**Wake Up and Keep Silent: Visualizing Jewish Aural Policies**

## Introduction: Visual Art in Aural Spaces

The chapter on ritual instruments, inscriptions, and images designed to direct the behavior of Jewish worshippers prior to and during the synagogue service is my tribute to Prof. Shalom Sabar.[[1]](#footnote-1) His ample scientific oeuvre has expanded the scope of research of the artefacts produced in or for cohesive Jewish communities from the art historical and iconographic discourses to inquiries in a wider ethnographic perspective. His research of artistic crafts, mass art production, and ephemera has extended the tacit boundaries of Jewish art history that heretofore preoccupied with the masterworks, notable monuments, and most remarkable folk visual production. Sabar’s works suggest that ritual, liturgical, household, and personal decorated objects, as well as illuminated manuscripts, prints, and paintings, which nowadays are untouchable showpieces in museums and private collections can be deeper understood if imagined in their original environments and performative uses. To mention but a fraction of his diverse investigations, the illuminated marriage contracts, amulets, Hanukkah lamps, and *Simḥat Torah* paper flags were designed to play a role in rituals, ceremonies, or casual performances that activate a variety of human faculties.[[2]](#footnote-2)

This study examines the artistic craft production that appeals to the sense of hearing and contribute to the “aural space” or “soundscape” (that is, the perceiving and production of natural or artificial sounds) of traditional Jewish communities.[[3]](#footnote-3) The shofar horns, Purim noise makers (groggers, rattles, and mallets) and decorated or inscribed shofars are perhaps the most remarkable and better explored kinds of hearable artefacts used for liturgical purposes.[[4]](#footnote-4) In distinction, my focus is on the hitherto understudied artefacts that provide ancillary support to audible para-liturgical and liturgical activities: the knockers announcing the ritual times,[[5]](#footnote-5) the pointers guiding the reading aloud of sacred texts; and the devices, inscriptions, and images urging the synagogue worshippers to abstain from chatting during the prayer.

## Announcing the Times

Since the antiquity, the astronomical cycles inspired people to accept the continuous and irreversible timestream as cyclical. This perception created the calendars that group the days according to the sun’s and/or moon’s revolution, into weeks and months, and define a certain date as the “new year,” i.e., the starting point of an annual cycle.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Mircea Eliade (1907–1986) contended that in traditional societies and religions, the rituals relying on the circular concept of time celebrated the “eternal return” of pivotal mythological or historical events.[[7]](#footnote-7) A common calendar consolidated the scattered adherents of a certain cult and assured their synchronic performance of identical rituals. When the astronomic observations necessary for reckoning the dates of rituals returned uncertain, social, and artificial means were employed to determine the cycle’s turning point. The Mishnaic tractate *Rosh ha-Shanah* (New Year) provides a third-century CE record of Jewish methods of announcing a new month. A court of judges in Jerusalem validated the reports of witnesses who had sighted the new moon.[[8]](#footnote-8) To transmit the court’s decision to the Jews in Babylonia, beacons were kindled on the mountaintops, from one peak to another. The optical signalization was fast, but vulnerable: the Samaritans corrupted it by lighting torches at the wrong times. Thus, the sages shifted to a slower but more secured communication by messengers who informed the Jews in the Diaspora of the start of the month.[[9]](#footnote-9)

A diurnal cycle of the Earth’s revolution is sacralized by everyday worship.[[10]](#footnote-10) The sunrise and sunset establish the primary anchors for reckoning the times of recurring daily rituals and prayers. Before the invention of mechanical devices for measuring of time, the subdivision of the daylight and night periods into shorter lapses of time, which we call “hours,” was based mainly on social conventions.[[11]](#footnote-11) In the sunny climates, the people may observe the apparent progress of the moon and sun through the sky or the sun shadow’s length during the daylight. However, the common people could barely rely on celestial signs, shadows, or intuition to manage precise horology within the light and dark periods.[[12]](#footnote-12) To ensure that worshippers begin the daily ritual in the assigned time, the hour should be announced to the congregation in short advance.

A shofar (horn) and trumpets are referred to in the Bible and later Jewish sources as the instruments sounding to signify theophany, military alarm and triumph, and to accompany the temple activities.[[13]](#footnote-13) The horn and metallic wind instruments, though differing in the tone, issued piercing sounds that were apt to signal ritual times. Along with the employment of shofar’s voice for celebrating the Jubilee year, new year, Day of Atonement, and new moon (as well as in addition to its supernal, liturgical, ritual, ceremonial, apotropaic, mystical, and military uses),[[14]](#footnote-14) the ancient Jews blew the shofar and trumpet to announce daily times. In the precincts of the Herodian Temple in Jerusalem, the priests announced the opening of the gates in the morning and daily offerings with a blast of trumpets.[[15]](#footnote-15) Trumpets were sounded from the topmost pinnacle of the Temple Mount to communicate the signal approaching, beginning, and end of the Sabbath to the people in the city of Jerusalem.[[16]](#footnote-16) Babylonian Talmud informs that the shofar’s signals introduced the three stages of the preparations for Shabbat, and this voice was heard in the city and countryside.[[17]](#footnote-17)

The trumpet sounds also synchronized the activities of closely-knit groups at enclosed compounds. Flavius Josephus wrote that in the Roman camps, the times for the daily collective procedures were notified beforehand by the sound of a σάλπιγξ (trumpet), and the trumpet sound signaled each of the three stages of the soldiers’ preparations for a march.[[18]](#footnote-18) In early-fourth-century Egypt, the voice of trumpet called the monks to assembly and daily prayers.[[19]](#footnote-19)

Jews and early Christians employed percussion sounds that could have been a ritual sign or convocation.[[20]](#footnote-20) The discussion of hand flaps on Sabbath in Jerusalem Talmud, *Beiẓa* 5:2 refers to Rabbi Samuel bar Isaac (active in the late third of early fourth century, moved from Babylonia to the Land of Israel[[21]](#footnote-21)), who “was in the opinion to knock for a new synagogue.”[[22]](#footnote-22) The text specifies neither what was his intention nor whether he struck the synagogue (presumably, synagogue’s door) by hand or by any beater.[[23]](#footnote-23)

Still in the early fourth century, another sound – streaking a hollow wood or wooden plank called *semantron* in Greek (σήμαντρον, from σημαίνειν: “to give a signal”[[24]](#footnote-24)) or *nāqūs* (ناقوس) in Arabic – summoned the members of monastic communities in Levant.[[25]](#footnote-25) Edward Williams speculated that John Climacus’ (ca. 579–649) mention of the “spiritual trumpet” of convocation that had replaced the trumpet and horn on Sinai, implied a monastic semantron.[[26]](#footnote-26) The use of wooden semantra spread in the Christian East, was occasionally adopted in the Western Church, and has survived in the contemporary orthodox monasteries.[[27]](#footnote-27)

The methods of acoustic announcement of the times addressed a varying scope of audience: from the entire community or its part to a household or person. The loud voices of shofars, trumpets, stationary semantra, later – church bells, and – after the emergence of Islam – muezzins dispersed from their fixed location around, over the neighborhood. The sound of a mallet or beater striking portable semantra that were carried across monastery grounds reached clusters of monks’ dwellings. In contrast, in fifth-century Egyptian and Palestinian monastic communities knocking the cell (assumingly, cell’s door) with an “awakening hammer” summoned each monk personally.[[28]](#footnote-28)

As Christianity mutated from organized communities to dominating societies, the range of acoustic announcement of liturgical times grew. Since the sixth century, ringing the bells has become the paramount announcement of church services.[[29]](#footnote-29) The Christians adopted this sound despite the objection of Church Fathers to the use of ringing the bells and striking other metal objects, which they denigrated as pagan sorcery against evil spirits.[[30]](#footnote-30) Upon gaining their dominance in the territories previously under the Christian rule, Muslims confined the volume of a *nāqūs-*semantron in churches.[[31]](#footnote-31) The *Ḥadīth* literature claimed that the Messenger of God established the muezzin’s chanting the *adhān* (call) for prayer as it differed from both Jewish (– blowing a shofar) and Christian (– striking a *nāqūs*) summons.[[32]](#footnote-32) The call of the muezzin from a high minaret extended the Islamic dominance over the audial domain.[[33]](#footnote-33) When the Catholics expelled the Muslims from Seville, the sonar dimension of Christian power was regained by converting the ninth-century minaret of the Almohad congregational mosque, into the cathedral’s bell tower (known as the Giralda).[[34]](#footnote-34) In the Christian oikumene, melodic chime from a high belfry enfolded the parish and welded the parishioners into a community – in other words, imposed the Christian primacy on the people, territory, and time.[[35]](#footnote-35)

The ringing church bells hegemonized the soundscape in medieval European Jewish quarters, too. The Jews, who sought to avoid any ideological dictate of the adverse religion, adopted a collateral signal for the synchronization of liturgical routines – knocking doors. The duty was imposed on the *shamash* (synagogue beadle), and by the fifteenth century the terms *schulklopfer* (“synagogue knocker”) and, rarer, *schulrufer* (“synagogue caller”) were designated in German and Yiddish to define the shamash’s role of summoning people to prayer.[[36]](#footnote-36) This announcement was effective in a compact neighborhood and not openly contested the Christian sovereignty, though it was familiar to Christian townsfolk. According to Moritz Güdemann (1835–1918), Christians associated the Jewish synagogue knockers with church bell-ringers called “campanatores” in Latin and “Glöckener” in German.[[37]](#footnote-37) Two fifteenth-century German carnival plays, Hans Folz’s (ca. 1437–1513) “Der Juden Messias” and anonymous “Ein Spiel von dem einliften Finger,” mention a *schulklopfer*.[[38]](#footnote-38) With their harsh anti-Semitic temper, the plays portray the synagogue knocker as a personification of Jewish tumult.[[39]](#footnote-39) A synagogue mallet was found among the typical Jewish ritual objects exposed in an eighteenth-century Christian replica of a synagogue built in Regensburg to provide Germans with a close view of “Jewish curiosities” and better argument against Judaism.[[40]](#footnote-40)

The earliest testimony of knocking doors to call the Jewish congregants to synagogue service comes from the twelfth-century Mainz. Rabbi Eliezer ben Nathan’s (*Ra’avan*; 1090–1170) mention of a shamash knocking at a home entrance as an accustomed spectacle in his hometown suggests that the practice was even older.[[41]](#footnote-41) Ra’avan concerned whether making the noise transgressed the halakhic prohibition of performing any work on Sabbath. He referred to the abovementioned discussion of clapping and flapping on Sabbath in the Jerusalem Talmud tractate *Beiẓa* 5:2 that contains, inter alia, Rabbi Eleazar’s harsh conviction against “all sound making […] on the Sabbath.”[[42]](#footnote-42)As we saw, the same section mentions of Rabbi Samuel’s “knocking for a new synagogue” without providing any reason for or whereabouts of the case. Nevertheless, Ra’avan accepted Rabbi Samuel’s deed as an etiological story and halakhic justification for the shamash’s duty to knock doors. Ra’avan permitted the knocking as a custom affirmed by the Talmud and done for the sake of obeying God’s commandments.

Concerns about noise making on Sabbath persisted for generations.[[43]](#footnote-43) Many rabbis of Ra’avan’s dynasty had to reiterate and elaborate his decision. It was supported by Ra’avan’s grandson, Mainz-born Rabbi Eliezer ben Yoel ha-Levi of Cologne (*Raviyah*; 1140–1225);[[44]](#footnote-44) Raviyah’s descendent Rabbi Mordechai ben Hillel of Nuremberg (ca. 1250–1298);[[45]](#footnote-45) Mordechai’s Cologne-born relative Rabbi Asher ben Yeḥiel (*Rosh*; 1250/59–1327);[[46]](#footnote-46) and a pupil of Mordechai’s disciple, Rabbi Alexander Zuslin ha-Cohen of Erfurt, Worms, Cologne, and Frankfurt am Main (died 1349).[[47]](#footnote-47) The abovementioned geography of rabbinical offices and mobility indicates the dissemination of the custom up to the mid-fourteenth century. In the fifteenth century, Rabbi Israel Isserlein (1390–1460) reported about its local versions: in his native Wiener Neustadt, Austria, the shamash performed a combination of four strikes (single-double-single), whereas in German Jewish communities the customary signal comprised three strikes (single, then double).[[48]](#footnote-48)

In the seventeenth century, Juspa (Yiftah Juspa-Joseph Halevy, 1604–1678), a beadleof the Worms synagogue, itemized a shamash-shulklapper’s daily itinerary.[[49]](#footnote-49) Early in the morning (the hour depended on the season), the shulklapper departed to the synagogue, knocking on his way upon his own home and the synagogue women’s annex. After entering the synagogue and blessing the early attendees, he made a round of knocking selected doors of Jewish houses, then he returned to the synagogue to begin the morning service. In pre-industrial urban environment, the nighttime knocking of the shamash could be heard from afar, so that the mallet’s sound apparently reached at every street of the Jewish quarter that measured about 200 by 400 meters.[[50]](#footnote-50) The selected points of the shamash’s route spotted the territory of the Jewish quarter and marked its core (the synagogue and residence of the Head of the Rabbinical Court) and edges (the gates at its east and west sides). The daily knocking repeatedly mapped and audibly restated the Jewish’s enclave in the Christian city of Worms.

Written and visual testimonies approve that a sequence of mallet blows commencing at the synagogue, meandering across the neighborhood, and returning to the synagogue in morning and evening was a daily acoustic experience of Jews in central and eastern Europe through ages. The known to me sources coming from German and Austrian cities and towns of the eighteenth to early twentieth century do not specify any designated stations on the shulklapper’s route.[[51]](#footnote-51) In these places, the Jewish population was concentrated along one or several streets rather than being enclosed within the gates of a Jewish quarter as it was in medieval Worms. Seemingly, to ensure that his signal to be heard by as many as possible, the shulklapper had to individualize it by knocking nearly each Jewish door or window shutter he passed by. Solomon Zalman Geiger (d. 1775), a synagogue precentor and community notable of Frankfurt am Main, described the *shamash* going down on the Jewish street to the synagogue while knocking with a wooden hammer on the doors of houses. The route was performed twice a day: “in the morning to wake up the sleepers, and in the evening to remind those who forgot that the time [for prayer] had come.” [[52]](#footnote-52) A comparable pattern of personal awakening among homogenous population adjacently living in the modern urban environment was observed in the residential zones of factory laborers of Britain after the Industrial Revolution. The “knocker-ups” tapped accurately at the bedroom window of each worker, using long sticks or fishing rods to reach the windows situated on upper floors.[[53]](#footnote-53)

Since the late nineteenth century, Jewish and Christian artists represented the shulklapper as a characteristic figure of the traditionalist Jewish community. An Alsace-born Jewish artist Alphonse Lévy (1843–1918) drew his memory of a shulklapper at a Jewish home’s door #. Polish artist Julian Fałat (1853–1929) depicted a shulklapper knocking a door in his country #.[[54]](#footnote-54) In the early-twentieth century, Alter Kacyzne (1885–1941) took a photograph of Ezrielke the shamash knocking a shutter in Biała Podlaska # and Mayer Kirshenblatt (1916–2009) painted his memory of a Jewish knocker rapping the shutters in pre-Holocaust Opatów #.

An ingrained medium of daily convocations, the sounds of shulklapper’s mallet were exploited for communicating supplementary annunciations and occasional messages. In early twentieth-century eastern Europe, the shulklapper also called the people to synagogue on seasonal occasions: in the times of the *seliḥot* (penitential prayers) and of the Psalm recitations.[[55]](#footnote-55) Like the ancient shofar blowers,[[56]](#footnote-56) on the eve of Sabbath the shulklapper signaled when the time came to stop trade and craft, shortly after did so again to close the shops, then he knocked once more to mark the imminent onset of the Sabbath.[[57]](#footnote-57) The shulklapper also performed the function of a herald transmitting information on casual occurrences and private festivities.[[58]](#footnote-58) The number of mallet strikes served an alert for either untroubled or grievous messages: two raps instead of the regular three ones notified of the death of a community member.[[59]](#footnote-59)

Further dispersion of Jewish population in urban geography, increasing noise of industrialized surroundings, and steady growing availability of mechanical timepieces, led to gradual comedown for ritual knocking at the Jewish doors in Ashkenazi communities.[[60]](#footnote-60) Rabbi David Sperber of Brașov (1877–1962) had to vehemently defend the shulklapper’s knocking as a tradition sanctified by the Oral Law in his response to the voices sounded by emancipated members of the Jewish community of Sânpetru (Petersberg) in Romania against that practice.[[61]](#footnote-61) In Poland during the 1920s, according to Majer Bałaban, shulklappers remained only in small Jewish communities, whereas in larger cities they knocked at houses in close proximity to the synagogue.[[62]](#footnote-62) The number of weekly rounds also decreased. As in their notes to images, Kacyzne # and Kirshenblatt # similarly referred to the Jewish knocker as a *Shabes-klaper* (Sabbath-knocker),[[63]](#footnote-63) it is reasonable to infer that in their time, the shulklapper’s work was limited to a single performance per week and his mallet was typically not heard during the weekdays.

The personalized audial synchronization of communal life was effective only in neighborhoods with a homogenous population. In some pockets of traditional Jewish life in eastern Europe, the practice of knocking on each door to summon synagogue-goers persisted until the Holocaust, and was never revived there. In contrast, in British industrial worker quarters, knock-uppers ceased to exist only in the early 1970s, long after the alarm clocks had become widely available. [[64]](#footnote-64) The weekly auditory notifications of ritual times are present in the areas with prevailing Jewish religious population in contemporary Israel and in some Jewish neighborhoods in the United States. However, lieu of individualized announcements, a siren is sounded to announce the required cessation of work and oncoming onset of Shabbat.

## Homiletized Sounds

The shulklapper’s knocking for announcing the times was accompanied by concurrent communication that elucidated, enhanced, or interpreted the primary non-verbal message. A simple yet potent elaboration of the custom was shulklapper’s ceremonial utterances that verbalized the exhortation. For that sake, the shulklapper uttered straightforward commands, for example: אין שוּהל אַרײַן (Yiddish: “To synagogue!”),[[65]](#footnote-65) שטייט אויף צו סליחות (“wake up for the *seliḥot*”),[[66]](#footnote-66) or “'Women, women! It’s time to light the candles and go to the synagogue.”[[67]](#footnote-67) He also could melodically chant utterances such as שטייט אויף לעבודת הבורא in Yiddish or קומי לעבודת הבורא in Hebrew (“Wake up for the service of the Creator”).[[68]](#footnote-68)

Rabbi Israel Isserlein’s writings disclose the fifteenth-century Jewish perception of the shamash’s signals as an esoteric code:

[…] a reason of why the shamash strikes when he calls to the synagogue one strike and then two strikes and then one strike: and the reason is that this is similar to “אָבֹא [I will come] unto thee and bless thee” [Exodus 20:20], the numerical value of the first latter of “אָבֹא” is one, of the second is two, and of the third is one.[[69]](#footnote-69)

The rapping was deemed a medium that transmitted letters of the Hebrew alphabet by an arrangement of elementary aural signals, a kind of medieval precursor of the modern Morse Code. Furthermore, the shulklapper’s code is multilevel: the signals encode the letters that, in turn, form an acronym of a biblical verse containing God’s promise: “In every place where I cause My name to be mentioned I will come unto thee and bless thee” (Exodus 20:20).

A mystical interpretation of the mallet knocks by preoccupation with the letters and their numerical values and linking their meaning to the Pentateuch imply the kabbalistic concepts of the ulterior dimensions of the creation and human activities, and of intemporal universalism of the divinely revealed Scripture. The evocation of divine presence to meet and bless the worshippers reveals a theurgical aspect of the shulklapper’s encoded message.[[70]](#footnote-70) Israel Isserlein’s elucidation is rare evidence of esoteric interpretation of the shulklapper’s mallet percussion. Along with its arcane meaning, the shulklapper’s performance and concomitant oral invocation connoted a wider homiletic sense: they encouraged the faithful to rush to godly worship. While the written sources provide inexplicit information on shulklapper’s edificatory role, the homiletic aspect of his activity came to the fore in the design of post-medieval synagogue mallets.

## Sculpting the Voices

Now let us focus on the shamash’s knocker. It’s early visual representation is a hammer that identifies the shulklapper among the small figures of Jewish community officers, which decorate the four corners of several German tower-like containers for spices that are smelt as part of the *havdalah* ceremony at the end of the Sabbath.[[71]](#footnote-71) Medieval rabbinical texts call the shulklapper’s instrument מכושא (*makosha*, Aramaic: hammer),[[72]](#footnote-72) later Jewish sources mention a פטיש or האַמער (*patish*, Hebrew, and *hamer*, Yiddish: hammer) and פטיש עץ or האָלצערנע האַמער (Hebrew *patish eẓ* and Yiddish *holẓerne hamer*, literally, wooden hammer; i.e., mallet), and with a diminutive ending, הילצערן העמערל (Yiddish *hilẓerne hemerl*, literally, “a small wooden hammer”).[[73]](#footnote-73) Hardwood mallets could be well resonant for issuing reverberant sounds and durable enough for long-time use. In some places they used a metal hammer such as that seen in a hand of Ezrielke the shamash from Biała Podlaska #.

When the shulklapper’s mallet or hammer looks like an ordinary craftsman’s instrument, only auxiliary information or a proper context can help us to identify its ritual function. For example, personal memories of a family originated from Mattersdorf, Austria, maintain an unadorned wooden mallet they keep in their home in Tel Aviv as a relic that was used by the shulklapper in their native community.[[74]](#footnote-74) The provenance of an unadorned wooden mallet from the collection of synagogue items looted by Nazis from synagogues in Lublin area make possible its attribution as a shulklapper’s tool.[[75]](#footnote-75) The epigraph praising Michael-Lezer Bauer of Kobersdorf (died 1898) for his lifelong mission “to awake up each man for prayer” suggests that an image of a wooden mallet on his tombstone is his synagogue knocker #.[[76]](#footnote-76)

Note that the textual sources about synagogue *patishim* or *hamers* remain inattentive to their form and design. A unique German description of a synagogue hammer’s appearance as “richly decorated” does not specify what the hammer looks like.[[77]](#footnote-77)

Although scanty, the visual and material evidence testifies that the form of knockers was not limited to standard hammers or simple beaters as that Mayer Kirshenblatt gave in his painting to a shulklapper #. Efforts were invested into designing more ergonomic and symbolically charged tools, an example of which is a wooden beater with a turned handle and round knocking head #. The Hebrew inscription on the knob – עורו // קומו (*uru* // *kumu*: wake up // arise) – quotes the beginning of shulklapper’s call, “Wake up for the service of the Creator”.[[78]](#footnote-78) The inscribed words not only identify the beater’s special function, but also record a vocal scenario of shulklapper’s daily attendance and consign an association of the beater’s knocks with the officer’s verbal message.

A crooked device in a hand of the Jew in Julian Fałat’s image (Fig. 1) and a similar eightieth-century Hungarian specimen from the Feuchtwanger Collection at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem # are functional objects that mimic something else – the shofar.[[79]](#footnote-79) In 1925, Eliza Unger-Goldstein (1899–1983) drew one more shofar-shaped knocker from the Golden Rose Synagogue of Lviv #. An odd sense of imitation of a fragile hollow horn by a wooden tool that should be solid enough to resist countless knocks is compensated by the associative bonds between the two instruments in Jewish minds. The shofar was an ancient Jewish instrument of convocation,[[80]](#footnote-80) and the voice of shofar persisted to be a miraculous call for spiritual awakening in Jewish liturgy through the ages.[[81]](#footnote-81) In a more pragmatic sense, the shofar-shaped mallet may have been created for the purpose of rousing people before dawn during the *seliḥot* of the High Holidays,[[82]](#footnote-82) accompanied by the sound of the shofar.

The symbolic meaning of the knocker’s shofar-like body is enhanced by reliefs and letters on its sides. There are images of an eagle and deer that abruptly illustrate the Mishnaic tractate *Pirkei avot* (Ethics of the Fathers) 5:20: “Be as strong as a leopard, as light as an eagle, as swift as a deer, as brave as a lion to do the will of your Father in heaven.” Medieval Jewish legislator Jacob ben Asher (1270–ca. 1340) popularized this moralistic adage by quoting it the very beginning of his *Arba‘a turim: Orakh ḥayim*, in the section dealing with the halakhic rules upon awakening in the morning. From the fifteenth to century to the 1930’s, the zoomorphic tetrad appearing in a myriad of versions in synagogues and on Jewish books, ritual objects #, and ephemera, was a ubiquitous and foremost visual symbol of virtues of a pious Jew.[[83]](#footnote-83) The pair of eagle and deer chosen to decorate the shofar-shaped knocker alludes to the promptness of faithful in performing God’s commandments. The didactic message of zoomorphic reliefs is complemented with a hint at the solemn sake of the men’s rush: the Hebrew letters ל (*lamed*) and ב (*bet*) engraved on the knocker’s narrow side probably allude to shulklapper’s standard proclamation לעבודת הבורא (*la*-*avodat ha-Bore* or לעבודת בוראו *la-avodat Bor’o*; “for the service of the Creator /… his Creator”).[[84]](#footnote-84)

Crafting the knocker as a statuary object was not a solely Jewish invention. For example, a small bronze cast lion with a ball in its paws used a door knocker in late-fifteenth or early-sixteenth century Germany #. Jewish carvers shared the idea of a ball that acts simultaneously as an artistic component of mimetic sculpture and as a utilitarian projection that enables loudly knocking solid surfaces. A maker of an eighteenth-century synagogue mallet from Poland masterfully transfigured the mallet’s head into a double-headed lion with a large ball in each mouth #. A naïver version of an animal-form Jewish knocker from Lviv features a dragon-like or serpentine creature with a knob in its mouth #. The sculptural rendering of these knockers emblematically redelegates the action of acoustic convocation from the human who manipulates the knocker to rather supernatural powers symbolized by dreadful animals.[[85]](#footnote-85)

The inscriptions on two sculpted knockers bear Hebrew mottos that address the synagogue, that is the destination where the shulklapper calls to. The inscriptions on the handle of the leonine-headed mallet (Fig. 9) read: בבית ה' נהלך ברגש (“in the house of God we walked with the throng,” Psalms 55:15) and אני תפילתי לך ה' עת רצון (“as for me, let my prayer be unto Thee, O Lord, in an acceptable time,” Psalms 69:14). Both verses were recited in some communities at the beginning of the synagogue service.[[86]](#footnote-86) The phrase on the Lviv knocker, שמחתי באמרים לי בית ה' נלך (“I rejoiced when they said unto me: ‘Let us go unto the house of the Lord’,” Psalms 122:1), is also a part of the Ashkenazi liturgy and a wall inscription in several east-European synagogues.[[87]](#footnote-87)

## Simulated Hand

Whatever the form, all knockers are designed as tools to be conveniently manipulated by a human hand: they have a prolonged handgrip ending in a peen. Meeting the same practical demands, a knocker from the Furman family collection # also creates a likeness of an arm: the knocker’s handle resembles a sleeve that dresses a hand holding a ball. The phrase שמרים לבקר (*shomerim la-boker*, “night watchmen”) on the sleeve’s cuff may attribute this piece to one of the religious confraternities for night vigils, *Shomerim la-Boker*, which operated in numerous east-European Jewish communities. [[88]](#footnote-88) When read in its wider context in Psalms 130:6 (“My soul waiteth for the Lord, more than watchmen for the morning“), the phrase rehashes the abovementioned concept of the soul arousing for God like a man awaking from night sleep for a new day. The liturgical connotations of Psalm 130 relate to a vocal supplication of the faithful in distress to God: “Out of the depths have I called Thee, O Lord. Lord, hearken unto my voice” (1–2).[[89]](#footnote-89) In a visual aspect, the shulklapper’s hand knocked doors with a tool, whose form duplicated the hand and its action.

Such artificial hands were produced by and for Jews for a variety of ritual purposes. The most widespread of those is a *yad* (Hebrew, literally: hand), a pointer to guide the reading of the Torah scroll in synagogues. Since the fifteenth century, the *yad* is usually designed as an elongated arm with a hand terminating in a stretched out index finger (for example, see Fig. 12).[[90]](#footnote-90) The shaped *yad* becomes not only an instrumental extension of but also its idealized counterpart of a human limb: a precious artistic model of a hand and its functional substitute that prevents the impure contact of the reader’s fingers with the sacred scroll.[[91]](#footnote-91) The pointer facilitates the proper chanting of the text, that is, again, visual art furnishes a sonic performance in a ritual space. A latent association of a Torah pointer’s outstretched finger with a be-quiet gesture of a finger placed on lips was disclosed by a graphic artist Michal Levit in her image calling to keep silence during worship and reading the Torah #.

Indeed, stick extending a hand, or a simulated hand were the forms of beaters used for sounding signals to public during the worship. As noisy crowding or chatting disturbed the aural contact between the worshippers and prayer leader, the latter could signal to the congregation the times of their responses or other collective liturgical acts. A third-century C.E. rabbinical source relates to a visual signal – waving a kerchief from a wooden bimah (platform) – that a *ḥazan* (cantor) sent to the congregation in the synagogue of Alexandria.[[92]](#footnote-92) In the modern times, synagogue beadles used loud acoustic signals to call the attention of congregants during the service. Bałaban discovered in Polish synagogues what was called a *pralnik*: a plank and leather pillow.[[93]](#footnote-93) He reported that the plank was laid on the bimah’s table and used to maintain silence (in fact, to stop chatting) during prayer by slapping the pillow.[[94]](#footnote-94) Such a wooden stick and pillow are discerned in photographs taken by Solomon Yudovin in the synagogues of Dubno and Kremenets in Ukraine in 1912–1913.[[95]](#footnote-95)

In 1938, a certain Hannah Ramba donated a metal rattle with a gilt-engraved dedicatory inscription # to the synagogue of Jewish emigrants from Jedwabne (Poland) in New York's Lower East Side neighborhood.[[96]](#footnote-96) In her new place of residence, it is probable that she desired to replant the old-home custom of using a Polish wooden *pralnik* with a more distinguished ceremonial object. In the Greenbank Drive Synagogue in Liverpool (built in 1857, closed in 2008), the beadle called the congregation to order with a judge's gavel,[[97]](#footnote-97) while in the Belz Great Synagogue in Jerusalem (built in 2000), a large wooden spatula is presently employed being struck against a leather cushion.

The wooden arm ending in an open palm # was struck against a lectern or desk in an unidentified Romanian synagogue. Once again, the design of a percussion tool mimics the human limb operating this tool and, thereby, freezes the acoustic action in a still plastic form. Even when not enacted, the hand-like beater laying on a lectern in front of the synagogue congregation manifests the sonic authority of the prayer leader.

## Gaging Mouth and Blessed Silence

The phenomenon of synagogue gavels leads to more conjectures concerning the two shulklapper's mallets that are designed in the form of an animal holding a ball in its mouth #.[[98]](#footnote-98) These knobs evoke a contradictory impression. In practical terms, they are peens that produce the knocking sounds. In a visual aspect, the knobs seem preventing the sound making: they mute the sculpted beasts by stoppling their mouths. Note that the inscriptions on the mallets relate the exalted mood of a synagogue attendee: walking “in the house of God […] with the throng” and “rejoicing when [going …] unto the house of the Lord” #.[[99]](#footnote-99) Does the visual expression reflect the use of these mallets for both calling the people to go to prayer and maintaining the sonic accord in the synagogue?

Although we have no sufficient grounds to attest this assumption, it is in the spirit of the shamash’s duty to call the public to keep silent before the prayers and rituals that required quiet attentiveness. Juspa the Shamash of Worms acknowledged that he did so on weekdays.[[100]](#footnote-100) To halt the bytalks that were denounced as interrupting the mood of holiness and thus peccant,[[101]](#footnote-101) the shamash or cantor loudly proclaimed: שתיקה יפה בשעת התפילה (*Shetikah yafah bi-sheat ha-tefilah*; Hebrew: “Silence is nice during the time of prayer”). [[102]](#footnote-102) One may suppose, their call could have been accompanied with a gavel’s clap.

Since the idle conversations were nevertheless an unavoidable output of any public gathering, unremitting endeavor was demanded to prevent them. In addition to the vocal admonitions and fines occasionally imposing on talkers,[[103]](#footnote-103) the visual medium became involved to silence the congregation during the prayer. Rabbi Yair Hayim Bacharach of Worms (1639–1702), a contemporary and compatriot of Juspa the Shamash, accounted a widespread custom of writing on synagogue walls the large-size letters שיב״ה (Sh-Y-B-H), the acronym of “Silence is nice during the time of prayer” that composes the Hebrew word שיבה (*seyvah*: “gray hair” and “old age”).[[104]](#footnote-104) Unlike the halakhic legislators who rebuked the transgressors,[[105]](#footnote-105) the folk custom promised a reward of longevity to the observants. Bacharach objected to the abbreviated spelling of the phrase and, therefore, the mystical approach to the aural discipline in the synagogue. He advocated the most didactic full spelling of the command. The amuletic posters representing the phrase “Silence is nice during the time of prayer” as an acronym of “old age” are found in contemporary synagogues #, and the belief in thaumaturgic power of the pious silence persists until the present.[[106]](#footnote-106)

The display of edifying texts continued to be a typical instruction for the proper acoustic behavior in synagogues through the ages. In the synagogue of Wyszogród (built about 1800), Poland, the call for hush was obviously so essential that the carver of the Torah ark incised the phrase “Silence is nice during the time of prayer” in large letters across the ark’s façade #.

Along with the conventional modes of visual signs calling for silence in synagogues, the visual and textual admonitions displayed in synagogues are highly variable. In the Great Synagogue in Buhuși, Romania, a depiction of a paddling of ducks was copied from a postcard # onto the wall near the stairs leading to the women’s section #. The caption, שווייגטץ קא[ט]שקעס (Yiddish: “Shut up, she-ducks”), bolsters the derogatory character of the painting that addresses the woman as a flock of noisy fowl. In the synagogue that acted in Moscow under the Soviet regime, the bilingual Russian-Yiddish prohibition of profane talks was stylized as an administrative ruling rather than a halakhic prescription #. Preventing “any kind of conversations and discussions” other than prayer and avoiding the Hebrew, the synagogue board put at a distance the matters that could cause accusations in political disloyalty and Zionism.[[107]](#footnote-107) A request for muting the mobile phones in the synagogue was visualized shortly after the emergence of cellular communication #.[[108]](#footnote-108) With their different plastic rhetoric and verbality, the visual media offer a constant and apparent reminder of the moralistic appeal to the congregation.

## Conclusions: Estranging the Familiar

The premise that the ritual art is inarticulate if detached from its performative contexts justifies the remapping of a conventional art historical classification: instead of dealing with the separate categories of shamash mallets and gavels, Torah pointers, and synagogue boards, all these kinds can be understood in their relation to making or restricting ritualized sounds and voices.

Summarizing the evidence, we may date the beginning of transition from purely functional to artistically fashioned objects relating to ritual sounds and voices to the eve of the modern times. The hand-like Torah pointers emerged in the fifteenth century; the written calls for silence during the prayer have been displayed in synagogues since the seventeenth century; and the art of sculpted synagogue mallets evolved from the eighteenth to the early twentieth century. The homiletic message of zoomorphic and anthropomorphic mallets reverberates the didactic and symbolic nature of the picturesque synagogue murals, carved Torah arks, and lavishly decorated Jewish ritual objects produced in eastern and central Europe in the modern period.[[109]](#footnote-109)

The designed and inscribed objects translate the transient immaterial phenomena of ritual knocking, vocal announcement, and declaiming the sacred texts into perpetual and palpable visual signs. Having once been recorded on the implement or in the synagogue, the utterances and predicant commentaries and are continuously able to convey their command or lesson to everyone who cast an eye on them. The artwork on knockers, posters, and synagogue walls allegorizes and hyperbolizes the act of suppressing (e.g., a ball in a beast's mouth) or making noise (e.g., quaking ducks). Additionally, carved mallets can create the illusion of an extended or duplicated human limb. The complicated or enticing form "estranges" the object and prolongs and intensifies its perception.[[110]](#footnote-110) The effect of "estrangement" is to defamiliarize the routine ceremonial implements, thereby reinvigorating their perception and eliciting a fervent moral attitude and reverence for the recurring religious acts.
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