶן</td>
<td>qidrôn</td>
<td>汲淪</td>
<td>jílún</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melchizedek</td>
<td>מַלְכִּים־יִכְּלַמ</td>
<td>malkisedeq</td>
<td>麥基洗得</td>
<td>màijīxídé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilpah</td>
<td>זִלְפָּה</td>
<td>zilpāh</td>
<td>悉帕</td>
<td>xīpà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megiddo</td>
<td>מֶגְיִדּוֹ</td>
<td>mēgiddō</td>
<td>米吉多</td>
<td>mǐjīdúō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallum</td>
<td>שָלָלֵם</td>
<td>šālālām</td>
<td>沙龍</td>
<td>shālóng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shittim</td>
<td>שִׁיתִים</td>
<td>šīttim</td>
<td>什亭</td>
<td>shètīng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddim</td>
<td>שִׁידִים</td>
<td>sidīm</td>
<td>西訂</td>
<td>xīdìng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succoth</td>
<td>סַקְקֹת</td>
<td>sukkōt</td>
<td>疏割</td>
<td>shūgē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the first group of examples (from *Absalom* to *Zilpah*), one or more syllable closing consonants are ignored with the result that the syllables become open. For example, the ב in the first syllable of מֹלָשְׁבַּא is not pronounced. Similarly, the ל in לָגְּלִג, קֶדֶץ־יִכְּלַמ, and הָפְּלִז, and ד in נֵדְּרַי, and ד in נוּרְדִיק are all left unpronounced. In the second group of examples (Megiddo to Succoth) consonants that are supposed to be germinated are not germinated in the pronunciation. Thus the ד in וֹדִּגְמַי and מֵידַו, ל in מָלַשׁ, ט in מִטִּשׁ, and כ in תֹכֻּס are all pronounced as if they were not germinated; this results in open instead of closed syllables.

In summary, the general factors that influenced the pronunciation of Hebrew words in ancient Kaifeng still apply today. With these in view, we can now look at the unique vocalization of KH with a better understanding.

### The Use of Dāgēš to Indicate Stressed Syllables

#### Chart 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23, 31</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>לְפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶלָפֶl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>דָּמָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>דָּמָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>דָּמָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>דָּמָוָתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62, 63</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>מָלָבָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>מָלָבָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>מָלָבָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>מָלָבָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>בּוֹמָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹמָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹמָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹמָוָתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>בּוֹמָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹמָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹמָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹמָוָתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>תָּבּוֹתּוֹא (AH, SH)</td>
<td>תָּבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>תָּבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>תָּבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>לְלָבָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>לְלָבָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>לְלָבָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>לְלָבָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>לָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>לָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>לָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>לָבּוֹתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>בּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
<td>אָוָתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>בּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹתּוֹא</td>
<td>בּוֹתּוֹא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Tiberian system of vocalization, a dāgēš in the bgdkpt consonants (i.e., ב, ג, ד, ת, ו, ב) indicates that the letter is either pronounced as a plosive (i.e., pronounced with a hard sound) or that it is

---
18 Not in main text; inserted in margin without vocalization.
both plosive and germinated. The general rule is that if the letter is pre-
ceded by a full or partial vowel, the dāgēš indicates that the particular 
consonant is both pronounced as a plosive and germinated. Following 
this rule, the ר in the above examples would be doubled since it is pre-
ceded by a vowel. For example, וּנָתּוֹא should be pronounced as ‘ʿôtánû 
instead of ‘ôtănû, פָלַכְכִּת as dēmûttam instead of dēmûtam, and as 
malkūtto instead of malkūṭo. However, as can be seen from comparison 
with the same words in the other Haggadoth, these consonants should 
not be doubled.

How do we explain this unusual doubling of the consonants at 
Kaifeng? In fact, in view of what we have learned about the Kaifeng Jews’ 
pronunciation of Hebrew, these consonants were most probably not ger-
minated. We have noted above that closed Chinese syllables end in /n/ 
or /ng/. They do not end in /ot/ (as in ‘ôt-tā-nû), or /ut/ (as in de-mūt-
tam and mal-kūt-tô). Furthermore, KFJ would either leave a closed syll-
able open or, alternately, used two syllables to represent the closed syl-
lables. In the above examples, it would have been cumbersome for them 
to use two syllables to represent the germinated ר. They would have to 
pronounce וּנָתּוֹא as ʿot-tě-tā-nû, פָלַכְכִּת as dě-mu-tě-tam (or, more likely, 
dě-mu-tě-tan), and as ma-lē-ku-tě-tô etc. More likely, they simply left 
the syllable closing consonant unpronounced, i.e., the words were pro-
nounced much the same way as they were written in the other Haggadoth 
except that they were pronounced as open instead of closed syllables.

What then was the function of the dāgēš? In reviewing the examples 
above, it appears that the dāgēš was to indicate stressed syllables (e.g., 
‘ôt-tā-nû, de-mū-tām, mal-kū-tō). The same use of dāgēš can also be seen 
in words with ב, ד and ר.

Chart 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC HUC</th>
<th>HUC HUC</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>הָדָּה</td>
<td>וֹּתּוֹא</td>
<td>(illegible)</td>
<td>יָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>הָדָּה</td>
<td>וֹּתּוֹא</td>
<td>יָה</td>
<td>הָדָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>בָּדָּה</td>
<td>בָּדָּה</td>
<td>בָּדָּה</td>
<td>בָּדָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>מָדָּה</td>
<td>מָדָּה</td>
<td>מָדָּה</td>
<td>מָדָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>מָדָּה</td>
<td>מָדָּה</td>
<td>מָדָּה</td>
<td>מָדָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>נָדָּה</td>
<td>נָדָּה</td>
<td>נָדָּה</td>
<td>נָדָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>קָדָּה</td>
<td>קָדָּה</td>
<td>קָדָּה</td>
<td>קָדָּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>קָדָּה</td>
<td>קָדָּה</td>
<td>קָדָּה</td>
<td>קָדָּה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The use of dāgēš to mark a stress is even clearer in the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>שַׁמְמַדֶּה</td>
<td>שַׁמְמַדֶּה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>עַמְדָּרִים</td>
<td>עַמְדָּרִים</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>יִנְבֶּר</td>
<td>יִנְבֶּר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>לֹרָה</td>
<td>לֹרָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>לְדָּר</td>
<td>לְדָּר</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, the consonants in question do not have variant plosive or fricative pronunciations (i.e., stop or spirant forms). According to traditional Masoretic pointing, they should have been doubled. However, as the comparison with the same words from other Haggadoth shows, they are not doubled. Furthermore, closed syllables like /ûm/, /ʾāl/ and /¯pîl/ are not attested in Chinese; thus, it is quite certain that the consonants in question were not doubled. Rather, the presence of the dāgēš indicated a stressed syllable just like in the examples given in the preceding tables.

In other cases, the reverse appears to be true. In some instances, a dāgēš was used to indicate stress rather than germination or a plosive pronunciation. Conversely, if a syllable was not stressed, the expected dāgēš might be missing. This is illustrated by the words עַבְּצֶא (footnote 19), דוּמְלַת (footnote 50), וּניֵלָﬠ (footnote 60), וּליִפֲאו (footnote 143), andוּבְּרִי (footnote 257).

19 The word “footnote” in the parentheses refers to the footnotes in the “Haggadah Text.”

In the case of עַבְּצֶא, the dāgēš was written in the second ב instead of the first because this was where the stress fell. Similarly the dāgēš was written in the ב but not the ב of וּניֵלָﬠ. The dāgēš in the ב, but not the the מ, has the same function in וּלָיִפּא.
The Use of Şērē to Indicate Stressed Syllables

Chart 18

Apart from using a dāgēš to indicate a stressed syllable, KFJ also indicated a stressed syllable with a şērē. This can be seen from the above examples with segolate vowel patterns. In these cases, instead of reading mé-le¯k, 'é-re˙s, and té-¯bel, KFJ read mé-le¯k, ‘é-re˙s, and té-¯bel.

The Reduction of Vowels for Unstressed Syllables

Chart 19

20 ֶלֶמ (elsewhere).
It appears that another way of indicating a stressed syllable at Kaifeng was by reducing the vowel of the preceding or following syllable; thus, instead of reading הָתַּא (ʿattāh), KFJ read the word as הָתֲּא (ʿˇa-t´āh). In this case not only did they reduce the pata˙h to a hātēp pata ˙h, they probably also left out the ת in the first syllable because there was no /at/ syllable in Chinese. Similar reduction of /a/ vowels are found in words like וּמְצֲﬠַיַו (wa-ya-ˇ a˙s-mú),םָהָרְבֲא (ʿˇ a-¯be-rā-h´ām) 21, and־לֲﬠ (ʾˇal).

The wordןַﬠַמְל abided by the same principle except that the reduction followed instead of preceded the stressed syllable, i.e.,לֲﬠ (lě-má-ˇ an).

In the case of /e/ vowels, they reduced sêrê to sĕgōl; therefore,ויָלֵא (ʿē-l´āw) becameוֹניֵא (ʿē-n´ ˇ o). The same process was at work inרָזָﬠְלֶא. Since a sĕgōl was already attested in the first syllable, it was reduced to a hātēp sĕgōl, i.e.,רָזֲﬠ (ˇe-lě-ʾā-zā[r]). In addition, following the observation that there was no closed syllable ending with /el/ in Chinese, we postulate that they instead divided the syllable into two. Finally, there was no closed syllable ending in /r/ either; the last syllable was probably pronounced as /zā/ instead of /zār/.

The Use of a Full Vowel to Represent Šĕwˇa' and Vice Versa

Chart 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמָצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמָצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמָצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמָצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
<td>בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי בָּמַצְבַּעְבִּי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above examples show that vocal šewˇa’ was sometimes represented by a long or short /e/ vowel. From these examples, we may conclude that the šewˇa’ was pronounced as a long /el/, similar to Modern Hebrew. There is

---

21 See above for transliteration into Chinese.
no reason to believe otherwise with עַבְצֶאֵב. The long /e/ vowel in רָעָה, however, was used to represent a compound šewâ’ with an /a/ vowel in שֵׁאָר, suggesting that the long /e/ might have the quality of an ultra-short /a/ vowel at Kaifeng. In the cases of יֵדֶי and שָׁמֶשׁ, the šewâ’ was represented as a short /e/. From the cited examples, it appears that the šewâ’ was pronounced as a long /el/, a short /e/ or an ultra-short /a/ at Kaifeng.

This observation is supported by cases where the šewâ’ was used as a vowel:

\[\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
\text{Footnote} & \text{HUC Ms 931} & \text{HUC Ms 927} & \text{PH} & \text{Others} \\
\hline
16 & המבּדֵל הַמַּבּדֵל & הקֵה & נִיל & הקרֹמָה \\
223 & הקֵה & הקֵה & נִיל & הַמְּכּ \\
257 & וּרְבּ & וּרְבּ & וּרְבּ & וּרְבּ \\
265 & וּרְבּ & וּרְבּ & וּרְבּ & וּרְבּ \\
316 & אַהָר & אַהָר & אַהָר & אַהָר \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

In the first example, the šewâ’ under the מ of ליִדְּבְמַּה was used to represent a short /a/ (ליִדְּבַמַּה). The šewâ’ under the מ in הְמְכּ was likely used to represent a short /a/ as well (הַמְּכּ), following the vocalization of PH. In the case of רֲחַא KFJ used an ultra-short /a/ to represent a long /e/ (רֵחַא), thus showing that the two vowels were linked in their pronunciation. Following this line of reasoning, the šewâ’ under the ‘ in וּבְּרְיַו might have represented an /a/ or /e/ vowel of varying length.

**Pronunciation of Qâmeš As Ḥōlem**

\[\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
\text{Footnote} & \text{HUC Ms 931} & \text{HUC Ms 927} & \text{PH} & \text{Others} \\
\hline
184 & לֶשֶׁאָל לֶשֶׁאָל & אַךְ & אַךְ & לֶשֶׁאָל \\
189 & אַךְ & אַךְ & אַךְ & לֶשֶׁאָל \\
201 & לֶשֶׁאָל לֶשֶׁאָל & אַךְ & אַךְ & לֶשֶׁאָל \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

The above examples indicate that the qâmeš was, in some instances, pronounced like a ḥōlem at Kaifeng. This can also be seen from the transliteration of the name Abraham as ā-wú-lúó-hàn (阿 無 羅 漢), where the /ra/ syllable was pronounced as /luó/. Pronouncing yirméyahû as yalimiyohu also bears witness to this tendency, although it was by no means consistent. Similarly the /ra/ syllable in the name Israel was
pronounced as /lè/ (yī-cì-lè-yè; 一 賜 樂 業), a pronunciation closer to hōlem than the expected qāmes.

Interchangeable /e/ and /i/ Vowels

Chart 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC</th>
<th>HUC</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24, 36</td>
<td>מְכֹדֶה</td>
<td>מְכֹדֶה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>נְלָיִים</td>
<td>נְלָיִים</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208, 230</td>
<td>נָלָא</td>
<td>נָלָא</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>אָלֶּא (YH); אָלֶּא (AH and SH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>מָנָה</td>
<td>מָנָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>נָלָא</td>
<td>נָלָא</td>
<td></td>
<td>אָלֶּא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>נָלָא</td>
<td>נָלָא</td>
<td></td>
<td>אָלֶּא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since both /e/ and /i/ vowels were from the same vowel class in Biblical Hebrew, the substitution of one for the other is not unexpected. The words אָלֶּא and אָלִּא were alternate forms; the former was a shortened form of אָלְּא (= אָלָם).

Vowel Reduction Rules

KFJ did not develop a new, consistent system of vocalization. As we have noted in the footnotes of the Hebrew transcription, conventional and unconventional forms appear a few lines from each other. The unique pointings show an attempt to indicate pronunciation. Despite their best efforts, we can surmise that their mastery of oral Hebrew degenerated with time. At some point, they had forgotten propretonic reduction altogether, as seen from the following examples:

Chart 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC</th>
<th>HUC</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>קְדֵרֶה</td>
<td>קְדֵרֶה</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>אָלָה</td>
<td>אָלָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>אָלָה</td>
<td>אָלָה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not in main text; inserted in the margin without vocalization.

The giving up of vowel reduction rules can also be seen from the following examples:

**Chart 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>יַעְקֹבְּﬠַי</td>
<td>יַעְקֹבְּﬠַי</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>שָׁאָתָנַה</td>
<td>שָׁאָתָנַה</td>
<td></td>
<td>(damaged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>נָגַלְּנַה</td>
<td>נָגַלְּנַה</td>
<td></td>
<td>גִּנְּהָנַה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>נִגְּהָנַה</td>
<td>נִגְּהָנַה</td>
<td></td>
<td>גִּנְּהָנַה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This development was probably due to the fact that vowel reduction was not present in Chinese. Instead, each Chinese word has a tone that may or may not change in relation to the preceding or following word. At some point, the tones of the vowels were flattened out, so that most words were pronounced without pretonic or tonic stressed syllables.

**Chart 26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>HUC Ms 931</th>
<th>HUC Ms 927</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>קָלָלַה</td>
<td>מַלָּלַה</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>נְדָר / נְדָר</td>
<td>נְדָר</td>
<td>נְדָר</td>
<td>נְדָר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>נְשָׁנַה</td>
<td>נְשָׁנַה</td>
<td>נְשָׁנַה</td>
<td>נְשָׁנַה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>נְאָרָמְי</td>
<td>נְאָרָמְי</td>
<td>נְאָרָמְי</td>
<td>נְאָרָמְי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>הָאָרִי</td>
<td>הָאָרִי</td>
<td>הָאָרִי</td>
<td>הָאָרִי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The loss of the vowel reduction rule, resulting in the flattening out of the tones, can also be seen in words where a dāgēş is used to indicate stress:

---

24 Written again on the next page.
The phonological rules that we know from the Masorites were generally followed in the greater vocalized portion of KH; nevertheless, there were many deviations from Masoretic pointing. In many instances where the pointing deviates, it corresponds to PH. In the other instances, variants can be grouped together into patterns that appear to be related to Chinese pronunciation. According to the analyses above, stressed and unstressed syllables were pronounced more or less correctly although they were indicated unconventionally in quite a number of instances. At some point in time, it appears that vowel reduction was altogether, or in the majority of cases, abandoned. This would correlate with Domenge’s remark that their pronunciation of Hebrew sounded more like Chinese than the Hebrew he knew.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE JUDEO-PERSIAN OF KH

The Language and Its Background

JP is Persian language written in Hebrew characters by Persian speaking Jews up until the late nineteenth, early twentieth century. Also spelled ‘Judaeo-Persian,’ it is represented in KH’s instructions for recitation of the Hebrew text and performance of ritual as well as for the blessing of redemption and the translation of the hymn הָתַּאָתְּלַאָגּ. Herein, the transliteration table on page xiii summarizes the Hebrew letters used for Persian.

In the context of a textual study of the JP in KH, it might be beneficial to provide an overview into its linguistic background. Persian is an ancient language that has evolved over the centuries. Of the three major stages in its development, JP is part of the most recent, referred to as New Persian (hereafter, NP). Since the earliest extant NP documents are written in Hebrew script, JP provides linguists with invaluable information regarding the evolution of the Persian language.

As with Persian, JP has undergone stages in its development. The first stage is referred to as Early Judeo-Persian or EJP and includes documents written from the eighth to the early thirteenth century CE. For the most part, modern day Persian speakers can understand EJP—thus Herbert Paper’s general impression that the JP found in KH and other manuscripts belonging to Kaifeng Jewry is “preserved relatively well as an intelligible tongue” in the introduction to Drenger’s Haggadah of the Chinese Jews. Yet, studies show notable differences between EJP and the later more standardized form of the language produced from the fourteenth century onward. Distinctions exist in respect to orthography, lexicon and grammar, many of which are found in KH.

Early Judeo-Persian is not marked by orthographic or grammatical uniformity. The extant corpus of texts is characterized by dialectal diversity traced to three geographic regions: the western provinces of Iran, particularly Khuzistan; north eastern regions, Khorasan and modern day Afghanistan included; north eastern regions, that is, the modern day Central Asian countries of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan referred to by the Jews of the region as Bukhara. There are too many differences between KH and the Khuzistan group to consider them a match; however, notable similarities exist between KH and the Khorasan and Bukhara groups. Upon comparing selected orthographic and linguistic features found in the three groups, the EJP of KH appears closest to that of the Bukhara region, for the following reasons: it shares features of orthography such as the use of the Hebrew letter ג for the sound value /j/, uses the prepositions רבא and רמזא and employs independent rather than enclitic pronouns. Additionally, the iżāfa is often rendered with the Hebrew letter י on the preceding word. י is also attached as an abstract suffix, third person plural verbs take the suffix דנ and passive verbs are constructed with the auxiliary דנמא.

2 Norollah believed the JP to be closest to the Khorasan school; see “The Jews in China,” *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*, 167. Shaked, “Classification of Linguistic Features in Early Judeo-Persian Texts”, *Exegisti Monumenta: Festschrift in Honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams* 17 (2009): 449–461, especially the comparative table, 451–453. At a conference jointly held by the Library of Congress and the University of Maryland in October of 2008, we spoke about our research of KH and plans to publish the present study. Shaul Shaked was a conference participant and kindly agreed to offer his insight with regard to some of the EJP of the HUC MSS. Copies of the MSS were sent to him for this purpose. We recently learned that Professor Shaked gave a talk at a June 2009 conference held by the Ben Zvi Institute of Jerusalem that addressed the EJP of these MSS. He has since shared with us the notes and unpublished article entitled: “כיסופו של אברハード: יהודים כבויים מצפון לשורות מדריד” (Ben Zvi Institute Conference. Sitry Nidahim: Jews with Concealed Identities, 2009), 1, 3.
In both KH manuscripts, JP instructions are written in smaller script usually on the same seven lines as the Hebrew text. Occasionally they appear at the top or right margin or in between lines. Mostly referring to the Hebrew text that follows, they are largely legible and clear. As mentioned earlier, HUC Ms 927 is missing text at the beginning. From page 6, its JP rubrics correspond to page 9 of HUC Ms 931. Thereafter, HUC Ms 927 is consistently three pages behind HUC Ms 931 and the JP in both MSS mostly mirror one another.

Each line of the Hebrew hymn is followed by the JP translation written by a single scribal hand. The pages are consistently kept to seven lines of text. The content and positioning of both the JP rubrics as well as the translation in the manuscripts are nearly identical. 3 There are instances when the instructions are difficult to decipher and HUC Ms 927 is generally more legible; 4 whereas, in the body of the text, HUC Ms 931 has fewer occasional errors than HUC Ms 927. 5

Orthography

Orthography is not always uniform within KH; words may be spelled differently throughout, an example being נדואג (pg. 56) and נדואיג (pg. 68). No distinction is made between the plosive and fricative of the following letters: /ג/ for /گ/ and /ג/ as in (pg. 56); /ד/ for /ד/ and /ד/ as in בוד (pg. 58) and דועב (pg. 62); /כ/ is used for /כ/ and /כ/ as in בוד (pg. 56) and דועב (pg. 60); /פ/ for /پ/ and /פ/ as in אפרטן (pg. 56); /ת/ for /ת/ and /ת/ as in נרבר (pg. 61) and נון (pg. 74). The letter /ה/ has the values /ה/ and /ה/ as with the other letters, no diacritics are used to distinguish them from one another.

Long vowel /א/ is spelled with א but it is left out in the term בלא (written בלא in NP) and is doubled in the term אנסא (pg. 77). A feature of words originating in Arabic, imāla substitutes long /א/ with /א/ or /א/ as in

3 Examples with respect to orthography include the following:אלב, 59; אלבל, 60; אלא, 61; אללא, 61; אלבלו, 61; בבל, 61; בלבלו, 61; בבל, 61; בבלבלו, 61; בבלבלו, 61.
4 See HUC Ms 927, 77, 78.
5 As in בלא, 53; בלא, 53; בלא, 53; בלא, 53; באלא, 63; באלא, 63; באלא, 63; באלא, 63. Notable exceptions where HUC Ms 927 has the correct form include תבשה, 60 and לדיא, 64.
6 The page numbers in parenthesis here and in the rest of this chapter refer to those found in the “Haggadah Text.”
The Hebrew letter /ו/ is used for consonant /v/ as in ידרוא (pg. 89) and long vowel /ū/ as in הודנא (pg. 95). The JP also uses /ו/ and /י/ as matres lectionis indicating historical short vowels no longer represented in NP. Examples include דנדוש (pg. 83), דירוב (pg. 93), ניתסוכנ, דרופסב (pg. 99), איאזיגעומ, דנתפוג (pg. 104). The term נמשד (pg. 95) is also spelled נמשוד (pg. 93), נאנמשוד (pp. 103–105). The term גרזב is rendered גרוזב (pp. 95, 101) and גרוזברת (pg. 97). Diphthong /aw/ is written with two /ו/ as in גוומ (pg. 93) and מוק (pg. 104), elsewhere spelled מוק (pg. 94). Similarly, the noun דנגוס and compound verb דנגוסהדרוכדוב (pg. 105) are written with a single /ו/.

The use of ʼiżāfa, that is the construction in Persian that marks possession and is also used to link syntactically related nouns as well as nouns and pronouns, in KH is not consistent. When it is rendered in writing, the Hebrew letter /י/ is used on the preceding word as in יאהיוכיוא for ‘its streets’ (pg. 105). In other instances, it is not marked. ʼIżāfa is also placed on the Hebrew term, חבזמ to reflect the genitive and possessive relationship in ‘the wall of Your altar.’ The blessing of redemption has approximately thirteen words with and five without. The hymn contains roughly forty two words with ʼiżāfa and approximately thirty one without. There is a tendency to leave off the ʼiżāfa after a nasal as in אמיאןארדפ, ‘our forefathers’ (pg. 98), and רצמןימזןאימד, ‘in the land of Egypt’ (pg. 99).

The following variant spellings are worth noting: התשארבא, ‘exalted’ (pg. 98); הבננ, ‘He threw’ (pg. 71); הבשארנד, ‘(they) opened’ (pg. 71); נלכ, ‘bitter herbs’ (pg. 57); גני נזר, ‘to cause to be lost’ (pg. 60); מרואני, ‘first born’ (pg. 66); סכומני, ‘words’ (pg. 74); יד, ‘city’ (pg. 77), אגנדי, ‘there’ (pg. 77); בהראני, ‘He led them out’ (pg. 68).

The attempt in KH to vocalize words in the JP translation of the Hebrew hymn according to the Tiberian sublinear vocalization system is inconsistent. There does not appear to be any pattern in what words are vocalized; attempts are made with nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs. Some words are completely vocalized while others, only partially. JP texts are not typically vocalized; however, there are Judeo-Tajik texts produced by Bukharan scholars and scribes that use the Tiberian Hebrew system of vowel diacritics for Persian words. The attempt in KH to mark pronunciation may be due to the isolation of Jews that, however rare, there are instances where the Tiberian sublinear vocalization is used as in the British Museum manuscript Or 5446.
The Judeo-Persian of KH As Compared to Other JP Haggadah Exegeses and Translations

The textual study of KH demonstrates a close connection between it and other JP Haggadah exegesis and translations. The present study found that KH shares JP lexicon and other features of language with the Haggadah (PH) in the earliest known JP prayer book as well as JP Haggadah exegesis and translations in MSS estimated to have dated from the fourteenth to the early twentieth century. When available in colophons, dates given are not necessarily those of composition but rather the dates the Mss were copied. They all tend to preserve archaic vocabulary and features of grammar and are also characterized by a conscious attempt to adhere word for word to the Hebrew. Such shared features point to a faithful scribal tradition spanning centuries. A comparison of KH to JP manuscripts consulted for this study with respect to word choice in the acrostic hymn showed the following approximate percentage overlap: BZI 4598 (hereafter, A)—67%; NLI 8’ 3199 (hereafter, B)—60.5%.

---

8 The JP Haggadah, PH-JTS 4522 (seventeenth century), includes the blessing of redemption and the hymn but does not have a JP translation. The facsimile is published by Shlomoh Tal in הליפתה הסحكومה. For an approximate dating of BZI 4598 Haggadah exegesis to the fourteenth century, see Netzer, ובנה+)/, 174; NLI 8’ 3199 (1796); NLI 8’ 1383 (1851); Shimon Hakham’s Haggadah edition, תקלה יפתא (Jerusalem: Yosef Hasid; First published in 1904; reprinted in 1963/64) also includes some of the archaic features of grammar and vocabulary. An immigrant to Jerusalem from Bukhara who published editions of religious and literary works, Hakham says that with this Haggadah he is presenting what was traditionally read and observed by the Bukharan community.

9 JP translations of the Hebrew Bible are also relevant and proved useful to compare, particularly Exodus and Deuteronomy from which the Haggadah quotes. For MSS of JP bible translations, we refer to Paper’s תידוהי־תיסרֶה and Biblia Judaeo-Persica 2(1). Abbreviations used here and in the Hebrew text are from Biblia Judaico-Persica; they include ב—BM Or 5446 (1319), ר—VatPers 61(seventeenth century), ו—BZI 1028 (nineteenth century),־—Constantinople Polyglot (published 1546) and ש—Shimon Hakham (published in 1904). The page numbers given for ב—BM Or 5446 (1319) are from הלוחות בﴌיטאיהו.
NLI 8° 1383 (hereafter, C)—69%; Shimon Hakham’s חספה התקח (hereafter, D)—59%. Manuscripts A and C contain the blessing of redemption; therefore, the percentage given for them includes it.

**Hebrew in the Judeo-Persian of KH**

The amount of Hebrew (and at times Aramaic) vocabulary utilized in any given JP work depends on the subject matter, religious texts generally containing more Hebrew than other texts. The translation of the Hebrew hymn in KH contains the following Hebrew terminology: יוי (pg. 63), בָּא (pg. 64), כְּהָו (pg. 72), יָסָה (pg. 77), הָו (pg. 79) and the Aramaic שׁבָּא (pg. 68). A number of calques or word for word translations from Hebrew are also included; they are יָדָא (pg. 57), כָּרָד (pg. 65) and נָאָו (pg. 74). KH uses the medieval form of the Tetragrammaton, יי with a stroke above the י, in both the Hebrew and JP text for ‘LORD.’

The Persian term יאדו is used to translate the Tetragrammaton as well as the Hebrew יולא (pg. 76). Proper names such as Pharaoh, Moses, Israel, Ham, Jacob and Abraham are also rendered in the Hebrew; whereas, Arabic/Persian is used for סָרָא, סָרָא, and יניאר. The Persian plural suffix had is attached to the word, as in יאהמכז and in six instances it is written separately, as in ינהנאשנ (pg. 65). Persian plural suffix NP is also employed throughout.

**Other Select Features of the Judeo-Persian of KH**

The following are early forms of the language found in KH: the verb יָבַשְׁע (‘He gave ear’ (pg. 63), from the infinitive יָבִישׁ is attested in Middle Persian; יַסְוִד (‘stumbling’ (pg. 68); יָסָה, ‘they were strewn; יַסְוִד, ‘corpse’ (pg. 73); יָסָה (‘dominion’ (pg. 58); יָסָה, ‘cry’ (pg. 67); יָסָה, ‘joyful’ (pg. 77). When available, equivalent alter-

---

11 The calculation includes words that are essentially the same but slightly vary with respect to orthography. MSS page numbers for the hymn are as follows: A—51b-55b; B—84a-85a; C—31b-35a; D—63a-64b.
12 MSS A and ל also use יי in the Hebrew text.
13 י—םייאו, י—םייאו, י—םייאו.
Archaic forms of NP found in the Judeo-Persian of KH include the perfective verbal prefix /ب،/ as in ‘He heard’ (pg. 63) and approximately twelve other instances. The one instance in which the perfective prefix /ب،/ is used to denote past habitual action is ‘(they) continually conspired’ (pg. 61). In contrast to NP’s use of the auxiliary verb نﺪﺷ after the past participle of the main verb, passive verbs in KH are rendered with نדמא as in ‘(he) was sent’ (pg. 64), and ‘(they) were decreed’ (pg. 65). NP verbs نﺪﺷ and ندﺎﺘـﺳﺮﻓ are found in the following archaic forms: ‘(he) was sent’ (pg. 64); ‘(it) fell’ (pg. 67). The term נא, ‘galloping’ (pg. 69) is a variant spelling of the participle from the verb זא (present stem זא).

KH has the following independent pronouns: Second person singular ו, ‘you,’ ‘your’; third person singular (NP, ) ‘he,’ ‘his,’ ‘its,’ ‘it,’ used for both animate and inanimate nouns; (NP, ) ‘that,’ ‘this,’ ‘theirs,’ for first person plural, ‘our,’ ‘us’; (NP, ) ‘they,’ ‘their,’ ‘them.’ Subject pronouns are used as second members of the iżāfa construction to indicate possession as in (pg. 56). The translation of  as ‘their’ to ‘our.’ The JP in KH does not make use of pronominal enclitics. It includes such phrases as תֵסִיבָה נֵפֵתנִה בֵּפַרְשָׁא אִישָׁא (pg. 70) and דֵּהֶא אִישָׁא בֵּכֶשֶׁדֶנָּא (pg. 71).

As in NP, when the preposition  is rendered with the Hebrew letter ב is followed by , or, or, , , euphonic /d/ is used, as in (pg. 57). The same is done with , making it (pg. 63). In English ב is most frequently rendered as ‘to,’ ‘with’ and occasionally as ‘for.’

The preposition יא marks the accusative. It is often used in EJP phrases directly translating the Hebrew as in (pg. 60). In a number of instances, יא is complemented by  in the postposition as in .

15 There is one instance of  in , 72.
16 As in , ‘His beneficence’ (pg. 68) and , ‘its streets’ (pg. 64). HUC Ms 931 has what appears to be an error here; the page number is from HUC Ms 927.
17 The JP Haggadoth, exegesis and translation also use .
18 In contrast to texts identified as part of the Khuzistan group as well as a tafsir on Jeremiah (T16); see Shaked, “Classification of Linguistic Features in Early Judeo-Persian Texts,” 453.
19 For other early JP documents that use this marker, see Shaked, “Early Judaeo-Persian Texts,” 210.
A textual comparison of the blessing of redemption and the acrostic hymn found in KH to other JP Haggadoth and exegesis containing the same reveals a great deal of similarity. Like JP Bible translations, they are mostly literal. Syntax meticulously corresponds to that of the Hebrew, at times making the JP clumsy as in the phraseםיִכַלָמַהיֵכְלַמךֶלֶמ (pg. 56), translatedהמההאשדאפ (pg. 58). Following the Hebrew, verbs often precede subjects and translations are word for word as in the phraseםיִרְצִמךֶלֶמהֹערַפדַיתַחַתּםיִדָּבְﬠֶשְמוּ (pg. 59). The plural of the Hebrewםיִבַּרסְיִמֲחַרְבּ is retained inםיִלָגְרִלםיִרֵחֲא (pg. 57) and again inםיִנְעְמוּיָהםִיַרְצִמץֶרֶאךוֹתּוּניֵתוֹבֲאתוֹיְהִבּ translatedןאראיסביאהתמחרב (pg. 60) andםָיַהרַגָס (He closed the sea) rendered in JPאיבְﬠָסְיוּן_thus the sea' (pg. 77). There is also an instance in which the definite article ה is often marked in the JP of KH with the pronounןא, as inץֶרָאָהרַפֲﬠַכּ (pg. 57). Similarly, the Hebrew definite article ה is often marked in the JP of KH with the pronounה, ‘the dust of the land,’ translated by all the JP MSS listed withמן seeBiblia Judaeo-Persica, 37.

There are a small number of instances in which JP word choice reflects a Persian perspective and/or a degree of interpretation that deviates

20 MSS A-53 and B-84 (slight variation) have the same.
21 An example from Bible translation is Ex. 2:17, ירִאָה הָעָרֹב, ‘and the shepherds came,’ translated by all the JP MSS listed withן; see Biblia Judaeo-Persica, 37.
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from the Hebrew. The Hebrew name for God is rendered יקילאכ (pg. 92).

An instance in which the mode of translation requires a degree of interpretation occurs with חָלְשׁוּהןוֹזָחְבּדיִדָיהֶשֹׁמםֶהֵמלַדִּגּרָשָׁיְובוֹט Th. The JP ascribes the adjectives רָשָׁיְובוֹט (translated התסיאשהווכינ, pg. 97) to Moses rather than God.

In the blessing of redemption, the Hebrew יבּרְוּרָפּ is not translated to JP. Thereafter, the JP has additional text that reads יָאַחֲחָרִיִשׁךְלְהֶדוֹנְו (translated תחארהמהרבאותבםיוגרירקאו, pg. 107). The Hebrew לָכּלַﬠשָׁדָחריִשׁךְלהֶדוֹנְו is rendered in JP תחאערלמהרבאותב with a close translation of the Hebrew text. Therefore, we may conclude that the Kaifeng community’s Passover liturgy originated in the Persian Passover rite.

**Conclusion**

It is reasonable to conclude from the observations made here that the JP found in KH is an early form of the language originally composed no later than the thirteenth century CE. The extensive use of EJP for instructions to the reading of the text and the translation of the Hebrew hymn points to the likelihood of the Passover Haggadah originated from Persian-speaking lands, perhaps modern day Central Asia. The Early Judeo-Persian of KH faithfully adheres to a scribal tradition of preserving archaic features of the language and a close translation of the Hebrew text. Therefore, we may conclude that the Kaifeng community’s Passover liturgy originated in the Persian Passover rite.

---


23 As noted in the Hebrew text, יבּרְוּרָפּ is also not translated. A- 56, אבך בכרדינ זנא אים; C- 35, אבך בכרדינ זנא אים.
CHAPTER FIVE

ORDER OF THE SERVICE

The order of service observed in any given Haggadah is connected to the liturgical tradition of the community in which it has developed. While it is not within the scope of the present study to determine the source of the Kaifeng Jewish Community’s greater liturgical tradition, it may be beneficial to offer a brief synopsis of scholars’ general conclusions to date.

Since the late nineteenth century, the liturgy found in the manuscripts of the Kaifeng Community have been identified as sharing most features with either the Persian or Yemenite traditions. For the most part, the Persian rite is associated with Saadiah Gaon, the Babylonian authority of the tenth century CE, and the Yemenite with Maimonides of the twelfth century CE. Elkan Adler identified the rite observed by KFJ as closely resembling that of the Persian. M. Norollah also argued for a Persian origin based on manuscript colophons of extant Torah scrolls belonging to the Community.

Adolf Neubauer saw more affinity with the Yemenite liturgy. In 1920 David Sassoon arrived at the same conclusion as Neubauer but put forward a more nuanced perspective twelve years later when he pointed to possible parallels in the Jewish rites of Persia, Yemen, Aleppo and Baghdad rather than subscribing to either scheme. B.D. Drenger and Cecil Roth would reiterate the same when they published the facsimile of HUC Ms 927.

More recently, Donald Leslie acknowledges similarities between the Persian rite and that of Kaifeng but gives more credence to the connection to Maimonides and the Yemenite rite. Zwi Werblowsky returns to

---

1 There is no mention in KH of the removal of leavened matter, forbidden during Passover, from the house in preparation for the holiday (Bab. Pesahim 30a).
2 Norollah, “Jews in China,” 167. He was also known as Norollah Hakim, an Iranian Jewish convert to Christianity who became a Christian missionary.

In his unpublished article, Shaul Shaked argues that generations would not continue to preserve JP if it were not their native language, especially since the spoken Chinese language of the region in which they settled was in no way related to it. He also dismisses
the nuanced perspective when he posits, “the Persian rite may be closer (via Babylonia) to Yemen than the fragmentary character of our sources permits us to determine,” and rightly suggests that after the tenth century CE one cannot distinguish between Babylonian and Persian traditions.\(^4\) There could also have been other early traditions common to the Chinese, Persian, and Yemenite that are no longer extant. KH contains material found in both Saadiah Gaon’s Prayer Book and Maimonides’ *Mishneh Torah*, resulting in parallels to both the Persian and Yemenite traditions.

The following synopsis is intended to assist in comparing KH to other Haggadah traditions. What is not found in KH is as revealing as what is; it does not include the discussion of the plagues by Yossi the Galilean and Rabbi Eliezer, the *Dayyenu* hymn, the ‘blessing over the unleavened bread’ (*maššāh*), the commemoration of the Temple according to Hillel, nor a quote from Psalm 79: 6–7 or Psalm 136. The likely explanation for the absence of most of these texts is that KH reflects an early Babylonian Haggadah tradition and, therefore, predates later textual expansion to which these texts belonged. It also leaves out passages deemed permissible but not obligatory. The exclusion from the text of the blessing over unleavened bread and *birkat hammāzôn*, ‘the benediction recited after the meal,’ does not necessarily mean that they were not recited. The possible reasons are discussed below. Overall, KH is shorter than most known Haggadah traditions and, in this regard, is similar to PH and YH.\(^5\) Also important to note is the prominence given to Saadiah Gaon’s hymn חַיְיוֹת חַיִיָּה; nearly twenty pages are devoted to it and its JP translation.\(^6\)

The JP rubrics, prompting observance of ritual and recitation of blessings, help to clarify characteristics of the tradition when the text leaves room for ambiguity. A case in point appears towards the conclusion of the seder when *birkat hammāzôn* is not written out but the JP

---


\(^5\) In certain instances, PH has a still shorter text.

\(^6\) HUC Ms 931, 57–75. In Chapter Four, we suggest that KH is part of the Persian Haggadah tradition.
instructions stipulate that it be recited. The absence of the text may be because the birkat hammāzôn was a standard text and it was taken for granted that the reader knew it by heart.

Alternately, there is some evidence to suggest that the absence of such content as birkat hammāzôn was due to KH being copied from a Haggadah written into a prayer book. Similarly, it can be argued that the blessing for spices recited for havdalah is retained even when it corresponds with Passover because it, too, was copied from a prayer book. Moreover, JP instructions pertaining to Hallel, Psalms 113–114 and Psalms 115–118, prescribe reading it in its entirety on the first two days but only part of it on the remaining six days. Such rubrics would pertain to synagogue service, not the Haggadah. In fact, the early Persian Prayer Book (PH) contains almost the same exact JP wording with respect to the morning synagogue service. In this instance, it appears that JP instructions specifically pertaining to synagogue service were confused with content for the Haggadah and mistakenly included in KH.

The Sanctification of the Holiday Recited over Wine

The order in this first part of KH does not conform to other traditions and is difficult to decipher. It begins with Kiddush, ‘the sanctification of the holiday over wine,’ and havdalah as recited when Passover falls on a Saturday night. As mentioned above, the blessing over the spice has been retained.

The Kiddush is the expanded version of Saadiah Gaon, which includes diburim, ‘hymns, utterances,’ designated as permitted by him. In between the two hymns is the havdalah form of the Amidah prayer. It appears to act as a supplement to the expanded Kiddush to be recited on a Saturday night and is well integrated into the text.

The closing formula for when the festival falls on a Sabbath corresponds to the Babylonian tradition, thus ending, “sanctifier of Shabbat,

---

7 Havdalah is the benediction marking the end of the Sabbath and the beginning of the week. Usually Haggadoth first address what prayers should be said if Passover falls on a weekday, then address the Sabbath and lastly the conclusion of the Sabbath. The use of spices for havdalah even on a holiday is attested and is not necessarily an error.

8 б Advice.

9 Also found in PH and YH.

10 Bab. Berakot. 33b, refers to it as the ‘precious pearl’ of Rab and Samuel. On the havdalah, see Safrai, חספלשׁהדגה, 100–101.
Israel and the holidays." It is followed by instructions to recite Genesis 2:1–3 on the eve of the Sabbath. The Šēhēḥēyānû blessing “Blessed are you, Lord our God, ruler of the world, who has kept us alive and sustained us and brought us to this festive time” follows the Kiddush and drinking of the first cup of wine.

Washing of Hands

The blessing, in preparation for the first dipping of a vegetable, recited with the washing of the hands corresponds with Gaonic authorities and Maimonides (as well as Rashi and early Medieval European authorities). Similarly, YH prescribes reciting a blessing while drying the hands.

Green Vegetable and Breaking of the Unleavened Bread

The green vegetable, usually karpas ‘celery’, was eaten as an introduction to a meal in antiquity. KH does not include the blessing over the eating of a green vegetable at this point in the seder, as is tradition in other versions. The blessing, which concludes with “Creator of the fruit of the earth”, is instead found at the beginning of the meal just before the blessing over mārôr, ‘bitter herbs’ (the second dipping). Its omission in the first half of the seder may be connected to its lack of halakhic, ‘legal’, significance.

The JP rubrics in KH (as well as PH) say to lift up the tablecloth, presumably with the unleavened bread. This should be done when reciting the passage that begins, “We left Egypt in a hurry.” As in Saadiah Gaon’s

---

1 Bab Pesahim 107b.

12 See Saadiah Gaon, 145. For earlier sources in favor of saying the prayer, see Kasher, המלה דגיה, 96–97. PH (117, notes 4–6) and other Persian Haggadoth consulted prescribe not saying the blessing. The head of the Ashkenazic household washes his hand but does not say the blessing.

13 For other Haggadoth that have the blessing, see Safrai, חספשלשה דגיה, 103–104. According to Guggenheimer, “The full ceremony of ritual washing with corresponding benediction is observed only among Yemenites and a few other groups of Oriental Jews” (Guggenheimer, The Scholar’s Haggadah, 23).

14 The same is found in some Genizah fragments, see 618, lines 5, 6. PH prescribes saying the blessing with the stem of an onion or chive.
Prayer Book, the breaking of the unleavened bread or setting it aside for *afikoman*, the final unleavened bread, is not specifically prescribed.\(^{15}\)

### Recital

In most Sephardic and some Middle Eastern communities, the second cup was filled while reciting the Aramaic statement per Amram Gaon and Maimonides, “We left Egypt in a hurry.” KH also includes it; however, there is no reference in the text or rubrics to filling the second cup of wine, as is custom at this juncture in Sephardic and Middle Eastern traditions. The statement as found in Saadiah Gaon and PH, “This year we are here; next year we shall be in the land of Israel; this year we are slaves; next year we shall be free. Everyone who is hungry should come and eat and everyone in need should come and celebrate Passover,” varies slightly from that of KH and YH. According to Persian custom as found in PH, the second cup was washed and filled with wine after this statement.\(^{16}\)

### The Four Questions

The recital of Israel’s slavery and redemption (the *maggid*) continues with *Mah Ništannāh*, “How is this (night) different (from the other nights)?”\(^{17}\) The order of the questions and details of orthography mostly correspond to Saadiah Gaon’s Prayer Book, while the content is more that of Amram Gaon and Maimonides. It is not indicated in KH whether the unleavened bread was uncovered, as in Ashkenazic and most Sephardic traditions, when reciting the biblical passage “We were slaves to Pharaoh in Egypt.” The story of the sages in B’nei B’rak and the questions of the four sons, with a few exceptions, correspond to Maimonides.\(^{18}\)

---

\(^{15}\) Saadiah Gaon prescribes reciting the blessing over the green vegetable and bringing forth the table with unleavened bread (page 136). PH and YH also prescribe bringing forth the table with unleavened bread.

\(^{16}\) Saadiah Gaon, 136; PH, 618.

\(^{17}\) YH has a longer recital than the others. Here KH differed from YH in having a shorter *Mah Ništannāh* section. As in Saadiah Gaon’s Prayer Book, PH says a boy is to stand and recite the questions.

\(^{18}\) As in Saadiah Gaon, the main text of PH does not include the story of the sages in B’nei B’rak and the passage related to R. Eleazar ben Azariah. Both emphasized the
KH includes the introductory statement to the stories of sages who discussed the Exodus beginning “even if we are all wise” also found in Rav Natronai, Rav Amram and Maimonides. In the section describing the four different types of children, it is worth noting the variation in KH as to the wicked son’s question, “To you, not to me.” The response in the first person “to me and not to you; if you had been there you would not have been redeemed” corresponds to Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, that is, the legal interpretations (midrash halakhah) of the biblical book of Exodus. The same wording is found in Genizah MSS and other Haggadoth, including PH.

With respect to the child who doesn’t know how to ask a question, other Haggadoth read, “To the one who does not know how to ask, you should initiate the discussion with him. As it is said, ‘You must tell your son on that day, saying, “On account of this that the Lord did for me when I went out from Egypt.”’” The KH text is, “To the one who does not know enough to ask, you should begin to (tell him) according to what is said, ‘You should tell your son on that day.’” Its shorter text is most likely due to the absence of a later expansion. This version parallels Saadiah Gaon and is found in many Haggadoth, including YH.

Subsequent to the questions of the four sons is the quote from Joshua 24: 2–4 regarding the idolatry of Israel’s ancestors, the calling of Abraham and praise to God for keeping his promise to Abraham. Then the story

---

importance of discussing the Exodus. They are, however, added in the top and bottom margins of PH; see 612-638.

19 It is not found in Saadiah Gaon. See Joseph Tabory, JPS Commentary on the Haggadah; Historical Introduction, Translation, and Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2008), 38; Safrai, חספליישדנה, 120–121.


21 Ex 13:8. Also see Maimonides in Kasher, נדיהשלום, 101, and Tabory, JPS Commentary, 87.

22 KH then moves to the discussion of when it should take place. KH and PH, 63ב add ‘perhaps’ before the second occurrence of the words ‘you must tell your son’ to introduce the discussion regarding when to tell one’s son about the meaning of Passover. The use of the word ‘perhaps’ allows for a smooth transition into the following discussion. PH is still shorter than KH; it reads, “And in every generation (one) must view himself as if he had gone out of Egypt. As it is said, ‘He took us out from there.’” The text from AH and SH has been added without vocalization in the left margin.

23 AH and SH have a longer version; see Guggenhiemer, 64.
of Jacob is recounted and how he and his people multiplied, became a nation in Egypt and suffered ill treatment at the hands of Pharaoh. It asserts that God actively interceded on their behalf; He saved them and continues to redeem His people in the future. No rubrics accompany the text that reads, “This is what sustained our fathers and us.”

KH contains the midrash, ‘explanation of key phrases,’ from Deuteronomy 26: 5–8 which begins with “And learn what Laban the Aramean sought to do to Jacob, our forefather.” The text mostly parallels that of Maimonides. The exegetical explication of Deuteronomy 26:8, “Through a strong hand, an outstretched arm, great fear, and signs and wonders,” is also included. This portion of the Haggadah ends with the ten plagues God is said to have brought upon Egypt.

KH and PH do not include the exposition of the plagues by Rabbi Yossi the Galilean and Rabbi Eliezer in which those brought on the Egyptians in their land are compared to the plagues brought upon them on the sea. According to Saadiah Gaon, it was a later addition and its recitation was not obligatory; Maimonides did not include it in his version. Similarly, the liturgical hymn Dayyenu, ‘It would have been sufficient,’ was also deemed voluntary by Saadiah Gaon and it, too, is not found in KH or PH.

No rubrics accompany the KH text that discusses the three words without which, according to Rabbi Gamliel, there can be no fulfillment of the duty of observing Passover—unleavened bread (maṣṣāḥ), bitter herbs (mārôr) and the Passover lamb (pesah). Therefore we do not know

24 According to most traditions, the leader of the ceremony covered the unleavened bread, raised the cup of wine and recited it. Tabory explains that this is a late tradition; see his “Introduction” and page 89.
25 HUC Ms 931, 32–47; HUC Ms 927, 29–44. Also see Saadiah Gaon, 243 and Tabory, JPS Commentary, 35.
26 Saadiah Gaon does not include the biblical verse from Genesis 47: 4 in support of “He (Jacob) went down to Egypt and sojourned there.” Orthographically, KH has many parallels to Saadiah Gaon.
27 This text also appears in PH and Tabory with a slight variation; PH begins it with, “God took us out of Egypt with.” It is in the upper margin of the folio and is unpointed. A variation of it is found in SH and AH just before, “The Lord brought them out of Egypt, not through an angel …;” see Guggenheimer, The Scholar’s Haggadah, 47 and Safray, הָדָּגָה חָשְׁפִל שׁ, 139–140.
28 KH makes no reference to the custom for which the leader of the ceremony dipped a finger into the wine glass and lifted out a drop for every plague or any variation of this tradition; see Guggenheimer, The Scholar’s Haggadah, 301–303; Tabory, JPS Commentary, 44–45, 94.
if the unleavened bread and bitter herbs were lifted and shown as the explanation of why they are consumed was read.\textsuperscript{29} This concludes the Recital.

Before the meal, Psalm 113 and 114 are recited. The KH introduction to Praise of God beginning “Therefore we are obliged to thank” is the longer version found in Maimonides; KH varies slightly in word choice and word order.

As with KH, PH and YH include Saadiah Gaon’s acrostic hymn, הָתַּאָתְּלַאָגּ, each line followed by the corresponding Judeo-Persian translation. Listed as the third of four diburim Saadiah Gaon says can be recited to supplement recounting the redemption of the Israelites, the hymn was popular among Persian speaking Jews. A large number of extant JP manuscripts include it together with JP translation. The blessing of redemption begins on pages 55–56 and resumes after the hymn on pages 75–76. The account of Israel’s redemption concludes here with the blessing and consumption of the second cup of wine.\textsuperscript{30}

\textit{Unleavened Bread}

The JP rubrics in KH say to take up one and a half pieces of unleavened bread and say the blessing. However, the blessing over the unleavened bread added to the standard blessing of bread (recited before the consumption of any meal), “Blessed are you, Lord, our God, king of the world, who sanctified us through his commandments and commanded us about the eating of the unleavened bread”, is not in the text.\textsuperscript{31} The most likely explanation for this is that it was taken for granted that the blessing over unleavened bread was to be recited immediately thereafter and that the reader would have memorized it. The rubrics in KH that follow

\textsuperscript{29} PH corresponds to the text found in Saadiah Gaon. Following the text that reads, “And in every generation, one has to view himself,” it quotes Deuteronomy 6: 23, skipping the text, “Since the Holy One, praise be to Him, not only liberated our forefathers.”

\textsuperscript{30} KH, 79. As with the Sephardic tradition, PH, 682, does not say the blessing over the second cup.

\textsuperscript{31} PH has detailed rubrics; it says to wash the hands and recite the corresponding blessing, take up two and a half pieces of unleavened bread, place the half between the two whole pieces, take the pieces in hand and say the blessing. Afterward, one should cut a piece of the top unleavened bread and the half unleavened bread and dip in salt, eat from them the size of an olive after reciting the blessing over bread and the same amount after reciting blessing over unleavened bread. See PH, 682.
say, “if (it is a) green vegetable, one should say (the following) . . .”32 It
is at this point that the blessing over a green vegetable not recited earlier
“Blessed are you, Lord, our God, king of the world, creator of the fruit of
the earth” is found in the KH text.

Bitter Herbs

After the blessing over mārôr, ‘the bitter herbs,’ the JP rubric of KH
prescribes taking unleavened bread and bitter herbs in hand. It appears
to be a reference to kôrēk (ךָרֶךְ), the custom attributed to the rabbinic
sage Hillel of placing bitter herbs in between layers of unleavened bread.
If this is indeed a reference to kôrēk, then there appears to be a conflation
between it and the ‘bitter herbs’ section.33 There is no separate recital for
kôrēk34 that would begin, “In remembrance of the Temple according to
Hillel.” The text of KH instead reads, “In remembrance of the mortar.”
Tit, ‘mortar, clay,’ is a Talmudic term. It is mentioned when prescribing
how the hārôset, ‘a mixture of fruits, nuts and wine,’ be made thick since
it symbolizes the mortar that the Israelites were forced to produce.35

Furthermore, the JP prescription in KH to eat roasted meat stands out
since, in most other respects, KH follows the Babylonian tradition. When
the Temple in Jerusalem still stood, one of the questions pertaining to
“Why is this night different from all other nights?” dealt with eating only
roasted meat at the seder whereas on other nights meat could be prepared
roasted, stewed or cooked. The Eretz Israel Haggadoth include roasted
meat in their blessing; therefore this might be a reference to an early
tradition of eating roasted meat to commemorate the paschal sacrifice.36

The benediction “Blessed are You, Lord, our God, King of the world,
Creator of a multitude of living creatures for all that He created. Blessed is

---

32 HUC Ms 927, 77, is legible; HUC Ms 931, 80, is not.
33 It is often anachronistically referred to as a ‘sandwich’ or ‘Hillel’s sandwich’ in
English language Haggadoth.
34 PH has the recital for the kôrēk; see PH, 698. Norollah translates the word following
‘bitter herb’ in KH as (לֶשֶת; Hebrew?) ‘morsel.’
35 Bab. Pesahim 116a; KH spells it as לאשיט לאשיט not לֶשֶת Leshit. The misspelling may be another
case of phonetic transcription.
36 The Mishnah, Pesahim 116a (70a) prescribes both the festival sacrifice and the
paschal sacrifice be roasted. PH (698) does not make any mention of consuming roasted
meat; see Tabory, JPS Commentary, 52–53. After the destruction of the Temple, meat was
no longer consumed with the unleavened bread and bitter herbs and the question was
replaced with one pertaining to reclining while eating the meal.
life everlasting” found in Saadiah Gaon’s Prayer Book after eating karpas, ‘the green vegetable,’ is here probably functioning as the concluding blessing for the green vegetable required by early authorities. The JP rubrics preceding it are difficult to decipher.

The Meal and Final Piece of Unleavened Bread

The rubrics following the blessing indicate that the festive meal was to be consumed at this point. No specific mention of the custom of eating the afikoman, ‘the last food to be eaten at the meal,’ is made here. The term afikoman, however, is used in the second to last line of page 24 in response to the son who does not know enough to ask. More rubrics follow, stating that after having eaten, one must wash everything, including the cup and one’s hands.

Washing of the Hands

At this juncture the leader of the ceremony washed his hands, reciting the benediction: “Blessed are you, Lord, our God, King of the world, who sanctified us with His commandments and commanded us regarding the washing of hands.” From its placement, it seems to be a blessing for the washing at the end of the meal before birkat hammāzôn.

Benediction and Third Cup of Wine

The verses from Psalm 79:6–7 beseeching God to punish the gentiles are part of a later tradition and are not found in KH. After the blessing over washing the hands, the rubrics prescribe reciting birkat hammāzôn, but the text is not provided. It may have been left out because KH was copied from a Haggadah that was part of a prayer book or taken for granted that

---


38 Norollah, “The Jews in China,” 169, makes no attempt to translate it. See also “Haggadah Text,” footnote 545 below.
the reader had committed it to memory. There is no mention of the third cup of wine or its blessing.\footnote{The JP rubrics of PH prescribe saying the blessing of the third cup.}

\textit{Praise}

The beginning of each psalm, 115–118, is marked with a Chinese negative particle, ‘no,’ ‘not,’ or ‘don’t.’ Preceding Psalm 115, just above the text of the Psalm are JP rubrics that reiterate the prescription to read the \textit{Hallel}, ‘praise,’ in its entirety the first two days and only partial \textit{Hallel} the remaining days. Except for a few non-biblical lines, this section is not vocalized. Therefore, it is possible the negative particle means that these passages need not be pointed because they were sufficiently well known Bible passages. However, it is also possible that the negative particle is an indication that this section stopped being recited at some point in the history of the Kaifeng Jews. This appears to be an instance where different layers of traditions are preserved side by side, the JP from an earlier period, the Chinese from a later period.

JP rubrics prescribe repeating “O Lord, save, please” twice. Likewise, the rubrics say to repeat twice “for His kindness is everlasting.” \textit{Yĕhallĕlû¯kā}, ‘God, I exalt You,’ being the blessing with which the \textit{Hallel} concludes, follows Psalm 118; it is the \textit{birkat haššhîr}, ‘the blessing of the song’ according to the opinion of Babylonia Amora, R. Judah.\footnote{Rather than \textit{Nishmat} based on R. Yohanan, an \textit{Eretz Yisrael} Amora. See Bab. \textit{Pesahim}, 118a.} Early Haggadoth from both traditions include the \textit{Yĕhallĕlû¯kā} blessing at the conclusion of \textit{Hallel}. Again, we see KH reflecting an early Haggadah tradition.

\textit{Conclusion}

Upon concluding the recitation of \textit{Yĕhallĕlû¯kā}, the blessing over the fourth cup (assuming that the blessing for the third cup had been made) is recited. KH concludes here instead of a later tradition of reciting Psalm 136 and drinking a fifth cup. The lack of additional songs in the KH is once again consistent with the supposition that the source of KH is an early Babylonian tradition.
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ברוח אשת יהוד אֲלָלָה מַכָּל 10שֶׁדֹקְלַי בָּיְהָקִיטוּלַי 11ליִדְּבְמַּה 12םָלוֹעָה
לֶאָרְֹשִיןיֶבוּ תֶשֵׁשְׁליִﬠיִבְשַׁהםוֹיןיֶבוּ ... it should be, “He distinguished us ... from all
the nations of the earth. He caused us to inherit a desirable thing.”

10 Instead of קָלָשׁ לַי, meaning “profane”. It is a textual difference; see Kasher, 4. Most of the versions, including the JP manuscripts, have קָלָשׁ לַי instead of קָלָשׁ לַי. Hayim Moreh, המגרתוארקמחספלשהדגה המלש (Tehran: Matba’t-i Danish Nasiriah, 1933/34), 10, has the same reading as KH.
11 Lit., ‘separates.’
12 The ה is hidden in the binding in HUC Ms 927. It is clearly found in HUC Ms 931.
13 Instead of קְלַשׁ לַי קְלַשׁ לַי. YH and PH also have קְלַשׁ לַי instead of קְלַשׁ לַי. See Kasher, 4. Saadiah Gaon, ולק.
14 After the Kaifeng text jumps to the last sentence of the paragraph. The intervening sentences (between “six working days” and “Blessed are you ...”) are transposed to page 9.
15 Instead of קָלָשׁ לַי. A, 24b (see footnote 377 below), has the same pointing as KH.
16 Instead of המבריל. From what we know (see “Influence of Chinese Pronunciation and Other Developments”) the scribe was probably reading the word as ha-mee-be-dil instead of hammahbdil.
17 HUC Ms 931 has קָלָשׁ לַי.
18 Although the expected form is attested elsewhere in KH. HUC Ms 931 has קָלָשׁ לַי.
19 Instead of בָּה. PH, 59b, line 8, corresponds to KH.
20 Instead of אֶהְיָב. PH, 59b corresponds to KH.
21 The two Hebrew words, בָּה (‘he chose us’), are joined into one word בָּה. This was a deliberate act. It was not a copyist error or copying two words too close to one another because the šewad’ indicates a deliberate act of joining the words together.
22 Instead of נְפָאְרָא. HUC Ms 931 has נְפָאְרָא.
23 Instead of נהָבוּ. In the other Haggadoth, the word ‘land’ is the object of the verb ‘he caused us to inherit.’ The sentence is thus, “He separated us from all nations, he caused us to inherit a desirable land.” In KH, the word ‘nations’ (יֵיוֹגּ) is in construct with the word ‘earth.’ Therefore it is clear that it should be, “He distinguished us ... from all the nations of the earth. He caused us to inherit a desirable thing.”
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The vowel is not indicated in HUC Ms 931.

The maqqē¯p is not attested in HUC Ms 931.

Both forms are acceptable. "שׁ" is also attested elsewhere in KH. The "שׁ" is inconsistently indicated in KH. Sometimes it is clearly written as "שׁ"; at other times it is written as "ש".

The expected form is attested in HUC Ms 931.

YH does not qualify the word 'things' with 'great.'

Same may be said of PH; see 592, line 12.

The vocalization of KH is fine since the word is a construct form of "עַטְנ".

The "hīreq" under the "מ" is mistakenly written as a "patah" in HUC Ms 927. HUC Ms 931 has the correct vowel.

In HUC Ms 927 it is clearly "לָכַּמ."
HUC Ms 931 has an extra ‘for they were’ (םשה) after קרס. This was probably a later addition since it is not found in HUC Ms 927 or the other Haggadoth. It might have been done to make the sentence parallel to the previous sentence, “For they are (םשה) likened to the host on high.” Another reason why this was likely a later addition is that it is unpointed while the surrounding texts were pointed. Finally, the sentence, as it stands, is awkward: “For they were and compared to the stars of the sky.” If the addition was written by the scribe as he was copying, we would expect him to leave out the so that the sentence would be, “For they were compared to the stars of the sky.” The reason there was an extra is most economically explained if the preceding word, גחא, was added after the sentence was written.

43 השם instead of משלם in HUC Ms 931. In HUC Ms 927, השמ is clearly indicated. The qames in HUC Ms 931 is likely a copyist error.

44 השם instead of השמ. Inconsistent representation of the word ש. In Biblical Hebrew we would expect מלם although ש ש ש ש are all attested.

45 עייקרה instead of עייקא. PH (59ב, line 17) is the same as KH. The definite article is not attested in YH.

46 חтик instead of חת. PH (59ב, line 17) is the same as KH. The definite article is not attested in YH.

47 בכר instead of בכרו. PH is the same as KH.

48 שבכ instead of שבכ. PH is the same as KH.

49 ו instead of ו (glory, brilliance). KFJ needed an extra /u/ vowel to pronounce the final waw. Thus they were pronouncing the word as zi-wu instead of zîw (See “Influence of Chinese Pronunciation and Other Developments”).

50 יהוה instead of יהוה. PH is the same as KH; see 60ח, line 2.

51 יהוה instead of יהוה. PH is the same as KH; see 60ח, line 2.

52 יהוה instead of יהוה. HUC Ms 931 has השמ instead of השמ. Doubling after the definite article is not attested. This is inconsistent since doubling after the definite article is indicated elsewhere.

53 יהוה instead of יהוה. PH is the same as KH; see 60ח, line 3.

54 יהוה instead of יהוה. PH is the same as KH; see 60ח, line 4.

55 יהוה instead of יהוה; sâgol instead of sere. Also a definite article is not found in YH. PH is the same as KH; see 60ח, line 3.

56 a) YH has ‘Lord of host’; b) יי as a short form of יהי is found in some ancient manuscripts documented by Kennicott and deRossi. PH is the same as KH, יי.

57 In HUC Ms 931, a dageš is attested in the .
Page 6

Page 7

Page 8

58 instead of שָׁרוֹן.
59 instead of מַרְיוֹן. YH’s doubling of the ש is fine in Mishnaic Hebrew. KH’s version is also fine according to Biblical Hebrew.
60 instead of שָׁרוֹן.
61 instead of מַרְיוֹן.
62 instead of מַרְיוֹן.
63 instead of מַרְיוֹן.
64 The sentence beginning, “He called us brothers …” is not found in YH. PH, 608, line 9 is the same as KH.
65 In HUC Ms 927 the text is slightly damaged with the result that the י is only partially seen. The word is clearly presented in HUC Ms 931.
66 (‘LORD, our God’) is not found in KH after יְשָׁמ לָשׁו (‘He did for us’). In this case, YH has the better reading since the subject of the verb is not found in KH.
67 instead of קְרָדַה.
68 instead of בָּאָבּוּבּ.
69 The sentence beginning, “He delivered us …” is not found in YH. PH is the same as KH; see 608, line 13–14.
70 instead of נָשְׁר. PH is the same as KH except for the דָּגָּשׁ in the י; see 608, line 12; however, it is in the margins and looks like it was written in a different script.
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בֶּקְדִציֵטְפִּミ וּנֵיְדְמַלְתַּו

Page 10

אֲתָא יִמְמֹנָהָה יִזְהַ אֶזַּי

The text is taken from HUC Ms 931.
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89 It is not clear if there is a dāgēš in the י.
90 It is not clear if there is a dāgēš in the ה.
91 It is not clear if there is a dāgēš in the י.
92 Instead of יִדּוֹהְלִי, HUC Ms 927 continues from this page.
93 PH 60ב has no י.
94 It is not found in the other haggadoth.
95 לָכְבּוֹת rather than לָכִּמ.
96 PH 60ב has the same without the dāgēš in the י.
97 PH 60ב does not have הָנָשְׁוַתּוֹא.
98 The infinitive was probably meant to parallel עַיִדּוֹהְלִי (to make known). If so, it was rather bad Hebrew. The word 'serve' (דבע) parallels 'took up' (לבק) rather than 'to make known.' This grammatical construction is found in both KH manuscripts.
99 It is unclear if there is a dāgēš in the ה.
100 Instead of saying 'on it they took upon themselves the yoke of his kingdom (מלך במלכות) with joy,' KH has 'on it they took up his kingdom with joy.'
101 PH has the same consonants as KH; see 60ב, line 14.
102 Instead of just יי, PH has the same consonants as KH; see 60ב, line 14.
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malē ṭemēḥ shēḇāt mōnēdī
kōrēṣh bēṣmēḥō šēšō
bērōṯ āḥāh yī mokēr ṭemēḥ
yīšrāʾēlōn ḥōminēm: āmō ṣēḇ bēḥt
mīḵlē rashmiṃ
kōḵr āḥāh bīm ṭemēḥ
mēlācḥōn āṣrū ṭešēh
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bīm ṭemēḥ mēḵlēmācḥōn
ašā šēʿāh: nōḇrēḏ ḡālīm
aḥōṭiṃ ṭemēḥ bēḵdēš āḥāh
yī bō ṭemēḥ mēḵlēmācḥōn
āshēr bārāʾ ḡālīm lēšōṭāh:
vi ḡālīm ni ṭemēḥ mēḵlēmēḵāh
ḏōwšē ṣēṭāḥiṯōn

110 ḥīdīḥi instead of ḥīdīḥi.
111 HUC Ms 931 has the expected ḥēsqāh.
112 ḥōminē instead of ḥōminē.
113 ḥōminē inserted before ṭemēḏ in KH.
114 ṭēšāh instead of ṭēšāh. The latter is more consistent because of ṭēšāh. PH is the same as KH; see 618, line 1.
115 bēḵdēš instead of ṭēšāh. PH is the same as KH; see 618, line 2.
116 ḥēsqāh (HUC Ms 927) instead of ḥēsqāh. In HUC Ms 931, the š is doubled.
117 The maqqēp is not attested in HUC Ms 931.
118 bēḵdēš ḡālīm lēšōṭāh is found in the Kiddush for the eve of Sabbath. It is found also in YH and PH 108.
119 ṭēšāh instead of ḥēsqāh. PH 618 has ḥēsqāh.
120 vi ḡālīm ni ṭemēḥ mēḵlēmēḵāh is attested in HUC Ms 931.
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122 instead of the expected. But it is written correctly in the very next line.

123 The syntax is not in conformity with Persian. The construction is normally
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124 HUC Ms 931 has בדואים instead of בדוא(ים)

125 instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי

126 YH has a pausal form. KH has a regular form with a sêrê instead of a ségal under the 3.

127 Norollah, “The Jews in China,” 169, translates שלוה as ‘broth’ (as in ‘soup’ or
pottage’) and suggests the translation, ‘He should eat the broth.’ The verb in both MSS is
clearly דנאכב, ‘to recite,’ not דנאכב, ‘to eat.’

128 Norollah, “The Jews in China,” 169, translates שלוה as ‘broth’ (as in ‘soup’ or
pottage’) and suggests the translation, ‘He should eat the broth.’ The verb in both MSS is
clearly דנאכב, ‘to recite,’ not דנאכב, ‘to eat.’

129 instead of בדוא(ים)

130 instead of בדוא(ים)

131 instead of בדוא(ים)

132 Persian manuscripts A, C and D (see footnote 455) have JP translations of these
lines beginning 'In haste.'

133 instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי

134 instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי

135 instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי

136 instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי

137 instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי instead of בדוא(ים) יָתִי
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�ֳִוִּוַטַּי
אָדָּחאָﬠְרַאְבּ
אָדָּחאָתַּשׁ
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שָּׁבֵכֶל הַלַּיְלָה אוֹנָאְכִּלִּי
ַנֶּמֶשָּׁה הַלַּיְלָה הֹוהָ בֵּלְכַּבֶּשׁ
ַשָּׁבֵכֶל הַלַּיְלָה אוֹנָאְכִּלִּי
ַהַלַּיְלָה הָמוּרֶרַיִם
ַשָּׁבֵכֶל הַלַּיְלָה אוֹנָאְכִּלִּי
כָּנָי אָנָי מַעְָבְּדַי הַלַּיְלָה
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והָה בֵּלְכַּבֶּשׁ
ַסֵּבָּדְי הָיָּני לַפְּרָעְה בֵּמְצַרְיָם
ַוּזִיָּאָני ויָיָא לַאֲלָבְּנָי

138 יֵתֶּּיַי instead of יֵתיֵי. The sěgōl might have been a scribes error or, given the unique Hebrew pronunciation at Kaifeng, an indication the sēwā’ was pronounced as an /e/ vowel.

139 אָדָּחאָﬠְרַאְבּ instead of אָדָּחאָﬠְרַה.

140 אָחָסַפְל instead of חַסַפְל.

141 אָדָּחאָתַּשׁ instead of אָדָּחאָתַּשׁ.

142 שָּׁבֵכֶל הַלַּיְלָה instead of שָּׁבֵכֶל הַלַּיְלָה.

143 שָּׁבֵכֶל הַלַּיְלָה instead of שָּׁבֵכֶל הַלַּיְלָה.

144 שָּׁבֵכֶל הַלַּיְלָה instead of שָּׁבֵכֶל הַלַּיְלָה.

145 הָלְיַלַּה instead of הָלְיַלַּה.

146 הָלְיַלַּה instead of הָלְיַלַּה.

147 הקט instead of הָלְיַלַּה.

148 The section beginning with “We left Egypt in haste” (page 16) until here is in Aramaic.
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149 Like Saadia Gaon, הַלְּכָה and PH ב 61.
150דְּיָנ instead of דְּיָנָה.
151 instead of מְשַׁבְּבִים (YH and SH) or מְשַׁבְּבַּי (AH). PH ב 61, line 12 has מְשַׁבְּבִים.
152 instead of בֵּין. The י is not attested. PH ב, line 11 is the same; both conform to Saadia Gaon's Prayer Book, page 137.
153 instead of מְשַׁבְּבִים. This is not consistent as the same word occurred with a pataḥ just a few lines down.
154 instead of לְפַרְעָה.
155 HUC Ms 931 has הָכֹת.
156 instead of הָכֹת. The use of the matres י for this word was consistent in this passage. The dāgēš is not attested in the ה in HUC Ms 931.
157 instead of חָרְזִיהוֹת.
158 instead of בֹּצַעַת.
159 The infinitive לְפַרְעָה is not attested after פּמַרְאִי. This may be a haplography because the same sequence of words, פּמַרְאִי בֹּצַעַת מַפָּרַת, is found directly above them in KH. It could also be a stylistic variation. PH ב, 61 ב, which added text to upper margins of the page, corresponds to YH.
160 instead of לְפַרְעָה. HUC Ms 931 has אֲלִיעָר.
161 instead of וּחוּרִים. The maqqēṣ was used in KH. Also KH used an א instead of a י for the final -ah syllable of the name; JP Ms C, 106 ב, corresponds to KH. This name was consistently spelled this way in KH.
162 Instead of בֹּצַעַת.
163 A letter on the right of תַאיִצִבּ (first word of the 4th line) is deleted in HUC Ms 927.
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רב אלעזר ברנימוריה מר
בכל שבעת שנות ליוו עמה.
שאתמר ברצאת מביתות סליחה
ecedor אתים עצמא.
מאור מצרים כל פי חיזח יתמי.
כי לי חיצ הלילה וחברים.
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א凱מס ימי חיזח חכית הקה.
כלי ימי חיזח לbbing עת ימות.
.icמיסט יברון מהקדים שעית.
ותורז ליישאראל עע בורך הוא.

Since this letter was outside the right margin, it is unlikely to be the original letter written by the scribe. In other instances where a letter or word appears on the right margin, it is a correction. This is probably the case here as well. Someone noticed that the correction was extraneous and deleted the extra ב (bet) or כ (kap) by blotting it out with ink.

164 Instead of קים.
165 עלם (HUC Ms 927) instead of עלם (YH) or עלם (AH and SH).
HUC Ms 931 has שיל.
166 יא instead of יא.
167 ר instead of ר.
168 אלא instead of את.
169 י instead of י.
170 וב instead of וב.
171 י instead of י.
172 It should read “(The days of your life) may refer only to the days.” The words in parenthesis are not found in KH. The נ was mistakenly copied as a ה.
173 Instead of ז’ét.
174 המיש instead of המיש.
175 — In HUC Ms 927, the patah under the נ is unusually thick. It seems like the scribe wrote the wrong vowel and corrected his mistake by writing over it with a thick patah. HUC Ms 931 has שט.
176 Instead of ז’ét.
177 Instead of ז’ét.
178 Instead of ז’ét.
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 вместо (YH, PH, and SH). AH has the same form as KH.

181 דָחֶא instead of דָחֶא. The second to the fourth דָחֶא have a ב. In the other Haggadoth, it is the last דָחֶא that has a ב. PH 638, line 33 has a ב before the second and fourth דָחֶא.

182 וּניֵאַשׁדַחֶאְוםָתּדָחֶאְועָשָׁר instead of וּניֵאַשׁדַחֶאְוםָתּדָחֶאְועָשָׁר. Since the vowel was indicated with a ו it was a deliberate act and not a scribal error. PH 638, line 3 has וּנְיַאַשׁדַחֶאְומָה.

183 לַאְשִׁל instead of לַאְשִׁל. The word in PH, לַאְשִׁל, is also without the ו. Instead of reading the word as a feminine plural, they read it as a feminine singular.

184 The word וִיֶעֶדּוֹי was inserted before the word לַאְשִׁל in HUC Ms 927. This word was inserted after the manuscript was written because the inserted word was on the right margin of the page. Someone, the scribe or another person, realized that a word was missing and inserted it into the text. This has happened a few times with individual letters. HUC Ms 931 has וִיֶעֶדּוֹי.

185 “The wise son’s reference to laws that God ‘commanded you’ would indicate that he—like the evil son, later on—dissociates himself from them. However, because he speaks of ‘our God’, it can be assumed that he does not mean to exclude himself from the fulfillment of the commandments (Rashi) … To avoid a possible misunderstanding, the Mehilta and Yerushalmi change the text of the question and have the wise son say וּנְתוֹא, commanded us. Actually, however, this may hardly be necessary. In contrast to the word מֶכָל, used by the evil son, the word מֶכְתֶא, you, can be understood to include the speaker, for it can be taken as a contraction of מֶכְתֶא וּתוֹא, me and you, like the word מֶכְתֶא (Sota 34a; Yavetz).” [Rabbi Joseph Elias, The Haggadah, The Artscroll Masorah Series, 9th impression (Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1986), 83.] Based on Babylonian traditions, Sephardic and Middle Eastern texts have “you.”

186 פָסָכֵן and פָסָכֶא instead of פָסָכֶא. PH, פָסָכֶא, line 6 has the same spelling. Note, however, that they seemed to pronounce certain /a/ as /o/ (e.g., Abraham > SHIPPING - hàn).

187 פָסָכֵן instead of פָסָכֶא. PH, פָסָכֶא, line 8 has the same orthography (פָסָכֶא).
Page 25

Page 26

191 instead of לו לא denotes direct quotation, replacing lv in the preceding quote; PH, 638, line 10 has the same reading. The use of the first person is found in a Genizah manuscript. The change may be because לו and לא sounded the same to the ear and it might be misunderstood or it may result a mistake in the reading. Ironically just such a mistake was made a few lines up. Alternately, it could be a play of word on the answer to the evil son. Since he did not say "What does this ordinance means for me" you shall reply with the word 'me' in the answer, "Because of what the Lord did for me ..."

192 instead of אסור.

193 KH has changed the order of the words slightly in the sentences about the evil son. The others have, "Since he has taken himself from the community and has denied the root, you shall surely blunt his teeth and said to him on account of this." KH has, "Since he has taken himself from the community and has denied the root, you shall surely say to him and blunt his teeth on account of this."

194 instead of נביא.

195 instead of ל, PH, 638, line 13 has the same. It is consistent with the use of direct speech found in the first line of page 25. It is attested in other Haggadah manuscripts. Note the use of a pausal form instead of the regular form.

196 KH continues the direct speech pattern in the rest of the answer to the evil son: "On account of this the Lord did to me when when I went out from Egypt. 'For me' and not 'for you' because if you were there you would not have been redeemed." In all these cases, the other Haggadoth have the third person pronoun. PH 638, lines 13 and 14, is the same as KH.

197 instead of אל.

198 instead of זור.

199 instead of ישנא (YH and SH) or ישניא (AH).

200 instead of ישנא. This form of the word appears numerous times in the Kaifeng Haggadoth and will not be noted in the footnote again.

201 instead of ישנא.
What the father was supposed to tell his son is not found in KH. Other Haggadoth read, “To the one who does not know enough to ask, you should begin with him. As it is said, ‘You must tell your son on that day, saying, ‘On account of this Lord did form me when I went out from Egypt.’’” KH has, “To the one who does not know enough to ask you should begin with him. As it is said, ‘You must tell your son on that day.’” KH then moves to the discussion of when it should take place. KH and PH, line 1 add ֹא before the second occurrence of the words ְנִבְלָתְדַגְִּּו to introduce the discussion regarding when to tell one's son about the meaning of Passover. The use of the word ֹא allows for a smooth transition into the following discussion.

203 PH, 63ב, line 2 has the same reading but without the dâgēs.
204 HUC Ms 931 has חורש.
205 ָת instead of ָת. They have the same general meaning in this context.
206 I.e., on the fourteenth rather than the first of Nissan.
207 דַּגְּשׁ instead of דַּג. AH and SH has the same word as KH except that the ד is a stop instead of a spirant.
208 אָל instead of אָל (YH) or אָל (AH and SH). PH, 63ב, line 5 corresponds to KH, but without the dâgēs.
209 מַגְּרָם instead of מַגְּרָם.
210 יְוָשָׁב instead of יְוָש (YH) or יְוָש (AH and SH). PH, 63ב, line 9 corresponds to KH. In previous cases, the furtive pataḥ was lengthened to a patah and placed under the consonant before the guttural (e.g., יָשָׁב). This could not be done here because of the י has a vowel under it; therefore, they left out the furtive pataḥ altogether. In this particular case, the pronunciation Yo-shu-wo is provided in the transliteration found in Chinese inscriptions.

[William C. White, Chinese Jews: A Compilation of Matters Relating to the Jews of Kai-feng Fu (2d ed.; New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corporation, 1966), 1:61.] Thus, at least for this name, it appears that they were pronouncing the furtive pataḥ as such or as a full vowel in the oral tradition.
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211 פָּרָה instead of פָּרֶה.
212 יָאָד instead of יָאָד. PH, 63ב, line 13 corresponds to KH. It should also be noted that in HUC Ms 927, there is a smudge above ב and ב.
213 אֲבָרָה. Cf. footnote 211 above.
214 אֲבָרָה instead of אֲבָרָה (YH and AH) or אֲבָרָה (SH). PH, 63ב, line 15 corresponds to KH but does not have a dagesh in the ב. YH and AH have a segol in the second syllable because they joined the verb to ב with a maqêp. SH did not join the verb to ב and this was why it has the expected sere. KH and PH join the verb to ב with a maqêp and thus have a segol as well.
215 בַּעֲבָד instead of בַּעֲבָד.
216 בַּעֲבָד. Cf. footnote 214 above.
217 בַּעֲבָד instead of בַּעֲבָד; the expected form of the name is attested just few lines down.
218 בַּעֲבָד instead of בַּעֲבָד.
219 בַּעֲבָד instead of בַּעֲבָד. AH has a piel perfect instead.
220 מַטַּש instead of מַטַּש. AH, "in the covenant" is not attested in KH and PH, 64ח, lines 4 and 5.
221 בָּּר instead of בָּּר. PH, 64ח, line 4 corresponds to KH. This variant is found in both HUC Ms 927 and HUC Ms 931.
222 בָּּר instead of בָּּר. Since the matres ב could be used to indicate an /o/ vowel, the consonantal difference was not very important. Like PH 64ח, line 4 they probably read the word as בָּּר. This word occurs very frequently in the Kaifeng Haggadoth usually in the fixed expression, בָּּר. Its unique spelling will not be noted again.
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הֶיְהִירֵגיִכּעַדֵתּ 225 עַוֹדָי
רֶמאֹיַו 224 םיִרָתַּבַּהןיֵבּ 
רָמֱאֶנַּשׁ : אֵמִירָאַהְו 
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לָכְבּ בֹּקֲﬠַיְלָה 235 הָדְּמָﬠֶשׁ 229 
וּנָלוּ 228 הָנָשׁ 227 איִהְו

A sôp pāsiq after the word דָּגֵּהָ in the word בָּלֵגֶּשׁ marks a break in the text of KH and PH. It probably
marked the covering of the unleavened bread and the taking up of the cup as in other
Haggadoth.

Both KH and PH, 64ח, line 11 have this alternate form of the word; PH lacks a dāgēš in the ב.

The alternate reading might have originated from a scribal error since רְשׁ (ר) looks very similar to dālet (ד). The error was then understood as 'another' and pointed accordingly. The present text of KH reads, "no one else stood against us."

The š is not found in PH, 64ח, line 11 as well. PH also does not have dāgēš in the ב.

As in the other Haggadoth, there is a break in the text after בּמַכֶּל. This was probably
when the cups were put down and the pieces of unleavened bread were uncovered.

Propretonic reduction is given up under the א.
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1. instead of א; PH 64א, line 15 has the same reading.
2. —Per Saadiah Gaon, PH and YH have this adjective; AH and SH do not.
3. instead of ו. PH 64ג, line 16 has the same pointing but not the ו or a dâgeš in the ו.
4. instead of ב.
5. instead of ב. These might have been affected by words like ב and ב a few lines earlier, i.e., the scribe thought that a šureq was supposed to be placed before a ב.
6. instead of ר, ב. PH 64ג, line 16 has the same pointing but not the ו or a dâgeš in the ו.
7. instead of ב. Thus also in the next line. A šegol is attested in HUC Ms 931.
8. instead of ב. PH 64ב, line 4 corresponds to KH.
9. There is a break after ב like in the other Haggadoth.
10. instead of ב (AH, SH and PH) or left out altogether in YH.
11. instead of ב. PH 64ב, line 7 corresponds to KH.
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ינאצם הכמה שלמה: בנו

Page 36

נתחкамהIFEST חכם בך

וילקאה ווכל זכר

על-שם שוא 지난ת-

וחודו בתו עמה

תורו והכמה שלמה

המשריר הכמה שלמה: הב

---

257. יברה instead of זברה.
258. HUC Ms 931 has תָּמֵא instead of תָּמֵא.
259. קה"ר instead of קה'ר.
260. NH Ms 931 has בך instead of בו.
261. PH Ms 64ב, line 10 has the same reading as KH but without a dagesh in the ב.
262. יברה instead of זברה.
263. HU Ms 931 has בך instead of בך.
264. SH Ms 64ב, line 13 corresponds to KH.
265. PH Ms 64ב has בך instead of בך.
266. PH Ms 931 has תָּמֵא instead of תָּמֵא. HUC Ms 931 (with doubled nöz) is attested in HUC Ms 931.
267. Shenayim—In HUC Ms 927 there is a shewa' under the נ instead of a hōlem. A faint shewa also appears under the נ in HUC Ms 931. However, this might have been an imprint from the shewa' of נ with ר on the opposite page. Note that both pages left water marks on each other. For example, the mirror images of the letters וה of הניאצם (the first word of the first line on page 36) are quite clearly imprinted on page 35.
268. קה"ר instead of קה"ר.
270. There is no dagesh in the ב in HUC Ms 931 (PH Ms 65ב, line 2 is the same), but it is found in HUC Ms 927.
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271 instead of בְּפִרבּ; PH 65א, line 5 is the same.
272 instead of כּנַבּ.
273 instead of בְּכָיַבּ.
274 instead of שִׁירְאַלְטּ. However, they spelled it in the conventional way just a few lines above.
275 instead of מֶלְדּ.
276 instead of אָלְלֹנַה. However they wrote it in the conventional way before and after.
277 instead of שֶׁלָם.
278 instead of דֹּדְדּ.
279 instead of יְשָׁרֻאָלַן.
280 instead of אָרֶנַן.
281 instead of יִשּׁאָל.
282 instead of כּלָל.
283 instead of דָלָל.
284 instead of שִׁירְאַלְטּ (YH) or שִׁירְאַלְטּ (AH and SH). PH, 65ב, line 2 corresponds to KH but does not have a dāgēš in the ת.
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וייצאנו, וי יציאנו ממצרים לא על דרכם;
ון שהם על דרכי, שיר לא על הקדות בכרות והא רבם בבר נס דרכם בבר.
ונרכה בבר, ונרכשו בכל מזרמים מאדם עד בחמה ובכל.

Page 41

אלו המעיין אשת השמס שקטים
אלו מה: דרכם והוקה בבר ומי והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקה בבר והוקa בבר והוקה בבר והוקa בבר והוקא
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285 ולא instead of ל. Note that the very next ל was spelled with the expected patach.
286 ממלך instead of ממלך; The lack of a hireq is likely a copyist's error.
287 על instead of על; The expected form is attested in HUC Ms 931.
288 ו instead of ו. However, it was written in the conventional manner in the lines above and below.
289 ו instead of ו; The lack of a hireq is likely a copyist's error. KH spelled the word with the matres מ, PH, 65ב, line 4 corresponds to KH.
289 ו instead of ו. However, it was written in the conventional manner in the lines above and below.
290 AH and SH read 'in His splendor by Himself'; PH 65ב, line 7 reads, 'by Himself'
291 ל вместו של. The expected form is attested in HUC Ms 931.
292 ו instead of ו. The expected form is attested in HUC Ms 931.
293 והוקה בבר instead of והוקה בבר; The rest corresponds to KH. The text is not found in other Haggadoth.
294 ו instead of ו; HUC Ms 931 has a segol. PH, 65ב, line 8 has the same without a dagesh in the "ו".
295 ו instead of ו (SH) or ו (AH). PH, 65ב corresponds to KH. The /o/ and /u/ vowels for this word seem to be interchangeable in SH and AH as well.
Page 42

Page 43

Page 44
Page 45

בָּרוּךְ הוָא לַעֲמָדָיו בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

In HUC Ms 927, the scribe left out the ב when he copied the word; he or someone corrected the mistake by inserting the ב in its proper place above the word.

There is an unidentifiable sign between בּוֹרָﬠ andםיִנִּכּ. In HUC Ms 931, it appears as (i.e., as a colon with a long comma on its right). The ink of this word in HUC Ms 931 is, however, much darker than the surrounding words and so could have been added later.

There is an unexpected dāgēš in the ה. The dāgēš is missing in HUC Ms 931.

There is an unidentifiable sign between בּוֹרָﬠ andםיִנִּכּ. In HUC Ms 931, it appears as (i.e., as a colon with a long comma on its right). The ink of this word in HUC Ms 931 is, however, much darker than the surrounding words and so could have been added later.

In HUC Ms 931, it appears as (i.e., as a colon with a long comma on its right). The ink of this word in HUC Ms 931 is, however, much darker than the surrounding words and so could have been added later.

The furtive patah is attested here.

There is an unexpected dāgēš in the ה. The dāgēš is missing in HUC Ms 931.

There is an unexpected dāgēš in the ה. The dāgēš is missing in HUC Ms 931.

There is an unexpected dāgēš in the ה. The dāgēš is missing in HUC Ms 931.

There is an unexpected dāgēš in the ה. The dāgēš is missing in HUC Ms 931.
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בָחַאְבּ שְׁדַﬠ ְצַדּ ןָמיִסםֶהָבּ רֵמוֹא לֵאיִלְּמַגןַבַּר

Page 79

בָחַאְבּ שְׁדַﬠ ְצַדּ ןָמיִסםֶהָבּ רֵמוֹא לֵאיִלְּמַגןַבַּר

330 בָחַאְבּ instead of בַחַאְבּ, PH, 668, line 15 corresponds to KH in using qames instead of patah but without a dagesh in ב.

331 שְׁדַﬠ instead of שַׁדֲﬠ. It is part of an acronym, so the pronunciation does not change the sense of the passage. The pronunciation of the šewa’ as a patah and vice versa is attested elsewhere in KH (see pages 50–51.).

332 ְצַדּ instead of ַצְדּ. The expected form is attested in HUC Ms 931.

333 ןָמיִס instead of םיִנָמיִס. PH, 668, line 14 corresponds to KH in using singular instead of plural but it is written in smaller script that appears to be a later addition. Also the introductory phrase ןָמיִסםֶהָבּןֵתּוֹנהָיָההָדוּהְייִבַּר is written in a smaller script in PH and appears to have been added at a later date.

334 Like PH, KH does not include the discussion of the plagues nor the hymn, Dayenu. Furthermore, KH and YH have אוֵֹמר, following Saadiah Gaon and Maimonides, instead of הָיהאוֵֹמר, ‘used to say.’

335 שְׁדַﬠ instead of שַׁדֲﬠ. The phrase, הָשֹׁלְשׁ (‘what was the reason?’), is not found in KH; but not in YH. PH, 662 does not have the text that reads, “The Passover that our forefathers ate when the Temple was still standing was because.”

336 והָיהאוֵֹמר instead of והָיהא, (‘they are as follow’) does not appear in KH and PH, 668, line 17. Both KH and PH (per Saadiah Gaon,.classList) have the plural (רֵמוֹא לֵאיִלְּמַגןַבַּר)

337 שְׁדַﬠ instead of שַׁדֲﬠ.

338 ְצַדּ instead of ַצְדּ.

339 KH has the word אֱוֹדִתוֹנִי found in AH and SH but not in YH. PH, 662 does not have the text that reads, “The Passover that our forefathers ate when the Temple was still standing was because.”

340 וּלֵּא instead of וּלֵּא.

341 The phrase, והָיהאוֵֹמר (‘what was the reason?’), is not found in KH; but not in YH. PH, 662 does not have the text that reads, “The Passover that our forefathers ate when the Temple was still standing was because.”

342 שַׁדֲﬠ instead of שַׁדֲﬠ. The word is written wrongly. The correction is written above the mistake.

343 The word is written wrongly. The correction is written above the mistake.

344 The word is written wrongly. The correction is written above the mistake.
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וַמַּהֲרֵם בְּזָה פִּסַּת הָזָא לְיִדְי
אֵשׁ פְּסַת עָלָי בֵּית בֵּית רַעְלָא
בִּמְעִירִי בְּנֵנֶה אֲדַמְּצֵדָא
וַאֲתָ בוֹטִינָא
יִקְלָא 346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
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לְהַמְּטִירִין דֶּנָא שַנְּגַלְּדַיְלָא
מָלְּקִי הַמָּלְכֵי בָּרֹד הָזָא
גָּנוֹלַתָא מְדִי שַנְּנַאָהָן
אַרְּדָכָּּן אָאָרְו הָזָא
וֹמַעָה בְּכַעָא שְּלַכְּבַּאָה
וּמַעְרַיָא 357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367

346 הנָאָא תַּעְלִי instead of דְּקִּיָא; PH, 66ב, line 5 is the same.
347 האָל instead of דְּקִּיָא.
348 בְּעָל instead of דְּקִּיָא.
349 There is a break after והשָׁתָה. In the other Haggadoth this is the time the leader of the Passover showed the unleavened bread.
350 HUC Ms 931 has והשָׁתָה.
351 a) The phrase על שָׁמָא הַמָּה (‘what was the reason?’) is not found in KH; b) אַקְלָל instead of אַקְלָל as above.
352 זוֹקְנָה instead of שַנְּנָה. HUC Ms 931 has שַנְּנָה.
353 ו instead of ו; PH, 66ב, line 6 is the same.
354 שַנְּנָה instead of שַנְּנָה. The two words were combined into one word in KH. This has occurred before, as noted above.
355 HUC Ms 931 has והשָׁתָה.
356 a) שָׁמָא as with YH and in contrast to שָׁמָא in AH and SH; b) על שָׁמָא הַמָּה על שָׁמָא in the other Haggadoth have been shortened to על שָׁמָא in KH.
357 Pages 48–52 are replacement pages in HUC Ms 931.
358 הַלִּיטֶה instead of לְהַלִּיטֶה.
359 שַנְּגַלְּדַי instead of שַנְּגַלְּדַי.
360 הַלְּטָה instead of הַלְּטָה. Here, KH corresponds to AH in contrast to SH, YH and PH.
361 הַלִּיטֶה (‘The Holy One’) is not found after ‘King of kings’ in KH.
362 בּוֹלָא instead of דּוֹלָא; סֶרֶה instead of סוּגֶל. A סוּגֶל is attested in HUC Ms 931.
363 בּוֹלָא instead of דּוֹלָא.
364 סֶרֶה instead of סוּגֶל. HUC Ms 931 has סוּגֶל instead of הַטֶּפֶל סוּגֶל under the ק and a דָּגֶשֶׁ in the ש.
365 בּוֹלָא instead of דּוֹלָא; קָוֵמָא instead of שְׁכָיוֹ. HUC Ms 931 has קָוֵּמָא instead of קָוֵמָא. KH follows Maimonides in having דָּגֶשׁ, ‘immediately.’
366 There is no דָּגֶשׁ on the ַ in HUC Ms 931.
367 HUC Ms 931 has מְמַמְּזְרִיָא.
There is a break after살והשל like the other Haggadoth. This break is for showing the מָרְור.

There are corrections and differences in spelling and pronunciation throughout the text. For example:

- Page 49, line 368: "In HUC Ms 927, a ' was inserted between ר and מ to correct the error.
- Page 50, line 382: "אַשָּר עָבְדָה כָּל בַּקָּדֶשׁ" instead of "אָשָׁר עָבְדָה כָּל בַּקָּדֶשׁ".
- Page 50, line 383: "וּדְבָּרֶשֶׁא תוֹאְרָלָא בִּיָּח רֹודְו" instead of "וּדְבָּרֶשֶׁא תוֹאְרָלָא בִּיָּח רֹדוֹו".

These corrections and differences reflect variations in orthography and pronunciation across different manuscripts of the Haggadah.
As if he himself went out, now, from the servitude of Egypt) instead of (As if he went out from Egypt) found in the other versions.

Alternate forms of the same word.

The expected dāgēš in the sh is not found; PH, 678, line 4 has the same orthography.

Furtive pataḥ is not found. HUC Ms 931 has an extra š in the line above, just before this word in the following line. It seems that after this scribe had written the first two consonants of the word, he realized that he would not be able to finish the word without exceeding the vertical column. So he began the word again in the next line, but forgot to cancel out the first two consonants after he had written the word below.

HUC Ms 931 has הָבִיך instead of הָבְיך. PH, 678, line 4 has the same orthography.

HUC Ms 931 has also the short instead of the long form of ‘we’ but with different pointing.

KH has ‘to us and to our ancestors’ instead of ‘to our ancestors and to us.’ PH only has ‘to us.’ In HUC Ms 927 the suffix ‘our’ is hidden in the binding. HUC Ms 931 has וַלְצָנְל instead of וַלְצַנְל. The š has been substituted with a ş; it is the first instance this has happened. PH, 678 does not have לְצָנְל.

HUC Ms 931 has לְצָנְל instead of ולְצָנְל. The š has been substituted with a ş; it is the first instance this has happened. PH, 678 does not have וַלְצָנְל.
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לֶבֶאֵמוּהָחְמִֹשְלןוֹגָיִמוּ 406

The following are Psalms 113 and 114, which are the first two of six Psalms (113–118) known as Hallel (Praise), recited on festivals to commemorate Israel's deliverance in times of crisis. Psalms 115–118 are taken up towards the conclusion of KH, 82–99.

The following is Psalm 113. HUC Ms 931 vocalized the first two words as הָלוּאְגִל. The name of God is written as הוהי here and the next two times it appears on this page in HUC Ms 931.

The scribe who touched up the word mistakenly wrote a נ instead of a ב. This mistake might have been influenced by יבישומ in the following line.
The following is Psalm 114.

The translation of the blessing of redemption and the liturgical hymn are here compared to the following Judeo-Persian Haggadoth manuscripts: A—BZI 4598 (fourteenth century), 51b-55a; B—NLI 8° 3199 (late eighteenth century), 83b-85a; C—NLI 8° 1383 (mid nineteenth century), 31b-34b; and D—Shimon Hakham (1904, 1961/64), 63a-64b. JP translations of the Pentateuch as printed in Paper's A Judeo-Persian Pentateuch and
Biblia Judaeo-Persica 2(1) were also consulted and Hebrew abbreviations from the latter are used here; they include ־—BM Or 5446 (1319), ־—VatPers 61 (seventeenth century), ־—BZI 1028 (nineteenth century), ־—Constantinople Polyglot (published in 1546) and ־—Shimon Hakham. The page numbers given for ־—BM Or 5446 (1319) are from A Judeo-Persian Pentateuch.

421 A—בָּדֵא בַּאֲלִיקָא אָתְּמַא; C—בָּדֵא בַּאֲלִיקָא אָתְּמַא.
422 This word is damaged in HUC Ms 927. The א is clearer in HUC Ms 931.
423 The נ was mistakenly left out in HUC Ms 927. A scribe corrected the mistake by inserting the נ above the word at the correct place. This mistake is not found in HUC Ms 931.
424 Literally, “in it.” Variations include ־—בָּשֵׁב בַּאֲלִיקָא בֹּאְי—C; ־—בָּשֵׁב בַּאֲלִיקָא בֹּאְי—A.
425 PH and YH have this same acrostic hymn that follows המָרָהִים. Here, the poem is interspersed with JP translation; see the description of JP in KH.
426 Spelled with ס, not ס. Persian has both spellings; סִיָרְצִמ instead of סִיָרְצִמ.
427 HUC Ms 931 has the expected אֲבָנְנוֹת בַּתּוּחָא אֲרָקִיָּמ. 428 HUC Ms 931 has the expected אֲבָנְנוֹת בַּתּוּחָא אֲרָקִיָּמ.
429 [ ] תַּאָרַא שָׁבֶּהוֹת קי יִסְדָּלְמָאָתָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב B—תַּאָרַא שָׁבֶּהוֹת קי יִסְדָּלְמָאָתָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב C—תַּאָרַא שָׁבֶּהוֹת קי יִסְדָּלְמָאָתָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב D—תַּאָרַא שָׁבֶּהוֹת קי יִסְדָּלְמָאָתָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב
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429 [ ] תַּאָרַא שָׁבֶּהוֹת קי יִסְדָּלְמָאָתָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב א—תַּאָרַא שָׁבֶּהוֹת קי יִסְדָּלְמָאָתָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב B—תַּאָרַא שָׁבֶּהוֹת קי יִסְדָּלְמָאָתָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב בַּתּוּחָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב C—תַּאָרַא שָׁבֶּהוֹת קי יִסְדָּלְמָאָתָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב D—תַּאָרַא שָׁבֶּהוֹת קי יִסְדָּלְמָאָתָא אֵּּבְרָאָה קָהָא חֶרֶב
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436 HUC Ms 927 mistakenly repeats the word, מנה, here. The mistake is not found in HUC Ms 931.

437 No definite article. The ה in PH 67ג, line 2 appears to be a later addition.

438 PH, 67ח, line 1 is the same but without a dāgēš in the ג.

439 A—אין.

440 See ש, כ, י, ר, page 5.

441 A—ויהי בנסיון; B—ויהי בנסיון; C—ויהי בנסיון; D—ויהי בנסיון.

442 There are three short strokes, whose meaning is unintelligible, after the name "Pharaoh". They are not found in HUC Ms 931.

443 PH instead of פָּרַע. Hiphil instead of Piel. PH 67ג has the same reading.

444 A, C, and D have the more literal translation סכן מhattan. B has תָּפָּרַע מasthan.

445 The sôp pāsîq in HUC Ms 927 appears as an 'I'. In HUC Ms 931, the expected form is attested.

446 A—בונים сырד; B, C, D—בונים сырד.
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The word was mistakenly copied as מ in HUC Ms 927. The correction was written above the mistake. The error is not found in HUC Ms 931; it has מ.

A—יתיג
B

Page 62

The text of PH, 67ב, line 5, corresponds to KH.

A—יתיג
B

Page 63

Both KH manuscripts have an extra י after the ב.

A, C—יתיג
B—יתיג
C, D—יתיג

459 Copyist error for י. The error is found in both KH Haggadoth.
The present text of HUC Ms 931 has קְמָיִין instead of קְמַיִין. The vowels have clearly been rewritten by a later scribe and the qāmeṣ might have been a sĕgōl that was incorrectly written.

KH adds ‘May he be blessed’ after ‘King of kings.’ PH, 67ב corresponds to KH.

This archaic verb קָרְשָׁה found in early PH is written as two separate words in HUC Ms 931, קָרְשׁוֹנָה, but it is correct in HUC Ms 927, page 60. A—הַנַּהָשׁ; B, D—הַנַּהָשׁ; C—הַנַּהָשׁ. It is found in the negative in כ, page 132, line 46 (גָּמֶל יִנָּשׁ).

HUC Ms 931 has קְמָיִין instead of קְמָיִין.
The Haggadah text is written in Hebrew. It appears to be a religious text, likely from a Jewish manuscript. The writing is in a cursive style, common in handwritten texts from the past. The text contains various Hebrew words and phrases, which are traditional elements found in Jewish prayers and blessings.

The page contains a mix of Hebrew letters and some Latin characters, indicating that this document might be an ancient manuscript or a transcription of one. The text seems to be structured in paragraphs, with each paragraph containing several lines of text. The Hebrew script is dense and tightly packed, typical of ancient manuscripts where space was valued and every character was used efficiently.

From the content visible, it appears to be a religious text, possibly a prayer or a blessing, given the presence of traditional Hebrew phrases and vocabulary. The text includes several names and terms that are characteristic of Jewish religious language.

Without translating the entire document, it's clear that this is a significant piece of religious literature, likely used during religious ceremonies or at特定的仪式。
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סְבוּרָנָּסְיוּרֶאֶּתֶרֶאֶהְו
אֵּنوֹֹשְו
וֹמָהְבּ בַּשֶּׁה
אֵּאָּלֶמְרָנֶאֶדָּבְ
אַּשִּאָּבְ אֵּדָּרֶאֶו קְוָלָּו

Page 69

בְּחָאַיָּבָּרֶאֶד
אַסְאִאו מַדָּבְ
מַּגְהָּאִו
מָﬠִגְּיַו
דָּיֵנִא אֵרִי
אֵּנוֹֹשְו
וֹמָהְבּ מַדוּרֶא
וֹמָהְבּ בַּשֶּׁה
בּוֹדֶאָו אִנוָּבְ
בּוֹדֶאָו אִו
בּוֹדֶאָו אִו

486 HUC Ms 931 has אֵנוֹֹשְו.
487 סְבוּרָנָּסְיוּרֶאֶּתֶרֶאֶהְו instead of שְּבוּרָנָּסְיוּרֶאֶּתֶרֶאֶה. PH, 68א also has 'his tribes' instead of 'tribes' but it was likely a later addition. A (ישיב), B, C (without pointing) and D also have 'his tribes.'
488 סְבוּרָנָּסְיוּרֶאֶּתֶרֶאֶה יִשְׁבַּה סְבוּרָנָּסְיוּרֶאֶּתֶרֶאֶה
A—יאָּו בַּשֶּׁה; B—יִשְׁבַּה מַדוּר; D—יִשְׁבַּה בַּשֶּׁה.
489 Written as two words in both KH, הסבר should be one word, הסבר, meaning, 'to stumble,' as is attested in other JP texts. The Hebrew letter /י/ at the end of the word is yā-yi va˙hdat or 'the ī of indeterminacy.' The variants found in the other MSS (A—יחדיוולכש; B—הושהדובּרוכס; D—הוושהדיבּרוכוס) are also attested in early JP texts.
490 בנבּ instead of בנבּ. Consecutive imperfect instead of perfect. HUC Ms 931 has יִשְׁבַּה.
491 בנבּ instead of בנבּ. Consecutive imperfect instead of perfect. HUC Ms 931 has יִשְׁבַּה.
492 A, C—דָּיֵנִי אֵרִי; B—דָּיֵנִי אֵרִי; D—דָּיֵנִי אֵרִי. Both manuscripts of KH have an archaic form of 'to lead.' Manuscripts A, C, and D more closely represent the NP causative form דָּיֵנִי אֵרִי.
493 A—דָּיֵנִי אֵרִי; B—דָּיֵנִי אֵרִי; D—דָּיֵנִי אֵרִי. Both manuscripts of KH have an archaic form of 'to lead.' Manuscripts A, C, and D more closely represent the NP causative form דָּיֵנִי אֵרִי.
494 Saadia Gaon, Guggenheimer and D—בּוֹדֶאָו אִו; A—בּוֹדֶאָו אִו; B—בּוֹדֶאָו אִו; C—בּוֹדֶאָו אִו. In HUC Ms 927, אִו is written over the ב, as if a scribe was trying to correct the spelling to י.
495 Instead of 배ּחָא found in HUC Ms 931. A scribe corrected the mistake in HUC Ms 931 by inserting the ב at the appropriate place above the word.
496 A variant spelling from the infinitive senate. A, C— senate; B— senate; D— senate.
Instead of the expected form, יואיהאפס they are written as one word in both KH.

A—בֹקֲﬠַיריִבֲאֵםםיִמֲחַר
B—בֹקֲﬠַיריִבֲאֵםםיִמֲחַר
C—בֹקֲﬠַיריִבֲאֵםםיִמֲחַר
D—בֹקֲﬠַיריִבֲאֵםםיִמֲחַר

Instead of וּאְסָנםֶהיֵניֵﬠ HUC Ms 931 has וּאָסָנ.

A—םֶהיֵאְנוֹֹש
B—םֶהיֵאְנוֹֹש
C—םֶהיֵאְנוֹֹש
D—םֶהיֵאְנוֹֹש

Instead of לַהָצ PH, 688 א also has דומנןאָלְווַג=לֵהָצ, ב—ןאלוג דומנ=לֵהיִצ, C—דזהרענ=להצ, and A—דזהרענ=לֵהִצ. Guggenheimer, 72–73, has לַלָצ, 'to plunge, submerge.'

Instead of וֹתּ־לֶא PH, 688 also has a Hiphil infinitive construct instead of perfect. HUC Ms 931 has הָלָצ. However, it is apparent that the vowels and word were darkened by a later scribe probably because the original words had faded. The original vowel is probably represented by HUC Ms 927.
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דרשמנא אカラ דרמא
ཀער דרי: קער רי
אתרטמ יים 510 לקית
שנשות לארביה
בירדויט קארא אברא
וא דרי בקוק כרמ סנטה
ואנ 513 מונת קורד בד יארבמה:

Page 73

ראז דריימ בפריר שביאמה
שנה מוקלי 14
לירישית קה:
דרידת ודסשה קא דר
סטונא איא ודשמנא אשתא
אנר איאשת אמסנדן
ולב איא דרייא: שרה
ומורה זרבו חול יאמר
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משה ברעור 518 לפלן קודה
נעג והנה סכונת חטלא
נפת מש בחרתי קויא
והחל:
איתפורת זרבו והשחבוט אמור

509 Saadiah Gaon, הק喁, has כימ. Instead of כים סח, סח כים. Thus also B, C and D have כים. Mi יס סח קים.
510 'Our forefather' is not found in KH or PH, 688, line 11.
511 In HUC Ms 927 the word was mistakenly written as בקוק. A scribe wrote the correct word, بكוק, on the right margin, next to 18. The mistake is not found in HUC Ms 931.
512 A scribe inserted a ב between כש and ח to correct the copyist's error in HUC Ms 927. This mistake is not found in HUC Ms 931.
513 סוטוור—嵊נער פגז켜 פזקנער אנק
514 Saadiah Gaon, הק喁; A, C—מקפיל; B, D, Guggenheimer, 73.
515 בלאה הדיא—בלאה השѧ; D—בלאה השѧ.
516 A—היא אשיאו אופטיאייטא אובר; B—היא אישיאו אופטיאייטא ונר; C—היא וישיאו אופטיאייטא אובר; D—היא וישיאו אופטיאייטא זרב.
517 Saadiah Gaon, קמק—קמק.
518 'Our rabbi' is not found in YH but Saadiah Gaon, PH, 688, B and D have it.
519 A scribe inserted a ב between וש and่าน to correct the copyist's error in HUC Ms 927.
This resumes the ‘blessing of redemption.’

‘the God of our forefathers’ is not found in YH. The JP in KH has it, as do Saadiah Gaon, A and C. HUC Ms 931 has אבדיה נון.

‘with joy’ is not found in YH, A and C; PH, 688, line 17 corresponds to KH. לרגלי per Saadiah Gaon, Galilean text from the Genizah and Maimonides.

Unintelligible marking in HUC Ms 927. It is not found in HUC Ms 931.

The words 신이 신이 are not translated to JP. A, C—ıkl.C—ıkl.

The phrase שָׁדָּחריִשׁ is not translated to JP. A—ıkl.C—ıkl.

The word ‘all’ is not found in PH and YH.

There should be a period at this point. It is not found in either KH.

KH has instead of לכן; PH, 688, line 6 has the same reading.

The מ in HUC Ms 927 can not be discerned because of damage to the text. It is clearly attested in HUC Ms 931 as אם.

Saadiah Gaon, חכמים.
A, C—רברא; B—דר רברא; D—דר רברא.
This resumes the ‘blessing of redemption.’
Saadiah Gaon, תכ.

‘the God of our forefathers’ is not found in YH. The JP in KH has it, as do Saadiah Gaon, A and C. HUC Ms 931 has אבדיה נון.

‘with joy’ is not found in YH, A and C; PH, 688, line 17 corresponds to KH. לרגלי per Saadiah Gaon, Galilean text from the Genizah and Maimonides.

Unintelligible marking in HUC Ms 927. It is not found in HUC Ms 931.

The words 신이 신이 are not translated to JP. A, C—ıkl.C—ıkl.

The phrase שָׁדָּחריִשׁ is not translated to JP. A—ıkl.C—ıkl.

The word ‘all’ is not found in PH and YH.

There should be a period at this point. It is not found in either KH.

KH has instead ofכן; PH, 688, line 6 has the same reading.

The מ in HUC Ms 927 can not be discerned because of damage to the text. It is clearly attested in HUC Ms 931 as אם.
A—ב cigarette; C—אייש
534 נורה בשאתה; הב ע続いて את השהד; C—a shadow; במשאתה; הב עbyterה את השהד.
535 The lines from "תשוגזאו" to "ותיחבזמידא" do not correspond to the Hebrew. They are not found in the other JP Haggadoth either. They appear to be reiterations or expansions of the previous statement.
536 The JP of KH does not translate "שדחריש". Instead there is a reiteration/extension of the previous statement; A, C—שדריש.
537 The phrase "וונרורוס" does not correspond closely to the Hebrew.
538 במשאתה; הב עbyterה את השהד.
539 כבודה; הב עbyterה את השהד.
540 Based on HUC Ms 927; it is not legible in HUC Ms 931.
541 The text of HUC Ms 927 is slightly damaged and that of HUC Ms 931 is also unclear.
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A מ was inserted to correct the word from הדאה to המדאה in HUC Ms 927. The mistake is not found in HUC Ms 931.

Norollah, “The Jews in China,” 169, also has המלך; he translated the term as ‘morsel.’

The misspelling of the final ס with ס may be another case of phonetic transcription.

The root רכשׁ has the general meaning of ‘to fill, saturate; to drink freely’ (Jastrow, 1896); if so, it may be a reference to the recital of a blessing of fullness or one who has eaten fully. It is also possible that the word should be read as תרמושׁ; if so, it may mean a blessing of observance or that someone observing the meal should recite the following blessing.

The following JP text, largely illegible, is found on the right margin here: [זורודרגא] [יזוריס] [לילהקוליד]. They are not translated in the English translation of KH.

There is a Chinese negative particle (bu, ‘no, not’) on the margin, next to the Hebrew word אל. This word occurs again at the beginning of all the Hallel psalms.
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השעץפחרשא :םהיבצע
םדאידיהשעמבהזוףסכ :
םיניעורבדיאלוםהלהפ
ואריאלוםהל :םהלםינזא...

Page 84

בנורונש: כמוה 어느عشיהם
כלהארושבשהדםישארל
בוטהבירוורוםמנגהוהא:
ביתאוחרשכתביורם
מכוננהוהאירייבוטחה:
בייוורוםמנגהוהא:
יהventarioידברירכאתбит
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ישראלברךאתביתאוחר:
ברךיריאוץקקטעמוס
כדוריסףויעלכמהעלכמה
עללביכס:בוכמסאתיבי
עשהשמווארכ:שמו
שםלורואאראנותלבך
겐ורמהלאהמכותיהוליהל
לאבכמס.
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כלתרדרותמהאנותכנברך
יהמ평가长约עלמהוליהל:553

552 The other haggadoth have יד הלל.
553 The JP word for ‘then,’ ‘after,’ ‘afterwards’ appears in the left margin to indicate that one should read this psalm after completing Psalm 115.
554 The verb is in the plural instead of the singular.
555 Psalm 116.
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אקראר אנה 557. יי מלה נפש: 
גן יי בדיר אללחנס: מרה:
שוכר פתחיש יי דלוי ו.
והישט: שובי נשפי לדוגייזרי
כי יי גמל עלייכי: כי תלעות
מש המשוות את עני.
דמעה את רפי מרד: 
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האתוכלס לפני יי בראשת היהם: 
האמות יי ברבר יי עניית
מקא: ימי אמורית בתרפי כל
האמוד בוב: חמי אשי לוי
כלה הנומולח עלי: חוס ישועות
אתא虺 יי אקראר: דורי
ליי אושל נודדה נא לבל 
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עם: יקמ בבעל יי חמות
ל setDate: אנה יי ביני
עמד יי בעד יי אמות
פתוחת לפשר: לכל אבוד
בחי והזוד ובש יי אקראר: 
נדה ליי אושל נודדה נא
לבל עם בחרות ביני 
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بوتככ Reality: ידושל חלהויי: 
הללוי 558. יי יי כל גוס שביהו

556  אנה ל; both KH MSS wrote them as one word.
557  PH ב70 has the same as KH. Saadah Gaon, Guggenheimer, Tabory have הנא.
558  Psalm 117. A Chinese negative particle is written on the upper right hand corner of the word 'praise.'
כל האמת: ויベース אלי
הסוד: ואמת ויベース הולילה
ודוה [不] לויベース ויベース

יאמר ובית אחרון ויベース
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Page 92
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559 Psalm 118. A Chinese negative particle is written on the top right hand corner of the Hebrew word, 'give thanks.'

560 In HUC Ms 927, the word ‘everlasting’ is left out in the main text. A small circle is written between the words ‘that’ and ‘his kindness,’ and the word ‘everlasting’ is inserted on the left margin by a scribe.
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In HUC Ms 927 the words לארשי מנה are written incorrectly. As a result, two new words are written next to the original words. For an unknown reason, a scribe felt the need to write three small circles above the words and inserted the word again on the right margin.
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There are two letters דע written at the end of the line. In JP, it can mean ‘two’ or ‘twice’; it makes sense here since these verses were to be repeated. This prescription is found in Persian Haggadoth up until present day.
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A Chinese negative particle is written on the right of the wordךוללהי. Since this is not a psalm from the Bible, the negative particles are not written to indicate that there was no need to vocalize the previous passages because they are from the Bible. It should, however, be noted that these lines look very much like the psalms. Above the Chinese negative particle appear to be JP words, the only legible of which reads, דנאכב, ‘one should read, recite.’
ישראל ברנה זזי לשמך
כי אהתי לי לוכ תהלות
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ולשמך נערי ל暝ו ומועלש
ועד עלפי אנה אל הברך
אנה אל המלך הממלך
המשבח מעמור ממלך ויקים
מספר מלך עלום עדו אנם
בוך אנה אל אחד
מלך ומועל וארא
פי תקן בטנת בתי מני
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בורך אנה אל אחד מלך
מלך על פתח טרי
נפמוק: מגלת את העדה
ועלתר את המקה ענבה ובח
שערית במלוכלך
אשテーレ
אבינו די ררס ואלך
עליני ישראל מעך על

567 Tabory, *JPS Commentary*, 116 has בּרָחִים.
568 Third line from the top, second last word המלך. The original scribe of HUC Ms 931 left out the י. A later scribe, who added a few missing pages as well as darkened some words, inserted the consonant into the word. The fact that the י was not in the original manuscript could be seen from the fact that it is much darker than the surrounding words. Also, it does not appear to be written over an original faded consonant as with the other darkened words. Finally, there is not enough space between the י of המלך and the next word, הממלך, for a י. The added י has a short horizontal stroke and is very close to the following word. This error is not found in HUC Ms 927.
569 The word 'king' is not found in the other Haggadoth.
570 HUC Ms 927 has instead of המשבח. HUC Ms 931 is not clear because of the watermarks.
571 In HUC Ms 927 the word 'creator' was mistakenly copied as אבורה. Someone noticed the mistake and corrected it to אבורה by inserting the י between א and א. This mistake is not found in HUC Ms 931.
572 The word 'name' is not found in the other Haggadoth.
573 The word תלחנה is mistakenly written as תלחלה in both Kaifeng MSS.
574 The word 'friend' is mistakenly written as הדלא in both Kaifeng MSS.
575 The word 'friend' is mistakenly written as הדלא instead of הדלא.
יְרוּשָׁלָיָּא עִזְרֵךְ וַעֲלֵיהּ צְדִיק מְשָׁכֶן
בָּרוּךְ אִנֵּה יָשׁוּבַּהּ לֵבָנָהּ וַשְׁמַעְתֶּנּוּ
בַּבֹּנֶאָנָה בַּכְּדַרְשָׁהּ בַּשָּׁטָהְרָה.

576 הָרַּטְבּוּ
577 הָשַׁדְּקַבּ

The other Haggadoth have, “let us eat and be satiated from its goodness, and we shall praise you for it in holiness and purity.” KH does not include all the words in between.

בַּכְּדַרְשָׁהּ instead of בַּכְּדַרְשָׁהּ.
ENGLISH TRANSLATION
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Haggadah of Passover Eve

[Kiddush recited over the first cup]

Blessed are You, LORD, our God, King
of the world, Creator of the fruit of the vine.

Prayer

If Passover falls on a Saturday night and if [ ],
one should recite the benediction marking the end of the Sabbath.

Blessed are You, LORD, our God, King
of the world, who creates aromatic herbs.
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Blessed are You, LORD, our God, King
of the world, Creator of the illuminating fire.

Blessed are You, LORD, our God, King
of the world, who distinguishes between holiness and holiness,
between light and darkness, between Israel
and the Gentiles, between the seventh day and the six working days. Blessed are You,
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O LORD, the one who distinguishes between holiness and holiness.
Blessed are You, LORD, our God, King
of the world, who sanctified us from all other people
and exalted us above all the tongues.
He chose us and made us great. He delighted in us

---

1 The English translation of the JP is italicized to distinguish it from the Hebrew. YH, AH and SH follow Guggenheim, Scholar's Haggadah.
2 Words in parentheses are not found in KH. Empty brackets signify indecipherable text and/or uncertainty regarding the meaning.
3 The capitalized 'LORD' or 'the LORD' are used to represent the Tetragrammaton while the uncapsalized 'Lord' is used for the Hebrew נֹדָא.
4 See “Haggadah Text,” footnote 8.
and He crowned us. He distinguished us as a sacred object from all the nations of the earth. He caused us to inherit a desirable thing.
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He sanctified His name in the world for the sake of the forefathers who did His will. He did great things, His wonders are beyond description, He called us an assembly of saints, a desirable vineyard (and) a delightful plantation. He called us a possession of His name. Of all the nations of the earth He took us as a first gift
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for they are likened to the hosts on high, and compared to the stars of the sky. They were (as) heavenly beings in the midst of the world and honored over all the people. The glory of their faces was like the glory of the sun. And the appearance of their likeness was like the ministering angels. Kings used to rise when they saw them, princes used to prostrate (when they saw them). For the LORD who
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is faithful, the Holy One of Israel, chose them; all who saw them recognized them, for they were the seed (that) the LORD blessed. He sanctified us by eternal holiness, His great name He called upon us. He called us a congregation of His name, a treasure and inheritance from the days of old. He called us brothers and friends, a kingdom
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of priests, and a holy nation. He drew us near before Mount Sinai, and presented us before Horeb. He gave us possession of the Words of Life, written by His glorious finger. He did
signs and wonders\(^5\) for us. He delivered us from our enemies, saved us from the hand of those who hate (us), and He redeemed us from the hand of (our) enemy. You gave us, LORD our God, righteous judgments, true laws, and good statutes and commandments. \textit{If it (Passover) falls on a Sabbath eve, one should recite:}

You made known to us just judgments. You taught us to observe statutes in which You delight. You gave us, O LORD our God, the holiness of Sabbath, the glory of (the other) holy days\(^6\), pilgrimage, festival.

You distinguished between the holiness of the Sabbath and the holiness of (the other) holy days, You sanctified the great seventh day and the holiness of the (other) six days. \textit{If it (Passover) falls on a Sabbath eve, (recite):}

You have given to us, O LORD our God, Sabbaths for rest, festive days to rejoice, pilgrimage and seasons for gladness.

(You have given us) this day of rest, this good day of holy assembly, this day of the festival of unleavened bread, the season of our liberation, (You have given us) in love a remembrance of the Exodus from Egypt. He has chosen this day over all the (other) days. He delighted in it and sanctified it over all the appointed times for those who praise Him because of all His wondrous works and for those who remember

\(^5\) Lit., 'powerful things.'
\(^6\) Lit., 'holy day.'
Him year by year; to make known that on this day, the LORD brought His servants out of Egypt. He delivered us from the iron furnace; to make known that on this day the LORD executed vengeance on their enemies, and on this day He sank their enemies in the sea; to make known that on this day they received His kingdom willingly and to serve Him whole heartedly; to make known that on it the LORD, our God, performed signs and powerful deeds for those who love Him, and many wonders for the children that He loved.

If it (Passover) should fall on Sabbath eve, one should recite:
Because You have chosen us and sanctified us over all the (other) people, You let us inherit the Sabbath and Your holy days with joy and gladness. Blessed are You, O LORD, who sanctified the Sabbath, Israel and the appointed times. Amen. (Recite the following on) Sabbath eve:
The heavens, the earth and all their hosts were completed. On the seventh day, God completed His works and He rested on the seventh day from all His work. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it because on it He rested from all the work He had done. Blessed are You, O LORD our God, King of the world, who kept us alive and supported us,

---

7 Lit., ‘on it.’
8 Lit., ‘God.’
Page 15

and caused us to reach this appointed time.

*On the first night, one should recite the blessing “who has kept us alive . . .” But on the second night, one should not read it.*

Blessed are You, O LORD our God, King of the world, Creator of the fruit of the vine. *One should recite [ ] and then, one should wash the goblet and the hands and recite the (following) blessing:*

[Washing of the hands]

Blessed are You, O LORD our God, King of the world, who sanctified us with His laws and commanded us regarding
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the washing of the hands.⁹

*Then, one should read “In haste” (and) lift up the tablecloth until (the text beginning with “We were) slaves” appears.*

We left Egypt in haste. This bread of poverty that our forefathers ate in the land of Egypt, all who are hungry, come and eat.

And everyone should come and celebrate the Passover. This year, in this land;
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next year, in the land of Israel.

This year we are slaves;

next year, we shall be free people.

How is this night different from all the (other) nights? On all the (other) nights we do not dip even once, on this night (we dip) twice.
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On all the (other) nights we eat leavened bread, but on this night only

---

⁹ Lit., ‘the lifting of the hands’—JP Haggadoth, MSS and published Haggadoth say not to recite the blessing. See Kasher, המלשהדגה and Saadiah Gaon's Prayer Book, 136. The blessing is also recited in YH.
unleavened bread. On all the (other) nights we eat other vegetables, but on this night, bitter herbs. On all the (other) nights we eat sitting or reclining on couches, but
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on this night, we all recline on couches. We were slaves to Pharaoh in Egypt, but the LORD, our God, brought us out from there with a strong hand and with an outstretched arm. If the Holy One, blessed be He, had not brought our forefathers out from Egypt, we, our children, and our descendants would still be servile to Pharaoh in Egypt. Even if all of us were wise, all of us discerning, all of us knowledgeable of the Torah, we would (still) be obliged to narrate the Exodus from Egypt, (to narrate) at length the (story of) the Exodus from Egypt; indeed this is to be praised.

Once Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi
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Joshua, Rabbi Eleazar son of Azariah, Rabbi Akiva, and Rabbi Tarphon were reclining in Benei Berak and recounting the Exodus from Egypt the whole night until their students came and said to them, “Our teachers, the time for the recitation of the morning Shema has arrived.”
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Rabbi Eleazar son of Azariah said to them, “Behold, I am seventy years old and have not succeeded (in explaining) why the Exodus from Egypt should be told every night until the interpretation of Ben Zoma.” It is said,
“You should remember the day of your Exodus from Egypt all the days of your life.” (“The days of your life”) may refer only to the days but “All the days of your life” refers to the nights (as well). The sages say that “the days of your life” refers to this world (only), but “all the days of your life” includes the days of the Messiah. Blessed is God who gave the Torah to Israel, His people. Blessed is He. The Torah speaks of four sons: One is wise, one is wicked, one is simple, and one does not know (enough) to ask. What does the wise one say? “What are the testimonies, statutes and judgments which the LORD, our God, has commanded you?” Surely you should tell him according to the Laws of the Passover, not missing (even) one (regulation of) the Passover (until) the Afikoman. What does the evil one say? “What is this labor to you?” “To you” and not “to me.” Since he has excluded himself from the group, (thereby) renouncing the root (of our faith), thus you should say to him and break his teeth, “This is on account of what the LORD did for me when I went out from Egypt.” “For me,” not “For you” because if you had lived there you would not have been redeemed. What does the simple one say? “What is this?” You should say to him, “With a strong hand the LORD brought us out from Egypt, from the house of slavery.” To the one who does not know (enough) to ask, you should begin (to tell) him according to what is said, “You should tell your son on that day.” Perhaps one may understand
“You should tell your son” to be referring to the beginning of the month. The Talmud clarifies, “On that day.” Perhaps
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one may understand “on that day” to mean daytime. The Talmud clarifies, “On account of this.” Thus I cannot but say that it refers to the time when the unleavened bread and bitter herbs are set before you. Originally, our forefathers were worshippers of idols but now God, blessed be He, brought us near to serve Him.
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As it is said, “Joshua said to all the people, ‘Thus the LORD, God of Israel said, “On the other side of the River your forefathers dwelled in ancient times—Terah, the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor—and they served other gods. But I took your forefather, Abraham, from beyond

Page 29

the River and led him through the whole land of Canaan. I multiplied his descendants and I gave him Isaac. And I gave Isaac Jacob and Esau. And I gave Esau Mount Seir as his inheritance. And Jacob and his sons descended into Egypt”’.”

Blessed is He who keeps His promise to Israel,
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His people. Blessed is He! The Holy One, blessed be He, planned to bring about the end (of the bondage). Just as it is said to Abraham, our forefather, between the parts (of the sacrifices). As it is said, “He said to Abraham, ‘Know for sure that your descendants will be strangers in a land that is not theirs. And they will serve them, and they shall oppress them for four hundred years.”
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And I will judge the nation that they serve, and afterwards they will come out with great wealth.’” And this is what sustained us and our forefathers; for not only once did someone stand against us but in all the ages they have risen up against us to destroy us. But the Holy One, blessed be He,
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saves us from them. Go and learn what Laban the Aramean sought to do to Jacob, our forefather. Pharaoh, the wicked one, decided only against the males but Laban sought to uproot everything. As it is said, “The Aramean sought to destroy our forefather and he went down into Egypt and sojourned there.” Note that he did not go down to settle down but to sojourn there.
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As it is said, “They said to Pharaoh, ‘We came to sojourn in the land because there is no pasture land for the flock of your servants because the famine is severe in the land of Canaan. So, please allow your servants to dwell in the land of Goshen.’” “Few in numbers” as it is said,
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“Your forefathers were seventy persons when they went down to Egypt and now the LORD, your God, has made you as the stars of the heavens in numbers.” “And he became a nation there.” Learn that Israel was distinctive there. “A people

---

10 See “Haggadah Text,” footnote 223.
11 Lit., “their hands.”
great and mighty.” As it is said, “The children of Israel were fruitful and multiplied and increased.
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And they became exceedingly strong and the land was full of them.” “Numerous” as it is said, “I made you numerous as the plants of the field; you multiplied and became great. You were adorned with ornaments. (Your) breast became firm and your hair grew, but you were naked and bare.” But the Egyptians wronged us just as it is said, “Come,

Page 36
let us deal craftily with them lest they multiply and when war breaks out they join our enemies and fight against us and depart from the land.” “They oppressed us” just as it is said, “They put taskmasters over them in order to oppress them with their hard tasks. They built storage cities for Pharaoh, Pithom and Ramses.”

Page 37
“And they laid hard labor upon us” as it is said, “The Egyptians enslaved the Israelites with hard labor.” “And we cried out to the LORD, the God of our forefathers” just as it is said, “In the course of those many days, the king of Egypt died and the Israelites groaned from their labor. They cried out and their cry for help ascended to God from their labor.” “And the LORD heeded our voices” just as it is said, “God heard their moaning and God remembered His covenant with Abraham

12 Lit., ‘him.’
13 Lit., ‘over him.’
and Isaac and Jacob.”
“And He saw our affliction.” This refers to the breaking up of family life14 as it is said,
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“God saw the Israelites and God knew.” “Our burden.” This refers to the children as it is said, “All the children that are born, you shall thrown in the Nile, but all the daughters you shall let live.” “And our oppression.” This refers to suffering as it is written, “Indeed I have seen the oppression with which the Egyptians are oppressing them.”
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“The LORD brought us out of Egypt.” Not through an angel, not through a seraph, not through a messenger, but the Holy One, blessed be He, through His glory as it is said, “I will pass through the land of Egypt in this night and I will smite all the first born in the land of Egypt, from humans to animals. And
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I will execute judgments against all the gods of Egypt. I am the LORD.” “With a strong hand, an outstretched arm, great fear, and signs and wonders.” “With a strong hand”—this refers to the plague as it is said, “Behold, the hand of the LORD will be against the livestock in your field, against the horses, the donkeys, the camels, against the cattle,
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and against the sheep; an exceedingly severe plague.” “With an outstretched arm”—This refers to the sword as it is said,

14 Lit., ‘the breaking up of the way of the land.’
“His sword is drawn in His hand, stretched out over Jerusalem.” “In great fear”—This refers to revelation of the Divine presence as it is said, “Or did any god try to come to take for himself a nation from the midst of another nation with trials, with signs, wonders,”
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with war, with a strong hand, and outstretched arm, with great terror, like all that the LORD, your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes?” “With signs”—This is the staff (of Moses). As it is said, “Take this staff in your hand, with which you will perform the signs.”
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“And wonders”—This is the blood as it is said, “I will perform signs in the heavens and on earth.” “Blood, fire, and columns of smoke.”

Another interpretation: “With a strong hand”—two; “with arms outstretched”—two; “with great terror”—two; “with signs,” two; “and with wonders”—two. These are the ten plagues that the Holy One, blessed be He, brought upon the Egyptians in Egypt.

They are as follows: blood, frogs, vermin, wild beasts, pestilence, boils, hail, locusts, darkness, slaying of the first-born. Rabbi Yehudah gave them (the following) acronyms: dašk ʿaḏš bē̇ḥāḥāḇ

Rabbi Gamaliel says,
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“Anyone who did not say these three words during the Passover has not fulfilled his duty: Passover sacrifice, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs.” The Passover sacrifice
that our forefathers ate when
the Temple was still standing was because
the Holy One, blessed be He, passed over
the houses of our forefathers in Egypt. As it is said,
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“And you shall say, ‘This is a Passover sacrifice to the LORD
who passed over the houses of the Israelites
in Egypt when He struck the Egyptians
but spared our houses.’ And the people bowed
and prostrated themselves.”
The unleavened bread that we eat was
because there was not enough time for the dough of our forefathers

to rise when He appeared to them,
the King of Kings, (the Holy One) blessed be He
and saved them immediately, as it is said, “They baked
the dough that they had taken out
from Egypt as unleavened bread because
it was not leavened since they were driven from Egypt
and they were not able to tarry. Furthermore
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they did not make provision for themselves.”
These bitter herbs that we are eating are
because the Egyptians made the lives of
our forefathers bitter in Egypt, as it is said,
“They made their lives bitter with hard work,
with mortar and bricks and every work
in the field, all their work that
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they performed under compulsion.” And in every
generation one must view
himself as if he were
now going out from the bondage of Egypt since
He did not only save our forefathers but
He also saved us, as it is said, “He brought us out from there in order to bring
us and to give to us the land that He promised on oath to our forefathers.” Therefore, we are obliged to thank, praise, laud, glorify, exalt, magnify, extol, and to acclaim the One who performed for us and our forefathers all these signs. And He brought us out from slavery to freedom, from servitude to redemption, from sorrow to joy, from mourning to festival, from darkness to great light. Let us say to him, Hallelujah! The first two days, they should recite all (of it); the six (following) days (they should recite) the shortened “Praise.” Hallelujah, O servants of the LORD, praise the name of the LORD. Let the name of the LORD be praised from now until forever. From sunrise until its setting, let the name of the LORD be praised. Exalted over all the nations is the LORD. Over the heavens is His glory. Who is like the LORD, our God? He who dwells on high, who looks down below, in the heavens and on earth. One who lifts up the poor from the dust, from dunghills He lifts up the needy to seat him with nobles, with the nobles of His people. He makes the childless woman a happy mother of sons. Hallelujah! When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob, from a people of strange tongue, Judah became his sanctuary, Israel, his dominion. The sea saw and fled, Jordan turned.
back, the mountains danced like rams,
the hills like young sheep. What is (the matter) with you,
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O sea, that you flee? O Jordan, that you turn back?
O mountains, that you dance like rams? Hills,
like young sheep? Before the Lord, the creator
of the earth, from before the God of Jacob, the one who turned
the rock into a pool of water, the pebble to a spring
of water. Blessed are You, O LORD,
our God, King of the world, who
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saved us and saved our forefathers from Egypt,
who caused us to reach this night to eat
unleavened bread and bitter herbs.
Blessed is Your name, O LORD,
our God, the eternal King,
who delivered
our forefathers from
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Egypt, and brought us to this
night to eat unleavened bread
and bitter herbs. You
saved our forefathers from Egypt
with a strong hand and an outstretched arm.
You delivered
our forefathers from Egypt
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with strong force and
exalted dominion. When
our forefathers were in the land of Egypt
they were deprived and enslaved under
the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt.
While in the land of Egypt, our forefathers were afflicted and sorely tried under the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt. There, too, they were fruitful and multiplied like the dust of the land, like the cedars of Lebanon they grew in height. There, also, they became prosperous and multiplied as the dust of that land and like the cypresses of the forest, they grew tall. Pharaoh spoke about blotting their name, about destroying their remembrance from the midst of the world. Pharaoh decreed to erase their name, to cause their memory to be lost from the midst of the world. He and his people counseled and dealt craftily with the seed of Israel. He and his people conferred and continually conspired against Israel’s offspring. They embittered their lives with forced labor and in great oppression they became impatient. They embittered their lives with oppression and in great torment, they lost their spirit. The seed of Jeshurun were clothed with sighing.

15 Literally, ‘in being.’
16 Lit., ‘their spirit became short.’
because the hand of the enemy was strengthened against them.

Israel’s offspring wore grief\textsuperscript{17} because the hand of the enemy dominated them.

The Living and Eternal (God) heard their voice, the King of all kings, blessed be He, heeded them. The eternal and everlasting God heard their prayers, the King of all kings, blessed is His name, gave ear
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to them. The good and just (God) raised from among them, Moses; the beloved, was sent in a vision.

He (God) magnified the good and worthy one, Moses, from among them; God’s beloved was sent with a prophetic vision.

Together they showed them the signs of
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the Almighty, and with (different) kinds of plagues they judged the sons of Ham. At the same time, he showed them the signs of the all-sufficient\textsuperscript{18} God. Various sicknesses were decreed to punish the people of Ham. He delivered all their first born to slaughter; the first of their womb,
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(He delivered over) to a great plague. He delivered all their first born to be killed;

\textsuperscript{17} Or, ‘they dressed in mourning.’

\textsuperscript{18} This is a common JP rendering of the Hebrew name of God (Šadday) as ‘one who has sufficiency.’
He gave over the first fruit of their womb to a great plague. 
Thus a great outcry fell in Egypt, wailing and dirges in all its streets. Thus, in this way,
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a great cry fell in Egypt, weeping and lamentation in all its streets. From slavery to freedom, the beloved went forth; none stumbled among the number of his tribes. The beloved of God came out from slavery to freedom; there was no stumbling among the number of His tribes. He led them in His goodness, the Rock of Ages, led them to the Red Sea in His great mercy. He led them out in His beneficence; the Eternal Creator brought them to the Red Sea with great mercy. He closed the sea in the tumult of the waves, while the enemy was pursuing in the tumult of his army. He closed that sea with the multitude of its waves on the galloping enemy and the multitude of his hosts. They lifted their eyes upwards to seek mercy from the Strong One of Jacob. They lifted their eyes upward to the heavens, to ask for divine mercy from the illustrious God of Jacob.
Those saved by the LORD opened their mouths and praised their King for the multitude of His miracles. 

*Moses spoke encomium and praise,*

words of exultation,

---

19 A—'His mount shouted, neighed.' B, D—'encircled, attacked.'

20 The Judeo-Persian does not translate 'rabbi.'
to holy God. The ransomed spoke praise, honor, words of praise before their redeemer. The delivered (Israelites) spoke words of
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exultation, reverence, and praise before our redeemer. May the LORD our God and the God of our forefathers cause us to reach, with joy, other festivals that are coming in the future in peace, joyful in the building of Your city and rejoicing in Your service.
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There, may we eat from the festive offerings and from the Passover sacrifices whose blood shall reach the wall of Your altar for goodwill. Let us sing a new song to You for all our redemption and deliverance of our person. Blessed are You, LORD, savior of Israel. Amen! Thus, O LORD, our God
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and the God of our forefathers, may He lead us in happiness to other upcoming holidays; joyful in the cultivation of Your city and tranquil in Your service. There, may we eat of those Passover offerings and sacrifices

---

21 Literally, ‘coming to meet us.’
22 The phrase “for goodwill” is not found in the JP translation.
23 The phrase “Let us sing a new song” is not found in the JP translation.
24 The phrase “and deliverance of our person” is not found in the JP translation.
whose blood shall be sprinkled
upon the wall of Your altar
and from
the meat of the whole offering sacrifices
whose blood shall be sprinkled
upon the wall of Your altar.
I thank You for
all our deliverance; blessed is Your name,

O LORD, God, deliverer of
Israel from eternal exile. Amen
Blessed are You, LORD, our God,
King of the world, Creator of the fruit of the vine. Amen!
One says the blessing over one and a half pieces of unleavened bread
Blessed are You, LORD our God, King
of the world, who brought forth bread from the earth.

If (it is a) green vegetable, (one should) say the (following) blessing:
Blessed are You,
LORD, our God, King of the world, Creator
of the fruit of the earth. Amen!
Blessed are You, LORD, our God, King
of the world who sanctified us through His commandments
and commanded us about partaking of the bitter herbs. Amen!
Then, take the unleavened bread and bitter herbs in hand and recite the blessing.

Remembrance of the mortar. One should eat roasted meat.
[ ]25 recite the blessing:
Blessed are You, LORD, our God, King of the world,
Creator of a multitude of living creatures for all that He created.
Blessed is life everlasting. One should eat and wash

25 The text is unclear here. See explanation given in “Haggadah Text,” footnote 545 above.
everything; then, wash the goblet and hands.  
Recite the (following) blessing: Blessed are You, LORD, our God,
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King of the world, who sanctified us
with His commandments and commanded us regarding the washing of
the hands.  
Then, one should recite the benediction after the meal; thereafter, recite
“Not for us.”
Not for us, O LORD, not for us but to Your name
give honor; for Your kindness and Your faithfulness;
Why should the nations say, “Where
is their God?” Our God is in the heavens, all
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that which He desires, He does.  
Their idols
of silver and gold are the works of human hands.
They have mouths but they do not speak,
they have eyes but they do not see. They have ears
but they do not hear, they have noses but
they do not smell. They have hands but cannot feel,
they have feet but they cannot walk. They do not make noise
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in their throat. Their makers will be like them,
all who trust in them. O Israel,
trust in the LORD. He is their helper and shield.
House of Aaron, trust in the LORD. Their help
and shield is He. Those who fear the LORD, trust
in the LORD, their helper and shield is He.
The LORD will bless those who remember us,

Page 85

He will bless the House of Israel, the House of Aaron.
He will bless those who fear the LORD, the small ones together with

26 Lit., ‘all that he desired, he did.’
the great ones. May the LORD increase your numbers, yours and your children. Blessed are you by the LORD, who created the heavens and the earth. The heavens are the LORD’s heavens, but the earth He has given to the children of Adam. The dead cannot praise the LORD, nor all who descend into silence. But as for us, we will bless the LORD from now until forever. Hallelujah!

I love (Him) because the LORD hears my voice, my supplication; because He inclined His ear to me on the day that I called. The cords of death surrounded me, Sheol besieged me. I discovered sorrow and anguish. But on the name of the LORD
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I will call, “O LORD, save my life!” Kind is the LORD and just. Our God is merciful. The LORD guards the simple; in my poverty He saves me. Return, o my soul, to your rest because the LORD favored you; because You rescued my soul from death, my eyes from tears, my feet from stumbling.
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I will walk about before the LORD in the lands of the living. I kept my faith although I said, “I am greatly afflicted.” I said rashly, “Every one is a liar!” How shall I repay the LORD for all His bounty to me? A cup of redemption I will lift up, and on the name of the LORD I will call. I will pay my vows to the LORD, in the presence of all His people. Precious in the eyes of the LORD is the death of His pious ones. O LORD, because I am Your servant, I am Your servant, the son of Your maidservant,
You loosened my bonds. To You I will sacrifice a sacrifice of praise. On the name of the LORD I will call. I will pay my vows to the LORD in the presence of all His people. In the courtyard of the house of the LORD,
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in the midst of Jerusalem, Hallelujah! Praise the LORD, all nations. Laud Him, all the peoples because His kindness over us is great; and the faithfulness of the LORD is forever. Hallelujah! Give thanks to the LORD for He is good. For everlasting is His kindness. Let Israel say that His kindness is everlasting.
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Let the House of Aaron say, “Everlasting is His kindness.” Let those who fear the LORD say, “His kindness is everlasting.”

From distress I called to the LORD, and the LORD answered me in a wide space.²⁷ The LORD is for me, I will not fear. What can humans do to me? The LORD is with me among my helpers, I will look (confidently) at my enemies.
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It is better to take shelter in the LORD than to trust humans. It is better to take shelter in the LORD than to trust in princes. All nations surround me; in the name of the LORD I will cut them down. They surrounded me, indeed, they surrounded me; In the name of the LORD I will cut them down. They surrounded me like bees, they are extinguished like burning thorns. In the name of the LORD I will cut them down. You pushed me until I was falling;

²⁷ Tabory, JPS Commentary on the Haggadah, 114, has, “and brought me relief.”
Page 93
but the Lord helped me. My strength and song is the LORD, He was my salvation. A sound of shouting and redemption is in the tents of the just; the right hand of the LORD did valiantly. The right hand of the LORD is exalted; the right hand of the LORD did valiantly. I will not die but I will live and relate the deeds of the LORD. The LORD has indeed disciplined me, but He did not lead me to death. Open for me

Page 94
the gates of righteousness. I shall enter them and praise the LORD. This is the gate of the LORD, the righteous will enter it. I will give thanks to You because You answered me and became my redemption. The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone. This was from the LORD, This was wonderful in our eyes. This is the day

Page 95
that the LORD has made; let us rejoice and be glad in it. O LORD, please save us! (say this) twice O LORD, please cause (us) to succeed! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the LORD; we bless you from the house of the LORD. The LORD is God and He enlightened us. Bind the festive sacrifice with cords to the corner of the altar. You are my God, I shall thank You;

Page 96
My God, I will exalt You. Give thanks to the LORD for (He is) good, for His kindness is everlasting. May all Your works praise You with us, O LORD, our God, may Your pious and righteous ones do Your will. May all Your people, the House of Israel give thanks to Your name in song; For You are the LORD, and it is good to praise You.
It is beautiful to sing Your name; from eternity
to eternity You are God. Blessed
are You, O LORD God, the King, who is praised,
who satisfies, who is glorified. The living and established King,
may He reign forever and forever. Amen!
Blessed are You, O LORD, our God,
King of the universe, Creator of the fruit of wine.

Blessed are You, O LORD, our God, King
of the world. For the vine, for the fruit
of the vine, for the produce of the field
and the good and spacious land
that You desired and caused our forefathers to possess;
Have mercy, O LORD, our God,
upon us, (upon)\textsuperscript{28} Israel Your people, and upon

Jerusalem Your city, upon Zion the dwelling
of Your glory. Raise us up in her midst, cause us to be happy
in her building, in holiness and purity.
Blessed are You, LORD, for the vine,
and for the fruit of the vine. A firm amen!

\textsuperscript{28} This word is not found in either of the Kaifeng MSS.
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