

Sinai Synagogue



LASALLE AVENUE AT EDDY STREET
SOUTH BEND, INDIANA 46617

April 30, 1975
Iyar 19, 5735

Rabbi Norman Lamm
The Jewish Center
131 West 86th St
New York, N.Y. 10024

Dear Rabbi Lamm:

Last evening, our board of directors announced the outcome of the congregational vote regarding partial mixed pews. If I might refresh your memory, a proposal was made to retain separate seating (no mechitza) in the front half of the main sanctuary and to institute mixed seating in the remainder. This needed a two-thirds majority to be passed. With over ninety percent of the membership returning ballots, which in itself is remarkable, there was a clear majority against the innovation and, consequently, it failed.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you again for your constructive advice on handling the problem. Instead of calling a congregational meeting, as you did in Springfield, to speak on the subject, I composed an article for our Bulletin, in which I tried to present the halachik, psychological, and sociological positions against mixed pews. I'm taking the liberty of including a copy of that issue of our Bulletin in this letter. If you have the opportunity to read it and have any observations, I would appreciate it if you would share them with me.

Thank you, again, for your help and advice. May the Ribbono Shel Olam bless you and your family with many years of health and strength to be a guiding force for authentic Judaism in America.

With Torah blessings,

Allen R. Kuperman
ALLEN R. KUPERMAN, Rabbi

ARK:av1

Allen R. Kuperman Rabbi
Phone: 233-5976
Maurice Parzen Rabbi Emeritus
Ronald S. Cohen President
Harvey Keleman Honorary President
Harry Fox Gabbi
Mrs. Morris Katz Sisterhood President

Non-profit Organization
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
South Bend, Indiana
Permit No. 129

SCHEDULE OF SERVICES
Sunday & Legal Holidays . . 8:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m.
Monday thru Friday morning . . 7:45 a.m.
Monday thru Thursday evening . . 6:00 p.m.
Friday evening 8:15 p.m.
Shabbat (9:00 a.m. and approximately
50 minutes before candle-lighting.)

SINAI SYNAGOGUE
1102 East LaSalle Avenue
South Bend, Indiana 46617

RETURN REQUESTED

Yahrzeit for the following will be observed in APRIL

* Nathan Hoffman	3	Solomon Sandecer	19
Emile Inwald	4	* Yosef T. Tenofsky	19
William Wolfson	5	Solomon Gaibe	21
* Samuel Plotkin	5	Israel Getzel	21
Will Welber	6	Clara Kapson	21
Rose Morrison	6	* Sarah B. Shimkovsky	21
Jacob Halperin	7	* Max Tanner	21
Abraham Isaac Schatz	7	Anna Cohn	23
* Genia Tanner	8	Lena Goldsmith	23
Max Brook	8	Freda Myers	23
* Ida Rosenberg	9	Samuel Lando	24
* Rachel Hoffman	9	Beila Oestreicher	24
* Helen Katz	16	* Phillip Rosenfeld	24
* Harry Cohen	16	* Helen Keleman	25
* Harry Laskey	16	* Meyer Paskin	25
* Ida Burke Zaretsky	17	Isadore Joel Wagner	25
* Yosef M. Berman	18	* Anna Waxman	25
Riva Lindenberg	18	Sara Schatz	28
* Simon Rosenstein	18	* Sam Zonenberg	28
* Bertha Smith	18	Shaya Price	28
Esther Rivka Gerstein	19	* Lena Rubin	29

* A light will be kindled on the Memorial Tablet. (Date given is for the evening service.)

BIBLE AND PRAYER BOOK FUND

SPEEDY RECOVERY to M. Silverman
IN MEMORY of Leigh Radding
by Mrs. Ethel R. Kahn
IN MEMORY of Leigh Radding
by Mr. & Mrs. Harry Rosenstein
Mr. & Mrs. Kurt O. Sternal
IN MEMORY of David Kapson
by Mr. & Mrs. Harry Rosenstein
Miss June Elizabeth Rosenstein
Mr. & Mrs. Jim Loewenberg

WOMEN'S AMERICAN O.R.T.

Women's American O.R.T. presents "Paraphernalia
75," an auction to be held at 8:00 p.m. on Saturday,
April 26, 1975 at the Indiana Club.
Proceeds from the auction will be donated to the
School of Engineering at the Hebrew University in
Jerusalem. Mrs. Brett Morse and Mrs. Stephen Davis
are co-chairmen of the event.

SINAI SYNAGOGUE



... the Synagogue of Tomorrow

April 1, 1975 Vol. 42, No. 8 20 Nisan, 5735

SCHEDULE OF SERVICES AND EVENTS

APRIL 1	TUESDAY	20 Nisan
	Fourth Day of Chol Hamoed Candle-lighting at 6:52 P.M. — Services at 6:45 P.M.	
APRIL 2	WEDNESDAY	21 Nisan
	Seventh Day of Pesach — Services at 9:00 A.M. Candle-lighting at 7:53 P.M. — Services at 7:45 P.M.	
APRIL 3	THURSDAY	22 Nisan
	Eighth Day of Pesach — Services at 9:00 A.M. — YIZKOR Mincha at 7:00 P.M. — End of Pesach at 7:55 P.M. Please do not use any chometz until 9:00 P.M.	
APRIL 4	FRIDAY	23 Nisan
	Candle-lighting at 6:56 P.M. — Services at 8:15 P.M.	
APRIL 5	SATURDAY	24 Nisan
	Torah Reading: SHEMINI — Services at 9:00 A.M. Mincha at 6:40 P.M. — Shabbat ends at 7:57 P.M.	
APRIL 11	FRIDAY	30 Nisan
	First day of Rosh Chodesh — Services at 7:45 A.M. Candle-lighting at 7:03 P.M. — Services at 8:15 P.M. Honoring the Religious School 7th Grade	
APRIL 12	SHABBAT	1 Iyar
	Second day of Rosh Chodesh Torah Readings: TAZRIA & METZORA — Services at 9:00 A.M. Mincha at 6:45 P.M. — Shabbat ends at 8:03 P.M.	

APRIL 14	MONDAY	3 Iyar
Sisterhood meeting at 1:00 P.M.		
APRIL 16	WEDNESDAY	5 Iyar
Israeli Independence Day — Services at 7:45 A.M. Mincha at 6:00 P.M.		
APRIL 18	FRIDAY	7 Iyar
Candle-lighting at 7:11 P.M. — Services at 9:00 A.M.		
APRIL 19	SHABBAT	8 Iyar
Torah Readings: ACHAREI & KEDOSHIM — Services at 9:00 A.M. Mincha at 6:50 P.M. — Shabbat ends at 8:11 P.M.		
APRIL 25	FRIDAY	14 Iyar
Candle-lighting at 7:19 P.M. — Services at 8:15 P.M.		
APRIL 26	SHABBAT	15 Iyar
BAR MITZVAH of Larry David Metzelaar Torah Reading: EMOR — Services at 9:00 A.M. Mincha at 7:00 P.M. — Shabbat ends at 8:19 P.M.		
APRIL 29	TUESDAY	18 Iyar
Lag B'Omer — Services at 7:45 A.M. Mincha at 6:00 P.M.		

BAR MITZVAH



LARRY DAVID METZELAAR

The family cordially invites all members and friends to attend services and worship with them on Saturday morning, April 26th at 9:00 A.m., on the occasion of Larry's Bar Mitzvah, and to the Kiddush following the service. Larry is the son of Marilyn Metzelaar and the grandson of Elsie and Morris Hoffman.

CAST YOUR VOTE

On April 1, 1975 each member of the synagogue will be mailed a ballot with which to express an opinion either "for" or "against" partial mixed seating. The Board of Directors urges everyone to cast their vote. A two-thirds majority of those voting is required to pass the motion allowing partial mixed seating. The votes will be counted on April 28, 1975 and the outcome announced at the April 29 meeting of the Board. PLEASE VOTE!

THE DEADLINE FOR THE MAY BULLETIN IS TUESDAY, APRIL 8TH.
PLEASE PLAN AHEAD AS THE SECRETARY DOES NOT WORK ON
MARCH 27, AND APRIL 2 AND 3.

BEN FARBER
MEMORIAL YOUTH FUND

IN MEMORY of Leigh Radding
by Mrs. Gloria Farber and daughters
Miss Gail Poszik
Miss Judy Kronwiter
Mr. & Mrs. Wm. L. Goldenberg
IN MEMORY of Norman Fox
by Mr. & Mrs. Max Gentner
Mr. & Mrs. David Piser
IN MEMORY of David Kapson
IN HONOR of Jack Mooren, 80th birthday
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Jack Pury
IN HONOR of new son
to Mr. & Mrs. Ronn Medow
by Mr. & Mrs. Ronald Cohen
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Paul Gilbert
by Mr. & Mrs. Nathan Sutlin
William Stein
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Paul Gilbert
IN MEMORY of Leigh Radding
by Mr. & Mrs. Alfred Oppenheimer
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Paul Gilbert
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Sally Brumer
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Carol Hamburg
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Emma Sutlin
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
50th anniversary
by Mrs. Ben Farber
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
50th anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. Leonard Schrager
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Mendel Piser
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Emma Sutlin
by Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
YAHREITZ OBSERVANCE:
for Lena Goldenberg, sister — Wm. Goldenberg
for Mary Kline, sister — Mrs. Wm. Goldenberg
for Feidel Moses, mother — Mr. Sadie Greenhut
for Ann Gartenberg, mother —
by Mrs. Harry W. Rosenthal
and Mrs. David Fenn

BESSIE EIN MEMORIAL LIBRARY

IN MEMORY of Leigh Radding
by Mr. & Mrs. Max Ein
Mr. & Mrs. Bernard Ein
Mr. & Mrs. Morris Katz
Friends from Robertson's
Mr. & Mrs. Louis Apfel
IN MEMORY of David Kapson
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Louis Jaffe
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Sam Tass
by Mr. & Mrs. Donald Wasserman
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Sally Brumer
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Oscar Blumenthal
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Mendel Piser
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Anna Schultz
GET WELL to Sylvia Berebitsky
by Mr. & Mrs. Morris Katz
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Paul Gilbert
by Mr. & Mrs. Irving From
IN MEMORY of Joseph Gargano
by Mr. & Mrs. Max Ein
GET WELL to Ben Abrams
by Mr. & Mrs. Morris Katz
Mr. & Mrs. Bernard Ein
Mr. & Mrs. Max Ein

IN HONOR of Max Ein, his birthday
by Mr. & Mrs. Morris Katz and Family
Mr. & Mrs. Bernard Ein
Mrs. Marie Coussens
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Mendel Piser
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
50th anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. Albert Katz
Mrs. Anna Schultz
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Rosenstein
40th anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. Kurt Simon
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
50th anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. Max Ein
Mr. & Mrs. Morris Katz
Mr. & Mrs. Morris Cooper
Mr. & Mrs. Charles Mintz
Mr. & Mrs. Aaron Schatz

CAPITAL FUND

SPEEDY RECOVERY to Paul Gilbert
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Louis Levitansky
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
50th anniversary
IN MEMORY of Jean Ross
IN MEMORY of Norman Fox
IN MEMORY of Gilbert Friedman
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Mendel Piser
YAHREITZ OBS. for Joseph Vogel, father
by Mr. & Mrs. Jerry Vogel
IN MEMORY of Norman Fox
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
50th anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. Leo Plotkin
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
50th anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. Bennie Jacobs and Family

DONATIONS TO SYNAGOGUE

IN MEMORY of Leigh Radding
by Mr. & Mrs. Boris Schuster
Mrs. Harry Pryweller
Mr. & Mrs. Milton Rubin
CONGRATULATIONS to
Mr. & Mrs. Fred Goldsmith, Esti's engagement
CONGRATULATIONS to
Mr. & Mrs. Leonard Schrager, son's wedding
by Dr. & Mrs. Abraham Goetz
IN HONOR of Esti's engagement
by Mr. & Mrs. Fred Goldsmith, parents
IN MEMORY of Harry Pryweller
by Mrs. Harry Pryweller & Family
(Sinai Memorial)
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Louis Jaffe
by Mr. & Mrs. Max Cossman
IN MEMORY of David Kapson
YAHREITZ OBSERVANCE of Harold Rubin
by Mr. & Mrs. Jean Rubin (Rabbi's Fund)
IN MEMORY of Ethel Schrager
IN MEMORY of David Kapson
by Mr. & Mrs. Allen Schrager
SPEEDY RECOVERY to William Greenhut
IN MEMORY of Leigh Radding
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Harold Zubkoff
IN MEMORY of Atto Ullman
by Mr. & Mrs. Jerry Bendit
Mrs. Sadie Greenhut
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Paul Gilbert
by Mr. & Mrs. Philip Welber
Mr. & Mrs. Milton Rubin
IN HONOR of first grandchild to Helen Berman
by Mr. & Mrs. Max Cossman

CONGRATULATIONS to Mrs. Mollie New
new granddaughter, Allison Goldberg
by Mrs. Sadie Greenhut
50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY
to Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
by The Goetz Family
Dr. & Mrs. Morris Wagner
Mrs. Louis Jacobs
Mr. & Mrs. Simon Moses and Family
Mr. & Mrs. Max Deitel and Family
Mr. & Mrs. Max Cossman
Mr. & Mrs. Wolff Szymkowicz
IN HONOR of their 50th wedding anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
IN MEMORY of David Kapson
by Mr. & Mrs. Henry Feferman
IN MEMORY of their son Norman Fox
by Mr. & Mrs. Harry Fox
IN MEMORY of Leigh Radding
IN MEMORY of Norman Fox
by Mr. & Mrs. Abe Price
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Mrs. Jerome Brumer
IN MEMORY of Norman Fox
by Mr. & Mrs. Erwin Karlin and Family
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
50th anniversary
IN MEMORY of Norman Fox
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Mrs. Jerry Brumer
IN HONOR of first grandchild, to Helen Berman
by Mr. & Mrs. Jerry Bendit
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Rosenstein
anniversary
by Mrs. Sig Welber
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Sheldon Parzen
by Miss Sophia Levy
Mrs. Rose From
IN MEMORY of Leigh Radding
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
50th anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. Morris L. Shapiro
IN MEMORY of Norman Fox
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Harry Karlin
50th anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. Aaron Katz
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Mendel Piser
by Mr. & Mrs. Jerry Bendit
Mr. & Mrs. Max Cossman
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Philip Welber
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Bob Ortenstein
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Mendel Piser
by Mr. & Mrs. Aaron Katz
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Leo Plotkin
40th anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. David Berebitsky
YAHREITZ OBSERVANCE:
for Louis Tenofsky — the Tenofsky Family
for Jennie Byer, mother — Mrs. H. S. Altman
(Rabbi's Fund)
for Isadore Janovsky, father — Mrs. Ida Nelson
for Anna Rachel Cohen, mother — Mrs. Wm. Winer
for Abe Finkelstein, husband — Mrs. Finkelstein
for Mary Rosenblatt, sister — Sophia Levy
for Grandmother — A. H. Herzog
for Jennie Horwich, mother — Anne H. Abrams
for Dvorah Gentner, mother — Mrs. Edith Rifkin
for Herman Gentner, father — Mrs. Edith Rifkin
for Charlotte Reck and Meyer Paskin
by Henry Paskin
IN HONOR of Mr. & Mrs. Leo Plotkin
40th anniversary
by Mr. & Mrs. Arnold Cohen
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Mendel Piser
CONGRATULATIONS to Helen Berman
new granddaughter
CONGRATULATIONS to Mollie New
new great-granddaughter
by Mr. & Mrs. David Berebitsky
SPEEDY RECOVERY to Sylvia Berebitsky
by Mr. & Mrs. Jerry Bendit
GET WELL to Mrs. Sylvia Polay
by Mr. & Mrs. Robert W. Barron

Sisterhood

Greetings!

Our Sabbath Purim Dinner was one of the most enjoyable evenings. To Fran Piser, Ina Gilbert, Phyllis Rubin, Sylvia Plotkin and Maybelle Cohen, our sincere thanks. The long hours cleaning chickens and cooking were really appreciated.

Also, to Millie Gentner and Dorothy Berebitsky, thank you for the lovely Mini Brunch at our Savings Bank luncheon. As always, the food was delicious. One thing you can say for Sisterhood, they can really cook up a storm.

Our new slate is ready and will be voted upon at our April meeting. To those of you who are leaving the executive Board, I want to thank you for all your hard work and support. You really made my year so easy. To all the new officers, I'm really looking forward to working with you. I sincerely hope all members will attend the April meeting and show these women what support you have for them.

It's a little late, but I do hope you all had a happy and healthy Passover.

. . . Betty

HAPPY DAY FUND

GET WELL to Mendel Piser
by Mr. and Mrs. Milton Brook
Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gilbert

GET WELL to Jeannette Rymer
by Mr. and Mrs. Irving From
Mr. and Mrs. Philip Oestreicher

GET WELL to Emma Sutlin
by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gilbert

GET WELL to Philip Welber
by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gilbert

GET WELL to Syl Berebitsky
by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gilbert
Mrs. Jean Nathan

GLAD YOU'RE BETTER to Paul Gilbert
by Mrs. Maurice Marcus

HAPPY BIRTHDAY to Mrs. A. Cohen
by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gilbert

CONGRATULATIONS
to Mr. and Mrs. Charles Mintz,
son's engagement
by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gilbert

CONGRATULATIONS
to Mr. and Mrs. Fred Goldsmith,
daughter's engagement
by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gilbert

CONGRATULATIONS
to Mrs. Lewis Berman,
new granddaughter Allison
by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gilbert

ANNIVERSARY CONG.
to Mr. and Mrs. Irving Minkow
by Mr. and Mrs. Reuben From
Mr. and Mrs. Irving From

50TH ANNIVERSARY CONG.
to Mr. and Mrs. Harry Karlin
by Mr. and Mrs. Irving From
Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gilbert

ANNIVERSARY CONG.
to Mr. and Mrs. Reuben From
by Mr. and Mrs. Irving Minkow

CO-CHAIRMEN: Ethel Shapiro, 255-7127
Syl Berebitsky, 291-6829

SINAI ITEMS . . .

. . . A very generous donation has been made to the synagogue by Mr. and Mrs. Harry Karlin in honor of their 50th wedding anniversary. To them, the congregation extends heartiest congratulations and best wishes for many more anniversaries.

. . . A donation has also been received from Mr. and Mrs. Harry Fox as a "thank you" for the many cards, calls, etc. received by them at the time of their recent bereavement. May God comfort them.

. . . Please check our Bulletin Board from time to time. Sometimes there are flyers announcing various events which do not appear in the Bulletin. Also, if you lose something, check the Bulletin Board; your item just might be found there.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS:
Mr. William Stein, 2225 Union Avenue

from the Rabbi's desk. . .

A few weeks ago, I happened to be listening to a radio talk-show. The topic was various occupations and what you, as the caller, would like people to know about your job. I was sorely tempted to pull my car off the road, then and there, and call him and let him know a few things about the rabbinate. Aside from being a social director and drama coach, the vocation of rabbi has two major components: leader and teacher. They overlap somewhat, because the ideal is to lead by teaching. There are, however, times when the two stand apart. There are times when the rabbi can only teach. This is just such a time. As you know, in the next few days, you will be receiving a ballot requesting a vote on the issue of partial mixed seating. The synagogue constitution is very clear that issues such as these must be voted upon by the congregation. They are out of the province of this office. Because this is an emotionally-charged issue, I prefer to by-pass the component of leadership and fulfill my function as teacher. I would hope that you will answer the ballot based on a reasonable understanding of our tradition, yours and mine. I, therefore, ask that you read this column very carefully and give every idea your fullest measure of thought and consideration. Additionally, you will be fulfilling the mitzvah of Torah study.

Let me begin, if you will indulge me for a moment, in a caveat. Several members, good and fine people, have attempted to interpret actions and statements on my part to press their positions to the fore as being mine. I have resisted these attempts, because they are out of character for this position and office. My function is to serve the entire congregation without discrimination. As such, I cannot allow myself to be put into the position of appearing to minister to only one segment of the diverse population of this synagogue. Human behavior is not monolithic; it is made up of responses to varied, diverse and often conflicting motivating factors, called stimulus. In the position of rabbi of a congregation as contrasting as Sinai, the stimulus is varied, diverse, and most often conflicting. Therefore, let the reader be aware that the following article is solely educational and not propagandistic of my views, personally. The accumulated wisdom of the centuries is presented; OUR tradition speaks!

There is only one clear-cut reference to segregation by sex in the Bible, and we shall deal with that later. During that time and almost through the time of the second Temple, women participated in the sacrificial service. It must be noted, however, that this was not on a regular basis. In other words, if a woman appeared at the Temple wishing to offer a sacrifice and participate in the services, she was allowed to and there were no restrictions on her performance save those imposed on any lay-Israelite. The Bible in Samuel I, chapter 1, tells us of Hannah's appearance at Shiloh, where the Tabernacle was stationed. There is no reference in the Bible or in the Talmud of there being a restriction on public participation of women in the first Temple, nor of there being a record of a separate portion of the Temple set aside for women.

The second Temple did have a court designated the Ezrat Nashim or Women's Court. The general consensus of the scholars is that this title was not legal in character and was probably a name given by the general public to the outer court or the court of the general assembly in the Temple. It was most probably a place of meeting for those not participating immediately in the Temple service. Since the greatest number of such people were women, it thus became known as the Women's Court. There is much debate among scholars as to whether there was a Women's Court in the First Temple. However, any such debate is academic, because most scholars agree that the designation "Women's Court" was not meant to denote an area specifically limited to women. So, although there was an Ezrat Nashim in the Holy Temple, it was not directly comparable to the women's section in our synagogues.

Every halachik study of segregation by sexes in the synagogue stems from a Mishnah (Sukkah 51A). It explains that there was a ceremony on the first day of Sukkot called The Rejoicing of the Drawing of the Water. This was a very festive gathering where "men of piety and good deeds used to dance before them (the assembled multitude) with lighted torches in their hands and sing songs and praises." The Levites sang and the young priests drew the water which was poured over certain sacrifices on the great altar. The Mishnah continues by telling us that

at the conclusion of the first day the sages entered the Women's Court and made a great enactment. I now quote from the Gommoroh (Sukkah 51B): "At the conclusion of the first festival day . . . What was the great enactment? — Rabbi Eliezer replied, as that of which we have learned. Originally the walls of the Women's Court were smooth, but later the Court was surrounded with a gallery, and it was enacted that the women should sit above and the men below. Our rabbis have taught, originally the women used to sit within (the Court) while the men were without, but as this caused kalus rosh, it was instituted that the women should sit without and the men within. As this, however, still led to kalus rosh, it was instituted that the women should sit above and the men below."

This change was corroborated by a passage from the book of Zechariah (12: 12) which reads: "And the land shall mourn, every family apart: the family of the house of David apart, their wives apart," and so on. The argument proposed by the rabbis was that if the Bible tells us to be separate at times of mourning, when one's thoughts are not easily diverted, then how much more so when one's thoughts can easily be diverted, such as the festival of the Rejoicing of the Drawing of the Water?

It would appear that the regular series of events at the Temple may have included women in the ceremony, but certainly not in any quantity. The only time women were in attendance in large numbers was the service mentioned above. Now, the rabbis observed a lack of reverential attitude which they called "kalus rosh" — casualness. Therefore they instituted several changes. First they positioned the women on the inside and the men on the outside, but this did not seem to bring about the correct attitude. They, then, tried having the women on the outside and the men inside, but this also failed. It would seem that the lack of concrete participation coupled with the mingling of the sexes — even on the periphery of the group — produced the negative result of lack of the reverential attitude so necessary in worship services. This, in fact, forms the earliest source for a requisite segregation by sex at festive religious events, such as weddings and other ceremonial occasions. This, by the way, is a practice still upheld in traditional circles to this day. Orthodox weddings not only segregate the people by sex at the ceremony, but also at the reception following.

It would appear that the rabbis were not concerned for this lack of reverential attitude where there was only one or two women in attendance among numerous men. Perhaps the reason for this is that as the ratio of women to men remained small (eg. one woman to fifteen men) the prevailing attitude and atmosphere of prayer and reverence was preserved. However, as the number of women increased, there may have been a detectable shift from a reverential atmosphere to a social atmosphere, and that was unacceptable during worship services. A single woman did not serve as a distracting force; however, a group with significant numbers was a socially distracting entity.

I must digress for a moment and amplify on this innovation. The pattern for the First Holy Temple was transmitted by God to Nathan and Gad the Prophets who explained it to King David. He, in turn, transmitted it to his son, King Solomon, who commissioned its construction. The architecture of the Second Temple, completed and dedicated on Sukkot 516 B.C.E. — exactly seventy years following the destruction of the First Temple, followed the same Divine pattern showed to Solomon by his father, David. The holiness of the Temple extended to its very construction plan, and changes in that plan were made only after great religious debate and consultation. Consequently, an innovation as serious as constructing a women's gallery was not made casually, but only after much serious debate and consideration. All this leads up to the point that if the rabbis did execute a change in the arrangement of the floor plan, it was a change with far-reaching implications both legal and religious.

In the year 70 C.E. the Holy Temple was destroyed by the Romans. Around this time, Rabbi Yochanan Ben Zakkai managed to secure permission from the Roman General, soon to become Emperor, Vespasian, to establish a religious retreat in the little town of Yavneh, in order to carry on the academic and intellectual study and practice of Judaism. The people were faced with a serious problem immediately upon the destruction of the Temple. How could they serve God without the Temple for offering sacrifices? Rabbi Ben Zakkai and his colleagues considered the question and ordained that prayer would substitute for sacrifices. There had always been some minimal prayer in conjunction with the sacrificial ceremony, but now it assumed paramount importance over-shadowing the Temple service.

purpose and one purpose only — to pray. Community business was handled in the ante-rooms. The sanctuary was for the business of praying. It is important that there be something distinctive about that room, so as to send out a mental signal to each person as they enter that they were now in a special place. The uniqueness of the sanctuary is that men and women are to be separated. When one enters the sanctuary and sees the separateness of the sexes, it becomes clear that this is no ordinary place. This is a place for the exercise of the religious duty to pray — not the exercise of the social option of socializing. Rabbi Norman Lamm has put it very succinctly, by writing: "If a synagogue is a place to meet friends, and a service the occasion for displaying the latest fashions, then we must agree that 'if I can sit next to my wife at the movies, I can sit next to her in Temple.'"

In conclusion, I think that I have shown that there is much compelling reason to indicate that separate seating is an important part of the modern synagogue. Clearly, the halachik sources point to the conclusion that there is no legal precedent for mixed pews, and that such an arrangement would be in violation of the law. I have expounded these laws in the first part at length, because I want the enlightened reader to understand that this decision was not made arbitrarily or pulled out of an old yarmulke. The practice of separate seating dates continuously back seven centuries. For the past seven hundred years synagogues have had women's galleries. Prior to that when there were a significant number of women at a public service the policy was to segregate them. This dates back to an enactment of the sages of the time of the Second Temple.

I have also attempted to show that there are social, psychological, and philosophical reasons for adherence to a policy of separate seating. I shall not review these points, but please allow me to point out that there are inbred limitations to them. The rationalizations are independent of the actual practice. The rationale should not be implied to be the primary motivation for the law. For when all is said and done, every rabbi remains with the response of Tevye: "You ask why? And I'll tell you. I don't know! But that's Tradition."

I have undertaken this lengthy work in the hopes that an educated congregation will make a correct decision. Any shortcomings of this article are the author's and certainly not the

religion's. The study of Torah has always served the people of Israel well to elevate them to the exalted position of God's Chosen. Thus may it ever be that through the study of Torah, we will merit the ultimate redemption of the Messiah. May he come speedily and in our days. Amen.

THANK YOU! THANK YOU!

We want to thank all those who attended Friday Night services in honor of our 50th Anniversary. We thank those who made contributions, sent flowers, gifts and cards. We appreciate Rabbi Kuperman's kind words. To Carol and Bennie Jacobs, thank you for the beautiful florals for the synagogue. A special thanks to our daughter-in-law Corinne and her helpers who made the evening such a joyous occasion. We want to thank our grandsons, Martin and Gary, for conducting a beautiful service. Above all, we thank G-d for the many blessings he has bestowed upon us.

. . . Harry and Florence Karlin

SLATE OF OFFICERS FOR ELECTION IN APRIL, 1975

President	Mrs. Morris Katz
1st Vice-President . . .	Mrs. Morton Alpert
2nd Vice-President . . .	Mrs. Morris Wolff
3rd Vice-President . . .	Mrs. Brett Morse
Treasurer	Mrs. Isadore Katz
Financial Sec'y.	Mrs. Norman Holtzman
Recording Sec'y.	Mrs. Harold Stein
Corres. Sec'y.	Mrs. Jacob Raab
Advisory Counselor . . .	Mrs. Charles Mintz
Trustees	Mrs. Donald Medow
	Mrs. Helen Rosen
	Mrs. Herbert Sim

SISTERHOOD MEETING — APRIL

A Fresh New Spring will be the theme for the next Sinai Sisterhood meeting when Mrs. Doris Freedman Leventhal gives a demonstration of floral arranging, incorporating our own art objects and nature's wonders. The meeting will take place at Sinai Synagogue April 14th at 1:00 for tea, coffee and dessert.

Mrs. Levanthal is a member of the National Council of Garden Clubs and is also a flower-show judge.

Come join us and welcome spring and a delightful surprise — a door prize — will be given, one of Mrs. Leventhal's creations.

. . . Posi Tucker, publicity

They understood that men are unconsciously uncomfortable in the presence of women, and that the presence of a woman would in itself be distracting mentally. The unfortunate part of this is that many people are weak daveners, and the presence of women is a much greater distraction in our generation than perhaps at any other time in our history.

Volumes and volumes have been written regarding the philosophy of prayer. It is not my intention to survey the literature, nor to add to it significantly. I would merely like to make several observations.

The sacrificial service was called the avodah — work. It demanded active participation as one's occupation does. When that was supplanted in favor of the worship service, it was called the avodah she' balev — the work of the heart. The task of serving was taken over by the heart. It must be understood that this title does not mean that the prayer or the service took place in the heart, and hence, a silent devotion. This is erroneous! It meant that the heart as the seat of the mind and the emotions, had to be the motivating factor of prayer. Rather than a physical participation, there was now a mental participation. The key element in successful prayer to the rabbis was kavannah — devotional concentration. When the form of service was physical, it was immaterial whether there was a distracting noise; however, once the process became mental, there had to be a device to exclude any distractions. This is why kavannah assumed so great an importance. It was the key that unlocked successful prayer.

In order to achieve devotional concentration, the early pious rabbis would arrive at the synagogue about an hour early and begin to clear their minds of distracting thoughts until such time as they could pray with devotion and attachment to God. These men were so successful at their concentrating that the Mishnah declares that if a snake were to be poised at their foot they would not be distracted. Now, this is clearly an extreme, but it is not unthinkable. Many have been the times that I have literally been lost in prayer, and kept the congregation waiting an extra few minutes, because I had lost track of the time in the midst of prayer. Granted this type of communing with God is not easily acquired, but, on the other hand, it is by no means impossible to reach. The state of true attachment to God requires by its very nature a detachment from the physical world. You must be able to ignore the surroundings

and open up your heart to God. Otherwise, prayer becomes the meaningless repetition of words.

I might add one note aside for a moment. Many people have expressed a desire for mixed seating, because they have difficulty following the service. I admit that this is a legitimate problem. Mixed seating is no panacea, though. I would wholeheartedly advise you, if this is your problem, to visit our library and borrow a book on the service or the siddur. One or two books about the prayerbook will make you confident and independent of the need to rely on another to follow the service. This is a much more efficient solution than mixed seating, because the chances are good that the person you want to sit next to is not as knowledgeable as you think. Education is always a better solution.

Many Americans have been raised on the slogan, "The family that prays together stays together." This may sound very enticing, but philosophically it's ridiculous. If this is true, then the families that pray apart will flood the divorce courts. According to this propaganda from the National Council of Churches, the orthodox must have the highest percentages of divorce. Nothing is further from the truth. The togetherness of the family must of necessity extend well beyond the reaches of the worship service if there is to be any cohesiveness at all. The truth of the matter is that American families do very little together, and so the National Council of Churches felt that togetherness could be stimulated by family praying experiences. The truth of the matter is that we shall have to do more than sit in the same pew in a synagogue to insure family togetherness. We shall have to build homes where the Jewish family is a cohesive unit at home — not merely, on hopefully weekly, excursions to the shul; homes where the table is an altar and the food is blessed; homes where prayer will be heard regularly and Torah studied.

Another point to be considered is the unique aspect of the synagogue as compared to all the other places we visit in the course of our day. Although the tradition accepts the possibility of praying at home or at the office, assuming the locale meets minimum requirements, it encouraged synagogue attendance. Why? The answer lies in the fact that the shul's exclusive function was a makom tefillah — a place of prayer. It was plainly clear to the people that when they were in the sanctuary it was for one

A secondary question that arose simultaneously was the question of the relative status of the newly ordained prayer houses. Did they have the same "holiness" and status as the Temple? How was one to compare them religiously? The rabbis (Gemarah Megillah 29A) ordained that they were miniature sanctuaries as Ezekiel had observed: "Yet I shall be to them as a little sanctuary" (Ezek. 11: 16). And so, our synagogues assumed the same sanctity as the original Temple, which meant that the synagogues were a continuous extension of the Temple. This is important to understand, because although they housed different practices, and superficially do not appear to be comparable, they are indeed to be likened and compared in almost all respects.

The synagogue in those days and through the Talmudic times had no women's compartment, like many oriental synagogues today, simply because no woman was there as one of the religious fellowship, but as a visitor, who came irregularly. There was no need to provide a special place for her. She remained in the entrance hall or sat silently and reservedly in the back row, following the prayers or listening to the discourse of the teacher. There was no demand for a wall of separation between her and the male congregation, except when the synagogue, as in the case of the Temple, became the locus of a general public assembly where women came as a right and in large numbers.

This pattern was followed throughout the entire Talmudic and geonic times. However, we do find in the post-geonic times that women's sections become more in evidence. This indicates that they became more in evidence as attenders and that they were becoming reckoned with as part of the public religious community. This practice became most visible in the thirteenth century. The author of the "Mordechai" (Sabb. 311) notes that when large assemblies gathered to hear the discourse of the rabbis on Shabbat afternoon "a curtain was stretched across to divide the men from the women." This reference comes to us from the beginning of the thirteenth century. By the end of that century, we already find references to sections designated as "the women's synagogue." Its exact structure was not uniform from synagogue to synagogue, but from that time on the practice seems to have spread across Europe. It is of interest to note that as the attendance of women increased, the re-

sponse of the rabbinic leadership, rabbis of great religious knowledge, was identical to that of the sages in Temple times. They resorted to a forced separation as a means of limiting and curtailing the mingling of the men and women to minimize distraction and maximize the reverential attitude necessary for religious service. This practice is in continual usage to this day. As I'm sure you are aware, many synagogues have separate sections for the women and the men.

To sum up this section . . . We have seen that in earliest times, there was generally no separate section for women in the Holy Temple. However, this was because the number of women in attendance was so minimal as to serve no distraction for the men who were participating in the service. When, in fact, large numbers of women did attend, the rabbis observed a casualness out of place for the Temple. They therefore experimented with different standing arrangements (there was no seating) and found that only a physical separation would meet their standards. They, then, instituted "a great innovation" of erecting a women's gallery or balcony for those times when large numbers of women attended. With the destruction of the Temple and the assumption of its position by the miniature sanctuary, the synagogue, women became infrequent visitors to the synagogue. When they did attend, they either remained in the ante-chamber or sat unobtrusively in the rear, since in such small numbers they served as no great distraction. We have observed that during the thirteenth century, women became more in evidence as attenders of public worship services. The leading scholars of that generation again resorted to the Talmudic device of segregating the sexes. This has continued to our day. It must be observed, in addition, that those who have abandoned this practice have offered no religio-legal justification for it. There have been no halachik treatises, to the best of my knowledge, rationalizing such a change. They have simply broken with the tradition of long standing, and by their silence tacitly acknowledge that their practice is wrong. Rabbi Louis Epstein, a past-president of the Conservative Rabbinical Assembly and past chairman of their Commission on Law and Standards, wrote a book in 1948 entitled "Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism." In the section on "Sex Segregation in Public Places," he concludes by saying: "For the most part, Jews today do not challenge the validity of separating the men from the women in the synagogue. Even the

moderate Reformers of Central Europe to this day retain the women's gallery in their Temples. The extremists among Reform Jews were the first to break down the wall of separation. The Conservatives in America tend to follow that policy. The orthodox in other countries are at peace with the old tradition, but in America they find preservation of the women's gallery a most difficult task, because it seems to run counter to the tastes of the women and to the trend in American Jewry." (P. 83) One of the foremost figures in the history of the Conservative movement wrote in 1948 that there was no justification for mingling of the sexes at worship services from an halachik perspective. Only those who are considered "the extremists among Reform Jews" by a leading Conservative scholar initiated and perpetuated this practice. Dr. Jacob B. Agus, a well-known Conservative leader and member of the Conservative Commission on Law and Standards, has stated that for years the Commission on Law and Standards has merely "condoned" and not "approved" mixed seating. [Conservative Judaism Vol. 11, No. 1, p. 11 (1956)]. The most fascinating aspect of the identification of the Conservative Movement with mixed seating is that the Jewish Theological Seminary, the very alma mater of most Conservative rabbis, not only has separate seating, but a very tall mechitza, partition. The answer to this puzzle is that the Conservative Movement has made all of its "innovations" in keeping with their own self-defined understanding of the halachik process. Their problem with the issue of separate seating is that there is no halachik basis for such a change, no matter how carefully they scour the sources. It's interesting to note that the group of rabbis who think that they've uncovered a solution to the question of driving on Shabbat can find no source to support mixed seating.

While the traditionalist will be satisfied with a simple yes or no, in the uniqueness of American Jewry this does not suffice. To many, the disagreement over mixed pews appears to be a trifle. It is, however, trifles such as this that are so often symbols of issues of far greater moment. The issue of separate pews has become symbolic of the struggle between two competing ideological camps. It has become a *cause celebre* in the debate of the validity of traditional Judaism and its survival intact in a modern world. On the one hand, there are those who understand the need for tradi-

tional Judaism to be an external guide, objectively defining the norms of human conduct. On the other hand, there are those who would see Judaism become internalized, in the sense that they themselves become the ultimate deciders of normal human conduct. It boils down to the final proposition: "Will religion tell me what to do, or will I determine religion?" This was made very clear to me several weeks ago, when I received a phone call from a young man who was new in the area. He wanted to arrange for the naming of his baby daughter. After taking all the pertinent data, I explained to him that since I didn't know him or his wife I had to ask him whether or not his wife was Jewish. He said that he understood that I had to ask such a question, and that his wife was not Jewish. I then explained to him that since his wife wasn't Jewish, the daughter was not Jewish, and consequently, I could not give a Jewish name to a baby who was not Jewish. He said that he understood, and then he volunteered, "Rabbi, I always considered religion to be a personal thing." This young man was telling me, in essence, "Who the heck are you to tell me what to do? It's my religion and I'll do what I want with it!" Now, it has always been true that each individual ultimately does what he thinks is best, but there must be a line drawn between what an individual decides and what is in fact the objective truth of the Jewish religion. And so, I hope, that in this perspective, you can understand the significance of the debate over mixed pews.

Sociologically speaking, there is much to understand about the issue. We Jews are and have always been a totally unique people. No other people has remained in exile two thousand years to return to its ancestral homeland. Our very devotion to the land of Israel symbolizes our individuality. We are different in the way we eat, in what we eat, in the holidays we observe, and so on. It is this separateness that has kept us alive in order to be able to return to Israel, and also to fulfill our historic mission. This distinctiveness has kept us alive throughout the millennia, and it has the power to sustain us through the millennia to come.

The source of this principle is found in the Torah. "Neither shall ye walk in their ordinances," and "And ye shall not walk in the customs of the nations" (Lev. 18: 3 & 20: 23). God prescribed for us a regimen so unique and so different from the pagan cults which surrounded Israel that we could not be lost among

the remnants of history. According to Maimonides, this principle is so fundamental that it is responsible for a major part of the Torah's legislation.

The Apostle Paul, spokesman for the early church, took the position against incorporating women into the service and included a prohibition against praying in mixed company. In F. Godet's book "First Epistle to the Corinthians," he conceded that this is clearly "a rule taken over from the synagogue and maintained in the primitive church." Mixed seating was later introduced by Corinthian members of the church, who were steeped in pagan worship practices. Thus, mixed seating, the current standard of the church, is of pagan origin, not a hold-over from Judaism. Let us take this line of sociological logic a step further. It has been documented that the Reform temples in Europe adhered to the tradition of separate seating, with only scattered exceptions. It was introduced in America by Isaac Mayer Wise, in about 1850, when he borrowed a Baptist church for his Reform services in Albany, New York. He found the mixed seating much to his liking that he decided to retain this feature for his temple. This can be substantiated by reading Samuel S. Cohen's article "Reform Judaism" in the book, "Jewish Life in America" (ed. Freedman and Gordis) p. 86. Thus, it would appear that the drive for mixed seating during worship services is an attempt to mimic our Christian neighbors. Therefore, it seems there is a prohibited act: mimicking the Christians, something clearly counter to the entire stream of Judaism. Instead of our teaching them practices of worship, we wish to adopt practices of worship from them.

There is a psychological factor that must be taken into consideration, also. I never cease to marvel how 20th century science keeps proving what Judaism has told us for centuries. Howard Fast's book "Body Language" has confirmed what students of Jewish prayer have known all along: namely, that we behave differently in mixed company. Actually, we have known this for a while, but the upshot of his book is that this happens on an unconscious level. We don't realize it, but when a woman walks into a room, all the men subtly change their posture, and their unconscious attitude is modified. While the changes that take place are less with your wife or husband, they are certainly there with another's spouse. In a mixed seating congregation, one may certainly be sitting next to one's wife or husband, but the chances are

also excellent that you'll be sitting next to someone else's wife or husband too. This concept is especially true of your son or daughter who is not married.

The late Dr. Kinsey's works prove that the intuitive insights of the sages are confirmed by modern statistics and sexological studies. Kinsey wrote in his magnum opus, "Sexual Behavior in the Human Male" that upper class males are more responsive to erotic visual stimulus. Additionally, Kinsey noted, upper class males have a "greater capacity to visualize situations which are not immediately at hand." Thus, greater erotic responsiveness is experienced by higher class men. I think that no one need be concerned that American Jewish males do not fall into the category of "upper class."

It has been submitted numerous times, that this argument is fallacious because it takes an exaggerated view that devout Jewish men who come to a synagogue to pray should not be suspected of romantic day-dreaming. That this point should be raised in a post-Freudian age complete with Kinsey's sexological studies is unthinkable. When we live in an age, where we are learning daily how little of our behavior is controllable and how much of it is unconscious or sub-consciously motivated, I cannot believe that people resist separation of men and women during worship.

I'd just like to note that there is a good reason why women have greater difficulty accepting separate pews than men. Prof. Kinsey in his book, "Sexual Behavior in the Human Female" noted that women are half as responsive to visual stimulation as are men. Thus, Kinsey proves what Judaism has known for a long time: namely, that women have greater purity of mind than men. This would explain why there are many Playboy-type magazines aimed at the male reader, but only recently have their female counterpart appeared. No doubt this is a reaction to the dissolution of culturally defined roles for women.

At any rate, this would explain why women have more difficulty sympathizing with the traditional posture regarding mixed pews. It would seem that the goal is not to separate the women from the men, but rather, to separate the men from the women.

And so, we have seen that psychologically, the sages were on the right track. They understood that the mere presence of a woman might be enough to inhibit the free flow of prayer.